

LETTER FROM DR. BELL.—To the Editors of the AMERICAN HOMŒOPATHIC REVIEW, *Gentlemen*; Your review of Dr. Helmuth seems to be me just. I trust few would subscribe to his routine modes of treatment and imperfect indications for remedies. Yet there are many, who, although they would gladly learn these dim and uncertain ways, are still obliged to help themselves out by the use of strong medicines, and frequent changes, for want of more certain knowledge of better modes. The advocates of the style of practice of which Dr. Helmuth is an example, are constantly strengthening this weakness, by constantly promulgating their views, in the form of treatises, reports of cases, etc., while those who claim the success of high potencies, and long intervals, give us only the vague and general report to the American Institute.

Now why will not Drs. Hering, Lippe, and others give to the profession reports of individual cases with details of the symptoms of the disease and results of treatment in full. There are a large class of homœopathic physicians who are unprejudiced and progressive, and have no sympathy with the really retrospective philosophy of the physiological or rational school. To such a pure Homœopathy is the great evangelism of medicine, and they would hail with joy the proof of the superior power of the higher potencies over this greatest of modern scourges—diphtheria. Why should we not then have the proof, and have it in detail from those whom we regard as masters in our art and science, in order that as Hahnemann directs, we may not only “*Nach machen*,” but “*genau nach machen*?”

Most respectfully yours,

Augusta, Me., December 24th, 1864.

JAMES B. BELL.

HOMŒOPATHIC MEDICAL COLLEGE OF PENNSYLVANIA.—We have received from the Dean of the College Dr. C. HERRMANN the following list of graduates of the session of 1864—5.

Ephraim Bancroft, Philadelphia, Pa.; Lyman Bedford, Buffalo, N. Y.; John Buck, Philadelphia, Pa.; Abram Clayton, Huntingdon Valley, Pa.; A. H. Ehrman, M. D., Cincinnati, O.; Jairus Robert Ely, Philadelphia, Pa.; William Gilman, Marietta, O.; Charles Gundelach, Bellesville, Ill.; J. P. Harrey, Philadelphia, Pa.; Levi R. Lentz, Vogelsville, Pa.; Henry N. Martin, Buffalo, N. Y.; R. W. Martin, Philadelphia, Pa.; W. H. H. Neville, Somerton, Buck's Co., Pa.; Herbert Reynolds, Bridesburg, Pa.; John F. Rose, West Philadelphia, Pa.; G. B. Slough, M. D., South-Easton, Pa.; J. R. Tantom, Bordentown, N. J.; S. G. Tucker, Taunton, Mass.; William Willits, Muncy, Pa.; A. J. Wilson, Wilmington Del.

The special degree was conferred on C. W. Boyce, M. D., Auburn, N. Y.; David Wilson, London, England.

The honorary degree was conferred on Rev. P. Henry Knabe, Elizabeth, N. J.; Gottlieb Liebrecht, Lemke, Philadelphia, Pa.; Lemuel Stephens, A. M., Philadelphia, Pa.

THE  
AMERICAN  
HOMŒOPATHIC REVIEW.

Vol. V.

NEW YORK, MAY, 1865.

No. 11.

INTRODUCTORY LECTURE.\*

BY CONSTANTINE HERING, M. D., PHILADELPHIA, PA.

What should be our first consideration, when we strive to attain an end, particularly when we, in the relation of teacher and students, aspire to an object?

Clearly and definitely that which we are striving for must be fixed in our minds; the way in which we expect to reach the goal must be clear before us.

What is our object to-day, beginning lectures on Therapeutics? To heal the sick! That is all. It is a great end, truly a very great one.

Let us take for granted, every one of us knows this, and every one of us bears it constantly in mind, night and day. It is not your wish to become doctors only, to get a position in society, to attain honor before the people, to make a living, make money, get rich, etc., but it is solely and mainly to be a man able to *heal the sick*. Let us take this for granted as a matter of course. Now let us go to work and see what is hidden in these few words, to heal the sick.

Firstly: we must have means to do this, and these means we must know.

\* Delivered at the Homœopathic Medical College of Pennsylvania, October, 1864.

Secondly: we must know the sick and all that is to be known about them; and as every sickness is only a deviation from health, we ought to know what is health.

Thirdly: the connecting link between the first and second, how we must use the first, the means at our command; for the second, the sick, by what rule we must apply the means we have to the sick who come under our care.

The rule of Hahnemann is, like all great truths, plain and simple, but to apply it in life requires the greatest exertion of the human mind, and in fact we have to learn continually and never cease learning. Let us now glance over these great dominions of the empire in which we have to rule.

While we are spreading it out like a map before our eyes, let us remember that to heal the sick is an *art*, and remains an art, in spite of all that has been said and done to make it appear as a so-called science. It is an art to find in nature the means to heal, an art to prove drugs, an art to prepare them. It is an art to examine the sick before us. It is an art to apply the right means in every case. But there is no art without knowledge, and every art leads to knowledge. Therefore a physician is like a man who, when walking, first puts his left foot forwards, this is knowledge, then the right, which is art. Thus he continues and advances. It is only when knowledge is brought into order that we may call it a science.

Now let us overlook our first great domain.

If there are *means* to heal the sick, where are they? What may be used as such? How are they to be had? Where do they come from? What is said about them? What is really the fact, how do they act? What is the way, the sure way to find it out? How are they to be prepared, administered, etc.?

To learn all this you must first have a knowledge of Chemistry, the great key to unlock the inner world of things. Chemistry will tell you all about the metals and the metalloids forming the mountains; tell you what is deposited as their foundation, what crystallizes in their veins, what is poured out in their fountains, and what is contained in the

seas, and even what forms the ocean of air we breathe and live in. Without Chemistry you can understand neither the vegetable world, nor the animal, nor the formation of our body, nor its functions, nor the conditions of life, nor the causes of sickness, nor the ways and means to prevent or to heal it.

Further, you should have a knowledge of Botany. It was the beginning of the downfall of the old schools, to abolish the professorships of Botany in their Colleges. Since they had the impudence to declare Botany to be a study for *girls*, they began to murder methodically with Mercury and other metals, and to kill people by their alkaloids.

A true physician must have a knowledge of his tools, and without plants we cannot heal the sick. It was and shall be forever true, what is said of the tree of life: the leaf thereof shall be for medicine.

The next is Zoology. The number of animal medicines had been lessened very much, they were even disregarded and despised, since the remains of the middle ages had been shaken off; and it became the fashion to doubt as much as possible, in order to appear to be a wise man. Notwithstanding all this, Hahnemann has, by his researches, also opened the animal kingdom again to our art.

If you are sufficiently acquainted with the sources of *Materia Medica*, the next step, is to know how to prepare the drugs. A true master of his art must be independent and know how to help himself. It is not only to save the dollars; plenty will go to the apothecaries, and it is a blessing that we have such trustworthy assistants, but, if a good mechanic is able to make his own tools, should a physician not be able to do the same? The certainty we feel in handing a self-prepared medicine to our patient, is worth having. Let us at least now and then prepare a drug ourselves, following our great master also in this respect.

But the most important of all is the knowledge of the *effects* of our drugs.

In the good olden times of our school we considered it our

duty to prove even newly prepared tinctures or triturations of Hahnemann's old medicines so as to be convinced of their efficacy, and many a useful symptom was obtained in this way. After potentizing a medicine we tried to convince ourselves of its efficacy, and took some of it ourselves; this kept us in the constant habit of observing, kept us on the lookout, like a sportsman walking through the woods.

And further, while we were preparing the so-called *old medicines* we never forgot our position as explorers of the unknown world of results, of effects; never forgetting the ground-work of our healing art, we prepared from time to time *new medicines* also; we made a regular proving at least once a year, often twice and even three times a year. These provings were the high feasts in our church, and you cannot consider yourselves true members of it without joining in these feasts.

Proving is a most wonderful thing, the world has never known its like. We suffer, and we enjoy it; we sacrifice a little of our comfort, and gain abilities and power by it; we lose a part of a few days, and gain years of strength by it; we go to school to learn, and we increase the certainty of the healing art. At the same time, to prove drugs is of all other ways the very best, the nearest and the easiest to learn to master our *Materia Medica*. It is the way to learn; to *observe* the art of arts, the principal one, on which all others are based.

Thus if you ask an introduction into our *Materia Medica*, this is the most natural and the most effectual.

Our *Materia Medica* may seem to some like an impenetrable forest, but only to such as do not follow the example of our master. Suppose you live in the midst of a wilderness, and are not afraid to rise early, rain or shine, and go out to ramble through the woods; suppose you make the same exertion as a man who goes for the pleasure of shooting wild birds, the strange dark forest will very soon become a familiar hunting ground, where you easily find your way in and out again. Such an exertion we cannot expect of every

one—I mean hunting in the woods, but the other exertion we have a right to expect every one to make who intends to be a follower of Hahnemann.

We come to another division in our empire, we come to the bed-side of the sick, to the art of collecting and arranging the symptoms of a case before us.

At first sight, nothing seems to be easier for a Homœopathician than the plain teaching of Hahnemann: take the symptoms, but *all* the symptoms. Either the patient, or, it is a child, the mother or the nurse tells one symptom after another; the rest we see before us or hear by sounding. Nothing seems to be easier, and it may be so sometimes, but a physician should be ready for all cases, not only for the easy ones as they occasionally happen to come in his way. And you will soon find the examination of the sick is not only the first thing you must learn, but you will find it the most difficult. Hahnemann's advice you will find is an entirely new one; never before taught. It will necessarily occupy the most of our time during the lectures on practice; and you will not only find that, as an art, it requires great skill, but it also requires of you, as a necessity, that you store up in your minds knowledge upon knowledge, science upon science; you have of course, in most cases, to complete the report given by the patient or nurse, by questions. But you cannot ask a single question, you cannot know what differs from health without knowing all about the healthy functions. Physiology is, in fact, the light you must constantly have at hand, to shed its rays on every symptom; you can do nothing without it. At the same time, we can never complete the symptoms, never look to them as influencing each other, never bring them into order without knowing all that has been collected and stored up for ages under the name of *Pathology*. To understand something about the connection of symptoms, to know the importance of the one above the other, to inquire in such directions as will lead to the full knowledge of all the symptoms, to be able to give an advice with regard to the diet and manner of living, to be able to

tell with some probability what we have a right to expect as the next or prognosis, in fact, every one of our acts as physicians requires Pathology.

Our opponents have said and still say, "Hahnemann denies all science, particularly the science of Pathology." They have said so everywhere, all over the world, now these fifty years. As often as it has been said, it was a slander. It is not an error, not a misunderstanding—no, it is a slander. No one that said so has ever tried to learn to examine the sick according to Hahnemann; they do not even know what is required to be able to do it nor what they must know before they can attempt it. Why is it that up to this day old-school physicians find it so difficult to learn to examine the sick according to Hahnemann? Why is it that most of them never learn it? It is so great a difficulty and for the majority insurmountable, that it has been the original cause of a split in the ranks of Homœopaths. Since thirty years a new sect of Half-Homœopaths has been started, some among them of even a lesser fraction than half, quarters, halves-of-quarters. This class of Homœopaths take as much Pathology as they can get hold of, fork it up, and put it down on the field of Homœopathy; they push between themselves and their patients as many names of diseases as they have been able to commit to their memory; they take only a small number of the symptoms of a case, and give them a high ruling rank, and call them diagnostic symptoms, change them into a name and are ruled by such names, not by symptoms. It may be much easier for such doctors, it certainly is not for their patients. These halves or quarters call their doctrine an improvement; they call it the perfection of our healing art, whilst they turn the carriage back and down hill into the mud again, out of which Hahnemann had with his herculean power lifted it, and, after ages, was the first to turn the wheels of our art forward. They call this an improvement, because it makes the examination of the sick and all the rest of our art so much easier for them. They are exactly like the slaveholders in our times, the slaveholders who preach to the world

this strange doctrine, that the most perfect state of society, in fact the only "respectable" one is to have a handful of men called the aristocracy, to form the "republic," and to rule it; the rest of the inhabitants are either what is called "white trash" or black slaves. The former do not care to learn to read and write, and the latter are forbidden to learn it. Such a miserable imitation of the slavonic Asiatic nations they call an improvement! Call it the most perfect state of human society! With the same contradiction to common sense, such "would-be" Homœopaths call their half or quarter Homœopathy the progressed, the improved, the most perfect system of medicine. They introduce a similar kind of aristocracy among the symptoms, where a few are to overrule the rest, and the same aristocracy they introduce into their revised and improved *Materia Medica*; for instance, fever and hot skin and quickened pulse—Aconite is to be given of course; difficulty in swallowing and redness of the skin, and of course Belladonna is the remedy; if both are to be found together or blended, of course both remedies are to be given in alternation, and as they pretend to be homœopathic, they do not mix them in the same tumbler, but prefer to mix them in the same stomach.

Hahnemann's doctrine is to examine each case as if it were the only one, regard each sick person as the true sole object, and each case as an individual one. The healing art has according to Hahnemann the sick as its sole object, not the sickness.

A quarter of a century ago this main rule of Hahnemann's healing art was already expressed by his followers in these words: *We have nothing to do with diseases, we have only the sick to treat.* Diseases are never an object of cure, only the sick. As we cannot plough the fields with the horse in natural history, but must have a real one out of a stable, just so we must have a real drug and know its real symptoms, and likewise we must know the one sick patient and his real symptoms.

Five years ago the latest writer of a history of medicine

told his astonished readers (*Wunderlich, Gesch. d. Med. p. 360.*) the main idea, the ruling thought of the new intuition. "In the medical art of our age, the main idea is, *the physician's calling is not to cure the diseases but the diseased.*"

So says one of the bitterest opponents of Homœopathy. He stole his remark, like all and every good one in his book, from others, this one from Professor Oppolzer, and Oppolzer had adopted it. Oppolzer is a great allopathist, but a reader of homœopathic journals, and is famous for his good memory.

You see, there is hope, there is a beginning; the rays of the morning sun fall on the old school. It is high time for all of you to rally round Hahnemann and not remain behind the age like the quarter men; never forget, as they do, when examining a patient, that we have to heal the sick, and have nothing to do with diseases; never forget, that this is the main idea of our age.

This brings us to the third part of our bird's-eye-view, the shortest part in an Introductory, the longest in your life.

Suppose you have prepared yourself to know the means of healing, suppose you are properly informed in all the knowledge indispensable for the examination of the sick; suppose you are artistically skilled in it, by what rule must we apply the means we are master of, to the cases before us? We all know Hahnemann's answer in three words or even two words. It is our sole rule, it is the great law of nature. It will be the object of more than one lecture, to show you how such a plain, briefly expressed rule can be applied. In some cases it is easy enough, in others very difficult, and we must know how to meet all such apparent and real difficulties. You will find that it requires the skill almost of a general, of a good tactician. One little thing you ought to keep in mind from the beginning, from the very first hour. In the national meeting of the so-called allopathic physicians of the United States, a by-law was passed unanimously. All students of medicine, all physicians, whether they have studied medicine in all its branches for months or for years or not at all, are declared to be, if they follow a simple rule, or

if they make a general law of nature their keystone, they are without exception declared to be quacks. Webster's dictionary must be altered and must give this "improved" definition, or else the whole body of physicians will reject it as imperfect. So they say. And you will have to make up your minds, in spite of all your learning, in spite of all your cures—to be *quacks*. They exclude us, because they would like to get rid of us, but there are two sides to the question. They did not ask us whether we wished to get rid of them.

Again, the case is exactly parallel with the southern states wishing to get rid of the Yankees and expel the six Yankee states, the main obstacle in their way, because they think they can easily rule the rest afterwards.

But there are also two sides to this question. The Yankees do not want to get rid of the union, and if they were driven to the necessity, they would come down from their mountains, invincible men, with money by the millions, and conquer the whole continent.

So it is with us. The Allopathists try their best to get rid of us, but we will not get rid of them. We will study all the sciences, all natural sciences, all medical sciences, every discovery they make, every invention, if it is really useful, we intend, as well as themselves, to master all they master, and our own art besides.

May our College be one of the means to increase the number of such as are really able to heal the sick. Let the fashionable schools try to exclude us in civil life, they cannot exclude us from the free empire of science, nor can they prevent our healing the sick. The time will come, when we will have "men and money" to rush down like an avalanche from our mountains and reconquer our domain—the whole continent of the healing art.

## NOTES ON LACHESIS.

BY J. H. P. FROST, M. D., BANGOR, ME.

May it not have been the case that those Homœopaths who have thrown doubt upon the efficacy of Lachesis, did not possess a reliable sample of this heroic remedy? Such has been the thought that passed through my mind as, again and again, I have seen the most prompt and beneficent action follow the exhibition of Lachesis in the most hopeless and desperate cases. When properly prepared as a homœopathic remedy, its power for good is the exact analogue of the tremendous power for evil which it exerts in the natural state.

The forms of disease that *best* display the astonishing virtues of Lachesis, though various, are fortunately rare. But when they do appear, no other remedy can arrest the march of the destroyer. And in its far-reaching influence upon the deepest and most interior recesses of the human organism, no other drug, save Arsenic perhaps, can be compared with this. For it not only reaches the disease in the very *penetralia* of the system, but follows its course and completely removes it, even after it has produced such structural changes as, in themselves, threaten to become reactively destructive. Its wonderful power in advanced stages of membranous croup, and the regenerating influence which it exerts upon gangrenous and dropsical conditions are examples to the point. Even Hempel\* is forced to admit its efficacy in gangrene; but he has as little reason for limiting the sphere of Lachesis to "traumatic gangrene," as he had for totally repudiating it in the first place. We give brief details of a case of each of the above-mentioned forms of disease, in which Lachesis was given alone and with the most gratifying results.

*Case 1.* About three o'clock of the second night I had

\* *Materia Medica*, Vol. II. p. 541, Second Edition.

spent in watching over a severe case of membranous croup, in a child of two years, I took advantage of some seeming abatement of the symptoms, to go home and get some sleep. Being summoned in haste, three hours after, I found the little boy in his cradle, recently awakened from sleep, *apparently in a dying condition*. This was not a simple paroxysmal aggravation of the case, but, after forty-eight hours struggle with the disease, the child seemed actually dying. I was just on the point of turning round to the parents and telling them so, and that I could do no more for him. But at the moment it occurred to me that they did not send for me for that purpose, but rather to try all in my power to save him. The desperate nature of the case and perhaps some peculiarity of the symptoms which I do not now recall and especially the *remarkable aggravation after sleeping*, led me to give Lachesis. And when I left the house half an hour after, so great had been the immediate improvement that I considered the patient out of danger. He took no other remedy, and made a speedy recovery. This was the termination of one of the severest and most obstinate cases of croup I ever fought out, one which began also in the middle of the afternoon. And I have ever noticed that the attacks of croup, which begin in the afternoon, are always of a graver character than those which first appear later in the evening; while those which occur after midnight seem milder still.

*Case 2.* A babe about a year old, and apparently healthy, had one or two incisors lanced. The little fellow proved to be what is popularly termed a "natural bleeder." For five days and nights the blood flowed constantly, resisting every homœopathic remedy, and external application. The flow, kept up in no small degree by his incessantly sucking the bleeding gums, continued till he vomited blood, passed only blood per anum and refused all nourishment. At last the Per-chloride of Iron arrested the hæmorrhage. But the child, being of a remarkably scrofulous constitution as indicated by the nature of the case, if by nothing else, became cachectic and dropsical.

The anasarca was very great. *Black and blue spots, ecchymoses, appeared all over him; the least touch or pressure would produce them; and it was exceedingly difficult to handle him on account of the excessive tenderness of his body; there was a well-marked aggravation after sleeping; and extreme deathly paleness of the face.* To this condition the case had advanced, in spite of Sulphuric acid, Arsenic, China and other remedies. And still the child grew worse, and the vital powers so feeble, that all expected a speedy release of the little sufferer by death. Lachesis\* prescribed and administered by Dr. B. C. Woodbury, at that time studying with me, and under whose immediate care the case was (at a considerable distance in the country,) effected a complete cure, of which the child is now a sturdy witness.

It is greatly to be regretted that no examination of the urine was made in this case; as it is a matter of no small interest to decide that the dropsy which results from excessive loss of blood is attended by albuminous urine. Marshall Hall\* says of such cases "I do not know whether the urine be coagulable." Nor have I been able to find in other works, any more positive testimony on this point. But from what may be termed dynamic reasons, as regards the condition of the blood itself, I am inclined to think that the very scanty urine, whether whitish or darker colored, of persons laboring under dropsy from loss of blood, will be found largely albuminous.

*Case 3.* On the second day of last June I was called to see a Mrs. F., aged about 20, two years married, and now six months advanced in her first pregnancy. A year previous she had been very ill with fever, under allopathic treatment; and ever since, she had suffered from pain in the small of the back, and difficult, scanty and painful urination. Now, her lower limbs were very much enlarged, the *drop-sical swelling was very obvious in the sacral region*; the urine was *very scanty, whitish*, and threw down a thick sediment. In spite of the remedies which I gave, seeing

\* Quoted by Marcy and Hunt, II. 741.

her twice only in the first week of my attendance, she grew rapidly worse, partly from going up stairs to sleep at night, and was soon entirely confined to her bed. The urine on being boiled became *wholly solid*, albuminous to the last degree. The vulvæ became enormously distended, so that she could only lie on her back with her legs widely separated. From her feet to her waist, the œdema was very great indeed; her body up to the mammæ was as round as a barrel. The totality of the urine passed in twenty-four hours would not exceed two ounces. She had little or no cough, and both heart and lungs remained unaffected; the œdema was excessive but there was no effusion. The pulse was about ninety.

Acupuncture relieved the vulvæ; the flow was copious, rapidly saturating the cloths; but although the almost transparent enlargement of the parts was not reduced more than one fourth during several days, she was made more comfortable. But neither Arsenic, Digitalis, Mercurius nor Apis, nor in fact any remedy I could find indicated, had any effect to increase the quantity of urine or in the least retard the steady and rapid increase of the general dropsy. It seemed that paracentesis would be absolutely indispensable; and even with that I could anticipate little more than temporary relief. And the more especially since I learned that not only her mother but all her mother's sisters and even her maternal grandmother were much inclined to dropsy in general, and particularly when *enceinte*.

Anxiously desirous of avoiding the operation which, if but partially successful, would yield little relief, and which if it allowed the escape of much of the vast quantity of water accumulated in the abdomen alone, could hardly fail to be followed by fatal collapse, I determined to make one more trial, and gave her on the evening of the 17th, one half of a fresh infusion of Apis. The next morning I found she had passed *a chamberful of urine*. Directing the remainder of the infusion to be given in divided doses through the day, on the morning of the 20th, I found to my disappointment,

that no very considerable amount of urine had been discharged, though the patient was easier. Part of a new infusion of Apis was at once given, and at three p. m., being called in great haste, I found her in the almost convulsive agonies of desperate labor. The peculiar conformation of the œdematous vulvæ rendering the passage of the head impossible, I perforated it with my pocket knife, and, within five minutes of entering the house, successfully delivered my patient of a fully developed child of seven months, which had evidently been dead several days. Before the delivery, it did not seem possible she could survive, so intense was the agony, more than a few moments; while the distress about the chest and the imminent danger of thoracic effusion called for the most prompt and effectual action.

The next day the patient was quite as comfortable as could be expected. But the dropsy, instead of beginning to diminish after the delivery, continued rapidly to increase. The vulvæ still required the acupuncture. The feet and legs at first seemed to decrease in size; but on the 26th inst., I found the *left leg very much more swollen and painful* from the knee down; and she had dry, hacking cough. On the 27th, her pulse was 110; the swelling of the bowels had subsided as the left leg increased in size; and she complained of great pain from the least movement of the leg, and a steady ache in it all the time. The whole of the *left side* was now remarkably enlarged, and but little urine had passed since her delivery. She got Bryonia with no improvement, till the 29th, when she complained of pain in the bowels and head, and nausea and faintness on being raised up; the urine was almost totally suppressed, and she was evidently very low. On the 30th no better; the left side and leg still more heavy, the latter almost like elephantiasis and so enlarged that she was entirely unable to move it. Gave Lachesis<sup>s</sup> a powder dry, once in four hours.

Calling the next day I was most agreeably surprised to find her better. She had passed *six quarts* of urine since taking the Lach. twenty-four hours ago; and she can move

her leg a little. July 2nd, I continue to quote from my note-book, *passed a great quantity* of urine under Lachesis<sup>s</sup>. July 3rd. Much better; the swelling is going down from the left side and leg; passes a great deal of water. Lach.<sup>s</sup> *ter in die*. July 4th. Still better; pulse ninety-six; Lach.<sup>ss</sup> July 6th. Much better; medicine continued. On the 9th, I gave Lach.<sup>s</sup> with benefit. On the 13th, for pain in calf of the leg worse on motion, she got Bry. On the 15th, she complained of feeling faint, "all gone" after eating; pains in the left knee, with considerable contraction of the cords; gave Kalm. lat. under which she improved. I find no further notes of this case till the 29th. "Still some swelling in the legs; but she is down stairs, goes up to sleep, and has been out of doors." Lachesis<sup>s</sup>, a dose once in a day or two, for a little while, removed all the last traces of her illness.

Thus the Lachesis (with the doubtful help of one or two intercurrent remedies) in a remarkably short time restored to perfect health a young woman constitutionally predisposed to dropsy, whose kidneys had been diseased for an entire year, and in whom the dropsy and albuminous urine incident to pregnancy had very greatly increased after her premature delivery. Her health and strength are now, after six months, better than they had been for a year and a half previous; she keeps house and does her own work. The most strongly pronounced indications for this remedy in this case are found in the *the remarkable swelling of the left foot and leg, and the swelling of the whole of the left side*. Great *paleness of the face* was also a marked feature in this case.