

## The Theory of Eliminative and Antiseptic Treatment of Typhoid Fever.

BY W. B. THISTLE, TORONTO.

[Abstract of a paper read at the Canadian Medical Association.]

SINCE the writer had published his first paper on this subject in April, 1893, and the objection that such treatment was accompanied with danger was now seldom heard, still there existed much misconception regarding the ideas which underlay this form of treatment. An example of such misconception had been shown in a very inaccurate report of the eliminative and antiseptic treatment which appeared in a recent edition of a well-known work on the practice of medicine. The writer of the book had stated that the treatment of the disease was based on erroneous ideas as to the pathology of the disease, that this form of treatment was administered under the idea that the specific bacteria were confined chiefly to the intestine. The writer of the book had stated positively that the specific bacteria were not present in the intestine until the ninth day of the disease. The author had further stated that the specific germs were found in the spleen and other parts of the body, the reader being led to infer that the advocates of the eliminative treatment had failed to appreciate that fact. The essayist then reiterated his views as to the pathology of typhoid fever. The toxins generated by the germs produced the phenomena of the disease. In his former papers the essayist had held to the view that the toxæmia was induced by more than one form of bacterium, that the bacilli coli communis contributed to the poisoning.

During the progress of the disease there is a continual augmentation of the toxæmia by the absorption of toxins from the intestine and of quantities of poison produced by colonies in the spleen, mesenteric glands and Peyer's Patches. Recent investigations had confirmed his views as to the nature and extent of the poison. He had also questioned the correctness of the very generally accepted statement that the specific bacilli were present during the first nine or ten days. This contention, too, had been agreed with by recent observers: for the bacilli had been found in all stages of the disease, distinction between Eberth's bacillus and the bacillus coli having been made by perfected methods of bacteriological investigation. So that his great error, according to the author referred to, in supposing that the bacilli were