

Book Reviews

(other?) women, some of which reflects a historical situation in which wealthy women were able, in large part, to control their own lives. One can also see a growing scholasticism, perhaps taking place over a generation, as the masters of Salerno adopted Greek and Arabic modes of argument and explanation. These links with the early School of Salerno are judiciously explored, with consequent modifications to the standard story.

Given the fluidity of the Corpus and its redactions in the manuscript tradition, Green does not claim to be producing the original text, but merely to present the text as it was at one stage in the process of transmission, the “standardized ensemble” of around 1300. This is found in twenty-nine manuscripts, nine of which are used to construct the text. This is a wise decision, and one can only applaud the care and accuracy with which this has been achieved (even perhaps to a fluidity between -ocio/-otio?). But there are some problems, especially when reference is made to other redactions, and the decision to have separate notes to the Latin and the translation is both cumbersome and unhelpful to those whose interest is in both. But non-Latinists can rest assured that the translation of the text before them is accurate, and problems of plant identification can be checked against Green’s appendix of compound drugs and her index of plants.

One cannot, however, emphasize too strongly that the text of “Trotula” as printed here differs substantially from that which appeared in print in 1544 and has since then been taken to represent Salernitan gynaecology. As Green shows, this edition is merely one phase, and an unlucky one at that, in the attempt to bring together Salernitan writings on women. Even the present edition marks a beginning, not an end, for scholars will now have to consult a variety of texts and redactions before they can pronounce with any certainty about Salernitan gynaecology. But,

in return, they can be grateful to Monica Green for ensuring that, from now on, the foundations of their theories can rest on solid ground, not sand.

I append three minimal notes. The source of some additions to the text, for example, chapter headings, is not always clear in the apparatus or notes. The reference to Rufus (p. 72/231), if genuine, must derive at this date from an Arabic source, possibly referring to his (now lost) treatise on self-help medicine. More survives of (ps.-) Cleopatra’s *Cosmetics* than is printed by Hultsch (p. 208), mainly as mediated through Statilius Crito, and there are possibly other fragments in Arabic.

Vivian Nutton,

The Wellcome Trust Centre for the
History of Medicine at UCL

David Cantor (ed.), *Reinventing Hippocrates*, The History of Medicine in Context, Aldershot, Ashgate, 2002, pp. x, 341, £55.00 (hardback 0-7456-0528-0).

What a good idea this was for a book: study the different uses to which Hippocrates has been put in different historical contexts, in various countries from the Renaissance to the twentieth century. This was not only a good idea in theory but also a well-executed one in practice. An introduction and thirteen essays of a uniformly high standard address the theme without straying. Broadly speaking, the uses to which Hippocrates has been put are two. First, he has appeared as an adjudicator in matters of practice and theory, and second, as an authority in issues of ethics.

These deployments are illustrated in all the chapters except the first one in which Helen King interrogates Renaissance texts to discover why Hippocrates was appointed “father” of medicine, a term not previously employed to describe him. King suggests the appellation may be related to changing

Book Reviews

ideas of maternal and paternal contributions to the creation of the foetus. We do not learn, however, whether the bestowal of paternity was peculiar to medicine or if other arts and sciences also gained a male parent at this time.

As might be expected, in the practical arena physicians or communities of physicians who considered themselves the upholders of empiricism, of sound no-nonsense practice, unsullied by theory, have most often invoked Hippocrates. Invocations of this sort dealt with here include those of Thomas Sydenham and his circle, the fellows of the eighteenth-century Royal Society concerned to develop medical meteorology, the physicians of Paris medicine and Antebellum American doctors. All the authors dealing with these communities attempt to understand the defences of empiricism and the use of Hippocrates in a wider context. Other essays in the volume, however, remind us just how much texts can be manipulated. That Hippocrates might be used to endorse theory rather than practice seems unlikely at first sight. Yet Jole Shackelford in his chapter on the Paracelsian doctor Petrus Severinus shows exactly that. It was not the case, however, that chemical philosophers were united in their appeal to the Greek sage. In one of Andrew Cunningham's examples of the use of Hippocrates in the seventeenth century, the chemical physician Marchmont Nedham shows downright hostility to the great man. Non-use is as intriguing as use. This is Robert Martensen's theme. Martensen looks at the Oxford circle around Thomas Willis and finds not hostility to Hippocrates, simply indifference. Martensen speculates that since the Puritan doctors had appropriated Hippocrates and made him the father of plain speaking and an opponent of speculation he was of little use to Royalist theoreticians.

The ethical uses of Hippocrates are modern, no doubt because in one sense medical ethics are modern. In Susan

Lederer's essay on early twentieth-century America, Hippocrates enters the public sphere, on stage, screen and in paperback. At this time, critics of the profession dragged the oath through the mud of fee-splitting and illegal abortion to show how modern doctors had fallen from the standards set by the physician of Cos. Three essays on France, Britain and Germany in the inter-war years conclude the volume. The Hippocrates of this period is hard to sum up, although he clearly was employed to organize nostalgia for an organic lost world where the doctor was treated as a priest and the healing power of nature replaced modern technology. These three essays remind us, particularly Carsten Timmerman's on Germany, that the doctors who wrote on Hippocrates at this time comprised the last generation to be schooled in the classics.

I may be mistaken, but Hippocrates no longer seems to have the presence in medical debates that he once did. Nor is he any longer a presence in a doctor's education. It is hard (but not impossible) to invoke someone in your cause if you do not know what he said. Hippocrates lives however. In the popular imagination he is medicine personified. As David Cantor shows in his introduction, any computer game that needs a doctor has its Hippocrates. I have done scant justice to the essays I have mentioned and none to the excellent ones I have not. This is a most rewarding read about a man who was all things to all doctors.

Christopher Lawrence,
The Wellcome Trust Centre for the
History of Medicine at UCL

Robert Fortune, *The words of medicine: sources, meanings, and delights*, Springfield, IL, Charles C Thomas, 2001, pp. xvi, 424, US\$84.95 (hardback 0-398-07132-2), US\$59.95 (paperback 0-398-07133-0).