

DENTAL HISTORIAN



Number 24

May 1993

DENTAL HISTORIAN

NUMBER 24

May 1993

CONTENTS

Officials of the Lindsay Society, 1992-93	2
From the Chair	3
The reputability of sixteenth and seventeenth century toothdrawers <i>A.S.Hargreaves</i>	5
Leeds Dental School: conception to birth <i>Alan Stanley</i>	11
Some German dental practitioners of the 1790s <i>Peter Schröck-Schmidt and Curt Gerhard Lorber</i>	19

LINDSAY SOCIETY FOR THE HISTORY OF DENTISTRY

OFFICIALS 1992-93

Hon.Chairman	A.S.Hargreaves Department of Restorative Dentistry Dental School Framlington Place Newcastle upon Tyne NE2 4BW
Hon.Secretary (till Dec 1992)	Julia Marsh BDA Museum 64 Wimpole St London W1M 8AL
Hon.Treasurer	Christine Hillam 6 Brancote Road Oxton Birkenhead Merseyside L43 6TJ
Committee	R.J.Anderson G.Barnes R.C.Fereday

Membership eligibility

In Britain: members of the British Dental Association, dental students and other interested persons not dentally qualified.

Overseas: all dental practitioners and other interested persons not dentally qualified.

Subscriptions

£6 pa payable in sterling to the Hon.Treasurer in October. Free to student members of the BDA.

Dental Historian

Free to members. £2.50 per issue to non-members, available from the Hon.Secretary.

FROM THE CHAIR

Members of the Lindsay Society will have been saddened to learn of the death of Archie Donaldson on 20 February, a founder member of the Lindsay Club (as it was entitled initially) in 1962, and a staunch supporter of all aspects of study into dental history. His encyclopaedic knowledge of dental artefacts, techniques and bibliography will be sorely missed. Our sympathies are extended to his daughters and other members of the family in their bereavement. A fuller appreciation of his work will be published in a later issue of the *Dental Historian*.

Members will also be aware that Julia Marsh has resigned her posts as Hon.Secretary of the Society and as Editor of the *Dental Historian* on her appointment to the Victoria and Albert Museum. We wish her well in her new post, and would like to thank her for all her hard work for the Society over the last few years. Contributions for the *Dental Historian* are always needed, but for the immediate future submissions should be directed to the Chairman in the first instance.

The summer meeting of the Society will be incorporated as usual into the BDA Conference, which this year is to be held at Bournemouth. As 1993 is the bicentenary of the death of John Hunter, we are pleased to welcome as our speaker Sir David Mason, President of the General Dental Council, whose presentation is entitled "John Hunter: his origins and his influence". This will take place on Saturday 3 July in the Stour Room of the Bournemouth International Centre (1st floor); coffee will be available from 11.15am onwards at the back of the room, before the paper at 11.30am. This should be an excellent meeting and I look forward to welcoming as many members of the Society and their guests as possible. Members attending this meeting only do not have to pay the registration fee for the whole conference.

The next Annual General Meeting will be held on Wednesday, 10 Nov 1993, at Wimpole Street, when a new Chairman and Secretary must be elected. Nominations to the Chairman or members of the Committee for both posts, please, in good time. The AGM will be followed by a paper on the early years of the Racquet Court practice (established in 1702 by John Watts as the first wholly-dental practice), presented by the outgoing Chairman.

ASH

THE REPUTABILITY OF SIXTEENTH AND SEVENTEENTH CENTURY TOOTHDRAWERS

A.S.Hargreaves *

The popular image of the itinerant toothdrawer roving around the English countryside, in fancy dress at the markets and fairs, with a zany or merry-andrew at hand to help drum up trade and amuse the gawping, mocking crowd, is almost certainly a romanticized picture which draws heavily on sixteenth and seventeenth century European illustrations; it overlooks any satire or caricature, and is unable or unwilling to distinguish between those attempting to earn a reasonably honest living and the charlatans. The existence and flamboyance of the latter cannot be ignored, however, since their activities threatened the livelihood of the more responsible toothdrawers. Kindheart, an Elizabethan toothdrawer who frequented Bartholomew Fair, bewailed the "cousoning toothe drawers, that from place to place wander with banners full of horse teeth" who deprived him of his trade,¹ whilst an anonymous 17th-century commentator, attempting objectivity about the various medical services then available, declared:²

A Quack Doctor is one of the Epidemical Diseases of this age. Betwixt Ignorance and Impudence an Heterogenious jumble..... for his skill is not so much as a Tooth-drawers, and a Corn-cutter is an Aesculapius to him.

Although toothdrawers were frequently itinerant, many had a fairly settled base, either in the towns or the more populated rural areas, and could with some justification feel aggrieved by their feckless counterparts who lacked any

* Dr. A.S.Hargreaves is a lecturer in the Department of Restorative Dentistry, Dental School, University of Newcastle upon Tyne

1 H. Chettle, *Kind-Harts Dreame* (London, 1592).

2 Anon, 1676. Cited in C.J.S. Thompson, *The quacks of old London* (Bretano, London, 1928), 78.

fixed abode. Significantly, there is no mention of toothdrawers in the rogue literature of the Tudor and early Jacobean period, despite its mixture of fact and fiction; they may have been rough, tough and itinerant, but they were not vagrants, vagabonds or criminals, though a few vagrants are known to have pretended to be toothdrawers and surgeons.

Some early commentators have not always been fully aware of the danger of making assumptions about clinical standards based on the nature of the surviving evidence about an individual. If a particular toothdrawer is known today only because of the record of a court appearance for unruly behaviour or antisocial activity, this may lead to an imbalanced perception, however unwitting, of his clinical responsibility or skill. David Tothedrawer had appeared before the wardmote in January 1422 as a result of activities suggesting that he must have been a menace to the opposite sex,³ while John Page of New Wyndesore had sought protection against the toothdrawer John White earlier in 1409.⁴ Samuel Robbes of Hadley (who with others assaulted "one of His Majesty's officers within His Highnes' Chase at Enfield" in 1610),⁵ may be strongly reminiscent of some of his mediaeval forebears, yet it must be remembered that Matthew Flynt, in 1400, was not only aggressive but sufficiently capable to be awarded a salary from the royal coffers,⁶ albeit for only a short period.

There is, moreover, some surviving evidence which indicates that a few Tudor toothdrawers were highly skilled and respected in their craft, despite crude instrumentation, a relative lack of anaesthesia and poor control of infection. Kindheart, active in mid-Elizabethan London, was almost certainly a specific and highly-regarded individual, even though most of the surviving references to him are literary.⁷

The well-respected toothdrawer, John Brycket, is known rather through his association with the London Company of Barber-Surgeons, which was far from being a closed shop, having been prepared to admit men from other trades to the freedom of the Company since 1503. It is not wholly surprising,

therefore, that on 10 September 1551 their Court minutes noted:⁸

Also the sayd M[aste]r and wardens hathe admytted John Brycket toothe drawer for a brother into this house, and he to paye thre wekes after Crystemas & xxs for hys admyttance, Besyde quartrage, orelles Mr Holland to paye the same for him.

George Holland had been Master in 1543 and 1549, and was to hold the office again in 1556. If he had been prepared to pay the initial dues for Brycket, then the toothdrawer's skills must have prompted considerable respect from his contemporaries. Brycket enjoyed the privilege of Company membership only for a few years, since he died in mid-February 1555; the Court's later records of 1557 include a reference to his widow (who had by then remarried).

Brycket must have been making a competent living, as witnessed by the fact that he had sufficient estate (in this case two houses and a gatehouse) to justify making a will.⁹ This property was primarily left to his well-beloved wife Katheryn, but after her decease his main residence was to pass to his daughter Joan so that six sacks of charcoal could be given each Easter to the poor of his parish of St. Botolph without Bishopsgate, "so longe as the worlde shall endure". The second house plus gatehouse was to pass to Raffe Wilkes, his son-in-law, for the guaranteed provision of a further six sacks. All his goods and chattels, moveable and unmoveable, were bequeathed to his wife, to meet his burial expenses and for prayers for his soul.

Somewhat less skilled than John Brycket was a fellow-parishioner, William Tomlyn, whose first encounter with the Barber-Surgeons' Court must have been dispiriting, to say the least, although matters were to improve for him. At the beginning of October 1557, the Court met in force to examine two individuals, and found against them:¹⁰

M[emorandum]. It is Condescended and Agreed the vth daye of october, before M[aste]r Thomas Vycary, wth hys wardens Thomas Whyttingam, James Wodd and John Warren, and by thassystantes of the howse, a[d]j[uto]r holland, M^r Green, a^j Sprygnell, Maister Wryte, Robert Brownell, Wylliam greene, John Smythe, Alexsander Mason, hewgh Lymcocke, Richard Tholmod, John Aucytr.. [?Awcetter] John Smarthwayghte, William Walton, Thomas Bailye, and Robert

3 A.H. Thomas, ed., *Cal Plea and Memoranda Rolls 1413-37* (CUP, 1943), 122.

4 *Cal Close Rolls Hen IV, 1409-13*; 64.

5 W.J. Hardy and W. Le Hardy, *Middlesex County Records Reports, 1902 to 1928* (Miller, London, 1928), 169.

6 *Cal Close Rolls Rich II, 1396-99*, 70-1; *Cal Patent Rolls Hen IV, 1399-1401*, 255.

7 A.S. Hargreaves, "Kindheart the toothdrawer: individual or type?", *Bull. Hist. Dent.*, 40(1992), 13-18.

8 Guildhall MS 5257/1, f3d.

9 Guildhall MS 9171/13, f56.

10 Guildhall MS 5257/1, f33r. Of the 15 men of the Court of Assistants, 3 had already served as Master (Holland, George Green and Sprygnell) and 7 were to serve as Master in future years (Whittingham, Wood, Brownhill, William Green, Mason, Tholmwood and Mudesley).

mudsey, That [blank] dawson Late the wyfe of Brycket Toothe drawer shall paye no quartryge to the hawle nor hange oute any sygne or clothe wth teethe as she hearetofore hath don. And also forder that Wyll[iam] Tomlyn tothe drawer shall do in like maner and not otherwyse.

The marginal summary for this entry notes firmly that "nether to be admytted brethren of this howse", but an entry in the minutes the following month shows some partial relentment by the Court:¹¹

The Same Daye, beyng the xxijth Daye of November, here was before the aj[uto]r and gov[er]nors Wylliam Thomlyn, toothe drawer, dwelling whoute Bisshoppes gate, and he had Lycence, to for to Draw teethe, and to make Cleane teethe, and no more, and he ys so admytted A brother in to thys howse, but not yet sworne, and he hathe payde .x^s. and rest other ten shyllinges he wyll brynge in as sowne as he can.

The marginal summary confirms his licence "to worck", but with the rider that he was "not to sett oute no sygne". Such careful specification of his permitted sphere of treatment implies that he was not of the clinical stature of Brycket, nor could he have been as financially secure, since he was unable to pay the required fee in a lump sum. The poverty of some toothdrawers was clearly not merely a mediaeval phenomenon.

After the Black Death of 1348-9 the reduction in population was such that women had been welcomed into many trades and occupations. The guilds of Barber-Surgeons, in other towns and cities as well as London, admitted men and women on equal terms, although the latter did not wear the livery on formal occasions. Women could enter either by apprenticeship or, sometimes, by inheritance from a father who was a member; they could also take apprentices. Amongst the earliest of the ordinances of the York Barber-Surgeons, the right of women to practise was laid out quite clearly,¹² but, as population levels slowly increased and then expanded more rapidly in the 16th century, attitudes towards women became ambivalent, for their skills were no longer so urgently required outside the immediate hearth and home. Added to any underlying fears of witchcraft, were elements of chauvinism and misogyny, Richard Whitlock being notoriously severe on *The Quacking Hermaphrodite, or Petticoat Practitioner, Stript and Whipt*.¹³

11 *ibid.* f35r.

12 *York Memorandum Book* (Surtees Society, 120(1912), 1-li and 209.

13 R. Whitlock, *Zootomia, or observations on the present manners of the English* (London, 1654), 55. This passage does not specifically state that women commonly practised as toothdrawers, as some earlier commentators have suggested. There were

Nay if a Beggar would perhaps beg some thing for the Ach of his Teeth he shall have it, but nothing to set them a going. The fame of Curing them is greater, than of Comforting them, with Food, and that is the very principle of their Charity, of these liberall Shee-doctors ...

We have already seen that two years after the demise of John Brycket in February 1555, his widow was ordered by the Barber-Surgeons' Company to "paye no quartryge to the hawle nor hange out any sygne or clothe wth teethe as she hearetofore hath don". This entry has not infrequently been interpreted from a chauvinistic viewpoint, but it may not necessarily have been illiberal. Mrs. Brycket had obviously been carrying on her late husband's trade; such a practice was frequently permitted during widowhood, although the ordinances and regulations of the Company carry no specific reference to the topic nor to what was permitted on remarriage (particularly if the new husband belonged to a different livery company or trade). Such a practice was probably enshrined in ancient custom and never written down. Nor is there any evidence of whether widows practising their former husbands' trades were themselves licensed.

By 1557 Widow Brycket had become Mistris Hew Dawson (?Hugh Dawson, "citezen and cooke of London", d.1577), but the issue may not be simply a marital one, which might have obliged her to forfeit her own right to continue her toothdrawing activities. The same entry in the Court minutes was concerned also with William Tomlyn. Although he was later admitted to the Company, it is clear that his clinical skills were somewhat limited. This would suggest that the Court's main concern on this occasion was with expertise, rather than with whether both parties were actually licensed or not. All secondary source references to Mistris Dawson appear to be unaware of, or to ignore, both the inclusion of William Tomlyn in the same Court proceedings and general livery company practices. The taking in isolation of the ruling against her by an all-male Court may, therefore, explain the chauvinistic bias that has been noted in some commentaries. The complete entry, with its further reference to William Tomlyn, enables an alternative interpretation to be offered that may better reflect the circumstances.

Whilst permission to practise medicine and surgery had long been in the hands of the bishops (following the Henrician ruling of 1512),¹⁴ the Company of Barber-Surgeons had reached an agreement with the Bishop of London that he would not issue his episcopal licence for surgical practice until the Company had confirmed the candidate's training and clinical ability. By the close of the

ways of treating toothache other than by extraction.

14 3 Hen VIII, cap XI. *An Act concerning Phesicians and Surgeons.*

sixteenth century, however, there were signs that this arrangement was being honoured more in the breach than in the observance, to the annoyance of the Company. The last individual to be considered here appears to have become entrapped in the ensuing acrimony.

It was in vain that Leonard Smith protested to the Company on 26 January 1629/30 that "Edward Whiteing of Holbone Peter Heyband of Norwich John Smith surgion Low contryes one Hedlow Whitechappell were witnesses to the Bisshopp" for his approbation.¹⁵ The Company still ordered him to forbear his surgical practice and firmly recorded him in their Court minutes as "tooth-drawer". The detailed names of his supporters lend some verisimilitude to his claims that he really had been licensed, but since no such licence has been traced, it must remain conjectural whether this had been as "toothdrawer" or as "surgeon", and hence who was in the wrong, he or the Company.

The picture is further complicated for the historian by the problems of title that can occur when examining so fluid and competitive a health-for-sale medical market. The "theoretical" physicians had long regarded themselves as superior to the "manual" surgeons, but the latter in their turn were equally contemptuous of those with more limited skills, such as the phlebotomists and the toothdrawers. William Clowes, the Tudor surgeon, was justly scathing of the upstart "runnagates" and "apple-squires" who claimed to be surgeons but who melted away like snow when called upon for clinical duties in the army or navy;¹⁶ but then he tended to regard all non-trained men as quacks, pejoratively dismissing them as "toothdrawers" even in non-dental contexts.¹⁷

Not all toothdrawers were guilty of self-aggrandisement, but when there is little surviving evidence about a particular individual, it may become difficult to categorize as precisely as is desirable. Leonard Smith, therefore, must retain his ambiguity and hence his reputability.

LEEDS DENTAL SCHOOL: CONCEPTION TO BIRTH[†]

Alan Stanley *

INTRODUCTION

The year 1880 may be said to have seen the conception of the Leeds Dental School. Its birth occurred on 27 July 1905. The twenty-five year gestation period was a time of great importance for the dental profession, for the city of Leeds and for society generally. By combining an examination of the wider social background with the particular events which led to the opening of the School, this paper is an attempt at a social history seen through the eyes of a dental historian.

THE SOCIAL BACKGROUND

The City of Leeds

In the years around the founding of its dental school, Leeds was a self-confident and prosperous place. In 1870 it was the largest provincial town in terms of area and fourth as regards population. In 1893 it was granted the title of City and four years later Letters Patent ordered that the Chief Magistrate should be styled the Lord Mayor of Leeds. Trade at the turn of the century was described by the Chamber of Commerce as "exceptionally good". In the country as a whole, the period 1870-90 was a difficult time. However, Leeds managed to retain its prosperity by a wide diversification in its trade.

Civic pride was reflected in the success of its triennial music festival and in the opening of the Central and Reference Libraries in 1871-2 and the Art Gallery in 1888. A number of secondary schools were instituted towards the

15 Guildhall MS 5257/5, 104. The order was reiterated on 19 April 1630.

16 W. Clowes, *A Brief and Necessarie Treatise, touching the cure of the disease called Morbus Gallicus, or Lues Venerea* (London, 1588: Epistle to the reader).

17 *ibid.* A *Prooued Practise* ..., 93-96.

[†] paper read to the Lindsay Society for the History of Dentistry 11 February 1993

* Alan Stanley is a General Dental Practitioner and Postgraduate Research Student in Dental History at the Leeds Dental Institute

end of the century. The Yorkshire College, which began as a college of the Victoria University in 1874, became the University of Leeds in 1904.

The upper and middle classes of Leeds were a stable and self-assured group. Their moral values were influenced significantly by Christian teaching. Although the churches were by no means full, religious observance was much more evident among these classes than among working people. Many Victorian civic and business leaders were committed Christians, as was at least one major figure in the story of the Dental School. This religious basis underlying the formation of the ethical and moral frames of reference of the professional class cannot be ignored. Less easy to evaluate, but undoubtedly also of significance, is the influence of Freemasonry upon those who were in positions of authority in the medical and dental establishments of the city.

Leeds was not without its poor slum dwellers. The city authorities made good use of the Housing of the Working Classes Act 1890 to clear some sixty-seven acres. By the end of the century the poor had satisfied the lowest level of expectations and were able to give some attention to their dental needs. This is of importance, for a person's response to illness is influenced by a number of factors. Rates of uptake of treatment are determined less by its availability and cost than by competition from other more pressing needs, such as that for food. The Leeds poor had enough of their more basic needs met by the time the School opened to seek dental treatment in large numbers.

Society and the dental profession

The Leeds dentists who founded the school were products of both their professional and social backgrounds. Socially, late Victorian and Edwardian England saw an almost revolutionary change in the rôle of the State. The traditional *laissez-faire* attitude of government gave way to an interventionist approach. Social legislation abounded. The Edwardians inhabited an era of change. In Victorian times poverty and social distress were generally felt to be inevitable. Now it was coming to be believed that the nation should take steps to assist its most helpless members. By 1904 the Leeds dentists believed this very strongly.

They also knew that the 1878 Dentists Act may have created a profession, but it was proving next to useless in protecting its boundaries. There was no requirement to register and the qualified men needed to band together to fight against the unqualified practitioner. This assault was waged on two fronts — treatment provision and training leading to qualification. The united efforts of the qualified Leeds dentists to promote these two issues was arguably the single most important factor in the birth of the Leeds Dental School.

THE DENTAL SCHOOL

First moves

T.S.Carter, LDS, was appointed Honorary Dental Surgeon to the Leeds Infirmary in February 1881. At the Annual Meeting of the Trustees of the Leeds Public Dispensary held on 11 August 1881 it was decided to appoint a Dental Surgeon to that institution also. An advertisement in the local press produced only one response. G.A.C.Benham, LDS, was elected to the position of Honorary Dental Surgeon at a Special Meeting of the Dispensary trustees on 19 November. These two men thus became the first holders of public dental office in Leeds.

From the inception of the posts, the training of dental students was in the minds of both the Infirmary Board and the Leeds School of Medicine. Discussions within these bodies on the introduction of a dental course had to be postponed because of the difficulty of providing sufficient facilities for practical chemistry. In March 1882 two members of the Council of the Leeds School of Medicine reported on a meeting they had attended with Carter concerning the institution of a dental course in connection with the School. The Council thereupon formed a small committee which, after a thorough investigation of the possibilities, reported as follows in June:

This committee has held two meetings since the Council last met, at the latter of which they conferred with Mr W.H.Nicol, Vice President of the Midland Branch of the British Dental Association, and Mr T.S.Carter, Dental Surgeon to the Leeds Infirmary. The committee have obtained information from the R.C. of S. of London, from the Birmingham, Liverpool, Plymouth and Exeter Schools (having Dental Departments) and from the London School of Dental Surgery and Dental Hospital - also some most valuable advice and kind offers of assistance from Mr J.Smith of London, Hon.Sec.to the B.D.A. and dental representatives to the Middlesex Hospital.

This introduction to the report demonstrates that the Council of the School of Medicine took the proposal to establish a dental department very seriously. It also provides an insight into the spirit of co-operation between the medical and dental professions which was later to be of considerable importance. The difficulty this committee encountered was in the provision of practical and clinical training.

The dentists of Leeds were also becoming more aware of the value of establishing formal dental training in the town. The large numbers of cases treated at the Dispensary may have raised their awareness of the demand from the poor for treatment which was free and provided by a qualified man. The numbers may also have persuaded the dentists that being on the staff of a public institution would be beneficial to their own practices. In this they would be no

different from medical and dental practitioners across the country.

Benham died in 1884 and this time three men applied for the post. Competition was evidently keen. When the three attended upon the House Committee and Honorary Staff of the Dispensary they were invited to discuss between themselves to see whether two would withdraw so as to avoid the need for an election. None felt they wished to withdraw and so the election was held: F.Sherburn was elected with 52 votes to J.E.Greaves's 30; H.B.Hosey received no votes at all.

Prayer for a dental school

Towards the end of 1888 a committee of the dentists in the town presented a memorial to the Council of the Medical School praying for the establishment of a complete Dental Curriculum in connection with the Medical Department of the Yorkshire College. The Council had sympathy with the proposal but delayed their consideration as the same proposal was about to be discussed by the Medical Faculty of the Infirmary. Nevertheless, the dentists of Leeds had demonstrated their awareness of the need for establishing a formal dental training in the town.

George Brunton may be credited with initiating the final burst of activity which led to the decision to form the School of Dentistry. By 1900 still no progress had been made towards developing a dental curriculum with either the Medical School or the Infirmary. In that year the Annual General Meeting of the British Dental Association (B.D.A.), of which Brunton was President for the year, was held in Leeds. As part of his planning for the meeting, Brunton wrote to the Medical Department of the Yorkshire College asking whether delegates might look over the Medical School. His initiative in approaching the Medical School may have rekindled in the Board of the School an interest in dental education. Board members resolved to establish a sub-committee to look into the possibility of a Dental School in Leeds. This committee later reported that, after discussion with the Infirmary Faculty, it had been unanimously resolved to urge on the Dispensary Committee the setting up of a Dental Department in connection with that institution.

Near disaster

The Leeds dentists were also encouraged into action by Brunton. In his Presidential Address to the British Dental Association he reviewed the history of the discussions concerning the establishment of a Dental School in Leeds. He asked whether members could assist in any way in giving strength to the appeal of the Dispensary Faculty for formation of a dental department within the Dispensary. Brunton thus acted as a catalyst to a number of initiatives which had become inactive.

The interest of the Infirmary Faculty, the Medical School and the Leeds dentists co-incided with the consideration by the Faculty of the Dispensary of their need for a new building. At the General Meeting of the Dispensary held on October 18 1900 it was unanimously resolved

That the sub-committee charged with formulating the requirements of the Dispensary in their new building, are hereby instructed to include five rooms for the accommodation of a Dental Department.

Happily, the aspirations of all interested parties were of mutual benefit and, being focused on the new building, gave substance to a concept which can be said to have existed in embryo for as long as a quarter of a century.

Co-operation between the dentists and the Dispensary now became the key to successfully implementing the proposal. A large representative meeting of the dental profession practising in Leeds was held; from this a delegation met with the Dispensary Committee at 4 o'clock on Thursday 10 January 1901. The period of co-operation had begun.

The delegation of dentists consisted of Messrs Carter, Horden, Leigh, Margetson, Marston, Hey, Sherburn and Young. The Dispensary Chairman, Mr (later Sir) John Ward, informed the delegation that there had been considerable discussion in the Committee as to the formation of a Dental Institute in connection with the new Dispensary, and it had been decided to provide five rooms for the accommodation of a dental department.

Carter, speaking for the delegation, said he thought it would be a great boon to the poor of Leeds to have an institution where teeth can be conserved as well as drawn. He considered that Leeds should have a Dental Department including a Teaching Department for, without the latter, students would have to go to other, larger, towns to complete their qualifications.

Robert Levitt, a member of the Dispensary Committee and also a Trustee, said that he quite agreed with the educational advantages, but asked where the money was to come from. He considered that if the Dispensary established a Dental Department for poor people to have advice, extractions and some simple stoppings it would meet all the necessities of a Charitable Institution. He was not in favour of establishing an Educational department which would entail the Dispensary in vast expense, which, in his view, would be difficult, if not impossible, to meet. He thought the Leeds Infirmary was the proper place to establish a Dental School. Levitt was later to press his views to the point where they nearly caused the whole scheme to be postponed.

However, the Dispensary Committee held a competition for the design of the New Dispensary and the winning plans included room for the dental department. By February of 1902 the estimated cost was presented to the Dispensary Committee. This was £17,000 as opposed to the £12,000 the

Committee desired. Levitt proposed asking the architect what the cost would be if the Dental Department were left out. The Committee held a Special Meeting on 27 February 1902 to consider a resolution to omit the Dental Department from the New Building in the form in which it was shown on the plans.

This resolution was moved by Levitt but vigorously opposed by the medical and surgical members of the committee. Dr Chadwick (who served on the Staff for nineteen years) said that he could not see how a dental department could be worked without an Educational department. Dr Griffith, speaking for the Faculty of the Dispensary, said they wanted a Dental Department to do for dentistry what Leeds Infirmary was doing for medicine and surgery.

Eventually it was agreed:

That the rooms for the so called "Dental Department" be proceeded with. But that this Department be not actually worked until funds be forthcoming for the sufficient support of this special department.

There, as far as the Dispensary Committee was concerned, the matter rested. The co-operation and active support of the medical profession had prevented the scheme falling at its first hurdle. The scheme had, however, lapsed into a state of suspension.

The rôle of the British Dental Association

It was now up to the Leeds dentists to see whether they could reactivate the aspirations of the many interested parties. The problem of the dental needs of the poor in Leeds was fully discussed at the meeting of the Leeds and District Section of the B.D.A. held on 17 November 1903. The President (Alfred Cocker) opened the discussion by reviewing the problem and suggesting that the Leeds members should form themselves into a committee "for the purpose of adopting a scheme whereby dental services can be rendered to the poor and needy of this growing city". After further discussion, the President called upon Percival T. Leigh who presented a lengthy paper entitled "Our Section, and its Possibilities". Towards the end of the paper, Leigh said that

for the last twenty years the formation of a Dental Institution for Leeds has been talked about, but nothing has been arranged. The Yorkshire College will provide lectures for us, the Infirmary has finally decided not to move on the matter, and the Leeds Dispensary, although ready to offer rooms, yet made it impossible for the dentists of Leeds to entertain the idea of working with them. We therefore have no one to help us but ourselves.

A committee consisting of T.S.Carter, Dr Gaddes, James Nicol, P.T.Leigh and R.L.Young was duly elected to establish a Provident Dental

Dispensary in Leeds.

The committee met, James Nicol acting as secretary, and wrote to the Dispensary to ask whether the Dispensary Committee would give the use of rooms for a Provident Dental Department if the dentists of Leeds could furnish, equip and staff the rooms at their own expense. Dental Education would be essential to the running of the department.

The Dental Department was on the agenda at the April 1904 meeting of the Dispensary Committee. An amendment was made to the resolution to proceed suggesting postponing the final decision on the Dental Department until after the formal opening of the New Dispensary. This amendment was lost by just one vote.

The New Dispensary building was formally opened on Thursday 12 May 1904. A meeting of the dentists evidently took place during May and this resulted in another meeting between the Dispensary and the dentists which set the department on the road to its being equipped and eventually opened on 27 July 1905.

It has been seen that the initiative for establishing the department which was to be the forerunner of the Leeds Dental School, although arising in a number of places at the same time, was driven to its conclusion by local dental practitioners. A number of the dentists involved were well-respected professional men in the city and it is reasonable to suppose that informal discussions with the medical men at the three institutions -- the Infirmary, the Dispensary and the Medical School -- contributed to the issue being addressed by these institutions at approximately the same time. The occurrence of the Annual General Meeting of the British Dental Association being held in Leeds in 1900 demonstrates the regard of the profession for George Brunton and through him for the ability of the Leeds dentists to stage such a prestigious event. This can only have had a powerful effect for good on the credibility and standing of those dentists who were seeking to progress the scheme for a dental school.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources : Minute Books of the Leeds Public Dispensary (West Yorkshire Archives, Leeds).

Minute Books of the Leeds School of Medicine (Leeds University Archives).

on the effusions and inflammation from which arise swelling and ulcers of the gums.⁴ He later moved to Berlin where he published in 1803 his *Practical description of all the operations of dentistry*⁵ and in 1822 his *Daily precautions to keep the teeth and gums always clean and healthy*. At the time of his death in 1830 he was the court dentist of Prussia.

In **Frankfurt am Main** the Chief Physician, Behrends, declared in 1797: "Among the surgeons here there are many who perform operations on the teeth excellently".

Jakob Meyer carried on a well-established and apparently lucrative branch practice in the city. He was born in 1735 in Herzogenbusch, the son of the surgeon Eustachius Meyer. In his youth he was a ship's doctor in the East Indies. During the Seven Years War he was an army surgeon, first in the service of Prussia and then of Polish Saxony. After 1760, he became a citizen of Hanau where he practised as a surgeon, but, as F. Schrodt relates, he came to specialise more and more in dentistry, writing several papers in this area. He was court dentist in Hessen-Kassel and in 1789 was also appointed as court dentist to the King of England and to the Elector of Braunschweig-Lüneburg. In 1793, Landgrave Ludwig X (later first Grand Duke of Hessen-Darmstadt), appointed Meyer Court Surgeon and subsequently Privy Councillor. According to Dagmar Pennrich he was one of the first dentists in Germany to carry out reimplantation of teeth, reporting four cases.⁶ He was active in Frankfurt after 1760 and died in 1795.

His son, Bernhard Meyer (born on 24 August 1767 in Hanau) studied medicine in Marburg and in 1790 graduated as a physician and surgeon. From 1791 he practised as a physician in Hanau. On 29 October 1796, the Prince of Isenburg-Birstein granted him protection and accommodation in Offenbach, but only as a dentist. Meyer had earlier applied (in March 1796) for a licence to practise dentistry in Frankfurt, being a Physician-in-Ordinary to the widow of the Landgrave of Hessen-Kassel. Apparently, he had already been introduced to dentistry by his father, for his petition begins with the words, "Many

4 J.J.J. Serre, *Abhandlung über die Flüsse und Entzündungen, von denen die Geschwulsten oder Zahnfleischgeschwüre herrühren ...* (Vienna, Leipzig, 1791).

5 J.J.J. Serre, *Praktische Darstellung aller Operationen der Zahnheilkunst* (Berlin, 1803).

6 D. Pennrich, *Ein Beitrag zur historischer Entwicklung der Zahnheilkunde und zahnärztlichen Versorgung in Bereich Hessen-Kassel in kurhessischer und in preussischer Zeit (1864-1933) mit historischem Rückblick* (doctoral thesis, Giessen, 1981).

respected and notable persons here have asked me to assist them with the knowledge I have acquired in operations on the teeth and in treating dental diseases." He pleads that his father already had the same licence and that he himself had gained exhaustive theoretical and practical knowledge. It seems that he intended to practise dentistry in Frankfurt to the same extent as did his father, for he requests permission to announce the day of his arrival and the place and length of his stay in the weekly newspaper. He was permitted to "help those who applied to him" but freedom to advertise in newspapers was refused. Meyer moved to Offenbach, which was to be a great advantage to his practice in Frankfurt. Soon afterwards he took over the "Swan" pharmacy in Offenbach. Because of his activities in many other scientific areas, his involvement in dentistry appears to have become very limited; it is not known whether Meyer continued his dental practice in Frankfurt after taking over the pharmacy in Offenbach. He died on 1 January 1836.

Johann Anton Dell was born on 21 May 1730, the son of an operator for the teeth in Erp, part of the electorate of Cologne. He was apprenticed to the herniotomist Johann Friedrich Zorn in Trier for three years, after which he practised his profession in the electorate of Fulda. In 1764 he petitioned for protection, being betrothed to the widow of a burgess of Frankfurt. His request was immediately granted, without recourse to the surgeons or the Health Board. The Board, it seems, had not realised that Dell had never passed an examination of any kind. After a number of demands from the Physicians, he agreed to be examined; his results were clearly very poor:

We have to report that we have conducted an examination of the so-called dentist Dell but that we found him to be such that it is our duty to bear witness, before God, your Highness and the Township, to the fact that we have never before seen anyone so defective in his knowledge both of the theory and of the practice of dentistry.

Although several aldermen supported the physicians in demanding Dell's expulsion and although he had no means of support, the Council nevertheless let him stay. All further demands by the physicians failed to bring about any change in the situation. Despite the fact that he was hampered for several years by severe illness, Dell succeeded in amassing a fortune of 2,400 florins. He died of phthisis on 21 December 1767, aged 67.

Johann Jakob Lackmann, born on 14 January 1745, the son of a goldsmith in Frankfurt, petitioned for a licence to practise dentistry in 1779. He had studied surgery and had already worked as a journeyman dentist for more than ten years. His request was turned down as out of order since he had just fathered an illegitimate child. Only on his second request, to which he added evidence of successful dental cures, was he granted a licence, with the

proviso that he "abstain from surgical operations". Lackmann signed the Burgess Roll on 3 May 1779. Advertisements informed the public of his abilities:

I practise according to the principles of John Hunter, Dentist and Surgeon Extraordinary to the King of England, and I fix complete pieces of four, six or more teeth firmly in the mouth.

According to an advertisement of 1786, he frequently treated the nobility, which may be seen as a proof of his efficiency and good name. Despite this, he laments the increasing number of rivals, calling them "hoodwinking knights in shining armour". He died in October 1813, aged 68, leaving no appreciable fortune behind him.

A later dentist, Johann Peter Frey, born on 24 January 1749 at Eichenbühl near Miltenberg, the son of a bondsman, was in Frankfurt for a while in 1786 and 1787 by permission of the Lord Mayor. He then made the acquaintance of Aldermen whom he found to be well disposed towards him. After his requests for residence were turned down, in 1789 he asked for and was granted leave to remain for three months. Later, he was given an extension of a further two months to carry out the aftercare needed following the operations he had performed in the mouth. From this resulted "a rather considerable increase in the number of his patients", whose treatment could, naturally, not be suddenly stopped. Therefore, in another petition he invoked the desire of his patients to keep him in Frankfurt. In a further application, his patients' imploring him not to leave was the sole grounds for his wish to remain. On his subsequent request for a six month extension of his residence permit, he was granted only two. However, he took matters in hand, fraternised once more with the Aldermen and was finally granted his further six months. He now had a considerable number of patients, an adequate income and met the qualifications for limited citizenship. He was subsequently appointed dentist at several courts. He is still listed as a dentist in Frankfurt in 1805 but is believed to have died elsewhere in 1806 or 1807.

Romeick⁷ states that Johann Beukin (the French dentist from the Brussels court) stayed in Erfurt, the original university town of the electorate of Mainz, on 23 July 1791. On 26 May 1792 there appeared the qualified and licensed operator and dentist J. Adolf Reuter from Münster. He recommended himself as one skilled at speedily removing broken down teeth and even fragments of roots and at scaling teeth of all concretions and filth. His dentifrice could keep the teeth continuously clean and his tooth-opiate rendered the gums firm and

reattached loose teeth. In addition, he offered a remedy against severe toothache. His artificial teeth could not be distinguished from natural ones and enabled the patient to eat with confidence.

Also present in Erfurt (24 November 1792) was the qualified and licensed dental surgeon J.C.F. Lippold from Ilmenau with written testimonials from professors and medical men. A Madame Lippold, also emanating from Ilmenau and most probably the wife of J.C.F. Lippold, visited the town on 28 May 1796. She returned on 4 June 1796 offering a smaller range of treatments but a larger assortment of unspecified articles for sale. Three years later (7 September 1799) the retired Weimar court dentist Alexander van Mäßen visited the town. He had been born in Liège and qualified at the Bavarian Palatine College of Medicine.

Further visitors to Erfurt were Lapiers (who stayed from 31 May 1800 until the Whitsuntide fair) and dentist and chiropodist Ludwig Manfroni (22 November 1800). This last practitioner had passed examinations at the main Royal Medical College of Braunschweig and trained with the Chief University and City Physician of Leipzig. He had with him for sale a range of articles far exceeding the dental.

Romeick also reports the presence in Erfurt of Joseph Hirsch, dentist to the ducal court of Weimar and to the principality of Brandenburg-Anspach. He was additionally licensed to practise in the imperial domains of Austria and had passed examinations in Strasbourg. It was on 6 December 1788 that he offered his services to the public of Erfurt.

The town was also visited by the far better known Friedrich Hirsch, (1750-1827)⁸ dentist to the ducal court of Saxe-Weimar and holder of other similar court appointments. On 13 December 1794, 5 December 1795 and 17 December 1796 he was practising from the principal hotel of the day in Erfurt, the "Roman Emperor". Born in Sensheim in Franken on 2 October 1753, Hirsch practised in southern Germany (chiefly in Stuttgart) and was court dentist in Weimar from 1791. In 1796 he was appointed dentist to the English and Hanoverian courts and appointed university dentist in Göttingen. In 1798, he stayed in Ilmenau, in 1799 at the courts of Lippe-Deimold and Oldenburg and in 1802 in Göttingen. From about this time (in 1804) he adopted the name "Hirschfeld". In 1812 he was appointed court dentist to the Duke of Anhalt-Bernburg but then fell ill with amaurosis.

Karl Schmidt was in Erfurt on 20 September 1794. Supposedly born in Berlin, he is also known to have visited the fair at Leipzig whilst dentist to the court of the Prince of Anhalt-Dessau. He is additionally found practising in

7 D. Romeick, *Die Erfurter Zahnärzte von 1587 bis 1967* (Erfurt, 1968).

8 also mentioned by W. Hoffmann-Axthelm, *History of dentistry* (Quintessence, Chicago, 1981), 233 *et seq.*, 273, 293.

Düsseldorf. Schmidt was a regular visitor to the Frankfurt fairs. On the occasion of one Easter fair, the Chief Physician, Pettmann, attested that

Mr. Schmidt has such good testimonials of his dexterity that I hope he will be allowed by the Lord Mayor to operate at this fair. I consider this would be very beneficial to the public and request that he be granted a longer stay.

Schmidt was consequently allowed to stay in Frankfurt am Main three further months "with the proviso that he is not a burden on the laudable charitable foundations". However, he was not able to exercise this privilege as he was called to Mainz where he had been appointed dentist to the court of the Prince Elector and to the court of the principality of Solms-Braunfels. He was also licensed to practice by the Bavarian Palatine College of Medicine of Düsseldorf in the Jülich and Bergisch areas.

Schmidt published in 1801 a booklet entitled *The art of maintaining beautiful teeth from youth onwards, including instructions concerning the shedding of milk teeth*.⁹ He had a name for

striving for perfection in the drawing of teeth and their replacement with artificial teeth indistinguishable from natural ones which do not have to be removed for eating or sleeping.

In evidence in 1792 in the Württemberg capital, Stuttgart, was the court dentist and surgeon Karl Matthias Rheinwald.¹⁰ Up to 1796, Karl Friedrich von Ruhmfeld was also in the city succeeded, from 22 January 1796, by Jean Bertrand Loudet, the court dentist.

In the capital of Palatine-Zweibrücken a law was passed prohibiting alien doctors from practising. The dentist Laforgue had apparently to be dismissed owing to the state's financial difficulties.¹¹

Bamberg saw little of dentists, although Joseph Lazarus was in practice there briefly. The presence of Franz Werner Götting is currently being

9 K. Schmidt, *Kunst schöne Zähne von Jugend auf zu erhalten, nebst einer Anweisung zum Wechsel der Milchzähne* (1801).

10 research of Gudrun Holm, doctoral student, Research Centre for the History of Dentistry, University of Giessen.

11 research of Ruth Auer, doctoral student, Research Centre for the History of Dentistry, University of Giessen.

researched.¹²

In the *Official Imperial Advertiser* for 1797¹³ a certain J.B.T. from G. reports having had his teeth cleaned by the dextrous dentist Ascher Moses from Oberlauringen in Lower Franconia.

The writings of A. Müller show Ernst Nickolaus Stegmayer to have been dentist to the court of Hessen-Darmstadt from 1798-1813. On 19 September 1803 he petitioned for financial support for the purchase of books and instruments to enable him to practise dentistry. His letters patent are dated 24 August 1798; before this he had been a "Küchenschreiber", in charge of record-keeping in the palace kitchens. He was granted an annual salary of 468 gulden on 1 September 1807.¹⁴

There is extensive evidence for the presence of dentists in Marburg in the 1790s.¹⁵ Bernhard Lazarus practised there, as did Johann Bernhard Ammon who in 1795 obtained a licence to exercise his profession in the territories of the princes of Dillenburg and in 1801 similar permission for the domains of the princes of Hachenburg. He then applied for a licence for the upper principality of Hessen-Kassel and specifically for Marburg. It was in Marburg that the professor of pathology at the university, Johann Heinrich Sternberg, made a particular study of the complications of teething.

An occasional visitor to the city was Joseph Lazarus, already mentioned in connection with Bamberg. Like Ascher Moses, Lazarus, too, came from Oberlauringen where he was born on 10 January 1760. In 1789 he arrived in the state of Kassel with his wife and children and presented his certificates to the faculty of medicine in Marburg. After his petition for a licence to practise dentistry in the Residential city had been granted by the Medical College on the grounds of his competence, he acquired on 10 March 1789 the so-called "tolerance paper". This was needed by Jews who were not in possession of the sovereign protection paper and hence had no right of abode. Lazarus settled in Carlshafenstrasse from where he practised dentistry. About a year later he was

12 research of Uwe Fischer, doctoral student, Research Centre for the History of Dentistry, University of Giessen.

13 *Kaiserlich Privilegierten Reichsanzeigen*, 1797.

14 research of Edzard Müller, doctoral student, Research Centre for the History of Dentistry, University of Giessen.

15 Pennrich, *op.cit.*

appointed dentist to the Hesse-Kassel court.

Although he had indicated to the Medical College "that he did not wish to deal with all the medical and surgical mishaps which befell the teeth", he was, in fact, to judge from the range of his treatments, a typical surgical operator, for his advertisements in trade newspapers indicate a knowledge of orthodontics as well as of surgical, prosthetic and restorative techniques. He was even called in by military surgeons to treat army personnel when their own skill was deficient. However, it has to be said that Lazarus retained a tendency to vigorous self-publicity and active self-promotion. His work cannot be seen as the zenith of dentistry in Kassel; nor can he be considered as one of the leading experts of the day, as was Calman Jakob Linderer who came after him. Lazarus's sons also worked as dentists in Kassel, later taking the name of Mombert.

The apprenticeship certificate of Peter Joseph Roloff was signed in **Cologne** by Petrus Lempert and Jakob Peter Frank. Roloff was later in surgical practice in **Giessen**, specialising in dentistry.

In **Düsseldorf** we encounter once more Schmidt (who practised in Erfurt and was described as dentist to the English court). He stayed in the city in 1790 on his way from Berlin, returning in 1792 and 1793 when he lived in the Karlstadt district, beside the posthouse. In 1791 "Professor" Le Noble took up residence in the "Great Golden Anchor". He was mainly promoting his tooth cleansers and his pain-killing antiscorbutic tincture (which could be obtained after his departure from a shop in Flingerstrasse). In the same year Professor Sömmering in Mainz had certified the virtues of his "dental concoction", but his application to establish a practice in the city was finally turned down by the electoral district government on 22 March 1791 "once and for all". Dominique Merelli from Tuscany arrived at the "Bavarian Court" Inn in Düsseldorf in 1792. His advertisements over the years in the Jülich-Bergisch weekly newspaper¹⁶ offered an antiscorbutic remedy which would

tighten and strengthen loose gums and teeth, turn the blackest teeth white as ivory and give the mouth a wonderful smell and the lips a lovely reddish colour.

In the same newspaper in 1781,¹⁷ Mrs. Schild announced "to all and sundry" that she had settled in the old coffee house and that she possessed great dexterity in cleaning and extracting teeth. Naturally, she too concocted her own

16 e.g. *Jülich-Bergischen Nachrichten*, 33(1792) and 48(1802).

17 *Jülich-Bergischen Nachrichten*, 47(1781).

antiscorbutic pain-killing remedy. Considering the length of her stay in Düsseldorf, she must have had quite a good income. Sometimes she was in trouble with the authorities, as happened in April 1790. On that occasion she was restricted absolutely to extracting and cleaning teeth and any treatment of "fistulas in the gums and dental disease proper", as well as the sale of remedies connected with these, were utterly prohibited to her. This ban, and the fear of prosecution, can have held few terrors for Mrs. Schild for by 1791 she boldly declared "that she was curing fistulas and other dental diseases" and that all sorts of remedies could be procured from her. She appears to have been still in business in 1808, for in that year she received a further warning. Two other women, Mrs. Kippen and Mrs. Bläser from Elberfeld, practised dentistry in Düsseldorf from 1798 to 1802 but without really succeeding in establishing themselves.

Responding to an enquiry in the *Official Imperial Advertiser* of 27 July 1793¹⁸ as to "how one should treat carious teeth so as to render them disease-free or at least preserve them for as long as possible", Dr. Bücking of **Wolfenbüttel** wrote very knowledgeably

One could, provided the decay is not too deep, by filing out the tooth with a fairly coarse file and by excavating all foul material with suitably sharp diamond-tipped instruments (such as a coarse jeweller's scarf) until all the decayed matter is removed, conserve such a tooth for a long time.

This answer is in accordance with the favourable impression we receive from reading his fascinating book.¹⁹

Finally, we come to the renowned Jacob Calman, better known under the name he later adopted, Linderer, who in his day had an excellent reputation as a dentist. He was born in 1771, but the exact date and place are unknown. In 1793 he passed his examination with the Medical Board and subsequently had many opportunities to operate on the teeth, acquiring great dexterity and knowledge in the process.

From 1797 he lived in **Bad Pyrmont** where he was licensed to practise during the season to the exclusion of all other dentists. At that time, he inserted single teeth but also made complete prostheses for those patients of the highest rank.

18 *Kayserrlich Privilegierten Reichsanzeiger*, 24(1793).

19 J.J.H. Bücking, *Vollständige Anweisung zum Zahnausziehen für angehende Wundärzte* (Stendal, 1782).

On 11 December 1802, Linderer was appointed court dentist to Prince Karl August of **Waldeck**. In that town he made the acquaintance of many illustrious persons with whom he could exchange ideas; these included the senior officer of health, Dr. Consbruch, and particularly Privy Councillor Loderer. Through these friendships he had the opportunity of publishing articles in the *Journal of Surgery, Obstetrics and Juridical Pharmaceutics*.²⁰

Linderer must have had a good reputation, for he was often called in to perform difficult extractions. Thus he was invited in 1809 by Professor Dr. Louis Stromeyer to **Hanover** to carry out the extraction of an upper wisdom tooth which had already defeated two other surgeons. Linderer had no such problems.

In 1812 he is said to have been appointed dentist to the university in **Göttingen**. It is not known who might have made this appointment and the statement should be viewed with some scepticism since no mention can be found in the records of that period of the name of Linderer or of a dental department.²¹

In 1814 Linderer is to be found in Erfurt, in 1826 in **Berlin**; his professional travels took him to **Elberfeld** in 1830 and to **Königsberg** in 1833.

He published in 1834 *Examples of all the operations in dentistry from the best sources and after forty years of personal practice*.²² Eight years later appeared (co-authored with his son) *A handbook of dentistry, comprising anatomy and physiology, materia medica dentaria and surgery after forty-three years of personal experience etc.*²³ Several treatises also appeared in the Berlin medical *Central Journal*.

20 *Journal für Chirurgie, Geburtshilfe und gerichtliche Arzneikunde*.

21 J.L. Pütter.

22 C.J. Linderer, *Lehre von den gesamten Zahnoperationen nach den besten Quellen und eigener 40-jähriger Erfahrung dargestellt* (Berlin, 1834).

23 C.J. Linderer, *Handbuch der Zahnheilkunde, enthaltend Anatomie und Physiologie, Materia medica dentaria und Chirurgie nach einiger 43-jähriger Erfahrung u.s.w.* (Berlin, 1842).