

cine. One may require *Sulphur*, another *Syphilinum*, a third *Mercurius*, and so forth. We can not generalise—much less in the way of Dr. Koppikar—on the data of all the 400 millions of Chinese nationals that all human beings are flat-nosed. Homœopathy is a science of discrimination and careful individualisation, and not of sweeping generalisations, I repeat.

Any way, we must think and think anew to prove or disprove a theory, or discover a new, in our eternal search for Truth; else we are not human beings. I can not close this subject without sincere thanks to Dr. Koppikar, who is after all a brother physician and a brother country-man of mine, and who has striven hard to build a new theory of his own, be it building in the air or on a solid foundation.

—*The Homœopathic Recorder*, June, 1949

---

### SAMUEL HAHNEMANN

*In commemoration of the bicentenary of his birth,  
April 10, 1755*

DR. KARL KÖNIG, M.D. (VIENNA)

In the usual books on the history of medicine, Hahnemann has either no place or a very obsolete one. He is generally mentioned in connection with John Brown, Ernst Stahl, Franz Anton Mesmer and Friedrich Hoffmann. Each of them had a special theory upon which their diagnosis and treatment were based, and Hahnemann is still regarded as one of those theorists and extremists.

Guthrie writes: "Samuel Hahnemann was the originator of homœopathy, a system of medical treatment which is usually associated in our minds with the use of drugs in infinitesimal doses. The chief principle of

nomœopathy, however, lies not in the absurdly small dose but in the selection of the drug."

Castiglioni describes Hahnemann's work in a very short and wrongly placed paragraph, introducing it in the following way: "According to Hahnemann, drugs were thought to act by modifying the vital force, so as to cause the disappearance of symptoms by increasing the energy of the vital force." The translator adds the following remark: "Here, too, as in the case of mesmerism, an irregular system based on false, even absurd, principles had an unwarranted vogue, yet contained a germ of truth that had a beneficial influence on the main current of medical treatment."

These two instances characterise very typically the general ignorance of Hahnemann which prevails among the medical profession of to-day. Hardly anyone had found it necessary to read his books, but condemns him without any knowledge of the man and his work.

There is no need to be a homœopathic physician in order to pay justified homage to his great scientific achievements. To find his rightful place in the history of medicine will be the task of the following essay.

#### *HIS LIFE AND PERSONALITY.*

##### *An Independent Mind.*

Hahnemann was born on April 10, 1755, at Meissen in Saxony. He was the son of an artisan, a porcelain-painter. His childhood was spent in humble circumstances, and the only way he could attend the Meissen high school was by becoming a servant in the house of one of the masters.

At the age of 20 he moved to Leipzig and started studying medicine at the university there, earning his living by translating English books into German. In order to gain more practical experience in the field of medicine he went for a few months to Vienna; from there he went to Hermannstadt in Hungary as the librarian of a noble-

man, and then returned to Leipzig. For years on end he remained a wanderer, restlessly moving from one place to another. Everywhere he started to heal his patients, came into conflict with the resident physicians, moved away and started anew. He was deeply dissatisfied with the current ways of pathology and therapy, and did not hesitate to express his opinion quite openly and rather sharply in word and writings.

His first papers and books reveal an independent mind. He is up in arms against all the theoretical nonsense of his time and accuses his fellow-physicians of their inability to help and to heal. During this time, the years between 1780 and 1790, he gradually realises that he himself is equally unable to do so; therefore he is honest and stern enough to give up his practice and to continue his theoretical studies. He is especially interested in all the new chemical discoveries, following closely the ideas and experiments of Lavoisier and others. He experiments a great deal himself and finds a new preparation of mercury for use in medicine.

At this time he earns his living for his ever-growing family by translating English and French medical books, but he is by no means a mere translator. He annotates and criticises the text with many remarks, and points out the mistakes of his authors very sharply. In the course of this work he has to translate Cullen's "Materia Medica". Cullen, who can be regarded as the founder of the Glasgow School of Medicine, was a very renowned physician of his time; he died in 1790, and in the same year Hahnemann worked at the translation.

*Dawn of 'Rational Art of Healing'.*

Cullen describes in his book the qualities of Peruvian bark (quinine) as a remedy, but Hahnemann is full of doubts about Cullen's statements. He takes quinine himself to prove Cullen's mistakes, and now experiences the dawn of his "Rational Art of Healing". Quinine gives him a feeling of fever and other symptoms, for which the subs-

tance is supposed to be the remedy. With this experience he has discovered the key which will gradually unlock for him the gate into a new land of healing.

From now onwards he develops this new seed in every possible direction, proving the influence of several medicinal plants on himself and his children. In 1796 he is able to formulate his findings in a paper, '*Versuch über ein neues Prinzip zur Auffindung der Heilkräfte der Arzneisubstanzen*' which is published in "Hufeland's Journal," one of the leading medical journals of the time. In English the title reads, "An Attempt concerning a new Principle for Discovering the Healing Forces in Remedies". The main sentence in this article is thus formulated: "For the disease which is to be healed we might use the one remedy which is able to provoke another, fairly similar, artificial disease, and the former one will be healed: *Similia Similibus*."

The key for finding the rational remedy is now forged, and Hahnemann is going to use it in the years to come. He gives up his work as a translator and again becomes a physician. With unfailing diligence he proves remedies on himself, his children and his pupils, noting down with minute exactitude, all the symptoms. His work embodies a tremendous accumulation of experience.

In 1810 the first edition of his main book appears: "Organon of the Rational Knowledge of Healing". The title of the second edition is changed into: "Organon of the Art of Healing" and its motto is: *Aude sapere* "Be courageous enough to become wise".

Hahnemann is now 55 years of age and has revolutionised contemporary ideas within the medical field. The "Organon" gradually becomes the true gospel of his followers, but his enemies are stronger than ever before. He again moves from place to place, together with his wife and their nine children.

*Physician of Wide Fame.*

In 1821 he finds refuge in Cöthen, a small town

between Leipzig and Magdeburg. Hahnemann is now an old man. He is a physician of wide fame, and the sick come from all over Europe to seek his advice. His experiences are laid down in the many volumes of his "Materia Medica Pura", and he writes another book on "Chronic Diseases", of which the first three volumes appear in 1828. In this work Hahnemann describes his most fundamental ideas, but he knows that only few, even among his pupils, will be able to understand him.

In 1830 his wife Henriette dies, and his neighbours are now expecting his death also. He never leaves his house, sees fewer patients and works less and less. He becomes quarrelsome and forgetful, tyrannical and impatient; until suddenly the "Homœopathic Journal" prints a notice which astonishes the medical world. In the number for July 13, 1835, there appears: "Dr. S. Hahnemann left for Paris on June 14".

He went to Paris with his young wife, whom he had married in January of the same year. A second youth began for the aged physician. Hardly any other famous person has been granted such a happy second lease of life. For eight more years Hahnemann lived and worked as a famous physician in Paris, in complete harmony with his young wife. He died on July 2, 1843. A Scotsman who met him during the last year of his wife, described him thus: "His face had a luminous expression. He made, I may say, the impression of a heavenly being, for there was something divine in his appearance."

#### *HIS TIME AND HIS CONTEMPORARIES.*

##### *New Age of Materialism.*

The span of Hahnemann's life begins in the middle of the 18th century and reaches almost into the middle of the 19th. This period was of the utmost importance for the development of human thought. It saw the coming of the French revolution and the rise and decline of Napoleon. Hahnemann was a contemporary of Goethe and of the

three great German philosophers Fichte, Schelling and Hegel. Kant was born only 13 years before him and Voltaire died when Hahnemann was 22 years of age. Charles Darwin was in his thirties when Hahnemann died, and Pasteur had already started to work.

Hahnemann could have read the "Handbook of Physiology" of the great Johannes Müller, for it appeared before the year 1840, thus starting the new scientific way of investigation. During the same period the Germans Schwann and Schleiden discovered the cell, describing it as the simple building-stone of every living creature. In 1842 J. R. Meyer announced the equivalence of heat and work, and with all these and many more important discoveries the new age of materialism in science began.

Hahnemann was born into the time of the French movement of Enlightenment. All his life he remained a rationalist, and ordinary religion was very far from him. He never attended a church; but from his 22nd year onwards, throughout his life, he was a faithful member of the Masonic Order.

Between the rationalistic period of the 18th century and the beginning of scientific materialism during the third decade of the 19th century, there intervenes a most dramatic period in the development of human thinking. This is the classical period in Germany, followed by the period of the romantic revival all over Europe.

The chief representative of this new art of thinking is Goethe. In his scientific investigations in the field of physics (theory of colour) and anatomy, in his writings on the metamorphosis of plants and animals, he introduces a new approach to the understanding of nature's phenomena. At the same time scientists such as Loder and Carus, Humboldt and Steffens, Oken and G. H. Schubert are trying to follow the same path and to overcome the rationalism of the previous period.

*Homœopathy Survives Materialistic Onrush.*

It is of the greatest significance that the birth of hom-

œopathy coincides exactly with Goethe's discovery of the archetypal plant. Between 1790 and 1796, when in Hahnemann's mind the idea of *Similia similibus* is perceived, in Goethe's mind the idea of the archetypal plant is born. During this period Fr. Schiller writes his letters "On the Aesthetic Education of Man", in which is seen a first image of the threefold nature of the human being.

Novalis, the great German poet and thinker, in writing down his "Fragments", undertakes the gigantic task of a spiritual interpretation of Cosmos, Man and Earth, and in so doing becomes the founder of a new science, which will unfold only in times to come. The heroic efforts of all these men were not in vain, yet the great materialistic flood submerged their work. The jackboot of agnosticism trampled down the tender shoots of a new spiritual epoch.

One of the few things strong enough to survive the materialistic onrush was Hahnemann's homœopathy. This in itself is a miracle. Though hardly acknowledged by the medical science of to-day, homœopathy is still alive and the work is expanding. Time and again some of the leading surgeons and physicians have tried to do justice to this stepchild of scientific medicine.

Is homœopathy merely a sectarian effort of a few odd doctors who are dissatisfied with their colleagues? Or is it such a new way in medical thought that only few can follow? What was Hahnemann really saying when he formulated the following sentence: "This eternal, universal law of Nature, that every disease is destroyed and cured through the similar artificial disease which the appropriate remedy has the tendency to excite, rests on the following proposition: that only one disease can exist in the body at any one time, and therefore one disease must yield to the other"?

"THE ORGANON OF THE ART OF HEALING".

*A Wealth of Medical Truth.*

The above sentence is in the 20th paragraph of Hahne-

mann's "Organon". This remarkable book is built out of paragraphs, each one of them set like a brick, upholding the next one. Each single brick contains in a few sentences a wealth of medical truth. Some three hundred bricks (the various editions of the "Organon" differ slightly from one another) build the temple of the rational art of healing.

Hahnemann had spent the time before writing his "Organon" in trying to destroy the old temple of medicine. He destroyed it thoroughly, but he also built the new one in a very complete way. What did he destroy?

He showed that diseases are not entities which can be described, ordered and classified; he explained that a disease differs according to the human individual in whom it occurs. He was also unwilling to allow that the nature of disease can be understood. Paragraph 5 reads: "It may be granted that every disease must depend upon an alteration in the inner working of the human organism. This disease can be mentally conceived only through its outward signs and all that these signs reveal; in no way whatever can the disease itself be recognized."

*Complexity of Symptoms.*

Paragraph 10 simply states: "A disease in its whole range is represented only by the complex of morbid symptoms." It is this complexity of symptoms which for Hahnemann assumes a foremost importance. Out of the various symptoms revealed by a sick person, he describes the appearance of one special disease.

Hahnemann does not believe in an entity which before him was called pneumonia. He does not care what "pneumonia" in itself is; he finds a sick person, with a special degree of temperature, a special type of cough, a significant type of pain. He asks whether this person is relieved by a warm room or a cold draught. He inquires whether the patient is anxious or hopeful, likes to talk or to be silent. He tests the skin as to whether it is dry or moist, he inquires into the appetite and likes and dislikes



of the sick one. In this way he arranges a chorus of symptoms, which means everything to Hahnemann.

In a note to paragraph 10 he says: "Formerly physicians, not knowing how otherwise to render help in cases of disease, sought to combat by remedies one single symptom out of several and if possible to suppress it . . . One single symptom is no more the actual disease than one foot is the whole man."

The totality of the symptoms, including the patient's constitution and habits, forms a whole image, which now gives the possibility of finding the right remedy. This is the second great step which Hahnemann made.

Paragraph 17 states: "If, now, experience should show (and indeed it does show) that a given disease-symptom is removed only by the very medicine which has produced a similar symptom in a healthy body, then it would be probable that this remedy is able to uproot that disease-symptom by virtue of its tendency to call forth a similar one."

With this second discovery Hahnemann has opened the door for the finding of appropriate remedies. He proves a medicinal substance by the way in which it works on a healthy person. He notes down exactly the symptoms observed by the prover, and if a harmony is found between the patient's symptoms and the symptoms of provings, this determines the selection of the remedy *Similia similibus*. This, without doubt, appears to be a rational way of healing.

*Proving and Potentising.*

Hahnemann is well aware of the differences in all the various substances which nature puts into the physician's hand. In the 97th paragraph he writes: "As every species of plant differs from every other species in its external form, in its individual mode of life and growth, in its taste and in its smell, and as every mineral and every salt is certainly different from every other in external appearance as well as in its inner physical and chemical peculiarities,

so assuredly are they all different in their power to produce disease and therefore also in their power to heal."

Now, having found and asserted this second discovery, he makes a third step which concerns the way in which the remedy is to be administered to the patient. In the 242nd paragraph he states: "One of the chief laws of homœopathic therapeutics is the following: The counterforce chosen as exactly as possible for the removal of a natural disease-force should be so calculated that it will only just attain its object, and will do the body no harm in any way through unnecessary strength." And he continues in paragraph 243: "Now, as the smallest quantity of medicine naturally disturbs the organism least, we should choose the very smallest doses, provided always that they are a match for the disease."

The minute dose, prepared in a very special way, is the third new step which Hahnemann made. He discovered the preparation of medicines by means of potentising. This is an action which has very little in common with the ordinary way of diluting a substance and thus reducing its action by lowering its mass. To potentise means to dilute in rhythmical progression, whereby the inner power of the active force within the substance is gradually set free. This gentle method of rhythmical dissolution has since proved to be an entirely new and exceedingly satisfactory way of preparing medicines.

#### HOMŒOPATHY AND ALLOPATHY.

##### *The Fundamental Difference.*

We have now tried to describe the three fundamental discoveries of Hahnemann and his new approach to the art of healing. What has he really done, that led him to consider himself the great apostle for the new medicine to come? In fact, he turned the ordinary way of medical thought into an entirely new attitude.

For the physician who is not trained in homœopathy, all the symptoms of a patient are almost equally import-

ant. He observes the different signs, he inquires into the symptoms, he ponders about them at great length. Yet what they mean for him is not in the least the same as what they mean for the homœopath. For the latter the chorus of symptoms indicates a remedy ; for the former it describes a disease. That is the fundamental difference.

The allopathic physician is out to find the illness ; he is satisfied in his search after discovering that a patient is suffering from pneumonia, asthma, inflammation of the kidneys, or any other disease. His great scientific quest is to find the seat as well as the nature of the disease. He wants to know whether the heart or the bowels are ill, whether the nerves or the muscles are functioning abnormally. He then tries to classify the disease and to find an order within the various forms of diseased organs.

The homœopathic physician is not interested in the disease. For him the symptoms have a different meaning: they indicate the probable remedy which can be used. If the symptoms are similar, irrespective of the nature of the disease, the same remedy will be used. Therefore ACONITE or BELLADONNA, MERCURY or CALCAREA CARBONICA can be used for different diseases, if only the symptoms are in harmony with the remedy.

This is obviously a fundamental difference, not of opinion but of approach, and therefore it is so exceedingly difficult for the representatives of the two schools of medicine to understand one another.

*Disease the Allopath's Hidden Treasure.*

Hahnemann states: "The nomenclature or classification of the countless varieties of disease, even if it could be accomplished with tolerable accuracy and completeness, would serve the physician only as a natural historian, in the same way that the classification of other natural phenomena and natural objects is of value in general natural history. In other words, it would aid his historical perception by means of a tabulated and ordered survey. But for

the physician as a practitioner of the art of medicine it would be of no value whatever.

No allopathic physician would ever express such views. For him, disease is the hidden treasure which he tries to bring to light from under the cloak of symptoms and signs.

How did this fundamental difference arise? It was due to the difference between the Hippocratic and the Hahnemannian way of thinking. Hippocrates, the great physician, the founder of medicine as a science, he who wrested medical knowledge from the hands of the priests in the Greek and Egyptian temples, taught one of these ways. He observed the symptoms of patients and ascribed them to the functional disorders of the various systems of the body and soul. He studied the influence of the elements on man; he inquired into the impact which climate, food, habits and living conditions could have on the patient. These influences he formulated, and he described the way in which man reacted to them.

Hippocrates studied the response of the brain to the heat of the summer, the response of the bowels to the humidity of the spring, the response of the liver to the cold of the winter. He showed the influence of different kinds of food on the function of the stomach and intestine, and he continually made his fellow-physicians aware of the different parts of the body in health as well as in disease. Hippocrates therefore induced the study of anatomy and physiology, of obstetrics and surgery. His way was the path *from nature to man*.

#### *Reversal of Hippocratic Doctrine.*

Those who followed him, during the next 2,000 years, continued along the path he pointed out. They studied the four different humours in man: the blood, the phlegm, the black and the yellow bile, and they practised according to the words of Hippocrates: "These four humours make up the nature of man's body, and through these he feels pain or enjoys health . . . . Pain is felt when one of these

elements is deficient or in excess, or is isolated in the body without being compounded with all the others."

Thus they studied the body, because in its various parts the seats of the four elements were to be found. These followers also tried step by step to enlarge on the Hippocratic statement: "Every disease has its own nature and arises from external causes, from cold, from the sun, or from changing winds."

To find the way from the powers of nature to their influence on the human body, and to study and classify the resulting symptoms as different forms of disease—this was the Hippocratic way of medicine. Out of this special approach the allopathic ideas of *contraria contrariis* arose. What was too hot had to be cooled down; what was too dry had to be moistened; what was too moist had to be dried. Were there too much blood, it had to be drained; were there too little, it had to be replenished. Fever had to be suppressed and cramps had to be loosened. Diarrhoea called for constipation, and constipation for evacuation.

Hahnemann completely reversed all this. He disregarded disease altogether. He disregarded the affected organ. The symptoms, for him, pointed to the remedy. He revised the approach and showed a path which led in the opposite direction: *From man to nature!* He was in search of the remedy; Hippocrates was in search of the disease.

#### FROM COS TO COTHEN

##### *Interpretation of Symptoms—The Gulf.*

As soon as the fundamental difference in the interpretation of symptoms by Hippocrates on the one hand and by Hahnemann on the other is realised, the deep gulf between allopathy and homeopathy is apparent. Hahnemann himself was clearly aware of this gulf, but only dimly did he surmise the divine hand which placed him and his work into the setting of his time.

In 1805 he published a small booklet with the title:

"Aesculapius in the Balance". In it he wrote the following most remarkable words: "We were never nearer the discovery of the science of medicine than in the time of Hippocrates. This attentive, unsophisticated observer sought Nature in Nature. He saw and described the diseases before him accurately, without addition, without colouring, without speculation. In the faculty of pure observation he has been surpassed by no later physician. Of only one important part of the medical art was this favoured son of Nature destitute, else had he been completely master of his art: the knowledge of medicines and their application.

"But he did not affect such a knowledge—he acknowledged his deficiency in that he gave almost no medicines (because he knew them too imperfectly), and trusted almost entirely to diet. All succeeding ages degenerated and wandered more or less from the indicated path . . . in this great period of nearly 2,000 years the pure observation of disease was neglected. The wish was to be more scientific, and to discover the hidden causes of disease!"

I have quoted this passage at length, because it reveals the dim but strong feeling in Hahnemann that Hippocrates was the pioneer, and that he himself had started to fulfil what Hippocrates had begun. He did not clearly realise that he had actually reversed the Hippocratean path.

*Knowledge Learned in Mystery-Temple.*

Hippocrates was the last son of an old family of priests, regarded in earlier times as having had a divine origin. In the mystery-temple of Cos he was initiated into the art of healing. But he left the mystery-temple, stepped out into the open forum of the world and betrayed his initiation. He was the true and rightful contemporary of Plato. As Plato disclosed his mystery-knowledge in the dialogues with his pupils, so did Hippocrates betray his temple-wisdom to his immediate followers. Thus medical science was founded. For the next 2,000 years it lived and worked in search of the hidden causes of disease. It was directed

in such a way that man was the centre of its research. Man as the bearer of illness, man as the recipient of the forces of nature.

From the time of the death of Hippocrates in the year 355 B.B. (Plato died in 347 B.C.) until the year 1805, when Hahnemann wrote the above-mentioned essay, a time-cycle of 2,160 years passed by. This period is the exact time-space of one cultural epoch, according to Rudolf Steiner. During it, the art of healing was conducted according to Hippocrates, and with its close the period of medicine free of any mystery-knowledge came to an end. To mark this finish, Hahneman was born, and created the new art of healing. He neglected the search for the hidden cause of disease; he found that the symptom is an indication for the medicine and not for the illness. He also placed man in the centre of his research, but for him the human symptoms of any disease pointed outward, to where in nature the remedy can be found.

Is it not a strange writ of destiny that Hahnemann finished his work at Cöthen and Hippocrates started it at Cos? The path of medicine led from the little island in the Aegean Sea to the little town in the heart of Germany. Hippocrates left the silent mysteries behind him and walked out into the radiant light of the awakening power of human thinking. The relation between man and his divine origin gradually disappeared and left him lonely, but gave him the gradual realisation of himself as a person.

*Back to the Mysteries.*

As soon as this process had come to an end, Hahnemann appeared. He divined the new path of medicine: Back to the mysteries. He stood in the light of the setting sun, in whose dawn Hippocrates had stepped out. Now the sun has disappeared. Medicine is no longer an art, but a natural science, which often has little to do with the art of healing. Will the outer night be filled with an inner light, that dawns within the human soul? Will the coming phy-

sicians be willing to search for the gate of the new mysteries?

The time between Cos and Cöthen has come to an end. The new age is at hand.

One of the greatest of Hahnemann's disciples, the American physician J. T. Kent, published in 1900 a book, "Lectures on Homœopathic Philosophy". In the very first chapter he describes the discrepancy between the homœopathic art of healing and the science of medicine of his time. He says: "The doctrine of the vital force is not admitted by the teachers of physiology and therefore the homœopath sees that true physiology is not yet taught, for without the vital force . . . there can be no cause and no relation between cause and effect." He continues:

"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 . . . . We must, to be scientific homœopaths, recognize that the muscles, the nerves, the ligaments and the 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 life, but from the life to the body."

—*Homœopathy*, April 1955

---

### CORONARY THROMBOSIS

DR. T. DOUGLAS ROSS, M.B., CH.B., F.F.HOM.

An attack of Coronary Thrombosis is justly dreaded by the average middleaged man upon whom the blow is apt to fall when he is at the height of his powers, and when his duties and responsibilities are most heavy.

It may come as a bolt from the blue, out of a clear sky of perfect health, or there may have been pain in the chest