

and its concomitant evils may be defied. Nothing short of this combination will prove really effective and safe. Other half-way measures are mere palliations, and liable at any moment to a breakdown. To revert again to the SANITARY RECORD of July 27, 'The strength of the whole is the strength of the weakest part.' We have no weak part: each part is calculated to effect treble the work it will ever be called upon to perform.

TUBERCULOSIS (CONSUMPTION) IN MILCH COWS, AND THE CONTAGIOUSNESS OF TUBERCULOSIS BY THE DIGESTIVE ORGANS.

BY A. N. BELL, M.D. (*From the Sanitarian*).

It is well known to physicians abreast with the times, that within the last dozen years or so the study of tuberculosis has received a new impetus, chiefly from the revival of the theory of its infectious nature, first promulgated about a hundred years ago by Morgagni. Buhl and Niemeyer may be regarded as the leaders of modern investigation of the subject in its application to mankind; but contemporary with them, among their own countrymen especially, there have been several other diligent investigators of the nature of tuberculosis from a different, equally instructive stand-point, whose labors it is the object of this paper to present. For whatever facility with which I may accomplish this object I am in great measure indebted to my associate in literary work, Dr. T. P. Corbally, of Brooklyn, for his aid in translating several papers and letters into English.

The subject seems to have been first prominently brought forward by Professor A. C. Gerlach, of Berlin, under the inquiry: *Is the flesh of cattle affected with pearl-disease, and especially of animals affected with tubercular disease, to be allowed or to be prohibited, as an article of human food?* Of which inquiry the following is an abstract:

From the time when pearl-disease in animals was supposed to have some relation to the venereal-disease as found in human beings, or, as supposed by some, was identical with it, the use of the flesh of all animals affected with the disease was strictly prohibited. The very natural fear of venereal infection was so great, and the general aversion among the people was such, that official prohibition was demanded to prevent its sale. In tubercle people saw only enucleated or incysted masses of venereal poison, and this idea was most generally associated with tubercles as found in the chest and abdominal walls, but more particularly with the former; all other abnormal conditions might be passed unnoticed; but a couple of nodules found on the walls of the chest, or on the diaphragm, were sufficient to cause the animal to be at once rejected. People feared even to touch the blood or the entrails of such animals, and the butchers knife was thrown away with the worthless carcase, and in many cases, even the axe with which the animal was felled. . . .

The *aversion* to the use of such meat did not disappear so readily, and Viborg states, in his treatise published in 1818, that in 1810 the