



## The art of medicine

### Taking to tobacco

We live in an era of national No Smoking Days. With reminders to give up tobacco as regular events, it is worth thinking back 400 years, to when Europeans were starting to smoke for the first time. No other intoxicant has done more to shape and define the modern world than “the holy herb”, as its early proponents tended to call it. Without Europeans taking to tobacco, it is difficult to see how the English colonies in Virginia would have first survived and then flourished; whether African slavery would have become the bulwark of trans-Atlantic economies; how western governments would have garnered the revenues they have; and whether people around the globe would socialise, relax, pose—and of course die—the way that they do. Or to put that another way: a recent estimate suggests the global tobacco market is worth US\$760 billion (excluding China), with \$680 billion generated by the consumption of approximately 5500 billion cigarettes per year. And, in 2015, it was estimated that smoking cost the UK’s National Health Service £2.6 billion, while bringing £12 billion in taxes to the Treasury.

From the perspective of medicine there is, of course, a huge historical irony at work here. In 2018, it is health professionals who, by and large, are the most vociferous and effective opponents of tobacco: it is medical research that eventually proved that tobacco is a killer and medical experts who carry most authority when talking about it in relation to individual and public health. But moving back to circa 1618, scholars have identified western medicine and its practitioners as one of the main reasons why Europeans

ever even contemplated indulging in the new and very strange behaviour of setting a herb on fire and inhaling the smoke into the body in the first place.

The proponent-in-chief is usually taken to be the Spanish physician Nicolas Monardes—healer of monarchs and one of the most respected medical practitioners and authors in Europe. Monardes published parts I and II of his epic study of medicinal curatives and properties found in the “new world”, *Historia medicinal de las cosas que se traen de nuestras Indias Occidentales que sirven al uso de la medicina*, in 1565 and 1571. Part II contained an extensive explanation of the healing properties of tobacco, which was translated into English by the Bristol merchant, John Frampton, as *Joyfull Newes Out of the Newe Founde Worlde* in 1577. The book became an instant hit, republished at least three times thereafter. It described the qualities of tobacco in the language of humoral medicine that English readers would have understood. Derived from the ancient medical writers Hippocrates and Galen, this conceived of human bodies as consisting of four humours: blood, phlegm, black bile, and yellow bile. Humoral equilibrium was essential to physical and mental health and to maintain it people were required to monitor their diet and environment as well as regulate their bodies through bloodletting, purging, vomiting, and sweating. Monardes presented tobacco within this system as hot and dry in the second degree. As an agent that warmed and dried the body and acted as a purgative within and balm without, it was suited to treat ailments as diverse as toothache and cancer.

In England, this celebration of tobacco as a medical panacea was fully endorsed in 1588 by Thomas Harriot’s promotional pamphlet, *A Briefe and True Report of the New Found Land of Virginia*. Although Harriot was not a physician, he whipped up interest in tobacco, and so the attractions of Virginia, by extolling its humoral medicinal qualities. Explaining how the fumes were “sucked” into the stomach and head, Harriot rhapsodised:

From whence it purges superfluous phlegm and other gross humours, opens all the pores and passages of the body: by which means the use thereof, not only preserves the body from obstructions: but if also any be, so that they have not been of too long continuance, in short time breaks them: whereby their bodies are notably preserved in health, and know not many grievous diseases wherewith we in England are often afflicted.

Harriot also assured readers that they did not need to take his word for it. Back in Europe “the use of it by so many of late, men and women of great calling as else, and some learned Physicians also, is sufficient witness”.

Given this early emphasis on the medicinal qualities of tobacco, it is hardly surprising that historians have identified



National Portrait Gallery, London, UK/Photo © Stefano Baldini/Bridgeman Images

Benjamin Jonson (circa 1617) by Abraham van Blyenberch

physicians as the key players in making the drug palatable to Europeans. More than this, early modern physicians can be seen as establishing a cycle of substance legitimisation and denigration that continues to this day, with doctors in the 19th and 20th centuries first sanctioning and prescribing drugs like opium and cocaine before lobbying against their use once they began to be available commercially and consumed recreationally. In 17th-century England, the power of medicine to sanction and encourage behaviours must have been especially strong given that an early opponent of tobacco was none other than the King James I of England, and VI of Scotland, who published *A Counterblast to Tobacco* in 1604 and originally tried to tax the drug out of existence.

While it is in the interest of nobody to lose sight of medicine's role in this cycle of legitimisation and denigration—least of all medical professionals themselves—it is nevertheless the case that, in the case of tobacco, valorisation was not the responsibility of medical practitioners alone. Indeed, looking at the early debates about tobacco and the way it was represented in Elizabethan and Jacobean popular culture reveals a more complicated scenario. Physicians were divided among themselves over the benefits and dangers of tobacco. For every William Barclay, who was prepared to reveal all the “secrets of physic” to demonstrate tobacco to be a “sovereign” cure for “an army of maladies”, there was an Eleazar Duncan, who could only conclude on the basis of applied humoral theory that tobacco “threaten a short life to the great takers of it”. But it was not only physicians doing the talking. Monardes's English translator was a merchant, after all, and Harriot was a mathematician and explorer, not a physician.

This in part indicates just how widespread medical learning had become by the beginning of the 17th century, thanks largely to a burgeoning tradition of medical self-help literature, to legions of unlicensed practitioners, and to the fact that most healing was done by family members in their own home. But if Elizabethans and Jacobeans were well informed medically, it is also striking how, at the very moment tobacco was entering the consciousness of English men and women, humoral language was also becoming a way of talking about people's social and cultural deportment as much as their medical condition.

The great exponent of this new kind of social and satirical commentary was the poet and playwright Ben Jonson, who announced his arrival on London's literary scene with his first great city comedy, *Every Man in His Humour* (1598). City comedies were a specific genre of theatre, adapted from the Roman theatrical tradition, in which contemporary social types and manners were mocked both for comedic effect and to encourage moral reflection. Jonson became the acknowledged master of the form, with *Every Man in His Humour* followed by a string of city-comedy classics that included *Volpone*, *Epicene*, and *The Alchemist*.

One feature of Jonson's comedies was the way he created characters through the interplay of their humoral and social characteristics. But another was his profligate dramatic use of tobacco, both as a subject for comedy and means of characterisation. Jonson used or referenced tobacco in his plays twice as often as his nearest playwriting rivals—indeed, during this period he was one of the most likely writers to discuss tobacco across all printed genres. That he did so in city comedies was also important: if theatre had become one of the most popular forms of entertainment by the early 17th century, then city comedies were one of the most popular theatrical genres. And while Jonson dramatised tobacco more than anyone else, other writers of city comedies were not averse to using it either.

What did Jonson do with tobacco? In his plays before 1603, he dramatises the debates about tobacco raging in learned texts and pamphlets, such as whether or not it is a medical panacea, and adds a twist of social satire. In *Every Man in His Humour* and *Every Man out of His Humour*, tobacco emerges as a novel marker of social status. Tobacco has a complicated, almost mystical set of skills associated with it—a bundle of materials and techniques that men assured of their masculinity (“wits”) perform easily, which social wannabes are desperate to learn—and it is often consumed inappropriately, to comedic effect. Thereafter, Jonson took a hiatus from the subject, before returning with two plays in which tobacco is again prominent. In *The Alchemist* of 1612, tobacco fuels capitalist enterprise, with the ambitious London citizen Abel Druggier building his new business around the sale of tobacco and also using the intoxicant as a kind of barter, along with luxury items like damask, to glean favour and knowledge. 2 years later, in *Bartholomew Fair*, tobacco is both the intoxicant of choice of the dangerous but indomitable fair-people and a lubricant of sociability among the play's true wits.

There was, then, an unexpected convergence in 17th-century England: a new kind of popular media (theatre), a new genre of popular drama (the city comedy), a new and skilful exponent of the art (Jonson), and a new intoxicant to serve as dramatic subject and prop (tobacco). This convergence, I would argue, had an impact on consumption habits and tastes, with consequences that shaped the modern world and with which we still live today. It was not just physicians who helped Elizabethans and Jacobeans take to tobacco: England's poets and playwrights did, too. And it is as much the world of cultural representations as medical knowledge that has shaped people's attitudes to tobacco ever since.

#### Phil Withington

Department of History, University of Sheffield, Sheffield S3 7RA, UK  
p.withington@sheffield.ac.uk

Phil Withington is Director of the Intoxicants and Early Modernity Project ([www.intoxicantsproject.org](http://www.intoxicantsproject.org)), funded by the Economic and Social Research Council.

#### Further reading

Goodman J. Tobacco in history: the cultures of dependence. London: Routledge, 1993

Hughes J. Learning to smoke: tobacco use in the west. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2003

Jonson B. Watson RN, ed. Everyman in his humour. London: Methuen, 1998

Jonson B. Cook E. ed. The alchemist. London: Methuen, 2010

Withington P, McShane A, eds. Cultures of intoxication. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014