

cases, which he calls "a diabolical operation," utterly unlawful to any who profess themselves christians; and even allowing the effect it has to prolong life, (which, though, he positively denies, for he asserts that "*the confessed miscarriages in this new method are more than have happened in the ordinary way,*") he argues that the security this holds out *would tend to promote vice and immorality*, by removing from man, that, than which he says "it will be readily granted there is no one thing so universally dreaded," and that the fear of it is a happy restraint upon many who, but for this providential destruction, would give loose to extravagance and licentiousness.

The Rev. Theodore de la Paye likewise, (Woodville, p. 258,) in a sermon intitled, "Inoculation an indefensible Practice," *published even so long after its introduction as 1753*, viz. 31 years, asserts, "that it will be hard to produce out of the huge systems of hurtful inventions, ever an instance big with more *infidelity* and *atheism* than this of inoculation."

But the most redoubted Champion, says Dr. Woodville, who appealed to the public against inoculation, was Dr. Wagstaffe, *a man of extensive professional practice*, and who, as a Fellow of the College, and Physician to St. Bartholomew's Hospital, could not fail to influence the minds of many to a considerable degree, especially as his "Letter, shewing the danger and uncertainty of inoculating the Small-pox, was addressed to the learned Dr. Friend. He objects to it 'that it may differ from itself as practised in another country; *that it is not agreeable to reason*; that the positions of the favourers of inoculation are false, and their practice precarious.'" The other writings Dr. Woodville declares (p. 130) to contain little more than *unfounded conjectures* on the practice, with *fanciful conceits* concern-