

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/339051932>

Heilkunst Series: An Affair to Remember: The Curious History of the Use of Dual Remedies, its Suppression and Significance

Book · January 2003

CITATIONS

0

READS

121

2 authors, including:



Rudi Verspoor

Hahnemann Center for Heilkunst

12 PUBLICATIONS 3 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:

Project

History of Romantic Science [View project](#)

Project

The History of Romantic [View project](#)

Heilkunst Series

*An Affair to Remember:
The Curious History of the
Use of Dual Remedies,
its Suppression
and Significance*

**by Rudi Verspoor, FHCH, HD(RHom.), DMH,
in resonant collaboration with
Steven Decker, FHCH(Hon.)**

Copyright 2003 by R. Verspoor and S. Decker.

All rights reserved under International and
Pan-American Copyright Conventions.

No part of this book may be used or reproduced in any manner whatsoever
without written permission from the Publisher, except in the case of brief
quotations embodied in articles, reviews and academic papers.

ISBN 0-9685166-5-3

First Printing

Printed in Canada

Hahnemann Center for Heilkunst
2411 River Road
Ottawa Ontario K4M 1B4
Canada
Tel: (613) 692-6950
Fax: (613) 692-0183
info@heilkunst.com

Introduction

It is now more than 200 years since Dr. Samuel Hahnemann (1755-1843) gave up the practice of allopathic medicine and began, in the nature of all genius, the long, arduous and often lonely search for a better way to restore the sick to health. This is commonly called homeopathy, although his system of remediation, which he termed *Heilkunst* (the art, literally, of making people whole), extends beyond the proper meaning of this term.

In these intervening years, as during much of his life, there has been little understanding of the complete aspects of this new system of medicine. As a result, the secondary homeopathic literature, as well as the various translations of his works, consist of confusion rather than clarity, misconceptions rather than understanding and, in some cases, deception rather than perception of the truth of what is written in the legacy bequeathed to mankind by Dr. Hahnemann.

Because of the failure of generations of followers to fully understand the nature of genius as embedded in Hahnemann's writings, in particular, the *Organon der Heilkunst* (*Organon of the Art of Remediation*), which is linked to numerous of his other works, such as *Chronic Diseases* and occasional articles (collected under the misleading title, *Lesser Writings*), both students and practitioners of his system remain confused about basic concepts critical to the proper and effective application of therapeutic medicine according to Hahnemann's insights.

This failure of comprehension is due to both faulty translation and an inability to fully comprehend the depth of meaning embedded in Hahnemann's writings. It is the nature of genius to be ahead of its time and to leave to future generations the task and joy of unfolding the treasures that lie hidden. What is required in this case is both a command of the German language, including a deep understanding of the cultural and philosophical context within which genius operates, in order to be able to discern the full meaning of the terms used, and experience clinically in the application of the system of

remediation provided to us. To this the authors can reasonably lay claim.

The purpose of this book is to present the first complete history (based on all known documents) of a pivotal event in homeopathic history involving the use of dual remedies. As Santayana stated, those who do not remember their history are condemned to repeat it. Historical knowledge, what the Greeks called *historia*, is fundamental to becoming a genuine practitioner of the remedial art, a *Heilkünstler*, as Hahnemann termed it.

Conventional homeopathy, by ignoring, denying or suppressing the facts of the dual remedy affair, condemns itself to a partial, one-sided and superficial treatment of the myriad of diseases afflicting mankind. The history here unfolded is due to extensive examination of the sources in the light of new insights regarding Hahnemann's medical system, *Heilkunst*, based on a new inter-linear translation of the extended *Organon* (that is, including its full references) by Steven Decker.

The complete results of the extensive collaboration of the authors regarding Hahnemann's writings have been published in *Homeopathy Re-examined* (2001) and its successor, *The Dynamic Legacy: from Homeopathy to Heilkunst* (2002). The latter is available as an on-line book (completely searchable and cross-linked) from the publisher. The reader is encouraged to read this last work for the more extensive context and understanding of Hahnemann's complete medical system, *Heilkunst*. As research proceeds, this work is continually being expanded and refined.

The reader also is referred to the public material available on the Internet through the website, www.heilkunst.com.

Note: All translations of Hahnemann's writings are from the new Interlinear version of the Extended *Organon* by Steven Decker, unless otherwise specified.

Table of Contents

Introduction iii

CHAPTER 1	<i>A Momentous Spring</i> 1
	Aegidi's Letter 3
	Boenninghausen's Dual Remedy Case 6
	A Controversial Background 8
	The Dual Nature of Disease 13
CHAPTER 2	<i>The Importance of Aegidi's Letter</i> 17
CHAPTER 3	<i>The Köthen Peace Conference</i> 21
	The Peace Agreement 22
	Hahnemann's Decision 24
CHAPTER 4	<i>Continued Use of Dual Remedies</i> 29
	Simultaneity of Action and Ingestion 31
	Hahnemann's Continued Use of Simultaneous Action 32
	Hahnemann's Seminal Role 34
CHAPTER 5	<i>Suppression of the Historical Record</i> 37
	Lutze's Revelations 39
	Lutze's Chapter on Dual Remedies 41
	Aegidi's Missing Article 44
	Aegidi's Article: Excerpts 48

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 6	<i>Dual Remedy Timeline</i>	51
CHAPTER 7	<i>One Remedy Per Disease</i>	55
	At A Time (Auf Einmal)	59
CHAPTER 8	<i>Dual Nature of Disease</i>	63
	The Hunt for Specifics	63
	Selected Passages	66
CHAPTER 9	<i>Conclusion</i>	71
Bibliography		i

A Momentous Spring

It was the Spring of 1833 in Köthen, a small town near Leipsic, in the eastern part of Germany. Dr. Samuel Hahnemann (1755-1843) had just celebrated his 78th year of life. His wife of many years had passed away only a few years earlier, and he now lived alone with his two grown daughters who had stayed to look after him.

He was, in many respects, at the pinnacle of his career. He already was a renowned physician throughout much of Europe and North America, with many scientific writings and discoveries to his credit. Followers of his new medical system were bringing the word about his new medical system to numerous countries around the globe. The main outlines of his radical system of medicine, as set out in his various writings for publication, and as codified and integrated into his *Organon der Heilkunst*, were already in place, including the monumental discovery of the chronic miasms and diseases.

Dr. Hahnemann had not, however, stopped his ceaseless search for insights into the true treatment of disease and imbalances in health, and had just completed the manuscript for the 5th edition of his *Organon*, to be published that year. He also was still embroiled in an acrimonious and very public dispute with the German homeopathic doctors in Liepsic regarding the purity of the application of his system of medicine in the first hospital to use that system. However, with the death of his long-time companion and helpmate, and his own advancing years, Dr. Hahnemann could be forgiven for thinking that he was more likely entering the final, relatively quiet and peaceful phase of his life on this earth, than a remarkable last decade, filled with new discoveries and controversies leading

finally to another, 6th revision of his pivotal work, which we have before us today.

This illusion, if he held it at all, would be forever shattered by a series of events that were marked in history by a letter that Dr. Hahnemann received in the Spring of his 78th year, some 40 years after he had abandoned the practice of allopathic medicine as unconscionable and had embarked on a remarkable voyage of medical discovery, the results of which would spread around the globe and change the face of Western medicine forever. The letter heralded a new and powerful final chapter in Hahnemann's already momentous and eventful life. It, and the events that followed, although ignored or distorted by almost all, represent, in reality, the logical development, like the LM or Q potency, and culmination of a lifetime of work,¹ which continuity is in the very nature of genius.

The historic letter to Dr. Hahnemann that Spring of 1833 came from one of his closest followers, Dr. Aegidi, concerning the positive clinical results of a new approach to the application of remedies. The chain of events that it triggered has become known as the Dual Remedy Affair and that has bedevilled homeopathy and his followers ever since. Until now, the details and meaning of the events here recounted (covering the period roughly from 1830 to 1870) have been largely hidden or suppressed out of a mix of miscomprehension and political expediency, and the distorted version of events was subsequently perpetuated due to dogma and ignorance.

The nature of the new insights that came to consciousness in the Spring of 1833 were such as to challenge the understanding of all but Hahnemann himself and a few close followers. In the end even these, when the time came to stand up for the truth, chose to deny what had happened in the face of pressure from the homeopathic establishment with its fears and one-sided understanding of the meaning and import of this seminal event.

One cannot help but think of the universal truth of the fate of the Logos, or the Word in human history as foretold in Scripture. Christ had to speak to those, other than his close followers, in parables, the only manner in which they could comprehend the meaning

1. For more on this issue, see *Historical Development of Dose and Potency* in the "Articles" section at www.heilkunst.com.

of what he had to tell them, and to his disciples he revealed the deeper meaning of these parables. In the place called Gethsemane, Christ chose only three among his disciples to go with him to pray prior to the coming event, but in the end they could not remain awake (retain their consciousness) so as to remain with the Truth of what was about to be revealed. When the time came, when Jesus was arrested, they, too, forsook Him, the Logos made flesh (as it is stated in the beginning of the Gospel of John).

Aegidi's Letter

Karl Julius Aegidi (1795-1874) was an Italian doctor who had become an adherent of Hahnemann's new medical system following the cure of his psoric disease in 1823. Aegidi subsequently became a confidante of Hahnemann, perhaps the closest next to von Boenninghausen, in the intimacy of letters exchanged and the personal relationship developed with the founder. At the time of the letter on dual remedies, Dr. Aegidi was working in Düsseldorf, Germany, thanks to Hahnemann's personal interventions with some of the aristocracy in that city.

The story ostensibly begins with Dr. Aegidi's letter to Hahnemann on 15 May, 1833 giving details on 233 cured cases. This in itself was not so remarkable, but in this case the cures had been obtained by the use of two highly potentized substances "given together" and "each from a different side." We do not have a copy of Aegidi's letter, but we have the contents of Hahnemann's reply a month later, on 15 June 1833, no doubt only given after having carefully considered it and the cases mentioned. Hahnemann's reply, to anyone who knows the official history and the oft-repeated tenets of conventional homeopathy, is surprising to say the least.²

2. This reference is to one of the foundations of homeopathy being the single remedy. This is nowhere fully explained in terms of meaning, and as will be seen in the complete unfolding of the dual remedy affair in this book, not tenable in the way usually referred to, namely to only give a second remedy when the full action of the first has been completed.

Dear Friend and Colleague,

Do not think that I am capable of rejecting any good thing from mere prejudice, or because it might cause alterations in my doctrine. I only desire the truth, as I believe you do too. Hence I am **delighted that such a happy idea has occurred to you, and that you have kept it within necessary limits; 'that two medicinal substances (in smallest dose, or by olfaction) should be given together only in a case where both seem Homeopathically suitable, but each from a different side.'** Under such circumstances the **procedure is so consonant with the requirements of our art that nothing can be urged against it;** on the contrary, homœopathy must be congratulated on your discovery. I myself will take the first opportunity of putting it into practice, and I have **no doubt concerning the good result.** I am glad that **von Bönninghausen is entirely of our opinion and acts accordingly.** I think, too, that **both remedies should be given together;** just as we take Sulphur and Calcareo together when we cause our patients to take or smell Hepar sulph, or Sulphur and Mercury when they take or smell Cinnabar. Permit me then to give your discovery to the world in the fifth edition of the 'Organon,' which will soon be published. Until then, however, I beg you to keep it to yourself, and try to get Mr. Jahr, whom I greatly esteem, to do the same. At the same time I there protest and earnestly warn against all abuse of the practice by a frivolous choice of two medicines to be used in combination." (Haehl, Vol. II, p. 85) (bold added)

Hahnemann next took the trouble to write to his friend von Boenninghausen, only two days later, on 17 June 1833, confirming that not only had he himself started to use the approach advocated by Aegidi, but that he would include mention of this in the new, 5th edition of the *Organon* awaiting publication, in the form of a special paragraph.

I too have made a **beginning with smelling two suitably combined remedies,** and hope to have some good results. I have also **dedicated a special paragraph** in the fifth edition of the 'Organon,' to this method, and in this way introduced it to the world. (Haehl, Vol. II, p. 253) (bold added)

The new paragraph for the 5th edition of the *Organon* on the use of two remedies together was to have been as follows:

Section 274b. There are several cases of disease in which the administration of a **double remedy is perfectly**

Homœopathic and truly rational; where, for instance, each of two medicines appears suited for the case of disease, but **each from a different side**; or where the case of disease depends on more than one of the three radical causes of chronic disease discovered by me, as when in addition of psora we have to do with syphilis or sycosis also. Just as in very rapid acute diseases I give two or three of the most appropriate remedies in alternation; i.e., in cholera, Cuprum and Veratrum; or in croup, Aconite, Hepar sulph. and Spongia; so in chronic disease I may give together two well-indicated Homœopathic remedies acting from different sides, in the smallest dose. I must here **deprecate** most distinctly **all thoughtless mixtures or frivolous choice of two medicines**, which would be analogous to **Allopathic polypharmacy**. I must also once again particularly insist that such **rightly chosen Homœopathic double remedies must only be given in the most highly potentized and attenuated doses.**" (Bradford, p. 486) (bold added)

Aegidi's letter of 15 May 1833 marks the formal beginning of the history of the use of dual remedies. However, the origins of this use can be identified several years earlier.

Both Hahnemann and Boenninghausen were aware of what Aegidi was doing well before Aegidi wrote to him in 1833 about the 233 cured cases. According to Boenninghausen, in a later account of the matter:

...There was about this time (1832 and 1833), at Cologne, an old physician named Dr. Stoll, himself invalid and hypochondriac, who distrusting the old medical doctrine, but having only a superficial smattering of Homœopathy, had conceived the idea of **dividing the remedies into two classes**, the one of which should **act upon the body** and the other upon the **soul**. He thought that these two kinds of medicine should be **combined in a prescription** in order to supplement each other.

His method making some noise in Cologne, and **Dr. Aegidi**, then at Düsseldorf, having in vain endeavoured to discover the essential secret of this novelty, the latter **induced me** to endeavour **to find out. I succeeded in doing so**. Although the idea of Dr. Stoll was utterly devoid of foundation, it nevertheless **induced us to make experiments** in another way; namely, that above recited [use of dual remedies for two sides of disease]... (Bradford, p. 491-492) (bold added)

Hahnemann indicates his awareness of the matter in an earlier letter to Aegidi of 28 April 1833. At this point, Hahnemann is cautious about the use of mixtures given his general criticisms of polypharmacy and his wariness over the ability of others to undermine the hard fought gains he had made in medical reform.

Do not cease from announcing publicly in great detail your work in the Düsseldorf institution. But do cease to pay any attention to Dr. Stoll's mixtures; otherwise I might fear that you were not yet convinced of the eternal necessity of treating patients with simple unmixed remedies. I have seen even shepherds and hangmen do some wonderful things now and then. Are we to chance to luck in the same way? (Haehl, Vol. I, p. 393)

Boenninghausen's Dual Remedy Case

Boenninghausen, who along with Aegidi, had started to explore the use of dual remedies with Hahnemann's knowledge and tacit consent, provides us with a striking example of the dual remedy concept from this period.

Boenninghausen fell ill in April 1833 with a serious intestinal blockage, and was, he felt, on the verge of death when he found almost instant relief in *Thuja*. He then wrote to Hahnemann about this incident and received a reply dated 28th April 1833. Hahnemann relates that he too had fallen ill on or about 3 April 1833 for two weeks from an illness that had threatened his life. He had been saved only by the use of several remedies in a short period of time.

What is interesting is that Boenninghausen had also been forced to have recourse to two other remedies, approximately eight days apart, to complete the cure begun by *Thuja*, and that these were precisely the two remedies Hahnemann had suggested he take not knowing that Boenninghausen had already taken both, each one well-indicated for the case.

In spite of the great care I took, some vexation... may have contributed to my getting a suffocative catarrh, which for seven days before the 10th of April, and for fourteen days afterwards, threatened to choke me... Only since the last four days I feel myself saved. First by smelling twice of *Coffea cr. X-o*, then of *Calcarea*; also *Ambra* contributed its share...

I was sorry to hear from all my heart, that you have been so sick... Now if you would have an additional advice for the restoration of the activity of your bowels, I would call your attention to *Conium* and to *Lycopodium*, and to take daily walks in the open air. (Boenninghausen, *Lesser Writings*, p. 205-206)

Boenninghausen at this point in the article comments on Hahnemann's suggestion of two remedies:

I would add here that a few days after sending off my letter [likely the 15th of April] in which I had neither asked for his advice nor spoken of any additional treatment I had taken the homœopathically indicated *Lycopodium*, and so also about eight days before receiving the letter ["first days of May"] from our Hahnemann, *Conium*, each in a minimal and single dose, and nothing else at all... What a mass of observations and of experience was required, together with what a rare divining power, in order to give in advance (in a disease which had only been communicated as to its leading characteristics and as to the mere naming of the first remedy used), **two remedies** which only *subsequently*, through their symptoms, were so distinctly and determinedly indicated, as **homœopathically suitable**, that of all the other remedies none could come into competition and the **result** had already **proved the correctness** of the advice before it had become known to me! (Boenninghausen, *Lesser Writings*, p. 206) (bold added)

We need to note that this involved two medicines (Boenninghausen emphasizes "two remedies"), each indicated for the case, and presented by Hahnemann as the medicines to be used, not as possible ones from a long list. Why were two needed to complete the case treated first by *Thuja*? How did Hahnemann know which medicines were needed with only the leading characteristic symptoms? From observation (of symptoms) on the one side and (clinical) experience on the other, joined by "a rare divining power?"

We should at this point also indicate that Hahnemann, despite his illness, was seen to be in full health. The illness that he succumbed to briefly was an example of an idiopathic disease caused by constant vexation (homogenic dimension) due to the dispute with the Leipsic half-homeopaths.

But in spite of everything the old man, almost eighty years of age, was physically and mentally fit and cheerful, as Griesselich has so realistically described in his 'Sketches' taken in Köthen. Here was, indeed, remarkably blessed old

age, full of keen vigour and unquenchable zeal. (Haehl, Vol. I, p. 183)

A Controversial Background

In his letter of 28 April 1833 to Aegidi, Hahnemann indicates his general concern to maintain the purity of his system against the pressures of allopathic medicine, echoing the struggles he was having in this regard:

The purifying and separating of the true from the false which I undertook with the highest motives and which has the unmitigated approval of the best and most dependable of my students, must draw the world's attention to real values. What have you to fear from a frank and earnest separation of pure homœopathy from that humbugging which must be the grave of homœopathy if it is allowed to continue advertising itself as genuine and gradually insinuating allopathy again — a very convenient resource for the slugs? The science and I have need of fewer but truer adherents, I do not wish to see my colleagues increased by a large number of those false coiners. I wish to count as mine only a few good men and true. (Haehl, Vol I. p. 256)

The events leading up to Aegidi's historic letter of 15 May 1833 were serious indeed. Hahnemann had just announced to the world, in 1828, his discoveries of the chronic miasms, in particular psora. This had not been well accepted by many homeopathic doctors in Germany, as Hahnemann had indeed anticipated and feared. At the same time, as a result of his concern over the introduction of allopathic methods of treatment (e.g., blood-letting, crude drugs, emetics, etc.) by those who did not have full confidence in the curative and healing powers of his new system, Hahnemann felt the need to intervene in a dispute between homeopathic physicians in Leipsic attendant on the opening of the first homeopathic hospital in the world in that city. This dispute was highly public and unusually bitter.

As Hahnemann himself reported the matter to Boenninghausen toward the end of 1833:

Already four years ago, I wrote a friendly but forcible pastoral letter to the Leipsic Society, in which I showed them my displeasure at the unscrupulous and criminal behaviour of some of them, who treated their patients with

homœopathic and allopathic measures simultaneously, to the detriment and shame of our science. But I saw no signs that these arbitrary fellows, who boasted of being the most distinguished of all the homœopathic physicians, took any heed of it.

...Yet, what happened? Of course after Müller's public declaration of intentions, they dared not be so bold as to use venesection, leeches, emetics, laxatives, etc. in the Homœopathic Hospital... But now their anger against me became loud... an open revolt against me signed by the whole of the Society...

...This is how I am treated by these ungrateful ones... (Haehl, Vol. II, p. 289-291)

When Aegidi urged Hahnemann to reconcile with the Leipsic homeopaths, Hahnemann reiterated his position against false homeopathy in the letter of 28 April 1833 already referred to above.

You have not judged my proceedings against the pseudo -homeopaths from a right point of view. How can you advise me to offer these public cheats my conciliatory hand?

It is just this purging and this division of the true from the false, that I have undertaken from higher motives, and which has met with the unanimous approval of the best and the most reliable of my pupils, that will point out to the world, what is genuine. What do you fear, from a public and serious separation of pure homœopathy from that imposture, which is bound to become the grave of true homœopathy, if it were to continue to proclaim itself as the genuine article, and at the same time, overshadow it with allopathic practices, which of course would be very opportune for the lazy ones?

I, and our art, have only need to a few true followers; I do not wish to have as colleagues that large crowd of forgers of base coins. I only wish to number among my own a few good men. Do speak to our worthy Böninghausen on that subject; he will enlighten you and make you understand what I cannot accomplish by letter owing to the overwhelming amount of other work. Let it suffice that your opinion on this subject, I regret to say, is erroneous... (Haehl, Vol. II, p. 282)

Here is one example of the reaction of those “moderates” who saw much good in homeopathy but also wished to see a union of it and the prevailing medical system, the one thing Hahnemann most feared (that is, co-option by the Old School, leaving homeopathy gutted and lifeless).

With this extravagance Hahnemann's homœopathy had reached the highest summit, and would have undoubtedly gone under, if sensible physicians had not taken the matter in hand, and protected the great discovery which this genius had made, and saved it for the benefit of humanity. There is indeed something tragic in it, if we consider how Hahnemann himself moved by hatred against the older medical school, developed his own creation more and more one-sidedly, and drove it even to a sharper point, until he nearly destroyed it. (von Brunnow, quoted in Haehl, Vol. II, p. 164).

Hahnemann remained faithful to his strict dogma in spite of all these letters, and spoke most violently against the behaviour of the more moderate school of homœopathy... I had prefaced this second translation [in French of the *Organon*], which came out in 1832, with a new detailed introduction, in which I declared myself a follower of the new moderate ideas, and... he was very irate about it, and demanded from me a repudiation of all the heretical parts that displeased him, in some homœopathic periodical." (von Brunnow, quoted in Haehl, Vol. II, p. 165)

The Psora Theory, which brought clearly to Hahnemann's consciousness the supersensible (phenomenal) nature of the constant Wesen (tonic) diseases, as opposed to the more sense-oriented dimension of the pathic diseases (symptoms), was difficult for many, still ensconced in the materialistic world of the Old School, to accept.³

Dr. Richard Haehl, Hahnemann's main biographer, wrote in 1922:

His conception of these diseases and, in particular, his Psora Theory aroused the criticism of friend and foe to a tremendous extent from the very moment of their publication. At this point many of his adherents and students refused to follow him any further. To his opponents these views of his seemed to be even more idiotic than the high dilution medicines of homeopathy and for nearly a century

3. The reader may not be familiar with the distinction that Hahnemann made between the two types of disease as this is nowhere to be found in any secondary texts. Reference can be found in the glossary of the O'Reilly edition of the *Organon* (based on a translation by Steven Decker) to the term Wesen. The complete discussion of this distinction, including the concepts of tonic and pathic diseases, based on Hahnemann's own writings, can only be found in *The Dynamic Legacy: From Homeopathy to Heilkunst* (see bibliography for details).

they have formed the target of their scornful ridicule.” (Vol. I, p. 137)

Already, in Hahnemann’s lifetime he witnessed the formal rejection by the German Central Association (of homeopaths) of the theory of psora (once he had left for Paris), while they paradoxically “recognised fully the efficacy of the psora remedies in chronic diseases,” (see Haehl, Vol. II, p. 163) thereby rejecting the concept that had led to the discovery of the medicines themselves.

Here we find the seeds of the still prevailing attitude to Hahnemann’s deeper insights, particularly as relates to the dual nature of disease, in the form of rejection by both followers (who reject his theory of disease, but accept the use of the remedies in practice on the basis of the law of similars) and critics (ridicule). His earlier works, on materia medica and on the law of similars leading to the *Organon*, had been criticized, but had also garnered many followers who saw there a useful and necessary reform of medicine.

However, such followers and supporters, headed by Hufeland and his influential medical journal, never ceased to think that the reformers could eventually be reconciled with the mother church of allopathic orthodoxy. If Hahnemann at any time thought this might be possible (and there is no evidence that he did), such thoughts would have been entirely banished by his work between 1810 and 1830, which brought fully to his consciousness the dynamic (non-material), dual (constant and variable) and hierarchical (jurisdictions and layers) nature of disease and medicine.⁴

These new insights, however, could not be grasped by those without the proper capacity to “see” them. For those living in a different paradigm, or organizing idea, these new insights were ridiculous indeed. They felt that they could use the practical results of the theory without needing to accept the theory itself, a form of empiricism that Hahnemann rejected. Without the strong foundation of the theory, the practical results would simply lead to the absorption of the practice into the all-encompassing power and authority of the Old School.

4. The full view of Hahnemann’s conception of disease is nowhere to be found due to the general conflation of patient and disease in most of the secondary texts. For the full discussion of the concept of disease, its dual nature, jurisdictions and layers, see *The Dynamic Legacy: from Homeopathy to Heilkunst*.

It is no wonder that Hahnemann felt the need, because of the precedential nature of the operations of the Leipsic Homeopathic Hospital and its symbolic importance for the advancement of homeopathy with the authorities and the public, to attack the Leipsic Homeopathic Society for using allopathic methods simultaneously with homeopathic ones.

Hahnemann even warned Aegidi against straying from the true path, telling him that he had nothing to fear from a separation of true from false homeopathy. In the light of this warning, it is all the more remarkable that Hahnemann reacted so favorably to Aegidi's use of two remedies in mixture (simultaneous ingestion).

The Dual Nature of Disease

At the same time, Hahnemann was becoming ever more conscious of the dual nature of disease (constant and variable Wesen diseases). He had discovered this earlier in his search for a new system of medicine, and his understanding was heightened by the discovery of the chronic miasms.

His great enthusiasm for Aegidi's communication of the 233 cured cases using dual remedies in mixture as being "fully consonant with the homeopathic art," is, in the light of the history of the idea of duality in disease, not at all surprising.⁵

He was now also more fully cognizant of the dynamic dimension of disease and medicine, and he had begun using remedies in quick alternation in acute self-limiting diseases. While he may have formally considered or intended that such use of two remedies be after the full action of the first remedy, it is conceivable that in practice Hahnemann may have found the need to use remedies in close enough proximity that there was the possibility of overlapping action (that is, that the second remedy was prescribed and ingested while the secondary action of the first remedy had not yet exhausted itself).

5. For a full exposition of this history, see *The Dynamic Legacy: From Homeopathy to Heilkunst*.

In a letter to Dr. Stapf of 24th April 1830, Hahnemann wrote how he had cured himself using *Staphysagria* and *Arsenicum* in short alternation. Also, during the cholera epidemic of 1831, we find a recommendation for the use of several remedies in alternation.

This evidence comes from a paper written by Dr. O.A. Julian in 1984, who also lists ten more examples of Hahnemann's use of remedy combinations. Clearly, the concept of using more than one remedy within the time frame of action of another remedy was starting to form in his consciousness. In the new paragraph on dual remedies proposed for the 5th Edition, Hahnemann refers to the use of dual remedies as being similar in concept to his previous use of two remedies in quick alternation in acute diseases. Dr. Julian's evidence is discussed in an article in *Homeopathy Online*:

Continental homeopaths have known for over a century that Hahnemann did in fact sometimes use remedy combinations, despite what he wrote in the Organon. This was confirmed by Dr. D. Demarque during the 41st Congress of the International Homeopathic League in Rio de Janeiro in 1986. Dr. Demarque's statement caused great controversy at the congress and it was alleged that he was advocating 'polypharmacy.' However, Dr. P. Fisher, editor of the British Homeopathic Journal, wrote in his report on the congress that: 'Demarque's historical evidence appeared to be irrefutable.' (BJH 1987, pp. 6-7)

The late Dr. Julian showed clearly in a paper in 1984 that Hahnemann did in fact use remedy combinations. In a letter to Dr. Stapf, Hahnemann wrote on 24th April 1830 how he cured himself during a serious illness by taking *Staphysagria* and *Arsenicum* alternatively at short intervals. During the cholera epidemic of 1831 Hahnemann recommended the use of several remedies, among them *Bryonia* and *Rhus Toxicodendron*, taken in alternation. (Julian 1984, p. 42)

In the paper referred to, Julian gave ten more examples, with references, showing that Hahnemann did use remedy combinations. Many of the references were to Dr. Richard Haehl's German biography, *Samuel Hahnemann, sein Leben und Schaffen*, which was published in 1922. An English translation of this book has only been published quite recently.

The most recent reference to Hahnemann using polypharmacy is the following: 'Another extremely interesting feature of Hahnemann's practice at this time is his use of two remedies at once.' (Handley, 1988)

Continental homeopaths have known from Hahnemann's own time that he did use combination remedies, and the material in the German biography of Hahnemann by Dr. R. Haehl has been available to homeopaths who can read German for 74 years. But these historical facts have not been easily accessible to English speaking homeopaths who do not read German. So it is not surprising that Anglo-American homeopaths have believed for a long time that Hahnemann never used remedy combinations. The documented historical fact, however, is that he did.' (see *Homeopathic Drainage Treatment According to Vannier*, Dr. Eddy De Ruyter, *Homeopathy Online*, Vol. 6).

Hahnemann had further developed a dual conception of the Living Power of the human being as well as a duality between the Spirit (Geist) pole and the nature (Wesen) pole. Thus, he had come to realize the profound duality of life.⁶

6. Again, much of this evidence is only available in *The Dynamic Legacy* due to extensive research by the authors. The issue of alternating and intercurrent remedy prescriptions must, of course, be dealt with (as it is in that book), as these are clearly to be differentiated from dual remedy prescribing. However, the main point made here, namely that Hahnemann was likely led from this use to a conscious use of two remedies in close approximation (which is one form of dual remedy prescribing - simultaneity of action), stands.

The Importance of Aegidi's Letter

We may reasonably ask at this point, what was so remarkable about Aegidi's letter of 15 May 1833?

The superficial answer is to be found in the history of denial, denigration or marginalization of this historic event and its attendant meaning in the homeopathic literature. For most homeopaths, then and now, where they could not deny the facts, they have either ignored the event altogether rather than try to explain what is to them an embarrassing anomaly, or they have explained it as an aberration which was quickly abandoned by Hahnemann once he had had a chance to reflect on the matter.

Neither of these answers can be sustained in light of the historical evidence available. The second also opens up Hahnemann to the absurd charge that he, who had fought so hard against allopathic tendencies intruding on his new system of medicine, had taken temporary leave of his senses (having, of course, regained them later in time to revise the *Organon* a sixth and final time).

The more profound answer is to be found in the historical record itself, as seen through the lens of Hahnemann's earlier insights into the dual nature of disease (constant and variable diseases, as set out mainly in his occasional works - see *The Lesser Writings*).¹

What was new and important in Aegidi's letter was that the idea of the dual nature of disease and the corresponding idea of the use of dual remedies had finally come into full consciousness and

1. See also *Precursor to the Organon: Hahnemann's Occasional Writings*, by the same authors, part of the Heilkunst Series.

use, in the form of two remedies used concordantly (simultaneity of ingestion) to address the dual nature of disease, each from a different side.

The prescription of two medicines in mixture appeared, at least on the surface to the uninitiated, to go counter to Hahnemann's long-standing opposition to polypharmacy. However, despite this apparent violation, Hahnemann, as we have seen in Chapter 1, greeted Aegidi's news with tremendous enthusiasm. As if this wasn't enough, he further decided to try the use of dual remedies in mixture himself and then almost immediately wrote a new paragraph for the 5th edition of the *Organon*, then at the printer, for insertion, without the need for any further changes to that work. This paragraph stressed the link between his earlier use of two remedies in alternation and this new approach.

From the perspective of conventional homeopathic teachings and understanding, it would be harder to create a better case for the senility or insanity, albeit temporary, of this great man. The truth is, as we will see, far from this, and reveals to an even greater extent the genius of the founder of Heilkunst.

Let's go back to the initial letter written by Hahnemann to Aegidi in 1833 on dual remedies. In it we can see that Hahnemann accepted and blessed the new practice on the basis of the two conditions stated by Aegidi himself. What seems to have assuaged Hahnemann's earlier concerns over the mixtures of Stoll is the "happy idea" stated by Aegidi that each remedy in the mixture would approach a different disease (each based on the law of similars and each treating disease from a different side) and that each would be in "the smallest dose."

As we have seen, the first point is consistent with, as Aegidi must have known, the earlier discoveries of Hahnemann regarding the dual nature of disease (such that disease, conceptually speaking, has two "sides," the constant Wesen and variable Wesen types of disease).

The second point regarding dose harkens back to Hahnemann's own earlier discovery that there is a relationship between the size of the dose and the length of the initial action of the medicine.² The implication here is that the dynamic dose (in dilutions beyond any chemical laws) is not subject to the same stricture as chemical doses, such that the giving of two suitable (that is, each from a dif-

ferent side) remedies in mixture does not create a problem for cure, but rather enhances it. Earlier, Hahnemann had found that the dynamised doses increased in therapeutic power despite increased dilution.

Was he now realising that the dynamised dose in mixture, treating the duality of disease (that is the two diseases in the patient — tonic and pathic), actually enhanced the therapeutic power of treatment as well? Certainly, the experience of Aegidi, Boenninghausen, and later Lutze, would confirm this.

Aegidi's letter comes then as a culmination of several streams of thought, each moving toward this high water mark in prescribing by the law of similars. We see therein the discovery early on of the dual nature of medicinal action, though the emphasis is on the initial action in self-limiting and acute cases. We also see the discovery of the dual nature of disease in the form of constant and variable diseases, with the early focus in the aphoristic *Organon* on the many individual, variable types of disease for which no effective specific remedies had yet been found. We finally see the concern to dilute the crude doses then in vogue so as to minimise any negative effects and yet to retain some therapeutic action, followed by the dawning of the realisation of the hidden (dynamic) power in such small doses.

We then can follow the movement of dilution past the biochemical laws into a supersensible (spiritual) realm, into the world of potencies (as opposed to dilutions), coupled with the discovery of the hidden constant chronic miasms (phenomenal in nature).

A schism emerged in the ranks of his followers over these two moves into the supersensible realm of nature, and Hahnemann became concerned over the movement back (reaction) to the materialism of allopathy. This triggered an otherwise embarrassing and uncharacteristically bitter public feud with the Leipsic homeopaths. Hahnemann, at the same time, became entranced by the dynamic nature of potentised medicines and tested this by another seemingly embarrassing use of olfaction to the exclusion of other methods. He moved from the single dose and wait method previously employed, to repeated doses (both through olfaction and the liquid dose),

2. Details on this aspect can be found in *The Dynamic Legacy: From Homeopathy to Heilkunst*.

though cautiously (every week in chronic cases), in trying to speed up the time of cure.

By 1833, Hahnemann had arrived at a profound insight into the dynamic and dual nature of disease and of medicinal action and commenced with the use of overlapping doses. He apparently began the use of overlapping action of remedy in the case of self-limiting diseases (at least in his own case, as we have seen - see CHAPTER 1: *A Momentous Spring*).

At this point Aegidi appears on the scene and suggests to Hahnemann the use of two remedies in mixture, each from a different side, in high potency (and Hahnemann adds, consistent with his work at the time, through olfaction as well). From all that has gone before, if it is all examined closely, this can only be seen as the culmination of Hahnemann's ideas. And that is exactly how Hahnemann reacted.

The Köthen Peace Conference

At this point, Hahnemann's enthusiasm propelled him, beyond trying this method for himself and writing a new paragraph for the 5th edition of the *Organon*, to herald the new method to the world, in the form of an announcement of the new discovery of dual remedy prescribing to a gathering of the Leipsic homeopaths to be held in the neighbouring town of Köthen, where Hahnemann lived. These were the same doctors he had only recently chastised as being half-homeopaths. They had agreed to meet in Köthen, on 10 August 1833, to try to resolve their differences with Hahnemann.

The gathering was intended to be a peace conference following a lengthy, acrimonious and very public dispute over the running of the first homeopathic hospital in that city. The key issue in that dispute was over what constituted homeopathic prescribing.

An editorial in the *British Journal of Homæopathy* of July 1865 explains what transpired:

Dr. Aegidi proposed to Hahnemann to administer a mixture of two highly-potentized remedies each corresponding to different parts of the disease. In the potentized state the medicines thus mixed would be incapable of chemical reaction, but would each act separately in its own sphere. Dr. Boenninghausen approved of the idea and Hahnemann was induced to present the matter to the meeting of the Central Society for 1833. Hahnemann was persuaded that this would probably lead to the polypharmacy of the old school, and he decided to exclude this doctrine from the new edition of the 'Organon.'"

As we will now examine, this reported ending was not quite what happened, but was the version of events that homeopathic orthodoxy required.

The Peace Agreement

We can well imagine the atmosphere that prevailed at that meeting in Köthen. Several years had gone by in deep dispute over what practices were consistent with Hahnemann's principles and which ones risked bringing allopathy in by the back door when it had been unceremoniously shown the front door years earlier as a result of Hahnemann's insights and teachings. Both the other homeopaths present and Hahnemann himself must have been highly sensitized to the possibility of any divergence from these principles. Hahnemann, knowing that this was essentially a peace conference after several years of difficult contention, must have been fully conscious not to introduce anything that would upset the pending declaration of peace.

It is interesting then to consider that Hahnemann had no hesitation in presenting Aegidi's "happy idea" on dual remedy prescribing to the meeting. It is also interesting and instructive to examine the "peace agreement" signed by Hahnemann and the other participants at the August meeting in Köthen.

The agreement directly deals with the allopathic treatment modalities that Hahnemann had so criticised in his acerbic communications with the Leipsic homeopaths, yet we can find no mention of concern with the use of dual remedies in the form of a reference to the use of single remedies.

Indeed, such a reference might have been expected even had the use of dual remedies in mixture not been raised, as it undoubtedly was, if the use of the single remedy was a foundation of Hahnemann's system, as we are often led to believe. It is all the more astounding that the matter finds no place in the peace agreement despite the fact that Hahnemann brought the matter to everyone's attention.

As a result of the Leipzig affair and after the disclosure of the discovery of dual remedies, the meeting set down a series of principles relating to the foundations of homeopathy which he and the Leipzig doctors signed at the meeting in Köthen on 11 August 1833 as a form of peace treaty after the cessation of hostilities. The peace agreement only reinforces the fact that dual remedy prescribing was not considered by Hahnemann and the others as being inconsistent with the rules as they understood them:

Agreement on the 11th of August 1833

The main pillars of homeopathy are:

1. Strict and unqualified adherence to the principle of *Similia similibus* and consequently
2. Avoidance of all antipathic methods of treatment, wherever it is possible to attain the objective by homeopathic remedies; and therefore the greatest possible
3. Avoidance of all positive remedies and those weakening by their after-effect; consequently, the avoidance of all bleeding, of all evacuation upwards or downwards, of all remedies causing pain, inflammation or blisters, of burning, of punctures, etc.
4. Avoidance of all remedies selected and destined only to stimulate, whose after-effects is weakening in every case.

Whoever has acknowledged as his own these tenets, which are the main pillars of homeopathy, let him sign his name below. S.H. (Haehl, Vol. I, p. 200)

As can be readily confirmed, the main pillars of Hahnemann's system of medicine are the giving of remedies on the basis of similar resonance, and the avoidance of measures that only serve to weaken the life force (all antipathic and allopathic measures).

A further indication that the use of dual remedies, even in mixture, was consonant with the principles of his system as Hahnemann had earlier communicated to Aegidi, is a letter to Hering, dated September 13, 1833. Hahnemann wrote to him of the Leipsic dispute. He also made reference to the single remedy issue:

On August 10th I had with me here, upwards of twenty of my best pupils from all parts (including Bönninghausen) and they all agreed again on the one point, that a true homœopathist should administer only one carefully selected homœopathic remedy at a time, after accurate investigation into the condition of the morbid state; he should avoid all palliatives, all kinds of weakening processes, all stimulation with so-called tonics, and all external painful applications. (Haehl, Vol. II, p. 288)

Note carefully the phrase, "one carefully selected homeopathic remedy at a time." The key to the matter lies in the meaning of the term "at a time." As is set out in detail in *The Dynamic Legacy: From Homeopathy to Heilkunst*, the term, "at a time" meant to Hahnemann "within the initial action of the previous remedy." Thus, it was entirely possible to give a second remedy within the full action

of the previous remedy, without violating this rule, the one that is also written into the 6th edition of the *Organon* (Aph. 272).

At this point, however, we will simply focus on the fact that Hahnemann saw no inconsistency between this statement and his acceptance of and presentation of the dual remedy idea.

Hahnemann's Decision

We can now return to the final statement in the 1855 report on the meeting in the *British Homeopathic Journal*. It states that Hahnemann was persuaded to withdraw the new paragraph on dual remedy prescribing from the upcoming 5th edition of the *Organon* because of concerns over a return to polypharmacy. There are two issues here: the concern over polypharmacy and the timing and meaning of Hahnemann's decision to withdraw the new paragraph on dual remedies from the 5th edition manuscript then at the printers.

We have already seen that the official record of the meeting, that is, the peace agreement, makes no reference to the issue of polypharmacy. While Hahnemann's report on the meeting to Hering did mention that the issue of one remedy at a time prescribing was discussed, this did not seem to be inconsistent with Aegidi's idea on dual remedy prescribing. That this is the case is reinforced by the fact that Hahnemann left the meeting without having agreed to remove the new paragraph, despite evidence that the others asked him to do so in the light of political, not philosophical, concerns.

In the face of the strong negative reaction of the other homeopaths at the August peace conference Hahnemann, nonetheless, wrote to Aegidi on 19 August 1833, thus, only a week after the meeting, repeating his approval of the use of dual remedies in mixture and confirming that he had indeed written a new paragraph for insertion in the 5th Edition of the *Organon*. The letter notes that this truth (the use of dual remedies) should not be withheld from the world even though he, Hahnemann, had not necessarily discovered it. This was, perhaps, a reference to his earlier delay in publishing the discoveries relating to the chronic miasms because of concern that others might not appreciate it or acknowledge its source. (see Haehl, Vol II, p. 154)

I have devoted a **special paragraph in the fifth edition** of the *Organon* to your discovery of the administration of **double remedies**. I sent the manuscript yesterday evening to Arnold and enjoined him to print it soon and put the steel engraving of my portrait as a frontispiece. The race for priority is an anxious one. Thirty years ago I was weak enough to contend for it. But for a long time past my only wish is that the world should gain the best, **the most useful truth**, be it through me or others. (Haehl, Vol. II, p. 85) (bold added)

And yet, the 5th edition of the *Organon* was finally published without the new paragraph on dual remedy prescribing. There was no question of skullduggery here as it was Hahnemann's own decision to remove the paragraph from the 5th edition. What had happened to change Hahnemann's mind?

Hahnemann's final decision to withdraw the new paragraph on dual remedy mixtures was based on purely political considerations, namely a concern that the allopaths not be able to take advantage of this development in order to discredit homeopathy. So, we find that on the 15th of September 1833, Hahnemann wrote to Boenninghausen that he had now decided to withdraw the paragraph as he had earlier been urged to do. What finally forced his hand was a rumour that Hufeland, an influential allopath who had strong sympathies for homeopathy, was greeting the news of the new paragraph on dual remedies as presaging the return of homeopathy to the bosom of orthodox medicine, something that he strongly wished and Hahnemann strongly feared. As he wrote to Boenninghausen in his letter:

I was told a short time ago that it had become known to Hufeland (probably through the printer) from my manuscript of the fifth edition of the '*Organon*' that I have taken up treating with two medicines, and he is already rejoicing at the fact that homeopathy will have to return at last into the bosom of the only saving church, and would again have to join the old science. As it is **never**, as we know, **absolutely necessary (although at times advantageous)** to prescribe for the patient a **double remedy**, and the advantage gained from the exposition of this sometimes useful method, is, as I see, greatly overbalanced by the disadvantage which would certainly arise from a **misinterpretation by the allopaths and allo-homeopaths**, I have, with your approval I feel sure, had the manuscript sent back to me, and have put everything back integrum, and also added a reprimand against such a proceeding, so that the orthodox pope of the old school will be

considerably upset when he sees in the 'Organon' a publication which will make his rejoicing melt away. I know you approve of my action... (Haehl, Vol II, p. 253) (bold added)

However, in deciding to remove the new paragraph, Hahnemann still had to wrestle with his own conscience. He expressed his problem in writing to Boenninghausen. Boenninghausen apparently urged him, despite his own success with dual remedies, not only to remove the disputed new paragraph, but to amend the existing text to include a criticism of the use of dual remedies because of the political risks. This we can see in Hahnemann's reply:

Your eloquence would have easily persuaded me, if I had been in your position, that is, if I had been **as much convinced as you are from a large experience** of the possibility and even **great utility of giving double remedies**. But from many attempts of this kind only one or two have been successful, which is **insufficient for the incontrovertible establishment of a new rule**. I was therefore, **too inexperienced in this practice to support it with full conviction**. Consequently it required only slight momentum to induce me to alter that passage in the new 'Organon,' which results in this, that **I concede the possibility that two well chosen remedies may be given together with advantage in some cases** but that this seems to be a very difficult and doubtful method. And in this way I believe I have done **justice to truth on the one side and to my inner conviction on the other**. (Haehl, Vol. II, pp. 253-54) (bold added)

Hahnemann felt, in the face of strong opposition, that his own experience was still too limited for "the incontrovertible establishment of a new rule." Under strong attack from the others, he did not have enough of his own intimate knowledge of the new concept of two sides and the use of two substances ("this practice") to "support it with full conviction." However, he concedes that a new rule is possible as "two well-chosen remedies may be given together with advantage." Hahnemann both closed the door on those who might abuse the discovery and re-introduce polypharmacy on the one hand, and left it ajar for those who could understand the legitimate use of dual remedies in mixture. He also left open the possibility that eventually a new rule could be established with "full conviction."

Thus, instead of the new paragraph, Hahnemann withdrew it and altered the existing paragraph of the 4th edition by adding a

footnote to the existing Aphorism 272. Far from being a condemnation of the double remedy approach, Hahnemann here repeats essentially what he had written to Boenninghausen on 16 October 1833, namely that the footnote "...concede(s) the possibility that two well chosen remedies may be given together with advantage in some cases but that this seems to be a very difficult and doubtful method."

Some homeopaths have made the experiment, in cases where they deemed one remedy homeopathically suitable for one portion of the symptoms of a case of disease, and a second for another portion, of administering both remedies at the same or almost at the same time; but I earnestly deprecate such a hazardous experiment, which can never be necessary, though it may sometimes seem to be of use.

(Dudgeon, *Organon*, 5th edition)

Hahnemann faced a difficult choice. On the one hand, he knew the truth of what Aegidi had presented, and knew that Boenninghausen had also had very good, indeed "surprising," results. On the other hand, he faced the reality of his many followers who could not really be trusted to leave behind the corrupting framework of the Old School (using suppressive means with homeopathy), much less grasp the new insights into disease (Psora Theory), and his many critics who were seeking ways to assimilate the practical aspects of his new system of medicine, if not to destroy it altogether, leaving at best a hollow shell of reform.

No wonder Hahnemann, after his experiences with the schism occasioned by the Psora Theory and the higher dilutions, sought only those few "good men and true" who really understood, rather than the many who would simply distort his teachings. As he expressed it to Aegidi just prior to receiving the landmark letter on dual remedies,

I, and our art, have only need of a few true followers; I do not wish to have as colleagues that large crowd of forgers of base coins. I only wish to number among my own, a few good men. (Haehl, Vol. II, p. 283)

Despite the "happy idea" of the two sides of disease, Hahnemann still did not have, from his own understanding and experience, a means of explaining and of defending the practice of dual remedies against both attack and misuse. Without such a base, how could this approach be distinguished from the false use of mixtures in allopathy (polypharmacy), he must have wondered.

Continued Use of Dual Remedies

Hahnemann faced a difficult situation following his withdrawal of the disputed paragraph on dual remedy prescribing for political and tactical reasons. On the one hand, he had not rejected the approach, but still did not have, from his own understanding and experience, a means of explaining and of defending the practice of dual remedies against both attack and misuse. Without such a base in principle it was difficult to see how this true mixture could be distinguished from the false use of mixtures in allopathy (polypharmacy). On the other hand, he needed to continue his work on this issue, but was concerned about the improper use of dual remedies by those with little or no understanding of its full meaning and application.

As a result, Hahnemann apparently ceased the use of dual remedies in mixture, but continued the use of dual remedies in another form. This form was the one he was more familiar with, at least from his development of the multiple dose method between 1829 and 1837, that is, the use of two remedies within the full action, but not within the initial action of the first remedy (simultaneity of action). All this was consistent with what he had written in the aphoristic *Organon* and occasional writings, as well as in his various letters.¹

In writing to Aegidi on 9 January 1834, Hahnemann was at pains to ensure that only those who really understood the new insights continued the use of dual remedies in mixture, and then not

1. See the section below on the two forms of dual remedy prescription: simultaneity of ingestion and simultaneity of action.

in the full public glare. This is an echo of earlier concerns expressed in his *Chronic Diseases*:

305.1 As to the second main mistake in the treatment of chronic diseases (the unhomeopathic choice of the medicine), the homeopathic beginner (many, unfortunately, remain such beginners all their lives) sins mostly through inexactness, carelessness and indolence.

Given the difficulty of grasping the principles behind such use, any work is “hazardous” and to be left to only a “few good men.” Thus, he wrote to Aegidi on 9 January 1834 to try to bring some degree of order to the process. Obviously, Aegidi was still quite enthusiastic about the use of dual remedies in mixture.

In my opinion you have **proceeded somewhat too speedily in the matter of administering double remedies**, since you are generally an impulsive man. I cannot and will not prevent you from talking about it in public; I don’t do it myself.

You presuppose that imitators could easily find the correct Simillimum in such a case of illness not only for the one part of the symptoms but also the other part and in such a way that they could always achieve good results. Ah! If most homeopaths could or would discover only ONE remedy, exactly suitable in accurate similarity to the characteristic symptoms, we would gladly excuse them the necessity of finding the nearest suitable one!

For my part, I find the discovery of the right remedy difficult and laborious in every case. Therefore, I do not see how they would hit upon the first, to say nothing of the second **twin remedy** so easily! Pardon me for being so incredulous in this matter. However, **I leave it to you to write about as you think fit** — but I beg of you to use only the ‘Archiv,’ as both the homœopathic periodicals appear before the public; it will be a delight for the allopaths. (Haehl, Vol. I, pp. 393-94) (bold added).

In this letter, Hahnemann first gently chastises Aegidi for having acted too quickly, presumably before the way could have been better prepared (theoretically and practically), as it had been by Hahnemann in the case of the psora theory – 12 years of careful research. This is in keeping with Hahnemann’s rude reception in Leipsic and his eventual retraction of the new paragraph.

He then goes on to say that he will not prevent Aegidi from discussing the issue discreetly, although he, Hahnemann, will not do it. This is further evidence that Hahnemann had not condemned the

method, but had only beaten a tactical retreat. His concern was a practical one in the face of allopathic maneuvering to discredit or assimilate homeopathy: to expect that others would be able to find two suitable remedies, much less just the one.

The reputation of his radical challenge to the prevailing system rested on the finding of the correct remedy for each disease. This was difficult enough for the first disease, and to expect others to find the second remedy for the second disease was perhaps more than the system could demand at this point. Clearly, more work needed to be done before a rule could be made and defended. The wording of the letter also suggests that Hahnemann was at that point still using, or at least thinking about the use of, double remedies in mixture, but would continue his work in private.

Simultaneity of Action and Ingestion

Within the pivotal history of dual remedy prescribing, we find in turn two aspects that are confused in any accounts to date, namely simultaneity of action and simultaneity of ingestion.

Simultaneity of ingestion refers to the taking of more than one remedy in a mixture or one pellet of each under the tongue.

Simultaneity of action refers to the taking of a second remedy while the full action (*Wirkung*) of the first remedy continues to work.

Dual remedy prescribing (a function of mutual action, as pointed out by Aegidi and Lutze, two of the main users of this approach, in addition to Hahnemann and Boenninghausen) involves both of these aspects of overlapping action.

As we shall see, some alternation of remedies (reciprocal action) involves this overlapping of action, as Hahnemann came to discover, and there well may be elements of intercurrent prescribing that includes overlapping action. Intercurrent prescribing, as is examined elsewhere², seems to be distinguished by the fact that the “well-indicated” remedy did not (apparently) act and another rem-

2. See *The Dynamic Legacy: From Homeopathy to Heilkunst*.

edy is needed to remove a presumed blockage, which then allows the previous remedy to now act. This could involve overlapping action, as the non-action of the first remedy is only apparent. Its later repetition with clear action confirms its homeopathicity to the disease for which it was given. In the case of alternating remedies, each acts more clearly than either one alone.

All of this dual remedy use needs, finally, to be distinguished from the simple giving of one remedy after another in sequence without any overlapping action, based on the diseases that exist in sequence.

There are some who would contend that when Hahnemann's initial use of two remedies in mixture (simultaneity of ingestion) ended, to the extent we can determine, towards the end of 1833, the use of dual remedies by Hahnemann ended as well. It is closer to the truth to say that the use by Hahnemann, on a regular basis, from at least 1836 (if not from 1833) to his final years in Paris, of two remedies in close approximation (often only 6-12 hours apart) is a continuation of dual remedy prescribing in the form of simultaneity of action, without simultaneity of ingestion. As such, dual remedy prescribing, which began in 1830 by Hahnemann, did not end in that year, but continued for at least a dozen years, if not until his death in 1843.

This remarkable change in practice by Hahnemann, namely the use of dual remedies, is not, as some would contend, simply the continuation of the prescribing of alternate and intercurrent remedies that Hahnemann had done since the beginning of his homeopathic career, but represents a profound shift in his conscious understanding of nature and medicine.

*Hahnemann's Continued Use
of Simultaneous Action*

Much has been made of the contention that Hahnemann no longer used two remedies in mixture after his withdrawal of the new paragraph from the 5th edition of the *Organon*. However, for those who have taken the trouble to investigate the dual remedy issue, they cannot escape the conclusion that Hahnemann was now prescribing in a manner fundamentally different from his previ-

ously stated views, as set out in *Chronic Diseases*, for example, that one should not give a second remedy as long as the action of the first remedy continued.

A study of the Paris case-books, as was done by Rima Handley in her two books, *A Homeopathic Love Story* and *In Search of the Later Hahnemann*, reveals all too clearly that the time frame between giving a remedy, usually *Sulphur*, in the morning and another remedy in the afternoon, for chronic disease cases involved simultaneity of action, if not of ingestion.

Simultaneity of action occurs, as we have stated, when a second remedy is given within the range of action of a prior remedy. So, for example, one remedy is given on Day 1 at 10:00 a.m. and a second remedy is given several hours, days or even weeks later. However, the full action of the first remedy has not yet been completed when the second is introduced.

Let's look at one example from Hahnemann's own case books from his Paris period (1836-43), as reported in Rima Handley's *In Search of The Later Hahnemann*, p. 69:

So, for example, when M. de Simencourt came with his sight badly affected following a cerebral fever caused by a fall from a horse, Hahnemann treated him with *Sulphur* in a high centesimal potency and *Arnica* in a low centesimal potency in alternation, until his eyesight and other after-effects of the cerebral fever improved.

We can reasonably assume that the time frame for the "alternation" is approximately twelve hours, as can be seen in the following case commented on by Handley.

When Mme. Chueleher consulted Hahnemann about her palpitation, she was told to inhale *Sulphur* in a high centesimal potency in the evenings and to take *Aconite* orally in a low centesimal potency in the mornings. It always seem to have been important to him to maintain this difference in frequency.

Handley shows that this twelve hour rule was very common in Hahnemann's prescribing during the Paris period.

If we look at Gibson Miller's listing of the duration of action of remedies, to be found with Kent's *Repertory* and known to all prescribers, we would find that *Sulphur* has a duration of action of between 60-90 days. Thus, to give *Aconite*, a shorter-acting remedy (Miller gives no duration, but it is commonly considered to be

shorter in action than *Sulphur*) in this case, probably later in the day, is a case of simultaneity of action.

Thus, we have the following situation in terms of the duration of action of the two remedies:

Duration of action of the two remedies (*Sulphur* in red and *Aconite* in blue):



The darker area shows the duration of the combined effect of the two remedies given their respective time of action.

Hahnemann's Seminal Role

Now the evidence, noted by Dr. De Ruyter in his article for *Homeopathy Online*, Vol. 6 as quoted in CHAPTER 2: *The Importance of Aegidi's Letter*, that Hahnemann used two long-acting remedies in short intervals fits into a larger picture. Why? Because of the germinating realization that a certain percentage of his alternating and intercurrent use of medicaments was indeed “concurrent” in action and effective in practice.

When Hahnemann had cases that required the use of two remedies in sequence, it is entirely feasible that at times, in actual practice, he ended up inadvertently giving the second remedy within the action of the first, and that he found that this, nonetheless, worked. Hahnemann would then have gradually realized, after numerous such cases over the years, that he was working in terms of simultaneity of action. This would also help to explain why he used his alternation of remedies in acute prescribing as a means to explain the dual remedies in his proposed insertion for the 5th edition of the *Organon*.

The dilemma that Hahnemann, and the others who used dual remedy prescribing (Aegidi, Boenninghausen and Lutze), faced was: how could one distinguish this new and real relationship of remedies, based on a real relationship of diseases (the two sides), from the false relationship of remedies based on a false concept of disease (uniformitarian), called polypharmacy? As Aegidi has

pointed out, the dual remedies, each treating for a disease from a different side, involved a type of symbiotic relationship that comes from the intrinsic duality of disease.

Indeed, if Hahnemann himself, according to report, first practiced on himself in 1830 with two medicaments, then it is conceivable that he himself is the real progenitor of the dual remedy concept if he verbally communicated this to any of his followers. It would be interesting to know where Dr. Stoll got the idea of dual remedies. Hahnemann was aware of Dr. Stoll's work, as evidenced by his correspondence with Boenninghausen (see Bradford, p. 492). And where did Aegidi get the initial idea? It is at least plausible that some tentative remark on Hahnemann's own part set the whole thing in motion. The latter is speculative, but the fact of his own original experiment upon himself, if fact it be, lends credence to the metamorphosis from "alternation" (being simultaneous in some instances) in self-practice (1830, if not sooner) to enthusiastic reception and use of dual remedies in mixtures (May 1833), to the public paragraph (May 1833), to his continued use of simultaneity of action in prescribing (1836 into his Paris period).

Suppression of the Historical Record

Hahnemann died in Paris in July 1843, survived by his second wife, Melanie. He had been working on another revision of the *Organon* in his last two years, and had notified his German publisher of a new edition in February of 1842. However, Hahnemann died before the new, 6th edition could be completed for publication. There was a great deal of anticipation around this new edition, but for various reasons, including a need for some editing of the annotations in Hahnemann's handwriting and a reluctance by his widow to release the new edition unless it could be published in a form completely faithful to Hahnemann's wishes, the 6th edition was held back.

We can, looking back on events that have seriously distorted and misrepresented what Hahnemann actually taught, better understand Melanie Hahnemann's concern about releasing the manuscript to the many homeopaths who requested it, insisting on undertaking the arduous task herself.

Negotiations were underway in 1865 between Melanie Hahnemann and prominent American homeopaths for the publication of the much awaited 6th edition, when a German homeopath, Dr. Arthur Lutze of Köthen, concerned that the true story might not emerge, published what he claimed was the intended 6th edition of the *Organon*. This edition contained, most importantly, the disputed paragraph on dual remedies intended for the 5th edition, which had been taken out of that edition for political reasons, as we have seen. Dr. Lutze, a key figure in the history of homeopathy, is the one about whom the least is known, or about whom the least has been written.

We learn from Lutze that in 1834 Aegidi wrote a formal presentation of his discovery for Stapf's *Archives*, the pre-eminent journal for homeopathic matters in those years.

Lutze informs us that in 1853 he first learned about the use of dual remedies in mixture from Aegidi himself. This was already some twenty years after Aegidi first brought the matter to Hahnemann's attention, and indicates at least Aegidi's continued interest in the matter, if not continued use.

Lutze must also have learned of Boenninghausen's own experiences with dual remedies from Aegidi, because sometime during the years 1854-7 according to Lutze, Boenninghausen reported his successful use of dual remedies to Lutze as well. Again, this demonstrates Boenninghausen's own continued interest in (and possible use of) dual remedies in mixture.

By 1857 Lutze had recorded, by his own account, "many thousands" of successfully treated patients with this method.

In 1865, Lutze decided to publish the paragraph on dual remedies in mixtures that had been taken out of the 5th edition for political reasons. We can see from his own account that he was frustrated by the silence over this important aspect of Hahnemann's work. We can only imagine, based on later comments by both Aegidi and Boenninghausen, that when the storm broke over this publication Lutze, fully convinced himself of the validity and efficacy of dual remedy mixtures, was also frustrated by the apparent unwillingness of Boenninghausen and Aegidi to deal more publicly with the matter (although they were willing to let him into their confidence privately).

For a man of Lutze's enthusiasm for homeopathy and for the new form of dual remedy prescribing, such reticence would eventually lead to a breaking of the general silence. After all, Lutze had not been party to the apparent agreement amongst Hahnemann, Aegidi and Boenninghausen in the fall of 1833 not to continue with dual remedies in mixture, or at least not to talk of it publicly, and did not feel as constrained thereby as the others. Whatever concerns there were about the negative political effects of publication (in terms of the fight against allopathy) must have been outweighed, in his mind, by the tremendous benefits for suffering humanity that Lutze experienced personally in his practice.

Finally, Lutze must have found it difficult, having discovered and personally verified the efficacy of the dual remedy mixtures, to see the general tendency in homeopathy after Hahnemann to try to reduce everything the Master had written to a unidimensional view of disease — the so-called single remedy tenet, which could conceive, officially, of only remedies in series (that is, with no allowed overlapping of action).

The resultant publication by Lutze in 1865 of the missing chapter from the 5th edition of the *Organon* unleashed a storm of protest and a concerted effort to deny the facts of the historical record, or at least to bend them to the prevailing orthodoxy of the single remedy. However, it is evident to all who have the “eyes to see” that Lutze alone of the three who had followed Hahnemann into the most profound unfolding of his life work, the few good men and true that Hahnemann had sought over mass adulation, most fully captured the spirit and essence of the dual remedy idea.

Lutze's Revelations

Lutze published a book in 1857 on his experiences involving dual remedy prescribing. The book is essentially unknown among homeopaths and no longer published. It reveals some interesting facts. These are facts not reported by Haehl who, despite his access to much of the record, chose to only include a partial version of the dual remedy affair, and a version that supported the prevailing view that it was a minor, temporary affair, one from which Hahnemann quickly extracted himself once he realized his “folly.”

1. In 1834, Aegidi wrote up a formal presentation of his discovery for the *Archive*, the main journal for homeopathic matters in those years. This followed the initial debate on the matter in Köthen in August 1833 and subsequent withdrawal in October of that same year on the part of Hahnemann of the disputed new paragraph on dual remedy use for the 5th edition of the *Organon*. The publication seems to have followed Hahnemann's advice to Aegidi to publish only on the matter of dual remedies in Stapf's *Archives*.
2. In 1853, Lutze was first informed about the use of dual remedies by Aegidi in person. This signifies that Aegidi was still promulgating, and in all probability still practicing, the method himself, some twenty years after the initial phase.

- That he should still be practicing that which had such a resounding success that it even induced Hahnemann to publish it in the *Organon* is not surprising.
3. Sometime during the period 1854-7, Boenninghausen reported his successful usage of dual remedies to Lutze. We can only conclude that he also was still practicing this way and endorsing it in private like Aegidi. This makes his later "denial," if real, when the storm broke in 1865 over Lutze's publication of the disputed paragraph on dual remedies, more a matter of expediency and concern for reputation than a refutation of the efficacy and reality of the issue.
 4. By 1857 Lutze had recorded by his account "many thousands" of successfully treated patients with this method, thereby placing it beyond all doubt as to its efficacy and superiority.
 5. Between 1857 and 1865, the time of his bringing out an edition of the *Organon* with the missing paragraph from Hahnemann, Lutze likely added several thousand more cases to the record. So from 1830 until at least 1865, there are thousands of cured cases accomplished by means of dual remedies by Hahnemann, Aegidi, Boenninghausen and Lutze.
 6. Sometime before 1874, Lutze passed on without any renunciation of his most successful use of this method, even though Aegidi and Boenninghausen seemed to have attempted to distance themselves in public from the apparent witch-hunt going on as the result of Lutze's publication of the disputed paragraph on dual remedies.
 7. In 1897, a unique monument was erected in Köthen to honor Hahnemann and Lutze. This is a monument that Haehl mentions as being particularly notable for its beauty and provides a picture for us to admire (Vol. 1, p. 368). Haehl curiously doesn't specify that it is the only monument where Hahnemann shares the honors. The two busts of Hahnemann and Lutze are equal in size and placed at the same height. Haehl presents this monument as being a tribute to Lutze by a grateful businessman over a formula for a coffee substitute, but this doesn't explain why Hahnemann is then also featured in the monument.

Lutze's book, *Lehrbuch der Homöopathie*, is little mentioned in the homeopathic literature, except in negative terms, and is not available for sale, as important as it is for the history of Hahnemann's Heilkunst. Fortunately, while undertaking the research on this issue, we were able to obtain a copy of the book second hand in the original German.

In the light of the obscurity in which this important work has been relegated to date, we provide to the reader part of the complete chapter on dual remedies by Lutze for the first time in a special

English translation by Steven Decker. The complete chapter is to be found in our larger work, *The Dynamic Legacy: From Homeopathy to Heilkunst*.

Lutze's Chapter on Dual Remedies

Textbook of Homeopathy

Eighth revised edition 1874 by Dr. Arthur Lutze (Translated by Steven R. Decker)

A most important chapter is that of dual remedies. As in the case of acute diseases where two remedies must be given in alternation when both are indicated, so can we also in a case of chronic suffering, all of whose symptoms are not covered by one remedy, but **where two medicines are weighed in the balance**, each of which has pretty nearly the same justification for being given; so, I say, **we can give both medicines together**, that is four or five pellets of each dissolved in one and the same glass of water to be taken, as is taught above with respect to chronic diseases, for three days, whereupon a pause of several months must follow. For example, in cases where rash or herpes and great weakness due to blood withdrawal or loss of humors of other kinds are present at the same time, I give Sulfur x and China x together. Sulfur for the psora, China for the weakness, both indicated, both equally justified, and **experience teaches that the result is surprising, and we can cure significantly faster thereby than when one of the remedies alone is given**. For stomach cramps whose symptoms are covered by Nux. vom, present at the same time with skin eruption, or an earlier occurrence thereof, I give: Nux. vom. x and Sulfur x together. In a case of herpes which arose after smeared over (externally treated) scabies and expulsed syphilis, I give Sulfur x and Mercury x together, etc. etc.

A warning must be given here **about arbitrarily giving two remedies** together, each of which for the single case is **neither homeopathically fitting**, i.e., not congruent (resonant) with the symptoms, nor motivated by the causative moments, i.e., previous injury or psora; however, that actually goes without saying, since in general no action is to be expected from a non-homeopathically chosen dose.

There are no exceptions pertaining to remedies which could not be given together in high as well as at the highest potency...

This most important doctrine of the **highly effective use of dual remedies, indispensable for the practicing physician**, was already sent, with 233 cured cases by dual remedies, disclosed and tabulated, to our master Hahnemann, and received joyfully by him, 24 years ago in the year 1833 by Dr. Julius Aegidi, then personal physician to the princess Frederica von Preussen in Düsseldorf, now privy medical councilor in Freienwalde on the Oder, but was stolen from the world due to stupidity and narrow-mindedness of others; all the while the worthy discoverer was besmirched with derision and insult by a pack of such scribes and Pharisees, which were not worthy to loose his shoe-laces...

So speaks the Master, and we now query: what has become of that paragraph? We page through the Organon from the first to the last page without finding it!

I will now explain how that could happen: Father Hahnemann presented the new discovery, which he had kept secret up till then, to the **homeopathic physicians** on August 10th 1833; but instead of finding open hearts he found rigid, stuffy spirits, staid and stultified, who **saw therein not the saving grace which lay hidden in the new discovery, but rather only grounds for new attacks and hostilities from the side of their opponents, comparing it with the multiple mixtures of the allopaths...**

Thus were we and the world deceived for twenty one years, robbed of the most important discovery in Homeopathy: for the **publication of the matter by Dr. Aegidi in the 14th volume of the Archive for Homeopathic Heilkunst (1834)** met with so many irrational shameless attacks, that it was soon forgotten since the majority only listens to the cry of the crowd, and **the worthy discoverer fell silent rather than subject himself to further abuse** consisting of stupidity, narrow-mindedness and envy...

When the opponents of double medicaments brought them into connection with the manifold mixtures of the allopaths, they thus showed clearly that they had neither fathomed in spirit the nature (Wesen) of Homeopathy nor of potentization. When a medicinal dose is selected homeopathically, i.e., according to the law of similarity, all arbitrariness ceases which holds sway in allopathy; and **an arbitrary mixture cannot be compared with a combination**

of remedies resting upon laws. Secondly, we can **speak of mixture only with respect to cruder matter**, but not in the case of high dynamizations of such refined development of power that they are divested of all materiality and carry in name only the spirit of the original substance...

The first communication about double remedies came to me three or four years ago by way of the discoverer, and since I had ample opportunity in my busy clinic to adequately test them, there are now many thousands of successful results on record, so that there can now no longer be any more contradictions or objections. I would only ask that my colleagues go about all tests in the most exacting manner and select well prepared high potencies so that the results do not prove unavailing due to ineffective means. **Our most excellent Boenninghausen has verbally communicated to me that he also has achieved just as happy results with double remedies, and each sincere prover will have the same experience.**

1. My first test was made in Berlin on the very day on which I first received communication about double remedies...

I now began my clinical trials...

2. Antonia D., two and a half years old, was so scratched up by a cat pouncing upon her that she fell with her head against a chair and trembled with fright. A half hour later, she began to stutter, which got worse day by day. I gave her Arnica x and Opium x dissolved in water for three days - one sip mornings and evenings (Arnica for the shock of the fall and Opium for the fright). After a small initial aggravation, she improved significantly, and in a few weeks the child was fully restored, and spoke as fluently as ever. [the rest of Lutze's striking cases will be found in the complete translation in *The Dynamic Legacy: From Homeopathy to Heilkunst*]

Much, in some cases everything, depends on **matching the similarity of the symptoms of the disease with those of the remedy, but it is just as important to investigate the proximate, originating cause of the malady**, and to keep an eye on the bodily constitution, the phase of life and the temperament, along with the disposition of the patient.

For example, a young girl of 19 suffered for months of bilious vomiting with severe stomach pains, which were assuaged with moderate movement. The period was light and sporadic. Normal stool, sometimes pulpy, slimy. Little

appetite. No thirst. Dismal voice. — Weakly body build. Pale. Soft disposition. The bilious vomiting first arose after intense vexation.

All of the symptoms down to the hyphen are resonant with those of Puls.; body build, disposition, and age also fit in. However, the cause is completely dispatched with Cham., which incidentally cures bilious vomiting also. Therefore, I would be completely right in having to select Puls. x and Cham. x together for this case; and the malady would be cured hereby very quickly and indeed entirely.

Thus, the most important thing for the physician is to know first what is characteristic of the remedies, and gradually to acquire a knowledge of all their symptoms, because in many cases, neither the cause of the disease is known, nor the other points that are determinative.

Second, the physician must know by heart those remedies which cover the most common originating causes...(bold added)

Aegidi's Missing Article

From Lutze's work, previously suppressed or unknown, we learned of the existence of an article on dual remedy prescribing written by Aegidi relatively shortly after the withdrawal of the new paragraph for the 5th edition of the *Organon* in the Fall of 1833. This article, published in Stapf's *Archives*, has never been seen in English and is presented in part here, based on a translation by Steven Decker.

Aegidi wrote this article, it seems, because he wished to leave a record of his side of the matter. You will recall that Hahnemann had asked Aegidi, after the conflict of 10 August 1833 with the Leipzig homeopaths, not to speak publicly of the issue for political reasons, but authorized him to publish in the *Archive* of Stapf, which would be read only by the cognoscenti. This Aegidi eventually did, prodded it seems, by a reference Jahr made in his *Handbook* to an upcoming presentation by Aegidi.

Handbuch der Haupt-Anzeigen für die richtige Wahl der Homöopathischen Heilmittel oder: Sämmtliche zur Zeit näher gekannte Homöopathische Arzneien in ihren Haupt- und Eigenwirkungen nach bisherigen Erfahrungen am Krankenbette bearbeitet und mit einem systematisch-

alphabetischen Repertorium versehen" von G.H.G. Jahr. Düsseldorf, Verlag von J.E Schaub, 1834.

[Handbook of the main indications for the correct choice of homeopathic remedies, or all the now better-known homeopathic medicines in their primary and particular actions, compiled from previous experiences at the sick-bed and furnished with a systematic alphabetical repertory", by G.H.G. Jahr, Düsseldorf, published by J.E. Schaub, 1834.]

Als ein, außer der Wiederholung zuweilen angezeigtes Verfahren, möchte hier vielleicht noch die von Hahnemann empfohlene Abwechselung mit zwei der bestpassenden Mitteln und dann auch die von dem Herrn Dr. Aegidi zuerst versuchte Verbindung derselben zu einer Totalwirkung zu erörtern sein: allein, da über beide noch zu wenig gesetzbestimmende Erfahrungen vorliegen, und in Hinsicht der letzteren der verehrliche Erfinder derselben sich vorbehalten, zu seiner Zeit selbst ausführlicher zu sprechen, so möge vor der Hand diese Andeutung und die Bemerkung genügen, daß namentlich das letztere Verfahren nicht nur dem Herrn Dr. Aegidi selbst, sondern auch dem Herrn v. Bönninghausen und mir, so wie noch manchen Andern, in besonderen, Schwierigen Fällen außerordentliche Dienste geleistet.

Hahnemann's recommended alternation of two of the best fitting remedies as well as Dr. Aegidi's originally attempted combination of the same into a total action may perhaps be discussed here as a procedure occasionally indicated aside from repetition: but, since too few law-determining experiences exist about either and since, in light of that, the venerable inventor of the procedure has reserved to himself the right to speak out on the subject in his own time more extensively, so must this hint and comment suffice for the time being, that, namely, **the procedure in question has proven extraordinarily serviceable in especially difficult cases not only for Dr. Aegidi himself, but also for Herr von Boenninghausen and me, as well as for many others in addition.** (from footnote, from the "Vorwort" (Forward), pg XXIII from the book - translation by SRD)(bold added).

However, the important content of the article and the confident manner in which it is presented contrasts with the seeming reluctance and with the other ritual bows to the orthodoxy then already established regarding homeopathy. Aegidi's fortitude was somewhat less than his discoveries. He also did not have the strong backing of Hahnemann on the issue, who was himself wrestling

with the issue and its ramifications. This tendency to bow to authority turns up again later, when the dual remedy controversy re-emerged in 1865 with the publication by Lutze of Hahnemann's dual remedy paragraph for the 5th edition of the *Organon*, shattering the uneasy compromise reached in Leipzig.

Under pressure from the establishment to disavow dual remedies, Aegidi provides a seeming recantation. However, the wording of his "recantation" is much in the nature of a Galileo, who conforms outwardly, but offers neither refutation to the substantial medical arguments of his earlier essay nor any additional medical arguments to support his "politically correct" attitude. Indeed, the full text, when properly read in the context of the issue, reveals Aegidi's concern, rightly so, that the dual remedy method would be abused by those less knowledgeable. Without a clear understanding of disease, particularly in its dual nature, there can only be an allopathic use of the dual remedy approach.

The protest of the honoured representatives of the Homœopathic press, of Germany, against the alleged sixth edition of the 'Organon of the Healing Art,' whilst including the mention of my name... yet omitted to mention that... years ago, I loudly and publicly made known my disapproval of the administration of so-called double remedies, as an abuse and mischievous proceeding. (Haehl, vol. II, p. 86)

We also find in Aegidi's article several important ideas beyond the dual remedy issue, which seem later to have been taken up by Hahnemann in the 6th edition (which was not published until 1921, and the changes related to dose were not fully realized for their importance until several decades later) and even now are still not part of mainstream homeopathic practice and teachings.¹

Aegidi could not have known the extent to which Hahnemann would adopt many of these ideas, and if he did, the failure of publication of the 6th edition of the *Organon* did not allow him to garner any support from Hahnemann posthumously so as to improve his standing within the homeopathic community in dealing with the contentious dual remedy issue. The call for his compatriots to provide a deeper and more detailed analysis of remedy relationships in the context of concordance can be seen as the seed for Boenning-

1. For the complete text, see *The Dynamic Legacy: from Homeopathy to Heilkunst* by the authors.

hausen's chapter on Concordances, which has bedeviled homeopathy ever since, because completely misunderstood.²

We can safely say that this article represents a watershed of sorts, in that it is the first substantial critique of certain idealistic (i.e., static) tendencies in homeopathy, listing various issues that remained open to question and admitting of the practical lack of success in many cases, despite the ideal of cure set up by Hahnemann in Aphorism 2 of the *Organon*. Many homeopaths, as Aegidi points out, were already acting as if the ideal had been reached and there was nothing new to be learned. This tendency, to cast into canon and creed on the basis of selected scripture that which is still evolving, is common to history. We can see the results even today in the effort to limit Hahnemann's medical system to the tenets of "classical" homeopathy.

Many of the things Aegidi writes about, in terms of the practical problems in finding the correct remedy and the use of dose and potency, were ones that Hahnemann, too, must have been grappling with and led him earlier to dual remedy prescribing in practice (overlapping action), if not in theory. We can see in the complete article the seeds of the later formal prescribing by Hahnemann of repeated doses along the LM or Q scale (see *The Dynamic Legacy: From Homeopathy to Heilkunst*)

Hahnemann, Boenninghausen, Aegidi and Lutze represent the inner circle of the most advanced homeopaths, those who had sufficient knowledge (gnosis) to grasp the insight of the dual nature of disease and of cure, mirroring the duality within nature itself, which is to be found everywhere. Their insights on this duality were suppressed for almost 150 years, preventing the full development of the power of the dynamic medical system revealed by Hahnemann and called Heilkunst. Instead, we have a system, called homeopathy, which is limited in scope and one-sided in understanding.

2. This is another seemingly mysterious chapter in homeopathic history, which can only be clarified in the context of the understanding of the dual nature of disease and remedial action. This is discussed in more detail in *The Dynamic Legacy: From Homeopathy to Heilkunst*.

Aegidi's Article: Excerpts

Suggestions for the Extension of Homeopathic Technique

by Dr. Julius Aegidi, Personal Physician to Princess Frederica of Prussia in Düsseldorf. 1834 (translated by Steven R. Decker)

As long as the exercise of Homeopathy is made more or less difficult due to faulty technique, every suggestion for its improvement, even if it should be superseded later on by more fortunate efforts, is worthy of consideration... Even the master has already published the fifth improved edition of his Organon and thereby made clear to all that it is still improvable. In this consciousness, everyone should be free to state his opinion frankly and to scrutinize those of others.

However thankfully the strivings from many sides to improve the technical aspect of the new theory are to be acknowledged, there is nonetheless much to be desired...

Thus I too have sincerely striven to prosper this good cause in various ways, spurred on by the need which a comprehensive sphere of action commanded...

No one can deny that the different mineral springs have proven themselves curative in countless cases and that many a sick, hopeless patient has achieved complete health by using them. Analysis of the most effective Hot Springs reveals the smallest quantities of anti-psoric remedies amongst their constituent elements, and often several are united in one spring. Accordingly, if the homeopathic physician were to use nature's own cue in this regard, it would not earn the title of being a nonsensical procedure in particularly difficult cases. However, he would be **deserving of great blame were he to mix several homeopathic remedies together without rhyme or reason** to give to patients while crossing his fingers. A **fixed norm is here all the more indispensable**, because he would otherwise not be able to account for his experiments and would steer into the Charybdis of allopathic recipes, where all rational grounds are missing for an excuse. **The law of similars must also remain his lodestar here.** The violability of this law would forbid his using more than two remedies for easily surveyable reasons.

If he doesn't find a single remedy completely correspondent to the symptom totality of the disease and its peculiar relations, rather the best choice covers only one part of the characteristic symptoms, then he is **to select a second remedy which corresponds to the other side of the**

disease in a genuinely homeopathic manner, but which also stands in an antidotal relation to the first one, and to combine both by putting one or more pellets from each into a flask of water, intrinsically mixing them by vigorous shaking, and then having the patient draw from this solution. In especially difficult individual cases, the homeopathic physician will be able to make good use of this procedure, which has **already been proven beyond all doubt, not only by my own extensive experience alone, but also by that of other highly distinguished men.**

Indeed, Hahnemann has given us his scruples about this procedure inasmuch as he opines: "it is not at all easy to find the correct Simile for each case of disease, and if most Homeopaths could find but one medicine to fit the characteristic symptoms in exact similitude, a next best one would be gladly spared them." But when this one perfect remedy is not to be found, when selection is wavering among several, and one is at odds with himself whether to give the nod to this one or that, when the most promising remedies have already been used without success, then I regard, guided by nature and experience, **the informed remedy combined from two suitable remedial substances, but each fitting from different sides, to be a rare find, for which the perplexed physician, uncertainly vacillating, is to be sincerely congratulated in difficult cases, and which procedure, grounded as it is upon the irrefutable high law of Homeopathy, does not deserve the reproach already leveled at it of smacking of allopathy and endangering the purity and simplicity of Homeopathy.**

*After the suggestion to test this procedure last year at the convention in Cöthen on Aug. 10 met with such vehement opposition, I intended to hold back the public announcement thereof. However, since Jahr briefly mentioned it in a note to his Handbook xx given in the form of a prefatory treatise and referred readers to an upcoming discussion by me, so have I now had to resuscitate this topic against my will. Of course, anyone who has no use for **such a procedure** is free to ignore my suggestions which are **supported by important experiences.** (bold added)

Dual Remedy Timeline

- 1796: Hahnemann starts with the discovery of specific medicines for constant diseases (homogenic and pathogenic), borrowed from folk medicine, and distinguishes these from the variable, individual (pathic) specifics for variable diseases. He also discovers the dual nature of treatment (cure and healing = heilen, involving the initial action and the counter-action), as well as of disease. Concern over the repetition of dose within the initial action of the first (too strong a dose) and waiting for the full action of the first remedy to exhaust itself before giving a second remedy/dose. Establishment of the principle of a direct relationship between the length of initial action of a remedy and the dose, as well as the intensity of the disease and nature of the remedy, which insights he developed over the next decade, and beyond.
 - 1816-28: Discovery of the chronic miasms (constant or tonic side) and chronic diseases (pathic side). Growing realisation of the dynamic nature of the succussed dilutions (potencies as opposed to medicines). Awareness of the length of action and importance of the counter-action with increased emphasis on waiting for the action of the single dose to exhaust itself before the repetition of dose.
 - 1825-43: Use of the olfaction method and repetition of dose within shorter time frames.
 - 1830: Hahnemann uses two remedies in short intervals on himself.
 - 1831: Hahnemann uses two remedies in short intervals in the cholera epidemic.
 - 1831-32: Aegidi, Boenninghausen, Stoll begin with dual remedies in mixture.
 - 1833 (April): Hahnemann uses many remedies in short order to treat himself. Hahnemann prescribes two remedies, each perfectly indicated, for Boenninghausen's illness.
-

-
-
- 1833 (May): Dr. Aegidi communicates 233 cured cases using double remedies to Hahnemann.
 - 1833 (June): Hahnemann writes a new paragraph sanctioning the use of double remedies for insertion in the 5th Edition of the *Organon*.
 - 1833 (August): German homeopaths at a conference in Köthen reject the new paragraph for the 5th Edition for political reasons (fear it will weaken homeopathy by opening the door to polypharmacy). Hahnemann resists and the "peace agreement" of 11 August 1833 as to the pillars of homeopathy makes no mention of the matter.
 - 1833 (September): Hahnemann writes to Aegidi re-confirming his intention to add the new paragraph on dual remedies to the 5th edition of the *Organon*.
 - 1833 (October): Hahnemann decides to withdraw the disputed new paragraph from the manuscript of the 5th Edition after reading an article by Hufeland seeing (falsely) the use of dual remedies in mixture as a return to polypharmacy.
 - 1833 (Fall): Hahnemann, Boenninghausen, Aegidi enter into an agreement not to continue practising with dual remedies in mixture (or at least not to do it publicly).
 - 1836 (September): Hahnemann writes to Boenninghausen about his surprise on learning that he, Boenninghausen was still prescribing dual remedies.
 - 1836 (November) - 1843: Hahnemann's casebooks record the continuing use of dual remedies (simultaneity of action).
 - 1846: Boenninghausen's publication of his repertory with the section on Concordances.
 - 1856-57: Lutze learns of the dual remedy from Aegidi and Boenninghausen and undertakes thousands of successful cures.
 - 1865: Dr. Lutze publishes his version of the 6th Edition of the *Organon* (after apparent fruitless attempts to have Hahnemann's version published). It includes the disputed paragraph on the use of double remedies.

The concept of two sides seems to disappear at this point in the hue and cry elicited by Lutze's publication of the disputed paragraph on dual remedies. However, if an idea has enough energy, it will embody itself in some form. The history of homeopathy since has seen the following, which reflect the Wesen of the idea of dual remedies:

- The use of "intercurrent" remedies, supposedly sequential, but often, in fact, concurrent.

-
-
- The growing use of nosodes (mostly based on clinical experience) as well as remedies chosen more on the symptomology.
 - Keynote prescribing, which attempts to focus on the underlying, less changeable disease process rather than the more voluble symptoms.
 - Boenninghausen's *Repertory* organised around the pathic aspect of disease (grounded in the Wesen as opposed to the Geist) with the underlying sub-duality or functional pair of psychic and somatic.
 - Kent's *Repertory* with its emphasis on the mental image of the disease (drug picture or portrait, involving the Geist). This organising idea, which has come out more in his followers, addresses the underlying aspect of disease because it is little based on the workings of the Wesen (which is the side that primarily produces the symptoms or pathology, i.e., suffering of the patient) and more interested in the underlying workings of the Geist.
 - Boger combines the two sides (Kent and Boenninghausen) in his own person by his dual contributions to the essence of both repertories.
 - Eizayaga focuses more on the pathology (suffering) of the patient, although he also emphasises the need to treat for the chronic miasms underlying the disease expression using nosodes related specifically to the miasms. He also describes a full spectrum of disease.
 - European medical doctors (Hughesian tradition) focus more on the material changes (and reject the psora theory). While chronic miasms can be seen simply in their expression (pathology), they also introduce the concept of a latent or hidden side.
 - Various homeopaths carry on the Kentian approach, developing the idea of constitutional prescribing further (Borland, Tyler, Coulter, Herscu, Vithoukhas).
 - Sankaran develops the idea of participating in the suffering of the patient at the psychic (delusional) level directly, effectively de-emphasising the symptomology and achieves a genuine concept of "dia-gnosis."

To fully explore these issues in this small work would not be possible, but all of the evidence and analysis is contained in our more comprehensive work, *The Dynamic Legacy* for those who are interested in pursuing matters further.



One Remedy Per Disease

One of the fundamental aspects of Hahnemann's criticism of the allopathic physicians was that they practised polypharmacy, that is, the use of more than one remedy at one time with the patient.

When Hahnemann left the university to begin his practice as a doctor, he was none the wiser as to the question of disease and treatment. Medicine in his day was one of accumulated authority and academic theories, with little or no real observation as to the actual nature of disease and little or no true knowledge as to the curative powers of medicines. The practice at the time was largely one of prescribing set mixtures according to various theories and in large doses.

There were sweetening medicines, diluting and dissolving ones, coagulating, blood-cleansing, cooling, evacuating, phlegm-secreting ones, etc. To prescribe one medicine alone never occurred to anyone and would not have satisfied anyone. After an old custom every medicine prescribed for the patient had to consist of a basis, a constructive part (the constituents), a supporting part (adjuvans) and a taste-improving part (the corrigers), to which Hahnemann ironically proposed to add a "dirigens." (Haehl, Vol. I, p. 306)

Hahnemann, the scientist, realised that this practice of mixtures could never lead to any true knowledge of the curative power of medicines. His initial work on reform of medicine was a clarion call to create a true materia medica, *Essay on a New Principle for Ascertaining the Curative Powers of Drugs* (1796). Here Hahnemann reviews the various ways in which one could discover the curative power of a substance, including chemistry and botany, but concludes that this can not furnish anything other than a partial understanding at best. What is needed is to test each substance on a

healthy person, as testing on sick persons would mix the disease process with the effects of the medicine on the patient, leaving the physician none the wiser as to the action of the medicine. He does not disparage the discovery of curative remedies through clinical work, as this can reveal the specific remedy in cases of diseases of constant nature (Wesen), but does not see this as a very effective means of discovery for the many diseases of changing nature, which are more numerous.

Nothing remains for us but to experiment on the human body. But what kind of experiment? Accidental or methodical?

I have no intention of denying the high value of this [accidental, empirical] mode of discovering medicinal powers — it speaks for itself. ...Will the chance of such discoveries suffice to perfect the healing art, to supply its numerous desiderata? From year to year we become acquainted with new diseases, with new phases and new complications of diseases ...what we imagine, or what appear to us to be, similar diseased states. But how often shall we fail in accomplishing our object, for if there be any difference, the disease cannot be the same! Sadly we look forward into future ages, when a peculiar remedy for this particular form of disease, for this particular circumstance, may, perhaps, be discovered by chance, as was bark for pure intermittent fever, or mercury for syphilitic disorders.

Such a precarious construction of the most important science — resembling the concourse of Epicurean atoms to make a world — could never be the will of the wise and most bountiful Preserver of mankind. (*Lesser Writings*, p. 258-259)

Nothing then remains but to test the medicines we wish to investigate on the human body itself. (*Lesser Writings*, p. 263)

Hahnemann also condemned the use of large doses of crude drugs, realising from his knowledge of chemistry that these substances mingle and mix in a way that is completely unpredictable (unlike the potentised medicines that do not obey such chemical laws but are more akin to radio waves that can mingle in the air without cross interference).

Thus, Hahnemann came to strongly condemn the practice of established mixtures of medicines in crude dose for presumed simi-

lar diseases, or for presumed partial roles in the treatment of a presumed single disease.

I have no hesitation in asserting that whenever two medicines are mingled together, they almost never produce each its own action of the system, but one almost always different from the action of both separately — an intermediate action, a neutral action, — if I may be allowed to borrow the expression from chemical language.

...Formerly I was infected with this fever; the schools had infected me...

Are we in earnest with our art?

Then let us make a brotherly compact, and all agree to give but **one single simple remedy at a time, for every single disease**, without making much alteration in the mode of life of our patients (*Lesser Writings*, p. 320)¹

Dare I confess, that for many years I have never prescribed anything but a single dose until the action of the former one had ceased... (*Lesser Writings*, p. 321)

And thus, as though they were independent beings endowed with free volition, each ingredient in a complete prescription has its task allotted to it [by the doctor] ...For there are many learned considerations in a regular classical prescription. This indication and that one must be fulfilled; three, four and more symptoms must be met by as many different remedies. Consider, Arcesilas! how many remedies must be artistically combined in order to make the attack at once from all points. Something for the tendency to vomit, something else for the diarrhoea, something else for the evening fever and night-sweats, and as the patient is so weak, tonic medicines must be added, and not one alone, but several, in order that what the one cannot do (which we don't know) the other may.

-
1. Here we can see the early foundation of Hahnemann's position regarding polypharmacy and his later acceptance of the dual remedy idea as being entirely consistent with his system. Polpharmacy occurs when more than one medicine is given for the same disease. When two medicines, each "homeopathically indicated" are given for two diseases (each from a different "side," that is, for a variable, or pathic disease and for a constant, or tonic disease), as was specified in the letter Hahnemann wrote in reply to Aegidi in 1833, this is consistent with this rule. As this review of the history shows, there is no "aberration," no "temporary departure" from the principles of his system by Hahnemann, but a marvellous consistency of action that is the hallmark of genius, even if lesser minds then and now remain unable to follow the path blazed by such genius.

But what if all the symptoms proceeded from one cause, as is almost always the case, and there were one single drug that would meet all these symptoms? (*Lesser Writings*, p. 349)

From this beginning, the need to have accurate knowledge of the curative action of medicines in true diseases (not fragments of one, or false diseases that are but conditions arising from several diseases) became the lodestar of Hahnemann's system. Already in 1805, in *The Medicine of Experience*, the precursor of the *Organon* of 1810, he writes:

The knowledge of diseases, the knowledge of remedies, and the knowledge of their employment, constitute medicine. [viz.§3]. (*Lesser Writings*, p. 439)

While Hahnemann did accept, as we have seen, the validity of clinical knowledge, in the case of diseases of constant Wesen (tonic side) to find the specific remedy, as the cause would normally be known (e.g., exposure to measles), he realised that the specific remedy for the variable, individual (pathic) diseases could only really be found through an analysis of the symptoms. In addition, he had not yet fully comprehended the principles underlying the tonic side, through its various dimensions. Accordingly, he attempted to find the specific remedy for the as yet undiscovered specifics for already known tonic diseases (e.g., Scarlet Fever), as well as for newly discovered tonic diseases, through the symptoms as well (e.g., *Sulphur* for Psora).

What we come to see here, as did Hahnemann, is that disease is a phenomenon that is a unity. This unity cannot be broken down into separate, abstract parts (the false unity of the materialists), or a unity that somehow exists outside the parts (the false unity of the vitalists). It is an emergent unity that can be approached either directly, through the phenomenon itself, using our organs of supersensible knowledge (*Geistes-und Gemüths-Organen*) or indirectly through the meaningful parts (characteristic symptoms).

Thus, as is clear from what has preceded, there can be only one remedy per disease. Polypharmacy is the giving of more than one remedy for a given disease.

To prescribe a mixture of medicines as was done by the allopaths was false, according to Hahnemann, because it was based on no true knowledge of disease and no true knowledge of the medicines used. Without both, there could only be blind empiricism

(simply prescribing for effect), or the breaking up of the unity of the disease being treated on arbitrary grounds, such that each part of the medicinal recipe was to treat a supposed part of the disease.

At A Time (Auf Einmal)

Let us look at what Hahnemann states regarding this matter in the final edition of the *Organon*.

§273.1. In no case of cure is it necessary, and on this account alone even admissible, to employ more than a single, simple medicinal substance at one time with a patient.

§273.2. It is inconceivable how it could be subject to the least doubt as to whether it be more in accordance with nature and more reasonable to prescribe only a single, simple well-known medicinal substance at one time per disease, or a mixture of several different ones.

§273.3. In Homeopathy, the only true and simple Remedial Art in accordance with nature, it is absolutely prohibited to administer two different medicinal substances at one time to the patient.

§273 was wholly re-written for the 6th Edition. Hahnemann here combined §272 and 273 from the 5th Edition and added a third sentence. He also eliminated the footnote he had added to §272 in the 5th Edition to caution against, for political reasons, the use of two remedies "at the same or almost at the same time."

Hahnemann gives us in this sentence a time reference "at a time" (*auf einmal*). Time is a very concrete term, moreso in German than English. Time exists in units depending on the circumstances. Time, in living organisms, is a function of the life energy. Time can be slow or fast depending on the organism and its functions. We know that time passes very slowly for children and much more quickly for adults. Veterinarians know that time goes more quickly for animals and that they seem to be able to take remedies more quickly, that is, within a shorter time frame. We have also seen that the duration of the action of a remedy is dependent on the disease and the dose, the smaller doses having a shorter action and the action being shorter in the more intense diseases, particularly as regards the initial action.

So, we need to understand what unit of time Hahnemann is referring to here. The use of *auf* (upon) is the clue. If we look elsewhere in the *Organon* for a similar reference, we find §63, which speaks of the initial action of the remedy.²

§63.1. *Jede auf das Leben einwirkende Potenz, jede Arznei, Each upon the Life in-working Potence, each medicine stimmt die Lebenskraft mehr oder weniger um, tunes the Living Power more or less, und erregt eine gewisse Befindens-Veränderung around and arouses a certain condition-alteration im Menschen auf längere oder kürzere Zeit. in the human for a longer or shorter time.*

§63.1. Each Life-impinging Potence, each medicine, resonifies the Living Power more or less and arouses a certain alteration of condition in man for a longer or shorter time.

§63.2. *Man benennt sie mit dem Namen: Erstwirkung.*

One names it with the name: first-working.

§63.2. One designates it by the name of initial-action.

The measure of time Hahnemann is speaking of is, thus, the time of the initial-action of the remedy on the Living Power. This is consistent with Hahnemann's own continued use of two remedies in one day in protracted and chronic diseases, or even acute situations, wherein the full action of the remedy would not yet have been completed before the giving of the second remedy or the second dose.

Now let's look at the next sentence which links time with the disease(s) to be treated:

§273.2. *Es ist nicht einzusehen, wie es nur dem mindesten Zweifel unterworfen seyn könne,*

It is not realizable, how it even to the least doubt subjected be could,

ob es naturgemäßer und vernünftiger sey, nur einen einzelnen, einfachen,

2. The translation that follows by Steven Decker is first inter-linear, that is, word for word German-English, followed by the English rendition. In this way, the reader can closely follow the process even if not a German speaker.

whether it more in accord with nature and more reasonable be, only a single, simple,
wohl gekannten Arzneistoff auf einmal in einer Krankheit
well known medicinal stuff at one time in a disease
zu verordnen, oder ein Gemisch von mehren, verschiedenen.
to prescribe, or a mixture of several, different ones.

§273.2. It is inconceivable how it could be subject to the least doubt as to whether it be more in accordance with nature and more reasonable to prescribe only a single, simple well-known medicinal substance at one time per disease, or a mixture of several different ones.

Thus, Hahnemann has here laid down the rule that derives from his previous practice and insight, namely that two remedies should not be prescribed within the initial action one of the other. At this point, since this has been his position all along, we can reasonably ask how it is that dual remedies in mixtures (simultaneity of ingestion, not just of action) fits in.

Some answer to this can be gleaned from the principle of relationship between the dose and the duration of the initial action. If we examine the history of the dual remedies in mixture, we note that Hahnemann congratulated Aegidi for the “happy idea” of two remedies, each from a different side and in the “smallest dose or by olfaction.” The smallness of the dose is an important factor here. Given that Hahnemann also refers to the olfactory (smelling) method, and given that he was here advocating direct doses and smelling using at least the 30C potency, it would seem that such smallness of dose (the dynamic level) would reduce the initial action to the point that mixtures would not breach the general concern he had had earlier with chemical action.

Hahnemann had already learned that the use of infinitesimal (dynamic) doses (30C and olfaction) allowed the closer repetition of dose. Then, with Aegidi’s mixture of two well-selected medicines, he learned that the same infinitesimal doses allowed the closer repetition of remedies, in this case, to the point of being given not just within the overall action of the medicine (simultaneity of action), but at the same time (simultaneity of ingestion). To the extent that the dynamic action of the medicine shortens the initial action to the point that it no longer exists, this would be consistent. However, there also appears to be another aspect involved here.

The mixing of two remedies in potency seems to create a new remedy of sorts such that there is no violation of the rule regarding repetition.

Dual Nature of Disease

The foundation for Hahnemann's enthusiastic reception of Aegidi's dual remedy use was established right from the start of his work on a new system of medicine in the last decade of the 18th century. We find most of the evidence for the dual nature of disease, on which the dual remedy prescription is based, in the occasional writings prior to the publication of the *Organon* in 1810. These writings have been collected and published as *The Lesser Writings*.¹

The Hunt for Specifics

The goal of Western medicine has essentially been to discover specific medicines for specific diseases. Such specific medicines are immensely valuable, as the physician has only then to diagnose the disease in a patient to know its specific curative medicine. Through trial and error, a number of such specifics were discovered and the search for more such valuable medicines became the primary objective of medicine.

1. This title is unfortunate, though it reflects the general view of most that these writings are less important than the *Organon of Heilkunst*. Instead, these occasional writings are an integral part of Hahnemann's system of medicine and the *Organon* cannot be fully understood without a careful study of the insights contained in them. They form a dynamic polarity with the more formal *Organon* within which the full meaning of Hahnemann's genius can emerge. For a more detailed analysis of the occasional writings that led up to the dual remedy affair, see *Precursor to the Organon: Hahnemann's Occasional Writings*, part of the Heilkunst Series.

That it was requisite, in order to find out empirically **the proper remedy**, that all diseases, for which **the specific** was sought should be identical and preserve an **invariable fixed character**, appears not to only have been surmised, but to have been deeply felt by the medical community of the old school. They imagined that they must represent to themselves the various diseases of humanity in certain **fixed forms**, before they could hope to discover for each a suitable, **trustworthy remedy**, and this (as they knew no other better — scientific — way of finding the fitting medicine in diseases) by means of experimenting on them with all possible drugs, - a method which had succeeded so well in the few fixed diseases above alluded to." (*Lesser Writings*, pp. 687-689)(bold added)

Initially, Hahnemann discovered that there were two types of diseases: those that had a relatively fixed and constant nature (Wesen) and those that were more variable in nature.

The earliest examples of constant Wesen diseases were the self-limiting infectious illnesses of childhood, such as measles and scarlet fever, as well as traumatic injuries (e.g., falls, bruises, and emotional shocks, which Hahnemann labelled in the Introduction to the *Organon* as homogenic in nature).

Hahnemann referred to the medicines for the constant, fixed diseases as constant specifics or peculiar remedies. Essentially, the medicine was determined from the knowledge of the disease or the particular disease cause.

The understanding of the second form of specific medicine arose because there seemed to be maladies in which no fixed, constant nature was easily identifiable. The disease nature was much more variable and difficult to diagnose. In such cases, which formed the majority of problems facing the physician, Hahnemann discovered that he could determine the remedy for the disease, that is the specific, through the symptoms of the patient, the pathology (*pathos* = suffering), as expressed in alterations in feelings, functions and sensations.

The provings had given him the totality of characteristic symptoms of the curative medicine, and he had only to match this to the totality of characteristic symptoms of the disease as expressed in the patient. This was a more difficult approach to the treatment of disease and became the focus of his main treatise on medicine, the *Organon der Heilkunst* (first published, as noted earlier, in 1810).

It was this approach that was altogether new and which he termed “homeopathy” from the Greek words “homoios” (similar)² and “pathos” (suffering). It is unfortunate that the other side of his system of therapeutic medicine, the treatment of the constant Wesen diseases, has been neglected such that it is common to use the term homeopathy to encompass his entire system of medicine, when it only covers a part. Even in the *Organon*, which has its focus on the homeopathic approach, is not exclusively concerned with this one side, and is rightly titled the *Organon der Heilkunst*, not the *Organon of Homeopathy*.³

We could call the medicines for the more variable, or individual diseases, variable specifics, as the medicine needed will depend to a large degree on the individual symptoms of the case of disease at hand. What was used in a previous case of a headache, for example, would not necessarily be valid in the next case, as the diseases causing headaches are variable in nature.

Thus, Hahnemann came to the realization early on that disease, conceptually speaking, was of two types, or that it had two sides to its nature - constant and variable. From here it was not a large step to the enthusiastic acceptance of Aegidi’s idea of dual remedy mixtures and to the insertion of a new paragraph in the 5th edition of the *Organon*, without the need for any further alterations to that closely written and argued text. There is an unbroken line of descent from the idea of the dual nature of disease to the idea of the dual nature of prescription. What we see in the history of Hahnemann’s teachings is the unfolding of this logic.

-
2. The treatment of both types of disease, of course, was to be based on the ancient law of similars.
 3. The term “Heilkunst” is difficult to translate into English. At a very demotic level, it has the banal meaning of medicine or healing art, but the term “heil” from the verb “heilen” includes both the concept of healing and curing. It also involves more than medicine, as Hahnemann talks about the legitimate use of the law of opposites, in the realm of therapeutic regimen (imbalances). Given Hahnemann’s concern for the health of the whole person, including spirit, soul, mind and body, the term “Heilkunst” is best understood as the rational art of rendering people whole so that they might carry out the deeper spiritual purposes of their life on earth (see Aphorisms 9&10 of the *Organon*).

Selected Passages

The following quotations provide an illustration of Hahnemann's early comprehension of the dual nature of disease.

It is only the very great simplicity and **constancy** of ague and syphilis that permitted remedies to be found for them, which appeared to many physicians to have specific qualities; for the variations in these diseases occur much more seldom, and are usually much less important than in others, consequently bark and mercury must be much more serviceable than not so. But neither is bark specific in ague, in the most extended sense of the term, nor mercury in syphilis, in its most extended sense [that is, where there are compound diseases]; they are, however, probably **specific in both diseases, when they occur simple, pure and free from all complications**. Our great and intelligent observers of disease have seen the truth of this too well, to require that I should dwell longer on this subject.

Now, when I entirely deny that there are any absolute specifics for individual diseases, in their full extent, as they are described in ordinary works on pathology, I am, on the other hand, convinced that there are as many specifics as there are different states of individual diseases, i.e., that there are **peculiar specifics for the pure disease, and others for its varieties**, and for other abnormal states of the system. (*Lesser Writings*, p. 260-61) (bold added)

We observe a few **diseases that always arise from one and the same cause**, e.g., the miasmatic maladies; hydrophobia, the venereal disease, the plague of the Levant, yellow fever, small-pox, cow-pox, the measles and some others, which bear upon them the distinctive mark of **always remaining diseases of a peculiar character**; and, because they **arise from a contagious principle that always remains the same, they also always retain the same character and pursue the same course**, excepting as regards some accidental concomitant circumstances, which however do not alter their essential character...

These few diseases, at all events those first mentioned (the miasmatic), we may therefore **term specific**, and when necessary bestow on them distinctive appellations.

If a remedy have been discovered for one of these, it will always be able to cure it, for such a disease always remains essentially identical, both

in its manifestations (the representatives of its internal nature) and in its cause. (*Lesser Writings*, p. 440) (bold added)

By an infinite number of trials of all imaginable simple substances used in domestic practice, in a **well-defined disease, which shall constantly present the same characters, a true, certainly efficacious, specific remedy** for the greater number of individuals and their friends suffering from the same disease might certainly be discovered, though only casu fortuito...

...The **constant specific remedies** in these few diseases were capable of being discovered by means of trying every imaginable medicinal substance, only because the thing to be cured, the **disease, was of a constant character**; - they are **diseases which always remain the same**; some are produced by a miasm which constitutes the same through all generations, such as the venereal disease; others have the same exciting causes, as the ague of marshy districts, the goitre of the inhabitants of deep valleys and their outlets, and the bruises caused by falls and blows...

Only for a want of a constant character can we suppose a supply of a constant character.

§46.1. Very many examples of diseases would be adducible, which in the course of nature were cured homeopathically by diseases of similar symptoms, if we did not have to keep solely to **those few static [gleichbleibend] diseases arising out of a fixed miasm**, and thus worthy of a determinate name, so as to be able to speak of something determined and undoubted.

§81.1.b]1 How many improper, ambiguous names are there not therein, under each of which highly different disease states are comprehended, often only resembling themselves in a single symptom, like: ague, jaundice, edema, consumption, leucorrhoea, hemorrhoids, rheumatism, stroke, convulsions, hysteria, hypochondria, melancholy, mania, croup, paralysis etc., which are declared to be **static, fixed diseases [gleichbleibende, festständige Krankheiten] in and of themselves and are treated by name according to standard practice!**

§81.1.b]6 Even those common acute disease are documented by the old medicinal school as if they were **always uniformly recurrent, already known, fixed diseases** like: Typhus- hospital-, or jail-, camp-, putrid-, typhoid nerve- or mucous-fever etc., although every epidemic of such circulating fevers distinguishes itself each time as another new **disease, never before entirely extant, and very divergent with respect to its course, as**

well as to several of its most striking symptoms, and its entire respective conduct.

§81.1.b]11 If one however, nevertheless, occasionally believes himself in need of certain disease names in order to make himself succinctly understandable to common people when the patient is being spoken of, so let him make use of the same only as a collective name and say e.g.: the patient has a kind of St. Vitus' dance, a kind of edema, a kind of nerve fever, a kind of ague, never however (so that the delusion in these names may finally cease once and for all): he has the St. Vitus' dance, the nerve fever, the dropsy, the ague, since there certainly aren't any **fixed, static diseases [gleichbleibende, festständige Krankheiten]** by these and similar names. (bold added)

In the above passage, Hahnemann has given us a principle relating to the degree of constancy of a disease:

Only for a want of a constant character can we suppose a supply of a constant character.

That is, where there is a disease (want) of a constant character, we must look for a remedial agent (supply) of that same constant character. Thus, the diagnosis of the disease, usually through the cause, gives us the remedial medicine, all because of the fixed, constant nature of these diseases (*gleichbleibende, festständige Krankheiten*).

As regards the naming of disease (diagnosis), only the fixed, constant diseases can be given a distinctive name that allow them to be recognised, such as measles or whooping cough.

However, the variable, individual diseases can only be identified by their remedy. Thus, the names given by allopaths are false names in most cases, as they describe the result of disease and then only that which is material in nature. If someone suffers, for example, from protracted lack of energy with no known cause, they are “diagnosed” with chronic fatigue syndrome; if with certain sensitivity and stiffness in the joints, accompanied by swelling, with rheumatoid arthritis.

These are *results* of disease, not true diseases, and even then, they are not even true conditions, being only a fragment of the actual condition (alteration in feelings, functions and sensations) produced *by* the disease. As Hahnemann states, we can only speak of a type of fatigue, or a type of arthritis, if we wish to use these allopathic names.

For Hahnemann, the desired approach in medicine is first to determine if the disease in question is of a constant, fixed nature and then treat for that disease with the appropriate constant remedy. This approach has the advantage that the physician often has only to know or to look up the constant or true specific that has previously been identified to cure the case, allowing for the treatment of disease rapidly and with relatively few remedies.

Where the disease is not of a discernible typical constant nature (either recognisable as such, as with measles or scarlet fever, or because the cause is known, as in the case of accidents, poisonings and traumas) and thus, is of a variable, individual nature, the physician must then take the route of eliciting and analysing the expression of the individual disease (symptoms) in order to find the curative medicine.

Hence it happens that with the exception of those few **diseases that are always the same**, all others are **dissimilar and innumerable** and so different that each of them occurs scarcely more than once in the world and each case of disease that presents itself **must be regarded (and treated) as an individual malady** that never before occurred in the same manner...

The internal essential nature of every malady, of **every individual case of disease**, as far as it is necessary for us to know it, for the purpose of curing it, **expresses itself by the symptoms**, as they present themselves to the investigations of the true observer in their whole extent, connection and succession. (*Lesser Writings*, pp. 442-443)

In order to treat successfully the other cases of disease occurring in man, and which, be they acute or chronic, differ so vastly among each other, **if they cannot be referred to some primary disease which is constant in its character**, they must each be regarded as peculiar diseases, and **a medicine which in its pure effects on the healthy body shows symptoms similar to those of the case before us, must be administered.** (*Lesser Writings*, p. 693) (bold added)

It should be noted from the above quotes that Hahnemann also distinguished between simple, uncomplicated (true) diseases and those that were more complicated and formed varieties of this true disease. This insight would later prove useful in Hahnemann's discovery of the chronic diseases, both in terms of the simple, true disease and its many varieties.

The events surrounding the receipt by Hahnemann of Aegidi's letter of 1833 reporting 233 cured cases using dual remedies in mixture (simultaneity of ingestion) ranks among one of the most, if not the most momentous in the history of homeopathy. Yet, if one reads most of the homeopathic secondary literature, it is simply ignored and treated as if it never happened.

If the student is, nonetheless, adventurous enough to venture off the beaten path and comes across Haehl's biography of Hahnemann, he or she will find a reference to the letter and the use of dual remedies in mixture because, while the historical record can be distorted, it cannot be entirely hidden. However, the strong impression will be left, upon reading what has heretofore been made public, that this was an aberration in an otherwise undisturbed march of homeopathic medicine along the road of the single remedy.

Hahnemann, the genius of the *Organon*, somehow was carried away despite his experience and erudition, by Aegidi's letter. After some reflection, and the counsel of "wiser heads," Hahnemann regained his senses and went on to write the 6th and final edition of the *Organon*, which all homeopathic practitioners are using today. At least that is the official and orthodox version, to the extent that the issue arises at all.

On the face of it, this version has little credibility. On the basis of the historical record, it is completely false. The record shows that Hahnemann was aware of what Aegidi and Boenninghausen were doing regarding dual remedies and that he had been using remedies in alternation in closer and closer time proximity (thereby effecting simultaneity of action) either consciously or only partly so since around 1830. The record is also clear that Hahnemann agreed to the

two conditions for dual remedies in mixture as proposed by Aegidi (without any experience himself regarding this), namely in high potency and each from a different “side” of disease. He further decided to place a new paragraph on dual remedies in the 5th edition of the *Organon*, then at the printers, without the need for any other change to what he had written.

The peace agreement of 10 August 1833, though it concerned the issue of the purity of homeopathy, and had led Hahnemann to engage in an acrimonious and public dispute that threatened the unity of his followers, made no mention of the issue of dual remedies nor the matter of the “single remedy.” This is all the more remarkable given that Hahnemann raised the matter with enthusiasm at the meeting.

These issue of dual remedies can no longer be ignored, based on the extensive research undertaken by the authors and set out here. The tactic of ignoring the issue is no longer sustainable, if indeed it ever was. The “temporary insanity” defense is equally unsustainable, as attractive as it must be for supporters of the tenets of “classical” homeopathy. It is neither consistent with the dictates of reason nor with the exigeses of the historical record grounded empirically. No other explanation of the facts of the matter than that the use of dual remedies in mixture was fully consistent with, and a logical development of, Hahnemann’s prior discoveries and experiences can stand in the light of the evidence and rational analysis.

The historical record further shows that Hahnemann, along with Aegidi and Boenninghausen, did not cease the use of dual remedies, which had proven unusually efficacious, after 1833, nor was the wording of the 5th and 6th editions on this issue condemnatory of the use of dual remedies as is often argued. However, we can see in the reaction to Lutze’s publication of the missing paragraph on dual remedies for the 5th edition of the *Organon*, that there was then, and has continued to be a concerted effort on the part of the majority of homeopaths who had little understanding for what Hahnemann had written and taught, to maintain their limited, one-sided and faulty version of Hahnemann’s medical system. The truth was suppressed or distorted due to vested interests and a philosophical framework that could not grasp the dynamic, polar nature of disease and remediation inherent in dual remedy use and Hahnemann’s complete system right from the start.

The misunderstanding of the majority of his followers, as well as the continued macinations of the Old School medicine, forced Hahnemann to retreat from the overt use of dual remedies (simultaneity of ingestion) and to continue the practice in the form of simultaneity of action. After Hahnemann's death, these few (Aegidi, Boeninghausen, and likely Jahr) continued their practice of dual remedies (possibly in mixture, certainly in the form of simultaneity of action), but in secret because of the strong prejudice that remained among the majority of Hahnemann's followers.¹ Lutze later had the courage and conviction to stand up to the cover-up and silence and brought the wrath of the homeopathic establishment down on his head.

The legacy of this cover-up of the truth of dual remedies is continued confusion over the full meaning and application of Hahnemann's complete medical system. Instead of a recognition that homeopathy cures disease, we have a mystical conflation of disease and patient. Instead of an understanding that there can be more than one disease in the patient at a time, we have attempts to take all of the symptoms of the patient and find one remedy that fits those symptoms when there may be, and usually is, more than one disease in the patient producing symptoms. Instead of the understanding that there are two types of disease, the tonic and the pathic, we have a confused search for the essence of a case and mystical references to the "hidden case." Instead of the understanding that there can only be one remedy per disease, we have a complex and convoluted approach to the symptoms of a case based on the false idea that there is a simillimum for the patient.

-
1. The explanation of this prejudice is itself a fascinating study into the realms of the dynamic philosophy that frames and infuses Hahnemann's true system of medicine, Heilkunst. It is the result of a one-sided view of the world, either mystical or materialist in conception, that is the hallmark of the modern age, that is, since the start of the 16th century. This prejudice was essentially due to a failure of the human power of imagination, that true power to create and unify that lies at the heart of all truth and evolution of human knowledge and consciousness. It was the result of what Coleridge, in his *Biographia Literaria*, dubbed "men of palsied imaginations, in whose minds all healthy action is languid," unable to perform an act of imaginative cognition. As Owen Barfield states in *What Coleridge Thought*: "the apprehension of polarity is itself the basic act of imagination." (p.36); "the first step towards apprehending reason, as active, is the apprehension of polarity."(p.111); "the apprehension of "separative projection", that is polarity, is the moment of imagination." (p.217, n.3)

The key to opening the riches of Hahnemann's complete medical system and to removing the legacy of confusion and distortion regarding his works lies in the knowledge and full comprehension of the dual remedy affair. Rather than allowing it to remain hidden, suppressed and distorted, we need to give it the attention it deserves. The affair over dual remedies in homeopathic history is clearly an affair to remember.

Bibliography

Bibliography

- Boenninghausen, C.M.F., von, *The Lesser Writings*, compiled by T.L. Bradford, trans. by L.H. Tafel, 1908, reprinted by B.J. Publishers (P) Ltd., New Delhi, 1988
- Bradford, Thomas Lindsley, MD, *The Life and Letters of Dr. Samuel Hahnemann*, 1895, reprinted by B.J. Publishers (P) Ltd., New Delhi, 1992
- De Ruyter, Dr. Eddy, *Homeopathic Drainage Treatment According to Vannier*, Homeopathy Online, Vol. 6
- Haehl, Richard, MD, *Samuel Hahnemann, His Life and Works*, Vols. I & II, 1922; edited by J.H. Clarke, reprinted by B.J. Publishers (P) Ltd., New Delhi, 1985
- Hahnemann, Samuel, *The Organon of the Medical Art*, edited by Wenda Brewster O'Reilly, Birdcage Books, Redmond, Washington, 1996
- Hahnemann, Samuel, *The Chronic Diseases*, trans. by L.H. Tafel, edited by P. Dudley, 1896, reprinted by B.J. Publishers (P) Ltd., New Delhi, 1986
- Hahnemann, Samuel, *The Lesser Writings*, ed. by R. E. Dudgeon, MD
- Handley, Rima, *A Homeopathic Love Story*, North Atlantic Books and Homeopathic Educational Services, Berkely, 1990
- Handley, Rima, *In Search of the Later Hahnemann*, Beaconsfield Publishers, Beaconsfield, Bucks, UK, 1997
- Verspoor, R. and Decker, S., *The Dynamic Legacy: from Homeopathy to Heilkunst*, 2001 (online book)
- Verspoor, R. and Decker, S., *Homeopathy Re-examined: Beyond the Classical Paradigm*, Hahnemann Center for Heilkunst, Ottawa, Canada, 1999

Bibliography

Bibliography

Index

A

A Homeopathic Love Story 33

Action

full, of the remedy 60

Aegidi 2, 3, 5, 17, 18, 21, 22, 24, 27, 29, 30, 31, 34, 38, 44, 45, 47, 51, 61, 63, 66, 71

and Leipsic homeopaths 9

Hahnemann's warning 12

informed Lutze on dual remedies, 1853 39

seeming recantation 46

Ague of marshy districts 67

Allopathic 48

Allopathic measures weaken life force 23

Allopathic practices 10

Allopathy 22, 38

Alternate remedies 32

Alternation in acute self-limiting diseases 13

Antidotal relation 49

Archiv 30

B

Blood-letting 9

Boenninghausen 3, 4, 5, 9, 19, 21, 25, 26, 27, 31, 34, 38, 51, 71, 72
illness, April 1833 6

report on dual remedies to Lutze 40

Boenninghausen's chapter on Concordances 46

Boenninghausen's Repertory 53

Boger 53

British Homeopathic Journal 24

British Journal of Homoeopathy 21

Bruises and exciting cause 67

C

Characteristic symptoms 58

Index

Chemical action, Hahnemann's concern with 61
Cholera epidemic and two remedies 51
Cholera epidemic of 1831 13
Chronic Diseases 30, 33
Chronic diseases 11, 51, 70
Chronic miasms 13, 20, 51, 53
Clinical work and curative remedies 56
Concordances section in Boenninghausen's repertory 52
Concurrent remedies 52
Constitutional prescribing 53

D

Disease

- a unitary phenomenon 58
- allopathic names 69
- common acute 68
- complicated varieties of true 70
- constant 51
- contagious principle 67
- desired approach in medicine 69
- dia-gnosis 68
- diagnosis of 68
- distinctive appellations 67
- dual nature of 13, 18, 20, 66
- false concept of 34
- false names of allopaths 69
- false unity of the materialists 58
- false unity of the vitalists 58
- fixed miasm 67
- has two sides 65
- hierarchical nature of 12
- homogenic 51, 64
- homogenic dimension 8
- mystical conflation of, and patient 73
- only fixed, constant can be given a distinctive name 68

Index

- pathic 58
 - pathogenic 51
 - peculiar specifics 66
 - primary, which is constant in its character 70
 - principle for degree of constancy 68
 - protracted, use of two remedies in one day 60
 - self-limiting and overlapping action of remedies 20
 - simple, uncomplicated 70
 - specific medicines for 63
 - that always arises from same cause 66
 - tonic side 58
 - treating for constant Wesen 58
 - two types 64
 - unidimensional view of 39
 - variable 51
- Diseases
- constant nature 56
- Dose
- and initial action 19
 - crude, Hahnemann condemns mixtures in 56
 - dynamic 19
 - hidden (dynamic) power 19
 - infinitesimal, allowed the closer repetition of remedies 61
 - large, of crude drugs 56
 - LM or Q scale 47
 - olfaction 20
 - repeated 20
 - repetition within shorter timeframes 51
 - single, and wait method 20
- Dr. Stoll 5, 6
- Dual remedies
- formal beginning 5
 - use by Hahnemann after 1833 32
- Dual remedies in mixture 31
- Dual remedy concept

Index

Hahnemann the real progenitor 35
Dual remedy prescribing 29, 47
Duality of life 15
Duration of action of two remedies 34

E

Eizayaga 53
Empiricism, blind of the allopaths 58

F

False homeopathy 9
Folk medicine 51

G

Galileo 46
Geist 15, 53
Geistes- und Gemüths-Organe 58
German Central Association 11
Gethsemane 3
Disease
 static 67
 fixed, static 68
Gnosis 47
Goitre 67

H

Half-homeopaths 8
Handley, Rima 33
Heilkunst 47
Hidden case 73
Homeopathy On-line 34
Homoios (similar) 65
Hufeland 12, 25
Hughesian tradition 53

Index

I

In Search of the Later Hahnemann 33

Initial action

 and dose 51

 no two remedies within 61

 principle regarding dose and the duration of 61

Initial-action

 time of 60

Intercurrent prescribing 31

Intercurrent remedies 32

J

Jahr 44, 73

Julian, O.A. 14

K

Kent's Repertory 53

Keynote prescribing 53

L

Lehrbuch der Homöopathie 40

Leipzig Homeopathic Hospital 12

Lesser Writings 17

Living Power 15, 60

Logos 3

Lutze 19, 31, 34, 37, 38, 40, 46, 52, 73

M

Medicine

 constant specifics 64

 second form of specific 64

Medicine of Experience 58

Melanie Hahnemann and 6th edition 37

Moderates 10

Index

Monument erected in Köthen, 1897 40

O

Old School 10, 11, 12, 27

Old School medicine 73

Olfaction 61

Olfaction method 51

One remedy in sequence 32

Organon 1, 5, 12, 17, 18, 19, 21, 24, 29, 32, 34, 37, 39, 40, 42, 46,
47, 48, 52, 58, 59, 60, 63, 65, 71, 72

 new para on dual remedies 5

Overlapping action 32

P

Paris case-books 33

Paris period 35

Paris period, case book example of dual remedies 33

Pathology

 expressed in altered feelings, functions, sensations 64

Pathos (suffering) 65

Political expediency 2

Political reasons 38, 52

Polypharmacy 6, 21, 26, 27, 29, 34, 52, 55, 58

Polypharmacy. 24

Potency

 LM or Q 2

 LM or Q scale 47

Provings

 totality of characteristic symptoms 65

Pseudo-homeopaths 10

Psora Theory 11, 27

R

Ruises 67

Index

S

Sankaran 53

Schism in the ranks 20

Scripture 3

Sequence or remedies 32

Sick persons, testing remedies on 56

Simillimum 30

Simultaneity of action 29, 31, 33, 34, 35, 52, 61, 73

Simultaneity of ingestion 18, 31, 33, 61, 71, 73

Single remedy 22

Single remedy tenet 39

Specific medicines for specific diseases 63

Specific remedies 19

Specific remedy 58, 67

Specifics

 pathic 51

Stapf 13

Stapf's Archive 39, 44

 and Aegidi's article on dual remedies 38

Stoll 18, 35, 51

Symbiotic relationship 35

T

The *Lesser Writings* 63

W

Wesen 11, 13, 15, 19, 42, 52, 53, 56, 58, 64

Wirkung 31

Witch-hunt over dual remedies 40

Index
