

Cow-pox exploded ; or the inconsistencies, absurdities, and falsehoods of some of its defenders exposed / [George Lipscomb].

Contributors

Lipscomb, George, 1773-1846.

Publication/Creation

London : J. Barfield for J. Callow & G. Robinson, 1806.

Persistent URL

<https://wellcomecollection.org/works/hd3d3qsn>


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>



FF

L. LXVI.

19/12

Lipscomb

x/may-

33861/p

COW-POX

EXPLODED;

OR, THE

INCONSISTENCES, ABSURDITIES, AND FALSEHOODS

OF

SOME OF ITS DEFENDERS

EXPOSED.

BY GEORGE LIPSCOMB, SURGEON;

AUTHOR OF

INOCULATION FOR THE SMALL-POX VINDICATED; A DISSERTATION ON THE
FAILURE AND MISCHIEFS OF THE COW POX; A MANUAL OF INOCULA-
TION FOR THE USE OF THE FACULTY AND PRIVATE FAMILIES, &c. &c.

LONDON:

PRINTED BY J. BARFIELD, 91, WARDOUR STREET,

Printer to His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales,

FOR

J. CALLOW, CROWN COURT, SOHO: G. ROBINSON, PATERNOSTER
ROW: AND ALL OTHER BOOKSELLERS.

1806.

thought altogether improper, when I have explained the motives for this address.

The question which has arisen respecting the utility of Inoculation for the Cow-Pox, is evidently connected in an essential manner with the welfare of the whole human race, as well as with the political jurisprudence of the country.

It is worthy of the attention of the Statesman and Philanthropist.

To your Lordship, in that high and important character, and as a nobleman pre-eminently conspicuous for the soundness of your judgment, your comprehensive views of civil polity, and an amiable regard for every thing which relates to the interests of humanity and of science, I therefore take the liberty of presenting these remarks.

The questions submitted to your Lordship's notice are, whether the practice of Vaccination has been proved to be a *safe* or *infallible* preventive of the Small Pox: and if proved to be *not* so; whether it ought to be encouraged by the Legislature, in preference to the practice of Variolous Inoculation, which, when properly conducted, *is both safe* and *infallible*?

Your Lordship's exalted station, your independent character, your impartial justice, and your profound knowledge on every literary subject, render you the

fit Arbiter in such a cause.—I submit it, with great deference, to your Lordship's consideration.

I have another motive for the great liberty which I have taken, more personal, but, I hope, not unpardonably presumptuous—it is, that as a native of Buckinghamshire, I may publicly express to your Lordship, the FRIEND and FATHER of that County, my unfeigned sentiments of the most perfect respect, veneration, and attachment.

I have the honor to be,

My LORD,

Your Lordship's


Most obedient servant,

GEORGE LIPSCOMB.

Frith-street,
25th Sept. 1806.

PUBLICATIONS

BY THE SAME AUTHOR,



1. AN ESSAY on the Nature and Treatment of a PUTRID MALIGNANT FEVER. 8vo. Price 2s. 6d.
2. A JOURNEY into CORNWALL; through the Counties of Southampton, Wilts, Dorset, Devon, and Somerset. 8vo. Price 5s.
3. A JOURNEY into SOUTH WALES; through the Counties of Oxford, Warwick, Worcester, Hereford, Salop, Stafford, Buckingham, and Hertford; dedicated, by permission, to Horatio Lord Viscount Nelson, Duke of Brontë, &c. &c. &c. and with a Frontispiece, engraved by Medland. 8vo. Price 8s.
4. A DESCRIPTION of MATLOCK BATH, with some account of Chatsworth and Kedleston, and the Mineral Waters of Quarndon and Kedleston in Derbyshire; dedicated, by permission, to his Grace William Duke of Devonshire, &c. &c. &c. 12mo. Price 3s.
5. OBSERVATIONS on ASTHMA, and the Cause of it proved to depend on Acidity in the System. 2d Edition. 8vo. Price 5s.
6. INOCULATION for the SMALL-POX, VINDICATED, and its superior Efficacy and Safety to the Practice of VACCINATION clearly proved. 8vo. Price 2s.
7. A DISSERTATION on the FAILURE and MISCHIEFS of the Cow-Pox, in which the principal Arguments in favour of Vaccination by Drs. Jenner, Pearson, Woodville, Lettsom, Thornton, and Adams, are EXAMINED and CONFUTED. Price 3s.
8. A MANUAL of INOCULATION for the Use of the FACULTY and PRIVATE FAMILIES; pointing out the most approved Method of Inoculating and conducting patients in safety through the SMALL-POX, &c. &c. Price 2s.

COW-POX

EXPLODED.

HAVING in my “Dissertation on the failure and mischiefs of the Cow-Pox,” pledged myself to the public to reply to any arguments which might be brought forward by Dr. JENNER, Dr. PEARSON, Dr. LETTSOM, Dr. ADAMS, or Dr. THORNTON, in defence of their former opinions: these pages are intended to fulfil that promise, and, it is hoped, to close the COW-POX controversy.

Dr. Thornton’s “*Vaccinæ Vindicia*,” so long and so often promised, as a *complete refutation* of every case which has been published adverse to vaccination, having *at last* made its appearance, I shall employ a few pages in the exposure of some of the mis-statements and absurdities of that pamphlet.

Not because of the weight of Dr. Thornton’s authority: not because of any force (for I cannot perceive any) in his opinions; nor because of any advantage which has been derived to the *Jennerians* from an aux-

iliary so destitute of temper, good manners, and understanding: but because it is evident, from the Doctor's own words, that he is determined to misconstrue silence into acquiescence, and forbearance into pusillanimity.

“*Vaccinæ Vindicia*” (a *title* worthy of its author) is, as a literary composition beneath contempt:—it has no claim to the support of genius or science, for it possesses neither of them: but Dr. Thornton has made it the vehicle of so much abuse, impertinence, and absurdity, that it ought not to pass unnoticed. It may be compared with a scavenger's cart, which, full of the vilest species of dirt, scatters impurity wherever it goes, splashes every passenger, offends every eye, and contaminates even the common air.

Of an heterogeneous mixture of brainular confusion, miserable invective, and impotent revenge, how can I speak but in terms of indignant reprobation? And why should I apologise for bestowing severe and deserved chastisement on one who, to use his own expression, is—“so *spiteful*,” that neither friendship, humanity, nor christian charity, could restrain the ebullitions of his phrensy, or shield even *the dead* from the violations of his ruthless hand?

Notwithstanding the *Jennerian* society, Dr Pearson, and all sensible men among the

vaccinators, had abandoned the principle of INFALLIBILITY, for which Dr. Jenner received *ten thousand pounds*, Dr. Thornton was determined to support the sinking cause of vaccination, whether *it did* or *did not* accomplish what was expected from it.

The Doctor resumed his pen, with the very *liberal* and *laudable* design of impeaching the credit of the witnesses of Cow-Pox failure and mischief! With a pretended regard for truth, he has *denied* facts which could not be *rationaly* doubted; and in the character of a promoter of science, misrepresented circumstances which he *knew*, if fairly related, would have destroyed the very theory they were intended to support.

Dr. Thornton has gone farther: he has imputed *lying* and *falsehood* to men of honour and integrity; has puzzled a plain case by *incoherent language*; and, not content to asperse the living, has, by a most indecent perseverance in abusing and misrepresenting Dr. ROWLEY, violated the awful sanctuary of the dead.

Dr. Thornton, in the Cow-Pox controversy, stands confessed the delegate of the *Jennerian* society, and entrusted with "*vast piles*" of their correspondence and reports, is not a little proud of the *honourable* office he has undertaken,

He has, indeed, very formally and very solemnly denied that he “broke out of Salisbury-court, with a *huge bundle of waste paper on his back* ;”* but confesses that the reports of the society were sent to him for the purpose of—publication.

This modern *Goliath* announced his approach to the field of battle, in pestiferous advertisements, scattered through every dirty vehicle of popular notoriety; and proclaiming that Dr. Thornton pledged himself “to prove the FALSITY OR FALLACY of EVERY adverse case.”

If those who are implicated in this abominable aspersion, treat Dr. Thornton with a greater degree of severity than he likes, he may transfer a portion of it to *the society*, to which he has submitted to become the *scape-goat* and *champion*.

Had Dr. Thornton accomplished his proud design, the blasphemers of *Vaccina* might have expected as severe a punishment as Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego. The *Vaccinarian blast-furnace* was heated to receive us; and “the most mighty men” in the *Jennerian* army stood ready to vindicate their insulted Goddess.

The *denunciations* and *anathemas* of her chief

* Moseley's Commentaries, p. 161.

*priests** and scribes, left no ray of hope: we must not have presumed to cherish the idea of being re-embodied in the shape of *Phœnixes*. That happier fate is reserved only for such writers as the "*Refutor* to the Jennerian Society."

Dr. Thornton informed the Public, that the first part of his intended Refutation was destroyed by fire in Salisbury-court, Fleet-street, in the archives of the *Jennerian Society*, but that it would arise *from its ashes, like a Phœnix!*

It did so; not, however, in a flame, but in smoke: but still Dr. ROWLEY's cases have not been refuted—not even one of them.

This has been *impudently* denied by some blockheads, and opposed, by Dr. Clutterbuck, in his Review for *August*, 1806. I challenge Dr. Clutterbuck, and his brother Reviewers, to shew, *which* of Dr. ROWLEY's cases has been refuted by Dr. Thornton?

I am more than half inclined to make a few remarks on *some other Reviewers*, particularly on *A. Aikin* and Co.: nothing but that sort of Pythagorean principle, to which the meanest insects are indebted for their safety, would suffer them to escape; and resentment is now so far subdued by the discontinuation of that

* The Rev. *Rowland Hill*, the Rev. G. C. Jenner, Mr. Blair, Mr. Moore, &c. &c.

disgrace to the freedom of the press, once called the "Annual Review," that I can only consign it to the dust, or rather the dirt whence it originated, and cover its grave with hellebore and nightshade.

When Dr. Thornton began his investigation, more than 500 cases had been published.

In his first number of *Vaccinæ Vindicia*, he gave *some account of three* of them. At the rate at which the Doctor then travelled, he would have necessarily passed thirteen years, before he could have arrived at his journey's end. Alas! a few short months have terminated his Herculean task, and cut off the sanguine hopes of Grub-street, which was to have been rebuilt by the profits of the work, so generously "*presented to the trade*," by Dr. Thornton.

As Dr. Thornton, who *promised* to examine and confute *all* Dr. ROWLEY's cases, only skimmed over the surface of *a few* of them, it can not be expected that I, who have *not promised* to follow *him* through all his *perilous researches*, among persons whom he delicately styles "*vulgar tavern keepers*," "*old witches*," "*half fuddled women*," and "*filthy inhabitants of hovels*," should exactly contradict by evidence *all* Dr. Thornton's assertions.

The public will be satisfied by a few sam-

ples of Dr. Thornton's *correctness* and *veracity*, how much dependence ought to be placed on what *he calls facts*!

With respect to the first and second cases in Dr. ROWLEY's book, or, as Dr. Thornton denominates them, the *two first* cases—these he has so mangled and confused by useless references and idle quotations, that at last he only arrives at a *possibility*, that the matter used for the purpose of Vaccination *might not* have come from Dr. Jenner, and *therefore* concludes that “*the import of these two cases are somewhat doubtful,*” and of course, they are “*completely refuted!*”

As to the third case;—Dr. Thornton, with the aid of his *learned* and *unlearned* correspondents at Oxford, has fully established, that *the child was vaccinated*, and believed to be *secure*, but afterwards had the natural Small Pox. This is another *complete refutation*! Most of them are of the same *genus*.

In some cases, Dr. Thornton perceives defects in the mode of introducing the Vaccine matter, which he says should be done “*in the leg.**” *These cases therefore go for nothing!*

* Lest Dr. Thornton should be suspected of *originality*, it may be proper to notice, that this suggestion respecting the insertion of the matter in the leg is not *new*: inoculation for the Small-Pox in that manner having been practised by Mr. Wreden, who published an Essay on the subject in the year 1729.

Sometimes the Doctor detects the *probability* of constitutional affections, such as the itch and a sore head. Here the Cow-Pox *could not* have taken place, and consequently these cases are “*completely refuted!*”

Sometimes the names are spelt wrong, or the place of abode has been neglected: these errors are fatal, and such cases are of course “*completely refuted!*”

In some instances, the dates are incorrect, *therefore* the facts said to have happened, did not take place: *these cases have refuted themselves!*

Some of Dr. Thornton's correspondents, not having the fear of Jenner before their eyes, or being moved by a regard for *the truth*, have expressly supported Dr. ROWLEY's testimony, and declared that it was perfectly correct: the evidence of such persons is rejected, and the cases so defended, are—“*completely refuted!*”

Before I dismiss this part of the subject, I will endeavour to supply a portion of evidence illustrative of Dr. Thornton's mode of refutation, which either his “mild forbearance,” or some other motive, has occasioned to be suppressed.

Endeavouring to improve on his former account of Mrs. Bossward's son, Dr. Thornton declares, that the abscess which followed the

Cow-Pox, if it had been (as Dr. MOSELEY said) as large as an orange, *could not* break into his mouth.

Mrs. Bossward declares it *did* break into his mouth; and was as large as Dr. MOSELEY stated.

Dr. Thornton says the child recovered in a few days

Mrs. Bossward says he was very ill a month, that she nursed him, and he was attended by an apothecary during that period.

Dr. Thornton asserts, that Mrs. New, of Chelsea, requested Dr. MOSELEY to give an *opiate* to her child, when *dying of the Cow-Pox*.

Mrs. New asserts that she never was so impertinent as to say any such thing.

Dr. Thornton, she supposes, *always prescribes* for his patients whatever they or their nurses suggest! Dr. MOSELEY knows better.

Dr. Thornton says that Mr. Ince's child had no patch of hair growing on his back subsequent to Vaccination; and he also says, that Mrs. Leach, the child's nurse, told him so.

Mrs. Leach denies it; and says the child had a *very large* patch of hair growing on his back: which was seen not only by herself, but by many other persons, who confirm her evidence.

Dr. Thornton asserts that Dr. MOSELEY

attended Mr. Joules's *daughter* in the Small-Pox, with Dr. ROWLEY.

This *daughter* happened to be a *son*, whom Mrs. Joules informs me, Dr. MOSELEY did *not* happen to see.

Dr. Thornton says that Mr. Joules is an unhealthy man, and has formerly suffered from the Evil.

Mr. Joules declares that he is *not* an unhealthy man; and that the greatest *evil* he ever suffered, is the trouble of Dr. Thornton's impertinence and mis-statements* respecting himself and his family.

Dr. Thornton accuses Mrs. Joules of being "addicted to liquor."

Mrs. Joules says that Dr. Thornton "is addicted to lying."

* The account of *Joules's* son, as published and re-published by Cow-Pox Authors and Reviewers, is so shamefully opposite to the real fact (as may be seen by comparing it with *Mr. Joules's* certificate in Dr. MOSELEY's book, p. 220) and is so evidently designed to mislead the public, that if it were mentioned in appropriate terms, it might be called, in Lord Kenyon's words, "a nasty stinking fraud double hatched!"

The abscess did *not* break—but was opened with a lancet! The boy was *not* cured by the surgeon of the *Bloomsbury* Dispensary, nor did he derive any benefit from his attendance! The other children are free from scrophula; and Mr. Joules, who *never had* the Scrophula, has *not* had even a day's illness for years!

Dr. Thornton declares that Mr. Baillie told him, the child was afflicted with a scald-head: and the Doctor brings forward this assertion, to disprove the fact that he had the Cow-Pox previous to the Small-Pox.

Mr. and Mrs. Baillie solemnly contradict Dr. Thornton: and state, that the child had first the Cow-Pox, and then the Small-Pox; but *never had* a scald head.

Here I entreat the Reader to pause—and consider how *science*, the boasted object of Dr. Thornton's regard, can be promoted, by gross and wilful mis-statements, by manifest deviations from truth, and a dereliction of every principle of moral honesty!

But such are Dr. Thornton's refutations! As the summer is not yet over, it is probable that *the Doctor* may be seized with another *fit of gadding*: in order, therefore, to afford him a new *theme for abuse*, I present him with the following cases, on which he may either *ruminate*, or display his talents at refutation, as it may seem to him meet.

I select these cases from more than an hundred in my possession, which have never yet been published—not because they are the most striking, but because they sufficiently explain what the Cow-Pox *is*; and what it *is not*.

CASE I.

Joseph Lawson, aged about four years, son of Mr. Lawson, Music-seller, in *Tottenham-Court-road*, had the Cow-Pox in *June*, 1802, vaccinated by Mr. Blair, Surgeon, &c. He has the eschars remaining on his arms.

In *June*, 1806, he caught the Small-Pox, had it dangerously, and is much marked.

Mr. Blair, Mr. Douglas, and many other Vaccinators, saw him in the Small-Pox. Mr. WILLIAM SUTTON inoculated from him. He had often been, before this, where the Small-Pox was, without effect.

CASE II.

Mary, the daughter of Mr. Smith (of the house of Smith and Dutton, Scale-makers) No. 248, *Tooley-street*, Borough, now about four years and a half old, was vaccinated, when about half a year old, by a respectable professional Gentleman in the neighbourhood: had the Cow-Pox in the most decided and satisfactory manner; there being *an evident*, though slight, constitutional affection, besides a pustule, which appeared in all its stages exactly such as has been described by Dr. Jenner, to afford the criterion of complete Vaccination; and leaving a *perfect eschar* on the arm.

She was *repeatedly* exposed to the influence of the Small-Pox, by being frequently in company and playing with other children in that disease; but *without being affected*.

In July, 1806, she caught the infection, had the eruptive fever at the usual time, and during the usual

period; violent head-ache, pain in the back, cold chills, and excessive sickness and vomiting. These symptoms were followed by a copious eruption of hundreds of pustules, and the child was seen by several practitioners during the progress of the disease.

I do not think it necessary to publish more cases, but shall content myself with remarking, that those which I have related *prove*, in the most satisfactory manner, that the assertions of Dr. Jenner are incorrect, and that *the influence of the Cow-Pox is not permanent*: for, as these children were rendered unsusceptible of the Small-Pox during four years, the Cow-Pox must have been *true and genuine*—therefore, if in that period the degree of unsusceptibility were so far worn out, that at the expiration of it, they could suffer all the usual symptoms of the Small-Pox—had they *not been exposed* to the influence of contagion till a still later period, when the state of the constitution, and other circumstances, might have been less favourable, they *undoubtedly* would have had a *severer* disease, and *probably* might have perished in it.

How unreasonable would it have been to re-inoculate these children with vaccine matter! and what security, besides that of a *temporary*

suspension of the usual powers of the system, can be expected from an experiment equally fallacious and absurd?

Dr. Thornton was certainly one of the most sturdy defenders of vaccination to be found in England, Scotland, or *Ireland*: for he has been known to declare, when writing on the use of mercury and bark, that he *would always maintain the principle of their INFALLIBILITY, though he should meet with fifty proofs of their failure!*

Considering the *unbounded success* of Dr. Thornton in procuring counter proofs respecting the cases which he investigated, it is rather unhandsome that he, who has been celebrated by his panegyrist, Dr. Milne,* nay, who has celebrated himself as “*a gentleman of forbearing† manners,*” and “*rare and estimable candour,*” should have mentioned some of the persons,—with whom he was evidently solicitous to become acquainted, in terms of superciliousness and *contempt*: and accused them of drunkenness and stupidity.

Poor Woolley (whose son fell a sacrifice to the boasted security of vaccination, after having suffered all the horrors of martyrdom) is described as “*a complete figure of po-*

* Preface to Milne's Dictionary, reprinted on the cover of Dr. Thornton's *Vaccinæ Vindicia*.

† Vac. Vind. p. 391.

“ verty, living in a small back room in one of
 “ the *most low* and filthy streets in London.”*

This may be all very true, and yet the facts of his child having been dreadfully diseased after the Cow-Pox, and that he died of the natural Small-Pox are not to be denied, on account of the man’s *poverty* or *appearance*.

Did Dr. Thornton offer to relieve the wretchedness he has described, when he sat for *two hours* wrangling about vaccination, with this same “ figure of poverty,” in this same *low and dirty* “ hovel,†” at the very time when the child was lying ill of the confluent Small-Pox ?

Dr. Thornton, perhaps, thought his condescension of as much value as the beneficence of Dr. ROWLEY, who kindly supplied the poor child with wine and other comforts, and instead of worrying Mr. Woolley with unmeaning questions and conversation, did him the effectual service of recommending him to employment as — what he is—“ an *ingenious* “ *engraver.*”‡

Dr. ROWLEY, though called by Dr. Thorn-

* Vac. Vind. p. 322.

† Ibid, p. 330.

‡ See Dr. ROWLEY’s “ Cow-Pox Inoculation no Security “ against Small-Pox Infection,” Case of Woolley’s child.

ton “*an inhuman monster,**” was indeed a gentleman and a christian: he did not despise Woolley’s misery, nor insult his appearance. A poor person was, in his view, an object of charity and compassion, whatever *low or filthy* place he might inhabit—whether *Cross-street*, or *Hinde-street*.

Dr. Thornton’s correspondents also come in for a share of his ribaldry. One in particular, Mr. Englefield, master of the Assembly-house at *Kentish-town*.

The Doctor is marvelously severe on Mr. Englefield’s letter, which he presents to his readers in great triumph, as incorrect in style, and deficient in grammar.

Dr. Thornton’s intercourse with “vulgar tavern-keepers, and women half fuddled with gin,” might have been supposed to furnish him with worse letters: but there is no doubt if Mr. Englefield had contradicted Dr. ROWLEY at the expense of veracity, and complimented Dr. Thornton, on account of *his disinterested regard for the public service*—that Dr. Thornton would have submitted this unfortunate letter to the correction of the person he employs, to prune and turn into something like English, *his own writings*.

Start not, gentle Reader, for this is a fact

* Vac. Vind. p. 216.

capable of proof : * nay, of many proofs ; for Dr. Thornton so frequently changes his agents, that an impeachment always hangs over his head.

* The following extract from a letter addressed to me by a literary gentleman, into whose hands I happened to put Dr. MOSELEY's Commentaries, will elucidate this remark.

“ I have perused Dr. MOSELEY's admirable Commentaries
 “ on the Lues Bovilla, with singular pleasure, but must beg
 “ leave to animadvert on one passage in that work which has
 “ excited my astonishment ; I mean the ill-timed and *unme-*
 “ *rited* compliment paid by Dr. MOSELEY to Dr. Thornton.
 “ After chastising the ignorance and insolence of that self-
 “ conceited son of Esculapius, he adds, ‘ It is with pleasure
 “ ‘ and sincerity I acknowledge, that, in *my opinion*, HIS
 “ ‘ Temple of Flora, or Garden of Nature, is an honour to
 “ ‘ the country and age in which it was produced. On this
 “ ‘ table, *Fame* shall inscribe the name of Thornton, and
 “ ‘ deliver it to the protection of *Immortality*!’—Had it
 “ not been for the solemnity with which Dr. M. has intro-
 “ duced this tribute of applause to a blockhead, I should
 “ have conjectured it to have been one of those matchless
 “ effusions of wit and humour, for which the Doctor is so
 “ justly celebrated. The Temple of Flora unquestionably
 “ is a splendid work ; Reinagle executed the embellish-
 “ ments with taste and judgment ; Dr. SHAW and others
 “ contributed some poetical descriptions, illustrative of the
 “ flowers.—But who composed the grand body of the work ?
 “ Was it Dr. Robert John Thornton ? Notwithstanding his
 “ name is pompously inscribed on this table as its founder,
 “ I have *strong grounds for believing* Dr. Thornton to be
 “ merely the publisher, and not the author of that work.
 “ Those who have been in habits of familiar conversation
 “ with Dr. Thornton, must acknowledge, that no trait of

It was, at all events, unfair to print Englefield's letter without his consent; and Dr. Thornton could not have forgotten the alarm he himself felt, when Dr. MOSELEY suggested

“genius, no brilliancy of thought, no depth of judgment,
 “is to be discovered in him; neither will his epistles exhibit those talents which the *real author* of ‘The Temple
 “of Flora’ must possess. The letters of Dr. Thornton
 “(such, at least, as have come within the sphere of my
 “observation) are replete with the most disgraceful *grammatical errors*; an *incongruity* of thought, and an absurdity of expression rarely to be met with. Such an illustrious scholar as Dr. Thornton—the first physician, the first botanist, and the first vaccinist in the world—to whom the Autocrate of all the Russias was pleased to send a ring as a token of high consideration—that this wonder of the nineteenth century should be incapable of writing a letter *equal to a parish school-boy*, is strange indeed. ‘Publish it not in Gath: tell it not in the streets
 “of Askelon.’

“Though his letters might not vie with those of Cicero, Pliny, or Melmoth's Fitzosborne's, yet they might justly be supposed to contain common sense and common grammar. He who is incapacitated from writing a letter, is ill qualified to appear before the public tribunal as an author. It is therefore, by a parity of reasoning by analogy of argument, that I conceive Dr. MOSELEY has been burning incense to a strange GOD—that he has been worshipping at the shrine of a *nonentity*—and that, above all, he has *libelled posterity*. Frivolous as the present age is, the *fame* of Dr. Thornton has been sounded *only by that gentleman himself, or by persons acting under his influence*. Will you, Sir, indulge the

the idea of publishing his (Dr. T.'s) letters: and earnestly besought the Doctor to suppress those *damning proofs of ignorance* !

Dr. MOSELEY has suppressed them: and extended his compassion still farther; for *I know* that the Doctor is in possession of a letter from Dr. ROWLEY, full of remarks on Dr.

“ romantic idea, that his fame will survive his existence?
 “ &c. That Dr. Thornton has himself written a book, I
 “ will easily admit: his *Vaccinæ Vindiciæ* bear evident
 “ marks of his talents—insolent invective, vulgarity of lan-
 “ guage, orthographical errors, and the most flagrant abuse
 “ of the rules of syntax, *combine to prove him* the author.

“ I trust, Sir, that you will coincide in opinion with me,
 “ that the complimentary tribute of Dr. MOSELEY was
 “ both *ill timed* and *unmerited*. In making use of the
 “ *former epithet*, I especially refer to Dr. Thornton's rude
 “ treatment of Dr. MOSELEY, and his ruthless attack upon
 “ the late benevolent Dr. ROWLEY. To respect the ashes
 “ of the dead, has ever been thought a sacred duty in
 “ every age and country; yet this unfeeling assassin has
 “ entered the awful mansion of death with brutal ferocity !”
 &c.

“ *To G. Lipscomb, Esq.*

“ *Frith-street, Soho-square.*”

I am not at liberty to *publish* the name of the writer of the above letter: but if Dr. Thornton, among the *numerous* DRIVERS of his PEGASUS, can not recognize an old acquaintance, I shall readily gratify the Doctor's curiosity, by giving *him* the name of my correspondent.

Thornton's conduct respecting vaccination, and containing *other particulars*, connected with his opinions of Dr. Thornton, which, if laid before the public, would make an impression *never to be effaced*. Dr. MOSELEY's generous forbearance has met with a very unsuitable, a very ungrateful return!

After what has been said, it may not be improper to present a copy of Dr. Thornton's letter to Mr. Englefield, which is as follows:

" Nov: 26, 1805.

" *Hinde-street, Manchester-square.*

" SIR,

" "In Jan. 1805 your two children had the Cow-
 " "pock — & then the *mange*—One died of dis-
 " "eased Lungs—The other is under the care of Dr.
 " "ROWLEY.—More dreadful Cow-Pox mange never
 " "appeared in both these children"—so says Dr.
 " ROWLEY. I, Sir, have inoculated with Cow-pock
 " my own children, and thousands, and seek infor-
 " mation?

" What was the age of these children?

" By whom were they vaccinated?

" What is the health of the *other* children?—if
 " you have *others*.—Do you believe yourself that the
 " Cow-Pock produced the *mange* in both these
 " children?

" I am sure you will answer me these questions *to*

" *the best you know.* I am sure I would *so to you*,
 " and I remain,

" SIR,

" Your obliged obed Serv:

" ROBERT JOHN THORNTON, M. D."

" *For Mr. Englefield,*

" *Assembly House, Kentish Town.*"

Mr. Englefield, without *pretending to be* a man of letters, has as fair a character for honesty and integrity, (not to mention his *veracity*, which has hitherto been undisputed) and is as useful and reputable a member of society as Dr. Thornton.

With respect to composition, I think Mr. Englefield's letter is *in no respect* inferior to Dr. Thornton's.

As to the circumstance on which Dr. Thornton wishes to lay so *critical a stress*:—that Englefield confuses *the third person* and the first, it is exactly paralleled by his own *printed* letter to Dr. MOSELEY, in which the same blunder may be reckoned at least *thirty times* in the course of the work.

By the bye, who, with any knowledge of grammar, would have stated his objection, in the words used by Dr. Thornton?

" Mr. Englefield's* *note* to me is as follows,

* Vac. Vind. p. 339.

“ *verbatim et litteratim*, Who begins with the
“ *third person*, and ends with *the pronoun* ?”

Eye upon it! *a note who* begins! The relative *used* to agree with the antecedent in gender, number, and person! Besides, Dr. Thornton *ought to know*, that the most elegant card ever penned, might begin “ with *the third person*, and end with *a pronoun* !”

And this from a *late* member of the University of Cambridge—a physician of *four* years standing, according to (his own account in) the title page of *Vaccinæ Vindicia*. I should rather have suspected it to be the production of a boy *four years old*, than of a voluminous writer, and a botanist, distinguished by his discovery, that the leaf of the *Nelumbium* “ being shaped like an umbrella,” was therefore “ fashioned for the reception “ of a god !”*

I cannot close my remarks on Dr. Thornton’s *scholarship* here.—it were well for him if I could: for *Vaccinæ Vindicia* has been made the instrument of verbal criticism on so many occasions, and with so much impudence, and so much ignorance, that I must indulge myself in a few reprisals.

Dr. Thornton records his own mild *forbearance*, in suppressing one letter from a medical

* Thornton’s *Flora*, Art. *Nymphœa Nelumbo*.

practitioner, lest its errors in orthography and grammar should have discredited the profession. It is plain that he had not always so much prudence, as the letter of his friend, Mr. Morrison,* even in its introductory sentence, will testify : and it must excite something like contempt and indignation, to see Dr. Thornton turn critic, particularly among those who, having been “ pestered with his correspondence,† ” know how shamefully deficient he himself is, in grammatical knowledge.

Of this I will give the reader a few proofs, from about *half a score* of Dr. Thornton’s letters, taken at random out of “ piles ” in Dr. ROWLEY’S possession ; which, in consequence of the Doctor’s death, have (unfortunately for Dr. Thornton) fallen into my hands.

Had Dr. Thornton shewn himself “ a gentleman of *forbearing manners* : ” had he not barbarously insulted the memory of Dr. Row-

* See Mr. Morrison’s letter to Dr. Thornton, Vac. Vind. p. 372.

“ Whatever *is* the extent of my slender abilities, and I
“ am fully conscious how much *they are* over-rated in your
“ very flattering letter ; *but* such as they are, I trust I shall
“ never be backward when called upon to exert them,” &c.

Dr. Thornton finds no fault with the diction of this letter—indeed, it is very much like *his own* !

† Moseley’s Commentaries.

LEY, had he not “turned critic,” these letters should have never been exposed *to daylight*.

But I will do him no injustice ; they shall be *literally* and faithfully copied from his own MSS. and the reader will please to take notice, that every letter quoted, is in my possession.

In the first letter, I find—

“As a Medical Man I am sure you cannot be an
“Enemy to Science, & I have no other object, &
“therefore, shall feel myself greatly obliged by an
“answer & am Dr. Sir, With much esteem

Your faithful obed. St.

“ROBERT JOHN THORNTON, M.D.”

In the second—

“May I request of you some account of Mr. Col-
“bech children” &c. “Did they have the Small-Pox
“bad—Did you take matter from them to inoculate
“with—

“*Where* did a young woman live *in the 5 Fields,*
“*chelsea*—vaccinated at Hampton 3 years ago—
“Dr. ROWLEY *visated* this woman at your request—
“Did she have the small-pox bad—I can find out
“no such person.”

In the third, which appears to have been addressed to Dr. MOSELEY—

“Your work on Tropical Diseases—is a *standarn*
“of clear and exquisite writing—and has established
“you a great name,”— &c.

“I shall trouble you with my remarks on *each*

“ case as I have found them—and shall thank you
“ for yours in return.”

“ No one has said *better things* of the Cow-pock
“ inoculation than you,”—&c.—“ but your union with
“ ROWLEY and SQUIRREL* is abominable.”

In the fourth, which was also addressed to
Dr. MOSELEY—

“ I know your talents, your benevolence of heart,
“ that you are too much a man of honour to wish or
“ intend to deceive. Thousands of lives depend
“ upon your pen. I trust and hope I shall see you,
“ notwithstanding all the *abuse* and *dirt* thrown at
“ you, *forgive personalities*, † and appear with that
“ lustre you before shone with *in* all medical sub-
“ jects,” &c.

* This insinuation is equally false and malignant—false,
because Dr. Thornton knows that Dr. MOSELEY is not at
all acquainted with Dr. SQUIRRELL—malignant, because
Dr. Thornton wishes to convey a disreputable idea of Dr.
SQUIRRELL, with whom he himself has been for years on
the most intimate footing of association, and to whom he
is under very great obligations.

† These remarks, addressed to a man whom he has at-
tempted to traduce by every species of wretched, impotent
vulgarity!

Dr. Thornton addressed a complimentary letter to me
on the *good* which he said might be expected from my
“ Manual of Inoculation;” and in *Vaccinæ Vindicia*, he
calls Inoculation “ *murderous*,” abominates those who en-
courage it; and abuses the Legislature for not prohibiting
so baneful a practice!!—Such is Dr. Thornton’s *consistence*.

In the fifth—

“ Vaccinating whole *villages* and *Towns* in the
 “ North, six years ago—these *persons* have been
 “ most of them put to the Test, by exposure to small-
 “ pox infection—& by authentic information, received
 “ from the North—not *one* of my patients *have*
 “ received the small-pox.”

“ It is a cruelty to the Human Race—and a disgrace
 “ to the Profession—to *find* men so shutting their
 “ eyes—as *to assert* in a Title Page—Cow-pox No
 “ Security against Small-pox—and such titles Pasted
 “ on the Walls all around and in the Metropolis—and
 “ as far as my Information *reaches*, the cases are not
 “ sufficiently clear *as* to make even the slightest
 “ Grounds for Such a Title Page. Many of them I
 “ know to be *falsehoods* and many *Mistatements*,” &c.

In the sixth—

“ Might not *general inoculation* be ordered by Go-
 “ vernment—by *cow-poxing* the *Exceptions* to va-
 “ riolous Inoculation?—these being *established* well.”

In the seventh, which is addressed to Dr.
 ROWLEY—

“ Doctor, I am *affraid* to say the word dear, for
 “ I so far differ from you with regard to the cow-
 “ pox, and in defending a cause, I am *obligated* to
 “ use such strong expressions, that I *should* fear you
 “ might think I *was*, insincere.—

“ *I have* and shall *continue to give* you every cre-
 “ dit, which you most highly deserve, for your pro-

“ found knowledge * on *every other subject*, but the
 “ Cow-pox.—This is a branch of knowledge, *that*
 “ you *could not know before it was promulgated*—
 “ and therefore here *my experience* is equal to yours
 “ —*But* with this difference—*I* have practised the
 “ art—*I* saw some of its deficiencies—*I* attempted
 “ to bring it nearer perfection—and *I* drew upon
 “ myself suspicions *from not being blind* respect-
 “ ing it.—*I* proposed a *new mode* for inserting
 “ the matter—and a *new Place*—the Leg.—You,
 “ Sir, condemn the art from *some* results often, or
 “ *ever arising* from the artists—and permit me to
 “ say, that you have been so extremely *deficient* in
 “ obtaining the Facts—that I was astonished, *that we*
 “ *found nothing* of Dr. ROWLEY in this Part of
 “ Himself—and I could scarcely believe that one so
 “ illustrious could be *in this instance (only)* so ex-
 “ tremely deficient.—*Fearful* that such exposure
 “ might create pain—and altho’ applicable to one
 “ subject only, might, unintentionally, mislead,—I
 “ did offer—if my pen would wound sorely—only to
 “ confer about the Cases—and *destroy* my *observa-*
 “ *tions*—but you chose to abide by your cases.—and
 “ *bid* me publish my remarks on them—” &c.

“ I hope you will not think I *press hard* upon
 “ you—for I have said ‘ that Dr. ROWLEY might as
 “ ‘ well attempt to *stand* upon his head on a horse
 “ ‘ at full *gallop*, to amuse an *audience*, as to write
 “ ‘ to instruct mankind on the subject of the Cow-
 “ ‘ pox, which *he has never studied*’—”&c.

* This remark addressed to a man whom he “ seriously
 “ thought a lunatic.”—O rare Dr. Thornton !

***** “The idea to you at first was unpleasant—&
 “being made a substitute for small-pox, an untried
 “remedy for an established approved practice—a
 “doubtful Event for a certain blessing—you who had
 “long embraced small-pox inoculation, as the high-
 “est perfection of art—looked upon *this* as a man
 “who *chooses a whore deserting a wife,—and felt*
 “*so*” &c.

***** “variolous inoculation has brought on the
 “odium it merits, ‘*as the highest curse*’—for being
 “partial—it spreads the natural Disease. &c.

“10,000 *Souls* were vaccinated by me in the North
 “of England—Most of these in 6 years have been
 “where the small-pox was, & *remained* uninfected—
 “So far, *this* is equal to small-pox —& I reflect
 “also, I did not *benefit some*—& *thereby* injure
 “others.—&c.

“Adieu—wishing to see you zealous on the side
 “where *the Preference* should be,

“I have the honor to be,

“*Dear Doctor,*

“Your faithful obliged St.

“R. J. THORNTON.”

In the eighth—

“He writes me word it was not the case, neither
 “*him or his son ever* having had a Small-Pox patient
 “after Vaccination.”

In the ninth—

“Does it not appear *strainge* to you, that a person

“ with 3 children—& keeping a Servant—of a particular name—and *where* so extraordinary an occurrence happened—& *no* medical man—or other *persons should have* ever heard of such a name at Salisbury !” &c.

“ Dr. ROWLEY has caught up cases without such care, as they required, *and only by Number*.—I am certain you must feel as I do, and will not *blame* me for the scrutiny I have undertaken, & will *help me all that lies in your power*, & I have the honor to remain,” &c.

In the tenth—

“ If in early times wolves *were formerly—the same Legislative Wisdom*—might appear in this enlightened age.—against the small-pox—The Plague, supposed foolishly to exist in the air—a visitation from almighty God,—has ceased.”

In the eleventh—

“ Having written to Mr. Coates Surgeon Salisbury &c to enquire about Mr. Codlings children *being vaccinated*, & then having the small-pox—*they know no such name*.”

These are thy trophies, Ignorance and Thornton !

These are the letters of a *Critic*, who has run his head against Mr. BIRCH, because he wrote “abundance of children *have*,” the said

Critic not knowing that an aggregate noun may be followed by a plural verb !

The same Critic, "great and redoubted" (to use his friend Rowland Hill's beautiful expression), attempting to correct Dr. MOSELEY, *bit at* a relative instead of an antecedent. Not discerning that the error was typographical, he, who seems to know as little of *print*, as he does of writing, seized this bone of contention out of the mouth of Rowland Hill, who had already broken his teeth upon it, and nibbled away with about as much effect, as *his brother* in the fable *biting the file*.

In another place, he quarrelled with *the spelling* of a word, which, he might have seen, had been erroneously copied by the compositor from a former edition, where it was *correctly* printed ; as it was also *twice* in the very same leaf before his eyes. Thus, like that "botcher of words," Rowland Hill, Thornton did not "know a blunder of the press from "blunders like his own :"* and yet this horn-book critic has dared to attack Dr. MOSELEY, who has been abundantly proved, by the classical purity and elegance of his various literary performances, to be one of the best

* Moseley's Commentaries, p. 201,

scholars of the age : but as the Doctor himself has remarked, “ of what use is fine writing to Cow-Poxers ? ” *

Without even the smallest pretensions to accuracy ; indebted to hireling scribblers for all the literary fame which, among superficial readers, he may have acquired ; and destitute of the means of repelling or resisting one single dart of his powerful opponent—the resentment which Dr. Thornton’s egregious folly may provoke, would overwhelm him.

His only chance is, that Dr. MOSELEY being a sportsman, and accustomed to pursue *real game*, may not think it worth while to throw away powder and shot upon one of the cuckoo † species.

After the admonitions which Dr. Thornton has already received : and after *the rebukes wherewith* Dr. MOSELEY hath rebuked ROWLAND, the Stentor of the Jennerians, I know not whether most to admire, the vanity, the folly, or the impudence of such a writer as the author of *Vaccinæ Vindicia*, in presuming to provoke his mighty wrath.

* Moseley’s Comm. p. 169.

† Dr. Thornton calls Jenner, “ Great Investigator of the Arcana of the Cuckoo ! ” So the pedantic butler, Lingo, in the farce, exclaims to an old cheesemonger—“ Great Rusty-fusty !—Most sublime Porte ! ”

Dr. MOSELEY, with the penetrating glance of true science, discerned, in 1798, the havoc which the Cow-Pox would make in the intellects of some of his professional brethren, he foretold that it would lead to errors, and anticipated its failure. His consistency and firmness—his discretion and sagacity—the native courage of a great mind, which bade defiance to an host of opponents, and at length obtained a glorious victory over the combined force of numbers and clamour—afford to the Faculty of Medicine an example whose value his contemporaries are bound to appreciate; and whose influence will extend to future ages.

Dr. Pearson considered the investigation of the Cow-Pox as *a question of science*: but there were some authors, who regarded it merely as *a source of disputation*. Dr. Thornton joined this herd of scribblers, and determined to annoy by personalities, when he had been defeated by facts.

When Dr. Thornton advertised his intention “*to prove the falsity, or fallacy, of every case*” which had been laid before the public, adverse to vaccination; I certainly thought it necessary to defend myself from such an impeachment of my veracity: but neither on that occasion, nor on any other, have I said or done any thing to provoke the illiberality, im-

pertinence, and misrepresentation which I have experienced *from the pen* of Dr. Thornton. The Doctor accuses me of betraying *private conversation*, in order to make *him* utter *an absurdity*, which he says was not only *improbable*, but *impossible* ! Fortunately, those who are acquainted with me, will acquit me of such meanness ; and those who know Dr. Thornton, will readily allow, that the *absurdity* of the remark attributed to him, is a pretty strong proof that *he really uttered it*.

The truth is, that Dr. Thornton and I never had any *confidential intercourse* on the subject of the Cow-Pox :—it would have been extraordinary, if we had :—being almost entire strangers ; and avowedly maintaining opposite opinions.

Dr. Thornton's ungenerous design in the above aspersion is evident :—but it will lose its effect.

He calls me an anti-vaccinist *in armour* :—be it so—mine is the *armour of truth* :—I wish Dr. Thornton would for once try to exhibit himself in *such armour*.

Dr. Thornton farther asserts, that I have accused him of “suppressing *the particulars of* “*the case of Mr. Baillie's child*,”* and quotes these words with inverted commas, as if taken

* Vac. Vind. p. 235, note.

from my letter—adding, that the case “ was
“ already published.”

Dr. Thornton has thus, by *wilful* mis-quotation, conveyed to the public what is *not true*.

My remark was — “ it would have better
“ accorded with the character of a lover of
“ *truth and science*, if the Doctor had not suppressed *the particulars of his personal application to Mr. Baillie:*” * Those *particulars*, I repeat it, were *suppressed*:—*the case*, indeed, was published by Dr. Thornton—but in a manner so opposite to the real fact, that Mr. Baillie has since publicly, and in print, charged† Dr. Thornton with downright *falsehood* in the relation of it: *a charge*, which hangs over his head like the fatal sword. He has also declared, that he had “ not let slip
“ past a single case” ‡ of Dr. MOSELEY’s, but he not only “ let slip past” the case just mentioned, without attempting to expunge that stain of moral turpitude affixed on him by Mr. Baillie’s certificate; but totally avoided mentioning those of *Seyffort’s* children at *Chelsea*; *Amelia Haydon*, of *Mitcham*; *Mr. Sabridge’s* children; *Mr. Shaw’s* children; the young lady at *Exeter*; *Batsford’s* son, seen by

* Moseley’s Commentaries, p. 165.

† Baillie’s certificate, *ibid*, p. 239.

‡ *Vac. Vind.* p. 178.

Rowland Hill, and allowed by that great medical character to have had the Small-Pox so decidedly, that it was “*of no use to tell a lie about it* ;” *Clayton’s child* ; *Mr. Grimaldi’s son* ; *Sarah Parrot* and *Jane Soan*, of *Windsor* ; *Mr. Hayward’s child*, of *Tottenham-court-Road* ; *Brockwell’s child* ; *Burley’s child* ; *Hussey’s*, of the *Borough* ; and the grand-children of that truly learned and venerable prelate *Dr. Percy*, Lord Bishop of *Dromore*, &c. &c. all in that very edition of *Dr. Moseley’s* book, from which *Dr. Thornton* has made a partial selection, and then so elegantly told the public that he had “*not let slip past a single case!*”

Nay more, he has altogether omitted the cases of the two *MABERS*, to whom the public are indebted for having opened the eyes of the gentlemen at the *Broad-street Institution* ; and compelled them to acknowledge, that “*no one can be authenticated to be secure from the Small-Pox by vaccine inoculation.*”

Alluding to these cases affords me a pleasing opportunity of recording, with the respect it deserves, the candour of *Dr. Pearson*, who, like a true philosopher, a good physician, and an honest man, has fairly conceded to the opposers of vaccination, that that practice is NOT A SECURITY AGAINST THE

SMALL-POX: that it is productive of NEW DISEASES,* and is sometimes FATAL.

Thus have the infallibility and the fame of the Jennerian practice gradually declined: and every subterfuge by which it was attempt-

* In a desultory publication by Dr. Willan, on which I have hastily cast a single glance, this fact seems partly denied, but in a manner not very intelligible. Dr. Willan says, that "a few cases of morbid appearances, not necessarily connected with the specific disease, may be excited by vaccine inoculation:" and instances the cases of Mr. Watts's children, of St. Mary-Axe. He does not tell the public, as he ought to have done, that these children *died* in consequence of a disease produced by vaccination: although, in order to cover such "*unfortunate accidents*," the most unjustifiable calumnies were circulated respecting the previous health of the children and the parents; and every species of excuse set up, rather than admit two fatal cases of Cow-Pox inoculation in fine healthy infants, who had never previously had any symptoms of disease.

Dr. Willan, who says that he is no *partisan*, seems to think that the opposers of vaccination, whom he calls "Cow-Pox ravens," are so blind and ignorant, as to mistake scrophula for those abscesses, ulcerations, and cutaneous affections, which are observed to follow the Cow-Pox. As Dr. MOSELEY is well known to have had more experience in cutaneous diseases than perhaps any physician in the world, (I am far from excepting Dr. Willan) I hope he will condescend to examine Dr. Willan's remarks. I commend the Doctor to his lenity—for he will have much need of it: and will only observe, that either Dr. Willan has seen at least *one new* disease subsequent to vaccination, or is not well acquainted with the Small-Pox! For example—Mr.

ed to be defended, has yielded in turn to the glorious and splendid influence of Truth.

That *miracle* in pathology—that the Cow-Pox could not prevent its own recurrence, but was capable, *even without influencing the constitution*, of destroying the susceptibility of variolous contagion, has been expressly contradicted by the man most “famed for experience, or renowned for science,” among the supporters of vaccination. The good example which Dr. PEARSON has recently

Hayward’s child, of Tottenham-court-Road, who had the Cow-Pox about three years before, had an eruption in April last, which was preceded by fever, head-ache, and vomiting. Dr. Willan saw this eruption, and (as I am informed by Mrs. Hayward) said that it was not *properly* the Small-Pox. Mr. DANIEL SUTTON and myself declared that *it was*: inoculated with matter taken from pustules on the neck and loins, and produced the SMALL-Pox *properly*.

Either the original disease must therefore have been the Small-Pox, contrary to Dr. Willan’s assertion; or it must have been a NEW disease, *equally* capable of producing Small-Pox by inoculation!

Hereafter, I hope, Dr. Willan will either be silent about the Small-Pox; or not deny that *a new disease* sometimes follows the *Cow-Pox*.

Dr. Willan also attended Mr. Grimaldi’s son, who had a disease for years, which, *I suppose, was NEW*, for it was treated as the itch without being relieved: and the child being afterwards placed under the care of Dr. MOSELEY, he (as Mrs. Grimaldi informs me) considered the disease to be Scabies Bovilla, treated it accordingly, and *effected a cure*.

shewn to all who have been persuaded, cajoled, or influenced into a favourable opinion of the Cow-Pox, as *a safe and infallible preventive* of the Small-Pox: affords a solid ground, at least for hope, that the remaining errors which prevail relative to the supposed advantages of a second vaccination, will be *speedily abandoned*.

For the Cow-Pox is *a temporary security*; and no more. This was the original report of its character by the Gloucestershire practitioners and farmers, who had been long acquainted with the disease. This accords with experience, and is reconcilable with true pathology. Its influence in the human system gradually wears out. Mr. D. SUTTON, as well as myself, found that the Small-Pox was usually communicated with greater or less facility to persons who had had the Cow-Pox, in proportion as they had been vaccinated at an earlier or later period previous to inoculation; and that the degree of the subsequent disease was generally influenced by the same circumstance.

But unless *the duration* of the prophylactic effect of vaccine matter can be ascertained, the danger of becoming infected with the Small-Pox must be *almost continual*, particularly as a great variety of circumstances may lead to such changes and alterations, as are

capable of diminishing the influence of the Cow-Pox in the system ; or, of subduing it altogether.

Therefore the experiment of a second vaccination can not be, in any case, conclusive ; for, it being acknowledged that vaccine matter has some tendency to oppose, for an uncertain time, the influence of Small-Pox infection — a repetition of the operation of inserting such matter (which, it is not pretended, can be done in a more effectual manner than has been hitherto practised) can, at most, only postpone the period at which the system shall again become liable to the variolous infection.

And if the Cow-Pox have any power to diminish the activity of variolous matter, and retard or interrupt the Small-Pox—it is evident that the insertion of both kinds of matter at the same time, as lately proposed at the Broad-street institution, can *not* afford any reasonable ground for security or confidence ; but *may lead to* a false and fatal deception.

A reference to the case of Mr. Smith's daughter, inserted at page 18, and numerous other instances, justify the above reasoning so completely, that whatever be the fate of the crude opinions of Dr. Thornton, as mouth-piece of the Jennerian society, I feel *a perfect confidence*, not only that Dr. PEARSON, but

every other sensible man in the profession, will speedily abandon the lingering attachment with which some of the faculty seem disposed still to cling to an ill-founded and unreasonable hypothesis.

Dr. Thornton is not satisfied with disgracing his employers by personal abuse and misrepresentation, but he has thought proper to become a trader in caricatures.

Dr. Willan recommended *silence* to Dr. Thornton as the best method *he could take* to disarm the antagonists of vaccination. He *brutishly* disregarded this salutary advice, and ran his *vituline head* against the *most despicable* species of annoyance.

If Dr. Willan wrote to him in *latin*, as he asserts he did, Dr. Thornton might have some excuse for not understanding him; but I receive all the Doctor's reports with great caution, since the publication of Mr. Baillie's son's case: and the specimen of Dr. Willan's *elegance*, selected by his correspondent Thornton, multiplies my doubts on the subject.

The passage quoted from Dr. Willan's letter is as barbarous in latinity, as it is vulgar and indecent in sentiment.

When Dr. Willan reads *Pliny*, from whom he borrowed the idea conveyed in the passage alluded to, I would advise him to study, that

author's elegance of style, rather than to search for pert expressions of invective. These, without reading *latin* or *english*, he may find in the correspondence of his friend Thornton, to whom all writers, ancient and modern, must yield *the palm of scurrility*!—a most enviable distinction!

Dr. PEARSON did *not* write to Dr. Thornton in *latin*, he knew better than to *cast pearls before swine*: but if he said, “the men whom Dr. Thornton was going to refute merited only contempt,”* he must have been prompted by the same Taurine spirit which has brutalized the manners of Thornton; and great indeed must have been the Doctor's humiliation, to have been since compelled to yield to the arguments of those very persons, at whom he had “shaken *his head*” so disdainfully.

Mr. Cline, according to Thornton's account, was more prudent, for he expressed an unwillingness that Dr. Thornton should bring forward *his name* among “*nonsense*!”

I was for some time at a loss to discover the Doctor's intention in republishing a print of the old woman with horns. I did not even suspect *him* of *wit*, and I looked in vain for *meaning*. I thought it might be an engraving from one of his *family pictures*, strayed from

his Linnæan gallery, until I was informed by a friend of Dr. Thornton, that it was intended as a *caricature of Dr. ROWLEY*.

This was a most unlucky *butt*:—for Dr. ROWLEY's activity and energy of disposition were remarkable. His was as opposite as possible to that species of character which is called *old-womanish*. The *sexual* sarcasm is therefore lost. As to *the horns*—had Dr. ROWLEY been an *airy* visionist, a mere “culler of simples,” and a *married man*, he perhaps might have deserved them, like *some of his neighbours*.

Dr. Thornton is fond of caricatures, and so it seems is his friend Jenner*, who held a correspondence with him on the subject: but it was surely neither humane nor decorous to caricature the miserable objects of Cow-Pox

* An indication of this appeared in the early stage of Cow-Poxing, in the publication of a placard, around which are depicted, in a variety of groups, maimed and mutilated cripples deploring the ravages of the Small-Pox; sturdy blacksmiths hard at work, forging falsehoods respecting vaccination; while Dr. Jenner is represented in an elegant attitude, without his hat, under a tree in the middle of a field, either looking for a cuckoo's nest, or listening to a dialogue between a milk-maid and a Cow-Doctor. This publication is now become very scarce; but many copies were formerly distributed, gratis, at ale-houses and Cow-Pox stations, as memorials of the *ingenuity* and *taste* of the vaccinators.

mischief, as he has done in the case of Joules's son, and of Mary Ann Lewis.

Such deplorable victims of folly and infatuation, seduced from the paths of security and peace, into danger and sufferings, by the promises of Cow-Poxers, are not fit subjects for mirth or ridicule.

What would Dr. Thornton have thought of me, if I had prefaced these remarks with a likeness of one of his own "*sweet babes*," as he calls them, dying in the Small-Pox—and had under-written—*an infant perishing through the ignorance of an unskilful inoculator*—a scene in *Hinde-street*: witnesses, Mr. Cruikshank, who was not the inoculator, and Dr. Thornton——?

And yet the Doctor might have repelled such an insult:—he might have caricatured me in return. The poor persons, whose children he has so unfeelingly exhibited, can not resent the inhuman act, they are no match for a furious enthusiast, disregarding every humane and generous feeling; therefore, the man who thus tramples on poverty and distress—"hath the greater sin."

In another part of his book, Dr. Thornton talks of *his judgment*: this *judgment*, as he calls it, does not enable him to perceive that on the subject of the Cow-Pox, Dr. MOSELEY has even *wit*.

Nobody supposes that Dr. Thornton's judgment is very *clear*, but he has writhed and twisted so much under the lash, that he *must have felt* the force of Dr. MOSELEY's *wit*:—whether he *understood it or not*, is another question. It will be fortunate for him if he do not feel it as long as he lives.

Rowland Hill does understand it, for on the perusal of Dr. MOSELEY's "Cow-Pox Epistle," he took down his Cow-Pox sign-board under the wing of his chapel, and, it is said, resolved never to *take out his lancet again*: being heartily ashamed of his vaccinating project, and determined to confine himself in future to "Surrey-Chapel spoutings," and the correction of the *vice* of lying,—in consequence of a hint from the *Vice suppressing-Society*.

Dr. Thornton's *judgment* has however disposed him to commend monotonous jargon, flippancy, and impudence: to applaud villainous calumniators of the living, dastardly defamers of the dead, and the *stupendous wisdom* of a Cow-Pox luminary, who recommends vaccination as *a cure for cancers*!

So much for Dr. Thornton's judgment!

Abusing the dead is so detestable to all candid and liberal persons, that only few words are necessary on the subject of Dr. Thornton's indecent conduct towards the memory of Dr. ROWLEY; who, in his life-time, amidst all

the ribaldry and scurrility with which he was assailed by Dr. Thornton, and other scribblers, never lost his good-humour; nor uttered one ungenerous expression to the prejudice of Dr. Thornton. Of him, and of his behaviour in the Cow-Pox controversy, Dr. ROWLEY always spoke with the greatest compassion; for he was aware of Dr. Thornton's deficiency of understanding, and pitied the vanity which prompted him to enlist under the Jennerian banners, knowing that such patronage could not give

“ to airy nothing,

“ A local habitation and a name.”

It is not surprising, that a furious fanatic, like Rowland Hill, who talks of *Deity* as he does of *old clothes*, and sports all manner of impertinences and impurities—even in the sanctuary—it is not at all surprising that such a *ranter* should forget the respect due to departed worth: but that Mr. Blair, who is said to be a man of some *education*, if not of abilities, to whom, as he himself acknowledges, Dr. ROWLEY never gave *any cause of offence* :* should have joined in the same *evil work*, and in a manner so vehement and indecent, reflects equal disgrace on his profession, and on his moral character.

* Blair's Vaccine Controversy.

Language has been tortured for epithets of insult to wound the feelings of Dr. ROWLEY's friends. The Billingsgate vocabulary, used by two or three preceding dirty scribblers, being exhausted by Rowland Hill, Blair, and Thornton, recourse was had even to the fictions of poets, for effusions of calumny and abuse.

Dr. Thornton boasted that *he had killed* Dr. ROWLEY, by the uneasiness he had occasioned him, on the subject of vaccination!

Dr. Thornton declared that he would have the last word in the controversy! But these were the *bellowings* of the same person who stated in the public newspapers, that he had "*completely refuted* ALL Dr. ROWLEY's cases," *before* he had investigated *one* of them:—of the same "Cow-Pox wizard," who told the Earl of Lonsdale, that Cow-Poxing was "*a plan for the annihilation of death.*" *

Dr. Thornton's abuse of Dr. ROWLEY has been so diabolical, that I have no hesitation in saying, he would not have dared to publish it, before the death of his opponent—nor do I think he would now, were he not *a lunatic*. Madmen have an inveterate hatred against one another; and Thornton, believing Dr. ROWLEY to be like himself, has pursued him "*beyond the visible diurnal sphere;*" or, to use

* See Thornton's Dedication, prefixed to his Facts decisive in Favour of the Cow-Pock.

the sublime language which Dr. MOSELEY has applied on the same occasion to Rowland Hill, "up to the very doors of heaven."

Dr. Thornton has *circulated* a report that Dr. ROWLEY made a pecuniary collection among his pupils and auditors, on the exhibition of Frederick Joules (the Cow-Pox ox-faced boy) at his lecture; and instead of giving the money to the poor child, "pocketed it himself."

Mrs. Joules declares that Dr Thornton reported this to her, on the authority (as *he* said) of "a stout gentleman, dressed in black," who was present in the lecture-room when Frederick Joules was shewn there.

This "gentleman in black" could have been no other than Dr. Thornton's *familiar*; for none else would have forged so vile a calumny.*

I have conversed with many gentlemen who were present at Dr. ROWLEY's introductory lecture, and many who regularly attended the Doctor: they all contradict this infamous assertion, and express their detestation of the unexampled profligacy which could dictate such atrocious slander.

Dr. Thornton, prompted, perhaps, by this "gentleman in black," or by the Jennerian society, has even attempted to make the pub-

* "Nay, then, let the Devil wear black."—*Hamlet*.

lic believe, that Dr. ROWLEY's opinions respecting Vaccination were changed on his death-bed, and that he had addressed a letter to him (Dr. Thornton) on the subject.

I am AUTHORISED by Dr. ROWLEY's family, his friends, and medical attendants, to declare that *this also is a* POSITIVE FALSEHOOD.

The principles on which the Cow-Pox was originally opposed, have been at length admitted: those on which it was defended, have been abandoned.

Unlike other medical disputes, the Cow-Pox brought into notice in 1798, after engrossing the attention of the faculty, not only in England, but (if the friends of Vaccination may be credited) throughout the world, has, in these few years, yielded to the sound arguments of its opposers.

In this country, and almost as soon as Dr. Jenner had announced his discovery, Dr. MOSELEY opposed to it a clear, manly, and philanthropic effort to stem the torrent of prejudice, and arrest the public determination respecting a subject on which it was impossible to form an hasty or immediate judgment. He was treated with inconceivable impertinence and disrespect: science and learning were disclaimed, and experience was abjured. Dr. MOSELEY also first exposed the falla

cious doctrine of Vaccination,—has borne the buffetings of the tempest with calmness and fortitude; and lived to see the day in which his opinions have been submitted to; and the justness of his prophetic aphorisms acknowledged, even by his most vehement opponents.

I know no objection men of science, or philosophers, can make, even to the severity of ridicule with which the Doctor has treated some of his unscientific and unphilosophical antagonists; unless it be that he has “damned them to everlasting fame” in his *TREATISE*, and *COMMENTARIES*, by recording insignificant names, in writings, of which the wit, the excellence, and the force, justify my assertion, that though they must perish, it will only be, when science itself shall be forgotten, and language be no more.*

It now remains for me to add a few words on the part which I have taken in this controversy.

On my settling in London, I discovered,

* *Treatise on Lues Bovilla, or Cow-Pox*; published in September, 1798: *Commentaries on the Cow-Pox*; published in March, 1806. These works have been translated into all the European languages; and have influenced the practitioners in America, (where the evils Dr. M. predicted, have already appeared) to renounce Vaccination.

that the opinions which had been so generally circulated in this country, respecting the Cow-Pox, were opposed by many practitioners of distinguished eminence, besides those who had published on the subject. Dr. MOSELEY, of whose abilities and experience his writings had sufficiently informed me, had been joined by my worthy and valued friend, Dr. ROWLEY, and supported by many other respectable gentlemen. The motives which induced me to engage in the dispute, were not to make myself known either as a professional man, or as a controversial writer. The voice of truth, unconnected with either interest or vanity, allured me: and although, from the characters and violence of some of the vaccinating enthusiasts, and the experience of writers on the same subject, I was aware of the impotent attacks of offended ignorance, which, when defeated, always quits the field with scurrility and abuse; thus powerfully attracted, opposition, destitute of argument or reason, was set at defiance. The elucidation of science was my only object.

If my labours meet with the approbation of the candid and liberal, I shall be amply rewarded in the reflection, that I have not been a timid and idle spectator of one of the most important discussions which has at any time engaged the attention of medical

men: and shall congratulate my good fortune, in having borne a part in establishing the triumph of truth over as great an outrage as ever disgraced the civilized world.

G. L.

8th October, 1806.

P. S.—What recompense can be made to the feelings of society, and to insulted humanity, by those persons who obstinately persist in the practice of Vaccination, after such melancholy occurrences as the following?

Mrs. Fenner, of Paradise-row, Stockwell, *now* lies dead of the confluent Small-Pox, after having had the natural Cow-Pox several times, from milking, when a dairy-maid in the country. She was in the thirtieth week of pregnancy with her fifth child; and notwithstanding this shocking instance of the fatal consequences of relying on the security of the Cow-Pox, the person who attended her, VACCINATED the four children during their mother's illness!

THE END.

Speedily will be published by the same Author,

IN ONE VOLUME, QUARTO,

PATHOLOGICAL DISQUISITION

CONCERNING

THE GOUT.

THE END.

