

JONATHAN GODDARD

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

*A LOST WORK OR A GHOST?*

IN the discussion of this book by F. H. Ellis and L. M. Payne (*Med. Hist.*, 1963, 7, 188–90), the argument in favour of its being a ghost seemed by far the stronger. This conclusion can in fact be clinched by demonstrating a fatal flaw in the argument there put forward to prove that Goddard had written a work since lost.

There is of course no doubt that Goddard did publish in 1670 *A discourse setting forth the unhappy condition of the practice of physick in London*, but the exact date is not known and it is on the question of dating that the case for a lost work rests. This argument is that *Lex Talionis*, which was published in the early summer of 1670, referred to a work by Goddard bearing the date 13 November 1669 (*Lex Talionis*, sig. A.3.). Other references in the Apothecaries' records make it quite clear that there was indeed a book by Goddard in circulation by the spring of 1670. (There is a definite reference by 12 April and a probable one on 8 March 1670, S.A.C.,\* 1651–1680, ff. 133d, 132 respectively.) Ellis and Payne then argued that this had to be the lost work because the known work was not licensed until January 1670 and was not published until August. Thus all the references by the apothecaries in the spring must refer to the lost *Discourse concerning physick*.

It is nevertheless reasonably certain, as the authors admitted, that the November 1669 reference to a book by Goddard is due to a confusion with a similar work by Merrett which was mistakenly assigned to January 1670. Therefore the case for the existence of two works depends upon the authors' assigning the second work by Goddard to August 1670. This dating was based on a quotation from Merrett in which he said that:

'Aug 3 . . . a worthy member of our College and of the R.S. also, . . . this day published some papers writ in the year 1664 . . .'

This quotation, on closer study however, cannot refer to any works of Goddard because a preceding key phrase, omitted from the quotation, makes it clear that Merrett was referring to a 'Third Author'! Now the first author was Daniel Coxe whose *Discourse wherein the interest of the patient . . . is soberly debated . . .* had been published in 1669 (see Table). The second was Goddard—the lost work of November 1669. The third author therefore can only be Timothy Clarke who followed Coxe and Goddard in August 1670 with an attack on the apothecaries. This, as Merrett implied, was entitled *Some papers writ in the year 1664 . . .* (see Table). There was thus only the one book by Goddard *A discourse setting forth the unhappy condition of the practice of physick in London*. This was ready for publication in January 1670 and came out within two months.

This pamphlet warfare between the Physicians and Apothecaries of London was part of a long and complicated struggle and this particular episode really dates back to 1664 when Timothy Clarke had a resolution passed by the College that physicians should make their own medicines (*Annals of the Royal College of Physicians*, 1647–1682, f. 84). Until the present writer's full-length study of this struggle appears, the following table may be of use in clarifying the progress of the dispute.

\* S.A.C. = Society of Apothecaries, Court Minutes.

## Society Reports

### PAMPHLETS IN ORDER OF PUBLICATION

- (1) T. M., A letter concerning the present state of physick, and the regulation of the practice of it in this kingdom, London, J. Martyn and J. Allestry, 1665. (This appears to have been written to Timothy Clarke who as host had been airing his hostility to apothecaries (See No. 6). This work is attributed to Merrett in Wing but internal evidence makes this impossible.)
- (2) [Coxe, D.,] A discourse wherein the interest of the patient in reference to physick and physicians is soberly debated. Many abuses of the Apothecaries . . . detected . . . , London, C.R., 1669 [1670]. This is largely based on No. 1. That Daniel Coxe was the author can be seen from No. 3. (2nd Edit.), p. 63, which is earlier than the authorities cited by F. H. Ellis in *Notes and Records of the Royal Society*, 1963, 18, 37.
- (3) Merrett, C., A short view of the frauds committed by Apothecaries . . . , London, J. Allestry, 1669 [1670?]. (A second edition of this outspoken book came out in the summer of 1670. Merrett had been made a freeman of the Apothecaries in 1659 (S.A.C., 1651-1680, f.50d), and so this gave more offence than those of T. M., Coxe and Goddard.)
- (4) Goddard, J., A discourse setting forth the unhappy condition of physick in London . . . , London, J. Martyn and J. Allestry, 1670. (This was written before the Plague (*ibid.*, pp. 57-58), but was not made ready for publication until shortly after Merrett's book. The two were then licensed by the Booksellers on the same day, 17 February 1670, *The Term Catalogues 1668-1709*, ed. E. Arber, 3 vols., London, privately, 1903-1906, I.)
- (5) Lex Talionis; sive vindiciae pharmacoporum: or a short reply to Dr. Merrett's book . . . , London, M. Pitt, 1670. (There is no real evidence that Henry Stubbe was the author of this counter-attack on the College of Physicians. The author, or authors probably, seem to have been apothecaries and the reason for concentrating the attack on Merrett has been noted.)
- (6) C[larke], T., Some papers writ in the year 1664. In answer to a letter, concerning the practice of physick in England, London, J. Allestry, 1670. (This is Timothy Clarke's answer to T.M. (No. 1). The reason for the delay in publication of this, and Goddard's book, is probably that the Plague and Fire had caused a temporary abatement of the quarrel.)

R. S. ROBERTS

## Society Reports

---

### AUSTRALIAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION (VICTORIA BRANCH)

#### SECTION OF THE HISTORY OF MEDICINE

At a meeting of the Section of Medical History held on 25 November 1963, Dr. John McLean presented a paper entitled 'A Short Biography of Fay Maclure'. Alfred Fay Maclure was an eminent Melbourne surgeon and an outstanding surgical teacher who is remembered with affection by many members of the medical profession in Melbourne. He was born in 1883 at Hay, New South Wales, and after a brilliant scholastic career at Wesley College, Melbourne, where he was dux in his final year, he entered Melbourne University and completed his medical course with distinction.

Maclure served his residences at the Kyneton District Hospital and at the Alfred Hospital, Melbourne, where he began a close association with Sir Hamilton Russell which lasted until the latter's death. In 1911, he went to England where he worked at the Middlesex Hospital and in the following year returned to Australia where he was appointed an out-patient surgeon at the Alfred Hospital. During World War I he served in the Australian Imperial Forces as a surgeon and spent some time in a plastic surgery unit under Sir Harry Gillies.