

## **The harmful cure observed by Hering and Kent in contrast to Hahnemann's gentle restoration of health.**

---

Ubiratan Cardinalli ADLER; Amarilys de Toledo CESAR; Ana Elisa PADULA; Maristela Schiabel ADLER; Erika Nakabara GAROZZO; Wania Maria Papille GALHARDI; Abigail ALVES; Izabel Cristina SOUZA.

*Homeopathic Links, 2006, 19(3):121-127.*

### **Address**

---

Homeopathy Postgraduation Program - Jundiaí Faculty of Medicine  
Av. Moema, 170/52.  
São Paulo/SP  
Brazil  
04077-020

[ubiadler@uol.com.br](mailto:ubiadler@uol.com.br)  
[www.audesapere.com.br](http://www.audesapere.com.br)

### **Key-words**

---

Hahnemann; Hering; Kent; aggravation; cure; laws of cure; eliminations; old symptoms  
skin lesions; dermatology; ethical committees.

## Abstract

---

**Introduction:** the “laws of cure” for chronic diseases have been Hering’s most divulged work throughout generations of homeopaths. Kent endorsed Hering’s laws and their ultimate progression up to skin lesions, and included “severe aggravations, revival of past symptoms and eliminations” among the expected results during the homeopathic treatment of chronic diseases. Notwithstanding Hering and Kent have claimed to be Hahnemann’s followers, the cure standards established by them seem quite harmful and contrary to Hahnemann’s gentle restoration of health ideal. **Objectives:** to ascertain if Hering and Kent based their arguments and procedures on Hahnemann’s principles when inferring and observing those harmful cure standards. **Methodology:** Analysis of Hering’s propositions in behalf of his laws of cure and Kent’s remarks about severe homeopathic aggravations compared to Hahnemann’s writings. **Conclusions:** 1) Hering’s “laws of cure” cannot be justified upon Hahnemann’s premises, once according to Hahnemann internal and external symptoms should improve together, without a specific direction order. The only convergence point between Hahnemann and Hering’s laws is the observation that the latest symptoms that have been added to a chronic disease are always the first to yield in an antipsoric treatment. 2) Misdirecting Hahnemann’s recommendations, Kent was careless with dosage; admitted as pathway to cure severe and long homeopathic aggravations, return of all past symptoms, exteriorizations and eliminations, which were considered by Hahnemann as organism defences against dose excess or incorrect prescriptions. 3) Hering and Kent did not follow Hahnemann’s principles and the harmful cure they observed was probably a result of their own procedures in Homeopathy, deviating from the objective of gentle restoration of health.

## **The harmful cure observed by Hering and Kent in contrast to Hahnemann's gentle restoration of health.**

---

ADLER, U.C.; CESAR, AT; PADULA, AE; ADLER, M.S; GAROZZO, E.N.; GALHARDI, W.M.P.; ALVES, A.; SOUZA, I.C.

Constantine Hering was born in Oschatz, in the Saxon region of Germany, on January 1<sup>st</sup> 1800. After having attended the Surgery Academy in Dresden, he moved to Leipzig in 1820 to give continuity to his medical studies, and this happened to be the exact year in which the persecution against Hahnemann was reaching its climax, in that city. Hering was a student of a teacher whose name was Robbi and who had received the incumbency of writing a book against Hahnemann and its “homeopathic heresy”. Robby transferred the incumbency to his new disciple and thus, Hering began analyzing Hahnemann's manuscripts (who had already left Leipzig and established himself in Köthen) and ended up “converting himself” to Homeopathy.<sup>1</sup>

In Suriname, Hering dedicated himself to provings, including the first experiment of *Lachesis*, in 1828. In the United States, he was president (1835-41) on the first school of Homeopathy in the world, in Allentown, Pennsylvania. From 1848 until the year of his death, 1880, he lived in Philadelphia, where he organized and published the “Guiding Symptoms of our Materia Medica” and was a professor of Materia Medica in institutions of Homeopathy that he helped to found and direct.<sup>1</sup>

In 1871, the year in which Hering pensioned off from the function of Materia Medica<sup>2</sup> teacher, the North-American James Tyler Kent (1849-1916) was graduating in Medicine to become another encourager of Homeopathy in the United States with worldwide repercussion.

Notwithstanding the importance and extent of his work, the most divulged contribution from Hering among the current homeopathic generations is known as the “laws of cure”, “the law of order”, “law of direction”, or simply “Hering's laws”.

The authors found two texts in which Hering details his propositions relative to the order or direction in the evolution of the symptoms: one Preface written by him in 1845 for the North-American edition of Hahnemann's "The Chronic Diseases" (available in <http://www.homeoint.org/cazalet/hering/chronicdiseases.htm>, access in 5/25/04) and an article originally published in 1865 in a periodic called *The Hahnemannian Monthly*: "The three hahnemannian rules regarding the hierarchy of the symptoms", translated to Portuguese and published by the *Homeopathic Selecta*<sup>3</sup>.

Subsequent to a partial presentation of this work at the XXVI Brazilian Homeopathy Congress (Brasilia, November/04), the authors became aware of a review by Saine<sup>4</sup>, who located the Hering's Laws from the same sources.

In the 1845 Preface, Hering makes it clear that he was revealing his opinions and still underestimated them: "*although it would not make much difference Hahnemann's disciples' opinion...*" He then affirms that:

*"Every homeopathic physician must have observed that the improvement in pain takes place from above downward; and in diseases, from within outward. This is the reason why chronic diseases, if they are thoroughly cured, always terminate in some cutaneous eruption".*

In the 1865 article the "law of order" appears more detailed and amplified. In the treatment of chronic diseases the medication selected should remove the symptoms:

- "*from within outward*",
- "*from upward downward*";
- "*from the most essential organs to the less essential*";
- "*from the brain and the nerves outward and downward, to the most external and the lowest of all organs: the skin*",
- "*in the reverse order of its appearance*".

Hering also adds that *“any affection that goes from one side of the body to the other is more effectively conquered by medication which cause or produce a similar affection, but in the opposite direction”*. However, he places this last rule as an Appendix which still requires additional observations prior to being established.

In that same 1865 text, Hering refers again to the “law of order” as a consequence of hahnemannian`s teachings. Reinforcing this supposed communion of ideas he affirms that the obedience or not of these hierarchy laws inferred by him (Hering) would make the difference between a *“mere empirical in Homeopathy, a perverted homeopath and a true hahnneonian”*.

Kent endorsed the “law of order”, but differently from Hering, understood that Hahnemann had written nothing about it:

- ❑ *“Hering first introduced the Law of Direction of Symptoms: from within out, from above downward, in reverse order of their appearance.*
- ❑ *It does not occur in Hahnemann's writing.*
- ❑ *It is spoken of as Hering's Laws”*.<sup>5</sup>

According to Kent`s understanding and observation the externalization of the chronic illness is part of the process of the homeopathic cure and frequently occurs provoking a “turmoil” in the system:

- ❑ *“All chronic diseases have their first manifestations upon the surface, and from that to the innermost of man.*
- ❑ *Now in the proportion in which they are thrown back upon the surface it is to be seen that the patient is recovering.*
- ❑ *...Here is that the turmoil spoken of above follows the true homoeopathic remedy, and the ignorant do not desire their old outward symptom to be brought back even when it is known as the only possible form of cure.”*<sup>16</sup>

In Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary (available at [http:// www.m-w.com](http://www.m-w.com), access on 1/25/05), the meaning of turmoil is “*state or condition of extreme confusion, agitation or commotion*”. A turmoil reaction seems to be part of the “healing” process of more serious diseases”, according to Kent’s observations of his practice:

*“A disease of very long standing sometimes fails to yield without this aggravation and disturbance and turmoil in the economy, and the deeper it is the more tissue change you have to contend with, all the more wonderful and distressing and painful is this reaction.”* <sup>17</sup>

Like Hering, Kent exposes himself as a defender of Hahnemann’s teachings:

*“We most assuredly believe Hahnemann’s Organon of the Healing Art to be the only true guide in therapeutics. Let us then not, tolerate any teaching which seeks perverts or abridges this master-work in any way.”* <sup>6</sup>

Notwithstanding their pro-Hahnemann clamour, a cure path that includes skin lesions and **“wonderful, distressing and painful reactions”** seems quite harmful and contrary to the therapeutics hypothesized by Hahnemann:

*“The highest ideal of cure is rapid, gentle and permanent restoration of health, or removal and annihilation of the disease in its whole extent, in the shortest, most reliable, and most harmless way, on easily comprehensible principles.”* <sup>20</sup>

## **Objectives**

In view of this contrast, the objective of this doctrine review is to ascertain if Hering and Kent based their arguments and procedures on Hahnemann’s principles to conclude that skin lesions and severe aggravations are expected results during the homeopathic treatment of chronic diseases.

## Methodology

- Analysis of Hering's propositions on behalf of his laws of cure in the above mentioned sources to ascertain if they were really based on Hahnemann's premises.
- Analysis of Kent's remarks about severe homeopathic aggravations reported in his "Lectures of Homeopathic Philosophy" and "Lesser Writings" ascertain if they "*pervert or abridge*" the Organon "*in any way*".

Since Hering and Kent did not know the posthumous 6<sup>th</sup> edition of Hahnemann's "*Organon of Medicine*", for comparison purposes the authors utilized the German (Haug) editions of the *Organon of Medicine* - 5<sup>th</sup> edition, *The Chronic Diseases* - 2<sup>nd</sup> edition and *Pure Materia Medica* - 3<sup>rd</sup> edition. The English texts quoted in this paper, were respectively prepared versions by Dudgeon, Tafel and Dudgeon.

## Analysis of Hering's laws

The following compares 5 statements made by Hering, at the revealing of his laws, with Hahnemann's teachings on the same subjects.

### 1. Hering:

*"...the quintessence of his doctrine is given to all chronic diseases, that is, the progress from outwards inwards, of the less essential parts of our body to him most essential of the periphery to the central normally from downwards up."*<sup>3</sup>

Hering does not quote the source of this affirmation, which must therefore express his own concept.

According to Hahnemann the idea that the destruction of the cutaneous symptom would impel the scabies to the interior of the system was common at that time, but false<sup>37; 21</sup>.

Hahnemann clarifies:

*“...all miasmatic maladies which show peculiar local ailments on the skin are always present as internal maladies in the system before they show their local symptom externally upon the skin;”*<sup>38</sup>

*“Only when the whole organs feels itself transformed by this chronic myasmatic disease the vital ill force will try to relieve and soften the internal illness, through the establishing of a proportional local symptom on the skin...”*<sup>39</sup>

Therefore, contrary to what Hering affirmed, Hahnemann, in his theory regarding chronic diseases, believes that the internal disease precedes the cutaneous primary symptom, that is, it progresses from the inside outwards.

2. Hering:

- *“All Hahnemann’s anti-psoric drugs have this as their most characteristic peculiarity; the evolution of the effects from “inwards to outwards”..*
- *“These drugs, as they are opposite in their direction or in their way of action should preferably in all these cases be given as they react from inwards - outwards, up and down, from the essential organs to the least essential, of the brain and the nerves , outwards and downwards, to the most external of all organs: “the skin”.*<sup>3</sup>

On reviewing the theoretical part of the 1<sup>st</sup> volume of the German edition, Hahnemann’s concept about the “antipsorics” is found in the Chapter Psora (author’s emphasis):

*“First of all, the great truth is established that all chronic ailments, all great, and the greatest, long continuing diseases (with the exception of a few of the venereal ones) spring from spore alone and only find their thorough cure in the cure of the Psora; they are, consequently, to be healed mostly only by antipsoric remedies, i.e., by those remedies which in their attesting as to their pure action on the healthy human body manifest most of the symptoms which are most frequently perceived in latent as well as in developed Psora.”*<sup>40</sup>

On defining them, Hahnemann did not mention any characteristic whatsoever relative to the order or direction of the action of the antipsorics, but did leave it clear that these medications characterize themselves by their higher pathogenetic similarity to the *Psora* symptoms.

Therefore, considering the antipsorics as drugs whose primary characteristic would be the “*evolution of the effects from inside outwards*” is a Hering’s premise, not supported by Hahnemann’s observations.

### 3. Hering:

*“The metaphysic of our science tells us that all medication diseases (paranosis) are in essence and offspring, in opposition to all the epidemics, contagious diseases and other diseases...”*<sup>3</sup>

Different to the metaphysic proposed by Hering, in Hahnemann’s model of Homeopathy the affection producible by a medicine does not oppose to the natural disease, but replaces it:

*“by reason of its similarity of action involves precisely the same part of the organism that were previously affected by the weaker morbid irritation, which, consequently, can no longer act on these parts, but is extinguished ”*<sup>22</sup>

### 4. Hering

- *“A reduction or improvement of the external symptoms with an increase in the complaints of the internal, even though the latter have an apparently less importance, shall be to us an indication that our patient is getting worse, and we have to try to discover among his symptoms which is the principal one so as to prescribe another medicine that will be really healing.”*<sup>3</sup>
- *“The law of order which we have pointed out above accounts for the numerous cutaneous eruptions consequent upon homeopathic treatment, even where they never had been before”*. <http://www.homeoint.org/cazalet/hering/chronicdiseases.htm>

To Hering therefore, the improvement of the external symptoms with worsening of the internal, indicates that the wrong medicine must be replaced, but the contrary is not true, that is, cutaneous lesions are expected in the evolution of the chronic patient.

Hahnemann's has seemingly a more holistic understanding: skin symptoms are part of the whole; local and internal disease must improve together:

*“By means of this medicine, employed only internally (and, if the disease be but of recent origin, often after the very first dose of it), the general morbid state of the body is removed along with the local affection, and the latter is cured at the same time as the former, proving that the local affection depended solely on a disease of the rest of the body, and should only be regarded as an inseparable part of the whole, as one of the most considerable and striking symptoms of the whole disease”.*<sup>23</sup>

#### 5. Hering:

*“Hahnemann affirms in his Treatment of Chronic Diseases, first edition p.228, second edition p. 168, American translation p. 171, the most recent symptoms are the first to cede, the older symptoms are the last to disappear”.*

Hering makes a precise reference to the hahnemannian text, that can be found in the same page of the 2<sup>nd</sup> edition published by Haug editor, that is, on page 168 Hahnemann asserts:

*“The latest symptoms that have been added to a chronic disease which has been left to itself (and thus has not been aggravated by medical mismanagement) are always the first to yield in an antipsoric treatment;”*<sup>41</sup>

Therefore, in this proposition, Hering faithfully repeats Hahnemann's observations.

## Analysis of Kent's severe aggravations

The following Table summarizes contrasts found in Kent's and Hahnemann's writings about homeopathic aggravations. Observations about primary action and reaction were also included for a better understanding of their standpoints.

### Kent's and Hahnemann's remarks about primary action, reaction and homeopathic aggravations.

Concepts	HAHNEMANN	KENT
Primary action	Primary action is the derangement caused upon vitality by any agent. <sup>24</sup>	"The primary action of a drug represents the effect of the crude drug"
Secondary action (or reaction)	Secondary action or counteraction is an automatic opposition of the vital force to the primary action <sup>24</sup>	"In attenuated form, primary and secondary effects, opposite effects, are found." <sup>7</sup> "All the symptoms that appear after the taking of the drug that was administered, are the genuine symptoms of the drug, are the primitive and specific effects of that drug, whether occurring in the first day or many months afterwards." <sup>8</sup>
Intensity of reaction on healthy individuals	"An obvious antagonistic secondary action, however, is, as may readily be conceived, not to be noticed from the action of quite minute homoeopathic doses of the deranging agents on the healthy body". <sup>25</sup>	"The reaction in healthy people will always be greater than the primitive shock." <sup>8</sup>
Intensity of reaction on the sick	"...any more considerable reaction than will suffice to elevate its present state of health up to the healthy point... - that is but little effort is required" <sup>26</sup>	"The action of the homeopathic medicine is mild, but the reaction is a turmoil". <sup>9</sup>
Aggravation: variables associated	primary action <sup>27</sup> dose <sup>28</sup> patient's impressionability <sup>33</sup>	vital reaction <sup>10</sup> potency <sup>11</sup> duration of the disease <sup>17</sup> degree of tissue change <sup>17</sup>
Aggravation duration (in chronic diseases)	one or several hours <sup>27</sup>	Many weeks (marked tissue change) Few days ("vigorous patients – no structural change in the vital organs") No aggravation (functional nerve diseases, ideal potency) <sup>18</sup>
Aggravation: intensity (expected)	scarcely observable <sup>28</sup>	strong ("vigorous patients – no structural change in the vital organs") <sup>18</sup>

According to Kent, the proper action to a dynamized medicine is it in proving or therapeutics comprises all symptoms appearing after its dose, including also the reaction (when the patient is curable), which is “*the evidence of repair of the vital force*”.<sup>8</sup>

Diverging from Hahnemann, Kent proposed an imbalance between primary action and reaction:

*“The action of the remedy is mild. The medicine does not act violently, but the reaction of the economy in throwing off the disease may be violent.”*<sup>9</sup>

So, in order to “throw off the disease”, severe or prolonged aggravations could be justified, also as a measure of vitality:

*“The vital reaction to the remedy may be estimated by the intensity of the aggravation that follows the remedy.”*<sup>10</sup>

For Hahnemann homeopathic aggravation is a dose-related primary action that should be kept as small as possible:

*“Doses of all homoeopathic medicines without exception are to be reduced to such an extent that after their ingestion, they shall excite a scarcely observable homoeopathic aggravation”*<sup>28</sup>

Dose for Hahnemann meant the “*quantity of material medicine contained in the dilutions*”, being associated with the magnitude of the medicinal effect:

*“The action of a dose, moreover, the dose did not diminish in the direct ratio of the quantity of material medicine contained in the dilutions used in homoeopathic practice. Eight drops of the tincture of a medicine to the dose do not produce four times as much effect in the human body as two drops, but only about twice the effect that is produced by two drops to the dose.”*<sup>29</sup>

Diverging from Hahnemann, Kent considered dose-quantity insignificant:

- ❑ *“It never matters whether the remedy is given in water in spoonful doses or given in a few pellets dry on the tongue-the result is the same.*
- ❑ *It has been supposed by some that by giving one or two small pellets that a milder effect would be secured, but this is a deception.*
- ❑ *The action or power of one pellet, if it acts at all, is as great as ten.*
- ❑ *If a few pellets be dissolved in water, and the water is given by the tea spoon full, each teaspoonful will act as powerfully as the whole of the powder if given at once, and the whole quantity of water if drank in one go will have no greater curative or exaggerative power than one teaspoonful”.*<sup>12</sup>

Generating confusion for many of his followers, Kent misinterpreted dose for potency, as can be seen from his comments in paragraph 159:

Organon § 159: *“The smaller the dose of the homoeopathic remedy, the slighter the apparent aggravation of the disease and it is proportionately of shorter duration.”*

Kent’s comments:

- ❑ *“This was written at the time of Hahnemann's experience with what might be called small doses, ranging from the lower potencies to the 30th and seldom much higher.*
- ❑ *He had had ample experience with the 30th, and occasionally with the 60th, but not with the tremendous turmoil that comes from the very highest attenuations”*<sup>17</sup>

Kent obtained these “highest attenuations” initializing using a Fincke mechanical dynamizer and subsequently, his own dynamizer. Fincke’s machine started from a 30th potency, manually dynamized, that was which was then submitted to only a flow of continuous water. In the beginning of the XXth Century Kent developed his own dynamizing machine used by the company known as Ehrhardt & Karl to produce potencies above 1M. A continuous flow of water passed through the tubes which were shaken 10 times before being emptied and refilled.<sup>43</sup>

Carelessness with dosages and using potencies prepared by peculiar and different devices, Kent not only obtained severe and prolonged aggravations, but also “symptom flashbacks” and eliminations, which are analyzed in the following.

“Symptoms flashbacks”:

- *“Patients having only feeble reaction are only palliated, while those of strong reaction go through all their past symptoms in the reverse order of their appearance.”*<sup>13</sup>
- *“In proportion as old symptoms that have long been away return just in that proportion the disease is curable. They have only disappeared because newer ones have come up.”*<sup>18</sup>
- *“It is quite a common thing for old symptoms to appear after the aggravation has come, and hence we see the symptoms disappearing in the reverse order of their coming. Those symptoms that are present subside, and old symptoms keep coming up”.*<sup>18</sup>

Hahnemann did not mention “return of old symptoms” in the 5<sup>th</sup> edition of the *Organon*. In chronic cases, he expected brief homeopathic aggravations, 6 to 10 days after the dose, which would be followed by an improvement of the whole malady. The original symptoms of the disease were still present and would appear increased by the primary action of the medicine (author’s emphasis) :

*“..where medicines of long action have to fight a malady of, considerable or of very long standing, where one dose, consequently, must continue to act for many days, we then occasionally see, during the first six, eight or ten days, **the occurrence of some such primary actions, of the medicine, some such apparent increase of the symptoms of the original disease** (lasting for one or several hours), while in the intervening hours improvement of the whole malady is perceptible.”*<sup>27</sup>

In the 6<sup>th</sup> edition, among his most perfected method, he introduced a new prognosis: *“the homeopathic aggravation of the original symptoms of a chronic disease can appear only at the end of the treatment when the cure is almost or quite finished”*<sup>34</sup>. So, as the

improvement comes first, the supervening homeopathic aggravation appears as a return of one (or more) of the symptoms:

*“The dose of the medicine that continues serviceable without producing new troublesome symptoms is to be continued while gradually ascending, so long as the patient with general improvement begins to feel in a mild degree the return of one or several old original complaints. This indicates an approaching cure through a gradual ascending of the moderate doses modified each time by succussion (§ 247). It indicates that the vital principle no longer needs to be affected by the similar medicinal disease in order to lose the sensation of the natural disease (§ 148). It indicates that the life principle now free from the natural disease begins to suffer only something of the medicinal disease hitherto known as homoeopathic aggravation.”*<sup>35</sup>

Hahnemann would then have left the patient without any medicine for 1-2 weeks. The aggravated symptom(s) should disappear in a few days or hours<sup>33</sup> if a cure is to follow. He never observed or mentioned that the patient must undergo all past symptoms as a path to cure, i.e., the chancre do not have to come back during the treatment of a patient who had had Syphilis, at least not in Hahnemann’s Homeopathy.

Eliminations according to Kent (author’s emphasis):

- *“..in acute disease we seldom see anything like striking aggravation unless the acute disease has drawn near death's door, or is very severe, unless it has lasted many days, and breaking down of blood and tissue is threatened, or has taken place. Then we will see sharp aggravations, great prostration, **violent sweating, exhaustion, vomiting and purging following the action of the remedy.**”*<sup>17</sup>
- *“At times you will be treating the more advanced and complicated forms of psora, where there are organic changes ; after the patient gets the homoeopathic remedy for a while he comes to a standstill, seems to be doing nothing, but in the course of time **vicious ugly eruptions come out upon the body. This is a good sign in so far as the disease manifests itself upon the skin, or in catarrhal discharges, the***

*internal organs are safe, but when these outward manifestations are stopped the internal parts suffer.”*<sup>18</sup>

Eliminations according to Hahnemann (author’s emphasis):

*“ the very small doses prescribe by Homeopathy produce the uncommon effect they do just because they are not so large as to render it necessary for the organism to get rid of them by the revolutionary processes of evacuations. **And yet these very small doses excite the system to evacuations (which shorten their duration of action) in cases of disease where the remedy has been unsuitably and not accurately homeopathically chosen.**”*<sup>44</sup>

Hahnemann did not consider eliminations as homeopathic aggravations, or as “good signs” of a correct homeopathic prescription. On the contrary, for the creator of Homeopathy eliminations are organism defenses against dose excess or incorrect prescriptions.

## **Discussion**

Strong exacerbations of the patients’ symptoms, revival of past ailments, skin lesions, “*great prostration, violent sweating, exhaustion, vomiting and purging following the action of the remedy*” are treatment effects accepted and even desired by Hering and Kent but combated by Hahnemann.

One reason that could explain why Hering and Kent may have frequently obtained skin lesions as a result of their homeopathic praxis is the priority given by them to mental symptoms, when selecting the remedy:

Hering:

*“All the symptoms of the internal affections, all the symptoms of the mind or of other internal action, are of much higher value than the more molesting or destructive symptoms that occur on the surface of the body”.*<sup>3</sup>

Kent:

*“Symptoms to be taken into account:*

- *First-are those relating to the love and hate, or desires and aversions.*
- *Next-are those belonging to the rational mind, so-called intellectual mind.*
- *Thirdly-those belonging to the memory.*
- *These, the mental symptoms, must first be worked out in the usual form until the remedies best suited to the mental condition are determined, omitting all symptoms that relate to a pathological cause and all that are common to disease and to people. When the sum of these has been settled, a group of five or ten remedies, or as many as appear, then, we are prepared to compare them and the remedies found related to the remaining symptoms of the case.”*<sup>14</sup>

In the selection of the homeopathic medication Hahnemann certainly stressed the importance of mental symptoms<sup>30</sup> but, contrary to Hering and Kent, he did not underestimate the importance of the cutaneous symptoms: *“one of the most considerable and striking symptoms of the whole disease”*<sup>23</sup>

That is, in semiology Hahnemann established a horizontal hierarchy: mind, local and general affections are on the same level, once they have proved to be *“strong, well-marked (characteristic), and peculiar symptoms”*<sup>31</sup> of the case.

Hering and Kent have exerted a widespread influence in Homeopathy and their teachings are frequently mistaken as hahnemannians. For instance, Debats asserted:

- *“The 97 cases Hahnemann quotes in his “The chronic diseases are all without exception examples of syndromes shifts from the skin into the interior and vice versa.*
- *It is said sometimes that Hahnemann did not know Hering’s law. Those who hold that view to be true should study the chronic diseases.....Especially the initial*

*existential improvement that is the beginning of the improvement from within outward is mentioned by Hahnemann in paragraph 253 of his Organon”.<sup>45</sup>*

Debates are correct in affirming that the cases Hahnemann quoted in his “The chronic diseases” are examples of syndrome shifts from the skin into the interior and vice-versa, but those were not homoeopathically treated cases, just examples of local symptoms suppressions and their inward consequent manifestations, which sometimes improved when a local ailment could be re-established. Regarding paragraph 253:

*“Among the signs that, in all diseases, especially in such as are of an acute nature, inform us of a slight commencement of improvement or aggravation that is not perceptible to every one, the state of mind and the whole cease of the patient are the most certain and instructive. In the case of ever so slight an improvement we observe a greater degree of comfort, increased calmness and freedom of the mind, higher spirits - a kind of return of the natural state...”*

It states that improvement begins with greater comfort, calmness, etc, but that is all. Neither here nor anywhere in Hahnemann’s work there is any mention of symptoms direction during homeopathic improvement. Hahnemann did mention, however, in a note of this same paragraph 253 (5<sup>th</sup> =6<sup>th</sup> edition) the importance of the minuteness of the dose for that initial improvement:

*“The signs of improvement in the disposition and mind, however, may be expected only soon after the medicine has been taken when the dose has been sufficiently minute (i.e., as small as possible), an unnecessary large dose of even the most suitable homoeopathic medicine acts too violently...”<sup>32</sup>*

Hahnemann did his best to guarantee a smooth, but effective evolution, culminating with his most developed<sup>36</sup> method of therapeutics: fifty-milesimal potencies in repeated dynamized doses with periodic and gradual potency upgrade. Of course, this is already Organon’s 6<sup>th</sup> edition, unknown by Hering and Kent, but both should at least have known part of this method, the centesimal repeated dynamized doses, introduced by Hahnemann in

a Preface of *The Chronic Diseases*<sup>42</sup> showing how to overcome aggravations and new symptoms during daily repeated liquid doses. Instead of that, the following is Kent's opinion about frequently repeated doses:

*"It is fortunate that the physicians who repeat while the remedy is acting are such poor prescribers or their death-list would be enormous."*<sup>15</sup>

Maybe Kent hold that opinion because he had not known the above mentioned Preface, once it was not included in the 1845 North-American edition of *The Chronic Diseases*<sup>46</sup>.

Saine has questioned Hering's laws, imputing to Kent its popularization<sup>4</sup>. Maybe Kent had found in Hering's propositions an useful link between Medicine and his theological views:

- *"You cannot divorce Medicine and Theology. Man exists all the way down, from his innermost Spiritual, to his outermost Natural.*
- *The healthier the patient becomes the more likelihood there is for an eruption upon the skin. The vital energies must be sufficient for this. A cure progresses from within outward."*<sup>9</sup>

Other reviews have pointed out divergencies between Kent's and Hahnemann's Homeopathy<sup>47; 48</sup>. One of them, made by Hehr, quotes a wise citation:

*"An adulator is far worse than a vilifier."*  
*A Punjab Proverb.*

This paper incorporated some of the writings from Hering and Kent into a common subject: the harmful cure bequeathed by them, which should not be accepted as a law, but rather as clinical results of their own method of Homeopathy.

Although there is some data indicating the safety of homeopathic medicines<sup>49</sup> and reported homeopathic aggravations are not frequent events in clinical trials<sup>50</sup>, scientific literature on clinical Homeopathy lives its primordium and these studies did not focus on daily praxis inside the doctor's office.

Nowadays the possibility of severe predictable risks would make Kentian experimental protocols in human subjects not viable when submitted to ethical committees and may turn away patients from Homeopathy, once their concern about (allopathic) side effects is an important reason for seeking homeopathic care<sup>51</sup>. A gentle restoration of health should be their reward.

## **Conclusions**

- Hering's "law of cure" cannot be justified upon Hahnemann's premises, once according to Hahnemann internal and external symptoms should improve together, without a specific direction order. The only convergence point between Hahnemann and Hering's laws is the observation that the latest symptoms that have been added to a chronic disease are always the first to yield in an antipsoric treatment.
- Misdirecting Hahnemann's recommendations, Kent was careless with dosage, admitted as pathway to cure severe and long homeopathic aggravations, return of all past symptoms, exteriorizations and eliminations (which were considered by Hahnemann as organism defences against dose excess or incorrect prescriptions).
- Hering and Kent did not follow Hahnemann's principles and the harmful cure they observed was probably a result of their own procedures in Homeopathy, deviating from the objective of gentle restoration of health.

## References

1. Haehl R. Samuel Hahnemann: His life and Work. Vol. 1, New Dehli, B Jain, reprint 1989, p.431-434.
2. Thomas P. Homeopathy in the USA. *Br Hom J*, 2001, **90**:99-103.
3. Hering C. As Três Regras Hahnemannianas sobre a hierarquia dos sintomas. Translator: Gilda Campos. *Selecta Homeopathica*, 1997, **5**(2):83-89. Original title: The Three Hahnemannian Rules about the hierarchy of the symptoms.
4. Saine, Andre. La ley del Hering: ley, regla o dogma? *Homeopatia Mex*, 2004, **73**(628): 11-18.
5. Kent JT. Lesser Writings. New Dehli, B Jain, reprint 1985-7, Correspondence of organs, and direction of cure, p. 273.
6. \_\_\_\_\_ Address, p. 208.
7. \_\_\_\_\_ The plane of disorder and cure, p. 410.
8. \_\_\_\_\_ The Action of drugs as opposed by the Vital Force, p.379.
9. \_\_\_\_\_ Aphorisms and Precepts, p.641.
10. \_\_\_\_\_ What shall we do when the law fails, p.485.
11. \_\_\_\_\_ Observations regarding the selection of the potency, p.346.
12. \_\_\_\_\_ The administration of the remedy, p.388.
13. \_\_\_\_\_ Why is cancer incurable, p. 222.
14. \_\_\_\_\_ Use of the Repertory, p. 255.
15. \_\_\_\_\_ The second prescription, 415.
16. Kent JT. Lectures on Homoeopathic Philosophy. New Dehli, B Jain, reprint 1986, Lecture 2 The highest ideal of a cure, p.27.
17. \_\_\_\_\_ Lecture 34 The homeopathic aggravation, p. 253.
18. \_\_\_\_\_ Lecture 35: Prognosis after observing the action of the remedy, p.264.
19. \_\_\_\_\_ Lecture 18 : Chronic diseases – Psora, p.146.
20. Hahnemann S. Organon der Heilkunst: aude sapere. 5. Auflage, Leipzig, Heidelberg, Haug, 1986, § 2.
21. \_\_\_\_\_ § 202.
22. \_\_\_\_\_ § 45.
23. \_\_\_\_\_ § 193.
24. \_\_\_\_\_ § 63.
25. \_\_\_\_\_ § 66.
26. \_\_\_\_\_ § 68.
27. \_\_\_\_\_ § 161.

28. \_\_\_\_\_ § 280.
29. \_\_\_\_\_ § 284.
30. \_\_\_\_\_ § 211.
31. \_\_\_\_\_ § 67.
32. \_\_\_\_\_ § 253
33. Hahnemann S. Organon der Heilkunst: aude sapere. 6. Auflage, Leipzig, Heidelberg, Haug, 1988, § 281.
34. \_\_\_\_\_ § 161
35. \_\_\_\_\_ § 280
36. \_\_\_\_\_ § 246
37. Hahnemann S. Die chronischen Krankheiten, ihre eigentüml. Natur u. homöopath. Heilung. 1. Theil, 2.Auflage, Heidelberg, Haug, 4. Nachdr., 1988, p. 21
38. \_\_\_\_\_ p. 42.
39. \_\_\_\_\_ p. 50.
40. \_\_\_\_\_ p. 146.
41. \_\_\_\_\_ p. 168.
42. Hahnemann S. Die chronischen Krankheiten, ihre eigentüml. Natur u. homöopath. Heilung. 3. Theil, 2.Auflage, Heidelberg, Haug, 4. Nachdr., 1988, Vorwort.
43. Winston, J. A brief history of potentizing machines. *Br Hom J*, 1989, **78**(4): 59-68.
44. Hahnemann S. Reine Arzneimittellehre. Heidelberg, Haug, 5. Nachdr, 1991, Band 1, Vorrede, p.6.
45. Debats, F. Syndrome shift, or the morbid substitution as a leading principle in homeopathy. *Homeopathic Links*, 1992, **5**(1): 32-34.
46. Schmidt, Josef, History and relevance of the 6th edition of the Organon of Medicine (1842), *Br Hom J*, 1994, **83**: 42-48.
47. Hehr, GS. Was Kent a hahnemannian? *Br Hom J*, 1984, **73**: 71-74.
48. Cassam, A . Was Kent a Hahnemannian? *Br Hom J*, 1999, **89**: 78-83.
49. Dantas, F; Rampes H. Do homeopathic medicines provoke adverse effects? A systematic review. *Br Hom J*, 2000, **89**(1): 35-38
50. Grabia, S; Ernst, E. Homeopathic aggravations: a systematic review. *Homeopathy*, 2003, **92**(2): 92-98
51. Sharples, FMC; van Haselen, R; Fisher P. NHS patients'perspective on complementary medicine: a survey. *Complementary therapies in Medicine*, 2003, **11**:243-248.