

THE LIFE AND TIMES OF DR RICHARD FREWIN (1681-1761):
MEDICINE IN OXFORD IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

A. H. T. Robb-Smith

(ed. Margaret Pelling)

[What follows is an edited version of the fifteenth Gideon de Laune lecture, given by Dr A. H. T. Robb-Smith to the Worshipful Society of Apothecaries of London on 19 April 1972]

The name of Dr Richard Frewin is little known beyond the bounds of Oxford and I wondered whether it was not too parochial a subject for the fifteenth Gideon de Laune lecture which you have given me the great honour of delivering, doubts which became stronger when I considered the distinguished historians who have preceded me.

Yet Dr Frewin epitomised the successful provincial physician, an aspect of English social history which has only gained recognition in the last ten years, while his professional relations reflect the changes that took place in the first half of the eighteenth century consequent on your Society's successful struggle to free the apothecary from the dominance of the Royal College of Physicians.

There are two faces to the Augustan era: the patterned elegance of its architecture and literature conforming to the rules of taste, and a coarseness and brutality of manners that was to be found in all ranks of society. There was a lethargy in the English universities, professional bodies, and other national institutions, though they were only touched by the systematic corruption that characterised the organised manifestations of Parliament. Yet it was in this same period that we find the emergence of a social conscience, that great outburst of philanthropic spirit and humanitarianism which preceded the evangelical movement. This humanitarian spirit engendered a tolerance and liberality of outlook as Anglicans and nonconformists found they could work together in these charitable enterprises. Catholics and protestant dissenters were still barred from the universities of Oxford and Cambridge, though there was a way round; Catholics could go to a continental university, while Protestants were welcome at Leiden and in Scotland. When we turn to the level of achievement of English medicine we find the same dichotomy. Alexander Pope once said that physicians were in general the most amiable companions and the best friends, as well as the most learned men he knew; indeed there was then a higher proportion of cultured physicians than at any other period of English history. The names roll off - Mead, Freind, Arbuthnot, Akenside, Garth, Askew, Sloane, Lawrence, William Hunter - and yet the achievements of English medicine are negligible, limited to some good clinical descriptions by Fothergill, Huxham and Heberden, improvements in midwifery by Smellie and in surgery by Cheselden and Pott, Floyer's pulse watch, and Pringle's work on military sanitation. The only epoch-making contributions I can think of are Robert Whytt's work on experimental neurology and James Lind's study of scurvy. But just as physicians could be able poets, connoisseurs of arts and letters, or expert botanists, so it was that the amateur could advance medical knowledge - the physiological studies of the curate of Teddington [Stephen Hales], Lady Mary Wortley Montagu's advocacy of smallpox inoculation, in which she received the support of Richard Mead

and James Jurin, and the discovery of the value of salicylates in rheumatism by the Reverend Edward Stone, rector of Chipping Norton – all reflections of this age of reason. There is much dispute as to the cause of the remarkable fall in mortality rates during this period; I myself believe that it can be attributed not to improvements in medical care, but rather to the rise in financial prosperity. Yet there was a striving for better medical training and care of the sick, of which I shall say more later, all part of the desire to advance mankind by conquering ignorance, and so we have the charity schools, the hospitals and dispensaries, the societies for the propagation of Christian knowledge and for the reformation of manners, Ephraim Chambers' *Cyclopaedia or Universal Dictionary of Arts and Sciences* which was to inspire Denis Diderot's gigantic *Dictionnaire Raisonné*, and the emergence of associations for sharing knowledge and ideas, of which one of the earliest was the Gentleman's Society at Spalding.

Many of these philanthropic projects were not actuated solely by compassion. By providing education for artisans' children, or by treating the sick poor, the nation would gain economically and so increase its material prosperity. The charter of the South Sea Company was granted so that by its successful trading the National Debt of thirty million pounds would be wiped out in twenty-five years, but the directors distributed over a million pounds in bribes to achieve their purpose. When the bubble burst it was the financial genius of Sir Robert Walpole that came to the rescue, but he had said 'The scheme held out a dangerous lure for decoying the unwary to their ruin by a false prospect of gain and to part with the gradual profits of their labours for imaginary wealth'. The South Sea Company was only a magnified example of the national enthusiasm for speculation; there were lotteries everywhere, there were projects of every sort, for making salt water fresh, for Puckle's machine gun which would fire rounds or square bullets, and even one to establish a company for carrying on an 'undertaking of Great Advantage' but no one to know what it was. However we should not forget that Daniel Defoe's grandiose scheme for a Pension Office, which was to include hospital care, was expected to show a surplus of £90,000 in five years.

It is against this background of elegance and brutality, of tolerance and prejudice, of benevolence and cupidity, that we must view the life of Dr Frewin. I shall not attempt to describe the kaleidoscopic political scene in Oxford at this time, of which Professor Ward has given such a brilliant account, for it would seem that Dr Frewin, although a supporter of the Establishment whether Whig or Tory, managed to avoid getting embroiled in the political factions and manoeuvres of the common rooms; it was only in medical politics that he revealed his feelings and prejudices.

Richard Frewin was a Londoner but little is known of his early life until 1693, when, at the age of twelve, he entered Westminster School as a King's scholar under the famous Dr Richard Busby. Busby was by then in his eighty-seventh year, for he had ruled since the day of Charles I and made Westminster the leading school in England, equal if not superior to Eton and Winchester. Frewin was clearly able, for in 1697 he was captain of school and gained a studentship to Christ Church, which was linked to Westminster almost as closely as Winchester School was to New College.

When Frewin came up to Oxford in July 1698, at the age of seventeen, he may have travelled from London in Haynes's flying coach which did the journey in a day at a cost of twelve shillings. The view of Oxford as he came over Shotover was of a city of only about 6000 inhabitants; there were open fields almost up to Magdalen Bridge, as there had been little extension outside the old city walls and many of the now-familiar architectural landmarks had not been built. Along High Street, The Queen's College had not yet undergone its classical transformation, nor would Frewin have seen the dome of the Radcliffe Camera, Hawksmoor's towers in All Souls College, or All Saints' Church, but above the plate-glass windows many of the shops on the south side still are as they were then. Otho Nicholson's conduit was still at the

centre of Carfax, for Oxford had been one of the first towns to have a piped water supply and it was from this conduit that water drawn from Hinksey Hill was distributed to those who could pay. On festive occasions claret and beer flowed from it; until a century ago many of the colleges continued to use this source, infinitely purer than the sewage-contaminated wells. As young Frewin turned down St Aldate's, Christ Church would have looked much as it does today, for Great Tom, the bell from Osney Abbey, had first sounded its mighty strokes from Wren's tower only fourteen years before. So Frewin became one of the 101 students of Christ Church - 'the House' - and once again was fortunate, for not only did he find many of his old Westminster friends there, but the Dean, Henry Aldrich, was an exceptional man. A lampoon said of Aldrich, 'one while he's chymist, Theologue, Logician, now an anatomist, then a Musician' and this was no exaggeration, for he was a forerunner of the eighteenth-century virtuoso. An excellent churchman, he was a versatile teacher and his manual of logic continued to be used for generations. He had studied mathematics under William Oughtred, and applied this skill and his superb draughtmanship to architecture and to the buildings he designed which add beauty to Oxford - his own Peckwater Quad, Trinity College Chapel, All Saints' Church, The Queen's College library, and many more. He was a member of the Oxford Philosophical Society and an able musician, but above all he was a friendly man who loved to dispense hospitality. As he wrote:

If all be true that I do think

There are five reasons why we should drink; Good wine - a friend - or being dry -

Or lest we should be by and by -

Or any other reason why.

This bonhomie was always in moderation and even Thomas Hearne, the crabbed antiquary and critical recorder of Oxford, wrote of Aldrich:

Consider him either as a Christian, a Scholar or a Gentleman, he was one of the most eminent men in England.... He was a severe student himself, yet always free, open and facetious... He was a man of admirable Natural Parts and was vers'd both in Ecclesiastical and humane learning almost beyond compare. He was humble and modest almost to a fault. He was always for encouraging Industry, Learning, Integrity and whatever deserves Commendation.

Under his rule Christ Church was a place of high ideals. It was the Dean's custom to invite one of the young members of the college to edit a classical work which was then presented to the other students as a New Year gift. When Frewin arrived at Christ Church one of these youthful efforts was creating a literary brouhaha which soon developed political overtones. Charles Boyle, fourth Earl of Orrery and a great-nephew of Robert Boyle, had been encouraged to edit the 'Letters of Phalaris', an ancient literary forgery, and this appeared in 1695, when he was only nineteen. In the preface he complained of the rudeness of Dr Richard Bentley who at that time was the King's Librarian, but was later to become the turbulent Master of Trinity College, Cambridge. Bentley defended himself in an essay appended to William Wotton's *Reflections upon Ancient and Modern Learning* trouncing Boyle's views in a rough, humorous way. This contempt infuriated the Christ Church wits who in 1698 replied, venting their cleverness upon him with scant regard for fairness or good manners, and the battle rolled on for years, being satirised in Swift's *Battle of the Books*, but as Bentley was a Whig favourite, it cost Dean Aldrich the loss of his New Year gift of a brace of bucks from the royal park at Woodstock. Young Boyle entered the army and served under Marlborough at Malplaquet, but turned Tory and so found himself in the Tower in connection with a Jacobite plot. There he was soon joined by Bishop Atterbury who had taken a leading part in the Bentley controversy, and by his old tutor Dr John Freind.

Freind had also been at Westminster School, but was senior to Richard Frewin, coming up to Christ Church in 1694. Dean Aldrich recognised his classical scholarship, and so he was Charles Boyle's tutor although a year younger than his pupil. With Peter Foulkes, who came up from Westminster at the same time and was to become a distinguished scholar and divine, Freind translated some Greek orations of Aeschines and Demosthenes and wrote a number of light-hearted Latin poems. But Freind, like Frewin, had determined to make a career in medicine and so we must consider what was available to them in Oxford.

The numbers entering the university were falling, and this was reflected in the medical faculty. In 1670 there were 450 matriculants, in 1700 300, and in 1750 200, and of these about three-quarters took degrees. In the medical faculty during the period 1650 to 1700 there were 459 graduates, and in 1700-1750, 292. It was not until the latter part of the 19th century that the medical school returned to its 17th-century size. Venn has calculated that in 1630, 1:3,600 of the male population went to Oxford or Cambridge; this had dropped to 1:5,600 by 1700, and to 1:11,400 by 1800, whereas nowadays about 1:165 of the male population go to a university.

I have spoken before of the fallacious idea that there was no real medical education at Oxford and Cambridge until the middle of the nineteenth century and that until that time would-be physicians, having taken their MA degree, went abroad for their medical training and doctorate which they incorporated in their alma mater and so became eligible for fellowship of the Royal College of Physicians in London with its social and financial advantages. In fact, until about 1750 when the Scottish schools began their organised mass-production of doctors, Oxford and Cambridge were the only universities in Great Britain offering a medical education and up to that time only a tenth of the Oxford and Cambridge medical graduates had incorporated foreign degrees. Moreover, it was only later that significant numbers of medical men went into practice solely on the basis of a Scottish or foreign degree.

However, we must look at the *sort* of medical education available at Oxford at the beginning of the eighteenth century. The statutory requirements were perfectly straightforward. Ten years had to elapse after matriculation before a candidate could take the BM, and the doctorate could not be granted until four years later. The first four years of preparation for the BA involved disputations and examinations in logic, grammar, moral philosophy and geometry; after the Bachelor's degree was taken there were a further three years of disputations, lectures and examinations in similar subjects, together with natural philosophy (that is to say physical sciences), history, and geography before the Master's degree could be taken. The remaining three years preparatory to the BM involved attending a course of anatomy, and defending and opposing questions in medicine before the Regius professor of medicine. The licence to practise needed a certificate signed by the Regius and at least one other doctor, confirming the candidate's ability. A candidate for the doctorate was required to deliver a number of lectures commenting on a book of Galen. Furthermore, before one could supplicate for any degree, approval had to be given by one's college as well as by Congregation [the collectivity of MAs active in the university].

Now, everyone knew that these disputations and academical exercises in the Examination Schools were almost invariably a hollow mockery, the disputations being a formal repetition of syllogisms, of which sets were handed down from undergraduate to undergraduate, while the lectures were delivered pro forma to the bare walls of an empty room. It is true that on occasion permission to supplicate for a degree was withheld, but this was usually on grounds of religious, political or moral irregularity, rather than ignorance, and all that really mattered was paying the various fees and entertaining the examiners.

If this was the situation at Oxford, as it undoubtedly was, and Cambridge was no better, how could the London College of Physicians justify their attitude that their fellowship should only be

granted to doctors of these universities and how was it that many of these doctors were men of culture and competent physicians? Richard Frewin took his BM in 1707, nine years after matriculation, and John Freind preceded him by four years, so I have examined the careers of a cohort of the thirty-six physicians who graduated between 1704 and 1710. They were distributed between sixteen colleges and halls, Christ Church and Brasenose each having four, the others one, two or three. The average age at matriculation was sixteen, for the BA twenty, and the MA twenty-three, which corresponds to the statutory interval. The average age for the BM was twenty-nine, but this is distorted because several left the university with the licence to practise and only returned at a later date to take the BM and DM [i.e., MD] degrees. If these are omitted the age for the BM comes down to twenty-seven, just over the statutory period, while for the doctorate it was thirty-three. Only three of the thirty-six went to a foreign university prior to graduating. John Beeston, the son of the Warden of New College, went to Leiden for a year before he took his BA, but his career was somewhat anomalous as he first took a BCL, gave lectures on chemistry in Oxford, and only ten years later took his DM. Moreover, though he practised in London, he would not join the College of Physicians. The second of the three, John Lane, was the son of a Wallingford doctor, who spent a short period at Leiden after he had taken his MA from Exeter College; he obtained his doctorate at the age of twenty-seven and twenty years later gained an MD by royal mandate from Cambridge, while he practised at Banbury in Oxfordshire. The third, George Mullins, was also at Exeter, obtained his licence to practise after the MA, and set up at Salisbury; later he spent a short time at Leiden, received his Oxford DM at the age of forty-five, and continued to practise in Salisbury where he is buried in the cathedral.

If we look at the subsequent careers of the whole thirty-six, we find that ten went to London, seven of these being fellows of the College of Physicians, one a physician to the Fleet, one a surgeon, and the tenth was the John Beeston already mentioned. Six more remained in Oxford, of whom three died young, the others being Richard Frewin, William Beauvoix who was Regius professor for a year, and Robert Thompson of whom little is known. Ten others went into practice in country towns, mostly in the south and west, four took holy orders and combined medicine with parochial duties, which was still quite common in small towns and villages; and there are six remaining whom as yet I have not been able to trace. Clearly these men, and they are in no way an exceptional sample, must have received some medical training at Oxford, but what form did it take?

The Regius professor of medicine was Dr Thomas Hoy, who had been appointed in 1698 on the death of his undistinguished predecessor Dr Luffe. Hoy was a fellow of St John's College, a member of the Oxford Philosophical Society, and had published some essays and translations of classical authors before he took his BM in 1686. He ceased to be a college fellow after receiving his DM in 1689, and went into practice, at first in Warwick but later in Surrey where he sought John Evelyn's support for appointment to the Regius chair. Evelyn found him 'a learned curious and ingenious person' and agreed to approach the Archbishop of Canterbury on his behalf, but the real influence in his successful appointment was his old tutor, Dr William Gibbons, John Radcliffe's *bête noire* and the introducer of mahogany to this country. Gibbons had supplanted Radcliffe as physician to Princess Anne and had the ear of Baron Somers, the Lord Chancellor.

Hoy seems to have been a sound physician, judging by a letter he wrote to Sir Hans Sloane when he was called to Badminton to advise on the treatment of Mary, Duchess of Beaufort, whom he considered was suffering from the spleen and vapours. He was equally sensible in his treatment of Alexander Torriano, the Gresham professor of anatomy, but this fragmentary evidence would not necessarily recommend anyone as a professor of medicine, though in the Oxford Almanacs for 1703 and 1707 Hoy was stated as giving his lectures on Tuesdays at 8.00 a.m. Certainly his appointment was viewed with the greatest disapproval by the Tories, Hearne writing of him as 'the little insect who was absent from Oxford as he generally is, it being his

custom to do the duties of his place by a deputy and employ his time in whimsical projects'. Elsewhere Hearne, who did not mince his words, called him 'a rank low church whigg, and a mighty projector for making salts. He is very good at getting children but nothing else that I know of'. There is an explanation for the remark about making salts in an undated manuscript, 'A representation concerning the manufacture of sal ammoniac hereby desired to be laid before the Lord Commissioners for Trade by Thomas Hoy R.P.M.', which naturally gives no clue as to the proposed process. It is just possible that this project is the 'business of the greatest and secret importance' which Hoy was anxious to impart to Sir Hans Sloane in 1709, for by the next year he was living in Jamaica, never to return.

The Regius professor of medicine was also Tomlins' reader in anatomy, who by statute was required to lecture on a dissected criminal after the spring assizes and on the skeleton in Michaelmas term. Almost invariably a deputy was appointed to carry out these duties who seldom did so. Hoy's deputy, Dr Charles Tadlow of St John's College, who had received his doctorate in 1693, was afraid to see a skeleton, according to the students, and in 1710, Hearne, who as sub-librarian at the Bodleian was also keeper of the anatomy school, observed that Tadlow, whom he described as 'a very fat man of little or no manner of honesty being either unwilling or else unable to do the duties of the Anatomy lecturer had appointed a deputy for himself', which caused a lot of trouble.

The Sedleian professorship of natural philosophy, which Thomas Willis had held with such distinction, was now enjoyed by his successor, Sir Thomas Millington, the great persecutor of the apothecaries, who had been President of the College of Physicians since 1695, but had not given a lecture in Oxford for a quarter of a century. At the physic garden the situation was somewhat more satisfactory, as Jacob Bobart, the acting professor, was a knowledgeable botanist as well as being an enthusiastic gardener. It was he who stimulated the interest of William Sherard, an undergraduate and later fellow at St John's, to the lasting benefit of the university and botany at large.

Elias Ashmole's Scientific Institution was not in such a happy state. Opened by the Duke of York in 1683, the NickNackatory housed Ashmole's (and Tradescant's) collection of rarities, a lecture room and a library together with a chemical laboratory. Here, the curator, Dr Robert Plot, lectured three times a week on chemistry, assisted by the university chemist, Christopher White; soon Plot's catalytic enthusiasm established the Oxford Philosophical Society. In 1689, Plot, denied the wardenship of All Souls by the disreputable antics of Leopold Finch, but enjoying the appointment of Historiographer Royal and anticipating the pleasures of matrimony, resigned from the chair of chemistry, and the scientific activities of the Ashmolean Museum soon ceased. Edward Hannes, a student of Christ Church, was appointed to succeed Plot, but, apart from giving an inaugural lecture and entertaining the aged Ashmole to a banquet in the museum, nothing is known of his teaching. His aim was to be a successful London physician and as Sir Edward Hannes, physician to Queen Anne, he achieved this; he was succeeded by John Beeston but he is only a name, one of the twenty-three children of the Warden of New College. After this lamentable catalogue, it is hardly surprising that the practitioner-apothecaries, and graduates of the continental universities, were envious of the privileges enjoyed in the College of Physicians by Oxford and Cambridge doctors, where as they maintained, medicine was not regularly taught.

In fact it was well known that the university professorships were sinecures, obtained on political grounds rather than merit, and that the real teachers were college tutors or private lecturers, though this was seldom admitted. However one anonymous writer puts it clearly:

The didactic part... having been long ago by Custom transferred from the Publick Professors to the Several Tutors in each particular college, both as a more familiar, and more effective method of Instruction; it being obvious that one Man

may to better purpose instruct a dozen or twenty pupils in his Chamber than one Man can teach three or four hundred in a publick school. But here again the publick Appearance of Instruction fails; for these Praelectors not being paid by their Audience (as the foreign Professors are) and having but small salaries allowed when they read publick Lectures in the School, chuse rather to forego their salaries by omitting to read publick lectures, than to incur the Expense of providing Bodies for Dissection and other expensive materials necessary for their several courses of Anatomy and Chemistry; and to read Lectures privately to such as will pay them.

It happens that we have a contemporary confirmation of this. In 1700 a Mr Lewis Maidwell, a private schoolmaster, petitioned Parliament for support for a Public Academy in London, of which he was to be the rector, for sixty young gentlemen who were to be taught ancient and modern languages, mathematics and the sciences, together with dancing, fencing and formal riding. This caused considerable alarm and opposition in the universities, as had Sir Thomas Gresham's college in the sixteenth century. Amongst the counter-petitions is a letter prepared by Dr John Wallis, the eighty-four year old Savilian professor of geometry and keeper of the archives, in which, in addition to analysing the defects of Maidwell's scheme - he was particularly against the instruction in dressage on the great horse - he reviews the facilities which were provided at Oxford. After considering the arrangements for mathematics and natural philosophy he observes:

The like hath been done as to Anatomy by Dr. Musgrave while he was fellow of New College in Oxford, who (upon request of some persons agreeing for that end) did with them go through a course of Anatomy; and the like hath been done (more or less) by Dr. Willis, Dr. Lower, Dr. Hannes, and others, for their own satisfaction, and for the information of such others as have desired it. And now of late Dr. Keil sometime at Oxford and sometime at Cambridge alternately, hath with divers companies (successively) gone through a course of Anatomy. And there seldome happens a publike execution of condemned persons but that one or more bodies are privately dissected for that end. And, at other times, the like is oft performed on the bodies of other animals; whereby many usefull discoveries, in anatomy, have been here made, which were not before observed.

Although bills to support Mr Maidwell's proposals came before succeeding Parliaments, the attempts to obtain an Act ceased in 1704, but curiously enough in 1751 Viscount Cornbury directed that the profits from the sale or publication of the manuscripts of his great-grandfather, Lord Clarendon, should be used to establish in Oxford a M^enage or Academy for riding or other useful activities. By 1860 the sum of £10,000 was available and, as the university had no need of a riding school, the money was used to build the Clarendon Laboratories for Experimental Philosophy, an extension of the University Museum which now accommodates the department of geology and mineralogy.

Unhappily I have not been able to find a young Oxford medical student's diary of this period, but we get a clear impression of the situation at Cambridge - where the official arrangements for teaching were no better than at Oxford - from the diary of William Stukeley, who came up to Corpus Christi College to read medicine in 1703 at the age of sixteen and took his MB six years later, as Cambridge medical students were excused the arts degree. After describing his reading with his tutors in classics, logic and mathematics, he goes on to say:

I turned my mind particularly to the study of Physick, & in order thereto began to make a diligent & near inquisition into Anatomy and Botany, in consort with Hobart, a senior Lad of our College who was entered into that study, & since

dead. With him I went frequently a-simpling, & began to steal dogs & dissect them & all sorts of animals that came in our way. We saw too, many Philosophical Experiments in Pneumatic Hydrostatic Engines & instruments performed at that time by Mr. Waller, & the doctrine of Optics and Telescopes & Microscopes, & some Chymical Experiments, with Mr. Stephen Hales then Fellow of the College, now of the Royal Society. I contracted acquaintance with all the Lads (& them only) in the University that studyd Physic [he mentions the names of nine in various colleges]. With these I used to range about once or twice a week the circumjacent country, & search the Gravel & Chalk pits for fossils. Gogmagog hills, the Moors about Cherry Hinton, Grantchester, Trumpington, Madingley Woods, Hill of Health, Chesterton, Barnwell, were the frequent scenes of our simpling toyl, armed with Candleboxes & Rays catalogus. We hunted after Butterflies, dissected frogs, us'd to have sett meetings at our chambers, to confer about our studys, try Chymical experiments, cut up Dogs, Cats, & the like. I went to Chymical Lectures with Signor Vigani at his Laboratory in Queen's College. I took down all his Readings in Writing, & have them in a Book with Drawings of his manner of building Furnaces of Dry Bricks without Iron or Mortar, & his manner of regulating the Fire to any degree of heat.

Stukeley's father died early in 1706, and he did not return to Cambridge until June 1706:

At that time I sett myself to work in dissecting Dogs, & Herons, & all sorts of Animals that came in my Way. We had an old Cat in the house, which had been a great Favorite of my Fathers & the whole Family, & by my Mothers leave I rid her of the infirmitys of age, & made a handsom sceleton of her bones, which I carryd to Cambridg with me the next Journey thither, & after I had taken my Degree & was leaving the University I buryed her in a high walk by the side of the Lane leading from the Spittle house Conduit & the bridge in the road to Gogmagog hills, where I used frequently to walk. I likewise sceletonised several different sorts of birds, & made air pumps & 20 inventions to try mechanical & philosophical experiments I had learnt in my Academical Lectures... We took up old Hoyes that hangd himself & was buryed in the highway, & dissected him, & afterwards made a sceleton of his bones, & put them into a fine Glass case with an inscription in Latin.... At this time my Tutor gave me a Room in the College to dissect in, & practice Chymical Experiments, which had a very strange appearance with my Furniture in it, the wall was generally hung round with Guts, stomachs, bladders, preparations of parts & drawings. I had sand furnaces, Calots, Glasses, & all sorts of Chymical Implements. I then tryd a good experiment of blowing up the lungs thro a heated gun barrel for a day together, a pair of bellows being tyd to the wind pipe, & a pan of charcoal under the barrel, so that the lungs being thro'ly dry I pourd into them melted lead which filld up all their ramifications like the branches of a tree, then rotting the subst ance of them with water I had the finest animal plant that ever was seen which was mightily admired, but I pulld it all to bits to give away little portions of it among my acquaintance. Here I & my Associats often din'd upon the same table as our dogs lay upon. I often prepar'd the pulvis fulminans & sometime surpriz'd the whole College with a sudden explosion. I cur'd a lad once of an ague with it by fricht. In my own Elaboratory I made large quantitys of sal volatile oleosum, Tinctura Metallorum, Elixir Proprietatis, & such matters as would serve to put into our Drink. I used to distribute it with a plentiful hand to my Tutors Fawcett & Danny, to Mr. Kidman who was their Tutor, then Senior Fellow & President, to Mr.

Williams, & Bacon acquaintances of my Tutors since dead (the two last), & an any of the Lads I kept Company withal.... I visited the Apothecarys shop to make my self perfect in the knowledge of Drugs, & Officinal Compositions & Exercised a little Gratis Practise among the poor people that depended upon the College, & such lads as would trust themselves to my Care. I prescribed often to one Smith, who was our Joyner, & the Fellow in gratitude promised me his body to dissect when he dyd, which happening next Spring when I was out of the College he expressed much concern that I could not have the benefit of his Promise.

Stukeley took his MB in January 1709 at the age of twenty-one. He then went to St Thomas's Hospital in London for eight months as a pupil of Richard Mead, and did some further dissection before settling in practice in Lincolnshire early in 1710. It is not unreasonable to suppose that an enthusiastic Oxford medical student would have done the same sorts of things as Stukeley. It is possible to deduce something further of what was happening in Oxford in the early eighteenth century from the careers of John Freind and Richard Frewin. As already mentioned, Freind came up to Christ Church in 1694 at the age of seventeen, when Hannes was still teaching chemistry and anatomy, and took his BA four years later when Frewin joined the college. In the spring of 1695 a remarkable Irishman, Dr Bernard O'Connor, arrived in Oxford from the continent, where he had travelled widely, and gave a course of lectures in which he described the new discoveries in anatomy, physiology and medicine made by Malpighi, Bellini and Redi. This caused quite a stir, but by the summer he was in London lecturing at the Royal Society, and the lasting influences on the medical school at this period were John and James Keill. In 1691 David Gregory, a master-commoner of Balliol College and a member of a remarkable Scottish family which during two centuries provided fourteen professors in British universities, was appointed to the Savilian chair of astronomy. Three years later his favourite Edinburgh pupil, John Keill, followed him to Oxford. Keill had mastered Newtonian philosophy, and as deputy for Sir Thomas Millington, gave a course of lectures and demonstrations on natural philosophy from a mathematical angle, which were very popular. About 1700 Dean Aldrich invited him to Christ Church where he gave lectures two days a week at 8 a.m., which John Evelyn, the grandson of the diarist, mentioned that he and many other members of Christ Church attended.

These lectures, which were published in 1701 as *Introductio ad veram physicam* and continued to be a successful textbook of physics for many years, show that Keill applied Newtonian concepts to physiological problems and to chemistry, and it seems that he was also giving private lectures in chemistry. On Sir Thomas Millington's death, Keill did not succeed to the Sedleian professorship as the electors chose the Reverend James Fayrer, a fellow of Magdalen, 'a very proud haughty man, of no learning and therefore altogether unfit for the Natural Philosophy lecturer. Some years ago he was rector of Appleton, near Abingdon, in Berks., but he soon resigned that he might lead a drowsy inactive life in the College'. The chair continued to be held by nonentities until the end of the century. While Keill was teaching physics, Professor Gregory was giving private courses in mathematics, which he restricted to ten or fifteen students, and offered to examine them weekly if they desired. So there was no shortage of good instruction in physical sciences for those who sought it. In about 1698 John Keill was joined by his younger brother, James, who had studied at Edinburgh, Paris and Leiden, translated Nicolas Lemery's *Cours de chymie* and wrote *Anatomy of the Human Body Abridged* (1698) which was to become the leading student text for three quarters of a century, going through twenty editions and being translated into several languages.

Having purchased an Aberdeen MD, for £4, James Keill set up in practice in Northampton and gave regular courses of anatomy lectures and demonstrations at both Oxford and Cambridge.

James was influenced by his brother's Newtonian philosophy and wrote a book of iatromechanical physiological essays which caused considerable interest in spite of its dubious mathematics. James Keill ceased his anatomy courses about 1707, presumably because his clinical practice was growing, for he looked after many of Sir Hans Sloane's patients when they came to the midlands. At his death in 1719 he left his large fortune to his brother, whose subsequent career as Treasurer of the Palatines, Decypherer to Queen Anne, and Savilian professor of astronomy does not concern us.

We often forget that the present arrangement of the medical curriculum, with its orderly progression from physical sciences to biological sciences and then to clinical subjects, is just over a hundred years old, the brain-child of Sir Henry Acland, while a member of the General Medical Council. As a medical student at Edinburgh and St George's Hospital, London, Acland had been confused by the mixing of anatomy, pathology, chemistry and ward work, which until then was the ordinary practice. Thus in the early eighteenth century an Oxford medical student, while he was attending the lectures of the brothers Keill and practical courses on physics, chemistry and anatomy, would go simpling with Bobart, learn about drugs in an apothecary's shop, and attach himself to a practitioner to learn about patients. If a patient died, in all probability he would take part in a postmortem examination and so learn something of pathology as well as anatomy. I have not been able to determine when it became unusual for postmortem examinations to be carried out on patients dying at home, but certainly it was the common, but not invariable practice up till the early part of the nineteenth century, and I would suspect that it was the horrors and alarms of the Resurrectionists that turned public feeling against it.

Both at Oxford and Cambridge there were always a number of sound practitioners who were willing to have one or two students attached to them: some like Richard Frewin ultimately joining the practice, while others like John Freind, after gaining their initial experience, would move on to London. In 1699 when Freind was twenty-two and had obtained his BA the year before, he sent to Sir Hans Sloane an account, which was published in the *Philosophical Transactions* of the Royal Society, of a small child with hydrocephalus who subsequently died. Freind's account includes a detailed postmortem report. In the following year he described an outbreak of convulsions in young girls in a village near Oxford, which was probably hysterical; it was about this time that one of the Christ Church students, Edward Ivie, in the preface to an essay on Epictetus, expressed his indebtedness to Frewin for looking after his health, which enabled him to complete the work, though Frewin had not yet taken his BA. Freind graduated BM in 1703 and in the same year published his *Emmenologia*, a discussion of menstruation and its disorders from an iatromechanical viewpoint. We need not concern ourselves with Freind's conclusions, which as Major Greenwood remarked show that he was wholly destitute of the qualities which made a scientific investigator, though Greenwood admits that Freind's principles of treatment differ in no significant way from those which would have been used by gynaecologists at the beginning of the twentieth century.

On the other hand, we find that this recently graduated physician had read widely in current and ancient authorities, and had dissected the female genitalia with care, paying particular attention to the blood supply. Freind had also carried out a series of experiments on the various drugs claimed to bring on or reduce the menses, to see their effects on blood coagulation, which included intravenous injections into dogs and subsequent postmortem examination. Between October 1700 and 1702 - that is to say, just before and after he had taken his MA - he had examined and treated some nine women with menstrual disorders of which he provides admirable clinical accounts. There is no doubt that in all Freind's writings his recording of clinical details, which he modelled on those in Hippocrates' writings without introducing archaism, is superior to that of any of his English medical contemporaries. Nor was this all; in the preface to the *Emmenologia*, Freind deplures the fact that 'Theory of Physick, which in many

cases may be explained with the same certainty as Geometry, should as it is usually handled in the writings of Authors, appear not only conjectural, but also absurd', and he goes on to suggest:

Thus has Chymical Philosophy, as it has hitherto been managed obscured an Art of itself very rational: though at the same time a thorough knowledge of it, might be advantageous to Physick, that if it was reduced to the Mechanical Reasonings (which we may hope will be done some time or other) there is nothing, which seems to be of more service even in illustrating the Theory.

This is just what Freind did, for in 1704 he was appointed praelector in chemistry to succeed John Beeston, and subsequently published the course of nine lectures which he had delivered at the Ashmolean 'for no other reason but that I have too just a suspicion they would be published by somebody else and they wanted no additional mistakes by a careless translater'. These lectures, which were dedicated to Sir Isaac Newton, attracted considerable interest as they were the first to apply the philosophy of the *Principia* to chemistry. Freind expressed his indebtedness to John Keill for the concept of physical attraction to explain chemical phenomena which Keill later, in 1708, set out in a paper to the Royal Society. Freind, arguing from an attraction between particles which may be greater on one side of each particle than on the other, varying with distance faster than the inverse square and acting only over very small distances, built up a system for chemical change supported by algebraic demonstrations. It is very possible that Newton was indebted to Freind's concept for the chemical suggestions which he put forward in the *Opticks* (1717). In addition to the lectures, Freind's book contains tables of physical constituents, the result of his own researches, of which he said:

I have employed all the care and diligence that I could in making the tables and experiments. For 'tis not a thing that can be done without a great deal of Pains and Patience. I have often willingly had the assistance of Dr. Richard Frewin, a Person every way worthy of the place that bred him, and very well vers'd in all sorts of learning, especially those which relate to Physick.

But Oxford was not a large enough stage for an ambitious young man like John Freind, and in 1705 he was away to Spain as army physician to the expedition under the joint command of Sir Cloudesley Shovell and the eccentric Earl of Peterborough. When the Earl went to Italy to seek the assistance of the Duke of Savoy, Freind accompanied him and took the opportunity of meeting Baglivi and other Italian physicians, and sent a report back to John Keill of an outbreak of fever in the army. The Earl was recalled to England in 1707 to account for his actions, and Freind returned as official apologist, writing his skilful account of the Earl of Peterborough's conduct in Spain, in which, in spite of the campaign ending in complete failure, Freind showed the public 'in glowing terms the valours, skill and wisdom of a British General; the glorious achievements of British troops: and the ungratefulness of a British Government'.

When Freind left Oxford for the beginning of his medico-political career, Richard Frewin, having just obtained his MA at the age of twenty-four, succeeded him as chemical praelector. At Convocation [a meeting which all MAs, outside as well as inside the university, could attend] on 12 June 1707, Freind was created DM by diploma as he had been abroad for two years on military service, and Richard Frewin was allowed to receive a BM although he would not be in full standing until Michaelmas term. After this the ways of the two friends parted, but John Freind, whether in prosperity or adversity, never forgot his indebtedness to Richard Frewin.

Freind's next book, *Hippocratis de morbis popularibus* (1717), has a lengthy and fulsome dedication to Richard Frewin, calling him a great mathematician and algebraist, who had encouraged him in his historical studies, so perhaps we should couple Frewin's name with the Tower of London as the begetters of Freind's delightful *History of Physick* (1725-6). It was Freind's essay on fevers, in which he recommended purging in the second week of confluent

smallpox, that set in motion the mighty dispute between Richard Mead and John Woodward in which no one was spared, not even Dr Frewin who had provided one of the cases in support of Freind's hypothesis.

I hope that I have been able to show you that in spite of the inadequacy of the Regius professor and the other official posts in the faculty of medicine, it was possible for an able but in no way outstanding medical student to gain an excellent training, both theoretical and practical, at Oxford at the beginning of the eighteenth century. But there had been proposals for an even better medical training. In 1693 when Sir Thomas Clayton died, King William attempted to impose Dr Radcliffe as Warden of Merton in gratitude for his having cured the Earl of Portland, but the fellows would have none of this and so, by the cunning of Archbishop Tenison, they enjoyed the tenure of seventy-three-old Dr Lydall who slumbered away his eleven years in the warden's lodgings. It might well be that if Radcliffe had been elected he would have treated the post as a sinecure, but he had a sincere devotion to his alma mater and might have exercised his brusque personality to good effect on the medical school. A little before this, the Reverend William Stone, Principal of New Inn Hall, had left the residue of his estate for such charitable purposes as might be determined by his trustees Obadiah Walker, Master of University College, Radcliffe's old tutor and friend, and Dr Stephen Fry, a local practitioner. At first it was proposed, perhaps at Radcliffe's suggestion, to establish a hospital for 'sicke and sore persons which might in divers respects be useful and profitable for the University as well as the City', but in the end the project fell through. Instead, Dr Stone's almshouse was erected in St Clements in 1700.

In 1698, the principal of Gloucester Hall, Dr Benjamin Woodruffe, a learned but eccentric schemer, believed that he had cornered a benefactor, Sir Thomas Cookes, who might provide £10,000 to transform his decrepit hall into a new college. Accordingly Woodruffe drafted some model statutes for this projected college, which were remarkable for both their ample provision for lecturers, and their inadequate finance. An early fellow of the Royal Society who had studied chemistry with Peter Stahl, Robert Boyle's protégé, it was natural that Woodruffe should make ample provision in the new college for science, and his proposals for anatomy, chemistry and botany were remarkably progressive:

Concerning the anatomy course

Let the anatomy reader know that it is his duty to explain and to teach in two lectures the site, nature and use of all the parts of the human body as well as the shape, structure and texture of the similar and dissimilar parts; that he shall lecture upon the skeleton and give an account of the bones and of their site, nature and purpose in three lectures; that he shall explain and teach the site, nature and use of the natural parts, namely, the liver, spleen, stomach and intestines in two lectures; that he shall explain and teach the site, nature and use of the vital parts, namely the heart and lungs, etc., in one lecture; that he shall explain and teach the site, nature, and use of the animal parts and faculties namely the brain, etc., in one lecture; that he shall explain the circulation of the blood in one lecture. In addition he shall lecture twice about whatever part of the human body as seems desirable either explaining more fully a part already mentioned or adding new things (especially curious and recently discovered things). Finally at the end let him be guided by the first seven verses of the twelfth chapter of Ecclesiastes for better instruction.

There was less detail in the proposals for chemistry and botany and the total amount allotted to the lecturers for the three courses was £26 per annum.

Unhappily the baronet began to tergiversate and then died, and poor Dr Woodruffe soon followed him after some months in the debtors' side of the Fleet Prison. In the end Worcester

College was founded with Sir Thomas Cookes' money, but the especial provisions for teaching science were omitted from the statutes.

Even Cambridge was anxious to improve the teaching in Oxford, for in 1706 William Piers, a fellow of Emmanuel College, wrote to Dr Hudson, Bodley's Librarian, asking whether there would be any real support if Dr Vigani, the distinguished Cambridge chemist, came over to give a course of lectures. But like many other proposals this came to nought.

But we must leave all these flimflams and return to Richard Frewin who had decided to go into practice in Oxford. He joined with Dr Matthew Frampton, a somewhat shadowy figure but said to be the leading practitioner in the city in the early eighteenth century. It is difficult to determine how many of the college fellows with medical degrees were actually in practice, as the acquisition of a medical fellowship avoided the necessity of taking holy orders or residence, and there was no doubt that it was not difficult, if one wished, to graduate in medicine without any intention of practising. This abuse became most overt at All Souls, where a physic place became a mere synonym for a non-resident Member of Parliament or lawyer; but Warden [Bernard] Gardiner, with the aid of his veto, waged a mighty battle and reduced the number to four, who had to be bona-fide students of physic. If, after having obtained dispensation from holy orders on this ground, they took to practising at the Bar, they would forfeit their fellowships. The Warden's arguments were marshalled in a pamphlet, *Reasons against the profession of physick in All-souls College, Oxon.* (1709?). More especially, if used as an argument to Release the Fellows There from the Obligation of taking upon Them Holy Orders'; he notes that 'Dr. Palmer, the Parliament's Warden, was a Physician, never Fellow of this College, nor in Holy Orders; a specimen of the irregularity of these Times in the Warden as well as Fellows', but makes no mention of Warden Warner, the first Regius professor of medicine.

Dr Frampton, the son of the famous Bishop of Gloucester, one of the six who joined Archbishop Sancroft in the Tower, entered Wadham College in 1686 and was elected demy of Magdalen at the Golden Election of 1689. He took his BA in 1690 and MA in 1693, but in 1696 he and another fellow, Samuel Adams, were warned that, as they had not taken holy orders, they must either resign their fellowship, obtain ordination, or travel abroad; they both adopted the last course but what universities they attended is unknown. They were both back in Oxford by 1700 and received their dispensations. Frampton practised medicine, but Adams, who according to Hearne was of a peevish ill temper and good for nothing at all, was the college praelector in moral philosophy, but in the end did take his BM and DM and died of tuberculosis in 1711.

Matthew Frampton soon made a name for himself as a sound physician, though he did not take his BM until 1702, when he was aged thirty-three, and became a DM four years later. According to Hearne, Frampton was neither handsome nor good-natured yet in 1707 he married a pretty young girl of seventeen, Molly Levins, the daughter of the bishop of Man, resigned his fellowship and set up in practice in St Giles parish. After ten years they had a child who died of consumption at the age of nine, Mrs Frampton having died three years before of a dropsy in the stomach and much afflicted by gout. It is probable that Frewin joined Frampton in practice when he set up in St Giles, but it is difficult to determine how close such partnerships were.

We hear of Frampton attending patients with Frewin and he is mentioned as 'the very learned and judicious Oxford physician' in a little-known pamphlet, *An essay upon the duty of physicians and patients, the dignity of medicine and the prudentials of practice* written in 1715 by Samuel Parker, a nonjuror and theological writer who was the son of the famous bishop of Oxford; this essay is very illuminating in its attitude to medical practice. In 1737, when the Oxford Tories were in disarray following the unexpected death of William Bromley, the recently elected burgess, there was talk that Frampton might stand, but nothing came of this and he died in 1742 at the age of seventy-three.

But now we must proceed with Richard Frewin. At first the notices are non-medical. In 1708 Frewin contributed to the great volume of exequial poems in Greek, Latin, Hebrew, Arabic, Coptic, Welsh and Anglo-Saxon which the university printed on the death of Prince George of Denmark, Queen Anne's husband. Two years later Frewin was rhetoric reader at Christ Church, and in November 1710 he made a modest and ingenious speech at the Visitation of the Bodleian. But he was also building up his practice, for it was in this year that he contributed the case-history of a boy of thirteen with smallpox to Freind's *De morbis popularibus*. It was a good time for a young doctor to set up in Oxford, for Dr William Breach, a very successful Christ Church physician, had died in 1708 and the other leading consultant, Dr Stephen Fry, succumbed to a stroke in the spring of 1710. Of Dr Breach, Lord Fermanagh wrote in 1707: 'Dr Breach of Oxford hath this week been on a visit amongst his patients ...at all which places, I believe he hath well lined his pockets and by it you may judge how sickly this country is'. Frewin's medical work may have caused him to neglect his duties as praelector in chemistry; at any rate a rather disgruntled German visitor, who came to Oxford in the autumn of 1710, was not very favourably impressed with the state of the chemical laboratory in the Ashmolean:

It is moreover regrettable that after the Royal Society had wholly removed to London, this excellent laboratory should not have been maintained in the condition in which Benthem found it in 1694 and praised it. The present Professor of Chemistry, Richard Frewin, does not trouble much about it and the operator, Mr. White (said to be a good for nothing man) still less. And so, although the furnaces are in fairly good order, they look very much the worse for wear. Not only are the finest instruments, tiles and such like almost all broken to pieces, but the whole place is filthy. Is it credible that so little attention should be given to so costly and beautiful a work?

We do not know when Frewin gave up the praelectorship, as there is a gap in the records and White, who had succeeded his father as university chemist in 1695, was also a druggist in the town.

At the time of Conrad von Uffenbach's visit to Oxford in 1710, Dr Frewin was much concerned about the first of his patients that we know by name: a very important one, Dean Aldrich. After Dr Breach's death, John Radcliffe, who was an intimate friend of the Dean, entrusted him to Frewin, indicating his confidence in this young man of twenty-nine. In the autumn of 1710 the Dean was far from well, with an ulcer of his bladder, and at the end of November he had gone to London to be under Radcliffe's care, where he died suddenly on 14 December. The simple funeral that he had desired took place on 22 December and it fell to Frewin as rhetoric reader to deliver the formal oration - an excellent speech it was said.

A year later Dr Atterbury, the new Dean (and a very different Dean) arrived. Met at Shotover by a cavalcade of some 500 horses, he was installed on 28 September and there was a great banquet in Hall, said to have cost three hundred pounds, 'an entertainment managed with consummate wisdom, exact Decorum and true magnificence. Everything was sumptuous and yet not the least intemperance or irregularity'. As the Dean ascended the stairs to Hall, he was greeted by speeches from an undergraduate and the Senior Student, and in Hall, standing in front of the fireplace, Dr Frewin - he had just become an MD - as rhetoric reader delivered an elegant speech in which, having just touched upon the excellences of Dr Aldrich, he declared the happiness of the college in having so excellent a person to succeed the great man. He extolled Dr Atterbury for his wisdom, prudence, quick parts, and excellent learning, and for zeal and affection to religion, the Church of England, and the college. Speaking from high table the Dean made his reply, in which he commended Dr Frewin for his speech and signified how unworthy he himself was of any one of those praises that had been accorded him by the doctor, and how unfit he was in all respects to succeed such a very great man.

All this sweet reasonableness did not last long, for, as Canon [William] Stratford had written, 'we expect nothing but war' and he was right; after a turbulent two years, Atterbury was translated to Rochester and the Christ Church chapter welcomed with a sigh of relief the perfect peace that Dean Smalridge provided. Luckily Dr Frewin could escape from all the feuds and rages, for Mr Edward Smith became rhetoric reader in December 1712, but like so many young men of the time, he died of tuberculosis two years later.

By this time we are just beginning to hear something more of Frewin's patients. In 1714 he was staying at Claydon House as Lady Fermanagh was poorly and though the Viscount had no great opinion of the medical profession - 'I do not consult doctors, tho' I am not at all well, I believe her ailment is chiefly colik which I think no doctor can cure no more than the gout' - Frewin continued to attend the Verney family. It is however interesting to note that, at least until 1717, it was Dr Frampton who attended Lord Fermanagh, while Frewin looked after the Viscountess, but after that Frampton is no longer mentioned. It would seem that Frewin, like Freind, kept detailed clinical records, and each night wrote an account of the patients he had seen, but unhappily he directed that all his papers should be burned at his death - 'numberless indeed were the folio of cases and his observations which were committed to the flames'. Indeed, apart from the few case reports in Freind's and Russell's books, there is, so far as I know, only one detailed professional letter that has survived. This concerns a young undergraduate of University College, William Swaine, and is written to Dr Richard Richardson, the well-known Yorkshire physician and botanist, who had looked after Swaine as a child. Swaine was now returning to Yorkshire 'for the advantages of his native air and Dr. Richardson's assistance'. The letter illustrates Frewin's care and clinical assiduity. There is an excellent account of the patient's symptoms; he was probably suffering from pulmonary tuberculosis, as he was

...in a very languid state, had pains sometimes in the forepart of ye thorax, sometimes near ye scapulae. He spit much night and morning. The matter was purulent and of a green colour. Commonly towards morning he sweat profusely, had flushing in his face and heat in his hands after eating, tho his appetite was very much decay'd.

The treatment adopted, which was moderate in character, is described in detail. Frewin ends the letter 'If I have written more freely than you think I ought to have done, I hope you'll excuse it in one who is perfectly unknown to you. But if you think my opinion and judgment will be of any service, I shall be at any time ready to communicate it to you'. Swaine never graduated, so perhaps he succumbed to his lung disease accompanied by a confirmed hectic fever, which was Frewin's diagnosis.

It could be that it was on his country visits that Frewin met his first wife, for Castlethorpe was only twelve miles from Claydon and there lived a friend of the Verneys, Lady Dorothy Tyrrell, a young widow of thirty-six, whose husband had died in Ireland in May 1714 leaving her with a small estate and three lively daughters. She married Dr Frewin in 1715; they had three children all of whom died in childhood. In her youth Miss Dorothy Eyre (she was the daughter of Sir Giles Eyre, a justice of the King's Bench with a seat in Wiltshire) had been somewhat lively herself and her name had been linked with that of Lord Trevor Hillsborough [Trevor Hill, 1st Viscount Hillsborough] one of the latter-day Restoration rakes, whose nudist antics made him somewhat notorious. However, as the wife of Dr Frewin, Lady Tyrrell was described as a very good woman, beloved by her neighbours and others, and very charitable. She was godmother to John Keill's daughter who was born in 1718. Keill had for some years been having a liaison with a bookbinder's daughter, Mol Clements, much to the disapproval of his brother James; finally, at the age of fifty, when she was but twenty-five, he married her and restored family harmony such that James left his brother his huge fortune. The godfathers to this first child were James Keill, and the Earl of Caernarvon [James, duke of Chandos] to whom John had dedicated his book on

astronomy (1718), and it was for the Duchess of Chandos that he produced an English translation (1721):

It is no Flattery to the Ladies to say that such of them as delight in Arts and Sciences, as to Quickness of Perception and Delicacy of Taste, are equal, if not superior to Men; and it is no Affront to the most refined of either Sex to say, there is not a finer Genius than my Lady Duchess.

It is about this time that we get an idea of Dr Frewin's appearance from this delightful miniature, in which he wears his doctor's robes and which is thought to have been painted by Christian Richter. Frewin is described as a small man, though his wife was large. Sir Thomas Cave remarked, 'I think Lady Tyrrell has not siz'd her well for her doctor is very thin, but probably active'. After his marriage Frewin had set up in practice at 102 High Street (now Thomas Cook & Sons) which was later occupied by Henry Towsey, one of the original surgeons to the Radcliffe Infirmary, and continued to be a doctor's house until the middle of the nineteenth century. Since mediaeval times, the medical quarter of Oxford had been in the vicinity of the university church, St Mary's, as this district, called the Spicery, was specially allotted to the apothecaries and spicers for their trade.

In contrast to these peaceful domestic events there had been considerable stirring in the university and particularly, in the faculty of medicine. On 1st August 1714, Queen Anne died, followed three months later by her erstwhile physician, Dr John Radcliffe. Radcliffe had been generous to his alma mater in his lifetime and it had been known for some years that he wished to enlarge the library at Oxford, so there was considerable speculation as to the contents of his will, particularly when it was learned that he had left some £140,000. After some family legacies and a small bequest to St Bartholomew's Hospital in London, the residue of his estate was to be divided between University College and his trustees. There were to be two travelling scholarships for Oxford Masters of Arts studying medicine, who were to be maintained for ten years with free rooms in University College, but at least half of that time was to be spent in travel abroad for 'their better improvement'. The second of Radcliffe's bequests was for the building of a library in Oxford with a salary for the librarian and £100 a year for books, while the residue of his estate was to be applied to such charitable purposes as his trustees at their discretion should think fit. There is no mention of a hospital in his will, but it is of some interest that in the year of Radcliffe's death, John Bellers, a Quaker, wrote a remarkable pamphlet *An essay towards the improvement of physick*, in which he proposed a complete health service, financed by taxation and organised by the Royal College of Physicians, with hospitals, laboratories, and regional medical care, which would not only save lives but also improve medical education. In particular, Bellers specified that hospitals should be built at Oxford and Cambridge with different wards for each disorder. He claimed that attendance at these hospitals would teach the potential physician more in seven years than they could learn in fourteen by any other method 'and the better qualifie them for Practice in whatever Quarter of the Kingdom they shall settle. At present it is not easy for the students to get a body to dissect at Oxford, the Mob are so mutinous to their having one'.

Fifty years were to elapse before Oxford had a hospital, though in 1736, Edmund Boulter of Haseley Court, a descendant of Sir John Cutler, the benefactor of the Royal College of Physicians, founded the Cutler-Boulter dispensary, consisting of six almshouses and a house for an apothecary, who was to receive £50 a year and undertake to give free medical advice to the sick poor of Oxford. The almshouses have been swept away but the charity is still maintained. There is little doubt that Bellers' tract influenced philanthropists such as Henry Hoare who initiated the voluntary hospital movement.

The university decided to recognise Radcliffe's benefaction with full honours, partly because

of its magnitude, but also to show the whiggish Hanoverians their respect for the old order. Accordingly, on 3rd December, there was a funeral of great solemnity at St Mary's, but for over a hundred years there was no inscription to mark Radcliffe's tomb. It was not until 1953 that the Radcliffe trustees, in the presence of the Vice-Chancellor and members of the university, unveiled a memorial tablet, which was dedicated by the Bishop of Oxford. Dr Frewin took no major part in the funeral ceremony, but no doubt he joined the procession of the medical faculty which followed the coffin from the Divinity School, where the body had lain in state, in the solemn march down Broad Street to the Northgate, then to Carfax whence it proceeded down High Street to St Mary's. The university, aware of the political uncertainties of the new reign, took steps to ensure that there were no demonstrations:

All persons whatsoever, are enjoined upon the severest penalties, not to tear off the Escutcheons or to make any disturbance in the Church, the Divinity School or in any part of the Procession. And all Magistrates are to take care that no disorder may happen thro' the whole course of the solemnities, or, at least, that no offender may go unpunished.

There were no disturbances - that was to come - and no time was lost in selecting the first two Radcliffe fellows, Noel Broxholme and Robert Wyntle. The notable selection committee which Radcliffe had appointed - the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Lord Chancellor, the Chancellor of the university, the bishops of London and Winchester, the two principal secretaries of state, the lord chief justices of the King's Bench and Common Pleas, and the Master of the Rolls - or as the will adds, the major part of them - had made their choice by July 1715 and the first fellows contributed to the vast folio volume of over a hundred indifferent funerary poems which the university issued in commemoration of their benefactor.

Noel Broxholme had been at Westminster School and came up to Christ Church in 1704, taking his MA in 1711. He had already determined on medicine as a career, for in 1709 he spent a few months as a pupil with Richard Mead at St Thomas's Hospital. He was clearly looked on with favour at Christ Church, as in 1711 he was selected by Canon Stratford as a private tutor for Lord Glenorchy's son, who was coming to Christ Church and was going to live in a house in Broad Street, but the boy's father had insisted that his tutor should share his rooms and take no other pupils. Broxholme continued at Oxford studying medicine in the eclectic manner that has been described. He was a bit of a poet, ghosting for William Bromley, the university burgess. Had he not been awarded the fellowship he would probably have taken his BM about 1715, but instead Broxholme went to Padua. He did not take his degree there and in any case the Paduan medical school was not at its best at that time. He then spent a period in Paris and attended a rich merchant who as a fee gave him a draft for £500 Mississippi Stock, which on his return to England he sold for £10,000. In 1723 Broxholme graduated BM, DM, but prior to this he was called to see one of the Pulteneys who was taken ill while staying with Lord Chetwynd in Staffordshire. This patient had already been seen by Dr Hope of Stafford and Dr Swynfern of Lichfield, a Pembroke contemporary of Frewin's and the godfather of Samuel Johnson; they each received 100 guineas for their pains. Then Mrs Pulteney brought in John Freind from London, and he received 300 guineas. Broxholme came from Oxford for a fee of 200 guineas and agreed with the other physicians that the prognosis was hopeless, but the patient was said to have asked for some small beer and this was given to him; after he had drunk a quart or so he went to sleep and made an uneventful recovery.

With these achievements behind him, Broxholme soon removed to London, became a fellow of the College of Physicians and delivered the Harveian oration in 1731. Two years later he was elected as one of the original physicians to St George's Hospital and in 1734 was appointed physician to the Prince of Wales, attending Princess Augusta in her unhappy confinement. When Queen Caroline was taken ill in November 1737, after Dr Tessier, the King's physician, had

prescribed Daffy's elixir to no effect, Dr Broxholme was sent for and recommended two more quack remedies, Raleigh's cordial water and Ward's pills. All the time, owing to the Queen's prudery, the cause of her colic - a strangulated umbilical hernia - was concealed. When the surgeons - John Ranby and John Shipton - were called and George II insisted on revealing the truth, it was too late, and the arrival of Sir Hans Sloane and Sir Edward Halse could not influence the fatal outcome recorded in horrifying detail in Lord Hervey's memoirs. A few years after this Dr Broxholme lost his sanity and he committed suicide in 1748.

The career of the other Radcliffe fellow, Robert Wyntle, though less spectacular, is equally unsatisfactory. A Pembroke undergraduate, Wyntle was elected to a Merton fellowship in 1705 and received his MA four years later. His health was not too good and in 1711 and 1712 he was given leave to go to the spa at Baiae. According to Dr Hearne, Wyntle was a 'violent proud ill-natured Whig' and it was likely that it was government influence that secured him, now aged thirty-two, the Radcliffe fellowship. He was sub-warden of Merton and in November 1715 there was an election of eight fellows pending, and the college with its considerable wealth and size was of importance to the Whigs. They did not doubt Warden Holland's soundness, but the political allegiance of the fellows was evenly divided and, as the Warden was anxious to secure the election of his nephew, Richard Meadowcourt (who was soon to gain notoriety as a government informer on university affairs), it was feared that he might compound with the Tories. However, with the militant support of Wyntle, the Warden, by an underhand device, secured the election of six Whigs to the college and in the fullness of time, when Holland died in 1734, Robert Wyntle succeeded him as warden. During the tenure of his Radcliffe fellowship Wyntle went abroad on three occasions and received his BM in 1726, but there is no evidence that he ever practised or taught medicine, and the sixteen years of his wardenship - he died in 1750 - were marked by constant disputes between him and the fellows.

It was Dr [Samuel] Johnson who complained that little profit had come from these travelling fellowships, that it was useless for the fellows to visit European countries, but that they should be sent out of Christendom, amongst the barbarous nations. Though in the earlier years the fellows contributed little to medical education or progress, the majority of them profited personally from their experience.

Although Radcliffe's funeral passed off without incident, by the following year Oxford was in turmoil, with undergraduates, often aided by their elders, demonstrating their support variously for the Old Interest, or for the Hanoverians, by meetings, speeches and window-breaking. The government, nervous about a rumour of a Jacobite revolt centred on the university, sent Colonel Pepper's regiment with all urgency to Oxford, and at 4 a.m. on 9 October 1715, they established a complete blockade of the town. Three weeks later Brigadier Handasyde's regiment was quartered in Oxford, beginning the military occupation of the city, which was to last for a considerable time. In the following year Frank Nicholls, a seventeen-year-old medical student of Exeter, who was later to gain fame in a different manner, was sentenced to a fine of £5 and six months' imprisonment (the sentence was reduced by half on the appeals of his tutor) for challenging a soldier to fight with him and crying out 'An Ormonde for ever' in the streets. James Butler, Duke of Ormond, the former Chancellor and recognised leader of the Jacobites in London, was finally goaded into actual treason and in August 1715 had fled to France to join the Pretender. Apart from this Clochemerle atmosphere in the streets - for the relations between troops and townsmen reached breaking point and during a scuffle the Mayor was roughly handled and his windows broken, while a bullet went through the mace-bearer's hat - there were political machinations in higher quarters.

The more extreme members of the government were anxious to bring the university to heel either by a royal Visitation or by the introduction of a Bill which would give the King the power to nominate all the offices, headships and scholarships. However the more moderate elements

preferred to see patronage used ruthlessly for the encouragement of government supporters. An opportunity arose in April 1716 when Dr Tadlow, the deputy Regius professor of medicine, died, and as Dr Hoy was still in Jamaica, the Vice-Chancellor appointed as deputy Dr Philip Code, a medical fellow of All Souls of independent means, who had received his BM in 1703 and was in a small way of practice in the town. Although Dr Code was acceptable to ministers, the government nominated Dr Lasher of St John's College by virtue of its royal patronage for the Regius chair. Though the Vice-Chancellor was acting within his rights in appointing a deputy as nothing had been heard from Hoy, the Whig press abused the Vice-Chancellor as a surly fellow who was resisting a clear prerogative of the crown. Dr Lasher was also a local practitioner, indeed he was ten years senior to Hoy, having taken his BM in 1676; being obliged to resign his fellowship in 1670 on his marriage to a barber's daughter, he set up in practice in Pennyfarthing Street (Pembroke Street). Hearne, with his political prejudice, described him as a 'silly Puritanical prick ear'd Whigg', whereas Lasher himself claimed that 'he was the only person of eminence in that profession at Oxford whom one should chuse to distinguish'. The memorial in St Aldate's church speaks of him as 'vir a multis desideratissimus' who had practised in Oxford for half a century. In the end Hoy was given a royal dispensation of absence and Lasher was appointed as deputy, but he was not installed until after Code's death in 1718. Nor were Lasher's difficulties over then, as it was not until 1722, after much agitation and appeals to Sunderland, that he obtained his desires, and then he was only Regius for seven years, dying in 1729, whereas Hoy survived him in Jamaica until 1735.

Whilst these disputes as to who should be deputy Regius professor were in progress, Dr Pierce Dod, another medical fellow of All Souls and near-contemporary of Richard Frewin, made himself conspicuous. In July 1717 it was rumoured that Sir William Whitelocke, one of the university burgesses, had died; Dod who was a rabid Tory began to canvass the younger and more extreme fellows, and when Whitelocke did in fact die, in November of the same year, Dod was prepared to stand, but the more statesmanlike heads of colleges, who regarded Dod 'as a downright jacobite whose warmth will bring him into confinement and would draw the malice of the government on the university', supported Dr George Clarke who was also a fellow of All Souls, had represented the University in James II's parliament, and as well as being a man of taste, was a considerable benefactor to his college. Clarke was a skilful man of business rather than a politician; indeed Dod's friends said he was more fit for an alderman than a university burgess, but it was soon apparent that he had the support of Christ Church and Magdalen College, so Dod for the moment gave up the struggle. In the following year when it was rumoured that the other burgess, William Bromley, had died, he started canvassing again, but the rumour was untrue and so Dod abandoned the field of university politics and removed to London. He became a fellow of the Royal College of Physicians in 1720, delivering the Goulstonian lectures in the same year and the Harveian oration in 1729. In 1725 he was elected physician to St Bartholomew's Hospital. He had two case-reports published in the *Philosophical Transactions* of the Royal Society, and then in 1746 there appeared his magnum opus, *Several cases in physick, and one in particular, giving an account of a person who was inoculated for the small-pox, and had the small-pox upon the inoculation, and yet had it again*. Dod was a foolish and conceited man, meticulous in his dress, loving to wear a sword as well as carrying the proverbial cane. He was bitterly opposed to inoculation and his pamphlet, which upheld that view, was a ridiculous production; it was cruelly lampooned by Drs Kirkpatrick and Barrowby and this ruined Dod's practice. Barrowby and the facetious William Wagstaffe had been Dod's contemporaries at Oxford and all three were physicians at St Bartholomew's Hospital.

It is a remarkable fact that in all the political correspondence of the period, and reports from informers official and unofficial who were watching the university closely, Dr Frewin's name is never mentioned, even though he was active in his profession and his practice was so extensive

that he had to have four horses and two coachmen. We find him writing to Sir Hans Sloane for advice about Viscountess Valentia who died at Woodstock in 1718, and a few years later Frewin was attending Browne Willis, a grandson of Dr Thomas Wilkes and a substantial topographical historian: 'Mr. Willis complaining of Rheumatism in his hands as well as legs etc., Dr. Frewin advised him to go to Bath and (that the humour might not settle) not to write much'. Frewin himself had considerable antiquarian tastes and was accumulating a large library. It is of some interest that he endeavoured to collect information about the provincial hospitals.

In 1724 Frewin's stepdaughter, Mistress Doll Tyrrell, died following smallpox inoculation: 'This young woman (a mighty good natured Creature) had the smallpox at the house of Mr. Skinner, Recorder of Oxford, but she was recovered. However, being very full of them, the Remains broke out in Boyls, which caus'd her Death, just as she was taking the Air'. Until the Suttons instituted their method of inoculation, the hazards were significant and it is not very surprising that a few years later the Vice-Chancellor issued the following notice:

Whereas the Long Continuance and Contagion of the Small-Pox (from which by God's Blessing We seem at Length to be freed) hath of late been highly Prejudicial and Detrimental to the University and City of OXFORD: I do therefore earnestly intreat every regular Physician in this Place, That They will not for the future receive, attend or prescribe for any Persons whatsoever, who shall desire or apply to them to be inoculated with the Small Pox within this City or Suburbs.

And I do require, and strictly enjoyn every Surgeon and Apothecary exercising their respective Occupations in OXFORD, That They do not for the future inoculate, or attend when inoculated, or furnish Medicine to any Person whatsoever abiding in any College or Hall or Private House and undergoing the Operation of Inoculation with the Small-Pox within the aforesaid City and Suburbs.

And this Order I expect to be duly comply'd with under such Penalties, as the Statutes and Laws of the University do empower me to Inflict.

GEO. HUDDSFORD, Vice-Chan.

In 1725 Mrs Frewin died, 'having been afflicted for a great while mightily with the Gout and Rheumatism', and a few months later her two surviving daughters, 'Mistress Bel' [Christabella] and 'Mistress Hal Tyrrell' [Harriet, or Henrietta], both got married, amidst general condemnation which subsequent events on the whole justified. They had been a great torment to their stepfather who was of a placid temperament and loved domestic quiet, though he was always very good to Harriet's children. Harriet's first husband, Mr Man of Kidlington, was a gentleman of good estate, perfectly good-natured, very handsome and personable, being rather more than six foot high, but Harriet was a flighty individual and her husband left her, dying in 1731. After Mr Man's death, Harriet married a Mr Lamb, and fared still worse, but Christabella's matrimonial affairs took a very different turn. Her first husband - John Knapp - was a Gentleman of the Horse to the Earl of Abingdon, and drank himself to death after two years of married life, but when her second husband, John Piggot, died in 1751, at the age of forty-seven, he left his widow with a considerable fortune and for her lifetime a fine estate - Doddershall near Grendon Underwood in Buckinghamshire. Two years later she married Richard Fiennes, the sixth Viscount Saye and Sele, though she was fifty-eight and he was only thirty-seven. As it was said at the time he preferred the comfort of a buxom widow and a good jointure, to the possibility of transmitting splendid poverty to his heir, while she said that she had married her first husband for love, her second for a fortune and her third for a position. Lord Saye and Sele, who had been a fellow of New College, was the son of a country clergyman, and succeeded to the title in 1742,

but to little else besides.

It probably amused her stepfather and her old Oxford friends to see Lady Saye and Sele as one of the honoured guests at the Encaenia which followed the notorious Oxfordshire election of 1754, and she would have enjoyed the four oratorios performed by over 110 vocalists and instrumentalists to welcome the new High Steward, the Earl of Westmorland. Viscountess Christabella, who had been regarded as sickly in her youth, lived to the age of 94, and died at her house in Queen Street, Mayfair, in July 1789; she hated the idea of getting old and dressed, even at the close of her life, like a girl of eighteen, in muslin gowns trimmed with gauze and pink ribbon. She would not wear a cap, but had her hair dressed in the most fashionable mode. Her ladyship was devoted to dancing and was attending balls almost to the last weeks of her life. She was always lively and in excellent health up to the end, and liked everyone to be as cheerful as she was; if want of money made them sad, her purse was generously at their disposal. In her will she left a considerable sum for the school at Grendon Underwood, and it was agreed that the poor had lost a generous benefactress and her neighbours an agreeable companion.

Shortly after his wife's death, Frewin removed from High Street to New Inn Hall Street where, since 1721, he had held the lease of a house which was formerly the Augustinian priory known as St Mary's College. In 1580 it had become the property of Brasenose College who leased it to various tenants; it served as the first meeting place of the Quakers in Oxford, and then was leased to Sir Thomas Millington, until it came into the hands of Dr. Frewin. He greatly improved it so that it received the name of Frewin's Hall, which it still bears. A neighbour of Frewin's in New Inn Hall Street was Dr Joseph Woodward, DCL, a fellow of Oriel College and registrar of the Vice-Chancellor's court, and in February 1727 Dr Frewin, now aged forty-six, married Elizabeth Woodward, Dr Woodward's niece - a woman of extraordinary good nature, who had looked after her uncle for many years.

Now we come to a curious episode in Dr Frewin's life, which puzzles me, because it is out of character. In August 1727, Dr Sedgewicke Harrison, Camden professor of history, died, and Dr Frewin, the sole candidate, was elected as his successor and held the post until his death. This chair had been founded in 1622 by William Camden, Clarenceux King of Arms; it was not established by statute, but there was a letter setting out the founder's wishes, which stipulated that the professor should neither be in holy orders, nor hold a benefice, and that he was to read civil history 'not inter-meddling with the History of the Church or controversies, further than shall give light into the times which he shall then unfold'. On the whole these wishes had been acceded to and a number of former professors, such as Lewis du Moulin and John Lampshire, had been physicians. Dr Sedgewicke Harrison, who had been elected to the professorship in 1720, was a DCL and fellow of All Souls, but only delivered two lectures during his seven years' tenure of the chair. At one time Harrison dabbled in medicine - he contributed four cases to Freind's letter to Richard Mead on smallpox. He was apparently not a very pleasant character: Dr King's right-hand man, he had caused trouble at All Souls, and, according to Hearne, when he died 'was lamented by nobody. He had a complication of distemper occasioned chiefly by drinking strong drams'.

Now, so far as is known, Dr Frewin never delivered a single lecture during his thirty-four years' tenure of the chair, although he did spend £100 on books to prepare himself for the post, and there is a catalogue of his historical library of some 400 volumes of which a tenth had been purchased after 1740. As a successful and prosperous physician Frewin did not need the salary of £120 a year; he had shown no desire to be embroiled in University politics, he had always carried out meticulously the posts he had held in the past, and yet so far as we know he treated the Camden history chair in the same negligent manner as his predecessors and successors. This is a mystery which may yet be resolved, but I think it just possible that he accepted the post to gratify his new father-in-law, who had been involved in the Oriel College lawsuit over

fellowship elections.

A few months later, in April 1728, Frewin was drawn into a political squabble, which from its medical aspects was a harbinger of a great battle in the future. Since the end of the seventeenth century Balliol College had admitted Snell exhibitioners who by the founder's will must have been born in Scotland and studied for three years at Glasgow University, and a very distinguished group of men they have been. In 1710, a son of the manse, William Fullerton, was elected to read medicine, but at the age of twenty-one, his conscience would not allow him to take the statutory oaths and so Fullerton had to resign his exhibition and join the ranks of nonjurors. Fullerton went to Leiden, and two years later obtained an MD from Rheims, which was simply a matter of paying a fee. Anxious to set up in practice in London, he began to see what influence he could use to obtain an Oxford DM, and at Convocation in 1726 a letter was read from the Chancellor asking that William Fullerton might have the degree of doctor of physic conferred on him by diploma. This was granted, after much opposition.

The opposition had been led by John Freind, formerly rabid Tory, but now as physician to George II and Queen Caroline a 'complier'. He had the support of John Burton of Corpus Christi College, a Whig propagandist who endeavoured to improve teaching in the university, Dr Matthew Lee of Christ Church, and Dr Frewin. It is clear that the motives of this opposition were varied. Some were hostile on purely political grounds, but the physicians felt that it was too easy to get a degree on the continent, with the concomitant risk of lowering the status of the physician and of course impairing the vested interests of the Oxford and Cambridge doctors. However Fullerton became a fellow of the Royal College of Physicians in 1729, a fellow of the Royal Society in 1731, and was physician to Christ's Hospital, dying in 1737. Matthew Lee was another Westminster School and Christ Church physician, who graduated MB in 1722, delivered the Bodleian oration in 1723, and received his DM in 1726. He lived in part of Frewin's house in New Inn Hall Street, so probably gained his clinical practice with him. However, when James Keill died in 1719, he left Lee his microscope and all his medical books, and as Lee was a Northampton man, he may have studied with Keill as well. Dr Lee moved to London in 1730, became a fellow of the College of Physicians and Harveian orator, and succeeded Noel Broxholme as physician to Frederick Prince of Wales, but neither he nor Sir Edward Wilmot recognised the gravity of the Prince's fatal illness. Lee's benefaction will be mentioned below.

John Freind died three months after he had led the opposition to Dr Fullerton's degree and his will revealed his continuing interest in Oxford. He directed that if his son should die without any children, £1,000 should be applied to the building of an anatomy school at Christ Church and to the salary of the reader, and if his brother's two sons should leave no children, his whole estate should be expended towards the building of a hospital in Oxford. Dr Freind's son died unmarried in 1750 and the bequest, augmented by some £10,000 by Dr Matthew Lee, came to Christ Church; however the reversionary proposals were not implemented. Nonetheless, after Bellers' general proposal in 1714, this is the first serious suggestion for an Oxford hospital.

It was probably a few years before this, though the document is undated, that Sir John Floyer, the well-known Lichfield physician, who had been a contemporary of John Radcliffe's at Oxford, put forward a proposal for a fully organised medical school at Oxford, which was quite unknown until Dr Denis Gibbs discovered the manuscript in the library of The Queen's College a few years ago. Floyer proposed that by Act of Parliament one of the halls should become a medical college, the fellows to be elected after two years at their own college. They would have to give up their fellowship within three years of their doctorate, but they were to continue to be corresponding members, reporting to the college all rare cases and experiments. The professors of physic, anatomy, chemistry, and botany were to be members of the foundation and were to be elected for three years only. There was also to be an eminent apothecary and surgeon attached to the college and they were to teach the young students these practical arts first; then the students

were to go through courses of anatomy, botany, and chemistry, and finally attend on the physic professors and see their practice upon the poorer sort.

The great expense in degrees would be diminished and the doctor's degree at seven years' study would be seen as sufficient. Floyer also proposed that applicants should present for the degree a thesis on a particular disease. He further advocated the erection of a hospital in Oxford where students could observe the practice of physic, surgical operations, and midwifery, plus Floyer's particular interest, the therapeutic value of hot and cold baths. He suggested that if the colleges and the town would join their purses, it would soon be possible to build a hospital for the cure of the poor and the instruction of young students. Whether Freind or anyone else was aware of Floyer's proposals is not known. The plan was certainly farsighted, though proposals to provide an Oxford college for a particular discipline have always ended in failure.

These were only schemes, but in 1728, the university had received a notable benefaction for the study of botany. William Sherard, whose enthusiasm for plants had been fired by James Bobart when he was up at St John's College, returned to England in 1717, having made a fortune in the middle east, and brought with him a remarkable collection of plants, a superb botanical library, and a notable herbarium. He persuaded John Dillenius, a distinguished German botanist, to assist him in the arrangement of his collection, which he decided he would bequeath to the university, together with £3,000 for a professorship, but on certain conditions: the most important being that the first professor should be Dillenius and that the Royal College of Physicians should appoint his successors so as to minimise the risk of the chair being held by effete nonentities.

William Sherard died in 1728 and his executor was his brother James Sherard, a freeman of the Society of Apothecaries in London who had a prosperous practice as an apothecary in Mark Lane. James was also an enthusiastic botanist, having a superb garden at Eltham. But it must be confessed that he was not a very attractive character: he made great difficulties with the university over the execution of his brother's benefaction, and forced Dillenius to catalogue his plants at Eltham instead of proceeding with his botanical researches. Nevertheless the university acknowledged its gratitude by creating him DM in 1731, and in the following year, on a suggestion from Sir Hans Sloane, the President of the College of Physicians, Sherard applied for disfranchisement which was granted by the Society of Apothecaries on payment of a fine of 35 guineas. (This cannot have worried Sherard as his estate when he died in 1738 was valued at £150,000.) At a comitia of the College of Physicians in September 1732, eleven days later, James Sherard was elected a fellow of the college without fee or examination, though there were murmurings as to the propriety of admitting to the fellowship one who had been an apothecary.

Owing to the disputes with James Sherard, Professor Dillenius did not take up his duties at Oxford until 1734. He was assisted by a committee consisting of the Vice-Chancellor and proctors, and the resident medical doctors. There is in the Radcliffe library a superb but undated *hortus siccus* of medicinal plants and against each plant Richard Frewin has written their pharmacological properties; he was one of the most regular members of the garden committee from its first meeting in 1735 till 1758, within three years of his death.

When William Sherard returned to Oxford to make the preliminary arrangements for his benefaction, he found that almost all his old friends at St John's were dead or departed, except the President William Delaune, a great-nephew of the founder of the Society of Apothecaries, whose character, I regret to say, did not redound to the credit of the family, though it reveals the dulled conscience of the university. Dr Delaune was President of St John's for thirty years and during his Vice-Chancellorship he misappropriated £3,000 of university money, for which he had his living sequestered. Yet he was afterwards elected Lady Margaret reader in divinity; he even borrowed £100 from William Sherard which he never paid back, much to James Sherard's

fury. Dr Delaune died on 24 May 1728, at the age of sixty-nine, and I had hoped to be able to say that Dr Frewin attended him, but although I think it is highly probable, I cannot prove it. Canon Stratford wrote 'Delaune is dying of a dropsy. You were used to tell me that the water I drank would bring a dropsy on me. He has a dropsy which has not been brought on by drinking water'.

A few years after this, Dr Frewin had some very different patients to deal with. As is well known Methodism had its origin in Oxford, for Samuel, John, and Charles Wesley were all at Christ Church and Charles, inspired by John, initiated the Holy Club, that group of young men who read together, visited the sick and prisoners in the gaol, and practised abstinence, fasting on Wednesdays and Fridays after the custom of the primitive church. In John Wesley's journal, we find that Dr Frewin did not approve of these ascetic extremes. One of the young men gave up singularity and Wednesday fasting on the advice of Dr Frewin when he developed a fever, while the unfortunate young William Morgan, whose excessive devotion to Wesley's ideals caused his death, had been told by Frewin, when his illness was beginning, that while he persisted in his rigid course of life, a physician could be of no service to him.

In September 1731 Dr Frewin's second wife died of a shivering fit and was buried in St Peter's in the East by the side of his first wife. She had inherited the considerable fortune of her uncle Dr Joseph Woodward who had died two years before. Less than six months later, in March 1732, Dr Frewin married a widow, Mrs Graves, the sister of a Herefordshire physician Dr John Cranke. Then in June, Dr Frewin's mother died; she had lived with him for many years as his father had died when Richard was only ten.

Much of what has been written so far about Dr Frewin so far has been drawn from the pages of the *Remarks and Collections* of Thomas Hearne, the cantankerous antiquary of St Edmund's Hall, whose diaries give such clear illustrations of eighteenth-century Oxford. But Hearne's life was drawing to its close, and Frewin was to be in attendance. We first learn that Hearne is ill from a letter by James West, the politician and antiquary, written on 6 February 1735, in which he says that he hopes Hearne has Dr Frewin's advice, which he takes to be as good as any in Oxford or elsewhere. Hearne made light of his illness, while confessing to Brome that he had been ill for some time with much pain, but whether it was strangury, gravel, or piles, he did not know. On 8 March, West came to see Hearne, and, finding him far from well – he had not been outside the walls of St Edmund's Hall since before Christmas – West persuaded him to write to Dr Richard Mead and to see Dr Frewin. Hearne's letter of 9 March to Mead reveals his symptoms:

I have had a Diarrhoea for several months; the flux is now so troublesome, that I cannot retain my excrements but with great difficulty. A relaxation of the *sphincter ani* is the occasion of it. I know not what to do to contract or constrict or bring it to due order, and must therefore beg your advice and direction. I am persuaded that were a stop put to this, I should be well, and able to walk about again with ease, having no other distemper that I can perceive...I apply to you as the ablest friend I have.

A week later, Hearne wrote to Mead again, saying that he had seen Dr Frewin who would discuss the case with Mead when he was in London, and that the fomentations ordered by Frewin had done no good so far. In his diary for 23 March is the note: 'On Friday morning last died suddenly (upon the close stool I am told) Mr. Crank, father in law to Dr. Richard Frewin the physician. He died at the Doctor's House near New Inn Hall, the Doctor and his wife (daughter of the said Crank) being absent, going both for London on Tuesday March 11'. On 6 April, Hearne wrote to Mead that he was considerably better, as Frewin had altered the treatment, but a week later he was writing to Mead that he was worse, and that he was unable to retain his excrements during his sleep: 'Dr Frewin is away in London and not likely to return for

a week. If Dr Frewin cannot himself be speedily here, I would kindly intreat him to send directions hither either to me or to my apothecary Lever'. Dr Mead replied the same day: 'I met Dr. Frewen today and showed him your letter upon which we agreed upon the inclosed Method, which we desire you will be pleased to give to your Apothecary, and most heartily wish it may be of service to recover your health'. A fortnight later, Hearne tells Mead that he has followed the treatment and is no better; all his friends are becoming anxious for his health and advising him to lay aside his books and defer the publication of his projected book. Mead wrote again on 2 May: 'Dr Frewin having been out of Town I could have no opportunity of consulting with him upon your case as described in your last letter until this morning. We have now agreed upon the underwritten method, which I most heartily wish you may find successful'. Shortly after this, Frewin returned to Oxford and there was a slight improvement in Hearne's condition, but Mead's last letter to Hearne, written on 22 May, reveals the tactical optimism of the skilled physician: he will subscribe for the book which Hearne is planning to publish:

I am glad to find by your last account of your illness, that though the weakness of the Part continues, your Pains are not so bad, I hope by degrees they will be quite removed. Pray give my most humble service to Dr. Frewin, and when he thinks proper, if he will be pleased to favour me with the circumstances and alterations in your indisposition, I shall most readily joyne my opinion to his.

But Hearne and his friends knew the truth: he could scarcely write and sat most of the day dozing in his chair. On 1st June, he wrote a short and shaky note in his diary, but in the next days he could only write the date, and he died on 10 June, aged 57. He was buried in St Peter's in the East, which he must have looked at so often from his room in St Edmund's Hall, and his epitaph, near Dr Frewin's memorial, is written as he wished it: 'Here lyes the body of Thomas Hearne, M.A., who studied and preserved Antiquities'. It would not be profitable to guess the nature of Hearne's complaint, but the brief account of his illness reveals the relationship between two eighteenth-century physicians, endeavouring to care for a friend and difficult patient.

Without Hearne's diary, the account of the rest of Frewin's life would have been episodic and fragmentary, had I not had the good fortune to come on a three-page manuscript memoir of his latter years amongst the Radcliffe Science Library muniments, which is anonymous but was probably written about 1810.

On 26 December 1735, Mrs Frewin was delivered of a son who was christened Peter, and was the darling of his parents; he grew up to be a fine child and was to go to Westminster School when he was aged nine. (Here we see Frewin aged about 55, as portrayed by Michael Dahl.)

In the meantime Dr Frewin for the first time became embroiled openly in university politics. After James Keill gave up lecturing in anatomy in 1707, there had been no regular teachers, official or unofficial, until 1721, though various members of the university and visitors had from time to time given courses for a year or so. It was in 1721 that Frank Nicholls, the young man who had got into trouble over his Jacobite enthusiasms, was appointed university lecturer in anatomy, although he had only just taken his MA and did not graduate in medicine until 1724. His teaching was very popular, but for a short while he was in practice in Cornwall; then, deciding that teaching was more profitable, he went abroad to gain experience with Winslow, Morgagni and Santovini, and on returning set up as an anatomy teacher in London while continuing his courses in Oxford. His lectures embraced anatomy, physiology, and pathology, as well as therapeutics, and he published a compendium of his lectures with blank interleaved sheets which went through a number of editions and was in use in Oxford until 1780.

There is no question that Nicholls was the leading teacher of anatomy in England between 1730 and 1740, influencing both William Hunter and William Smellie. But his increasing practice in London caused him to give up his Oxford courses in 1736, and in 1743, on his

marriage to Richard Mead's youngest daughter, he gave up lecturing in London and I shall not follow his subsequent difficulties and successes. It had been intended that his great friend, Dr Thomas Lawrence, should succeed him at Oxford and so gain experience that would prepare him for the London classes. However Dr Woodford, the Regius professor, who spent most of his time away from Oxford, did nothing about it and eighteenth-century apathy returned.

It happened that a Brasenose graduate had an elder brother, Dr Nathan Alcock, who had graduated from Leiden in 1737, and was in some doubt how he should start in practice; it was suggested that he might fill the need for a teacher in Oxford, and so Dr Alcock arrived in Oxford in 1739, and started lecturing privately on anatomy and chemistry with great success in Jesus College. The faculty were in a flurry; Frewin summoned the aged Regius from Bath, Lawrence was asked to lecture in anatomy, and Dr Hughes was to read chemistry lectures, but neither was successful, while Alcock remained master of both fields. In 1741, the Masters in Convocation moved that Alcock should receive an MA degree, which would formally qualify him to teach, but this was rejected by the Heads of Houses [heads of colleges], as Dr Frewin had been active in canvassing and spreading all kinds of rumours. Dr Alcock was offered a BA degree which he refused, and feeling ran so high that the majority of Convocation decided that they would veto everything that was proposed and so stop all proceedings, until Dr Alcock's degree was passed. It happened that William Warburton, chaplain to the Prince of Wales, and later bishop of Gloucester, was proposed for an honorary DD; the traditional question was asked and the reply came back, '*non-placet*', whereupon 'Mr. Warburton looked on himself not merely as not honoured by the degree solicited, but as greatly affronted and publicly disgraced by the general rejection of it, and he ever after bore ill-will to the university, though very unjustly'. After months of passive resistance the Vice-Chancellor and doctors gave in; Dr Alcock received his MA in October 1741, and a few years later, the BM and licence to practise, so the opposition was roundly defeated and Alcock's success as teacher and practitioner continued until his health broke down in 1757.

In 1743 Dr Frewin was attending William Russell, a young law student at Christ Church whose father, Dr Richard Russell, was a Leiden graduate practising at Lewes. Richard Russell had published his Leiden thesis and a paper in the *Philosophical Transactions* of the Royal Society and was obviously quite able, as he attended the Duke of Newcastle and members of the Pelham family when they were in residence at Laughton. Dr Russell came up to Oxford to see Dr Frewin about his son, and also met Dr William Lewis, Frewin's young assistant, who had taken his BM from Christ Church two years before. According to Frewin they discussed 'various medical matters especially certain medicines that were less known or little understood. Amongst these discourses we mentioned sea water which you yourself had used long ago in the cure of scurvy and many diseases arising from tumours of the glands'. Russell recalled that he had the idea of using sea water after reading Frewin's discussion of his case in John Freind's *De morbis popularibus* which advocated purging in the second week of confluent smallpox. Frewin had suggested that it was desirable to carry off the morbid matter by the intestinal glands and that nature often effected this by the help of a flux. How much this was all hindsight one cannot say, but there is no doubt that it was Dr Russell's book on the use of sea water, first published in Oxford in 1750, which gave a scientific authority to his practice. He had moved from Lewes to the little fishing village of Brighthelmston which he helped to transform into Brighton the spa. He may well have had some assistance from the Pelhams for it was certainly the Duke of Newcastle, as Chancellor, who arranged that Russell should receive a Cambridge MD in 1754. It was also Newcastle to whom Russell dedicated the original edition of his treatise, which contains fulsome letters between Russell, Frewin, William Lewis, Sir Edward Wilmot and Matthew Lee. William Lewis was a student of Christ Church who graduated BM in 1741 and DM in 1745; he assisted Frewin in his practice and succeeded to it at his death.

We get an impression of Dr Frewin at this time from the Egmont diaries. Countess Egmont had been suffering from severe, possibly migrainous, headaches for a good number of years and her own practitioner, Sir Edward Wilmot, had not been able to relieve her. In July 1744 she was staying with Mr Augustus Schulz of Shotover House who suggested that she should

consult Dr. Frewin who is esteemed the Borehave of that city and county but she came back ill as she went and he knew not what to advise her only he bled her with a leech at the fundament and ordered her pills to be taken twice a day wherein there is a guyacum and bid her journey abroad and continue to take coffee for her present ease and laudanum to make her sleep and above all to avoid fretting or taking anything to heart.

This seems an unpleasant site for phlebotomy as there is no doubt that Johnson's dictionary uses fundament in the same way as we do, but in spite of the Earl's gloomy views, the Countess's headache did get better and she lived to the age of sixty. By this time Frewin's practice was so extensive and so many of his patients went to Bath, either for the season or on his advice, that he purchased a house in Queen Square, and his name appears each year in the list of visitors arriving in April.

In November 1745 [the 'tyrannical' Dr Robert Shippen, brother of the Jacobite MP William Shippen], died; he had been principal of Brasenose College for thirty-five years, and was an old friend of Frewin's having married him to Mrs Woodward in 1727. Frewin was invited to compose Shippen's epitaph, and the memorial in the college chapel shows that he had in no way lost that facility in Latin which had marked him out as a young Christ Church rhetoric reader, while his epithets are reminiscent of Dr King at his most subtle and ambiguous. We read that Dr Shippen was 'Vir, Si quis alius, ad amicorum utilitates atque commoda promovenda alacer, solers, et fidelis. Ad Collegii reditus et emolumenta amplificanda, sedulus, gnarus, et indefesus. Academiae jura atque privilegia tuenda et vindicanda, vigil, acer et strenuus'.

In March 1747 Dillenius, the first Sherardian professor of botany, who had been in poor health for some time, suffered a stroke and died on 2 April at the age of sixty-three. He had been attended by Drs Frewin and Lewis and he left them each a copy of his magnificent *Hortus Elthamensis* (1732), the account of James Sherard's garden, in two folio volumes with over 300 plates which he had drawn and engraved himself. The copies for his two doctors, Dr Frewin's bound in morocco, that for Dr Lewis in boards, had the plates coloured by his own hand.

In the British Museum [now British Library] there is volume after volume of the Newcastle manuscripts - state documents - reports from informers and requests for favours, but amongst them all there is only one letter from Dr Frewin and that is on behalf of a patient, Lord Euston, a ne'er-do-well son of the Duke of Grafton, who [not clear which] had treated his [not clear whose] wife with extreme brutality. In July 1747 Lord Euston had been taken ill at Bristol and brought by water to Bath to see Frewin. Dr Frewin felt that although Euston's bodily health was extremely impaired, his main symptoms were due to great disquiet and anxiety of mind. Frewin asked the Duke of Newcastle to use his good influence to reconcile father and son, adding that 'without such reconciliation there is little probability that Lord Euston can recover'. There was no reconciliation and Lord Euston died at Bath on 7 July and was buried at Euston a fortnight later.

It may be asked why it was that Dr Frewin, with his extensive and important practice, had never been elected a fellow of the Royal College of Physicians. I think there were three reasons. In the first instance, there was no real need for him to be a fellow as he mainly practised outside London, although quite a number of other distinguished country practitioners were extra-licentiate fellows. The second reason was that when Frewin was starting in practice there was a dispute as to whether Oxford and Cambridge graduates practising in London, with their

university licence to practise throughout all England, required to be examined and admitted to the college. The courts had ruled in the cases of West and Levitt that the college had the right to control university licentiates if they practised in London, but there was still resistance. Sir Edward Hannes, although he was examined, never entered the college, John Freind was hesitant about it, and there were several others of similar mind. Lastly, it is clear from the cases of Drs Fullerton and Alcock and the Reading affair, which we will come to shortly, that Frewin and many others like him were concerned about the fact that the college was quite willing to make Leiden and Scottish medical graduates extra-licentiates and so give them a status as high if not higher than Oxford and Cambridge graduates who were practising in the country.

In 1747 an anonymous pamphlet appeared (it was signed A Z), *An address to the College of Physicians, and to the universities of Oxford and Cambridge; occasioned by the late swarms of Scotch and Leyden physicians, etc., who have openly assumed the liberty ... of practising physick in England, contrary to the privileges of our universities, and of the charter granted to the College of Physicians in London.* It was the opening shot in the battle which was to reach its height twenty years later in the siege of Warwick Lane, and was clearly written by an Oxford medical graduate. Though there is no reason to suppose it was written by Dr Frewin, it certainly expressed his views. Having discussed the legal situation and the procedure for obtaining a medical degree at Oxford and Cambridge, the author contrasts this with the requirements of the Dutch and Scottish universities. He then suggests that Oxford and Cambridge graduates should always sign themselves DM Oxon. or MD Cantab., whereas others could only put 'Licentiate of the College of Physicians'. In conclusion he asserts that the practice of physic was at a very low ebb, and that the discouragement given to the graduates of both universities (partly through their own fault and that of the London college) must in a few years be totally destructive of all improvement in this truly useful branch of science: 'nothing can revive its ancient credit but by putting the laws in execution with the utmost Rigour; by giving all imaginable encouragement to our members and by refusing all publick offices to those who are not regular practitioners, and by not suffering any but graduates of Oxford and Cambridge to our public hospitals'. This chauvinistic approach was doomed to failure but it is interesting to see it spelled out so clearly.

Young Peter Frewin was now aged nine and had gone to Westminster, but after two years he had to leave school on account of ill health, and died in his father's house on 20 February 1748 - of gout it was said, but a more likely diagnosis is rheumatic carditis. It was a terrible blow to both parents and Mrs Frewin never recovered from the shock, dying of a stroke nine years later on 5 August 1757. After this Dr Frewin gave up his practice entirely and spent the remainder of his days 'in perfect quiet and social benevolence'.

Dr Frewin took no part in the celebrations that marked the opening in April 1749 of Gibbs's magnificent Radcliffe Library [now the Radcliffe Camera]. It had been necessary to delay the opening for a year as the university was once again in serious trouble with the government. In February 1748 some drunken undergraduates had shouted 'God damn King George, God bless King James 3rd of England' and the Vice-Chancellor had refused to accept the depositions of an informer. The undergraduates were arrested, charged with treason, and sentenced to two years' imprisonment. Against the advice of the Attorney General, the ministry decided to prosecute the Vice-Chancellor as well, but after being twice cited in the courts, his prosecution was abandoned. The Radcliffe trustees, all friends to the Old Interest, were at loggerheads with ministers and were under threat of prosecution by the Attorney General for their management of the trust.

It was against this background of resistance and anger that the university decided to stage a mighty demonstration of public support. The ceremony, which lasted a week, with Handel conducting three oratorios, cost some £20,000 and took the form of a Tory Triumph. The great moment was the inflammatory speech by Dr William King, the leader of the Jacobite faction,

with its manifold 'Redeat' ['may he return'], praying for the restoration of a patriot kingdom in which the university would flourish. The trustees asked that honorary degrees should be conferred on three physicians, and to the indignation of Dr Frewin and his friends, they were all Leiden doctors: Dr Gilbert Kennedy, physician to the British factory at Lisbon, Dr Richard Conyers, physician to the army and later to the Foundling Hospital, and Dr William Pitcairne, soon to be physician to St Bartholomew's Hospital and a distinguished president of the College of Physicians. When this proposal came before Congregation they were described as 'medicasters, empyricks and whatnots'. Dr William Lewis, Frewin's partner, delivered an elegant and fulsome oration on John Radcliffe, but when all the hurly burly was over, the university found itself saddled with a very elegant white elephant, as the new library was poorly endowed for the purchase of books and its purpose was not over-clear.

Naturally the Whig ministers had been kept fully informed of the whole proceedings, and numerous privy councils were held to consider the matter. In the end the idea of a Visitation was dropped, but it was decided to play up the vice and immorality of Oxford as this had nothing to do with party distinctions. George Wilmot, a fellow of Balliol, persuaded a fifteen-year-old Magdalen College chorister to accuse Dr Lewis of impropriety, and published the details in a pamphlet; Lewis replied, and if both stories are correct, nothing very grave took place, though there had been a disgraceful affair involving the Warden of Wadham some ten years before.

The slur on Dr Lewis's character did not appear to affect his professional career as he succeeded to Frewin's practice, though in 1754 it was rumoured that he was to be made state physician of Ireland. When the Radcliffe Infirmary opened, Lewis became one of the physicians and at his death in 1772 at Beam Hall, Thomas Willis's old house, he left some £35,000. Lewis remained unmarried and after a small donation to the Infirmary, the rest of his fortune went to his mother and his brother, the Dean of Ossory.

In 1750 [1745?] Dr Frewin figured in a lighter vein in a complaint against Dr Pitt, an Oxford physician, written by Miss Mary Jones. Miss Jones was a sister of Revd River Jones, chanter of Christ Church Cathedral; she was something of an amateur poet and a friend of Samuel Johnson who used to call her the 'Chantress'. Thomas Warton said that 'she was a very ingenuous poetess and published a volume of poems and on the whole, was a most sensible, agreeable and amiable woman; she died unmarried'. In her *A letter to Doctor Pitt, an eminent physician at Oxford, by a young lady of Oxford* (1750 [1745?]), she appeals in medical terminology to Dr Pitt to remedy the cachexia of his partition fence which was causing a nuisance to her, and remarks of the treatment she advocated, that she is sure Dr Frewin (if he were called in) would approve of it, as entirely consistent with the doctrine of evacuations. Dr Evan Pitt was a Christ Church physician and a protégé of the Duke of Marlborough, who recommended him to Newcastle as Regius professor when Dr Woodford was dying in 1758. There were however innumerable contenders, and though in the end Pitt was nominated on 7 January 1759, he died before the appointment was made, and so Dr John Kelly, the Duke of Devonshire's candidate, became Regius professor on 16 March 1759, and spent most of his time in Bristol.

In 1749, Dr Frewin had been dragged into print in a more serious manner, as he became embroiled in two medical controversies which went public in a series of pamphlets. The first involved a group of Irish doctors. It would seem that a certain Mr Baker of Cork was suffering from a continued fever and had four physicians in attendance - Drs Rogers, Flaherty, Bonbonous and Connell - but as he was making little progress, Mr Baker, without consulting the quartet, called in a rival physician, a Dr Blair, who announced that the previous treatment was wrong, prescribed *tinctura antiphysica* and Mr Baker recovered. The quartet were furious, for they maintained, apart from the ethics of the matter, that it was both improper and hazardous to exhibit this drug in a continued fever. Dr Rogers sought the opinions of Drs Mead and Frewin: Mead upheld the treatment, and then wrote to Dr Blair, as he felt Dr Rogers had misquoted him.

Dr Frewin was more cautious and wrote:

I am ashamed to reflect that I have so long deferred my answer to your letter [the enquiry had been received on 1st November 1748, and Frewin replied on 16 January 1749] but an infirmity in my eyes, some melancholy distress in my family and the daily engagements in business have prevented my writing sooner. I am of opinion the gentlemen do their adversary too much honour in applying to a physician of another nation.

Frewin remains remarkably evasive as to the merits or demerits of *tinctura antiphthisica*. This is all set out in an anonymous pamphlet published in 1749 entitled *An account of a medical controversy in the city of Cork, ... to which are subjoined two letters from Dr. Mead and one from Dr. Frewin*. Dr Patrick Blair, who graduated from Edinburgh in 1738 with a dissertation *De obstructionum origine*, appears to have been an able physician but an awkward character. In 1750 he was involved in another dispute, as to his emergency (and successful) treatment of a patient who had swallowed arsenic, and again there was a pamphlet, *The cause of the late dispute between Doctor Farmer and Doctor Blair, laid open to the publick*. In 1774 Dr Blair wrote *Thoughts on nature and religion. Or, an apology for the right of private judgement, maintained by Michael Servetus M.D., in his answer to John Calvin*, in which Dr Blair maintained his right to the Unitarian viewpoint.

The other dispute occurred at Reading and in this Dr Frewin was much more deeply involved. In the 1750s there were three physicians in Reading, Drs Addington, Merrick, and Zinzan, all of whom were Oxford graduates. Dr Merrick had been at St John's, taking his BM in 1697 and his DM in 1708, and was now aged seventy; he had two sons, one a doctor who had graduated in 1731 and was in practice in Isleworth, and the other, James, a well-known scholar and poet. Dr Anthony Addington had been at Winchester and Trinity, graduated MB in 1741 and DM in 1744, and went into practice in Reading in 1745, aged thirty-two. Shortly afterwards he married Mary Hiley, daughter of the headmaster of Reading grammar school and a great beauty, who brought him a small fortune of £3,000. Dr Peter Zinzan had been a fellow of Magdalen for fifteen years, and took his medical degree in 1742. He set up in Reading following his marriage, and was aged forty-five. Accordingly as Dr Merrick was reducing his practice, Dr Addington shared patients with Dr Zinzan but had the lion's share.

This was the situation when a further doctor began in practice in 1748 in Henley, only eight miles away. Dr Richard Russel (no relation to Dr Richard Russell of Brighton) was the son of a nonjuring clergyman who kept a boarding house for nonjuring Westminster scholars, but was also a bookseller and publisher who was involved in the *Grub Street Journal*, the periodical which attacked Pope's adversaries. Dr Russel was born in 1714, had been apprenticed to Mr Clutton, an apothecary in Holborn, and then went to France; he studied in Paris and obtained an MD from Rheims in 1738. On his return to England he set up in practice at Hoddesdon, married, and in 1740 was appointed physician to the branch of Christ's Hospital at Ware. In 1742 he became an extra-licentiate of the College of Physicians, but as he failed to obtain the post of physician to Christ's Hospital in Hertfordshire, he decided to move to Henley and practise medicine and man-midwifery, as there was no physician in the town. Out of courtesy, Russel arranged for a friend to call on Drs Addington and Merrick to inform them of his intentions. Dr Merrick expressed no objection, but Dr Addington was reported to have said that Henley was too close to Reading to support a physician and had never been able to do so; he suggested High Wycombe as an alternative.

Dr Russel thought this was good enough and all went well until July 1748 when Dr Addington was called in to see a patient whom Russel was attending. Addington informed Russel that he could not consult with him as he had entered into an agreement with several

physicians, Drs Frewin and Pitt of Oxford, Dr Hayes of Windsor, and Dr Zinzan of Reading, not to consult with any physician who was not an Oxford or Cambridge graduate. The patient's wife was then asked whether she wished Dr Addington or Dr Russel to continue to look after her husband, and after consulting the apothecary, she decided upon Dr Addington. Dr Russel had been confident of the diagnosis and treatment, but under Dr Addington's care the patient died after a fortnight. That was not the end of the matter, for one day Addington was at the Club in Henley and made offensive remarks about Dr Russel's abilities. He repeated the story of the agreement, and furthermore persuaded the local apothecaries not to make up Dr Russel's prescriptions. So in 1749 Russel's father published *A letter to Dr. Addington*, setting out the whole matter. In the meantime Dr Zinzan had consulted with Dr Russel, Dr Hayes stated that he had never entered into any such agreement and indeed had never heard of such a thing, and Dr Pitt had said that the Oxford physicians never refused to consult with doctors holding foreign degrees provided they had a licence from the London college. Dr Russel did not say anything about Dr Frewin's views, save that it was unlikely that a man of that age, learning, experience, and reputation in the world would enter into such an agreement with Addington. Nonetheless, in view of his difficulties with the apothecaries, Russel was going to make up his own medicines, and further announced that on each Thursday, which was Market Day, he would give his advice free to those who could not afford to pay.

Russel got no response from Addington, and so in 1750 he moved to Reading and set up in practice there! – and his next pamphlet was addressed to Mr Thomas Bigg who had been surgeon to St Bartholomew's Hospital from 1737 until 1745 when he retired on grounds of ill health, and had moved to practise in Wallingford. It would seem that Bigg and Addington were circulating a derogatory letter about Russel, but would not let him see it. Russel however had found out that it referred to his unsuccessful application for the Christ's Hospital post as Biggs, who was then a governor, opposed his appointment as he wanted it for a surgical friend and claimed that Russel was unsuitable. Of course Russel in this second pamphlet goes over all the old ground, but adds that when Addington was consulting with Dr Lewis about one of Mr Bigg's patients, he had asked Lewis about consultation with Russel and had advised him against doing so. Russel mentions that while he was disputing with Addington in 1748, the latter was building two houses, one for himself, the other as a private lunatic asylum which would accommodate twelve patients at £18 a week, netting nearly £1,000 a year. (This glass portrait of Dr Addington was formerly on the staircase and was discovered by Dr Brynmor Thomas.) There was no response from Biggs or Addington, but in the meantime the latter had been the principal medical witness in the notorious Mary Blandy murder trial, and in 1753 he published an essay on scurvy in which he recommended hydrochloric acid as a form of therapy.

That was not the end of the story. Also in 1753, Addington decided to move to London; Dr Zinzan had married again and was giving up practice. So a young New College physician, Francis Piggott, whose father was in practice in Isleworth, was advised by young Merrick to see his father in Reading as to an opening there. Piggott had a recommendation from Dr Frewin and was well received by Addington, who tried to persuade Piggott to buy his two houses (which still stand in London Road; his residence is occupied by a solicitor, but the madhouse, now called Olympia, appropriately houses a political club and a bingo hall!). But in the meantime, Piggott discovered that another New College physician, Henry Blackstone, was being encouraged by both Frewin and Addington to take over the Addington practice. Now Blackstone was a brother of the famous lawyer Sir William Blackstone, and both had been brought up by their uncle Thomas Bigg. The outcome of all this double-crossing was that Addington went to London, became physician to Lord Chatham, and was called in to George III when he was insane. His son became Lord Sidmouth [prime minister 1801-4]. Blackstone gave up the battle, took holy orders and became vicar of Adderbury. Piggott and Russel stayed at Reading, and were later

joined by young Merrick.

Frewin was an old friend of Anthony Addington and was over seventy when he got involved in this fracas; I can well believe that his prejudices got the better of him. It was in 1752 that we hear of his attendance on Dr Martin Benson, bishop of Gloucester, who was suffering from rheumatism but was too ill to go to Bath. Frewin's last extant official letter, written in 1756, was in connection with the Botanic Garden where they were having trouble with the gardeners. Thomas Potts had been appointed in November 1734 but had proved unsatisfactory; he was discharged but there had been no replacement and so Frewin wrote to the Vice-Chancellor:

Sir,

The decree orders the Executor of Dr. Sharrard to pay out £3,000 in an estate in land or in the purchase of an annuity for the stipend of the Professor. The same decree orders the University to pay £150 yearly out of their annual income, which sum is declared to be for further maintaining. and keeping up the garden and gardener. I have put a paper into your book now returned where you will find these words. I am of opinion that the Committee have no more power to avoid choosing a gardener than the visitors have to elect a professor. If ye present gardener will serve us no longer, I hope another will be provided against we are to meet on February 7th.

I am your most obedient servant,

R. Frewin

Sure enough, on 7 February, John Foreman was appointed at a salary of £40 a year. He continued until 1779 when he was succeeded by his son, who retired in 1813, when the famous William Baxter was appointed.

Dr Frewin was now aged seventy-five and in the following September he drew up his will, to which some six codicils were added, the last one in May 1761. We have a vignette of the ageing Frewin, who is also well portrayed in the Roubiliac bust:

Dr. Frewin was one of the most pleasant and placid old men I ever knew, warm and sincere in his Friendships and extensive in his Charities. He lived by rule in these latter days and moved by clockwork, keeping up the same establishment as in his full practice. He always went an airing every day, just to the two mile stone and back again and sat down to his well furnished table at three. His most intimate and beloved friend, Counsellor Gilpin (then Recorder of Oxford) always dined with him every day, beside some Gentleman or other, and a Lady, who continued with him after Mrs. Frewin's death, with whom she had been a particular favourite. He played his rubber every evening with his usual coterie, till nine, then drank his Dish of Chocolate and went to bed, and was always sat up with by an old Nurse, whome he kept for that purpose.

Dr Frewin's last attendance at a meeting of the Physick Garden Committee was in March, 1758; by December, 1758, he was in poor health and there were rumours of an imminent vacancy in the Camden professorship, which with its stipend of £140 per annum, was a profitable sinecure. On 27 January 1759, Richard Radcliffe, at that time rector of Colsterworth, was writing to his friend Dr James, the headmaster of St Bees' School:

Old Snod is candidate for the Professorship of History, which, it is supposed, will be soon vacant by the death of Dr. Frewin. We have all promised (as in duty bound) to appear for him on the shortest notice. His antagonist is Mr. Warnford, of Corpus, a man unexceptionable in his character, and, I used to think, one of the

best practical preachers that ever peeped over a cushion at St. Mary's. Mr. Warnford has been making interest for the place these seven years, though it seems to be the opinion of most people that our old tutor will stand the best chance.

'Old Snod' was George Fothergill, at that time principal of St Edmund's Hall; Frewin's health improved, but George Fothergill died in 1760, and when the Camden professorship did become vacant, it was his rival, the Reverend John Warnford, who was elected to the chair and the founder's instructions continued to be largely ignored, until the statute recommended by the Commissioners in 1877 amended the terms of the professorship.

It was on 26 April 1758 that the Radcliffe trustees signed an order for £4,000 to build a hospital in Oxford. The architect, Stiff Leadbetter, submitted his plans to the trustees on 8 March 1759, which were approved. A contract for £5,692 10s. was signed on 24 May, and the foundation stone of the new hospital was laid on 27 August; they did things quicker in those leisurely days.

It was on 3 September 1759 that Frewin added to his will the following document which he had signed on 4 June:

It is my request to my three Trustees that they would lay out two thousand pounds of that Surplus in the purchase of Government or Land Security, and let the Interest or produce of the said two thousand pounds be accumulated till the new hospital in the parish of St. Giles in Oxford be finished, and then or sooner if they please to lay out the said two thousand pounds and the accumulated produce thereof, in Land or some other good security, and that they would vest or settle the same, as their gift or donation, according to Law, to be paid to the Physician who shall be appointed physician of the said Hospital, so long as he shall continue in that office, and perform his Duty personally, and reside in Oxford.

Two years later, after a short illness, Dr Frewin died, on 29 May 1761, in his eightieth year, and was buried in St. Peter's in the East 'as near the bodies of my relatives as conveniently can be and with as much privacy as decency will permit'. *Jackson's Journal* said of him: 'his abilities in physic and his character as a polite scholar are too well known to need any Encomium. The former were remarkably visible in the extension of his own life greatly beyond the limits apparently adapted to his constitution - a life spent not only in the service of the public, but also in the compassionate relief of private indigence and distress'.

Dr Frewin's will is a monumental and revealing document; his executors were James Gilpin (1710-1766), recorder of Oxford, an able lawyer of the strictest integrity, who as we have seen was an old and intimate friend; Dr James Hawley (1704-1777), an Oxford graduate and physician to the Westminster Hospital; and the Revd John Frewen (1705-1767), fellow of Oriel and later rector of Tortworth, Gloucestershire. Dr Frewin's selection of John Frewen as an executor raises an intriguing genealogical problem. Dr Richard Frewin's father was Ralph Frewin of the city of London, who died in 1691, and his mother, Susan, lived with him in Oxford and died in 1732, but that is all that is known of his family. On the other hand the Revd John Frewen was a member of a large and complex family - the Frewens of Northiam, descended from the Revd John Frewen (1560-1628) who by his first wife Eleanor had seven children, amongst whom was the Revd Accepted Frewen, a royalist, president of Magdalen College and archbishop of York. John Frewin married again and had five further children, some of whom were Parliamentarians, who migrated to Ireland after the Restoration and established a family line there. There were a number of doctors among the Northiam Frewens, from the seventeenth century to the present day.

It might appear that Dr Frewin's choice of the Revd John Frewen as an executor indicated a relationship, but the positive evidence is negligible, and the negative evidence fairly strong, so it must remain for some future biographer to determine the matter. The fact that Dr Frewin always spelt his name with an 'i' (though his friends varied in the spelling they adopted), while the Sussex Frewens spelt it, as they still do, with an 'e', is not of great importance, but nowhere in his will does Dr Frewin call the Revd John his kinsman, and in his lifetime, when he was ordering a book from Hearne for Thomas Frewen (d. 1738), a member of the Northiam family, Dr Frewin wrote of him as his namesake. Furthermore neither Ralph nor Richard occurs as a Christian name in the pedigree of the Sussex Frewens.

Dr Frewin's will opens with bequests to his relatives, the Hunts of Essex, his brother-in-law Dr Cranke, his stepdaughters, his kinsman Revd Mr Vaughan, minister of Leominster, the latter's son Henry, and his daughter, in case there was any claim, as the overplus was very large. Frewin also left £50 to Henry Baughan, apothecary of Leominster, in lieu of a reversionary interest on some of his Essex property. Attempts to learn more about Dr Frewin's Essex relatives have not been very successful. Turning to Herefordshire, there was a Peter Cranke of Leominster who received a bishop's licence to practise medicine in 1731, who may be the same as the Peter Cranke who matriculated at Worcester College in 1724 at the age of nineteen; but nothing can be learned of John Cranke, Frewin's brother-in-law.

Of his kinsman the Revd Vaughan there is rather more information, although what his relationship was to Dr Frewin is obscure. The Revd Henry Vaughan was at Leominster for over forty years, and was succeeded in 1762 by his son, the Revd Richard Vaughan; another son was Henry Vaughan (1714-1779), surgeon at Leominster whose son, James Vaughan (1740-1813), was a physician to the Leicester Infirmary. Dr James Vaughan had six sons: the eldest died young, but the other five all had notable careers. Henry, educated at Rugby and Christ Church, became a doctor and his transformation into Sir Henry Halford, GCH [Knight Grand Cross of Hanover], PRCP, physician-in-ordinary to George III, George IV, William IV and Queen Victoria, is a remarkable success story which it would take too long to tell here. John read law and became the Rt Hon. Sir John Vaughan, judge and baron of the Exchequer; Charles became a diplomat and as the Rt Hon. Sir Charles Vaughan, GCH, was ambassador to the United States; Peter and Edward joined the church; Peter became dean of Chester and warden of Merton, while Edward was vicar of St Martin's, Leicester. Edward's two sons played important parts in the Liberal evangelical movement. One of Judge Sir John Vaughan's sons became a fellow of Oriel and Regius professor of modern history; his son William Wyamar Vaughan, was headmaster of Rugby and Dame Janet Vaughan, principal of Somerville, is his daughter. If Dr Frewin could have foreseen what a remarkable progeny his kinsman Dr Henry Vaughan was to have, he might have been more generous in his legacy, 'as the over-plus was so large'.

Returning to his will, there were various bequests to his godchildren. His professional friends also received legacies; £100 each to Drs James Hawley and Anthony Addington 'for their trouble in attending me in sickness', small gifts to Dr William Lewis and Mr Charles Nourse, who practised in Oxford, and to the children of Thos. Marock, Dr Frewin's apothecary; there were gifts to various other friends, and bequests to his servants.

Then came his public bequests: to Christ Church, various portraits and £500 for the new library, and his Wiltshire estate for Westminster students admitted to Christ Church. To the Radcliffe Library, all the books in his study and closet, of which a catalogue was to be prepared and kept near the books. To the university, the leasehold of his house which he held from Brasenose College for the use of the Regius professor of medicine, provided he personally lived in it and did not sublet it. Dr Frewin's object was that 'the residence of the Regius Professor may endure to the honour and interest of the University and of the Professor of Physick there. My will therefore further is that if any Regius Professor of Medicine shall be absent from Oxford or

shall not actually personally and bona fide dwell and reside in my said dwellinghouse for the space of one year together or for the space of one and a half years in two years at different times, he shall forfeit all interest and the University shall let the house at a rack rent for their own use'.

The residue of the estate was to be divided between the three executors who each received £500 in addition to personal bequests. James Gilpin was to have the use of Frewin Hall for his life, together with its contents, though he was requested to leave such furniture in the house as would be suitable for the Regius professor; Dr Hawley was to have use of his house at Bath and its contents for life, after which it was to be sold for the benefit of Frewin's relatives; the Revd Frewen was to have some plate and a Baskerville bible. The exact amount of the estate is not known but it exceeded £12,000, and it is interesting to see what came of his public benefactions.

Westminster students at Christ Church still enjoy his benefaction which amounts to about £70 per annum. A catalogue of Dr Frewin's books was prepared on 10 June 1761, recording in a folio volume of 52 pages, some 2,300 books and is now in the Bodleian (M.S. Radcl. Trustees c. 35). It is essentially a working library of scientific (predominantly medical) and historical books - the standard texts and reference books of the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, with a smattering of sixteenth-century books but no incunabula.

It seems unlikely that Dr John Kelly took up residence in Frewin Hall after James Gilpin's death in 1766, as he spent most of his time in Bristol, but the subsequent Regius professors - William Vivian, Sir Christopher Pegge, and Dr John Kidd - did occupy the house. The university renewed the lease in 1789 and 1799 at a rental of £3.6s. per annum but Brasenose College inserted in the latter lease that after 28 days' arrears the lease would be void. It was during Dr Kidd's time - about 1849, though the details remain obscure - that the university failed to renew the lease and so the property reverted to Brasenose. Dr Kidd purchased 37 St Giles, which on his death he left to Christ Church, to be the residence of Dr Lee's reader in anatomy.

Frewin Hall has had some distinguished tenants in the last century. James Skene, friend of Sir Walter Scott, retired to Oxford after his residence in Greece, and Frewin Hall was a centre of great activity during the cholera outbreak of 1854 as his daughter, Felicia Skene, the novelist, organised a band of nurses under Sir Henry Acland's direction. But the old house became most famous as the official residence of Edward VII when he was an undergraduate at Magdalen. It was afterwards occupied by Edward Chapman, fellow of Magdalen, to whom all Oxford long-distance train users are unwittingly indebted, Dr Shadwell, provost of Oriel, Dr Heberden, principal of Brasenose, and Sir Charles Oman, Chichele professor of modern history. Brasenose graduates now enjoy its eighteenth-century elegance.

It is unnecessary to record all the difficulties and delays that occurred between the laying of the foundation stone of the Infirmary on 27 August 1759, and the opening on St Luke's day, 1770, but it is clear that Frewin's benefaction was known to the governors, for the fourth ward to be opened at the end of November 1770 was named after him, and there has been a Frewin ward in the Infirmary until recent times. However it was not until 1774 that the court of Chancery agreed to pay over to the treasurer of the Infirmary £66 each year for the physicians.

The physicians continued to enjoy Dr Frewin's benefaction until 18 January 1960, when the board of governors received a letter from the legal department of the Ministry of Health, on the subject of the Frewin trust, in which it was pointed out that the National Health Service (Remuneration and Conditions of Service) Regulations, 1951, in effect prohibit 'your Board from paying its officers, whether out of Exchequer or non-Exchequer funds, a greater remuneration than the approved remuneration. It therefore appears that the payment of the Trust income to the senior physicians constitutes a breach of the Regulations and I have to advise the Board accordingly'. The medical staff were informed of the matter and suggested to the board of governors that the trust income should be used to award a Frewin prize each year for the best

memoir dealing with recent original work in any branch of medicine submitted by a senior registrar in the United Oxford Hospitals, and since 1962 a Frewin prize of £50 value has been awarded annually.

In this lecture I have attempted to present to you the training and career of a successful country physician of the early eighteenth century. Dr Frewin wrote nothing and directed that his notes on patients should be destroyed at his death, so we can only reveal him as seen by others. It is clear that his opinion and advice were valued by his patients and his colleagues. He had his prejudices, but by nature he was kindly and generous. He was anxious that the profession and its practitioners should maintain the high ideals that have been associated with the art of medicine from the earliest times, and to further these aims, he returned to the profession the riches he had gained.

.....

Further reading:

Brasenose College Register (1909), p. 174.

British Library, Sloane MS 4059, f. 14: letter of Frewin to Sir Hans Sloane, n.d.

Brown, T. M., 'The College of Physicians and the acceptance of iatromechanism in England, 1665-1675', *Bulletin of the History of Medicine*, 44 (1970), 12-30.

-----, 'The changing self-concept of the eighteenth-century London physician', *Eighteenth-Century Life*, 7, n.s. 3 (1982), 31-40.

Bynum, W. F. and R. Porter (eds), *William Hunter and the Eighteenth-Century Medical World* (Cambridge, 1985).

Cook, H. J., *The Decline of the Old Medical Regime in Stuart London* (Ithaca, 1986).

-----, *Trials of an Ordinary Doctor: Joannes Groenevelt in Seventeenth-Century London* (Baltimore, 1994).

Cunningham, A. and R. French (eds), *The Medical Enlightenment of the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1990).

Davies, A. E., 'The locations and careers of provincial physicians in eighteenth-century England, with particular reference to Devon and Suffolk' (PhD, University of Exeter, 2008).

Grell, O. P., A. Cunningham and J. Arrizabalaga (eds), *Centres of Medical Excellence? Medical Travel and Education in Europe, 1500-1789* (Farnham, 2010).

Haycock, D. B., *William Stukeley: Science, Religion and Archaeology in Eighteenth-Century England* (Woodbridge, 2002).

Hearne, Thomas, *Remarks and Collections*, ed. C. E. Doble et al., 11 vols (Oxford, 1885-1921).

-----, *Reliquiae Hearniae...Being Extracts from his MS Diaries*, ed. P. Bliss, 2nd edn, 3 vols (London, 1869).

Jones, H. S., 'The foundation and history of the Camden chair', *Oxoniensia*, 8-9 (1943-4), 169-92.

Lawrence, C., *Medicine in the Making of Modern Britain, 1700-1920* (London, 1994).

Lawrence, S. L., *Charitable Knowledge: Hospital Pupils and Practitioners in Eighteenth-Century London* (Cambridge, 1996).

Loudon, J., 'Frewin, Richard', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.
Oxford Dictionary of National Biography (2004 and online).

Pelling, M., 'The refoundation of the Linacre lectureships in the nineteenth century', in F. Maddison, M. Pelling and C. Webster (eds), *Linacre Studies: Essays on the Life and Work of Thomas Linacre c. 1460-1524* (Oxford, 1977), pp. 265-89.

Porter, R. and D. Porter, *In Sickness and in Health: the British Experience 1650-1850* (London, 1988).

Rolleston, G., *The Cambridge Medical School: A Biographical History* (Cambridge, 1932).

Rook, A., 'Robert Glynn (1719-1800), physician at Cambridge', *Medical History*, 13 (1969), 251-9.

----- (ed.), *Cambridge and its Contribution to Medicine* (London, 1971).

Stevenson, L. G., 'The siege of Warwick Lane, together with a brief history of the Society of Collegiate Physicians (1769-1798)', *Journal of the History of Medicine*, 7 (1982), 105-21.

Tildesley, N. W., 'Dr Richard Wilkes of Willenhall, Staffs., an eighteenth-century country doctor', *Lichfield and South Staffordshire Archaeological and Historical Society Transactions*, 7 (1965-6), 1-10.

Von Uffenbach, Zacharias Konrad, *Oxford in 1710: From the Travels of Zacharias Conrad von*

Uffenbach, ed. W. H. Quarrell and W. J. C. Quarrell (Oxford, 1928).

Vaughan, L. K., "'Improvements in the art of healing": William Heberden (1710-1801) and the emergence of modern medicine in eighteenth-century England' (D Phil, University of Oxford, 2004).

Ward, W. R., *Georgian Oxford: University Politics in the Eighteenth Century* (Oxford, 1958).

Weatherall, M., *Gentlemen, Scientists and Doctors: Medicine at Cambridge, 1800-1940* (Woodbridge, 2000).

Webster, C., 'The medical faculty and the physic garden', in L. S. Sutherland and L. G. Mitchell (eds), *The History of the University of Oxford. Vol. 5: the Eighteenth Century* (Oxford, 1986), pp. 683-723.
