


# THE SOCIETY OF CHEMICAL PHYSICIANS, THE NEW PHILOSOPHY, AND THE RESTORATION COURT\*

*Harold J. Cook*

 In its day, the short-lived Society of Chemical Physicians threatened to undermine both the academic physic and the corporate privileges of the College of Physicians of London. In early 1665, Thomas O'Dowde led an attempt to obtain a royal charter for the new medical organization in London. Since 1617, however, when the Society of Apothecaries was created, no new medical institution had been established in the metropolis. Further, public proposals to gain a charter for the Society of Chemical Physicians had intellectual as well as professional implications, since support for the Society was interpreted by some as an indication that many members of the Court found the "new" or "experimental" philosophy to be an increasingly attractive alternative to natural philosophies rooted in academic tradition. Manifest support at Court for the Society meant that the intellectual as well as the institutional standards of the medical status quo were being subverted, although, in the end, the Society of Chemical Physicians failed to obtain its charter.

The existence of the Society was first brought to light in 1953, through the posthumous publication of an article by Sir Henry Thomas which was based upon the discovery of a seventeenth-century broadside. This bit of medical ephemera—recovered by the staff of the Department of Printed Books of the British Museum from a pasteboard wrapping—was an advertisement published by the Society of Chemical Physicians during the last important outbreak of the plague in London, in 1665. Thomas developed the context for the broadside through a careful reading of some of the books published by chemical physicians of the Restoration, creating a story whose details have not been altered since.<sup>1</sup>

Albeit unchanged in its details, the story of the Society of Chemical Physicians has become a stalking horse for various interpretations of medi-

\*The "Annals of the College of Physicians" are cited with the kind permission of the Royal College of Physicians. Revised version of a paper presented at the fifty-eighth annual meeting of the American Association for the History of Medicine, Durham and Chapel Hill, North Carolina, 17 May 1985.

<sup>1</sup> Sir Henry Thomas, "The Society of Chymical Physitians: An Echo of the Great Plague of London, 1665," in *Science, Medicine and History*, ed. E. Ashworth Underwood, 2 vols. (London: Oxford University Press, 1953), 2: 56–71.

cine during the Restoration in England, particularly following the publication of two important articles in the mid-1960s. P. M. Rattansi and Charles Webster have forcefully argued that the social context of the Restoration needs to be explored much more fully if we are to understand the intellectual debates of the period.<sup>2</sup> In his article, Rattansi first pointed to the significance of the Helmontians' courtly patronage. But the major thrust of his interpretation was that the Society represented Helmontian practitioners who had increased in influence over the course of the interregnum because of the changing social needs of the growing metropolis of London. The Helmontians, he argued, briefly and inadvertently became third parties in an older social conflict, that between the gentlemen physicians and the tradesmen apothecaries, in which the Helmontians sided with the apothecaries against the physicians.<sup>3</sup>

Charles Webster, upon discovering a plan by a member of the Hartlib circle to create a "College of Graduate Physicians" in 1656, came to see the Society of Chemical Physicians as an outgrowth of projects originated during the Puritan Commonwealth. Webster noted that whereas William Rand's "College" of 1656 was to have contained respectably qualified practitioners, the Society of 1665 was a much more heterogeneous group of both respectable and "mountebank" practitioners; moreover, Rand's group had been proposed during what Webster believed to be a period of weakness for the College of Physicians, whereas the Society of Chemical Physicians had been a "defensive gesture taken after the revival of the . . . licensing power [of the College of Physicians]." But, he argued, because the Hartlib circle had been essential to promoting the growth of chemistry in England and because of overlapping membership between it and the Society of Chemical Physicians, a basic continuity existed.<sup>4</sup>

The argumentative intentions of Webster and Rattansi to investigate the contexts of the 1660s through the history of the Society of Chemical Physicians have stood up very well, but the discovery of documents unknown to these authors makes it possible to offer a new interpretation of the Society and its meaning for the medicine of the 1660s. The interpretation of the Society's brief existence offered here suggests that it had little to do with the social needs of Londoners or the interests of apothecaries; nor was it the outcome of plans proposed during the interregnum. I propose that the Society of Chemical Physicians came to the fore only after the powers of the

<sup>2</sup> P. M. Rattansi, "The Helmontian-Galenist controversy in Restoration England," *Ambix*, 1964, 12: 1–23; and Charles Webster, "English medical reformers of the Puritan Revolution: a background to the 'Society of Chymical Physicians,'" *Ambix*, 1967, 14: 16–41. Allen G. Debus for the most part follows Rattansi's interpretation in his *The Chemical Philosophy: Paracelsian Science and Medicine in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, 2 vols. (New York: Science History Publications, 1977), 2: 510–11.

<sup>3</sup> Rattansi, "Helmontian-Galenist controversy."

<sup>4</sup> Webster, "English medical reformers"; also see his *The Great Instauration: Science, Medicine and Reform, 1626–1660* (New York: Holmes and Meier, 1975), p. 307. Quotation is from "English medical reformers," p. 41.

College of Physicians had been seriously weakened; that the Society alienated apothecaries as well as physicians; and that, although it was indeed a heterogeneous group, the Society was in the main advanced by ambitious former royalists who played upon both the open-handed patronage and the intellectual sympathies evident among certain parties of the royal Court. Seen in this light, the story of the Society of Chemical Physicians can help illuminate why some proponents of learned physic thought themselves under attack not only by “Helmontian” chemists, but also by the “new” or “experimental” philosophy encouraged by certain groups at Court—a way of doing things from which not only intellectuals, but also medical empirics, could benefit.

If the royal Court was to be the source of patronage for the Society of Chemical Physicians, it had already been that for the College of Physicians. Lord Chancellor Wolsey’s patronage of the College was founded in large part upon a desire to defend academic medical learning. According to the preface of the College’s 1518 charter, Henry VIII founded the College in order to promote learned physic. That is, the physicians of the Court, foremost among them Thomas Linacre, were given the privilege of incorporating and licensing physicians in London so that their learned art could be furthered and dignified.<sup>5</sup> The art of physic, obtained through long and arduous study in the universities, was rooted in philosophical learning stemming from the ancient sources, knowledge of which was essential to a practitioner of dietetic medicine. The philosophical learning in which physic was rooted helped the learned physician not only to cure the sick, but also to counsel clients on how to retain health and prolong life. Physic, then, was distinct from mere medicine, which concerned itself only with therapeutic ministrations to the sick.<sup>6</sup> The physicians obtained fraternal protection from the competition of other practitioners in order to further the knowledge and dignity of physic.

By the end of the third decade of the seventeenth century, the College of Physicians, due to monarchical support, had come to exercise considerable power over the medical community of London. It both tried other practitioners in its capacity to sit as a court and subordinated the two other

<sup>5</sup> George N. Clark, *A History of the Royal College of Physicians of London*, 3 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964), 1: 58–66; Gweneth Whitteridge, “Some Italian precursors of the Royal College of Physicians,” *J. Roy. Coll. Phys. London*, 1977, 12: 67–80; Charles Webster, “Thomas Linacre and the Foundation of the College of Physicians,” in *Essays on the Life of Thomas Linacre, c. 1460–1524*, ed. Francis Maddison, Margaret Pelling, and Charles Webster (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977), pp. 198–222. Also see James K. McGonica, *English Humanists and Reformation Politics under Henry VIII and Edward VI* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965).

<sup>6</sup> For a discussion of the differences between the “science” of physic and the “craft” of medicine in the ancient world (a distinction upon which many discussions in the early modern period were based), see especially Ludwig Edelstein, “The Diетetics of Antiquity” and “The Relation of Ancient Philosophy to Medicine,” in his *Ancient Medicine*, ed. Owsei Temkin and C. Lilian Temkin, trans. C. Lilian Temkin (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1967), pp. 303–16, 349–66; and Owsei Temkin, “Greek medicine as science and craft,” *Isis*, 1953, 44: 213–25, reprinted in his *The Double Face of Janus* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1977), pp. 137–53.

local medical corporations, the United Company of Barber-Surgeons (established in 1540) and the Society of Apothecaries.<sup>7</sup> But many medical practitioners in London, including those practicing chemical medicine, had long objected to the College's juridical authority. Any new medical corporation created around a body of practitioners of mere medicine would pose a clear threat to the College of Physicians' power and undermine respect for the principles of learned physic.

Such a threat was especially grave in the mid-1660s, because the College of Physicians had been having difficulties in retaining its institutional preeminence in the practice of physic in London. In April of 1664, the College's public authority was weakened when the House of Commons refused to ratify the College's new royal charter. Believing that they had the support of Lord Chancellor Clarendon, the College officers had looked forward to having their new charter passed, rectifying the powerlessness caused by a legal decision of 1656 that had undercut the powers obtained in a charter from Cromwell. The outcome of the decision of the Parliament in 1664 left the College of Physicians in a frail institutional and legal condition, and heightened its members' concerns about the dignity of academic physic.<sup>8</sup>

A significant indication of the kinds of public sentiments that helped to undermine the College's case in the Parliament can be found in a book written by an author known only as T.M.<sup>9</sup> This work indicates that, in addition to the Society of Apothecaries and the Barber-Surgeons' Company, the virtuosi, or supporters of the new science, had also opposed the College's charter. Previous attempts to identify T.M. have been unconvincing.<sup>10</sup> Whoever T.M. was, his book gives an illuminating explanation of why the House of Commons voted down the charter of the College of Physicians.

A brief summary of T.M.'s point of view is in order here. First he says that medicine is currently in an imperfect state. This has been caused by the introduction of divisions among physicians, apothecaries, and surgeons

<sup>7</sup>On the College's juridical authority in the early seventeenth century, see Harold J. Cook, "'Against common right and reason': the College of Physicians versus Dr. Thomas Bonham," *Amer. J. Legal Hist.*, 1985, 29: 301–22; also see Charles Webster, "William Harvey and the Crisis of Jacobean England," in *William Harvey and His Age: The Professional and Social Context of the Discovery of the Circulation*, ed. Jerome J. Bylebyl (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979), pp. 1–27.

<sup>8</sup>The text of the proposed charter can be found at the British Library, Sloane 3914, fols. 100–103. Also see *House of Commons Journal*, 19 and 20 April 1664, 8: 546; and "Annals of the College of Physicians (1647–82)," 4, fols. 81b–84a.

<sup>9</sup>T.M., *A Letter Concerning the Present State of Physick, and the Regulation of the Practice of it in this Kingdom. Written to a Doctor here in London* (London, 1665).

<sup>10</sup>Most identifications of T.M. have assumed that he was a physician: the catalogue of the British Library, for instance, identifies him as Christopher Merrett, a Fellow of the College of Physicians, apparently on the strength of Merrett's involvement in the pamphlet wars that followed. But this identification is wanting. See R. S. Roberts, "Jonathan Goddard . . . a lost work or a ghost?" *Med. Hist.*, 1964, 8: 191. The title of T.M.'s book claims that the book is written "to" a doctor "here in London." Moreover, the only internal clues to the identity of the author are two claims: one, that he had a discourse with the virtuosi at Sir Thomas's house, and two, that "our House did not pass the Patent, by his majesty lately granted to the Colledge" (T.M., *A Letter*, pp. 4, 5). That is, he was associated with the virtuosi and also closely associated with, if not a member of, the House of Commons. But no medical practitioners were then members of Parliament; nor do the lists of members of the House of Commons and the Royal Society yield any probable author with the initials T.M., with letters of a name ending in T.M., or with the initials reversed ("M.T.").

during the “dark ages.” The ancients made medical advances because their physicians both gave advice and worked with their hands in preparing medicines and carrying out surgical operations. It would be good if the previous unity of medical practice could be restored, but since that is probably impossible, the best plan would be to reform the current practice of physic along experimental lines—to make the College of Physicians into an institution rather like the new Royal Society, which he praises highly.<sup>11</sup> T.M. then says that, to encourage further experimental learning in physic, the physicians should not send their prescriptions to be filled by apothecaries, but should make up their medicines themselves.<sup>12</sup> Finally, chemical medicines must be better incorporated into the practice of the physicians.<sup>13</sup>

This plan, if it were carried out, T.M. argued, would go beyond mere medical empiricism.<sup>14</sup> It would make medicine into a science, “which is so universally the design of the present Age.”<sup>15</sup> If the College of Physicians refused to initiate such a reform, however, “I could desire it may be thought advisable to provide for it by publick Authority”—that is, the king or the Parliament might step in to reform medicine if the physicians did not.<sup>16</sup> T.M., then, proposed both an experimental solution and a largely chemical solution to the problems of the 1660s by emphasizing medicine over physic, and he raised the specter of institutional changes imposed by “publick Authority.”

In the wake of the Parliament’s decision against the College, the intellectual and political sentiments behind T.M.’s book found expression in a long work penned by Marchamont Nedham, which detailed the advantages of Helmontian medicine.<sup>17</sup> A well-educated man, Nedham had become a chemical practitioner to help support himself when he first moved to London in the early 1640s, had studied chemistry without practicing while he was employed in other pressing pursuits, and then had practiced it again to earn a living sometime after Cromwell’s death.<sup>18</sup> During the years when he only studied chemical medicine, Nedham was one of the most prolific propagandists of the interregnum, siding first with the Parliament, then with the Independents, then with the royalists, then with Cromwell. Politically a “classical republican,” Nedham had a sharp pen and a keen nose for the latest political possibilities.<sup>19</sup> His salvo of late 1664—the first known piece

<sup>11</sup> T.M., *A Letter*, pp. 7–19.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 19–58.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 62–63.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 58–61.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 12.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 64–65.

<sup>17</sup> Marchamont Nedham, *Medela Medicinæ. A Plea for the free Profession, and a Renovation of the Art of Physick, Out of the Noblest and most Authentick Writers* (London, 1665).

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, sigs. A6–A6v.

<sup>19</sup> Blair Worden, “Classical Republicanism and the Puritan Revolution,” in *History and Imagination*, ed. Hugh Lloyd-Jones, Valerie Pearl, and Blair Worden (London: Duckworth, 1981), pp. 182–200, esp. pp. 192–99; and Joseph Frank, *Cromwell’s Press Agent: A Critical Biography of Marchamont Nedham, 1620–1678* (Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, 1980).

by him printed after the Restoration, appearing within six months of the College's defeat in Parliament—very strongly identified Helmontianism with the “new philosophy” coming into vogue. When a man of Nedham's political and polemical experience spoke on behalf of his calling, the learned men of the College of Physicians listened anxiously.

The tones the physicians discerned in Nedham's argument disturbed many of them deeply. He argued that the learning acquired by the physicians in their long university educations served no good purpose other than to convince an ignorant public that the physicians were superior men. Behind their showy Latin phrases and references to anatomy lay nothing that could help cure anyone; nothing, that is, except what was already known to those who could read English. Old women imitated the physicians' venesections and herbal purges. Not only were the physicians' therapies used by the vulgar, however—they were also dangerous. The true medicine came from experiment and the intuition of the properly prepared initiate: the way of chemical medicine as reformulated by Jean Baptista van Helmont. Helmontian medicine could cure more diseases with less risk and more certain results than could Galenical medicine, argued Nedham.<sup>20</sup>

Many parts of Nedham's argument had been heard before, but his was the first major work on chemical medicine since the return of the Stuarts. It was a large work, it stressed the need to concentrate on curing the sick rather than keeping the healthy well via academic dietetics, and it was penned by a master of persuasion, who frequently quoted at length respected authorities on the new philosophy, particularly Sir Francis Bacon and Robert Boyle.

Because Nedham's position seemed so threatening, within three months, a member of the College of Physicians brought out a reply to him. Robert Sprackling saw clearly that the “Fantastick Pleader” and “Innovatour” Nedham was trying to oppose both academic physic and the “legally established Corporation of Physicians.”<sup>21</sup> Sprackling therefore defended Hippocrates' and Galen's writings from the misunderstandings and abuses of Nedham; he corrected the record regarding the true sentiments of modern authors such as Robert Boyle and Thomas Willis as well as of practicing physicians; he defended dietetics, “wherein Chymistry is not much concerned,” as being just as necessary as pharmacy “to the Hygieinal and Therapeutique parts of Physique”;<sup>22</sup> he defended the modern notions of humors, elements, and temperaments;<sup>23</sup> and he was concerned to demonstrate to

<sup>20</sup> For lengthier descriptions of Nedham's treatise, see Richard F. Jones, *Ancients and Moderns: A Study of the Rise of the Scientific Movement in Seventeenth-Century England*, 2nd ed. (St. Louis, Missouri: Washington University Press, 1961), pp. 206–10; and Lester S. King, *The Road to Medical Enlightenment, 1650–1695* (New York: American Elsevier, 1970), pp. 145–54.

<sup>21</sup> Robert Sprackling, *Medela Ignorantiae: Or, A Just and Plain Vindication of Hippocrates and Galen from the Groundless Imputations of M.N.* (1665), sig. A3. The book bears a license dated “Feb. 24, 1664/5.”

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 32.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, esp. pp. 44–47.

the apothecaries that their economic interests lay with the physicians who sent prescriptions to them rather than with the “empirics” who would have the physicians make up their own medicines.<sup>24</sup>

Toward the end of his book, Sprackling began calling Nedham a “fanatick writer.”<sup>25</sup> Nedham’s argument that the London College of Physicians should be overthrown because of the abuses of the Paris Faculty of Medicine in suppressing alternative medical practices in the early seventeenth century was for Sprackling “a pretty Fanatick inference, which will serve as properly to overthrow any other Authority, that can be established in the world.”<sup>26</sup> Nedham was, thus, guilty of “treason and conspiracy.”<sup>27</sup> Similar arguments were soon made by other collegiate physicians.<sup>28</sup>

Sprackling’s abusive language toward Nedham grew worse as the book progressed because as time went on the chemists were not merely waging a war of words—they were trying to obtain institutional legitimacy, as well. Not four months after Nedham’s book, and just a few days after Sprackling’s book appeared, a pamphlet of one hundred pages written by Thomas O’Dowde announced in its dedication to Gilbert Sheldon, Archbishop of Canterbury, the formation of the Society of Chemical Physicians. O’Dowde’s little book for the most part advertised cures he had performed, but its preface strongly condemned the “Galenists,” and its conclusion contained two petitions: the first, for incorporation, addressed to the king by the thirty-five men who made up the potential membership of the Society, and the second, in support of the chemists, signed by thirty-eight noblemen and gentlemen.<sup>29</sup> O’Dowde’s petitions were published within a year after the House of Commons vetoed the College of Physicians’ new charter, at the same time T.M. was arguing that the College of Physicians was not enough like the Royal Society.

O’Dowde’s petitions were particularly troubling because they originated with a man who seemed to have influence in the realm. O’Dowde was a courtier, having recently been made a groom of the bedchamber of the king. This position would enable him to lobby for the scheme to create a Society of Chemical Physicians. By the time his pamphlet appeared, O’Dowde seemed to be gaining ground, for, according to its dedication, the pamphlet and its two petitions were published by O’Dowde “in obedience

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 24–30.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 120.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 158–59.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 162.

<sup>28</sup> John Twysden, *Medicina Veterum Vindicata; Or An Answer To a Book, entituled Medela Medicinæ* (London, 1666); Nathaniel Hodges, *Vindiciae Medicinæ et Medicorum: Or an Apology for the Profession and Professors of Physick* (London, 1666).

<sup>29</sup> Thomas O’Dowde, *The Poor Man’s Physician, Or the True Art of Medicine, As it is Chymically prepared and administred, for healing the several Diseases incident to Mankind. The Third Edition.* (London, 1665), sigs. A3v–A6v, and pp. 92ff. The pamphlet, dated 10 March 1665, is called the “third edition” because it is an elaboration on two earlier advertisements by O’Dowde, one of which survives in the form of the broadside described below.

to your Lordship[']s [i.e., Archbishop Sheldon's], and their Lordships the Earl of Clarendon, Lord High Chancellor of England, and his Grace the Duke of Buckingham's Commands."<sup>30</sup>

O'Dowde undoubtedly gained the position of groom and obtained a hearing from some of the most important lords at Court because he had been a royalist during the interregnum. The only account of his life relates that he had been born into a "generous" family in Ireland, but that his father's death and mother's remarriage, together with the "Troubles" in that country in the 1640s, caused him to lose his inheritance. He therefore entered the service of Charles I not long before the king's execution, and thereafter became an agent for the royalist cause, moving from place to place, being imprisoned several times (sometimes with his wife), and even (it was claimed) being examined by Cromwell himself on threat of death. Banished from England, he secretly returned to Nottingham and was taken prisoner again shortly before Cromwell's death, but he escaped again to join the king, returning to England upon the Restoration. During this time he also took up the practice of medicine full time to support himself and his family and to do good—all this according to his daughter's later testimony.<sup>31</sup> Whatever one may think of her apology, the gist of her story is probably true: O'Dowde served as a sometime royal agent during the interregnum and supported himself in part by practicing medicine without any training—a way of generating income common enough to form a theme in picaresque literature.<sup>32</sup>

Charles II, then, offered patronage to a loyal servant, O'Dowde, by granting him a place in his bedchamber. Equally important to O'Dowde's influence as his past, however, was the fact that the king held medical opinions that favored anyone who seemed to be able to cure, regardless of his credentials. Charles II went so far as to issue royal licenses to a number of empirics during the mid-1660s.<sup>33</sup> Therefore, as one of O'Dowde's associates later said, His Majesty "was pleased to give [O'Dowde] a kinde aspect, from a consideration of some notable Cures (as was reported) attained by him, which those eminent Galenists [of the College] could not accomplish."<sup>34</sup> That is, as he did to William Sermon, Sir Richard Barker, and other medical empirics offering novel medicines that had cured someone close to the king, the king was prepared to entertain the idea of extending his favors to O'Dowde.<sup>35</sup>

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, sig. A1.

<sup>31</sup> Mary Trye, *Medicatrix; or the Woman-Physician: Vindicating Thomas O'Dowde, a Chymical Physician, and Royal Licentiate . . . against . . . Henry Stubbe* (London, 1675), pp. 25–32.

<sup>32</sup> H. J. C. von Grimmelshausen, *The Adventurous Simplicissimus* (c. 1668), trans. A. T. S. Goodrick (reprint, Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1962), pp. 232–34, 242–43, 251–54; also see Herbert Silvette, *The Doctor on Stage: Medicine and Medical Men in Seventeenth Century England* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1967).

<sup>33</sup> Leslie G. Matthews, "Licensed mountebanks in Britain," *J. Hist. Med.*, 1964, 19: 30–45.

<sup>34</sup> George Thomson, *A Letter sent to Mr. Henry Stubbe* (London, 1672), p. 21.

<sup>35</sup> For a description of how patronage could advance a practitioner, see Harold J. Cook, *The Decline of the Old Medical Regime in Stuart London* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1986), pp. 47–48.



O'Dowde had been a groom of the bedchamber for one year by the time he announced the formation of the Society. In O'Dowde's earliest known publication, a broadside, he proudly signed himself "one of the Grooms of the Chamber to his Sacred Majesty King Charles the Second."<sup>36</sup> The broadside was licensed by the "surveyor of the imprimery" (that is, the royal censor) Roger L'Estrange, on 28 April 1664, perhaps significantly, just a few days after the new charter of the College had been voted down in the Parliament. As did most such contemporary advertisers, O'Dowde promised he could do great things that could not be matched by the "Galenists," including curing the plague in a mere six hours.<sup>37</sup> Had the College's charter been ratified, he would have risked punishment from its members by making such a promise.

This first advertisement of O'Dowde's allows us to infer who helped to bring him to the attention of the Court. Like many other contemporary medical advertisements, it includes a list of people cured by O'Dowde, several of whom were subsequently well placed at Court. Perhaps the man closest to O'Dowde was his "dearest friend Col. Robert Werden of the Bed-Chamber to his Royal Highness [the Duke of York]." Werden had distinguished himself as a royalist officer in the civil wars and took part in Booth's rising in Cheshire against the Commonwealth in 1659. Although after Booth's rebellion he turned informer, and then served two years in prison for treason upon the Restoration, he returned to the Duke of York's favor in 1662, and in June of 1665 he was commissioned a lieutenant in the duke's guards. Werden continued to take an interest in O'Dowde's activities until O'Dowde's death.<sup>38</sup>

But Werden is not the only important figure mentioned in O'Dowde's broadside as one of his cured patients: also included were Sir George Freeman, Knight of the Bath, and Lady Freeman; "Madame Katherine Needham," daughter of the late Lord "Kilmurry"; Mrs. Elizabeth Booth, daughter of Sir John Booth; some servants of the "late Lady Byron"; and "Mr. Henry Brun-kard of the Bedchamber." All of these well-born men and women were royalists from the area around and north and east of Chester who now had important places at Court, particularly in the circle of the Duke of York: Madame Katherine Needham was the daughter of Charles Needham, fourth Viscount Kilmorey, who died in prison after supporting Booth's insurrection; Mrs. Elizabeth Booth was the daughter of Sir John Booth, who was the brother of the rebel Booth; the "late Lady Byron" was the first wife of the first Lord Byron (also a royalist officer from Cheshire and Lancashire, who took as his second wife Eleanor Needham, another daughter of Kilmorey);

<sup>36</sup> Now located in the Bute Collection of the Houghton Library, Widener Library, Harvard University.

<sup>37</sup> Thomas O'Dowde, "The Poor Mans Physician. the true Art of Medicine as it is prepared and administered for the healing of all diseases incident to mankind" (London, 1664).

<sup>38</sup> See the letter of Werden's, published by O'Dowde in O'Dowde's broadside titled "Two Letters Concerning the Cure of Plague" (London, July 1665), Bute Collection of the Houghton Library, Widener Library, Harvard University.

and Henry Brouncker, an intimate friend of the Duke of York's, who had a 1646 doctorate of medicine from Oxford, was the younger brother of Viscount William Brouncker, President of the Royal Society. Since O'Dowde also mentions in his broadside that he had practiced in Derbyshire for four and a half years, and since his daughter relates that he spent time in Nottingham, it would seem that O'Dowde had acquired these patients while he practiced in the region of the southern Pennines during his period as a royalist agent.

O'Dowde was also able to gather support at Court because he at least pretended to a chemical practice. At the time of his first advertisement, O'Dowde was practicing out of a "laboratory" located "against St. Clements Church in the Strand," meaning that he had established a chemical practice on the well-traveled road between the City of London and Westminster.<sup>39</sup> Chemistry was then a fashionable pursuit at the royal Court. Even a Fellow of the College of Physicians had to admit that Archbishop Sheldon

and many other Persons of great Honor and worth do approve Chymistry as the most probable means to discover a sensible Philosophy, and to furnish noble Medicines for the benefit of Mankind.<sup>40</sup>

The king's boon companion the Second Duke of Buckingham believed for a while that he had uncovered the philosopher's stone.<sup>41</sup> Charles II himself practiced chemistry in a laboratory he built on the grounds of Whitehall Palace, venturing into his laboratory on many occasions with Sir Robert Moray, who had probably recently procured the charter of the Royal Society.<sup>42</sup> Viscount Brouncker, who was the president of the Royal Society, as well as a doctor of medicine (his brother, Henry Brouncker, had been one of O'Dowde's patients), liked chemistry very much.<sup>43</sup> In late 1664 and early 1665, not only the king and his brother, the Duke of York, but a flock of noblemen joined the Royal Society, in part because of their interest in chemistry.<sup>44</sup>

By early 1665, then, O'Dowde made a formidable opponent for the physicians of the College. He had a place at Court and well placed friends who had been treated by him. It seemed possible that he might convert the enthusiasm of many aristocrats and gentlemen for chemistry and the new

<sup>39</sup> O'Dowde, "Poor Mans Physician."

<sup>40</sup> Hodges, *Vindiciae Medicinae et Medicorum*, dedication. To Archbishop Sheldon, therefore, O'Dowde and the chemist George Thomson (as well as Hodges) dedicated their works in the mid-1660s: O'Dowde, *The Poor Man's Physician . . . The Third Edition*; George Thomson, *Galeno-Pale: or, A Chymical Trial of the Galenists* (London, 1665).

<sup>41</sup> Buckingham was therefore another person to whom a contemporary work by a medical chemist was addressed. See Edward Bolnest, *Medicina Instaurata, Or, A Brief Account of the True Grounds and Principles of the Art of Physick* (London, 1665).

<sup>42</sup> M. L. Wolbarsht and D. S. Sax, "Charles II, a royal martyr," *Notes Records Roy. Soc.*, 1961, 16: 154-57.

<sup>43</sup> J. F. Scott and Sir Harold Hartley, "William, Viscount Brouncker, P.R.S.," *Notes Records Roy. Soc.*, 1960, 15: 147-58.

<sup>44</sup> See the chronological list of membership in Michael Hunter, *The Royal Society and Its Fellows, 1660-1700* (Chalfont St. Giles, Bucks.: British Society for the History of Science, 1981).

philosophy generally into support for a new medical corporation. Therefore, O'Dowde began to organize the formation of a Society of Chemical Physicians, at the urgings, according to his dedication, of the archbishop, the Lord Chancellor, and the Duke of Buckingham. He circulated two petitions, one to chemical practitioners who were potential members of the Society, and one to aristocrats and gentlemen of the Court who were potential allies of the Society.

Among the thirty-five potential members of the Society of Chemical Physicians who signed O'Dowde's membership petition, little unity can be discerned in terms of political or religious affiliation, or general background. One physician who had been expelled from the College of Physicians, an Honorary Fellow of the College, and two Candidates signed on; so, too, did the royal chemist Nicaise Le Febvre; Colonel Robert Werden and his brother John signed both the petition of the chemists and the "Engagement" of its supporters; three former members of the Hartlib circle set their names to the document;<sup>45</sup> and several men who frequently published on medicine added their signatures. A number of well-known London empirics and chemists completed the list of those interested in becoming members of the proposed Society. A core of five names appears on O'Dowde's membership petition and on the other two lists of members of the Society (the broadside advertising the Society's services during the plague and the list of members of the Society published by George Thomson<sup>46</sup>): O'Dowde, Nedham, George Thomson, Everard Maynwaring, and Thomas Williams. Little is known of Williams; O'Dowde, Nedham, and Thomson (who had a medical degree from Leiden)<sup>47</sup> propagandized on behalf of chemical medicine but otherwise had little in common; Everard Maynwaring (who had a Dublin medical degree) wrote many books on medicine, virtually all of which were sympathetic to the learned physicians and dietetic medicine, although he favored some chemical medicines in therapy.<sup>48</sup> Aside from an interest in chemistry, members of the group appear to have lacked much in common.

The signers of O'Dowde's membership petition varied also in their orientation toward medicine. Some, such as Nedham, Le Febvre, Joseph Dey, and George Starkey, clearly were deeply versed in the teachings of Jean Baptista van Helmont. Some, such as Robert Werden, seem to have been interested in chemistry but not yet versed in its secrets. Others—for exam-

<sup>45</sup> Webster, "English medical reformers," p. 41.

<sup>46</sup> George Thomson, *Loimotomia; Or, The Pest Anatomized* (London, 1666); the list is reprinted in Thomas, "Society of Chymical Physitians," p. 65. Greek words in titles have been transliterated to Roman characters and placed in single quotes.

<sup>47</sup> See Charles Webster, "The Helmontian George Thomson and William Harvey: the revival and application of splenectomy to physiological research," *Med. Hist.*, 1971, 15: 154–67.

<sup>48</sup> See, for example, Everard Maynwaring, *Tutela Sanitatis. Sive Vita Protracta. The Protection of Long Life, and Detection of its brevity, from dietetic causes and common Customs* (London, 1663); *idem*, *Medicus Absolutus . . . The Compleat Physitian, Qualified and Dignified* (London, 1668); *idem*, *The Ancient Practice of Physick, Revived, and Confirmed* (London, 1670); *idem*, *The Method and Means of Enjoying Health, Vigour, and Long Life* (London, 1683).

ple, O'Dowde—seem to have been self-taught empirics who dressed their remedies in the garb of chemistry.

But if advertising was a sign of empiricism, O'Dowde was not unusual among the potential members of the Society: virtually all of the signers of his membership petition who published anything proclaimed their medical abilities, and they usually advertised their remedies, as well. O'Dowde's pamphlet containing the two petitions recommends Nedham's book, claims to have had a French gentleman referred to him by the king, argues that his medicines are the "finger of God," and generally lambasts his detractors, but for the most part it discusses cures performed by him on various persons (including those listed in his earlier broadside).<sup>49</sup> Edward Bolnest advertised his "pilula solaris," "quintessentia salis balsamica," "pilula nobilissima purgans," "tintura mirabilis," "balsamus vitae," and "specificum anodynum nobilissimum" in his treatise; George Thomson in many of his works advertised his "stomach essence," a remedy that John Heydon claimed had been stolen from himself.<sup>50</sup> The remedies of all these men were, moreover, exalted above those of mere empirics through references to chemistry and, often, to the new "experimental" philosophy.

The chemical empirics, naturally, disliked medical regulation. O'Dowde claimed that he had been persecuted by one or more of the members of the College of Physicians. He had to admit that in his first broadside he had "miscalled" the disease of Mr. Richard Rawlinson. Although O'Dowde was satisfied that he had cured Rawlinson, Rawlinson let it be known that O'Dowde had misrepresented his case, causing at least one physician (whom O'Dowde claimed had been unable to cure Rawlinson previously) to threaten O'Dowde with prosecution by the College.<sup>51</sup> Because of Rawlinson's case, the physician (who reminded O'Dowde of a vain Scottish physician) told the king and others that O'Dowde was an ignorant quack.<sup>52</sup> Setting up a new medical institution might be the best way for O'Dowde to clear his name and to hurt the College of Physicians, as well as to promote "Hermetic Physick."<sup>53</sup>

To gain support for his institution, O'Dowde claimed that it would be a society of "chemical physicians." T.M. and Nedham had both strongly urged

<sup>49</sup> O'Dowde, *Poor Man's Physician ... The Third Edition*, pp. 31, 48, 88–90, 79–84.

<sup>50</sup> Bolnest, *Medicina Instaurata*, pp. 16–70; John Heydon, *'Phontberfanzia': Or, A Quintuple Rosicrucian Scourge for the due Correction of that Pseudo-chymist and scurrilous [sic] Emperick, George Thomson* (London, 1665).

<sup>51</sup> O'Dowde, *Poor Man's Physician ... The Third Edition*, sigs. A4v–A5, pp. 4–8.

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 79–84. The College's most important apologist of the time, William Johnson, made much of Rawlinson's case against O'Dowde in his *Agurto-Mastix; Or, some Brief Animadversions upon two late Treatises* (London, 1665), pp. 113–19. One of O'Dowde's associates, however, later reprinted Rawlinson's retraction of his complaint against O'Dowde: George Thomson, *'Plano-Prigmos' Or, A Gag for Jobnson* (London, 1665), pp. 30–31. Sir Alexander Fraizer was the king's first physician and a Scot as well as a member of the College of Physicians.

<sup>53</sup> The plans of William Rand in 1656 and of Noah Biggs in 1651 (*'Mataeotechnia Medicinae Praxeus': The Vanity of the Craft of Physick* [London, 1651]) both argue for medical institutions that, like the College, would have exclusive memberships; O'Dowde's plan would have admitted virtually any empiric who claimed to practice chemical medicine.

that a close connection be drawn between chemistry and empirical science. Interest in the new philosophy and chemistry seems also to have been strong among the courtiers who signed O'Dowde's petition of support: eleven of the thirty-eight signers had already become Fellows of the Royal Society; among the fourteen lords who signed, seven had joined the Royal Society before July 1665.<sup>54</sup>

With empirical chemists like O'Dowde finding support among members of the Royal Society and other virtuosi, the recently founded institution for promoting the new philosophy seemed to be in conflict with the College of Physicians. An anonymous manuscript from the period says that the "experimentators" of the Royal Society "advance Odowds Colledge."<sup>55</sup> As Henry Stubbe later put it, "this is not more notorious to the world, than . . . that those objections [to learned physic] with which M[archamont] N[edham] and other Quacksalvers amuse the Age were suggested unto them by the Virtuosi, and derived their repute from them." Not only Nedham, but also O'Dowde, was associated with the virtuosi in another of Stubbe's works.<sup>56</sup> The College of Physicians "is in danger to be overthrown" by empirics and quacks, he wrote, and "all this mischief hath its principal source, original, and strength from the BACONICAL PHILOSOPHERS." Or, to put it another way, the proposal to create a Society of Chemical Physicians was another example of how "experiment" was becoming "a new inundation of Goths and Vandals amongst us"—particularly at Court.<sup>57</sup>

Not all of the monarchy's political leaders supported O'Dowde's scheme: Lord Chancellor Clarendon and Lord Arlington, next to the Duke of Buckingham the most powerful among the king's ministers, are notable by their absence from O'Dowde's list of supporters. Neither was enamored of Buckingham, and neither showed any evidence of interest in chemistry.

Perhaps a grave weakness of O'Dowde's proposal, therefore, was that only one or two groups among the many shifting factions at Court in the mid-1660s supported it. The list of thirty-eight signers of the petition in favor of the chemists was headed by the Archbishop of Canterbury, followed by the Duke of Buckingham, eleven earls, the Bishop of London, a viscount, and twenty-three gentlemen.<sup>58</sup> A large number of the gentlemen were associated with the Duke of York's household, perhaps thanks to Warden's influence.<sup>59</sup>

The political views of the fourteen signers of O'Dowde's petition who

<sup>54</sup> Hunter, *Royal Society*, list.

<sup>55</sup> Untitled, British Library, Sloane 1786, fol. 118b.

<sup>56</sup> Henry Stubbe, *Campanella Revived, Or an Enquiry into the History of the Royal Society* (London, 1670), [Preface] "To the Reader"; *idem*, *Legends no Histories: or, A Specimen Of some Animadversions Upon the History of the Royal Society* (London, 1670), sig. \*1v.

<sup>57</sup> Henry Stubbe, *The Lord Bacon's Relation of the Sweating-Sickness Examined* (London, 1671), second dedication.

<sup>58</sup> O'Dowde, *Poor Man's Physician . . . The Third Edition*, pp. 92ff; the list is reprinted in Thomas, "Society of Chymical Physitians," pp. 63–64.

<sup>59</sup> See Rattansi, "Helmontian-Galenist controversy," pp. 10–18.

sat in the House of Lords can be ascertained through an examination of the list of those voting against Clarendon in the House of Lords in July 1663. Excluding from the fourteen the two bishops (who clearly favored Clarendon's policies toward the Anglican Church), one finds that, of the twelve secular lords, five voted against Clarendon. Because the Duke of Buckingham voted for Clarendon in this instance but otherwise opposed him, at least half of the twelve lords who supported O'Dowde may be said to have opposed Clarendon. Of the remaining six signers of O'Dowde's petition, there is no record of the votes of three, the vote of one is uncertain, and only two voted in favor of Clarendon: the man to whom the College looked for regaining its authority.<sup>60</sup> Therefore, at least half of the lords who supported the Society of Chemical Physicians seem to have belonged to what can loosely be called the "Presbyterian" opposition of the 1660s. Perhaps the signers of O'Dowde's petition of support can be loosely described as "latitudinarian." But with O'Dowde dedicating his work to the archbishop and declaring that Clarendon had urged him on, great caution is required on this point.

O'Dowde's petitions to create a Society of Chemical Physicians were considered by the king and the Privy Council during an audience at either the end of March or the beginning of April 1665. Physicians like Sprackling, having received a rebuff in the House of Commons in part because they were not encouraging the new philosophy enough, and noting the aristocratic support gathered by O'Dowde, worried. But O'Dowde met with his first rebuff at this meeting. Unfortunately, the English State Papers contain no references to the interview. The chemists, and particularly O'Dowde, seem to have met with great difficulties, since former chemical associates of O'Dowde's tried to distance themselves from him almost immediately.<sup>61</sup>

We can infer that the College of Physicians had mustered its own support at Court against the Society. The royal physicians—all of them members of the College—would also have had a chance to object at O'Dowde's audience with the king and council. According to the later testimony of one of the chemists, George Thomson, one or more members of the College of Physicians sent out a spy to gather information on some of the chemists in order to show that they were quacks and politically suspect.<sup>62</sup> Thomson also declared that one "Mr. Galen" presented the complaints of the physicians to the council; perhaps he was the same person who had earlier told the king that O'Dowde was a quack.<sup>63</sup>

The "official" version of the meeting written by the College of Physi-

<sup>60</sup> Richard Davis, "The 'Presbyterian' Opposition and the Emergence of Party in the House of Lords in the Reign of Charles II," in *Party and Management in Parliament, 1660–1784*, ed. Clyde Jones (New York: St. Martin's, 1984), pp. 1–35; see the votes recorded in col. 1, app. 2, pp. 27–34.

<sup>61</sup> Thomson (*Plano-Pnigmos*, pp. 26–31) says that he considers O'Dowde more a courtier than a practitioner. See also Marchamont Nedham, preface to Bolnest's *Medicina Instaurata*.

<sup>62</sup> Thomson, *Plano-Pnigmos*, pp. 22–23.

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 1–10.

cians' chemist, William Johnson, says that O'Dowde and his confederates were accused of two matters. The first was quackery, since they had no proper training in medicine. As Johnson put it, they were "Fanaticks in Physick," being "made Doctors in the opinion of the Vulgar" who were in fact "Foot-Men, Gun-Smiths, Heel-Makers, and Butchers."<sup>64</sup> The second matter was political subversion: the members of the Society of Chemical Physicians were accused of anarchism, because they wished to "renounce all Order and Government in the State," and of republicanism, because they acted by petition, just as the late rebels had done.<sup>65</sup> It is clear at least that O'Dowde was found to be illiterate (that is, without a knowledge of Latin), and that he was also charged with causing harm to some of his patients.<sup>66</sup> George Thomson believed that the admission of "mock chemists" into the Society had damaged the reputation of all the members.<sup>67</sup>

The light in which O'Dowde's practice and proposal were placed may have caused several of the better chemical practitioners who had signed O'Dowde's membership petition to withdraw at least some of their support from the scheme, leaving, according to Thomson, only the "illiterate" ones to support O'Dowde.<sup>68</sup> Marchamont Nedham explained to the Duke of Buckingham that he was not "chidden" but, rather, "countenanced at our Audience at the King's Council-Table."<sup>69</sup> Presumably other "literate" chemists were "countenanced," as well, while the O'Dowdes among them were "chidden." These divisions within the ranks of the chemists were real, for, to many Helmontians and academic physicians alike, O'Dowde and his ilk soon came to represent the worst "cozeners" of the king's people—the quacks—who merely pretended to a knowledge of chemistry.

But the divisions within the ranks of the chemists can be overstated. O'Dowde, at least, did not give up. The plague (the Great Plague of London, as it has come to be known) made its first signs visible almost at the very moment he was proposing the Society of Chemical Physicians. Although the king and his council soon consulted the College of Physicians regarding what measures to take in the face of this grave public emergency,<sup>70</sup> many chemists began to berate the physicians for deserting their stations.<sup>71</sup> Soon O'Dowde, together with Thomson and Nedham, among others, published an advertisement for chemical medicines claiming that these medicines

<sup>64</sup> Johnson, 'Agurto-Mastix,' pp. 5–6. Johnson seems to mean Lionel Lockyer (the "butcher," who, according to George Starkey, learned chemistry from "Molton of Hogg-lane" (Starkey, *A Smart Scourge for a Silly, Saucy fool* [London, 1665]), William Trigg (who had first been trained as a shoemaker), and O'Dowde (the "footman"), all uneducated empirics.

<sup>65</sup> Johnson, 'Agurto-Mastix,' pp. 12–13; 85–86; also see the remarks of Twysden in the dedication to *Medicina Veterum Vindicata*. See, too, the voices of the College raised against the chemists cited in nn. 21 and 28 herein.

<sup>66</sup> These are the major charges rebutted by Thomson in *Plano-Pnigmos*.

<sup>67</sup> Thomson, *Galeno-Pale*, p. 103.

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 103ff; *idem*, 'Loimotomia,' pp. 178–79.

<sup>69</sup> Marchamont Nedham, introduction to Bolnest's *Medicina Instaurata*.

<sup>70</sup> See Cook, *Decline of the Old Medical Regime*, pp. 155–56.

<sup>71</sup> George Starkey, *An Epistolary Discourse*, printed with Thomson's *Plano-Pnigmos* (London, 1665), p. 54.

were prepared during the plague “in pursuance of his Majesties Command.”<sup>72</sup> One month later, O’Dowde published yet another broadside publicizing the Society of Chemical Physicians’ response to “His Majesties Commands by the Lord Ashley” to send one of its members to help relieve the plague in Southampton (a particularly sensitive spot, given its military importance during the ongoing war with the Dutch): they nominated and sent Edward Bolnest.<sup>73</sup>

O’Dowde and his wife perished of the disease in mid-August, despite his purported cures for the plague.<sup>74</sup> After James’s reign, no scheme to create a new London medical corporation came as close to success as O’Dowde’s had until the mid-eighteenth century, although ten years after O’Dowde, several chemical practitioners again publicly raised the idea of creating a new and innovative medical organization in London.<sup>75</sup> The London chemists of the 1670s, however, had no personal links to the Court. With O’Dowde’s death, then, the immediate institutional threat to the established medical corporations disappeared.

The social history of the Society of Chemical Physicians is largely the story of Court patronage for a chemical empiric and his associates. It may be that the effect of patronage on historical developments, particularly institutional ones, has too often been overlooked in medical history. Because of the connection between chemistry and the new philosophy of the period, the intellectual history of the Society of Chemical Physicians has far-reaching implications, as well. It illuminates the larger battle of the seventeenth century over whether learned texts (and dietetics) or empiricism (and the administration of drugs) would serve as the best foundation of practice: whether physic or medicine would be preminent. Many pamphlets and books on medical practice in London written in the next few years took up arguments similar to those of O’Dowde, Nedham, and T.M. The apothecaries were said to be bad and experimentalism good, and, as a consequence, a number of proposals were published to have the physicians make

<sup>72</sup> This was the broadside discovered by the British Museum staff which formed the basis of Thomas’s “The Society of Chymical Physitians.” A facsimile is printed on p. 56 of the second volume of Underwood, *Science, Medicine and History*.

<sup>73</sup> O’Dowde, “Two Letters Concerning the Cure of Plague.”

<sup>74</sup> O’Dowde’s daughter later gave an explanation of why the two died despite O’Dowde’s claims to have an infallible cure for the plague (Trye, *Medicatrix*, pp. 44–69). It was rumored at the time that O’Dowde and some others died as the result of performing an autopsy on a plague victim (John Tillison to Dr. Sancroft, 14 September 1665, in *Original Letters, Illustrative of English History*; ed. Henry Ellis, ser. 2., 4 vols. [London: Harding and Lepard, 1827], 4: 37). Because Mary Trye makes no claim to this kind of martyrdom, however, we can assume that her father had nothing to do with the plague anatomy in fact carried out by George Thomson (see his *Loimotomia*, esp. pp. 69–106).

<sup>75</sup> C.D., *Some Reasons, of the Present Decay of the Practise of Physick in learned and Approved Doctors* (London, 1675); Adrian Huyberts, *A Corner-stone laid towards the Building of a New Colledge* (London, 1675); George Thomson, *Ortho-methodos iatro-chymike: or the Direct Method of Curing Chymically* (London, 1675), pp. 185–99; *The Principles of the Chymists of London Stated, with the Reasons of their Dissent from the Colledge of Physicians, as They were unanimously agreed on by them, at a Meeting in London* (London, 1676), copy in the Yale University Medical Library.



up medicines themselves rather than send to the apothecaries.<sup>76</sup> Needless to say, the Society of Apothecaries, as well as the College of Physicians, was disturbed by such plans.<sup>77</sup>

If chemical medicine was one aspect of the struggles over the new philosophy of the period, however, O'Dowde's example ought to remind us that not all chemists of the period were true intellectuals; many were simply medical empirics playing to the latest intellectual fashions in order to better themselves. And, as the example of the gentleman-chemist Van Helmont ought to remind us, an interest in chemistry was not limited to a "bourgeois" or craftsman's milieu in the mid-seventeenth century; many aristocratic members of the English Court admired it. One may speculate about the reasons for aristocratic interest in chemical medicine in the 1660s, about how a "science" supposedly open only to an initiate could attract the interest of men who were exalted above the common herd. But aristocratic interest surely indicates that not only the social but also the intellectual basis of the vogue for medical empiricism and chemistry will not be fully understood until we investigate further the culture of the European courts, the milieu in which the Society of Chemical Physicians had its beginnings and in which the Royal Society was founded.

<sup>76</sup> Bolnest, *Medicina Instaurata*; Everard Maynwaring, *Medicus Absolutus*; [Daniel Cox], *A Discourse where-in The Interest of the Patient in Reference to Physick and Physicians is soberly debated* (London, 1669); Christopher Merrett, *A Short View of the Frauds, and Abuses Committed by Apothecaries* (London, 1669); Jonathan Goddard, *A Discourse Setting forth the Unhappy Condition of the Practice of Physick in London* (London, 1670).

<sup>77</sup> A London apothecary wrote anxiously to a friend about the books advocating that physicians make up their own remedies (British Library, Sloane 631, fols. 168–77); the apothecaries replied with *Lex Talionis; Sive Vindiciae Pharmacoporum: Or a Short Reply to Dr. Merrett's Book: And Others, written against the Apothecaries* (London, 1670). The Society of Apothecaries tried to have Christopher Merrett and Jonathan Goddard expelled from the College of Physicians for writing as they did, and this led to renewed attempts to create harmony between the two corporations ("Annals of the College of Physicians," [1647–82], 4, fols. 96b–97b). Stubbe argued that if the apothecaries and physicians were to quarrel at such a time, "then the impertinent virtuosi and insolent Quacksalvers would carry away all the advantage" (*Campanella Revived*, postscript, p. 20). See Harold J. Cook, "Physicians and the New Philosophy in Mid-Seventeenth-Century England," forthcoming in the proceedings of the 1986 Corpus Christi Conference on seventeenth-century medicine.