

A review of Jesse Foote's Observations on the new opinions of John Hunter, in his late Treatise on the venereal disease / by Charles Brandon Trye.

Contributors

Trye, Charles Brandon, 1757-1811.

Hunter, John, 1728-1793

Royal College of Surgeons of England

Publication/Creation

London : Printed for John Murray, 1787.

Persistent URL

<https://wellcomecollection.org/works/ymfxnshq>

Provider

Royal College of Surgeons

License and attribution

This material has been provided by This material has been provided by The Royal College of Surgeons of England. The original may be consulted at The Royal College of Surgeons of England. where the originals may be consulted. This work has been identified as being free of known restrictions under copyright law, including all related and neighbouring rights and is being made available under the Creative Commons, Public Domain Mark.

You can copy, modify, distribute and perform the work, even for commercial purposes, without asking permission.



Wellcome Collection
183 Euston Road
London NW1 2BE UK
T +44 (0)20 7611 8722
E library@wellcomecollection.org
<https://wellcomecollection.org>

*Mr. Hunter recd
from the Author*
A
R E V I E W

20

O F

JESSE FOOTE'S

S E R V A T I O N S

O N T H E

N E W O P I N I O N S

O F

J O H N H U N T E R,

I N H I S L A T E

A T T E N T I O N T O T H E V E N E R E A L D I S E A S E.

B Y

H A R L E S B R A N D O N T R Y E,

M E M B E R O F T H E C O R P O R A T I O N O F S U R G E O N S I N L O N D O N,

M E M B E R O F T H E R O Y A L M E D I C A L S O C I E T Y I N E D I N B U R G H,

A N D S U R G E O N T O T H E G L O C E S T E R I N F I R M A R Y.

P R I N T E D F O R J O H N M U R R A Y, N O. 32,

F L E E T - S T R E E T, L O N D O N.

M. DCC. LXXXVII.

W. I. V.

1800

1800

1800

1800

1800

1800

1800

1800

T O
THOMAS BEDDOWES, M.D.

CHEMICAL READER,

I N T H E
UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD,

T H E
F O L L O W I N G P A G E S

ARE MOST RESPECTFULLY DEDICATED,

BY HIS OBLIGED FRIEND,

AND

MOST OBEDIENT SERVANT,

T H E A U T H O R.

TO
THOMAS BEDDOWS, M.D.

CHEMICAL READER

IN THE

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

THE

FOLLOWING POES

BY
JOHN H. BARNARD, D.D.

OF
THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

AND

OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE

THE
AUTHOR

P R E F A C E.

A MAN, who offers his sentiments to the world, indisputably submits himself to the tribunal of criticism; nor should he affect to complain of the freedom, with which his works are canvassed.—Upon this principle we admit Mr. FOOTE's undoubted right to investigate the merits of Mr. HUNTER's *Treatise on the Venereal Disease*; and we sincerely wish that he had done it in a manner which justice could not have blamed.

But the most impartial person will agree with me, that, however Mr. FOOTE may imagine that he has distinguished himself by the brilliancy of his wit, and the poignancy of his satire, yet his Observations on Mr. HUNTER's Treatise are destitute of every pretension to liberality and candor;—that his views appear to be personal; and that he writes against Mr. HUNTER, rather than his opinions.

Even respect for the sentiments of the world should have induced Mr. FOOTE to have proceeded more cautiously. The opinion which it entertains of Mr. HUNTER, is not to be altered by ridicule and witticisms.—

Reason

Reason and experiment are the only means which can effect a change in that opinion.

Why I have undertaken a review of Mr. FOOTE's labours, is an enquiry of no moment to the public. How I have executed it, 'tis their's to judge. Whatever are its faults, let me not be charged with the least intention of being personal towards Mr. FOOTE. I do not know him farther than by his writings; and except when those lead me to unfavourable suspicions, I can believe him possessed of every useful and every amiable quality. If I have been free in my remarks, let him reflect, that I am betrayed into that liberty by the influence of his own example. On

On the question concerning pus, I have made mention of some respectable persons, in opposition to the doctrine which Mr. FOOTE enforces; not indeed because I am a believer in either of their opinions, but merely to demonstrate how unjustly Mr. FOOTE makes a boast of authorities.

Nor do I presume to attempt to lessen the importance of the very distinguished writer, whom Mr. FOOTE has quoted on that topic. Mr. POTT's reputation cannot be affected by controverting a matter of speculation; nor will the light of truth diminish the lustre of his merit.

In speaking of experiments made with the Ticuna, or American Poison, I allude to those lately published by the philosophical and scientific Abbé FONTANA.—I do not mean to convey the least suspicion of the accuracy of his Experiments; but, in expressing my doubts of the manner in which it kills, I only except to the experiments being adduced as proofs that wounds are very good absorbent surfaces. For objections are certainly to be raised to the theory, that the poison, previous to its proving mischievous, is conveyed through the channels of the absorbents into the blood vessels, and in that manner mixed with the blood.

I have made few practical remarks on the complaint under consideration; chusing to confine myself at present to the reviewing of the Observations. For it would have been inconvenient to have delivered my own observations in the course of reviewing the performance of another. And, moreover, the expedition with which the nature of a review requires it to be published, would not have allowed me to have digested my ideas in a manner, which could have justified my attempting to communicate them to the world.

I have perused the Second Part of Mr. FOOTE's Observations.—In merit it does not rise above the First Part;

Part; and in virulence it does not fall below it. As I am not certain that the public will approve of the Review of the First Part, I will not hazard the increase of its dissatisfaction, by proceeding at this time to review the Second.

I shall not trespass upon the reader's time, by pointing out the merits, or apologizing for the defects of the following pages; but will finish my preface with, I hope, no unreasonable petition,

contentus

—— *Veniam pro laude peto; ~~laudatus~~ abunde,*

Non fastiditus si tibi, lector, ero.

E R R A T A.

In the Title Page, read, *A Review of the First Part of, &c.*

Page 9, l. 13, for *Cullen*, read *De Haen*.

Page 56, l. 8, before *associating*, read *first*.

And there are a few Errors in the Punctuation.

A
R E V I E W
O F
M_R. FOOTE'S OBSERVATIONS.

TH E R E have been very few illustrious characters in this, or any other country, against whom envy and malevolence have not lifted up their heads: and the usual consequence of a distinguished personage's committing his opinions to writing, is an attack from some would-be critic, some hun-

B some

repel Mr. FOOTE's attack. Let me then humbly hope, that the Public will not blame my presumption, if I undertake that task ; and endeavour to do some justice to the reputation of a man, to whom Science in general, and Medicine in particular, have great and manifold obligations.

The reader will excuse me, if I do not particularly attend to every paragraph in Mr. FOOTE's work. Some of his objections, for obvious reasons, I may not think it necessary to notice.

From

From page 1st we learn, that Mr. FOOTE thinks it a matter of great importance that *his protest* be entered against Mr. HUNTER's doctrines. ^{1.}

We acknowledge the merit of this conduct; and with sentiments of gratitude, not of ridicule, will remember him as the *Protester* against the doctrines of the *Professor* or *Confessor* * JOHN HUNTER.

* By these titles Mr. FOOTE speaks of Mr. HUNTER, who unfortunately had no *Professorship*, before Mr. FOOTE was *facetiously* pleased to give him one.

In the upper half of page the eighth, he gives us a specimen of his powers in criticising.

Finding fault with Mr. HUNTER's definition of the Venereal Disease, he proposes, instead thereof, to "call the disease, "an animal poison peculiar to "man."—Now, in the name of reason, does this define the disease more accurately, than Mr. HUNTER's calling it "a morbid "poison?"—Will not Mr. FOOTE's definition apply equally well to the variolous, morbillous, and

and perhaps the pestilential poison?

Would any man have expected an objection to such plain, intelligible, simple language as this. “ The Venereal Disease arises from a poison, which as it is produced by disease, and is capable again of producing a similar disease, I call a *morbid poison*.—Like all such poisons, it may be communicated to others in all the various ways, in which it can be received, producing the same disease in some one of its
“ forms.

“ forms*.”—We have here a definition of a morbid poison; we know it strictly applies to the venereal poison.

The seven following pages the Proteſter has written, and ſaid nothing.

In page 16th, he preſents us with an opinion of Mr. HUNTER's, “ That the diſcharge from
“ a gonorrhœa is purulent;” and againſt this opinion having called to his aid every authority

* HUNTER on the Venereal Diſeaſe.

that he can, he is determined to make a considerable stand.—But let him that standeth take heed, lest he fall.

Let us hear the *Protester* :—
 “ Whoever has considered what
 “ was the cause of pus, uniformly
 “ agrees, that it must arise ne-
 “ cessarily from a solution of the
 “ parts where the pus was form-
 “ ed.”——Is he then persuaded,
 that Messrs. GABER, PRINGLE,
 HEWSON, CULLEN, BELL, and
 many other Writers, and Lec-
 turers on Physiology and Medi-
 cine, have all wanted considera-
 tion?—That they were all noto-
 C riously

riously superficial investigators of things, and of causes ?

Now, unfortunately, all these authorities arrange themselves in direct opposition to the doctrine embraced by the *Protester*. Notwithstanding he threatens us with calling up authorities, he does nothing more than bring a single quotation from Mr. POTT.—Why did he not remember, “ that
“ truth is not the child of au-
“ thority ;” and why did he not refute Mr. HUNTER, by adducing experiments, either his own, or of some other person ?

It is superfluous in me to profess the highest respect for the author, whom he has quoted. Few or none have deserved better of mankind, or contributed more to the improvement of his profession. Nor is it the least of his praise, that a more candid or faithful recorder of facts never existed.—But in matters of speculation and opinion, the single authority of any man whatever, must be considered as questionable.

The dignity of Mr. POTT's mind must lead him to think liberally of others, and raise him

above the mean suspicion that Mr. HUNTER, who is known to found every opinion upon some experiments at least, would teach that the discharge in a gonorrhœa, was purulent, merely because Mr. POTT has said it was mucous *.—It is both indecent and absurd to assign such a reason for Mr. HUNTER's conduct.

But authorities, and characters, and opinions apart, it is easy to produce a multitude of experiments to shew, that pus may be

* “ I know why the *Professor* persists to call this secreted fluid pus, and my readers shall know it; *because Mr. Pott says it is not pus.*”

FOOTE'S OBSERVATIONS, Part I. p. 20.

formed without any breach in the solids, or, in other words, without an ulcer. If the *Protester* be not acquainted with this truth, he has either wanted application, or opportunities to inform himself.

With respect to the particular question of the nature of the discharge in a gonorrhœa, if it be not in many cases possessed of every characteristic of pus, as colour, smell, diffusibility in water, want of ropiness, &c. I am persuaded, that half the Surgeons in *England* have no tolerably clear ideas of pus.—That it is always purulent, is to be denied:

nied: Mr. HUNTER makes no such assertion. The candid *Protester*, however, endeavours to persuade us that he (Mr. H.) does; and then shews how he contradicts himself.

An apology is certainly due to Mr. POTT, for the introducing of his name, and his work on this occasion. The *Protester* has forced that excellent writer into a controversy, in which, I am sure, he never dreamed of being engaged.—The book, which the *Protester* quotes, was written to correct some prevailing false opinions, which influenced the practice

tice

tice of Surgeons in the treating of *Fistulæ Lachrymales*. Deceived by the notion that pus was always generated by an ulcer, and seeing a purulent discharge in fistulæ lachrymales, they hesitated not to believe, that the parts from whence it issued were ulcerated, and the subjacent bones carious; and this supposed ulcer and caries, they fell upon with fire and sword.

The sagacity of Mr. POTT manifested to him the falsehood of their principles; and in the work which I allude to, he corrects the opinion of ulceration and caries,
and

and points out the true and rational mode of cure. To do this was his grand object; and his inquiry into the difference between purulent and mucous discharges, was made only with a view the more firmly to establish the principles and the practice which he recommends.—If the *Protestor* makes no more of *standing* against other opinions which he dislikes, than he has made of his *standing* on this occasion, verily he may as well *sit down*.—Here he was to make a considerable *stand*, and to call every authority, which he could, to his assistance.—What were we not led to expect?—

“ Blessed

Blessed are they who expect nothing, for they shall not be disappointed.”—Neither argument nor experiment are adduced against Mr. HUNTER; but merely an opinion is quoted from a work familiar to us all.

In the next paragraph we learn, that the *Proteſter* “ has never ſeen that the inflammatory ſtate took place a conſiderable time before the diſcharge.”—Mr. HUNTER, in ſupport of his doctrine, brings the evidence of facts; but the *Proteſter* is for weighing his doubts againſt them. *Is not this kicking againſt the pricks?*

If the accounts, which patients give of themselves, are to be depended upon, I may say, that I have known uneasiness in the urethra take place days before a gonorrhœa appeared.

Page 27.—Why does the *Protestant* ask Mr. HUNTER, “ if he calls “ the discharge, without *virus*, *pus* “ also ?” In the very beginning of the chapter upon which he is commenting, it is said, “ the surface of “ the urethra is subject to inflammation, and *suppuration*, from various “ causes, besides the venereal poison *.”

* HUNTER, page 32.

Page 27th to page 38th.—Here two points of Mr. HUNTER's doctrine are controverted; the first that time alone will cure a gonorrhœa: the second, that the addition of fresh venereal matter to parts already labouring under the venereal disease, doth not increase the same; and that a part labouring under the venereal disease may be cured in the usual space of time, notwithstanding the continual application to it of fresh venereal matter.—The second I will first consider: the *Protestor* “ *defies* Mr. HUNTER to prove that “ the gonorrhœa cannot be continued by the application of fresh “ venereal matter;” and bids him

“ stand forth and declare if the go-
 “ norrhœa is not continued by it.”

P. 33, 34.—But Mr. FOOTE may as well recall his challenge, and take up his gauntlet. For I do assure him that I have known instances in which men and their wives have laboured under the disease at the same time: the husbands, notwithstanding, continued their usual intercourse with their wives, and both parties obtained their cures much in the usual space of time. One person was well six weeks before his wife; but continued to cohabit with her the whole time, without any return of his complaints.

Touching

Touching the first point, experience has fully assured me, that gonorrhœas will sometimes go off without medical assistance. Whether this will be always, or even generally the case, I cannot determine, because where I have been suffered to follow my own inclinations, I have never left gonorrhœa to itself. My readers, I dare say, will calmly and carefully peruse what Mr. HUNTER says upon the question, and judge for themselves.

That both internal medicines and injections are sometimes useless in the cure of a gonorrhœa, I do not doubt,

doubt, because I have known the disease withstand the operations of both for nearly twelve months.

Of page 41 I shall observe, that the truth or falsehood of Mr. HUNTER's opinion is to be decided from an appeal to facts alone.

Moral conclusions are by no means to be drawn from physical experiments; and, therefore, if Mr. FOOTE had been a man of candour, and an advocate for simple truth, he would not in this, or any other part of his Observations, have taken the advantage of prejudicing his readers against Mr. HUNTER, by
 insinuating,

insinuating, that his doctrines have a tendency to promote vicious actions. Feeble, indeed, must be the attachment to virtue of that mind, which is restrained from the perpetration of crimes only by the fear of corporal inconveniences.

Page 43 and 44, *of the Chorde*.—
Mr. FOOTE seems to puzzle himself as well as his reader, in order to raise some objection to Mr. HUNTER's doctrine on this subject. Nevertheless he agrees with him as to the main point; that is, that the Chorde is owing to an incapacity in the corpus spongiosum urethræ of being distended in the same proportion

tion in which the corpora cavernosa are distended. So far he assents, but no farther; for the adopting any theory of Mr. HUNTER, is at all times a surrender of all his senses. And after all, he cannot compleat his explanation of the Chorde without adopting language and ideas similar to Mr. HUNTER's, — *Dispositions, Actions, Powers.*

As far as Mr. FOOTE agrees with Mr. HUNTER, he is right; but farther than this, I call upon his own experience to testify that he is wrong. He cannot but recollect a variety of cases in which the Chorde has remained, after every appearance
of

of inflammation has ceased. We cannot suppose him erring in this particular thro' ignorance, but led astray by his never-ceasing solicitude to perceive errors in "the Professor."

Chordés, if I may speak what experience has taught me, may be either *inflammatory* or *spasmodic*:—When inflammatory, the inflammation from the gonorrhœa having likewise affected the *corpus spongiosum urethræ*, its reticular substance from the extravasation of coagulable lymph, as in all other instances of *adhesive inflammation* is glued together. Mr. FOOTE is inclined

clined to sneer at the term *adhesive inflammation*.—Whether the expression be a very proper one, I will not inquire; but I will most positively assert, that the ideas, which are annexed by Mr. HUNTER to that expression, are to be demonstrated as true from every day's experience. The corpus spongiosum being in the above described condition, whenever an erection of the penis suddenly takes place, the two corpora cavernosa become completely distended; but the corpus spongiosum does not admit of a similar distension; and hence arise the pain and the bending of the penis. But we frequently meet
with

with Chordés, where we can discover no traces of inflammation; that is to say, we find no thickening, hardness, or foreness to the touch about the urethra, nor any heat in making water.

In such a case we can account for the contraction of the corpus spongiosum only by attributing that contraction to spasm.

Nor is this distinction merely theoretical; it is useful in practice. If we treat all Chordés alike, we shall find our practice frequently unsuccessful; but by varying it, as we perceive the symptom to be ei-

ther inflammatory or spasmodic, we shall procure greater relief to our patients, and satisfaction to ourselves.

Page 45, *Of the manner in which the inflammation attacks the urethra.*

Mr. FOOTE, as usual, indulges his propensity to cavil; and nevertheless proceeds to confirm Mr. HUNTER's opinion, by adducing the evidence of a case, which occurred under his own observation; and which strengthens that opinion, as much as a case can do.

As to the specific distance of the venereal inflammation; it can hardly
be

be doubted that the injections, which do not pass far into the urethra, would fail of relieving the complaint, were it not, that the inflammation does not commonly reach to a great extent. For injections are not often thrown high* into the urethra. In recent gonorrhœa, a bougie has been introduced. The complaint of soreness was made only while the instrument was passing along the first two or three inches of the urethra.

Mr. HUNTER is speaking only of the general course of the disease. He

* To make liquids pass along the whole of the canal of the urethra, it is necessary to inject with considerable force. Now the throwing up of even mild injections with violence, is generally productive of mischief.

acknow-

acknowledges, that sometimes the irritation and inflammation are extended along the whole of the urethra even to the bladder.

Sympathy.

Mr. FOOTE, in the course of his criticisms, has taken great pains to shew, that the term *sympathy* is used by Mr. HUNTER in an improper sense; and that the word *irritation* ought to have been substituted for it.—It is easy to instance a variety of medical writers of character, who have used the term *sympathy* in describing affections of the body independent of the mind.

But

But to say nothing of authorities, every man has most certainly the liberty of expressing his ideas by whatever terms he chuses, provided he does by those terms render his ideas intelligible.

When a part is affected with a painful disease, and another part which has no immediate connection with the first part, becomes likewise painful; some term is wanting, by which we may explain the affection of the second part.—If there be inflammation in the liver, and a pain be felt in the top of the shoulder, or if the testicle be squeezed, and an uneasiness of the stomach

stomach follow, by what word shall we communicate an idea of this secondary affection of the top of the shoulder, or of the stomach?

If we say a part has been irritated, we are supposing that some irritating substance has been applied to it. But when the testicle is compressed, and the patient feels an immediate sense of uneasiness in his stomach, we are at a loss to discover what irritation could have been applied to the stomach; or to conceive how an irritating substance could have been applied to it by squeezing the testicle.

Now

Now the word sympathy, which signifies, *the suffering with*, conveys as clear an idea of the secondary affection of the stomach, or of the top of the shoulder, as our present knowledge of Anatomy and Physiology can enable us to conceive. And if we say, that the Stomach sympathises with the Testicle, we explain ourselves as intelligibly as we do in saying, a Spectator *sympathises with Mrs. Siddons**, when we observe a passionate shriek of the latter, followed by a shriek from the former.

* “ When *Mrs. Siddons*, in some distressful scene in “tragedy, &c.”

The particular mode, in which a communication is made of the sensations of the stomach with the sensations of the testicle, is as little understood, as the manner in which similar passions in the audience are excited by the display of similar passions in the actresses.

Of the fwelled Testicle, p. 54.—It is here contended, that Mr. HUNTER is totally mistaken in his opinion that the *hernia humorrhalis* is a sympathy of the testicle with the urethra, and is not venereal.

To overturn the first part of this opinion, he reasons by analogy
from

from the swelling of the glands in the groin during the inflammation of the urethra.—These, he says, arise when the inflammation is the greatest, and subside as that goes off: whereas the testicle swells at the time when the inflammation is subsiding, or in great measure gone off.

Now it is obvious, that there is not the least analogy between the circumstances of the testicle, and those of the inguinal glands. The absorbents which arise from the immediate seat of the disease, pass thro' some gland in the groin. Being acquainted with this fact, it is

easy for us to understand, why, the absorbent being irritated or inflamed, the inguinal gland should swell.

But unless the venereal matter in the urethra be extended as far as the *caput gallinaginis*, which certainly, if we can judge from the feelings of patients, is not generally the case; no venereal matter can possibly be applied to the testicle.

Even when suppurations take place about the prostate gland, it is a very rare thing for a hernia humorrhalis to come on. Now, in such a case, it is far more likely that
the

the matter would be communicated along the *vas deferens* to the testicle, than in the common Gonorrhœa.—

Another thing worthy of our consideration is, what appertains to the *vesiculæ seminales*. These are certainly more in the way of contamination, than the testicle; because the distance between them and the urethra is less, than between the urethra and the testicle; and because being cavities, it is easier to spread the matter over their internal surfaces, than over the internal surface of the meanders of the epididymis and testicle. We do not ever find the *vesiculæ seminales* labour under an affection similar to the *hernia humorrhalis*. I

I have lately dissected the body of a patient who laboured under an ulcer in the prostate gland from a gonorrhœa, which ulcer extended itself into the bladder. The *vesiculæ seminales* were perfectly found, nor were the testicles swollen.

But the Author of the Observations, willing to make a *home thrust*, addresses himself to Mr. HUNTER in the following words;—" Do you, " upon your honour, cure all swollen testicles without mercury," &c.. page 56, line 1. to line 5.

Mr. HUNTER has said as much to give satisfaction on this point, as any man can reasonably desire.

He

He tells you, that in general the swelling of the testicle subsides with the common treatment of inflammation. He has even given an instance, in which a *testicle suppurated*, and nevertheless, the cure was effected without mercury.

He has told us, that mercury is sometimes to be used in the treatment of the swollen testis. But is it to be inferred, that the swollen testicle, which was cured by mercury, was venereal, unless it has been shewn, that mercury will cure no other swellings than those which are syphilitic?

Without

Without adjuring Mr. FOOTE by his *honour*, I will, in return, simply ask him, if he can shew that a venereal abscess has been cured by the means which cure a common abscess?

I will not assert, that no swollen testicle is venereal; but I think I may be permitted to assert, that Mr. FOOTE has not in any wise refuted Mr. HUNTER's opinion on the subject.

Page 60, 61, 62, 63.—The ingenious Author of these pages discovers in Mr. HUNTER's Treatise doctrines which he has never taught;

and then industriously applies himself to refute those doctrines.—

“ The symptoms of gonorrhœa are
 “ held in contempt by him (Mr.
 “ H.), and he is eager at all times
 “ to repeat to us, that the discharge
 “ is harmless; and that his doubts
 “ about the *bad consequences* arising
 “ from it, are entirely at an end.
 “ Notwithstanding there are *absor-*
 “ *bents, they do not absorb, &c.*”

Now to prove the injustice of this charge, nothing more is wanted than an appeal to the words of Mr. HUNTER.

Treatise on the Venereal Disease,
p. 86, line 26. “ It is always ne-
 G “ cessary

“ cessary to have in view the pos-
 “ sibility of some of the *matter being*
 “ *abforbed*, and afterwards appear-
 “ ing in the form of a lues vene-
 “ rea.”——Again, p. 87, l. 13.
 “ Where it is not known to be
 “ abforbed, &c.”

Again, p. 253, l. 9. “ The im-
 “ mediate *consequence* of the local
 “ diseases, *gonorrhæa* and chancre,
 “ which is called *bubo*, as also the
 “ lues venera, arise from the *ab-*
 “ *sorption* of some recent venereal mat-
 “ *ter* from some surface where it has
 “ been applied or formed.”

Again, p. 257, line 1. “ The
 “ *second mode of absorption* is more
 “ fre-

“ frequent than the former ; and
 “ it is when the matter applied *has*
 “ *produced a gonorrhœa, &c.*”

These and other texts to the same purpose, are plain evidence, that Mr. HUNTER's doubts about the bad consequences arising from gonorrhœa, are not entirely at an end ; and that he does not teach, that tho' there are absorbents, they do not absorb, &c.

With how fair, *attentive*, and candid a commentator, is Mr. HUNTER blessed !

Mr. HUNTER is in the next place lashed for his opinion, that wounds

are bad absorbent surfaces.—Here the *Protester* thinks he has him fast by the ears; and with some triumph instances innoculating for the small pox as a proof, that the reverse of Mr. HUNTER's doctrine is the truth, and that wounds are very good absorbing surfaces.

But surely, the gentleman has been either a stranger to the practice of innoculating, or an inattentive observer of the progress of the infection; otherwise he would have remarked, that an alteration in the state of the wounded part, almost always takes place before any proofs of the infection having been communicated

municated to the constitution, make their appearance.

This fact, therefore, supports Mr. HUNTER's theory, instead of overturning it.

Inductions from experiments with the ticuna are foreign to the subject; it being extremely doubtful in what manner that poison, on being applied to a wound, produces the death of the wounded animal.

The attentive part of the gentlemen, who have been hearers of Mr. HUNTER's Lectures for several years past, can readily determine what agreement there is between truth
and

and the lower half of page 63.—It is not for me to prove, that Mr. HUNTER never used the language, which Mr. FOOTE puts in his mouth; but a cloud of witnesses can testify, that he has repeatedly recommended it to his pupils to take notes, and compare them one with the other. And it is equally true, that the earliest copies of his Lectures agree in general with those, which have been lately taken.

Page 65 to page 84.—Mr. HUNTER is roughly handled for publishing his opinion, that a gonorrhœa will in general get well without the help of medicine. I can-

I cannot help suspecting, and my readers may likewise suspect, that interested motives may be an inducement with some persons to object to this doctrine. For whether true or false, its being generally received would be very disadvantageous to a number of empirics, and even to some men dignified by the titles of Surgeons. But what I have just said, calls for an apology: for I am conscious that it is wrong to follow Mr. FOOTE's example, in offering insinuations and suppositions in the place of arguments and experiments.

Before I proceed to the remainder of Mr. FOOTE's objections,

tions, let me present the reader with a summary view of Mr. HUNTER's opinions on the subject before us.

He believes that gonorrhœa in general cures itself, and that medicine is unnecessary. That, however, tho' time alone will commonly cure a gonorrhœa, yet that art will often render the cure more speedily effected, than if the complaint be left to itself.

The better to ascertain the truth of this opinion, he gives to some patients labouring under gonorrhœa, bread pills, and he finds they all get well ; but not so soon as when art is employed. That,

That, tho' a gonorrhœa often cures itself, yet very disagreeable effects sometimes follow it; as the inflammation extending itself beyond the ordinary bounds, along the whole of the urethra, and even to the bladder, ureters, and kidneys, occasioning ulceration in the urethra, abscesses in *Cowper's* glands, &c.

That sometimes the gonorrhœa will continue for a length of time, in spite of every thing which we can do; and that, in such a case, it is very happy, that in time a cure will be effected by the matter ceasing to have the power of keeping

up the irritation in the urethra, and in short, by the disease wearing itself out.

That in this manner a cure of the gonorrhœa takes place, but *not of its consequences.*

That it is very seldom, that the matter of a gonorrhœa taints the habit; yet that this does sometimes happen, and then the patient gets a lues venerea.

This, I believe, is an accurate statement of Mr. HUNTER's doctrine. I have repeatedly and attentively perused Mr. FOOTE's commentary
upon

upon it: I think with impartiality. But I can discern very little beside a continuation of his attempt to place his author in a ridiculous point of view, and to amuse the fancy of his readers by the irregular fallies of an ungoverned imagination.

When he is denying the proposition, that gonorrhœa cures itself, he confounds the gonorrhœa with the lues venerea; for he talks of *the gonorrhœa shifting its situation, and acting on every part of the constitution*. Page 70, line 23.—Now the absurdity of this objection is glaring; for if the urethra become free from disease, then gonorrhœa is unquestionably

at an end. A consequent constitutional affection is a new matter; and it ceases to be an object of concern, in what form the previous local affection appeared, and in what manner it was removed.

Mr. HUNTER tells us, that gonorrhœas will cure themselves. Nevertheless, that in many cases a cure is more speedily effected by proper remedies, than when art is totally neglected; but that the misfortune is, that we have not yet learned to distinguish in which cases medicine is serviceable, and in which it is useless. As we have not attained to that knowledge, it may be naturally

rally concluded, that in general it is worth while to make a trial of art; and we are acquainted with the author's methods of treating the complaint.

I do not presume to decide on the merits of Mr. HUNTER's performance; or to determine whether his mode of treatment has a claim to excellence; but, at any rate, he is intitled to the thanks of the public for the candid and unreserved manner in which he has laid open his practice.

The reputation, which he had acquired of accurately understanding,
and

and of being possessed of a peculiar and advantageous method of treating the disease, would have enabled him to have gratified every interested inclination, by affecting the concealment of his knowledge.

From the æra of the disease to the present hour, never has a work appeared, in which the author has advanced his sentiments with greater caution, diffidence, and modesty. Availing himself nothing of the great character which he possesses in experiment and observation, he is no where dogmatic. He asks credit for no opinion, farther than he supports it by facts and by reasoning. No

No work deserving the attention of criticism has appeared, in which there is an exemption from error. Mr. HUNTER's Treatise may have its imperfections. Had Mr. FOOTE attempted to have pointed them out in a manner agreeable to the true spirit and laws of criticism, his undertaking might have been praiseworthy. But with what kind of spirit he penned his Observations, or by what laws he was guided, let the reader discover.

Dean SWIFT said to a young clergyman, " Never attempt at *wit* in your discourses, for it is ten thousand to one if you have any."

Happily,

Happily, Mr. FOOTE never heard of, or despised the Dean's advice. Had he attended to it, Mr. HUNTER would have lost the honour of being introduced into the company of DIOGENES, LUTHER, and CALVIN.—Mr. FOOTE would have lost the glory of associating the ideas of Gonorrhœa, Fun, Religion, Idolatry, the Rubric, runaway Horses, Tricks upon Cards, Records of Parliament, and a sober game at Whist. And the Printer would have lost the entire profits arising from page 67, 68, and many other pages.

The remainder of this first part of Mr. FOOTE's work affords me little opportunity of replying to particular passages.

He declaims against the pernicious tendency of Mr. HUNTER's doctrines, and against his pretensions to novelty or utility; but his proofs and arguments are yet to come. They who have perused Mr. HUNTER's publication can tell if it has given them any information.—That there can be any thing in Surgery or in Science novel to Mr. FOOTE, let those determine, who are better acquainted with his erudition and knowledge. But as

I there

there are many in the profession, who have no pretensions to omniscience, to them it is possible that Mr. HUNTER may teach *something*.

In page 87, Mr. FOOTE is astonished, that Mr. HUNTER should conclude, that, because a gonorrhœa gets well, whatever injections be used, that therefore no injections cure a gonorrhœa, but that it gets well of itself.

He tells us, Mr. HUNTER should (on the contrary) have asserted, and with more consonance to reason, that all injections tend to the same
end,

end, and that the complaint yields to *their specific* power. But in page 101 we read, “ I say, that a mercurial injection is a *specific* for a gonorrhœa; and that the emollients, sedatives, and adstringents, set down by the Professor, ought to be considered as *adventitious aids*, under the *all-controuling* power of mercury, as flip-flops are to James’s Powder, and a variety of adjuncts to the Peruvian Bark.”

In the first quoted paragraph, *all* injections are said to be *specifics*.—In another page, mercurial injections are the *specifics*, and all the rest only adventitious aids. The

comparing of these two paragraphs, may suggest to the reader the old proverb, “ some great wits have “ short memories.”

In page 93, 99. The *Protester* being still resolved that Mr. HUNTER shall be ever in the wrong, presumes that though he has not said, yet he has conceived something in which he is mistaken.

Mr. HUNTER has been saying, that “ sometimes, by an accidental “ fever coming on, the discharge “ has stopped, the pain in making “ water

“ water has gone off, and the gonorrhœa has finally terminated.”

Now, could any man, beside Mr. FOOTE, have inferred from this narrative, that a person thus *cured by a fever* might not have suffered an *absorption* of venereal matter into the constitution *previous to, or during the cure by the fever?*

He will likewise permit me to ask, Whether, previous to his drawing his conclusion from the Lieutenant's case (p. 99), he ought not to have been certain, that no absorption of venereal matter took place
before

before the gentleman fell ill of the variolous fever.

Equally unfortunate is the *Protest* in confounding in page 100, the *absorption* of venereal poison *into* the habit, with the *action* of the venereal poison *in* the habit.

If the reader will attentively peruse Mr. HUNTER's work, pages 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, and compare them with pages 91, 92, and part of 93, he will render it needless for me to vindicate Mr. HUNTER from the charge of self-contradiction, which Mr. FOOTE brings against him in page 107.

If

If he has been a practitioner of much experience, he will be able to recollect numerous instances in which a swelled testicle from a gonorrhœa *speedily* subsided, and got well: and others, in which a partial enlargement of the testicle, and especially of the epididymis, remained for *a length of time*, in spite of all his endeavours to reduce it. And if he has performed the operation by incision for the radical cure of the hydrocele many times, or attended the cures of patients who have submitted to it, he will at once acquiesce in Mr. HUNTER's statement of the spaces of time required for the subsiding of the testis after
that

that operation, and for the removal of the swelling of the same part in many cases of Hernia Humorrhalis.

The same unfairness in the *Protester* is to be found in page 94.— If to his quotation ending line 16, he had added only two more lines, the reader would have perceived that he might have spared himself the trouble of quoting at all.

HUNTER, p. 76, line 3. After
 “ any action,” “ it can therefore
 “ be of no consequence whether
 “ the matter is allowed to lie upon
 “ it or not; but by removing it,
 “ the medicines are allowed to
 “ come

“ come in contact with the inflam-
 “ ed surface.”

I am not insisting upon the truth of Mr. HUNTER's theory; but I find no difficulty in shewing, that the *Protester*, in the examples which he has given us, has falsely charged him with self-contradiction.

In reviewing page 109, I remark, that it seems the observer *has looked* into SOUTH, LOCK, and JOHNSON. It had been *better to have studied* them.

I have now attended Mr. FOOTE through the first part of his Obser-
 K vations.

ventions. Of his language, stile, and grammar, I am silent; because the purity of a SWIFT, or the elegance of an ADDISON, could not have attoned for false reasoning, misrepresentation, and want of candor.

After all, it must be confessed, that the *Protester* is merciful in the midst of judgment.—Conscious that the value of his book will insure to it an *immortality*, he “will not be accessory to Mr. HUNTER’s farther disgrace, or aim to make an *ignominious stain* indelible, by enlarging on the subject.”

“ject*.” Was not Mr. FOOTE then of a *gentle* disposition, the escutcheon of Mr. HUNTER’S reputation would be sullied with a *stain*, never to be wiped away!—Mr. FOOTE is in no such danger from his humble Reviewer; *he* seeks not *immortality*; *he* writes not for *posterity*. If he can assist the less enlightened part of the *people* of *to-day*, in ascertaining the value of the *Observations on the New Opinions* of JOHN HUNTER, he asks no more.—When his work has done this, let it peaceably embrace Mr. FOOTE’S in the trunk-

* FOOTE’S Observations.

maker's warehouse, or let them go
hand in hand

— in vicum vendentem thus, et odores,
Et piper, et quicquid chartis amicitur ineptis.

F I N I S.

Lately published, Price 2s. 6d.

R E M A R K S
O N
M O R B I D R E T E N T I O N S
O F
U R I N E.

BY THE
AUTHOR OF THE FOREGOING REVIEW.











