

News, Notes and Queries

One must presume that Schoener derived two more crases in the same way: 'dry' with 'hot' and 'cold' balanced, and 'moist' with 'hot' and 'cold' balanced. In his opinion the yield was then eight combined crases, plus four simple crases and the eucrasic state in which 'hot' and 'cold', and 'warm' and 'moist' were equally balanced. But it should be obvious that in the simple crasis 'hot' (where 'hot' predominates over 'cold') 'moist' and 'dry' must be in balance, and so on for the remaining simple crases. Thus there can be only four combined and four simple crases in addition to the eucrasic state.

The matter is clearly explained by Galen in Chapter VIII of Book 1 *On Crases* (Kuehn I, pp. 554–59). He says that the four combined dyscrasias, 'hot' and 'moist', 'hot' and 'dry', 'cold' and 'moist', and 'cold' and 'dry' are well known to physicians and philosophers but they have neglected the 'first and best' of the crases—eucrasis, where 'hot' and 'cold', and 'moist' and 'dry' are in balance—as well as the remaining four, which are constituted, he says, by 'half' of the combined dyscrasias. In justifying the existence of the last four Galen states that when 'hot' predominates over 'cold' it is not necessary that either 'dry' or 'moist' predominate as well; they may be in balance. And so on for the remaining qualities. This being the case, Galen concludes, we have no reason to doubt that there are *nine* crases (*ennea tas pasas einai ton kraseōn diaphoras, eukraton men mian, ouk eucraton de tas oktō, tettaras men haplus, hygron, kai xēran, kai thermēn, kai psychran, allus de tettaras synthetous, hygran hama kai thermēn, kai xēran hama kai thermēn, kai psychran hama kai hygran, kai psychran hama kai xēran*).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Anon. Londin., XX 25–30.
2. De Gen. et Corr. 330 a 30–330 b 5.
3. Schoener, Erich, 'Das Viererschema in der antiken Humoralpathologie', *Sudhoff's Archiv. Ges. Med. Naturwiss.*, Beiheft 4, 1964, pp. 10, 62, 67, 79.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 93.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I wish to acknowledge my indebtedness to Professor F. Kudlein of Kiel for preliminary comments on this paper.

L. J. RATHER

NOTE ON THE FOUNDATION OF QUEEN CHARLOTTE'S HOSPITAL

UP TO THE year 1924 it had never been doubted that Queen Charlotte's Hospital, known at previous stages of its existence as 'The General Lying-in Hospital', and 'The Queen's Hospital', was the third oldest maternity hospital in Great Britain. It was accepted that it had been established in 1752, after the Brownlow St. Hospital (1749),¹ and the City of London Lying-in Hospital (1750). Indeed, the hospital's own Minute Books, which date from 1809, state clearly and repeatedly that 1752 was the year of its foundation.² There was, however, little evidence as to the hospital's original site.

¹ Renamed in 1756 'The British Lying-in Hospital', and amalgamated in 1914 with the Woolwich Home for Mothers and Babies, to form the British Hospital for Mothers and Babies, Woolwich.

² See also *The History of Queen Charlotte's Lying-in Hospital from its Foundation in 1752 to the Present Time*, by Thos. Ryan (Secretary to the Hospital), 1885.

News, Notes and Queries

But in 1924 Dr. G. C. Peachey, in an address to the Royal Society of Medicine (quoted by Gunn in *The Evolution of Hospitals*, 1964³), claimed to have proved that Queen Charlotte's originated in Jermyn Street, St. James's, and was in fact continuous and identical with the earlier lying-in institution opened by Sir Richard Manningham in 1739. According to this theory, Queen Charlotte's was not only the oldest maternity hospital in Great Britain, but also in the British Isles, being older than the Rotunda Hospital in Dublin.⁴

Prior to Dr. Peachey's address it had been thought that Sir Richard had opened his lying-in wards in the St. James's Poor Law Infirmary,⁵ though the charitable status of his institution makes this very unlikely.⁶ Dr. Peachey, however, quoted a letter of Manningham's discovered in the Sloane MSS, which had led him to the conclusion that Manningham's 'Charitable Infirmary' was in fact established in Jermyn Street. But though this letter (dated May, 1739) says that accommodation had recently been taken for this purpose, and is addressed from Manningham's house in Jermyn Street,⁷ it nowhere states where the hospital was to be.⁸ Thus while it is possible that it, too, was in Jermyn Street, this is by no means certain.

Peachey then goes on to the supposed connexion between Manningham's institution and Queen Charlotte's Hospital. It had always been known that Queen Charlotte's might have originated in Jermyn Street. Maitland's *History of London* (1756) shows that by that year the hospital was in Duke Street, but adds that it 'first began in Jermyn Street, St. James'. Corroborating evidence had, however, been lacking.⁹ But now Dr. Peachey's discovery of an advertisement dated 1752 for a course of midwifery lectures given at the 'Lying-in Infirmary in Jermyn Street', seemed to confirm Jermyn Street as the original site of the hospital. Peachey does not give the source of the advertisement, but a similar one appears in the *London Daily Advertiser* in February 1753, showing that the hospital was certainly there at that date. This appeals for further support for the Infirmary, 'where unmarried as well as married women are constantly relieved', and announces lectures to be given there by 'Faelix Macdonogh, Surgeon and Man-Midwife'.¹⁰

None of this, however, as Gunn points out,¹¹ proves Peachey's claim that this Jermyn Street Infirmary was the same as Manningham's earlier establishment, with Felix Macdonough as its new Medical Officer. In fact, contemporary evidence (as Gunn also mentions) goes to show that Manningham's institution had ceased to exist at least by 1749. In that year, some of the Governors of the Middlesex Hospital, dissatisfied with the share of the resources devoted to the lying-in wards there, broke

³ Alistair L. Gunn, 'Maternity Hospitals', in *The Evolution of Hospitals*, ed. F. N. L. Poynter, London, 1964.

⁴ *Proc. R. Soc. Med.*, 1924, 17, 72-76 (Epidemiology).

⁵ *Dictionary of National Biography*.

⁶ See *The Institution and Oeconomy of the Charitable Infirmary for the Relief of Poor Women Labouring of Child and during their Lying-in*, 1739.

⁷ According to the Poor-Rate Books for the area, Manningham occupied a house in Jermyn Street at least from 1737, and was still there in 1757.

⁸ Sloane MSS. 4056, p. 84.

⁹ See Thos. Ryan, *op. cit.*

¹⁰ *The London Daily Advertiser*, 10 and 17 February 1753.

¹¹ Alistair L. Gunn, *op. cit.*

away and founded a separate lying-in hospital in Brownlow Street. In a pamphlet published in 1752 they gave as their reasons for this move the fact that there was at that time 'no Hospital solely for Lying-in Women in His Majesty's Dominions, except in Dublin'.¹²

Thus the weight of evidence was in any case against the continuity of the two institutions: now, however, the recent acquisition by the Wellcome Institute Library of a hitherto unknown pamphlet published by the hospital in 1768 has enabled the question to be settled authoritatively. This publication, *An Account of the Rise, Progress and State of the General Lying-in Hospital, the Corner of Quebec-Street, Oxford Road* (besides showing that by this time the Hospital had moved yet again), gives the date of its foundation as 21 January 1752.

But the new Infirmary was not just another lying-in institution: its philosophy differed from that of the existing lying-in charities, as appears from the pamphlet's description of its foundation. The Middlesex, Brownlow Street, and City of London Hospitals catered for married women only, as had Manningham's by then defunct 'Charitable Infirmary'. Indeed, the advertisement announcing the establishment of Manningham's institution, though recognizing the need for provision for unmarried women, suggests that this should be met by a National Hospital founded by the Government.¹³ It was to meet this need, the newly-discovered pamphlet tells us, that the hospital was founded, commenting that it was 'rather wonderful that a Plan so noble, so worthy, and so interesting to the Community in general . . . should not have sooner taken Place in this Metropolis.' The design for the establishment arose, we are told, from 'one of the most melancholy Instances of Distress and Despair, which can be met with in this or any other Country, a Mother destroying herself in a Fit of Despair with her two Babes just ready to come into Life.'

The Charity was thus intended to serve *all* pregnant women in distress, 'but more especially those wretched unhappy Persons, who from the Restrictions of other Charities, and from the Remoteness of their Settlements' (i.e. the parish which had an obligation to care for them under the Poor Laws) were 'incapable of having Relief elsewhere'. Furthermore, the Charity was liberal-minded enough to extend this relief to women of other nationalities without distinction: hence, no doubt, the title it later assumed, 'The *General Lying-in Hospital*'.

But though the pamphlet does not mention the original site of the hospital, it makes it clear that the Felix Macdonough, who was 'Surgeon and Man-Midwife' to the 'Lying-in Infirmary in Jermyn Street' had been its Medical Officer from the beginning.¹⁴ He, it says, 'first planned, and set on foot, and has ever since attended on the service of this Charity.' There can thus be no doubt that the hospital, as Peachey suggests, was originally founded in Jermyn Street, but in 1752, not 1739.

J. E. DONNISON

¹² *An Account of the Rise and Progress of the Lying-in Hospital for Married Women in Brownlow Street, from its first Institution in November, 1749, to December 25th, 1751, 1752.*

¹³ *The Institution and Oeconomy of the Charitable Infirmary for the Relief of Poor Women Labouring of Child and during their Lying-in, 1739.*

¹⁴ Felix Macdonough, or 'Mackdonough' appears in the list of members of the Company of Surgeons of London from 1777 to 1790. In the early years of the Hospital's life he lived in Bury St., St. James', but later moved to Oxford St., where he lived until 1789. The last entry in the Company's list is for 1790, but this gives no address.