

Some remarks on three treatises of the plague: viz. I. Dr. Mead's Short discourse concerning pestilential contagion. II. Dr. Mead's Short discourse explain'd, etc. III. Dr. Pye's Discourse of the plague, etc.

Publication/Creation

London : Printed for J. Roberts ..., 1721.

Persistent URL

<https://wellcomecollection.org/works/g4e8qju5>

License and attribution

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>

SOME
REMARKS
ON
Three TREATISES
OF THE
PLAGUE:

VIZ.

- I. Dr. *MEAD*'s Short DISCOURSE
concerning *Pestilential Contagion*.
- II. Dr. *MEAD*'s Short DISCOURSE
Explain'd, &c.
- III. Dr. *PYE*'s DISCOURSE of
the *Plague*, &c.

Scribimus Indocti Doctique ——— HOR.

L O N D O N :

Printed for J. ROBERTS, near the Oxford-
Arms in Warwick-Lane. 1721.


Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2018 with funding from
Wellcome Library



S O M E
R E M A R K S
O N
T h r e e T R E A T I S E S
O F T H E
P L A G U E .



I N T R O D U C T I O N .

HE Appearance of the Plague in the Southern Parts of *France*, the length of its Duration, and the terrible Havock it has made there, have justly given the Alarm to all *Europe*. Here in *England* the Parliament, last Sessions, went on such Means as were then judged most proper, to keep out from amongst us so formidable an Ene-

my: And at present, the Danger of our being visited with this sore Affliction still continuing, the Wisdom of the Nation seems again intent on the same good Purpose; in considering what wholesome Laws may be farther enacted, either in order, if possible, to preserve us from so great a Calamity as the Pestilence; or, if that should prove impossible, to enable the Government to ordain such Regulations, as shall from time to time be judg'd fit and convenient, by the most skilful and able Physicians, to abate the Violence of this mighty Destroyer of Mankind.

But, what is more to my present Design, our Authors have not been sparing of their Advice on this melancholy Occasion; for *this* they have plentifully distributed, in many a Pamphlet, throughout the whole Kingdom. It is now near a Twelve-month since Dr. *Mead*, at the Request of one of the Secretaries of State, published *A short Discourse concerning Pestilential Contagion, and the Methods to be used to prevent it*. In that Treatise, the Doctor delivered it as his Opinion, That the Plague is no Native of our Country, but is generated only in the South and South-east Parts of the World: That when it appears amongst us, it happens by the Matter of Contagion, being imported hither in Goods from those Places where it is generated, and meeting in these Parts with a suitable Disposition of the Air, it spreads, and is rendred capable of infecting both such Goods and Persons as fall in its way. The Methods and Cautions the Doctor gives to prevent Contagion, are agreeable to this Opinion.

But

But since that Time, several Treatises have come abroad, whose Authors have thought fit to oppose these Notions of Dr. *Mead* with great Zeal. This Subject is of so much Concern to every body, that most People read all that is written about it; and seem to be very desirous of getting what Light they can, in an Affair that occasions them so much Uneasiness. The Opinion maintained against Doctor *Mead's* Notions, appears to be the most agreeable to their Wishes; but then, on the other hand, almost the whole World have for a long Time thought otherwise; and a Mistake in this Particular may be attended with the most fatal Consequences. The Generality of Readers, I have observed, in this Point seem to have no settled Opinion; but are apt, in some measure, to incline to the Sentiments of the last Author they have perused. This Wavering in Judgment arises chiefly from a Negligence in considering what is offer'd on either side; as few carry in their Minds the Substance of all they formerly read, or take the Pains to compare one Treatise with another; if they did, they would readily perceive both the Weakness of many Arguments they for a while look'd upon as unanswerable, and how it is frequent with the Writers themselves, to misrepresent the Expressions of those they write against. I therefore thought, it might be no useless Labour to publish some *Remarks*, both on what Dr. *Mead* and on what some of his Opposers have already presented the World with in relation to Contagion; hoping, that thereby every common Reader would, in some degree, be assisted in discovering, on what side of
the

the Question there is the greatest Appearance of Truth.

The Pamphlets written against Dr. *Mead* are too numerous to be all taken Notice of; and indeed I shall here make use of two only, which are the last I have read on this Subject; as being sufficient, I believe, for the Purpose I at present aim at. The first does not acquaint us with its Author's Name; the Title of it is, *Dr. Mead's short Discourse explained, or, his Account of Pestilential Contagion, and Preventing, exploded.* The other Pamphlet is, *A Discourse of the Plague, wherein Dr. Mead's Notions are consider'd and refuted, by George Pye, M. D.*

In prosecuting the Design I have undertaken, I shall observe the following Method: First I shall separately and distinctly produce such Passages out of these two last mention'd Authors, as I think fit to be considered; and then immediately subjoin a *Remark*, which will often contain in it those Places in *Dr. Mead's Discourse*, which the foregoing Passages were intended by their Authors to invalidate. I shall, for the most part, cite the very Words of these three Writers; but if at any time, for Brevity's sake, I shall give their Opinions in other Expressions, which I have very seldom done; I hope, upon comparing them with the Passages referred to in the Authors themselves, the Reader will find I have not wilfully at least misrepresented their Sense. I am sensible, I have omitted several Particulars that might have been remarked; but as I was afraid of being too tedious, so I am persuaded, that such as I have observed will be judged sufficient.

SECTION



SECTION I.

I Shall begin with the Gentleman that takes upon him to be *Dr. Mead's Explainer*, as his Performance was published before Doctor *Pye's*.

Explainer, in the Preface. ‘ The following
 ‘ Remarks I designed only as a *Protest* against
 ‘ the *Defects* of his (*viz.* *Dr. Mead's*) Method
 ‘ of Writing, &c. That contemporary Physi-
 ‘ cians abroad, and they who are to succeed
 ‘ us in After-ages, may not take Measures of
 ‘ our Knowledge in Physick in this Island, and
 ‘ in this Period of Time, from the mean Per-
 ‘ formances of an Author, who writ by Pub-
 ‘ lick Authority.

Remark. I set down this Passage, to shew the Vanity and Conceitedness of this Writer. What Opinion he ought to have of his Performance, will appear by and by.

Explainer, in the Preface. ‘ Many of the
 ‘ Faculty became easily apprized of the Errors
 ‘ and unfair Quotations, that were candidly
 ‘ mark'd out to them; (*viz.* in *Dr. Mead's*
Discourse.)

Remark. These many of the Faculty ought to have been named, or else we may certainly conclude they were none of Note; nor indeed has this Author been able to produce any Errors, or unfair Quotations, out of the Doctor's Treatise.

Explainer,

Explainer, *ibid.* ‘ The Doctor himself was
 ‘ brought to confess many Particulars, and
 ‘ stood convicted ; for he had it reported,
 ‘ that he only designed his Discourse for a
 ‘ *Politick Account* of the Plague, and how it
 ‘ may be staved off by *Force of Arms*.

Remark. The former Part of this Sentence ought to have been proved: For if the latter Part means only, that Dr. *Mead* designed his Discourse chiefly to inform the Government, what Methods were most proper to keep the Plague out of our Country, it is a Reflection every one must make, who reads the Doctor’s Book ; if it means any more, as would seem by the Words made use of by this *Explainer*, it is doubtless a great Falshood.

Explainer, *ibid.* ‘ Surely never Man plead-
 ‘ ed Want of Time with a worse Grace ; for
 ‘ the Work was near three Months upon his
 ‘ Hands.

Remark. A rash Assertion, without any Proof at all: However, the Doctor might have but few Intervals of Leisure to compose his Book in, during the Time it lay upon his Hands.

Explainer, *ibid.* ‘ The Faults are not the
 ‘ Defects of Hurry, but oftner of being at
 ‘ too great Leisure.

Remark. This I do not well understand: Were there any mistaken Quotations, they are a very natural Effect of Hurry.

Explainer, *ibid.* ‘ Was it not as easy for
 ‘ the Doctor to report, from Dr. *Hodges*, that
 ‘ the Summer 1665 was *cool* and *moderate*, as
 ‘ that it was *hot* and *sultry* ?

Remark. Where does *Dr. Mead* charge *Dr. Hodges* with saying, that Summer was hot and sultry?

Explainer, *ibid.* ‘Why should he, (*Doctor Mead*) ‘misreport the third Line of *Hodges’s* ‘Book; and tell us, that the Plague began in ‘August 1664, and not in the last of *December* that Year?’

Remark. Had *Dr. Mead* said this, it would have been no Misrepresentation of *Hodges*, unless he had quoted him for it: Yet *Dr. Mead* no where says this, but that it began in *Autumn* 1664 (p. 29.) and there are some now in being, and were then alive, who affirm it appeared in *September* that Year. This therefore is a manifest Calumny, in charging *Dr. Mead* with *suborning Vouchers*. Besides, it appears from the Bills of Mortality for the Year 1665, that *Dr. Hodges* was mistaken; for those Bills begun from the 20th of *December* 1664, and the yearly Bill shews six to have died of the Plague before the Time included within that Bill: Considering therefore the slow Progress the Plague in the Beginning made, it is not unlikely that it might first appear in *September*.

Explainer, *ibid.* ‘He (*Dr. Mead*) might, ‘indeed, have neglected *Contagion*, but he could ‘not fairly drop it.

Remark. He has not dropt it, but very fully shewn the Laws to which it is subject. Had *Dr. Mead* neglected it, he had neglected the principal Ground upon which all Cautions to keep out the Plague are founded.

We have now done with the *Explainer's* Preface, in the last Paragraph of which he apologizes for the Heat whereby he was actuated during his Writing, at the same time he seems to be very much under the Influence of it: for he concludes his Preface with pure Nonsense. We shall now proceed to examine his Book.

Explainer, p. 1, 2. ' He (Dr. Mead) tells his
' Patron that he rather chuses to *put down*
' *the principal Heads of Caution*, than a Set of
' *Directions in Form*. What this Head may
' be, that affords us no *Directions*, is hard to
' guess.

Remark. Can this Head afford us no Directions, because those Directions are not put down in Form?

Explainer, p. 2. ' We are promised effectual
' Methods of *suppressing Infection here*.

Remark. This is false; we are only promised proper Methods; it is no where in Dr. Mead's Discourse affirmed, they will certainly be effectual: If they are the best that can be used, as I am confident they are, it is sufficient.

Explainer, p. 2, 3. ' We find he (Dr. Mead)
' thinks it *necessary to premise somewhat in ge-*
' *neral concerning Contagion, and the Manner*
' *by which it acts*. But this is not enough;
' unless he does it so as was never done here
' formerly, nor by Physicians Abroad.

Remark. This Dr. Mead no where promises; but yet it is very true, for these Points were never well explained before.

Explainer,

Explainer, p. 3. ‘ Nothing follows (*viz.* in Dr. *Mead*’s Book) ‘ either concerning Contagion, or the Manner of its acting.

Remark. This is a gross Falsity. Is not the first Part of Dr. *Mead*’s Discourse chiefly about the Causes that spread the Plague, and consequently of the Contagion which accompanies it? And is it not shewn, in Pages 15, 16, how the contagious Atoms seize a sound Person; that is, the Manner by which Contagion acts? Dr. *Mead* has not indeed gone about to prove in Form the Existence of Contagion, that being needless.

Explainer, p. 3. ‘ The most antient and ‘ best Physicians knew nothing of *Contagion*, ‘ and far less of *Pestilential Contagion*; Words ‘ only brought in by Physicians in later Times, ‘ and of Ignorance.

Remark. The Use of the Word *Contagion*, or *Infection*, which signifies the same Thing, is no Mark of Ignorance, but necessary to express a real Thing. I suppose, it will not be doubted, that the Small Pox is contagious, and much less that the *Lues Venerea* is so; tho’ both these Distempers were unknown to the most antient Physicians. The Words are useful, and likewise rightly apply’d (in the Opinion of most Men) to the Plague.

Explainer, p. 4. ‘ What a propagating Cause ‘ may be, shall be left to those that deal in ‘ Metaphysicks to determine; it matters not ‘ what it appears to be, while the begetting ‘ Cause is unknown.

Remark. Is it improper to say, the Plague is spread, that is, propagated, by certain Causes; or is it spread by no Cause? And are

not the Causes of its being spread from the Southern Parts where it is bred, of more Consequence to us to know, in order for keeping it off, than the Causes which breed, or, if you will, which beget it there?

Explainer, p. 5. ‘ Here he misrepresents
‘ his Authors ; for *Hippocrates* is thought by
‘ many Writers not to treat of the Plague, in
‘ his third Book of Epidemicks.

Remark. Dr. *Mead* thinks these Writers mistaken, and agrees with those who are of a contrary Opinion ; and is there no Difference between misrepresenting an Author, and differing from him in Opinion? *Galen* says of this Place of *Hippocrates*, Κοινῶς γὰρ τινὲς ἔθνεσι πολλοῖς γρομμύς λοιμῶς τὴν δειήγησιν ἐν τῷδε ποιῶνται* ; that is, That *Hippocrates* in this Place, gives the History of a certain Plague which spread over many Countries.

Explainer, p. 6. ‘ It is manifest from *Hippocrates*, that this, and many other Alterations of the Air, do not make it contagious.

Remark. ‘ Dr. *Mead* does not think they do ; for he says, p. 14. “ That *Infection* is not received from the Air it self, however pre-disposed, without the Concurrence of something emitted from *infected* Persons.”

Explainer, p. 6. ‘ His chief Article about Carcasses is absolutely false, as may be proved by one of the best Physicians in any Age.

Remark. Should not this Physician have been named, and the Proof made out from him ? For I am so far from thinking this

* *Galen.* in tertium Epidem. comment. tert.

Article, upon this Assertion only, to be false, that I believe it, as Dr. *Mead* calls it, the chief.

Explainer, p. 6, 7. ‘ But what is all this to
‘ Contagion breeding the Plague?’

Remark. Nothing at all; for Dr. *Mead* does not say, that Contagion breeds the Plague, but only that it spreads it. But this is very much to the Original of the Plague, of which he has given some Hints, as being of Use in the main Design.

Explainer, p. 7. ‘ It is needless to enter up-
‘ on this Hint of a new *Hypothesis*; for if his
‘ Machine of Contagion, or Infection, be
‘ good, these (viz. *Stagnation in the Air*, fol-
‘ lowed by *Corruption* and *Putrefaction*) ‘ are un-
‘ necessary.

Remark. Not so; for Contagion is not the first Original of the Plague, but the Cause of its spreading farther than the Cause which gave Rise to it extends.

Explainer, p. 7. ‘ Is a Concurrence of all
‘ the supposed Causes necessary to make a
‘ Plague? Then there never was a Plague in
‘ the World.

Remark. This Dr. *Mead* does not say; but only that more than one of them is necessary: For no more than that do his Words signify, *That a Concurrence of Causes produces Diseases of this Kind*. Short Discourse, p. 4.

Explainer, p. 8. ‘ Hard and continued frof-
‘ ty Weather produces the Pestilence, most
‘ commonly, in our Northern Climates.

Remark. This is utterly false; for the Plague is never produced here without im-
ported Contagion; and besides, cold Weather

is known to resist it very much. Did not the Plague stop very much last Winter in *France*, so that at *Marseilles* they thought themselves well nigh clear of it? and did not it break out again when the Weather grew hot? The Contagion which brought the Plague among us last time was brought at the latter End of the Year 1664; but did it not lie quiet without destroying above half a Score Persons all the cold Weather, till the Summer Heat put it in Action? and did not the next Winter wholly suppress it?

Explainer, p. 9. ‘ If we consult the *Paris* Article in the *London Gazette* for July 21st, 1721; there it is said, that *the Court has received a Letter from the Marquis de Pons, who commands at Toulon, with Advice, that the hot Weather had much diminished the Plague in that City.*

Remark. All that follows from hence is, that the *Marquis de Pons* was mistaken as to the Cause which made the Plague abate at *Toulon*: For the Accounts of all Plagues shew, that usually they occasion the greatest Mortality in the hottest Season; which was manifestly the Case of our last Plague.

Explainer, p. 10. ‘ *Putrefaction* does not always precede *Fermentation*.

Remark. Here *Dr. Mead* is censur’d, for saying *Putrefaction* is a Kind of *Fermentation*: But is it any Consequence, because *Putrefaction* goes not before *all* kinds of *Fermentation*, therefore it is not *one* kind of it?

All the Jests which follow, upon *Fermentation*, are very ridiculous; for *Fermentation* is certainly one great Principle, by which
many

many of the Operations of Nature are performed.

Explainer, p. 11, 12. ‘ He (Doctor Mead) could shew us, *How the Alterations made in the Blood will favour Pestilential Diseases, by rendring the Body obnoxious to them.* Why, this is the Favour we have waited for in eleven tedious Pages.

Remark. No such Matter ; for this has nowhere been promised. It was promised to shew how Contagion acts ; which is shewn : But the Doctor nowhere undertook to shew in what Manner the Air favours its Action. It was necessary, in order to clear up some Difficulties relating to Contagion, to shew that the Concurrence of the Air was necessary to it ; but the shewing what those Operations upon the Body by the Air was, which were required hereto, he might have explained, or omitted, as he thought most proper.

Explainer, p. 12. ‘ What Account can he give to Physicians, for thus despising the received Opinion of *Hippocrates*, and of all their learned and experienced Predecessors, who unanimously declare, that the Plague differs nothing from a Fever ; or else, that a Fever attends every Plague of Pestilence.

Remark. Does Doctor Mead say, that the Pestilence is ever without a Fever ? Yet, as absurd as it may appear to have said *that*, this Writer is mistaken in thinking our Predecessors in Physick unanimous in the contrary Opinion ; for some have asserted the Plague to have been sometimes without a Fever.

ver. *Septalius* gives the Names of many holding that Opinion, as *Savonarola*, *Jacobus de Partibus*, *Alexandrinus Benedictus*, *Clementius Clementinus*, *Susius*, *Diomedes Amicus*, *Parey*, *Petrus Salius*, *Massarias*, vid. *Sept. de Peste*, Lib. I. Cap. IV. To these may be added *Riverius* in *Prax. Med.* Lib. XVII. Sect. III. Cap. I. *Quercetanus de Peste* Cap. II. as also *Diemerbroek de Pest.* Cap. V.

I think there is a great difference between a Plague's differing nothing from a Fever, and a Fever's accompanying it; the first seeming to imply, that there are no specifick Marks which distinguish the Plague from other Fevers; which is false, and well nigh contrary to what this Author says himself afterwards.

Explainer, p. 14. ' This Expression, (*viz.* Glands of the Skin) ' does not give us any ' favourable Opinion of *Dr. Mead's* Skill in ' Anatomy.

Remark. Why not? are there no Glands of the Skin? Do not the Anatomists call all Parts, framed to separate something from the Blood, by the Name of Glands? and is not perspirable Matter constantly separated thro' the Skin?

Explainer, *ibid.* ' Why upon the Glands of ' the Mouth? Surely this Supposition is not ' of any Use in this Place.

Remark. This is of great Use; for the noxious Particles being discharged into the Mouth, the Air, every time the Sick expires, will be tainted with them.

Explainer, p. 15. ' I cannot tell how well ' he manages in the remaining Part of the ' Paragraph;

Paragraph; and therefore I will only set it in View.

Remark. I suppose the Meaning of this is, that this Author had nothing to say against it.

Explainer, p. 16, 17. ‘There was old *Attraction*, Son of *Aristotle*; and there is young *Attraction* the great *Geometrician*; and a Counterfeit of this, in the Works of the celebrated *Dr. Anodyne Necklace*; which last is as like *Attraction* before us, as the two Doctors are like one another.

Remark. That is, not at all. Must a great Principle of natural Operations, supported upon undeniable Evidence, and the Discovery of the greatest Geometer that ever was (I had almost said, the only true Philosopher) be exploded, and the Name of it banished all good Writings, because an ignorant Quack has talked of it without Meaning?

Explainer, p. 18. ‘Here is a Devil rais’d indeed, that threatens to throw down this Paper Building; nor will he be quieted, unless *Dr. Mead* will contradict himself, and renounce his Defence of the *Pureness* and *Uncorruptedness* of Air.

Remark. Has *Dr. Mead* used one Word to prove the Air uncorrupted in the Time of the Plague? has he not asserted, that the Corruption of the Air is one Step towards Contagion? The Passage here alluded to, is this; “*A corrupted State of Air is, without doubt, necessary to give those contagious Atoms their full Force,*” p. 13. It is very hard to shew what Contradiction there is in this. The Doctor’s Design was to prove, that the Distemper is brought into, and spread in these
C Countries,

Countries, by Contagion only; but yet, that the Matter of Contagion may sometimes be brought here without very ill Effects; and that it exerts its full Force only, when the Air is particularly disposed to assist and add Strength to it. The last of these is evidently proved by the Paragraph here mentioned, and the former by the Paragraph immediately following.

Explainer, p. 21. ‘ It is asserted by those
 ‘ who oppose this *Contagion*, that a Plague is
 ‘ sometimes bred without it, otherwise it
 ‘ would be perpetual— *Contagion* may pro-
 ‘ pagate, but not begin a Plague.

Remark. Dr. *Mead* says, the Plague is originally bred in the Southern Parts of the World by Putrefaction and the ill Qualities of the Air, and not in these Countries; but is spread into these Countries by Contagion.

Explainer, p. 22. ‘ If a Man does not swallow his Spittle, there would be no Danger
 ‘ from the Pestilence.

Remark. Not so much; which gives Occasion to a piece of Advice in Pag. 22^d of Dr. *Mead*’s Discourse. But this would not be sufficient; because Dr. *Mead* observes the Blood will likewise receive Infection in the Lungs, Pag. 16th. whence he adds to the foregoing Caution another, *viz.* to hold the Breath when near the Sick.

Explainer, p. 24. ‘ I aver, that it may be
 ‘ demonstrated from the Nature of the Plague,
 ‘ that it never, or very rarely, is communica-
 ‘ ted from one Person to another.

Remark. This is a gross Absurdity; for, were it Fact, it were impossible to demonstrate

strate it from any thing yet known to Mankind, of the Nature of the Disease.

Explainer, p. 24, 25. ‘ At present, we will
 ‘ content our selves to evince this Truth by a
 ‘ Demonstration from Observation, and I will
 ‘ borrow it from Mr. *Graunt*: In his Observations on the Plague in 1636, he says, it lasted 12 Years; in 8 whereof there died 2000 *per Annum*, and never under 800; the which shews, *That the Contagion of the Plague depends more upon the DISPOSITION of the AIR, than upon the EFFLUVIA from the Bodies of Men.*

Remark. What is produced from *Graunt* only shews the Concurrence of some ill Quality necessary, according to *Dr. Mead*’s Opinion.

Explainer, p. 27. ‘ What Account can be given to Merchants, for their Goods serving *Quarantaine*? &c.

Remark. In all that is here said concerning Goods performing *Quarantane*, *Dr. Mead* is treated, as if he advised a new Practice upon an Opinion peculiar to himself; whereas it is the general and current Opinion of the World, as appears by the Custom of performing *Quarantanes* in most Places: And therefore, without any additional Reasons, the Practice ought to be continued, till it can be proved very undeniably, that this is a Mistake; seeing the Consequences of neglecting it, if it should prove true, may be very fatal.

Explainer, p. 29. ‘ Another new Conceit the Doctor would entertain us with, that the Matter of the Plague is an *Animal Juice*: But pray, good Doctor, of what Animal?

Remark. Is not Man an Animal? and are not the infectious Effluvia, supposed by Dr. Mead to be emitted from Men sick of the Plague?

Explainer, *ibid.* ‘ Is Musk commonly kept
‘ in Furs or Cotton?

Remark. Will it not be kept in Furs?

Explainer, p. 29, 30. ‘ Of all the mention-
‘ ed Plague-Keepers, three of them are ani-
‘ mal Substances, and but two of them of the
‘ Vegetable Kind. Mighty fine! and well
‘ ordered: But if we turn to another Page of
‘ this Book (*Pag.* 24.) we may find this useful
‘ Observation contradicted.

Remark. Here is no Contradiction; for, in the first Place, the simple Materials only are mentioned; but in the last, some of the Things made from them are likewise set down. And in the first place, not three only, as this Author says, but five are of the Animal Kind, and but two Vegetables; for they are Furs, Feathers, Silk, Hair, Wool, Cotton, Flax: Had Skins been here mentioned, as they might have been, Furs might have been esteemed as no distinct Species, but made up of Skins and Hair; and thus would the Number still have remained five; and the Number remains the same in the latter place, the Vegetable Kind, by excluding Paper, Books and Linen, which are compounded of Flax or Hemp, are three, the Number increased by the Addition of Hemp, which is much of the same Kind with Flax.

Explainer, p. 33, 34. ‘ The Pestilence has
‘ never taken a Journey hither, in all appear-
‘ ance, these fifty five Years past: In all that
‘ Time

‘ Time *Turkey* Goods, (*viz.* such Goods as
 ‘ come from Places where Plagues frequently
 ‘ happen) have not serv’d a Quarantine; a
 ‘ certain Proof that Goods very seldom, or
 ‘ ever, bring a Plague into a Country; and
 ‘ oftner find it there, than propagate it.

Remark. Here is proved no such Thing:
 It is not so much as absolutely proved, that
 infected Goods can ever be brought into a
 Country without infecting it; for Goods
 packed up in a Town or Port where the
 Plague is, may not always receive the Infec-
 tion. But upon *Dr. Mead’s* Principles, infect-
 ed Goods may sometimes be brought without
 Hurt, when the Air is in a right State; and
 that the Plague is caused only when the In-
 fection from Goods and an ill State of Air
 meet together.

Explainer, p. 35, 36. ‘ *Dr. Hodges* says, in
 ‘ the Winter 1665, when the People return-
 ‘ ed to *London*, they readily took Possession
 ‘ of such Houses wherein Persons had died of
 ‘ the Plague, &c. without any ill Consequen-
 ‘ ces: Which overturns *Dr. Mead’s* Notions.

Remark. What *Dr. Hodges* says, only proves
 the Air to have received such a healthy State,
 as dissipated and suppressed the Malignity.

Explainer, p. 37. ‘ So that it was incum-
 ‘ bent on *Dr. Mead* to have shewn the Dif-
 ‘ position that may be in every Man to re-
 ‘ ceive and entertain the Plague.

Remark. This was not incumbent upon *Dr.*
Mead; his Business was to explain the Causes
 which expose a Country to the Plague, by
 which the Government might take Methods
 to keep it out: Of the particular Advantage
 some

some have above others, of not being so easily infected, he had nothing to do.

Explainer, p. 39. ‘ What could Dr. Mead mean by so gross an Oversight, in an Article too so material for *preventing* Pestilential Contagion?’

Remark. This is not material to be consider’d, when we are deliberating about Ways to keep off the Plague: For what has a Disposition of some Persons to resist it more than others to do herein; especially seeing we cannot know, by any Signs, who enjoys this Disposition, and who not?

Explainer, p. 42. ‘ What real Security does he acquire, when his Reason is convinc’d, that the Plague of Pestilence is not begot by any *Contagion*, properly speaking? That this Plague is not propagated from the Body of a *sick* Person into the Body of a *sound*.

Remark. This Confidence, if it be ill grounded, may chance to cost any one dear.

Explainer, p. 44. ‘ The Doctor ought to take greater Care of his Memory; for, at two Pages off, he assures us, *That our Air is not disposed to receive such* (contagious) *Impressions*.

Remark. Dr. Mead only says, that there are Instances of the Plague’s having been abated, and proceeded with less violent Symptoms, by the mild Temperament of our Climate, our Air not being disposed to receive (contagious) Impressions: That is, our Air is of a Temper which makes it not fall into this evil Constitution often to a great Degree; but when it does receive this Disposition, to receive it sometimes only in Part.

Explainer,

Explainer, p. 45. ‘ Is any Plague in a Country without Consequence?’

Remark. Without *great* Consequence, it should have been; for that is *Dr. Mead’s* Expression, which this Passage is design’d to ridicule. But the Question is easily answer’d; for should the Plague infect a House or two only, and then stop, it would not be of great Consequence. And I believe the Assertion of *Dr. Mead* to be certainly true, that there never was any Distemper of great Consequence among us, that is, which caused a great Mortality, and was called the Plague, but was imported from abroad. I am sure, nothing has been advanced, why we should not believe as much.

Explainer, p. 46. ‘ Experience is of the side of the terrible, but common Opinion (*viz.* that we are visited with the Plague once in thirty or forty Years.)’

Remark. We have no Knowledge of this being so, in the earliest Times, before we had Communication with *Africa*, and the *East*; either immediately by our selves, or by the Means of our Neighbours.

Explainer, p. 48. ‘ All foreign Physicians declare it, (*viz.* the Sweating Sicknes) peculiar to *England*; and that a Parcel of it went into *Holland*.

Remark. The latter Part of this Sentence contradicts the former: But besides, it was likewise in *Germany*.

Explainer, p. 49. ‘ Is this (*viz.* Sweating Sicknes) truly a Plague, feeble and weak thro’ travelling?’

Remark.

Remark. What the Design of this Paragraph is, I know not. Dr. *Mead* does not call the Sweating Sicknes a Plague with less'd Force, because it did not kill many, but because it yielded to Medicines, and was much more easily cured than the ordinary Plague.

Explainer, p. 50. ' That (the *Dunkirk* Fever) was neither an *Ephemera* of one, nor
' of more Days, neither did it terminate in
' twenty four Days.

Remark. Dr. *Mead* has not called this Fever an *Ephemera*: But I suppose this is said, because *Keys* calls the Sweating Sicknes an *Ephemera*; and why the *Dunkirk* Fever may not be called an *Ephemera* as well as the other, I see not; for the last Part of this Assertion is a great Falshood, few having it longer than twenty four Hours.

Explainer, p. 51. ' Hereafter neither of
' these (*viz.* Patients or Physicians) will
' think themselves ill used, for Dr. *Mead's*
' saying that a Physician (especially if he
' hates or fears him more than the Plague) has
' mistaken his Disease, &c.

Remark. This Passage, I think, clears up something: I suppose from it, that this Pamphlet is written by some Pretender in Physick, whose Ignorance and Impertinence together, has made him insufferable to Dr. *Mead*.

Explainer, p. 52. ' But if we consult the
' Bill of Mortality of that Year, we find only
' 50122.

Remark. This is false; the Number in that Bill is 68596; instead of which, Dr. *Mead*, through Oversight has put down the whole Number of Burials in that Year. Upon this
Slip,

Slip of no consequence at all, is built all this Page.

Explainer, p. 52, 53. ‘ He (*viz.* Dr. Mead) ‘ makes the Plague in 1665 less terrible than ‘ it was, &c.

Remark. Throughout Page 53, Dr. Mead is charged with not having set out the Calamity of this Plague in its most terrible Appearance. And suppose he had not, what is the consequence? I am sure the Method this Author takes of doing it, is very whimsical.

Explainer, p. 57. ‘ He has not been pleas’d ‘ to tell us where the Plague first begins, and ‘ in what Manner it travels into distant Coun- ‘ tries.

Remark. Both these Assertions are false; for Dr. Mead says, p. 4, 5. ‘ Plagues seem to ‘ be of the growth of the *Eastern* (that is, the hot Parts of the *East*) ‘ and *Southern* Parts of ‘ the World, and to be transmitted from them ‘ into colder Climates, by the way of *Com- ‘ merce*.

Explainer, p. *ibid.* ‘ We have seen an O- ‘ riginal *English* Plague, that came from no ‘ place in the World.

Remark. I suppose here is meant, the Sweating Sickness; but this is only a confident Assertion, without any Proof, against what Dr. Mead has said of it; the Symptoms were changed from those of the common Plague, by the benign Influence of our Air; does it therefore certainly follow, that it was not derived from the common Plague?

Explainer, p. 58. ‘ But as far as we may ‘ depend upon the first and philosophical Part

‘ of this Discourse, (*viz.* Dr. *Mead*'s) there is
 ‘ no great occasion for either of them (*viz.*
 ‘ Quarantaines and Lazarettoes): We live a
 ‘ great way from the *South* of *France*, and the
 ‘ Doctor has assured us, that the Plague can-
 ‘ not reach us by some hundreds of Miles.

Remark. Dr. *Mead* has given no such Af-
 surances; but says the Plague may be carried
 much farther by Goods; and therefore pre-
 scribes Quarantaines and Lazarettoes.

Explainer, p. 59. ‘ But the Doctor per-
 ‘ suades us, that we at Home never knew any
 ‘ thing of *Quarantaines* or *Lazarettoes*, nor
 ‘ the People abroad; and that because his Ad-
 ‘ vice is altogether *new*, and what was never
 ‘ practised, neither at *Home* nor *Abroad*.

Remark. Is not this a most notorious Fals-
 hood? Where has Dr. *Mead* said his Advice
 about Quarantaines is new? On the contrary,
 he expressly tells Mr. *Craggs*, in his Dedicati-
 on, that he would see it differed little from
 the common Practice. Dr. *Mead* says his Cau-
 tions are of two kinds; the first, how to keep
 the Plague out of our Country; the second,
 how to treat it, should it enter. The first of
 these, he says, are little different from the
 common Practice; the second, only differing
 from it. See his Words: The first which
 relates to performing Quarantaines, &c. ‘ You
 ‘ who are perfectly versed in the History of Eu-
 ‘ rope, will see Quarantaines are agreeable to
 ‘ what is practised in other Countries, with
 ‘ some new Regulations.’ The next, ‘ Con-
 ‘ cerning the suppressing Infection here, are very
 ‘ different from the Methods taken in former Times
 ‘ among us, and from what they commonly do

†

‘ Abroad;

‘ Abroad : *But I persuade my self, will be*
 ‘ *found agreeable to Reason.*

Explainer, p. 59. ‘ He might foresee a
 ‘ Question might arise about the time they
 ‘ (Goods) should perform Quarantine. —His
 ‘ Answer is fine! why we must set little Birds
 ‘ upon the exposed Goods.

Remark. This Question does doubtless arise, and can only be answered by Experience. Forty Days is the common Practice, and therefore that should be continued, till Experience has shewn us to the contrary. *Dr. Mead* does not propose Birds as the proper Answer to this Question, but only hints a new Experiment, and therefore subjoins, “ But the
 “ Use of this Fancy Experience only must
 “ shew. p. 26.

Explainer, p. 59. ‘ But may not the Attempt prove dangerous?

Remark. Wherein? It is not necessary to let these Birds fly away after they have been thus exposed.

Explainer, p. 59. ‘ How beautiful are such
 ‘ Presages (of Birds leaving *infected* Countries)
 ‘ related by *Lucretius, Virgil, Ovid, Fracastorius,*
 ‘ *and other Poets?*

Remark. This is the first time I have heard of its being proper to take Information from the Poets in Points of natural History. And had this Author read *Lucretius*, whom he here pretends to commend, he would have known Contagion not to have been the Invention of Ignorance, as he has before said.

Explainer, p. 60. ‘ And here we must observe, that this Art of *Quarantaines*, and
 ‘ *Lazarettoes*, is so infallible, that we may

‘ blame the Civil Magistrate, and his Officers,
 ‘ if ever the Plague is suffered to come among
 ‘ us.

Remark. Who says the Civil Magistrate is to be blamed? *Dr. Mead's* Words here referred to are, “ In case, thro’ a Miscarriage in the Publick Care, by the Neglect of Officers, or otherwise——*p.* 31. Cannot the Care of the Magistrates miscarry without their Fault? or is it a Reflection upon the Magistrates to say, that Custom-house Officers sometimes neglect their Duty? Further, how does it appear by this Passage, that *Dr. Mead* thinks this Art of Quarantaines and Lazarettoes infallible? Does not the Word *otherwise* imply the direct contrary? For how should the Publick Care prove ineffectual, or miscarry, if all Officers do their Duty; but by the Methods they take being insufficient? If *Dr. Mead* had thought Quarantaines and Lazarettoes, as is here falsely said, infallible, he need not have advised the destroying of suspected Goods, in Cases of imminent Danger, as he has done, *p.* 28, 59.

Explainer, *p.* 60. ‘ The Physicians are to
 ‘ be blamed, when the Orders of the Civil
 ‘ Magistrate are hurtful.

Remark. True, if their Orders are hurtful, and by the Direction of Physicians: But not always when they are unsuccessful; for they may be the best the Case affords, and yet not infallible.

Explainer, *p.* 61. ‘ It appears by the *Paris*
 ‘ Article in the *Pest-Man*, *Aug.* 26. that the
 ‘ exceeding great Care of the Civil Magistrate
 ‘ has proved unsuccessful.

Remark.

Remark. It does not then appear to have been hurtful.

Explainer, p. 62. ‘The same learned Author (*Mercurialis*) ‘informs us, that burning *infect-*
‘*ed* Goods was found to do great Mischief in
‘ a Plague in *Padua*.

Remark. Judicious Author would have been more to the Purpose than learned, had this been his true Character. The Case here mentioned is yet disputable, and can only be decided by Experience, which yet we have not, in a sufficient Degree, to determine the Case absolutely, whence *Dr. Mead* has left it doubtful; advising, at the end of his Book, to bury Goods deep under Ground, if Burning be thought unsafe.

Perhaps it may be thought, that I here speak too flightingly of so very learned a Man as *Mercurialis*; it may therefore be expected I should produce some Proof to confirm this my Sentiment of him: At present I shall give one out of his Treatise of the Plague. In his sixteenth Chapter he sets down one of their Arguments, who are of Opinion that the Plague has not its Origine from the Air, in these Words: *Secundò ratiocinantur, quod, si Aër fuisset origo aliquo modo hujus Pestis (Venetæ & Patavinæ) cùm Aër sit corpus continuum, deberet etiam ejus inquinatio continua esse; & idcirco cùm Venetiæ, & hæc nostra urbs fuerint infectæ, debuissent etiam infici necessario Vicetia, Tarvisium, & suburbia omnia Patavina, quod tamen scimus non evenisse; immo vero dicunt experientiâ comprobatum esse loca, valde proxima illis quæ erant peste affecta, fuisse omnino immunia.* To this Argument *Mercurialis*,

in his seventeenth Chapter, thus answers: *Ad secundam horum argumentationem respondeo, Aërem quidem totum sibiipſi continuum eſſe; veruntamen nequaquam necesse eſſe, ut unâ parte Aëris contaminata, simul, & ſemel totus Aër contaminetur: id namque ſi verum eſſet, ſequeretur neceſſariò, in omni peſte totum terrarum orbem debere eodem tempore Peſte tentari; quod tamen à nemine fuit unquam memoriæ proditum, ut etiam exemplis demonſtrabo.* Now, doubtleſs, a Writer cannot be much applauded for his Judgment, who could think the ſetting an Opponent's Argument in the ſtrongeſt Light, is making an Answer to it.

Explainer, p. 62. ‘ His (*viz.* Dr. Mead's) farther inveighing againſt Phyſick and Phyſicians, is the moſt ſurprizing, unaccountable Inſolence, that Man ever was guilty of: A Man that has done nothing, but to corrupt Phyſick; for thus he puts an end to a great deal of rambling Stuff, about ſhutting up Houſes: *The Management in former times neither answers the Purpose of discovering the Beginning of the Infection, nor of putting a Stop to it when discover'd.*

Remark. This Author here contradicts himſelf. Is Dr. Mead blameable for ſpeaking againſt ſhutting up Houſes? In Page 61 of his Pamphlet, this Author ſays, ‘ the Phyſicians in London might not have adviſed the ſhutting up Houſes, if they had remember'd the fatal Experiments of it in other Countries, recorded in Books of Phyſick.

Explainer, p. 63. ‘ *Instead of ignorant old Women, we ought to have understanding and diligent Men.*

Remark.

Remark. This is a wilful corrupting of Dr. Mead's Expression, for it is a Piece only of a Sentence, neither that in Dr. Mead's own Words. The Sentence in Dr. Mead runs thus: " *Instead of ignorant old Women, who*
 " *are generally appointed Searchers in Parishes,*
 " *that Office should be committed to understand-*
 " *ing and diligent Men,* p. 38.

Explainer, p. 63. Secondly, *When the sick*
 ' *Families are gone (whither?) all the Goods*
 ' *of the Houses, in which they were, should be*
 ' *burnt; nay, the Houses themselves, if that*
 ' *can conveniently be done.* He has now the
 ' late Fire of London in view, and recom-
 ' mends another general Conflagration of our
 ' City.

Remark. To the Question *Whither?* I answer, into Houses, or what is equivalent thereto, as Barracks three or four Miles out of Town, as the Doctor in the preceding Page says, p. 39. For the latter Remark, I ask, How does it appear the Doctor thought of the Fire of London in this Place; and whether this Author imagines the City can be burnt a second time conveniently?

Explainer, p. 64. ' According to Custom,
 ' the Doctor contradicts himself on this Arti-
 ' cle, at the small Distance of four Pages,
 ' where Fires again are condemned as pernici-
 ' ous.

Remark. Dr. Mead does not contradict himself: He recommends burning Things in which Infection is suspected to lodge, in order to destroy them; and even thinks Fires may possibly correct some ill Qualities of the Air, which expose us to be hurt by Infection, should it
 be

be brought; and accordingly does not condemn what was perhaps the Practice of *Hippocrates* before the Plague comes; but what he condemns is, the making Fires, which may give to the Air an additional Heat, when the Plague is actually present; and in this he is surely right.

Explainer, p. 64. ‘*Pestilentes Febres* (says *Raymundus*) ‘*ardentes sunt, & idcirco ab aëre fervido, & calente augentur.*’

Remark. What is here quoted from *Raymundus* is a very just Sentiment. *Dr. Mead* has not said, that any of his Sentiments are new, tho’ many of them are so; but only that the Practice he advises has not commonly been used before.

Explainer, p. 65. ‘It was never the Heat of great Guns, but their Noise, that was recommended, which is a sort of Wind.’

Remark. Perhaps the Heat of great Guns was never recommended; does it therefore follow, that they give no Heat, or that their Heat will do no Hurt? How comes Noise to be a sort of Wind? I suppose, by Sounds being caused by a tremulous Motion of the Air; but the Parts of the Air are much too little moved out of their Places, by such Tremors, to cause a Wind: On the contrary, when a Sound is caused by the Vibrations of a Musical Chord, none of the Particles of the Air are moved out of their Places a greater Space than the Chord describes in its Vibration. When a Church Bell, which gives a louder Sound, is struck, the Motion of the Air is greater, the vibratory Motion of the Parts of the Bell being so; for here the Agitation of the Air exceeds not the reciprocal Motion by which the

the Mouth of the Bell changes alternately its circular Figure. The Sound of a Cannon indeed agitates the Air yet more; but is so far from causing any Wind thereby, that on the contrary a Sea Fight of many Ships usually produces a Calm. Add hereto, that when the Sound ceases, the Particles of the Air return into the Places from which they were first moved; and therefore this Motion could be of no use to blow away any thing noxious, were it great enough, as it is almost inconceivably less than any Wind.

Explainer, p. 65. ‘ As Fires are manifestly
 ‘ useful in Damps of Coal-Pits and Goals,
 ‘ why not in the raw Damps of Contagion?
 ‘ and if that is a true Experiment, why does
 ‘ Dr. Mead forsake *Hippocrates*? &c.

Remark. The Use of Fires in the Plague is no where recommended by *Hippocrates* himself in his Works. It is true, *Galen* says, *Hippocrates*, by the means of Fires, stopt a Plague that came from *Ethiopia*; but perhaps he only prevented its coming into his Country, by making Fires; that is, he made them before it came, and that Practice Dr. Mead does not condemn. But however that be, suppose Dr. Mead had contradicted *Hippocrates*, could not *Hippocrates* be mistaken? It is certain, the making Fires proved very ineffectual, as well in our last Plague here in *London*, as in that at *Marseilles*; as appears both from *Hodges*, and the *Journal of what passed in the City of Marseilles*, &c. just now published in *English*.

Explainer, p. 65, 66. ‘ If all these new and
 ‘ reasonable Instructions take effect, there will

' be no need of any Methods for correcting
 ' the Air, purifying Houses, &c. To all
 ' which (says Dr. Mead) if the Plague get
 ' Head, so that the Sick are too many to be
 ' removed, Regard must be had. Now as far
 ' as I understand the Doctor, the Plague may
 ' get Head against these infallible Methods.

Remark. Dr. Mead neither calls his Instruc-
 tions new, nor infallible; he only says, that
 he advises Practices not used before among us,
 and only supposes, they may possibly take Ef-
 fect, or be successful: And if they are the best
 Instructions that can be given, as I am confi-
 dent they are, he may justly say, they are
 agreeable to Reason.

Explainer, p. 68. ' He adds, *For the effectue-*
 ' *al doing of which* (defending particular Per-
 sons against Contagion) ' *it would be necessary*
 ' *to put the Humours of the Body into such a*
 ' *State, as not to be alterable by the Matter of*
 ' *Infection.* Is this Physick? what Physician
 ' ever said so before Dr. Mead?

Remark. If no Physician ever said so, they
 ought to have thought so; for is there, I
 pray, any other certain Way of making a Per-
 son absolutely secure against the Infection,
 when he is within Reach of it? This Author
 talks of this Passage, as if Dr. Mead thought it
 possible to make this Change in the Humours,
 contrary to the Sentence immediately follow-
 ing; which is, ' *That this is no more to be hoped*
 ' *for, than a Specifick Preservative against the*
 ' *Small Pox;* that is, not at all. Dr. Mead
 uses this Expression to shew the Usefulness of
 the numerous Medicines which pretend to pro-
 tect against Infection, and with which Books
 of

of Physick are usually stult; for this Observation at once shews the Vanity of them, seeing they do not, nor cannot, pretend to any such Effect.

Explainer, p. 68. ‘ And if Dr. Mead would
‘ have communicated some of those wise Rules,
‘ that are to be found in Books of Physick.

Remark. He has put down perhaps all that are useful, and moreover added some excellent Rules of his own.

Explainer, p. 69. ‘ Now, if Diseases take a
‘ Time before they are bred, then it is an ob-
‘ vious Consequence, that Diseases may be
‘ prevented.

Remark. This is no Consequence; for it is possible that the Causes which produce them may be too powerful to be resisted, tho’ they act gradually. Can the Small Pox be resisted otherwise than by keeping out of the Way of Infection? and if not, how should the Plague?

Explainer, p. 70. ‘ A specifick Preservative for
‘ the Small Pox; which, we find, is far from
‘ being impossible.

Remark. Is this possible? or rather, is not this plainly having no Regard to Truth, in order to oppose Dr. Mead?

Explainer, p. 70. ‘ Let us cease then to
‘ wonder, why so great Care is had to keep
‘ our Houses cool at Page 47, and so little for
‘ our Persons at Page 49 of the *Discourse*
(viz. Dr. Mead’s.)

Remark. All the Rules which are good and useful in the *Appendix* to this *Explainer’s* Pamphlet, are contained in this 49th Page of Dr. Mead’s *Discourse*; and in the next (viz.

p. 70.) more Directions, which are not to be met with in this ridiculous *Appendix*.

Explainer, p. 70, 71. ‘ He mentions *Vinegar* upon the Authority of *Rhazes*, which is no more for a Person that affects a Character for being learned, than if he had recommended it from *Dr. Hodges*.

Remark. *Dr. Mead* is doubtless a Person of great Learning ; but does he shew any Affectation of that Sort ? If quoting *Rhazes* does not shew Learning, it shews Judgment ; for surely the Physicians of the Country which is most subject to the Plague, are the most proper to be consulted about it.

Explainer, p. 71. ‘ There is a greater Store (*viz.* of Medicines) ‘ for that Disease (*viz.* the Plague) ‘ than for any other, and some of ‘ them come well recommended for the Purpose of *preventing* specifically.

Remark. Perhaps this *Explainer* is hammering out some such notable Specifick ; since those for the *Looseness* and *Gonorrhœa* are out of Request.

Explainer, p. 72. ‘ His Medicines are of ‘ two sorts ; one Set of them published in a ‘ very small Book, tho’ there is a large Account of their *Virtues* and *Uses*.

Remark. Does this Author mean here some Medicines published under the Name of Doctor *Radcliffe’s* Receipts ? None of them are against the Plague. But let me tell him those are excellent Medicines for the Purposes to which the Skilful will see they are designed. But the very ignorant Commentator upon them makes himself merry with them, by ascribing

scribing to them Uses for which they were never intended.

Explainer, p. 72. ‘ There is a second Sort (of Medicines) ‘ which some worthy Gentlemen of great Families, and great Estates, ‘ have told us of; and these were the *Secrets* ‘ of an eminent Physician.

Remark. Dr. Mead pretends to no Secrets. But what is all this to Remedies against the Plague?

I have now done with Dr. Mead's *Short Discourse Explained*, &c. and hope I have sufficiently made appear many of the Misrepresentations and Blunders contained in it. As to the *Appendix*, I need say little; for every Reader will easily perceive of himself, that it abounds with Trifles and Absurdities: The former this Author would put upon us as Matters of Importance, only by calling the most common and known Things by out-of-the-way Names: Of the latter, I shall just set down an Instance or two.

At Page 79. there is this unaccountable Assertion: ‘ If the Blood was not to decay, and ‘ that it never wanted a *Supply*, our Life could ‘ neither be so long nor so easy.’ From whence is made a notable Discovery; for there is immediately subjoined this Corollary, ‘ Hence ‘ it follows, that Man is naturally mortal!

At Page 80 are these Words: ‘ *A Person* ‘ *with the worst Blood will live longer by the* ‘ *common Supplies, than any one with the best* ‘ *Blood, but without those Supplies.*’ That is, a Person labouring under the worst Distemper that can befall a Man, for Example, the most malignapt

malignant Plague, would necessarily be longer a dying than he would be, though otherwise in the best State of Health possible, by being starved to Death.

And at Page 86. it is said, ' That the most
' useful Time to an Animal is the Time of
' Sleep.' This is very strange indeed ! However, this Author does not think this always to hold good ; for in the same Page he says,
' It must be particularly observed, that in the
' Plague much Sleeping is far more dangerous
' than the most obstinate Watchfulness.'

Again, at Page 88, we find the following Words: ' Could the Fluidity the Blood ac-
' quires in the Lungs, be preserv'd in all other
' Arteries, the Blood should be carry'd thro'
' all our Body, ready fitted and prepared for
' Excretion.' This Author had told us before, (p. 14.) that the Doctrine of Secretion had been perfectly well explained many Years ago. Now I want to be informed of the Doctrine of *Secretion*, to which this Assertion will agree ; for, I am sure, it is not consistent with that Account of Secretion which the Author of the Treatise of the *Looseness* has very much commended. That Notion supposes different Degrees of Fluidity in the Blood at different Distances from the Heart ; that the Particles fit to form any of the Secretions, may approach, be attracted by one another, and combine together, as they are carried to the respective Glands formed for that particular Secretion.

I shall only add one Passage more of this *Appendix*, which though awkwardly expressed, it would be well for us Physicians if our Pa-
tients

tients would believe it. Page 76. it is said,
 ‘ Was an ordinary Fever as much unheeded
 ‘ and disregarded, as we find the Plague, what
 ‘ could the Physician’s Skill avail us? And
 ‘ should not every Disease become as mortal
 ‘ and irretrievable? Our Funerals should be
 ‘ very frequent, but not so general; because
 ‘ those other Diseases are not so common and
 ‘ Epidemick.



SECTION II.

I Come now to consider Dr. *Pye’s Discourse of the Plague*, &c. wherein he has taken upon him to be Dr. *Mead’s Refuter*.

Refuter, in the Preface, p. v. ‘ If the People
 ‘ are made to believe the Plague is communi-
 ‘ cated from sick Persons, and by Commerce,
 ‘ of course they will be afraid of catching it,
 ‘ and thereby be necessitated to pass their
 ‘ Lives in continual Fears and Apprehensions
 ‘ of something very dreadful and deadly.

Remark. This is a Mistake; for People do believe this, and yet do not pass their Lives in continual Fears and Apprehensions. When they are in extraordinary Danger, it is fit they should fear.

Refuter, ibid. ‘ If the Plague can be conveyed by Commerce, then Quarantaines are proper and requisite.

Remark.

Remark. Here this Refuter contradicts himself; for he employs §. 6. of this Book to shew the contrary; *viz.* that though Quarantaines would keep out the Plague, yet it would not be proper to enjoin them.

Refuter, *ibid.* p. v, vi. ‘ Fears and Frights
‘ expose us greatly to the Evil we are most
‘ afraid of. This is commonly seen in the
‘ Case of the Small Pox.

Remark. Will Fears and Frights of themselves produce the Disease? if not, they may be of use to stir us up to sufficient Watchfulness against it. How comes the Small Pox here to be mentioned? when in p. 10. of this Preface there are these Words: ‘ Tho’ the
‘ Small Pox is a peculiar Distemper, whence
‘ nothing could be rightly argued with respect
‘ to the Plague,’ &c. A second Contradiction.

Refuter, *ibid.* p. vi. ‘ If these Notions prevail, and the Plague should happen among
‘ us, the Sick will be deserted by Friends, Relations, &c.

Remark. Does this affect the Truth of these Notions? or are these Inconveniencies great enough to make it proper to impose upon Mankind?

Refuter, *ibid.* p. vii. ‘ In short, shutting up
‘ People within Walls or Lines, is shutting
‘ them amidst, and exposing them to Famine,
‘ Plunder, Murder, Pestilence and Despairs.

Remark. Inclosing the infected Places with a Line, as practised in *France*, does not expose them to Famine; because it is the Care of the Guards to see them furnished by the Country: Nor to plunder and Murder; for it is the

Execution

Execution of the Law upon Offenders in those Kinds, which protect all Places against them, and Justice is not obstructed by those Lines; on the contrary, they effectually hinder Criminals from escaping Punishment by running away. And the two other Evils, Pestilence and Despair, Dr. *Mead* has provided against, by proposing, that all who will, be suffered to leave the infected Place, having first performed Quarantine in an airy Place within the Line, p. 54.

Refuter, p. xi. ‘ He (Dr. *Mead*) should not
‘ have bid publick Defiance as a Champion,
‘ till he had, &c.

Remark. Bidding publick Defiance is to oppose the common Opinion of the World, as this *Refuter*; not to close with it, and clear up the Difficulties which clog it.

Refuter, in the Book, Ch. i. p. 1. ‘ That the
‘ Plague is a Sickness or Disease, and not a
‘ real Poison, as Dr. *Mead* says, perhaps by
‘ Mistake.

Remark. Perhaps this is no Mistake in Dr. *Mead*; for it may be both. Is not the Madness of Dogs a Disease in them? and yet all Authors agree in ranking them among the poisonous Animals; and when they communicate their Disease to other Creatures by biting, are they not said to poison those Creatures?

Refuter, p. 1. ‘ That the Symptoms of the
‘ Plague in different Countries, and at different
‘ Times in the same Country, have been
‘ very various and different.

Remark. This is not true; there is usually no other Difference than what arises from the

different Degrees of its Violence, or the Difference of Constitutions it seizes; as the comparing together the Descriptions of Authors fully shews, and is taught in particular by *Diemerbroek*, l. 1. c. 7. in *Notis* §. 2.

Refuter, p. 2. ‘ From these Observations it is evident, that the Plague is not always one and the same Disease.

Remark. This is not evident; for the Observations here referred to, are in the Sentence preceding, and in this other; *viz.* ‘ that there is not any one, or at least not any one distinguishing Symptom, which constantly accompanies it.’ The Mistake of the first of these, I have already shewn; and from this last it cannot be concluded, that the Plague is not one and the same Disease; for is not the Small Pox allowed always to be the same Disease? and yet there is no one distinguishing Symptom which constantly accompanies it; for in some few Cases Persons have died of it, before any Eruptions have appeared; in which this Distemper resembles the Plague, for the Plague is never known to be without Tumours or Carbuncles, if the Diseased survive the first Attack of it.

Refuter, p. 2. ‘ And that it (the Plague) does not always arise from one and the same Cause, may be made appear, not only from the foregoing, but from many other Observations.

Remark. What the other Observations are which are not set down, I know not; none of the foregoing will do it: For is not the Small Pox allowed always to arise from the same Cause, though the Symptoms of it are as different in different Subjects, as the Symptoms of the Plague?

Refuter,

Refuter, p. *ibid.* ‘ But I think one Instance
 ‘ sufficient. Dr. *Keyes* speaking of the Sweat-
 ‘ ing Sickneses in *England* and *Germany*, makes
 ‘ the following Remark: *Moreover these* (the
 ‘ *Germans*) ‘ *are not hurt with our Air and Con-*
 ‘ *tagion, but with their own; and our own in-*
 ‘ *fects us, and not that of theirs: Our Contagion*
 ‘ *of this Year shews the former, and theirs of the*
 ‘ *Year 1529 confirms the latter.*

Remark. What is here brought from Doc-
 tor *Keyes*, can only prove the Cause of the
 Sweating Sickness not wholly to be lodged in
 the Air; which is the Use Dr. *Keyes* makes of
 it; but it will not prove, that the Cause of
 that Disease was not the same: On the con-
 trary, seeing the *Germans* had it in the Year
 1529, it is not improbable that they contract-
 ed the Contagion from us, who were molest-
 ed with it the Year before.

Refuter, p. 5, 6. ‘ In the second Page of
 ‘ this (Dr. *Mead*’s) Discourse, the Doctor as-
 ‘ signs three Causes of the Pestilence; the
 ‘ Air, Diseased Persons, and Goods transport-
 ‘ ed from Infected Places. The first of these
 ‘ is supported in that and the next Page, and
 ‘ proved, &c. But a little farther all this is
 ‘ forgotten, and the Doctor contradicts what
 ‘ himself before had been proving: for in
 ‘ Page 14. he says, “ On the other hand it is
 “ evident, that Infection is not received from
 “ the Air it self, however pre-disposed, with-
 “ out the Concurrence of something emitted
 “ from infected Persons.

Remark. Here is no Contradiction; for
 Dr. *Mead* has no where endeavoured to prove,
 that the Air, in these Countries at least, of it
 self,

self, or alone, can produce the Plague: On the other hand, his whole Design has been to prove the contrary: He only shews, that the Air is one of the Causes which must concur to give Rise to it; and that it can hardly, or not at all spread far, without Assistance from some ill Qualities of the Air.

Refuter, p. 6, 7. ‘ If the Plague can be
 ‘ kept from spreading by the Means aforesaid
 (*viz.* by strictly preventing all Intercourse of
 infected Places with the Neighbourhood) ‘ it
 ‘ follows, that Infection is not received from
 ‘ the Air without, nor yet even with the
 ‘ Concurrence of something emitted.

Remark. The first of these Assertions does indeed appear, and is what *Dr. Mead* would prove: but how does the last appear? Does it follow, that because the Air will not communicate the Plague to any one of it self; therefore when it is impregnated with noxious Effluvia emitted from Men diseased of the Plague, it shall not then be able to give the Distemper to others, by conveying into their Bodies those noxious Effluvia; and even by adding Force to them by means of some hurtful Qualities it may be possessed of, though those Qualities alone would not produce the Distemper?

Refuter, p. 7. ‘ But methinks, he should
 ‘ have brought an Instance, if any such could
 ‘ have been found, where the Plague had
 ‘ actually been kept from spreading.

Remark. How little is this Writer acquainted with Books of Physick? for he need go no farther than to the Works of *Dr. Sydenham* for such an Instance; where he will find, that
 the

the Grand Duke of *Tuscany* kept the Plague from spreading into his Country, when it ran all over the rest of *Italy*, by this very Means*.

Refuter, p. 8. ' Let it be supposed, that the
' Plague had not reach'd the adjacent Villages,
' until some Persons had found means to
' escape; how does it thence appear, that it
' had been confined within and by those
' Walls?

Remark. It would from hence appear, that the Cause of it was not solely in the Air; because this was a considerable Time, and, as *Dr. Mead* argues, the least Wind must necessarily convey whatever noxious Quality resides in the Air alone, even to a great Distance.

Refuter, p. 8. ' Plagues do not always
' spread themselves with the same Rapidity,
' but sometimes quicker, and sometimes more
' slowly.

Remark. The Slowness with which Plagues usually spread themselves, is a great Argument, that they are not caused by the Corruption of the Air alone; because any Disorder in the Air must of Necessity at once discover it self over a great Extent of Country, and very soon extend a great deal farther.

Refuter, p. 9. ' It might have been expect-
' ed, that a Fact whereon such a Notion was
' to be founded, and whereon so much de-
' pended, should have been supported and
' proved, &c.

Remark. This Author here talks, as if all *Dr. Mead's* Opinions relied wholly upon this Fact of *Marseilles*; which is no such Thing. Doc-

* *Sydenham* Oper. p. 73.

tor *Mead* does not, I suppose set down this as the only, or the most certain Proof which could be given, but as it was the freshest. For indeed Dr. *Mead* has all along taken for granted, that the Plague is propagated by Contagion; it having been the constant Observation of all Mankind for a long time, that it is so: nor indeed will the contrary be proved, though we should allow the Plague to be transported into the Villages adjacent to *Marseilles*, without being carried by Persons. For we might suppose, that when the Mortality in the City was very great, possibly the Air might be so deeply impregnated with the *Effluvia* constantly sent out from that Number of Diseased Bodies, that a sufficient Quantity might be conveyed by the Winds to a Village near, so as to infect People in it; and if this had been so, the Infection would notwithstanding originally have been derived from the Bodies of the Sick. But till some such Fact as this is clearly proved, it is unnecessary to make this Supposition.

Refuter, p. 10. ‘ He (Dr. *Mead*) should have proved by undeniable Evidences.

Remark. This *Refuter* talks here as if the Debate were about some speculative Notions of little or no Importance, and does not consider that the Welfare of Mankind depends upon it. Suppose undeniable Evidences cannot be had, must we not act upon the most probable Suppositions in a Case where a Neglect of any of these Things he would dissuade us from, for Want of Evidence, might be followed by the Destruction (nay, I had almost said, the Extirpation) of his native Country.

But let us see the Things he requires this Evidence for.

Refuter, p. 10. ‘ That not any one single
 ‘ Person had been sick of the Plague in any of
 ‘ the adjacent Villages, or without the Walls
 ‘ of *Marseilles*, till some Persons finding
 ‘ Means to escape, carried the Infection along
 ‘ with them.

Remark. It is sufficient to influence our Conduct, if it be probable.

Refuter, *ibid*. ‘ That some Persons, find-
 ‘ ing Means to escape, did go to the adjacent
 ‘ Villages, or any of them, and were received
 ‘ into them.

Remark. This is not at all necessary; to an absolute Demonstration it would; but that is not here necessarily required. If the Plague got not into those Villages before such Escape, it is a sufficient Proof, that the Escapers carried it.

Refuter, *ibid*. ‘ That the Persons escaping,
 ‘ and received into the adjacent Villages, were
 ‘ diseased Persons.

Remark. This is very trifling; for may not a Person escape with this Infection lodged in his Cloaths, which may give it both to others and also to himself after his Escape? And besides, some who by their natural Constitution are not so susceptible of this Contagion as others, may yet carry away with them enough, in their Cloaths, to infect others. Upon which Ground it is, *Dr. Mead* advises, in an infected Ship, to burn the Cloaths of the Sound, as well as of the Sick, p. 22.

Refuter, p. 10. ‘ And that the Plague was
 ‘ carried in like Manner into all the Villages,
 ‘ Towns,

‘ Towns, and Cities that were afterwards vi-
‘ fited with it.

Remark. This is plainly ridiculous. In a probable Argument, as this is, is it not sufficient, that there is no Proof of the contrary in any one single Instance?

Refuter, ibid. ‘ Unless all and every of
‘ these Particulars can be clearly proved, what
‘ the Doctor (viz. *Mead*) has here said, must
‘ by no means be allowed to be Fact; but in-
‘ stead of that, overthrow his Argument and
‘ his Notion too.

Remark. This is very strange, they can afford no Argument, unless the contrary were proved; for if these Facts cannot be proved, yet they may chance to be true.

Refuter, ibid. ‘ Why should not the Walls
‘ of *Thoulon* be as well able to keep the
‘ Plague out, as the Walls of *Marseilles* were
‘ to keep it in?

Remark. So, no doubt, they were.

Refuter, ibid. ‘ We have no Account, that
‘ any body escaping from *Marseilles*, either
‘ forced, or attempted to force their Way
‘ into *Thoulon*.

Remark. I think this is false; I have some Remembrance of such an Account. But suppose we had no Account of it; does that prove no body got into *Thoulon*, either from *Marseilles*, or some other Place infected. Might it not be done so privately, as not to be known? at least, is not this much more probable, than that the Air should preserve its Purity so long after the Air of *Marseilles*, to which it is but little distant, was corrupted?

Refuter,

Refuter, p. 11. ‘ If the Persons escaping
 ‘ were not diseased, nothing can be thence in-
 ‘ ferred in favour of what the Doctor has
 ‘ affirmed.

Remark. This is already answered.

Refuter, *ibid*. ‘ I answer, if the Atoms har-
 ‘ boured in a Man’s Cloaths are not capable or
 ‘ sufficient to infect that Man, whose Body
 ‘ they touched, and that perhaps constantly,
 ‘ or for many Days together; it is highly im-
 ‘ probable, if not utterly impossible, that they
 ‘ should infect any other, much less many
 ‘ others.

Remark. I answer again, may not these
 Atoms be lodged in a Man’s Cloaths without
 touching his Body, though his Cloaths do?
 Besides, it is sufficient if one Person be infected
 by this means, for that Person will generate a
 new Stock of Matter of Infection.

Refuter, p. 12. ‘ For as these Atoms are
 ‘ supposed, &c. to be very volatile, they would
 ‘ soon fly off, &c.

Remark. Are not Scents very volatile? and
 yet they will not soon fly out of Substances
 which imbibe them.

Refuter, p. 12. ‘ It is not likely they (Esca-
 ‘ pers from *Marseilles*) should go to the adja-
 ‘ cent Villages.

Remark. Must they not have gone through
 them?

Refuter, p. 14. ‘ The first Mention we had
 ‘ in our Publick Accounts of the Plague’s be-
 ‘ ing at *Marseilles*, was in an Article from *Pa-*
 ‘ *ris*, dated *August* 10th, N. S.

Remark. The Journal of what passed in *Marseilles* published by Authority, shews the Plague to have appeared first about the End of *May*, and to be declared the Plague at the Beginning of *July*.

Refuter, p. 14. ‘ In an Article from *Paris*,
 ‘ dated *August* the 21st. N. S. I find the fol-
 ‘ lowing Passage, *Though the Contagion is en-*
 ‘ *tirely ceased at Marseilles, yet abundance of the*
 ‘ *meaner sort die there, and in that Neighbour-*
 ‘ *hood.* From the manner of expressing this
 ‘ Passage, one might reasonably imagine, that
 ‘ the Plague had been some time in that
 ‘ Neighbourhood.

Remark. Is this reasonable? In the first place this Account, in relation to *Marseilles*, was not true; and what is said of the Neighbourhood, is no more than what they tell us happened before any Appearance of the Plague.

Refuter, p. 15. ‘ From what has been said,
 ‘ it appears that the Sickness was in the
 ‘ Neighbourhood of *Marseilles* long before
 ‘ any Persons found means to escape, and in-
 ‘ deed almost, if not quite, as soon as it was
 ‘ at *Marseilles*.

Remark. Hence we may judge of this *Refuter’s* Reasoning; for first it is impossible to know how soon any might make their Escape out of *Marseilles*; nor, again, does it appear that the Plague was so very soon spread beyond the Territory of *Marseilles*, which had a Line drawn about it. It was the seventh of *October*, N. S. before it got to *Aix*, as is said in the *London Gazette* of *October* the fourth, 1720.

Refuter, p. 16. ‘ He (Dr. *Mead*) says him-
 ‘ self, “ But when in an evil Disposition of
 ‘ this

“ this (the Air) they (Atoms emitted from dis-
 “ eased Persons) meet with the subtile Parts,
 “ its Corruption has generated, by uniting
 “ with them, they become much more active
 “ and powerful, and likewise more durable
 “ and lasting, so as to form an infectious Mat-
 “ ter capable of conveying the Mischief to a
 “ great Distance from the diseased Body, out
 “ of which it was produced.” ‘ If this be
 ‘ the Case, then it is impossible that either
 ‘ Walls or Lines can stop the Plague.

Remark. This does not follow. Has Doctor
Mead told us, that the Expression *great Di-*
stance signifies several Miles? To understand
 him right, take the whole Sentence. Page 12.

“ These (*viz.* active Particles thrown off from
 “ sick Persons) in Pestilential Cases, although
 “ the Air be in a right State, will generally
 “ infect those, who are very near to the sick
 “ Person ; otherwise are soon dispersed and
 “ lost. But when in an evil Disposition of
 “ this, &c.” Now the former part of this
 Sentence sufficiently explains the latter, cited
 by the *Refuter*, that when the Air is in a State
 which favours Contagion, not only those
 who are about the Sick, will receive Infec-
 tion, but some at a greater Distance, so as to
 cause the Plague to spread by degrees over a
 whole Town, and even to elude a Wall, by
 which a Street may be blocked up ; and this
 will be infecting at a great Distance, in com-
 parison of what it will do at other times. But
 it does not follow from thence, that Dr. *Mead*
 thought the Infection might be extended a
 Mile or two from any diseased Body ; and if
 this is not, it may be shut in by a Line. This

Author seems every where purposely to join Lines and the walling up of Streets together, to hide the better the Weakness of his Arguments ; but they differ much ; Lines Dr. *Mead* approves of, walling up Streets he must dislike, as being little different from shutting up Houses.

Refuter, p. 18. ‘ Thus the Doctor has
‘ shewed a great many ways by which the
‘ Air may be rendred noxious, and occasion
‘ infectious Diseases, without the Concurrence
‘ of something emitted from diseased Persons.

Remark. Dr. *Mead* has shewn no such Thing, nor intended it, of these Northern Countries : He only shews what Constitution of Air in all Countries promotes the Disease, and the Causes which first breed it, he declares only to produce that Effect in the hot Countries ; for no more than this is proved by the Authorities he quotes. And Dr. *Mead*’s Design is to shew how the Plague is bred originally in those hot Countries, and how it is transported from them to us.

Refuter, §. 2. p. 19. ‘ Any body would think,
‘ in reading his (Dr. *Mead*’s) Discourse, that
‘ when he says “ Contagion is propagated by
‘ “ three Causes,” &c. he intended to assign
‘ three distinct Causes, &c.

Remark. No doubt he did.

Refuter, p. 20. ‘ And yet there are some
‘ Passages of his Discourse, which are utterly
‘ inconsistent with this Meaning ; for besides
‘ what has been taken Notice of already, on
‘ another Occasion he says, “ A corrupted
‘ “ State of Air is without doubt necessary to
‘ “ give these contagious Atoms their full
Force.”

“ Force”——“ Consequently diseased Persons,
 “ or Atoms emitted from them, cannot possi-
 “ bly of themselves be the Cause, or one dis-
 “ tinct Cause of the Pestilence.

Remark. Each of these, no doubt, is a dis-
 tinct Cause ; must it therefore follow, that
 they can separately produce their Effect? cer-
 tainly the Word *distinct* signifies no such
 Thing. Dr. *Mead* has shewn what Causes are
 concerned in spreading among us the Pesti-
 lence, and treats of them distinctly one after
 another in Order, and assigns to each the pro-
 per Degree of its Effect. Goods import the
 Contagion first, infected Persons afterwards
 spread it, being assisted herein by the ill Qua-
 lities of the Air, and likewise by Goods.

Refuter, p. 20. “ The Doctor is no less in-
 “ consistent and contradictory ; for it is said,
 “ That it (infectious Matter) may be convey-
 “ ed to a great Distance” ; “ and yet, in an-
 “ other Place he expressly asserts the contrary ;
 “ his Words are, “ that the Air cannot spread
 “ these (Atoms emitted) to any great Dis-
 “ tance, if Intercourse and Commerce with
 “ the Place infected be strictly prevented.

Remark. This is very impertinent. Is the
 Word *great* of so limited a Signification, that
 it must always signify the same Number of
 Feet or Paces? is not the Sense of it very va-
 rious, according to the various Occasions up-
 on which it is used? In the first place, the
 Doctor used *great Distance* in respect to a
 Room, in the other in respect to a Town, or
 City.

Refuter, p. 21. “ The second Part of this
 “ Discourse proceeds upon a Supposition, that
 “ the

‘ the Plague may be kept off, and be stopped
 ‘ by Lines, &c. which cannot be done, if the
 ‘ Cause be diffused in or by the Air; there-
 ‘ fore, according to this Scheme, it can only
 ‘ be caused and propagated from one Person
 ‘ to another immediately, without the Con-
 ‘ currence and help of the Air.

Remark. This Scheme only supposes, that
 the Cause of the Plague is not diffused by the
 Air to a very great Distance from the Sick.

Refuter, p. 21, 22. ‘ Because none (if the
 Cause of the Plague be not diffused in or by
 the Air) ‘ then could be infected, but such
 ‘ as had been near to some diseased Person;
 ‘ whereas many Instances may be had from
 ‘ *France*, as well as from Authors, of People’s
 ‘ having been infected, though they had not
 ‘ been near any Diseased Person.

Remark. This, it seems, is designed for an
 Argument that the Cause of the Plague is so
 widely diffused by the Air, that Lines cannot
 keep it in; but it does not so much as prove,
 that the infectious *Effluvia* can be carried by
 the Air three Yards from a sick Person; for
 sound Persons may be infected by Cloaths, or
 other Goods, which have been near the Sick.

Refuter, p. 22. ‘ The Plague is very sudden
 ‘ and rapid in its Progress—The Plague was
 ‘ spread throughout the whole Town of *Mar-*
 ‘ *seilles*, and from thence into the Villages ad-
 ‘ jacent in six or seven Days time at most.

Remark. This is utterly false; it appears by
 the Journal before cited, that it was above a
 Month in the Islands where the Quarantine
 of the Goods, which brought it, was perform’d,
 before it entered the Town at all; and more-

over

over contradicts what was quoted from the Publick News in Page 14, though this Writer is so inconsiderate as to refer thereto upon this Occasion; for *August* 10th, the Plague was said to have been in one Quarter of the Town only; and, as far as appears by these Accounts, in *August* 21st. it was so far from having spread over the whole Town, that it was thought to have ceased entirely. Besides, the Journal before cited shews the Plague to have been owned a full Month (*viz.* from *July* 8th) before this 10th of *August*. Moreover, it is not said in the forementioned Journal, that the Plague had spread into every part of the Town before the 18th of *August*, twelve Weeks from the Time the first Person died of the Plague, on board Captain *Chataud's* Ship. This is one Instance, among many others, how rashly this Writer reasons.

Refuter, p. 23. ‘ If shutting up Houses cannot stop the Plague, &c. then for certain the Walls of Towns, or Lines, or Trenches cannot be conceived capable of doing it.

Remark. Why not? because the Infection may be conveyed by the Air from one House to another contiguous to it, does that shew the Air can carry it a Mile or two.

Refuter, p. 26. ‘ It follows, that the Infection is not communicated from sick Persons at all.

Remark. This follows, it seems, from the *Refuter's* having argued through the two preceding Pages what *Dr. Mead* never denied, but has shewn by the very Arguments this Writer has thought fit to repeat after him, *viz.* that the Plague cannot spread far from
sick

sick Persons without the Concurrence of the Air. But how does this *Refuter's* Consequence follow from hence? Must diseased Persons have no hand in this, because they cannot do it alone? Cannot this Writer conceive how two Causes, neither of themselves sufficient, may by uniting produce an Effect?

Refuter, §. 3. p. 27. ' It is not conceivable
' it (conveying the Plague from one Country
to another) ' can be done by Land; because
' Persons sick of the Plague can neither have
' Disposition nor Ability to travel by Land.

Remark. This Blunder I have already obviated.

Refuter, p. 27. ' And though the Sick may
' travel with more Ease by Sea, yet, &c.

Remark. This Argument is like the other. May not those of the Ship, who escape the Infection, escape it by their particular Disposition to resist the Contagion; and yet may they not carry the Infection in their Cloaths to others, who enjoy not such a Disposition?

Refuter, p. 28. ' But in Case any of the
' Ship's Crew should be seized before its De-
' parture from the Place infected; yet after its
' Departure, even according to what the
' Doctor says, the Sickness can go no farther,
' unless we suppose the same corrupted State of
' Air to be continued all the way.

Remark. This is not according to what *Dr. Mead* says, but the contrary. *Dr. Mead* does not say, a corrupted State of Air is necessary for these infectious Particles to act at all, but only to give them full Force, so as to spread the Sickness over a whole Town or Country; for, on the contrary he says, they
may

may infect such as are near the Sick, tho' the Air be in a right State; and all in a Ship are very near together.

Refuter, p. 29. ' It (the Plague) cannot be
' communicated in a Country where the Cli-
' mate or Qualities of the Air are different
' from those, by the Concurrence of which
' the Plague had been produced.

Remark. How does this appear universally? If this Author means Qualities quite different, the Plague will not be spread; if he means only different in Degree, it may.

Refuter, p. 30, 31. ' Now besides other
' bad Qualities of the Air, it has been gene-
' rally observed, there goes before, or accom-
' panies the Plague in those Countries, great
' and continued Heat, or Heat and Moisture
' together, such Heat, for Instance, as the
' Nature of our Climate cannot admit of.

Remark. Not indeed in so great a Degree; but does it appear that these ill Qualities are required in as great a Degree, to promote Infection, as to breed the Plague at first? this is nothing likely: Therefore our Air may sometimes possess the ill Qualities requisite in a Degree sufficient to promote this Contagion, when imported. *Dr. Mead* allows our Air not to be corrupted so eminently as that of *Africa*, and therefore the Plague never originally is bred in these Parts.

Refuter, p. 32. ' If the Plague had spread
' it self through *China*, the *East-Indies*, *Syria*,
' *Turkey*, *Ægypt*, *Greece*, *Africa*——now as
' these Countries are vastly distant and re-
' mote, it is absurd to imagine the Plague
' could be spread thro' so great Part of the

‘ World in so short a Space of Time, not by
 ‘ Means of the Air, but by a Communication
 ‘ from Person to Person only?

Remark. Do not every one of these Countries border upon some one of the rest?

Refuter, p. 32. ‘ And as there is not a continual current Commerce between them.

Remark. Not between those most distant from each other ; but no doubt there was enough for this Purpose between those that were next contiguous.

Refuter, p. 35. ‘ Here we see it is declared
 ‘ contrary to what Dr. Mead says, that this
 ‘ Disease (*viz.* Sweating Sicknes) was not foreign.

Remark. This indeed seems to be Dr. Keyes’s Opinion, though he does not expressly, in the Passage here quoted, say that ; yet since he informs us some were of another Mind, why may not likewise Dr. Mead? Is Keyes’s Opinion an undeniable Proof?

Refuter, p. 36. ‘ It does not follow, that it
 ‘ ever entred into their Thoughts that it was
 ‘ brought from the Siege of *Rhodes*.

Remark. Perhaps the Passage quoted by this Writer from Dr. Keyes does not strictly prove what Dr. Mead says ; but there is another Passage in that Author, which does prove it. In p. 53, 54. *Nov. Edit.* there are these Words,
 ‘ *Sed demus Trojano, Cantabrico, aut Rhodi-*
 ‘ *ensi bello (uti suspicantur quidam) non Bri-*
 ‘ *tannico solo morbum hunc natum esse: Grant*
 ‘ this Disease to have taken its Birth at the
 ‘ *Trojan, Cantabrian, or Rhodian War* (as some
 ‘ suspect) and not in the *British Soil.* Now
 is it not evident, that they who supposed the
 Disease

Disease not to have had its Birth here, must of necessity suppose it transported from some Place of its Birth, and certainly from *Rhodes*, where it was no longer than four Years before?

Refuter, §.4. p. 36. ‘ He (*Dr. Mead*) has
 ‘ no where clearly or expressly declared, what
 ‘ it is that Goods receive and convey, whe-
 ‘ ther it be the Poison supposed by him to be
 ‘ generated in the *Eastern* and *Southern* Parts,
 ‘ or whether it be something emitted.

Remark. It is no matter which, for both will have the same Effect.

Refuter, p. 37. ‘ As our Trade with *Turkey*
 ‘ has very much encreased since the Year 1665,
 ‘ we ought to have had more frequent Re-
 ‘ turns of the Plague since that Time, than
 ‘ before.

Remark. This does not follow; for the Absence of the requisite ill State of Air is sufficient to prevent that.

Refuter, p. 37. ‘ If Goods are so susceptible
 ‘ and retentive of Infection, as the Notion
 ‘ supposes, then such Persons as first unpack
 ‘ and open Goods brought from infected Places,
 ‘ would very often have been infected thereby.

Remark. *Dr. Mead* does not say how susceptible they are; but only that they are so susceptible as sometimes to occasion the Mischief. And if this be but seldom, yet the Consequence is so fatal, that we ought always to guard against it.

Refuter, *ibid.* ‘ If it be admitted, that In-
 ‘ fection is conveyed into them (Goods) by
 ‘ means of the Air, then Walls, Lines, and
 ‘ Quarantaines must be useless.

Remark. This at most will only shew these Things useless in the Places, where the Goods receive their Infection, and not where they are afterwards brought.

Refuter, p. 38. ‘ The *Europeans* sometimes
‘ have not been infected in *Turkey*, when the
‘ Plague has raged there among the Natives.

Remark. Because they either remove out of the Way of it, or shut themselves up; but at *Smyrna* the *French* Merchants, who use not that Caution, do seldom escape it.

Refuter, *ibid.* ‘ Nay, *Dr. Mead* says him-
‘ self, that all Plagues do not indifferently af-
‘ fect all Kinds of living Creatures. Whence
‘ it may be inferred, that the Cause of the
‘ Plague is not one and the same Thing, &c.

Remark. This only shews, that the Plague Men are subject to, and that which affects other Animals, is not the same.

Refuter, p. 39. ‘ Plagues happening at dif-
‘ ferent Times, though in the same Country,
‘ have been observed to vary very much in
‘ their Symptoms.

Remark. Not more than the different Kinds of Small Pox differ; excepting only the Sweating Sicknes, in which *Dr. Mead* supposes the Nature of the Contagion to be altered by the Quality of the Air it met with.

Refuter, *ibid.* ‘ The Sweating Sicknes here
‘ in *England* was as different from the last
‘ Plague we had in 1665, as any two Distem-
‘ pers can well be.

Remark. Perhaps not quite so different; for they were both more mortal than any other Distempers ever are. But even suppose the Sweating Sicknes had not the same Original

as the Plague, it only follows, that Quarantines may not therefore keep out the Sweating Sickness, not that they will not keep out the common Plague.

Refuter, p. 39. ‘ If the Cause of the Disease was a specifick Poison, &c. the same Methods would at all times be found useful.

Remark. This is no Consequence, any more than that the same Methods should always be useful in the Small Pox; both Distempers must be treated differently, when they are in a less Degree, from what they must be when in a greater.

Refuter, *ibid.* ‘ The same bad Qualities of Air as are necessary to put the Seeds of Contagion into Action in their native Climate, must undoubtedly be necessary in any other Climate, which is not natural to them; but the same bad Qualities of Air are never like to happen in *England*; and therefore, &c.

Remark. This is already answered; for the same bad Qualities do occur here, tho’ in a less Degree.

Refuter, p. 40. ‘ *Hodges*, *Bellini*, and others, have taken Notice of certain Signs, that are wont to precede the breaking out of the Plague. We may judge from them of the evil Disposition and Tendency of the Air; but they cannot possibly be supposed to signify, that a Ship is coming from *Turkey* with a Bale of infected Goods.

Remark. Here this *Refuter* seems to depart a little from his affected Gravity. But we shall answer with great Sobriety, that they shew therefore only, that if Contagion should be imported

imported by any means, the Plague will be like to follow; but these Signs are not infallible Marks of the Plague's certain coming.

Refuter, p. 41. ' They write from thence (*viz. Smyrna*) ' they never enjoyed a better ' State of Health. Thus, it is seen, Plagues ' will not be carried from Place to Place.

Remark. This Page only shews the present Air of *Smyrna* not disposed to receive Contagion.

Refuter, p. 42. ' The other is an Account ' from *Boccacio* of two Hogs, which died ' within an Hour after they had torn with ' their Teeth, &c. some Rags which came ' from a Man dead of the Sickness. It is ' very probable, these Hogs had before received the Disease, &c.

Remark. This is a very bold way of eluding an Argument. How is this probable, unless other Hogs had likewise been found to be infected?

Refuter, §. 5. p. 44. ' Now if it be likely, ' that in Winter the Contagion may not be ' taken out of Goods, &c. then Quarantaines ' in Winter will be a very precarious and uncertain Means, if they are not altogether useless.

Remark. What does this prove? that Quarantaines in Winter are not to be enjoined? Does it not rather prove, that no Goods should be dismissed out of Quarantine during the Winter? But what if this Warmth of Summer may be supplied at the easy Rate of making Fires in the *Lazaretto's*.

Refuter, p. 44. ' If the Persons, who first ' unpack the Goods coming from infected ' Places

‘ Places in the *Lazaretto's* Abroad, are never
 ‘ injured thereby ; and I cannot hear of any
 ‘ Instance that they ever have.

Remark. The Journal of what passed at
Marseilles affords more than one undeniable
 Instance hereof.

Refuter, p. 44. ‘ The enforcing Quarantaines
 ‘ will certainly and inevitably encrease
 ‘ the Running of Goods ; by which means we
 ‘ may be as much exposed to the Plague, &c.
 ‘ as if Quarantaines were not enjoined.

Remark. Not so much, unless all the
 Goods are run, so that none perform Quarantaine.
 Besides this only relates to one Case ;
 for Quarantaines are oftenest enjoined, in re-
 gard of Places from whence Goods are scarce
 ever run : Which is even the present Case ;
 for the Plague is not at present in any of the
 Ports in *France*, to which the *Owlers* Trade.

Refuter, p. 45. ‘ Such Goods as are clan-
 ‘ destinely run on Shore, will probably be
 ‘ kept more close (that is, than Goods not
 run) ‘ and therefore be the more likely to re-
 ‘ tain the Infection.

Remark. Will hiding Goods in a Cellar or
 other obscure Place, cause them to retain In-
 fection longer than shutting them up in a
 Warehouse? But what has the length of
 Time to do, in which Goods brought here
 may retain their infectious Qualities? if they
 retain them but long enough to infect one
 Person, they have done all the Mischief we
 need to fear from them.

Refuter, p. 45. §. 4. If *Lazarettoes*, &c.

Remark.

Remark. This Article only shews, that Goods when first brought into a *Lazaretto*, should not be promiscuously mixed with those, which have before been airing; nor Persons at their first coming be permitted freely to converse with those, who have been there some Time.

Refuter, p. 46. ‘ If the Seeds of Contagion
‘ can be brought by Persons and Goods, then
‘ the making *Lazaretto*’s must be erecting and
‘ establishing so many Storehouses or Semina-
‘ ries of Contagion.

Remark. For this Reason *Dr. Mead* directs them to be built remote from any Habitations in small Islands. But besides, these *Lazaretto*’s will not be so very replete with infectious Matter, as is here fancied, since the Goods brought into them are but seldom infected.

Refuter, p. 47. ‘ By the Motion of the
‘ Air, they (the Seeds of Contagion discharg-
‘ ed from Goods in a *Lazaretto*) ‘ may be con-
‘ veyed farther and farther, so as to spread
‘ the Infection not only all over the *Lazaret-*
‘ *to*, but likewise to the adjacent Villages.

Remark. *Dr. Mead* has shewn, that these Seeds of Contagion are scarce ever spread so far.

Refuter, p. 47. ‘ And we find in fact they
(*Quarantaines*) ‘ are not sufficient for keeping
‘ off the Plague.

Remark. These Facts only shew them not to be infallible, but do not shew them to be never effectual. And all that follows in Page 48, is of the same kind. And that they are mostly effectual, appears, that by a careful Observance of *Quarantaines*, the *European Coast*

Coast of the *Mediterranean* is much seldomeſ infected than the *African* ſide. Beſides, this is farther confirmed from hence, that the *Morea*, when in the Hands of the *Venetians*, by theſe Means, is rarely viſited with the Plague; but when in Poſſeſſion of the *Turks*, it does not eſcape Infection for three Years together: Which cannot ariſe from the Poverty of the Inhabitants, when they are ſubject to the *Turk*, exceeding what it is when they are under the *Venetian*; or any Fears and Conſternations they are more ſubject to in the firſt Caſe, than in the latter; which are the only great Cauſes ſuppoſed by Dr. *Pye* to enforce a Peſtilential State of Air; by reaſon it will be eaſily allowed, that no Government is harder upon their common Subjects, than that of *Venice*. See Dr. *Pye*'s Second Part, p. 16, 17.

Refuter, p. 49. ‘As to burning of Ships or Goods, that can never be of any Service, &c. for whatever infectious Matter may reſide in the Ships or Goods, the Heat of the Fire will neceſſarily throw it all at once into the Air, &c.’

Remark. This only ſhews, that theſe Things ſhould be burnt at a great Diſtance from any Habitations; and perhaps that the Perſons concerned in it ſhould be obliged to a Quarantine afterwards.

Refuter, §. 6. p. 50. ‘But let it be ſuppoſed, that Quarantines could be enforced, ſo as to become an effectual Means of Security; I am perſuaded it might ſtill be made appear, it would not be for the Intereſt of this Nation to enforce them.’

Remark. I need say little of this whole Section ; for I am persuaded the most interested Trader cannot think there is any thing in it. I shall only ask, whether any one in his right Mind can imagine, that from the Time of the last Plague to this very Hour, the Number of Families brought to Poverty merely by Quarantines, if there have indeed been any such, is any way to be mentioned or compared with the Number destroyed in that one Year by the Plague, in the City of *London* only?

Refuter, §. 7. p. 55. ‘The Doctor (*Dr. Mead*)
 ‘ supposes, that the Winter Season does sup-
 ‘ press it (the Plague;) but this could never
 ‘ be, if the Cause proceeded from sick Per-
 ‘ sons.

Remark. What does this prove? By the same Argument might be proved, that the *Tarantula*, the noted venomous Spider in some Parts of *Italy* is not really venomous, because its Bite produces ill Effects only in the hot Season, and not in the Winter.

Refuter, p. 55. ‘ According to this No-
 ‘ tion, every sick Person must emit vastly
 ‘ more of Pestilential Matter, than he had re-
 ‘ ceived.

Remark. What if he does? it is supposed, that the Juices of every sick Person’s Body are, some Part of them, corrupted into this contagious Matter.

Refuter, p. 55. ‘ And the Quantity of Pesti-
 ‘ lential Matter emitted must be immensely
 ‘ great.

Remark. The impertinent Calculations which here follow, conclude no more against a sick Person being infectious, than they
 would

would do against a Rose having a Scent ; for a Rose will have emitted Matter enough for as many Persons to have smelt, as here a sick Person is supposed capable of infecting. And was the Odour venomous and deadly, as is said of some Poisons, as many Persons would be killed by it.

Refuter, p. 56. ‘ If the Cause of the Disease
‘ was thus transmitted, &c. it is not easy to
‘ conceive how the Plague, when once it had
‘ seized any Place, should ever cease, but with
‘ the Destruction of all the Inhabitants.

Remark. Dr. Mead shews how this is to be conceived; viz. by supposing the ill Qualities of the Air, whose Concurrence he proves necessary to spread the Disease, to be corrected, and the Air to be restored to a healthful State.)

Refuter, p. 57. ‘ The Doctor has not told
‘ us, what he means precisely by a corrupted
‘ State of Air; which, methinks, he should
‘ have done.

Remark. Methinks he needed not. The Case is thus: Persons diseased of the Plague have been observed to infect others, and that the Plague, when it enters any Place, by this means spreads from House to House, and from Street to Street; notwithstanding which, the Plague afterwards shall abate and go off, as if its infectious Quality were gone. This Dr. Mead observes to prove, that some ill Quality of the Air is required to act in Conjunction with the infectious *Effluvia* to make them fully contagious; but this does not shew what that ill Quality precisely is; and therefore Dr. Mead was not obliged to say any thing about it.

Refuter, p. 58. ‘ And all Sicknesses, which
‘ are general and deadly, are, properly speak-
‘ ing, Plagues.

Remark. They are not always, properly speaking, Plagues. But this Author has shewn himself, throughout this Discourse, very ignorant of what Physicians have writ of this Disease, and if he has read at all, has certainly read without any manner of Judgment.

Refuter, *ibid.* ‘ How does it appear, that
‘ these Atoms emitted from sick Persons have
‘ any Share or Concern in the Affair? This
‘ the Doctor should have shewn.

Remark. It was needless; it having been already established by the Observation of Men in almost all Times and Places.

Refuter, p. 61. ‘ If, for Example, it should
‘ be said, that the Touch of a seventh Son
‘ will cure the Rheumatism, or any other Ail-
‘ ment; it would be thought enough to an-
‘ swer, that several Persons having tried it,
‘ had found no Benefit thereby.

Remark. This is not enough; the conclusive Argument against this, or any such Conceit, must be, that much the greatest Part of those who have tried, have found no Benefit.

Refuter, p. 62. ‘ If it be farther urged,
‘ that though some Persons have been near the
‘ Sick, and have not been infected, this may
‘ be attributed to the Strength and Vigour of
‘ their Constitutions; I answer, it has never
‘ been remarked, that such only have escaped.

Remark. This is perverting a true Answer into a ridiculous one. This is never ascribed to a general State of sound Health and
Strength,

Strength, but always to some more secret Disposition contrary to the noxious Vapour. And that this is no extravagant Supposition, every Day's Experience shews us in the Case of the Small Pox; for every one who has once passed thro' that Distemper, has afterwards got a Disposition by which he is ever after protected from Infection by it, whether he remain of a strong or of a weak Constitution; and no reason can be given, why some may not naturally have, in respect to the Plague, what all acquire in regard to the Small Pox, by going through the Disease.

Refuter, §.8. p. 64. 'When People die, either they have not at all discharged it (the Matter of the Disease) ' or not in any great Quantity; for if they had they would recover.

Remark. Why so? May not a very great Quantity be discharged, and yet enough retained to kill?

Refuter, p. 64, 65. 'It (the Matter of the Sickness) ' is never so (by insensible Perspiration, or by Breathing) ' discharg'd. This is ' evident, because sick Persons are never recovered by means of an increased Perspiration, or by Breathing, nor do they ever find ' Relief thereby.

Remark. This is boldly said; but how does it appear, that no Relief is had this Way, may not all who recover perspire more than usual? There is no Instance indeed of any being recovered by insensible Perspiration only. Perhaps this is never sufficient to carry off the whole of the Disease. But does not Dr. Sydenham teach us, that violent Sweating is the very best Cure of it?

Refuter,

Refuter, p. 67. ‘ Nurfes and fuch as have
‘ constantly attended on the Sick, have efca-
‘ ped much better than any others.

Remark. This is a hardy Affertion to be fet down thus without Proof. If it is true, perhaps the Obfervation of *Diemberbrook* will explain it, That in the Plague at *Nimeguen* old People efaped better than others.

Refuter, *ibid.* ‘ Some of the Antients pre-
‘ fcribed Amulets of Arfenic, &c.

Remark. This is a Blunder, in miftaking *Darfini*, in the Translators of the *Arabian Phyficians*, for *De Arfenico*; which *Dr. Mead* has long fince fhewn the Folly of. *Effay on Poifons*, p. 126.

Refuter, p. 68. ‘ Other violent Fevers, efpe-
‘ cially fuch as are termed Putrid, proceed in
‘ the fame Way and Manner as Plague-
‘ Fevers.

Remark. Thefe Fevers do never produce either Peftilential Buboës, or Carbuncles, without which this Writer has but three Pages before (p. 65.) affirmed no one in *France* to have recovered of the Plague. This then is another Contradiction.

Refuter, *ibid.* ‘ In all the more violent Fe-
‘ vers, thofe Glands, (*viz.* of the Mouth) are
‘ always empty, whence the Mouth is dry
‘ and clammy.

Remark. This Drinefs proceeds not from the Emptinefs of thofe Glands, but from the Tenacity of the Juices, by which the Glands are ftuff.

Refuter, p. 69. ‘ As to thofe who die, the
‘ Difcafe may be faid to have no latter End.

Remark. But very absurdly; for is not the Disease ended, when the Person is dead? and if so, is not a little before Death the latter End of it? But let *Dr. Mead* explain himself, who in his *Essay on Poisons* uses (in p. 174.) the Phrase here quibbled upon, and in p. 175. this other Expression, *the last Moments*, nearly in the same Sense.

Refuter, *ibid.* ‘ All malignant Fevers are
‘ said to throw off these Particles.

Remark. What Particles? not infectious, they are only called by *Dr. Mead* active; but in Pestilential Cases they are indeed infectious, as *Dr. Mead* rightly distinguishes, at p. 12. of his *Discourse*, which is the Place here referred to by this *Refuter*.

Refuter, *ibid.* ‘ If Diseases discharged by
‘ Buboës can be communicated in the Way
‘ I have been considering, the Venereal Disease
‘ would be so communicated.

Remark. This, sure, is the Masterpiece of this Writer’s Reasoning; for he is here more than ordinarily unhappy in the Choice of his Instance, the Disease he mentions being it self infectious: And surely the meanest Capacity might have seen it not to be improbable, that if there is one Distemper that often discovers it self by Buboës, and is infectious in a certain Degree; there may be also another Disease, attended likewise with Buboës, that may be infectious in a still greater Degree, and that the Plague is generally thought to be.

Refuter, p. 69. ‘ But it is very manifest the
‘ Venereal Disease is not infectious to the
‘ By-standers, nor by Contact, except Vene-
‘ real.

Remark.

Remark. This is not so; for Children and their Nurses will communicate this Disease to each other.

Refuter, p. 70. ‘ If Plague-Sicknesses, discharged by Sweat, can therefore be communicated to Persons near, all other Sicknesses discharged that way would be infectious too.

Remark. This is no Consequence; Plagues do not seize on others, because such as are sick of them have Discharges by Sweat, but by reason such Discharges are infectious.

Refuter, §. 9. p. 70. ‘ If any kind of Matter, Venom, or Poison, is capable of producing a Disease, which can be communicated to others, &c. Sublimate, Mercury, Arsenic, the Venom of Vipers, or of mad Dogs, &c. would cause such Sicknesses.

Remark. How does it appear, because some Poisons will do this, therefore all must? By the same way of Reasoning it would follow, that Opium does not kill by inducing Sleep; because Sublimate, Mercury, Arsenic, the Venom of Vipers, or of Mad Dogs, &c. which are all Poisons as well as Opium, have not that Effect.

Refuter, *ibid.* ‘ If any kind of Damps, Vapours, or *Effluvia*, are capable of producing an infectious Sickness, then Chymical *Effluvia*, or the Damps and Vapours of Mines, or Pits, &c. would cause such Sicknesses.

Remark. This is no better Reasoning than the former.

Refuter, p. 71. ‘ The Mortality at the Affize at Oxford, &c. was certainly, for the
Extent

‘ Extent of it, one of the most cruel and
 ‘ deadly Pestilences, &c. and yet they (the
 Persons infected) ‘ did not communicate the
 ‘ Sickness to any other.

Remark. This does not appear to have been the true Plague; for there is no Account of any Pestilential Tumors or Carbuncles appearing upon any seized; no wonder therefore if it was not so infectious.

In the foregoing *Remarks* I have made such Observations on Dr. *Mead's* and Dr. *Pye's* Performances, and that sometimes by comparing them together, as I question not but every indifferent Reader will thence be able to perceive how very short the latter has fallen, in making good what he boasted in the Title-Page of his Pamphlet, that he had refuted Dr. *Mead's* Notions. This is particularly apparent, where this *Refuter* attempts to shew, from the Nature of other Diseases and of Poisons, that it is impossible for the Plague, whether considered under either of these Heads, to be propagated by Persons or Goods: For as to what he advances there as a Proof thereof, nothing was ever produced more mean and trifling, nothing more distant from the least Shadow of a true Argument, by any one that called himself a Doctor in Physick. That because such and such Diseases, and such and such Poisons, do not infect after such a particular Way, therefore it is impossible that there should ever exist any Disease or Poison that can infect in that manner, is surely such a poor sort of Sophism, that an Under-Graduate in any of our Universities would be ashamed of

K

making

making use of it in an Academick Exercise. What therefore shall we think of a Doctor, that publishes it in Print as an unanswerable Demonstration?

This *Refuter*, in his second Part, which came out about a Week after the first, would insinuate, as if he had been much conversant in Books of Physick; for at Pag. 5. he talks of being able to prove something by all the Writers from *Hippocrates* to *Dr. Mead*. If he had been this Book-learned Person, as he there seems to intimate; and was verily persuaded, that the common Notion of Contagion, like that of Witchcraft and Possessions, was a mere vulgar Error, notwithstanding it had prevailed so much in the World, he ought to have let us see more of his Learning, and have shewn, that all Accounts that had been given of Plagues, and favoured that Notion, were altogether insufficient to prove it so much as probable; as a Right Reverend * Bishop of the Church of *Ireland* has excellently well done in relation to the Business of Witches and Conjurers. This would have been something to the Purpose; but to go about to demonstrate a Negative by a Way which was impossible, shews both the greatest Presumption and Weakness at the same Time.

As to this second Part, I shall say very little. It affords, I think, several Specimens of its Author's Learning and Judgment.

At Pag. 5. it is said, that (the Air) ' is even ' a necessary Part of the Fluids, without which ' they would cease to be fluid.' And at p. 6.

* *Dr. Hutchinson.*

‘ If the Air could be entirely withdrawn, and
 ‘ absolutely excluded from the Interstices, or
 ‘ minute Spaces between the Parts of the
 ‘ Blood, or Fluids, their Cohesion would (of
 Necessity, or, as he corrects it in the *Errata*)
 ‘ probably become firm, and the Fluids would
 ‘ be rendred Solids.’ These Passages shew,
 how much this Author is acquainted with
 experimental Philosophy: For we have no
 Experiment of any Fluid, which by withdraw-
 ing from it the Air included within it, makes
 any sensible Approach towards Solidity. And
 farther, no Bodies naturally solid can be kept
 in a State of Fluidity meerly by the Air being
 between their Interstices, by reason that the
 Powers by which the Parts of such Bodies
 attract each other, would be abundantly suffi-
 cient to drive out the Air between them.

At Pag. 25. there is another Flight, *viz.*
 ‘ Every Blood-letting takes away somewhat of
 ‘ of the sanguifying Power, which is the
 ‘ Principle of animal Life.’ This is no way
 evident; for though the Chyle is turned into
 Blood, when it comes into the Arteries and
 Veins, it does not therefore follow, that the
 Power in an Animal to change the Chyle is
 proportional to the Quantity of Blood where-
 with the Chyle is mixed. And besides, the
 Quantity of Blood usually drawn off in Bleed-
 ing, is so inconsiderable a Part of the Whole,
 that should the sanguifying Power be diminish-
 ed, as this Writer supposes, yet that Diminu-
 tion would not deserve any Notice, except in
 such Cases where the sanguifying Power is be-
 fore too weak, as in Dropsies, &c. I hope this
 Writer is not of the Opinion of some whim-

tical Chymists, that the red Part of the Blood can never be recruited; since that Part of the Blood in Children bears but an inconsiderable Proportion to what it is in a grown Person.

At Pag. 31. he talks against the Abuses of Blisters in such a manner as shews he knows but little what is really to be expected from them.

At Pag. 24. This Writer is so ridiculous as to say, ' that if Cotton was capable of bringing hither Infection from *Turkey*, the greater Quantity of Candles we burn, the more we shall be exposed to the Plague, the Weeks of them being made of that Material.' As the Inconveniency of burning many Candles is thus argued from another's Notion, so this Author has a most ingenious Conceit of his own to evince the same Thing. For he has discovered, that a great Number of lighted Candles consume too large a Portion of the Part of the Air most necessary to Life. But I wonder he did not consider, that as fast as this Air is render'd unfit to keep the Candles burning, and also according to his Notion improper to breathe in, that Air is continually carried off, and its want supplied by fresh Air; which is the Reason why lighted Candles are never ordinarily extinguished of themselves, as they soon are when inclosed in any Vessel to which the fresh Air has no Access. I admire, when this Author had it so much in his Head to demolish nightly Assemblies, he did not think of more obvious Arguments, and which may possibly have something in them. For the Fumes of many Candles, arising from the Tallow whereof they are made, are really

really found inconvenient to those whose Lungs are weak. But Candles, in their burning, are so far from having any other ill Effects, that they take off from the Hurt of their Fumes, which is most sensible when Candles are newly extinguished, and their Fumes are no longer attenuated by their Flame.

These, and other Instances there are to be met with in this Performance, let us see how very fit this Author is to pronounce dogmatically, as he does in the 30th Page, where are these notable Words, ‘ If any Judgment can be made from the present Nature of our Climate, and other Circumstances, **THERE NEVER** can happen a Plague here in *England*, in which Blood-letting will not be found pernicious and fatal.’ In the former Part this Author asserts (weakly enough) that every Distemper that is epidemick and deadly, is really the Plague. Now can this learned and ingenious Writer demonstrate, from the present Nature of our Climate, and other Circumstances, **THERE NEVER** can happen a Pleurisy here in *England* both epidemick and very mortal, which then, according to his Notion of the Matter, will be a real Plague? And if he cannot demonstrate this, then certainly there may (in this Author’s Notion of a Plague) such a Plague happen, wherein Blood-letting will be found neither fatal nor pernicious. Besides, *Dr. Sydenham* has given Instances where Blood-letting has proved very beneficial in what was really the true Plague. But I am weary of following this Author through these miserable Blunders: I shall therefore add but one more.

At Pag. 27. this *Refuter* says, ‘Let none be
 ‘ afraid of attending the Sick (*viz.* of the
 Plague;) ‘ for, as I have shew’d before, they
 ‘ cannot possibly receive any Hurt, but may
 ‘ more probably find Safety and Security in
 ‘ so doing.

The latter Part of the foregoing Sentence, when this Pamphlet came first out, I observed every Body excepted against; they wondering how so strange a Paradox could be proved. I believe this Author here has an Eye to what he said at Pag. 67. of his first Part, ‘ That
 ‘ Nurses, and such as have constantly attend-
 ‘ ed about the Sick, have escaped much bet-
 ‘ ter than any others.’ But as this is an Assertion grounded upon no Authorities; so this Writer himself seems to have thought it too bold a one to pass without some Reason for it; though the Reason he has assigned is, if possible, much more surprizing than the Assertion it self. For it is drawn from the extravagant Use some have assigned to Arsenick, of preventing Infection, supposed to be owing to the Arsenick’s attracting the Venomous Particles of the Distemper in the Air to it self. To make this an Argument, it must likewise be imagined, that the Body of an infected Person resembles Arsenick in this Particular, of drawing to it all that is apt to propagate the Disease, whereby the By-standers become free from Danger. But how full of Blunders and Absurdities is this Reasoning? At the Beginning of his first Part, this Writer believes the Plague not to be a Poison; but here the Body of the Sick of it is fancied to have the Properties of Arsenick. Then this Property
 of

of Arsenick being a Security against the Plague, is as ill-grounded a Conceit as ever got Admittance into Physick, and is altogether owing to a Mistake, as we observed above. And yet this *Refuter* draws from it a most amazing Conclusion. Does this at all suit with the Caution and Circumspection he would make us believe he never wanted, both by the curious and important Questions he asks *Dr. Halley*, in his Letter to him, printed at the end of the first Part; and the several Proofs he demands of *Dr. Mead* concerning many Particulars? But however, granting his Principles, that the Body of an infected Person drew to it the malignant Particles floating in the Air; does it thence follow, that such as are near this Body, are safer than those who are at a greater Distance? Does it follow, that one sitting near a Fire with a Door open at his Back, can receive no Injury, by reason the Fire draws to it self the whole Current of Air? Certainly these are no Consequences at all.

C O N C L U S I O N.

I Am at length come to the End of my Undertaking, which is no small Pleasure to me; for I think nothing in the World can be more tiresome than the Endeavour of clearing up any thing from Misrepresentation, and the Labour of answering Impertinence. And these have been my chief Employment in writing the foregoing *Remarks*. The Author who assumed to himself to be *Dr. Mead's Explainer*, has frequently given me the first Trouble;

ble ; and Dr. *Pye*, in his Attempt to refute Dr. *Mead's* Notions, has constantly exercised me with the *other*. As the *Explainer* makes no Conscience of wilfully misrepresenting what Dr. *Mead* says ; so he as often fails in the Point of Reasoning and Argument. He likewise many times aims at Smartness and Wit, tho' after a very aukward Fashion ; and is very ignorant of any true Theory in Physick, notwithstanding, in some Passages in his Pamphlet, there is room to guess, that it is wrote by one, who in other printed Discourses has pretended to great Knowledge of the Animal Œconomy ; and to be able to account mechanically for many of its Operations. But this is a Task too difficult for one of this Writer's Capacity. It is not a pillaging of *Bellini* and others, and that in their very Words, that can get a Man a Reputation for Skill in the true Theory of Medicine ; when what he produces himself, as well in this Performance, as in other Treatises of his, is beyond Conception weak and absurd.

Dr. *Pye*, on the other hand, does not seem to pretend to much Knowledge in Natural Philosophy ; but where he makes some Essays in that Way, he is very unfortunate. Nor has he shewn any where in either Part of his Discourse any tolerable Acquaintance with Books ; tho' in one Place (Part. II. p. 5.) he makes use of such an Expression, as if he had a Mind we should imagine him to be a Person of almost infinite Reading. The Tenour of his Discourse is seemingly grave, and not a little Magisterial. He perpetually aims at a sort of Argumentation, delivered in a most tedious

dious Compass of Words. As to the Force of his Reasons, we have fully considered *that* in the *Remarks* on his Performance, and concerning which we shall add nothing farther.

As it has been our Business, in the foregoing *Remarks*, to vindicate *Dr. Mead's* Discourse from the Objections that have been raised against it, by Misrepresentation and Impertinence; so upon a Review we are almost apt to think our Labour in a manner superfluous and needless: For *Dr. Mead's* excellent Treatise is delivered with so much Clearness as well as Brevity, that, I question not, but if any one will read it over with due Caution, and compare it with any thing that has been written in Opposition to what is there advanced, he will readily discover the Truth to be on *Dr. Mead's* side; and that he had produced nothing in relation to Contagion and the Plague, but what is to be deduced from the several known Phænomena of that Distemper. Indeed if some ingenious Beginner in Physick had attempted this Subject, he would probably have been more lavish in his Conjectures at the Causes of the Disease; not being willing to omit any Occasion of bringing into the Light part of that Stock of extraordinary Knowledge which he had lately received from the Mouth of some grave and learned Professor. And this perhaps might take with the Generality of Readers, who are for the most part apt to admire what neither they nor any body else will be ever able to comprehend; and to slight what is natural and certain, and what it is possible to discover in the Know-
L ledge

ledge of Nature; and what will direct us to something that may be of real Use and Service. Nor may the young *Æsculapius* himself at first doubt of the Truth and Certainty of those airy Speculations which were delivered to him by One, the Dignity of whose Office seems to require him not to be ignorant of any thing in the whole Compass of the Art of Healing. But Time and Experience, a stricter Search into the Nature of Things, and a steady Pursuit of a truer Philosophy than what has hitherto been taught in the Schools, may at length inform him better, and make him discern how little Truth there is in the many Notions that have been broach'd by the Compilers of Hypotheses and Systems. Then he may be able to perceive the Difference between Conjectures framed at random, and such Knowledge of Things as is acquired from the most diligent Observation, and the soundest Reason; between what is uttered from a University *Chair*, only in a methodical Way, and what is produced by one, whose natural Sagacity, improved by Study and the largest Experience, has rendered truly skilful both in the Knowledge and Cure of Distempers. And the *Short Discourse concerning Pestilential Contagion* will, upon the strictest Examination, be found worthy an Author of this last Character; as being altogether suitable to the Learning, good Sense, and Humanity, which every body who is so happy as to be acquainted with him, sees and admires in Dr. *MÉAD*.

F I N I S.



ERRATA.

PAG. 12. l. 24. after the Word *do*, add *of themselves in*
these Countries, p. 24. l. 28. for *has* read *have*. p. 26.
l. 29. read *relate*. l. 31. dele *Quarantaines*. p. 29. l. 32.
read *Vicentia*. p. 33. l. 25. after *mistaken?* add these Words,
For tho' it ceased then, it might not be owing to the waking of
Fires; since





E R R A T A .

For that in chapter three, it might not be proper to the making of
Five; Four
P. 24. l. 24. after the Word do add of themselves in
the Country, p. 24. l. 28. for but read have. p. 26.
l. 29. read shall. l. 31. dole Quantities. p. 29. l. 32.
read twenty. p. 33. l. 27. after mistaken add these Words.
in

