

A letter to *** [William Lewis], M.D. heretofore of ***** [Christ Church] College in the University of O-**-*-d [Oxford] / [George Wilmot].**

Contributors

Wilmot, George.
Lewis, William, M.D.
Christ Church (University of Oxford)

Publication/Creation

London : G. Griffiths, 1752.

Persistent URL

<https://wellcomecollection.org/works/nzrectwa>

License and attribution

This work has been identified as being free of known restrictions under copyright law, including all related and neighbouring rights and is being made available under the Creative Commons, Public Domain Mark.

You can copy, modify, distribute and perform the work, even for commercial purposes, without asking permission.



Wellcome Collection
183 Euston Road
London NW1 2BE UK
T +44 (0)20 7611 8722
E library@wellcomecollection.org
<https://wellcomecollection.org>

WILMOT, G.

59705/10

8305

A

L E T T E R

T O

***** M. D.

HERETOFORE OF

***** COLLEGE

IN THE

U N I V E R S I T Y

O F

O — * — * — * — * — D.

by George Wilmot

*Laudare quæ constat esse honesta, & vituperare quæ ex Confesso
sint turpia, est Oratoris Officium.*


QUINTILL. Lib. iii. Cap. 5.

Causa Patrocinio non bona pejor erit.

OVID. de Trist. Lib. i. 26.

L O N D O N,

Printed for G. GRIFFITHS, the Corner of *Elliot's* Court near
St. Sepulchre's Church. MDCCLII.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2018 with funding from
Wellcome Library

<https://archive.org/details/b30353208>

A
L E T T E R

T O

***** M. D. &c.

S I R,

WHEN *private* Men take upon them to teaze the Publick with *Inquiries, Accusations, Replies, Defences, &c.* every single Member of Society, who has Leisure to look into such *personal* Press Productions, and Patience to go through them, acquires a better Right to speak his own Opinion of such Performances, than the contending Parties have to ask it.

A Twelve-penny Brat, lately thrust into the World under the Title of *A Serious Inquiry into some late Proceedings at O——d, &c.* (in which, it seems You, Sir, are *fundamentally* concerned) would probably have perished unregarded on the Pamphlet-Bulks of this City, had not it's Birth been attended by an Advertisement in the publick News Papers, importing a speedy Answer to that same Inquiry.

These Intimations created a Curiosity in some quondam Ox—n—ns, who frequent *Dick's* Coffee House, to know what mighty Matters were on the Tapis in the Family of a good old Lady, to whom They esteem Themselves in their Youth to have had very high Obligations, and for whom, in their advancing Years, They are ready to profess the highest Veneration. Among the rest, I gave myself the Pain of an attentive Perusal of the *Inquiry*: In which I found certain Facts, of a criminal Complexion, urged against You, Sir, in a Manner which led me to hope, that either *personal* Animosity, or that Bane of Society, *party Spleen* might possibly be at the Bottom of the Accusation. Influenced by these Prejudices against the *Inquirer*, I waited with an honest Impatience for an Opportunity *audiendi alteram partem*; when to my Astonishment, by an Error destructive of every Pretension to Innocence on *Your* Part, and absolutely fatal to Your Character, *something* stumbled into Light, which it's unguarded Author call'd *An Answer to the Serious Inquiry*.

An Examination of this extraordinary Piece corrected my Sentiments of the *Inquirer*, and obliged me to acknowledge that You, Sir, have been treated by *Him* rather with *Compassion* than with *Cruelty*; and that certain *Imprudences*, *Offences*, *unguarded Expressions*, &c. *contra Bonos Mores* (excuse me, I use your own Words, if the Answer be Yours) are thrown into a more glaring and unfavourable Light by Your own Pen,
(or

(or by that of Your pretended Apologist) than by the severest Animadversions of the *Inquirer*, of whose Injustice You so loudly complain. In a Word ; Your *Answer*, Your *Defence*, Your *Exculpation* (if it be Yours) must appear to every unprejudiced Reader to be a Confession of more low and dirty Transactions than the *inhumane* Author of the *Inquiry* has laid to Your Charge.

You may possibly have good Reason for saying that You have for ever done, (or rather for wishing that You had for ever done) with Him and his Writings. But if He really is, as You insinuate in Your Preface, at this Time a Member of the same Community with Yourself, You may possibly very soon find that He hath not for ever done with *You* and *Your* Writings.—But after all why do I say *Your* Writings ?—You cannot sure be so absurd as to afford Your Hand or Countenance to so bitter a Libel against Yourself. No, Sir, this shameful Apologist, this low and dirty *Defender* must assuredly be one of those Engines, of which You complain, “ set at work to magnify and misrepresent in the blackest Manner, a few unguarded Words before a Boy,” [*Answ. p. 44.*] and who, under the Mask of *Friendship*, and the Appearance of pouring Oil into the Wounds made in your Reputation, has watched his Opportunity of stabbing You much deeper, than could be intended by the Author of the *Inquiry*.

You are quite right, Sir, it must be acknowledged, in Your Effort to creep under the Wing
of

of Power : But whether larding your Defence with a Panegyrick on your Magistrate, and blending Your own dirty Cause with His Conduct, will answer Your *Purposes*, is a Matter which admits of some Doubt. Whatever Your Expectations from *Him* may be, I am really told that He is heartily sick of *You* ; and I am in no Measure surprised at it, since Your admitted *Imprudences*, *Faults*, *Offences*, *Indecencies*, &c. have been the only Infelicity attending his Administration. His publick and his private Character stand confessed, without the least Assistance from your Pen:

“ *Non tali Auxilio, nec Defensoribus istis*

“ *Tempus eget.*”——

And whatever Writer shall take upon him to censure *His* Conduct, as You, Sir, have censured that of some of his Predecessors (for having in the Cases of *Th——te*, *S——l——n* and *D——be*, acted, as You in Terms assert, without a due Foundation in Law) [*pag.* 28] will find as slender an Attention from the Publick as You, or Your doughty Apologist have hitherto done.

The Mention of these Cases reminds me of something resembling a *Triumph* in Your Answer, built, it seems, on an Observation made by the *Inquirer*, that “ a Similitude of Offence call’d
“ for an Uniformity in Judgment, and, in Case
“ of Conviction, for an Equality in Punishment.”
Can He in the first Place say (as your Hero asks the Question) that there is any Similitude between the three Cases themselves?——Why yes truly, Sir, He, or any one else, acquainted with
the

the Laws of your Community, may with great Safety affirm, that there is a Similitude of *Offence* in those Cases, as each of them was such a notorious Violation of the wholesome Laws of the Place, as called for the Penalty of *Expulsion*, which was actually inflicted.

But again: It is demanded whether the Inquirer *dare* say that there is any Similitude between the first (*viz.* the Case of *Tb——te*) and the present Case? [*p.* 28.]—Now really I should apprehend that there would be nothing exceeding *daring* in such an Assertion. Let any unprejudiced Reader but compare the filthy Depositions in both Cases, and if He does not discover a Similitude of *Crime*, I shall not envy him for his Faculty of Penetration: And when He has made such a Discovery, he will not be forward to admit the Reasonableness of Your Charge of “*Affurance or scandalous Insinuations*,” brought against the Writer who call’d the Warden of *W——db——m*’s Case a Precedent. [*p.* 28.]

But to revert to Your own Case: There is something too absurd to merit a serious Reply in that Dream of Your Apologist, that “no College
“ in *O——d* (excepting *Ch. Ch.*) could have expelled one of it’s Members for a like Offence;
“ and that *Ch. Ch.* could only exert such an Authority, because that College was govern’d by
“ no Statutes.” [*p.* 29, 30.]

I could really wish, that before Your Apologist had so *roundly asserted*, he had given himself the Trouble of an Inquiry amongst your
Neighbours

Neighbours at C. C. C. for what Cause Mr. *Th—che*, a Foundation Member, was some Years ago expelled from that Society? And He would do well to ask the like Question at *W—db—m* College, in the Case of one *W—t—n* a Foundation Scholar, who was lately required to depart from that Society, and from the University, for the like Offence. It might not, lastly, be amiss to inquire whether there really are *any* Statutes in Both, or Either of those Colleges.

Alas, Sir, the *Reason, Equity, and Common Sense* [p. 30.] discoverable in such Assertions, in such a novel Mode of arguing may, with great Propriety, be ranked with the *Knowledge, the Learning, and Truth* conspicuous in another Argument of His, (*viz.*) that because an *English* Father cannot cut his Child's Throat with Impunity, therefore he shall not maintain an Action, in his own Name, against an Offender, for having corrupted or debauched (or by Acts of Lewdness or Indecency, attempted to corrupt or debauch) his Child.

Pray, Sir, on this Occasion rest not altogether on Your own Law Prowess, or on that of Your Apologist: But consult some of those Gentlemen, whom "You have had the Honour of breeding up," [p. 43.] and who are now Candidates for Fame in *Westminster-hall*. The youngest of these will tell you, that Civil Actions have latterly been brought by *English* Parents against the Man, whose Offence falls greatly short of *Παιδεραστία*, (*viz.*) the Corrupter of a *Daughter's* Chastity.

Chastity. In which Cases great Damages have been given for the especial Insult *offered*, the personal Injury *done* to the Parent. And for this very Reason possibly it may be that a certain O——d Parent, who it seems, was lately clamorous for Justice, is (as I am informed) just at this Crisis, by some extraordinary Turn in her *Affairs*, softened into an Acquiescence under all her Anxiety.—But the Publick having likewise a confessed Interest in a Prosecution for Offences *contra Bonos Mores*, the Complaint of that same Publick may probably be not so expeditiously silenced.

After all, Sir, as it is evident that the whole Art and every Argument of your Pseudo-Apologist rest upon this single Point, (viz.) that “ You have not been so criminal as you might have been :” To this I make a full Reply in a very few Words, borrowed from the Inquirer, “ *Perfecto Flagitio punitur Capite ; Imperfecto in Insulam deportatur.*”

And what now has Your Apologist to object to *this* Mode of doing Justice to an offended Community? —Why truly “ the Usage which You have already met with, may be look’d upon as Punishment adequate to Your Fault.” [*p.* 43.]——May it so? And pray what Circumstances of Terror attended this heavy Punishment? You have had the Trouble of writing Your Name at the Foot of a Bond for “ better Behaviour :” You will not say that there was

any thing very *smartful* in the Performance of *that* Ceremony.

“ But this alone has not been deem’d sufficient.” [p. 42.] How unreasonable such *Deemsters*! As if a Bond, executed in due Form of Law, was not ample satisfaction for the *Peccadillo* of giving a Kiss or two, and “ some Shillings to a Boy, and bidding him come again “ and fixing the Time.” [p. 3.]

But alas! who could have thought it? Notwithstanding this whole painful Operation of Bond-giving; this “ Chastisement of Your own “ kind Mother, that cruel Witch of a *Step-Mother*, that *Pratler* GOODY FAME catch’d “ the Hint, and assuming the Form of a common “ News Paper, away she flew—*Gorgoneis infecta* “ *Venenis*, founding forth, and swelling the ignominious Tale throughout the Kingdom.” p. 42.

Poor Gentleman! It must be acknowledged that this *Step-Mother* of Yours has not been quite so indulgent to You, as You had Reason to wish.—But if You had consider’d her *Sex*, and the Nature and Tendency of a *Fault*, which You “ have Sense enough to see, Ingenuity to confess it, and a Conscience to be sorry for it,” [p. 41.] You would not surely have affected any Sort of Astonishment at Her Resentment and Complaint.

Now, Sir, to convince You that one who is absolutely unknown to You, may be more Your Friend than Your pretended Apologist, I shall point out a Snare or two which He has laid for
Your

Your Judgment, and thereby give You a fair Caution to avoid them.

First then this Sham-Defender of You seems to betray his *real* Intentions to hurt You by a Sollicitude to lead his Readers into a Persuasion that You are highly injured by the *Inquirer*, “ who (says He) has taken Care to collect the “ *several* Incidents, which fell out accidentally at “ *different* Times, and to fling them all together in one View before the Eyes of the “ Reader, as if they had happened at the *same* “ Time.” [p. 7.]

Now really a close Attention to every Article of the *Inquiry* does not furnish me with *Evidence* of this Fact. But, for Argument's Sake, I admit it to be so; and then I ask whether You are more severely treated by an *Accuser*, who charges You with Enormities, into which Your confessed *Imprudence* hurry'd You at *one* and the same Time, or by a pretended Advocate, who allows a *Frequency* of Criminal Acts, repeated with Deliberation at *different* Times, each of a manifest Tendency towards *one* and the *same* *opprobrious* Point in View.

Again : One especial Act of shocking Indecency (which I cannot force my Pen to repeat from Yours) took Place (says Your Defender) not (as is insinuated by the *Inquirer*) in *private*, in a *College Chamber*; but truly it was in the *open College*, at *Noon*, in *Publick*, and in the *Sight* of two *Women*. [p. 5.]—Was it so, good Sir? The Matter is much mended indeed, and

Your *Modesty* and *Chastity* both sufficiently vindicated.

But after all, to lessen the Triumph of Your Apologist in this fancied Misrepresentation by the *Inquirer*, I cannot find that he makes any Sort of Mention of the Time *when*, or the Spot of Ground *whereon* this important Event took Place.—He seems indeed to have charged You roundly with the *Fact*, and *this* Your Defender hath most fully confessed—with Circumstances, which swell and aggravate the Offence: And after this You cannot surely entertain a Doubt whether the *Inquirer* or the *Answerer* has loaded You with the heavier Accusation.

But not contented with This, He would *secondly* induce You to believe that the Convocation in O——d is not a Court having Original Jurisdiction. [p. 27.] Had this *Affirter* thought fit *here* to have added the few following Words (viz. in *Civil Causes*) You might have rely'd on his Assertion.—But to your huge Misfortune, Sir, *Yours* happens to be a *Criminal Cause*, of which That venerable House hath *pleno jure* Original Cognizance; and in which That Court may exercise an Original Jurisdiction, as, in similar Cases, hath been hitherto constantly and uniformly therein exercised, and which, it is to be hoped, ever will be in Despite of Ignorance and Chicanery.

Thirdly, “ That the Convocation (says Your *knowing* Friend) is the supreme Court of Appeal is most undoubtedly true;” [p. 27.] A Proposition

Proposition which only happens to be most undoubtedly *false*. It is well known to every Boy amongst You, whose Law-Labours have fallen short of "*Hawkins's Pleas of the Crown*," [pag. 33.] and who has only look'd into Your own Statutes "*De Judiciis*," that an Appeal lies from this *supreme* Court of Appeal, to the King's Majesty in his *more supreme* Court of Chancery.

Fourthly, It is by this astonishing Genius affirmed, that the House of Lords, with all it's Authority, lays no Claim to Original Jurisdiction of (possibly that learned Gentleman might intend to say *in*) the most minute Cause in the first Instance. [p. 27.]—Here again I must take Leave to observe, that either *the most minute Cause*, by an uncommon Phraseology, must stand for *Civil Cause*, (which allowed, the Assertion is true) or that the *Rebel Lords*, who lately lost their Heads in pursuance of a just Prosecution begun and ended in That House, were *coram non judice*; since in their *Criminal* Causes That most respectable Tribunal *de Jure* assumed, and in Fact exercised an Original Jurisdiction: And the venerable House of Convocation in O——d hath, from it's Institution uniformly exerted the like Authority in *Criminal Causes*, without any Complaints of "having acted without a due Foundation in Law," [pag. 28.] until the Year 1751.

But, Sir, since Your Panick was such at the Apprehension of a *Convocation* Inquiry, if I am not led into an Error by Accounts from O——d,
 You

You have probably before this Time found Yourself indulged by a Proceſs, to which *no* Objection can lie ; I mean by a regular Denunciation of Your Offence, in the loweſt Academic Court of Juſtice, by an open, legal, publick Charge ; to which Your Answer will be required in that Court.

A Proſecution this ! commenced by voluntary avowed Accuſers, who abhor the Imputation of “ ſhooting Arrows in the Dark ; [*p.* 42.] who have no Indispoſition towards You, other than what ariſeth from the Offence given to the whole Community ;—who are ready (if required) to take the *Oath of Calumny*, (*i. e.*) to ſwear that They believe their Cauſe to be a juſt and honourable Cauſe, and that “ They proſecute “ *Juſtitiae Gratiâ*, without the leaſt Degree of “ of Spleen, Malice, or Hatred, towards the “ Party accuſed.”

They moreover aver their Readineſs to make Oath that “ They were abſolutely ignorant of “ any Intention to grant the Indulgence of a “ private *Oath of Purgation* ;” and that if any open and publick Notice had been given of ſuch Intention (uſual in Courts wherein Self Purgation by Oath was ever allowed) They would have appear’d, objected to, and oppoſed ſuch Procedure, and, making themſelves *voluntary Accuſers*, would have required a publick Trial, a publick Diſcharge, or Condemnation.

Theſe, Sir, I am told, are the Matters at this Time going forward at O——d ; and I wiſh
You

You a good Deliverance. In the mean Time I cannot avoid observing to You, that were I a Promoter of this intended Prosecution, I should really look no further for Evidence of Your *Dirt* than into Your own printed Confession, (if after all it be Yours) and out of That I should readily collect sufficient Matter of Accusation against You.

That You *now* are “*Your own Accuser*” [p. 39.] is apparent to every Reader; and if Your Prosecutors really wanted Proof of Your Offence “*contra Bonos Mores*,” You have kindly furnished them therewith; [p. 11.] insomuch that should You at this Time reassume any Thoughts of the “Facility of tampering with “a poor Boy, or with his necessitous Family” [p. 10.] in order to take off his Evidence, Your Scheme would be absolutely fruitless, because You have, in the Judgment of all Mankind, given publick Evidence against Yourself.

It was far from my Intention, when I took my Pen, to follow Your Apologist thro’ especial Scenes of *Dirt*, shocking to every modest Reader, and to every intelligent one Evidence of a Stain, which, by the unskilful Use of a Sponge, He has greatly increased.—I conclude therefore my Address to *You*, as Your Sham Advocate does His to the *Inquirer*, with a Piece of Advice, (viz.) When You really find Yourself animated to commence (as You are said to menace) a Prosecution against any supposed Author of the *Inquiry*, do Yourself still further
Justice

Justice by looking out for the Author of the Answer to that Inquiry, and let the warmest Fire of Your Indignation be pointed at this *mask'd Battery*, apparently raised to demolish Your whole Reputation.

As I am a hearty Well-Wisher to the Community of which You are *still* a Member, I dare not hazard my Claim to that Character, by saying that I am,

S I R,

Your Friend or Servant,

OLIM OXONIENSIS.

Dick's Coffee-House, Temple
Bar, 1st Jan. 1752.