

JONATHAN GODDARD:

*DISCOURSE CONCERNING PHYSICK AND THE MANY ABUSES THEREOF  
BY APOTHECARIES, 1668:*

A LOST WORK OR A GHOST?

Jonathan Goddard was one of the most distinguished scientists and medical men of his age.<sup>1</sup> Born in 1617, he graduated M.D. from Cambridge in 1643. Before the Civil Wars were ended, he became physician-in-chief to the parliamentary army and a 'great confidant' of Oliver Cromwell. From 1651 to 1660 he was Warden of Merton College and during part of this time, from 1655, he was also Professor of Physick at Gresham College, where he lived from 1658 to his death in 1675. He took part in the meetings of the 'invisible' or 'philosophical' college at Gresham College and became one of the founders of the Royal Society, to which he contributed 'at least fourteen' scientific papers. Between 1660 and 1672 he was eight times Censor of the [Royal] College of Physicians and was a determined defender of the College against the encroachments of apothecaries. In this role he is credited with writing two books: *A Discourse concerning physick and the many abuses thereof by Apothecaries* (London, 1668) and *A Discourse setting forth the unhappy condition of the practice of physick in London* (London, 1670; Wing G914). No copy of the first book, however, is known to exist. It is, therefore, either a lost work or a ghost conjured up through the multiplication of bibliographical error. Arguments for and against its existence are given below.

*A Lost Work:*

In the first sentence of *Lex Talionis; sive vindiciae pharmacoporum: or A Short reply to Dr. Merrett's book; and others written against the apothecaries* (London, 1670) Henry Stubbe lists the three works to which he is replying. The second of these, 'bearing Date . . . November 13, 1669,' Stubbe describes as 'Doctor Godard's'. But in the course of his pamphlet Stubbe appears to ignore Goddard's work except to make the implausible statement that the celebrated *Guttae Anglicanae* (the formula for which Dr. Goddard allegedly sold to Charles II for £5,000) were 'nothing but *Spirit of Harts-horn*, as may appear by the Story he tells himself in his Book'.<sup>2</sup>

The title of the book to which Stubbe said he was replying must be that given by William Munk as *A Discourse concerning physick and the many abuses thereof by Apothecaries* (London, 1668).<sup>3</sup> But it is not listed in Wing and a search of libraries in England and the United States has failed to find a copy.

It is strange, however, that a work on 'Abuses' by apothecaries by so well-qualified and distinguished an authority should have completely disappeared from sight. For it can easily be demonstrated that the book was published and that it is not identical with another work of Goddard's with a similar title: *A Discourse setting forth the unhappy condition of the practice of physick in London*. This work was licensed for the press on 19 January 1669/70, only two months after *A Discourse concerning physick* (if Stubbe's date is correct), but it was written, as Goddard explains in a Postscript, 'above five years since', before the Great Plague of 1665. Although licensed in January, it was not published until 3 August 1670.<sup>4</sup> Since this date is given by Christopher Merrett, Harveian Librarian of the [Royal] College of Physicians, in his surrejoinder to Stubbe's rejoinder to Merrett's reply to *Lex Talionis*, it is apparent that Stubbe's *Lex Talionis* cannot refer to Goddard's later work.

Stubbe also quotes Goddard in his rejoinder to Merrett's reply to *Lex Talionis*, *Campanella Revived, or an enquiry into the history of the Royal Society . . . with a postscript*

concerning the quarrel depending betwixt H. S. and Dr. Merrett (London, 1670, p. 21). Since *Campanella Revived* was written in May–June 1670 (the Postscript is dated 14 June), Stubbe must be referring to a work of Goddard's published before 3 August 1670. This work can be no other than *A Discourse concerning physick*.

*A Ghost:*

Goddard's *Discourse setting forth the unhappy condition* (Wing G914) is not uncommon. But *A discourse concerning physick* is not in Wing, nor is it to be found in the libraries of the British Museum, Royal College of Physicians, Royal Society or the Wellcome Historical Medical Library; yet it is mentioned in the *Dictionary of National Biography Munk's Roll*,<sup>3</sup> by Sir Humphry Rolleston (*Ann. med. Hist.*, 1940, 3rd ser., 2, p. 95) and by W. S. C. Copeman.<sup>1</sup> As far as can be discovered none of these writers had seen a copy.

It seems likely that Rolleston and Copeman were drawing on Munk and the *D.N.B.*, or an earlier source. No such alternative exists for Munk and Creighton, the writer of the article on Goddard in the *D.N.B.* This means that their common source must have been Ward's *Lives of the Professors of Gresham College* (London, 1740, p. 272). It may be remarked in passing that *Book Auction Records* (1938–9, vol. 36, p. 292) mentions the sale of a book by Goddard, *A Discourse wherein the interest of the patient is debated* (London, 1669). Ward, in turn, refers to the *Philosophical Transactions* for an account of the book he attributes to Goddard (1668, No. 41, p. 835). Here it is reviewed as an anonymous publication. Four of the five paragraphs of the review are virtually quotations from the 'Preface to the Reader' of *A Discourse wherein the interest of the patient in reference to physick and physicians is soberly debated and many abuses of the apothecaries . . . discovered* (London, 1669; imprimatur 1668); for example:

Now there are many things whereof most apothecaries are highly guilty, as carelessness, Unskilfulness, Unfaithfulness on the one hand and Intrusion into the Physicians Employment (I mean the Practice of Physick) on the other: on all which accounts as I have fully demonstrated they are exceedingly injurious to the Publick. (*Preface to the Reader*, A3.)

The Author . . . discovering . . . the many things, whereof most apothecaries are highly guilty, as Carelessness, Unskilfulness, Unfaithfulness on the one hand and Intrusion into the Physitians Employment (the Practice of Physick) on the other: on all which accounts, he thinks, he hath demonstrated they are exceedingly injurious to the Publick. (*Philosophical Transactions*, *ibid.*, p. 835.)

This *Discourse* is the one attributed by Halkett and Laing to Thomas Cox(e) or Daniel Cox(e) and is, in fact, the book attributed to Goddard in *Book Auction Records*. Quotations from this same book appear in Maynwarding's *Praxis Medicorum* (London, 1675) where Daniel Cox is named as the author.

One is now disposed to ask whether, in fact, Goddard wrote more than one *Discourse* against the conduct of the apothecaries, or if he did, under what title. Contemporary sources fail to mention a second work. In Arber's *Term Catalogues* and Clavell's *General Catalogue of Books, 1666–74*, Goddard is credited with only one *Discourse*. Stubbe describes the third work to which he is replying in the *Lex Talionis* as 'January 16, 1669. Doctor Merrett's'. One cannot help remarking that Goddard's *Discourse* (1670) has the imprimatur date 19 January 1669/70; and that Merrett's *Short view of the frauds and abuses committed by apothecaries* has that of 13 November 1669. Could 16 be an error for 19, and could Goddard's and Merrett's names have been transposed, especially as the author seems more concerned with Merrett than with Goddard?

It appears, therefore, that Goddard's *Discourse concerning physick* is nothing more than a ghost, conjured up from a succession of bibliographical errors.

## News, Notes and Queries

Since this matter can be definitively settled only by finding (or failing to find) a copy of Goddard's *Discourse concerning physick and the many abuses thereof by Apothecaries*, appeal is made to the readers of *Medical History* to communicate their findings to the writers.

### REFERENCES

1. COPEMAN, W. S. C., Dr. Jonathan Goddard, F.R.S., *The Royal Society: its Origins and Founders*, ed. Sir Harold Hartley, London, 1960, pp. 69–77.
2. WADD, WILLIAM, *Mems, Maxims, and Memoirs*, London, 1827, p. 150; Henry Stubbe, *Lex Talionis*, London, 1670, p. 6.
3. MUNK, WILLIAM, *The Roll of the Royal College of Physicians of London*, London, 1878, vol. 1, p. 242.
4. MERRETT, CHRISTOPHER, *A Short reply to the postscript, &c. of H[enry] S[tubbe] shewing his many falsities in matters of fact; the impertinencies of his promised answers to some physicians that have written against the Apothecaries; his conspiracy with Apothecaries to defame them, the R.S. and many learned men of our nation*, London, 1670, pp. 27, 39: 'Aug. 3 . . . a worthy member of our College and of the R.S. also, . . . this day published some papers writ in the year 1664.'

FRANK H. ELLIS  
*Smith College*  
*Northampton, Mass.*

LEONARD M. PAYNE  
*Librarian*  
*Royal College of Physicians*  
*of London.*

### MEETING OF MEDICAL LIBRARIANS

ON Sunday evening, 16 June, the 2nd International Congress on Medical Librarianship will open at the Shoreham Hotel, Washington, and will end one week later on 22 June. The 1st Congress took place in London in 1953. Since then, the rapid developments of medical science have been paralleled by novel methods of documentation (especially those newly introduced at the National Library of Medicine), and numerous libraries have sprung up in African, Asian and South American countries. Visitors to this Congress, which is sponsored by the Medical Library Association, will listen to papers chronicling the progress made in the last decade. They will be presented under six heads, from which medical history (though not medical library history) will be excluded. Visits are being arranged to the new National Library of Medicine building at Bethesda, and the customary American hospitality is evidenced by the plan to allocate one evening for 'at homes'. Abstracts of papers submitted will be pre-published, and a selection of the Proceedings will later appear in their complete form. Exhibits of books from Britain will be sent by Dawsons of Pall Mall, the Wellcome Historical Medical Library and the British Medical Association, and displayed in the Shoreham Hotel.