

will offer "hope," and the pockets of the 'pathists bulge with the fruition of playing the rôle of the straw.

These are some of the moral reasons why we should oppose them. They preach and write about the "uselessness of drug therapy," often bragging that "not a spoonful of poisonous drugs has ever passed our child's mouth."

We know a Christian Science mother who, after her husband covered with blotches was taken to a smallpox pest-house, allowed her children to play with neighbors' children and taught them to lie about themselves when their own little bodies broke out with the disease. What chance is there for scientific advancement, for better sanitary conditions, etc., when such an incubus drags on society?

In Kansas City, Mo., exists a spiritualist "healer" society called Unity. Detail your symptoms and send them two, five or ten dollars, and they will "offer" two, five or ten dollars' worth of "prayer." Their most fervent prayer probably is, "Thank God all the suckers are not dead."

As pharmacists we should enlighten the public relative to such practices and use every reasonable means in exposing their methods.

Was it by scientific medicine and scientific sanitation, or was it by unscientific humbug, that Goethals was enabled to free the Panama Canal Zone of yellow fever? Was it by the use of drugs or by spinal adjustments, faith "healing," etc., that typhoid fever was eliminated from our great army camps?

When the chill of malaria fever approaches what should the patient have—a spinal adjustment, a prayer, or a dose of quinine? We know and we believe the public ought to have the whole truth.

HISTORICAL FRAGMENTS.

BY EDWARD KREMERS.

17. Some Medico-Pharmaceutical Advertisements of the 17th Century.*

Any newspaper of 1664, whatever its name or character, will appeal to the newspaper-ridden world of to-day. When paper was made by hand, our modern sheets were out of the question. With not overmuch exaggeration, it might almost be said that a single copy of a metropolitan Sunday paper contains as much purified cellulose as did an entire edition of a diminutive newspaper two hundred and fifty years ago. The contrast in size constitutes possibly the greatest difference when compared with our modern daily. So far as the issue under consideration is concerned we find the same attempt at the suppression of free speech, the same accounts of wars and petty quarrels the world over that we have come to regard as characteristic of our own time. Even the secret nostrum advertisement is not wanting.

England had grown tired of her Cromwellian "democracy" and had invited back her king and with him the reaction that was of necessity coupled with the restoration of the Stuarts. In her commercial exploitation of inferior or less de-

* For having his attention directed to these advertisements, the writer is indebted to Mr. Oswald Garrison Villard, editor of *The Nation*, in whose collection the original is to be found and who kindly gave the writer permission to have photostatic copies prepared.

veloped nations, she came into conflict not only with these peoples (see news from Tangiers) but with other nations that were trying to play the same game (see news from Holland and the East). The Turk had invaded "Germany," that is, a part of what was but recently the Austro-Hungarian Empire, and the readers of *The Intelligencer* were apparently as ready to believe stories about the Turk, no matter how absurd the narrative, as our own people were ready only a few years ago to swallow every untruth told about the "Hun." How little the world has changed, after all, since the Pilgrims came to this country to escape persecution in England and then persecuted the religious minorities in New England, burned witches until no one was safe, and destroyed the pagan Indian for the greater glory of God.

However, this is not the occasion to indulge in general historical comparisons, not even is it to serve as an excuse to write a story about a newspaper in order to get even with newspaper stories. As already intimated, the excuse for calling attention to the *Intelligencer* for May 16, 1664, lies in some of its minor features, if smaller size and a different style of type are any indication of lesser importance, namely, to some of its advertisements.

This much must be said for the editor and publisher of *The Intelligencer*, that he prominently labeled his "Advertisements" as such. The first group of four ads on page 3 are "Advertisements of Books." The second of these pertains to John French's "The Art of Distillation." The second group of five ads on page 5 is miscellaneous in character and contains one of the kind that we now commonly designate patent medicine ads. This group includes "fresh *Epsum-Water*" and "An excellent and approved powder," the latter to be had at the shop of a book-seller.

A somewhat closer examination of these advertisements may not be altogether devoid of interest, especially in our country at a time when a reference to "London Distiller" might tempt others than pharmacists to purchase a copy of the book if it were in the market to-day. Such a purchaser, however, might be sorely disappointed in the greater part of the book and, upon a second glance at the advertising paragraphs conclude that, after all, he was more interested in "Epsom-Ale" and "Spruce-Beer."¹

Allusion has already been made to the rivalries between England and Holland in the East Indies. To appreciate fully this copy of *The Intelligencer* one must read, at the same time, Pepys' "Diary" written during the same period. The same motive for sea supremacy that caused England to stage the World War, caused her in 1663 to support a debauched king to get ready for a war against Holland. It was the discovery of the West Indies by Columbus, and the almost equally important discovery of an all-water route to the East Indies by Vasco da Gama in 1498, that caused spices, for some of which Europeans had formerly paid their weight in silver and gold, to be sold cheap enough to be used as medicaments by others than royalty and the nobility. Indeed, the spicers and apothecaries of Paris for a time constituted one guild, so closely were they related commercially. While Galenist and Paracelsist quarreled over the use of mineral medicaments, the new pharmaceutical chemist not only learned to prepare chemical remedies, but distilled every old and new spice that came from the two Indies. Indeed, he went so far in his

¹ "At the *Angel and Sun* in the *Strand* near *Strand Bridge* is to be sold every day fresh *Epsum-Water*, *Barnet-Water*, and *Tunbridge-Water*; *Epsum-Ale* and *Spruce-Beer*."

craze to distil everything, that he placed precious stones into his retorts and alembics and distilled them with either water or wine in order to extract their quintessence. Hence treatises on distillation constituted the "literature on new remedies" of the seventeenth century, though, in our shortsightedness, we imagine that we have a monopoly on things new in the *materia medica*. For this reason "The Art of Distillation; or a Treatise of the Chocycest Spagyricall Preparations, Experiments, and Curiosities, performed by way of Distillation," in Six Books: by John French, Doctor in Physique. To which is added in this Third Impression *Calcination*, and *Sublimation* in Two Books; as also the "London Distiller" was advertised in the issue of *The Intelligencer* under consideration, and no doubt, was a popular book. It was first published in 1651; a second edition in 1653; the third edition—the one here advertised—in 1664 and a fourth edition in 1667.

If one recalls that the first edition of French's "Art of Distillation" appeared scarcely a generation after the first edition of the London Pharmacopoeia had made its appearance in 1618 and that copies of this treatise are so scarce because the college was ashamed of its own work and had the first edition suppressed on account of the amount of superstition and vulgar "science" that had crept into it, we shall not be surprised at the crudities of the "Art of Distillation."

On the continent there had appeared a number of excellent treatises on distillation. Such were the books of Braunschweig, Ryff and others.¹ A disciple of Paracelsus, our English author had copied not a little of the bombast of his master. Like him he was an alchemist as well as an iatrochemist. Hence the contrast between the style of John French, "Dr. in Physick," and his contemporary, Robert Boyle, the "sceptical chymist," is noteworthy. Whereas Boyle wrote for the scholar, French wrote for the dilettante in science, or more correctly in this instance, for the one who dabbled in truth as well as in experiment. Curious experiments as well as money-making operations are described and if the "philosopher" is disappointed he must not blame the author but himself for having failed in his laboratory technique *Secundum Artem Alchymistae*. Hence the advertisement of this book alongside with "An Excellent and Approved Powder" is what one might expect, both advertisements appealing to the credulous. This readily explains the author's desire to produce a less expensive book than the German treatises on distillation.

It would be unreasonable to expect the intelligence of the people to rise higher than its source. Hence the reference to the "patent medicine"² advertisements and that of the alchemistic treatise on "The art of distillation" should be supplemented by one emanating from Whitehall and dated May 14. We have reference to the last paragraph of this newspaper of 1664:

"His Sacred Majesty having Declared it to be his Royal Will and Purpose to continue the Healing of his People for the Evil, during this Month of *May*; and then to give over till *Michaelmas* next, I am commanded to give Notice thereof, that the People may not come up to the Town in the *Interim*, and loose their Labour.

In Pepys' "Diary" we have the record of an eye witness of this species of royal quackery. Thus on June 23, 1660, Pepys recorded the following item:

¹ Comp. "Sixteenth Century Treatises on Distillation," *Ph. Rev.*, 20, p. 56.

² For a concise statement concerning English patents, more particularly with reference to their application to medicines, see Wootton, "Chronicles of Pharmacy," Vol. II, p. 161.

"To my Lord's lodgings. . . and then staid to see the King touch people for the King's evil. But he did not come at all, it rained so; and the poor people were forced to stand all the morning in the rain in the garden. Afterward he touched them in the Banqueting-house." Again April 13 of the following year: "To Whitehall by water. . . I went to the Banquet house, and there saw the King heale the first time that I ever saw him do it; which he did with great gravity, and it seemed to me to be an ugly office and a simple one." The editor of the edition reprinted in "Everymans Library" devotes one of his longest footnotes to this peculiar practice.

The King's evil is now regarded by some as a localized tuberculosis; at least so we are informed by a modern commentator. It is claimed that the power of curing this dread disease was of English growth "commencing with Edward the Confessor, and descending only to such foreign sovereigns as could show an alliance with the royal family of England. But the kings of France claimed the gift, and it was certainly practiced by Philip I, although he was allowed to have lost the power through his immorality." "Henry VII was the first to institute a peculiar service of ceremony on the occasion of touching, and this continued until the reign of Queen Anne. 'Touch-pieces' were coined from Henry VII's reign down to the time of James II. In 1748 the nonjuring historian T. Carte lost a subsidy from the county council of London for a note in his 'History of England' to the effect that a man had been cured of the King's evil by a touch of the Pretender in 1716." Truly the remedy was regarded sacred and, in the light of the immorality of the Stuarts, one wonders how immoral a divine English king might become before his touch ceased to be effective.

Contrast with this custom the practice of the irregular Puritanic healer in New England as described in "Receipts to cure various disorders" written "by some London physician" in 1643 "for my worthy friend Mr. Winthrop."¹

"For the Kings evill. Take 2 Toades & let them fast 2 or 3 dayes that they may spewe out their Earth, then boyle them in a pint of Oyle in a newe pipkin covered so long, till they be brought to a black Coale broken in peeces, presse out the Oyle, from the said Toades, reserve a 4th part, to the other three parts add half a pound of yellow wax, shavd small. Let the wax melt in the Oyle in wch dippe linnen cloathes, that they may be well covered cirecloathes. with the 4th part of the Oyle left, annoynt all the places infected, & then strewe of my powder of Toades (mentioned before for an Antidot agaynst the Plague) upon the sores of swellings, & then put on of ye cirecloath.

"dresse the running sores once everie 24 howres, but it will serve to dresse the swellings once in 4 dayes. Everie 4th day at furthest give of ye said black powder to the partie & let them swet upon it. you may proportion the dos from 5 graynes to a dragme according to the strength & constitution of ye partie. If the partie be strong, it is the better that they swet everie day or everie second day.

"By this Course ther is no doubt of the cure by Gods assistance."

One may well wonder what was more acceptable to the sight of the Lord: a roué Catholic king curing by faith or a Puritan preacher frying toads in oil in the belief that the charred animal would effect a cure "by God's assistance."²

¹ See the account of this interesting historical document by Oliver Wendell Holmes in "Massachusetts Historical Society Proceedings," Vol. 5, p. 379.

² Since this Historical Fragment was written there has come to the writer's attention a copy of Bickerstaff's New England Almanac for 1776 which, among "Experienced Medicines, extracted from Authors," contains directions for the preparation of medicaments against "King's-Evil," one to be used internally, the other to be applied externally.

Of the rôle which Epsom and other waters advertised in *The Intelligencer* were playing in English social life, we get some idea from Pepys. During his first visit to Epsom, July 25 and 26, 1662, he is surprised to see so many "citizens," as opposed to those higher up in society, of whom he had not known "that they had ever had it in their heads or purses to go down thither." While for his annual purge he selects a Sunday so as not to allow his "medicine" to interfere with his business, he by no means objects to a glass or more *en passant*. Thus under date of July 11, 1663, he records taking the coach to Holvorne and thence by horse to Barnett. Having bade his wife good-bye after dinner, he "and Will to see the Wells half a mile off, and then drank three glasses, and walked, and come back and drunk two more." He concludes his day's record with "not being very well, I betimes to bed."

Not everyone could afford to go to Epsom or even less fashionable "wells," hence the waters were brought to the people. This explains the advertisement. An interesting historical account of how the "waters," artificial as well as natural, were exploited has recently appeared from the pen of Wm. Kirkby.¹

It would not do to omit from this cursory account the exact wording of the advertisement which is responsible for having this copy of *The Intelligencer* brought to the attention of the writer, namely, that of "An Excellent and Approved Powder, for the Removing or Preventing of the Falling-Sickness; being also of singular Virtue against the Megrim, Swimmings in the Head, all Fainting, and Convulsion Fits; very good likewise against Worms. Is to be had at the House of *H. Breme* at the *Gun* in *Ivy-Lane*, Bookseller."

While comments on the advertisement itself seem quite unnecessary, it should be pointed out that both the "Excellent and Approved Powder" as well as the "Epsom-Water" are not offered for sale by apothecaries or druggists but that the "Approved Powder" may be had at a "bookseller" and the "Epsom-Water," etc., at the "Angel and Sun," presumably an inn.

A PHARMACEUTICAL EXAMINATION IN 1697.*

BY B. E. HOCKERT.

During a visit to Sweden in 1920 I secured a pamphlet, by Apothecary Axel Kockum, relating to the first pharmaceutical examinations in Sweden before the Royal Collegium Medicum (Board of Health). Before the Collegium Medicum was instituted by King Charles XI, in 1688, no examinations or stated requirements were demanded for starting an apothecary shop. But in the instruction given to the Collegium Medicum the King prescribed: "The old way, that the local magistrates give license to open and conduct an apothecary shop to whomever they consider competent, is wrong, and after this such licenses shall be issued by the King and only to persons who have been examined by our Collegium Medicum. The Collegium shall then put such questions to the persons called for examinations as will show their knowledge of medical simplicia and their preparations in Ga-

¹ *Pharm. Journ.*, 106, p. 386.

* Read before Section on Historical Pharmacy, New Orleans meeting, 1921. For discussion see Minutes, *JOUR. A. PH. A.*, for December, p. 966.