



Institutions, Identities and Historical Practices in Science and Medicine

Ludmilla Jordanova
STS Occasional Papers 6

Institutions, Identities and Historical Practices in Science and Medicine

Ludmilla Jordanova
Durham University

STS Haldane Lecture
20 March 2017



The Department of Science and Technology Studies publishes STS Occasional Papers to disseminate current research undertaken by our staff and affiliated scholars, and to publish the text of public lectures at STS. The aim is to inform, investigate, and provoke. The series covers the whole our diverse field: history, philosophy and sociology of science, science policy, and public engagement of science.

STS Occasional Papers no. 6

Jordanova, Ludmilla, 2018. Institutions, Identities and Historical Practices in Science and Medicine (London: Department of Science and Technology Studies, UCL)

Copyright © 2018 Ludmilla Jordanova

Published by Department of Science and Technology Studies, UCL, Gower Street, London, WC1E 6BT, United Kingdom



Preamble

In the lecture that follows I wanted to reflect on some of the most striking differences between the approaches I encountered when I started studying the history of science in 1969 and those that currently prevail.¹ One of these concerns institutions and the seeming decline of interest in them as privileged objects of historical analysis. I was particularly keen to say something about a recent piece of work I undertook for the Royal College of Physicians in London, as it has been my only experience of undertaking research and writing for a specific institution. The short book that resulted, *Physicians and their Images*, deals with the College's portrait collection.² One of its themes is the historical mindedness that portraits encourage. Portraiture, a sense of the past and institutions are closely related topics. I have long been interested in scientific and medical practitioners writing histories of their fields.³ It is hard to separate the role of institutions from questions around professionalisation since the former has been seen as an index of the latter.

There wasn't a chance to examine the notoriously difficult area of professions and their histories in the lecture. One of my underlying motivations was to play down a predominantly instrumental approach that stresses concerns about status and upward social mobility, and to show that institutions are complex webs of affinity, which include ties of kinship and friendship, and shared interests in collecting. I fully recognize that 'institution' is a coarse category, and plan to address this issue in due course.⁴ Academics too have complex professional and institutional interests, which reflexive historical practice takes account of. It is worth putting scientific and medical occupations in a broader context, hence I consider writers and artists alongside them in my research.⁵

This covers a substantial period of time, from the first half of the seventeenth century to the present day.

A note about images

All the paintings in the collection of the Royal College of Physicians in London may be seen on the ArtUK website. Everything in the primary collection of the National Portrait Gallery, London, and much of their secondary material, is also online. Other works are illustrated in *Physicians and their Images*, with page numbers provided in footnotes, and in the case of rare books, I indicate the library where I have consulted them.

I

During the First World War, a physician and his wife laboriously cut up a biographical compendium, and mounted the pages in three large volumes, setting more than two hundred portrait prints opposite the sitters' biographies. The physician had initially been trained in the Natural Sciences at Cambridge, and published a work of history before the war. In 1918 the three-volume work was completed and eventually given to the Royal College of Physicians in London, which had granted him the Fellowship in 1902. That same year, 1918, he became the College's Harveian Librarian, giving the Harveian Oration four years later, 'On medicine in the century before Harvey'. For this couple producing the extra-illustrated books was, in their own words, 'a labour of love'.⁶

In this example we find many of the themes I would like to address here. It shows, for instance, one way in which history, biography and portraiture were brought together in an institutional setting. And it reveals that strong emotions were at work in the project. It also prompts a number of questions – how might such a source best be used and interpreted? Is it possible to go beyond a single case and say something of more general interest, for example, about the genres involved and the nature of scientific and medical institutions? I certainly hope that it is possible, and I am offering some tentative thoughts about how and why we might think that doing so is worthwhile. It is an open question what historical responses might work best with such evidence. The physician and his wife were themselves being ‘historical’, in a certain sense, in collecting prints, and then arranging, cutting and pasting to produce these huge volumes composed of biographies arranged in chronological order.⁷

II

I am striving to be ‘historical’ in rather different ways. I want to understand their project in broader contexts: the history of collecting, the uses to which portraits have been put in occupational settings and the nature of the institution in which their volumes now reside. This quest has to consider *la longue durée*, since the College had already been in existence for 400 years when they were working, and because Munk’s original book traces that history through biographies of the Fellows arranged chronologically, the makers in a sense relived it as they were labouring. Thus past forms of historical mindedness within scientific and medical communities are an object of study for me. There is a great deal of work now being done in the general area of the history of history – whereas this case relates to a specific occupational-cum-institutional culture that is of particular concern to historians of science and medicine.⁸

One starting point is the examination of the accumulated collections to be found in scientific and medical institutions – books, manuscripts, prints, commemorative items in silver, glass, china, wood, ivory, and metal, oil paintings, albums and so on. Another is to consider the long-established deployment of genres, such as portraiture, that play a major role in the phenomenon we call ‘identity’, and a curiosity about how they work together. A further possibility is reflection on the ways we understand and interpret institutions – indeed that was my first research interest in the history of science – and how this has changed in our field over the last half-century or so.

I initially encountered institutions through work by Maurice Crosland and Roger Hahn, and in Charles Babbage’s 1830 rant about the decline of science in England.⁹ Assumptions in the 1970s about scientific institutions differ markedly from those underlying the possibilities I just outlined, which imply that accumulations of stuff, and specific types of artefact, such as portraits, are valuable historical evidence. Running through these modes of address are common threads, including how the past is represented and remembered, achievement marked and connections forged between individuals and generations. Such themes did not loom large in my introduction to institutions, and as a result I was not encouraged to feel sympathy for phenomena that are now much more resonant in a world jam-packed with commemorations, historical anniversaries, and celebrity culture.

It is helpful to reflect on the ways historians can pick up on and analyse diverse forms of historical mindedness within scientific and medical communities over long periods of time, and to chart contemporary manifestations of these phenomena, which touch us in our roles as citizens as well as historians, since much public culture depends on them. For example, we might ask searching questions about celebrity science and the

ways in which natural knowledge is presented in the media, which have an impact on voters' opinions concerning the value of experimental research, the authority of those who undertake it, and the levels of funding they should receive. Science museums too exemplify these points, since we need to understand the manner in which their diverse audiences understand both the past and the present of powerful forms of knowledge.

III

It is clear enough that portraits speak to identity, that they commonly have a connection to sitters' occupations, and that institutional affiliations are both a component of identity and occasions for making, displaying and disseminating portraits.¹⁰ It is also well established that for many centuries portraits and biographies have been holding hands, as it were, not least in historical works.¹¹

An example of the points I have just made is Thomas Birch's compilation *The Heads of Illustrious Persons of Great Britain*, which consisted of magnificent portrait prints by Houbraken and Vertue, with their 'lives and characters' described by Birch. The publishing history is complex, and spans the 1740s through to the early 1760s, with a new edition in 1813.¹² The basic format of portrait plus print can be found in many eighteenth- and nineteenth-century publications, of varying degrees of size, cost and visual sophistication. One notable feature of Birch's venture was the inclusion of the name of the owner of the original portrait at the foot of the print. Webs of association were thereby created between people with shared institutional affiliations, intellectual interests, friendships, and collecting practices. Birch included William Harvey, Thomas Willis, Robert Boyle, John Locke, Isaac Newton, Thomas Sydenham and Samuel Garth among his 'illustrious persons'. He was neither 'scientific' nor 'medical' strictly speak-

ing, but was closely connected with these communities, as he had been a Fellow of the Royal Society since 1735, its Secretary between 1752 and 1765, the author of its history in four volumes published between 1756 and 57, co-editor of Boyle's works and a member of the dining club of Richard Mead, Newtonian, collector and physician. Mead lent him portraits for prints to be made for *Heads*. Like so many others, Mead was a Fellow of both the Royal Society and of the Royal College of Physicians.¹³

My intention in using this example is to evoke something of the elaborate connections between people and institutions within which the past was deployed in the form of portraits, biographies and histories. History in many forms was mobilized and revered by men with elaborate institutional and personal links, although neither 'institutional' nor 'personal' quite captures the variety, depth and significance of the associations involved. I observe that not only have these phenomena occurred in all the periods I have worked on, and hence are not limited to the early modern world, but also that they provide a different perspective on the roles of institutions, which my opening example of the 1918 extra illustrated volumes was also designed to do. This perspective encourages us to think about gift exchange, intermarriage within occupational cultures, types of memorialization such as medals, and collecting ephemera and relics.

IV

Institutions speak about both individual and collective achievement, indeed they represent lineages of knowledge, and in doing so they are aided by their collections and by the drive towards acquiring ever more artefacts.¹⁴ They are places where alliances are formed (and by that token factions too), where friendships and collaborations are forged (and by that token rivalries and conflicts too), where forebears and contempo-

aries are celebrated (and by that token others ignored or marginalized). These processes both depend upon and shape visual and material culture.

I have been following these lines of thought for some time now, trying, among other things, to give a genre such as portraiture, often seen in institutional contexts as rather dowdy, its due. I want to be open about some of the issues such a form of historical practice raises. These range from managing the balance between critical distance and sympathetic engagement, to the craft of writing about intricate relationships, without which, historiographically speaking, portraits, biographies and histories remain inert. There is a risk that readers/listeners may be overwhelmed by a surfeit of detail, yet without that detail it is hard to grasp the multilayered nature of professional/occupational relationships and their emotional dimensions. In any case, these details mattered in the past.

It is my recent experience above all that has encouraged me to reflect further on the role of institutions, and on the complicated relationships that I have with them, in the hope that this may help us to consider further three key themes: how historians of science and medicine probe past forms of historical mindedness; how we handle the related genres of portraiture and biography; and the nature of our relationships with institutions, especially the most prestigious, long-lived national ones. Here I am speaking out of my own experiences.

It is now customary to begin formal meetings with declarations of interest, and it seems only fair for me to declare mine. In a committee, what counts as such is fairly clearly defined; I'd like to treat the term quite flexibly to include, if I can put it this way, some of the baggage I carry. In retrospect, I see my training as quite 'intellectualist', in the centrality it gave to major theoretical 'advances' despite the growing interest in the so-

cial dimensions of science. Institutions were deemed one of the best ways into those dimensions, yet their significance, for participants as for historians, was simply taken as read. As the very first sentence of Roger Hahn's book on the Paris Académie des Sciences put it: 'Every historian of science, whatever his special interest, has acknowledged the importance of the Parisian Académie Royale des Sciences as the central theatre in which science's intricate plot was unraveled during the Enlightenment.'¹⁵

Institutions were treated, indeed, as a kind of index, as earlier commentators such as Babbage and Lyell had done.¹⁶ They seemed to give us direct access to issues such as status, whether of fields or people, state recognition, professionalisation and career structures, which were construed as highly desirable. Biography was deemed an old-fashioned genre, too akin to the celebratory lives and letters of the nineteenth century to be taken seriously. Portraiture was hardly mentioned, while history written by practitioners was looked on with suspicion.

My commitment from relatively early on was to a cultural approach to science and medicine, that is, to thinking in terms such as 'science *as* culture' or 'medicine *in* culture' rather than the weaker formulations that simply use 'and'. To further develop that commitment, I took a master's degree in art history, and as a result formed a deep affection for another discipline. I have used materials *in* many institutions, of course, but have only undertaken one commissioned piece of research *for* one - the Royal College of Physicians in London. This should certainly be declared on any register of interests, as would being a Trustee of two national museums, first the London Portrait Gallery (2001-9) and since 2011 the Science Museum Group. These affiliations and preferences are easy to list, but it is extremely hard, I have found, to trace and conceptualise their effect on my own historical practice. This is one of the things I am trying to do

here and it relates quite directly to my opening example, since in being involved with an institution emotional attachments form in the historian too, which surely then shapes their historical thinking.

V

At this point I return to Arnold and Margaret Douie Chaplin, the 'Inlayers' with whom I began, who took a work by William Munk, *The Roll of the Royal College of Physicians of London; compiled from the Annals of the College and from other Authentic Sources*, first published in two volumes in 1861, covering 1518-1700 and 1701-1800 respectively. They used the second, three-volume edition of 1878, which took the story up to 1825. Munk was a physician-historian, Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries, the author of two biographies about Presidents of the College, Harveian Librarian for forty-one years, and a practicing physician with an interest in smallpox, and also in pain relief as his 1887 publication *Euthanasia, or, Medical Treatment in Aid of an Easy Death*, reveals.¹⁷ He was painted in 1898, the year of his death, by John Collier, T.H. Huxley's son in law, who was responsible for the depiction of many prominent scientific and medical figures.¹⁸ Munk long dwelt with the College's history and thus with his predecessors, and in preparing their extra-illustrated volumes, so too did Arnold and Margaret Chaplin.

I use the phrase 'dwelt with' advisedly, as the handwritten Preface to the Chaplins' volumes makes the idea perfectly explicit: 'While working we have been in [the] habit of associating ourselves, in the spirit, with the men whose Biographies and Portraits are contained in the work. We have formed our likes, and our dislikes. We have speculated on their characters, and we have often felt as if we were living in their time, and were sharing their joys and sorrows.'¹⁹

The short preface of less than 500 words repeatedly insists on the extent of their labour, and that as the work 'engrossed our attention more and more, ... we came to regard it as a solace, and a sure remedy for the sadness occasioned by that terrible cataclysm [i.e. the First World War].' It ends: 'When, however, the time has come that we are no more, we hope the Royal College of Physicians of London will see fit to accept these three volumes as evidence of our respect for that ancient and honourable body.'

In the Chaplins' Preface – the handwriting is Arnold's – the war, their labours, the College, text and images, their close relationships with each other and with historical figures, are brought, even merged together. While it is relatively unusual to find such sentiments so explicitly articulated, there is a good deal of evidence to support the claim that portraits and biographies kept figures from the past, united by virtue of their institutional affiliation, alive. While at first sight such a claim might appear naïve and sentimental, literary treatments of the power and vitality of portraits, would appear to confirm its wide currency.²⁰ Portraits assisted the expression of admiration and the articulation of memories - commentators who identified with historical figures indulged in what Geoffrey Keynes called 'hero-worship' when describing his own relationship with William Harvey.²¹

VI

It is striking how widely Harvey has been venerated, starting in his lifetime, and continuing to the present day. I participated in the Harveian Oration and dinner at the London College of Physicians the Autumn of 2016, during which a succession of images of him were projected onto a wall adjacent to the building where the meal was served. The photograph I took on that occasion shows the bust of Harvey that Richard Mead

gave to the College, visible through the glass windows of the dining area. The bust was based on the portrait Mead owned, which was also used as the template for the print depicting Harvey in Thomas Birch's *Heads*.²² Individual identities as well as a corporate one are being shaped and consolidated during such an evening, and many participants will experience these rituals on a regular basis over their working lives.

Here we encounter a problem I hinted at earlier: professional historians are taught to be wary of hero-worship, of sources in which it manifests itself, and of the forms of behaviour it incites. It is acknowledged that they may have characterized past accounts of science and medicine by interested parties, but it should not infect our own more detached and considered ones, we are told. Further, we are encouraged to look with suspicion on sentimental displays of affection towards establishment organisations, which the Royal College of Physicians most certainly is. All this is troubling because it is not safely in some 'past', but in our own worlds, worlds where Harvey remains a hero, where fresh ones are being minted – the current public adulation of cosmonaut Tim Peake is an excellent example – and where Royal Colleges and Societies retain considerable authority. Historians too have their own establishment bodies, rolls of honour, portraits and biographies.²³

This situation poses ethical questions familiar to those who have undertaken commissioned histories – how freely should historians speak, and even if they are not under specific instructions about what can and cannot be said in print, is there a certain decorum to be observed? Just as important for me are questions about how we manage the array of emotions that working closely with an institution gives rise to. I was thrilled to bits to discover the Chaplins' work, and I want to take seriously the impulses that in-

spired it. At the same time I should not be their passive mouthpiece - I want to interpret as well as report.

In charting these phenomena as precisely as possible, in giving as full and faithful an account as practical constraints allow, the seeds of analysis are being sown, allowing patterns to emerge in due course. In writing *Physicians and their Images*, I certainly made judgements based on decorum; for example, not to publish any of the costs involved in acquiring and caring for portraits. I did not criticise specific portraits on aesthetic grounds, while I tried to hint at patterns that emerged from the research.

VII

Most of the examples mentioned so far are 'medical' in that the practitioners named earned their livings as either physicians or surgeons. In using Thomas Birch's compendium of biographies and portraits, I noted his role in the Royal Society, a body more associated with 'science' than with medicine. Many successful physicians were Fellows of the Royal Society, but this is not enough to justify my use of the phrase 'science and medicine' in the title of this lecture. In any case, as historians we are wary of loose, anachronistic uses of 'science'. Yet I used the word advisedly since it does a great deal of work in medical contexts.

The rhetorical potential of the term 'science' and its cognates is a recurrent theme in the history of medicine. Thomas Joseph Pettigrew's *Medical Portrait Gallery*, 1838-40 is a case in point. We should note that 'portrait gallery' had a life in print culture before the physical institution came into being in London in 1856.²⁴ Pettigrew, a surgeon, antiquary, collector, historian and biographer subtitled his book – *Biographical memoirs of the most celebrated physicians, surgeons, etc., etc., who have contributed to the advance-*

ment of medical science, and accompanied those memoirs with portraits ‘from the most approved and authentic sources, and executed by the ablest artists.’²⁵ His concern to assert the value of his portraits, and of portraiture as a genre, rests on the importance of distinguishing ‘the man of science from the man of pleasure...’.²⁶ He continued, ‘Eminent men represented with all the charms of the pencil, and with the true and real expression of their countenances, must ever animate the bosom with a love of their excellence.’

Each portrait was accompanied by a printed version of the sitter’s signature, a practice that affirms Pettigrew’s concern with authenticity, as if the portrait-plus-signature were a piece of evidence about the natural world. While presented as a biographical compendium, the work is highly prescriptive about desirable behaviour, and I take his comments on ‘research’ and ‘science’ to be aspirational, since many of the figures he included were powerful medical men without much demonstrable intellectual distinction.²⁷ So ‘science’ and ‘medical science’ can perhaps best be seen as a mid-nineteenth century form of virtue-signalling.

This trend of casting as much as possible in the idiom of ‘science’, is nowhere better exemplified than in the case William Harvey.²⁸ I have argued elsewhere that his life, images and biography became important, starting in his own lifetime, and persisting to the present day, primarily for this reason, which accounts for T.H. Huxley’s interest in Harvey towards the end of his life.²⁹ The point here is that Harvey could be used specifically to sanction an experimental approach in general and vivisection in particular. Robert Hannah’s ‘history painting’ of 1848 of an imagined scene where Harvey is expounding his ideas to Charles I, and Henry Weekes’ 1864 statue in the new Oxford Museum, built 1855-60, where he is holding a still beating heart in his hand, are cases in point,

where the visible historical detail – clothing, for example – is making an important claim.³⁰ While neither version of Harvey can, strictly speaking, be treated as a ‘portrait’, viewers are nonetheless invited to trust that what they have before them is faithful to the historical record. In Oxford, Harvey is one of a suite of statues, including of Galileo, Leibnitz and Priestley, set amidst other scientific and medical luminaries, such as the geologists William Smith and John Phillips, who are present in the form of busts. The building is explicitly a ‘cathedral of science’, and presented as still inspirational to “researchers, students, and visitors to the Museum” according to a 2008 pamphlet.³¹ This series of sculptures designed to grace the interior of the neo-Gothic building shows how historical invocations were a tool in a concerted campaign to assert the centrality of science in the University in general with this building as its epitome.³²

It’s no surprise that certain forms of historical mindedness possessed clear and present utility. Nor that visual and literary genres complement and extend each other, sometimes blending together, as they do in extra illustrated books such as the Chaplins’. Remembering that ‘portrait’ is a powerful metaphor, suggesting a faithful account, an encapsulation, we note that individuals and corporate bodies can be ‘portrayed’ in many ways, including by coats of arms, such as those we see in the stained glass windows in the Museum of the History of Science in Oxford, the old Ashmolean Museum, built 1678-1683.³³ Biographies and histories can be ‘portraits’ too. Nonetheless, it seems that literal portraits, which conjure up specific faces and bodies for the eyes of others, possess a special status, as do ‘relics’. So how do items of visual and material culture work in institutional contexts? And why are there only a few depictions of groups if indeed collective identity is so vital to organisations?

My answer to the first question has been implicit in what I have said so far. They work through forms of association, in which words, images and objects act together. The link can be quite direct – a chair or a lock of hair, for example, where there is an immediate connection with a specific person. They may be more mediated, an object that is gifted, for example, a lectern, a piece of silver, where the association needs to be refreshed from time to time, as happens when they are brought out for special occasions and anniversaries. Just a name can do a lot.³⁴ So artifacts and associated texts provide perennial reminders of donors and sitters, of artists and owners, of institutional posts and honours, of forms of patronage. They jog memories, and their ‘content’ provides texture. They can be legitimating, inspiring and comforting. That is, they operate at a range of emotional and social levels. A portrait known or believed to be done from life is generally accorded a certain privilege.

The second question about visual representations of groups is harder to answer and invites further research and reflection. There were images of scientific groups made in the nineteenth century – for example, composites, where pre-existing images are blended together as if the sitters had really been together at a given moment.³⁵ Such composite prints and group photographs have been used for at least a century and a half to ‘record’ gatherings, real and imaginary. Some institutions have commissioned group paintings as both the Royal College of Physicians and of Surgeons have.³⁶ But these canvases are relatively rare, perhaps because they are cumbersome to produce, and it is hard to make them visually convincing. It may be worth pressing on what their forced, somewhat contrived appearance reveals about our capacity to visualize and conceptualize groups.³⁷ Their very scarcity might prompt us to reconsider the nature of collective identity in scientific and medical communities, especially where there

is a strong commitment to the strategic fiction of individual achievement, which portraits of a single figure serve to reinforce.

VIII

Other ways of representing corporate bodies are available. One common device is to portray the President or equivalent on a regular basis, as a kind of embodiment of the whole organisation. In the case of the Royal College of Physicians, this is apparently a relatively recent practice, which started with the 1951 portrait by the superstar artist Pietro Annigoni of Lord Moran. Moran was a divisive figure, whom Annigoni depicted in a small, old master-style work. Moran polarised opinion, both professional and public to such an extent that it is unlikely a portrait could have a unifying effect.³⁸ But it does conjure him up in a potent manner. Thus he remains a kind of living presence in the institution he led between 1941 and 1950, that is, during the most crucial period for the formation of the National Health Service. This work, as portraits so often do, acts as a provocation for comment and conversation, and I suggest that its aesthetic qualities play a major role here.

It is important to acknowledge the role that aesthetic judgements play in historical practice, avowing it in my own case, as we know full well they can do in scientific and medical practice. Of course I could make the move, as some art historians do, and turn to the reactions of critics, when these are available. This cannot fully solve the difficulty, however, since it is the responses of fellow practitioners, the staff who run institutions and visitors that are historically significant, allowing the portraits to do their identity-work. If portraits are powerful because they prompt what we could call a body-to-body or person-to-person response, then viewers' reactions need not to be denied

but to be acknowledged, examined and then turned to productive analytical effect. Historians can attempt to reconstruct past ways of seeing, but that does not require them dampen or deny their own.

I now want to flip the argument around, as it were, and move from sitters and their setting to the artist. Annigoni's visual account of Moran is, whatever you think of its subject, or indeed of the artist's strident anti-modernist stance, impressive. Both artist and sitter published their reactions to the other, and both were prominent figures – Annigoni's portraits of Queen Elizabeth II are particularly well-known, and Moran achieved further notoriety when, soon after Churchill's death, he published his records of his dealings with his famous patient.³⁹ But, in the end, there remains a judgement to be made about the work itself, and its status as a distinctive type of artistic commentary on the sitter. There are many ways in which an image becomes iconic, and aesthetic qualities play their full part.

In any institutional collection the artistic quality is bound to vary, and once it has been acknowledged that aesthetic properties play a significant role in the ways portraits work, it then becomes necessary to find a manner of speaking about quality that is both tactful and robustly analytical. When both sitters and artists are alive the matter is especially sensitive. More conventional and routine portraits too may be effective at expressing both individual and institutional identity – operating as a sort of visual prompt, to note, for instance, the rather new phenomenon of women holding the Presidency of the Royal College of Physicians. This issue is important since the first woman was only admitted to the Fellowship in 1934, long after it was possible for British women to train as physicians. The College appointed its third female President, Jane Dacre in 2014; her portrait will be unveiled in 2018. The visual idioms available for the de-

piction of successful professional women is a subject of considerable interest. The first two 'lady presidents', Margaret Turner-Warwick and Carol Black, were painted in 1992 by David Poole, and 2006 by Jeff Stultiens respectively.⁴⁰ By wearing her robes and having the caduceus across her lap, Turner-Warwick presents herself in such a way that her symbolic significance for the College is affirmed. Black, on the other hand, appears simply as a self-assured woman.⁴¹ It is striking that the most visually arresting portrait of a woman, the first of a female physician that the College acquired, was a gift and not a commission, and by an artist who is not at all well-known.⁴²

One way in which portraits can work in an institutional context is as a visual condensation, to be taken in relatively quickly, and certainly far more rapidly than reading a biography, however summary. Public cultures rely heavily on such condensations, by using shorthand, tags if you like, so that the person has a label that hints at their biography. One particularly revealing instance is the occupational categories used by the National Portrait Gallery and the Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.⁴³

IX

Bearing these points in mind, I wish now to return to William Harvey. When I first started this research I found myself mentioning him in conversation by saying something like, "you know, circulation of the blood", or "he discovered the circulation of the blood". I was simply repeating the tag that has been attached to him for centuries, a tag that takes 'discovery' as a clearly delineated event, a unit of currency in the economy of scientific and medical achievement. As we know, the practices that form and repeat such identity summaries are historical phenomena in their own right. We might excuse ourselves from taking them seriously by saying they are merely useful shorthand, but

there's also a more complicated phenomenon here, and to demonstrate how it can work it is worth considering a portrait of Harvey by an unknown hand, which came into the collection of the National Portrait Gallery in 1976.⁴⁴

In order to appreciate its significance we need to bear in mind that just as John Hunter's portrait by Joshua Reynolds lies at the very heart of the Royal College of Surgeons signalling 'surgery as science', so does a depiction of William Harvey, the only painting saved in the Great Fire, in the Royal College of Physicians, which communicates 'learned physic as science'. The artist is unknown, and it clearly depicts Harvey in old age. By contrast the portrait now in the London Portrait Gallery, also by an unknown hand, shows a much younger man, indeed it probably dates from around the time *De Motu Cordis* was published, that is, around 1628, and is one of a suite of family portraits originally located in a Harvey family house, Rolls Park in Essex. It was retrieved from that house after the Second World War and then exported illegally to the United States to join the extensive collection of a medical practitioner, Dr. Myron Prinzmetal, who also owned William Osler's overcoat. It was finally repatriated after a court case, and considerable publicity.⁴⁵

Precisely because of the illegal export, interested parties had to articulate what the picture meant to them, and negotiate over which institution should get it – Harvey's Cambridge College, Gonville and Caius, the Royal College of Physicians or the National Portrait Gallery in London. Geoffrey Keynes played a central role in the whole process of fundraising and giving it an institutional home. The condensation is especially neat here because the moment of discovery can be equated with the moment of portrayal, and the narrative of Harvey's achievement taken in at a glance. Here there are, if I can put it this way, layers of 'encapsulation'. The portrait stands for Harvey in his prime;

for his appearance around the time his key work was published; for his 'scientific' achievements; for his prominence as a Royal Physician; for his status as a learned man; for his institutional role at the College of Physicians; for his historical place in a British pantheon.

I have sought to present my thoughts in such a way that historical actors, historians, and contemporary culture are held in dynamic interaction with one another. Arguably this is one of the characteristics of self-aware historical practice. There are, however, special challenges when it comes to science and medicine. Four immediately spring to mind: deciding on the stance historians should take in relation to celebrations of these forms of knowledge; managing dominant discourses around heroism, including doing justice to teams in a world that focuses on individual stars; adopting an appropriate authorial voice/register, and finding ways of understanding institutions in which we are implicated and with which we want to be in critical dialogue.

This is where an institution such as the Science Museum becomes relevant, since it, like many museums about science, medicine and technology, is strongly committed to a celebratory mode. The recent acquisition of 'Tim Peake's spacecraft' is an excellent example. The specialized staff fully recognize that heroisation and exceptionalism are limited modes of address. Yet there may seem to be little choice over using tags, drawing attention to stars rather than teams, and using portraits as mere placeholders, if the widest possible audiences are to be reached. The currency has to be shared by curators and consumers, by media and markets. This places professional historians of science and medicine who practice outside the museum world in an especially tricky position, not least with respect to the ways in which we construct our identities in relation to those we study. This is especially the case when 'big names' are involved. It is our job,

at least in part, to critique the assumptions implicit in public cultures of science and medicine. These cultures draw on centuries of institutional activities that forged identities within occupational groups and mediated these to wide audiences. Yet to grasp such identities it is necessary to acknowledge their emotional dimensions. We have to, in a sense, 'dwell with' them. That entails taking seriously the affective properties of portraits and biographies, the labours of love that history-writing involved, the potency of images and objects. Understanding prestigious, long-lived institutions is an integral part of that project.

When Roger Hahn published his book on the Paris Académie des Sciences in 1971, he assumed the universal importance of a single institution at a given point in its history, and lamented its subsequent decline into one taken up with symbols and ceremonies, a descent he believes began in the early nineteenth century: 'Today it is a glorious relic of the past, more akin to a Hall of Fame than an Olympic stadium. Time and the very nature of the growth of science, which the Academy had so successfully stimulated, were its undoing. Age, wisdom, and ceremony now prevail where once youth, creativity, and debate reigned supreme'.⁴⁶ I wonder whether his account of how vitality allegedly ebbs away from a formal organisation taps into a broader concern, one that has probably been present in many different forms in a range of places and times, about the formal, conservative rigidity to which elite institutions are thought to be vulnerable, even as their capacity to endow members with status is recognised. The genres and practices I have discussed could be seen to epitomise such decline. But ritual and ceremony, like forms of rhetoric, whether verbal or visual, are not 'mere' phenomena, rather they go to the very heart of institutions. Established organisations clearly do shift over time, even

as they affirm and celebrate their heritage. They do not provide simple indices of status, state recognition or professional development.

Historians too are institutional and professionalising creatures, attentive to the changing environments of universities, museums and learned societies, while being complicit with forms of regulation and assessment that are, in some cases at least, dehumanising and demoralising. Perhaps that makes us peculiarly ambivalent about the forms of love, affection and affinity that characterised many institutions in the past. This response may be heightened when we cannot discern the connections between institutional power and widely recognised intellectual innovation - the quality that those very institutions are supposed to promote. In many historical fields, biography as a genre remains insecure when it comes to esteem indicators, and few life writings use portraits as the deep, rich sources they are capable of being. Perhaps this suggests not just scepticism about their value as evidence, but also an ambivalence with respect to the social structures, and especially to professional associations, that foster biography and portrait-making.

I cannot see any simple resolution of these tensions; for historians of science and medicine there is no choice but to accept that as our professions have become fully separate from the domains we study, we walk a tight-rope in order to avoid a detachment so cold we cannot do justice to labours of love and an appreciation so warm that we lose critical edge. Doing so becomes a little easier, however, as the role of institutions in mediating identities is understood, and to do that effectively, ritual, rhetoric and ceremony, portraits, gifts and biographies, come into focus as deserving of sustained historical attention. It is clear that Arnold and Margaret Chaplin derived comfort from history-making with images in a time of disorder, from finding continuities in a world of

chaos. We, then, may be particularly well placed now to trace affinities and associations across many generations, not to laud institutions, of course, but rather to grasp their capacity to keep alive, through their collections, elaborate relationships and connections between their members. In so doing, we may come to appreciate genres such as portraiture and biography that retain their affective powers. Full-bodied forms of historical inquiry are best placed to achieve these goals.

¹ I would like to express my warmest thanks to colleagues at UCL for the kind invitation to give this lecture and for their generous hospitality, and above all to Jon Agar. I am grateful to colleagues at the Max Plank Institute for the History of Science, Berlin, where a version this lecture was presented, for their insightful comments and suggestions, and also to Tom Stammers and Howard Nelson for their kind help. The archives at the Royal College of Physicians and the Heinz Archive at the National Portrait Gallery, London are indispensable; I appreciate the assistance I received at these organisations.

² Ludmilla Jordanova, *Physicians and their Images*, London, 2018, one of a series of 10 published to celebrate the 500th anniversary of the College in 2018. Each volume highlights 50 items of special interest connected with the College, with additional illustrations. The series thus forms a 'portrait' of an institution and its history, largely as seen from the inside.

³ See for example, Ludmilla Jordanova, 'The Sense of a Past in Eighteenth-Century Medicine', the Stenton Lecture 1997, Reading, 1999.

⁴ In *Servants of Nature: the Fontana History of Scientific Institutions, Enterprises and Sensibilities*, London, 1999, Lewis Pyenson and Susan Sheets-Pyenson distinguish between teaching, sharing, watching, showing and growing institutions. The Royal College of Physicians has a regulatory function. It also gives advice to public bodies and sees itself as speaking for the medical profession. Its many faceted public roles suggest similarities with the Royal Society, although the latter does not regulate professional practice. 'Medicine' is a capacious category, and hence the College is unlike specialist societies. Teaching, sharing and showing are certainly involved but they hardly do justice to the College's activities in either the past or the present. One way of understanding the College's profile is through its long, close associations with Royalty and the aristocracy. These gave many of those who held office, as President, for example, significant public prominence and status, which impinged upon the institution as a whole. That is to say, 'royal' in the name of the institution invites careful scrutiny. The ways in which members are selected, and the financial transactions between them and institutions are also crucial. A historian of science who has done inspiring work on many kinds of institution to reveal their social dimensions is Jack Morrell, *Science, Culture and Politics in Britain, 1750-1870*, Aldershot and Brookfield, Vermont, 1997 collects together 15 articles published between 1969 and 1985.

⁵ For example, Ludmilla Jordanova, 'The Body of the Artist' in Anthony Bond and Joanna Woodall, eds, *Self Portrait Renaissance to Contemporary*, London and Sydney, 2002, pp. 43-55; and 'Visualizing Identity' in Giselle Walker and Elisabeth Leedham-Green, eds, *Identity*, Cambridge, 2010, pp.127-156.

⁶ The couple were Arnold and Margaret Douie Chaplin. For a brief biography of Arnold see the free, fully searchable online version of *Munk's Roll*, the second edition of which they extra-illustrated: William Munk, *The Roll of the Royal College of Physicians of London*, 2 volumes, London, 1861, 2nd edition, 3 volumes, 1878. I discuss the Chaplins in *Physicians*, pp.96-103, where there are four images of pages from their work. All online sources were rechecked in February 2018. Arnold Chaplin's historical work is *The Illness and Death of Napoleon Bonaparte*, London, 1913.

⁷ On extra-illustration, see Lucy Peltz, *Facing the Text: Extra-illustration, Print Culture and Society in Britain, 1769-1840*, San Marino CA, 2017.

⁸ 'History of history' refers to many types of project, from charting the development of the discipline and the profession to studying historians and understanding the ways in which the past is used in a range of periods, including our own. Recent examples include: R.J. Bartlett, *History and Historians: Selected Papers of R.W. Southern*, Malden, MA, Oxford, and Carlton, Victoria, 2004; Michael Bentley, *Modernizing England's Past: English Historiography in the Age of Modernism, 1870-1970*, Cambridge, 2005; Billie Melman, *The Culture of History: English Uses of the Past, 1800-1953*, Oxford and New York, 2006; Daniel Woolf, *A Global History of History*, Cambridge, 2011; Stefan Berger with Christoph Conrad, *The Past as History: National Identity and Historical Consciousness in Modern Europe*, London, 2015; Martha Vandrei, *Queen Boudica and Historical Culture in Britain: An Image of the Truth*, Oxford, 2018.

⁹ Maurice Crosland, *The Society of Arceuil: A View of French Science at the Time of Napoleon I*, London, 1967; Maurice Crosland, ed., *Science in France in the Revolutionary Era Described by Thomas Bugge...*, Cambridge

MA and London, 1969 Roger Hahn, *The Anatomy of a Scientific Institution: the Paris Academy of Sciences, 1666-1803*, Berkeley, 1971; Charles Babbage, *Reflections on the Decline of Science in England, and on Some of its Causes*, London 1830. The main context for considering institutions in comparative perspective was a course I took in 1970-71 on the history of geology in a number of European countries, which focused on the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Part of the teaching was delivered by Roy Porter, see his *The Making of Geology: Earth Science in Britain 1660-1815*, Cambridge, 1977, which discusses many institutions. It seemed particularly clear how different England and France were, and that the latter was more supportive of scientific careers, which fuelled Babbage's critique of the former. My own interests then were in French science, and included the institutions of which Jean-Baptiste Lamarck was a member. See, for example, Dorinda Outram, *Georges Cuvier: Vocation, Science and Authority in Post-Revolutionary France*, Manchester, 1984, chapters VI and VIII. Joseph Ben David's *The Scientist's Role in Society*, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1971, was widely cited - it now appears strikingly teleological, but it did adopt a comparative approach. Some of his assumptions, about stages of professional development, for example, remain common. See also Charles Gillispie, *Science and Polity in France at the End of the Old Regime*, Princeton, 1980 and Maurice Crosland, *Science Under Control: the French Academy of Sciences 1795-1914*, Cambridge, 1992. Morrell, *Science*, article XI contains perceptive comments on these matters. See too James McClellan, *Science Reorganized: Scientific Societies in the Eighteenth Century*, New York, 1985. My current interest in institutions focuses on collecting and the production of identity through portraits, texts and artefacts. In medical contexts the links between portraiture, collections and history writing are especially clear. It must be stressed, however, that, as noted in footnote 4, 'medical' is a fluid category, and many practitioners had well developed interests that were 'scientific'. I am deliberately not considering the issue of discipline- or speciality-formation here. Nor am I concerned with the collection of specimens that had a direct bearing on the content of scientific and medical work.

¹⁰ Labels in the National Portrait Gallery in London indicate the sitters' occupations and these are also given on the website. It was clear from the very beginning of the Gallery's existence that the main criterion for inclusion was distinction in an occupation, members of the Royal family being a notable exception. That so many institutions possess portrait collections reinforces the close links between work, portraiture and professional associations. Portraits of patrons are also commonly collected. See *Physicians*, pp. 70-73 (on King Edward VII) and on portraits connected with science and medicine more generally, Ludmilla Jordanova, *Defining Features: Medical and Scientific Portraits 1660-2000*, London, 2000. Introductions to the genre of portraiture include Richard Brilliant, *Portraiture*, London, 1991; Joanna Woodall, ed, *Portraiture: Facing the Subject*, Manchester and New York, 1997, and Shearer West, *Portraiture*, Oxford and New York, 2004.

¹¹ Eighteenth-century magazines, for example, included small portraits above a short biography. There are many examples of these in the Wellcome Collection, the National Portrait Gallery and the Royal College of Physicians print collection, for which there is a printed catalogue by A.H.Driver, *Catalogue of Engraved Portraits in the Royal College of Physicians of London*, London, 1952. In this lecture I discuss two important publications, where biographies and portraits were closely related, assembled by Thomas Birch and Thomas Joseph Pettigrew. Pettigrew's biographies and portraits list institutional affiliations, for example, when medical practitioners were also Fellows of the Royal Society. In this way readers apprehended key components of identity as an ensemble. It is desirable to strike a balance between exploring overlapping memberships between institutions, while retaining a sense of each one's defining characteristics.

¹² Thomas Birch, *The Heads of Illustrious Persons of Great Britain*, London, 1743 on. On Thomas Birch, see the entry by David Philip Miller in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (hereafter *ODNB*), and A.E. Gunther, *An Introduction to the Life of the Rev. Thomas Birch.*, Halesworth, Suffolk, 1984, esp. chapter 5. I consulted the 18th century editions of *Heads* in Cambridge University Library, and the early nineteenth century one, London, 1813, in Durham University Library's Special Collections.

¹³ Birch did not always provide owners' names, but did so sufficiently frequently that a sense of ownership and collections could be built up. The example of Richard Mead, with whom he was friendly, is telling - see Gunther, *An Introduction*, chapter 3; my 'People, Portraits and Things: Richard Mead and Medical Identity' *History of Science*, 61, 2003, 293-313 and Craig Hanson, *The English Virtuoso: Art, Medicine and Antiquarianism in the Age of Empiricism*, Chicago and London, 2009, chapter 5. In *All Scientists Now: the Royal Society in the Nineteenth Century*, Cambridge and New York, 1984, Marie Boas Hall notes the high proportion of medical men who were Fellows, pp.44-5.

¹⁴ I do not mean to suggest that institutions are unselective. On the contrary, many are quite precise in the present day about which categories of artefact they acquire and have shed those from earlier periods that no longer fit. I note that at the Royal College of Physicians there is a strong interest not only in accepting gifts from their Presidents and from families of Fellows, for example, but in adding to the collections items that complement existing ones, or fill in gaps - portraits of significant figures that might not otherwise be represented, for instance. Richard Thompson, *Curiosities*. provides examples of objects acquired recently whether by donation or purchase: see, pp.76-7 on an inkstand, which had been given to Matthew Baillie by Queen Charlotte, and pp.108-9 for a lectern given by Carol Black, who was President 2002-6, the second woman to hold the position.

¹⁵ Hahn, *Anatomy*, p.ix.

¹⁶ Babbage, *Reflections*, [Charles Lyell], 'Scientific Institutions', *Quarterly Review*, June 1826, 153-179. On Lyell there is Morrell, *Science...*, article XII,, where he offers 'some general observations on London scientific institutions ... and... analyse[s] Lyell's varying allegiances to them in terms of his ambitions concerning the shape and direction of his career' p. 132. On this period see Jon Klancher, *Transfiguring the Arts and Sciences: Knowledge and Cultural Institutions in the Romantic Age*, Cambridge and New York, 2013, especially chapter 5.

¹⁷ On Munk, see the entry by Norman Moore and Patrick Wallis in the *ODNB*. And also, of course, the entry on him in *Munk's Roll*. He wrote biographies of two Presidents of the College: *A Memoir of the Life and Writings of John Ayrton Paris*, London, 1857; *The Life of Sir Henry Halford, bart.,...*, London, 1895. His other publications include an edition of *The Gold-Headed Cane*, London, 1884, a book in the voice of an iconic object in the collections of the College, and the short, privately-printed pamphlet *A Brief Account of the Circumstances Leading to and Attending the Reintombment of the Remains of Dr. William Harvey the Discoverer of the Circulation of the Blood in the Church of Hempstead in Essex on the 18th of October 1883*, London, 1883, both of which speak to history and forms of portrayal.

¹⁸ Collier's portrait of Munk is in the College's collections, see *Physicians*, p. 22, it shows him with the three volumes of the second edition of his *Roll*. See the ArtUK website for other works by Collier in public collections and for all the paintings in the Royal College of Physicians. There are 13 canvases by and some prints after Collier in the National Portrait Gallery and a short entry by Jill Springall on him in the *ODNB*.

¹⁹ The preface is at the beginning of volume one - the preliminary pages are not numbered - it is reproduced in *Physicians*, p. 98.

²⁰ For example, 'Visualizing Identity' pp. 135-46.

²¹ On Geoffrey Keynes, see the entry by David McKitterick and Stephen Lock in *ODNB* and his autobiography, *Gates of Memory*, Oxford and New York, 1983, especially chapter 24. See also Geoffrey Keynes, *The Life of William Harvey*, Oxford, 1966 and *The Portraiture of William Harvey*, London, 1949

²² Mead commissioned the bust from Peter Scheemakers and presented it to the College in 1739 - illustrated on p.38 of *Physicians*. The original portrait came into the hands of William Hunter and is now part of the Hunterian Collections, Glasgow. On Hunter's collections see E. Geoffrey Hancock, Nick Pearce and Mungo Campbell, eds, *William Hunter's World: the Art and Science of Eighteenth-century Collecting*, Farnham, Surrey, 2015

²³ The Science Museum in London has recently purchased what is often referred to as 'Tim Peake's spacecraft'. He shared it with two other astronauts, and it did not, of course, belong to him. The English astronaut has become a popular hero, especially with school children. The Soyuz capsule is undertaking a UK tour in 2017-18 and is eliciting widespread interest. In the UK, history's 'establishment body' is the Royal Historical Society, which celebrates its 150th anniversary in 2018. The National Portrait Gallery in London possesses a painting depicting the *Historians of Past and Present*, 1999, by Stephen Farthing (NPG 6518). *Past and Present* is an illustrious journal, although it would be a mistake to treat it as simply representing history's 'establishment'.

²⁴ For an introduction to the National Portrait Gallery in London, founded 1856, see Charles Saumarez-Smith, *The National Portrait Gallery*, London, 1997, and David Cannadine, *National Portrait Gallery: A Brief History*, London, 2007 and the Gallery's excellent website, which contains a great deal of material for researchers.

²⁵ Thomas Pettigrew, *Medical Portrait Gallery*, London, 1838-40, 4 volumes, volume I, Preface, p.6. Each section of the publication is numbered separately. Note that he included living figures and justified his decision in the Preface, where he emphasises that readers could bind the memoirs in any order they liked - they were not published in chronological order, for example. Taken together these memoirs were 'intended to give a complete portraiture of the Progress of Medical Science', Preface p.4. I consulted the copy in the National Library of Scotland.

²⁶ Pettigrew, *Medical*, p. 6; on the currency of the notion of a 'man of science', see Ruth Barton, 'Men of Science': Language, Identity and Professionalization in the Mid-Victorian Scientific Community' *History of Science*, 41, 2003, 73-199.

²⁷ Pettigrew took great pains throughout the work to show how medical men undertook scientific research. The point is particularly noticeable in his 24-page biography of Thomas Young in volume IV. He concedes on p. 9 that Young 'was not a popular physician', and emphasises his polymathic accomplishments, research and writings, rather than clinical acumen .

²⁸ I discuss Harvey in 'Visualizing Identity', pp. 146-54 and in Baretta et al eds, *Savant Relics*, pp. 166-171.

²⁹ There is material in the Archives at Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, where Harvey was a student, about the commemoration of his matriculation in 1893 and other ways in which he was celebrated. My thanks to the Master and Fellows for permission to view these materials. For example, we find Huxley, speaking at the dinner in 1893, Adrian Desmond, *Huxley: From Devil's Disciple to Evolution's High Priest*, London, 1998, p.600. For Huxley's interest in Harvey as a support for vivisection and correct scientific method see pp.487, 503 and 717, footnote 18. Note I am citing here the one-volume edition of Desmond's book, first published in two volumes in 1994 and 1997 respectively.

³⁰ Robert Hannah, *William Harvey Demonstrating to Charles I the Circulation of the Blood from the Heart of a Deer*, is now in the collections of the Royal College of Physicians in London. Hannah also painted Newton and the proverbial apple tree; this painting is in the Royal Institution, London. The Oxford statue stands in its original place, and the museum is open to the public free of charge. The current website stresses contemporary science and outreach. A list of the statues is available on the Statues Hither & Thither part of vanderkrogt.net site, under Oxford, and Parks Road, where the museum is situated, and the museum's own site: www.oum.ox.ac.uk/learning/htmls/statues.htm.

³¹ The pamphlet is at www.oum.ox.ac.uk/learning/htmls/statues.htm and its format follows a familiar path, with a photograph of the 'portrait', and a short biography beneath it. The phrase 'cathedral of science' is used on the site in the section on statues and in 'Learning more ... about the Museum', that about inspiration is also in the section on statues. Cf Susan Sheets-Pyenson, *Cathedrals of Science: The Development of Colonial Natural History Museums during the Late Nineteenth Century*, Kingston, Ont., 1988; Patrick Coffey, *Cathedrals of Science: The Personalities and Rivalries That Made Modern Chemistry*, London, 2008.

³² Information on the architecture may found in Jennifer Sherwood and Nikolaus Pevsner, *Oxfordshire*, New Haven and London, 2002, first published 1974, pp. 280-282 and on the museum's website in the section on learning, which includes a number of relevant pdfs.

³³ Sherwood and Pevsner, *Oxfordshire*, pp.,254-5, discusses the building, but does not indicate when the windows were inserted; the current Director of the Museum believes it was in the early twentieth century. My thanks to Dr. Silke Ackermann for her comments on this.

³⁴ A good example of the power of a simple name may be found in a watercolour in the Wellcome Library: 'Edward Jenner's surname made out of letters representing Aesculapius sending Hygieia to the four corners of the globe to disseminate Jenner's discovery. Painting by Miss Paytherus.' Ca 1820. Library Reference Number ICV No 19347.

³⁵ For example, George Zobel and William Walker, 'Men of Science Living in 1807-8', engraving, 1862, and Hughes & Edmonds publishers, 'Scientists', albumen print, 1876; both are in the collections of National Portrait Gallery, London. On William Walker's print, see Christine MacLeod, *Heroes of Invention: Technology, Liberalism and British Identity*, Cambridge and New York, 2007, pp.225-9.

³⁶ For example, Raymond Piper, 'Comitia', 1968 at the Royal College of Physicians, London; Henry Jamyn Brooks, 'Council of the College, 1884-5' and Jane Allison, 'The Court of Examiners, 2000' both at the Royal College of Surgeons, London and viewable on the ArtUK website.

³⁷ There are, of course, some very successful examples of group portraiture, and not only in seventeenth-century Holland. For this issue in the nineteenth century, see Bridget Alsdorf's compelling book *Fellow Men: Fantin-Latour and the Problem of the Group in Nineteenth-Century French Painting*, Princeton, 2013, which reinforces my conviction that comparing occupations could be very fruitful. Most of her examples concern writers and artists depicted in groups. On groups in relation to medicine, see Keren Hammerschlag, 'The Gentleman Artist-Surgeon in Late Victorian Group Portraiture', *Visual Culture in Britain*, 14, 2013, 154-178. On seventeenth-century Dutch groups see Ann Jensen Adams, *Public Faces and Private Identities in Seventeenth-Century Holland: Portraiture and the Production of Community*, Cambridge and New York, 2009, especially chapter 5. For an overview of Dutch art, which contains many examples of group portraits see Bob Haak, *The Golden Age: Dutch Painters of the Seventeenth Century*, London, 1984, pp. 104-115; 195-7; 230-3; 234; 274-5; 287; 290-6; 312; 377-9; 397-8; 400; 418-9; 456; 468-9, and especially pp.111-5 on anatomy lessons. The classic work is Alois Riegl, *The Group Portraiture of Holland*, Los Angeles, 1999, first published 1902. Another category of group portraiture is the conversation piece, see Kate Retford, *The Conversation Piece: Making Modern Art in Eighteenth-Century Britain*, New Haven and London, 2017; although many depict families, they also commemorate friendships, shared interests and occupations, see chapter 5.

³⁸ See the entry on Moran in *ODNB* by R.R.H. Lovell and his book length study *Churchill's Doctor. A Biography of Lord Moran*, London and New York, 1992, and also Moran's own books *The Anatomy of Courage*, London, 2007, first published in 1945 and his memoirs of Churchill, available in many different editions, first published in 1966. See *Physicians*, pp. 91-94 for more details on the portrait.

³⁹ See note 38 above, and Pietro Annigoni, *An Artist's Life as told to Robert Wraight*, London, 1977; also Charles Richard Camell, *Memoirs of Annigoni*, London, 1956.

⁴⁰ The phrase 'lady president' comes from Margaret Turner-Warwick herself, see her memoir *Living Medicine: Recollections and Reflections*, London, 2005, which recounts the process by which she was elected, see chapter 14, especially pp.141-142. The following chapter about her work as President is entitled 'A lady President after 472 years...'. P. 179 reproduces her portrait by Jeff Stultiens, for which no date is given and was presumably a personal commission - he painted the official portrait of the second female President Carol Black, see *Physicians*, pp. 82-3.

⁴¹ There is evidence in the archives that Carol Black exercised considerable agency over her portrait in a type-written account of a conversation between her and a curator. My assumption is that Margaret Turner-Warwick also did so, but I have seen no supporting documents.

⁴² Dorothy Hare by Fred Wicker, c. 1955. The National Portrait Gallery takes an admirably adventurous approach to its commissions. See for example the celebrated portrait of Dorothy Hodgkin ('chemist and crystallographer') by Maggie Hambling, 1985, NPG 5797. Hambling is a major artist, with an innovative approach to portraiture. Another example is Marc Quinn's 'portrait' of John Sulston, 2001, NPG 6591, 'geneticist'. Here I have provided the occupational descriptions from the NPG website.

⁴³ The *ODNB* and NPG have worked together, and most of their occupational designations are now closely aligned, but at other times they are different. Thomas Young, for example is a 'physician and natural philosopher' in *ODNB*, but 'physician, physicist and Egyptologist' according to the NPG. I find the latter anachronistic. The naming of occupations is a complex area, to which practitioners have long been sensitive. See note 42 above. And on Thomas Young note 27 above.

⁴⁴ NPG 5115. My account draws on the material in the Registered Packet for this portrait in the Heinz Archive at the National Portrait Gallery.

⁴⁵ See *Physicians*, p.50 and Alex Sakula, *The Portraiture of Sir Williams Osler*, London and New York, 1991, p.32 on the overcoat. Details relating to the Harvey portrait are in the Registered Packet noted above.

⁴⁶ Hahn, *Anatomy*, p. 318.

STS Occasional Papers

1 **Joe Cain** No Ordinary Space: A Brief History of the Grant Museum's New Home at University College London. 2011.

2 **Simon Schaffer** Mutability, Mobility and Meteorites: on Some Material Culture of the Sciences. 2014.

3 **Hsiang-Fu Huang** Ouranologia: an Annotated Edition of a Lenten Lecture on Astronomy with Critical Introduction. 2015.

4 **Helen Longino** Underdetermination: a Dirty Little Secret? 2016.

5 **Maja Horst** Reframing Science Communication: Culture, Identity and Organisations. 2016

6 **Ludmilla Jordanova** Institutions, Identities and Historical Practices in Science and Medicine. 2018



