I - The legacy of the past : Hahnemann and Kent[1]

The legacy linked to the past is manifold.
It reflects the changes in society as well as the turmoil affecting the care system…

It cannot be mentioned without the name of Hahnemann being quickly followed by that of Kent…
Each of them expresses a way of thinking, a period, a culture, with the different trends that may have modified its attitude to engender an evolution whose consequences are found even today and show a profound change which, from a common basis, is expressed in various ways.

It is divided into several stages
The first two stages are characterised by the similitude proposed by Hahnemann and respected by Kent - and in accordance with that accepted by scientific circles;
The third and fourth stages, by the replacement of that similitude by analogies and, on several points, the considerable distancing from Hahnemann and Kent.

An essential fact: notable changes from Kent;
A notion of a metaphysical nature introduced in the conception of disorders, the psyche put at the heart of the therapeutic choice with the unicity of the medicine, multifarious changes engendered by the difficulty of determining the latter characterise the Kentian period.
The use of various, successively Thomistic, psychoanalytic, botanical categorisations concerning the South American schools brought together by the concept of 'original sin'; botanical, mineral and animal ones for the most recent ones, which pride themselves on using the most modern scientific data are the characteristics of the post-Kentian period.

Similitude has gradually and imperceptibly been replaced by analogy…
Hence the need, in today's world, to define more clearly the different faces of what, in a more or less appropriate way, claims to come from 'Homoeopathy'.[2]

To be continued…

Doctor Geneviève Ziegel