

vable. What has become of the virus in the meantime? Although it is probably cut off from the distant tissues by the salutary action of the leucocytes, we are without proof that some of it has not been carried by the circulatory systems to remoter parts of the organism.

Even when a sore first becomes apparent, who can say that it is leuitic? It is rarely until the nearest glands are and have been for some time affected, that we can be more than suspicious of the syphilitic nature of the lesion. In fact, the rapid enlargement of the lymph-glands is one of the suggestive symptoms of this disease. Again, when the nearest glands are enlarged, is it not probable that others also may contain the virus?

Yet, I consider that we are justified in radical operations in certain selected cases. Even when the nearest glands are enlarged, in some persons we may do little harm and possibly much good by such radical measures which should not fall short, however, of the removal of the glands, if they are palpable, difficult though this latter procedure may prove to be. "Up to this time, all that can be said in the present state of the question is, that cutting out the initial lesion of syphilis can do no harm, and may do some good. It should be placed before the patient in this light, and, if he elects excision and the chancre is in a suitable position for thorough removal, it may be excised."

"On the hypothesis that local primary lesions afford no certain indication of the beginning of a constitutional disease, the general treatment applied before the development of undoubted syphilitic symptoms has been called the general preventive method," but this hypothesis cannot be accepted without exception. "The local primary lesion, if observed at all, must be recognized as the real beginning of the disease, and a general preventive treatment is then just as much out of the question as local methods. It follows logically that general, that is to say, specific, treatment should be adopted as early as possible; delay is justified neither theoretically, as everyone will admit, nor practically, as my own experience has taught me. It is true that on this principle patients will be subjected to specific treatment whose symptoms are purely local and might, therefore, dispense with general treatment. Such treatment, however, can do no harm, and affords, at least, that moral satisfaction of feeling that nothing has been left undone."⁸

The general preventative method is not looked upon with favor in this country. The possibility of submitting an individual to mercurial treatment, without need is quite naturally to be deplored. Our teachers have impressed on us that secondary symptoms delayed by mercurial treatment are prone to appear with greater violence at a later