

PHARMACOPŒIAL VEGETABLE DRUGS.

(1696) and Valentini (656b) (1698) into Germany, and 1694 by Fried. Dekker into Holland.

During the first part of the eighteenth century the drug was in frequent use in the various pharmacies of Germany, as is evidenced from its being mentioned in several old documents of that age. It is, for example, mentioned in the authoritative drug list of the Silesian town of Strehlen in 1724.

However, during the increasing employment of the drug, in the latter part of the eighteenth century, much confusion arose as to its botanical origin, insomuch that it became the habit to designate as ipecacuanha any emetic plant, regardless of its botanical source. A long list of such plants is enumerated, for example, in Martius (409). In this manner the characteristics of the plant furnishing true ipecacuanha root became almost forgotten, other plants being substituted for it. Ray, for example, held it to be a species of *paris*, and no less an authority than Linnæus himself thought *viola ipecacuanha* now known as *ionidium ipecacuanha* (684), to be the true ipecacuanha root.

In 1764, Mutis, a celebrated botanist in Santa Fe de Bogota, sent the younger Linnæus a Peruvian emetic plant with description, which he thought was the true ipecacuanha root. Linnæus fil. (385) accepted the statement of Mutis as correct and, moreover, believing the illustration given by Piso (511) of the true ipecacuanha plant to represent the specimen he received from Mutis, in 1871 gave it the name *psychotria emetica*, Mutis.

To Dr. Gomez (271, 272), who in 1800 returned from Brazil, is finally due the credit of having corrected this error. He re-established the nearly forgotten botanical character of true ipecacuanha in his memoir published at Lisbon in 1801, wherein he describes and figures the plant, and especially distinguishes it from *Psychotria emetica*, Mutis.

Having donated some specimens of the plant in his possession to his fellow countryman, F. A. Brotero (100), professor of botany, Coimbra, the latter published an account of it (1802) in the *Trans. Linn. Soc.*, naming it *Callicocca ipecacuanha* (100), but without giving credit to the source of his information, which chagrined Gomez considerably (422). Twelve years later Brotero left a copy of his article with a botanist by the name of Hectot, of Nantes, who communicated it to M. Tussac (656a), and the latter, in publishing it, gave it the name *Cephaelis ipecacuanha*, also laying stress upon its distinction from *Psychotria emetica*, Mutis, perhaps without having had any knowledge of Gomez's paper written twelve years before.

In 1820 A. Richard (550) again called attention to this distinction, but, as it seems, also without giving proper credit to Gomez, with the result that later authorities frequently quote the true ipecacuanha root under the name of *Cephaelis ipecacuanha*, A. Richard.

JALAPA

The purgative tuber known under the common name jalap, *Exogonium purga*, is a gift of Mexico, and by reason of its cathartic

PHARMACOPŒIAL VEGETABLE DRUGS.

qualities naturally became a favorite in Europe in the days of heroic medication. The early Spanish voyagers learned of its qualities from the natives, and in the sixteenth century carried large quantities to Europe. Monardes (447), in 1565, mentions a cathartic under the name Mechoacan rhubarb, or root, which some believe to have been jalap, but this Flückiger (239) discredits, because Colon, an apothecary of Lyons, in 1619, states that jalap was then newly brought to France. Flückiger also accepts that both drugs were well known in 1610, although often confused. Owing to this confusion between the two bulbs, one was called *black mechoacan*, while the other was known as *white jalap*. Strangely enough, the exact botanical source of jalap remained a question until 1829, when Dr. Coxe, of Philadelphia, author of *Coxe's American Dispensatory*, identified the drug from living plants sent to him from Mexico, and published descriptions, with colored plates, in the *American Journal of Medical Sciences*, 1829. This celebrated cathartic, so much used by licensed physicians and in domestic medication, is to be credited to the natives of Central America, whose employment of the drug introduced it to European commercial adventurers who, as a matter of business, made it known to the professions of medicine and pharmacy.

KINO

Kino is the dried juice of a handsome timber tree, *Pterocarpus marsupium*, a native of the southern parts of the Indian Peninsula and Ceylon. It is also obtained from several other trees which partake of the qualities of an astringent drug. One of these, *Pterocarpus indicus*, is a tree of Southern India, the Malay Peninsula, and the Philippine Islands. The drug, used by natives from time immemorial, was introduced into commerce by Fothergill (244), 1757. It came from the River Gambia, in Western Africa, where it had been previously noticed by Moore (449), who in his "Travels Into the Inland Parts of Africa," 1737, mentioned the product under the name *kano*. Mungo Park, 1805, sent specimens of the tree to England, and from that date African kino has been a regular product of the English drug market. According to Duncan (202) in the Edinburgh Dispensatory, 1803, kino as found in England was an African product, but he recognizes a variety, indistinguishable from this, coming from Jamaica. In the 1811 edition of the same work he asserts that the African drug is out of market, and that the East India Company now supply the market from Jamaica and New South Wales. It is evident that, as with *Krameria*, many species and varieties of the tree, native to widely different sections of the world, produce the substance known as kino, which, aside from the East India tree, *Pterocarpus marsupium*, are accepted as being very nearly identical with the material yielded by the kino tree of tropical Africa. Kino is obtained by incising the tree and removing the red jelly as it exudes, then drying it by exposure to the air. It is mildly astringent, and has been used in the manufacture of wine.