

THE GENERAL COUNCIL & STATE FACULTY OF
HOMŒOPATHIC MEDICINE, WEST BENGAL

1B, Old Post Office Street, Calcutta-1

NOTICE

Registered Homœopathic practitioners are hereby notified that the next T. C. Examination of the Council to confer the diploma of D.M.S. to the successful candidates will be held in the first week of December, 1951. Detailed informations regarding the said examination may be obtained from the Registrar by sending a 9 pies stamp to the above address.

Registrar.

THE MYSTERIUM OF PRESCRIBING

BY KARL KÖNIG, M.D.

In opening this lecture my I express my grateful thanks to the Faculty of Homœopathy for giving me again the opportunity of addressing the Faculty and for the permission to speak on the "Mysterium of Prescribing". This title has caused some of you to wonder what might be the content of my discourse. For many years I have occupied myself with the questions: What actually lies behind the mental process in man that, at times, enables us as physicians to find the true and proper remedy for some of our patients? How is it possible that by certain conscious and sub-conscious processes the proper remedy appears before our mental eye? What kind of inner answer can solve the complex question which a diseased person asks the doctor by way of the symptoms which he exhibits? For all the symptoms are to the doctor a question, and the remedy which he prescribes is the answer to this question. What, now, is really the mental process which makes it possible

for the physician to find the answer to this question which the symptoms ask?

I do not claim to be myself a homœopathic physician. In spite of this statement I have sometimes been able to find the proper remedy and to stand in wonder before the result and the achievement. These occasions give rise to the question: "What lies behind this *Mysterium of Prescribing*?" This is the problem with which I have been occupied for many years, and it is for the first time to-day that I dare to speak about this problem. Therefore, although I know that it will be a first attempt, I hope that, in spite of its incompleteness and deficiencies, it may be a first step in opening up the problem which in my opinion, has been rather neglected in medical literature. I am aware that the complexity of this question is so great that only in the course of years or centuries will the proper answer be found: therefore only the first step can now be attempted.

To begin with, I should like to describe the facts which lead us to arrive at a diagnosis. A good deal of literature exists in this field written by allopathic as well as homœopathic physicians; I shall first quote certain paragraphs from Dr. Ryle's book on *The Natural History of Disease* (Oxford University Press, 1936). In the chapter on "The Study of Symptoms", Ryle refers to the split within the whole field of medicine. There is on the one hand the way of scientific research; on the other hand the practical art of healing. Ryle now tries to discuss how it might be possible to bring the study of symptoms, which so far belongs to the subjective art of healing, into the objective field of scientific research. He writes: "It will, I think, be a very long time before symptoms can be studied experimentally on any considerable scale. Very few of them can be accurately reproduced. The majority of them as they occur in nature are transient. We have no practical method at present of measuring or photographing

subjective phenomena. They express the behaviour of disordered or diseased tissues." Please remember this very important statement! To the allopathic physician the symptoms express the behaviour of disordered or diseased tissues. Then Ryle continues: "Like the behaviour of plants and animals we are likely to learn more about them by constant and close observation, by careful recording, and by correlation of these observations with objective phenomena and existing physiological knowledge than by any other process of study."

In this book, which is so delightfully and earnestly written, Ryle continues his study of the nature of symptoms, and states: "Symptoms, as has been stated, express a disturbance of function. Although they are often caused by organic disease, they do not express the disease but the disturbance of function which the organic change produces. The same symptoms may thus be produced by functional error or structural flaw. While not specific for diseases, symptoms are nevertheless specific for functional errors, and these errors, for the most part, depend upon an exaggeration, a depression, or an inhibition of normal reflex phenomena. The dyspnoea of great effort in health is physiologically similar to the dyspnoea of small effort in heart disease. The angina of anxiety or tobacco excess or anæmia has the same physiological basis as the angina of coronary sclerosis, although none of its gravity. Gastric and intestinal pain, as severe as the pain of gastric ulcer or intestinal obstruction, may occur in the absence of gastric or intestinal disease."

Here in these words, the case is clearly stated. In studying symptoms and the complexity of their order, the allopathic physician thinks continuously of the disordered function and the disordered function leads him to a concept of what he describes by the word "disease".

The physician has then to ask himself what the symptoms mean in the whole household of nature, and Ryle

states: "The function of symptoms is presumably protective. Dyspnoea demands general rest for a local and general advantage. Pain in an injured limb compels local rest and so permits repair. The pain of angina pectoris demands instant immobility and so spares the heart in jeopardy from anoxaemia and acute muscle failure." Apart from these and many other examples, Ryle is, nevertheless, compelled to admit: "The protective significance of many other symptoms is obscure, but for the most part they are symptoms whose nature remains at present undetermined. In a more remote and less biological sense symptoms in man are protective in that they compel their victim to seek the advice and aid of others."

This kind of statement is scientifically untenable. It is the result of seeking for purposeful ideas behind natural phenomena. It is the same kind of thought which states that the good God has created the cork tree so that we are able to stopper our bottles of wine. Dr. Ryle is therefore quite unable to arrive at a proper answer to the question: "What is actually a symptom or a number of symptoms in a diseased person?"

If we now turn to the point of view of the homœopathic physician, we find in Kent's *Lectures on Homœopathic Philosophy* (Chicago, 1937) the following statement on the nature of symptoms: "Who is the sick man? The tissues could not become sick unless something prior to them had been deranged and so made them sick. What is there of this man that can be called the internal man? We say that man dies but he leaves his body behind. We dissect the body and find all of his organs. Everything that we know by the senses belongs to physical man, everything that we can feel with the fingers and see with the eyes he leaves behind. The real sick man is prior to the sick body and we must conclude that the sick man must be somewhere in the portion which is not left behind. That which is carried away is primary and that which is left behind is ultimate."

This statement is further substantiated when Kent continues: "We must, to be scientific homœopaths, recognize that the muscles, the nerves, the ligaments and other parts of man's frame are a picture, and manifest to the intelligent physician the internal man. Both the dead and the living body are to be considered, not from the body to the life, but from the life to the body."

Kent, in the following lectures, describes very clearly how symptoms are actually nothing else but the expression of what he calls "the internal man", the one who is not left behind when the physical body turns into a corpse. Only the living man can produce symptoms. This is a fundamentally new concept, and Kent states: "We study disease as a disorder of the human economy in the symptoms of the disease itself. We also study disease from the symptoms of medicines that have caused disorder in the economy. Indeed, we can study the nature and quality of disease as much by studying the *Materia Medica* as by studying symptoms of disease. . . . True knowledge consists of becoming acquainted with and understanding the nature and quality of a remedy."

Therefore, to the true homœopathic physician, the symptoms do not only suggest disease, they suggest the remedy itself, and from this fundamental principle springs the whole idea of the drug-picture.

There are two ways of looking at this single phenomenon, the phenomenon of the diseased person. If the allopathic physician examines a diseased person he can find exactly the same order of symptoms, being thorough and painstaking in his examination, as the homœopathic physician; but for the allopath, the various symptoms order themselves into a mental image which may fit into a picture of a known disease. For the homœopath, on the other hand, the order of the symptoms paints a mental picture which, to him, suggests a remedy. Therefore, when looking at a patient and his symptoms, two entirely different

images rise in the minds of the homœopathic and the allopathic physician. In the one, it is a disease, in the other a drug-picture which comes to the fore.

No doubt to the trained allopath, behind the diagnosis of disease, a certain medicine will be suggested, and to the homœopath, in the background of the drug-picture, a certain disease will occur. Nevertheless the main issue lies in the fact that a bundle of symptoms can be suggestive of two entirely different things: the disease or the drug-picture.

We now have to ask ourselves how it happened that these two different schools of medical approach to the patient, based on two such different points of view, have occurred in the development of the history of medicine. The homœopathic way arose some one hundred and fifty years ago and the allopathic some two thousand four hundred years ago. Let us make an excursion into the history of medicine.

Hippocrates, the great Greek physician who is called the Father of Medicine, lived from 460 to 377 B.C. in the island of Cos. If we ask ourselves from what source Hippocrates gained his tremendous knowledge we find that he was the son of another Hippocrates who also worked as a physician and that indeed there existed a whole family in which medical knowledge was handed down from generation to generation. All his forefathers, however, were physicians who had never spoken publicly of their medical knowledge. Hippocrates the Great was the first of them who dared to do so. I cannot withhold from you this statement: Hippocrates did not know more than his father and grandfather; he only made publicly known what he had learned. This is the reality behind the man Hippocrates. He lived in a time when medical knowledge was still cloaked in mystery for ordinary men. Before the age of Hippocrates, the mind of ordinary man was unable to grasp the knowledge which the family of the Hippocra-

teans held in their hands. The more the human mind developed from pictorial thinking to logical comprehension of ideas, the more all that was hidden knowledge was brought to the public notice. Hippocrates revealed a knowledge which, until his time, was hidden in the depths of the mystery temples.

At the same time Plato was forced to take a similar step, and his pupil Aristotle, out of his knowledge, created the laws of logical thinking. These three great men committed treason for the good of mankind. They gave away the secrets of the mysteries into which they were initiated.

Hippocrates emerged out of the temples and brought with him the secrets into which his forefathers were initiated. Hippocrates threw this mysterious cloak away, stepped out from the shadow of the temples and took with him a certain number of remedies which he knew he could use and which, until then, were known only to the initiated physician. With this handful of remedies and with a completely different and new approach to the diseased person, describing the difference between organic and epidemic diseases, and the way in which to detect symptoms, he opened the doors of medical knowledge to mankind.

If we now ask ourselves what was the content of all that was hidden within the mysteries and which Hippocrates tried to reveal in parts, we should not look for something mysterious. For Hippocrates, although he opened the doors to the mystery-knowledge, did not give away the magic source of its content. And the main content of the mystery-knowledge of olden times, in the sphere of the temple medicine, was nothing other than what we know to-day as the various drug-pictures of our homœopathic remedies. These drug-pictures were taught in the temples to those who were chosen to become physicians. This teaching was done in a different way. It was done in such a way that the imaginative powers of thinking were used and the drug-pictures then were real pictorial

images. These images were not permitted to be disclosed to the uninitiated. But the true initiates among the ancient physicians knew in a different way the same truth which we know to-day: that the same remedy which can heal, is also able to create disease. Therefore these remedies are, if known, a potential danger in the hands of men, and for this reason only those who were willing to heal and who had purified themselves to a certain extent, and of whom no misuse of knowledge was to be expected, were initiated into the mysteries of the temples.

Through Hippocrates who stepped out of the mysteries and closed the gate of the temple behind him, the pictorial images of the drug-pictures were lost to mankind. Man was no longer able to see the true picture of *Apis*, *Belladonna*, *Calcarea carbonica* or any other of the great remedies.

The trend of medical thinking had to move forward in a different direction. The physician had the task of gradually learning to study the symptoms in relation to the disease and not to the remedy, and more and more the body itself became the central subject of study in the realm of medicine. Hippocrates turned the eye of the physician from the remedy to the human body and all the surrounding forces which influence it.

Most of the physicians followed the teachings of Hippocrates, and only in a few remaining mystery temples were the old methods still carried on.

Parts of one of these mystery places are still preserved. In Epidauros we can see a huge amphitheatre, and among the ruins of the different temples and treasure-houses there exists a strange structure; beneath the earth a kind of spiral is built of stone, and from the inscriptions found in the temple of Epidauros it is known that the patient was led to this spiral in the evening and put to sleep there. During the night he dreamed of the god Asklepios, who appeared to him and held in his hand a plant or substance which, upon waking, the patient could remember. This

plant or substance was subsequently used as his remedy. This type of instruction by way of dreams happened many times in the mysteries, and brought healing to thousands of people. It was in Epidauros that the patient himself, and not the physician, experienced in a supernatural way his own particular remedy.

This way of finding the right and proper remedy was gradually lost to mankind from the time of Hippocrates. In Hahnemann, for the first time after two millenia, the foundation of a new medicine was again created. It was Hahnemann who resumed the search for the proper drug-pictures, but now in a new and scientific way. In the time between Hippocrates and Hahnemann, the history of medicine followed a special direction. It was its task to discover the nature of disease and not the nature of the remedy. Only odd people, old shepherds and old women of the countryside, had some insight into the healing powers of certain remedies. In the herbal remedies of the Middle Ages this remedial knowledge was preserved, but it was a traditional wisdom, not a scientific one. It was handed down like the old mystery knowledge from father to son and lived within the blood and hereditary forces of some families.

Hahnemann, in a precise and scientific way, had the great intuition to collect symptoms, not relating them to the disease but to the remedy. This was a tremendous step forward in the development of medicine. For it was Hahnemann who again opened the doors of the mysteries which had been closed since the time of Hippocrates.

The history of medicine has two great pillars, the two great "H's", Hippocrates and Hahnemann, the one who lived in Cos and the other who worked in Köthen; and we may rightly say that between Cos and Köthen the diagnosis of disease was the main element of medical knowledge. Before Cos and after Köthen, the diagnosis of the remedy was and will be the central theme of medicine.

(To be continued)

THE MYSTERIUM OF PRESCRIBING

BY KARL KÖNIG, M.D.

(continued from page 314)

Up to the time of Hahnemann, the Hippocratic tradition lived on in medical knowledge. In his book on pathology, the great scientist Rokitansky of the Vienna School of Medicine still adhered to the four humours, the blood, the phlegm, the black and the yellow bile. His book was written at the beginning of the last century. After this time, with the dawn of modern medicine, the Hippocratic ideas disappear. Medicine changed from the art of finding the disease into a mixture of science and traditional rules of attending a patient. Apart from the pupils of Hahnemann, medicine has gone into the realm of science and disregarded the sick person. When Hippocratic ideas came to an end the new Hahnemannian way of healing started. What to-day is considered as medicine in the medical schools has in reality nothing to do with medicine, but is biology, pathology and various other departments of scientific research which, instead of serving the physician's work, have attained to a point where they dominate him.

I have now tried to show these two ways of medicine. The search for the remedy and the search for the disease have their historical time. Both draw their knowledge from the study of symptomatology. Symptoms in themselves, as we can read in Kent, are the reaction of the living man, not of his bodily tissues. How is it then possible that the same symptoms can evoke in one physician the picture of the remedy and in the other the picture of the disease?

We all know the experience that sometimes, when seeing a patient, suddenly we know, in an instant, the right remedy. We are struck by the image of *Drosera* or *Antimony*. We are convinced that this is the right drug and

that it will fit the patient as a key fits into its lock. How does this come about? It is not a matter of combined thought and impressions of outer symptoms, it is a sudden and immediate knowledge.

Would this be possible were it not that every man, in the deeper layers of his existence, in the wide realm of the unconscious, carried all the drug-pictures in him? Can one not imagine that all the various drug-pictures live in the deeper stratas of man as potential powers, that we carry within us a complexity of forces, which are *Belladonna*, *Hyoscyamus*, *Calcarea carbonica*, *Sepia* and *Apis*, etc.? In the patient these potential forces of the inner man create the symptoms. In the physician the same complexity of forces gives rise to the image of the drug-picture.

Suppose that *Belladonna* rises out of the deeper layers of man to the surface, then these *Belladonna* forces create a complexity of symptoms which can appear, according to the patient's condition, at one time as pneumonia, at another time as an inflammation of the eye, as a sudden rise in temperature only or as a fully developed scarlet fever. If a physician with proper insight observes these symptoms, he will always recognize the same or a similar underlying combination of forces—the *Belladonna* type of symptoms—and immediately he will name the proper remedy.

Let us imagine that each one of our remedies is a melody; the symptoms which they produce are the score which they inscribe in the book of the body. If the physician is able to read the score, i.e. the symptoms, he will then discover the remedy, the right melody. Our *Materia Medica* is nothing but a collection of scores which we learn to read so that we may discern the right melody.

Outside in the world, there is the source of the melody: the plant *Belladonna*, the substance *Calcarea*, the metal *Argentum*, the bee for *Apis*. And now we discover that this melody, always the same in itself, has three different forms of appearance: the melody sounds in undisturbed

and unmodified simplicity when outside in the world. It then appears as the plant, *Atropa belladonna*. Within the deeper layers of man the same melody is potentially existent and, when rising up to the surface, appears in many variations. These are the symptoms. All the variations are written down in our *Materia Medica* and the physician has the task of discerning the variations, the simple undistorted melody. This is the *Mysterium of Prescribing*. But we will only be able to find the simple undistorted melody when, apart from studying it in its variations in the *Materia Medica*, we make a proper study of the pure melody in nature. We have a task before us to study *Apis* and *Belladonna*, *Sepia* and *Sulphur*, *Gelsemium* and *Bufo*, in their purity, as they appear in the world around us. This is the way of the true physician and *Paracelsus* expressed it when he said: "The physician must go through the examination of Nature."

If *Homœopathy* of to-day would start to work on this conception, I am convinced that it would be following the right path of development. The *homœopathic Materia Medica* is, to-day, very far from being comprehensible. To study it means a tremendous amount of work, of memorizing, of continuous exercising and training. In spite of this we often fail to find the right remedy. The reason is the almost complete neglect of the study of the pure "melody", the substance as it appears in nature. Only this study, "the examination of Nature", will add to the variations of the *Materia Medica*, the true melody, the archetypal picture of each remedy.

If, for instance, we start to study *Apis*, then we should not only learn the drug-picture as we find it in the *Materia Medica*, but we should also try to study as intensively as possible the life of the bee and the beehive. The bees are insects and throughout the insect world there is one special instinct and underlying force of development and life; all insects are obsessed by their striving to reach the light. Every insect develops towards the light. Their

eggs are laid in a dark place, for example in the bark of a tree, in a hole dug in the earth, in a specially folded leaf. Out of this egg the caterpillar or a further stage develops, and at last the imago unfolds to live for a few hours or days in the radiant light of the summer. The drive of insects to seek a light during the night, the nuptial flight of the queen bee, the playing of the butterflies in the light of the sun, are all founded on the same instinct and desire. This instinct also underlies the life of all bees, especially the workers. The workers among the bees are those which possess the special *Apis* poison, and it is this substance which keeps them to their task. This substance clouds the desire for the light and makes the worker bee return to the hive. Let us imagine this strong desire to reach the light and the poison *Apis* which counteracts this desire by its magic power, then many symptoms of the drug-picture of *Apis* will appear to us in a new light.

We may, for instance, remember the case which Dr. Tyler describes at the opening of her delightful account of *Apis*: a boy suffering from severe dropsy (ascites and hydrothorax). For many months this child was severely ill until an Indian woman suggested to the family the use of a bee. In a few weeks this child was cured; and Kent writes: "It is queer how old women knew, long before *Apis* was proved, that when the little new-born baby did not pass water they could find a cure by going out to the beehive and catching a few bees over which they poured hot water and of which they gave the baby a teaspoonful". This all points, as we know, to the strong relation of *Apis* to the function of the kidneys. The kidneys regulate the whole of the water metabolism in the body and they work to prevent our bodies from becoming too moist and watery. They dehydrate continuously the rising waters in the body, and if they fail to function, the body is drowned from within.

These kidneys in us are filled with the same drive to the light which is inherent in all the insects. Therefore,

they have an intimate relation to our eyes and every disease of the retina. Infact, the eyes and kidneys can more and more be seen as two closely related organs. I would not hesitate to call the kidneys the eyes of our abdominal parts. If they fail to work, then this drive toward the light which is able to keep the rising waters of the body in check, is unable to act. Dropsy develops, in the eyes, in the skin, in the throat (diphtheria), actually on any of the serous membranes. The *Apis* patient is irritable and he is worse from heat. His skin is dry and hot and he develops high temperatures without thirst.

May we not feel in all these symptoms the hot summer days with the flying bees busily gathering the pollen and nectar and bringing it back to the hive? The *Apis* poison keeps the bees down to the ground and creates a balance between light and darkness. In our *Apis* patients this balance is broken, and therefore the waters rise and overwhelm the drive to the light.

By such an approach to the archetypal image of a remedy, studying its melody in nature and then returning to its variations in the *Materia Medica*, we can achieve a new but living understanding for the word "cure" in Homœopathy. In similar ways, we should have to study plants and minerals, but the time is now too short to go into further details. This way of approach, however, of learning through the "examination of Nature", the true melody of our remedies is a necessity which we cannot forego. Only then will the true "Mysterium of Prescribing" gradually turn in us into a conscious act of healing.

Let us return to Hahnemann. He was born in 1755 and died in 1843. This makes him a contemporary of Goethe who lived from 1749 to 1832. This man Goethe, the greatest German poet, was also a great scientist. He started a new way of studying Nature, a way which is now-a-days more and more recognized. It was for the "true melody" in Nature that Goethe was searching and he conceived the idea of the archetypal plant. What Hahnemann did for

the study of symptoms, for the finding of the new *Materia Medica*, Goethe did for the realm of Nature. If homœopathic physicians would become earnest pupils of the Goethean way of nature study, then we should be able, in true Hahnemannian spirit, to celebrate this great physician's bicentenary in a few years' time. This path of approach was indicated by Rudolf Steiner, who fulfilled what Goethe had begun.

We must learn to understand that drug pictures are not fleeting ideas and chance combinations, but that they are living entities, living forces melodies which the physician can discern, which the patient can experience as his symptoms and which appear in their true form and melody around us in Nature. If this is gradually understood, then the doors of the temples which Hippocrates closed behind him will be reopened and medicine will again turn into a true Art of Healing.

DISCUSSION

Dr. JOHN PATERSON said that he was sure the members would sympathize with him in being called upon at such short notice to open a discussion or to make comments on this paper. He had had the opportunity on more than one occasion of listening to Dr. König, and on each he had been set thinking and, while it was a task to comment on this paper, he would be pleased to make some attempt to fulfil it because Dr. König had brought him great comfort in his exposition on the origin and importance of drug pictures.

Some members were aware that he had occasion to address medical students on Homœopathy and in going over his experiences he came to the conclusion that the only way in which he could present Homœopathy to students was to separate the word into two components, that is, "*homo*" and "*pathos*", *homo* in reference to drugs and *pathos* in reference to disease. He put before the students that their study of *Materia Medica* in the orthodox school was very limited, but in the homœopathic *Materia*

Medica there was a vast amount of knowledge. In other words, it was possible for the modern student to get drug pictures, and *Belladonna* mentioned by Dr. König was one of the examples which he used. He considered that it was the duty of the physician first of all to study drug pictures, that is, to get a picture of a drug as a living entity. Every drug had mental symptoms and pathological symptoms, and one must see the drug as a totality ; and the same with disease or rather with the sick person. It was possible for the student in the orthodox school of medicine to study the disease picture, that is, to note all the symptoms which were brought forth.

For instance, the orthodox school made a diagnosis of pneumonia but the homœopathic physician must do something more : he must take the reaction of the individual to the disease so that he got the type of reaction of the patient, and it was only when one had these two things, the picture of the drug and the picture of the disease, that it was possible to begin treating the patient.

It was of tremendous interest to hear the story of Hippocrates and it was with pleasure that he noted Professor Cawadias in the meeting, as he hoped he might have something to say on this particular subject. On the question of the physician and what he would call intuition, those who had been in practice for some time, particularly in homœopathic practice, would grant Dr. König his point that if the physician was spiritually-minded and anxious to cure the disease he very often got a picture of the remedy required by a patient. In other words, it looked as if one did have within oneself some knowledge which, if it got the opportunity, came out. Sometimes a patient came to see him and he chose a remedy, and yet at that particular moment he could not give the reason nor say exactly why he had chosen the drug. It was just that he had sensed the patient's drug picture and in some way arrived at a conclusion. It was difficult to explain, but physicians who

had been in practice for any length of time would bear him out on that particular point.

He was very interested in scientific research. The Faculty Research Committee meeting that afternoon had been considering again the question of the proving of drugs. He was glad that Dr. König had made the point that in the old temples of mystery there were drug pictures, and it was Hippocrates who gave away the secret. In his address Dr. König had given the Faculty a strong lead to go forward with drug provings.

Dr. König said that symptoms were the expression of the living man and the sick man was prior to the sick body. That was the philosophy of Hahnemann and of Kent, and they must as physicians take that into consideration. He would give one practical illustration which came to his mind. At the present moment a good deal of discussion was taking place on the cause of duodenal ulcer. Many cases came to one with the symptom picture of duodenal ulcer, yet when they had been examined no physical signs could be found, and X-ray examination was also negative. There was nothing organically significant, but the patient complained of pain and the other symptoms which one found in duodenal ulcer. These people were mentally sick and the actual primary factor was not a physical effect in the duodenum but a psychological one existing in the unconscious mind. This was one of the things which one met in general practice.

He was very grateful to Dr. König for his paper, and looked forward to seeing it in print and having more time to digest it.

Dr. CAWADIAS said that he was very touched by the reference Dr. König made to Epidaurus, as it was his father who discovered Epidaurus, and Dr. Cawadias himself had spent in his childhood many summers in this wonderful ancient health centre, the city of Asklepios, the God of Medicine. The relation between religious healing and scientific medicine in an ancient Greece is imperfectly

understood because for that one has to go deep into Greek psychology. The Greeks created medicine as a science, in other words they introduced the conception of disease as due to natural factors, and thus of treatment as based on natural agents. They were, however, conscious of the influence of mind over body and for this reason did not neglect religious psychotherapy, that is, of therapy based on the faith of the patient to divine intervention. Epidaurus, the great sanctuary of Asklepios, the God of Medicine, was a great centre of such religious psychotherapy, and its reconstruction by Professor P. Cawadias, who collected all the dispersed ruins, is a marvel of reconstruction of an ancient city with its own material. Patients arrived in this beautiful place situated in the centre of Argolis. They lodged in the beautiful Xenon (a fine hotel). They loitered in well planted alleys where they listened to philosophers and poets. We see in, these alleys, seats in marble arranged around a large seat for the philosopher teacher. These patients were also hearing beautiful plays in the magnificent theatre of Polycleto, the masterpiece of Hellenic theatrical architecture; they were witnessing musical contests in the Odeon; gymnastic contests in the Stadium. They were reading of the great cures effected by the god, cures whose details were engraved in some special columns in the park. They were talking with each other about the power of the god. And when they were thus prepared they were directed to sleep in the Abaton, and interviewed by the priests before going to sleep. (How these old Greeks knew of the influence on the subconscious!) The god appeared to them in their dream and they were awakened cured. It was the old Lourdes.

Although children of the earth, the ancient Greeks knew of the spiritual element in man, and their scientific physicians, even in the days of Galen, respected the religious cures of Asklepios.

Dr. TWENTYMAN said that it was by no means easy to speak at all after Dr. König's paper and after such an expert

as Professor CAWADIAS. He did not know whether everyone else had the experience that when the question of ancient Greece came up, untold and complicated ideas always came up with it. By no means was there only one view of what went on in ancient Greece, there were many different views, and he could not help reminding Professor Cawadias that his friend Mr. Rodocanachi in his book *Athens and the Greek Miracle*, put a different emphasis on the importance of the mysteries in the civic life of ancient Greece. Mr. Rodocanachi held that the whole of life was profoundly influenced by the ancient mystery schools and temples.

He remembered when he was visiting Karnak seeing the Egyptian temples which were heavy and massive, and every now and again one came across a Greek or Roman column and felt that one could breathe again. One must sympathize with what Professor Cawadias said about the sunshine in Greece. Nietzsche, who took up the question of whether the Greek idea was comprehended in youthful springlike joy, pointed out that there was a conflict in the Greek heart, terror and fear as well as joy in the beautiful. He was not saying this to enter into controversy, but because he thought in approaching these things one needed to see the two streams which were working even at that time, and perhaps something of this sort had come very much to the forefront to-day.

A great deal had been said about dreams and the temple healing ; it seemed to him that it was a most helpful interpretation to suggest that in these last 150 years Hahnemann had done something to break open and go back into a more ancient and more total realm of healing than we had had in the previous 2,000 years. Also in our own time in a somewhat perverted and distorted way there had come about through modern psychology something which had broken back into that same realm. This idea that the god appeared and gave one a dream showing in symbolic form what was necessary for the patient's healing was familiar

in psychotherapy, and it seemed to him that in addition to the study which Dr. König had suggested, it would help to vitalize the whole art of healing to-day if one could integrate that which had come to light in modern psychology with what had come to light through Hahnemann's work.

There were one or two other things which he wanted to add, because when one listened to such a statement as this of Dr. König there was a great danger that one would think it was too difficult. It was nice to have a simple principle which was easily comprehended and understood and to say that one would not be bothered to understand anything else, but when one heard that to understand properly what one did, one had to understand the whole natural history of the drugs which one used, one's instinct was to say "This is too much!"

In addition to Goethe there lived at the time of Hahnemann another contemporary who also had been forgotten, misinterpreted and misunderstood, Lorenz Oken. There were points in which he was superior to Goethe and *vice versa*, but there was one point which merited the most earnest consideration and which could form the basis of a whole deepening of therapeutic thought, and that was Oken's view that the whole animal kingdom was the equivalent of man, that what occurred outside in the animal kingdom occurred inside us, in our organs and functions. Man was synthesis, the animals represented analysis. Oken said that what occurred in nature as physiology occurred in man as pathology, that is to say, that the diseases of man occurred in natural history outside man as the physiology of some animal. He believed that if one was to follow up that thread one would get the possibility of a pathology and nosology which would be in accordance with the true realities of nature and not in accordance with some arbitrary scholastic ideas.

Another idea which Oken contributed was that one should be able to find the correspondence from one kingdom to another, from the disease in man, to the animal which

represented that disease, to the vegetable which was its correspondent.

In their own day there was a great scientist and biologist Jaworsky, who had the idea that animals and the organs of man were related, and he had used this correlation of functions of man and nature to produce remedies which had been helpful where everything else had failed. Oken's work was in the language of 150 years ago as, of course, was Hahnemann's, and it was difficult for a modern mind to grapple with it, but Jaworsky was modern and his writings could be easily read. He had made direct observation of the habits of an animal in nature and of the functions of an organ inside man, and he had shown that they were the same, the one inside and the one outside.

These were some of the suggestions which he wanted to bring forward, because he felt that unless one built some mental limbs to grapple with it, Dr. König's philosophy could sometimes be a very severe shock. One needed some support to help in digesting and absorbing what he said. What one had also to do was to assimilate, digest and give real internal form and order to the paraphernalia of the *Materia Medica*, and such a statement and proposals as Dr. König had put carried with them the possibility of constructing not a mere assemblage of items but a living internal order in the *Materia Medica*, so that these drug pictures and patients could become vitally alive in one's experience.

He was delighted that Dr. König should have given this lecture and he was very grateful to him for the immense effort of imagination and thought which he had put into it.

Dr. LEDERMANN drew attention to the thirteenth paragraph of the first edition of Hahnemann's *Organon*. In this Hahnemann points out that "research into the secrets of Nature" led to "fruitless hypotheses". Dr. Ledermann had always understood that Homœopathy was based on this interpretation of Nature. It implies that we are dealing with phenomena only in Homœopathy, found in the phenomena of disease and drug pictures.

Dr. König had made an entirely different suggestion, different from what he had always thought of as Hahnemannian medicine. He had said that they should go *behind* the phenomena to read nature as it used to be read in the way of a signature of the universe. The forms of Plato were the eternal forms, manifest in different phenomena. Dr. König had invited them to go back to the mystery approach and not to follow the scientific approach. If they did so, they should consider what they were leaving behind. He could not agree with Dr. Twentyman that the structure of science was arbitrary, it was not: science was systematized knowledge, and in its systematization and classification lay its justification, the science of orthodox medicine diagnosed disease, and the science of Homœopathy, drug pictures. He thought they must be clear that there was justification for the modest, admittedly fragmentary scientific approach: they had to understand that different scientific classifications were possible and how they stood towards each other. Science would never arrive at this vision of something behind phenomena. When one tried to have such a vision, one had to admit that one had lost touch with the rest of science. Although one might have the vision, others would not be convinced because they had not been initiated into the mystery.

That was the danger if Homœopathy associated itself with Steiner medicine. That was the issue for Homœopathy, and he thought it was an important issue, one they had to be clear about.

Dr. LEES said that he commenced medicine as an allopath and was very soon dissatisfied with what he was able to accomplish. He came in touch with Homœopathy and practised it for a number of years, and still he was dissatisfied because it seemed to him that there was such a gulf between the drug picture and the patient, the drug picture and the remedy. He always wanted to find out whether there was a connection between this illness, this group of symptoms, and those which produced the drug

picture, and he was quite unable to find it. To him it was something lacking in the drug picture that so much of it was the subjective symptoms of the patient because it took more than the patient's interpretation of the illness. It seemed to him that homœopaths placed a tremendous stress on the subjective symptoms and although there was something in oneself which helped one to arrive at the selection of the remedy, nevertheless there was something lacking.

In the homœopathic *Materia Medica* there was no description of the remedies, the name was given but which part of the world they came from, the plant, the habitat, the conditions under which it grew, were not mentioned at all. Clark had still some faint memory of the ancients when he mentioned the signature of a plant, and the speaker thought in that respect that present-day physicians had fallen away from something which ancient medicine had: there was something which they required to find again. Dr. Paterson mentioned that sometimes within him there arose the thought, "This is the remedy", if he was asked why he had given it he could not have said, and the speaker could understand that very well. Sometimes he saw a patient and up came the remedy, wherefrom he could not tell, but he knew within himself that this was the remedy and again and again it worked.

Dr. König had brought them in his excellent history of Homœopathy to what was historical but not ancient when he mentioned Goethe and Hahnemann: they were contemporaries, Goethe in science and Hahnemann in medicine. For him personally something else arose, because he did not think it was enough to go back to ancient times; the mind did not stand still, it went forward to the future; they could not base any practice on the past, it must be carried into the future. Hahnemann planted a seed, the plant of which was growing, but it was a struggling plant.

Unfortunately he lived at a great distance and could not often get to the meetings, but he read in the discussions so often the problem of how Homœopathy could attract

young doctors, how it could attract the medical profession, Hahnemann and Goethe had united the two. He had the great good fortune to meet Dr. König some years ago. As a pupil of Dr. König he could only say to the Faculty that life took on a new meaning altogether, instead of being a mere existence it took on a life and a joy, medicine became something living and worth while. He would have the temerity to suggest, if he might, that if there were any who wished to see this new way of correlating the patient and the remedy Dr. König would be very willing to help. He knew from personal experience that it was a joy in medicine and became something which was really worth while.

He would like to thank Dr. König very much; he was responsible for introducing him to the Faculty three and a half years ago; he was very anxious how he would be received, and he was very glad that he had been so accepted.

Dr. König, in reply, said that he was very grateful for the kindly treatment he had received in the discussion, although he felt he had given a certain shock to many members. There were many points to reply to, but as time was getting on he would only refer to a few where probably his expositions were not clear. He was surprised to hear that Dr. Cawadias was born in the same year in which Epidauros was re-discovered. He was under the impression that Epidauros was one of the great mystery temples; it carried on into the Roman period when all the other mysteries were more or less forgotten. He did not think it was only a kind of priestly cleverness to suggest to the patients certain remedies. The god Asklepios was a reality. He was the mental image related to a living entity and he appeared to the patients and gave to them, as a god, the right inspiration of their remedy. He agreed with Dr. Cawadias's description of Greece; the Greek would rather be a beggar on earth than a king in the world of shadows.

He was very grateful to Dr. Twentyman for his reference to Lorenz Oken and his conception of the animal and

plant kingdom. There were exactly the same seeds for the natural science of to-day of which Dr. Lees spoke when he said Hahnemann had planted a seed for medicine.

He felt he must answer Dr. Ledermann when he said there were two issues : either to go into the realm of occult science or to remain in the world of science. This was a wrong interpretation of what he tried to explain. Occult science is not occult any more. It was the great issue of our times that occult science through the work of Rudolf Steiner had become known to everybody. There were no mysteries which could not be approached by everybody, and every human being has in himself the faculties which explained, if he was told clearly enough, the mysteries and the secrets of the universe. Rudolf Steiner would never lecture on medical questions to any but graduates of medicine because he knew that scientific knowledge was a necessary foundation. Without it one was unable to pursue again the path towards a better knowledge ; in exactly the same way the homœopathic physician had to be conversant with the science of the day. It was necessary to possess scientific knowledge and to take in everything that science had discovered during the last four hundred or five hundred years which then had to be correlated, not by intuition but by listening and observing in such a way that not mere theories but direct insight resulted. Thus the questions are answered. Reading scientific books and studying the tremendous amount of collected facts, one got the impression that thoughts were paralysed and we had not the courage to make the limbs of our thoughts move again. Once upon a time the ancients had a grand mythology ; this had to be lost, and it would be quite wrong to return to this mythology. We had to take all that had been achieved during the last five hundred years in science and enliven it, not by intuition, but by a clear vision, and in this way the facts themselves would speak if one is humble enough to listen to the voice of nature.

—*The British Homœopathic Journal, January, 1951*