

**Observations on some late attempts to depreciate the value and efficacy of vaccine inoculation / [Samuel Merriman].**

**Contributors**

Merriman, Samuel, 1771-1852.

**Publication/Creation**

London : J. Murray, 1805.

**Persistent URL**

<https://wellcomecollection.org/works/k9cf62xt>

**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](mailto:library@wellcomecollection.org)  
<https://wellcomecollection.org>

36533/P

**OBSERVATIONS**  
**ON**  
**VACCINE INOCULATION.**

THE COLLEGE

OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

LIBRARY

OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

OBSERVATIONS

ON THE

ON

THE INOCULATION

OF THE SMALL POX

IN THE CITY OF NEW YORK

IN THE YEAR 1799

BY

JOHN HENRY

OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

MDCCXCIX

NEW YORK

PRINTED BY

JOHN HENRY

OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

MDCCXCIX

NEW YORK

PRINTED BY

JOHN HENRY



OBSERVATIONS  
ON  
SOME LATE ATTEMPTS TO DEPRECIATE  
THE VALUE AND EFFICACY  
OF  
VACCINE INOCULATION;

---

By SAMUEL MERRIMAN.

---

This practice still meets with unreasonable opposition from the obstinacy of prejudiced men, who have not only employed every plausible argument, but have been guilty of disingenuousness and misrepresentation, in order to discountenance and suppress it. But it must be mentioned to the honour of the physicians of this country, that very early the *most respected part* of them became its warm friends, and that (contrary to a well-known prediction) *they had virtue enough to destroy such a considerable part of their revenue for the good of mankind.*

SIR GEORGE BAKER'S "Inquiry into the Merits of a Method  
of Inoculating the Small Pox, 1766."

---

London:  
Published by JOHN MURRAY, 32, Fleet Street.

---

1805.

86819



---

Printed by G. SIDNEY,  
Northumberland Street, Strand.

## OBSERVATIONS.

---

WHEN the fortunate discovery of Vaccination was first made known, a certain degree of doubt and hesitation very naturally possessed the public mind respecting its value. In a very short time these doubts were dissipated; the evidence of its success in resisting the Small Pox contagion was considered to be so satisfactory, that the practice, notwithstanding some opposition, was generally thought to be established on a solid basis. Of late some fresh attacks have been made upon it, and in many instances these have been conducted with so much success as to shake the faith of several well-wishers to the practice, and greatly to alarm many others.

*Ecce ruunt, magnisque Urbem Terroribus implent.*

Among the most determined opposers of Vaccination, Dr. Moseley stands pre-eminent. Very early he subjected it to the test of ridicule; yet it rose in the public estimation, because it was evident, that his prejudices were the result of theory, not



of experiment. This attempt not having succeeded, the learned Doctor has renewed his endeavours, and has published his Objections in a new edition of the Treatise, on what he calls "The Lues Bovilla," or Cow Pox, by which he expects to set Vaccination entirely aside.

It has been confidently asserted, that this pamphlet contains such irresistible arguments, and such decisive cases, against the Inoculation of the Cow Pox, as could in no way be got over. I thought it, therefore, a duty which I owed to myself and those patients who confide in me, to procure and peruse this Treatise of his; for, if so much mischief were to be the consequence of Vaccination, as was stated to be therein *positively proved*, it would be incumbent upon me, in conjunction with every other honest man, not only to discontinue that method of inoculation, but to express the conviction openly, that I had seen reason to alter my opinion on the subject.

After a very attentive and impartial examination of this pamphlet, I have not the slightest hesitation in declaring, that I remain unconvinced, notwithstanding the arguments, the ridicule, and the assertions which it contains. The greater part of his deductions, indeed, have no better foundation than may be derived from the old exploded inference of *post hoc, ergo propter hoc*.

Before I proceed to animadvert upon some parts

of this Treatise, I deem it necessary to contradict an insinuation, which there is a manifest desire throughout of enforcing, viz. that some interested motive is at the bottom of every endeavour to promote and extend the practice of Vaccine Inoculation. Nothing is more clearly demonstrable than the contrary. Every medical man, who practises or recommends Vaccination, is a loser by his philanthropy. Exclusive of the very great number of persons whose children have been vaccinated gratuitously, (and among them are many who used to pay for variolous inoculation) those, who formerly gave large fees, give now much smaller ones, and among the middling classes, the fee is generally diminished one half:---add to this, that the diffusion of the Small Pox by contagion, a very considerable source of profit, is almost at an end. These severe losses are, however, submitted to without a murmur, by a very great majority of practitioners, who, to their honor be it spoken, suffer not the desire of gain to prevail over the dictates of their conscience, and the desire of doing good. Can the opposers of Vaccination lay their hands on their hearts and declare, that they are influenced by the same honest motives.

It is consoling to think, that though some practitioners endeavour to discountenance and suppress Vaccination, yet the most respectable physicians, those at the very head of the profession, the men of highest talents and abilities, of



consummate judgment and strictest investigation, who cannot possibly derive any pecuniary emolument from the practice, give it their most cordial interest and support. Even Dr. Moseley, in his own pamphlet, records the names of many of these truly estimable men, who have unanimously declared,\* that they never knew any mischief or injury to arise from Vaccination; and, in confirmation of this opinion, have submitted, and continue to submit, their own children, and grandchildren, to the process.

Can it be possible, that these gentlemen willfully persist in error? Can it possibly be their wish to deceive the public? Or, are we to be told, that they are less capable than Dr. Moseley of forming a judgment between the merits of the two species of Inoculation? Individually, their opportunities of acquiring information are, at least, equal, and, collectively, infinitely superior to his. Is it, then, to be supposed, that they would still suffer their names to be quoted and appealed to,

---

\* Mr. Goldson, in his "Recent Cases," page 94, affects to believe, that the signatures to this declaration were obtained through the importunate solicitations of a few zealous partisans of Vaccination. He says, "whoever refused their assent, prudently wishing to wait for more experience, were accused of sacrificing the welfare of society to their own individual interest." How absurd to suppose, that the first physicians and surgeons in London could be influenced by the insinuations of a few zealous partisans, to sign a testimonial, contrary to their real sentiments!

if they had met with a twentieth part of the evils arising from the Cow Pox, which he alleges he has seen? These are not men who would promulgate falsehoods, even to benefit themselves; certainly not, then, when it would be the means of injuring their own practice.

I know not, whether Dr. Moseley be the inventor of the term "Bestial Humour;" but he appears to have a father's fondness for it;---accordingly, in the second page of his Preface, is revived the favorite expression. This term has been, now, so long bandied about, that it has quite lost its power of terrifying. The Doctor, however, still announces this *Bestial Humour*, as capable of producing lameness, blindness, and deformity; and asserts, "that it has, by its fatal venom, removed many an infant untimely from the world." As if these effects were not sufficiently horrid, he, in a subsequent part of the pamphlet, page 11, denounces a still heavier curse on the introduction of this tremendous humour. "Who knows," he exclaims with prophetic rage, "but that the human character may undergo strange mutations from *quadrupedan* sympathy; and, that some modern Pasiphæe may rival the fables of old?"

Remove the Delphic obscurity of this sentence, and the vulgar may learn to fear, that the introduction of this *Bestial Humour* will so alter the constitutions of mankind, or rather of woman-



kind, as to make our females fall in love with bulls, and generate Minotaurs.

Can it be possible, that any man should be so infatuated as to believe, that such sheer nonsense as this is to upset a practice founded on the experience of the most judicious and able physicians and surgeons in the world? Is it to be supposed, that a grave physician, wishing merely to instruct and inform his fellow creatures, would fill his pages with such unmeaning, such impertinent declamation? Or does he expect, that the world will give credit to a publication, contaminated with so disgusting an insinuation?

For the vulgar, and the most ignorant of the vulgar only, can such arguments be intended. It is astonishing, then, that he who appears desirous, solely, of courting the applauses of this class of people, should attempt to make them believe, that no mischief whatever can be produced by the Small Pox, even if matter for inoculation be taken from patients labouring under "inveterate scurvy, scrophula, the itch, the venereal disease, or consumptions!"---nay, that matter may be safely taken after death, from those who have died of a confluent Small Pox, and from those who are in a state of putrefaction!

Very different is the general opinion. No caution is more earnestly impressed on inoculators by parents, than that they should chuse a favorable sort, and healthy subjects, to take matter



from. This attempt to remove prejudices is, therefore, fatal to the cause the Doctor advocates. For, if he can persuade the public, that it is perfectly safe to inoculate the Small Pox from human subjects so loaded with disease as he describes, they will hardly believe, that such baneful effects as his Treatise affirms, can be produced by matter taken from the cow,---an animal whose flesh affords us the most wholesome diet, and upon whose milk depends the very existence of many a helpless infant, many a debilitated adult.

Though a great number of persons continue to hold the opinion, that Variolous Inoculation is capable of producing other diseases, I believe there is no doubt that Dr. Moseley is correct in asserting, "It is true also, that no other disease can be carried into the habit by the Small Pox." But if this be true of one species of morbid contagion, it must be so of all. There is a unity throughout Nature's laws which cannot be broken. Thus a specific effect is produced by the infection of the measles, the hooping cough, the plague, and the scarlet fever; and the infection of each is incapable of producing any other than its own specific effect. It is the same with Inoculation. Small Pox virus can only produce Small Pox; the matter of chicken pox can only produce that disease; nor can any other than its specific effect be produced by the Cow Pox. Each

is a disease, *sui generis*, capable of propagating its like ; but incapable of exceeding its limited effect ; otherwise Nature's laws would be perpetually broken and counteracted. If, therefore, the Vaccine virus had ever produced any other disease than that simple effect which thousands have witnessed, such disease must uniformly attend the insertion of it ; the contrary of which we know to be a fact.

Dr. Moseley's pamphlet, indeed, as well as some others, tells of a variety of eruptions, head aches, wastings, &c. which are said to have occurred after the Cow Pox ; and are, therefore, very unphilosophically attributed to it.

The same has been repeatedly said of Variolous Inoculation. The opposers of that beneficial practice filled their writings with arguments of the same nature. Hear what Dr. Wagstaffe says ; " Though the real Small Pox be ingrafted by incision, yet there is no reason in Nature, *and we see experience confirms it*, but that it may produce an eruption of quite another sort, as perhaps a chicken pox." Here experience is declared to have confirmed, what we know never did, nor ever could, happen. Again, " I am informed, from persons of integrity and skill, that this very matter has been translated on the bones, and made them foul and carious ; and in others again occasioned an hectic fever, which may pro-



bably end in a consumption." \* Cases too were freely published detailing the lamentable effects of Inoculation. Many of these cases, on which very great stress was laid, are equal to any which have since been related as occurring in consequence of Vaccination. It may be worth while to give the particulars of one of these, in order to shew how little difficult it is to bring forward cases against Variolation, at least as striking and forcible as can possibly be reported by the most confident opposer of Vaccination.

" The case of Miss Rolt. †

" Communicated by one who was an eye-witness of it, from the beginning to the end.

" Miss Rolt, between nine and ten years of age, had enjoyed for above a twelvemonth perfect health, and being pronounced by the Inoculator a proper subject for the experiment, was inoculated September the 25th; she had had the measles in a favourable way about two months before: she had been purged four times, and had not the least cough after the distemper was over. The Inoculator gave assurances, that it should be a very mild sort; that nothing should ail her in ten days after the operation; and, that when they came out she might run about the room. He

---

\* Wagstaffe's Letter to Dr. Friend, p. 60.

† Published by Bryan Robinson, M. D. 1725.



ordered her not to eat any meat in ten days, which was punctually complied with. Upon the eruption he wished her joy, and said, she was now in for it; however, about five or six days after the Inoculation, she began to complain of symptoms common to the distemper, and in particular of violent pains in her joints. Three or four days after that, the Small Pox appeared in an irregular manner, breaking out in a cluster of red pimples, first in one place, then in another; but, at length, proved as full as possible, and the confluent sort. Upon the eighth day the fever was very high, and she grew delirious. A physician was called in, who apprehended so much danger, that he desired the assistance of another. She was let blood, which, with other methods, recovered her from the imminent hazard of life; but the next morning they perceived several tumors, particularly about the joints, the parts she so grievously complained of before the eruption.

“ These daily increased and spread all over her; some of these tumors were opened; the surgeon lanced her seven times in one morning.

“ The humor that was continually discharged from these imposthumations was of so sharp and virulent a nature that it eat away the flesh, and gnawed the ligaments asunder, so that the bones rattled one against another. Her limbs were tied up in pasteboard; notwithstanding which, if she



had lived a little longer, they must have dropt off from the rest of the body.

“ The first incisions never healed ; and it was remarkable, that no one sore which was opened either by the knife or the caustic, could ever be healed during all the time of her illness.

“ The physicians attended for above a month, but as it was purely a case of surgery, they had little else to do than to stand by and look on that terrible piece of work the *Inoculator* had made for himself.

“ In this deplorable condition she continued upwards of six weeks, being in most exquisite pain upon the least motion. Another surgeon was called in, some days before her death ; but he chose to look on, and never would open any of the wounds himself. After her death the nurse took off thirty-five plasters, besides several swellings which never had been opened : and the bones started out of the wounds of the joints, and were mortified.”

A similar account of this case was attested under the hand writing of the honourable Mrs. Rolt, the young lady's mother.

This, and some other cases which made a great noise at the time, produced such a sensation as greatly discouraged the practice. Howgrave, indeed, one of its most virulent enemies, cries out, “ *Io triumphé*, a complete victory is gained ! I have *proved*, that the hazard of Inoculation is not only



not considerably less, but considerably greater than that of the natural Small Pox. I hope, therefore, there will now be an end of the dispute, at least, among physicians, and *since this point is so fairly determined in the negative, the practice of Inoculation must on all hands be given up.* \*

Notwithstanding the decided opposition which was so steadily made to the progress of Inoculation, ---notwithstanding the adverse cases which were published and reported against it, the intrinsic value of the practice, and its generally successful issue, caused it at last to obtain universal approbation. The Wagstaffe's, the Massey's, and the Howgrave's died and were forgotten; their works are only remembered as examples of illiberality, casuistry, and prejudice.

It is evident from the success which afterwards attended it, that the practice of Inoculation excited alarm and opposition, more because it militated against the prejudices and interest of the then race of practitioners, than because it was in itself injurious. Whatever illness or disease, therefore, occurred after Variolation was attributed by the ill-judging and prejudiced to that operation, exactly as is now done with regard to Vaccination. Misrepresentation and exaggeration, malevolence and rancour, had nearly overwhelmed one

---

\* Howgrave's Reasons against Inoculation, p. 72.



of the most beneficial discoveries which the art of medicine had ever experienced. The same prejudices, the same illiberality, the same arts, are employed to suppress the present great discovery; but it still flourishes, and I doubt not will continue to flourish in spite of the most determined efforts of its opposers.

-----Injuriōso nec Pede prouent  
Stantem Columnam.

After all that has been written, or said, against this practice, its expediency as a substitute for the Inoculation of the Small Pox must eventually be determined by the answers to the two following interrogatories.

1st. Does the Cow Pox prove a permanent means of preserving the habit from Variolous infection?

2ndly. Do those who have been submitted to this process acquire, or become subject to any other disease in consequence?

Respecting the first, we have undeniable evidence, that many thousands have been preserved from Variolous infection for several years, and a few have had fifty and seventy years experience of its powers in this respect; though frequently exposed to the contagion of Small Pox.

Many reports, indeed, have been industriously propagated of persons who have had the Small Pox after Vaccination; but in most instances either the after-eruption was not the Small Pox, or the Vacci-

nating process had been deficient in some very essential particulars.

Admitting, however, that some cases may have occurred, in which the true Small Pox has appeared after what was believed to be the genuine Cow Pox; yet these cases have not happened so often as once in five thousand times.

If, therefore, the Cow Pox secures from the Small Pox in 4999 cases out of 5000, the probability is, either, that there was some defect in the efficacy of the Cow Pock virus; or, that the constitution of the patient was in that one instance not susceptible of the prophylactic power of Vaccination.

The failure of Small Pox Inoculation, under similar circumstances, in preserving the habit from subsequent infection is universally known and acknowledged. Repeated instances of the kind have been published, and further enquiry would bring many more to light. The publication by Lord Westmeath of the case of his children is a recent and remarkable instance of this. \* Either then the Variolous Inoculation, though properly

---

*\* Copy of a Letter to Dr. Jenner.*

“ SIR,

“ Understanding that a report has been industriously circulated, which, if believed, would tend much to weaken that confidence which is at present so generally and so justly entertained by the public in your system of Inoculation for the Cow Pox, namely, that my youngest son had taken the natural Small Pox,



conducted, sometimes fails in producing its genuine effect on the constitution, or the genuine Small Pox has occasionally occurred twice in the same person. As it never has been contended, that the Cow Pox was superior to the Small Pox in its prophylactic virtues, its strongest advocates will be willing to admit the possibility that Vaccination might fail where Variolation could not secure from re-infection.

---

after having been vaccinated, I think it but justice to you to contradict the report; and to state for your satisfaction the real circumstances of the case, which are as follows:

“ When he was about two months old, he was inoculated for the Small Pox, in the Suttonian method, by a physician in Ireland, who has been very generally successful in Inoculation, and pronounced, by him, to be entirely free from the risk of infection; notwithstanding which he caught the infection, about a fortnight since, and is now recovering from the natural Small Pox.

I beg to inform you, at the same time, that my youngest daughter, who was vaccinated, by you, about four years since, has not only been frequently exposed to the danger of infection, but was actually inoculated for the *Small Pox*, without taking it. I have considered it incumbent on me to bear this testimony to the efficacy of the Vaccine system, as I consider the report relative to my son, that originated in misrepresentation, to have been circulated for purposes obviously prejudicial to that most useful and fortunate discovery.

“ I request you will make any use of this communication which you may think necessary.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient humble servant,

WESTMEATH.”



I am aware, that the fact of the Small Pox occurring twice in the same person is questioned by many practitioners. Baron Dimsdale and Dr. Archer, both men of very extensive experience, are quoted as having entertained a different belief. The late Dr. Woodville, however, whose opportunities of knowing were very great, I have been told, had expressed a contrary opinion, and from the following passage in his "History of Inoculation," page 217, he seems to admit the fact. \*

"Dr. Deering, at Nottingham, whose opposition to Inoculation I should not have deemed it necessary to notice, had not his pamphlet, entitled, 'An Account of the Improved Method of treating the Small Pox,' published in 1737, contained a striking fact which has never been contradicted. He says, "I have, with pleasure, read the several accounts of the progress and happy success of Inoculation; but when I heard of some who had been inoculated in vain, no eruption ensuing; when *I was an eye witness of the Inoculation of a little boy, † who, notwithstanding the great care there was taken in the choice of the pus, had the confluent kind, severely, and twelvemonths after had them naturally, and the favourable sort, yet*

---

\* It is likewise stated, by Dr. Walker, in the Medical and Physical Journal, for November 1804, page 441, that Dr. Woodville had expressed this opinion in his hearing.

† This boy was the son of Dr. Croft, and inoculated by Dr. Steigerthal, physician in ordinary to king George the first.

*was very full*; when I met with many, and among them three in one family, miserably seamed and pitted; when it was known in several parts of London, that some of the inoculated persons had lost their lives; I could not help fearing these things might do that method harm, as they contradicted the sanguine promises of some of the favourers of that operation."

It has been insinuated, particularly by Mr. Rogers, a pupil of Mr. Birch, who has published a small pamphlet against Vaccination, that no mention has ever been made, till lately, of the Small Pox occurring a second time; "when so many objections were made to Inoculation for half a century, surely if this had ever occurred, the enemies to the practice would not have been silent on the subject; yet we know of no such instance (till now) brought forward." \*

Had Mr. Rogers taken the pains of enquiring before he so confidently asserted, he would have found, besides the above case in Dr. Woodville's History of Inoculation, several such instances mentioned among the early opposers of Variolation. Indeed the insecurity of Inoculation for preserving from variolous contagion was more dwelt upon than any other objection, and this not only at the introduction of the practice, but even so late as the year 1767.

---

\* Rogers's Examination. p. 26.



Of this kind was the case of the dutchess of Boufflers, inoculated in the year 1763, by M. Gatti, physician to the king of France, an Inoculator of great experience, and one of the most eminent physicians in Paris. There is no reason to doubt, that she was inoculated with genuine variolous virus; and though the circumstances which are recorded of the progress of the Inoculation are not sufficiently exact to satisfy us, that she passed properly through that process, yet they were so satisfactory to M. Gatti, that he repeatedly assured the dutchess she had nothing to fear from the Small Pox. Some time afterwards, however, she had the Small Pox by casual infection, and M. Gatti rather lamely attempts to account for it, by acknowledging that the opinion he formed was inaccurate. The case, more at large, which is very deserving of attention, may be seen in the Gentleman's Magazine for 1765, page 495.

There remain for consideration those cases of eruption consequent to Inoculation with variolous virus, after the patient has gone through the Cow Pox; these have been very unfairly called "Cases of Small Pox after Vaccination." I say *unfairly*, because it has been long known, that Inoculation with Small Pox matter will produce the same kind of eruption on those who have before had the Small Pox, whether naturally or artificially. A case of this kind was published so long ago as the year 1722, by Dr. Wagstaffe, which occurred in



St. Thomas's Hospital. Mr. Tanner, the surgeon to that Hospital, inoculated a person who had undergone the natural Small Pox some years before. Dr. Wagstaffe, who was a man of extensive practice, and physician to St. Bartholomew's Hospital, affirms, that the eruptions on him appeared rather *more fairly* than in those (the criminals) who were inoculated in Newgate;\* and he attended the whole progress of the disease in both instances. Had the practice of re-inoculating variolous patients prevailed in the same degree as it is employed at present with vaccinated ones, similiar results would, no doubt, have been oftener noticed.

It is well known, that mothers and nurses have been repeatedly infected from suckling and nursing children under a heavy load of Small Pox pustules; and such persons have sometimes suffered very severely from fever, &c. before the eruption appeared.

Experiments have been made to determine, whether the Small Pox could be propagated by inoculating persons with the matter of such eruptions, and these experiments were perfectly decisive in ascertaining, that the genuine variola was produced.† The fact is, therefore, absolutely established, that those who have gone through the Small Pox are equally liable to be locally affected as those who

---

\* See Ring's Answer to Goldson, p. 13.

† Wagstaffe's Letter to Dr. Friend, p. 31.



have been vaccinated. If, then, in the one instance these are not called cases of Small Pox, after Small Pox, it is unfair to call the others cases of Small Pox after Vaccination.

Surely, then, when the skins of elderly persons, nurses, &c. are liable to be infected by merely sleeping with patients in the Small Pox, it is not a matter of wonder, that the tender bodies of infants and children should be sometimes infected by the repeated application of most loathsome and virulent matter to them.

There is another thing, likewise, which deserves to be taken notice of, that at the introduction of Vaccine Inoculation the practice was adopted and followed, by many who had never seen the disease, nor knew its characteristics. Many, therefore, were supposed to have undergone it, who, in reality, had it not. Instances of this are so common that scarcely any one can be ignorant of such. It is to be feared, that even at present sufficient care is not taken to ascertain the identity of the disease; so that it is not at all unlikely, that other reputed failures will be announced, which in reality are no failures at all; for, if the patient have not been perfectly vaccinated, there can be no pretensions to security from the Small Pox.

If, however, out of 5000 vaccinated persons 4999 are permanently secured from the infection of the Small Pox, we have very sufficient reason to rely on the efficacy of the Cow Pox. In reality,

the majority in favor of Vaccination is infinitely greater, for the practice has been extended to many distant countries, in which thousands have been inoculated, and preserved from future danger.

The proofs of the preservative efficacy of the Cow Pox are very much greater (probably in the proportion of 3000 to 1) than had been obtained in favor of Variolation, during the same space of time after its introduction. We have, therefore, much more reason to be satisfied with the one than our forefathers had with the other.

It was impossible in considering the objections which have been so profusely raised against Vaccination, not to revert to what happened during the establishment of Inoculation for the Small Pox. At its introduction it had to contend with obstinacy, ill-will, and intolerance; yet it overcame them all. After a time a great improvement was adopted by the Suttons and others; this again raised an outcry. It was contended, that the inoculated disease was so mild, that it could not be relied on; and, that a sufficient fermentation was not raised in the blood to carry off the morbid matter, which it was affirmed would be continually breaking out into other diseases. Time and experience proved the falsity of this opinion; and now similiar objections are raised against the Cow Pox. But, notwithstanding all the hypothetical reasonings against this practice, its success



has been sufficiently established by experience and facts, to sanction and support its further continuance and use.

*Per varios Casus Artem experientia fecit,  
Exemplo monstrante Viam.*

Respecting the second question, Do those who have been submitted to this process acquire or become subject to any other diseases in consequence? I have already argued on the impossibility, that the ingrafting of one specific virus should produce another of a perfectly dissimilar nature. The world is, at present, too much enlightened to be made to believe, that those kinds of eruptions can be occasioned by the Cow Pox which have been again and again seen upon children after the measles, after the Small Pox, after the chicken pox, and repeatedly upon those who have never undergone any one of these diseases.

In order to prove, that the Cow Pox is capable of generating or producing any eruptive or other disorder, it is essentially necessary that this disorder be different from such as are daily and hourly seen in this country. Every one at all conversant with medical practice knows, that eruptions on the skin are excited by a great variety of causes. Profuse perspiration, want of cleanliness, teething, the application of blisters, the irritation occasioned on the skin by the Small Pox, the chicken pox especially, and all other eruptive diseases, are per-

petually proving the truth of this. These eruptions, then, are not produced by any humor carried into the blood, but are merely affections of the skin, the consequence of cuticular irritation. If they originated from any humor carried into the blood, the same species of eruption would not be the consequence of profuse perspiration, or want of cleanliness, as is sometimes observed after the Small Pox, or chicken pox. The fact is, whatever occasions most irritation on the skin is most commonly followed by such eruptions ; and they are for this reason more frequently seen after the chicken pox, which is a very irritating disease, than after any other. The eruptions which sometimes follow the Cow Pox stand in precisely the same point of view. They are much more rare after the Cow Pox, than after the Small Pox or chicken pox, because it excites much less irritation on the skin. It is almost needless to bring proofs of this, the case is so obvious ; but a very remarkable instance was mentioned to me by a patient not many days ago.

A very respectable tradesman, in South Audley Street, has had five children inoculated with the Small Pox ; every one of these has been subject to eruptions since, and one in a remarkable degree ; four others have since been vaccinated, and these four have all been free from such inconvenience.



A disease is indeed spoken of by Dr. Moseley, which differs from any I have ever heard of, viz. *the green itch*. Of the many vaccinated patients which I have been in the habit of seeing for these five or six years past, not one has had the least appearance of this green itch; nor can I learn the name of any other person who has seen this very rare and non-descript disease; yet I have made several enquiries for it among medical practitioners. If the doctor means to say, that this green itch is the same with “the malignant itch,” attended “with large pustules in the palms of the hands, full of a bright yellow matter, of the consistence of laudable pus;” there is not a medical man in London but will tell him, that such a state of malignant itch has been prevalent for many years before the Cow Pox was known even to Dr. Jenner. That it may occur after Cow Pox no one will doubt, because no one ever expected that Vaccination would preserve the skin from being infected with the itch. But, to assert that the itch, which is a contagious disease occasioned by animalcules of a particular kind, can be produced by the inoculation of another disease of a different kind, is only to be expected from those philosophers who expect women to bring forth bulls. The doctrine of equivocal generation has been too long exploded, to be revived by the philosophical sect of Anti-Vaccinists!

Excepting this green itch, which no one else

has seen, but which must (as I have before demonstrated) have constantly appeared, if it were necessarily implanted in the habit by Cow Pox virus; Dr. Moseley describes no one disease as occurring after Vaccination, which has not been long familiar to the practitioners of this country. To attribute those diseases to Vaccination which are the same now as they have been for fifty years past, which are curable in the same way, and which do not occur oftener than formerly, is a strong mark of want of candour, liberality, and proper investigation.

If it be ascertained that the Vaccine Inoculation is as much to be depended on as the variolous in preventing the infection of the Small Pox, it is unnecessary to attempt proving its superior value in other respects. Those who have once seen how much greater are the sufferings of patients under the mildest form of Small Pox than are those in the Cow Pox, cannot hesitate in giving a preference to the latter. But, when it is considered that many of those who are variolated have the disease very severely,---that some are marked, seamed, and even rendered blind, and that others lose their lives in consequence, none but the most perversely obstinate can continue to encourage the propagation of so fatal a disease. It is, indeed, contended, that the ill-effects and fatal tendency of variolous Inoculation are by no means so great as they are generally stated to be. Experience,



however, proves the contrary, and though some may have been more successful in the practice than the generality of Inoculators, I fear the average number of deaths and other dreadful accidents under variolous Inoculation, have been too clearly ascertained to admit of dispute.

Those who have honored this little Tract with a perusal will have observed, that Dr. Moseley is censured for the use of language, which can do his cause no service, and which is unfit to be introduced into any publication. The whole work is full of invective and abuse levell'd at the Cow Pox infatuation, the Cow Pox philosophy, and the Cow Pox bigots; who are accused of quixotic buffoonery and fanatic impiety. \*

Nor has he shewn himself in the cases he has published the man of calm examination, or the careful investigator of facts. Desirous of injuring the Cow Pox at all events, he has admitted cases against it, void of every trace of authenticity.

I have neither leisure nor inclination to investigate every one which he brings forward; nor is it necessary; the inquiry is already in the hands of a valued friend, indefatigable in his researches, and to whom the public is indebted for a very large share of the information they possess on the subject of Vaccination. The following is sufficient to shew, with how much facility any report

---

\* See Dr. Moseley's Treatise, page 67, et passim.

which can be collected against the Cow Pox, is admitted by Dr. Moseley.

It is given as the third case of the Appendix,\* and Dr. Moseley says, that he possesses “nearly a thousand of a similar nature;” *ab uno disce omnes.*

“Richard Curling, aged nearly six years, son of Mr. Curling, No. 18, George Street, Portland Chapel, had the Cow Pox in May 1800; inoculated by Mr. Ring, Apothecary, in Swallow Street, Hanover Square. Nine months after he had the Small Pox in the natural way; he had ulcerations about his body, and was otherwise much disordered after the Cow Pox.”

Having some previous knowledge of Mrs. Curling, I determined to call on her, and learn the particulars from herself. I was accompanied by my friend Mr. Henning, Surgeon, of Newman Street, who can vouch for the truth of the following statement.

On being informed, that we were desirous of making enquiries respecting a child of hers, who was said, in a publication of Dr. Moseley's, to have had the Small Pox after being vaccinated; she expressed a readiness to give all the information in her power; and the replies which she made to the questions put to her, were given in a candid and proper manner.

---

\* Moseley's Treatise, page 126.



They were in substance as follow :

That the boy was inoculated for the Cow Pox by Mr. Ring; that some months after, the exact time she cannot recollect, he had, what *she* thought, the Small Pox. That she shewed the child, whilst under the eruption, to Mr. Leighton, Surgeon, of Welbeck Street, and Mr. Draper, Apothecary, of Bulstrode Street, Marylebone; who both declared that the eruption was the *chicken pox*; that they both saw it when it was at or near the height; that Dr. Moseley did not see the child during the time of the eruption, nor did any other medical man, except those above mentioned; that a gentleman, who she supposes was Dr. Moseley, came to her about two or three months ago, and enquired if her child had not had the Small Pox after Vaccination, to which she replied she thought he had; and Dr. Moseley, *without making any enquiry into particulars*, said, there was no doubt about it. She further said, that the eruption continued out only a few days, *she is positive not a week*, and she believes the eruption was dried away at the end of five days at the farthest.

There are very visible on the breast several marks left by this eruption.

The following questions immediately occur.

Is it consistent with the character of a real searcher after truth, to propagate reports on such very slight foundations?

Is the opinion of any medical practitioner formed, not at the time of the eruption, but after an interval of four or five years, to be believed, in opposition to that of two competent judges, who saw the patient during the continuance of the disease?

Does the *genuine variola* ever die away completely, in the short space of five days?

If this be possible, would so slight an attack of Small Pox leave indelible marks on the skin?

Is it characteristic of the Small Pox to leave marks on the breast, and not on the face and limbs?

Whatever may be the case with other reports, it is evident that this was not an instance of Small Pox occurring after Vaccination. If the rest of Dr. Moseley's cases have no better foundation, the publication of them will do no injury to the Jennerian Discovery.

It must be admitted, that we have yet much to learn respecting the action, the powers, and the laws of the Cow Pox. The subject is very far from exhausted, and events requiring further investigation are frequently occurring. Whether from some constitutional idiosyncrasy, some error in the vaccinating process, or possibly from the patients being liable to receive the infection of *variola* twice, it cannot be denied, that a few of those who were believed to be secured by Vaccination have been attacked with the Small Pox.



The same may, with truth, be said of variolous Inoculation. A number of extraordinary cases have been reported and recorded, which require to be examined much more minutely than they have yet been. It has been usual to decide on these cases according to the general rule, that the Small Pox cannot occur twice.\* Yet, as we now possess more than one duly authenticated case of such second Small Pox; why may it not have occurred twice, in some of those instances which have been explained in another way, merely because such instances were supposed to be impossible?

If Dr. Moseley, or any other person, can bring to light, *real facts* and *decisive cases*, either for or against the Cow Pox, he will do very great service to society: but the very reverse will be the result of publishing cases which will not bear the test of inquiry. Thousands of such cases as Curling's will not induce the public to give up so valuable a discovery, as that of Dr. Jenner has hitherto appeared. *The number of Cases is nothing, the reality of the fact is the whole.* The strictest attention to the whole truth is, therefore, neces-

---

\* See Dr. Kirkpatrick's Analysis of Inoculation, 1754, page 30 et seq. and his Reply to Pierce Dod, M. D. under the assumed name of Dod Pierce, 1746, page 27. Reference may be likewise made to Dr. Haygath's Sketch of a Plan for exterminating the Small Pox, page 278.

sary, that we may neither deceive others, nor be ourselves deceived; and though there may be some over zealous partizans on both sides, the majority of medical practitioners and the public in general are only interested in, and ought to be solely desirous of, ascertaining and abiding by the Truth.

Hoc Opus, hoc Studium parvi properemus et ampli,  
Si Patriæ volumus, si nobis vivere cari.



*Since the foregoing Observations were sent to the press I have seen two cases of eruptions, called Variolous, after Vaccination.*

THE first was in a daughter of Mr. Vincent, grocer, corner of Holles-Place, Queen's Elm, who had been vaccinated about five years before, by Mr. Griffiths, Surgeon to the Queen's Household, and to St. George's Hospital. A few weeks ago, Mrs. Vincent inoculated with variolous virus a younger child, who had the disease rather full, but of a favourable kind. The two sisters were constantly together, and frequently lay in the same cradle, in consequence of which the skin of the elder child became infected with the Small Pox pretty generally, but mostly in the face. The eruptions were quite distinct *but remarkably small*. I saw the child on the seventh day, by which time they were completely desiccated. The child complained of head ach, &c. before the eruption, but did not seem to have been much indisposed.

The following circumstances would lead to a suspicion that this might be a case of local pustules only; similar to those which have sometimes occurred in consequence of re-inoculation with variolous virus. 1st. Mrs. Vincent acknowledged that she had a few eruptions of the same nature

on her body. 2ndly. Two neighbours, who likewise had children in the Small Pox, were similarly affected, one of them (whose child died of a confluent sort) to a considerable degree.

I was informed that two gentlemen had taken matter from the pustules on Mrs. Vincent's child, (which had gone through the process of Vaccination under Mr. Griffith's direction) in order to prove, what I presume nobody doubts, that it would communicate the Small Pox by inoculation; but I could not learn that any body had taken matter from either of the women for the same purpose; indeed it was equally unnecessary in both instances, as there is evidence enough on record that the matter of local pustules will produce the true variola.\*

The other case, if it can be called a case of variolous eruption after the Cow Pox, occurred in a little boy, son of Mr. Johnson, No. 16, South Molton Street, whom I vaccinated about two years ago, entirely to my own satisfaction. Mr. Johnson has lately had a younger child inoculated with variolous virus, by Mr. Hyde. This child had the disease very plentifully, during which time the boy, who had undergone Vaccination, was

---

\* See the Medical Transactions of the College of Physicians, Vol. III. Art. 25. Medical Observations and Inquiries, Vol. V. p. 40. Jenner's Inquiry into the Causes and Effects of the Variolæ Vaccinæ, p. 116. cum multis aliis.



continually with her. In the evening of Saturday, June the 22nd, a few pimples came out on him. On the Tuesday following, before three days had elapsed, they were completely dried away, as my friend, Mr. Seares, Surgeon, of Half-Moon Street, can testify. Four or five more pimples afterwards made an appearance, and as quickly disappeared,

An opportunity has likewise been afforded me of pointing out another erroneous report which Dr. Moseley has given circulation to, in his Treatise, page 135 ;---he there says, that the elder son of Mr. Englefield, of Kentish Town, who had been vaccinated by Mr. Sandys, "soon after the Inoculation broke out in violent ulcerations, and died in a miserable manner."

I am authorised by Mr. Sandys to contradict this report. He stated to me expressly, that the elder child, as well as his brother, recovered perfectly from the Vaccination ; that a slight eruption on the skin, altogether distinct from and independent of the Cow Pox, afterwards appeared, but that there was nothing at all uncommon or alarming in this eruption ; that about three months after being vaccinated, the eldest son was attacked with a peripneumony, of which he died.

Are these the cases that are to upset the Cow Pox ? Because the children of a tavern-keeper have eruptions on the skin ? Because an inflammation of the lungs, in a delicate child, proves

fatal? If Dr. Moseley had taken the pains to consult the bills of mortality for March last, he might have known, that inflammations of the lungs were no very uncommon occurrence either in children or adults; and he might more truly and philosophically have attributed them to the cold north-easterly winds, than to Vaccination.

If such are the only cases which Dr. Moseley can bring forwards, he will be disappointed in his expectations of “*oversetting the practice of Vaccination, and putting a stop to this destructive insanity.*”

THE END.



Dr. Da Costa, has taken the pains to  
collect the bills of mortality for March last, he  
will have known, that information of the  
fact, is not very uncommon, or has not other  
in children or adults; and he might have easily  
and philosophically have attributed them to the  
cold north-easterly winds, than to Vaccination.

It would be the only case which Dr. Da Costa  
can bring forward, he will be disappointed in his  
expectation of "overcoming the practice of Vac-  
cination, and putting a stop to this destructive  
innocence."

THE END.