

than to the traditional problems in the historiography of its subject. The text, which (as the editor shows) probably derives from medical teaching at Naples around the turn of the seventeenth to the eighteenth century, sheds little new light on the old controversial question of the bark's first introduction into European medicine. Obviously relying on Sebastiano Bado's *Anastasis corticis peruviae* (1663), it repeats the legendary story of the wife of the Spanish viceroy of Peru, the Countess of Chinchon, who is cured from a tertian fever by taking the bark, and gives 1640 as the date of this event. It also displays the contemporary confusion over the drug's botanical origin. Of the four chapters of the manuscript, dealing with the "history", "property or power", correct therapeutic use, and "preparation and administration" of the Peruvian bark, it is chiefly the second that deserves historical attention, because it discusses in detail seventeenth-century theories of the drug's mode of action.

The anonymous author's uncompromising rejection of explanations by Galenic primary qualities (heat and dryness, or—on the contrary—coldness) as well as concepts of occult, antidotal properties is remarkable. Instead, he critically reviews those contemporary theories, which—like that of Thomas Willis—saw the "particles" of the bark interacting with the "fermentations" in the blood, that were thought to cause intermittent and other fevers. Along these lines he develops a theory of his own, which is claimed to rest on clinical observation, but actually is highly speculative. Of interest also is the author's sceptical attitude towards efforts in experimental pharmacology. He questions the clinical transferability of *in vitro* experiments with the bark on freshly drawn animal blood, as described by Jacques Minot (1691), and he similarly doubts the significance of intravenous injections of substances in animals, such as those performed by Giorgio Baglivi.

As recent research of this reviewer has shown, attempts to replace traditional Galenic explanations by new theories, which were based upon observation, experiments, and speculation, also characterized late seventeenth- and eighteenth-century works on opium. The manuscript edited by Jarcho thus seems to reflect—and partly to represent—a more general, progressive tendency in pharmacology around 1700. Apart from such relevance of the text itself, the editor's introduction and annotations are a useful guide to the early primary sources on the Peruvian bark. As for the secondary literature, it is only striking that reference is made to M. L. Duran-Reynals' not always reliable *The fever bark tree* (1946), whereas the critical study of Jaime Jaramillo-Arango (*J. Linn. Soc., Botany*, 1949, 53: 272–309) remains unmentioned.

Andreas-Holger Maehle, Wellcome Institute

JOHN M. RIDDLE, *Quid pro quo: studies in the history of drugs*, Variorum Collected Studies series, Aldershot, Variorum, 1992, pp. xii, 316, £45.00 (0–86078–319–7).

Without the subtitle the reader might excitedly imagine that we have here a monograph on drug substitutes, a desideratum which Professor John Riddle is eminently qualified to provide, but there can be little disappointment in the fact that the volume actually represents a collection of 14 articles, published in the period 1964–1987, to which has been added a previously unprinted paper on 'Methodology of historical drug research'. There is no continuous pagination and errors in the originals, such as the failure to insert Greek names in paper V, remain uncorrected. The author's training in biology, classical history, and pharmacy, which had proved so fruitful in *Dioscorides on pharmacy and medicine* (1985), stamps these articles with an authentic concern for historical research, a pragmatic interest in the efficacy of drugs, and a healthy awareness of the problems of nomenclature, which will render them long indispensable for students of medieval medicine.

Although printed in the order of their first publication, the studies presented here fall thematically into a number of groups. Three (I, II, V) chart the confusion of the aromatic stimulants amber and ambergris, and their appearance amongst the "wonder drugs" of early medieval Europe which were imported from the East as part of an active trade, being more or less unknown to Antiquity, and which also included zedoary, camphor and galingale. Two studies (III, VIII) are concerned with lapidaries (616 MSS recorded) and lithotherapy with a special discussion of Albertus Magnus's *De mineralibus* (c. 1250) and the contribution of his own experience, which admirably complements Dorothy Wyckoff's translation and commentary of 1967. Dioscorides and his influence form the

subject of three papers (IV, IX, XIII) which deal with the Alphabetical Dioscorides (the Latin translation which superseded the earliest Latin version), the even more popular Pseudo-Dioscoridean *Ex herbis femininis* (sixth century), with a listing of its 71 herbal entries, and Byzantine commentaries post-dating the celebrated Anicia Juliana of AD 512 which offer more modest but qualitatively superior medical and botanical scholia to those on the Latin text of the *De materia medica*. Individual treatises studied are the *Medicinae ex oleribus et pomis* of the third-century Roman soldier-writer Quintus Gargilius Martialis (X) and the pseudo-Hippocratic *Dynamidia* (sixth century) covering the dietary and medicinal properties of 78 foodstuffs (listed in a table by Riddle) and based in part on Hippocrates' *Peri diaitis* Bk II and Gargilius Martialis. Interesting parallels between the understanding of the therapeutic properties of certain drugs in Antiquity/Middle Ages and in this century are drawn in two studies (XII, XIV including a table of 257 drugs from the Hippocratic Corpus) and the question of pragmatic versus theoretical knowledge considered there also forms the subject of a comprehensive paper dealing with the Middle Ages (VI). The scientific contribution of three previously neglected sixteenth-century figures are considered in an intriguing essay (VII).

To make this welcome collection even more useful, Professor Riddle has supplied an impressive index of manuscripts (over 200) and an admirably detailed index of terms.

Tony Hunt, St Peter's College, Oxford

*Medicine and healing. The Dublin Seminar for New England Folklife, annual proceedings 1990*, ed. Peter Benes, Boston University, 1992, pp. 200, illus., \$15.00.

One of the most welcome developments of recent years has been the erosion of the artificial barriers dividing traditional doctor-oriented history of medicine from what was long seen and often disparaged as the history of medical folklore. It is now recognized that, at least before the nineteenth century, there was much common ground between the medicine the regulars practised and the medical notions prevalent in the community; and that itinerants, irregulars, part-time healers, ladies-bountiful, printed medical texts and the literature of popularization served as decisive go-betweens. This excellent collection, examining healing beliefs and practices in North America from the seventeenth century up to the present advances this new social history of medicine. It helps confirm certain working hypotheses that have come into prominence in the last few years, not least the market-oriented, entrepreneurial dimension of pre-scientific medicine; and it also points to various special features that demarcate North American from Old World popular medicine.

Several studies in *Medicine and healing* lay bare the health and disease culture experienced and expressed by ordinary literate people in Colonial America. Barbara McLean Ward's 'Medicine and disease in the diary of Benjamin Walker, shopkeeper of Boston', and Wanda Burch's 'Sir William Johnson and eighteenth-century medicine in the New York colony' both reveal (as has become well-established from earlier studies) the combined providential and secular interpretations of illness typical of the times, and the reliance of educated people upon a complex mixture of professional, quackish, household and folk therapies. The handful of essays dealing with obstetrics are especially interesting because they demonstrate that co-operative and supportive networks of midwives, prominent citizens and (often geographically outlying) practitioners arose to deal with rural and smalltown childbirth. At least in the eighteenth century, there is little sign of the battle of the *accoucheurs* against the midwives that feminist historians of American childbirth, like Jane B. Donegan (*Women and men midwives. Medicine, morality, and misogyny in early America* [1978]) have so dramatically portrayed.

One imagines that the factors facilitating co-operation in the pre-1800 era were the vast distances involved, the sparseness of settlement, and the paucity of professional practitioners. It is surely these same factors that also explain the fact that *early* colonial America did not, on the whole, see the radical split and antagonism between regulars and quacks so prominent in Europe. That is hardly surprising in a situation in which the majority of healers had, perforce, to be jacks-of-all-trades, and often to move about the country, in search of their patients. In 'Itinerant physicians, healers, and surgeon dentists in New England and New York', Peter Benes fascinatingly demonstrates that