own was discussed, the leading figures in this first meeting being Drs. Hellier and Arthur Fuller. When the Association was formed, the Griqualand West branch continued its activities, having representatives on the Federal Council, of which I am proud to say I am one. In 1953, the late Dr. J. P. Collins of the Griqualand West branch was elected president of the Association and acted as host to the Federal Council meeting that year.

If we in Kimberley can continue in the same vein as in the pioneering days of eighty years ago and subsequently, then historians may be able to write: "Ex Kimberley semper aliquid novi."

THE SEVENTY-SECOND ORDINARY MEETING

The Seventy-Second Ordinary Meeting of the Society was held at the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of Glasgow on 2 March 1973. A paper was read by Mrs. Helen Brock, Senior Research Fellow in the Department of the History of Science at the University of Glasgow, entitled:

JAMES DOUGLAS OF THE POUCH

In 1886 Sir Norman Moore in his biography of James Douglas in the *Dictionary of National Biography* remarked that "when the first living authority on midwifery in London, the latest writer on the peritoneum and two of the best known teachers of anatomy were asked where Douglas's description of the peritoneum was to be found, none knew nor whether it was he or his brother the surgeon who they daily commemorated." Since then the situation should have been improved by Bryn Thomas's excellent little book, *James Douglas of the Pouch and his pupil William Hunter,* published in 1964. This was largely based on papers acquired by William Hunter and now in the Hunterian Library of Glasgow University.[1] Time has permitted more information to be extracted from these papers.

James Douglas was born in 1675 at Badds, West Calder, near Edinburgh. He was the third child in a family of twelve. His father was the largest landowner in the district and of some social standing. By tradition the sons of the family went into the army or into the church. They were almost certainly unsympathetic to the Stuart cause, for the oldest son, Walter, is said to have left his studies at Utrecht, a haven for many Covenanters and Anti-Jacobites, to join the army of William of Orange, in 1688. His brother-in-law fought for William in Ireland.

Beyond the date of his baptism, nothing is known of James Douglas's childhood. In 1694 a James Douglas obtained the M.A. degree at Edinburgh.[2] On 28 March of that year a James Douglas was granted permission to go to Harwich and embark within fourteen days for Holland,[3] but if this was our James Douglas he did not stay in Holland long, for by June he was back in Badds making jottings in a little notebook. Aphorisms, verses, imagined romantic situations, they show Douglas at nineteen years as a sophisticated, shrewd and witty youth. One example must suffice: "To know things and not to practice them is not to be a philosopher but a grammarian."

But he must have gone to Holland again, for the next record is the catalogue of his library in Utrecht in 1698. A collection of about eighty medical books, dictionaries, a French Bible, the theological works of Melchior, a work on geography and, perhaps on Sydenham's recommendation, *Les quatres premiers tomes de Don Quixhot,* Amsterdam, 1695. The medical works were well chosen, and include the main contributors to medicine in classical times and in the seventeenth century, and some of the actual books almost certainly still survive in the Hunterian Library. The presence of James Douglas in Utrecht with a medical library suggests that it was there that he studied medicine, but Utrecht University has no record of him and it was from Rheims in July 1699, that he obtained his medical degree. Whether he actually studied there is not known, but a set of anatomy lecture notes taken down by Douglas in Latin with comments by him in Latin and French might suggest that he did.

In 1700 he arrived in London, almost a century after William Harvey had settled there. Douglas was to prove himself a worthy inheritor of the new approach to science and medicine, all his work being characterized by careful observation and the testing of traditional beliefs against new discoveries. There exist histories of over two hundred of his cases between 1700 and 1712. These suggest that he was at this time closely associated with Paul Chamberlen of the obstetric forceps family. Some of the case notes were made on wrappers of letters to Chamberlen. Also one who is always referred to as "T.C.E." and who is as yet unidentified, figures frequently in his notes. He attended the Chamberlens' patients in their absence, and received advice from them on treatment. He also records advice from many others, including David Hamilton, obstetrician to Queen Anne and subsequently knighted by her, Richard Mead and William Salmon. His patients at this time were mainly small tradespeople or artisans. He recorded with care their symptoms, his own observations and opinions and his treatment and sometimes returned twice a day to note the results. These notes make fascinating reading even to the layman, as he left so little out. Mrs. Dawson, after a dose that "wrought 4 or 5 times upwards and 7 or 8 times downwards" was next day described as "lightsomer". Mrs. Bruce left him "for a quack who promised to make her as well as ever in less than two months, she died in less than that time." Mr. X (his name is in code) suffering from venereal disease had first made "application to Mr. Martin the surgeon . . . he sought the advice of Mr. Cotes surgeon . . . he took some clysters and the purging salts in wine from Mr. Douglas . . .. Then he consulted Mr. Crow . . . but all the symptoms returning he applied to me who humbly [invoking?] the assistance of Almighty God prescribed as follows . . .".

He records one experience with the forceps. "I was sent for by Mrs. Agnew the midwife to lay a poor woman . . . the child came right and was pretty low. I could put my fingers round the head which was very long, yea I could put hand up to the neck where I felt it was entangled with the string. . . . I went to work *anodo nostro* but could never fasten the thing so as to be able to pull by reason they were not made right and after three operations or an hour's endeavour to bring away the child one of them yielded so as to become straight whereby it was rendered useless. I was forced to leave the woman unlayed. I tryed to put a fillet round its neck but could not effect it. I went for young Dr. Hugh Chamberlen but he excused himself from coming. . . . Dr. Johnson was sent for, he lessened the head so brought it away

(which I could not do because I had not a hook)." He does not record whether he ever used the forceps again.

If his patients died he generally sought permission to carry out a post-mortem. The husband of Mrs. Casey refused him permission "to have her opened" but, judging from the number of records and drawings of diseased organs, the response was frequently that of Mr. Whyte, "Your proposal, carrying with it a benefit to the sex in such circumstances hereafter and as I do not see that I can be blamed for desiring to know the distemper that cut off my poor girl and left me with the care of a poor helpless enfant which I am not qualified for has induced me to agree to your request."

His treatment, however, like that of almost all his contemporaries, was often unscientific and basically still Galenic, relying on the elimination of humours by purging and vomiting mainly by medicines of vegetable origin and unknown specific action. He was not unacquainted with the growing science of chemistry. He made extensive notes on the metals and the preparation of their salts and their supposed medicinal properties, but except for mercury he does not seem to have used them in practice. He was an inveterate collector of prescriptions from friends and published works, and he compiled his own pharmacopoeia which is in the Hunterian Library. In 1974 he published an *Index Materia Medicae or a catalogue of simple medicines that are fit to be used in the practice of physic and surgery,* a list of animal, vegetable and mineral species with their names in English, Latin and Greek and the parts to be used. But nowhere does he appear to have attempted scientifically to assess their effects.

No case histories exist for the years beyond 1712, though they may have been lost. All that is known of his practice after this time comes from letters from patients, records of prescriptions and notes from other doctors handing their patients over to him. The illiteracy of some of his correspondents indicates that he still treated the poor but he was now also treating the aristocracy. The Lady Conway, Lady Leeds, Lady Smyth, Mrs. Walpole, the wife of Horatio Walpole, uncle of Horace Walpole, etc., were amongst his patients.

From the start of his time in London, Douglas had also been applying himself to pure anatomy both human and comparative. The second half of the seventeenth century was a period of great activity in comparative anatomy, particularly in Holland and France and he may have become caught up in this field when he was studying in these countries. Notes of dissections of quadrupeds, birds, reptiles, amphibia, fish and invertebrates, survive. He was also keeping abreast of new literature on anatomy, for in 1705 he gave his first paper to the Royal Society—a review of *De Aure Humana Tractatus*, published by Valsalva less than a year before.

In 1706 he joined the small band that since the end of the seventeenth century offered anatomy lectures outside the control of the Barber-Surgeons' Company. For his lectures he issued a prospectus, *What Mr. Douglas obliges himself to perform in a course of human and comparative anatomy*. Surviving records suggest that this may have been the first course in England on comparative anatomy and possibly the first course in which microscopic details were demonstrated. The extensive MSS on bones and muscles that he left may have been prepared for these lectures.

In the six years he had been in London he had already managed to win the notice and approval of his seniors, for in 1706 he was elected a Fellow of the Royal Society. On Douglas's copy of the *Philosophical Transactions* of the appropriate date, now in the Hunterian Library, is written, "I was admitted a Fellow of the Royal Society, Wednesday December 4, 1706. Sir Isaack Newton President, Dr. Sloan Secretary." His election was followed by very active participation in its meetings. He made over forty original communications to the Society, of which fourteen were published in the *Philosophical Transactions*, not only on such medical subjects as a swelling of the thyroid isthmus, an account of a hydrops ovarii, an ulcer in the right kidney, the left ventricle of the heart prodigiously swelled, of the glands in the human spleen, in which he gave the first description of amyloid degeneration, etc., but also on the armadillo, rhinoceros, tortoise, frog, scorpion, mistletoe, autumn crocus, Guernsey lily, cocoanut, coffee berries, etc., notes and drawings of which still exist. He served on the Council from 1726–29 and again from 1741 till his death. In 1740 he was exempted, for services rendered to the Society, from paying his annual subscription and in 1741 was elected Croonian Lecturer.

His first book, *Myographia Comparatae Specimen, or a comparative description of all the muscles in a man and a quadruped to which is added an account of the muscles peculiar to a woman* was published in 1707, probably in association with his anatomy lectures as it was described by him as "fit to be carried about to public dissections." In it he claimed no less than thirteen newly described muscles. Of its success there can be no doubt. It went through six English editions and two Latin and a Dutch edition and was still in general use in 1776 when John Lins in the introduction to his *Short description of the human muscles,* wrote "Several full and accurate descriptions of the muscles have already been published but their size and prolixity have rendered them of less value to the dissector than the small treatise of Dr. Douglas published about the beginning of the century." Douglas meant to produce five more similar manuals covering the whole field of human anatomy but they never appeared.

In 1712 Douglas was elected to the Gale Osteology Lectureship of the Barber-Surgeons Company. In Young's *Annals of the Barber-Surgeons of London* a slip by him in transcribing the original entry gives the lectureship for that year to Dr. Wadsworth. No published syllabuses of any osteology lectures appear to have survived, but four scraps of paper when pieced together turned out to be a draft of his final lecture in which he gave a survey of the whole course. In it he paid particular attention to the bones of the ear and nose and to diseases of bones.

In all his work Douglas considered the historical aspects of the subject, stating first what everyone from the classical writers onward had had to say before adding his own opinions. His next publication in 1715 was *Bibliographiae Anatomicae*—a list of writers on anatomy from Hippocrates to Harvey. It was the first real anatomical bibliography and was reissued in 1734 with additions by Albinus.

Douglas was elected to the Arris Muscular Lectureship in 1716. These lectures appear to have been much more stereotyped than the Gale lectures. Syllabuses for several of the series still exist including Douglas's, but irrespective of the lecturer, they are all virtually identical. In 1717 Douglas resigned his lectureship on account of a difference with the Masters of Anatomy, but the letter setting out the differences has been lost.

By 1720 James Douglas's position in medicine and anatomy was well established but he had not been able to become a Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians as he was not a graduate of Oxford or Cambridge. In 1720, however, when the College revived Honorary Fellowships, mainly to accommodate doctors with foreign degrees, he was one of the six elected, though he had to pay £100 for the privilege.

Through anatomy James Douglas made an important contribution to surgery. In January 1718, he read a paper to the Royal Society "relating to the history and manner of performing that difficult and dangerous operation called Lithotomy in which he proved from the structure of the parts that the high operation was possible." It was on the foundations of his anatomical work that his brother John, fifteen years his junior, and recently returned from the Leeward Islands where he had been Chirurgeon-General, started to perform the high operation which for a short time brought him much fame. In 1720, John published *Lithotomia Douglassiana*, describing his operation and later that year he was elected a Fellow of the Royal Society. He was the third Douglas brother to be elected a Fellow as the eldest brother, Walter, was elected in 1711 when he was made Governor-General of the Leeward Islands. John was also made an Honorary Freeman of the Barber-Surgeons Company. William Cheselden adopted the high operation and published his results in a *Treatise of the high operation for the stone* in 1723. However, in spite of its success in the hands of Douglas and Cheselden, mishaps did occur among other operators, generally due to ignorance of the necessary anatomy and Cheselden reverted to and perfected the lateral operation, which remained the standard method of lithotomy till the high operation was revived in 1819. James Douglas published in 1726 a *History of the lateral operation* in which he stated his intention to go on and publish "a history of the other three general methods of cutting for the stone, in three separate treatises" to which he would add "a fifth containing the anatomy and figures of the parts concerned in them all, the figures of all the instruments that have been used", and his own observations "concerning the advantages and inconveniences with which each of them is attended and in which any of them taken all together to be preferable to the rest." However, his only subsequent publication on lithotomy was in 1726 when *An appendix to the history of the lateral operation containing Mr. Cheselden's present method of performing it* appeared, although virtually the whole of the project exists in manuscript.

Another project for which he assembled material but which was never published was advertised at the end of the second edition of John Douglas's *Lithotomia Douglassiana*, in 1723. "There will be published in a short time a treatise intituled, Hernias in men and Procidentias in women, anatomically explained, from the parts fallen down in both sexes, being exactly delineated to life." He still was hoping to publish this in 1741.[4]

The work on lithotomy and hernias all contributed to the production of his most important anatomical work, published in 1730, *A description of the peritoneum and that part of the Membrana Cellularis which lies on its outside, with an account of the true situation of all the abdominal viscera.* It is in this book and in these words that Douglas described the pouch named after him. "Where the peritoneum leaves the fore side of the Rectum, it makes an Angle and changes its course upwards and forwards over the bladder." He then continues, "a little above this angle there is a remarkable transverse

stricture or semi-oval fold of the Peritoneum which I have constantly observed for many years past, especially in women." The remarkable stricture or fold, the first description of which Douglas credits to Winslow, was at one time called the ligament of Douglas but is now known as the recto-uterine fold.

At the same time that he was so busy with lithotomy and the peritoneum he was also pursuing botanical studies, both on the anatomy and on the growth of plants. In 1725 he published *Lilium Sarniensis or a description of the Guernsey Lily, to which is added the botanical dissection of the coffee berry,* and in 1727 *Arbor Yemensis Fructum Cofe Ferens or a description and history of the coffee tree.* But manuscripts on several other plants, a general botany, a work on the nutrition of plants, and a life of John Ray, the botanist, remained unpublished. The book on the Guernsey Lily is interesting as it has at its end an advertisement;

> Whereas his Majesty has been graciously pleased by a Gratuity of Five Hundred Pounds, to encourage and enable Dr. James Douglas, Honorary Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians and Fellow of the Royal Society, to communicate the observations and Discoveries he has made in Anatomy, both Human and Comparative, and in the Diseases incident to women which depend upon the vitiated structure of the parts. This is to give notice that the whole work being nearly completed, he intends in a very little time to publish on a large Imperial Paper, the first part of his *Osteographia Vetus ac Nova,* containing all the bones in an adult human body, drawn and engraved by the best Masters, in a great variety of instructive views, and all as large as Life, with a short description explaining each Figure. The rest of this Great Work will follow as speedily as the Business of his Profession can permit. And that the Design of his bounty may be fully answered, and the Publick reap the intire Benefit of it, this as well as the suceeding Parts, will be sold at a much easier Rate than could other wise have been afforded.
> The Method in which the whole History of the Bones is to Prosecuted, will be fully understood by that which is observed in the following Treatise now in the Press viz: *The Description and Anatomical History of the Patella.*

How George I become interested in Douglas's work is not known. George's wife, whom he left in Hanover, and his mistresses at the English court were past the age of requiring an obstetrician. It is more likely that the king became interested in Douglas through the latter's friendship with John George Stergerthal, the king's German physician, with whom Douglas corresponded.

Douglas had studied the reproductive system in the non-pregnant woman and at various stages in pregnancy, copiously illustrated with fine drawings. He had pertinent things to say about the allantois and particularly about the placenta. "I take the placenta to be nothing but a . . . of innumerable branches of the hysteric and umbilical blood vessels complicated and wound up into what we call glands by means of which a constant and needful intercourse is kept up and maintained between the child and the mother and a fatal loss of blood prevented, when the part becomes useless to both after the birth." He was also the first to describe the structure of the round ligaments of the uterus.

On a scrap of paper he jotted down the proposed contents of his *Introduction to the knowledge and cure of diseases incident to women and the improvement of y. practice of midwifery.* Amongst other things it was to contain the famous Dr. Harvey's history of the formation of the chick in the egg, illustrated with figures and with some original observations. There is reason to believe that Douglas himself was responsible for the figures—if he was, he was an artist of considerable merit.

As early as 1713, Douglas had been working on an *Osteographia*. There is a descriptive list by him of figures by François Boitard from that year. It is difficult to understand why, if Douglas was such a good artist, he employed Boitard—all that is generally recorded of him is that he was the artist of a set of obscene postures, restless and debauched. As an anatomical illustrator he left much to be desired, for his figures were heavily corrected by Douglas. Another set of figures, incorporating some by Boitard, who had died in 1715, dated from 1719. In 1729, Douglas exhibited at the Royal Society a set of forty-seven figures and their descriptions together with a plan of a great osteology which was to contain not only the figures but also a history of osteology, a history of osteological drawings, an account of the structure of bones and their diseases, and a lexicon of the Greek terms of osteology.[5] He later replanned the figures, now numbering over sixty, in two parts, Part I consisting of single bones, Part II, ossa conjuncta. Though one or two figures from the earlier osteologies still survived, the final set of drawings are mainly of very high technical and artistic merit. Who the final artist was is not yet determined, but the plates were probably engraved by Claude Dubosc who was brought over from Paris by Nicholas Dorigny to help him engrave the Raphael cartoons. With so much of the work finished it is difficult to see why it was not published. Perhaps the poor success of William Cheselden's *Osteographia,* published in 1733, may have deterred Douglas. But if the whole work on bones had been published, undoubtedly it would have been the greatest anatomical work of the eighteenth century. The *History of osteology* and of *Osteological figures* would bear publishing even today. Since the business of his profession also prevented the publication of Douglas's work on the diseases of women and not even the *Anatomical history of the patella*, complete in manuscript and said to be in the press, ever appeared in print, the design of the king's bounty was not answered and the public reaped no benefit from it, though James Douglas so nearly completed his undertaking.

In 1726 Douglas became involved in the great medical farce of Mary Tofts, the rabbit woman of Godalming. She confessed in the presence of Sir Richard Manningham, the Dukes of Richmond and Montague and James Douglas that she had been given pieces of rabbit which she kept in her pocket and pushed into her vagina when no one was looking. Douglas took down her confession, the manuscript of which is still in the Hunterian Library. Manningham subsequently published a diary of the affair in which he implied that Douglas had at first been taken in, so Douglas in his turn published *An advertisement occasioned by some passages in Sir R. Manningham's diary lately published*, giving his own account of his reactions to the affair.

These events presented rich material to the satirists and cartoonists. John Arbuthnot, Alexander Pope and Jonathan Swift composed verses. It is from this material that the only known physical description of James Douglas is obtained, for no portrait exists. In one piece, Mary Tofts is made to describe Douglas as a "fare faced, long-nosed gentilman".[6] In another, with a neck like a crane, he proceeds "with usual shrug and pearl at tip of nose."[7]

In 1727 James Douglas was appointed physician to Queen Caroline, wife of George II. The Royal Family must have held him in esteem, for when their daughter Anne, Princess of Orange, was, in 1734, thought to be pregnant, James Douglas was sent over to Holland with Tessier to look after her. For this service the king awarded him an

annuity of £500.[8]

Douglas probably had assistants working with him. William Douglas, no relative to James, who subsequently quarrelled so fiercely with Smellie, Robert Nesbitt,[9] Joseph Hurlock,[10] and James's brother, George[11] who became the fourth brother elected a Fellow of the Royal Society, were his pupils and may also have been his assistants. They subsequently dedicated their first published works to him, acknowledging his help and interest. In the 1730s James Parsons became his assistant and the association seems to have been very happy and profitable. Parsons acted as an amanuensis, and as he was a reasonable artist made many anatomical, post-mortem and zoological drawings for him. One of the projects he assisted in was Douglas's unpublished *Treatise of aneurisms*, covering the history of the recognition and treatment of aneurysms from Galen to his own times, with Douglas's own researches on the subject, particularly into the anatomy of the arterial wall. Unfortunately, this section is missing, though Douglas gave a brief account of his ideas on aneurysms in his book on the peritoneum. Douglas often took Parsons to meetings of the Royal Society and signed the certificate for his election to a Fellowship.

Douglas had a wide correspondence with doctors, botanists and zoologists not only in England and Scotland but also on the Continent. He quite often took foreigners to meetings of the Royal Society. He was well acquainted with Alexander Monro, *primus*. When Monro came to London, Douglas treated him for a septic arm. Monro kept him informed about medical matters in Edinburgh and particularly about the founding of the Edinburgh Royal Infirmary.

However, his large number of correspondents included the poor who were sick and those who had fallen on evil times. He helped his petitioners to health, jobs, coal, houses, and gave or lent money to them. One of the lame ducks he employed himself. Poor Samuel Boyse, Irishman, graduate of Glasgow, and a poet, was too poor to buy a second shirt, so he invented paper collars and cuffs to supply its place when his one shirt was washed. Douglas employed him as an amanuensis, and many of Douglas's non-medical manuscripts are in his hand.

Douglas's interests extended beyond science. There are many manuscripts on English, French, Latin and Greek grammar and on English pronunciation, and as recently as 1953 Holmberg edited and published Douglas's work on this subject which he described as "a systematic and valuable work on the early standard English spoken in London during the early decades of the eighteenth century."[12]

Another main interest which dated back to at least 1707 was in Horace. He collected and published a catalogue of all the known editions of Horace and of commentators on him from 1476[13]—in all some 557 volumes. He made a comparison between the various texts and discussed the various translations. He compiled an index and a dictionary for the works and wrote a life of Horace. In all this he was helped by David Watson who himself published translations of the *Odes, Epodes* and *Carmen Seculare* in 1741, which he dedicated to James Douglas, for he had used Douglas's library extensively in his work. The fate of Douglas's wonderful collection is not known.

His interest in Horace may have been responsible for his acquaintance with Alexander Pope, though they might have met through their common friends, the Queensberrys, Burlingtons, or John Arbuthnot. Douglas made sufficient impression on Pope

for him to put him in the *Dunciad*, published in 1728:

> To prove me Godess clear of all design,
> Bid me with Polio sup as well as dine
> Where all the learned shall at labour stand
> And Douglas lend his soft obstetric hand.

to which he added the explanatory note, "Douglas, a physician of great learning and no less taste, above all curious in what related to Horace of whom he collected every edition, translation and comment." Possibly Douglas did not appreciate his inclusion in this work, for Mr. Jones, Rector of Uppingham, himself an authority on Horace, remarked to William Stewkley, the antiquarian, that he thought their friend Dr. Douglas's life was shortened by Pope putting him in the *Dunciad*, though Douglas was not to die for another fourteen years.

It was his interest in Horace, probably, that put Douglas in contact with Robert and Andrew Foulis who may well have assisted him in his search for editions of Horace. And it was through the Foulis brothers who had been at Glasgow University with William Hunter that Hunter arrived in London with an introduction to James Douglas. Parsons had recently left Douglas who was therefore looking for a new assistant, and so William Hunter eventually left William Smellie in the autumn of 1741 and became assistant to Douglas and tutor to Douglas's son who was studying medicine.

Details of Douglas's first marriage are not known, though he was married when he lived at his first known London address, the Blue Boar, Fleet Street, against St. Dunstan's. A Mrs. Mary Douglas was buried in the vault of that church in January 1708. Perhaps the little poem amongst some of Douglas's private papers relates to his first wife. It begins,

> Hail happy bride for thou art truely blest,
> Three months of rapture crowned with endless rest.

A portion of a legal document between Paul Chamberlen and almost certainly James Douglas, although most of the Douglas has been cut out, concerns a bond for £400 and states, "that the true condition thereof is that if the said James [Douglas] shall be married to Captain Hogg's widow together with her fortune being possessed thereof by the said marriage to the value of five thousand pounds, the said obligation shall remain good in law, otherwise the said bond to be voided the day specified on the bond." The letter was dated 20 March 1708. It is this document that suggests that James Douglas was in some way legally bound to Paul Chamberlen, possibly as his assistant, on first arriving in London. However, Douglas did not marry Captain Hogg's widow and some time later he married Martha Wilkes, daughter of Israel Wilkes and aunt to the notorious John Wilkes. Douglas started treating professionally members of the Wilkes family in 1710. The date of the birth of their first child, Israel James, is not known; their second child, Martha Jane, was born in 1716, and their third, William George, in 1725. There is only one reference to the eldest son, in 1736, who appears to have died before William Hunter joined the household. It was to the younger son, William George, that Hunter was tutor.

Douglas was at this time preparing his Croonian lectures, the first of which was on

the *Membrana palati mobilis, the uvula, and tuba Eustachiana,* the manuscript of which at the Royal Society[14] is mainly in William Hunter's writing. He also helped with the final corrections to the *Osteographia* and with various dissections and acted as amanuensis. But what promised to be a happy relationship soon ended, for in April 1742, James Douglas died with his hand in that of William Hunter.

This, however, did not end Hunter's association with the Douglas family. He was to live on with them till 1749, though by this time William George had given up any thought of qualifying as a doctor. Immediately after Douglas's death he helped William George to put together his father's material for his second Croonian lecture on the bladder, which William George read to the Royal Society in May of that year. Hunter was joined in the Douglas household first by his brother James in 1742, but he stayed only a year, then by John in 1748. It is believed that William Hunter became engaged to Martha Jane Douglas, but she died while Hunter was in Paris with William George attending Antoine Ferrein's anatomy lectures in 1744.

Hunter arranged Douglas's drawings in folders and had many of the manuscripts bound. Finally they may have come into his possession as repayment for some of William George's debts. There is also increasing evidence of Douglas's books in the Hunterian Library. His collection of anatomical specimens which was described by Aston Warner in 1734[15] as "the best collection of practically useful anatomical preparations (acquired, prepared and preserved at a vast expense, fatigue and care) that either is or ever was in the possession of any single man", may well have formed the basis of William Hunter's collection. Certainly the roots of almost all William Hunter's medical work, on articular cartilages, aneurysms, diseased bones, connective tissues, the lachrymal duct, herniae, the lymphatic system, and last but by no means least, the gravid uterus, lie in Douglas's works and papers. It is sad that Hunter, alone of Douglas's pupils and assistants, pays no tribute to Douglas in his published works.

This has been but a superficial description of a man and his activities. In his commonplace book he wrote at the age of nineteen, "Fame is got by indefatigable labour". If any man deserved fame from the amount of work that he got through then surely James Douglas did, but he sacrificed the publication of his works to the business of his profession and the care of the sick. If he had not, maybe he would have been regarded today as one of the great scholars and men of science of the eighteenth century.

REFERENCES

1. John Young and P. H. Aitken, *A catologue of the manuscripts in the library of the Hunterian Museum*, Glasgow University Press, 1908. K. Bryn Thomas, 'Catalogue of the Blackburn cabinet bundles and packets', in *James Douglas of the Pouch and his pupil William Hunter*, London, Pitman, 1964.
2. *Catalogue of the graduates in the faculties of arts, divinity and law of the University of Edinburgh since its foundation,* Edinburgh, 1858.
3. P.R.O. State Papers, Domestic Series, Entry Book, 344: 191.
4. James Parsons, *A mechanical and critical enquiry into the nature of hermaphrodites,* London, 1741.
5. Royal Society, Classified Papers XII. ii, 29.
6. Anon, *Much ado about nothing or a plain refutation of all that has been written or said concerning the rabbit-woman of Godalming*, London, 1727.

7. Flamingo, *A shorter and truer advertisement by way of supplement to what was published the 7th instant or, Dr. Douglas in an extasy at Lacey's Bagnio, December 4th, 1726,* London, 1727.
8. *Lond. Mag.*, April, 1735.
9. Robert Nesbitt, *Human osteogeny explained in two lectures,* London, 1736.
10. Joseph Hurlock, *Practical treatise on dentition or the breeding of teeth in children,* London, 1742.
11. J. B. Winslow, *An anatomical exposition of the structure of the human body,* trans. from the French by G. Douglas, London, 1733.
12. Borge Holmberg, *James Douglas on English pronunciation (c. 1740),* Lund, 1956.
13. James Douglas, *Catalogus editionum quinti Horatii Flacci ab an 1476 ad an. 1739, quae in bibliotheca Jacobi Douglas ad servantur,* London, 1739.
14. Royal Society, L.-P. 1, 69.
15. Aston Warner, *Observations on Dr. Littlejohn's proposal to the Right Honorable the Lords of the Admiralty for the effectual cure of such seamen belonging to the Navy as may have ruptures,* London, 1734.

THE SEVENTY-THIRD ORDINARY MEETING

The Seventy-Third Ordinary Meeting of the Society was held at East Kilbride where an address was given by Professor George Shepperson, and thereafter a visit was paid to the Livingstone Memorial at Blantyre. The following is a summary of Professor Shepperson's paper which was entitled:

DOCTOR DAVID LIVINGSTONE

The paper, read on the occasion of the centenary of David Livingstone's death in what is now the independent African country of Zambia, was divided into three sections.

The first part was devoted to Livingstone the doctor. He was, and is, invariably known as "Dr. Livingstone". Undoubtedly this usage owed much to Livingstone's medical abilities and reputation. It has been claimed that he was the first person to practise medicine in south central Africa, and only the second medical missionary in the whole of Africa. These features of Livingstone's career have been described by Professor Michael Gelfand (*Livingstone, the doctor*, Oxford, 1957; "Livingstone's contributions to Malawi: Some aspects of the medical factor", in *Livingstone—man of Africa,* ed. by B. Pachai, London, Longmans, 1973, pp. 175–190), and discussed by Professor Shepperson himself (*Br. med. J.*, 1973, **ii**: 232–234). But the "Doctor" element in Livingstone's remarkable story also owed much to its popularization by Henry M. Stanley after his famous first encounter with the great explorer on 10 November 1871, and to its role as an indication of social status.

The second part of the address was a general description and discussion of the significance of Livingstone's life. Drawing heavily on his already published works on Livingstone ("David Livingstone the Scot", *Scottish Historical Review,* 1960, **39**: 113–121; *David Livingstone and the Rovuma,* Edinburgh University Press, 1965; "Livingstone and the years of preparation, 1813–1857", in *Livingstone—man of Africa,* op. cit., pp. 7–28; and "David Livingstone 1813–1873—a centenary assessment", *Geog. J.*, 1973, **139**, 205–219), Professor Shepperson showed him as a man of