Cohnheim* has recently told us that the cheesy part contains in reality but little fat.

Now, is there anything in all this which broadly separates this so-called caseous pneumonia in its minute structure from tubercle? Is there anything more than the evident admixture of a marked inflammatory lesion? Is there anything in the low vitality of the mass and its tendency to decay and fall asunder which is different? And if we call this affection at once "tubercular pneumonia," we are, I verily believe, much nearer to the truth than in endeavouring to separate it from tubercle altogether.

But it is not simply on histological grounds that I arrive at this conclusion. I have long studied the subject clinically, and I can record it here as my deliberate opinion that the number of cases of consumption which are supposed to have inflammatory beginnings is grossly exaggerated. They are the exception, not the rule; and even in the cases in which we have had evidence of an active bronchitis or pneumonic condition having seemingly been the start of all the difficulty, how often do we not find, on close analysis, that failing health, hacking cough, even slight spitting of blood, have preceded the acute symptoms? Then, too, we may get the history of inherited scrofulous or tuberculous diathesis. But I do not wish to be misunderstood. There are cases in which none of these qualifying elements can be discerned, which have, to all appearance, started in an acute inflammatory process. It is only the relative frequency of these cases that I am denying.

Again I ask, what becomes of the instances of so-called pneumonic phthisis? Do they not become tubercular? How many autopsies can any one recall, where persons dying from some intercurrent affection, while labouring under so-called pneumonic phthisis, did not show at some portion of the lung, or in the other lung, miliary tubercle or larger masses which everybody would pronounce undoubted tubercle?

Now, admitting the connection of so-called "caseous pneumonia," or "pneumonic phthisis," with the subsequent development of tubercle, —and nobody denies this, whatever his views as to the character of the connection,—I believe that it is quite as logical to reason from the after-appearance of the tubercle as to the primary character of the so-called inflammation, as to reason from the inflammation and the absorption of the products to the formation of its tubercle. The reasoning backward is as good as the reasoning forward, and, I think, infinitely more likely to be true.

Again, how many cases of ordinary pneumonia happening in perfectly healthy persons are met with which pass, no matter how, into tubercle? Certainly not many. When it occurs, there is generally the history of scrofula or tubercle in the family, the taint. Many of the advocates of the inflammatory origin of tubercle, or of its subsequent development after inflammation, tacitly admit this when they speak of the inflammation as special or specific. If it is special or specific, I say at once it is tubercular, —tubercular either from the onset, or it has become so when it presents the appearance of caseous changes.

I am advocating, then, the view that caseous pneumonia leads to tubercle elsewhere, because it is really tubercle already; and that it is not the products of ordinary inflammation, but the tubercular products, which infect. They may appear with the inflammation, or be the result of a special kind of inflammation; that does not affect my argument.

Now, one great difficulty in admitting this argument is, that since the researches of Virchow have familiarized us with the facts, we cannot assume all kinds of caseous degeneration as tubercular. We know that such changes may happen in purulent collections, in cancer, and that, microscopically, they present the features of the so-called cheesy degeneration which attends pneumonic phthisis. But is there nowhere else similarity of appearance without identity of meaning? Can we tell every case of cancer, under all circumstances, by its cell-growth alone? Are there no healthy textures in the course of formation that look like it? Does every sarcoma present infallible features at all its stages? Moreover, I have already stated that we very generally, nay, almost constantly, find in the pneumonic lesion

* Die Tuberkulose vom Standpunkte der Infektionslehre, 1879.