

of them only once. None of those having two inoculations had the disease, and the few who had it after one inoculation ran a very mild course.

Lifshitz gave 170 cases 243 vaccinations, only 3 receiving three doses. It was in the midst of a severe epidemic. In one of the villages 17 cases were reported in one week. Then there was a general vaccination with no new cases after it. Only three of the people vaccinated had scarlet fever, one of these four days after first injection.

Nikitin reports these cases:

528 vaccinated	1 injection	= 8	had scarlet fever.
106	" 2 injections	= 0	" " "
149	" 3 "	= 0	" " "
783			

In the villages not vaccinated, 16% of children had scarlet fever; in the villages vaccinated, 1.4% of children had scarlet fever.

Pratonoff had 52 cases, 2 of whom came down with scarlet fever, 1 very soon after the injection; the other case by many physicians was considered a reaction rash and not true scarlet fever.

Akaparoff had

123 given	1 vaccination	= 3	had scarlet fever on second day.
100	" 2 vaccinations	= 0	" " "
85	" 3 "	= 0	" " "
308		3	

Perwoff reports

231 vaccinated	1 injection	= 2	cases of scarlet fever.
51	" 2 injections	= 0	" " "
282			

Wasileff had 15 vaccinations, 2 cases of scarlet fever the day after the injection.

Neurzoft had 173 vaccinations, 2 cases of scarlet fever the second day after injection.

Langovoy reports the use of vaccines in a hospital in Moscow where, during the four years previous, 3% of the children in the wards had scarlet fever. Since its use, covering a period of several years, there have been only 4 cases among 309 children, or 1.2%.

Schwarin gave 497 cases vaccines, only 2 of whom had scarlet fever.

Orloff injected 45 cases, none of whom had scarlet fever.

Eskoff injected 34 cases, none of whom had scarlet fever.

Dobenesky injected 132 cases, none of whom had scarlet fever.

Tettno injected 23 cases, none of whom had scarlet fever.

From these published accounts it would seem that

1. The streptococcus vaccines, used as advocated by Gabritschewsky, have some influence in controlling epidemics of scarlet fever.

2. Their use, with proper care, is attended by no harmful results.

3. They should be given a wider application in this country to prove or disprove the contentions of the Russian physicians.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

- Anthony: Jour. Infect. Dis., 1909, vi, 332.
 Arkhangelski: Kharkov Med. Jour., 1906, ii, 337.
 Aronson: Berl. klin. Wochenschr., 1902, xxxix, 979, 1006.
 Babes: Bakt. Untersuch. . . . Prozesse d. Kinderh., 1880.
 Baginsky and Sommerfeld: Berl. klin. Wochenschr., 1900, xxxvii, 588.
 Bakradge-Dedaberi: Protok. Zased., . . . 1906-7, xliii, 398.
 Banks: Jour. Path. and Bact., 1907-8, xii, 113.
 Boas and Hange: Berl. klin. Wochenschr., 1908, xiv, 1566.
 Bogolyuboff: Sibersk. Vrach. Gaz., 1908, i, 179.
 Bukowski: Wien. klin. Wochenschr., 1905, xviii, 1277.
 Campe: Berl. klin. Wochenschr., 1905, xlii, 1615.
 Cheney: Chicago Med. Rec., 1907.
 Cumpston: Brit. Med. Jour., 1908, i, 1291.
 Daniloff: Russk. Vrach., 1908, vii, 676.
 Dorofeyeff: Vrach. Gaz., 1909, xv, 366.
 Egez and Langovoy: Jahr. für Kinderh., 1907, lxxvi, 514.
 Foix and Mallein: Presse Méd., Par., 1907, 777.
 Gabritschewsky: Russ. Vrach., 1905, no. 30; *Ibid.*, 1906, x, 469;
 Centrbl. für Bakteriöl., 1906, xli, 719, 844; Berl. Med. Wochenschr., 1907, no. 18.
 Garlipp: Med. Klin., Berl., 1905, i, 1311.
 Golomb: Russ. Vrach., 1908, vii, 720.
 Haendel and Schultz: Zeitschr. für Immun. forsch. u. exp. Therap., 1908-9, i, 91.
 Halberstaedter: Berl. klin. Wochenschr., 1908, xiv, 1917.
 Hakenknopf: Jahr. für Kinderh., 1903, lviii, 218.
 Hecht: Zeitschr. für Immun. forsch. . . . Therap., 1909, ii, 356.
 Hoehne: Berl. klin. Wochenschr., 1908, xiv.
 Hektoen: Jour. Am. Med. Asso., 1903, xl, 685; *Ibid.*, 1907, xlviii, 1158; Centrbl. für Bakteriöl., 1907, xlv, 456.
 Jasey: Prakt. Vrach., 1905; Münch. med. Wochenschr., 1905, lii, 1698.
 Jochman: Zeitschr. klin. Med., 1905, lvi, 316.
 Kerr: Lancet, 1908, i, 995.
 Klein: Report of medical officer, Local Gov. Bd., 1885-86, no. 8.
 Kurth: Arbeiten aus d. kais. Gesundheitsamt., 1891, Bd. vii.
 Langovoy: Centrbl. für Bakteriöl., 1906, xlii, 362, 463; Russ. Vrach., 1906, x, 565.
 Lifshits: Prakt. Vrach., 1907, vi, 773, 796.
 Livierato: Centrbl. für Bakteriöl., 1903, i, 422.
 McCullom: Oster's Modern Medicine, ii, 351.
 Makieyeff: Russ. Vrach., 1908, vii, 682.
 Markuzon: Prakt. Vrach., 1907, vi, 292, 315.
 Moser and Pirquet: Berl. klin. Wochenschr., 1902, xxxix, 193.
 Nedrigarilow: Centrbl. für Bakteriöl., 1906, xlii, 13, 102.
 Nikitin: Russ. Vrach., 1907, vi, 989.
 Perwoff: *Ibid.*, 1907.
 Portuyagin: Vrach. Gaz., 1907, xiv, 1177.
 Ravich: Prakt. Vrach., 1908, vii, 780.
 Rostovtsoff: Med. Obozr., 1908, lxx, 752.
 Rumyantseff: Russ. Vrach., 1908, vii, 685, 717.
 Salge and Hasenkopf: Münch. med. Wochenschr., 1902, lxxix, 1729.
 Schereneschewsky: *Ibid.*, 1908, lv, 777.
 Schick: Deut. Med. Wochenschr., 1905, xxxi, 2092.
 Schleisser: Centrbl. für inn. Med., xxx, 188.
 Schwarin: Russ. Vrach., 1907, vi, 891; Vrach. Gaz., 1909, xv, 367.
 Smirnof: Vrach. Gaz., 1909, xv, 368.
 Sommerfeld: Arch. für Kinderh., 1909, i, 38.
 Spaulding: Ill. Med. Jour., 1907, xi, 518, 580.
 Steckler: Med. Rec., 1883, xxiii, 316.
 Strickoff: Vrach. Gaz., 1909, xv, 370.
 Tsaregradski: Russ. Vrach., 1908, vii, 1035.
 Tunnichiff: Jour. Infect. Dis., 1907, iv.
 Weaver: *Ibid.*, 1904, i, 91; *Ibid.*, 1908, v, 608.
 Williams: Am. Jour. Obstet., 1908, lviii, 152.
 Wassjewski: Centrbl. für Bakteriöl., 1903, xxxiii, 461.
 Yemelyanoff: Vrach. Gaz., 1909, xv, 364.
 Young: Practitioner, 1909.
 Zeissler: Berl. klin. Wochenschr., 1908, xiv, 1887.
 Zelikin: Vrach. Gaz., 1909, xv, 372.
 Zlatogoroff: *Ibid.*, 1906, xlii, 325; Centrbl. für Bakteriöl., 1906, xlii, 77, 156.

A CASE OF ALCOHOLIC CIRRHOSIS IN A BOY OF FOUR YEARS.*

BY DAVID N. BLAKELY, M.D., BOSTON.

THAT alcoholism is a predisposing cause in certain cases of cirrhosis of the liver has long been believed. This position has been challenged, but there is no occasion at this time to consider the pros and cons of the discussion. Without doubt the diagnosis of alcoholic cirrhosis will be made in the future as in the past.

Many of the textbooks refer to cirrhosis in children as rather rare and conforming, in the

* Read at a meeting of the New England Pediatric Society, Jan. 29, 1910.

main, both clinically and pathologically to the adult type.

In general, cirrhosis due to alcohol has been characterized by atrophy of the liver, frequently preceded by hypertrophy, with ascites and without jaundice; that due to other causes has been characterized by hypertrophy of the organ, with marked jaundice, but with little or no ascites. The spleen is usually enlarged in both types, and hemorrhages from the mucous membranes and into the skin are frequently present. Osler refers also to the "fatty cirrhotic liver," a form occurring most frequently in beer drinkers, in which the fat is increased, even though the organ as whole is diminished in size. In the typical case of this variety, however, the liver is enlarged.

In Cotton's book it is said that "a study of reported cases shows that in children enlargement of the liver preceded atrophy in nearly every instance. Infants show a higher percentage of the hypertrophic form than do adults. This may be due to the fact that infants succumb more rapidly to the interference with metabolism and toxemia." Under causes of the disease it is said: "The ignorance of parents in regard to the effect of the use of coffee, tea and alcoholic stimulants is responsible for a large percentage of cirrhotic livers. The effects of these poisons are especially noticeable in the growing organism."

The recent edition of Pfaundler and Schlossmann's textbook includes, in its classification of cirrhoses, (1) atrophic alcoholic cirrhosis, and (2) hypertrophic cirrhosis. Under the first heading it is said: "Most of the reported cases of this disease are from England, where the poor children in the large cities are given brandy and gin at an early age, but the number of cases reported from other countries is daily increasing. It is believed that comparatively small amounts of alcohol may give rise to cirrhosis of the liver in childhood, and that the period of alcoholic indulgences need not be long. The duration is shorter than in adult life." Under the second heading it is said: "Hypertrophic cirrhosis is met with more frequently in childhood than the atrophic form. The etiology is still completely unknown. Hutinel, judging from the manifestations and course of the disease, classes it as a subacute infectious hepatitis, brought about by an unknown agent. Some cases may follow the acute degenerative processes. We can ascribe no importance to syphilis, alcohol, malaria or to the acute infectious diseases (scarlet fever, diphtheria, etc.) as factors in the production of hypertrophic cirrhosis. Evidently accessory factors, of whose nature we are ignorant, are necessary. Chronic, intensely marked jaundice, with considerable enlargement of the liver and spleen, characterize the disease. Ascites is not present or develops later."

The case which I have to report to-night is incomplete, in that there was no autopsy to establish the diagnosis. It does not fit exactly into any of the classes which have been mentioned, unless it be the "fatty cirrhotic liver" to which Osler refers as found most frequently in beer

drinkers. It is reported because the conditions present are, at least, infrequent. The clinical story is brief.

John W., four and a half years old, was the first child of healthy parents. A younger sister, now two and a half years old, is, and has been from birth, in robust health. There have been no other children and no other pregnancies. Measles was the only previous illness, and up to the end of last June the boy had been healthy, well developed, fully up to the average size and, so far as his parents knew, well in every way. The onset of his illness was indefinite; he simply did not seem as well as usual and began to lose weight and had more or less pain. During the summer he was seen by several different physicians and, apparently, no exact diagnosis was made by any one of them. Caries of the spine was considered at one time; so also was "rheumatism." The boy grew slowly but steadily worse. He came under my care in October. At that time he was pale and emaciated. The skin was in good condition. There was slight enlargement of the cervical glands. Teeth were in good condition, tonsils not enlarged, no nasal obstruction, ear drums appeared normal. The heart area was normal, action regular, a soft systolic murmur at the apex. Lungs normal, no tenderness nor rigidity of the spine. There was a question of slight tenderness in the muscles of the legs, nothing definitely localized and nothing very marked; no tenderness nor enlargement of any of the joints. The liver was symmetrically enlarged, nearly down to the level of the umbilicus in the mid-clavicular line. Spleen not palpable. The surface of the liver, so far as could be made out, was even and smooth, and there were never any irregularities felt. No jaundice present, no history of any previously, and none developed later. The liver continued to enlarge, so that at the time of his death, Nov. 25, 1909, almost exactly five months from the beginning of his illness, it extended about an inch below the level of the umbilicus in the mid-clavicular line.

There was an increasing loss of appetite, so that for the last two or three weeks of his life the boy took much less than would be required to maintain his nutrition, and the emaciation became extreme. In spite of the small amount of food taken, there was nothing that could be considered a disturbance of digestion, — neither vomiting, nor diarrhea, nor constipation, — and the gross appearance of the stools was normal. Urine, on several examinations, showed concentration, excess of urates and the slightest possible trace of albumen. There was no fever during this last month of life. A complete record of temperature was not kept, but on several occasions, both afternoon and morning, the rectal temperature was below 98°. During the last two weeks there was slight edema of both upper and lower extremities, and about a week before he died a very slight bronchitis developed. There was no ascites, and the spleen was at no time palpable.

The cause of this enlargement of the liver was not apparent. In speaking with Dr. Charles W. Townsend about the case he suggested the possibility of an alcoholic history. This had not occurred to me, but, on careful questioning of the mother, and also an aunt, who was a frequent visitor in the home, I learned that the father was accustomed to have beer or whiskey with his friends when they called, and frequently beer or ale was a part of the Sunday dinner. The patient was the first child, the only son, and it seems that

from the time when he was able to drink from a glass, whenever liquor was served in the family, Johnny was given some with the others. This must have continued over a period of nearly two years. It is impossible to estimate, with any approach to accuracy, either the frequency of his receiving alcohol or the amount, although it is believed that the amount at any one time was never large. Dr. Townsend saw the boy in consultation early in November, and the probable diagnosis of alcoholic cirrhosis was made and a bad prognosis given. The boy died, as already noted, Nov. 25. There was no autopsy.

STRAY THOUGHTS ON THE HISTORY OF MEDICINE.

BY JOHN E. DONLEY, M.D., PROVIDENCE, R. I.

It is, perhaps, not too much to say that all lovers of literature have been fascinated by the inimitable manner of Walter Pater. There is in his writings so much of Hellenic lucidity and grace, so much of that chaste embodiment of imagination that makes one think of a marble of Praxiteles turned to words. What, for example, could be finer than this? "Nothing which has ever interested living men and women can wholly lose its vitality — no language they have spoken, nor oracle beside which they have hushed their voices, no dream which has once been entertained by actual human minds, nothing about which they have ever been passionate, or expended time and zeal." Nothing about which they have ever been passionate, or expended time and zeal! How much of the world's history, with its kindnesses and hopes, its cruelties and fears, is compressed within the meaning of these few lines. Why we are, who knows? But what we are, we are, because Athens taught and Rome transmitted, because paganism succumbed and Christianity rose fresh upon its ruins, because in due time, — and, in truth, may we not sometimes think, out of due time? — Homer and Virgil, Dante and Milton, St. Paul and St. Francis, Hippocrates, Galen and Darwin lived, labored and suffered, that they might pass on the precious chalice of faith and knowledge. And yet so busy are we that we think but little about our heritage, purchased with so much time and labor. We lack perspective, and, wanting this, we misprize the record of our past. But some of us are more forgetful than others. I see in our bookstores, and upon the shelves of our libraries, a goodly array of biographies and appreciations of great statesmen and warriors, of distinguished artists and men of letters, but I look in vain for a record of the achievements of the illustrious men in medicine. Where they should be, they are not, — among the benefactors of mankind. Even physicians, I fear, seem not to know or to care as they should about the history of their great profession. And yet the history of medicine, relating, as it does, a part of the story of the organic life of humanity, is quite as expressive of the intellectual, moral and, I may even add, religious life of an age or of a

people as are its painting, its sculpture, its poetry or its political institutions. Each of these partially, and all of them in greater degree, do but mirror forth in visible expression the collective consciousness that produced them. There is in the writings of the greatest physicians a human touch, a concrete richness of detail, that one often misses in the more abstract, artificial productions of artists and men of letters. One may learn to know as intimately the many wise, complex and varied mental life and physical characteristics of the Greeks from the writings of Hippocrates, that grand old man of Cos, as from the tragedies of Sophocles, the comedies of Aristophanes or the histories of Herodotus.

The ancients thought and wrote not alone about the world of external nature and the realm of politics; they studied, first and foremost, man himself, his body and his soul. "We regard knowledge as a good and precious thing," says Aristotle, "but we esteem one sort of knowledge more highly than another either because of the acumen required for its discovery or because it is concerned with better and more admirable objects; for both these reasons we should rightly assign the investigation of the soul to the first rank." And as for the body, did they not carve imperious man in marble as he appeared radiant with health, in the public games at Olympia, and did they not provide at Rhodes, at Knidos and at Cos, famous Ascleipia, Temples of Health, for the solace and cure of his body, worn and wearied by disease? I like to know what these clear and untrammelled thinkers thought about men in health, but I like also to know what they thought about men in disease, for I cannot know them adequately in any other way.

The Greek mind, then, I say, has embodied some of its most powerful and fruitful thoughts in its works on medicine. To say this is to utter a truism, but, like most truisms, it is so big with truth as to have escaped our attention by reason of its very bigness. Whoever to-day has a taste for the practical will find in the productions of Greek medicine much to his liking. To illustrate this practical spirit, let me quote but a brief extract from the Hippocratic treatise, "On Ancient Medicine," which commences thus: "Whoever having undertaken to speak or write on Medicine have first laid down for themselves some hypothesis to their argument, such as hot or cold or moist or dry, or whatever else they choose (thus reducing their subject within a narrow compass, and supposing only one or two original causes of diseases or of death among mankind), are all clearly mistaken in much that they say; and this is the more reprehensible as relating to an art which all men avail themselves of on the most important occasions, and the good operators and practitioners in which they hold in especial honor. For there are practitioners, some bad and some far otherwise, which, if there had been no such thing as medicine, and if nothing had been investigated or found out in it, would not have been the case, but all would have been equally unskilled and ignorant of it, and everything concerning