

Charitable Knowledge explores the interconnections among medical teaching, medical knowledge, and medical authority in eighteenth-century London. The metropolis lacked a university until the nine-teenth century, so the seven major voluntary hospitals – St. Bartholomew, St. Thomas, Guy, the Westminster, St. George, the Middlesex, and the London – were crucial sites for educating surgeons, surgeon–apothecaries, and visiting physicians.

Lawrence explains how charity patients became teaching objects, and how hospitals became medical schools. She demonstrates that hospital practitioners gradually gained authority through their clinical teaching, research, and social status in London's urban medical culture, transforming the old tripartite structure into a loosely unified group of de facto general practitioners dominated by hospital men. As hospital physicians and surgeons became the new elite, they profoundly shaped what counted as "good" knowledge among medical men, both in the construction of clinical observations and in the proper use of science.





Charitable knowledge



## Cambridge History of Medicine

#### Edited by

CHARLES ROSENBERG, Professor of History and Sociology of Science, University of Pennsylvania

#### Other titles in the series:

Health, medicine and morality in the sixteenth century EDITED BY CHARLES WEBSTER

The Renaissance notion of woman: A study in the fortunes of scholasticism and medical science in European intellectual life IAN MACLEAN

Mystical Bedlam: Madness, anxiety and healing in sixteenth-century England MICHAEL MACDONALD

From medical chemistry to biochemistry: The making of a biomedical discipline ROBERT E. KOHLER

Joan Baptista Van Helmont: Reformer of science and medicine WALTER PAGEL

A generous confidence: Thomas Story Kirkbride and the art of asylum-keeping, 1840–1883 NANCY TOMES

The cultural meaning of popular science: Phrenology and the organization of consent in nineteenth-century Britain ROGER COOTER

Madness, morality and medicine: A study of the York Retreat, 1796–1914

ANNE DIGBY

Patients and practitioners: Lay perceptions of medicine in pre-industrial society EDITED BY ROY PORTER

Hospital life in Enlightenment Scotland: Care and teaching at the Royal Infirmary of Edinburgh GUENTER B. RISSE

Plague and the poor in Renaissance Florence ANNE G. CARMICHAEL Victorian lunacy: Richard M. Bucke and the practice of late nineteenth-century psychiatry S. E. D. SHORTT

Medicine and society in Wakefield and Huddersfield, 1780–1870 HILARY MARLAND

Ordered to care: The dilemma of American nursing, 1850–1945 SUSAN M. REVERBY

Morbid appearances: The anatomy of pathology in the early nineteenth century RUSSELL C. MAULITZ

Professional and popular medicine in France, 1770–1830: The social world of medical practice MATTHEW RAMSEY

Abortion, doctors and the law: Some aspects of the legal regulation of abortion in England, 1884–1984 DONALD DENOON

Health, race and German politics between national unification and Nazism, 1870–1945 PAUL WEINDLING

The physician-legislators of France: Medicine and politics in the Early Third Republic, 1870–1914 JACK D. ELLIS

Continued on page following the Index



# Charitable knowledge

Hospital pupils and practitioners in eighteenth-century London

SUSAN C. LAWRENCE
The University of Iowa





#### CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

32 Avenue of the Americas, New York NY 10013-2473, USA

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521363556

© Cambridge University Press 1996

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 1996

First paperback edition 2002

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data

Lawrence, Susan C.

Charitable knowledge: hospital pupils and practitioners in eighteenth-century London / Susan C. Lawrence.

p. cm. – (Cambridge history of medicine)

Includes index.

ISBN 0 521 36355 1 (hardback)

- 1. Medicine England London History 18th century.
- 2. Teaching hospitals England London History 18th century.
- 3. Medical education England London History 18th century.
- I. Title. II. Series.

[DNLM: 1. Medical Staff, Hospital – education. 2. Hospitals,

Voluntary - history - London. 3. History of Medicine, 18th Cent. -

London. wx 18 1996]

R488.L8L38 1996

610'.942'09033-dc20

DNLM/DLC

for Library of Congress 95-17710 CIP

ISBN 978-0-521-36355-6 Hardback

ISBN 978-0-521-52518-3 Paperback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.



In memory of my father and my brother





#### **CONTENTS**

	List of tables and figures	page x
	Preface	X
I	Introduction: Hospital medicine in eighteenth-century	
	London	I
	The setting	5
	Transformations	12
	Hospital medicine	19
	PART I. INSTITUTIONS AND EDUCATION	
2	The London hospitals: Virtue and value	33
	Charity and the hospitals	36
	Hospital practitioners	55
3	The Corporations, licensing, and reform, 1700–1815	74
	The London corporations: Membership and licensing	76
	Education at the halls and college	81
	Education, war, and the colleges: Reform and responses, 1780–1815	0.7
	responses, 1/80–1813	91
4	Walking the wards: From apprentices to pupils	107
	Apprentices and pupils, character and cash	110
	On the wards: Increasing numbers, blurry boundaries	I 34
	Learning on the wards	148
5	London lecturing: Public knowledge and private courses	162
	Private and public: Business, knowledge, access,	
	and authority	165
	The London system: An overview	167
	Entrepreneurs: Entertainment and expertise, 1700–1760 Bodies and businesses: Hospital lecturing, 1760–1820	175
	Dodies and businesses. Flospital lecturing, 1700–1820	188



#### viii Contents

#### PART II. COMMUNITY AND KNOWLEDGE

6	Gentlemen scholars and clinical cases, 1700–1760	215
	Public persona: Publishing	218
	Publicity and polemics	222
	Ancients and moderns	225
	Gentlemanly knowledge: Nature, medicine, and the	
	Royal Society	227
	Clinical knowledge: Public and private	234
	Hospital knowledge	24 I
7	London hospital men and a medical community,	
′	1760-1815	250
	Public platforms: Publishing and status	254
	Gatherings of like-minded men	259
	Diffusing useful knowledge	271
	Observing practitioners and men of science	276
8	Hospital men make medical knowledge, 1760–1815	289
	To observe – and "make the tryal"	293
	Clinical territory: Whose case? Whose knowledge?	301
	Men of science: The lures of experiment	310
	Dangerous disputes	327
	Conclusion	335
	Appendix I: London hospital men, 1700–1815	343
	I.A: Physicians, surgeons, and accoucheurs elected to	
	Guy's, St. Thomas's, St. Bartholomew's, the London,	
	the Westminster, St. George's, and the Middlesex	343
	I.B: Numbers of positions for staff physicians and	
	surgeons at the general hospitals, ca. 1700–1825	351
	I.C: Numbers of physicians elected to the general	
	hospitals: Fellows, Licentiates, and nonmembers of the	
	Royal College of Physicians, 1700–1820	352
	I.D: Numbers of physicians elected to each hospital:	
	Fellows, Licentiates, and nonmembers of the Royal	
	College of Physicians, 1700–1820	353
	I.E: Hospital surgeons and the Court of Assistants,	
	Corporation/Royal College of Surgeons, 1745–1815	355
	Appendix II: London hospital pupils, 1725–1820	350
	II.A: Population growth and hospital pupils, 1771-	
	1821, indexed on 1771 at 100	356



Contents		
II.B: Hospital pupils and Army medical entrants,		
1750–1820	357	
II.C: St. Thomas's Hospital: Entering pupils,		
1725–1820	358	
II.D: The London Hospital: Entering pupils, 1745–1820	359	
II.E: St. George's Hospital: Entering pupils, 1756-1820	359	
II.F: The Middlesex Hospital: Entering pupils,		
1765–1820	360	
II.G: Guy's Hospital: Entering pupils, 1778–1820	360	
Appendix III: London medical lecturers, 1700–1820	361	
Index	379	



#### TABLES AND FIGURES

	Map of London, 1780	page 32
	Tables	
2. I	The general hospitals of eighteenth-century London	39
4. I	Pupils on the wards in the London hospitals	109
4.2	Ward-walking at the London hospitals	I 20
4·3 4·4	University affiliations of St. Thomas's physicians' pupils Introduction of clinical lectures at the London hospitals,	144
	1770-1815	157
5. I 5. 2	The London timetable for the core subjects, ca. 1800 Institutional affiliations of lecturing physicians, surgeons,	172
	and chemists, 1750–1815	174
5.3	Lectures at the London hospitals, 1760–1820	190
5.4	Geographical distribution of medical lectures in London	192
6. I	Physicians and surgeons elected, 1700-1759	219
6.2	Physicians and publishing, 1700–1759	220
7. I	Physicians and surgeons elected, 1760-1819	255
7.2	Physicians and publishing, 1760–1819	256
7.3	· Medical Register of 1783: London physicians	257
7.4	Medical Register of 1783: Members of the Surgeons'	
	Corporation	258
7.5	London medical societies, 1746–1819	261
	Figures	
4. I	Pupils at the London hospitals	111
4.2	Surgeons' pupils	135
4.3	Physicians' and apothecaries' pupils	141
5. I	London lectures, 1755–1820	169



#### **PREFACE**

"Charitable knowledge," I have been told, is a rather peculiar conjunction of words. People are benevolent, generous, lenient, merciful, or philanthropic, giving of their time, compassion, or money; knowledge - well, knowledge, qua knowledge, is not. Yet "charitable knowledge" captures the major arguments in this book. Practitioners in eighteenth-century London hospitals used their medical knowledge and skills for charitable ends. They spent hours voluntarily attending to the sick poor. They tried to help ill men and women to get better, whether or not they were particularly successful with their cures or especially kind to the poor folk under their care. During the eighteenth century, hospital physicians and surgeons made teaching pupils on the wards integral to hospitals' charitable duties. In order to do that, they had to make the daily presence of large numbers of pupils on the wards fit into the meaning of charity for the lay governors whose time and money supported the hospitals. Using hospital patients as teaching objects had to become a good thing to do, a valuable contribution to social betterment for all people, not just a useful experience for a very small number of apprentices and personal assistants.

The modern teaching hospital exists because we – as a culture if not as individuals – in a fundamental sense value the moments when an experienced clinician instructs a medical student using the body and responses of a hospital patient. (This is, of course, sometimes valued more in the abstract than when one is the patient.) What is enshrined here is not the patient's "gift" of his condition and cooperation, although that may be appreciated, but rather the clinician's benevolence and generosity in sharing her knowledge and skills with a neophyte, whatever the patient may feel about the experience. Clinical teaching could only become – and remain – institutionalized in hospitals because even if we see it exploiting patients for purposes other than care, we understand that it serves a higher good – producing qualified doctors for other people, including ourselves. Hospital practitioners had to make this argument in the eighteenth century. That



### xii Preface

they did so successfully explains our comfortable belief that it is true. The second point that "charitable knowledge" offers arises from the first. The knowledge that eighteenth-century medical men made, deployed, and taught on - and off - the wards was itself configured by the rituals and meaning of charity practice in the major London hospitals. The lay and medical men who built, ran, and supported the voluntary hospitals envisioned that respectable, even eminent, practitioners would volunteer to serve them. In London, this meant physicians and surgeons who knew the customs suited to practice among the well-to-do. I argue that hospital physicians and surgeons always used their charity work to display behavior appropriate for elite practitioners, no matter what else they did with it. Practicing on the poor was all about practicing among the rich, not in the sense of providing the same remedies, operations, and attention, but in the more fundamental sense that having a hospital post distinguished a man with prestige, learning, and expertise from the common run of ordinary practitioners. In much of this volume, I present the complex implications of this perspective. It has allowed me to connect the social context of hospital practice with the ways that eighteenth-century medical men wrote about their clinical experiences; to intertwine the meaning of gentlemanly manners with the meaning of science within medicine; to explain the persistence of two visions of the body and its diseases - the physician's constitutional one and the surgeon's anatomical one - into the nineteenth century; and to explore the powerful ways that hospital men's teaching both created the general practitioner and kept him subordinate to them.

Charitable Knowledge, then, is a book about medical authority constructed in and through the voluntary hospitals of eighteenth-century London. As such, it is about the transformation of the traditional medical occupations – physician, surgeon, and apothecary – into the modern medical profession before the advent of organic chemistry, systematic microscopy, or anesthesia, indeed, before all of the changes that we now believe give medicine authority through correct science and efficacious practice. By the early nineteenth century, all sorts of medical students, ordinary practitioners, lay patients, politicians, and booksellers recognized that they were supposed to pay attention to the physicians and surgeons who staffed London's well-known charities for the sick poor. During the eighteenth century, the practitioners and pupils at St. Bartholomew's, St. Thomas's, Guy's, the Westminster, St. George's, the London, and the Middlesex hospitals made these institutions into sites for the production and legitimization of both reliable doctors and good medical knowledge. They still do.

I began this project over a decade ago and with each passing year the number of those who contributed time, inspiration, support, criticism, and even well-meaning impatience has grown substantially. Many of my



Preface xiii

students, colleagues, and friends at the University of Toronto, Ball State University, and the University of Iowa have given more than most of them will ever know to the final shape of this book. I regret that I cannot thank all of them individually in this Preface.

Financial support for research travel made this work possible. I am extremely grateful to the University of Toronto for support during my graduate program; to the American Philosophical Society for a summer research grant; to the National Endowment for the Humanities for a Travel to Collections grant (FE-20881-87); to Ball State University for a Faculty Research Grant; and to the University of Iowa for international travel funds.

I could not have contemplated, carried out, or finished this study without access to eighteenth-century hospital records, manuscripts, and publications. I deeply appreciate the time and effort that the staff men and women of many libraries and archives not only took to provide me with helpful suggestions and material, but also continue to take to preserve and to catalogue the collections entrusted to them. In particular, I want to thank the librarians and archivists of the Bodleian Library of the University of Oxford, the British Library, the Corporation of London Record Office, the Greater London Record Office, the Guildhall Library, the Norfolk Record Office, the Royal College of Surgeons of England, the Royal College of Physicians of London, the Royal Society of London, the University of Edinburgh Library, the London Hospital Medical School Library, St. George's Hospital Medical School Library, St. Thomas's Hospital Medical School Library, the Wills Library at Guy's Hospital Medical School, and the Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine in London. I owe a special debt of gratitude to Mr. Bompas, former Secretary of Guy's Hospital, for permission to study the student registers in his office; to the late Mr. Ralph Winterton, for access to the Middlesex Hospital archives; to Mr. Hugh Anderson, former Honorary Archivist to St. George's Hospital Archives, for access to St. George's Hospital archives; to Sue Palmer, when Archivist of the Guy's Hospital records at the Greater London Record Office, for information from material unfit for consultation; to Janet Foster, when District Archivist for the St. Bartholomew's Hospital Archives, for bringing me Ludford Harvey's diary; and to Claire Daunton, when District Archivist for the London Hospital archives, for her help with dozens of dusty volumes. They all went out of their way to let me work for long hours on the hospitals' boards of governors records.

For permission to reproduce Fielding's 1786 map of London, I acknowledge the Westminster City Archives; Michael Wilcox provided the graphics expertise to label the hospitals' locations.

On this side of the Atlantic, the staff of the Science and Medicine Library, John Robart's Library, and the Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library



#### xiv Preface

of the University of Toronto were endlessly patient with my requests. On my research trips to the National Library of Medicine, I always found the staff of the Historical Division generous with their kindness and expertise. I thank the University of Iowa's library staff for their assistance over the last few years, as I have written and rewritten this book. Additional noteworthy support from the University of Iowa came with the enthusiasm and skill of two graduate research assistants, Gail Hutchison and Louisa Starr Mack, and from Melanie DeVore, who has been a calm source of secretarial expertise and patience during the final year it has taken to prepare the manuscript. Thank you all.

This book went through many versions during a decade of increasingly abundant work on eighteenth-century medicine, science, and culture, and I owe many thought-provoking moments to the scholars whose work I acknowledge in my notes. Excellent work continues to appear, such as Medicine in the Enlightenment, edited by Roy Porter (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1995), published since the manuscript went to the Press in July 1994 and so not included in my analysis or references. For their considerable intellectual stimulation and challenge, my deep gratitude goes out to Toby Gelfand, my doctoral dissertation adviser, Cathy Crawford, Andy Federer, Jan Golinski, Henry Horwitz, Roy Porter, and John Harley Warner. Harold Cook, Charles Rosenberg, Daniel Goldstein, and Gail Zlatnik read and offered insightful and helpful comments on large portions of my manuscript; for their efforts to make this book better, I am enormously grateful. All the remaining flaws are entirely my own. A workgroup at the University of Iowa kept me going throughout all the ups and downs of academic life: Sally Kenney, Teresa Mangum, and Gita Patel, you did it. Lastly, Mary Fissell has done all of the above, and more. Her support, reading, criticism, enthusiasm - and long conversations about eighteenth-century medicine, culture, science, and poverty – always helped me to shape and to refine my arguments. That we sometimes disagreed reminded me at crucial moments that writing a book can be fun.

A note on quotations and dates: I have remained faithful to the spelling and grammar of eighteenth-century sources in all quotations, except that I have written superscripted abbreviations, such as w<sup>ch</sup>, as "wch." I use [sic], therefore, only when the peculiarities of the author's prose have convinced readers of the manuscript that there must be a mistake in the quotation. All dates before 1752 are given new style, with the calendar year beginning on January 1, unless otherwise noted.