

550. a. 11
4
A N
A N S W E R

TO WHAT

Dr. *F R E I N D*

Has written in his

HISTORY *of* PHYSICK,

Concerning several Mistakes, which he pretends
to have found in a short Work of

Dr. *L E C L E R C*,

INTITULED,

An ESSAY *of a* PLAN, &c.

Translated from the eighth Article of *Biblio-
theque Ancienne, & Moderne*, Vol. 27. Part 2.
by Mr. *L E C L E R C*.

To which is added,

A P R E F A C E,

By *W. COCKBURN*, M. D.

L O N D O N,

Printed for J. CLARKE at the Bible under the Royal-
Exchange, 1728.

T H E

P R E F A C E.

TH E Letter from *John Baillie* to Dr. — is writ with that peculiar Art of Falsification, and Calumny; that I find every body agreed about the true Author: but as it pretends to defend Dr. *Freind* against his two Adversaries, Dr. *le Clerc*, and the *Author* of *Observations*, &c. it is very proper to set this Controversy in a true light, and, in order to that, to give an *English* Edition of *le Clerc's Defence* from *Freind's* Insults, in the *History of Physick*. For, thereby, every Reader may judge of Dr. *Freind's Design* of writing his *History*, and of his *Candor* in supporting the scandalous Charges brought there against all Physicians.

If, on one hand, we consider the shining Characters of *Virtue* and *Learning*, of a consummate *Judgment* and *Experience* in *Physick*, he recommends in ancient Physicians,

ficians, whom he alone imitates, and whose Virtues he only possesses ; no body can doubt of his Excellencies from so impartial a hand as his own.

On the other hand, the *Doctor* gives us a melancholy View of the Physicians of his own times : that *they* are either so *ignorant*, that they are not able to distinguish one Disease from another ; or *they* are so great *Abridgers* of the *Materia Medica*, that they have not *Receipts* to cure any : an excellent Complement on the two famous *Universities*, and the *College* of Physicians.

Some Physicians, we must confess, are found with another Character in the History of Physick ; who are more unhappy than the former, they being to be hunted with *Calumny*, and worried by the People, upon the account of their *Learning* and successful *Practices* : the good Offices of these are their Ruin, while the former may not only pass under general Scandal, but humbly comfort with their Conqueror.

Dr. *Freind* being thus to expose Physicians, under the pretext of a History, he
sets

sets up, in the next place, for a superior Capacity for that Work; that as he himself is the greatest Physician, so he must likewise appear to be the best Writer of Physick History.

On this account the learned Dr. *le Clerc* falls under the Displeasure of Dr. *Freind*. *Le Clerc* had writ the History of Physick, beginning with *Hippocrates*, and ending with *Galen* so accurately, that Dr. *Freind* tells us, *we find amply and clearly represented all the Philosophy, the Theory, and Practice of ancient Physicians; so that there is scarce a Nation, a Distemper, a Medicine, or even the Name of an Author, to be met with amongst them, of which he has not given a full and exact account.* This Accuracy has been universally confessed; but is now the occasion of all the Scandal from the *History of Physick*: for *Freind* must have still a superior Character for an Historian, and *le Clerc's Essay of a Plan* for continuing the History of Physick must be represented not only as *a very imperfect and superficial Performance; but in many Particulars inaccurate and erroneous.* But as this Character is altogether inconsistent with the former;

former ; so it is very certain, that *le Clerc* is to be misrepresented, in order to *Freind's* affirming his Claim.

It is strange, that our *Physicians* have tamely submitted to this *Imputation of Ignorance* ; and that the *Author of Observations*, on *Dr. Freind's History*, is the only Person who has defended himself against the Doctor's Calumnies ; while *le Clerc*, a Foreigner, refuses to bear with the scandalous Charge laid against him. *English Physicians* have their *Profession* and their *Bacon* to preserve, as well as their Honour, while *le Clerc* has scarcely the last to defend, in the opinion of learned Men. We shall therefore proceed, and consider this Controversy, which is now enflam'd by *Baillie's* pretended *Defence* ; the rather, that a true History of Physick may at length arise out of the exposing of a false one.

But here we are called upon in the *Letter*, wherein *le Clerc*, as the *Author*, of *some Observations*, &c. are unfairly represented, as the Aggressors in this Dispute : for the *Justness and Truth*, as we are told, of all *Dr. Freind's Writings* are sufficient to
 I bear

bear them out: while, however vigorous the Critick appears in Dr. le Clerc's Defence, he nevertheless acknowledges most of the Errors alledged against him. Then the Letter-writer concludes, that the Defender has writ from some other Motive than a strict regard to Truth: and this Motive we are assured is a malicious Pleasure, in writing against some excellent Performance. A Piece, continues the Letter, must be written, and what Book more proper to attack, than one of Character, no matter how justly.

We shall quickly find how well Doctor Freind's Works bear themselves out; but in the foregoing Quotations he plainly has no regard to Truth. Can *le Clerc* be an Aggressor, and yet be always upon the Defensive? even in this account of the Doctor, the very Title of his Book, and every Section in it prove it a Defence. Dr. *le Clerc* ends his Book with a full Pardon to Doctor Freind, for discovering his Errors; provided he had not represented him more faulty than he truly is: all which is far from attacking Dr. Freind; and thus the *Letter* discovers, very early, how fair an Antagonist he is like to be.

This

This Author's Talent for Defamation being very considerable, he could not be under the necessity of having recourse to a *Common-place* for Calumny : *a Piece must be written, and what Book more proper to attack than one of Character*, is so common a Style of Contempt with every pauntry Author, that the *Letter-writer* as little wanted this borrow'd Sentence, however low he may be, as it fitted Mr. *le Clerc* : He is always well supply'd by the learned Works, both of ancient and modern Authors ; and has too mean an Opinion of Dr. *Freind's* Performances , to raise in him an Emulation of any kind. Indeed, whatever high Value the *Doctor* and his *Defender* may pretend to have of the History of Physick, the *Bookseller* does not find the World thinks as they do.

Had not Dr. *Freind's* excessive Pride and Vanity, in attacking *Monsieur le Clerc*, altogether blinded him ; he must have thought it very natural, in that Author, to defend his Brother from the malicious Accusations in the *History of Physick* : or to give his Brother's proper Defence a place, in his an-

cient

cient and modern *Bibliothèque* ; without his becoming a Critick on a Book, he shews so small a Value for. This is very unbecoming a Person of a liberal Education, or one who has studied with enlarged Views : and Dr. *Freind's* Readers, who can thus be imposed upon, are of very low Minds, and low Understandings ; for they must even believe, that the year 1727, when *le Clerc* defends himself, precedes the year 1725, when Dr. *Freind* attacks him in his History of Physick. But I proceed to consider the state of the Controversy between Dr. *Freind* and Dr. *le Clerc* ; nor will I insist on the injudicious Criticism of the former, about the Propriety of the Title, *An Essay of a Plan* ; nor on the ill placed Animadversion on *le Clerc's* bestowing so much of his *Plan* on *Paracelsus*. The Criticism altogether proceeds from Dr. *Freind*, and his *Defender*, not understanding the Sense of the word *Essay* ; and their mistaking the modest way Dr. *le Clerc* is always defended. For if a *Plan* is a *Model*, according to the *Letter-writer* ; and that every *Model* is not so perfect, as not to want to be mended ; in this Sense, an imperfect *Model* may be mended ; and an *Essay* of a *Model*, is

an *Attempt* at a *Model*: which *Model* proving perfect, or having small Defects, is not the more imperfect for the Modesty of its Author, in calling it an *Essay*, or an *Attempt*. This Sense of a *French* Word is very clear; if we consider its equivalent in *Latin*. What the *French* mean by *Essay*, the *Romans* express by *Tentamen*; and every School-boy knows how to render this *Latin* Word into *English*. So that when the Words *Essay* and *Plan* are so managed by the *Doctor* and his *Letter-writer*, as to come out of their Mint a *Plan of a Plan*; it only proves, that they know nothing of the import of the two Words; especially of that of an *Essay*.

This Charge against Dr. *le Clerc*, of bestowing too much of his Plan on *Paracelsus*, is equally unjust as the former; and his modest Reply, that every one is not of Dr. *Freind*'s Opinion, exposes him to the farther Censure of the *Letter-writer*; who is truly void of all Modesty. Now though I keep clear from making any Defence for *Mons. le Clerc*, who is far abler to answer for himself: yet it must be confessed; that, if *Paracelsus* had been neglected for some
personal

personal Faults, the History of those Times had been very defective. What a Work Dr. *Freind* makes about *Rhases*, for giving us one chymical Medicine, which was none of his own; and now capriciously contends, for neglecting an Author, who made one of the greatest Revolutions in Physick; by introducing the method of curing Diseases by chymical Medicines, to the total Overthrow of *Hippocrates* and *Galen*; and that for a considerable Period of time. What account can be given of the Vanity of an Author, who sets to build, and pull down, as the humour takes him? It is not enough, I hope, to object to *Paracelsus*; that he was often drunk after Dinner, or that he was not a Favourite of the Churchmen. No; we consider only the Influence of his Art on the Schools of Physick: by no means his commonly getting drunk with, or without the Fathers; who, at that time, were commonly very near as barbarous as himself. But the *Doctor*, and his *Defender*, know that the more Faults they find, the more they hope to please, and impose upon their Reader: or, the more they hope to establish the Doctor's Pretence of superior Learning and Knowledge in his Profession.

To return from this Digression ; we are told, that Dr. *le Clerc* acknowledges most of the Errors alledged against him ; and that, as far as I can observe, because he confesses his Mistake about the times, wherein *Oribasius*, *Aëtius*, &c. lived ; which is a very unjust and an unfair manner of arguing. Where is the Crime in owning his falling into the mentioned Error ? or in his being misled by the Authority of the learned *Renè Moreau* ? On the other hand, we find Dr. *Freind* assuring us, that he never can be deceived : because he never trusts any thing to the most learned Historian ; yet he has only been more happy in taking his account of the mentioned Author's *Æra* from *Fabricius*, than Dr. *le Clerc* was from *Moreau* : had the Doctor been as ingenuous as *le Clerc* ; and had he not introduced this picce of History, with *all the Historians*, even the best of them, given a very confused account of the Age wherein these Writers lived ; and are so careless as to be very well contented, if they were within a hundred, or two hundred years of their due time, he had not brought upon himself an Imputation of Plagiarism ; when he under-

takes

takes to settle this *Æra* in a very few Words.

The Discovery is far from being restored to Dr. *Freind*, by what is urged in the Letter: that the Doctor had *writ all* the material parts which relate to *Oribasius, &c.* before he had ever seen the twelfth *Volume of Fabricius*: for *le Clerc* affirms that the *Physick-Historian* had made up his account from the eighth and twelfth Volume of *Fabricius's Bibliotheca*, and the sinking one half of the Evidence as an unfair way of proceeding in any Cause. This kind of Argument is so foul, that we may justly doubt whether Dr. *Freind* had not considered both the mentioned Volumes, before he began any part of his *History*.

The *Author* of the Letter is apprised of the Consequence of Dr. *Freind's* pretending to be the first, who fixed the Times of *Oribasius, &c.* and therefore gives us a Notion of his own of a *Plagiary*, that the style of a *Plagiary is never equal, and uniform; but like their patch'd up Work is always unequal*: But this Notion is very particular, and may be cut out for themselves: whereas a *Plagiary,*

giary, among the Learned, is a *Thief*; who pilfers the Works of learned Men; and passes them off in the World for their own, in whatever stile it may be delivered. Let a *Plagiary*, then, collect ever so much like a *Bee*, he is still a *Pilferer* of Authors; and he is the more insufferable that he upbraids the Authors he is stealing from. I wish Dr. *Freind* had, oftner, given us the Words of Authors, than his own, when he wrote his History of Physick: for thus we should have seen their Sense and Opinion of Things and not the Doctor's, who often misleads us and too commonly with a Design.

But the *Letter-writer* is pleased, in the next place, to carry us from the Niceties of *Chronology*, into the *History* of Physicians Discoveries; which are the Treasure we are to expect from Historians, not their rounded Periods, or equal Stile, but good Sense, that may add to our Knowledge: and, indeed the want of this renders any History, however excellent its Stile may possibly be, little better than waste Paper.

The first Attack upon Dr. *le Clerc*, is for affirming that *Oribasius* and *Aëtius* con-
tain

tain every thing that is essential in the *Theory and Practice of Physick*; particularly in *Anatomy*, and *Surgery*: But as this Charge is dwindled into nothing in the *Letter*, by not comprehending both the mentioned Authors, in the Affirmation; so the Victory is left to Dr. *le Clerc*. Aëtius, says the *Letter-writer*, omits *Anatomy*; and what is purely *chirurgical* in him, is scattered confusedly here and there, and is imperfect as well as immethodical. But if *Oribasius* was an excellent *Anatomist*, and a *Discoverer* in *Anatomy*, as *Freind*, erroneously, affirms; and *Aëtius* equal to *Paulus*, on many things of *Surgery*: in that case, Dr. *le Clerc* may have affirmed what is true of both these Authors conjunctly. † *Aëtius*, Dr. *Freind* assures us, was a *Practitioner in Surgery* — particularly, he is as full, in cases of the *Eyes*, as *Celsus*. Nay farther; that * in his *chirurgical Pieces* there are many things worth taking notice of, — which are even omitted by *Paulus*; the most considerable of any of the *Surgeons* in the Doctor's opinion. Indeed, an Author should at least condescend to be consistent with himself in the Judgment of the *Letter-writer*, and let him use what

† Hist. Vol. 1. pag. 14.

* Pag. 33.

Freedom he pleases with his *Adversary*, he should (in my humble opinion) pay that piece of Complaisance to his own Character as not to give himself the Lye.

At this time Dr. *Freind* is charged with a grammatical Error, in Orthography, for misspelling *Aëtius* with *Æ*; a Charge heavy enough on a Declaimer. The Answer of some Authors writing the Island *Aëria*, in the like manner, is a forced giving up the Charge, and a pleading guilty.

But the next Error, to be acknowledged, must stick harder upon the Pride and Infalibility of the Doctor; it equally striking at his Reading, and his distinguishing Diseases. The Case is of the Worms *Vena Medinensis*, and *Affectio Bovina*; which are thought the same by *Freind*, and the first mention of this Disease to be made, by the *Arabian* Physicians: whereas, the last is only mentioned in the *Plan*, and the first is related in the History of the *Greek* Physicians, from *Hippocrates* ending with *Galen*. Hitherto, then, Dr. *Freind* is beforehand with Dr. *le Clerc* in Errors; but very short of him in confessing them.

However mortifying this last Article must prove to a Person of high Pretences; we find this Author quickly recollects himself, and returns as briskly to the Charge, on the case of *Rhubarb*, as if he never had been foil'd. *I need not tell you, Sir, (as we find in the Letter) that Dr. Freind, in his History of Physick, corrected the Error not only of Dr. le Clerc, but every other Writer, with whom I am acquainted, on that Subject, gave to the Arabians the honour of first mentioning Rhubarb. — In this, as indeed in all other parts of his History, the Doctor has been very accurate.*

After all this Ostentation, there seems to be greater Confusion than ordinary between the contending Parties; Doctor *le Clerc* nowhere denying the *Rheum* or *Rhubarb* of the *Greeks*; but insisting only that this is not the true *Rheubarb*, or *Rheubarbarum* of the *Arabians*. Moreover, that neither the *Greeks* nor *Arabians*, before *Mesue*, knew any thing of the purging quality of this Drug. Doctor *Freind* says little in opposition to what *le Clerc* affirms: The Letter, indeed, calls this Observation of *China-Rheubarb* of the *Ar-*
b
bians,

bians, a most excellent Conceit; and thus proceeds, *Is he (le Clerc) sure there was no other good Rheubarb in the World? Or suppose it was not so good in its kind, will that exclude it from being true Rheubarb?* It is then incumbent on Dr. *Freind* to prove, that there is true, purging, *Rhubarb*; besides that which is brought from *China*. Every body knows the different Species of *Rhubarb*; and that few of them are endued with the Power of purging: but these are not in the Question.

On the other hand, Dr. *le Clerc* should do a manifest Injury to the *Greeks*, perhaps; but surely to all the *Arabians*, that precede *Mesue*, if they are not supposed to know *Rhubarb*, because they were not so well apprised of its *Virtues*. But a farther Determination of the true *Rhubarb* I leave to the contending Physicians. This I may say, that we are, at present, in great want of a purging *Rhubarb*; while we are deprived of that from *China*. Doctor *Freind* should, once, do something useful to the World; if he would discover the *Rhubarb* of the *Greeks*; that is but a little weaker than that of the *Arabians*.

The Doctor falls into another Mistake, in his Claim for the *Greek* Physicians; by putting it too low, and in taking it from Compilers. * *Galen* recommends *Rhubarb* against all *Bleedings*, the *Bloody-Flux*, and the *Celiac-Affection*; and the Physicians, in many succeeding Ages, say no more of it. And therefore if the *Doctor* has not been more accurate in other parts of his History, than in this, he must fall short of all the Applause he tells us he deserves.

It is not easy to guess, why Dr. *Freind* is commonly unhappy when he deals with *Galen*; and why he would not rather take this Observation from that excellent Author, than from *Paulus*, who probably takes it from the former; if it is not my quoting this very Observation in my Book of *Fluxes* long before the History of Physick appeared. I cannot go so low for an Answer to these Doubts, as the Words in the Letter concerning *Monsieur le Clerc*. As I would fain imagine him, a Gentleman and a Scholar, I would as fain attribute his Unfairness to the not reflecting, how much below both Charac-

* De Medic. simp. fac. Lib. 8.

ters his manner of writing would appear. I rather leave the Doctor to settle them, when he is farther to consider his Discoveries about *Rhubarb*.

But the farther our Historian proceeds in the material, useful, and necessary Branches of his Profession, the more he wanders from the Argument; and exposes his own Weakness: for while he pleads for *Rhazes* first making use of chymical Medicines, the *Blessed Oyl*, and the *Oyl of Eggs* are his Vouchers: the first, no doubt, a chymical Preparation, but not invented by *Rhazes*. The second, a mere *Oyl* made by Expression, no chymical Preparation at all: The reason of our Historian's Mistake, is its being made by the help of Fire, in frying the *Eggs*. *Rhazes* does not pretend first to have made this kind of *Oyl*, and *Serapion* (as *le Clerc* observes) gives the Method of making it before *Rhazes*.

Dr. *le Clerc*, then, will readily confess, that there was a *chymical Oyl* in *Rhazes*'s time; as on the other hand, Dr. *Freind* must acknowledge, that the *Oyl of Eggs*, described by *Rhazes*, is not a chymical Preparation:

paration: consequently it is not a proof of chymical Medicines being known at that time. *Rhases* is so far from assuming to himself the Invention of the *Oleum Benedictum*; that he tells us, * *that it was kept among the Secrets of the Philosophers*: from whence, probably, it was called *Oleum Philosophorum*.

Dr. *Freind* does not part with his Errors easily; for (in the Letter) we are told, † that the great Objection against the *Oyl* of Eggs, is its being a *simple Process*: which Affirmation is very false; the Objection truly, being against its being any manner of *Process*, or *chymical Preparation*, as that Word *Process* is commonly understood: but merely an *Oyl* by *Expression*, which is altogether different from a chymical *Oyl*, as every *Apothecary's Apprentice* knows.

In the same Letter, another evading Argument is produced, that the *Oyl of Eggs* was equally known to both the *Physicians*, *Rhases* and *Avicenna*. What then? is an *Oyl of Eggs* by *Expression* a chymical *Oyl*, because *Avicenna* knew it? No: but there

* Antidot. lib. i. p. 557.

† Pag. 46.

was a chymical *Oyl* of *Eggs* described by *Avicenna*, which *Rhases* did not know; which Example proves only, that *Avicenna* knew more than *Rhases*; and that the *Author* of the *Letter* is a very quibbling, uncandid, Adversary.

If any Sincerity may be supposed to remain with the Letter-writer; we find he does not understand the Difference between a *chymical* and *galenical* Medicine: for he seems to believe; that every Medicine, that is mentioned in a Book of Chymistry, is a chymical Medicine. Thus, an *Oyl* of *Nutmegs*, and of *Mace*, both made by Expression, may be found in *Lemery's* Book of *Chymistry*. A wretched Error, and easily discovered if he writes to an Apothecary, for either of these *Oyls*, alone, and not mixed with any other thing, that may determine the sort. But had these Gentlemen (if two there be) consulted their Author, they had there found other *Oyls* made by Expression; and without any Fire to mislead them: as the *Oyls* of *Aniseed*, *Filbirds*, *Almonds*, *Poppies*, &c. yet these are not the more chymical *Oyls*, that they are found in *Lemery's* Chymistry. Nothing is
more

more gross than this Pretence. It is plain, then, that the Defence is a pure Trick, and Imposition; and the *History of Physick* was altogether designed to impose upon Men, and not to instruct Physicians.

What has been said of *Oyl of Bricks*, is equally true of *Quicksilver killed and sublimed*; that it was a chymical Preparation, but so well known, in the time of *Rhases*, that it seems to have been invented long before him: because he prescribes Remedies against its Injuries, which were more common, and better known, than if it had been lately tried. But as this Account from *Rhases* must be admitted, because *Sublimation* is a chymical Operation; so, on the other hand, we may wonder why the same Operation, and *Distilling* should not have the same meaning in *Avicenna*; notwithstanding that we find more Preparations of that kind in the last, than in *Rhases*. *Avicenna* proposes to cure *brackish*, and other *unwholesome Waters* by *Distilling*: He speaks of making *Rose-water* by *Distilling*, and not only tells us that this Water is a great *Cordial*, but even kept it a *Secret*. And therefore if Dr. *Freind* had any degree of the

the

the Candor, in admitting *sublimate Mercury* to be a chymical Preparation ; he must far rather confess, that *Avicenna* purify'd common *Water* by *Distillation*, and *sublimed*, or *distilled*, a *Water* from *Roses* : which is the first distill'd *Water*, ever mentioned. Besides ; it was a Cordial, and is useful in *Fainting*, which no Preparation of *Roses* was before noted for ; yet this Quality Physicians found true by their own Experience, and Dr. *Freind* confirms in the case of the Emperor *Alexius*.

However plain this Account is ; yet *Avicenna* must not be allowed to know *Rose-water* ; because he does not instruct us in the manner of making it. Besides ; Physicians misunderstand him, because a *Decoction* of a Plant is sometimes called its *Water* : as a *Decoction* of *Barley* is called *Barley-water*.

And first ; it is no manner of proof of *Avicenna's* not knowing *Rose-water*, because he does not teach us the manner of making it ; for first, it was a *Secret* for above a hundred Years : and Dr. *Freind* deliberately misleads us, when he affirms that *Mesue*

was

was the Inventor, because he gives us the method of preparing *Rose-water*: whereas *Mesue*, speaking of the Virtues of *Roses*, and of some Medicines prepared from them, informs us that † *Water, wherein Roses have been infused, is detergent; but Water distilled from Roses is strengthening; or is a Cordial.* Here is nothing of the *manner* of making *Rose-water*, as the *Doctor* assured us there was.

But the Falseness of this kind of Argument farther appears, from the daily custom of Physicians; who do not give the *manner* of making any Preparation they prescribe, or every time they mention its Virtues. We do not find, for Instance, the *manner* of making *Philonium Romanum*, or *Tinctura Sacra*, in *Freind's Bills*, no more than of the way of making *Rose-water* in *Avicenna*: we ought not then to conclude, that Dr. *Freind* does not know the *manner* of making *Philonium*, tho' he did not know, that it had long been kept a *Secret*; and far less, that *Avicenna* did not know the *manner* of preparing *Rose-water*.

† De simplic. fol. 34. pag. Ult.

As to the use of *Aqua Hordei*, and *Decoction Hordei*; that Ambiguity is so small, that I never yet heard of any Confusion occasioned thereby. Besides; the *Cordial* Quality of *Rose-water*, never attributed to the *Decoction* of *Roses*, is more than sufficient to determine the Sense in the present case.

But to prosecute this Argument farther than is necessary; we must still hear Dr. *Freind's* Defender, tho' that be to hear more trifling only, and some voluntary Falsifications. And first, this *Rose-water* must be only a *Decoction*; because *Plempius* translates it *Aqua*, and *Succus Rosarum*. Here indeed is no manner of Ambiguity; and what Translation, or what Use, ever render'd *Succus* a *Decoction*? So foolish is this *Defender*, or what *Fools* does he suppose his Readers to be? Yet in the Prosecution of this Argument the Defender proves himself more *Knave* than *Fool*.

For we are told that *Mesue* calls *Rose-water* *Aqua infusionis Rosarum*; then the *Letter-writer* artfully divides the Sentence so, that the Parts of it do not meet again

again in two Pages. The first is altogether false, and the Separation a *Trick*. These are the Words of *Mesue*; *Aqua cui infusæ sunt Rosæ, mundum facit, terget, purgat; per Sublimationem vero, facta, multum roborat, &c.* The first part of this Sentence is falsified, merely for the benefit of the Word *Aqua*, and thereby to work in a *Water* of the *Infusion* of *Roses*: and this Water is of great use in the *Forgery*; for thus it is passed for the *Rose-water* of the *Arabians*; and next it is cold, and cures a *Syncope* like common cold Water. Who must not applaud the Wit of our Author, even when he destroys the Words of *Mesue*; who teaches us to make a *Tincture* of *Roses*, that is *detergent*?

The *Letter* is not so happy in the Corruption of the latter part of the Sentence, after it is parted from the first: for the *distilled Rose-water* is only mentioned; without the least Hint about making it: which Dr. *Freind* affirmed, was done. The Defender, indeed, has puzzled the Cause; and thus gives a greater Handle for wrangling than before. The Equivocation, formerly, turned upon *Water*, and *Decoction*; but our

c 2

ingenious

ingenious Author adds *Juice*, and *Tincture*; either of them will admit of great Changes, as a witty Historian will employ them.

There is Justice due to the *Grace*, as well as the *Wit*, of our Author; who, on this Occasion, beyond his Custom, seems to be under Confusion and Shame : for, after all his Labour, he cannot avoid asking Quarter of his Antagonist ; *If the Writer will not allow, that Mesue here speaks of the manner of making it (Rose-water) by Chymistry, the Doctor will be satisfy'd; if it be allowed, that he mentions at all the distill'd Rose-water.* This Petition is granted: for *Mesue* mentions nothing besides *Rose-water distilled*, because he knows not any other; but *Freind* undertook to shew how this *Rose-water* was distilled, and that from *Mesue*; which Promise is not performed.

It may be needless to observe, that as *Rose-water* was esteemed a generous Cordial by all Authors, after *Avicenna* ; so the making use of it, in Cases of a *Syncope*, is a considerable Proof of this *new* Preparation of *Roses* having other Qualities than any other ; as *Mesue* expressly observes : which
cordial

cordial Quality render'd it useful in the Prescription of *Avicenna* ; and in the very Case of the Emperor *Alexius*, mentioned in the *History of Physick* ; which Cases the *Letter-Autho*r would represent to be very different : but it is very plain, that he has not any Notion of the Disease ; for he seems to frame to himself as different Species of a *Syncope*, as are the different Administrations for curing it.

But as a *Syncope*, however it may be occasioned from *Fear* or *Evacuations*, &c. is a *Failing in the Spirits* ; whereby the *Heart* is more immediately affected : So the *Indication* of curing it, is by relieving the *Spirits* themselves ; or by giving of *Cordials*, such as *Rose-water* is supposed to be. We must then conclude, that there are not different Species of a *Syncope* ; because we often find People, in that Condition, are brought up by *sprinkling cold Water* on their *Faces*, or by *drinking* it : and as this is the readiest Remedy, so it is most commonly made use of in this kind, even when it arises from an over-Evacuation by *Bleeding*, &c. I should desire this Author to explain the different Methods of Relief ; but that I find

find him not to have any Genius to Truth, or Knowledge. Indeed, he has shewn so much Ignorance in the Case of a *Syncope*, that I should rather suspect his *Purging* and *Bleeding* for the curing it, than of his giving a *Cordial*; except, perhaps, in such a Case as that of *Alexius*; and even then his Notion of the Disease is wrong, tho' the Practice should prove right; because the disappearing of an Eruption does not denote the *Cause* of the *Syncope*, but is the *Effect* only. But this general Observation I would recommend to our Author, for the good of Mankind, and to prevent farther Effusion of Blood.

However; it is evident, that *Avicenna* first mentions *distill'd Rose-water*; which is the Question under Consideration: and as the Author of the Letter is wilfully guilty of this unfair Quotation, he deserves (to use his own Words) to be class'd amongst the most mercenary Pens. *Avicenna* bears a better Character with Mr. *Savill*, the beneficent Founder of the Profession of *Astronomy*, and *Geometry*, in *Oxford*, than is here allowed him by these half-bred *Oxford Scholars*: for we find, in his second Lec-

ture upon *Euclid*, that he thought him superior to *Galen*. *Avicenna* formed the Art, whereas *Galen* wrote occasionally, and without Order, upon sundry Subjects, as they offered.

I am heartily tired in going thro' the Misrepresentations, false Quotations, and Blunders of Dr. *Freind*, and his Defender; and I should willingly leave Dr. *le Clerc* to the Judgment of any common Reader, who will easily discover; that neither *Actuarius* was conversant with the *Arabian* Physick, nor Dr. *Freind* with *French*, or *Pharmacy*: but as this Author has taken an unexpected turn about a *Nostrum*, *Actuarius* believes belong'd to *Hippocrates*; which *Nostrum*, or the *Crown*, that is said to have attended it, have turned the Doctor from his former general Assertion, of every one being a *Quack* that had a *secret* Medicine, and of every Prescription consisting of many Simples for its Composition being a *Quack Bill*, and the Medicine itself a *Quack Medicine*: and, *I hope*, there is no *Quackers* in the Reformation.

Actuarius,

Actuarius, after sixteen hundred years dead Silence, affirms, that *Hippocrates* had a *secret* Medicine, wherewith he cured the *Plague*; and that, for this Service, he received a *Crown*; and Dr. *Freind* shews us how well he can maintain contrary Positions, in supporting this Fable of *Actuarius*: for, in time, he may expect a *Coronet* for some imaginary Cures by some *Secret*.

Dr. *le Clerc* had exposed, in his *Plan*, this fabulous Pretence of *Actuarius*, and gives no Credit to the *Reward* of a civick *Crown*: the last he calls a very *Tale*, and the first he thinks inconsistent for *Hippocrates* to father a Medicine so compounded, beyond his Custom, or the Knowledge of his Times: especially, that this *Secret* was not heard of in sixteen hundred years.

Both these Arguments seem to be very pressing and conclusive; but Dr. *Freind* vehemently opposes *le Clerc* with very little reason: and we must go to his Second for clearing up this long and dark time of absolute Silence. For as to the Objection, says the *Letter*, that no other Author mentions

tions this *Antidote* as compos'd by Hippocrates, it is by no means a proof, that *Actuarius* forg'd it, or even that it was not used by Hippocrates himself. For at this rate of arguing, one might say, the Composition we now have of the *Mithridate* is not genuine, because *Celsus* does not describe it.

The *Author* of the *Letter* fairly gives up the Question in the first Argument; wherein he grants that *Actuarius* is the first Person who mentions this *Secret Antidote*; and the second Argument is no Proof nor Support of the former; because we have the *Mithridate* described by *Celsus*, and nothing of *Hippocrates's Antidote* before *Actuarius*, who lived sixteen hundred years after him. Besides; this Argument could not prove any thing, if we had never heard of *Mithridate* before *Galen*; for the Receipt might very well have been preserved for so small time, and when there were very few Physicians that wrote between the times of *Celsus* and *Galen*: whereas this is a mere Fable, opening a door to any Pretender to an ancient *Secret*.

When Dr. *le Clerc* peremptorily demands, how *Actuarius* came by this *Receipt*, after its being unknown for so many Centuries, so that no Author mentions it ; the Letter-writer, wretched Creature, is at last forced to take Shelter in a *May-be*. Might not several of these Authors, which are now lost to us, have inserted it into their Works? This Argument equally proves the Antiquity of the *Alcoran*, as of Dr. *Freind's* *Nostrum*. Had any such Books existed, so late as *Actuarius*, we should, more than probably, had a better account of them. The Relation then of the Secret of *Hippocrates* is very idle, and very absurd.

Aëtius, insists the Letter, gives us an account of a great many Compositions of the *Antients*. Is therefore every idle Story that may be found in every Book true? *Aëtius* either gives us memorable Opinions of Physicians near his own time, and when the Books might be commonly read, or else he takes them from Authors of Credit and Integrity : whereas the *Legend* of a Receipt is trump'd up without any Foundation, and after a long Silence of sixteen hundred years.

This excellent Amasser of Opinions, and Prescriptions, did not chiefly collect from *Galen*, as *Freind* erroneously affirms; and tho' he took the Receipt of the *Philonium* from him, yet he is more obliged to *Crito*, a Disciple of *Acron* of *Agrigentum*, than to *Galen*; and had Dr. *Freind* taken it likewise from him, he never could have fallen into the Blunder of commending *Philo's Nostrum*, for never having been a *Secret*. We may therefore conclude, that this pretended *Secret* of *Hippocrates* is a very Tale.

But as Dr. *Freind* seems now disposed to change his former Opinion, about secret Medicines, and to believe with learned Men, that Physicians, in all Ages, had their *Arcana*; I hope he will hereafter found his Belief upon a better *Basis* than this glaring Romance of a *Civick-Crown*. Let the Doctor be persuaded, that *le Clerc* should have had an unanswerable Proof against this pretended *Secret* of *Hippocrates*; if ancient Physicians had not commonly had their *Secrets*; and as no body has with equal Accuracy writ the Lives of the ancient *Greek* Physicians, in *Freind's* Opinion, as Dr. *le Clerc*; so he must likewise believe, that the having

d 2

of

of *Secrets* was very common among learned Physicians. For had not the Custom been common, *Hippocrates* could not be supposed to have had an *Arcanum*; because no learned Physician ever had; as Dr. *Freind* has formerly affirm'd.

Dr. *Freind* has, hitherto, been very unhappy, whatever side of the Question he has undertaken to support: His present Change proves him mightily mistaken, when he affirmed, that the *Ancients* had not *Arcana*: more; when he commended one of the best concealed *Secrets*, for its never having been one. At last; he sets up for a *Nostrum* upon an idle Tale he finds in *Actuarius*: but in the former Cases there was never a *Crown*; and the *Nostra*, on that account, might not be worth contending for.

This short Account between Dr. *Freind* and Dr. *le Clerc*, is easily ballanced; whether we consider their *Errors*, or their *Readiness* to acknowledge them: The pretended Perfection of all Dr. *Freind's* Works does not prevent his extenuating many Errors, nor his express Confession of some; no

more than his affirming, that *le Clerc's* Defender acknowledges most of the Errors alledged against that Physician, makes the Charge more true. Dr. *le Clerc* cannot be blamed for acknowledging his Mistake, about the Times of *Oribasius*, &c. and that he trusted too much to *Rene Moreau* for that piece of History: nor can Dr. *Freind* be commended for his pretended Infallibility, by never trusting to the most learned Historian; while he takes his account from *Fabricius*, and is only more happy, by copying a better piece of *History*, than *le Clerc* had from *Moreau*. But the former State of Facts is so manifest, that it is needless to compare them any more: I shall therefore return to the *Letter*, and shew how well he has supported Dr. *Freind*, against the Defence of another Physician in the *Observations on Dr. Freind's History of Physick*.

Tho' the Charge against this Author was very grievous, and very different in its Nature, from any Calumny brought against *le Clerc*; yet we find nothing in the *Letter-writer*, but delirious Complaints against the *Observations*, for the want of *Wit, Manners, &c.* All which proves Mr. *Baillie* to have

have been in so great an Anger, as to have lost his Wit; and that his Ravings are his best Answer. A *Physician* may practise successfully; without his being conversant in chronological Niceties, or his knowing when chymical Medicines were first introduced into the Practice of Physick; but if any Person is a *Quack*, or an *Empirick*, (in Dr. *Freind's* Language,) a *Plagiary*, or a *Madman*: These affect the *Benefit* of a Profession, and the Honour of the Physician so much; that the Slanderer should find a Punishment in the Law, were not his Accusations laid out of the letter of it; and thus out of its reach. Yet every good Man will acknowledge, that the Blaster of Reputations is not the more innocent, that he meets not with due Correction.

Dr. *Freind*, according to his Custom, affirms; that every Physician is a *Quack* that keeps a Medicine *secret*; because the *Antients*, nor learned Moderns, 'tis pretended, never did.

In *the Observations* we find the natural Right of every Physician, in keeping, or divulging, his Inventions maintained: as also,
that

that some of the most learned Physicians, ancient and modern, had always their *Secrets*. Our Author does not go far for a Proof; but joins issue with Dr. *Freind* upon his own Authors, and proves from them, that the learned *Ancients* had *Secrets*: For indeed the Doctor's Arguments are very surprising, how witty soever he may think them: *Aëtius*, says he, *collected a multitude of Receipts; particularly those, which had been much celebrated or used as Nostrums*. Will not any Reader believe that *Aëtius* gives full proof, that in his days, or before him, there was never a *Nostrum*, or a *secret* Medicine? *Aëtius* we find affirms the having of *Secrets*. *Freind*, upon the Authority of *Aëtius*, concludes the *Ancients* never had: most irrefragable *Logick*.

As it is now agreed, that there were *Secrets* among ancient Physicians; so the *Defender* admits of the Moderns having likewise *Arcana*; thus the Learned among ancient and modern Physicians had their *Secrets*, and were *Quacks*: great Honours done to the most ignorant Dealers in human Flesh, who support by their *Wit*, what they want in their Learning. But the true
Con-

Conclusion is, that learned Physicians, who invented efficacious Medicines, concealed them for their own Use or Advantage, if they thought fit: and I must add, very much for the Good of Mankind, and the Honour of Physick.

Aëtius, indeed, gives an account of these *Secrets* openly, and not in the manner they had been concealed; which shews, that Dr. *Freind* knew no more of them, than as he read them in that Author: his want of reading misled him into a very unwary Observation, that *Aëtius* gives these *Nostra* no *Character* himself, nor recommends them from his own *Experience*, as he does, very deservedly, the *Philonium*; as if this had never been a *Nostrum*. The *Doctor*, it is evident, did not know that *Galen* first discovered this *Secret* of *Philo's*; nor that *le Clerc* gives this account, in his accurate *History of Physick*.

As the *Author* of the Letter has allowed, that many of the best Physicians, *Rational* as well as *Empiricks*, *Ancient* as well as *Modern*, had their *Arcana*; so he makes no manner of Defence of his Charge of *Plagiarism*,

liarism, in stealing an *Oyntment* from *Fallopius*: and thus its Inventor being acquitted of a heavy Crime, he was maliciously charged with, *Freind's* gentle Readers have leave to believe; that an useful *Oyntment* was invented by the Person, injured by him. And I desire every body to believe, that there are more than two *Receipts* in the Book of the *Gonorrhœa*; tho' the *Doctor* and the *Servitores* have thought fit traditionally, to confine them to that small number.

It is, indeed, more surprising, that the *Witty Letter-writer* had nothing to offer, in Vindication of the Doctor's artful corrupting, both *Avenzoar*, and *Alchindus*; that the first, thro' the later, might assist him to the Calumny, he flants on the *Problem*, for determining the *Doses* of *Purging* and *Vomiting* Medicines. Was the Falsification so very gross, that a mighty *Wit* could not possibly wipe it off?

Dr. *Freind's* advancing *Avenzoar*, for this pretended Service, among the number of *rational* Physicians, no less exposes his *Vanity*, than his Attempt on an allowed *Demonstration*,

monstration, whereby the *Doses* of the mentioned Medicines are determined. Did he envy the Happiness of Men that might now safely take Medicines, which had commonly proved fatal? Or did he fear, that Men, beyond their Custom, would have too grateful a Sense of their Delivery? 'Tis *Envy* we find, that provokes the *Doctor* for that has always attended *Glory*; and they, who most excel others, have always been subject to the most *licentious* Detraction.

What can redound more to the Honour of Physick, than to convince Men, that it is no longer a *precarious Art*, but a *demonstrative Science*: that the just Complaint of the great *Hippocrates*, of *Experience* being *fallacious*, is removed; and that an easy *Judgment* may be made of what passes before us? *Experience* taught us little before this: for the height of the best Physician's Knowledge, was that a Medicine did purge one more gently than another; and that, at the Expence of many Lives, while the most learned Physicians, every where, complained; that the *dosing* of the mentioned Medicines was so very difficult, as to be altogether

together conjectural. *Experience* was the great Pretence of *Empiricks*, who zealously contended, that our *Reason* had no place in Physick. *Medicines*, say they, *must differ, according to the Nature of the Country wherein they are to be administred; and one sort is wanted in Rome, another in Ægypt, and a third in France.* This Objection is, now, removed by the *Solution*: because all this Difference is perfectly discovered, and we may equally prescribe as if there were no difference in the mentioned Countries.

And therefore the *Method* of the *Solution* plainly restores Physicians to the use of their Reason, for *curing Diseases*; as the *Solution* itself renders the Administration of *purging* and *vomiting* Medicines safe: however *whimsical* or *mad* that Attempt is represented, by the witty Dr. *Freind*.

Mr. *Baillie*, I know, charges the *Solution* with *Obscurity*, and want of *Wit*: both which, in some Sense, may be true. For what has *Wit* to do with Demonstration; unless it be, to make the People believe, that these witty Men understand it? just so, the *Obscurity* of a Demonstration consists

not in the thing, but in the Person who does not apprehend it. Thus *Euclid*, Sir *Isaac Newton*, &c. are void of *Wit*, and full of *Obscurity*. Thus the witty Works of Dr. *Freind*, like *Almanacks*, are all writ for an ensuing year; tho' his Defender has not lived half that time; and the Books that have occasioned Envy and its attending Calumny, are every where read and commended; as they will hereafter, if *Freind* is a better *Prophet*, than he is a *Physician*.

Before I put an end to this Preface, some account is expected of the pretended *Ignorance* of the *Physicians* in *London*; the *History of Physick* roundly charging them for not being *capable to distinguish one Disease from another*; a grievous Accusation only to render them Foils to the *Doctor's* Lustre!

This Charge is too general to be true; for was it so, more Physicians must be comprehended, than is meant in the Calumny, and many more Physicians are like to fall under the Imputation of Ignorance. Besides; the distinguishing one Disease from another is nothing so easy, as Dr. *Freind* imagines.

imagines; and is not, on that account, any proof of the present Ignorance of Physicians. The Sagacity of many ancient Physicians was, in this Case, very singular; and their Skill, of collecting Diseases from the Sick, very perfect; never failing to tally with Nature to this day. It should then become an unpardonable Crime, to be a Stranger to these Descriptions, Physicians have anciently, and faithfully recorded; while the Difficulty of collecting them, from the Sick, is at this time very great. Every Physician ought, readily, to rehearse the Symptoms of a Disease he is ask'd about; and there is none in the *College*, who has not undergone this Tryal. And therefore, Dr. *Freind* does every *Physician*, in the *College*, the greatest Injustice, when he charges them with this kind of *Ignorance*.

The great Difficulty of collecting the mentioned Symptoms from the Sick, for distinguishing a Disease, as often arises from a want of Sagacity, as the being Strangers to the Descriptions of the Ancients. Sure it is; that we never can fail, in distinguishing one Disease from another, but when we are first defective in the most perfect Knowledge
of

of ancient Physicians: and when Physicians differ about the proper Name of a Disease, they are more or less to be charged, with their want of Physick Language.

We may find the distinguishing Diseases is not so easy, as Dr. *Freind* pretends; the *slow Fever* still destroying in *England*, and in many parts of *Europe*, had swelled the *Bills of Mortality* for seven years; and yet so little was it distinguished, that a *slow Fever* was represented as an impossible, and unheard of Distemper; and I was no less the Subject of their *Wit*, as the *Fever* itself. A *nervous* Disease, *Vapours*, and such general *Expressions*, and cant Diseases, were sufficient to raise the weekly Bills for many years, and in 1723 to 3447 higher than the preceding year: tho' this very *Fever* has been constantly described from *Hippocrates* to Dr. *Willis*; whose Description is likewise very plain.

Sir *Richard Blackmore* was the first who gave me an Opportunity of chastising this Mistake, and indecent Mirth, of some Physicians. He described a strange Disease; so far he was to be commended: but failed

in giving the Name it had among Physicians, and thus betrayed his reading. This Correction had that good Effect; that, next year, mention is made of a *slow Fever* in the *History of Physick*, neither is there Scope left for farther joking.

Thus we find it no easy matter to distinguish Diseases; and yet, if a Work, so perfect among ancient Physicians, seems to be now lost among some great Physicians; what melancholy Considerations offer, about these great Men knowing their *Nature* and the Method of curing them, so imperfectly handed down from ancient Times. A *slow Fever* is wittily compar'd to a *hard Swelling*, or a *Scirrhus*; and they who know least of the Disease, pretend to be the best Curers of it. Too liberal a use of *Diaphoreticks* without proper Evacuations are, justly condemned; without being able to shew when the first is too liberal; or, in the least, letting us into the grand *Nostrum* of *Propriety*. This last year has sufficiently disproved most Evacuations; by the frequent Burials occasioned by them, and all for want of knowing the *Nostrum*. Nay; woe be to the People, that are otherwise treated;
for

for *Diseases* are entailed on them, worse than *Death*. This is *new* and *witty* Phy. sick; well deserving publick Consideration.

This *Preface* is longer than I designed; tho' not so long as Dr. *Freind* expected; yet I must add one piece of History; because it shews the Doctor's applauded Exactness, in relating the Discoveries of Physicians: for he reads every thing himself, as he pretends; and never trusts to any other Historian in his Accounts of Authors.

Oribasius, says the Doctor, gives us the first account of the *salivary Glans*, which is either omitted by Galen, or is lost together with some of Galen's Works. But it seems *Galen* was not worthy Dr. *Freind's* reading; for if he had, he might there have found * *Oribasius's* account in so many Words. *Oribasius* did well to copy *Galen* in his accurate Description; but *Freind* has nothing to value himself on his Reading.

* Book XI. of the use of the Parts; and in the Book of the Voice, and Breath.

An ANSWER, &c.

DOCTOR *Freind* having begun his History of Physick where Doctor *le Clerc* ends, thought himself obliged to take some notice of the later; of which he speaks very favourably. *Freind* certifies; † *That he has always had a great opinion of the Learning and Judgment which this Author has shewn in the three parts (of the History of Physick) already published. In them, continues Dr. Freind, he brought down the History to the end of Galen's time; and having searched into his Works, and into those of all the Writers, who preceded him for above six hundred*

† Dr. *Freind's* Hist. of Phys. part I. pag. 1.

years, he put together his *Memoirs*, not only with indefatigable Industry, but with exquisite Skill, &c. But it is surprising that he has not the same opinion of the *Supplement* to that Work, in the new Edition, publish'd in 1723.

I. ‡ *In this Edition*, says Doctor Freind, we have a Plan (containing fifty six pages) which he designs should serve for a continuation of the History, down to the middle of the 16th (the title by mistake says the 17th) Century; a space of 1200 years, and too large to be well explained in so short a Sketch, tho' he had not filled half of it with relating all the obscure Fargon and Nonsense of that illiterate Enthusiast Paracelsus.

You desire that I would send you my Thoughts of this Piece: I must own

‡ Ibid. pag. 2.

I wish I could give it the same Character, which the former very justly deserved. But it seems to me not only a very imperfect and superficial performance, but in many particulars, inaccurate, and erroneous, &c. It is of consequence to examine this heavy charge of Dr. Freind, Paragraph by Paragraph.

One would hardly think that after all the commendations, so liberally bestowed by him on Dr. *le Clerc's History of Physick*, he should speak, in the manner he does, of what he calls the *Supplement* to that Work, tho' written by the same Author. But it will be no difficult matter to shew that he has not had a just idea of the small piece he so *rashly* condemns. Dr. *Freind* is mistaken in several points. First, he has not understood what Dr. *le Clerc's* meaning was by these words, *Essay d'un Plan pour*
 B 2 *servir*

servir à la continuation de l'Histoire de la Médecine. Which is in *English*, *An Essay of a Plan to serve for a continuation of the History of Physick.* He thought, no doubt, that it was the same thing as if Dr. Clerc had said, that *that Plan was a continuation, or a sequel of the History of Physick;* whereas the Author has only meant it as a *Plan, or Rough-draught,* which might be of use to such as would undertake to bring that History down to the time he has mentioned. He openly declares in the Advertisement which is at the head of his History of Physick, that *he is not in a condition to set about so great a Work as the continuation of the three first Books of that History would be.* However, says he, *to answer in some measure the desire of those who would be glad to see this continuation, I'll endeavour to draw a kind of Rough-draught of such a Work,*

to give a general idea of the manner how I think one should go about it, in order to compass such a design with success.

This was Dr. *le Clerc*'s aim. He never once pretended to give a continuation of what he had written before: and, in several places of his Plan, he carefully distinguishes between his *Sketch*, and a *continuation of the History of Physick*; which he presumes no body has hitherto undertaken to write. To be satisfied of the truth of it, one may but cast ones eye upon the second Paragraph of this Plan, where Dr. *le Clerc*, after a short mention of *Oribasius*'s Collections, continues thus: ‡ *Aëtius has done the same thing: He likewise has collected what he found best in the Books of the Physicians who had gone before him.*

— One may, in a continuation of

this History, *say on what account these Physicians are named by Aëtius, and search if there be no mention made of them any where else.* It is manifest; that he speaks of this Continuation, as of a Work differing from the Plan, and which still remains to be done.

We may likewise observe, that in many places, Dr. *le Clerc* addresses himself to those who will undertake the Continuation of the History of Physick, in relation to some things he thinks of importance to the History; pointing out to them the Places where they may be best disposed.

Thus he advises (pag. 767, which is only the third of the Plan) that *as he has in his History given a list of all the distempers described by Hippocrates, it would also be of great use, to draw up one of all those treated of by Oribasius, Aëtius, Alexander, Trallianus, and Paulus*

Paulus Ægineta, *the number of which greatly exceeds the other*; and then he shews what might be the use of this last list.

Mr. *Freind* goes on, as has been shewn above, and says, that Mr. *le Clerc's* Plan, *containing but 56 pages, cannot serve for a continuation of the History, down to the middle of the 16th Century; a space of 1200 years, and consequently too large to be comprehended in so short a Sketch.* Sure the Doctor has not taken notice that this very Plan is not a complete piece, Dr. *le Clerc* having brought it down but to Paracelsus inclusively; being hindered from completing it by several indispositions: These are the very words of the Booksellers in their Advertisement at the end of the Book. If he had continued it to the 16th Century, or even to the 17th, as it was his design to do, the two latter Centuries would

would have furnished him with more matter than the 1200 years, mentioned by Dr. *Freind*; which, if it had been, the number of pages, or of sheets, had been greater. Dr. *Freind* again finds fault with Dr. *le Clerc*, for *filling half of the 56 pages of the Plan with relating all the obscure Jargon and Nonsense of Paracelsus*: Some perhaps may be found who are not of his mind. It was of too great a concern to the History of Physick, either to slight *Paracelsus*, or only to speak of him *en passant*, and not to lay him open. As much an *Enthusiast* as he was, it cannot be denied that among the extravagancies with which his Writings abound, and which have been related to shew evidently the character of the man; that one might learn not lightly to give credit to and take his word for all he says even when his judgment is soundest.

It cannot be denied, I say, that there are not many useful things in him. A great many will think that there has not even been enough said of this Innovator; the most famous that ever was in Physick.

Doctor *Freind* affirms at last, that Doctor *le Clerc's* Plan *seems to him not only a very imperfect and superficial Performance, but in many Particulars innaccurate and erroneous.* Indeed this Plan, I own, is *imperfect*, in that, as I have just now observ'd, it is not completed. It may again be look'd upon as *superficial*; the Author having but lightly touch'd the matters he treats upon: But, in this respect, he might use his liberty, it not being his design to inlarge more than he has done. But as to the errors, there is no Excuse; the Author is necessarily answerable for them.

II. Mr. *le Clerc*, says Mr. *Friend*,
 † places Oribasius, *Ætius*, Alexander,
 and Paulus, *all, without any distinc-*
tion, in the fourth Century: Whereas
 the first only lived in that Century,
 and the others flourished but in the
 fifth, sixth, and even in the seventh.
 Dr. *Freind* having marshalled each of
 these four Physicians in their proper
 order, as he thinks; and having cor-
 rected this chronological Error in Dr.
le Clerc, goes on thus: * *I must con-*
fess all our Historians, even the best
of them, give a very confused account
of the Age, wherein these Writers
liv'd; and are so careless, as to be ve-
ry well contented, if they come within
a hundred, or two hundred years of
their true time. Then he comes to
Vander Linden, who, says he, ‡ *thinks*
it very uncertain whether Alexander

† Pag. 3.

* Ibid.

‡ Pag. 5.

flourished in 600, 413, or 360. Thence he passes on to the Author of Bibliothec. Literar. N. 2. 4. † who sets down the age of these Physicians thus:

	<i>A. C.</i>	
Oribasius	—	— 350
Alexander	—	— 360
Ætius	—	— 400
Paulus	—	— 420

and who finally by a *small mistake of about 800 years* makes *Diocles Carystius* to live in *A. C. 500*. Dr. *Freind*, after these Remarks, lays a great stress upon the necessity of clearing up these chronological Points, and concludes in this manner: * *These, perhaps, at first sight, may seem to some mere chronological niceties: But I believe, upon reflection, they will acknowledge, that unless this point, i. e. the age of*

† Pag. 7, 8.

* Pag. 9.

every Author be first cleared up, any historical detail of the state of Physick must be extremely defective, &c.

What Dr. *Freind* alledges about the confusion caused in History by chronological Errors, is true in general; but, in this respect, some distinctions must be made. The mistake concerning the time *Diocles* lived in, is a capital one indeed, since, in effect, it overthrows the chronological order of the History of Physick. It is not fair then to put this Error in parallel with that committed on account of the four Physicians just now mentioned, (as it seems Dr. *Freind* has had a mind to do) which Dr. *le Clerc* was led into by following *René Moreau* *. The

* This Author, whom Dr. *le Clerc* quotes as his Authority, says that *Oribasius* flourished about A.C. 330, *Aetius* in 350, *Alexander* in 360, and *Paulus* in 380. After so precise an Account, Dr. *le Clerc* never thought of distrusting so learned a Man, and one so well versed in Antiquity as *Moreau* was. This reliance it is, that hindered him from examining more narrowly into the thing, and led him into that mistake.

difference

difference is very great; and there is even here a singular circumstance, which hinders this last Error from causing hardly any confusion in the History of Physick; *viz.* that these four Physicians, who are the only Physicians of their time, whose Writings have come down to us, stand, as it were, by themselves; I mean they are intirely separate from those who have gone before, or come after them. The better to understand this, one must know that *Oribasius*, who is the first in order, lived, as all Authors agree, in the fourth Century; and that there has not been any Physician in the third known to us either by his Writings, or by any other manner, unless it be *Stephen of Athens* only, who is reckoned the last of the ancient *Greek* Physicians. If *Oribasius* then could not have any thing at all to do, either with respect to time or order, with

this Physician, who indisputably preceded him: *Paulus*, the last of the four in question, has *still* less to do in the same respect with the Physicians who have succeeded him. The reason of it is the great *Chasm* which every one knows is in this place of the History of Physick: *Nonus*, who lived in the tenth Century, being the first of the *Greek* Physicians after *Paulus*, whose Writings have reached us. This *Nonus* flourished also some time before the earliest *Arabian* Authors who have written of Physick.

Dr. *Freind*, moreover, would gladly give us to understand, that all the World, *before him*, had intirely been ignorant of the time wherein we ought to place *Oribasius*, and the other three Physicians mentioned by him. For I don't see that he quotes any Author for his Voucher. However, it is an easy matter to see that he is indebted

debted for his Discovery to the learned *Fabricius*, who has largely treated upon this Question in the 8th and 12th Volumes of his *Biblioth. Græc.* tho' Dr. *Freind* has not thought fit to quote him, in order to give himself the Honour of being the first Discoverer of it. Dr. *Freind* may indeed have cleared it up a little; but, nevertheless, it must be allowed that the original Discovery belongs intirely to *Fabricius*; or at least, that he has unravell'd this matter before Dr. *Freind*.

III. This last Gentleman is unfortunate in his Guesſes, when he ſays, ‡ that *Mr. le Clerc* bestows no more than three pages upon all these four Authors; and thinks this a sufficient reason to give for it, that they were Compilers. That was not the reason why he has bestowed no more than

‡ Pag. 10.

three pages upon these Authors; it was because his design was to give only a general account of the Contents of their Writings; leaving to those who will continue the History of Physick the care of doing what he suggests besides, for enabling them to give a greater knowledge of these ancient Physicians. Among the things Dr. le Clerc has thought necessary for that purpose, he has advised the making a list of the Names of all the Diseases they mention, in order to compare it with that he has given of the Distempers mentioned in the Writings of Hippocrates; in order to observe how much longer that which he proposes to make is than the former.

** To this Catalogue, says Dr. le Clerc, it should seem necessary to subjoin a description of those Distempers, their Symptoms, Causes, &c. but this would*

prove too tedious a Work, and would be read but by a few. It would be best, in my opinion, to refer to the Authors themselves, such as would be thoroughly instructed in all these. Alexander Trallianus could alone, if one would, be sufficient to give a just idea of the Practice of those Times, and his Book will not take up so much time in reading as those of others. If Dr. le Clerc had been at liberty to make this Catalogue himself, he should have had by that means an opportunity of entering into a sort of detail of what these four Physicians say, concerning some of the Distempers they have treated upon; and would not have fail'd of shewing what Notions were peculiar to them, as Dr. Freind has undertaken to do. But Dr. le Clerc has no where said *that all of them were only Compilers*. It is true, that speaking in general, he has ranked them among

the Compilers; and so they were, as Dr. *Freind* himself owns, since he himself says, † *that the two first, and the last were chiefly such.* Dr. *le Clerc* had already distinguished the third, who is *Alexander Trallianus*, from the others, and had said he had more the air of an *original Writer* than either *Oribasius*, or *Aëtius*, which Dr. *Freind* does but repeat after him. Dr. *Freind* confesses again, * *that there are not a great many things in them in proportion to the ‡ bulk of their Books, but such as may be found in Galen and others; and yet, adds he, some there are too, which are new, and Particulars, that cannot be found any where else; and that may be of great use to Physick.* In all this Dr. *le Clerc* agrees with him. *In the Writings of these Physic*

† Pag. 10.

* Ibid.

‡ The Works of *Oribasius* and of *Aëtius* together fill 760 folio pages in *Henry Stephen's* Edition, the print of which is small enough. *Alexander Trallianus* and *Paul Ægineta's* together make 300 pages.

cians, says he in the same page, † *may be pick'd, besides the greatest part of what is already in the Book of those who have preceded them, divers things not to be met with there; besides several Observations peculiar to these four last Authors.*

IV. Dr. *Freind*, going on in his Critick upon Dr. *le Clerc*, accuses him with having said of *Oribasius* and *Ætius*, that they * *furnish us with every thing which is essential in Theory or Practice, particularly in Anatomy and Surgery: But*, adds Dr. *Freind*, *I must observe that Ætius, in his long Work, intirely omits Anatomy, and the use of the Parts, and what is purely chirurgical in him is scattered confusedly here and there, and is imperfect, &c.* Let us compare what Dr. *le Clerc* has said with what has just been transcribed from Dr. *Freind*: These are his very Words: ‡ *These two*

† Pag. 767.

* Pag. 11.

‡ Pag. 766.

Authors, meaning *Oribasius* and *Aëtius*, furnish us with every thing that is most essential in the *Theory*, or *Practice of Physick* in general, and particularly in *Surgery*. Besides these they give an *Account of Anatomy*, *Botany*, and the *Drugs* then in use, the *Qualities of the Air*, *Water*, *Food*, *Baths*, *Exercises* useful for the *Preservation of Health*, &c. It is thus plain, that *Dr. le Clerc* never said, as *Dr. Freind* would have us believe, and who relates but a part of his Discourse, that *each of these two Authors* had spoken of every thing that concerns *Physick* in general, and *Anatomy*, and *Surgery* in particular, as well as of the other *Articles* just now mentioned. *Dr. le Clerc* has said, that *these two Authors furnish us with all these things*. And so they do, if you take them together. Besides; I do not understand why *Doctor Freind*, or his

Translator, for I have not seen the Original, always writes *Ætius* with a *Æ* instead of writing it thus *Aëtius*, with an *A* and an *E* separately?

V. Mr. *Freind* is still more unfortunate when he asserts, that Mr. Clerc, in his * Supplement, *supposes that the Vena Medinensis is the same as another Distemper described by the Arabians, the Affectio Bovina, which is a little Worm, and often found in Cows. But Ætius plainly distinguishes the two sorts, large and little: And Albucasis has two separate Chapters concerning these two Diseases, &c.* Here follow the very Words of Dr. Clerc after he has spoken of some Diseases, such as the *Small-Pox* and the *Measles*, unknown to the Greeks. Albucasis, Avenzoar, Alfaravius, make also mention of a Distemper unknown to the Greeks, caused by a little

* Pag. 51.

† Pag. 777.

*Worm, which breeds between the Flesh and the Skin, and so moves over all the parts of the Body. They have called this Disease Affectio Bovina. Some other may yet be found, which I leave to the Continuator of this History to enquire after. Dr. le Clerc has now where said that the Distemper, called Vena Medinensis, was the same as that called Affectio Bovina. He speaks but of the last in the place quoted by Dr. Freind, not so much as mentioning the first; because this was known to the Greeks, and described by Aëtius, after Leonidas, under the name of Dracunculus. In this Place he was to speak but of the Diseases first mentioned by the Arabians. He was very far from confounding these two Distempers, which he had clearly distinguished seven or eight years before, in his * Treatise*

tise of Worms. Doctor *Freind* alone is most egregiously mistaken in making two sorts of Worms out of one. The Passage which he quotes out of *Aëtius* only concerns the *Vena Medinensis* only, and not the *Affectio Bovina*. This Author has not a Word of this last; and here follows what he says of the first: *The Worms called Dracunculi are like the common Worms, (Similes sunt lumbricis) and they are sometimes large, and sometimes little; (& aliquando magni, aliquando parvi reperiuntur) they breed most frequently in the Legs, and sometimes in the muscular parts of the Arms. They breed in Æthiopia and India, &c.* * This ancient Physician also

* *Aëtius Tretrabibl. 3. Sermone 2. cap. 8.* The Latin Translation of *Aëtius* is quoted here for want of the Greek Original. The Worm is here called *Dracunculus*, little Dragon, because in proportion to the smallness of it, it is surprisingly long. The *Arabians* have called it *Vena Medinensis*, that is to say, the *Vein of Medina*; because they thought it rather a Vein; or
a kind

also takes notice that the *Dracunculi* are not all of an equal largeness; that some are smaller, some larger: But for all that, he has not made *two different sorts of them*, as Dr. *Freind* believed. This Passage of *Aëtius* is illustrated by another in *Albucasis*, where he says, *that this Worm is in some People five Palms long, in others six, and that a Man had one even of twenty Palms length*. All modern Authors who have written on this Worm, and have seen it, agree that there are some short, and some long ones, and that the length of one is not the same as that of another: But it does not follow from thence that there are two sorts. It is to no purpose, after this, that Dr. *Freind*, in order to prove his Assertion, that *Aëtius* had

a kind of Nerve, than a Worm; and because the Inhabitants of *Medina* in *Arabia* were subject to it. This Worm is also frequently found on the Coasts of *Guinea*, and other hot Countries.

distinguished the two sorts, adds, † that Albucasis *has two distinct Chapters concerning these two Diseases, and that the Description he gives of them is very different.* The two Diseases treated of by this *Arabian Author* are first the *Vena Medinensis*, or *Aëtius's Dracunculi*, and the other is that called the *Affectio Bovina*; which, in effect, are two Distempers really distinct, and caused by Worms of a quite different nature; which require each a quite different Method to cure them. It behoved him then very well to distinguish them. But ‡ *Aëtius*, who speaks only of the first, was not obliged to make any Distinction; and accordingly has made none.

Mr. *Freind*, passing on to another Subject, and speaking of *Rhubarb*,

† Pag. 51, 52.

‡ He has indeed distinguished them, and has, as Dr. *Freind* says, two separate Chapters; having treated of the first in Chap. 93. of his second Book, and of the other in the 94th.

says, ‡ *that, if he mistakes not, Alexander Trallianus was the first who mention'd it; tho' Mr. le Clerc tells us that the Arabians introduced the use of it.* However, he confesses that † *Alexander was in a mistake in that he mentions it only as an Astringent, as the elder Greeks describe the Rha-ponticum, without the least hint of its purging Virtue.* Mr. Freind adds, that *Paulus seems to be the first who takes any notice of the purging Faculty in the Rheum, (he calls it simply so) and tells us, how we may make some laxative Medicines stronger, by the addition of this.* Such is Dr. Freind's Remark; and it is true that *Alexander* is the first who has spoken of the *Rheum*, which he calls *Barbaricum*, very likely to distinguish it from the *Rheum*, or *Rha-ponticum* of *Diosco-*

‡ Pag. 113.

† Pag. 114.

rides. He advises the use of it for strengthening the Liver, and for the Dysentery: But it seems, as Doctor *Freind* observes that he rather offers it as an *Astringent*, than a Purgative. *Paulus Ægineta* speaks also of the *Rheum*, without determining the Species. *To loosen the Belly*, says he, *give of Therebinth the bigness of an Olive, and if you will loosen a little more, add to it a little Rheum*. This is all that these two Greek Authors have said of *Rhubarb*; in two Words only, and, as it were, *en passant*.

Let us now see after what manner the *Arabians* have spoken of it. I do not indeed find any great matter on that Subject, among the most ancient Writers of that Nation. *Serapion* has mentioned only the *Rha-ponticum*. *Rhazes*, in the first place, † speaks of *Rhubarb*, which

† Treatise I. Cap. 4.

he calls *Rheubarbarum*, and tells us *that it is hot, and good for the Stomach, and the Liver*. He adds, *that if it be drank, it is good against Falls and Bruises*. In * another place he speaks of the *Rheum* by the Name of ‡ *Ravet Seni*, which he makes an Ingredient in the *Lozenges of Barberries*; but it does not seem that he depends much, in that place, on the laxative Quality of this Root. He also gives a † Description of *Pills*, which he calls *Pilulæ de Ravet*, for curing the Dropsy, which are really purging, but it is rather on Account of the *Agarick* and the *Mezereon*, which he puts to the *Ravet* in a pretty large Dose, than of the *Ravet* itself; of which there is but a small Portion in these Pills. *Avicenna* speaks also somewhere of *Rhubarb*; but rather as an Astringent than

* Treatise 9. Cap. 67.

‡ In the next Paragraph may be seen the meaning of these two Words.

† Treatise 9. Cap. 69.

a Purge: and if, on any Occasion, † he makes it an Ingredient in some purging Medicines, he mixes with it, according to the manner of *Rhazes*, Drugs, which alone are strong Purges; insomuch, that it is on their account rather than on that of *Rhubarb*, that they have this Faculty. *Avicenna*, in the place I have just quoted, calls *Rhubarb* *Reubarbarum de Seni*; as *Rhazes* had called it *Ravet Seni*, which is the same thing. It appears, by what has been said, that these two chief Physicians, among the *Arabians*, had not yet, it seems, a sufficient knowledge of the Virtues of *Rhubarb*; tho', in that particular, they knew more than the *Greeks*; they even knew a new Species, the best of all, with which the first were utterly unacquainted, as we shall shew presently.

† Lib. 3. Fen. 14.

But what is wanting in *Rhazes* and *Avicenna* is abundantly made up by *Mesué*, one of the last Authors of that Nation; from whom we have all that one could wish to learn about *Rhubarb*, of which he speaks in the following manner. *Rhubarb*, says he, is a mild and excellent Medicine, and has all the Virtues most to be esteemed in a Purgative. *Rhubarb*, says he, purges the Bile and Phlegm; it cleanses the Blood, takes off Obstructions, and cures the Diseases arising therefrom, such as the Jaundice, Dropsy, &c. Then he shews the uses it may be put to outwardly, *Oyl*, says he, wherein it has been infused or boiled is good for Bruises, and the Contraction of the Muscles, if it be used externally. The Powder of toasted *Rhubarb* cures the Dysentery, when it is taken with the Juice of Plantane and red Wine. As to the manner of choosing

chusing this Drug, this Author teaches *there are three sorts of Rhubarb, the first of which grows in the Indies, and is called Ravet-Sceni; the second sort is the Ravet-barbarum, and the third is the Ravet Turcicum; the best of which, says he, is the Ravet Sceni, the next Ravetbarbarum, and the worst of all the Ravet Turcicum.* An old † Commentator on *Mesué* says, that *the Ravet Seni, or Ravend Sini is called so, because it grows in the Country of the Sinæ; that is to say, in China: and to this day the best Rhubarb is brought from thence.* The said Commentator adds, that *the second sort came from the Country of the Troglodyti, which lies on the Red Sea, or the Arabick Gulf: and that the third sort, which is the Rha-pon-ticum, grew in Pontus, which in Me-*

† *Andr. Marinus.*

fuë's time was already in the possession of the Turks. Mesuë, says he, knew of no ill Quality this Root had: that it may be given at all times, in all ages to small Children and Women with Child, That good Rhubarb must of a brown colour, turning a little upon the red: that altho' this Root be porous, it must be heavy: that, when broken, the pieces of it must be reddish, mixed with yellow; and the Tincture of it of a Saffron colour. He takes notice that it is used either by infusing it in Water, or some other Liquor, or taking it in Powder. The Dose of each of these Methods, according to the same Author, is from a Dram, or a Dram and a half to three. I had forgot to take notice of a Cheat committed, says Mesuë, by the Inhabitants of the Country where the best Rhubarb grows. They infuse a great quantity of the Roots whole in Water

for

for five Days; and, after evaporating the Water, they made Troches with what was left in the bottom of the Vessel; which, he says, are a precious Medicine. The Roots were sold after they had dried them; but he takes notice, that they had lost what was good in them. And then he teaches, at last, how to know the good, from this bad, sort of Rhubarb. What else he has said of this same Drug may be read in his Works; for I have avoided relating all, lest I should be too prolix. I should have even been much more concise, had not I thought myself obliged to be pretty full on this occasion; the better to shew the Difference between what the *Greeks* have said of *Rhubarb*, as we have already seen, and what is found upon the same Subject in the *Arabian* Authors, and chiefly *Mesué*. Dr. *le Clerc* has, in his Plan, said that these very *Arabians*

F

have

have imparted to us the knowledge they had of many simple Medicines, not taken notice of by the *Greeks*, such as several *Purgatives* taken from Plants, as *Manna*, *Sena*, *Rhubarb*, &c. And really with respect to this last Drug, one may say; that the *Greeks* have made no mention of the true Rhubarb, which is that which comes from *China*; and which I think is now the only one used in the greatest part of *Europe*. Besides, if they have known another Species that comes nearest the true one, they might as well have taken no notice at all of it, as to have said but the two or three Words related above. The same cannot be objected to the Writings of the *Arabian* Physician, just now quoted. Nothing escapes him that contributes to the knowledge of this Root, and its different species: He teaches how to chuse it, and the various man-

ners of using it, and likewise its effects. From all that has been said, we may safely conclude; that to the *Arabians* it is, and not to the *Greeks*, that we are indebted for what we know of *Rhubarb*, and its Properties; which is what Dr. *le Clerc* has affirmed.

VII. Mr. *Freind*, speaking of the introducing Chymistry into Physick, has these Words; * *Mr. le Clerc fixes the Epoche of it in the time of Avicenna; who, as he supposes, first applied this sort of knowledge in the way of Medicine.* Mr. *Freind* goes on, *that if it be, as perhaps it may be, derived from the Arabians, the Honour of the Invention ought rather to be restored to Rhazes; for, not to mention Mercury extinct and sublimate, which he takes notice of likewise, ‡ Oyl of Eggs, the only chymical Medicine as*

* Pag. 277, 278.

‡ *Ad Almanz.* 8, 42.

I can find in Avicenna, is described by that Author. Rhazes, besides, gives us the first account of the Oleum Benedictum, or Philosophorum. In answer to Dr. Freind, I shall first take notice, that the Oyl of Eggs, such as it is described by Rhazes, ought not to be rank'd among the chymical Preparations; since, in order to prepare this Oyl, one must only boil the Eggs till they are hard, take out the Yolk, fry them in a Pan, and then press them in a Cloth to extract the Oyl out of them, nor is the meanest Apothecary ignorant of this Preparation. Serapion, who has not, in any place that I could find, any chymical Medicine, had already taught, long before, the very same method of making that Oyl. If Rhazes mentions, as Dr. Freind observes, Mercury extinct, and sublimate, it is only in order to shew the noxious Qualities of it, and teach the

Medi-

Medicines proper for those who might feel the pernicious effects of it; but not to advise any one to the use of it as a Medicine. Come we now to the *Oyl of Bricks*, called, *Oleum Philosophorum*, which is indeed a *chymical Preparation*, proposed by *Rhazes* as a Remedy against divers Diseases; and this *Dr. le Clerc* had not taken notice of, when he said there was no mention made of any chymical Medicine in the Writings of the Physicians, who have preceded *Avicenna*. Behold, a chymical Medicine described by an earlier Author than this last! But if *Dr. le Clerc* was mistaken in this, it does not follow from thence that *the Honour of the Invention of chymical Preparations belongs to Rhazes*, as *Dr. Freind* pretends it does; since this *Arabian Physician* does not say he had invented it, or first discovered the manner of preparing the Medicine in Question,

tion, which he might very well have learnt of some other Chymist. All that can then be concluded from what has been said, is, that *Rhazes* is the first Writer of Physick, whose Writings are come down to us, who has mentioned chymical Medicines; for there is no reason to think why there should not be any more ancient than himself, tho' not of many Ages, as *Dr. le Clerc* has shewn it in his Plan; and consequently, the Epoche of the introducing of the Remedies of this kind as far as it may be known, ought at least to be brought to the time wherein this Physician lived. Now this time preceded *Avicenna's* but by about 50 years; *Rhazes*, according to *Dr. Freind's* Calculation, being dead in 932, and *Avicenna* born but in 980; so that they both lived in the same Century, which is the tenth after *Christ*, tho' several years one after the other.

This :

This being supposed, *Rhazes* and *Avicenna* must then be the oldest Physicians we know, who have taken this Method: and as it is likely that Experiments, on this Subject, were not yet very frequent in the life-time of the first; that may be the reason why one only chymical Preparation is mentioned by him. *Avicenna*, however, who came after him, is something fuller on that head: and this has escaped Dr. *le Clerc*'s notice, who, in his Plan, has said that *Avicenna* has nowhere spoken of any chymical Medicine, save *Rose Water* alone. This inadvertency was occasioned by his looking over a little too hastily, the Works of this Author, which besides their Prolixity, are so very ill translated, that the reading of them can but be extremely tedious. ‡ Dr. *le Clerc*,

‡ Dr. Freind might, with much more Justice, have charged Dr. *le Clerc* with this Fault, than all the other
 he

Clerc, in a second re-search, more exact than the first, has found in two or three places, different from those he has already quoted, some things that have a relation to chymical Physick. The first, which he had omitted, and which will be related in the following Paragraph, concerns, again, *Rose Water*. The second is that where *Avicenna*, after he has spoken of the various Vir-

he has, without any reason, corrected him for; but unfortunately he is himself guilty of a like, if not greater, and less excusable, over-sight. Tho', says he, † I have often look'd into his (Avicenna's) Writings upon several Occasions, (for you won't suppose, I believe, that I have gone thro' him in any regular course of reading) I could meet with little or nothing there, but what is taken originally from Galen. If Dr. Freind, writing his History of Physick, and treating expressly about what the Arabians have contributed, on their part, to the Advancement of this Art; if, I say, he seems to value himself upon his not having read throughout and methodically the Works of an Author, who has ever been esteem'd the Prince or Chief of all the Physicians of that Nation, can he presume to find Fault with Dr. le Clerc who has only given a short Essay of a Plan, in order to serve those who would treat upon the same Subject for having done as he has done?

† Part. 2. Pag. 73.

tures of *Water*, proposes a method of mending by *Distillation* that which is bad; saying besides, that they may, in a manner, be made better by *Coction* ‡. These Passages prove first, that he understood the *Art of Distillation*, which is one of the chief parts of *Chymistry*. A third Passage, in the same Author, shews he could use it for the preparation of some Medicines, and among the rest, for preparing a sort of *Oyl of Eggs* very different from that described by *Rhazes*. In this place *Avicenna* has affected a Conciseness that renders his Words obscure. One, however, must see, that he proposes, in the beginning, a very simple manner of making the *Oyl of Eggs*, much about the same as that in *Rhazes*; but he adds to it, again, one or two more.

‡ Sublimatio præterea, & Distillatio aquas rectificat
 malas: Et si istud non fuerit; decoctio rectificat. *Ca-*
nonis, Lib. I. Fen. 2.

Mesué, who flourished towards the end of the twelfth Century, shews three ways of preparing this Oyl; but they seem a little different from that which *Avicenna* describes. ‡ *Take*, he says, *the Yolk of thirty Eggs, or thereabouts. Boil them till they are hard: after you have bruised them in your hands, fry them over a slow Fire in an Iron Pan till they grow red, and the Oyl separates from them. Press them afterwards with a Spoon, to extract this Oyl in greater Quantity. Another method of making this Oyl, is to grind the hardened Yolks of Eggs in a Mill, and press them as they do Almonds to extract the Oyl out of them. The third manner, is to distill it in a Cucurbit, with its Alembick, as the Oleum Philosopho-*

‡ *Oleum de Ovis, says he, fit aut molendo vitellos elixatorum, aut distillando in vase vitreo compositio aut cum distillatione sublimata.*

rum is distilled. Thus *Mesué*. This last sort of Oyl is now drawn by the means of the *Retort*; but I don't see that any one goes about to prepare the Oyl of Eggs by *Distillation*, as *Avicenna* and *Mesué* did. The first seems to shew two ways of doing it, one by means of what he calls *Sublimate Distillation*; the other by means of *Vas vitreum compositum*. Tho' one cannot justly say what were the two sorts of Vessels used by *Avicenna* on this occasion, it may from thence be gathered, that he knew more than one way of distilling. To put an end to what I have to say concerning *Avicenna*, I must, again, take notice; that it is not only from what he has said of some Medicines taken from Chymistry, in the places quoted from him, that one must infer he had applied himself to the study of this Art. He had likewise writ a Book on purpose, where he

treated about Chymistry; as one of his Disciples witnesses. *See the Life of Avicenna by Sorsanus, an Arabian, and the short account given of it by Dr. le Clerc, in his Plan.*

VIII. I had almost forgot that I am to answer a Difficulty raised by Dr. *Freind*, concerning the nature of *Rose Water*, mentioned by *Avicenna*. The Question is; whether in the Passage of this Author, where these two Words *Aqua Rosarum* are found, must be understood *Rose Water distilled*, or only a mere *Decoction of Roses*, made in Water. Dr. *Freind* is of this last opinion. If Mr. le Clerc † would look into *Avicenna* more carefully, he would find that there is not the least hint of Distillation, but a very plain Direction how to boil the *Roses in Water*, the same as the Greeks used

† Part 1. pag. 279.

in making the Rhodostacton, and Hydrorofaton; Mr. Freind goes on; and what Gesner says of the old Arabians, I believe is true: that wherever the Water of any Plant occurs in their Writings, there is meant nothing more than a Decoction.

Dr. le Clerc agrees with Gesner and Dr. Freind, that what is called in the Translations we have of the *Arabian Writings, the Water of a Plant*, is often nothing else but a *Decoction* of that Plant in Water. Thus, Barley Water, *aqua hordei*, is only a *Decoction*, or *Ptisan*, made of Barley. But it does not follow from thence, that the Word *Aqua* should always be interpreted in the same manner; nor that *Aqua Rosarum* in *Avicenna* should always signify a *Decoction* of *Roses*. It cannot be doubted but that this ancient Physician understood *Distillation*; and tho', in the places quoted from

from him, he does not expressly tell the nature of the *Rose Water* he speaks of: that is, whether this Water be distill'd, or not; yet it is easy enough to see by the use he would have it applied to, that it was made by *Distillation*, and that it was the same thing as our *Rose Water* at this time. In the little Book, *De Viribus cordis*, he uses Rose Water as a Cordial. But one may yet better judge of the Virtues he attributes to his Rose Water, by a Passage taken from the second Book of his *Canon*. cap. 575, where he treats of Roses, and where are these Words: *Cùm aqua rosarum bibitur confert syncopi*: That is to say, *Rose Water must be given to drink to those who fall in a Syncope*. Dr. le Clerc had forgot to join this last Passage to the other two, quoted in his Plan. do not think any one can deny, but that distilled Rose Water is meant in this place.

place; and far less Dr. *Freind* than any other. To be convinc'd of this, we may but read what he relates. * *There is a very particular Passage in the History writ by Anna Commena, (concerning Rose Water distilled.) The Emperor Alexis Comnene finding himself ill, and fainting away, some of this Liquor was poured down his Throat; which brought him immediately to his Senses. The Words are τὴ τῶν ῥόδων σαλάγματος. This Expression cannot, I think, with any Propriety of Language, be adapted to signify either the Syrup, Decoction, or express'd Juice of Roses. — † Besides, in the case reported in this History, one cannot easily imagine that plain Juice of Roses could ever have been thought upon as a Cordial, in such an Extremity. If the Medicine, made use of to prevent the Emperor's fainting, had been nothing else*

* Part I. pag. 280.

† Pag. 281.

but *distilled Rose Water*, as Dr. *Freind* asserts, with very good reason, I do not see why the *Rose Water* prescribed by *Avicenna*, to prevent, or cure a *Syncope*, should not rather be *distilled Rose Water*, than a mere *Decoction* of Roses. If this *Decoction* was never look'd upon as a *Cordial*, as Dr. *Freind* agrees, why would he have such a Physician as *Avicenna* advise the use of it to those who fall into a *Syncope*, which is the same Distemper as that of the *Greek Emperor*, and who was cured not by a *Decoction* of *Roses*, but by *Distilled Rose Water*?

It is likely, that in the time of *Avicenna*, the manner of making *Rose Water* was kept a *Secret*; and one does not find that he has any where taught how to make it. *It is certain*, says Dr. *Freind*, in the same Page, † *that of all the Arabian Writers*,

† Pag. 280.

Joh. Damascenus, called Mesuë, who lived in the latter end of the twelfth Century, in the Reign of Frederick Barbarossa, is the first that has described the Process of making this Water, in the chymical manner. I do indeed find that *Mesuë* (*de simplicibus*, cap. 10.) speaks of *Rose Water* drawn by *Distillation*, (*aqua sublimando ex Rosis educta*) and to this Water he attributes the Virtue of strengthening the Heart, Stomach, and Liver; but I don't find he describes the process of making it either in this Chapter, or any where else. The first I think, who has described it, is an *Arabian* Author of a Work which the Translator intitles *Liber servitoris*, and which he says is the 28th Book of *Bulcasim*. The Author's Design, as himself informs us, is to teach how to prepare divers Simples, which want Preparation, before they are used; such as

Ablution, Uftion, &c. He proposes, there, more than one Method of making *Rose Water* by *Distillation*, and he begins the Chapter where he treats of it, in this manner; *Aquæ rosarum operatio, scita est apud multas gentes. The Process of making Rose Water is known now in several Countries.* This is a proof that, at that time, the Process of making Rose Water was not yet generally known. Dr. *le Clerc*, in his Plan, supposes that this *Bulcasim* might be the same as *Albucasis*, whose true name is *Abulcasim*, and he gives his reason for his Supposition, but does not decide the Question. Dr. *Freind* says, * *He does not find any Certainty of this Author's Age, but he is generally suppos'd to have liv'd about the year 1085, but he does not think he was quite so ancient, and seems to*

place him *at least in the middle of the twelfth Century*. Dr. *Freind*, in another † place speaks of a *Physician* whom he calls *Bulcasem*, who wrote *late in Spain*, and mentions some chymical Preparations. According to this account, if this *Bulcasem*, who, as Dr. *le Clerc* thinks, is not different from *Bulcasim* just mention'd, be not the same as *Albucasis*, they were at least very near Contemporaries.

IX. It is now time to go on to another Article. Mr. *le Clerc*, says Mr. *Freind*, * *supposes that Actuarius was bred in the School of the Arabians, and learnt somewhat of the chymical Art from them: but this seems to be a mere Conjecture, founded upon no Authority whatever. For tho', without dispute, Actuarius knew some of the Medicines they had introduced,*

† Pag. 205.

* Part 1. pag. 277.

which might be owing to some casual Commerce, and Communication, at that time, between the Greeks and the Arabians: Yet it does not, in the least, appear that he was vers'd in their physical Writings: as one may be well acquainted with a Drug, and the use of it, which comes from the East or West-Indies, without knowing farther of the Theory, or Practice of Medicines in those Countries. Dr. le Clerc answers that his Conjectures can hardly be better founded. In the first place, it cannot be denied that *Actuarius* was acquainted with *chymical Medicines*, and *distilled Waters*, in particular, as *Langius* has observed on the Words *Rhodostagma*, and *Intybo stigma*, which occur in the Writings of this Greek Physician, and which signify *Rose Water* and *distilled Endive Water*. Dr. le Clerc supposes that this same Physician owed the Knowledge

he

he had of *distilled Waters*, to the *Arabians*, who first introduced Chymistry into Physick. It is, likewise, very probable he had learnt of them the manner of making *Julapium rosatum*, which he describes, the whereof Composition is also related in *Mesué*. I must, in the second place, observe, that what Dr. *Freind* says, *that it does not, in the least, appear that Actuarius was vers'd in the physical Writings of the Arabians*, cannot consist with what *Actuarius* says himself * in the place quoted in the Margin, where after having spoken of the *Theriaca Andromachi* (*Venice Treacle*) he goes on in the following manner; *I shall, hereafter, treat of other Antidotes composed by many ancient and modern Authors, as well Greeks as Barbarians*. One cannot question but that by the

* Method. Med. Lib. 5. cap. 6.

name of *Barbarians*, he meant the *Arabians*. He describes, in the same place, two sorts of Antidotes, whereof *Musk* is the Basis, and wherein it has a place with several *Aromaticks*, as *Cloves*, *Ginger*, *Cardamoms*, *Long-Pepper*, &c. *Pearl*, *yellow Amber*, *Coral*, and, even, in the last Description, the *Filings of Gold* are an Ingredient. If any Compositions ever seemed to have come from the *Arabians*, sure these two have: and, as such, *Mesué* has described them; saving a few Alterations, whereof one is striking the Gold out of it, which the Physicians of that Nation use in some of their Prescriptions. After what has been said, I cannot think one can with Dr. *Freind* affirm, that *Actuarius* was not, in the least, *vers'd in the physical Writings of the Arabians*. That which proves, beyond Contradiction, that *Actuarius* was *vers'd in the Writings of these*

these Authors, is, that he closely adheres to Principles peculiar to them. In order to be convinc'd of it, one may look over the two Books that are at the head of his Works, where he treats of the nature of Spirits, of the means of preserving, and restoring them, and remove the Disorders that may happen; which is a matter *Avicenna* had handled before him, and which, it seems, the *Greeks* had but slightly touched upon. This is not an *After-proof*; Dr. *le Clerc* had already made use of it, in his Plan, to confirm the very Argument which is here maintained, with respect to *Actuarius*, and methinks Dr. *Freind* should not have passed it over.

X. We have now done with what may be found in the *first part* of Dr. *Freind's History of Physick*, concerning the Faults he pretends Dr. *le Clerc* has been guilty of in his *Plan*.

Dr.

Dr. *Freind* * asserts a second time his Position in the *first part of his History*, page 378, that Rhazes is the *first who mentions chymical Preparations*, and he thinks he has made it plain enough, tho' Mr. *le Clerc* attributes the Introduction of them into Medicine, to *Avicenna*. One may see the Observations I have already made upon the place I have quoted out of his first part.

XI. Dr. *Freind*, continuing his Attacks upon Dr. *le Clerc*, speaks thus; † *Actuarius* (*Method. Medend. Lib. 5. c. 6.*) quotes an Antidote of Hippocrates, which consisted of several things, and for which he was presented with a Crown from the Athenians; a remedy, he says, effectual in many cases. Mr. *le Clerc* (p. 216.) supposes this a piece of Grecian Vanity in this Writer, who

* Part 2. p. 59.

† Part 2. p. 211.

invented, he thinks, this Story out of his own Head, and made use of that great Man's Name, only to recommend the Medicine the more. But I cannot perceive that it is upon any good Grounds he builds this Remark: For besides what has been mention'd before, (and not to mention another of the like kind, recited under the same title by Myrepsus) if we look into Celsus, who understood Hippocrates very well, and constantly copied after him, we shall find, among his Antidotes, Acopa, and Catapotia, Medicines as much compounded as this I have been speaking of; or, indeed, as much as any described by the Arabians.

The better to understand what the thing now in Question is, we must necessarily see what Dr. *le Clerc* has said in the place quoted out of him. These are his very Words: *We must not forget to make, here, an important*

I tant

tant Reflection on the Pharmacy of Hippocrates; which is, that the compounded Medicines, made use of by him, were but very few, and consisted of a very few Simples, two or three generally; four or five at the most: rarely more. We find indeed, in Actuarius, the Description of a very compounded Antidote, which he calls Hippocrates's Antidote; for which, says this Author, the Athenians presented him with a Crown. But it is plain that this is a Fiction, and that Actuarius gives his Antidote one of those specious Titles the Greeks knew, so artfully, how to give to their Medicines; the better to procure the sale of them; of which we shall see several Examples hereafter.

The Examples given by Dr. le Clerc in other places, and which, plainly, make out this Assertion, are these; The *Divine Antidote*, the *Immortal Antidote*,

Antidote, equal to God, Antidote, called Panacea; that is to say, that *which cures all Diseases, &c.* Nothing was more frequent with the *Greek Physicians* than these pompous Names; which plainly prove that *Quacks* are not of a late standing. There were also Medicines that went by the Names of *Gods* and *Goddeses*, as *Isis*: and there are several Compositions under that Name, in *Galen*, as well as under that of *Plato*, which the Contrivers of these Compositions had borrowed to procure them a greater Esteem. 'Tis with that View that the *Antidote*, proposed by *Actuarius*, was attributed to *Hippocrates*; in the same manner that several Books of Physick had been published under the Name of this *Father of Physick*; that never were his. This is the Foundation upon which *Dr. le Clerc* builds the Reflection he makes upon the *Antidote* described by *Actuarius*; to which

might be added a reason, which alone would suffice, were there never any others besides. If the Antidote here in Question, was truly *Hippocrates's*, should it be possible that *Celsus*, who, as Dr. *Freind* says, *constantly copied after him*; should it be possible, I say, that he should have omitted this *Composition*, and have failed putting it to so many more, which he has given a description of in his Books? Could it be possible that *Galen*, who, also, had an excessive Esteem for *Hippocrates*, should have failed to have done him the honour of mentioning this famous Antidote, if what *Actuarius* says were true? Sure no body will ever think so. Pray, where was the Receipt of this Medicine hid for four or five hundred Years, elapsed between *Hippocrates* and *Celsus*, or six or seven hundred, if we come down to *Galen*? Was it kept so close that nei-
ther

ther of these two last Physicians could come at the knowledge of it? Was it made publick only a little before, or at the time that *Actuarius* lived, nine or ten Centuries after *Galen*? Nothing can be said on this account that has the least Appearance of certainty. What has been added, that as a *Reward for this Antidote*, Hippocrates was, by the Athenians, presented with a Crown, is equally certain with the rest. 'Tis even very probable, that it is a Story contrived, either in the time of *Actuarius*, or before, occasioned by an old Tradition full as doubtful, concerning a like Present made to this same Physician, in the same City, for having assisted the Sick, or given Advice in the time of the Plague. We may see what Dr. *le Clerc* has written on this Subject, in his *History of Physick*, Part 1. Book 3. Chap. 31.

After

After what has been said, we might, it seems, be excused from examining more narrowly the Motive of Dr. *le Clerc*, in affirming; that the Antidote in Question is none of *Hippocrates's*, a Motive taken from this; that *this ancient Physician made use of but very few Simples in the compounded Medicines he employed: whereas; that, in the Antidote described by Actuarius, there are a great many.* But an Answer must be given to Dr. *Freind's* Objection, who insists, with great vehemence, that among the Antidotes of *Celsus*, some Medicines are found as much, or more, compounded, than the pretended Antidote of *Hippocrates*? If *Celsus*, he says, *who understood Hippocrates very well, and constantly copied after him, gives Descriptions of Medicines, wherein are a great many Ingredients: why is it thought strange, that Hippocrates should himself give*
some

some such? But, that the Consequence should hold true, *Celsus* should have always copied after *Hippocrates*, or to use Dr. *Freind's* Phrase, should have constantly copied after him, which is the same thing, and have never inserted any thing in his Book but what should have been taken out of *Hippocrates*. But it is far otherwise: for what the *Latin* Physician has taken from the *Greek* one makes a very small part of his own Works. And it is, even, *observable*, that what he has translated from him has nothing at all to do with Medicaments. To this may be added, that Physick had undergone very great Alterations in the space of four or five hundred years, that interven'd between the time of *Hippocrates* and that of *Celsus*; and that if the first Physicians used but very simple Medicines, the same cannot be said of those who came after. On the
contrary,

contrary, it seems that the latter Physicians strove who should contrive the most compounded Medicines. *Mithridate*, one of the first, and at the same time one of the most famous Antidotes, is an Instance of what I say. *Celsus* gives a Description of it, wherein are *thirty six* Druggs; which is, perhaps, much more than is needful. But this number was not yet thought sufficient: for in *Damocrates's* Mithridate, there are, if I mistake not, *fifty*. This Composition is recorded by *Galen*, and is the same with that now in use. There was one also in *Pliny's* time, wherein, he assures us, there are *fifty five* Ingredients. It may be objected; that in the pretended Antidote of *Hippocrates* there are but *twenty four* Simples; but this very Number is still three or four times greater, than that of the Druggs used in the compounded Medicines, described by this ancient
Phy-

Physician. This Antidote, says *Actuarius*, has great Virtues, and is good for many things. It cures *Pain in the Head*, and in the *Ears*: It is good for a *Cough*, *spitting Blood*, *Pain in the Sides*, *Obstructions of the Spleen*, and of the *Liver*; for the *Stone*, for the *Cholick*, *Sciatica*, for the *Quartan Ague*; and even for those who are *possess'd with evil Spirits*, or are *troubled with Sprights*. It is wonderful that a Medicine, contrived by *Hippocrates*, and indued with so many wonderful Properties, should have been lost in Oblivion; whilst *Mithridate* and the *Treacle of Andromachus*, whose Authors were not of near so great a Reputation as *Hippocrates*, have kept their Ground, and still do to this day. They, who are curious to know the Composition of this Antidote, may consult *Actuarius* in the place quoted above.

This Article is already long enough; however, I cannot forbear, before I conclude it, to observe; that there is something not easily to be comprehended in what Dr. *Freind* adds, *that we find among Celsus's Antidotes Acopa, and Catapotia, Medicines as much compounded as that he (Dr. Freind) had been speaking of.*

† By these Words *Acopa*, and *Catapotia*, as used by him, one would be apt to think they are in the *Singular*, but I am willing to lay the Fault upon the Printer, rather than think him guilty of it. But then what must we do with the rest? The *Catapotia* were either Pills, or Medicines taken in the fashion of a Bolus; and might some-

† Dr. *le Clerc* having seen but the *French* Translation of Dr. *Freind's* History of Physick, which says *Acopa & la Catapotia*, the Translator alone is answerable for *this* Blunder; and Dr. *le Clerc* is fair enough to clear Dr. *Freind* in this Point; but it lies on this last Gentleman to shew he is not chargeable with the last part of this Imputation.

times have the same Consistency as the Antidotes, tho' they were not the same thing. But as for the *Acopa*, which were a sort of Ointment, they have nothing at all to do with Antidotes. It is likely that Dr. *Freind*, who understands very well how to make Distinctions, has not, in this place, had Justice done him by his Translator.

XII. In the third part † of Doctor *Freind's* History of Physick, Dr. *le Clerc* is again charged with having committed more Faults. Dr. *Freind* says, * that the *Introduction of the Arabian Physick into Europe is not merely owing, as Mr. le Clerc intimates, to the Croisade*. Mr. *le Clerc* has *nowhere* said that this Introduction was *merely* owing to that Cause : it is enough if we are chiefly beholden to the *Croisade* for it.

† Part 2, pag. 118. of the Original.

* Part 2. p. 259, 260.

XIII. * Mr. *le Clerc*, says Mr *Freind*, seems to think that P. de Apono could furnish us with some things, not only in Chymistry, but in other points relating to Physick. I don't find he deserves this Character either way, &c. It is pretty hard to understand what Dr. *Freind* would be at. Dr. *le Clerc*, after having spoken of *Thaddæus* the Florentine, and *Albertus Magnus*, goes on in this manner: ‡ There is also in the Writings of Peter de Apono, or Abono, the description of an excellent Balm, and some other chymical Medicines. This Physician, who is otherwise called the Conciliator; and concerning whom several things might be said, which he that continues this History may take notice of, as he goes along: this Physician, I say, lived from A. C. 1250, to 1306.

* Part 2. pag. 259, 260.

‡ Pag. 785.

Doctor *Freind* adds, ‡ that *what he touches upon in Chymistry is very inconsiderable*. He agrees, however, that this *Italian Physician has mentioned some chymical Medicines*: and he even takes notice of some, such as * *Spirits drawn from Metals, of which, he says, an Elixir may be made*. Dr. *Freind* makes mention of an *artificial distilled Balsam*, described by *de Apono*, and recommended much for a *Palsy*. Dr. *le Clerc* has not said so much, and has nowhere spoken of any *Light*, great or small, that the *Conciliator's* Writings can furnish us with in *Chymistry*, and far less in *Physick*. 'Tis true that he has intimated that *he could say a great deal more of this Author*: the meaning of which is only, that he is an *Author who has made a great noise*. In effect, *he had, as*

Dr. *Freind* himself informs us ‡ *the reputation of being equally a great Physiognomist, Chymist, Mathematician, and Astrologer; he is said to have dealt much in Talismans; and therefore, being suspected of Magick, he was persecuted by the Inquisition; but dying before they could proceed to condemn him, he was burnt in Effigie: tho' some Historians pretend to say that he was actually burnt in his proper Person: and others, that he was absolv'd.* Is not this a large Field to expatiate on?

XIV. Dr. *Freind* makes again another Thrust at Dr. *le Clerc*. † *Surely Physick had another Face upon the opening of the sixteenth Century; and the History of that Age could have afforded us a great many Particulars, much more worth taking notice of, than the long detail Mr. le Clerc gives of Paracelsus's idle System.* The Particulars here

‡ Pag. 260, 261.

† Pag. 336.

meant by Dr. *Freind*, are the origin of the *Venereal Disease*, which began at that time to spread in *Europe*; and what he adds, is a Consequence of what was just now said. ‡ *Mr. le Clerc* gives us scarce any account of the *Symptoms, or Cure, of that new Disease*. I have already answer'd the Objection concerning the System of *Paracelsus*. I must now answer what is added. It is true that Dr. *le Clerc* has not dwelt long; either upon the Symptoms, or the Cure, of the *Lues Venerea*. But it was not necessary, for the end he had proposed to himself, that he should dwell long upon it; what he has written upon that Subject, being sufficient to give a general idea of the one and the other: besides; this matter has been as good as exhausted; a great number of Books having

‡ Pag. 338.

been written on that Subject. That which was the least known, and required a more particular inquiry, is the *Origin* of this Distemper. The Question is; *whether the ancient Greek, Latin, or Arabian Physicians had any knowledge of this first Disease, or whether it appeared in Europe towards the close of the fifteenth Century; and whence it came?* This Question, I say, is, without doubt, the most curious point for a *History of Physick*. 'Tis also for that reason, that Dr. *le Clerc* has more particularly applied himself to it; and he may very justly flatter himself upon his Success; at least in some Particulars; since Mr. *Freind* has made ‡ no difficulty to say; that he finds one of his Observations on that Subject very judicious; whereby he endeavours to prove; that

this Disease is nothing so ancient, as some have pretended.

But if Dr. *Freind* has been so friendly as to approve, in this occasion, Dr. *le Clerc's* Observation, he has not been long without blaming him for having said, very groundlessly, that *James of Carpi* had kill'd a great many People. But here follow Dr. *le Clerc's* words, *James of Carpi*, a Surgeon, was one of those who began to use mercurial Oyntments for the cure of the Lues Venerea: and, with these Oyntments, he cured several Patients labouring under this Disease. True it is, he killed some; but these were much fewer than what he cured. This, continues Dr. *le Clerc*, is what Falloppius tells us of this Affair, &c. If Dr. *Freind* had had the patience to read this throughout, he might have seen that Dr. *le Clerc* had on-

ly copied from that Author. He should then have censured the last, and not the first of these. These are *Fallopianus's* Words: *Carpensis ille Chirurgus, ex sola curatione Gallici morbi, cum his in unctionibus, lucratus est plus quam quinquaginta millia Ducatorum aureorum; & plures interfecit, quamvis majorem partem sanaverit.* Dr. *le Clerc* ventures to say further, that there is nothing but what is very probable in what *Fallopianus* says. If, now a days, it is no rare thing to see some Patients die under the hands of Physicians and Surgeons, who have been salivated by them in order to their cure: if, notwithstanding an infinite number of Experiments made on that Subject, which should thoroughly have instructed one in the manner of using this Medicine, fatal Accidents nevertheless happen sometimes: what might not one be exposed to in *Jarnes*
of

of *Carpi's* time: when the first Experiments, which are accompanied with danger, were then making? Happy the Physician, who, on the like Occasions, has nothing with which he may reproach himself.

XVII. Dr. *Freind* at last, after having remark'd that *Fallopious* had read Lectures at *Padua* upon some Diseases, about the year 1555, concludes thence; † that these Lectures must have been read much later than Mr. Clerc places this Physician. It is hard to guess at what Dr. *Freind* would say, here in this place. If *Fallopious* died but in 1562, or 1563, as will be shewn by and by, I cannot understand why it should be impossible that he should have read Lectures, on any Subject whatever, in the year 1555: seven or eight years before his Death. However, this does not hinder Dr. *le Clerc* from having been guilty of a

† Pag. 376.

Mistake, in stating the birth of *Fallopian* much earlier than it is: that is to say; in placing it, as he has done, in the year 1490. It is surprising that any difficulty should still subsist about the time that a Physician of his note was born: especially that he has, very justly, acquired so great a Reputation, and has lived in an Age so near our own. But here follow some Observations, Dr. *le Clerc* has made on that Subject.

We learn from *Jacobus Augustus Thuanus*, † that Gabriel Fallopius, of Modena, being Professor at Padua, died there the * VII. Id. Oct. 1562, of an untimely death; having hardly completed the 39th year of his Age. The same Author adds, that Fallopius was very learned in Philosophy, and other Sciences, but chiefly in Anatomy, which he has enriched with di-

† Hist lib. 34.

T. a c 14th of Oct.

vers Observations; and consequently in both Branches of Physick, which he has illustrated by his learned Writings. *Castellanus* confirms the Words of *Thuanus* as to the Age of *Fallopious*, when he died, as well as to the year and place of his Death: adding to it, that a Tomb was erected for him at the entrance of the Church of St. *Anthony* of *Padua*. He takes notice again, that † this Physician was born in the year 1523, which is exactly *Thuanus's* account. What these two Authors say, as to the untimely Death of *Fallopious*, agrees with what is told us by *Andreas Marcolini*, one of his Disciples; for whom he had the greatest Affection, and to whom he had left his M S. Works. This is what is gathered from some Letters and Prefaces of this last Author, printed before the Trea-

† Vit. illustrium Medicorum.

tise of *Fallopious de Aquis Medicatis, atque Fossilibus*; as well as from the Answer written to him, by *Hieron. Mercurialis*, to whom he had sent that Treatise. *I have read, † says Mercurialis, the Lectures you sent me upon Baths and Mineral Waters, written by that most eminent Physician Gabriel Fallopious. I could not do it without being extremely moved, not only at the tender remembrance of my dearest Master; but at the incredible loss which I am certain the whole Faculty has suffered by his untimely Death. This Treatise was printed at Venice in 1564, two years after Fallopious's Death. And, at the head of this Work, be-*

† *Gabrielis Fallopii, Medici eminentissimi, lectiones de Balneis, ac Fossilibus, a te missas ad me, perlegi ex quibus vehementer commotus sum, tum ob jucundissimam, mibique semper dulcissimam præceptoris, recordationem, tum ob incredibilem jacturam, quam ex immatura illius morte, totam Medicinæ Facultatem passam esse certe scio.*

sides the Letters or Prefaces of *Marcolini*, mentioned above, is a *Latin* Elegy written by *Dionys. Athanasius*, in which the Author, after having expressed the Sorrows of all *Italy*, and of all the Learned in other Countries; concludes with two Verses, † which shew how much he was moved himself, that the Life of so great a Man had ended so long before its time. *John Anthony*, and *James de Francis*, Booksellers at *Venice*, who have printed *Fallopious's* Works in 1606, confirm also in their Preface what these Authors have said concerning his *unexpected*, and *untimely* Death.

After what has been said, there is no reason in the least, one would think, to question the Truth of such a Fact, attested by Witnesses, some of whom were Contemporaries with *Fallopious*,

† *Nec minus ipse aliis doleo, æternumque dolebo
Immatura nimis stamina rupta tibi.*

his Disciples, and his particular Friends; and who consequently took too great a share in this sad Accident, to leave room for a possibility of suspecting they were not perfectly apprised of all its chiefest Circumstances. Yet some Authors, who have written long after, say the very contrary. If we are to give credit to * *Thomasini*, and ‡ *Ghilini*, we shall find that *Fallopious* was born three and thirty years sooner than what I just now said, viz. in 1490, and that instead of dying in the flower of his Age, as is plain by what has been said above, he shall have reached to seventy three: a pretty advanced old Age, and almost double the time he lived; if *Thuanus* and *Castellanus* have been exact. But, as the other two, whom we have just now named, and whose Account

* *Elogia Doctorum virorum.*

‡ *Teatro de Litterati.*

is so widely different, do not inform us from whence they have their Information, nor upon what they ground their Calculation, one ought not, methinks, to scruple, in the least, to reject their Testimony, and keep to that of the first, who could hardly be deceived, for the reasons we have given.

They may be followed with so much the more Certainty, that it is easy to discover, by another method, that *Fallopious* cannot have been born so early as these new Authors pretend: Every one knows *Vesalius* was born in 1514, which being laid down, it is not at all probable, that if our *Fallopious* had been born in 1490, and had consequently lived twenty four years longer than him, it is not probable, I say, that *Fallopious* should have spoken of *Vesalius* in the manner a Disciple does of his Master, always with great Respect, as his Custom is.

‡ This Difficulty will entirely vanish, if in following the Opinion of the first, we place *Fallopious's* birth in the year 1523; who, according to that account, must be nine years younger than *Vesalius*. As to what is said by *Thomasini*, and *Ghilini*, that *Fallopious* died in the year 1563, the Mistake is not so gross as that about the number of years he lived: but it is likely they have, in this also, been guilty of a Mistake; this Physician having died one year before, as the others have asserted. This is, however, what, it seems, may be inferred from what says *Anton.*

‡ Fallopious, *after he had commended in the very beginning of his Anatomical Observations, Vesalius's Fabrica Corporis Humani, as a Divine Work, and an everlasting Monument, and had excused himself very much for daring to write of Anatomy after that great Man, concludes thus: Magistri reverentiam, & timorem, ipsius exemplo, lenivi. Quoniam uti Vesalius (non in scholis quidem vivæ vocis Auditor, sed in Musæo quia Librorum ejus helluo eximius fuerit) Galeni discipulus factus, non ipsius auctoritate deterritus est, quin plurima Arti adderet, quæ a Præceptore ejus prætermissæ erant; ita & ego in illius schola, quia ejus Scripta diligenter legerim, versatus, alacrius in hoc pariter Artem juvare tentavi.*

Riccoboni

Riccoboni, that † Bernard. Trevifanus succeeded Gabriel Fallopius in 1563, who had read Lectures in Surgery, and on the Simples so early as 1555. And, indeed, if *Fallopius* had died but towards the Close of the year 1562, or VIII. Id. Octob. as we learn from *Thuanus*; it is very probable his place could hardly be filled before the following year. To this may be further added, that if this illustrious Author, we have just now quoted, not being satisfied with setting down the year wherein this famous Physician died, has also recorded the very day of his Death, it is a plain proof he was perfectly well apprised of both.

Moreri, in his historical Dictionary, says; that *Jacobus Philippus Thomafini*, Bishop of Emonia, or Citta Nuova, in Istria, published, in the seventeenth Century, two Volumes

† *Gymnasii Patavini.*

on the Praises of illustrious Men; the greatest part whereof were Italians, with a Catalogue of their Works; sure, adds Moreri, his Works must have been in a very great Esteem, since they procured him a Bishoprick. 'Tis, in all likelihood, the great Esteem which this same Author supposes Thomasini's ‡ Works were in, which obliged Anthony Teissier, who wrote in the same Age, and long after this last Author, to take his Word for it, rather than Thuanus's, with respect to the Birth and Death of Fallopius. Teissier having commended Fallopius, affirms first, that this Physician died at Padua in the seventy third year of his Age, according to what Thomasini and Ghilini say, whom he quotes in the Margin, and then he concludes in this manner: And so Thuanus was described,

‡ I don't mention Abbot Ghilini, because he seems to have done hardly any thing else but copy Thomasini upon that Article.

when

when he says that Fallopius was but 39 years old when he died. He, again, mistakes in placing his Death in the year 1562; for, says he, Ghilini and Thomadini say he died in 1563. † These are the Grounds upon which Teissier has gone, without taking notice that the Authors quoted by him, as his Authorities, want proper Vouchers themselves, at least by what I can find.

Two other Authors, who have written much about the same time as Teissier, Mercklin*, and Freberus ‡, are very near of his Opinion. The first of these two, in the Article of Fallopius, says that this Physician was born at Modena in 1490, and that he died at Padua in 1563, aged 73 years, as

† See the Additions of Teissier to the Elogies of learned Men, taken from the History of Thuanus.

* Vid. Mercklini Lindenius Renovatus.

‡ Vid. Freberi Theatrum virorum eruditione clarorum.

we learn it, says he, *from Thomāsinus*. It is true, that this *Mercklin* takes, afterwards, notice; that *Castellanus*, in his *Lives of Physicians*, reckons otherwise; so that the Reader may adopt which of the two opinions he pleases. *Freberus* begins also by relating what *Thomasini* says, and, at last, copies *Castellanus*. In fine, the last Author I know, who has mentioned the Birth, and Death of *Fallopius*, is *Goëlicke*, a learned Professor of Physick, in the University of *Hall**. He likewise says he was born in 1490, and fixes the time of his Death in 1568; and withal adds, that others say in 1562. All these have erred, and Dr. *le Clerc* has committed the same Error with them. But he has endeavoured, since, more carefully to investigate the Truth of the Fact in

* Vid. *His History of Anatomy*, printed in 1713.

Question. I do not at all question, that the Explanations he now publishes to the World, in this respect, will be thought satisfactory to those who shall read the Account given here.

These are, if I mistake not, all the Articles in Dr. *le Clerc's* Plan, which Dr. *Freind* has undertaken to censure. This Plan containing but six or seven Sheets, if it were true that there are as many Errors in it as the last pretends, this Work being so small, one might very justly conclude, as Dr. *Freind* has done, that *it is a very imperfect, superficial, inaccurate, and erroneous Performance.* But I think I have already sufficiently demonstrated; that nothing could be charged on Dr. *le Clerc* with less reason, not to say with more folly; since if there are Faults, they are few, and inconsiderable. However, such as they are, if Dr. *Freind* had contented himself with
 setting

setting him right, he was at liberty to do it; but to endeavour, as he has done, to find Errors where there are none; it is what one should not have expected, and what has occasion'd this Answer.



F I N I S.