pharmacy in Mediterranean countries. The gaps in his argument (a price worth paying for a work covering such a wide sweep of time and place) provide scope for others who wish to approach the subject in the same rigorous and interdisciplinary way.

Teresa Huguet-Termes,
Universidad Complutense, Madrid

Cornelius O'Boyle, *The art of medicine: medical teaching at the University of Paris, 1250–1400*, Education and Society in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, Leiden, Brill, 1998, pp. xv, 330, €104.00, $121.00 (hardback 90-04-11124-7).

Any good general history of medieval medicine will tell the reader briefly about a collection of short medical texts later known as the *Articella*, saying that it provided an introduction to medicine and established the authority of Hippocratic and Galenic medicine, and that it became the core of medical teaching in medieval universities. Cornelius O'Boyle explores what it meant at the university of Paris up to 1400, first describing the origins and development of the medical faculty and the origins and careers of medical students, before analysing the origins and various forms of the collection. The collection had three main stages and names. (1) The *Art of medicine* (*Ars medicine*), started out with five texts, the *Isagoge* (*Introduction*) of Johannitius, the Hippocratic *Aphorisms* and *Prognostics*, and two texts of Byzantine origin on urines and the pulse. (2) The much larger *Commented art* (*Ars commentata*) also included Galen's commentaries on three Hippocratic treatises and Haly Ridwan's on Galen's *Tegni*, while (3) the *Little art* (*Articella*) contained only these last four commented texts. O'Boyle's database is about 180 manuscripts of the *Art*, and these enable him to chart in detail these three manifestations and their many and various subordinate forms. The origins of the *Art* and its earliest form are linked to translations at Monte Cassino and Salerno in the eleventh century, twelfth-century teaching at Salerno, and (possibly) the development of scholastic techniques in the schools of northern France, while later forms are linked to the later development of university teaching and also to regionalism, with the *Commented art* triumphing in Paris and the *Articella* in Italy. O'Boyle concludes with chapters describing how the *Art* was acquired, taught and learnt.

O'Boyle is always firm in his view and clear in exposition, witness, for example, his careful summary of conflicting modern theories about the origins of the *Art*. His concern for detail and the concrete is already seen early in the book, in the chapter on Parisian medical men. While necessarily relying on Ernest Wickersheimer's biographical dictionary of medieval French medical practitioners and Danielle Jacquart's supplement and prosopographical study of them, he reworks the material to bring named individuals closer to the reader. The concern is even more striking in the middle and later chapters. These parade before the reader's eyes the *Commented art* as a folio book, physically much larger than the *Art of medicine*; they show where a copy could or could not be borrowed; they reveal how much a copy cost and how long it took to copy it out. In two splendid concluding chapters O'Boyle looks at the layout of texts and various sorts of emendations, marginalia, diagrams and notes, and uses these to bring back to life the teaching and learning of the text in those now remote classrooms. Most readers will be impressed and some may be moved by O'Boyle's intellectual passion: to demonstrate as *tangibly* as possible what his manuscripts show.

I have only two caveats, both minor and neither of them serious criticisms of the author. One is that more active copy-editing was needed, and the other that the reader

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0025727300068964 Published online by Cambridge University Press

who wants to *read* the medieval Latin of the translated texts which are being discussed is not often helped towards a printed edition: this is an understandable consequence of the manuscript focus of the book and (perhaps) the author's view of the poor quality of older editions. O'Boyle has produced a very clear account of the complex history and development of a text which was very important in the medieval university, and he describes its use in a remarkably vivid way. This is a major achievement. Suggesting as it does many thoughts and reflections, O'Boyle's book should do much to advance work in the future. Some examples: a large proportion of the *Art of medicine* contained Greco-Latin rather than Arabo-Latin translations, and the collection's later history suggests the need for more general discussion of the tensions between the routes. O'Boyle has deliberately concentrated on the formal and external characteristics of the collection and its commentaries, confining himself, as far as their contents are concerned, to brief comment on their general characteristics and (in the chapter on teaching) brief examples, mainly from the beginnings of commentaries. A path is opened up for those who want to *read* the western medieval glosses and commentaries more widely, and O'Boyle has provided the route with meticulous sign-posts. At the heart of O'Boyle's book is a very static view of what went on in medieval university medicine, essentially the communication from masters to pupils of a common gloss on a canonical collection of texts. This is salutary and at the same time it may stimulate debate.

On this and on more general views of medicine in Paris, readers will also want to compare other major work in the field, in particular Danielle Jacquart's *La Médecine médiévale dans le cadre parisien* (Paris, Fayard, 1998). While focusing mainly on later medieval Paris, Jacquart's book sometimes goes earlier, overlapping and sometimes contrasting with O'Boyle's. Examples in detail are Jacquart's discussion of knowledge of Johannitius's *Isagoge* displayed in Paris as early as the 1120s (by Hugh of St Victor), and also different nuances in her use of early evidence of organized medical teaching. More significant are the different hues of the portraits presented in these two different books, in pigments supplied on the one hand more by study of the characteristics of manuscripts and on the other hand more by reading the contents of texts. Both portraits are of high interest.

Peter Biller,
University of York

Andrew Wear, *Knowledge and practice in English medicine, 1550–1680*, Cambridge University Press, 2000, pp. 496, £45.00, $74.95 (hardback 0-521-55226-5), £16.95, $27.95 (paperback 0-521-55827-1).

What is the connection between eating fish and staying healthy? For a citizen of seventeenth-century England, fish can "produce 'much grosse, slimie superfluous flegme', which in turn could cause gout, bladder stone, leprosy, scurvy and other skin diseases". For sea-fish, therefore, " 'that is best which swimmeth in a pure sea, and is tossed and hoysed with winds and surges: for by reason of continuall agitation, it becometh of a purer, and less slimie substance, and consequently of easier concoction ... and of a purer iuyce.' Similarly the best freshwater fish would be that 'which is bred in pure, stonie or gravelly rivers, running swiftly' " (p. 203).

Much has been written *about* early modern English medicine; *Knowledge and practice*, on the other hand, is a rich serving *of* that medicine. After wading through close to 500 pages, in which more than a third of the text appears to be direct quotations in the vernacular (including contemporary English translations of Latin texts), we come away with a remarkable

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0025727300068964 Published online by Cambridge University Press