

### III - The legacy of the past.

#### Second stage: James Tyler Kent<sup>1</sup> (1849-1916)

##### ***It shows the first changes***

They were considerable, given what they generated, and their effects can still be felt today.

According to Kent,

##### ***Illness has a spiritual cause that disrupts the functioning of vital energy:***

Mentioned more or less clearly in various annexed writings, 'original sin' is at issue...

More or less questioned, the 'illumination' and categorisations coming from Emanuel Swedenborg (1688-1772), a Swedish scientist, theologian, and philosopher and the founder of a Church to which Kent's wife belonged, seemed to have some influence but they were not the only ones. The somewhat biased translations of Charles Julius Hempel (1811-1879), strongly influenced by Christianity and religion, most probably played a role as well.

##### ***The marks of the 'original defect' responsible for all disorders should be looked for in the 'mental state' of the subject...***

The mental signs reflecting a change in 'the subject's way of being in the world' should be located first.

They are the dominant elements in the choice of the medicine and the first signs of the 'real illness'.

Their search justifies the methodologies used...

##### ***The view proposed is more psychosomatic than somatopsychic.***

It carries underlying metaphysical points of view. The subject's mentality has their marks on it and the disruption of vital energy bears witness to them.

##### ***The similitude proposed by Hahnemann is respected.***

This is an essential point that is worth mentioning.

##### ***In spite of that important theoretical difference and while he introduced subtle changes, Kent's position remained relatively similar to Hahnemann's.***

##### ***The use of Materia Medica remains the same but...***

More and more *pathogénésies* are carried out in order to get as close as possible to the original disruption that engendered the disorders observed.

##### ***A different use of clinical cases appears...:***

More than an illustration of the cases recounted, they are used for authenticating the impact of a medicine coming from the new pathogenetic tests...

---

<sup>1</sup> Third section of a seven-part article entitled, *Entre héritage du passé et modernisme... L'homéopathie*, Geneviève Ziegel, December 2019, published on homeopsy.com

*There are no recounts of dreams to be compared with those of the patient to be treated.*  
That point is totally in line with Hahnemann's teaching.

*The content of repertories and their use tend to be strengthened.*  
The increase in the number of *pathogénésies* inevitably leads to it.

*Mental signs are more and more over-enhanced.*

Bearing witness to the central disruption responsible for all illnesses, they have to be looked for first.

***On the other hand, blurred and confused areas appear...***

*Confusion then mixing up of 'psychic' signs with 'mental' - mental: mentire - signs...*

It is not possible to determine when the going from one word to the other without distinction occurred.

Depression, anxiety, anger: those are psychic signs;

Thinking that nobody can help one (Natrum Mur), being indifferent to those one loves most (Sepia): those are mental signs.

*Imperceptible shifts in vocabulary, appearance of new words...*

Modifications showing the Kentian influence were gradually introduced in the concepts and words referring to them: there was the gradual going from 'psychic sign' to 'mental sign', from 'good responder' to 'responding type'<sup>2</sup>...

In fact, the introduction of the concept of 'basic remedy' led, without it being said precisely, to a form of 'similitude - to the - subject' and to the scars of their original illness rather than to similitude to the disorder without more precision...

In fact, in Kent's opinion, when the medicine likely to cover all the disorders coming from the original illness - whose marks lie in the mental state (*simillimum*) - cannot be found, that for the disorder at a given moment (*simile*) can be given<sup>3</sup>.

Except for the fact that he introduced a concept that placed the subject in a history going beyond the genetic element<sup>4</sup> to put them in the wider one of mankind and the marks transmitted from generation to generation, it must be stressed that Kent introduced a subtle change.

The latter was all the more important as it engendered vagueness and confusion.

*Change in the way of seeing and approaching the concept of vital energy*

The latter is not just 'set in motion' but described as likely to be disrupted if there is a break with natural laws.

***Directly after Kent, forms of distortions gradually appeared...***

---

<sup>2</sup> The word 'type' is not insignificant, as it is meant to show both the individualisation of the response and a form of categorisation which, directly after Kent, also affected the world of homoeopathy.

<sup>3</sup> With the risk raised by many 'purists' of suppressing symptoms, which would later be problematic, to the extent that some of them have said that it was better to give Saccharum Lactis or even nothing, or else an allopathic treatment than not to give the *simillimum* for the original disorder, which would be so representative of the subject that, in the absolute, as many *pathogénésies* as human beings would be needed, hence the increase in the number of the former - it seemed that Kent wore himself out carrying them out.

<sup>4</sup> - whose effects the concept of diathesis introduced by Hahnemann expresses -

*Certain pathogénésies proved to be problematic...*

More or less developed and from various sources, they had, according to their origins and the rigour accompanying their putting in place, varying aspects directly linked to the mode in which they were carried out and to the conclusions drawn from them.

*The clinical cases illustrating them were more or less representative...*

They seemed to be meant to make their conclusions tally with the medicine - which makes one wonder about the interpretations which may come from them...

*The way of seeing the medicine was modified...*

The looking for the 'spirit of the remedy' from the perceptions of various participants - experimenters or not of the *pathogénésie* - and from what came from it gradually seemed to wander from the observation of the signs alone.

***Kent's Unicism and the unicity of the medicine advocated by Hahnemann (5<sup>th</sup> version of The Organon) are often confused.***

Particularly in France and Europe, the misappreciation of the importance of the theoretical changes introduced, the paucity of translations and the different trends touching the world of care as a whole (post-war restructuring, contribution of psychoanalysis, scientific advances, desire to see the 'irrational' decline, etc.) have probably had a significant impact.

***The perception and practice of homoeopathy are affected by this.***

**In the United States, where Kentism appeared...**

***There were several favouring factors***

Given the religious connotation of his theorisation, Kent could only be well accepted.

Given what was linked to it and the interesting analogy between the two approaches<sup>5</sup>, the work of Carl Gustav Jung (1875-1961) could only strengthen his point of view.

Besides, the more and more fashionable tendency towards classification of all types was favourable to the use of repertorisation.

The importance of the mental state and its place at the heart of the illness could only herald an era of change and an extraordinary increase in the number of *pathogénésies* and data from the repertories.

***From then on Kent gradually supplanted Hahnemann... except that...***

The appearance of recounts of dreams in *pathogénésies* (Henry Clay Allen, 1836-1909) and the religious connotation linked to the Kentian point of view are problematic.

They are all the more out of place as, added to the Flexner Report - wished for in order to tidy up medical teaching and give back their place to doctors<sup>6</sup> -, the need for order and rationality linked to scientism asked for it.

---

<sup>5</sup> See the book, *Rêves et cauchemars au coeur de l'homéopathie*, Ed. Homeopsy.

<sup>6</sup> During the First World War, many nursing people tending the wounded were trained on the job and were not doctors, which posed problems after the war and called for explanations.

Even though they were not as widely spread as Jung's, Freud's contributions - with the fact that it was hard for anyone with a great love of rationality to accept them and they encouraged one to question oneself - most probably played a role.

***All those combined elements have led to the eradication of homoeopathy...***

If, in 1914, entire hospitals were treated with Hahnemann's approach, there was none left in 1945...<sup>7</sup>

To be continued...

Doctor Geneviève Ziegel

---

<sup>7</sup> Translated by Pascale Tempka