

## Book Reviews

---

*Pharmacy in History*, by G. E. TREASE, London, Bailliere, Tindall & Cox, 1964, pp. vii, 265, illus., 50s.

In the seventeenth century the English apothecaries, newly separated from the Grocers Company, began to practise medicine. Their action brought the wrath of the physicians down upon their heads and the ensuing quarrel is noted for the vituperative literature it engendered. In the nineteenth century when the chemists and druggists organised themselves they were particularly careful not to encroach upon the domain of the physicians and restricted themselves to the sale and dispensing of medicines. In time they were forced, for economic reasons, to expand their business to include items not strictly pharmaceutical. To maintain a balance between the requirements of the profession and the economic necessities of business is a delicate matter and a conflict between the two gently smouldered, occasionally fanned into flame by discussions on pharmaceutical education or professional ethics. The profession has been criticized by pharmacists and laymen alike and it is unfortunate, although by no means unusual, that the critics are frequently ignorant of the problems involved. If we agree with Marc Bloc that 'misunderstanding of the present is the inevitable consequence of ignorance of the past' then any work which sheds light on the development of pharmacy and demonstrates the diversity of its interests is to be welcomed.

This new work by Professor Trease is a useful and interesting introduction to the subject. Although a major portion is devoted to the English situation, the growth of pharmacy as a science and profession is clearly outlined. Facts concerning its practice are related to events and developments in general and social history. Data culled from inventories, wills and similar records are used to indicate the status of the apothecary or pharmacist. Lists of pharmaceutical preparations, discoveries in materia medica and developments in the pharmaceutical sciences are carefully recorded and serve to indicate the changes which have taken place in pharmacy as an art and a science. They serve also to indicate the reason for the change from an apprenticeship training to a three year university course involving a variety of scientific disciplines.

One regret, in reading this interesting book, is that the author has not always ventured to relate his many facts to general developments. He gives lists of preparations in successive editions of the *Pharmacopoeia Londinensis* but there is little attempt to indicate how they reflect (or fail to reflect) current trends in therapeutics. 'It were certainly a disgrace . . . if pharmacy should longer abound with those inartificial and irregular mixtures, which the ignorant of the first ages introduced . . .' This statement appears in the Preface of the 1746 edition of the pharmacopoeia but although Professor Trease has listed the preparations from *Praep. Simpliciores* to *Epithemata* there is no indication that it was so different from its predecessors that the compilers chose to describe it not as a revision but as a reformation.

Coming nearer to our own time we find in the book an excellent description of the development of the machine-compressed tablet but no explanation why this popular and convenient dosage form was excluded from the pharmacopoeia until 1948 (see the table on page 249). Also by omitting reference to the work of Buchheim and Schmiedeberg in the chapter on the history of pharmacology an opportunity is

### *Book Reviews*

missed to discuss the relation between the older materia medica and the modern experimental science of pharmacology.

The book is marred by some omissions and a number of spelling errors. On p. 190 we are told that the private schools of pharmacy will be mentioned in the next chapter but no further reference to them occurs. On p. 186 the description of the Arms of the Pharmaceutical Society stops short after a description of the Supporters. There are many interesting illustrations but two (figs. 40 and 41) are wrongly captioned and fig. 28 is illegible.

M. P. EARLES

*Extramural Medical Education in Edinburgh*, by DOUGLAS GUTHRIE, Edinburgh, E. and S. Livingstone, 1965, pp.43, illus., 15s.

The University of Edinburgh, founded in 1583, did not establish a Faculty of Medicine until 1726, so that all medical and surgical teaching before that date was non-academical. In fact it was the Royal College of Surgeons of Edinburgh that led the way in the teaching of anatomy, by appointing Borthwick and later Monteith. Even after the Faculty had been established it delayed so long in founding a Chair of Surgery that in 1804 the Surgeons set up an extra-mural professor of their own, and it was not till 1831 that the University followed suit.

As new subjects were brought into the medical curriculum more extra-mural teachers sprang up and in 1841 an attempt was made to combine them in the 'Queen's College, Edinburgh' which taught anatomy, botany, chemistry, operative surgery, midwifery and other subjects, but this effort was premature and the College only lasted a few years.

Extra-mural teaching became more important when in 1855 the University gave it recognition. Its ranks were increased by many famous teachers and some of them became pioneers in teaching such subjects as tropical medicine (A. W. P. Pinkerton), diseases of the ear, nose and throat (J. K. Duncanson), diseases of the skin (W. Allen Jamieson) and diseases of children (R. Peel Ritchie). Other distinguished extra-mural teachers were D. Noel Paton, John Chiene, J. Halliday Croom and Patrick Heron Watson.

Extra-mural teaching underwent a great expansion in 1895 when the two Royal Colleges obtained a Charter of Incorporation for their new School of Medicine. This School, under a series of able Deans, flourished for fifty years, but came to an end as the result of the expansion of the University medical department and the policy adopted as the result of the Goodenough Report of 1944. Dr. Guthrie pays a tribute to the splendid work it had done:

'Its contribution remains as a wonderful heritage—The School supplied thirty-five professors to the Medical Faculty of Edinburgh University, and, if other Universities are included, a total of sixty-one professors. This is indeed a remarkable achievement.'

Dr. Guthrie has done well to make this record public, for it is the first time that the significance of the extra-mural teaching in Edinburgh has been so well brought to notice.

ZACHARY COPE