



Pieters G.
Gloriantlaan 52, App.6D
2050, Antwerp, Belgium.

In Several Homoeopathic Magazines, I have recently read some comments and criticisms on Kent's Repertory because there are some shortcomings.

Well-minded Homoeopaths bring suggestions to bring out a new edition with corrections and more perfection. Experienced Homoeopaths know that Kent's

successful prescriber.

In his book "Lesser Writings" (Clinical Cases) we find numerous cases where Homoeopathic colleagues or Allopathic doctors had no success with their treatment of dangerously sick patients.

Then desperate relatives came to him in the last instance pleading for help.

KENT'S REPERTORIUM

Pieters G is quite familiar to the readers of QHQ. His articles having many important suggestions were published in the 1st and 4th issues of QHQ. We should actively consider and try to imbibe the ideas in this article as well.

There is a global trend to try to purify the Kent's Repertory. In this article, he gives a word of warning to us not to do anything that may result in the devaluation of our Golden Book. At the same time, the efforts with a competitive spirit is gathering strength to computerize the Repertory. Computerisation is inevitable in the present circumstances when time and speed have become very vital in our age. Still, we cannot ignore the sad plight that may befall in the long run if repertory is computerised without any restraint.

Pieters G does not elaborate his points in detail. All the same, the hints he gives in his article are to be considered earnestly as we cannot ignore his ideas in this new trend in repertorisation.

Repertorium is regarded as the best in its field. But they know also that there exist some shortcomings in this "Golden Book", the "Bible" for Homoeopaths.

However, these shortcomings are spread all over the 1423 pages of the Repertory. But reading them one after another in an article, makes an impressive list at the end.

So all experienced Homoeopaths will applaud the healthy trend to correct the Repertory and bring out a new edition.

Young students with less experience and trying to find their way in the complex theories of Classic Homoeopathy could therefore come to the idea that Kent's Repertory is an unreliable book.

For their sake I want to point out that James Tyler Kent was a very famous physician and a very

Dr. Kent had a remarkable gift of keen judgement and he usually found the peculiar symptom or striking sign that leads to the curing remedy.

The thankful patient and his relatives never hesitated to spread the news of such wonderful cures. So his parlour was crowded with patients all the time. He had a very busy practice.

And those who were too sick to come to him, he visited them on their sickbeds.

Travelling in those days was not so easy as to-day and therefore sufferers from farther away in the country wrote many letters to him to be helped from distance.

Dr. Kent answered those letters and included the selected Homoeopathic remedy, never being sure that he ever would be paid for his services.

He was also oft invited by assembled Homoeopathic physicians or Homoeopathic Committees to deliver lectures before them.

For young students he was a beloved teacher with a special gift to make remedies alive in their minds with his famous Homoeopathic drug pictures.

And if that were not already enough he wrote Homoeopathic books in the hours between and after all these activities.

So when there are some shortcomings in Kent's Repertory they are not due to incompetence!

Assembling those many thousands of symptoms from the different Materia Medica in alphabetical rubrics and sub-rubrics with the many thousands more corresponding remedies in an abbreviated form created many opportunities for shortcomings.

The first edition of Kent's Repertory was edited in 1897 and received with great enthusiasm in Homoeopathic Medical circles.

Bringing out a new corrected Repertory will be a gigantic task and may be too much for one man.

We will now consider some of these shortcomings mentioned in the articles that I have read.

There are some wrong spellings, -improper use of English/ language, -wrong punctuation, -no uniformity in cross-references, -some remedies with more than one name are differently named, -obsolete words and old terminology, -remedies not included in the index list but referred to in the text, -no uniformity in abbreviations, etc.

There are also some discrepancies; and substitution by wrong remedies in abbreviations like **Bov.** for **Bor.** (Bovista/Borax) or **Cocc.** and **Cocc-e** (Cocculus/Cocculus Cacti).

As I checked some of these imperfections I found differences in the proposal to correct them in the pages mentioned in the article and the pages in my two copies of Kent's Repertory.

So I want to raise a warning finger

"O.K. there are some shortcomings in Kent's repertory, but in trying to correct them, let us not make other new imperfections!"

In one of the articles the question is raised :

"If it were not desirable to bring out an abridged edition of Kent's Repertory?"

Now let us consider that every symptom in the Repertory was produced in the healthy provers when they took the remedy or that a remedy was clinically observed to cure other symptoms in a patient.

So all these symptoms were really noticed and which will we leave out now?

Suppose a new Repertory is made only on the Keynotes of remedies.

And next we have a patient before us that has some of the left out symptoms and is in need of one of the left out remedies?

Will we raise our voice again and demand for a more explicit Repertory?

Barthel and Klunker brought a new edition "Synthetic Repertory" in three volumes, and already I have read the criticism that "too many symptoms for a rubric is an absurd situation"

Are we not a little bit spoiled with the modern facilities in our lives so that we are always looking for the easiest ways?

The Old Masters in Homoeopathy already warned the coming generations that prescribing only on Keynotes would bring disaster in Classic Homoeopathy.

Dr. Samuel Hahnemann and his loyal followers made countless wonderful cures with far less facilities than we have now at our disposal.

But they knew really their remedies! And they knew their remedies because of hard and profound study.

Please read again the article on page 41 of the Spring-edition of *Quinquina Homoeopathic Quarterly* where Dr. Hasan seems to practise a totally different sort of Homoeopathy in prescribing all at once the curing remedy on some simple signs when looking at the patient!

Now if we want to cure the same way as Dr. Hasan, we must try to reach his stature of excellence and study as hard as he did until we know by heart as many drug pictures as he does!

Some modern Homoeopaths would even like to have a computer so that with some typing at the keyboard the curing remedy will appear in a few seconds on the screen.

That would be very nice indeed!

But let us always remember that a computer can only bring out what someone has put in before!

And we will need always these "Someones" that know **WHAT TO PUT IN!**

Progress in Classic Homoeopathy does not exist in burning what Dr. Hahnemann and his loyal followers have left us, but in completing and perfecting it!

How in the world can we become the same successful prescribers when our love of ease and our impatience prevent us to do the necessary hard and profound studies? □