

Sectarian Identity and the Aim of Integration: Attitudes of American Homeopaths Towards Smallpox Vaccination in the Late Nineteenth Century

Eberhard Wolff



Introduction

IN THE HISTORIOGRAPHY OF MEDICINE, sectarian medical movements have been analysed mostly from the perspective of a conflict with regular medicine. Homeopathy, in particular, has been regarded as a distinct medical world with a way of therapeutic thinking apart from orthodox medicine and of not being compatible with it.¹ On the level of theory, this is largely correct as, especially, the efficiency of minimal doses cannot be accepted by regulars, and 'regular' doses cannot be accepted by homeopaths who take seriously the homeopathic principles. Thus, from this point of view, an integration of homeopathy with allopathy is, to some extent, a contradiction in terms. However, recently this perspective has been replaced partially by focusing on those issues which regular and sectarian physicians had in common.² In fact, these boundaries between the factions were never so clear-cut for on the level of homeopathy's everyday practice (or practical principles); transgression was normal. Nevertheless, these transgressions raise the

question of how thoroughly homeopaths kept to the concept to which they were devoted. An exploration and analysis of these transgressions can throw light on how homeopathic physicians perceived their identity as a group. This paper traces the identity of American homeopathic physicians in the late nineteenth century, but offers a different approach to that of Naomi Rogers by focusing on a single issue. The homeopathic, sectarian or distinctive identity of homeopathic physicians between sectarian segregation on the one hand and eclectic³ integration on the other is studied only as it is reflected in their judgement of smallpox vaccination.

Homeopathy and Vaccination: A Perpetual Debate

IN GERMANY, CONTEMPORARY HOMEOPATHS, as well as adherents of sectarian medicine in general, are known commonly to be critical towards immunisation.⁴ In the United States, a similar phenomenon can be shown. Harris L. Coulter, in particular, is not only a historian of homeopathy and a convinced orthodox homeopath but also a critic of immunisation and alleges an influence on a wide range of common ailments.⁵ In history, this phenomenon existed as well, yet, the historiography of homeopathy has hardly noticed it. Nevertheless, research on the historiography of vaccination recognised the phenomenon that anti-vaccinationism in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries had a deep response among adherents of non-regular medicine. In the historiography of vaccination in Germany, this fact is frequently recognised.⁶ It has even been claimed that anti-vaccinationism arose from non-regular medicine.⁷ Scholarly study documented the overlapping of both institutional and personal aspects, focusing, for the most part, on hydrotherapists, anti-vivisectionists and vegetarians. The usual interpretation of this alignment is that they shared an attitude of 'Medizinkritik' i.e. criticism of the scientific, hegemonic, regular or 'school' medicine.⁸ The shared distrust and criticism of vaccination gave these diverse groups a common platform and made them co-operate.⁹ In the United States, Martin Kaufman has investigated the anti-vaccinationists and their arguments in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.¹⁰ His results are similar though his focus is somewhat more on the homeopathic contribution to anti-vaccinationism. He states that anti-vaccinationism was 'the meeting ground for all who had been adversely affected by state or federal public health legislation.' Among them, 'the largest group of irregulars were the homeopaths.'¹¹ As the result of being excluded from professional societies in the 1880s and 1890s 'many homeopaths were willing to join any organisation opposed to medical

licensure. In addition, some rejected much of the practice of the allopath, including many preventives such as vaccination. In consequence, homeopaths played a major role in the anti-vaccination movement and were among the founders of the first anti-vaccination organisation in the United States'.¹²

These assessments, seen from the perspective of the anti-vaccinationist movements, are fundamentally correct. However, it is a different question as to whether most of the adherents of sectarian medicine were anti-vaccinationists. This might seem likely, at present as well as in the past. Recently, one German homeopath wrote: 'By now every homeopath knows what disastrous side-effects vaccinations are able to trigger.'¹³ Articles in contemporary homeopathic journals usually focus on the danger of immunisation, and it is a major assumption of contemporary homeopaths who discuss immunisation topics that in the history of homeopathy this was also the case.¹⁴ This is to be seen, in addition, in the surprise of contemporary homeopaths on hearing that the founder of their therapeutic system, Hahnemann himself, was a spokesman in favour of smallpox vaccination. For him, this invention represented a 'grosse[r] Glücksfund' (important lucky finding).¹⁵ Kaufman implicitly gives the impression that, for the history of homeopathy in the United States, the homeopathic majority had an anti-vaccinationist attitude while commenting: 'Articles condemning the Jennerian method and editorials opposing compulsory vaccination can be found in almost every homeopathic medical journal.'¹⁶ Yet, is this interpretation historically correct? A closer examination of the sources demonstrates that the great majority of professional American homeopaths, at least during the nineteenth century, in their public debates approved of vaccination in favourable terms.

The historiography of the anti-vaccinationist image of homeopaths seems to come from the perspective of an opposition movement which results in the interpretation of a merely sectarian identity. Although of social historical interest, this perspective, to some extent, is blind to the complexity of the relationship between homeopathy and smallpox vaccination since it focuses only on the latter's disapproval of vaccination. In this paper a different approach is employed being not from the anti-vaccinationists' perspective but from the perspective of homeopathy. Firstly, the history of vaccination and anti-vaccinationism in the United States and in Germany is given. Secondly, the various opportunities for homeopaths to assess vaccination and the different assessments in the early history of homeopathy is emphasised. Subsequently an impression of the attitudes towards vaccination occurring in American homeopathic books, selected

journals, and domestic medical guides is suggested. Thereafter, the interpretation returns to the theses previously outlined. However, the perspective characterises American homeopathy as tending toward integration with regular medicine rather than as advocating 'Medizinkritik' and opposition to it. In addition, it demonstrates how American homeopathy in the late nineteenth century is influenced to a remarkable degree by non-homeopathic ideas. Nevertheless, it had some characteristic approaches of focusing on diseases, especially chronic diseases, and their treatment in a very homeopathic manner and it displayed thinking in terms of 'constitution' and a therapeutic optimism.

The Pros and Cons of Vaccination

AN UNDERSTANDING OF THE EMERGENCE of anti-vaccinationism and the vaccination debate in the late nineteenth century requires some attention to the history of vaccination. Smallpox vaccination was first introduced into scientific medicine by the English country physician Edward Jenner in 1796, the same year in which homeopathy first appeared. Its principle was to infect a person with cowpox, a disease similar to smallpox but much less dangerous. Thus, the vaccinated person became immune to smallpox. Vaccination was introduced into Germany¹⁷ as well as into the United States¹⁸ during the first years of the nineteenth century and spread quickly since it was the first effective and relatively secure preventive means that physicians could employ. Thus, it constrained an epidemic disease which had been one of the main causes of infant mortality. Although the vaccination rates were sufficient to diminish smallpox epidemics, smallpox was not eliminated as the duration of the efficacy of immunisation was partly assumed to be lifelong and re-immunisation was performed reluctantly. While the efficacy of vaccination was accepted by a majority, it could not be proven finally before the late nineteenth century. Much more difficult to be answered and still discussed was the question as to whether vaccination had any side-effects. Adherents of vaccination usually talked the risks down, whereas opponents saw a number of common diseases following vaccination as being caused by it. The transmission of disease was of particular concern, as in the example of the transfer of syphilis, by using an infected person to provide vaccine from the vaccination pustule. This was discussed for decades, until the use of human lymph was superseded by animal lymph from the 1880s.

Both Europe and the United States faced the most severe outbreaks of smallpox in decades in the 1870s. The united German Empire in 1874

enacted a law that made primary and secondary vaccination compulsory for all children. This law standardised various state legislation that made vaccination mandatory which had dated back partly to the first decade of the nineteenth century. In the United States, state legislation was even less uniform but generally not so strongly based on coercion. Vaccination laws of differing severity had been enacted in several states or cities in the 1870s but, in many instances, had to be repealed because of popular resistance.¹⁹ Sometimes, however, access to public schools was restricted to vaccinated children and all immigrants were forced to be vaccinated during their passage to America.

Smallpox vaccination always met with attitudes ranging from enthusiastic acceptance to definitive opposition. However, it was not until the second half of the nineteenth century that a remarkable resistance to vaccination arose principally in Germany²⁰ and Great Britain.²¹ Nevertheless, an anti-vaccinationist movement could be found also in the United States. In Europe, resistance to vaccination rose during the 1850s and 1860s; in Germany climaxing in the 1870s and 1880s in the discussion of the Imperial vaccination law and its implementation.²² Anti-vaccination associations were founded, mostly from the 1870s, co-operating with associations promoting the water-cure, homeopathy and other sectarian medical movements. Although all of these associations had many physicians as supporters, anti-vaccinationism had strong roots in the general public. Anti-vaccinationist arguments rested on medical, political, and even religious arguments, expressed partly in rational and sober and partly in curious and radical writings. The American anti-vaccinationism developed similarly to its European predecessors. First publications, from the mid-1850s, sometimes refer to British or German colleagues.²³ Opposition rose markedly in the 1870s when facing new vaccination laws.²⁴ Yet, on January 14, 1878, E.M. Bruce from New England wrote in a letter to a leading British anti-vaccinationist: 'I have made inquiries concerning vaccination, and I am not able to discover that there is any organized movement against it, or any literature opposing it, in America. The doctors, some of them professors in Boston University, with whom I have talked on this subject, all agree in saying that there is a widespread feeling against vaccination, and that it is steadily growing, but does not as yet take the form of organized resistance.' However, he did notice strong individual resistance.²⁵ Opposition against vaccination, both in Germany and the United States, had two aspects. One was the serious doubt concerning its efficacy and a serious fear of its possible dangers. Representatives of this faction were more worried about medical risks than the regular physicians as, for them, medicine should be less

invasive and follow natural and physical processes. Some of them were anti-contagionists. Another group in this movement, small but loud, demonstrated a curious reasoning, using any argument to discredit vaccination and vaccinators. The latter were accused of promoting vaccination in order to raise their income by treating the diseases caused by it. Vaccination was even compared to the murder of the Bethlehem child ordered by King Herod. The Bible was quoted as testimony against vaccination and irrational fears of getting 'animalised' by the cowpox vaccine occurred. Vaccine was made responsible for all the modern developments of the late nineteenth century, the degeneration of the people and their morals. However, these extreme arguments were caused also by traditional medicine's inability to understand the anti-vaccinationists' complaints. Martin Kaufman tends to stress the extreme arguments in order to make anti-vaccinationism appear irrational.²⁶

The Double-Faced Interpretation of Vaccination among Homeopaths

VACCINATION CAN BE ASSESSED, from a homeopathic point of view, in two opposing ways. First, vaccination could be regarded as a purely homeopathic treatment since it is based on the tenet of intervention into physical processes by the means of similarity. In this way, Hahnemann interpreted vaccination as a homeopathic protection from smallpox from the first to the fourth edition of his *Organon*.²⁷ Second, homeopaths could reject vaccine prevention because the vaccine has not been potentised. Since homeopathy's principles do not prescribe an unequivocal attitude towards vaccination, adherents of homeopathic medicine theoretically had the choice to support either contention. Moreover, they even had the choice to employ neither of the homeopathic arguments but one outside the narrow world of Hahnemann's homeopathic concepts and to join the arguments of regular medicine by assessing vaccination by its efficacy in preventing smallpox and by the possibility of dangerous side-effects. All of these explanations were to be stressed by homeopaths. Indeed, attitudes of homeopaths towards vaccination were diverse almost from the beginning. In 1878, Constantine Hering expressed this fact 'from the standpoint of a physician who for more than half a century has belonged to the school of Hahnemann.' 'In every edition of his 'Organon' he quoted Jenner's vaccination as a fact corroborating the law *similia similibus*. His followers, never adhering blindly to the master's words, had already in 1831 – that is, during his life – declared in their main journal that vaccination was a

poisoning of the blood.²⁸ This contradiction was even taken as an example of the inconsistency of homeopathy by one of its critics. The Edinburgh physician James Y. Simpson wrote in 1854:

Hahnemann and his followers allege, that the prevention of small-pox by vaccination is a striking instance of the operation of the infallible law of homoeopathy. But, it may be added, a homoeopathic physician, Boenninghausen, actually proposed to present a petition to government praying for the suppression of vaccination, as he believed it to be a fertile source of chronic disease [...]. Such is the alleged “harmony” among the disciples of the “eternal, unchangeable, infallible law”, *similia similibus curantur*.²⁹

Tracing Anti-Vaccinationism among American Homeopaths (I): Books and Journals

ANTI-VACCINATIONIST STATEMENTS of American homeopaths in the nineteenth century are relatively rare and appeared much later than in Europe. Constantine Hering was not only one of the first American homeopaths, he was also one of the first and one of the few having a critical attitude towards vaccination from his first American years. In 1831, still in Surinam, he had stated:

I have more than once plainly seen and often heard of cases where children remained ailing from the time of vaccination, who were previously in robust health. [...] A homoeopathic physician need but be reminded of the size of the dose [...], in Jennerian vaccination, there is the production of a real contagious disease, acting by zymosis or fermentation in the blood, thus endangering the organism, and resulting in only making the system less liable to, not proof against, the disease.³⁰

However, for decades he seems not to have promoted actively this opinion for, in his various materia-medica-publications, naturally, there are no statements on vaccination. His *Homeopathic Domestic Physician*³¹ lists only prescriptions to cure smallpox and it was not before 1880, when his four page *letter on vaccination*, was published in the United States. He had written this letter two years previously after being asked ‘to give an opinion on the “burning question of vaccination”’ by British anti-vaccinationists.³²

Homeopaths seem to have written hardly any complete book or pamphlet on this subject; an impression confirmed by Bradford’s voluminous homeopathic bibliography, which contains very little literature on vaccination, mainly off-prints of small journal articles or meeting papers published in *Transactions* or *Proceedings* literature.³³ The only substantial book was published in 1886 by George William Winterburn, Ph.D., M.D,

entitled: *The value of vaccination. A non-partisan review of its history and results*. At the time Winterburn was the editor of the journal *The American Homoeopathist*, President of the American Obstetrical Society, and physician in chief to the Manhattan Hospital.³⁴ It was published by the homeopathic pharmacist F.E. Boericke in Philadelphia. Although Winterburn claimed an impartial approach to the subject and did not argue radically, the book criticises consistently smallpox vaccination: 'Vaccination is performed, with the easy nonchalance of the impossibility of doing harm.' However, 'there are innumerable instances, in which vaccination has awakened a latent disease.'³⁵ Moreover, vital statistics, 'gathered from every quarter of the world, establish the fact, that smallpox, like the other zymoses, originates from unsanitary modes of life, and can only be effectually conquered by removing the cause; and that, finally, vaccination is inoperative on the general death-rate where sanitation is defective, and superfluous where sanitation is efficiently enforced'.³⁶ He concludes: 'Even though vaccination had proven all that Jenner, in the flush of his early triumph, so confidently claimed for it, to make it compulsory would be a wrong without justification in law or morals. Vaccinia is a disease, and no man has a right to disease another against his will'.³⁷ He finished his treatise with the italicised German quotation: '*Die Weltgeschichte ist das Weltgericht*' (global history is the global tribunal). Such a book might give the impression that, in the meantime, anti-vaccinationism had become popular among American homeopaths. Characteristically, Kaufman takes Winterburn and his book as a key example of his thesis of widespread homeopathic anti-vaccinationism.³⁸ Yet, in reality, it is just another one of the rare examples for this genre and gives clues of its relative singularity at that time. The subject to the editor, or at least in the way Winterburn treated it, was to some extent unfamiliar. Thus, the editor first allowed the manuscript to be peer reviewed.³⁹ Another hint of the scarcity of homeopathic anti-vaccinationist literature in the United States is the book's bibliography. It lists a substantial number of British publications on the subject, a few German and only a few titles published in the United States. The authors of the latter seem to be mainly hydrotherapists or just anti-vaccinationists.⁴⁰

However, the perspective based on books alone might be biased, and must be checked by examining the large number of homeopathic journals. The present sample consists of some periodicals in different periods viz. *North American Homoeopathic Journal* (1, 1851 to 14, 1865/66); *American Homoeopathic Review* (1, 1858/59 to 2, 1859/60); *Hahnemann Monthly* (1, 1865/66 to 19, 1884) and *The American Homoeopathist* (1, 1877 to 19, 1893). The first was selected, since it was one of the early and important United

States-homeopathic journals.⁴¹ The *Hahnemann Monthly* was chosen as a renowned and influential journal with a long tradition and Hahnemannian orientation.⁴² Finally, *The American Homoeopathist* was settled upon, since G.W. Winterburn, known to be a critic of vaccination, was its editor for some years.⁴³

The North American Homoeopathic Journal between 1851 and 1864 paid little interest to vaccination. However, it occasionally gave abstracts from regular medical journals or discussed the limitations of vaccination's efficacy in view of the increasing amount of smallpox occurring among formerly vaccinated persons, but it never criticised this preventive means. Confronting this limited efficacy, one author said: 'Still I advocate vaccination most strenuously' for vaccination was still 'the greatest blessing ever conferred upon man [...]'.⁴⁴ The journal deviated little from the discussion among the regular physicians in arguing this way. Even at a time when vaccination had been made a problem by dutiful critics in the United States, the vaccination issue seems not to have been problematic for this journal.⁴⁵ Its friendly attitude towards vaccination is shared by another periodical of this early period. The *American Homoeopathic Review*, in the first two volumes (1858/59; 1859/60), does not mention vaccination except for one lengthy article where it praises its efficacy, albeit limited, and demands compulsory vaccination. Neither the term 'homeopathy' nor any of its tenets appears either explicitly or implicitly as an argument in the whole article.⁴⁶ The *Hahnemann Monthly* between 1865 and 1884 sometimes raised the question of vaccination. The majority of articles were favourable towards this preventive means, a few of them were sceptical or critical but never in any distinct anti-vaccinationist terminology. In 1867, a British homeopathic anti-vaccinationist publication was reviewed and criticised. Only 'carelessness and incompetence' while administering vaccination in the United States were sometimes conceded.⁴⁷ However, to confirm the book's argument, the following volume contained a report of a woman allegedly dying from vaccination.⁴⁸ Other articles praised vaccination: 'The constitutional symptoms are so slight, that they very seldom require any medical treatment, and the only local attention necessary is care to guard against mechanical injury.'⁴⁹ In the 1871/72 volume the first article remarks on the very different attitudes towards vaccination in Europe and the United States.⁵⁰ The 1875/76 volume contains two very sceptical articles concerning vaccination.⁵¹ Nevertheless, after that until 1884, only positive assessments of vaccination are found.⁵² In this journal and in this period also vaccination is perceived, and even criticised, much more than in the previous journal. However, it had an inconsistent approach to vaccination

and seems to have had no definite standpoint on the vaccination problem. The articles are very separate from each other and, for the most part, they do not refer to any scholarly dispute on the subject.

The American Homoeopathist between 1877 and 1893 presents also an inconsistent picture. However, it is the only journal using anti-vaccinationist terminology and arguments, at least in some of its volumes. It had, in turn, a pro-vaccinationist, an undecided or even an anti-vaccinationist attitude. Whether this controversial question was raised in articles or not, and in which way it was presented, was not apparently just a reflection of the common opinion among the readers for it must have reflected also editorial policy. In the first two volumes (1, 1877, 2–3, 1878, edited by J.P. Mills) the issue of vaccination was not stressed. The volumes for 1879 to 1882 were edited by Chas.E. Blumenthal and from 1880, vaccination begins to be stressed as a medical problem. This seems to be initiated by Hering's *Letter on Vaccination* addressed to British homeopathic physicians which was republished in this journal.⁵³ The British homeopathic physician, Edward Rushmore, sent Hering's letter to the editor and suggested the inclusion of the vaccination issue in the journal.⁵⁴ Thereafter, in the editorials of this journal, vaccination was blamed for 'ravages'⁵⁵ and called a 'plague'.⁵⁶ This standpoint was continued by G.W. Winterburn, editor from 1883 to 1886. William Tebb, a British anti-vaccinationist activist, even thanked the editor because he had 'opened the columns of your journal to the discussion of vaccination'.⁵⁷ In 1882 and 1883, the journal had a certain anti-vaccinationist appeal. Yet, it was followed by two volumes scarcely recognising vaccination and by another volume (12, 1886) with one moderate anti-vaccinationist article climaxing in the statement that vaccination 'plants in the organism it is intended to protect the seeds of chronic disease which sooner or later are sure to germinate into destructive processes which are met in various forms of gravest diseases and sufferings'.⁵⁸ The volumes for 1887 and 1888, again, under a new editor, B.F. Underwood, contain no article on vaccination. In 1889, however, the editorship changed to Frank Kraft who pleaded against vaccination but let the journal solicit both the pro and contra point of view.⁵⁹ Subsequently, several pertinent articles were published but from the following year until 1893, the issue almost disappeared from the journal's table of contents.

Although criticism of vaccination among American homeopaths must have existed from the very beginning, it was not discussed as a serious problem, with some exceptions,⁶⁰ before the mid or late 1870s. Thus, it followed other American anti-vaccinationists and European homeopaths with a time-lag. The homeopathic assessment of vaccination changed slowly

from appreciation to scepticism to a situation in which approval, scepticism and professed disapproval were expressed simultaneously. Therefore, anti-vaccinationism in the 1880s had some adherents among homeopaths but there is no evidence that this attitude was very popular among them. Even though the vaccination problem was discussed in the late nineteenth century, only a small minority of American homeopathic physicians were anti-vaccinationists and, to a large extent, the discussion was incoherent. The expression of criticism was more of a casual gathering than of a movement. A paper given before the Hahnemann Academy of Medicine of New York in the mid 1870s confirms this view: 'In correcting a misinterpretation in one of our daily papers, regarding the prophylactic treatment of small-pox by the homoeopathic school, the author asserts that the homoeopathic practitioners furnish a much smaller percentage of opponents to vaccination than is to be found among the allopathists.'⁶¹ It is possible that this attitude changed to some extent by the turn of the century and later, the period from which Kaufman took most of his references for anti-vaccinationist articles in homeopathic journals. Kaufman's assessment that anti-vaccinationist articles were to be found in almost every homeopathic periodical is, at least, a great simplification.⁶²

Tracing Anti-Vaccinationism among American Homeopaths (II): Homeopathic Domestic Medical Guides

YET, BEFORE ATTEMPTING A DEEPER INTERPRETATION of this statement it is necessary to check it against another genre of homeopathic literature as books on homeopathy, and even homeopathic journals, do not necessarily mention vaccination even when they emphasise smallpox.⁶³ Domestic medical guides might provide much better material to assess homeopaths' attitudes towards vaccination.⁶⁴ They are not addressing specialised physicians but patients and their medical needs on a broader scale. In their role of physicians advising patients in all their physical needs, dietetic or prophylactic advice was more common than in other parts of homeopathic literature.⁶⁵ Homeopathy's specific appeal to lay practitioners generated a wide range of publications in this field in the United States and in Germany.⁶⁶ Nevertheless, for several reasons, exact numbers would be misleading for it is not easy to delineate the borders of this genre. Textbooks, manuals, treatises were frequently meant to be used by physicians and domestic practitioners, too, even though it was not always expressly mentioned in the title. Moreover, not every homeopathic domestic guide can be sharply delineated by author, title, publisher or edition. For example,

to what extent can a new edition be said to be a new bibliographical entity?⁶⁷

The study is based on approximately fifty titles which represent a high proportion of the total number of relevant books.⁶⁸ The major focus was on the first edition available, though further editions were included where it seemed to be of some interest. The books were published in the United States between 1835 and 1900, the years of publication are spread relatively equally across the complete period, a few more in the 1850s than after 1860 though even fewer appeared before 1849. A large percentage are translations from foreign languages or American reprints of British books. Nevertheless, since they were published and read within the United States, they represent one opinion expressed in America and thus represent one contribution to the American 'discourse' on this subject. Only six did not mention, for mostly unknown reasons, smallpox or vaccination.⁶⁹ Another thirteen did mention smallpox and its treatment, but not its possible prevention with vaccination.⁷⁰ The earlier the books were published, the more they disregarded vaccination.⁷¹ Although vaccination had been introduced and spread decades before the first appearance of homeopathic domestic medical guides, vaccination was not noticed much by the early authors, whereas, it was perceived to a much greater degree by authors after 1850 in both absolute and relative numbers. The remaining almost thirty titles mentioned, with one exception,⁷² both smallpox and vaccination, some with a short sentence, some with a paragraph or even a whole page. Among these, only one has an open and purely anti-vaccinationist character *viz.* Henry G. Hanchett's *Elements of modern domestic medicine*, first published in 1887.⁷³ A few other books are sceptical about the efficacy or security of this prophylactic treatment but not to the extent that they would be called anti-vaccinationist. The great majority basically welcome it. Epps & Cook (1849) state that 'vaccination is a perfect preventive against small-pox.'⁷⁴ and Eaton (1888) says 'We think all should be vaccinated, and also revaccinated every few years through life. If all the world agreed with these views, and carried them out, small-pox would entirely die out.'⁷⁵ A review of the arguments on whether vaccination was seen as a homeopathic treatment or not confirms this interpretation. Between 1843 and 1864, ten of the books mentioned that vaccination was a homeopathic measure, genuinely or purely homeopathic, some of them in an almost enthusiastic way because of its similarity to the simile.⁷⁶ Laurie, for example, wrote in 1843: 'This is an operation purely homoeopathic, and one which, from its efficacy in the prevention of a disease exhibiting analogous symptoms, has been frequently quoted by our Great Founder and his disciples, as one of the best illustrations of the immutable similia similibus curantur.'⁷⁷ None of the domestic medical

guide authors, however, mentioned that vaccination does not comply with the principle of potentisation.

This singular occurrence of devoted opposition towards vaccination, in spite of the alleged strong links between anti-vaccinationism and homeopathy, is quite surprising. Moreover, the situation is even more equivocal than the image given by the journal articles. Nevertheless, beyond the rough differentiation of vaccination's approval or disapproval, the homeopathic domestic medical guides reveal a remarkable awareness of vaccination's possible side-effects. Only one book (John Ellis, 1846) says explicitly that 'there is no danger of injury from vaccination.'⁷⁸ Among the domestic medical guide books approving of vaccination about one half do not mention the side-effects or the danger of transmitting diseases. Some of them seem to do so as they do not emphasise the topics of smallpox and vaccination whilst the others acknowledge any sort of danger resulting from vaccination. Most of them emphasise the importance of administering pure lymph taken from a healthy child.⁷⁹ In addition, some focus explicitly on serious ailments resulting from vaccination. There is an awareness of side-effects below the surface of a widespread welcoming of vaccination for it was made responsible for the emergence of 'psoric symptoms',⁸⁰ a 'morbid disposition',⁸¹ the 'spread of scrofula',⁸² 'chronic disease',⁸³ and 'erysipelas and eruptions'.⁸⁴ A striking example of how commonly diseases after vaccination must have been expected can be seen in the *Homoeopathic medical index*, a 31-page leaflet first published in 1874 by the Boericke & Tafel pharmacy for promoting their products. By 1891 'about twelve hundred thousand copies have been gratuitously distributed.' Here, Thuja was recommended, without any further comment, 'also for ill health dating from vaccination'.⁸⁵

Focusing on details reveals a small but remarkable decrease in the intensity of vaccination's approval from the 1840s to the late nineteenth century. Vaccination was recognised to a much greater degree after 1850 than before which indicates that vaccination, to some extent, became more important in the medical debate or in addressing medical information to the public. Furthermore, the evaluation of vaccination grew more serious. Euphoric approval of vaccination was given more in the early 1850s, for example, Pulte wrote in 1850: 'Through vaccination the triumphs of homoeopathy have been shown to the world by innumerable blessings, in arresting such a loathsome disease as small-pox.'⁸⁶ Warren (1859) named vaccination as an 'immensely important discovery' that will 'render the name of Jenner famous through all time.'⁸⁷ Assessments such as these were not found again during the following decades and, if they were ever found,

they were used as tactical arguments to fight anti-vaccinationism.⁸⁸ Another obvious change was the disappearance of the argument that vaccination was something purely homeopathic which was quite common in the books between 1843 and 1864, being stressed in ten out of seventeen editions mentioning vaccination. After 1864, it was not found as it had lost some of its naiveté. This evidence, therefore, indicates a reaction to the vaccination dispute with its onset during the 1850s, or, at the latest, during the 1870s. Vaccination more and more lost its character, mostly outside homeopathic circles, as being a matter of routine and became a matter of controversial debate. In the homeopathic domestic medical guide literature, other than in the journal articles, this process was not reflected on the surface by approval of vaccination on principle but below it in small but numerous details.

Specific Arguments on Vaccination Reflecting General Attitudes of American Homeopaths

VARIOUS CAUSES MAY BE FOUND for the approval or rejection of vaccination among homeopaths. Naturally, attitudes towards vaccination were decided individually and must have been based mainly on medical grounds and experiences. However, the almost collective appreciation and the similar arguments, provide an opportunity to attempt a consolidated way of dealing with this medical treatment. Moreover, the choice of different attitudes towards a treatment, complying with one tenet of homeopathy, yet being completely opposed to another, might reveal aspects of homeopaths' dealing with homeopathy. Furthermore, vaccination as a basically non-homeopathic business might reflect the relationship of American homeopathy to the outside medical world. The evidence characterises American homeopathy as (a) not aiming principally to be in opposition or conflict to hegemonic medicine, (b) influenced by non-homeopathic ideas to a remarkable extent, but (c) nevertheless, having some characteristics of focusing on diseases and their treatment in a very homeopathic manner. In emphasising these three aspects attention has to be paid not just to the attitudes towards vaccination but also to the pro- and anti-vaccinationist arguments

The Fear of 'Odium on the Homeopathic Profession'

AS TO THE FIRST CLAIM, Kaufman's explanation can be overturned. Kaufman sees anti-vaccinationism as a meeting ground for opposition to public health legislation and anti-vaccinationist activities among

homeopaths as a symbol for the rejection of allopathic medicine. In terms of German medical historiography, homeopathic anti-vaccinationism expressed as 'Medizinkritik' towards the hegemonic system of medicine. Indeed, in the history of medicine, vaccination was a symbol of regular medicine for vaccination has not been introduced and spread by homeopaths but by representatives of non-sectarian medicine. Most of all, it became one of the main symbols for scientific progress and the increasing effectiveness of allopathic medicine at a time when this was very rare. Thus, vaccination provided a key issue for sectarian medicine to present its attitudes towards regular medicine. If they ever wanted to stress differences in medical conceptions or treatment, the vaccination issue would have been a perfect occasion to promote it. According to Kaufman's description this criticism of regular medicine played an important role among anti-vaccinationists' arguing, for example, among the so called eclectic school of sectarian medicine.⁸⁹ Not so among the homeopaths. The fact alone that the great majority of nineteenth-century American homeopathy approved of vaccination could lead to the conclusion that these homeopaths did not have the aim of underlining the differences with hegemonic medicine. However, there is much more evidence for this assumption for even criticism of vaccination was connected hardly with criticism of allopathic or hegemonic medicine in general. All the more the faction which approved of vaccination did not criticise regular medicine. Only one pro-vaccinationist author, E. Ellis in 1882, criticises regular medicine – in history: '[...] the time was when for a score of years it (*vaccination*) was most violently opposed by the dominant school of medicine, and Jenner denounced as a fanatic who sought to interfere with the wise designs of providence.' He sees, in this example, a similarity to homeopathy that formerly was said to be prosecuted in the United States, namely by 'hoary-headed disciples of allopathy', 'covered with the mildew and cobwebs of antiquity'. However, this criticism of allopathy is an almost singular exception and moreover, it criticises allopathy in history, not in the present. Characteristically, even this author feels the need to apologise for his attack: 'Surely there are some things which, though forgiven, can never be forgotten.'⁹⁰ In addition, most of the curious anti-vaccinationist arguments that would have underlined the difference from regular medicine hardly appeared. Homeopathic anti-vaccinationist arguments did not go beyond medical reasoning of efficacy and side-effects into the direction of religion, man's relation to nature or providence, and a general scepticism towards cultural progress. The one example is Benjamin F. Cornell who gave an annual address in 1868 before the Homoeopathic Medical Society of the State of New York 'on the

physical degeneracy of man', in which he stated: 'It is my firm conviction that vaccination has been a curse instead of a blessing to the race.'⁹¹

Yet this general attitude can be illustrated more clearly by paying attention to the pro- and anti-vaccinationist arguments with respect to the homeopathic principles. None of the domestic medical guide authors mentioned that vaccination did not comply with the principle of potentisation. In the journal literature criticising vaccination, this main argument to illustrate the one basic difference between homeopathic and allopathic medicine was hardly employed. Only two of the journal articles critical of vaccination stressed the problem that smallpox vaccine is not a homeopathic remedy or preventive. One is Hering's letter, in which he quotes his almost fifty year old citation 'a homoeopathic physician need but be reminded of the size of the dose' (of the vaccine).⁹² The other is Alexander Berghaus' article in the 1875/76 volume of the *Hahnemann Monthly*, asking: 'Vaccination is homoeopathic, but do we use our remedies in the crude state? Some are known to have their medical properties only developed by being potentized.[...] Why not use vaccine-matter potentized?'⁹³ Naturally, potentised vaccine (vaccin) or potentised smallpox material, variolin, is recommended more or less frequently as a preventive but in most of these instances, it was just recommended and not compared to vaccination because of its fundamental differences. Berghaus is the only one to give an explicit homeopathic reason why vaccin was the favourite choice. Among those who were not anti-vaccinationists, sometimes both vaccin and vaccine were recommended. Thus, the distinction with allopathic thinking was hardly expressed. Moreover, the two possibilities of assessing vaccination homeopathically gave an opportunity for competing with allopathic medicine.⁹⁴ This was the pro-vaccinationists' argument that vaccination was essentially a homeopathic form of treatment; thereby, proving that homeopathic thinking was the best approach to medical treatment. From this perspective, allopathy could even be said to have adopted homeopathic thinking. Moreover, it could be seen as a first sign of allopathy's collapse.

Homeopathic authors stressed the argument that vaccination was basically a homeopathic treatment, but they did not use it as a form of competition with allopathy nor as a missing link between the two disciplines. Mostly, when this argument was employed in the domestic medical guide literature, it seems to have been used to convince a hesitant public of vaccination and also of homeopathy. Thus, the argument was not used to separate allopathy from homeopathy but rather to blur the differences between the two disciplines and not to raise any problem with

allopathy. Among the various factions in homeopathy, the tone was one of a peaceful co-existence, emphasising harmony between homeopathy and regular medicine, and ignoring their contradictions.

The same can be seen in the presentation of the personality of Edward Jenner who, as the man responsible for the introduction of smallpox vaccination, was made a sort of secular medical saint to the regular medical profession. Laurie and Williamson (1854) call Jenner 'celebrated',⁹⁵ Warren (1859) says that he was 'immortal' and that his discovery 'will render the name of Jenner famous through all time'.⁹⁶ Freligh (1853) says: 'We are indebted to Dr. Jenner for the introduction of this artificial inoculation [...]'.⁹⁷ Edmonds (1881) mentions Jenner as responsible for an innovation 'fraught with so great a boon to civilization and humanity'.⁹⁸ An objection would be that Jenner is only being praised because of his invention's similarity to the *simile*-principle and, thus, he would have represented an early homeopathist, even though probably not being aware of it. Yet, only one of these books (Laurie and Williamson) mentions this similarity when praising Jenner.⁹⁹ A further objection would be that these authors really believed in what they wrote, and did not realise these contradictions. Yet, forgetting about potentisation, forgetting that vaccination was an allopathic achievement *par excellence*, and forgetting about Jenner's allopathic image would render any homeopath hopelessly naive. The major explanation lies in another direction for American homeopathic physicians in the second half of the nineteenth century hoped to be integrated into the hegemonic medical community rather than become a sect of outcasts. A striking example of this attitude is the contribution of the homeopathic physician William C. Richardson to a discussion on vaccination at the American Institute of Homeopathy in 1882: 'I am sorry that any paper should have been read or any idea should have been introduced into this institute unfavorable to vaccination. It will bring odium on the homeopathic profession at large. All kinds of things will get into the newspapers. It will be bruited abroad that the members of the American Institute of Homoeopathy are opposed to vaccination.'¹⁰⁰ The desire for integration even exceeded their need of ideological consistency which would have ended in ideological isolation. This led sometimes to an almost ludicrous search for harmony and peaceful coexistence as in the conclusion of Williamson's article in the 1869/70 volume of the *Hahnemann Monthly*: 'Let the appropriate honor, then, be paid to Jenner, for the propagation of vaccination, and to Hahnemann for the promulgation of the law which is destined to serve as a guide to the way and a lamp to the feet of medical men, in the treatment of all diseases.'¹⁰¹ American homeopathy, in this view, seems to have followed

the allopathic doctors for, at a point where criticism was very likely, the homeopaths did not behave like outsiders, criticising fundamentally hegemonic medicine. The general background to this attitude may be interpreted differently. One explanation might be the habit of the majority of homeopathic physicians to use homeopathy as just one additional therapeutic tool employed among naturopathy, allopathy etc., thereby giving up the exclusiveness in practice.¹⁰² Kaufman even used the term 'pragmatism' to describe American homeopaths' attitude which was growing towards the end of the century.¹⁰³ Another explanation emerges from the German point of view. The scarcity of anti-vaccinationism and of criticism of allopathy in the homeopathic literature could have had its origin in the American homeopathist's status, which was much more established within the complete system of medical services in comparison with Germany. In Germany, homeopathic physicians were much more outcasts and they were a small minority with fewer institutional resources than their colleagues in the United States. Therefore, the latter did not have to seek their identity in stressing their differences from mainstream medicine. On the contrary, their identity in the late nineteenth century was embedded in their established status as a strong part of the American medical system, so they rejected increasingly an anti-orthodox image.¹⁰⁴ A third explanation links finally the analysis to the relationship between homeopaths and allopaths in this period. During the second half of the nineteenth century the relationship between regular medicine and medical sects changed in two different, even opposite ways. On the one hand, the conflict over vaccination emerged in sectarian medicine and even among homeopaths. On the other hand, according to the common interpretation of homeopathy's history, the conflict between allopathy and homeopathy, after intensifying in the 1850s,¹⁰⁵ decreased while facing a 'relaxation of allopathic hostility toward homoeopathy' some decades later.¹⁰⁶ The present results seem to fit this concept. When the conflict between homeopaths and allopaths was even more virulent from the 1850s the vaccination question was not yet on the agenda of a broad medical discussion. However, when it did emerge among sectarian medicine around the 1870s, homeopathic physicians were more established in the medical system and their status less often attacked. This even meant a split among homeopaths on the issue of vaccination as, for a minority, anti-vaccinationism was a major issue and even fuelled a conflict with regular medicine. However, for the majority, the predominant issue must have been to strengthen, not to challenge, their status and their newly acquired recognition. Even when vaccination was criticised, it was hardly used as a weapon to attack regular medicine.

Influence on Homeopathy from the Outside Medical World

THE MATERIAL INVESTIGATED HERE characterises American homeopathy as influenced, to some extent, by the medical world outside homeopathy. This is not a new aspect but the complementary side of the description given characterising homeopathy as willing to compromise with allopathic medicine and even practising it alongside homeopathy which represents a type of medical eclecticism.¹⁰⁷ Again, it is necessary to stress the striking rarity of homeopathy in the homeopaths' arguments both for and against vaccination. Homeopathic anti-vaccinationism did not employ the argument that vaccine was not potentised. In general, homeopathy as a term does not appear usually in relevant articles. Even in the main homeopathic anti-vaccinationist source, Winterburn's book, it is not found among all the arguments, only on the title page listing the author's professional and scholarly status. The book's reasoning resembles all the other anti-vaccinationist publications written by allopathist or hydropathist physicians. Those homeopaths who disapproved of vaccination did so for reasons appropriate to regular medicine and were employed commonly by non-homeopaths. The first common argument was the question of the effectiveness of vaccination. This was debated prolifically, mostly stressing vital statistics and personal experiences. The second common argument was whether vaccination had dangerous side-effects. Among these arguments, sanitarian reasoning had a remarkable influence. In C. Baelz's opinion, published in the 1871/72 *Hahnemann Monthly*, the best prophylactic against smallpox was cleanliness:

Generally it (*smallpox*) is to be found in streets and alleys crowded with laboring people; where numbers of them are crowded together in one or two small, ill ventilated rooms, where they wash, dry clothes, cook, and sleep, are provided with bad water (in this city), and often with poor food. Only as an exception it attacks the better class of people, who live in easier and healthier circumstances. In the country, where there is plenty of good air, and water, the disease seems to have no foothold at all.' 'As the epidermis, as well as the mucous membrane, sustains the main attacks of the poison, for that reason I consider as good a prophylactic, and a more physiological than vaccination, daily ablutions of the body, plenty of fresh air, pure water for drinking and cooking, good food, and abstinence from articles in excess of carbon, and the utmost cleanliness in and around dwellings.'¹⁰⁸

Likewise, for Winterburn, smallpox was easily prevented by avoiding its genuine cause of 'unsanitary modes of life'.¹⁰⁹ At first sight a sanitarian argument such as this is anything but extraordinary.¹¹⁰ In this respect, the American homeopathic anti-vaccinationist faction seems to have developed

a type of second-hand anti-vaccinationism. The vaccination debate was not a genuine homeopathic one. The slow shift in the journals' attitudes towards some anti-vaccinationism seems not to have originated from any inner-homeopathic discussion but from the growing anti-vaccinationism among other sectarian groups and adherents of hegemonic medicine. Furthermore, another suggestion for anti-vaccinationism came from the British and some German homeopathic colleagues. Kaufman emphasises the large contribution of homeopathy to anti-vaccinationism in terms of providing representatives.¹¹¹ In practice, homeopathy seems not to have contributed much to the debate but rather adopted non-homeopathic arguments. In a similar manner, the defendants of vaccination seem not to deal very thoroughly with homeopathy when facing the vaccination problem. Only a few of the journal articles mention incidentally that vaccination had a similarity, at least to some extent, to homeopathy. Most of the others, while praising vaccination, did not employ any homeopathic reasoning. Even the defendants of vaccination among homeopathy employed the sanitary argument as vaccination was an 'important sanitary measure'¹¹² or 'fraught with great benefits to man in a sanitary point of view'.¹¹³ Harris L. Coulter has argued that American regular medicine has adopted a lot of ideas from homeopathic medicine.¹¹⁴ American homeopathy, however, did the same with regular medicine. Homeopathy, in this respect, was not an isolated and ahistorical world based on nothing but Hahnemann's eternal concepts. It was very much a part of an interactive medical society with mutually interacting factions.

Judging Side-Effects of Vaccination the Homeopathic Way

NEVERTHELESS, BEYOND ALL SIMILARITIES to the non-homeopathic debate on vaccination, there might be one peculiarity of the homeopathic argument among both pro- and anti-vaccinationists. This is a remarkable concern for the side-effects of vaccination and a particular way of dealing with them. A typical description of homeopaths' attitudes towards vaccination is given in a report of a discussion at a Central New York Homoeopathic Medical Society meeting in the 1874/75 volume of the *Hahnemannian Monthly*. This discussion started with remarks such as: 'Dr. Spooner considered vaccination as a perfect preventive as could be had.' and: 'Dr. Clary had confidence in the protective power of genuine vaccination.' Then the subject changed slowly to the alleged dangers of vaccination, ending with much more critical statements: 'Some of the members were of the opinion that the virus might awaken some latent

disease in the system.¹¹⁵ Although offering approval, a perception of the possible harmful effects of the preventive measure existed. Frequently this concern was not for the immediate but rather for the long-term side-effects such as chronic diseases or changes in the vaccinee's constitution. A perspective that fitted into the common homeopathic view on a patient's constitution. Thus, for example, in Hering's opinion, vaccination had the effect, in particular, of weakening the constitution of a child. Winterburn said, vaccination would 'awaken a latent disease'. Others stressed that 'chronic diseases' followed vaccination.¹¹⁶ Even the arguments of the defendants of vaccination were based partly on the slight constitutional symptoms.¹¹⁷ Indeed, the pro-vaccinationist authors of homeopathic domestic medical guide literature frequently stressed vaccination's side-effects. However, this assessment of vaccination's risks, for regular physicians, could be the equivalent of being anti-vaccinationists. On the other hand, regular physicians being devoted pro-vaccinationists in their books tended much more to persuade their audience of the lack of harm from vaccination. Nevertheless, these homeopathic authors, despite all the assumed danger, were quite friendly towards the value of vaccination. Indeed, those quoted here are the less enthusiastic about vaccination, but still supportive of it and not having any major reservation about administering it. They considered, at most, alternative prevention such as the homeopathic variolin or vaccinin without condemning vaccination.¹¹⁸

The explanation for this surprising co-existence of both perceiving vaccination's dangers and, at the same time, suggesting its use as a preventive measure is twofold. First, these homeopaths, emerging from their own thought, might have had another idea of the nature of the side-effects. In homeopathy, the side-effects mentioned might not have been considered as mere dangers but rather as symptoms which might not necessarily be frightening. Second, there seems to have prevailed, among its adherents, an optimistic attitude towards the efficacy of homeopathic therapy. Naturally, the risks and advantages of vaccination could be analysed and the conclusion reached that the risk was less than that of withholding it. However, Humphreys (1872) is almost the only one to express this thought.¹¹⁹ The other books refer briefly to homeopathic treatment of these diseases where sulphur is most recommended. This was the way, for Laurie and Hull (1843), even to prevent 'psoric symptoms' occurring after vaccination.¹²⁰ In addition, *Thuja* was sometimes recommended and it was commonly suggested as a homeopathic treatment for smallpox.¹²¹ Indeed, vaccination's alleged dangers could be accepted with a therapeutic optimism given a strong trust in homeopathy's efficacy.

Conclusion: A Homeopathic Identity?

THESE HOMEOPATHIC PHYSICIANS, seen from the perspective of approval or disapproval of vaccination, did not have a sharply delineated 'homeopathic identity', not even a strong sectarian or 'distinctive' identity. They did have convictions which were different, to some extent, from those of regular physicians but their convictions had their roots in more than just the main homeopathic tenets. Similarly, before the late nineteenth century, American homeopathy saw itself increasingly as just a 'medical specialty' among others, not as the only way of dealing with sickness.¹²² Yet, this is not the crucial point for a homeopathic consciousness could have existed alongside other spheres of medicine such as sanitation, pathology, hydrotherapy or laboratory diagnosis.¹²³ The crucial point is that genuine homeopathic identity was weak enough to promote a prophylactic means which was totally opposed to the law of potentisation. Even among homeopathic anti-vaccinationists their specific identity and self-consciousness was not strong enough to fight vaccination with homeopathic arguments. In this respect, those homeopaths taking the sectarian way, had no identity which was distinctive from other sectarians. Instead, on the level of theory, the identity of American homeopaths can be found rather on the level of principles.¹²⁴ One of these main principles was an eclectic pragmatism or, as John Harley Warner stated, both homeopathic and allopathic identity was superseded by a common 'scientific' professional identity drawn from experimental medicine that did not have the need to rely on old dogmas.¹²⁵ Nevertheless, besides this, a homeopathic identity showed much more below the surface of its main tenets by dealing with vaccination's side-effects, and seeing them in a homeopathic way not so much as threatening diseases but as individual symptoms that can be cured by homeopathic remedies.

Many thanks to the German Historical Institute, Washington, D.C., which made the research for this paper possible by providing a grant, and to Prof. Dr. Robert Jütte and Dr. Peter Becker for giving scholarly support. I am indebted to Li-Chuan Chen Ph.D., Bethesda MD, Demerie Faitler Ph.D., Meadville PA, and Victor Fung Ph.D., Bethesda MD, and Mary Nagle Wessling Ph.D., Midland MI, for their American and/or Asian hospitality. Maury Hanson M.D., Washington D.C., smoothed the English of my conference paper. The staff of the National Library of Medicine, History Department, and James Cassidy Ph.D., Bethesda MD, supported my bibliographical research.

Notes

- 1 See, for example, William G. Rothstein, *American physicians in the nineteenth century, from sects to science* (Baltimore, London, 1972), pp. 152–74, 230–46, & 298–326.
- 2 For example, this is the major focus of Lamar Riley Murphy, *Enter the physician, the transformation of domestic medicine 1760–1860* (Tuscaloosa, 1991), ‘There were significant areas of tacit or explicit consensus among orthodox physicians and their rivals. Crucial issues about how to cope with disease and promote health transcended acrimonious rhetoric and boundary disputes [...]’ (XVII).
- 3 ‘Eclectic’ here is used in the original meaning of integrating all medical concepts including regular medicine. It is not used in the meaning of the eclectic medical movement which stood in opposition to the latter. See John S. Haller Jr., *Medical protestants, the eclectics in American medicine, 1825–1939* (Carbondale, Edwardsville, 1994).
- 4 G. Buchwald, ‘Impfen schützt nicht! – Impfen nützt nicht! – Impfen schadet!’ *Deutsches Journal für Homöopathie* 8 (1989), 47–87. G. Buchwald ‘Nützt Impfen? – Schützt Impfen? – Schadet Impfen?’, *Deutsches Journal für Homöopathie* 11 (1992), 124–60. See various articles in *Homöopathie Zeitschrift* 3 (1993), 32–40; Joachim F. Grätz, ‘Impfungen – homöopathisch betrachtet,’ *Besseres Leben* 1 (1992), Nr. 5, 10–15, 36, Nr. 6, 13–17, 26. Many thanks to Dr. Martin Dinges for acquainting me with this reference. For the nineteenth century see, for example, Ernst Weber, *Die Impffrage und das Impfgesetz* (Leipzig, 1881) (= *Sammlung wissenschaftlicher Abhandlungen aus dem Gebiete der Homöopathie*, 2). The most influential publication, however, was Arthur Lutze, *Die Schutzpocken-Impfung völlig unnütz und Verderben bringend. Aus statistischen Tabellen und durch die berühmtesten Autoritäten nachgewiesen. Ein Mahnruf, allen Staatsgewalten ans Herz gelegt* (Cöthen [Köthen], 1861).
- 5 Harris L. Coulter, *DTP, a shot in the dark* (San Diego, 1985); Harris L. Coulter, *Vaccination, social violence, and criminality, the medical assault to the American brain* (Berkeley, 1990); Harris L. Coulter & Barbara Loe Fisher, *A shot in the dark, why the P in the DTP vaccination may be hazardous to your child’s health* (Garden City Park, n.d. [1991]).
- 6 Andreas-Holger Maehle, ‘Präventivmedizin als wissenschaftliches und gesellschaftliches Problem, Der Streit über das Reichsimpfgesetz von 1874,’ *Medizin, Gesellschaft und Geschichte* 9 (1990), 127–48, here 137f.; Axel Helmstädter, ‘Post hoc – ergo propter hoc? Zur Geschichte der deutschen Impfgegnerbewegung,’ *Geschichte der Pharmazie* 41 (1990), 19–23, here 22; Claudia Huerkamp, ‘The history of smallpox vaccination in Germany, a first step in medicalization of the general public,’ *Journal of Contemporary History* 20 (1985), 617–35; Eberhard Wolff, *Gesundheitsverein und Medikalierungsprozess. Der Homöopathische Verein Heidenheim/Brenz zwischen 1886 und 1945* (Tübingen, 1989) (= *Studien und Materialien*, 2), p. 128f.

- 7 Helmstädter, 'Post hoc,' 22. In fact, anti-vaccinationism was not born inside alternative medicine.
- 8 See Martin Dinges (ed.), *Medizinkritische Bewegungen im Deutschen Reich* (Stuttgart, 1996) (= *Medizin, Gesellschaft und Geschichte*, Beiheft 9).
- 9 Maehle, 'Präventivmedizin', 138. Helmstädter, 'Post hoc', 22; P. Kübler, *Geschichte der Pocken und der Impfung* (Berlin, 1901), p. 337.
- 10 Martin Kaufman, 'The American anti-vaccinationists and their arguments', *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 41 (1967), 463–78.
- 11 Kaufman, 'anti-vaccinationists', 467.
- 12 Ibid., 468.
- 13 E.g. Wilhelm Meyer, 'Macht's nach – aber nicht immer genau nach,' *Homöopathie Zeitschrift* 1 (1991), 37–9, here 37. Many thanks to Prof. Robert Jütte for acquainting me with this reference.
- 14 Meyer, 'Macht's nach'.
- 15 See Joseph M. Schmidt, *Die philosophischen Vorstellungen Samuel Hahnemanns bei der Begründung der Homöopathie* (bis zum *Organon der rationellen Heilkunde*, 1810) (Munich, 1990), p. 124. In paragraph 46 of his *Organon*, Hahnemann explained the law of similars with smallpox inoculation and cowpox vaccination. Samuel Hahnemann, *Organon of medicine*, translated from the 5th and 6th edition by R.E. Dudgeon, M.D., (reprint, New Dehli, 1988), pp. 49–51, see also paragraph 38, 56. In a letter to Regierungsrat Heinrich von Gersdorff, (August 26 1825), Hahnemann mentioned the 'excellence' (Vortrefflichkeit) of smallpox vaccination. Published in Richard Haehl, *Samuel Hahnemann – sein Leben und Schaffen*, vol. II, appendices (Leipzig, 1922), p. 273f. On Hahnemann's attitude towards vaccination see also Harris L. Coulter, *Divided legacy, the conflict between homeopathy and the American Medical Association, science and ethics in American medicine, 1800–1914* (Richmond, 1982), p. 24, & 77. An example of the astonishment of contemporary homeopaths about Hahnemann's attitude towards vaccination see Meyer, 'Macht's nach', 37. Another reaction to this fact is supposing that Hahnemann would have a different opinion, if living today. See for example J. Kögel, 'Schutzimpfungen', *Gesundes Leben – Natürliches Heilen* 1 (1962), 73–6, here 73. For another contemporary discussion on Hahnemann's statements on smallpox vaccination see Günther Maring, 'Homöopathie und Impfungen', *Allgemeine Homöopathische Zeitung*, 210 (1965), 211–7; E.H. Schmeer, 'Homöopathie und Impfungen', *Allgemeine Homöopathische Zeitung* 211 (1966), 14–8.
- 16 Kaufman, 'anti-vaccinationists,' 468.
- 17 Kübler, *Geschichte der Pocken und der Impfung*; Eberhard Wolff, *Einschneidende Maßnahmen. Pockenschutzimpfung und traditionale Gesellschaft im Württemberg des frühen 19. Jahrhunderts* (*Medizin, Gesellschaft und Geschichte*, Beiheft 10) (Stuttgart, 1998).

- 18 See e.g. Kaufman, 'anti-vaccinationists'; Frank Fenner et al, *Smallpox and its eradication* (Geneva, 1988); Allen Chase, *Magic shots, a human and scientific account on the long and continuing struggle to eradicate infectious diseases by vaccination* (New York, 1982); Abbas M. Behbehani, *The smallpox story in words and pictures* (Kansas, 1988).
- 19 Kaufman, 'anti-vaccinationists', 464.
- 20 See Huerkamp, 'The history'; Helmstädter, 'Post hoc;'; Eberhard Wolff, 'Die Schlacht auf dem Zahlenberge. Impfgegnerschaft im späten 19. Jahrhundert – das Beispiel Sachsens,' in Ragnhild Münch (ed.), *Pocken zwischen Alltag, Medizin und Politik* (Berlin, 1994), 113–28.
- 21 R. M. MacLeod, 'Law, medicine and public opinion, the resistance to compulsory health legislation 1870–1907', *Public Law* (1967), 107–28, 189–211; Ann Beck, 'Issues in the anti-vaccination movement in England', *Medical History* 4 (1960), 310–21; Dorothy Porter & Roy Porter, 'The politics of prevention, anti-vaccinationism and public health in 19th century England', *Medical History* 32 (1988), 231–52.
- 22 Maehle, *Präventivmedizin*.
- 23 See the work of the main anti-vaccinationist character in the early period, Carl Georg Gottlob Nittinger, a physician in Stuttgart, Germany, partly translated into English. C.C. Schiefferdecker, *Dr. C.G.G. Nittinger's evils of vaccination* (Philadelphia, 1856).
- 24 Kaufman, 'anti-vaccinationists', 464.
- 25 Reproduced in James John Garth Wilkinson, *Vaccination tracts, historical and critical summary in three parts* (London, 1878), 37.
- 26 Kaufman, 'anti-vaccinationists', 464, 471–3.
- 27 'Kann die Kuhpocke anders gegen Menschenpocken schützen, als homöopathisch?' (Are the cowpox able to prevent from smallpox in a way other than homeopathically?). See Samuel Hahnemann, *Organon der Heilkunst*, 4th ed. (Dresden & Leipzig, 1829), 80. In the fifth edition (Dresden & Leipzig, 1833), 64, Hahnemann replaced the pertinent chapter (examples of unintentional homeopathic healings by physicians of the old school) by a single reference to the preceding editions.
- 28 Constantine Hering, *Letter of Dr. Constantine Hering of Philadelphia on vaccination, dedicated to the homoeopathic practitioners of Great Britain* (London, 1878), 1. See this letter also reprinted in *The American Homoeopathist* 6 (1880), 73–5. Yet, Hering's following reference to Stapfs Archiv gives no evidence to this fact but is a reference for a quotation of an article written by himself quoted in the following. An early critic of vaccination among homeopaths was Clemens v. Bönninghausen who in 1849 described cowpox vaccine as 'without doubt immensely spreading scrophula' ('[...] die in leichtfertigen Händen so gefährliche, das Scrophelgift ohne allen Zweifel ungemein verbreitende Vakzine [...]'). Clemens v. Bönninghausen, 'Ueber die Heilkraft der Thuja gegen Menschenblattern', *Allgemeine*

Homöopathische Zeitung 37 (1849), col. 21f. In 1908, Bradford added more information on this subject, 'von Boenninghausen brought up vaccination at the meeting and considered that as practised now it is the chief cause of the disquieting spread of scrofulous diseases. All the physicians present agreed in this view and promised to give special attention to this important subject so as to be able to follow up the matter next year. There has not as yet been any opportunity to test the discovery of von Boenninghausen concerning the curative power of Thuja in small-pox; this has also been confirmed in France, and it is to be expected that we may have opportunities in the course of the year to test this also here.' Thomas Lindsley Bradford (comp.), *The lesser writings of C.M.F. von Boenninghausen* (Philadelphia, 1908), 4. Yet, Bradford's additional information could not be found in the volumes of the *Allgemeine Homöopathische Zeitung* during this period (vols. 34–42, 1847–52). See additional information about Bönninghausen's attitude toward vaccination in Rima Handley, *A homeopathic love story, the story of Samuel and Mélanie Hahnemann* (Berkeley, 1990), 137. On Boenninghausen and Thuja, see Wilhelm Meyer, 'Thuja – das erste Impffolgemittel', *Homöopathie Zeitschrift* 3 (1993), 37f.

- 29 James Y. Simpson, *Homoeopathy, its tenets and tendencies, theoretical, theological, and therapeutical*, 1st American edition, from the 3rd Edinburgh edition (Philadelphia, 1854) p. 261, partly in the footnote. Another example for this inconsistency for him is the unequivocal assessment of Thuja as an alternative preventive for smallpox. In the following, Simpson renounces vaccination to be homeopathic, since Hahnemann in his *Organon* claimed a remedy causing a similar but stronger disease, while cowpox, in Simpson's view, was an identical and weaker disease.
- 30 Hering, *Letter*, 2, quoted from Constantin Hering (zu Paramaribo auf Surinam), 'Nachträgliche Bemerkungen über das Schlangengift. Aus einem Schreiben des Herrn Dr. Hering in Paramaribo, vom 18. Juni 1830, an Dr. Stapf', *Archiv der homöopathischen Heilkunst* 10 (1831), 24–32, here 28. Originally in German, 'Ich habe deutlich gesehen, und mehr als einmal, und von ähnlichen Fällen viel gehört, dass Kinder vom Tage der Impfung an kränkelten, und die früher blühend gesund waren, es nachher nie wieder so geworden sind. [...] Einen homöopathischen Arzt braucht man nur zu erinnern an die Grösse der Gabe [...] ferner daran, wie oft die Impfung der Schutzpocken auch eine Krätzimpfung sein möge, und die erzeugte Komplikation dann weit schwerer zu überwinden ist.' As an alternative he suggested to administer potentised vaccine.
- 31 Constantine Hering, *The Homeopathic Domestic Physician* (Allentown, 1835), p. 234. In later editions, however, a chapter criticising vaccination but accepting it as the 'lesser of two evils' is added. See *ibid.*, 10th American edition (Philadelphia, 1897), pp. 387–92.
- 32 Hering, *Letter*.
- 33 Thomas Lindsley Bradford, *Homoeopathic bibliography of the United States, from the year 1825 to the year 1891, inclusive* (Philadelphia, 1892).
- 34 Winterburn, *The value*, title page.

- 35 Ibid., 46.
- 36 Ibid., 114.
- 37 Ibid., 145.
- 38 Kaufman, 'anti-vaccinationists', 468.
- 39 Ibid. One reviewer agreed with Winterburn's opinion, the other one appreciated the 'scholarly effort' and found 'not a dull page in it.' (preface).
- 40 For example the eclectic Robert Alexander Gunn, *Vaccination* (New York, 1877); Carl Spinzig, *Variola, its causes, nature and prophylaxis – and the dangers of vaccination* (St. Louis, 1878).
- 41 William Harvey King, *History of homeopathy and its institutions in America; their founders, benefactors, faculties, officers, hospitals, alumni, etc. with a record of achievement of its representatives in the world of medicine*, 2 vols. (New York & Chicago, 1905), vol. II, p. 50.
- 42 Ibid. 21. Martin Kaufman, *Homeopathy in America; the rise and fall of a medical heresy* (Baltimore, 1971) p. 169f.
- 43 Kaufman says it was 'a leading journal of the homeopathic school'. Kaufman, 'anti-vaccinationists', 468. Unfortunately, he gives no evidence for this statement.
- 44 John Redman Coxe Jr., 'An essay on variola', *North American Homoeopathic Journal* 4 (1856), 469–77, here 475.
- 45 A.N. Bell, J.P. Loines, H.D. Bulkley, A. Nebinger, Jas. F. Hibberd, 'Protection from Small-Pox, by means of Vaccination and Re-Vaccination', *North American Journal of Homoeopathy* 14 (1865/66), 14–32.
- 46 Benjamin Franklin Joslin Jr. 'Vaccination and Revaccination', *The American Homoeopathic Review* 1 (1858/59), 214–30.
- 47 Review of, 'Charles T. Pearce, *Vaccination, Its tested effects on health, mortality and population* (London, 1868)', *Hahnemann Monthly* 3 (1867/68), 483–5.
- 48 M.A. Richter, 'Effects of vaccination', *Hahnemann Monthly* 3 (1867/68), 63–5.
- 49 W. Williamson, 'Vaccination (read before the Philadelphia Medical Society)', *Hahnemann Monthly* 5 (1869/70), 187–92, here 189f.
- 50 C. Baelz, 'On vaccination (Read before the Allegheny Co. (Penna) Homoeopathic Medical Society)', *Hahnemann Monthly* 7 (1871/72), 393–8, here 393.
- 51 Alexander Berghaus, 'Vaccination and its consequences', *Hahnemann Monthly* 11 (1875/76), 36–43; Alfred K. Mills, 'Vaccination. Read before the Hahnemann Academy of Medicine of New York', *ibid.* 43–5.
- 52 Vol. 18 (1883).
- 53 Hering, *Letter*.
- 54 *The American Homoeopathist* 6 (1880), 72.
- 55 6 (1880), 188.

- 56 8 (1882), 85.
- 57 9 (1883), 205. Kaufman writes on Tebb's influence in America's anti-vaccinationism, 'In 1879 William Tebb, the leading British anti-vaccinationist, came to New York, and the Anti-vaccination Society of America was founded.' Kaufman, 'anti-vaccinationists,' 465.
- 58 P.P. Wells, 'Vaccination, Personal Experiences, with comments', *The American Homoeopathist* 12 (1886), 109–14.
- 59 'We solicited and have received opinions on both sides of the question of vaccination, and trust to receive still further expressions of opinion from other of our subscribers and contributors. We may add, that in our personal experience with vaccination the results in many cases [...], have been of so alarming a nature as almost to discourage further vaccination.' Frank Kraft, 'Editorial', *The American Homoeopathist* 15 (1889), 83f.
- 60 One early anti-vaccinationist statement found, is a paragraph in, Benjamin F. Cornell, '[Annual] Adress before the Homoeopathic Medical Society of the State of New York. Delivered February 11, 1868. [On the Physical Degeneracy of Man]', *Transactions of the Homoeopathic Medical Society of the State of New York (Albany)* 6 (1868), 34–48, here 43.
- 61 Berghaus, 'Vaccination', 36. As another example for the pro-vaccinationist attitude of American Homeopaths see D.H. Beckwith, 'Vaccination', *Transactions of the American Institute of Homoeopathy*, 35th session (1882), 342–62, discussion 363–77.
- 62 See a similar critique of Kaufman's assessments and further material on the subject in J.J. Buder (ed.), *Letters of Henry Austin Martin. The vaccination correspondence to Thomas Fanning Wood, 1877–1883* (MA thesis, University of Texas at Austin, 1991).
- 63 The prolific materia-medica-literature lists symptoms of homeopathic pharmaceuticals and little beyond that. Even literature focusing on homeopathic therapy in a wider scope does not necessarily mention prevention. The same is true of homeopathic journals.
- 64 For this genre see Murphy, *Enter the physician*.
- 65 *Ibid.*, 218–25.
- 66 For Germany see the detailed article of Achim Willfahrt, 'Homöopathische Hausarztliteratur des 19. Jahrhunderts als Anleitung zur Selbstmedikation', *Zeitschrift für Klassische Homöopathie* 35/36 (1991/2), 114–21, 153–9, 194–202, 62–72.
- 67 In new editions, e.g. one or several authors were added. Titles were changed slightly or almost completely, or the publisher changed. Translators of foreign language books frequently did more than just translate it. Since the translators mostly were devoted adherents and practitioners of homeopathy, too, they revised and commented on the books or added paragraphs or chapters to the basic work

and in this respect became co-authors, too. New editions under the same title could contain very different texts, either in quantity or in quality. The other way around, different titles of the same author could be based on similar or even identical texts. Finally, some authors copied parts of their colleagues' books published earlier, sometimes explicitly, sometimes not. It is not the aim of this paper to trace these ways of changing, overlapping or even melting into each other in depth.

- 68 My selection is based on the American homeopathic domestic medical guide literature, accessible in the National Library of Medicine's historical collection. This collection represents the big majority of the homeopathic domestic physician guides listed in Bradford, *Homoeopathic bibliography, or book offers of the Boericke & Tafel Companies*, frequently bound with homeopathic books. Yet, since the reason for selecting this bibliographical genre was not patient advice itself but the higher probability of finding their topic mentioned, a few works are included, that might not be seen as those of a proper domestic guide.
- 69 Thomas Roupell Everest, *A popular view of homoeopathy* (Allentown, 1835); J. T. Curtis, James Lillie, *An epitome of homoeopathic practice; compiled chiefly from Jahr, Rueckert, Beauvais, Boenninghausen, etc.* (New York, 1843); G. H. G. Jahr, *The homoeopathic treatment of the diseases of females, and infants at the breast* (New York, 1856); Edwin W. Lewis, *The family guide and medical manual* (Watkins, 1872); Thomas Cation Duncan, *Diseases of infants and children, with their homoeopathic treatment* (Chicago, 1878); Carroll Dunham, *Homoeopathy, the science of therapeutics; a collection of papers elucidating and illustrating the principles of homoeopathy* (Philadelphia, 1885).
- 70 Among them are, Constantine Hering, *The homoeopathic domestic physician* (Philadelphia, 1835); Charles Julius Hempel, *The homoeopathic domestic physician* (New York, 1846); John Niesz, *The family guide to health and husbandry [...]* (Canton, 1851); Emilius Kreussler, *The homoeopathic treatment of acute and chronic diseases* (Philadelphia, 1854); Alvan Edmond Small, Jacob F. Sheek, *The pocket manual of homeopathic practice* (New York, 1855); Samuel Morgan, *The text book for domestic practice, being plain and concise directions for the administration of homoeopathic medicines, in simple ailments* (New York, 1860); Frederick Humphreys, *Manual of specific homoeopathy* (New York, 1869); Isaac D. Johnson, *Therapeutic key* (New York, 1870); A. F. Worthington and Company, *Practical guide to homoeopathy for family and private use [...]*, Rev. and enl. ed. (Cincinnati, 1894).
- 71 Before 1849 it was five out of eight. Between 1849 and 1860 it was four out of eighteen. Between 1861 and 1900 three out of twentythree.
- 72 William A. Edmonds, *A treatise on diseases peculiar to infants and children* (New York & Philadelphia, 1881) mentions vaccination but not smallpox.
- 73 In this book, he encourages parents, after being recommended to have their child vaccinated, '[...] no consideration should induce a parent who cares for the health of the little innocent in his charge to permit the useless and dangerous operation to be performed either at this (period of dentition, E.W.) or any other period of

his life'. Henry G. Hanchett (the whole issued after careful revision by A.H. Laidlaw), *The elements of modern domestic medicine, a plain and practical hand-book, describing simple diseases, their causes, prevention and safe home treatment; the earliest signs that a physician is needed and the procedure till the doctor arrives, in all emergencies*, (New York, 1887). See also Henry G. Hanchett, 'The prophylactic and therapeutic resources of mankind', *The New York Medical Times* 16 (1888), 97–101, especially 100.

- 74 John Epps, George W. Cook, *Domestic homoeopathy; or rules for the domestic treatment of the maladies of infants, children, and adults and for the conduct and the treatment during pregnancy, confinement, and suckling* (Boston, 1849), p. 39. Quotation italicised in original. For John Ellis (1864) vaccination was 'the only safe and reliable preventive, and this will rarely fail if the individual has been recently vaccinated with good fresh matter from a healthy person'. John Ellis, *Family homoeopathy* (New York, 1864), 63. The American edition of Jahr's therapeutic guide (1876) says, smallpox's 'fierceness had been moderated by the introduction of vaccination [...]'. G.H.C. Jahr, Charles J. Hempel, *Therapeutic guide, the most important results of more than forty years' practice with personal observations regarding the truly-reliable and practically verified curative indications in actual cases of disease* (New York & Philadelphia, 1876), p. 261f.
- 75 Morton Monroe Eaton, *Domestic practice for parents and nurses* (Cincinnati, 1882), p. 597. For Hale and Williams (1888) there was 'but one means known by which this terrible disease can be prevented or modified; that consists in vaccination.' Edwin Moses Hale, Charles A. Williams, *The compendium of health pertaining to the physical life of man and the animals which serve him, including the horse, ox, sheep, hog, cat, poultry, and birds, embracing anatomy, physiology, and hygiene [...]* (Chicago, 1884), p. 234. Finally Verdi mentioned (1893), 'Vaccination should be sought, of course, during epidemics of smallpox.' Tullio Suzzara Verdi, *Special diagnosis and homoeopathic treatment of disease, for popular use, including such functional disturbances as are peculiar to girls and to maternity* (Philadelphia, 1893), p. 535.
- 76 For example, Pulte said, vaccination is 'in accordance with the homoeopathic principle – similia similibus [...]'. Joseph Hippolyt Pulte, *Homoeopathic domestic physician, containing the treatment of diseases, popular explanations of physiology, hygiene, hydropathy, anatomy and surgery, and an abridged materia medica* (Cincinnati, 1850), p. 391. Sherrill, 'Since the discovery of the law of cure by Hahnemann, an opinion has been held that vaccination was based on the homoeopathic principle, as an instance that like remedies cure like diseases.' Hunting Sherrill, *A treatise on homoeopathic practice of medicine, comprised in a repertory for prescribing, adapted to domestic or professional use*. 3rd, improved and enlarged. ed. (New York, 1854), p. 338f. The same in, Hunting Sherrill, *Family physician or homoeopathic practice of medicine; adapted to domestic and professional use*. 4th, improved and enlarged ed. (New York, 1860). Small, 'That vaccination affords another illustration of the great homoeopathic law, all homoeopaths will no doubt readily admit'. Alvan Edmond Small, *Manual of homoeopathic practice for*

- the use of families and private individuals* (Philadelphia, 1854), p. 755. Tarbell, 'There is no better illustration of the principle on which homoeopathy is founded, than the well-known circumstance that a medicinal influence producing analogous symptoms to those manifested by the small pox, invariably acts as a preventive or modifier of said disease.' John A. Tarbell, *Homoeopathy simplified, or, domestic practice made easy, containing explicit directions for the treatment of disease, the management of accidents, and the preservation of health*. 2nd ed. (Boston, 1856), p. 142f. Guernsey, 'The prevention of this fearful disease by vaccination, is purely homeopathic [...].' Egbert Guernsey, *The gentleman's hand-book of homoeopathy; especially for travellers and for domestic practice*, 2nd ed. (New York, 1857), p. 169. Similar Egbert Guernsey, *Homoeopathic domestic practice, containing also chapters on physiology, hygiene, anatomy, and an abridged materia medica*, 5th, enl., revised and improved ed. (New York, 1862), p. 428. Finally John Ellis, Vaccination 'is strictly a homoeopathic remedy for the prevention of small-pox, as it causes a similar disease and thus destroys the susceptibility to that fearful and loathsome malady.' Ellis, *Family homoeopathy*, p. 63. See also Joseph Laurie, Amos Gerald Hull, *Homoeopathic domestic medicine*. 1st American ed. (New York, 1843); Joseph Laurie, Walter Williamson, *The parent's guide, containing the diseases of infancy and childhood and their homoeopathic treatment. To which is added a treatise on the method of rearing children from their earliest infancy; comprising the essential branches of moral and physical education* (Philadelphia, 1854).
- 77 Laurie & Hull, *Homoeopathic domestic medicine*, p. 229. In 1854, the same author names vaccination a 'homoeopathic principle', Laurie & Williamson, *The parent's guide*, p. 375.
- 78 Ibid. Warren says, re-vaccination 'is done with little trouble'. Ira Warren, *The household physician, for the use of families, planters, seamen, and travellers. Being a brief description description, in plain language, of all the diseases of men, women, and children with the newest and most approved methods of curing them* (Boston, 1859), p. 136.
- 79 E.g. Laurie & Hull, *Homoeopathic domestic medicine*. Edward Charles Chepmell, Samuel B. Barlow, *A domestic homeopathy, restricted to its legitimate sphere of practice; together with rules for diet and regimen*, 1st American ed. (New York, 1849); Pulte, *Homoeopathic domestic physician*; Franz Hartmann, Charles Julius Hempel, *Diseases of children and their homeopathic treatment* (New York, 1853), p. 462f., '[...] the vaccine that had been taken from psoric, syphilitic, or impetiginous individual, may transfer these diseases to other children; scrofulous affections, principally, are liable to being transferred by vaccination.' John Adams Tarbell, *Homoeopathy simplified; or, domestic practice made easy [...]*, 2nd ed. (Boston, 1856), p. 144; Samuel Lilienthal, *A treatise on diseases of the skin* (New York Philadelphia, 1876), p. 250, stresses the importance of 'reliable lymph'.
- 80 Laurie & Hull, *Homoeopathic domestic medicine*, p. 229f. Similarly Sherrill (1854, 1860) who mentioned the possibility of 'eruptions and affections' through

- vaccination and suspected the vaccine 'virus' to carry a 'psoric contamination'. Sherrill, *A treatise*; Sherrill, *Family physician*, p. 339f.
- 81 Hartmann & Hempel, *Diseases*, p. 462.
- 82 Laurie & Williamson, *The parent's guide*, p. 385.
- 83 Frederick Humphreys, *Humphreys' homoeopathic mentor of family adviser in the use of specific homeopathic medicine* (New York, 1872), p. 267.
- 84 Lilienthal, *A treatise*, p. 251.
- 85 Boericke & Tafel, *Homoeopathic medical index. A guide to homoeopathic treatment of common ailments*. (Philadelphia, no date given), p. 28. The NLM copy is dated 1900 by the library without any evidence for this year on it. Additional information taken from Bradford, *Homoeopathic Bibliography*, p. 30.
- 86 Pulte, *Homoeopathic domestic physician*, p. 391. For Freligh (1853), the 'blessings' of vaccination were 'gratefully acknowledged' among all 'civilized people'. M. Freligh, *Homoeopathic Practice of Medicine, Embracing the history, diagnosis and treatment of diseases in general, including those peculiar to females; and the management of children. [...]* (New York, 1853), p. 361.
- 87 Warren, *The household physician*, p. 136.
- 88 There can be found two other euphoric assessments in the early 1880s when Edmonds (1881) wrote, 'few discoveries in medical science have been fraught with so great a boon to civilization and humanity.' Edmonds 1881, p. 185. For Erastus Ellis (1882), 'vaccination was the greatest discovery ever make [sic!] in the world. Without it, one-half of the people in the world would die, and the other half would be so scarred as to be unpleasant to look at.' Erastus Ranney Ellis, *Homeopathic family guide and information for the people*, 2nd ed. (Detroit, 1882). At first sight, this seems to represent a revival of euphoria towards the discovery of vaccination now dating back more than eighty years. Nevertheless, reading thoroughly the pertinent passages, reveals that it is another sort of euphoria. The enthusiasm of both books seem to be used as a tactical argument against the growing number of anti-vaccinationists. Both books mention the objections in the immediate neighbourhood of these quotations. Ellis refers to the historical critics of Jenner, and Edmonds refers to one hundred years of 'discussion and controversy' about vaccination and asserts that 'at present the weight of authority, both in the profession and among the laity, is overwhelming in its favor as a preventive measure.' Edmonds, *A treatise*, 185. At this point (1881) Edmond's opinion was more wishful writing than dispassionate description.
- 89 Kaufman, 'anti-vaccinationists', 469. However, Haller Jr., *Medical protestants*, does not mention anti-vaccinationism among the eclectic school.
- 90 Ellis, *Homeopathic family guide*, p. 202.
- 91 He continues, 'every physician knows that cutaneous diseases have increased in frequency, severity and variety, to an alarming extent. Not only the ancient forms of eruptive disease, scrofula, psora, erysipelas, salt-rheum, tetter etc., but new

- varieties are making their appearance, for which no satisfactory cause can be given, unless they are a compound of all the others, with a sprinkling of veneral to give them respectability; and as contemporaries, a corresponding increase of cronic disease of all the internal organs. To what is this increase owing? Many families transmit disease hereditarily; contagion may account for some of the varieties; in a large majority, however, to no medium of transmission is the wide-spread dissemination of this class of disease so largely indebted as to vaccination.' Cornell, '[Annual] Adress', 43.
- 92 Hering, *Letter*, p. 2.
- 93 Berghaus, 'Vaccination', 41.
- 94 See Rogers' contribution to this volume.
- 95 Laurie & Williamson, *The parent's guide*, p. 375.
- 96 Warren, *The household physician*, p. 136.
- 97 Freligh, *Homoeopathic practice*, p. 361.
- 98 Edmonds, *A treatise*, p. 186.
- 99 '[...] the homoeopathic principle of vaccination, the discovery of the celebrated Dr. Jenner [...]'. Laurie & Williamson, *The parent's guide*, p. 375f. It has to be conceded as well that Jenner easily can be seen as a martyr, since his innovation first had been disregarded and criticised by hegemonic medicine. This is true, although the quotations above do not refer to this aspect. With the one exception quoted above (E. Ellis 1882), Jenner here is not presented as an outsider.
- 100 Beckwith, 'Vaccination', discussion, 370.
- 101 Williamson, 'Vaccination', 192.
- 102 Kaufman, *Homeopathy*, p. 114, 116, 122ff.; See Rogers' contribution to this volume.
- 103 *Ibid.*, p. 183.
- 104 See Rogers' contribution to this volume.
- 105 E.g. *ibid.*, 61.
- 106 Coulter, *Divided legacy*, p. 308, 308–16. Reinhard Schüppel, 'Die amerikanische Homöopathie des 19. Jahrhunderts – ein Lehrstück für heute?', *Allgemeine Homöopathische Zeitung* 238 (1993), 47–53, here 50. See also Rogers' contribution to this volume.
- 107 The eclectic school, however, opposed allopathic medicine strictly. Eclectics defined themselves as 'medical protestants' against allopathic medicine. See Haller Jr., *Medical protestants*.
- 108 C. Baelz, 'On vaccination (Read before the Allegheny Co. (Penna) Homoeopathic Medical Society)', *Hahnemann Monthly* 7 (1871/72), 393–8, here 397f.
- 109 Winterburn, *The value*, p. 114.

- 110 See e.g. John Duffy, *The sanitarians. A history of American public health* (Urbana & Chicago, 1990).
- 111 Kaufman, 'anti-vaccinationists', 467f.
- 112 Review of, 'Charles T. Pearce [...]', 484.
- 113 Williamson, 'Vaccination', 190.
- 114 Coulter, *Divided legacy*, p. 241. Harris L. Coulter, *Homoeopathic influences in nineteenth-century allopathic therapeutics, a historical and philosophical study* (St. Louis, 1977).
- 115 W.H. Brown, 'Central New York Homoeopathic Medical Society (meeting report)', *Hahnemann Monthly* 10 (1874/75), 368–72, here 371.
- 116 Wells, 'Vaccination', 109–14.
- 117 Williamson, 'Vaccination', 189f.
- 118 See e.g. Sherrill, *Family physician*, p. 304.
- 119 Humphreys, *Humphreys' Homoeopathic Mentor*, p. 267. See also Hering, *The Homeopathic Domestic Physician*, 10th American edition.
- 120 '[...] we may, during that period, administer sulphur as a precautionary measure, exhibiting one dose and repeating it twice, at intervals of a fortnight, each time from a fresh solution.' Laurie & Hull, *Homoeopathic domestic medicine*, p. 229f. Sherrill (1854, 1860), 'To prevent the eruptions and affections of the skin which sometimes succeeds vaccination, give sulphur of high attenuation, one dose a day for three or four days; this also renders the virus more pure and free from a psoric contamination.' Sherrill, *A treatise*; Sherrill, *Family physician*, p. 339f. The same was suggested by Lilienthal (1876), when he stated that effective treatment of erysipelas and eruptions was possible. Lilienthal, *A treatise*, p. 251. Lilienthal, *Homoeopathic therapeutics*, 4th ed. (Philadelphia, 1907), p. 1103.
- 121 See for example *ibid.* or Boericke & Tafel, *Homoeopathic medical index*, p. 28.
- 122 See e.g. Murphy, *Enter the physician*, pp. 218–27. See Rogers' contribution to this volume
- 123 *Ibid.*, p. 223.
- 124 See this distinction in, John Harley Warner, *The therapeutic perspective, medical practice, knowledge, and identity in America, 1820–1885* (Cambridge & London, 1986), p. 5.
- 125 *Ibid.*, p. 263f.