



**“And What Say the Living?”  
An Examination of Public Discussion of Anatomical  
Dissection Prior to the Doctors’ Riot of 1788**

Carmen Niemeyer  
Lycoming College

*The Doctors’ Riot of 1788 in New York City offers a moment in post-Revolutionary American history during which publicly-printed dialogue empowered citizens to take action against social disruptions. Study of the riot also provides insight into interdisciplinary conflict between distinct generations of the emerging American medical field. This violent riot depended on the documentation and printed discussion in the popular press of the parallel developments of anatomy and medical education, a growing student population’s needs in contrast to those of their professors, and the public’s hostile distrust all documented and discussed within the popular press. The event represents a culmination of the tension between public concern and anger and medical professional frustration. Exposing the hostility and disagreement from both sides, this study attempts to understand the struggle between medical authority and public opinion, while alluding to the public press’ influence on society.*

John Hicks Jr., a medical student in New York City studying under the tutelage of Dr. Richard Bayley, had no idea the effects a facetious gesture could make on his profession’s public image. On April 13, 1788, he jokingly waved out the window of the local hospital to a young boy in the yard below. This act may have seemed harmless and ordinary had it not been that the arm Hicks waved belonged to an inanimate white woman.

A quick wave out the window to a young boy was all it took to provoke an already angry crowd into a violent mob intent on harming medical doctors and their positions in society. Seeing the detached limb, the startled boy ran to alert his father, because the family had recently buried the boy’s mother, and the youth believed the arm belonged to her. Discovering the woman’s body missing from her coffin, the boy’s father gathered his work crew and rushed in an angry furor to the hospital.<sup>1</sup> As they approached the New York City Hospital, the group swelled to more than 2,000 people (5,000 by some accounts). Under threat of violence, hospital doctors fled the premises. The crowd surged into the hospital, finding a vast collection of specimens and preserved human body parts. Wright Post, and other advanced anatomy

students, stayed behind in order to save a priceless collection of preserved materials, but all findings were “taken and destroyed.”<sup>2</sup> Angry citizens thrust dissected specimens out of windows with cursing cries for those outside to witness. Rioters forcibly dragged the students out of the building and presented them to the teeming crowd. The riot continued for four days and only ended when the local militia forcibly established authority. The day after Hicks’ wave, “whether from any concert of action, or impelled by mere curiosity, is not known, crowds began to fill the street and yard in front of the city hospital.”<sup>3</sup> In response to the throngs’ calls for a thorough search of the hospital and doctors’ homes, the mayor beseeched the masses to return home, adding that a “thorough investigation should be made” by the proper officials.<sup>4</sup> Crowds gathered later that afternoon at the jail and threw dirt, stones, “contemptuous epithets,” and laughter at the local military force then “snatched away their muskets, and broke them to pieces on the pavement.”<sup>5</sup> When physically attacked by the throngs, troops fired into the multitude of rioters, killing and wounding many. For days following the incident, troops patrolled the city and citizens gathered aghast at the riot’s destruction.<sup>6</sup>

Most historians agree that this sequence of events triggered the Doctors’ Riot. Just as many scholars assume that student negligence and disruption of pre-existing social norms caused the mob to react violently.<sup>7</sup> Nevertheless, scholars rarely address the conditions that fostered the social tension that elicited angry vengeance from a sudden mob. If scholars examine the opinions and actions of medical students, medical professors, and the general public, it becomes apparent that the post-Revolutionary generation of students’ public presence shifted from their predecessors’ publicized positions on public image, which amplified public hostility and ultimately prompted a destructive riot leveled at the medical profession.

Immediately preceding the riot, there was an important public discussion occurring between doctors and citizens. As American medicine developed throughout the eighteenth century, established physicians presented moral and professional standards to the public and their students. In spite of the doctors’ efforts to incur a favorable public image through their students’ actions, by the late 1700s, students had rejected their professors’ ideals. Young anatomists’ actions provoked animosity, fear, and anxiety from the general population. This increased opposition produced an important dialogue that was crucial in fostering the hostile atmosphere that led to the riot of 1788. These printed debates were available to the literate public and therefore played an integral role in the social discussion.

Public dissonance between the images portrayed by professors and students, and the printed dialogue between medical students and community members sparked the public’s disapproval of dissection studies into a riotous flame. Speeches by established medical professionals, often the teachers and advisors of a fledgling cohort of medical students, provided a clear impression of professorial, generational cautions for public image. Nevertheless, the growing student population disregarded the advice of their elder educators and incited the public’s rage. Although society had accepted, to a certain extent, anatomo-

my as an essential part of medical study, members reacted violently to students' excessive disruption of common practices, especially when the debate entered the popular press.

### **“Prejudices of the People in general”**

Though medical professionals attempted to educate the colonial public and increase medical awareness by giving lectures and expanding their own knowledge, medicine in America did not actively develop until after the Revolutionary War. During the colonial period, public lectures on anatomy and basic health did little to spread public acceptance of the medical field. To encourage medicine's legitimization in the colonies, a group of six English-educated doctors established the first fully formed medical school within King's College of New York City in 1767, but even then, the founders recognized society's poor opinion of the field.<sup>8</sup>

On the eve of the American Revolution, a small number of students had matriculated, studied, and graduated from the school. However, during the imperial conflict, King's College shut down, and many past and current students with medical training served as surgeons in the Continental Army. When British forces invaded and held New York City, continental supporters, including physicians, fled. Of the six original professors, only Samuel Bard (once dubbed a British supporter) remained in New York at the war's close in 1783.<sup>9</sup> King's College became Columbia College under a new American charter and reopened its medical school with new faculty in 1784. When patriot supporters returned and new professors joined the school, competition thickened between medical schools in America. Each aimed to increase its student and graduate numbers, thereby claiming society's approval and esteem for their medical programs. Because of this interschool rivalry, the total number of medical students entering college instead of a traditional apprenticeship rose significantly. With a great rise in the number of medical students enrolled, the number of cadavers needed for dissection studies also increased. It was in this active medical environment that hostility between the public and the profession grew to seemingly violent proportions.

The post-war increase in medical students and cadaver requirements deepened the public's long-held reservations towards medicine. Society's distrust and resistance to anatomy study in particular peaked during the late eighteenth century in part because the increase in numbers of medical students augmented the public's customary distrust of doctors, medical disruptions in funerary customs and beliefs, and increased repulsion to dissection. Fatal treatments and unqualified, unlicensed physicians created a general mistrust and confusion among the mass population about the role of doctors in treating ailments. During this same period, burial customs also became more important in defining personhood and demonstrating social identity among the lower classes, a population often dissected by students. Furthermore, when law makers affirmed dissection as a punishment for various crimes, images of surgical examination disgusted not only criminals receiving the punishment, but also the

general public. These three trends demonstrate ways in which public dissent against anatomy increased along with medicine’s growth in America.

As the medical field grew and established roots in the American colonies, phony doctors took advantage of the general public, often mistreating their symptoms and hurting the institution’s image. American colonists’ incapacity to distinguish trained doctors from conniving quacks often resulted in poor care and criticism of the field. Until 1760, no regulatory legislation defined or restricted the practice of physicians, so the public relied only on the doctors’ word to verify their training. Because physicians did not establish the first American medical school until 1767, educated doctors obtained their degrees from European schools. Most colonial practitioners, however, could not afford this education and instead apprenticed themselves to skilled physicians as teenagers. As an apprentice, a young man typically studied under only one doctor, thus limiting his education to his teacher’s subset of skills. This tradition resulted in a population of broadly unskilled practitioners in the colonies.<sup>10</sup>

Often to the distress of patients and their family members, doctors treated patients with all ranges of symptoms by bloodletting. Though bleeding could be dangerous and fatal, if practiced repeatedly, physicians bled the ill to rid them of disease and supposed poisons. Medical doctors believed this strategy healed the whole body. Instead of symptom-specific treatment, physicians pursued one-track regimens with information gained from their limited training.<sup>11</sup> As physicians’ studies of anatomy and disease increased, the inclination to treat all symptoms with bloodletting decreased. When doctors did attempt surgical treatment, the patient did not typically receive anesthesia and had little chance of survival. Wary of “professionals,” colonists frequently explored folk remedies because they wanted their friends and family members to survive illness instead of perishing from bloodletting or risky surgical operations.

Colonists often used homemade tonics to cure their loved ones of disease, but also turned to popular elixirs, thereby participating in the delegitimization of medicine. Untrained businesspersons claiming to be doctors produced all sorts of miracle pills and solutions claiming to cure sicknesses. These quacks advertised products such as Godfrey’s Cordial, Robertson’s Stomachic Elixir of Health, Dr. Anderson’s Scotch Pills, and Turlington’s Balsam. Some creators of these fake remedies claimed their recipes came from Native American tribal medicines or Roman elixirs.<sup>12</sup> Though they allegedly cured a spectrum of conditions, most did little to decrease pain and illness.

A growing population of duped, outraged laymen, city leaders, and doctors called for regulation of the medical profession. As the contemporary colonial historian William Smith described, “Quacks abound like locusts in Egypt and...we have no law to protect the lives of the King’s subjects from the malpractice of pretenders.”<sup>13</sup> This widespread criticism instigated the 1760 “Act to regulate the Practice of Physick and Surgery” in New York that prohibited the practice of medicine in the colony without a license. Official licenses could only be obtained via an examination from three regulatory officials. These administrators, though supported by doctors, included only local government figures such as colonial Supreme Court judges, local legislators, the At-

torney General, and the Mayor. Unfortunately, the act did little to lessen public concern because the law did not require “quack” physicians to obtain a license. The regulatory system grandfathered in all doctors practicing before the act, and only new medical professionals needed to acquire a license. In short, this act failed to regulate medical practitioners, because many schemers passed themselves off as licensed professionals, thereby increasing the public’s distrust of medicine.<sup>14</sup>

The growth of sham medicine and impostors before the Revolutionary War not only vexed the public but also spurred the medical community’s desire to legitimize their profession. During the pre-revolutionary era, colonial physicians pushed for the establishment of a medical school to confer authentic education and baccalaureate degrees. The school would “expose the quacks and pretenders whose often fatal treatments, secret cures, and worthless concoctions were still being advertised and sold with impunity.”<sup>15</sup> Other efforts to promote regulation of medical practices included a meeting of Virginian anatomy students in 1760 to improve physic study, and an assembly of doctors in New Jersey in 1766 to “raise the level of professional education and practice in that province.”<sup>16</sup> This legitimization became necessary as studies of human anatomy bolstered social distrust and hostility towards physicians.

While established professionals worked to legitimize the field, their students’ unsettling actions ultimately galvanized public dissension toward the medical tradition. Retrieving bodies from graves disrupted funerary beliefs and customs while also disturbing burial’s important link to social identity. Many doctors attributed public concern for students’ actions to a poor and uneducated population’s superstitions and fears of the unknown.<sup>17</sup> This medical belief did not allow for consideration of anatomy’s intrusion into society’s customs surrounding death.

In colonial America, two widespread beliefs existed about death and lifeless bodies. First, a dead body was part of a dead human who needed protection and safekeeping. Second, the living needed to protect themselves from a dangerous dead body that could harm them.<sup>18</sup> This paradox suggests that the relationship between the living and the dead was one of sacred fear. A third overarching belief came into direct conflict with anatomical needs. Colonists believed that the body experienced a period of sleep after death and that they must maintain respect by letting the body rest for a length of time. According to historian Michael Sappol, this period “ritually affirms the humanity of the dead individual” and any “dismemberment or rough treatment” distressed the deceased and their living relatives. Populations that felt most strongly and defensively about this key aspect of funeral rites could not fully participate “in the community or polity.”<sup>19</sup> This group of strong believers included the poor, blacks, criminals, prostitutes, Indians, and some immigrant groups. These individuals were also the people most often taken from their graves and dissected by anatomists.

The aforementioned persons were often lost in the masses of society, so funerary and death customs were the last, possibly the only, chance for them to establish social identity for themselves and their families. Death was an im-

portant event in one's life that secured one's social identity. For example, proper burial in a church cemetery or yard symbolized a stable inclusion in the social order. Those from the lower classes of society could not claim this inclusion, but their own funeral rituals strove to emulate the practice.<sup>20</sup> Often, families would have to stand watch over their relative's grave so that anatomists did not steal the body. Those who failed to prevent body snatching failed to establish their loved one's social identity in death. Historian Michael Sappol claims, “Death was regarded as the epitome of life. How one died, and how one's body was treated after death, fixed for eternity one's moral, aesthetic and social status.”<sup>21</sup> This tradition came into direct conflict with anatomical practices, thus furthering society's distrust of the medical profession.

A third contributing factor to the common distrust of medicine in colonial America was a visceral repulsion to the act of dissection. During the 1840s, a trend emerged labeling anatomists “buzzards,” because they reduced human life to “carrion.”<sup>22</sup> Doctors who worked in almshouses waited for residents to die, while preparing their examination tables for dissection of fresh cadavers. Though this label arose in the nineteenth century, it harkens back to growing public dissent over physicians preying on the graves of indigent colonists. When grave-robbing became a major public concern in the eighteenth century, legislatures enacted laws sentencing criminals condemned to death for dissection afterward. By creating this legislation, governments intended to scare offenders away from committing crimes but also supplied physicians with bodies to study. Such a penal code terrified prisoners threatened with dissection upon execution. They imagined their bodies cut up on a table with “images of sharpened knives and lacerated flesh.”<sup>23</sup> These apprehensions demonstrate society's fear of the anatomist's marauding scalpel.

### **“Time and Perseverance however must overcome popular Prejudices”**

American physicians appeared thoroughly aware of the displeasure and distrust society had for their field and sought to dispel the common negative attitude through their students. The medical field needed to abate public hostility caused by the previous distrust of physicians, anatomy's disruptions in funerary rituals, and increasing public repulsion to dissection.

A speech given in 1769 at the first commencement of King's College Medical School notably documents the medical community's awareness of this divisive issue. Samuel Bard, one of the six founding professors of King's College Medical School, delivered an oration for the first graduates in New York to give them advice that he deemed necessary for their careers after graduation. Bard stated that he published the speech in order to present his ideas to the broader public and explain why advancement of the medical profession was important.<sup>24</sup> Publication of the oration was key to establishing the medical profession's stance on public image. Bard firmly intended to present a positive view of the profession to the masses and therefore further the legitimization and improvement of a burgeoning medical field. His title, *A Discourse upon the Duties of a Physician...As Advice to those Gentlemen who then received*

*the First Medical Degrees conferred by that University*, indicates that students required his guidance to define the role of doctors in society because the public harbored ill will towards their profession. Bard's speech represents the ideals and actions of his generation's struggles to sway the public's negative image of medicine into a positive light. The lecture forms the foundation of the ideology that the next generation's students rejected.

Established physicians recognized that their professional institution's appearance required improvement, and Bard, among others, believed the first medical school graduation would propel medicine into its "rising Reputation and future Utility."<sup>25</sup> Bard spoke confidently that the increase in professionalism of doctors would justify and legitimize the medical profession and thereby increase the reputation of the institution as well as individual practitioners. Bard's opening passages show that he, as an educated professional, recognized medicine's dreadful and distrusted position in society. He depended on King's College's new graduates to tip the scales of public perception.

In his discourse, Bard addressed the lack of proper medical training in the past and improvements that his comrades had already made. Without directly stating so, he also acknowledged the medical community's fault in allowing quack doctors to continue practicing without efficient regulation against sham medicine. Warning the graduates against this disgrace and advising them for their future career, Bard stated, "A Profession, in the Practice of which, Integrity and Abilities, will place you among the most useful; and Ignorance and Dishonesty, among the most pernicious Members of Society."<sup>26</sup> In other words, if they gave patients any reason to doubt the value of their education and accrued knowledge, the graduates could be labeled frauds. Bard encouraged the graduates to avoid the public's past image of shams and pretenders. He addressed the quackery issue and insisted that physicians should actively avoid society's pigeonhole by advising, "On no Pretense whatever, practice those little Arts of Cunning and Dissimulation, which to the Scandal of the Profession, have been but too frequent amongst us."<sup>27</sup> This warning demonstrates the professional medical institution's efforts to validate their field and their students' education in the face of lasting public dissent.

Bard also recognized that without proper education, doctors in America had been erroneously treating patients. The lack of appropriate training had caused families to grieve for deaths that their physicians could have prevented with the correct treatment.<sup>28</sup> Bard, a professionally educated doctor, took responsibility for the social stigma surrounding medicine. However, he stated, this groundless treatment attributable to ill-informed practice would change with the inaugural graduating class of doctors from King's College, thus highlighting the students' education as a key to recreating medicine's image in society.

Because they had succeeded in beginning their medical education, Bard instructed the college graduates to continue their acquisition of knowledge for personal and institutional benefit so that their generation of physicians could earn society's acceptance. He encouraged them to embrace their position as physicians and to pursue a broader knowledge of disease in the hu-



man body, taking every opportunity to learn more. The professor stated, “I see no Reason why Time only should lessen our Abilities, and surely Experience must increase our Knowledge.”<sup>29</sup> Nevertheless, as educated people in pursuit of ongoing learning, doctors were also obligated to acknowledge risk. Bard cautioned that physicians were “accountable for the Errors of Ignorance, unless you have embraced every Opportunity of Obtaining Knowledge.”<sup>30</sup> In other words, if practicing physicians chose not to expand their training continually, they needed to take responsibility for preventable mistakes that might harm their reputation and their patients.

As a practicing physician and professor, Bard advised the graduates to use not only their medical knowledge, but also their good character to treat patients. He urged integrity, tenderness, honesty, and overall compassionate bedside manner. Bard also stressed that if one failed to exhibit these character traits, the most important matter was to “consider the sixth commandment, ‘Thou Shalt do no Murder.’”<sup>31</sup> By stating this, Bard accounted for all facets of the public impression. While he encouraged the new doctors to take pride in their attributes, he also warned them against social repercussions for their mistakes. His suggested caution shows the professor’s concern for the students’ public image and his generation’s guidance to appease their community.

Furthermore, Bard pressed the students to use unfortunate circumstances for a larger anatomically educational cause. If doctors did all they could and a patient died nonetheless, they had an obligation to investigate the body and discover the cause of death, thereby enhancing their personal knowledge of disease and the general knowledge of medicine.<sup>32</sup> As a doctor in the emerging medical field, Bard was mindful of medicine’s growing needs despite the public’s negative image. By encouraging both compassion and investigation, he attempted to maintain a balance between the students’ continuing education and societal interpretation. Throughout his speech, Bard repeated that the study and practice of medicine was a continual process. Doctors must always strive to build on their own knowledge and the accumulated knowledge of the past with their own experiences. This idea reinforced the need for continuous study of anatomy and pathology of the human body.

In addition to presenting advice to the new graduates, Bard used the commencement occasion to convince the public of the necessity of a public hospital in order to gain support for the medical profession. He suggested that many significant citizens such as medical professionals and clergy had already supported the idea and formed a society to pursue the founding of a public medical hospital. He said, “Gentlemen engaged in the practice of Physic, and Offices of Religion” already knew and understood the “great Necessity” of a hospital for society.<sup>33</sup> Doctors, in particular, promoted the idea of a hospital and the “usefulness of their profession” and worked together to form a hospital board.<sup>34</sup> Bard stated that the doctors’ group had appealed directly to the people through public lectures. He also emphasized that a public hospital must be created to benefit all classes, races, and religious denominations.<sup>35</sup> A hospital would benefit the medical field as well. Doctors could identify and study disease best in a hospital setting where they could observe all those who were sick



at once to find disease patterns. This setting allowed for better symptom study and treatment overall.<sup>36</sup> With the first class of American medical graduates from Columbia College, Bard suspected something could change in society. The atmosphere was ripe to present a professional and confident argument to the public once more.

The first graduation from the first fully formed medical school marked a point in the professionalization of American medicine when public legitimization could emerge. American degrees certified the profession and validated doctors as trustworthy and dependable. Because of this new legitimacy, medical professionals could call for greater respect and appreciation from the public. By declaring that a public hospital would be available to citizens from all backgrounds, Bard hoped to gain support from the general public.

Another prominent physician of the time, Benjamin Rush, also hoped to increase his students' public image and to improve medicine's reputation in society. By the late 1700s, Rush had become a well-known physician and political figure in the United States. He held a professorial position at the University of Pennsylvania and worked at the Pennsylvania Hospital where he made waves in social medical reform. Like Bard, Rush published an oration on the "duties of a physician" in which he enumerated the many practices graduates must perform to secure trust from patients while also continuing to expand their medical knowledge.<sup>37</sup> Especially with rural folks, Rush advised new doctors to "assume no superiority" and avoid ostentatious demonstrations that "advertise his skill."<sup>38</sup> In stating his instructions, the professor encouraged graduates to allow the public to form an opinion of medicine based only on polite, knowledgeable, respectable doctors, and their acts of health improvement.

Rush's recommendations on improving medical knowledge paralleled Bard's advice written twenty years before. He instructed his students to "open all the dead bodies you can" and keep record of diseases or epidemics seen throughout the year in order to establish patterns among them. In addition to this direction, Rush insisted that the students not infringe on their patients' opinions or verify the "prejudices of the common people" whilst increasing their own practical education.<sup>39</sup> In regards to quack doctors and their fraudulent cure-alls, Rush advised that the young doctors talk with them and discover medicines that may actually heal human illnesses. He also suggested that students investigate natural remedies from the land around them. Above all, Rush impressed upon his audience that the time was ripe for medicine to take its place in society to improve human life in America.<sup>40</sup>

Samuel Bard's and other physicians' efforts to deliver and publish orations for student and public benefit demonstrate that their generation of medical professionals recognized society's hostility towards doctors and the study of anatomy via dissection. Though subsequent generations of students undoubtedly received similar lectures, repercussions of their rising numbers after the War for Independence encouraged growth in public hostility. This dangerous progression rose into the public atmosphere by means of a newspa-

per dialogue between concerned citizens and medical students just months before the riot.

### “The many Obstacles you will meet”

Despite their professors’ knowledgeable advice, students did little to improve medicine’s public image. Though Bard and Rush urged the next generation to practice honestly and assume no authority over their patients, student anatomists stole bodies for dissection without regard to the public’s outrage. They endeavored to increase their anatomical education, as advised by professors but did so without integrity and compassion for the dead. In response to this generational contradiction, New York citizens initiated a crucial public dialogue, consequently increasing their general enmity towards medicine.

In February of 1788, *The Daily Advertiser*, a New York City daily newspaper, published a series of letters to the printer in response to medical students’ grave robbing. Views expressed in these letters provide insight into the intensified public discord between the medical field and the public. Each submission presented a distinct view from either a concerned citizen or a shameless student. The students’ letters exhibited a distinct conflict between the image professional doctors attempted to convey (Samuel Bard’s commencement advice) and that of their students at medical school. This series of letters elucidates both medical students’ actions and ideologies, and society’s main concerns and motives for aggression in response to the students. These published public words on anatomical studies and grave robbing transformed the atmosphere of New York City into a vulnerable field ripe for conflict. The hostile dissonance emerged because of a few letters to the newspaper editor.

Newspapers fostered dangerous opinion and dialogue through popular discussion in taverns during America’s colonial period, so they are reliable sources to reference public perception. Depending on the tavern type, the population present could vary. The patronage included people from all levels of society including wealthy men, laborers, craftsmen, merchants, clerks, and rogues so that the characteristic group comprised a “socially and culturally heterogeneous” mixture.<sup>41</sup> Those frequenting local common houses for all classes usually included residents of the neighborhood and travelers passing through. They met to discuss the day’s happenings, to eat, drink, and enjoy each other’s company. The chatter could include anything from meaningless small talk to plans for illegal activity. Local customers met on a regular basis to continue conversations or arguments. Taverns regularly kept both local colonial and British newspapers for common reading. These papers were frequently read aloud to all patrons who would listen. Taverns were therefore a key area to brew public aggression against medical students because habitual patrons primarily from the lower class read or heard published opinions and likely discussed or quite possibly argued over the attitudes expressed in print. Public fury gathered and grew here and lurched into the open following a student’s singular act.

From tavern talk to written opinion, the public's distress with medical education's anatomy studies materialized in three letters to the printer published by *The Daily Advertiser* in February 1788. A concerned citizen wrote the first of these pertinent articles to the editor, directing it to members of the medical profession. As the first published outcry, the citizen's opinion piece initiated an open discourse between the public and medical students on February 16, 1788. Ordinary citizens had not previously printed grievances regarding the major dissension and hostility towards students of physic. The article instigated public discussion of an offensive subject. Its publication thereby validated the public's argument as a legitimate cause for distress.

The author aimed to make other citizens overtly aware of the desecration of disinterred bodies and to plead with medical students to reduce their use of human cadavers. He argued that grave robbers vandalized burial sites of many people, especially black residents, with a complete disregard for interment's sacredness, adding that, "It is said that few blacks are buried, whose bodies are permitted to remain in the grave."<sup>43</sup> He stated that by law in England, doctors could only use criminals' bodies sentenced to anatomy study and suggested that New York create similar legislation. This suggestion parallels one put forward in a petition by a group of concerned free black citizens to the Common Council of the City of New York just thirteen days before.<sup>44</sup> Members of the council effectively ignored this request, further angering the petitioners.

To exacerbate the grave-robbing problem, the author suggested, "that this horrid practice is pursued to make a merchandize of human bones, more than for the purpose of improvement in Anatomy."<sup>45</sup> His statement insinuated that beyond breaking the sanctity of burial, the students had gone farther to desecrate bodies in a taboo black-market trade. These comments suggested, from the view of this particular anonymous author, that the public was not so much against the study of anatomy, but instead were adamantly disturbed by the students' excessive body-snatching practices and an upset in burial sanctity. Though they eventually took violent action against doctors and students at the New York Hospital because they disapproved of grave robbing, perhaps citizens were more outraged at the probability of a body trade. No matter which objectionable practice distressed the author most, it is clear that he blamed an increasing number of students for abuse of their anatomical-study requirements.

This author submitted a second letter to the printer on February 25, signing off as "Humanio," an acquired title, and emphasized his previous points with an account of a specific grave robbing to arouse more citywide concern. He reiterated his concern that students often stole "corpse of the Blacks" and rarely let them lie in their graves.<sup>46</sup> The practice so increased that a community of black people acquired a private yard in which to bury their dead. Nevertheless, the author continued, a group of male anatomists, violently asserting their practices, demanded one night that the owner of the property not intrude and stole a child's body without shame. Humanio stated that "Mr. *Abductio*," "would think it no crime to drag his grand-father and grand-mother

out of their graves.”<sup>47</sup> The author used these details to introduce readers to the ghastly, brazen, and completely disrespectful medical students who are conducting unnatural exercises in the common man’s graveyard. Humanio both aroused the public’s hostility and left the perpetrators with a warning, “they may not alone suffer an abduction of their wealth, but perhaps their lives may be the forfeit of their temerity, should they dare to persist in their robberies, especially at unlawful hours of night.”<sup>48</sup> These words foreshadowed the abuses of the crowds surrounding the hospital and the jail weeks later during the riot.

A second citizen submitted a letter to the editor defining the public’s attitude towards the medical profession and image of its educated students. “A Friend to Decency” acknowledged that medical education required human bodies to study dissection but argued that students should have acquired these bodies in limited numbers, not in mass quantities for unending practice. According to students, there should have been no limit to the number of bodies used, because the amount of practice students had directly affected their skill-level. The non-medical author enquired into a sufficient number of dissection candidates with professional anatomists. By taking this step, he established that citizens were aware of conflict within the medical field between generations of medical practitioners. The professors he spoke with declared that only three bodies were necessary per series of lectures. Furthermore, “in the hands of the unskillful, ten thousand can be of no manner of use.”<sup>49</sup> This statement clearly indicates that the public recognized a discord between professors and professional doctors, and their young students. This difference in opinion separated their actions in the public view. The following statement from “A Friend to Decency” further emphasizes the idea that, within the public image, the student body has no authority when compared to professional doctors, writing, “I confess, there appears to me not much room for a controversy, in deciding between the weight that ought to be allowed to the authority of the gentlemen alluded to, and that of our *Student*; and if the skill of his knife does not exceed the address of his pen, but few, I think, will differ from me in opinion.”<sup>50</sup>

These citizens asserted their controversial objections to medical students’ practices and ideologies in print, but students also submitted their ideas to the public. Student ideology reflected a direct contrast to the public’s views. In response to the first concerned-citizen’s letters, a “Student of Physic” defended a medical position on dissection of lifeless bodies with a letter to the printer published just a week later on February 23, 1788. A young medical student in the city most likely contributed the submission. He began by questioning Humanio’s (his given pseudonym for the February 16<sup>th</sup> letter’s author) lack of consideration for the greater good of anatomy study’s contributions to science and humanity. According to the student author, Humanio failed to take into account that the dissected people died from a variety of causes. Students could study this range of causes of death to examine many diseases afflicting the population. Echoing Bard and Rush, the author argued that examinations of deceased bodies would help the living in their pursuit of vigorous lives. The student emphasized that physicians and surgeons could only excel at their craft and improve the condition of human life if they studied the dead, no matter

how they procured subjects. Students believed the best way to acquire dissection and surgery skills were through extensive practice. The principal way to find bodies to study had always been from freshly dug graves. The medical community considered this method practical.

In response to Humanio's legislation suggestion to use only criminals' bodies, the student author argued that local governing institutions were aware of the widespread grave robbing but ignored it, thereby granting tacit consent, and allowing anatomical education to mature. Though England instituted a law restricting dissection candidates to convicted criminals, many physicians in training still practiced grave robbing to fulfill students' needs.<sup>51</sup> The student author refuted each grievance submitted by Humanio in order to underplay the public's concern and portray Humanio as an ignorant citizen. In a second letter, the Student of Physic, using language indicating that his fellow students shared his ideas, augmented the assumed public ignorance by insisting Humanio was "meddling with matters that do not concern him." He decried the "*dirt and filth*" that the "stupid wretch" had "belched out against us."<sup>52</sup> The very submission of his brazen letters to the printer indicates that by 1788 medical students had discarded Bard's generation's advice not only to increase their medical knowledge but also to improve medicine's public image.

In order to placate Humanio's anger over the students' profane body-snatching practices, the author insisted he and his fellow students disinterred burials with the utmost respect. They had the highest regard for appropriate behavior while committing the act and he declared, "the greatest secrecy has been studied" so that they did not disturb the living. The author also denied ever considering selling the recovered bodies for financial profit. In closing, he asked that Humanio calm "those furious fellows, who out of compassion to the dead, would take the lives of the living," urging them not to pursue violent action against medical students or professionals.<sup>53</sup> Though the student author broke from the professorial urgings of an older generation by attacking the public arguments against anatomy, he realized that the public perception of his actions could cause harm to himself and other students.

In essence, the student presented an attitude toward the populace that directly contradicted Bard's and Rush's advice for medical graduates. With the post-Revolutionary War generation of students, the presentation of medical education's reputation to the public had evolved from a professor's warnings of caution to a student's blatant lack of respect for the populace. However, the "Student of Physic" wrote his words deliberately. He responded directly to Humanio's voiced concerns and purposefully rejected social anxieties about anatomy study. Moreover, the author knew he was in direct conflict with a proper medical reputation and while he confronted Humanio for criticizing anatomists, he also expressed concern for other students' safety from citizens' reactions to his published account.

In direct response to the student author's shameless opinions that differed so distinctly from Bard's recommendations, a third citizen author submitted a radical, satirical view of anatomy studies that directly assaulted the professionalism of physicians. Published on February 28, self-titled Philo-

Smilion's letter stood alone in its presentation of a biting argument. He purposefully roused the public's anger and abused medicine's reputation in one fell swoop. The author's name, Philo-Smilion, translates from the Greek to “friend of the scalpel” and represents a deliberate play on words. The article feigned to defend anatomists and shame the public for their hostility to those whose professional purpose was to promote and sustain life. Philo-Smilion insisted that society should thank doctors for pursuing a “laborious and disagreeable profession,” in order to increase scientific knowledge.<sup>54</sup> The author argued that the students' insistence for gratitude was unwarranted because of their unnatural practices on human bodies.

Once he established a position, the author submitted a novel, if not comical, plan to contend with the body-snatching predicament. Cities should ban funerals and citizens should be required to give their deceased friends and relatives directly to anatomists. To encourage compliance, doctors and other medical professors should lead by example and dissect their own family and friends. If medical professionals practiced this habit, society might have felt more comfortable with the suggestion. The author directly assaulted the professionalism of physicians with this argument. If doctors did not dissect deceased members of their own families, why should the public allow their loved ones to be cut apart?<sup>55</sup> His ideas indicate the growing public hostility and suggest that society considered anatomical studies to be unnatural and against acceptable postmortem practices.

Philo-Smilion presented additional ideas insulting the medical profession that simultaneously increased citizens' wariness and anger towards the discipline, amplifying the existing aggression. He proposed that a monetary prize be awarded to the anatomist who dissected the most bodies in a given period, suggesting that students participate in a game-like situation when they studied anatomy. This competition would encourage anatomists to gain a broader knowledge of the human body by wielding the knife often and cutting apart many bodies. In addition, the country needed to import “more acute and violent diseases” from the Caribbean Islands, because the medical schools lacked subjects to study these diseases.<sup>56</sup> The author turned around a main argument of legitimacy of the medical field on physicians. Because students insisted they required many bodies to study, understand, and better treat a vast array of diseases, Philo-Smilion suggested the next logical step: import new diseases so doctors could study the gamut.

The author strove to incite the masses further by linking the anatomy debate to one of class quarrels. Many wealthy citizens encouraged physicians' study of anatomy and the founding of a medical school at this time. Body snatching rarely affected their graves, so the wealthy had little to lose through support. Philo-Smilion urged wealthy citizens to undergo a yearly program of medicine. This contribution benefited both the patient and the individual physician's knowledge. Furthermore, “This would, besides, be attended with much private advantage to themselves; as the many bad consequences of intemperance...would be obviated, and the Physician become thoroughly acquainted with their constitutions.”<sup>57</sup> In other words, Philo-Smilion thought it proper for



physicians to treat the wealthy with questionable medications instead of the lower classes. This was more practical because the wealthy were most likely to be able to afford a doctor, so the physicians could support their studies more effectively if they learned about diseases of their class. They ought to have stayed away from poor deceased bodies from which they could learn little. Philo-Smilion's argument completely contradicts Samuel Bard's encouragement to medical graduates to help the very poor, because they are the most in need. The author's plan suggests that young medical students had changed their practices from those for which Bard pleaded.

These arguments portrayed dissection and grave robbing as practical, commonsense practices to increase medical knowledge among students. Because the article is so heavily laden with satire, it most surely angered medical students. More importantly to the Doctors' Riot, Philo-Smilion would have enraged the masses and inflamed their enmity by publishing his radical argument in a public newspaper.

While a "friend of the scalpel" certainly roused the general public's bitterness towards students, another piece of the dialogue exaggerated it further. A reward advertisement for pertinent grave robbing information is perhaps the most significant publication in this series of *Daily Advertiser* articles, because it highlights a moment when students stepped across class boundaries to infuriate the upper classes and incite the raging mobs of the Doctors' Riot. This article abruptly altered the upper class' perception of medical students' morals to match society's view as a whole. Someone, most probably an anatomy student, had robbed a deceased member of the Trinity Church from her grave in February of 1788. The church advertised in the widely read *Daily Advertiser* for a one hundred dollar reward given to whomever found the grave robbers.<sup>58</sup> The church's notice was the first publicly advertised incident of a white person's body stolen from a gated churchyard. Students typically used bodies of the poor white and black residents from the paupers' and Negro burial grounds for dissection purposes with few repercussions. Through public apologies written in 1770 in response to rumors and vocal allegations that they had robbed graves, William Shippen Jr., a Philadelphia physician, and his student Joseph Harrison insisted that their dissection subjects were not from a graveyard owned by "any Denomination of Christians whatever" or "any religious Society in this City."<sup>59</sup> They did not state that they had not ever stolen bodies from any grave, and likely procured their subjects from Potter's graves. The *Daily Advertiser* posting signaled a shift in the public discussion and a growing awareness of medical students' differences from their previous generations. A student had been so bold as to have crossed the graveyard gates.

During the winter of 1787 and 1788, the increased number of anatomy students may have dug up a greater number of bodies or disinterred them in a more careless manner in unacceptable places than previously so that the public gave their situation more attention and, in consequence, fostered more animosity. Stories of grisly grave-robbing shocked the citizens of New York. These reports caused increasing concern with the medical fields' actions and some residents tried to defend themselves against a dissecting fate.<sup>60</sup> At graves near

hospitals or medical training buildings in the city, people stood guard over their families' bodies for multiples days and nights to prevent students from stealing them.<sup>61</sup> All levels of society attempted to take these precautions or paid others to stand guard, though the lower classes struggled to find time or finances for the luxury.

Students' greater need for specimens spurred them to take bodies from outside the socio-economic hierarchy of acceptable cadavers. Before, "Students had contented themselves with ripping open the graves of strangers and negroes, about whom there was little feeling; but this winter they dug up respectable people, even young women, of whom they made an indecent exposure."<sup>62</sup> As the author of the *100 Dollar Reward* advertisement alleged, the students went beyond the bounds of this accepted hierarchy. Bodies of people from all levels of socioeconomic class and both genders had been unearthed and used by medical students causing an increasingly public uproar throughout society. Publication of the social conflict between citizens, medical students, and their professors ignited the burning embers of mistrust and fear smoldering in individuals like a young boy's father, recently widowed and armed with masonry tools. The printed debate sparked a crowd's hostility into the roaring riotous flame of April 1788.

### **“Remove these Difficulties, and open this Door to Medical Improvement”**

Soon after the Doctors' Riot, medical students and their professors fled the city or went into hiding, avoiding the persistent violence and hostility. They “stowed into carriages, and hurried off into the country, where they remained till the excitement died away.”<sup>63</sup> Public tension over students' increased illicit use of bodies had boiled over to violence and many physicians could not risk any continued aggression from their communities.

In response to the April 1788 riot, New York state legislators created a statute, the Anatomy Act of 1789, to prohibit “the odious practice of digging up and removing for the purpose of dissection, dead bodies interred in cemeteries or burial places.”<sup>64</sup> The previous law allowing medical students to use corpses of executed criminals for dissection was upheld by the courts. In addition to the statute, legislators used the Anatomy Act to generate legal punishment for grave robbing. As students believed, bodies supplied from criminal hangings were not sufficient for rising medical school practices. Their English-educated professors may have thought otherwise but clearly gave tacit consent and allowed students to continue obtainment of deceased bodies following the act's institution. Restrictions and enforcement introduced by the Anatomy Act limited student opportunities to disinter their own specimens. In 1797, nearly a decade after the riot, Samuel L Mitchill, a New York physician, insisted that one could not properly teach or study anatomy using only descriptions of the body. Practice with deceased bodies and an anatomy collection was essential to reinforce lecture.<sup>65</sup> Students' parallel inability to procure practice cadavers safely and their necessity for anatomical practice motivated a rise in professional resurrectionists who illicitly sold bodies to medical schools. Such spe-

cialists continued to “control the supply of cadavers for generations,” well into the nineteenth century.<sup>66</sup>

Published discussion between professional doctors, their students, and the common people reveals a discord among members of the medical profession and between the profession and the public. Colonial American society had grudgingly accepted anatomical studies, because professors used a small number of corpses, mainly of poor and black citizens. As publicized by his commencement speech, Bard, and the older generation, generally, pressed their pupils to tread lightly in the public’s eyes by acting with the utmost discretion and respect while practicing and continuing their education. Medical students, however, rejected these ideas and disinterred bodies for study in excess, daring even to break the accepted hierarchy and dissect white citizens. Furthermore, their published rebuff of Bard’s guiding principles and vocalized public concern created more open hostility of the taboo subject throughout society. Publication of these student actions and their shift from the previous generation’s ideology augmented a brewing public aggression that prompted a violent and destructive riot at the wave of a hand.

This investigation of the Doctors’ Riot of 1788 established a shift in execution of the medical field’s public image. The dramatic transition, along with the causes defined by previous historians, instigated the riot in New York City by causing a more public discussion of students’ grave robbing and prompting violent action fueled by society’s misgivings about anatomy.

During the late eighteenth century in New York, medical students did not act appropriately towards the public to establish a mutual trust and collective growth. By publishing their concerns in reaction to citizens’ publications, student anatomists increased hostility and generated the atmosphere for the Doctors’ Riot of 1788. Still, after the riot and the Anatomy Act, grave-robbing continued, pointedly without large, violent public disturbances. Mobs did not preserve the fervor preceding the Doctors’ Riot because their arguments with students were no longer a published discussion. This indicates that the influence of the media, especially written word, can greatly affect actions taken by masses of people. Without the published, hostile discussion, such a widespread negative attitude in New York City may not have culminated in mob-led violence. Therefore, the students’ wave only triggered the Doctors’ Riot of 1788 because of the increased enmity from previous weeks’ publications. Examination of the motivations behind society’s violent reactions allows for a better understanding of the struggle between medical authority and public opinion, and published works’ influence in society.

### Notes

- 1.) Joel Headley, *The Great Riots of New York: 1712-1873* (New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1970), 58-59, and Caroline De Costa and Francesca Miller, "American Resurrection and the 1788 New York Doctors' Riot," *The Lancet* 377 (January 22, 2011): 292-293.
- 2.) De Costa and Miller, "American Resurrection and the 1788 New York Doctors' Riot," 293.
- 3.) Headley, *The Great Riots*, 59-60.
- 4.) Headley, *The Great Riots*, 60.
- 5.) Headley, *The Great Riots*, 62.
- 6.) Headley, *The Great Riots*, 62-63.
- 7.) Steven Wilf, "Anatomy and Punishment in Late Eighteenth-Century New York," *Journal of Social History* 22, no. 3 (Spring 1989): 509-511; Michael Sappol, *A Traffic of Dead Bodies: Anatomy and Embodied Social Identity in Nineteenth-Century America* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2002), 102-104; Headley, *The Great Riots of New York*, 56-57; Tannenbaum, *Health and Wellness in Colonial America*, (Santa Barbara, CA: Greenwood, 2012), 29-31; De Costa and Miller, "American Resurrection," 292-293; Walter Hellerstein, "Body-Snatching" Reconsidered: The Exhumation of Some Early American Legal History," *Brooklyn Law Review* 39, no. 2 (Fall 1972): 350-354; and Thomas Gallagher, *The Doctors' Story* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1967), 49-64. Historians argue that the riot was caused by an upset in religious customs and cultural beliefs, disruption of the established race and class hierarchies, or a lack of action by government institutions such as the City Watch and the Common Council of New York City to halt grave robbing prevalence. Scholars such as Steven Wilf and Michael Sappol asserted that open public opposition grew in correlation with the growth of medicine in early America, because many believed practice of dissection violated nature and was a fearful process of heresy. Joel Tyler Headley offered a similar argument, adding that body-snatching insulted the sacredness of burial. Rebecca Tannenbaum, and Caroline De Costa and Francesca Miller, argued that anatomy students after the Revolutionary War required more cadavers than previous anatomists, but that college students' professors assured citizens of the higher social classes that students primarily used cadavers of deceased blacks, criminals, and poor citizens. Walter Hellerstein argued that legislation addressing the public's outrage before the riot did little to quell the common hostility towards doctors' obtainment of bodies. Thomas Gallagher also blamed the city government and professionals for the violent riot in *The Doctors' Story*. He stated, "Caliber, dedication, and purpose of these men [Columbia's medical professors and other medical professionals], the inaction of the Common Council, and the ineffectiveness of the city watch" made the riot inevitable.
- 8.) Gallagher, *The Doctors' Story*, 20.
- 9.) Gallagher, *The Doctors' Story*, 35.
- 10.) Gallagher, *The Doctors' Story*, 6-7.
- 11.) Gallagher, *The Doctors' Story*, 8.
- 12.) Gallagher, *The Doctors' Story*, 9.
- 13.) William Smith, as quoted in Gallagher, *The Doctors' Story*, 10.
- 14.) Gallagher, *The Doctors' Story*, 9-12. Historian Thomas Gallagher used this sham medicine argument as evidence for a growing push in the medical community for the establishment of a medical school in the colonies, but it also provides key evidence for citizens' mistrust of medical doctors.
- 15.) Gallagher, *The Doctors' Story*, 12.

- 16.) Whitfield J. Bell, Jr, "A Portrait of the Colonial Physician," in *The Colonial Physician and Other Essays*, ed. Whitfield J. Bell, Jr. (New York: Science History Publications, 1975), 10.
- 17.) Sappol, *A Traffic of Dead Bodies*, 14.
- 18.) Sappol, *A Traffic of Dead Bodies*, 15.
- 19.) Sappol, *A Traffic of Dead Bodies*, 17.
- 20.) Sappol, *A Traffic of Dead Bodies*, 17 and 35.
- 21.) Sappol, *A Traffic of Dead Bodies*, 31.
- 22.) Sappol, *A Traffic of Dead Bodies*, 18.
- 23.) Wilf, "Anatomy and Punishment," 510.
- 24.) Samuel Bard, *A Discourse Upon the Duties of a Physician* (New York: A & J Robertson, 1769), title page.
- 25.) Bard, *A Discourse Upon the Duties of a Physician*, 2.
- 26.) Bard, *A Discourse Upon the Duties of a Physician*, 3.
- 27.) Bard, *A Discourse*, 9.
- 28.) Bard, *A Discourse*, 1.
- 29.) Bard, *A Discourse*, 8.
- 30.) Bard, *A Discourse*, 4.
- 31.) Bard, *A Discourse*, 6.
- 32.) Bard, *A Discourse*, 13-14.
- 33.) Bard, *A Discourse*, i.
- 34.) Bard, *A Discourse*, ii.
- 35.) Bard, *A Discourse*, ii-iii.
- 36.) Bard, *A Discourse*, 17.
- 37.) Benjamin Rush, "Observations on the Duties of a Physician, and the Methods of Improving Medicine. Accommodated to the Present State of Society and Manners in the United States," (Philadelphia: Prichard & Hall, 1789), 2.
- 38.) Rush, "Observations on the Duties of a Physician," 3-4.
- 39.) Rush, "Observations on the Duties of a Physician," 9.
- 40.) Rush, "Observations on the Duties of a Physician," 11.
- 41.) Peter Thompson, *Rum, Punch and Revolution: Tavern going and Public Life in Eighteenth-Century Philadelphia* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1998), 75. Though this evidence is provided by a study of colonial Philadelphia, the growth and use of taverns in American colonies was similar across the region. For the purposes of this research, we assume that New York taverns were frequented by crowds similar in makeup to Philadelphia's.
- 42.) Sharon V. Salinger, *Taverns and Drinking in Early America* (Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002), 54-58.
- 43.) Mr. Printer," *The Daily Advertiser*. February 16, 1788.
- 44.) The following excerpt selected from the February 3, 1788 petition via Caroline De Costa and Francesca Miller, "American Resurrection and the 1788 New York Doctors' Riot," *The Lancet* 377 (January 22, 2011), 292-293: "Most humbly sirs, we declare that it has lately been the practice of a number of young gentlemen in this city who call themselves students of the physic, to repair to the burying ground, assigned for the use of your petitioners. Under cover of the night, in the most wanton sallies of excess, they dig up bodies of our deceased friends and relatives of your petitioners, carrying them away without respect for age or sex. Your petitioners are well aware of the necessity of physicians and surgeons consulting dead subjects for the benefit of mankind. Your petitioners do not presuppose it as an injury to the deceased and would not be adverse to dissection in particular circumstances, that is, if it is conducted with the decency and propriety which the solemnity of such occasion requires. Your petitioners do not wish

to impede the work of these students of the physic but most humbly pray your honors to take our case into consideration and adopt such measure as may seem meet to prevent similar abuses in the future."

- 45.) *The Daily Advertiser*, February 16, 1788.
- 46.) Humanio, "Mr. Childs," *The Daily Advertiser*, February 28, 1788.
- 47.) *The Daily Advertiser*, February 28, 1788.
- 48.) *The Daily Advertiser*, February 28, 1788.
- 49.) A Friend to Decency, "The Following Would Have Appeared Sooner, but the Copy of it was Misaid," *The Daily Advertiser*, February 29, 1788.
- 50.) A Friend to Decency, *The Daily Advertiser*, February 29, 1788.
- 51.) A Student of Physic, "Mr. Printer," *The Daily Advertiser*, February 23, 1788.
- 52.) Student of Physic, jun., "Mr. Childs, by Genius to be Sneer'd at, is a Curse," *The Daily Advertiser*, March 1, 1788.
- 53.) *The Daily Advertiser*, February 23, 1788.
- 54.) *The Daily Advertiser*, February 28, 1788.
- 55.) *The Daily Advertiser*, February 28, 1788.
- 56.) Philo-Smilion, "Mr. Childs," *The Daily Advertiser*, February 28, 1788.
- 57.) Philo-Smilion, *The Daily Advertiser*, February 28, 1788.
- 58.) "100 Dollars Reward," *The Daily Advertiser*, February 26, 1788.
- 59.) William Shippen, Jr., "Body-Snatching in Philadelphia," in *The Colonial Physician and Other Essays*, ed. Whitfield J. Bell, Jr. (New York: Science History Publications, 1975), 217-218.
- 60.) Headley, *The Great Riots*, 57.
- 61.) Headley, *The Great Riots*, 56.
- 62.) Headley, *The Great Riots*, 57.
- 63.) Headley, *The Great Riots of New York*, 65.
- 64.) De Costa and Miller, "American Resurrection," 293.
- 65.) Samuel L. Mitchill, *The Present State of Medical Learning in the City of New York*, (New York: Swords, 1797), 6-9.
- 66.) De Costa and Miller, "American Resurrection," 293.

### Bibliography

- Bard, Samuel. *A Discourse Upon the Duties of a Physician, With Some Sentiments, on the Usefulness and Necessity of a Public Hospital: Delivered Before the President and Governors of King's College, at the Commencement, Held on the 15th of May, 1769: As Advice to Those Gentlemen Who Then Received the First Medical Degrees Conferred by That University*. New York: A. & J. Robertson, at the corner of Beaver-Street, M,DCC,LXIX, 1769.
- Bell, Whitfield J. Jr. "A Portrait of the Colonial Physician." In *The Colonial Physician and Other Essays*, edited by Whitfield J. Bell, Jr., 5-25. New York: Science History Publications, 1975.
- The Daily Advertiser*.
- De Costa, Caroline and Francesca Miller. "American Resurrection and the 1788 New York Doctors' Riot." *The Lancet* 377 (January 22, 2011), 292-293.
- Gallagher, Thomas. *The Doctors' Story*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1967.



- Headley, Joel Tyler. *The Great Riots of New York: 1712-1873*. New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1970.
- Hellerstein, Walter. "Body-Snatching" Reconsidered: The Exhumation of Some Early American Legal History." *Brooklyn Law Review* 39, no. 2 (Fall 1972), 350-369.
- Mitchill, Samuel L. *The Present State of Medical Learning in the City of New York*. New York: T. and J. Swords, 1797.
- Rush, Benjamin. *Observations on the Duties of a Physician, and the Methods of Improving Medicine. Accommodated to the Present State of Society and Manners in the United States*. Philadelphia: Prichard & Hall, 1789.
- Salinger, Sharon V. *Taverns and Drinking in Early America*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002.
- Sappol, Michael. *A Traffic of Dead Bodies: Anatomy and Embodied Social Identity in Nineteenth-Century America*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2002.
- Shippen, William, Jr. "Body-Snatching in Philadelphia." In *The Colonial Physician and Other Essays*, edited by Whitfield J. Bell, Jr, 217-218. New York: Science History Publications, 1975.
- Tannenbaum, Rebecca. *Health and Wellness in Colonial America*. Santa Barbara, CA: Greenwood, 2012.
- Thompson, Peter. *Rum Punch and Revolution: Tavern going and Public Life in Eighteenth-Century Philadelphia*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999.
- Wilf, Steven Robert. "Anatomy and Punishment in Late Eighteenth-Century New York." *Journal of Social History* 22, no. 3 (Spring 1989), 507-530.

