

Remembering Dr. Sloane: Masculinity and the Making of an Eighteenth-Century Physician

This is the submitted version of the article (pre-peer review), which has been accepted for publication in a special issue of the *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies* on “The Sciences and the Sexes” (December 2019). This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions.

Abstract: By the 1720s, Sir Hans Sloane was at the centre of London’s eighteenth-century medical and scientific world; he was a royal physician, President of the Royal Society, and President of the Royal College of Physicians. This article examines Sloane’s use of self-fashioning early in his career, which was key to his later successes. Sloane’s career-building offers an opportunity to consider role of gender in men’s medical and scientific activities. This article argues that Sloane used existing concepts of ideal manhood—self-management, independence, and polite sociability—to establish his medical practice and scientific networks.

Keywords: Hans Sloane, History, Physicians, Professional Identity, Masculinity, Gender

It is counter-intuitive that Sir Hans Sloane (1660-1753) is a mystery man. Sloane, after all, owned the founding collection of the British Museum and held illustrious roles, from President of the Royal Society to Royal Physician. But Sloane himself remains overshadowed by his collections and networks, partly because he left relatively little personal writing.¹ Even James Delbourgo’s insightful biography focuses on the man *behind* the collections.² This essay shows that Sloane’s collections and networks were outcomes, not preconditions, of an already-flourishing career. To find Sloane, I examine examples of his tactics for success in his early career, using his correspondence (ca. 1685-1745). I argue that his achievements were contingent upon and reflective of his judicious self-fashioning as an honourable and polite ‘man of science’.³ Gender as an analytical category frames my understanding Sloane as an individual.⁴

Sloane is an interesting case study for gender identity, as he deviated from the ideals of upper-class English masculinity. He suffered from a chronic disorder, came from a marginalised ethnic background, and lacked independent means. His chronic condition of

coughing up blood contrasted the eighteenth-century paradigm of a self-contained male body. Independence was an essential marker of manhood, but Sloane originally depended on female patronage. He left behind the core of a national collection, but his critics accused him of collecting frivolities. Even his ethnicity (Scots-Irish) and medical training (University of Orange) potentially put him at the periphery of patronage networks, yet he ended up at their centre. Sloane maneuvered these obstacles, carefully depicting himself as a respectable medical man. His medical practice allowed him to form close relationships with well-placed patients and to exhibit his trustworthiness and good judgment. Within the Republic of Letters, he embodied early eighteenth-century ideals of masculinity: disciplined in mind and body, independent yet sociable. Sloane negotiated the complicated boundary between physician to the aristocracy and independent man of science by deploying idealised masculine traits common to both groups; his success came from an ability to integrate self-control, good judgment, and politeness with his medical and botanical expertise.

I. Remembering Sloane

Sloane's identity is historiographically amorphous, with shifting perceptions according to the author's preoccupations. Contemporaries at once embraced Sloane as charitable and useful, a virtuoso and an entrepreneur, and dismissed him as a quack, charlatan, and toy-man.⁵ Modern historians have relied on criticisms made by Sloane's eighteenth-century Tory detractors who focused on his collecting and Royal Society activities; they maintain that Sloane lacked ability, had frivolous interests, and was protected by patronage.⁶ Popular memory, in turn, leans toward the commercial. The myth that Sloane created milk chocolate regularly circulates online, prominently presented on the websites for the British Museum and Natural History Museum.⁷ Sloane's identity as a physician, in contrast, has been little studied—even though it was the thread that connected his various interests.⁸ The difficulty of finding Sloane

amid his connections and collections is linked by the historical and historiographical tendency to tease apart his medical career and scientific interests rather than seeing them as a coherent whole. When Sloane's role as physician becomes the focus, however, the overlaps among his activities and networks emerge, making visible the role of gender in his self-fashioning strategies.

Sloane's intellect has been disparaged by cultural commentators who have focused on modern concepts of scientific genius. For example, a nineteenth-century biographer attributed Sloane's indifference to Linnaeus to not being 'gifted with the talismanic power of genius, by which kindred minds discover each other'.⁹ Such notions perpetuate an individualistic, masculine image of science.¹⁰ Sloane does not match this trope; he put the wider world of scholarship ahead of his own publications and, like most physicians, promoted common-sense over grand theories.¹¹ Sloane's contributions, celebrated at the time, faded away. His eye remedy, which he made public out of charity, was considered dangerous by 1771, while his behind-the-scenes work for smallpox inoculation is overlooked.¹² Sloane provided detailed botanical descriptions in catalogues and *Voyage to Jamaica* that were widely praised, even used by Linnaeus in developing his taxonomies.¹³ For a genius-focused society, Sloane's efforts were worthless; but for many contemporaries, he furthered wider knowledge. An image of Sloane as the ungifted amateur scientist obscures that of Sloane the expert physician.

In the late seventeenth century, physicians redefined their group identity to emphasise a masculinity centred on civic virtue, which was central to Sloane's self-fashioning. Throughout the early modern period, physicians were deeply concerned with hierarchy and masculinity, lacking a clear place in the social order. Although university-trained, they did not belong with clergy or lawyers; neither were they integrated into guild structures. And, despite their aspirations to be an elite group, most physicians came from lower gentry or

bourgeois families. The work of physicians, moreover, was similar to the work of women (and, more specifically, female servants), including duties associated with body servants, go-betweens, or confidantes.¹⁴ These roles were not necessarily effeminate for physicians, given the essential roles of emotional intimacy and physical care for masculine friendship and service in elite households.¹⁵ Indeed, for much of the seventeenth century, the ideal physician *was* a close counselor who provided good advice and preventative physic.¹⁶ Sloane fit this ideal while he was the household physician to the Duchess of Albemarle (remarried as the Duchess of Montagu), but the late seventeenth-century medical world was becoming a medical marketplace that devalued counsel and medical knowledge. Physicians instead increasingly claimed authority based on their usefulness, familiarity with new remedies, and study of natural history.¹⁷ They also had to please wealthy patients, who conflated medical effectiveness with a physician's gentlemanliness: good taste, financial nous, sociability, and wit.¹⁸ A continued dependency on wealthy patients undermined physicians' autonomy—the very foundation of ideal early modern manhood.¹⁹ The social placement of physicians was challenging.

Sloane's use of sociability in establishing his networks was part of his successful self-fashioning. Recently, historians have considered Sloane as someone who brought people and ideas together through his international network of scholars, collectors, and patients.²⁰ Lindsay O'Neill attributes Sloane's importance to his offices (such as Royal Society Secretary), whereas Margaret DeLacy argues that Sloane's effective promotion of smallpox inoculation resulted from his skilled network-building.²¹ Neither considers *how* Sloane entered the networks in the first place. Yet, polite sociability—the ability to conform with group expectations for appropriate behaviour in social situations—was central to elite and scientific notions of manhood. Requiring restraint through civility and obligations, sociability was serious work.²² Politeness expanded networks for those at the fringes of elite society,

while reinforcing social hierarchy; manners indicated virtue and usefulness, as well as belonging.²³ Being Royal Society Secretary, Sloane was entrenched in the Republic of Letters—an international community of scholars working together to further knowledge. Sites of socialising (such as coffeehouses) were also sites of scientific practice.²⁴ The scholarly community, too, depended on generosity and politeness more than genius.²⁵ It helped to be good at sociability for acceptance into the community, as Sloane apparently was, being ‘free, open, & engaging; & his Conversation chearfull, obliging & communicative’.²⁶ Sloane’s network-building reveals a public identity that was based on contemporary masculine ideals: self-controlled, independent, and sociable.

It is also crucial to consider the intersections of Sloane’s medical and scientific networks, particularly how the two facets of his career reinforced each other. When identifying points of contact, Sloane’s most meaningful connections are not always obvious in the correspondence or its catalogues. The letters, for example, reflect relationships that were geographically-distant (temporarily or ordinarily) rather than Sloane’s day-to-day interactions with patients or friends.²⁷ The Willughby cluster is just one instance of real, but hidden, relationships in the Sloane correspondence that also shows medical and intellectual overlaps. In 1693, Sloane wrote to Cassandra Willughby at the request of the Duke of Montagu. The letter does not mention the Duchess of Montagu (formerly Albemarle), making it easy to assume that the Duke was Sloane’s patron, rather than the Duchess whom Sloane had treated for years. Sloane corresponded several times with Miss Willughby about medical and botanical matters. She even introduced him to her brother Thomas, whom Sloane nominated for Royal Society fellowship. The Willughby correspondence from 1705 uncovers another connection: their father (Francis) had been John Ray’s patron.²⁸ Neither the letters nor the British Library catalogue indicates ties between Miss Willughby and James Brydges (the first Duke of Chandos), although they married in 1713 and Cassandra (the first Duchess

of Chandos) was a powerful patronage broker for the family.²⁹ Brydges regularly saw Sloane at Temple Coffeehouse, but their association became particularly close during the 1720s when Brydges relied on Sloane's medical expertise for the Royal African Company.³⁰ A Royal Society connection was present among the men (excluding Montagu), but the initial relationships were medical or social and involved women. The historiographical separation of Sloane's medical and intellectual circles has meant that major relationships—including women who were patrons or friends—have been overlooked.³¹ Sloane's overlapping networks provided a strong foundation for his career, enabling him to claim skill in both areas and to draw on the support of (or to bring together) multiple groups or people.

II. *Self-disciplined Sloane*

Independent and scientific masculinities were unstable; any perceived loss of self-control or creditworthiness threatened the foundations of one's manhood. Polite masculinity required constant monitoring of the body and self through self-mastery techniques, such as physical and mental regimen.³² There were, of course, many other models of manhood. Youthful excess was tolerable and explicable within humoral theory, while virile sexuality played valuable social and marital roles.³³ Some medical practitioners, such as Dr John Woodward and Sir John Hill, adopted a masculinity centred on risk-taking and genius.³⁴ Sloane, however, cultivated a self-controlled masculine persona; he was well-known for his management of body, time, and estate—in other words, practicing good oeconomy, the foundation of social order.³⁵

Sloane suffered from an indisposition that could undermine masculinity if bodily management lapsed. The ideal male body should not leak regularly through hemorrhoids or coughing blood, which made it more like a female body. One cause of such problems, as well as menstruation, was thought to be the build up of excess of blood from too much food and

too little exercise: ‘plethora’, as physicians typically called it. The recurrence of such ailments in men had potential moral implications, evoking one’s failed self-mastery.³⁶ As reported by Thomas Birch, Sloane’s eighteenth-century biographer, Sloane started spitting blood when he was sixteen. Throughout his life, Sloane tried to master his ailment ‘by Temperance & abstaining from Wine & other Fermented Liquors, & the prudent Management of himself in all other Respects’.³⁷ Several correspondents knew about Sloane’s health-monitoring, referencing his temperance or spitting up blood.³⁸ Sloane’s bodily management ensured that he remained active until he suffered a paralytic disorder in 1739 and retired in 1741. In one paragraph of the ‘Memoirs’, Birch mentions Sloane’s vigour or mental acuity in old age twelve times, a rhetorical move reiterating Sloane’s bodily control. ‘[T]ho’ feeble’, Birch reported, for example, Sloane remained ‘perfectly free from any Distemper, enjoying his rational Faculties & having all his Senses in good Condition’ until death.³⁹ The obviousness of Sloane’s bodily control to Birch and others suggests that his self-regulation was integral to his public identity.

Sloane’s self-regulation is evident from his dietary regimen. According to Sir Erasmus Philipps, who visited Sloane on 1 June 1730, Sloane refused to have three things at his table: burgundy wine, champagne, and salmon.⁴⁰ Burgundy was thick, rich, and nourishing, while champagne was sharp, lively, and diuretic.⁴¹ As stimulants and restoratives, they were thought to increase the circulation and quantity of blood, which Sloane, with his plethora of blood, would need to avoid.⁴² Fish was considered dangerous for scholars, its coldness and moistness causing lassitude and indifference, and salmon in particular produced was associated with flatulence and increased blood.⁴³ Sloane’s preferences show that he adhered to contemporary dietary theory, avoiding foods that might cause bodily imbalance.⁴⁴ Sloane’s personal papers include several recipes for common medicines to treat his ailment. Some highlight the importance of precision and regularity. For example, taking an ‘excellent

receipt' for consumption required discipline; it was to be taken twice daily for a month on an empty stomach and followed by exercise after each dose.⁴⁵ Sloane's restraint was connected to an earlier image of a good physician: someone who had a healthy body.⁴⁶ But the control of one's own bodily resources also reflected the eighteenth-century concern with oeconomy. Through a careful, often-public regimen, Sloane minimised the potential social effects of his physical problem.

Sloane accomplished much in his 'Life of varied and incessant Labours'.⁴⁷ At nineteen, he attended lectures in anatomy and physic in London. In 1683, he studied in Paris and Montpellier, before obtaining his medical degree. Physician Thomas Sydenham took him into his London practice in 1684 and, three years later, Sloane was admitted to the Royal Society and the Royal College of Physicians. He accompanied the Duke of Albemarle to Jamaica, returning to London in 1690 with the widowed Duchess. Sloane soon took on several positions: Royal Society Secretary (1693-1713), Christ's Hospital Physician (1694-1730) and Royal College of Physicians' Dispensary (1696-1725). His list of titles grew, including Royal Physician (1714-1740), Physician-General to the Army (1716-1727), President of the Royal College of Physicians (1719-1735) and President of the Royal Society (1727-1741). He oversaw various projects, such as revisions of the *London Pharmacopoeia* (1720), smallpox inoculation experiments and the government's plague preparations (1721), and breastfeeding guidelines for the London Foundling Hospital (1741).⁴⁸ He wrote (or contributed to) over forty articles for the *Philosophical Transactions* and two editions of his *Voyage to Jamaica* (1707-25).

Sloane developed and maintained a strictly regimented schedule. As a student in Paris, his days started at six; he learned botany at the Royal Gardens in the mornings, then attended anatomy and chemistry lectures in the afternoons.⁴⁹ Birch described Sloane's habits later in life, by which time he was an established physician: 'His custom was to rise very

early in the morning, & from his first getting up was constantly drest fit to have gone abroad'. Until ten in the morning, he treated free of charge the poor who came to his house. Sloane declared that he never denied care to the poor or refused to attend someone who asked.⁵⁰ Numerous short notes from his patients indicate that his presence was often requested, such as when James Monro asked him to visit John Cake in Greenwich in 1718.⁵¹ He typically replied in thoughtful detail to longer letters within a week.⁵² Collecting, too, involved global correspondence; purchasing, maintaining, and cataloguing was a never-ending task—even with assistants—and he personally showed many visitors around his collection of curiosities, which was displayed in his house.⁵³ He attended frequent Royal Society meetings, hosted a weekly dinner party, and went daily to coffeehouses for news and business.⁵⁴ Even seemingly leisurely social engagements, such as Sloane's coffeehouse visits, adhered to a strict schedule. The letters suggest that Sloane's visits, for example, occurred during a set time of day, following his morning patient visits. Inglis, for example, assumed Sloane might be around at noon, while in 1733, royal physician George Louis Teissier invited Sloane to meet at Gilles' at eleven.⁵⁵ Sloane needed to be good at time management, which in turn reflected his capacity for masculine self-discipline.

Sloane also proved his economic skills by managing a large estate that was valued at £100,000 at his death. Sloane's household, it is worth noting, was very much in the public eye. The museum took up considerable space in Sloane's homes, first in Bloomsbury and later Chelsea. By 1748, for example, the museum covered at least eighteen rooms over two floors of his manor house in Chelsea.⁵⁶ The Sloane estate spanned the Atlantic Ocean. After marriage to Elizabeth Sloane (née Langley) in 1695, he administered the Jamaican properties belonging to his wife and three step-daughters.⁵⁷ Delbourgo discusses Sloane's canny acquisition of a fortune through a lucrative medical practice and honours, as well as benefitting from Mrs Sloane's extensive Jamaican plantations (inherited from her first

husband).⁵⁸ The scale of the sugar and rum-producing plantations is suggested by the number of enslaved labourers who worked there. Mickleton, for example, recorded 124 enslaved people in 1766 and Knollis listed 178 in 1799.⁵⁹ Sloane invested in property around Westminster, Essex, and Chelsea. Five tenements in Westminster alone were valued at £1,220 in 1740 when the government purchased them to make way for a new bridge.⁶⁰ Part of being a good estate manager was appointing and overseeing appropriate help, as direct management was unusual.⁶¹ Over the years, several assistants helped to organise and catalogue Sloane's collections.⁶² But Sloane had more general estate help, too. Gilbert Heathcote was Sloane's banker and accountant, while William Derham (Upminster clergyman and natural philosopher) oversaw his Essex properties, reporting on land disputes in Orsett or tenants' complaints of a haunted house in Rotten-Row.⁶³ Sloane's sphere of domestic management extended far beyond Bloomsbury. This was significant: a man's ability to manage his household or estates was at the foundation of his masculine status.⁶⁴

The broad social and moral implications of oeconomy were useful in Sloane's self-fashioning. A perpetual tension in Sloane's medical practice, for example, was his wealth; the very thing that gave him independence also threatened his claims to moral authority. Even when he aimed to be useful, such as publishing a pamphlet on his famous eye remedy, he also earned money from selling them.⁶⁵ Practicing oeconomy, however—whether in terms of bodily estate or family estate—demonstrated a man's ability to participate in civic life. If a man effectively controlled his body or organised his household, then he was ready for the responsibilities of citizenship.⁶⁶ Charitable activities revealed private moral order and public-spiritedness: one's potential contributions to the national economy.⁶⁷ Sloane's refusal of fees for hospital work and free treatment of poor patients should be seen within the context of establishing rectitude, but his ultimate act of civic charity was his bequeathal to the British nation of his vast collection for £20,000—an estimated quarter of its actual value. As early as

1739, Sloane's will gave Great Britain the right of first refusal, followed by academic societies and other nations.⁶⁸ The 1739 will was a clear statement about Sloane's intentions. His collection was a compilation of 'the works of creation', useful for 'the confutation of atheism and its consequences, the use and improvement of physic, and other arts and sciences, and benefit of mankind'.⁶⁹

And yet, Sloane's display of morality was firmly linked to his power. Take Sloane's refusal of poor patients' fees. As a charitable act, it emphasised Sloane's wealth and independence and indicated that he could fit in socially with his wealthy patients.⁷⁰ Sloane's will, moreover, put him at the centre of British empire. This was implicit in the 1739 version, in which Sloane expressed a wish to keep the collection in London, 'where they may by the great confluence of people be of most use'.⁷¹ The 1747 will explicitly depicted Sloane as an empire-builder. Not only had he assembled his collection with items acquired 'either in our own or foreign countries', but he wanted it to be 'kept and preserved together whole and intire in my manor house'.⁷² London, the most populous city in Europe, was no longer a sufficient showcase; Sloane envisioned his own household in Chelsea as the best seat for the British nation's museum. In Sloane's case, oeconomy was not just the reproduction of patriarchy, but the construction of empire.⁷³ Sloane's authority, derived from his close regulation of self and household, was underpinned by a narrative that linked oeconomy with patriarchy and empire.

III. From Patronage to Independence

Sloane went on to fulfil the masculine ideal of being a good manager of bodily and financial estates, but his independence was uncertain early in his career while he was employed as a household physician. In 1687, Dr Peter Barwick recommended Sloane to the new Governor of Jamaica, Christopher Monck, the Duke of Albemarle. The Duke was in poor health, while

the Duchess (Lady Elizabeth, née Cavendish) had long-term mental illness symptoms.⁷⁴

Although Sloane's service to the Duke is well-known, his care for the Duchess enabled him to distinguish himself. However, biographies omit his years with the Duchess—a consequence, in part, of Sloane's autonomy.⁷⁵ When Sloane started his private medical practice in 1694, he was at the centre of multiple networks and his manhood signified by his good judgment and knowledge.

Sloane turned his attention to assisting the vulnerable, newly-widowed Duchess in Jamaica once his last duty to the deceased Duke (embalming the corpse) was discharged.⁷⁶ Not only had the climate and shock of sudden widowhood worsened the Duchess' health, but the Duke had acquired sunken treasure that she now needed to transport. The Duke had invested heavily in a treasure-seeking mission to find a Spanish galleon that had sunk off the coast of Hispaniola in 1659. The Duke received an unexpected, but substantial return on his initial investment—and part of the booty—when the divers recovered twenty-six tons of treasure.⁷⁷ Sloane and the Duchess boarded a ship home in March 1689, with Sloane acting as her 'guardian and protector'.⁷⁸ By mid-April, it was clear that the Duchess and Captain Lawrence Wright disagreed about political matters. The Captain, as a supporter of James II, wanted to land in France if a revolution had occurred in England. The Duchess, however, was willing to support William of Orange. Concerned that the French government would seize her treasure, she insisted on continuing to England. With Sloane's support, the Duchess changed ships, ambitiously moving her entourage, plate, jewels, and 500 tons of furnishings.⁷⁹ In late May, Sloane showed his prudence and loyalty by playing hero when he took out an armed boat to gather the most recent news from a fishing crew: were England and France were at war and was James II still on the throne? On learning that William and Mary were the new monarchs, England was at war with France, and privateers were active nearby, the travellers landed at Plymouth. Sloane's duty ended once the Duchess, 'her Plate, Jewels, &c' reached

London.⁸⁰ The Jamaican trip had allowed Sloane to prove his competence and reliability. Besides demonstrating skills that ranged from the esoteric (embalming) to the practical (overseeing their departure), Sloane also revealed his trustworthiness through his protection of the Albemarle household.

Sloane continued as the Duchess' personal physician, living with her at Welbeck Abbey and Bloomsbury until 1694.⁸¹ He provided regular updates to Barwick between 25 September 1689 and 20 September 1690.⁸² Initial letters focused on the Duchess' health: dejected spirits, poor appetite, and fever. Sloane administered vomits for her stomach and Jesuit's Bark for the fever. Once the fever was controlled, Barwick recommended that Sloane stop giving the Bark, which might weaken her appetite and strength; he hoped that the melancholy would pass along with the fever.⁸³ Some medical consultations were linked to legal discussions. For example, Barwick wondered if an ongoing dispute over Albemarle's estate worsened her illnesses.⁸⁴ In February 1690, Barwick described the appeals process and later asked Sloane's counsel about Lord Bath contesting the will.⁸⁵ Sloane may have proved useful in this regard, as his brother James Sloane (an advocate) supported the Duchess in the lawsuit.⁸⁶ How James Sloane became her advocate is unclear, though presumably Sloane's recommendation helped James' advancement. Barwick and the Duchess, moreover, expected Sloane to be familiar with the legal case. An educated and trusted member of the household, he was well-positioned to observe the household's affairs and to liaise between the Duchess and her advocate. The references to Sloane's legal participation hint at non-medical expectations for a household physician's duties.

As Sloane's case suggests, the role of a household physician was ambiguous: where exactly did a physician fit within the domestic order? Historian Naomi Tadmor has identified the complicated overlap between the categories of servants, families, friends, and patrons in eighteenth-century England. 'Family' might apply to household members, including servants

and lodgers, while ‘friends’ could mean select friends, family (within and beyond the household), employers, or patronage relationships. ‘Family’ implied proximity, but ‘friends’ indicated assistance and obligation.⁸⁷ A household physician might fit either category. For example, Sloane undertook non-medical functions common to high-level servants, including advice and information-seeking.⁸⁸ Servants were clearly dependents within a household. An association of any domestic work with servanthood might be part of the reason behind the efforts of Sloane’s mentor, Thomas Sydenham, to dissuade Sloane from employment with the Albemarles. Sydenham had taken Sloane into his London medical practice, offering a fine opportunity for a young physician to establish his own practice.⁸⁹ But by going to Jamaica as a personal physician, Sloane left the possibility of an independent practice. Despite the ambiguity, Sloane seems to have situated himself within the household as a ‘friend’, not just servant. Many of Sloane’s activities, like the legal assistance, went beyond servanthood in that they provided support to the Duchess. Even when he was established in his career, Sloane provided favours for patients, exchanged gifts or gave non-medical advice; these activities were intended to solidify social bonds through reciprocity.⁹⁰ Although Sloane was socially subordinate, and his role overlapped with that of a servant, his capability and good judgment ensured his place as a ‘friend’.

To establish manly independence, Sloane used his botanical expertise. Indeed, the opportunity to expand his knowledge was a benefit that outweighed any possible loss of independence. The Jamaican trip meant Sloane saw exotic botany first-hand and could collect specimens, both great boons for a natural philosopher. He also had time to work on his research and expand his intellectual networks rather than focus on building a medical practice.⁹¹ By 1690, Sloane’s knowledge of Jamaican flora was well-regarded. John Ray, famed natural philosopher and Sloane’s friend, approvingly discusses Sloane’s botanical research in his *Synopsis Methodica Stirpium Britannicum* (1690).⁹² Ray’s preface to Sloane’s

Catalogus Plantarum (1696) identified Sloane's contribution: describing new plants that he had seen in person.⁹³ As such, Sloane's use of Bark to treat the Duchess is noteworthy. That the remedy was new—only added to the London *Pharmacopoeia* in 1677—explains Barwick's caution in prescribing an unproven drug.⁹⁴ Sloane found it so efficacious in Jamaica that he invested heavily in it. Perhaps Sloane had financial motive to prescribe it for disorders beyond fever (including nerves, mortifications, and bleeding), but his biographer Birch (unlike Barwick) considered Sloane's multiple uses of it to be efficacious and pioneering.⁹⁵ In the Duchess' case, Sloane continued to administer the Bark post-fever for her nervous disorder.⁹⁶ Sloane's use of the remedy pointed to his botanical knowledge and medical innovation, as well as his cosmopolitanism as a traveller and intellectual.

Sloane also gained authority from acting as a medico-legal expert. Perhaps his legal association with the Duchess indicated that he could make a good witness. In 1692, the Duchess married the Duke of Montagu, despite her deteriorating mental health.⁹⁷ After the marriage, Sloane continued to live at the Duchess' residence and both Sloane brothers provided legal help. In 1694, for example, Sloane testified about the Duke of Albemarle's will, publicly demonstrating loyalty to his patrons.⁹⁸ The high-profile case came before the House of Lords.⁹⁹ Sloane's visibility may have been a factor in his involvement in another high-profile case in 1699: the trial of Spencer Cowper for the murder of Sarah Stout.¹⁰⁰ Sloane made a credible legal witness: gentlemanly, expert, disinterested, and perceptive—qualities of an independent man.¹⁰¹ The Spencer case unusually relied on medical experts drawn from the Royal Society.¹⁰² Until the late eighteenth century, English physicians were reluctant to take on such roles, unlike continental practitioners who had long considered medico-legal roles a privilege.¹⁰³ In the Spencer case, Sloane testified on the processes of drowning and breathing. His French training was vital, as he was familiar with European medico-legal expertise on dissection and anatomy.¹⁰⁴ Throughout his career, Sloane provided

medical evidence in legal cases, ranging from Abraham Meure's mental incapacity for a commission of lunacy to Mrs More's venereal disease in a divorce case.¹⁰⁵ The role of medico-legal expert provided a novel basis for Sloane's growing authority, while his credibility as a witness underscored his independence.

Treating the Duchess of Albemarle allowed Sloane to display his personal qualities as both a friend and physician: expertise, good judgment, reliability, and competence. The Duchess was declared 'lunatic' after Montagu died (1710), with guardianship shared between her brothers-in-law, the Duke of Newcastle, the Earl of Thanet, and the Earl of Sunderland.¹⁰⁶ There are no records of Sloane treating the Duchess after 1694, when he moved into his own home. But then, his correspondence reflects his extensive practice of medical consultation-by-post; these were patients who had written to him for advice rather than consulted with him in person. However, the Duchess' extended family appeared regularly in Sloane's correspondence. There are letters from the Tuftons (Earl of Thanet) between 1704 and 1732, the Pelham-Holles and Pierreponts (Duke of Newcastle) during the 1720s, and the Earl of Sunderland from 1709 to 1715.¹⁰⁷ Indeed, in his final will, Sloane named family members to be trustees ('visitors') who would monitor the state of his collection after his death: the Duke of Montague, the Duke of Newcastle, and Henry Pelham, Esq.¹⁰⁸ The longevity of Sloane's relationship with the family suggests that they trusted him. Sloane, moreover, believed that they were good enough friends to be willing to look after his collection. Sloane's self-fashioning as an independent man of good judgment and expertise helped to attract and retain wealthy patients—and friends.

IV. *Sociable Expert*

Sloane's medical networks provided opportunities to demonstrate his social skills and expertise, but his intentional uses of sociability in career-building are most visible in the

correspondence when looking at his intellectual networks. As an ambitious young physician and botanist, Sloane could benefit from participation in the Republic of Letters—if he fit in. The Republic of Letters was an imagined community that connected far-flung people and places through institutions (such as the Royal Society), periodicals (like the *Philosophical Transactions*), and regular post.¹⁰⁹ The free flow of ideas through conversation, whether spoken or written, was central to the Republic. Although spoken conversation was ephemeral, correspondence reveals the importance of self-fashioning for community members. Letter-writers displayed their intellect and sociability in their (potentially publishable or shareable) words.¹¹⁰ The Republic, however, was an intensely masculine, elite space.¹¹¹ Conversation around ideas could be fraught, which is why an adherence to politeness was needed. Civility was thought to temper masculine aggression.¹¹² Advancement was closely connected to one's understanding of how to be polite, both in terms of managing scholarly relationships and attracting patrons. Many elite men were members of the Royal Society, interested in natural philosophy and its overlaps with social utility. The Royal Society facilitated friendship-building for those who could behave appropriately in a gentlemanly fashion.¹¹³ Sloane's correspondence suggests his adeptness at scholarly sociability, which required time, effort, and exchange.

The rules of sociability emerge in Sloane's correspondence with new people. When forming connections, scholarly correspondents agreed on their mutual responsibilities.¹¹⁴ In 1709, for example, Abbé Bignon and Sloane agreed to exchange 'news of what is happening in the learned world', especially unpublished information.¹¹⁵ The scholarly community relied on a system of services and favours, including reading others' work, writing recommendations, and sharing books.¹¹⁶ Fulfilling mutual obligations required discipline. Failure to uphold social commitments was a breach of contract, undermining one's status within the community. In 1695, Henri Basnage de Beauval, Huguenot writer and editor of the

Respublica Litteraria, rebuked Sloane for neglecting their correspondence. Beauval excused Sloane because of his recent marriage, but insisted that Sloane remember their arrangement:

you offered me an epistolary exchange, and that is a commitment which I do not accept to have been annulled by the other duties that you have recently taken upon yourself. Be so good then as to fulfill what you promised me, and recognize that it is well that I should ask you to do so.¹¹⁷

This was serious. Basnage de Beauval underlined the fragility of Sloane's social credit: promises needed action.¹¹⁸ The Republic of Letters mirrored the wider moral economy, with trust and reciprocity as the foundations of exchange.¹¹⁹ Creditworthiness and manliness were closely connected. An independent man's worth was contingent on his fulfillment of debts and agreements. Creditworthiness was easily lost, especially in new relationships, and required repeated proof.¹²⁰ Citizens of the Republic of Letters needed self-control to ensure it functioned.

Sloane's familiarity with the social expectations of the Republic of Letters, as well as his growing networks, meant that he could draw on connections to mediate disputes.¹²¹ Intermediaries were helpful in negotiating unequal social relationships, providing introductions, and settling scholarly arguments.¹²² When John Ray and Joseph Pitton de Tournefort quarrelled in print about classification methods (1694-1696), Sloane helped to resolve the problem between his two mentors civilly.¹²³ By the 1720s, merely invoking Sloane's name could ease disharmony. After Richard Bradley ridiculed Patrick Blair's theories of plant generation, friends calmed Blair down. They claimed that Sloane (Blair's patron) would 'not be pleased with being made a party in the dispute'.¹²⁴ Beyond Sloane's effective mediation, the examples emphasise the community's insistence on resolving disagreements civilly.

Sloane excelled at consolidating collegial ties through friendliness and intimacy. His friendship with John Ray (1627-1705) reveals Sloane's self-fashioning over twenty years. 'Perfect' friendship, which is what existed between Sloane and Ray, was a classical ideal:

trust, loyalty, and emotional intimacy between equals.¹²⁵ When the correspondence between the two men began, twenty-four-year-old Sloane was a newcomer, while fifty-seven-year-old Ray was an expert. Sloane first wrote to Ray in 1684, interested in his history of plants. He offered the assistance of his French mentor, Tournefort.¹²⁶ Sloane and Ray exchanged plant specimens and Sloane shared his unpublished descriptions of rare plants.¹²⁷ Ray encouraged Sloane's botanical work, praising his clarification of classifications.¹²⁸ Sloane initially benefited from access to Ray's mentorship, but the relationship changed with time.

Sloane astutely negotiated the bonds of friendly obligation. Initially, Sloane enquired about Ray's health and advised or remedies—a tactical gift reciprocating Ray's guidance while emphasising Sloane's medical abilities. He attended to Ray's well-being, providing emotional support or sending gifts such as medicines.¹²⁹ After learning of Ray's low spirits from pain, Sloane sent a diverting note about a strong man's feats.¹³⁰ As Sloane's social status increased, he sent sugar gifts (fourteen times from 1692 to 1704). Ray appreciated the sugar, but was 'never likely to requite' the favours, which Sloane must have recognised.¹³¹ Ray's willingness to share increasingly intimate details needs to be seen in this light; he was offering a gift of the (virtual) body in return. For much of the seventeenth century, physical contact between men was treated as a mark of perfect friendship.¹³² Physical contact was not an option for Sloane and Ray who seldom saw each other, but the intimate exchanges can be understood as a replacement for physicality. Ray, for example, only asked for advice after 1697; health topics deepened emotion connection. Sloane discussed his wife's poor health, hinting at conception troubles, while Ray described grieving his daughter's death.¹³³ As Ray aged, he shared his fears, such as not finishing his book on insects before he died.¹³⁴ Over time, Ray's letter-closings changed. Ray started as 'your humble servant', but from 1692, he became 'your (very) affectionate friend', 'yours in all offices of love and service', and 'much obliged friend and servant'.¹³⁵ Ray rarely expressed emotion with other correspondents.

‘Affectionate’ appeared forty-two times—forty in letters to Sloane.¹³⁶ Perhaps Ray’s affection increased with Sloane’s patronage, but their familiarity evokes true friendship.¹³⁷ Initially, Sloane used his medical skill to return Ray’s intellectual favours, but as Sloane’s status increased, Ray reciprocated through intimacy.

Not all of Sloane’s relationships were harmonious, of course; an example of a relationship breakdown underscores Sloane’s talents for maneuvering around the boundaries of sociability. Dr John Woodward’s dispute with Sloane in 1710 exposes friendship’s inherent tensions: that friendship often entailed dependence on a patron and that it was linked to a concept of normative masculinity. Joseph Levine treats Woodward’s and Sloane’s animosity as a struggle for intellectual control of the Royal Society, casting Woodward as an innovative thinker excluded by the Royal Society and Sloane as personifying mediocrity and patronage.¹³⁸ Woodward and Sloane were initially friendly. They had medicine and collecting in common. Woodward, Barwick’s apprentice, first appeared in Sloane’s correspondence in 1689 when Barwick sent Woodward’s greetings, or ‘service’.¹³⁹ In 1692, Sloane provided references for Royal Society admission and the position of Physick Professor at Gresham College.¹⁴⁰

The relationship began to sour by 1697 when Woodward, a ‘rude & insolent fellow’ according to Ray, publicly criticised Sloane.¹⁴¹ Sloane missed two appointments—perhaps deliberately—when Woodward came to be examined for the Royal College of Physicians in 1698.¹⁴² By 1703, Woodward questioned their friendship. Sloane, he complained, took offence at something he had said in a Royal Society Council meeting yet sent a mutual friend to discuss it rather than confront him directly: ‘If we are in Friendship according to all ye Rules and Measures that I ever heard of your sending me such a Message by a third Hand could not but be very surprising to me’.¹⁴³ Woodward apologised, while impugning Sloane’s honour. It is clear, however, that from early on Woodward considered Sloane’s interests

frivolous and believed the Council was unfairly dominated by Sloane's friends. By 1700, rumours abounded that Woodward had written *The Transactioneer*, which satirised Sloane's editorship of the *Philosophical Transactions*.¹⁴⁴ The *Transactions* appeared in another dispute in 1708, when Woodward blamed Sloane for Edward Lhwyd's book review that had referred to him unflatteringly. Although Isaac Newton, as Royal Society President, had Sloane print a retraction, Woodward tried to remove Sloane by arranging John Harris's election as co-secretary in 1709.¹⁴⁵

The 1710 dispute, unsurprisingly, was linked to Sloane's editorship of the *Philosophical Transactions*. It was part of a broader effort to remove Newton and Sloane from Council, though Woodward targeted Sloane.¹⁴⁶ In March 1710, Woodward undermined Sloane again. An anonymous letter was sent to Newton that described the tense meeting on 8 March. Woodward challenged Sloane about a paper on bezoars: 'no man that understands anatomy, can assert that the stones in the gall-bladder are the cause of colic'. Sloane claimed that all medical writers agreed, but could not name any when Woodward insisted. In 'a small mean shift' Woodward asked Dr Richard Mead, who disagreed. To this, Sloane responded with 'grimaces very strange and surprising'.¹⁴⁷ The Council discussed the dispute on several occasions in March and May. Neither man had behaved well. To make matters worse, Sloane threatened to resign if the Council failed to support him. On 24 May, Woodward was removed from Council for bringing the Society into disrepute.¹⁴⁸ Woodward later lamented that his attempt to improve the Society was 'prevented by a Mystery of Iniquity that reigns there'.¹⁴⁹

The dispute exposes friendship's potential burden: the system of favours and obligations was complicated. For example, as Secretary, Sloane granted access to the Council or publication in the *Transactions*. His power increased when he became court physician in 1715. Even those who loathed him might need favours. This included Woodward, whose later

entreaties ranged from asking to exchange specimens in 1713 to requesting Sloane's support for a position with Lord Cadogan (Sloane's son-in-law) in 1722.¹⁵⁰ Many found dependence challenging. For example, Westfall argues compellingly that William Derham wrote the anonymous letter to Newton that blamed Sloane.¹⁵¹ Derham's typically friendly letters (1698-1731) to Sloane included personal details alongside natural philosophy and property matters. But in 1710, Derham hinted at disliking Sloane to John Flamsteed (who also wanted to supplant Sloane and Newton). Derham's letters ceased from August 1709 to August 1710. An uncharacteristically brief letter in August 1709 did not mention any problems.¹⁵² Familiarity resumed in November 1710. Derham begged Sloane's advice for his ill nine-year-old daughter and described his wife's difficult birth, the death of their baby, and the death of his mother-in-law.¹⁵³ Whatever Derham's betrayal, Sloane's patronage continued, including arranging for Derham to become the Prince of Wales' Chaplain in 1715.¹⁵⁴ Derham's actions suggest resentment, along with an assertion of autonomy. Reliance on a patron was problematic in the age of independent manhood.

The Woodward-Sloane quarrel offers insight into the ideals and reality of masculine sociability. Delbourgo perceives Sloane's friendliness as a mask for his quest for power.¹⁵⁵ But this was a fundamental quandary in the Republic of Letters. Sociability was indispensable for the community, yet inextricably linked to dependency, patronage, and individual gain. And Sloane was good at it. Woodward was not, lacking Sloane's reputation for good judgment and restraint. He misread the use of an intermediary in their early dispute and his quarrelsome nature broke the bonds of civility so necessary for the Society's collective trustworthiness.¹⁵⁶ Sloane and Woodward were equally to blame, but only Sloane fit the mould of sociable man. 'Fit' went beyond patronage; Sloane's adherence to community expectations and his social credit were decisive. At the 10 May meeting, Sloane admitted to grimacing, while Woodward once again just raged at him to speak intelligibly.¹⁵⁷

By apologising for his previous lapse, Sloane observed the Royal Society's expectations for decorum, but Woodward's continued lack of gentility confirmed his unsuitability for the Council.¹⁵⁸ As Newton allegedly observed, Woodward was a good natural philosopher, but 'not a good moral one'.¹⁵⁹ The Royal Society sent a clear message about what behaviour—and what type of man—was acceptable; Woodward's genius was less useful than someone like Sloane who strengthened the group. Community belonging was defined along a narrow continuum of self-controlled and polite masculinity.

V. *Conclusion*

Hans Sloane the individual becomes much easier to find when looking for him through the lens of gender; his shrewd self-fashioning as an adaptable, polite expert was firmly based on new concepts of ideal manhood for physicians and men of science. Sloane's early career provides a good case study for a physician's masculine self-fashioning at the turn of the eighteenth century, particularly in terms of how someone at the periphery of upper-class London society was able to become so wealthy and powerful. Sloane's power was vested in his person. His careful management of body and estate not only proved his manhood, but (within the wider discourse on domestic oeconomy) his ability to contribute to a patriarchal society. Considering Sloane's medical and intellectual worlds alongside each other, moreover, reveals the importance to his career success of being able to draw on multiple types of expertise and different networks. While employed as a household physician, Sloane established his independence by simultaneously developing his natural philosophical, medical authority, and medico-legal reputation. Sloane's polite sociability, specifically his awareness of and willingness to adhere to social conventions, also ensured that he remained ensconced within key networks.

Certainly, Sloane's sociability and estate management had their dark sides, bringing people under his control and maintaining the status quo for a model of masculinity from which he benefitted. The trajectory of his career suggests his talent for—and possibly cynical use of—self-fashioning, as he cultivated a type of manhood based on the ideal traits of an early eighteenth-century physician, natural philosopher, and independent gentleman: one who combined self-discipline, good judgement, expertise and sociability in useful ways. The independence required by a man of science was at odds with the (dependent) relationship initially demanded by aristocratic patients, but Sloane's authority and capacity for friendship ensured that he could fit within both groups. His sociability and self-governance, moreover, were not superficial qualities. His ability to manage the family estates, care for patients, and defuse scholarly disputes indicates that these qualities ran through every aspect of his life. Sloane's self-fashioning according to contemporary concepts of masculinity was so effective that his long-term role as the Duchess of Albemarle's household physician was forgotten. Unfortunately, the qualities that contributed to establishing Sloane's illustrious career in the eighteenth century—self-mastery, judiciousness, and polite sociability—came to be devalued by later generations, leaving just the remembrance of a man and his stuff.

NOTES

¹ Arthur MacGregor, 'The Life, Character and Career of Sir Hans Sloane', in Arthur MacGregor (ed), *Sir Hans Sloane: Collector, Scientist, Antiquary*, (London: British Museum Press, 1994); Eric St. John Brooks, *Sir Hans Sloane: The Great Collector and his Circle* (London: The Batchworth Press, 1954); G.R. de Beer, *Sir Hans Sloane and the British Museum* (London: Oxford University Press, 1953; reprint: New York: Arno Press, 1975); Alison Walker, Arthur MacGregor and Michael Hunter (eds), *From Books to Bezoars: Sir Hans Sloane and his Collections* (London: The British Library, 2012).

² James Delbourgo, *Collecting the World: The Life and Curiosity of Hans Sloane* (London: Allen Lane, 2017), p.xxv-xxix.

³ Sloane MSS 4036-4069, 4075-4078, British Library, London. On self-fashioning: Stephen Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, [1983] 2005); Michèle Cohen, *Fashioning Masculinity. National Identity and Language in the Eighteenth Century* (London: Routledge, 1995).

-
- ⁴ See Jan Golinski, 'The Care of the Self and the Masculine Birth of Science', *History of Science* 40 (2002), p.125-45; Heather Ellis, *Masculinity and Science in Britain, 1831-1918* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017), p.3-6. On gender categories: Joan Scott, 'Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis', *The American Historical Review* 91: 5 (1986), p.1053-75.
- ⁵ Barbara Benedict, 'From Benefactor to Entrepreneur: Sloane's Literary Reputation 1685-1800', in Walker et al. (eds), *Books to Bezoars*, 33-40; Idem., 'Collecting Trouble: Sir Hans Sloane's Literary Reputation in Eighteenth-Century Britain', *Eighteenth-Century Life* 36, 2 (2012), p.111-142.
- ⁶ See Maarten Ultee, 'Sir Hans Sloane, Scientist', *The British Library Journal* 14: 1 (1988), p.1-20.
- ⁷ See The British Museum, accessed 19 October 2018, https://www.britishmuseum.org/about_us/the_museums_story/general_history/sir_hans_sloane.aspx and the Natural History Museum, accessed 19 October 2018, <http://www.nhm.ac.uk/research-curation/scientific-resources/collections/botanical-collections/sloane-herbarium/about-sloane/index.html>. For disproving the myth, see James Delbourgo, 'Sir Hans Sloane's Milk Chocolate and the Whole History of the Cacao', *Social Text* 106 29: 1 (2011), p.71-101.
- ⁸ See Kay Dian Kriz, 'Curiosities, Commodities, and Transplanted Bodies in Hans Sloane's "Natural History of Jamaica"', *The William and Mary Quarterly* 57: 1 (2000), p.35-78; Wendy Churchill, 'Bodily Differences? Gender, Race, and Class in Hans Sloane's Jamaican Medical Practice, 1687-1688', *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences* 60: 4 (2005), p.391-444; Lisa Smith, 'Reassessing the Role of the Family: Women's Medical Care in Eighteenth-century England', *Social History of Medicine* 16: 3 (2003), p.327-342.
- ⁹ Abraham Rees, 'Sloane, Sir Hans', in *The Cyclopaedia; or, Universal Dictionary of Arts, Sciences, and Literature*, vol. 33 (London, 1819).
- ¹⁰ Ludmilla Jordanova, 'On Heroism', *Science Museum Group Journal* 1 (2014), <http://dx.doi.org/10.15180/140107>; Rebekah Higgitt, 'Challenging Tropes: Genius, Heroic Invention, and the Longitude Problem in the Museum', *Isis* 108: 2 (2017), p.377.
- ¹¹ Ultee, 'Scientist', p.6-7, 16; Brooks, *Sloane*, p.80-90.
- ¹² Sylvanus Urban (ed), *The Gentleman's Magazine and Historical Chronicle*, vol. 41 (London: 1771), p.485-86; Margaret DeLacy, *The Germ of an Idea: Contagionism, Religion, and Society in Britain, 1660-1730* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), p.105.
- ¹³ Ultee, 'Scientist', p.14-5; Delbourgo, *Collecting*, p.112; Alice Marples and Victoria Pickering, 'Patron's Review: Exploring Cultures of Collecting in the Early Modern World', *Archives of Natural History* 43: 1 (2016), <https://doi.org/10.3366/anh.2016.0342>; Hans Sloane, *A Voyage to the Islands Madera, Barbados, Nieves, S. Christophers and Jamaica*, vol. 1 (London, 1707).
- ¹⁴ Margaret Pelling, 'Compromised by Gender: The Role of the Male Medical Practitioner in Early Modern England', in Margaret Pelling and Hilary Marland (eds), *The Task of Healing: Medicine, Religion and Gender in England and the Netherlands 1450-1800* (Rotterdam: Erasmus Publishing, 1996), p.100-33.
- ¹⁵ Alan Bray and Michel Rey, 'The Body of the Friend: Continuity and Change in Masculine Friendship in the Seventeenth Century', in Tim Hitchcock and Michèle Cohen (eds), *English Masculinities, 1660-1800* (London and New York: Routledge, 1999), p.65-84.
- ¹⁶ Harold Cook, 'Good Advice and Little Medicine: The Professional Authority of Early Modern English Physicians', *The Journal of British Studies* 33: 1 (1994), p.16, 21.
- ¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p.22.

¹⁸ Steven Shapin, *A Social History of Truth: Civility and Science in Seventeenth-Century England* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1994), p.69, 241; Cook, 'Good Advice', p.21, 24, 29-31.

¹⁹ R.W. Connell, *Masculinities* (Oxford: Polity Press, 1995), p.77-80; Alexandra Shepard, *The Meanings of Manhood in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), p.26-46; Margaret Hunt, *The Middling Sort: Commerce, Gender and the Family in England 1680-1780* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1996), p.101-24, 193-215; Matthew McCormack, *The Independent Man: Citizenship and Gender Politics in Georgian England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005).

²⁰ Delbourgo, *Collecting*, p.202-57; Alice Marples, "Collecting and Correspondence in the Papers of Sir Hans Sloane (1660-1753)" (PhD thesis, King's College London, 2016), p.39-85; Richard Coulton, 'The Darling of the Temple-Coffee-House Club: Science, Sociability and Satire in Early Eighteenth-Century London', *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies* 35 (2011), p.43-65; Anne Goldgar, *Impolite Learning: Conduct and Community in the Republic of Letters, 1680-1750* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), p.18-26; Lindsay O'Neill, *The Opened Letter: Networking in the Early Modern British World* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2015); T. Christopher Bond, 'Keeping Up with the Latest Transactions: The Literary Critique of Scientific Writing in the Hans Sloane Years', *Eighteenth-Century Life* 2: 2 (1998), p.1-17; Marples and Pickering, "Exploring Cultures."

²¹ O'Neill, *Letter*, p.161-163; DeLacy, *Germ*, p.85. See also Kim Sloan on Sloane's scientific approach to art collection and related network building: 'Sir Hans Sloane's Pictures: The Science of Connoisseurship or the Art of Collecting?' *Huntington Library Quarterly* 78: 2 (2015), p.394-400.

²² Delbourgo, *Collecting*, p.200; Lisa Smith, 'Sloane as Friend and Physician of the Family', in Walker et al. (eds), *Books to Bezoars*, p.48-56. On sociability, see Goldgar, *Impolite*, p.21-26; Mario Biagioli, 'Etiquette, Interdependence, and Sociability in Seventeenth-Century Science', *Critical Inquiry* 22: 2 (1996), p.193-238; John Mullan, *Sentiment and Sociability: The Language of Feeling in the Eighteenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), p.2-4.

²³ Lawrence Klein, 'Sociability, Politeness, and Aristocratic Self-Formation in the Life and Career of the Second Early of Shelburne', *The Historical Journal* 53: 3 (2012), p.658, 600; Michael Brown, *Performing Medicine: Medical Culture and Identity in Provincial England, c. 1760-1850* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011), p.48-50; John Mee, *Conversable Worlds: Literature, Contention, and Community, 1762-1830* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), p.8-9.

²⁴ For example, see: Philip Carter, *Men and the Emergence of Polite Society, Britain 1660-1800* (London: Routledge, 2000); Brian Cowan, *The Social Life of Coffee: The Emergence of the British Coffeehouse* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2005); Idem., 'What Was Masculine about the Public Sphere? Gender and the Coffeehouse Milieu in Post-Restoration England', *History Workshop Journal* 51 (2001), p.127-57; Coulton, 'Temple-Coffee-House Club'.

²⁵ Goldgar, *Impolite*, p.156.

²⁶ Thomas Birch, "Memoirs Relating to the Life of Sir Hans Sloane," in Walker et al. (eds), *Books to Bezoars*, p.243. Although I also consulted the original manuscript (Add. MS 4241, British Library), I reference the excellent published transcription, which is more accessible for many readers.

²⁷ See Coulton, 'Temple-Coffee-House Club', p.60; Brown, *Performing*, p.50; Naomi Tadmor, *Family & Friends: Household, Kinship, and Patronage* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), p.28, 173-75; Joan Lane, "'The doctor scolds me': The Diaries and Correspondence of Patients in Eighteenth Century England", in Roy Porter (ed), *Patients and*

Practitioners: Lay Perceptions of Medicine in Pre-Industrial Society (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), p.231-36.

²⁸ Smith, 'Sloane as Friend', p.50-52.

²⁹ The British Library's online catalogue entries for Cassandra Willoughby (which mentions only her father) and Cassandra Brydges (correspondent for Sloane MS 4066) are unconnected: searcharchives.bl.uk (1 October 2018). On the Duchess' networks, see Rosemary O'Day, *Cassandra Brydges (1670-1735), First Duchess of Chandos: Life and Letters* (London: Boydell Press, 2007).

³⁰ Elizabeth Hagglund, 'Willoughby, Cassandra [married name Cassandra Brydges, duchess of Chandos] (1670-1735)', *ODNB* <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/72388>; Larry Stewart, 'The Edge of Utility: Slaves and Smallpox in the Early Eighteenth Century', *Medical History* 29 (1985), p.54-70; Cowan, *Coffee*, p.109-10; Copley to Sloane, 26 September 1706, Sloane MS 4040, ff.225-26.

³¹ O'Neill identified Sloane and both Brydges as correspondents, but did not connect the Duchess of Chandos with Cassandra Willoughby: *Opened Letter*, p.13-14.

³² Golinski, 'Care of the Self', p.127-28, 134-38; Alexandra Shepard, 'From Anxious Patriarchs to Refined Gentleman? Manhood in Britain, circa 1500-1700', *Journal of British Studies* 44: 2 (2005), p.291.

³³ Jonas Liliequist, 'Masculinity and Virility – Representations of Male Sexuality in Eighteenth-Century Sweden', *Collegium: Studies across Disciplines in the Humanities and Social Sciences*, 2 (2007), p.57-81; Shepard, *Manhood*, p.106; Brown, *Performing*, p.27.

³⁴ George Rousseau, *The Notorious Sir John Hill* (Bethlehem: Lehigh University Press, 2012), p.57.

³⁵ Karen Harvey, *The Little Republic: Masculinity & Domestic Authority in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), p.24.

³⁶ Lisa Smith, 'The Body Embarrassed? Rethinking the Leaky Male Body in Eighteenth-Century England and France', *Gender & History* 23: 1 (2011), p.29, 34-35.

³⁷ He rarely drank more than one glass daily. Birch, *Memoirs*, p.237, 243.

³⁸ For example, Tancred Robinson teased Sloane about drinking in his honour and John Ray referred to Sloane spitting blood. Thanks to Alice Marples for the Robinson reference. Tancred Robinson to Sloane, 8 April 1688, Sloane MS 4036, f.32-33; John Ray to Sloane, 1 February 1698, Sloane MS 4037, f.23-24.

³⁹ Birch, 'Memoirs', p.242. The single paragraph occurred over two folios: Add. MS 4241, f.10r-v.

⁴⁰ Henry Shelley, *The British Museum: Its History and Treasures* (Boston: L.C. Page and Company, 1911), p.41-42.

⁴¹ Anonymous, *The Medical Museum, or, a Repository of Cases*, vol. 2 (London, 1763), p.442; Rod Phillips, *French Wine: A History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2016), p.37, 118.

⁴² Richard Pearson, *A Practical Synopsis of the Materia Alimentaria, and Materia Medica*, vol. 1 (London, 1797), p.104.

⁴³ Ken Albala, 'Fish in Renaissance Dietary Theory', in Harlan Walker (ed), *Fish: Food from the Waters* (Totnes: Oxford Symposium/Prospect, 1998), p.9-10, 12-13.

⁴⁴ Emma Spary, *Eating in the Enlightenment: Food and the Sciences in Paris, 1670-1760* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012), p.271.

⁴⁵ Hans Sloane, Correspondence, n.d., Sloane MS 3984, f.53.

⁴⁶ Cook, 'Good Advice', p.16.

⁴⁷ Birch, 'Memoirs', p.237.

⁴⁸ DeLacy, *Germ*, p.85, 129-30, 142-43, 157; Delbourgo, *Collecting*, p.176-77.

⁴⁹ Birch, 'Memoirs', p.238.

-
- ⁵⁰ Ibid., p.243.
- ⁵¹ James Munro to Sloane, 15 December 1718, Sloane MS 4076, f.88. See ‘visits’ and ‘medical’ in *The Sloane Letters Project* (www.sloaneletters.com) and examples in Lane, ‘Doctor Scolds’, p.229.
- ⁵² Sloane’s response time can be estimated by patients’ replies to him. See Lane for examples: ‘Doctor scolds’, p.227-28.
- ⁵³ ‘Memoir of Sir Hans Sloane’, in *The Analyst: A Quarterly Journal of Science, Literature, Natural History, and the Fine Arts*, vol. 5 (London: Simpkin, Marshall & Co., 1836), p.10; Delbourgo, *Collecting*, p.292-300.
- ⁵⁴ For example, Sloane met James Reilly’s servant at the Rainbow Coffeehouse to visit curiosities (1719) and gave medical advice at the Grecian Coffeehouse (1722). Birch, ‘Memoirs’, p.239; Brook, *Sloane*, p.116. On Sloane and the Temple Coffee-House Club, see Coulton, ‘Temple-Coffee-House Club’; Larry Stewart, ‘Other Centres of Calculation, or, Where the Royal Society Didn’t Count: Commerce, Coffee-Houses and Natural Philosophy in Early Modern London’, *British Journal for the History of Science* 32 (1999), p.133-53; James Reilly to Sloane, 13 March 1719, Sloane MS 4045, f.197-98; John Inglis to Sloane, 19 April 1722, Sloane MS 4046, f.230-31.
- ⁵⁵ George Louis Teissier to Sloane, 22 January 1733, Sloane MS 4053, f.148.
- ⁵⁶ Marjorie Caygill, ‘Sloane’s Catalogues and the Arrangement of his Collections’, in Walker et al. (ed), *Books to Bezoars*, p.131-33.
- ⁵⁷ Birch, ‘Memoirs’, p.243-44.
- ⁵⁸ Delbourgo, *Collecting*, 151-52, 173-74, 185-92.
- ⁵⁹ These were the earliest dates for Mickleton, Knollis, and Sixteen Mile that listed numbers of enslaved labourers. No details are available for Sixteen Mile Walk (parish of St. Thomas-in-the-Vale), an area with mixed cattle and sugar farming. Edward Long recorded 7568 enslaved labourers in the parish in 1734. ‘Fulke Rose’, *Legacies of British Slave-Ownership*, accessed September 30, 2018, <https://www.ucl.ac.uk/lbs/person/view/2146650539>; Estate searches for Mickleton and Knollis, accessed September 30, 2018, <https://www.ucl.ac.uk/lbs/estates/>; Edward Long, *The History of Jamaica*, vol. 2 (London, 1774), p.57-59.
- ⁶⁰ Adjudication of Thomas Green, 25 November 1740, O/579/12, London Metropolitan Archives.
- ⁶¹ Jane Whittle and Elizabeth Griffiths, *Consumption and Gender in the Early Seventeenth-Century Household* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), p.35; Harvey, *Little Republic*, p.34.
- ⁶² Delbourgo, *Collecting*, p.258.
- ⁶³ Ibid., p.186; William Derham to Sloane: 20 April 1705, Sloane MS 4040, f.27; 4 February 1706, Sloane MS 4040, f.130; 6 March 1708, Sloane MS 4041, f.115; 13 December 1708, Sloane MS 4041, f.256.
- ⁶⁴ Harvey, *Little Republic*, p.189.
- ⁶⁵ Delbourgo, *Collecting the World*, p.193.
- ⁶⁶ Ibid., p.55; Smith, ‘Body Embarrassed’, p.38.
- ⁶⁷ Harvey, *Little Republic*, p.63, 187.
- ⁶⁸ Sir Hans Sloane, *The Will of Sir Hans Sloane, Bart. Deceased* (London: John Virtuso, 1753).
- ⁶⁹ Ibid., p.3, 16-17.
- ⁷⁰ Benedict, ‘Collecting Trouble’, p.116-7.
- ⁷¹ Sloane, *Will*, p.3.
- ⁷² Ibid., p.17.

⁷³ On the concepts, see Harvey, *Little Republic*, p.169-91; Pratik Chakrabarti, 'Sloane's Travels: A Colonial History of Gentlemanly Science', in Walker et al. (ed), *Books to Bezoars*, p.73-4.

⁷⁴ Delbourgo, *Collecting*, p.34-35; Hans Sloane, Account of the Illness and Death of Christopher, Duke of Albemarle (1687), Sloane MS 3984, f.282-85; Estelle Frances Ward, *Christopher Monck, Duke of Albemarle* (London, 1915), p.157, 161-64, 169-71, 272.

⁷⁵ E.g. Birch, 'Memoirs', p.239. Other biographers mention the missing years in passing: Delbourgo, *Collecting*, p.148-49; De Beer, *Sloane*, p.51-52; Brooks, *Sloane*, p.46-47, 77.

⁷⁶ Ward, Monck, p.322.

⁷⁷ Ibid., p.243-44, 253.

⁷⁸ Ibid., p.325-26, 330.

⁷⁹ Sloane, *Voyage*, vol. 2, p.344; Ward, *Monck*, p.330.

⁸⁰ Sloane, *Voyage*, vol. 2, p.347-48; Ward, *Monck*, p.334.

⁸¹ This includes her second husband's residence. His letters to Cassandra Willughby refer to Montagu House: Sloane MS 4066, n.d., f.164; Sloane MS 4068, 30 November 1693, f.12-13. See also de Beer, *Sloane*, f.51-52.

⁸² Peter Elmer, 'Barwick, Peter (1619-1705)', *ODNB* <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/1614>; Barwick to Sloane, 6 April 1690, Sloane MS 4036, f.74-75.

⁸³ Sloane continued to administer it, but followed Barwick's other advice. Barwick to Sloane, 2 October 1689, Sloane MS 4036, f.58; 9 October 1689, f.59-60; 12 October 1689, f.61.

⁸⁴ Barwick to Sloane, 2 October 1689, Sloane MS 4036, f.58. The first will left the estate to the Earl of Bath and the second, to Henry Monck: Ward, *Monck*, f.340-43.

⁸⁵ Barwick to Sloane, 8 February 1690, Sloane MS 4036, f.68-69; Barwick to the Duchess of Albemarle, 20 September 1690, Sloane MS 4036, f.97-98.

⁸⁶ Brooks, *Sloane*, f.77.

⁸⁷ Tadmor, *Family*, p.167, 272-3.

⁸⁸ D. R. Hainsworth, *Stewards, Lords and People: The Estate Steward and his World in later Stuart England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), f.8-11; Shepard, *Manhood*, 179, f.195.

⁸⁹ Brooks, *Sloane*, 44-5, 78.

⁹⁰ Smith, 'Sloane as friend'; Tadmor, *Family*, p.89, 213-214, 236.

⁹¹ On building intellectual networks, see Smith, 'Sloane as friend', p.50-51.

⁹² Birch, 'Memoirs', p.239.

⁹³ De Beer, *Sloane*, p.99-100.

⁹⁴ Londa Schiebinger, *Plants and Empire: Colonial Bioprospecting in the Atlantic World* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2004), p.26.

⁹⁵ Birch, 'Memoirs', p.244. Sloane's innovation may have been influenced by Sydenham: DeLacy, *Germ*, p.58. Schiebinger suggests Sloane's profit motives: *Plants*, p.28.

⁹⁶ Barwick to Sloane, 2 October 1689, Sloane MS 4036, f.58; 9 October 1689, Sloane MS 4036, f.56; 12 October 1789, Sloane MS 4036, f.61.

⁹⁷ Ward wondered where Sloane and Barwick were: *Monck*, p.342-43.

⁹⁸ Brooks, *Sloane*, p.77; Shepard, *Manhood*, p.123.

⁹⁹ Ward, *Monck*, p.347.

¹⁰⁰ Julia Rudolph, *Common Law and Enlightenment in England, 1689-1750* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2013), p.104-12; Mark Knights, *The Devil in Disguise: Deception, Delusion, and Fanaticism in the Early English Enlightenment* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), p.23-24.

¹⁰¹ Barbara Shapiro, 'Oaths, Credibility, and the Legal Process in Early Modern England: Part One', *Law and Humanities* 6: 2 (2012), p.172-76; Idem., 'Oaths, Credibility, and the Legal Process in Early Modern England: Part Two', *Law and Humanities* 7: 1 (2013), p.19-25.

-
- ¹⁰² Rudolph, *Common Law*, p.110.
- ¹⁰³ Catherine Crawford, 'Legalizing Medicine: Early Modern Legal Systems and the Growth of Medico-Legal Knowledge', in Michael Clark and Catherine Crawford (eds), *Legal Medicine in History*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), p.90-93; Silvia De Renzi, 'Medical Competence, Anatomy, and the Polity in Seventeenth-Century Rome', *Renaissance Studies* 21: 4 (2007), p.551-67.
- ¹⁰⁴ Rudolph, *Common Law*, p.106, 110.
- ¹⁰⁵ See letters from Moses Pujolas and Abraham Meure regarding Abraham Meure (senior) and papers on the More case. Pujolas to Sloane, n.d. [pre-1716] Sloane MS 4060, ff.141, 142-43; Meure to Sloane, n.d. [pre-1716], Sloane MS 4059, f.346; Sloane, deposition of attendance on More's wife, 1719, Sloane MS 4034, f.40; More to Sloane, 1719, Sloane MS 4034, f.103.
- ¹⁰⁶ Ward, *Monck*, p.349.
- ¹⁰⁷ Names searched in *Sloane Letters*.
- ¹⁰⁸ Sloane, *Will*, p.20.
- ¹⁰⁹ Goldgar, *Impolite*, p.21-26; Dena Goodman, *The Republic of Letters: A Cultural History of the French Enlightenment* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994), p.140; Elizabeth Yale, *Sociable Knowledge: Natural History and the Nation in Early Modern Britain* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016), p.55-88; Robert Mayhew, 'Mapping Science's Imagined Community: Geography as a Republic of Letters, 1600-1800', *British Journal for the History of Science* 38:1 (2005), p.73-92.
- ¹¹⁰ Publications such as the *Philosophical Transactions* attempted to capture spoken conversations. Yale, *Sociable*, p.95, 106-109.
- ¹¹¹ For a useful overview of the historiography as well as insight into the development of a masculine science, see Golinski, 'Care of the Self'.
- ¹¹² Goodman, *Republic*, p.91; Mee, *Conversable*, p.5; Walter Ong, *Fighting for Life: Contest, Sexuality, and Consciousness* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1981), p.80, 122-23, 140-44; Lawrence Klein, 'Gender, Conversation and the Public Sphere', in Judith Still and Michael Worton (eds), *Textuality and Sexuality: Reading theories and practices*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993), p.103-104, 108.
- ¹¹³ For example, Robert Fox, 'Science and Government', in Roy Porter (eds) *The Cambridge History of Science*, vol. 4, *Eighteenth-Century Science* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), p.107-128; Stewart, 'Edge of Utility', p.58-62; Cowan, *Coffee*, chapters 4 and 5.
- ¹¹⁴ Goldgar, *Impolite*, p.17.
- ¹¹⁵ Thanks to Ann-Marie Hansen for pointing out these letters (translations hers). Jean-Paul Bignon to Sloane, 1 May 1709, Sloane MS 4041, p.323-24; Goldgar, *Impolite*, p.18.
- ¹¹⁶ Goldgar, *Impolite*, p.13, 19-26; Yale, *Sociable*, p.83-87.
- ¹¹⁷ Henri Basnage de Beauval to Sloane, 10 November 1695, Sloane MS 4036, f.219; Goldgar, *Impolite*, f.18.
- ¹¹⁸ Shapin, *Truth*, f.65, 68; Shepard, *Manhood*, f.189, 194; Craig Muldrew, 'Interpreting the Market: The Ethics of Credit and Community Relations in Early Modern England', *Social History* 18: 2 (1993), p.169, 174, 177.
- ¹¹⁹ See Muldrew, 'Interpreting the Market', p.169, 173-174, 177; cf. Shapin, *Truth*, p.65-68.
- ¹²⁰ Shepard, *Manhood*, p.189, 194.
- ¹²¹ Including medical: Smith, 'Reassessing', p.336-38.
- ¹²² Goldgar, *Impolite*, p.30-33, 161-62.
- ¹²³ Jean Jacquot, 'Sir Hans Sloane and French Men of Science', *Notes and Records of the Royal Society* 10: 2 (1953), p.87-89.
- ¹²⁴ Kathryn James, 'Sloane and the public performance of natural history', in Walker et al. (ed), *Books to Bezoars*, p.46.

-
- ¹²⁵ Ibid., p.124-25.
- ¹²⁶ Edwin Lankester, *The Correspondence of John Ray: Consisting of Selections from the Philosophical Letters Published by Dr. Derham, and Original Letters of John Ray, in the Collection of the British Museum* (London: The Ray Society, 1848), Sloane to Ray, 20 December 1684, p.157. Thanks to Rob Konkel for research assistance on Ray.
- ¹²⁷ Ray to Sloane, 28 February 1693, Sloane MS 4036, p.161.
- ¹²⁸ Ray to Sloane, 12 February 1695 and 23 June 1696, Sloane MS 4036, p.226, 238.
- ¹²⁹ Ray to Sloane, 28 February 1694, Sloane MS 4036, p.161; 2 November 1698 and 16 November 1698, Sloane MS 4037, p.151, 155.
- ¹³⁰ Lankester, ed. *Correspondence*, Sloane to Ray, 25 November 1699, p.369; Ray to Sloane, 22 November 1699, Sloane MS 4037, p.353-354.
- ¹³¹ Ray to Sloane, 25 May 1692 and 27 April 1697, Sloane MS 4036, p.123, 307.
- ¹³² Bray and Rey, 'Body of the Friend', p.74, 76, 79.
- ¹³³ Ray to Sloane, n.d. December 1697 (referring to Sloane's letter) and 2 March 1698, Sloane MS 4036, f.380-381, f.35-36.
- ¹³⁴ Ray to Sloane, 22 March 1696, Sloane MS 4036, f.28.
- ¹³⁵ Thanks to research assistant Rob Konkel for this insight. Ray to Sloane, 25 May 1692, Sloane MS 4036, f.123; 28 June 1698, Sloane MS 4037, f.91-92; 2 April 1700, Sloane MS 4038, f.4.
- ¹³⁶ Of 192 letters in Lankester, *Correspondence*.
- ¹³⁷ Sloane supported Ray's widow and organised his memorial: e.g. Margaret Ray to Sloane, n.d. November 1709, Sloane MS 4042, f.69-70.
- ¹³⁸ Joseph Levine, *Dr. Woodward's Shield: History, Science, and Satire in Augustan England* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991), p.84-9.
- ¹³⁹ Levine, *Shield*, chapter 1; Barwick to Sloane, 2 October 1689, Sloane MS 4036, f.58.
- ¹⁴⁰ Robert Southwell to Sloane, 12 September 1692, Sloane MS 4036, f.135; Levine, *Shield*, p.19.
- ¹⁴¹ Ray to Sloane, 13 October 1697, Sloane MS 4036, f.363-63.
- ¹⁴² Woodward to Sloane, 5 May 1698, Sloane MS 4037, f.63; 21 June 1698, Sloane MS 4037, f.87.
- ¹⁴³ Woodward to Sloane, 14 May 1703, Sloane MS 4039, f.128.
- ¹⁴⁴ Richard Westfall, *Never at Rest: A Biography of Isaac Newton* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), p.671-72.
- ¹⁴⁵ Levine, *Shield*, p.89-90; Woodward to Thomas Hearne, 19 August 1710, *Early Modern Letters Online (EMLO)*, tinyurl.com/yakwh9g7; Woodward to Ralph Thoresby, 10 January 1710, *Letters of Eminent Men Addressed to Ralph Thoresby*, vol. 2 (London, 1832), p.217-217.
- ¹⁴⁶ Westfall, *Never at Rest*, p.674; Adrian Johns, *The Nature of the Book: Print and Knowledge in the Making* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998), p.596.
- ¹⁴⁷ Anonymous letter to Newton, 28 March 1710, printed in full by David Brewster, *Memoirs of the Life, Writings, and Discoveries of Sir Isaac Newton*, vol. 2 (Edinburg, 1860), p.185-86. Sloane was correct, according to modern medical knowledge.
- ¹⁴⁸ Westfall, *Never at Rest*, p.672-74; Council Minutes 2, f.213-14, 218, Royal Society Archives, London.
- ¹⁴⁹ Woodward to Hearne, 30 December 1710, *EMLO*, tinyurl.com/yd32wmfc.
- ¹⁵⁰ Woodward to Sloane, 19 October 1713, Sloane MS 4043, f.196; 11 July 1722, Sloane MS 4046, f.266.
- ¹⁵¹ Westfall, *Never at Rest*, f.671-73.
- ¹⁵² Eric Forbes, Lesley Murdin and Frances Wilmoth(eds), *The Correspondence of John Flamsteed* vol. 3, 1703-1719 (Midsomer Norton: Institute of Physics Publishing, 2002),

p.xlviii-xlix; William Derham to Flamsteed, 16 January 1710 (no. 1256) and 20 September 1710 (no. 1269); Derham to Sloane, 3 August 1709 and 18 August 1710, Sloane MS 4042, f.25, 165.

¹⁵³ Derham to Sloane, 3 November 1710, Sloane MS 4042, f.200.

¹⁵⁴ Richard Westfall, 'William Derham', *The Galileo Project*, <http://galileo.rice.edu/Catalog/NewFiles/derham.html>; Derham to Sloane, 3 October 1715, Sloane MS 4044, f.11.

¹⁵⁵ Delbourgo, *Collecting*, p.195.

¹⁵⁶ Johns, *Book*, p.471-472; Biagioli, 'Etiquette', p.205-206; Goldgar, *Impolite*, p.26, 155.

¹⁵⁷ Levine, *Shield*, p.92; Brewster, *Memoirs*, p.187.

¹⁵⁸ John Hill later saw parallels between Woodward's situation and his own rejection by the Royal Society. Rousseau, *Hill*, p.51-7.

¹⁵⁹ Brewster, *Memoirs*, p.188, note.