

## OBITUARY.

## CONRAD LEWIS DIEHL.

1840—1917.

Professor Diehl came to this country in 1851 at the age of eleven years, his father being a political refugee from Germany. He was born in Neustadt A. H. in Rhenish Bavaria. He was the eldest son of Therese Phillipine Rossi and Conrad Lewis Diehl.

Lewis and his brother entered school at Oakfield Academy, near St. Louis, but he left school permanently in 1854 and joined his father in Philadelphia, obtaining a position with R. and G. A. Wright, perfumers and drug sundrymen, where he remained until 1857. In 1858 he began an apprenticeship with an excellent pharmacist who practiced medicine, Dr. John R. Angney, of Philadelphia, and while there he attended the Philadelphia College of Pharmacy. He next accepted a position with Emilius Herwig, of Fifth and Brown Streets, Philadelphia, and became acquainted with German pharmacy. Subsequently he entered the employ of John Wyeth and Brother, where he worked in the laboratory until August, 1862, when he enlisted in the 15th Regiment of Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry.

He served gallantly in this Regiment until the Battle of Stone River, when he was severely wounded. After convalescence he obtained the position of assistant chemist in the United States Army Laboratory of Philadelphia, remaining there from April 1863, to January 1865. He and Professor Maisch became associated and the intimate friendship never ceased until the death of Professor Maisch.

At the close of the Civil War, Professor Diehl accepted a position with Ernst George Mueller and subsequently became a manufacturer of chemicals in the laboratory of Bender, Mahla

and Company, remaining there until July 1865, when he became manager of the Louisville Chemical Works, which position he held until December 1868.

In June 1869, he purchased a drug store in Louisville at First and Walnut Streets, and in August 1874, he opened a new store at the corner of Third Avenue and Broadway which he conducted until 1903.

In 1863 he read his first paper on Oleum Aethereum at the meeting of the American Pharmaceutical Association and was elected a member. In 1866 he was appointed Chairman of the Committee on the Progress of Pharmacy and in 1872 he made a report on the progress of pharmacy, which was presented at the Richmond meeting in 1873, and it was in this year that he began his services as Reporter on the Progress of Pharmacy. He held this position nearly forty years, resigning in 1915. In 1890, owing to ill health, he declined re-election, but again took the office in 1895. In 1874 he was elevated to the highest position in the gift of the Association, being elected its President.

Professor Diehl might properly be called the founder of the Louisville College of Pharmacy.

He was elected its first President in 1870 and was re-elected annually until 1881, when he declined the position. He was made Professor of Pharmacy in this College in 1871 and served until 1916. There was an interim in his services from 1881 to 1883.

Professor Diehl was a member of the Committee of Revision of the United States Pharmacopoeia first in 1890 and was elected to the Committee at the Conventions of 1900 and 1910, a period of twenty-seven years of continuous service.

He was also Chairman of the Committee of Revision of the National Formulary (second



C. LEWIS DIEHL.

Twenty-second President of the American Pharmaceutical Association.

For thirty-eight years Reporter on the Progress of Pharmacy; for twenty-eight years identified with the work on the National Formulary.

revision) published in 1896, and he continued in this position until 1917. He was able to serve both Committees of the National standard authorities and was of great service in preventing duplication of processes and formulas in both books.

In his own State, Professor Diehl was a member of the first Board of Pharmacy of Kentucky in 1874, on which he remained until 1886. In 1897 he again accepted appointment to the Board and was a member until the time of his death. He was President of the Kentucky Pharmaceutical Association and he was regarded as a tower of strength not only in his own State, but in the country of his adoption.

In reviewing his life, one must be struck by the great capacity for work which he possessed. He was a great student; he soon acquired a mastery of the English language and one of his great services to pharmacy was rendered through his ability to abstract from various foreign and domestic journals the salient points and pith of the various papers. This he rendered in language easily understood by readers of the Proceedings. This great gift, though appreciated by many of the members of the Association, was overlooked by many others who did not realize the difficulties of the abstracter.

He died in the City of Louisville on Sunday, March 25, 1917, and thus has passed away one of the most devoted, earnest, and faithful members of the profession of pharmacy in America.

He is survived by his wife, and three daughters, Mrs. Emily Frank, Miss Eleanor Diehl and Miss Jennie Diehl.

JOSEPH P. REMINGTON.

#### IN MEMORY OF PROF. C. LEWIS DIEHL.

JOHN F. HANCOCK.

C. Lewis Diehl was an educator and an up-lifter of pharmacy.

We were friends for many years. Each of us joined the American Pharmaceutical Association in 1863 at the annual meeting held in the City of Baltimore. He was a man of great mental ability and industry. In his early life he had some special advantages in laboratory work.

He was the Soul of Honor and his master work for many years as reporter of the Progress of Pharmacy of the American Pharmaceutical Association was a favorable introduction to the large membership of that organization.

Previous to 1872, when the Report depended upon a committee, the results had not been

satisfactory and a committee was appointed in 1872, consisting of Wm. Procter, Jr., Ed. Squibb and E. H. Sargent to consider better means to secure more satisfactory reports. The Committee presented the following at the Richmond meeting in 1873:

"RESOLVED, That after careful consideration followed by a full consultation with Mr. Diehl who had voluntarily consented to perform that service in the previous year, with credit to himself and satisfaction to the officers and members of the Association, they proposed the name of C. Lewis Diehl with the proviso, that he be paid an annual salary for his laborious services."

He was the first Reporter on the Progress of Pharmacy elected by the Association and proved so eminently satisfactory in the performance of his duties that no other member had the courage to aspire to the position until age and infirm health made him unequal to the task.

The annual reports on the Progress of Pharmacy were in themselves worth more to each member who was interested in the progress of pharmacy than the annual dues. This I have often suggested to those whom I have endeavored to induce to join the Association. These reports alone will stand as a record of his ability and should endear his memory to every member of the American Pharmaceutical Association.

Though he had become too feeble to take an active part in the meetings, he was an annual attendant and his popularity was manifested at the Atlantic City meeting last year by the hearty applause he received when he entered the room where the first general session was being held.

JOSEPH L. LEMBERGER.

Surely the body of the American Pharmaceutical Association is being invaded: One by one, the last roll call is answered, this time by one to whom a large majority of the membership were endeared for the valuable service rendered by him. For over fifty years we have met at our annual gatherings, and until in recent years, when physical infirmity prevented, the Association was the recipient of his herculean labor, his good work as the Reporter of the Progress of Pharmacy for thirty-seven years. This will ever be a monument to the skilful, energetic and intelligent effort of Professor Conrad Lewis Diehl. From early boyhood, to advanced age, his was an

interesting career. He was a good citizen, a diligent workman, and at the call of his country a loyal patriot.

In common with many of the members who shared his friendship and congenial fellowship, we feel his death as the personal loss of a friend, and join in sincere sympathy for the bereaved family.

JAMES M. GOOD.

The grim reaper has been very busy of late, in gathering to himself our prominent members.

The announcement of the death of our friend and old-time member of the A. Ph. A., although not unexpected, gives each of many of us a day of sadness. Not being personally well known by the younger, active members of the Association, yet they are all well acquainted with his work as Reporter on the Progress of Pharmacy and fully appreciate it. This work, in the form presented by him, we may properly consider completed, and it remains as his monument.

He leaves a host of friends in the A. Ph. A. He was the peer of such men as Maisch, Procter, Parrish and Squibb. He was one with them and of them. He was a connecting link between us and them. We cannot think of him without visions of them standing before us. His last days were those of anxiety and more or less suffering. His death brings rest and peace. We say: "Well done, good and faithful servant, enter thou into thy reward."

JOHN URI LLOYD.

Your letter, advising me of the death of Professor C. Lewis Diehl is to me exceedingly painful, for more reasons than one. From the time that I became concerned in the American Pharmaceutical Association, Professor Diehl has been to me a companion, not only at the meetings, but in the pleasurable visits we have had between times. He accomplished much in his long service to the Society, and established for himself a monument in the record that he made in the Progress of Pharmacy Section, in the Proceedings, so many years, in fact, I may say, decades. Nor need any one attempt to introduce to your readers the Professor Diehl so well known to all, and especially to one of the "Old Guard," of whom so few are left, of the class that embraced Professor Diehl and myself.

Each recurring year brings to me new vacant

places, with accompanying personal heart-aches, and when in Atlantic City last fall Professor Diehl and I sat together on the stage, there came to me the sad reflection that within a very short time, we too must be parted. That time has come.

FREDERICK J. WULLING.

I first became acquainted with C. Lewis Diehl in 1885 when I was introduced to him by my good friend and preceptor Prof. P. W. Bedford in New York City. At that time I did not yet have much pharmaceutical information. That accounted for the great respect I immediately gained for Prof. Diehl because of his wide and profound knowledge of pharmacy, which respect, however, I never lost thereafter. A few days of association with him at that time made me resolve to leave nothing undone to acquire at least as extensive an acquaintance with pharmacy as Prof. Diehl had. I remember distinctly having asked him for an estimate of time it would require for me to know as much about pharmacy as he did. He replied saying that it would not take very long to learn as much as he then knew, but that since he had not yet finished his pharmaceutical education and did not expect to finish it until he died, I would have to live a long time to catch up with him. While he said this jokingly, I at once caught the truth of the remarks. I first learned from Prof. Diehl the lesson that our own personal education is never finished, but that we are in a process of constant mental evolution, the degree of development depending upon the earnestness and will-power that we employ.

Not only has Prof. Diehl been an inspiration to many young men just starting out upon pharmaceutical careers, but he has been one of the foremost contributors to everything else that tends toward better and higher standards of pharmacy. He has made for himself an enviable position in the pharmacy of his time. His work on the National Formulary on the U. S. Pharmacopoeia, as teacher, ethical practitioner, Reporter on the Progress of Pharmacy of the A. Ph. A. and pharmaceutical writer has had a deep, profound and affirmative influence upon pharmacy. His gentleness, kindness, forbearance and patience have had an ennobling influence upon all those who had the privilege of his friendship and acquaintance. Pharmacy has sustained a great loss in his demise. The practical and necessary question with us who remain is to win for the calling

such young and new men who have in them the promise and ambition of becoming as efficient, loyal and kind pharmacists and men as C. Lewis Diehl was.

HENRY MILTON WHELPLEY.

The long and useful life work of Professor C. Lewis Diehl in pharmacy is on public record and a matter of common information. I will not dwell on it at this time.

Professor Diehl also had an extended personal acquaintance. This might be expected of one who had been in public pharmaceutical work for more than a half a century. With Professor C. Lewis Diehl, the personal acquaintances were by no means confined to those coming to him in the pharmaceutical eye. It was his personality which won intimate and lasting friendships.

I had the good fortune of becoming personally acquainted with Professor Diehl in 1884 and we met at least annually since that time. He was one of those persons who caused you to feel pleased with each interview. He took a genial view of life and imparted optimism to others. He was always ready to talk about pharmaceutical affairs but never bored you with uninteresting details. He did not go out of his way to criticize others. He was one of those few people who had plenty of time to mind his own business. After a visit with Professor Diehl, you thought all the more of him and also of others who happened to be concerned in the conversation.

The passing of Professor C. Lewis Diehl removes another and very nearly the last of the coterie which included Diehl, Ebert, Maisch, Gordon, Markoe, Searby, and from there extended back to the time of Procter and Parrish.

GEORGE M. BERINGER.

The grim Reaper has exacted heavy toll from the ranks of pharmacy during the last few months. With the decease of C. Lewis Diehl, a former President of the American Pharmaceutical Association, another of the commanding figures, of what could appropriately be termed the first century, of American pharmacy, has crossed to the Great Beyond.

I esteem it as one of the greatest privileges of my pharmaceutical career to have been associated with him and to have enjoyed his friendship. As a member of the Committee on National Formulary, we corresponded on many topics and likewise in the work of the

Pharmacopoeial Revision, we were associated on a number of the committees and this also necessitated frequent correspondence.

His letters always gave a keen enjoyment and impressed me with his many great qualifications. They demonstrated the personality of the writer, the mental poise, the high ideals, the clearness of thought and accuracy of expression, the forcefulness tempered with reserve and kindly consideration for the views of others, the earnestness and sincerity of a real friend. He was always accurate and his opinions were concisely and clearly stated and supported by reasons that demonstrated that they were based upon thoughtful consideration.

As a soldier, as an official, as a pharmacist, C. Lewis Diehl always well performed his duty. In his devoted work in behalf of his chosen calling, he sacrificed his personal financial gain that pharmacy might be enriched. The achievements that will survive and commemorate his life are undoubtedly that monumental work—"Abstracts on the Progress of Pharmacy" and the National Formulary.

As an abstractor of the literature of pharmacy and the cognate sciences, he has had no superior. His choice of matter, the completeness, the accuracy, the arrangement were ideal.

The several editions of the National Formulary, prepared under his chairmanship and editorship unquestionably reflect very largely the personal work of Professor Diehl. He carried this work through the several stages of its evolution and without this preliminary and well laid foundation, the National Formulary could not have achieved its present form and legal status.

In recent years, his failing health precluded his undertaking the labors that he loved and to which he had devoted so much of his life and in our conversations and correspondence he not infrequently expressed his regret thereat.

He was well informed on the topics of the times as well as on matters scientific and pharmaceutical and I enjoyed greatly the conversations that we had at the meetings of the A. Ph. A. and on the several visits that he made me. These have added to and materially aided in strengthening those invisible bonds of friendship that bind kindred spirits. I would not miss this opportunity of adding my tribute of appreciation of his work, his worth and character and of expressing the sorrow at the removal of this sincere friend that I so keenly feel.

LEWIS C. HOPP.

In the death of C. Lewis Diehl, American Pharmacy loses one of the few great men left in pharmacy. He was a big man, thorough and conscientious: a man of the highest ideals.

He was one of the pillars of strength in the A. Ph. A. always of good sound judgment. Many times in Council session when knotty questions came up with every one at sea, some one would say, "Diehl, what is your opinion? What do you say?" And in a few words he would clear the atmosphere.

Words are inadequate to express my admiration for Mr. Diehl. I never lost the opportunity of spending a little time with him at each meeting of the Association. To know him was to love him.

J. W. ENGLAND.

Conrad Lewis Diehl will be remembered in American Pharmacy long after many of his contemporaries have been forgotten. His services have been invaluable. For thirty-eight years, he was Reporter on the Progress of Pharmacy and for twenty-eight years he was most actively identified with the work of the Committee on National Formulary. But it was not the number of his years of service alone that made them so worth-while; it was the high, scientific quality of his work, rendered possible by his analytical mind, his well-balanced judgment and his whole-hearted devotion to the profession he loved so well. His work was constructive, never destructive, and his labors for pharmacy will bear fruit through the years to come and be a lasting monument to his memory.

He had the respect and esteem of a troop of friends who can say with Fritz Greene Halleck:

"Green be the turf above thee,  
Friend of my better days.  
None knew thee but to love thee  
None named thee but to praise."

W. B. DAY.

In the death of Professor Diehl, the pharmaceutical profession loses one of its finest representatives and the American Pharmaceutical Association mourns the passing of a leader who gave his time and effort without stint to its cause. As a teacher, state board member, writer, investigator and pharmacist, Conrad Lewis Diehl ranked high, but the beautiful character of the man himself endeared him to all who knew him.

JULIUS A. KOCH.

The news of Prof. Diehl's death comes to me as a great shock. With him the American Pharmaceutical Association and American Pharmacy have lost a most able defender.

I am sure that few of us realize the vast amount of work which Prof. Diehl has been able, in his long and busy life, to accomplish for the good of his chosen profession.

JOHN G. GODDING.

The passing away of Prof. C. Lewis Diehl removes one who has devoted his life untiringly to pharmacy.

His work in the American Pharmaceutical Association will stand as a lasting monument to his memory. Indeed the A. Ph. A. loses one of its most valued members. To me it is the loss of a personal friend.

E. G. EBERLE.

Few members of the American Pharmaceutical Association ever succeeded in winning, to the extent that Professor C. Lewis Diehl did, the love and respect of the membership. What a thronging host of loving reminiscences the memory of him calls up as well as of generous deeds and unselfish sacrifices in behalf of his country and profession. We would not have the time ever come when we should not grieve over the loss of our friends for, while we have them in our hearts, the gap made by their loss is never wholly filled; even after a time when their name is mentioned, we think of them because they are missed from among us.

The American Pharmaceutical Association is better for his having been a member of it and we are fortunate who knew Professor Diehl, remembering not only his companionship but his labors for pharmacy.

JOSEPH FEIL.

Joseph Feil, of Cleveland, Ohio, and for many years Dean and Professor of the Cleveland School of Pharmacy, died at his home February 3. Joseph Feil received his early education in the schools of Cleveland. After leaving school he worked in a Cleveland wholesale grocery, but soon engaged in the pharmacy of H. Hensch. He came to Philadelphia and also clerked for a time in Towanda, Pa., and was apothecary assistant in the New York Hospital. He attended both the Philadelphia and New York Colleges of Pharmacy. He graduated from the latter institution in 1880.

Returning to Cleveland, he engaged as chemist with Strong, Cobb & Co., and thereafter entered the drug business on his own account. He soon, however, devoted his entire time to teaching and held the professorship of chemistry and physics in the Cleveland School of Pharmacy and was also professor of chemistry in the Medical Department of Wooster University, and instructor



JOSEPH FEIL

in natural sciences in the Cleveland Central High School, a position held by him for thirty years. Professor Feil was very active in the Ohio State Pharmaceutical Association, to the proceedings of which he contributed many valuable papers. He joined the American Pharmaceutical Association in 1885.

Professor Feil was in his sixty-second year, and is survived by his wife, two sons and one daughter.

#### ROBERT WALTER WHITE.

Robert W. White, druggist at 56th and Lansdowne Avenue, Philadelphia, was stricken with apoplexy February 19. Mr. White was born in Chambersburg, Pa., February 3, 1864, received his preliminary education in that city and afterward attended Dickinson College, at Carlisle, Pa. Returning to Chambersburg, he became an apprentice in a drug store and afterwards attended the Philadelphia College of Pharmacy, graduating in the class of 1888.

After graduation he worked for a time in Lock Haven, after which he returned to Philadelphia and accepted a position with William MacIntyre, where he remained until 1907. Then he opened a drug store on his own account and here he remained in business until the time of his demise. Mr. White was active not only in business but also in association matters, taking particular interest in the Philadelphia Retail Druggists' Association, of which he was president in 1916. Mr. White is survived by his wife, formerly Miss Lillian Shank of Chambersburg, three sisters and three brothers. Interment was made at Chambersburg, under the auspices of the Masonic bodies. Mr. White became a member of the American Pharmaceutical Association in 1911.

---

#### IN MEMORY OF DR. WILLIAM C. ALPERS.

Doctor Alpers was one of the most striking and interesting figures in contemporary pharmacy. He brought to the practice of pharmacy an unusually well-drilled mind, with a broad knowledge of the sciences and a command of English which was all the more remarkable in a man with whom English was a secondary language. His contributions to the Proceedings of the American Pharmaceutical Association were characterized by an unusual combination of scientific knowledge with practical training. He had the faculty of presenting facts in the most interesting manner and his papers were always listened to with interest. He was also endowed with the gift of humor and made an excellent presiding officer at the informal sessions of the Diastase Section. This gift of humor shone out brilliantly in a brief address at the Asheville meeting of the A. Ph. A., in which he voiced the thanks of the Association to the local pharmacists. Doctor Alpers was a man of very strong convictions and having once adopted an opinion he was tenacious in his advocacy of it in spite of the most active opposition. While this quality brought him into frequent conflict of opinion with others, such differences did not necessarily lead to estrangements since the purity of his motives was always unquestioned. He had been constant in his attendance at the meetings of the Association and will be missed by a wide circle of the older members of the Association who knew him well.

CASWELL A. MAYO.