



**IJAYUSH**  
*International Journal of AYUSH*  
AYURVEDA, YOGA, UNANI, SIDDHA AND HOMEOPATHY  
<http://internationaljournal.org.in/journal/index.php/ijayush/>

International Journal  
Panacea  
Research library  
ISSN: 2349 7025

---

Review Article

Volume 10 Issue 06

Nov – Dec 2021

---

## HAHNEMANN UN-ANSWERED

Dr. Partha P. Ray

M. D. (Hom.) M. Sc. (Applied Psychology), PGDGC

---

Email ID: ddithi31@gmail.com

**ABSTRACT:** *Homoeopathic principles were discovered against the un-scientific and in human treatment protocol of Hahnemann's time. Hahnemann's solitary revolt ultimately became successful and homoeopathy attracted the attention of thousands of people across the universe. He came out with many new perspectives but in many occasions these dictums are not well explained, missed and not beyond controversy.*

**KEY WORDS:** *Homoeopathy – Hahnemann –Potency – Genus epidemicus – Miasm - Vital force*

### INTRODUCTION:

At the very outset I want to pay my deepest homage to the founder of Homoeopathy, Dr. Samuel Hahnemann. The work done by this man in two hundred years before was not only innovative, but ahead of his time. The concept of smallest possible dose, individualization, concept of miasm astounds us. We have seen the efficacy of small doses in terms of vaccination. Individualization – a concept getting supported from modern thinkers<sup>1</sup>. The genetic diseases make us understand the worth of concept of miasm.

---

<sup>1</sup> “When a patient sees a doctor, he has some expectations and hopes”, **API Text Book of Medicine** says, “They expect him to be interested in them as an individual. – He should not consider the patient as a bundle of symptoms, abnormal physical signs or pathological tissue specimens but a human being who has approached him for relief from physical and mental agony”. **Harrison** also declares, “---In this era of ‘Techno-medicine’, physicians need of approach to the patient not as ‘case’ or ‘disease’, but as individual whose problems are also to often transcend their

This article is only for finding the conceptual dis-integrity of the work of Hahnemann whose rectification is essential to fit Homoeopathy as per the demand of science.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS:** We have studied a vast literature and tried to understand the concept, evolution and references of such theory in Homoeopathy. The theoretical study was conducted at Aurangabad from September 2020 to March 2021.

#### **REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE:**

As we all know that the official announcement of homoeopathy, that is a mode of therapy may exist apart from the conventional thought, was made through an article titled **“Essay on a new principle for ascertaining the curative power of the drugs”** published in the Hufeland’s journal for the practicing physician Vol. 2, pts. 3,4. This was for the first time, public announcement of the new principals guiding Homoeopathy made, which as per **Haehl**, *“the fact remains that 1796 is the year of birth of Homoeopathy”*. Interestingly, **Edward Jenner** became successful in the same year<sup>2</sup>. Further to add that this was an era of translation of different material medica by Hahnemann. In 1787 we found Hahnemann to translate **“MedizinalPflanzan”** by **Kholer**. During 1790 he translated, **“A treatise on the materiamedica”** (Leipsic / Schweikret / 2 volumes) by **William Cullen** and in 1791 he translated **Donald Monro’s “Medicinal and pharmaceutical chemistry”** (Leipsic / 2 vols.<sup>3</sup>)

In this article that is **“Essay on a new principle for ascertaining the curative power of the drugs’** Hahnemann for the first time speaks regarding law of similia (***similiasimilibuscurenture***). That is not came as direction, a proposal which reads, “We should imitate nature, which sometimes cures a chronic disease by super adding another, and employ in the (especially chronic) disease we wish to cure, that medicine which is able to produce another very similar artificial disease, and the former will be cured ; similia

---

physical complaints”. The ‘ideals’ cited in the **Oxford Handbook of Clinical Medicine** also says, “Treat the whole patient, not the disease”, which sounds like Hahnemann, conveying his unrest request form the last to last century.

<sup>2</sup> Samuel Hahnemann, His life and time/ Trevor Cook/ B. Jain/ New Delhi/ 2001/ P= 79

<sup>3</sup>The Life and Letters of Dr Samuel Hahnemann/ By Thomas Lindsley Bradford, M.D.

simili bus curenture<sup>4</sup>". Even in the **first edition this law came in the introduction under bracket and no aphorism is dedicated for that.**

Gradually the other doctrines developed, which was the working hypothesis such as drug proving, simplex, potentization and later the theories of chronic diseases and vital force. Hahnemann first proved china and understood that is the only way which shall help to find the therapeutic action of the remedy. This is not Hahnemann only, many enthusiastic persons used to take drug to see its effect. Many unfortunate incidences had happened also. We find Hahnemann was much cautious in the process of proving he adopted. Stapfin response to Stapf's proposal to invite all physicians to conduct homeopathic drug provings: "No, only young heads which are not yet filled to overflowing with the conventional dogma, through whose veins do not yet stream millions of medical prejudices; only such young and impartial people who still value the truth and happiness of humanity, who are open to our simple doctrine of salvation... etc<sup>5</sup>. Hahnemann's scepticism was presumably partly the result of his failed attempt at interesting the physicians of Leipzig in his homeopathy courses. Medical students, as he had found out, were more amenable.

In the initial days of practice Hahnemann used the drugs prepared by other people only the similia was maintained. Later he understood that micro doses may produce mega result. Theory of potentization which is the counterpart of dilution and succession was the outcome of his constant experimentations. He never gave up experiments and really he did not believed on empty speculations.

Hahnemann was motivated by Hippocratic teaching without doubt. Hippocrates closely observed the effects of these similars and opposites on the constitutions of his patients and noted the responses of the treatment on the "**vismedicana natura, physis**". Vide **Hippocrates**, "*There are diseases to be treated by similars, others better treated by*

---

<sup>4</sup>Essay on a new principle for ascertaining the curative powers of drugs, paragraph 64

<sup>5</sup> Hahnemann the founder of Homoeopathy / Robert Jutte

*contraries. Everything is dependent on the nature of the disease.*<sup>6</sup> He was motivated by Bacon and Immanuel Kant<sup>7</sup> of his time and developed a view of rational thinking.

### **HAHNEMANN AND POTENCY PARADOX:**

---

We find Hahnemann to speak on constitution in section 5 which reads, "In these investigations, the ascertainable physical constitution of the patient (especially when the disease is chronic), his moral and intellectual character, his occupation, mode of living and habits, his social and domestic relations, his age, sexual function, etc., are to be taken into consideration."<sup>8</sup> This word is further used in Aphorism 78, 81 and etc. where only this concept was attached only of **physical structure** but later in section 136 he speaks of **corporeal and mental constitution**. The word temperament is nowhere used in the text or footnotes of Organon. He used the word **disposition** and footnote 213 reads, "*Thus aconite will seldom or never effect a rapid or permanent cure in a patient of a quiet, calm, equable disposition; and just as little will nux vomica be serviceable where the disposition is mild and phlegmatic, pulsatilla where it is happy, gay and obstinate, or ignatia where it is imperturbable and disposed neither to be frightened nor vexed*'.

Homoeopathy is expected to stick to the principle of Individualization and totality of symptoms with perfect direction on power and doses (amount and time). While speaking on mental disease conditions he writes, 'If, however, insanity or mania (caused by fright, vexation, the abuse of spirituous liquors, etc.) have suddenly broken out as an acute disease in the patient's ordinary calm state, although it almost always arises from internal psora, like a flame bursting forth from it, yet when it occurs in this acute manner **it should not be immediately treated with antipsoric**, but in the first place with remedies indicated for it out of the order class of proved medicaments (e.g., **aconite, belladonna, stramonium, hyoscyamus, mercury, etc.**) in highly potentized, minute, homoeopathic doses, in order to subdue it so far that the psora shall for the time revert to its former latent state, wherein the patient appears as if quite well"<sup>9</sup>. **Here what potency to be used is not mentioned.**

---

<sup>6</sup>Aphorisms of Hippocrates/ ADAM'S Hippocrates

<sup>7</sup> Samuel Hahnemann his Life and works / Richard Haehl/ Vol. 1/ B. Jain/ New Delhi/ 1992/ P= 251.

<sup>8</sup> Hahnemann/ Organon of medicine / tr. By Dudgeon & Boericke/ B. Jain/ New Delhi/ 1996/ Section 5

<sup>9</sup>Hahnemann/ Organon of medicine / tr. By Dudgeon & Boericke/ B. Jain/ New Delhi/ 1996/ Section 221

Because we know Hahnemann was stuck by his assertion that 30 were “high enough for any homoeopath”<sup>10</sup>. Hahnemann himself felt, in 1829, the urgent necessity of a limit in potentisation and declared the ultimate degree of dilution to be the 30th centesimal potency. It is true however, that he had already exceeded this limit in 1825, when, as we saw, he recommended Thuja for gonorrhoea; in that case he had described the **60th potency** as being particularly efficacious<sup>11</sup>. *In the year 1829, Hahnemann came upon the strange idea of setting up a kind of standard dose for all curative remedies used in homoeopathy. This was to be the 30th centesimal*<sup>12</sup>.

**The most unanswered issue from Hahnemann is this potency paradox. Why he restricted only to thirty potency, is not known.** This was 1829. He observed the work of Dr Gross of Jüterbogk, Dr Schréter of Lemberg and General Korsakoff in Russia. They became the real founders of the theory of high potencies, which later on found an industrious and zealous protagonist in Stapf<sup>13</sup> also. How anxious he was at that time to set a limit to the over-enthusiasm of his students, is best shown by the following letter to Dr Schréter, of Lemberg, of the 12 Sept 1829: *“I do not approve of your potentising medicines higher than to XII and XXII [my emphasis] - there must be a limit to the matter, it cannot go on indefinitely. But by definitely deciding that homoeopathic medicines should be diluted and potentised up to 30 C - a homogeneous process arises in the cures of all homoeopaths and if they describe a cure, we are able to work after them in the same degree, since they are operating with the same tools as we are. Then our enemies cannot reproach us with all having nothing definite, no fixed standard”*<sup>14</sup>.

Did Hahnemann understand that he cannot stop his disciples especially like of Korsakoff in Russia who created a peculiar method of Potentization. A good number of Homoeopathic stalwarts like **Boenninghausen, Dr. Stapf, and Dr. Rummel and Dr. Hering** were in favor of increasing the potency. Hering shouted, “Higher, higher every year” across Atlantic. This

---

<sup>10</sup> Hahnemann and Homoeopathy/ Peter Morrel/ B. Jain/ New Delhi/ 2003/ P = 138

<sup>11</sup> Ibid /P = 139

<sup>12</sup> Samuel Hahnemann his Life and works / Richard Haehl/ Vol. 1/ B. Jain/ New Delhi/ 1992/ P= 321 - 221.

<sup>13</sup> Dr. Stapf and Gross actually wrote Chronic diseases, their nature and Homoeopathic treatment as per Hahnemann’s direction. They were called because Hahnemann’s health could not permit him to write the manuscript.

<sup>14</sup> Samuel Hahnemann his Life and works / Richard Haehl/ Vol. 1/ B. Jain/ New Delhi/ 1992

further added fuel in the theory and very soon Homoeopath got 100, 200, 500, 800, 1000, 1500, 2000, 10,000, 50,000 and even higher potencies. Was this the reason the Hahnemann was going to introduce his fifty millicimal scale or it was already there and so Hahnemann lost his interest on centesimal scale? **The question has no answer.**

#### **HAHNEMANN AND GENUS EPIDEMICUS:**

---

In the same way when He makes a guideline for the treatment of epidemics of Ague (Malaria) the doctrine of individualization seems to vanish. Aphorism 282 reads ‘...., which would have been useful in the first paroxysms (rarely an antipsoric), is now no longer suitable and cannot be of any service. We have now to do with a psoric intermittent fever only, and this will generally be subdued by minute and rarely repeated doses of **sulphur or heparsulphuris** in a high potency.’ Again we don’t know what is the potency and why **sulphur or heparsulphuris only. Is it to be given without any totality? If it is then where the doctrine of totality gone?**

Aphorism 243 says, “ ...., a homoeopathic remedy selected for the special case from the other **class of proved (not antipsoric) medicines**; but if, notwithstanding this procedure, the recovery is deferred, we know that we have **psora** on the point of its development, and that in this case antipsoric medicines alone can effect a radical cure” and, “..but one or two very small doses of a **highly potentized solution of cinchona bark would**, conjointly with the well-regulated mode of living just alluded to, speedily free him from the disease (Aphorism 244)’ and finally, ‘Large, oft-repeated doses of cinchona bark, as also concentrated cinchona remedies, such as the **sulphate of quinine**, have certainly the power of freeing such patients from the periodical fits of the marsh ague; but those thus deceived into the belief that they are cured remain diseased in another way’. **Doesn’t it violate the rules of Homoeopathy?**

#### **HAHNEMANN AND CHRONIC MIASM:**

---

The third area where we find Hahnemann was unanswered, his theory of chronic miasm. He writes in a foot note of page no. 44 of Chronic disease, *“It was more easy to me, then to many hundreds of others, to find out and to recognize the signs of psora as well as when latent and as yet slumbering within, as when it has grown to considerable chronic diseases, by an*

*accurate comparison of the state of health of all such persons with myself, who, as is seldom the case, have never been afflicted with the psora, and have, therefore, from my birth even until now in my eightieth year, been entirely free from the (smaller and greater) ailments enumerated here and further below, although I have been, on the whole, very apt to catch acute epidemic diseases, and have been exposed to many mental exertions and thousand fold vexations of spirit”<sup>15</sup>.*

Hahnemann admits then, though indirectly, that there is a state of predisposition prior to the getting infected with the psoric miasm. Here Hahnemann seems to distinguish between two types of susceptibility on the part of human beings; **susceptibility to acute infections and that to the chronic diseases**. But he fails to develop his contention. Thus we come to the conclusion that the psora is not a diathesis or dyscrasia but a diseased condition itself<sup>16</sup>. Regarding the same issue Stuart Close write, “The primary error consisted in regarding psora merely as a dyscrasia or diathesis, which is directly opposed to what Hahnemann taught as we now understand it. Instead of regarding psora as a dyscrasia Hahnemann included several dyscrasias among the morbid conditions and disease caused by psora”<sup>17</sup>.

This is true that Hahnemann could not make him free from this dilemma. Accordingly in the first edition of Chronic disease and in an essay submitted to the homoeopathic congress in 1830 he recommended the application to the back or elsewhere of a **Burgundy-pitch**<sup>18</sup> **plaster, for the purpose of bringing out an eruption; but he afterwards found that the production of such an eruption did not forward the cure, so in second edition of Chronic Disease and fifth edition of Organon, he retracts his recommendation for this**. He says, however, the plaster, may be serviceable to show the reality of the existence of psoric diseases, for it is, he alleges, only where the later exists that the former produces the eruption; in a non-psoric individual the plaster occasions neither eruption or itching. In the first three editions of Organon he adducted a number of examples of chronic diseases, especially asthma and phthisis, cured by infection of itch but in last two editions he says

<sup>15</sup> Hahnemann/ The chronic diseases/ B. Jain/ New Delhi/ 1992/ P = 44

<sup>16</sup> Hahnemann’s Organon – commentary by B. K. Shirker/ M. Bhattacharya & Co. Calcutta/ 1987/P = 353

<sup>17</sup> The Genius of Homoeopathy / S. Close / B. Jain/ New Delhi/ 1995 / P = 94

<sup>18</sup> **Burgundy-pitch** is yellowish brown or reddish brown hard viscous resin obtained as an exudation from the Norway spruce and used especially formerly in medicinal plasters or resin from any of various pines or firs sometimes mixed with other substances (such as turpentine) / <https://www.merriamwebster.com>

they must not to be over looked upon as such for these maladies are themselves arising as they are of psoric in origin<sup>19</sup>. Dudgeon writes, 'It seems to me, **the uncertainty Hahnemann felt as to the truth of his doctrine of chronic diseases, and his unwillingness to make a complete retraction of opinions he had formerly exposed, though by failing to do so he put himself in the predicament of inculcating opposite opinions in different works**".

**Dr. Stapf**, who actualized this work with Hahnemann, accepted this new theory saying it to be the surprising revelation respecting the nature and treatment of chronic diseases wrongly being thought till date. **Dr. Alexander Peterson** of Pensa in Russia accepted this Psora theory. **Rau** of Giessen, the materialist man, accepted that any of the chronic diseases are due to the ill cured itch. **Dr. Wolf** supported this theory. **Dr. Schrön** admitted that this doctrine has had a material influence on practice. **Dr. Hering**, was skeptical when Hahnemann first introduced his miasm theory, but after observing the syndromes in his patients, he became a great contributor to the further development of the doctrine and followed Hahnemann believing that all epidemic fevers are psoric<sup>20</sup>. So as the post Hahnemanian homoeopaths are concerned Kent supported this theory to massive extent. The glimpses are collected Vide **Kent's Lectures on Homeopathic Philosophy**<sup>21</sup>, which says, "Asthma, when it is hereditary, is one of the sycotic diseases of Hahnemann". Another experienced homeopath, **H. C. Allen**, offered his opinion as to the use of the totality without an understanding of the chronic miasms and their layers. In his classic, **The Chronic Miasms he writes**, "I think I hear many say, are not the totality of the symptoms, all there is to disease? Yes, but to me it is necessary to know something of what is behind that grouping of the totality. If you do not know this you are prescribing for a Jack-in-the-box. You cannot follow the evolution of the curative process; you cannot even prescribe intelligently the proper diet for a patient, unless you know the basic miasm. Of course the diseases that are present will help you to some extent, but you have no surety unless you know the underlying basic disturber of the disordered life". **Dr. Allen** shared his feelings in this way, "We make no attack upon the law; no cure can be made outside of the law. But we

<sup>19</sup> Lectures on the theory and practice of Homoeopathy/ R. E. Dudgeon/ B. Jain/ 1987/ 257

<sup>20</sup> Lectures on the theory and practice of Homoeopathy/ R. E. Dudgeon/ B. Jain/ 1987/ 267

<sup>21</sup> Lectures on Homoeopathic Philosophy/ J. T. Kent/ Paul Medico/ Calcutta/ 1992/ P =169

do believe it is necessary to know whether the phenomena presented in a given case are of sycotic, syphilitic or tubercular origin; for the totality grouping of the symptoms must be around the symptoms of the active miasm” and again “A knowledge of all miasmatic phenomenon would be, in Toto, a complete knowledge of all that is known as disease, and beyond these symptoms there is nothing discoverable or recognizable as disease”<sup>22</sup>. **H. A. Robert** extended his support in it saying psora is a deficiency<sup>23</sup>.

**Dunhum** passes this puzzle saying it may be impotent for anamnesis. He also says that psora may be said as pre-disposition then a disease itself.

**Burnett** wrote: "The truth, for me, is that you cannot kill acari by any dynamic dose of any remedy whatsoever, and hence I have thrown the doctrine overboard... I would restate the doctrine thus: You cannot cure the itch by dynamic medication, and you must therefore kill the acari; they should be killed on the spot, the sooner the better; you cannot kill acari with dynamic remedies, and they should be killed at once."

We find **Otto Lesser** remarks in his **Textbook of Homoeopathic Materia Media**, “Although one does not have the impression of a ‘loquacitassenilis’<sup>⊙</sup> there is the ring of incompletely formulated mental sequences. **Only in a type of summary has Hahnemann finishes this thoughts and then, capricious as he was, attributed itch as the cause of psora and there with the majority of chronic diseases.** He gave the most unimportant aspect of the entire psora theory as excessive accent and there was and still is the danger that the good is cast away with the bad, that is, in this instance that theoretically and practically important thoughts on the relation of chronic diseases remain unconsidered”. **Dudgeon** commented that, it is not a doctrinal coeval with the promulgation of the homoeopathic principle, but on after taught, and not developed until thirty-two years later and as we might give credence to it, like Autereith, Schoenlein and others, without losing any of our claims to the doctrine. It is not a doctrinal coeval promulgator of the Homoeopathic principals --- so we may reject it with out losing any claims of the subject or

---

<sup>22</sup> The chronic miasm, psora, pseudo and Sycosis/ Allen, J. H./ B. Jain/ New Delhi/ 2002/ Vol. 1/ P = 15

<sup>23</sup> The principles and art of cure by Homoeopathy/ Robert H. A./ B. Jain/ 1993/ New Delhi/ P = 185

<sup>⊙</sup> Old man’s talks when he attends senility.

title<sup>24</sup>” and again, “When Hahnemann talks of the utter inefficacy of the treatment of chronic diseases he is guilty with the great exaggeration, a fault which he very frequently commits; for there is no doubt that chronic diseases were cured by Hahnemann by himself, as we learn from many cases detailed in his Lesser writings, before the discovery of the psoric origin of disease, and before he knew a single so-called anti-psoric medicine”<sup>25</sup>. **Griesselich** said that Hahnemann’s psora theory is too much one sided. By accepting this theory as genera; morbific because we shut ourselves out from investigating the cause of diseases<sup>¶</sup>. **Dr. Arlond** says, “It becomes therefore a question, how a skin disease that is caused and kept up by a parasite can give rise to the diseases of the other organs?”<sup>¶</sup>.

### **HAHNEMANN AND VITAL FORCE:**

---

Hahnemann as a keen observer and as a lifetime student most probably followed all of the fore said contemporary as well as the old writings. Being the full devotee to the God<sup>26</sup> studied the Bible thoroughly so the ideas regarding the Vital Force were not unknown to him. He was a student of classical philosophy and a master of Greek and Latin he got the privilege of studying the original works of Naturalists and Hippocratic cannon. It seems that Hippocrates massively influenced Hahnemann. Samuel’s introduction of ‘**Vigor Vitae**’ is based on the conception of Hippocrates, Stahl & Barthez. Hippocrates thought physics was innate to the human constitution and temperament. This life force is responsible for homoeostasis, adaptation and self-preservation of human being. The Greek called the life force, dynamic, the Sovereign, because it rules all human activities. In **Organon** Hahnemann had defined Vital force as the single ruling dynamic power that enlivens the material organism and provides the harmony in the vital operation. Hahnemann used the word ‘**Seele**’, which means soul.

---

<sup>24</sup> Lectures on the theory and practice of Homoeopathy/ R. E. Dudgeon/ B. Jain/ 1987/ 289

<sup>25</sup> Lectures on the theory and practice of Homoeopathy/ R. E. Dudgeon/ B. Jain/ 1987/ 279

<sup>¶</sup> Lectures on the theory and practice of Homoeopathy/ R. E. Dudgeon/ B. Jain/ 1987/ 285

<sup>26</sup>Sec: 17, “It is only thus that God the preserver of mankind, could reveal His wisdom and goodness in reference to the cure of the disease to which man is liable here below, by showing to the physician what he had to remove in disease in order to annihilate them and thus re-establish health”./ Sec: 60, F.N. 1 “*But God knows the patient on his bed of sickness was not treated with violence, for the prick of a small lancet is not really painful and the gum Arabic solution (Eau de Gourme, almost the only medicine that Brousseau used) was mild in taste and without apparent action - the bite of the leeches insignificant and the blood letting by the physician done quietly while the luke warm baths could only soothe, hence the disease from the very start must have been fatal, so that the patient, notwithstanding all efforts of the physician, had to leave the earth.*”

Hahnemann viewed human body as a trinity of the conscious spirit, the instinctive Vital Force and the physical organization. This is the trinity of psyche in Homoeopathic philosophy – the functional polarity of the vital plane is represented by human essence and the Vital Force. So, this goes without saying that Hahnemann did not invent this idea but defined them in Homoeopathic paradigm. Hahnemann used the term, **Lebenskraft**<sup>27</sup>, from **Lebens - life + Kraft - force, power, and energy**. He also used the terms **Lebens-Energie, life-energy, Lenens-Erhaltungskraft**, the substantive power of life, and **Nature-Kraft**, the power of nature. In the old historical German dictionary the term, **Lebenskraft**, is linked with the Latin root word, **Vigor Vitae**. This is important because the homoeopath must recognize the connection between the vital force and vitality, as it is essential to understanding the philosophy of healing. In the 6th edition of the Organon Hahnemann uses **Stahl's term, 'Lebensprincip'**, the life-principle, in several places. This term is associated with the Anima Mandi of Vitalism what Chamber's English Dictionary affirms.

Not only the modern science but also the homoeopaths those believing upon physiological school, pathological stand point also criticized Hahnemann for introduction of such obsolete theory in Homoeopathy. **Dr. T.P. Wilson**, in the editorial of Medical Advance (Jan. 1884) wrote “We reject the assumption of life principle, first because it is unscientific and secondly because it is not needed to account for the phenomenon of life, health and disease”. **John William Draper** said such a preposterous doctrine would not bear the touch of exact science for a moment. **Carpenter** writes in Human Physiology: By resting assumption of a Vital Principle of organic agent as affording a sufficient amount of all that is mysterious in the nature of life, we really remove it from the domain of scientific enquiry. **Dr. Grauvogal** in his first part of “**Text book of Homoeopathy**” writes: from the natural laws of physiology thus far presented, no Vital Force can be inferred. **Richard Hughes** claimed Vital Force to be hypothetical and suggested to reject it. But at the same time we can see a strong support is being paid by **Dr. Wells** who commenting over Vital Force in Medical Advance vol. Xiv 7, as ‘without this force as a chief factor Homoeopathy has no Philosophy; neither can there be, without this force included in it, any rational

---

<sup>27</sup> ‘For should our vital force have its integrity impaired by injurious influences from without, then this force strives instinctively and automatically to free itself from the adventitious derangement (disease) by revolutionary processes’ / Preface / 4<sup>th</sup> Edition of Organon/ Dudgeon

philosophy of life, health and sickness'. **Dr. Finkein** Medical Advance vol. Xiv No. 11 says 'the vital force which every birth, death and daily life can testify to'. Tate said 'to deny vital force seemed like being unable to distinguish between a cadaver and a living body'. **Robert** and **Kent** also strongly recommended this concept. **Robert** said that "In order to understand Homoeopathy and to get concept administering our remedies and even of taking the case, we must get Hahnemann's concept of principles that enter into the studies of Homoeopathic physician. One of the first and foremost element with which the Homoeopathic physician must be conversant is the different forms of energy, for it is on the basis only that we can practice Homoeopathically ---- this was the first introduction to the medical world of the rational concept of the life itself <sup>28</sup>."

Kent really tried to give a new meaning to this theory. He all together changed the idea of force to substance. He put some criterion upon which this simple substance plays in the body. Though Hahnemann changed vital force as vital principle in the sixth edition, even, though wrote, 'vital force of the vital principle' could not at all helped us to come out from the criticism of the world.

Here question comes what was the need of introduction of this age old, controversial and dogmatic theory in homoeopathy. What is the position of Hahnemann as a medical philosopher? He was **philosophically** speaking **Hahnemann** may be classed under the school of **Empiricism** but as it is said which was justifiable, he took the note<sup>29</sup> Like so many of his contemporaries Hahnemann was a **Deist**<sup>30</sup>. Other view says, Hahnemann was a Vitalist. "He saw in the body but an organism made up of the material particle in themselves dead but vivified and adapted to the real living man, the spirit with us. The connection between this spiritual and immaterial being, on one hand, and psychologic function, on the other, was accomplished by the supposition that there existed a vital force which he designed Dynamis"<sup>31</sup> But Stuart Close ascribes him as a substantialist. "The basic thought of Substantialism is that all things in Nature which exist or are really substantial

---

<sup>28</sup> The principles and Art of Cure by Homoeopathy/ Robert H. A. / B. Jain/ 1993/ P = 49

<sup>29</sup> Hahnemann's Organon – commentary by B. K. Sarkar/ M. Bhattacharya & Co. Calcutta/ 1987/ P = 85

<sup>30</sup> Samuel Hahnemann his Life and works / Richard Haehl/ ibid./P= 252

<sup>31</sup> A Compend of the Principles of for Students in Medicine/ Garth Boericke/ B. Jain/ New Delhi/ 1991/ P = 67

entities. They may include the life and mental powers". Hahnemann's position and statements in regard to the Deity; to life, mind, vital force, matter, potentization (or dynamization), infinitesimals are all supports his substantialistic idea. Neither was he an idealist in the extreme sense of one who believed, with Bishop Berkeley (and Mrs. Eddy) that all which exists is spirit, and that which is called matter, or the external World, is either a succession of notions impressed on the mind by Deity, an illusion or "error," or else the mere edict of the mind itself as taught by Fichte.

**CONCLUSION:** Truth is that, apart from being substantialist, Hahnemann had no rode open to place him in the world of facts and reality. Homoeopathy deals with many **abstract ideas**. This begins with the concept of totality of symptoms. He expected the portrait of the disease but that never became equivocal, rarely Homoeopaths came down to a single remedy. He could not been able to produce a scientific mechanism to create the totality. It is not possible, we know, to frame the picture -is an art, but when we call homoeopathy is a science too, our guideline never get a foundation. The process of Individualization suffers from the same integrity of ideas. Hahnemann wanted to standardize (Idealism) everything. His cure has a definition, his physician has a definition, his expected knowledge form a physician has a definition – but how to find the characterizing symptom, how to known this expression is of worth – has no standardization. Same stands for the concept of miasm, a perception which is entirely based on conceptual work, having no way to prove. We have to depend upon the list of expressions written in books. We can refer page no. X or Y of chronic disease but we have no answer, if it is asked, what methodology was used by Hahnemann to conclude this. Same stands for Vital force. Same stands for the method of dynamization (ten strokes). Same stands for relationship of remedies (complementary, antidote, follows well, followed by etc.). Same stands for method of drug proving itself. But to be a science so much of abstraction cannot be granted.

#### **REFERENCES:**

1. Siddharth N Shah, Editor / *API Text of Medicine*/ / 7<sup>th</sup>. ED./ 2003/ P = 7
2. Kasper D, Fauci A / *Harrison's Principles of Internal Medicine*/ Vol I./ McGrew-Hill/ 2005/ P = 1

3. R. A. Hope, J. M. Longmore / *Oxford Handbook of Clinical Medicine*/ MurryLongmore / 15th. Ed./ 2001/ P = 2
4. Trevor Cook/ *Samuel Hahnemann, His life and time*/ B. Jain/ New Delhi / 2001/ P= 79
5. Thomas Lindsley Bradford / *The Life and Letters of Dr Samuel Hahnemann*/ 2010/ B. Jain/ New Delhi / P = 126
6. Hahnemann / *Essay on a new principle for ascertaining the curative powers of drugs / Lesser writings/ paragraph 64/ B. Jain /New Delhi / P = 124*
7. Robert Jutte/ *Hahnemann the founder of Homoeopathy* / e. book
8. *Aphorisms of Hippocrates/ ADAM'S Hippocrates* / e. Book
9. Richard Haehl/ *Samuel Hahnemann his Life and works* / / Vol. 1/ B. Jain/ New Delhi/ 1992/ P= 25, 321 – 221, 252
10. Hahnemann/ *Organon of medicine* / B. Jain/ New Delhi/ 1996/ Section 5, 221
11. Peter Morrel / *Hahnemann and Homoeopathy*/ / B. Jain/ New Delhi/ 2003/ P = 138
12. Hahnemann/ *The chronic diseases*/ B. Jain/ New Delhi/ 1992/ P = 44
13. B. K. Shirker / *Hahnemann's Organon – commentary* / M. Bhattacharya & Co. Calcutta/ 1987/P = 353, 85
14. S. Close / *The Genius of Homoeopathy* / B. Jain/ New Delhi/ 1995 / P = 94
15. [merriam webster.com](https://www.merriam-webster.com)
16. R. E. Dudgeon / *Lectures on the theory and practice of Homoeopathy*/ / B. Jain/ 1987/ 257, 267, 289, 279, 285
17. J. T. Kent / *Lectures on Homoeopathic Philosophy*/ Paul Medico/ Calcutta/ 1992/ P =169
18. Allen, J. H./ *The chronic miasm, psora, pseudo and Sycosis*/ B. Jain/ New Delhi/ 2002/ Vol. 1/ P = 15
19. Robert H. A / *The principles and art of cure by Homoeopathy*/ B. Jain/ 1993/ New Delhi/ P = 185

20. Hahnemann/ *Organon, Preface / 4<sup>th</sup> Edition of Organon*/ B. Jain / P = 14
21. Robert H. A / *The principles and Art of Cure by Homoeopathy* / B. Jain/ 1993/ P = 49
22. Garth Boericke / *A Compend of the Principles of for Students in Medicine* / B. Jain/  
New Delhi/ 1991/ P = 67