

exhibit the same or analogous phenomena,—if it does not march in the same train, and is not followed by the same results, where then is the propriety of arranging it with them as of the same nature? If I were to show you, kind reader, a piece of metal, and tell you it was a specimen of the California gold, would you take it to be gold if the yellow color and other attributes of that metal were absent?

So, if I were to show you a disease, and tell you that it was infectious, and you should ask—was it caused by the absorption of a specific virus generated in a living body?—has it usually exhibited symptoms of fever and inflammation?—does it afford immunity from subsequent attacks?—has it a tendency to a spontaneous cure?—does it originate spontaneously?—is it uniformly or generally followed by the same results? No. Then I trust you would not pronounce it an infectious disease, for the plain and simple reason that it did not exhibit the phenomena or possess the essential attributes of a disease of that character.