

# A NEW CHAPTER

PAULA DE VOS, TANJA POMMERENING, AND LUCAS RICHERT

In 2021, after discussion with and approval from the AIHP Board of Directors, *History of Pharmacy and Pharmaceuticals* chose to amend the editorial structure of the journal so that it might include additional editors-in-chief. It was mutually decided that more voices and more expertise at the top of the journal was both desirous and essential to ensure that *HoPP* continued to flourish in the years ahead. The fact that this editorial transition marked a break from the past was far outweighed by the intellectual, geographical, temporal, and methodological diversity that was to be gained through the change. Recent years at the journal and at AIHP have witnessed a steady evolution, and the inclusion of other editors-in-chief further builds on momentum to provide a modern flagship journal for the Institute as well as to help address underexplored areas of pharmacy and pharmaceutical history.

This issue is thus the beginning of an exciting new chapter at *HoPP*. With more capacious global and temporal expertise at our disposal, we are in a better position to revamp our intellectual agenda and provide more holistic coverage of the pharmacy history field, as well as adjacent fields. Following from the rich discussions featured in Volumes 61 and 62 on “the future of the history of pharmacy,” we propose a broader scope for the journal in terms of subject matter, temporal coverage, and geography. In his article from Volume 61, Joseph Gabriel outlined George Urdang’s contention in 1938 that only “scientific pharmacy,” and

---

PAULA DE VOS is Professor of History at San Diego State University; pdevos@sdsu.edu

TANJA POMMERENING is Director of the Institute of the History of Pharmacy at the University of Marburg, Germany; pommeren@uni-marburg.de

LUCAS RICHERT is the George Urdang Chair in the History of Pharmacy at the University of Wisconsin–Madison School of Pharmacy; lucas.richert@wisc.edu

HISTORY OF PHARMACY AND PHARMACEUTICALS | 64:1

ISSN 2694-3034 | E-ISSN 2694-3042 | doi:10.3368.hopp.64.1.1

© 2022 by the Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System

not its ties to commerce or trade, constituted the appropriate subject matter for pharmacy history. Within a decade, Urdang himself had come to recognize a broader subject matter for the field related to the “manufacture and distribution of medicines,” a conceptualization further refined and explicated by Elizabeth Siegal Watkins in an influential article from 2009, in which she identified a “new pharmaceutical history” whose object of investigation was no longer narrowly focused on the apothecary or pharmacist, but rather on “pharmaceutical companies (big pharma and biotech), the industrial production of drugs, and the penetration of these products ... into so many aspects of modern society.” The focus on the materials, techniques, and processes of drug formulation and mass manufacture opened the door not only to the study of pharmacy as big business and mass manufacture, but also to the material culture of pharmacy.

As Watkins pointed out in her response (in Volume 62) to the discussion on the future of pharmacy in Volume 61, however, the “new pharmaceutical history” she had referred to in 2009 focused almost exclusively on the modern period. Watkins was therefore pleased to acknowledge in 2020 “the work being done by scholars in other eras,” particularly in the medieval and early modern periods. Despite her enthusiasm and the value of her analysis in pharmacy history circles, it’s worth acknowledging that Watkins failed to capture the full scope of academic work done in Europe at least since the 1960s, as mentioned by Helmstädter (in Volume 62). In Marburg, for example, an institute for the history of pharmacy was established by Rudolf Schmitz in 1965, in which 216 PhD dissertations have since been completed by his graduate students and those of the following directors of the institute. The topics have ranged from Ancient Near Eastern minerals (from 2000 BC) to more contemporary histories of pharmaceutical concerns. With expanded editorial expertise at our journal, we will be able to better reckon with scholarship from beyond the shores of North America and across wider time frames.

Broader definition of what is considered an appropriate subject matter and temporal framework for pharmacy and pharmaceutical history leads naturally to broader inclusion in terms of geographic coverage, methodology, and scope. Whereas the journal in more recent decades has tended toward more modern and North American-based analyses (a natural byproduct of resources, personnel, and structures within research organizations like AHIP), the new editorial direction seeks to encourage more global representation that reflects innovative recent scholarship on transnational and “entangled” histories of the movement, circulation, and translation of knowledge and goods, and that recognizes and values non-Western epistemologies and practices. This type of evolution at our journal, thus, does not occur in a vacuum but must be viewed as part of the larger intellectual and higher education landscape.

As one example, recent emphasis in the history of science on the artisanal contribution to the Scientific Revolution has brought increased attention to the importance of “makers and doers” and the role of objects, techniques, and workshop practices to what Pamela Smith in *The Body of the Artisan* (2004) referred to as “artisanal epistemology.” Emphasis on material culture and workshop practices also points to the way artisanal pursuits bring together theory and practice, knowledge, and technique—and thus a way of conceptualizing pharmaceutical practice that depends not at all on modern ideas of it as a “science,” but as a craft tradition that goes back to the earliest human communities. With this approach, pharmacy history can be traced back to its earliest beginnings as a medicinal and technological practice, long before the professions of pharmacists and physicians were separated in medieval times. This approach also will necessitate inclusion of expertise in Archaeology, Egyptology, Ancient Near Eastern Studies, Classical Philology, and Byzantine Studies, for instance.

In this way, the journal in fact seeks to reprise the goals of the AIHP’s early leaders, Edward Kremers, George Urdang, and Glenn Sonnedeker, who shaped the field’s intellectual agenda to include ancient and early modern *materia medica*, recipes, traditional medicines, knowledge translation and transfer, and cultural divides/overlaps. Our aim, though, is not to prioritize some scholarship in a reflexive manner in the near term, but rather to thoughtfully address the balance of content at the journal, and, where possible, actively work to incorporate innovative and under-studied topics. Ours is a project of inclusion, that is: to broaden the history of pharmacy and pharmaceuticals tent. In so doing, we also heed William Zellmer’s call from Volume 61 to “keep pharmacists in pharmacy history” and continue the journal’s unique collaboration between practitioners and historians in the field.

At the outset of this new chapter in the journal’s history, we recognize too that our intellectual agenda must be complemented by additional approaches and actions. To this end, we have developed and will continue to develop relationships with like-minded organizations, in addition to working more effectively and closely with the Institute’s national association sponsors to appropriately leverage historical information to add to contemporary discussions around pharmacy practice and health policy more broadly. Further, we have developed and will continue to develop special issues that grow the history of pharmacy and pharmaceuticals in new directions. Besides these efforts, we will attempt to connect pharmacy history institutes and organizations across the globe, as well foster new initiatives to support graduate students and early career researchers through internships, exchanges, workshops, and collaborations. We invite members and nonmembers alike to take part as much as possible.

This issue of *History of Pharmacy and Pharmaceuticals* was a pleasure to bring to print. The following pages showcase research from emerging scholars in the field, as well more seasoned scholars who have long been embedded in the history of pharmacy and pharmaceuticals. Articles touch on community pharmacy, pharmacy education, apothecary shops in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and the pharmaceutical industry in Japan during the mid-nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Violetta Barbashina's article, called "In Charity, for the Sake of Charity, and with Charity," examines the meanings of *caritas* in the apothecary's practice, but also the perceptions of the albarello as the ointment jar in the 1450s–1550s. In "Picturing the Politics of Pharmaceutics," by Isaac C. K. Tan, the pharmacist-physician relationship is analyzed in Japan during the 1860–1930s in an effort to evaluate drug dispensations, professional identity, and production of knowledge. Then Wesley Sparkmon explores regional chain pharmacy, the political-economy and business of pharmacy, and evolving pharmacy practice during the 1940s–1970s in "Fred's Pharmacy." Finally, Bob Buerki, in "Prescription for Death," reopens a famous poisoning case in The Ohio State University's College of Pharmacy to understand pharmacy education and administration, as well as tell a gripping story. Overall the issue encapsulates well the big tent—the broad scope—of pharmacy and pharmaceutical history. It is worth emphasizing, too, that Isaac Tan was awarded the 2021 Glenn Sonnecker Prize and is a new member of the AIHP. Bob Buerki, by contrast, has served as the Institute's president, on the Board of Directors, as secretary, and has been a member of the AIHP since 1965.