

lished a brief account in the AMERICAN HOMŒOPATHIC REVIEW, Vol. 3., pp. 28, *et seq.* Dr. Lippe says, "This very valuable medicine was first introduced as a remedy in scarlet fever by Dr. C. Hering, and the attention of the profession was first called to it in number nine of *The Homœopathic News*. Since then many cases of malignant scarlet fever have been successfully treated by this new remedy, and some indications for the administration of this medicine can now be given. \* \* \* The most indicative symptoms for Arum are the great sore feeling of the mouth, the redness of the tongue, the elevated papillæ, the cracked corners of the mouth and lips and the stoppage of the nose without much coryza. Urine very abundant and pale, the submaxillary glands swollen. The eruption all over the body, much itching and restlessness. Arum very often caused a great hoarseness and while other symptoms will improve, the hoarseness will become much worse if the medicine is continued too long."

Dr. Hering, who is quite Hahnemannian in his views and practice, has been regarded as altogether an "old fogy" by some of our "progressive" colleagues, especially those in the West, who, little knowing the wide range of his observations and his untiring labors, represent him as quite ignorant of, and indisposed to employ the more recently discovered remedies and which they suppose him to contemptuously designate "new fangled remedies."

In view of this fact it gives us pleasure to point out that Dr. Hering, the "old fogy," was the first to introduce to the homœopathic school, fourteen years ago, a remedy now again introduced as a "new" one, by a Homœopathician who seems to have overlooked the fact that *this very new fangled remedy*, has to the "old fogy" been an "old story" for many a day.

We should have expected also to see in this work the proving of *Lachnanthes tinctoria* by Dr. Lippe, recently published in this REVIEW.

In typographical execution the book bears evidence that, in Detroit no less than in New York, the pressure of the war is severely felt, deranging every form of industrial labor. Errors of the compositor and lapses of the proof-reader are very numerous, though not very often likely to lead the reader astray. We could have wished, however, that the proof-reader had not perverted Walter Scott's famous line,

"Oh! woman in our hours of ease,"—*Scott's Marmion*.

into "Oh! woman in our bowers of ease."—ascribing it to *Milton!*

D.

MEETING OF THE HOMŒOPATHIC PUBLICATION SOCIETY.—A Meeting of the Homœopathic Publication Society will be held in Philadelphia, October 10th, 1864. At this meeting a permanent organization of the society will be effected. Members of the society and the profession generally are invited to attend.

By order of the Executive Committee,

CARROLL DUNHAM, M.D., *Secretary for the East*.

THE

AMERICAN

## HOMŒOPATHIC REVIEW.

Vol. V.

NEW YORK, NOVEMBER, 1864.

No. 5.

### HAHNEMANN'S THREE PRECAUTIONS.\*

BY DR. C. VON BËNNINGHAUSEN, MUNSTER.

The now deceased author of Homœopathy in his works the *Chronic Diseases* (Vol. 1, page 146, and also on the following pages of the second edition) has especially laid down "Three Precautions," and recommended them in the most urgent manner to his followers and disciples, designating the neglect of them (page 149) as the greatest error that the homœopathic physician could be guilty of. These cautions are as follows:

1. To suppose that *the doses* which after many experiments and compelled by experience I have moderated even up to this present time, and which I have pointed out under each antipsoric remedy, *are too small*.
2. The improper selection of a remedy.
3. Hastiness in not allowing each dose sufficient time to develop and exhaust its action.

Whether it is superfluous and out of season to remind Homœopathicians again of these teachings and warnings of the great acknowledged observer, I will certainly leave to the judgment of all true Homœopathicians, for it is an acknowledged fact that these three precautions, especially

\* From the *Neues Archives*.

the *first* and *third*, constitute the difference and contradiction of the practice of the present day with the original doctrine.

When, some years ago, the lamented separation among Homœopaths took place, and when it seemed probable that Griesselich and Co. were already gaining a complete victory in the dubious specificism over Hahnemannism, that portion of the Homœopaths who had adhered to the revealed truth, hoping for more enlightened times and tired of the literary cudgalings, retired for a period from the scene of action, and abandoned the field to the loquacious scribes and leaders of this newly established school, who seemed to take pleasure in exercising their ingenuity in the denial of the doctrines and practical rules established from long years of experience by the founder of Homœopathy. In the place of the *Organon* which the conscientious and qualified Hahnemann had uninterruptedly for the space of thirty years, purified and remodelled, they read the *Organon* of Rau, which having started up like a fungus disappeared as fast, and in the place of the doctrines contained in the work on *Chronic Diseases*, results of twenty years experience, they studied the hypotheses and contradictions promulgated in the ephemeral pages of the *Hygea*. Who can deny, or be astonished, that in consequence of the pernicious doctrines of that journal, the homœopathic school in Germany lost a considerable portion of the ground which the original disciples of Hahnemann had conquered with so much honor and perseverance; for almost every homœopathic practitioner was more or less carried away by the whirlpool, and I myself am indebted for a speedy return to the doctrines of true experience and science to the warning of my deeply regretted teacher and friend, who faithfully and in an uninterrupted series of letters helped me to distinguish truth from falsehood by careful experiments, comparisons and unprejudiced observations.

Many must have shared my doubts, but have probably been freed from them more slowly than I. The number of those who repel the errors that have been introduced in our school, and who defend them against the original and only

true doctrine of the master, is increasing from day to day. A year ago and scarcely any one dared to speak in their favor; the impertinent, bold and frequently vulgar tone of the Specificals had intimidated the most capable and even the most experienced disciples of Hahnemann to the extent, that they finally kept their better convictions to themselves, and the Editor of the *Archives* is at liberty to impeach my veracity if I here deviate from the truth, but, out of fear of the strong dose men, they did not hesitate to advise that great cures by means of the smallest and rarest doses should be kept concealed.

During this period of weakness and ignominy when I should have been proud to struggle openly for the truth, together with other honorable men who shared my faith and convictions, circumstances unforeseen prevented me from fighting the battle for truth and justice. My contributions to some numbers of this journal had therefore to be published anonymously.\* This induced a few mean opponents, although the Editor of the *Archives* gave my name afterwards as the author of those publications, to doubt the truth of my simple narrations, although I can at any time prove the facts by my journals. If I felt grieved by the proceedings of my opponents, it was not that the attack could injure either my honor or good name, the only sorrow felt was the evidence of the great decay of true Homœopathy in Germany, where cures were doubted which had formerly been credited, even at a time when the homœopathic doctrine was less advanced than it is now.

Unless the signs deceive me, we are at the commencement of a new epoch, marked by the death of a master, whose genius hovers to inspire us, an epoch when the unity of the school shall be restored, when the excrescences shall be

\* They are all signed Dr. B., at D., and I make this remark to prove that even in small matters I respect the truth. D., Darup, is my country seat, three and a half leagues from Munster, which I visit almost every week for a few days of relaxation and, where, not pressed by patients, I found more leisure to pen these contributions and give my time and attention to the study of Homœopathy without molestation.

chopped off, and the genuine metal separated from the dross, which up to this time has been a check to the progress of the science. We must henceforth be more firmly united. Let all who desire the good, exclude from the ranks, and with unrelenting severity, those who ridicule the great cause, schismatics and all who attempt to substitute opinions and hypotheses for careful observations. But we may at the same time honor the memory of the great reformer in medicine, in a manner both practical and respectful, by subjecting the doctrines of a man thus gifted with rare talents, and who devoted fifty years to close observations and study to leave us the results, if after repeated and comprehensive examinations and trials, we candidly communicate our own experiences one to the other. This would be the best mode of preparing the monument which the great man has merited by the services he has rendered to humanity.

After this digression which time and circumstances have caused me to make, I return to my original proposition.

PRECAUTION No. 1. *Smallness of the Dose.*—The debates relative to the smallness of the dose are further than ever from being considered closed. The more that has been written on that subject for some years past, the more contradiction has been heaped upon contradiction. A truly remarkable circumstance in this discussion—a circumstance which is by no means creditable to the opponents of the small doses—is the fact of the manner in which Hahnemann gradually arrived at the introduction of the small doses in practice, from repeated trials, observations and experience, and which seems to have been either forgotten or entirely ignored. It is therefore quite time to recall the precepts and opinions of the old master once more to mind.

My readers will certainly save me the trouble of showing by the *Organon*, from the first to the fifth edition, that it is experience only which led the carefully observing author of that immortal text book step by step to the minuteness of doses, which has now become an object of derision to the Specificals. As I may presuppose that this book is in the

hands of all those who merit the name of Homœopaths, it will be easy to find in sections 275 and 288 (fifth German edition) what has been said on the subject. I can not with the same certainty expect that Hahnemann's work on *Chronic Diseases*, and especially the second edition, should be in the hands of every one, because at that very period views were expressed, to illustrate which is not the place here, and which two years later were alluded to by the author and will be fully understood by those familiar with the history of Homœopathy when reading the preface of the third volume published by another publisher. It will, therefore, be advisable to quote the very words of the experienced investigator.

After Hahnemann had spoken of the homœopathic exacerbation, he says, in the second edition of the *Chronic Diseases*, "If the original symptoms of the disease continue with the same intensity in the succeeding days as in the beginning, or if this intensity increases it is a certain sign that, although the antipsoric remedy may be homœopathic, yet the *dose was too large*, and it is to be feared that no cure will follow. The remedy by the magnitude of the dose is able to produce an effect in some respects similar, but in consideration *that the medicine by its too powerful action develops by its similarity not only effects extinguishing the disease, but also an unsimilar chronic disease in place of the natural disease*, establishing a more painful and severe disease without curing the former.

That portion of the preceding quotation printed in Italics, embodies great truths which have never been denied, and which have been abundantly confirmed by the numerous results of the allopathic treatment of chronic diseases, and is therefore well worthy of attentive and serious consideration. Such results are even witnessed in the comparatively easy treatment of syphilis from abuse of Mercury, which is then termed secondary syphilis; but especially do we witness them in the treatment of primary itch with the simultaneous use of Sulphur internally and Mercury externally, which begets a monstrous chronic disease, and in most cases would even be inaccessible to Homœopathy without Causticum or Sepia.

Hahnemann continues afterwards: "This pernicious effect of too large a dose may be observed already in the first sixteen, eighteen, or twenty days of the action of the remedy administered in too large a dose. In such a case it becomes necessary either to give an antidote, or, if the antidote should not be known, to administer a very small dose of such an antipsoric as corresponds most homœopathically to the symptoms, both to the artificial and natural disease. If one antipsoric should not be sufficient, another one of course should be given after being selected with the same care.

To confirm this rule, and as a proof that it has been drawn from experience, the acute observer adds in a note: "The accident, above alluded to, which is very much in the way of a cure and cannot be sufficiently guarded against, I have witnessed in my own practice, at the time when I was not fully acquainted with the power and strength of the action of the remedy. I administered *Lycopodium* and *Silicea* in the billionth potency, in doses of four and six small pellets.—*Dicite moniti.*" What Specificical, endowed with the acute powers of observation which characterized the genius of Hahnemann, has ever been able to give the lie to his master's teachings in regard to the magnitude of doses, by defeating Hahnemann's experience by his own! As long as Hahnemann has not been convicted of error, I should say that it is a gratuitous and foolish indiscretion to substitute a different practice for his, and even to demand that the experience of a few rash innovators should be credited more than that of Hahnemann, backed by the experience of a host of able and devoted practitioners of the homœopathic healing art.

How little an excessive dose is capable of displaying its full curative powers, may be seen from the following remarks of the author of Homœopathy: "The excessive action of the otherwise homœopathic remedial agent having been subdued by the proper antidote or by antipsoric remedies, the same agent may be exhibited again if homœopathically indicated, but of a much higher potency and in a more minute dose." But this agent would have no effect, if a first powerful dose

of it had accomplished in the beginning all the good that the agent was capable of.

"Finally," Hahnemann observes (page 149), "Nothing is lost by giving even smaller doses than those which I have indicated. *The doses can scarcely be too much reduced*, provided the effects of the remedy are not disturbed by improper food or any other counteracting influences. The remedial agent will act even in its smallest quantity, provided, always, that it corresponds perfectly with all the symptoms of the disease and its action is not interfered with by dietetic transgressions. The advantage of giving the smallest dose is this, *that it is an easy matter to neutralize its effects should the medicine not have been chosen with the necessary exactitude.* This being done, a more suitable antipsoric may be exhibited."

This advice ought to be carefully considered especially by beginners, together with the warning which Hahnemann has expressed in the preface to his work on *Chronic Diseases*. "What would they have risked, if they had at first followed my indications, and had employed small doses? The worst which could have befallen them, would have been that the doses would prove of no avail. It was impossible that they should do any harm. But instead of exhibiting small doses, they employed, from a want of sense, and from their own poor knowledge, too large doses for homœopathic use, thus endangering the lives of their patients, and arriving at truth by that circuitous route which I traveled over before them with trembling hesitation, but the end of which I had just reached with success. Nevertheless, after having done much mischief, and having squandered the best portion of their time, they were obliged, when really desirous of curing a disease, to resort to the only true method which I had demonstrated to them without reserve, candidly and openly, a long while ago."

I should weary the patience of my readers if I were to continue this subject still further. He who is desirous of having an accurate knowledge of my views about the matter

of the doses, may read my work entitled *Homœopathy for Intelligent Laymen*. Page 203 of this work, a special chapter has been devoted to the "smallness of the doses," which I feel bound to approve of even now, after many years of experience, and after having suffered myself to be carried away for a time by the hue and cry against small doses, and having also prescribed larger ones with much less success, especially in the treatment of chronic diseases. The reasons for my adhering to the small doses may be found in my journal, which has now grown to the number of fifty-five large quarto volumes, and also in my communications to the *Archiv.*, signed Dr. B., of D. I should observe here that Hahnemann has never deviated from this practice of giving small doses, even in the last years of his practice; and the insinuations of the Specificals to that effect are totally without foundation. These insinuations are not only contradicted in the preface to the *Chronic Diseases*, which was written at the end of 1838, but I can likewise show their falsehood by the letters which have been exchanged between Hahnemann and myself without any interruption, from the middle of the year 1830 until two months previous to his death, evidently proving that, so far from increasing the doses, Hahnemann had, on the contrary, steadily diminished them progressively until the last moment.

Inasmuch as we know but little of the cures performed by our late master, with the exception of the two cases reported in the preface to the second volume of the *Materia Medica Pura*, and a few more facts which have been but slightly touched upon, I may perhaps afford a pleasure to most Homœopaths, by communicating two extracts from Hahnemann's Journal, which he sent to me on the 24th of April, 1844, as proofs of the efficacy of small doses. Whenever the potency is not distinctly indicated in these two reports, the reader will please understand the sixtieth.

Case 1. Julie M., a country girl, 14 years of age, has not yet menstruated. September 12, 1842. Sleeping in the sun, a month ago. Four days after having slept in the sun, she

imagined she saw a wolf; six days after this she felt as though she had been knocked on the head; she became delirious, frantic, wept a great deal, sometimes breathed with difficulty, spit up white mucus, was unable to express what she felt. She took Belladonna in seven tablespoonfuls of water, after shaking the dilution; mixing one tablespoonful of it with a tumbler full of water, taking one teaspoonful in the morning.

16th. More calm; was able to blow her nose which in her frenzy was impossible; she is yet delirious, but does not gesticulate as much, had wept a good deal the night previous. Stool normal. Sleep pretty good. Is yet restless but was a great deal more so previous to taking Belladonna. The capillaries of the eye are considerably injected. Appears to have a pain in the nape of the neck. One teaspoonful from the tumbler in which one tablespoonful had been mixed was poured into a second glass of water, and taken every morning from two to four teaspoonfuls of the second mixture, increasing the dose by one teaspoonful every morning.

20th. Much better, speaks more rationally, wants to do something, calls me by my name, and wants to kiss a lady who is present. This was the commencement of a sort of sensualism which now manifested itself. She is easily irritated, fault-finding, sleeps well, weeps very frequently, gets angry about trifles, eats more than usual; when she is in her senses she likes to play, but like little children. Belladonna, one pellet, to be dissolved in seven tablespoonfuls, one tablespoonful of which to be mixed in another tumbler full of water, taking one teaspoonful a day, early in the morning.

28th. Considerable irritation on the 22d, 23d, 24th, day and night; great lasciviousness in manners and words, raises her frocks and wants to touch the genitals of other persons; gets angry easily and strikes every body. Hyosciamus X°, prepared as the Belladonna, one teaspoonful.

October 5th. Had not been willing to eat any thing for five days past; complains of colic; is less angry and lascivious, more rational. Stool very soft, itching over the whole

body, especially in the region of the genital organs. Sleep sound. *Saccharum lact.*, for seven days, one teaspoonful as above.

10th. On the 7th she had a violent fit of anger, wanted to strike every body. Next day, fit of fear and tendency to start, as at the commencement of her disease (fear of an imaginary wolf); she imagines she is going to be burnt. Since then she had become calm, and had talked rationally and with perfect propriety for the last two days. *Sacch lact.*, etc.

14th. Feels well and is rational.

18th. The same, has sometimes a little headache; disposition to sleep in daytime; less cheerful. Sulphur, one pellet in three successive tumblers; one teaspoonful early in the morning.

22d. Feels very well, has very little headache. Sulphur, next lower potency, in two tumblers.

She used Sulphur occasionally until November, and remained a healthy, sensible, lovely girl.

Case 2. O., actor, 33 years old, married.

January 14th, 1843. Has been frequently troubled with an affection of the throat for several years past; has a new attack, which lasted already for a month. When swallowing saliva, he feels a stinging sensation, tight and sore feeling.

When the throat is not affected, he suffers with a fissure in the anus, painfully smarting; the anus is then swollen, inflamed and narrower than usual; the expulsion of the feces is very difficult under those circumstances, and is accompanied by the protrusion of hæmorrhoids. *Bell. X°* dissolved in seven tablespoonfuls of water, one tablespoonful to be mixed in a tumbler full of water, one teaspoonful of this last mixture at a dose.

15th. The sore throat was worse in the evening.

16th. The sore throat had disappeared, but the affection of the anus had returned. Painful stool in the evening. He confessed that he had had a chancre eight years ago, the removal of which by cauterization had been followed by the above named symptoms.

On the 10th of January, he took *Merc. viv.*, one pellet, prepared and taken as above.

20th. Sore throat had almost gone. Anus improved;—feels yet some soreness after the stools; pulsations, swelling and inflammation had disappeared. The narrowing was less. *Merc. viv.*, one pellet, ( $\frac{2}{3}$ ) of the second higher dynamization, prepared in the same way as before, and taken in the morning.

25th. Throat almost well, but smarting pain and *violent stiches* in the anus, violent pain in the anus after stool, some narrowing and heat.

30th. Last dose (one teaspoonful) in the afternoon. On the 28th the anus was better, the *sore throat had returned*; the smarting in the throat was pretty violent. One pellet in sugar of milk, dissolved as above, and taken for seven days, one teaspoonful a day.

February 7th. Considerable ulcerative pain in the throat. Colic, good stools, but several in succession, with great thirst. Anus is perfectly well. Sulphur  $\frac{2}{3}$  in seven tablespoonfuls, as above.

13th. Had an ulcerative pain in the throat, especially when swallowing the saliva, which he now secretes in abundance, especially on the 11th and 12th. The anus has become a little narrower, especially since yesterday. Smelled of Mercury, and took *Merc. v.*, second highest potency, one pellet to be dissolved in seven tablespoonfuls of water, to which was added half a tablespoonful of brandy; mix one tablespoonful in a tumbler full of water, and take one teaspoonful as above.

20th. The throat has been better since the 18th; great pains in the anus; stool is painful when passing it; thirst decreased. Sugar of milk in seven tablespoonfuls, etc.

March 3d. No sore throat. When passing the stools, an empty hæmorrhoidal tumor makes its appearance, with itching of the part (formerly with burning and smarting).

Smelling of *Ac. nitr.* and sugar of milk, in seven tablespoonfuls, etc.

20th. The pain after the stool has almost gone; yesterday he passed some blood with the stool (old symptom). The throat is sound; there is a slight sensation when drinking cold.

Smelling of Ac. nitr.—(Smelling is performed by opening a little vial containing one-half ounce of diluted alcohol or brandy, and smelling for one or two moments of a pellet which had been dissolved in it.)

Remained well ever since.

Hahnemann designates these cases as not being the most instructive. Leaving both the Hahnemannians and the Specificals to comment upon them, I pass to the second precaution.

(*To be continued.*)

#### PATHOLOGICAL CONDITIONS NO INDICATION OF TREATMENT.

BY AD LIPPE, M.D., PHILADELPHIA, PA.

The angels in heaven rejoice over the conversion of every sinner, and so should we, wishing and striving to procure happiness to suffering mortal humanity. The first step after an offence, when the desire becomes irrepressible to reconciliation, is *confession*. Such a confession we find in Nos. 22, 23, Vol. 68, of the *Allgemeine Homœopathische Zeitung*, and this confession is made by Dr. Heinrich Gottfried Schneider, Magdeburg. His confession is embodied in an article on diphtheria and consequent paralysis observed on himself.

The article undoubtedly has been written by the learned author with the desire to convince all such of his colleagues as have fallen, or are in danger of falling into the error of believing that we can ever find a specific remedy for a pathological condition or name of disease, that it is an impossibility, and that the practical application of such erroneous doctrines must lead to very disastrous if not fatal results. The learned doctor does not *express himself exactly thus*; but his deduc-

tions from the case as he states them will allow the interpretation that his great modesty prevented him from contending for a much higher principle which should be adopted in the homœopathic treatment of the sick, viz.: that the pathological condition does not indicate the treatment, and that by following strictly the practical rules laid down by Hahnemann and confirmed by so many experiments, especially the rule that the truly curative remedy, in a given case, must be similar in its characteristics to the characteristic symptoms of the patient, we shall—instead of disappointment and disastrous results following the selection of a remedy according to pathological notions—meet with most astonishing results in the way of cures.

We will now give a concise translation of Dr. Schneider's article and his own "epicrise," and conclude with the deductions we draw from the facts as related by himself.

Dr. Schneider says, "I have enjoyed, generally, very good health, and during my practice in the country from my 29th to my 46th year, and in the city from my 46th to my 63d year, I have been obliged to stay at home from inability to practice, only ten days, when suffering from dysentery during the cholera epidemic of 1855.

I was attacked by diphtheria in the night, from the 13th to the 14th of October, 1863, without any premonitory symptoms; I suffered from fever and accelerated pulse; took Aconite.

October 15th. During the night which was similar to the previous one, the right tonsil became painful with retarded deglutition. The examination in the morning showed swelling and redness of the right tonsil and a diphtheritic patch on it. A moderate fever continued. Belladonna.

From the 16th to the 18th of October. Enlargement of the diphtheritic patch towards the uvula, the patch began to ulcerate; gradually increased inflammatory condition of the mucous membranes of the bronchial tubes. The fever remained the same, profuse offensive nightly perspirations with increasing debility. Mercurius, Apis, Nitr. acid.

19th. Till now I had been able to lie on the sofa during the day, but could not do so any more. The diphtheria had extended to the point of the uvula, voice hoarse, speech difficult, much expectoration of mucus. Fever and night sweat increased. Three physicians were now visiting me, and declared the uvula in danger. They ordered a solution of Kali chloricum, every two hours one tablespoonfull, which I took.

20th. No improvement, the same remedy to be continued, but I could not possibly take it regularly, as it irritated the throat and larynx in a very unpleasant manner.

21st. The diphtheria is also extending downwards, towards the larynx; there were also some spots in the pharynx, great debility, very disagreeable taste, like decomposed brine of herring; expectoration, hawking and coughing up of great quantities of mucus. Entire aversion to eating and drinking, the only thing I could swallow with great difficulty was some light beer, when swallowing I had a pain as if rows of large needle-points were driven into the fauces—no stool—urine dark, putrid smelling, no sediment. I now declared to my three colleagues, this morning, that I did not wish to take any more Kali chloricum, but would take Arsenicum, and they assured me that I had anticipated their proposition. I took, then, every two hours, a few pellets of Arsenic. My colleagues demanded that I should submit to the external application of Argentum nitricum, and have the diphtheritic ulcers touched by it. I then asked to have the opinion of my friend, Clottar Mueller, of Leipzig, who was summoned by telegraph and met the three colleagues at half-past nine, p.m.; he declared that he fully agreed with the treatment, which was continued on the 22d of October.

23d. The diphtheritic ulcers have a better appearance, and new spots have not appeared; but the bronchitis has become worse, causes much rattling of mucus in the chest, and I am afraid of paralysis of the lungs. I, therefore, took Carbo veg.<sup>24</sup>, in alternation with Arsenic.

24th. Some improvement, the diphtheritic ulcers look cleaner, so that my colleagues consented to desist from the

painful application of Argentum nitr. The bronchitis is no worse. Continue the same medicine.

The diphtheritic ulcers healed towards the end of the month, the bronchitis was better, the fever left me, the night sweats were less and I slept better, while I continued to take the Arsenic since the 25th. The uvula alone remained affected by diphtheria. I could eat soups, roasted meats and compote, and drank claret with sugar and water, and even a glass of champagne noon and night, although it caused me some burning on the throat.

In the beginning of November I was so far convalescent that I could dress myself, walk about the room and attend to my correspondence. I have yet to remark that I felt a sensation of numbness in the skin of the exterior side of the upper leg during the second week of my sickness, and also the same numbness with tingling in the points of the fingers, at first in the thumb, then in the index finger and later in the toes, beginning in the big toe; this remained unaltered until the end of December.

The convalescence was interrupted in the middle of November by renewed fever with night sweats; by renewed but now paralytic difficulties in swallowing, with catarrh of the mouth, larynx, stomach and bowels, also of a paralytic nature. The vocal muscles and the muscles of the alimentary canal participated in it.

I could only swallow one teaspoonful of fluid, at a time and had then to be very careful, if I swallowed more it escaped from the nose; solids remained before the velum and had to be hawked out again with much difficulty. The uvula was hanging towards the left side. I had a nasal voice, if I spoke I soon became hoarse and even lost the voice, could not modulate my voice. I could perceive no motion in the abdomen, no eructation, no noise, no flatulency, no stool.—When I finally had a passage after an enema of soap-water, oil, molasses and salt, I felt so debilitated and exhausted that I feared to die. With it a great aversion to eating and drinking, so that I had to force myself to take something and