

London came to nothing. Yet the Inns of Court ranked with the finest law universities, and following the precedent of Bologna could easily have been joined by a Faculty of Medicine with the royal hospitals and their staffs as a basis. This development was one which the College of Physicians might well have fostered at any time from 1518 onwards had they not concentrated their energies on a disciplinary role which made them into a kind of primitive General Medical Council with little positive influence on medical education. That obtainable at Oxford and Cambridge was certainly no source of pride and a college restricted to members of either university had to lean heavily on foreign universities for the effective education of its own fellows. The first volume of Sir George Clark's *History* of the college is a model of its kind and the College is to be congratulated on obtaining the services of a historian of such distinction. It is beautifully written and, when one stops to recall the rather dry material on which it is based, it is surprisingly interesting. Only towards the end of a substantial volume does one begin to wonder whether the efforts of all these learned physicians might have been better employed in energetic action to better the education of the lower orders of the profession rather than in hounding them from their modest livings among the poor. Not that Sir George ever hints at any criticism of this kind; he states the facts, and the facts of course speak for themselves, in the long accounts of prosecutions and punitive fines which occupy such a large part of the *Annals* at this period. Linacre himself gave it the name of 'College', a title with an academic connotation; it could not help but be demeaned when it deliberately adopted the role of policeman, as well as judge, jury and even occasionally jailer. Of the more pleasant side of the College's activities, Sir George writes with wit and charm, emphasising the importance of the college in shaping the image of a learned profession, with all the good fellowship and social ritual which is now associated with it. What is particularly valuable too is to have the College history presented against a background which is sketched in with a masterly authority. It is my guess that this work will still be read and consulted fifty years hence but that Mr. Hill's will have been forgotten, even by those aging historians who were stirred up by it in their youth to examine the still unfamiliar scene he describes and have gone on to make their own names by the books which have superseded it. Of the one there is no more to be said but of the other there is much still to be discovered.

F. N. L. POYNTER

*Untersuchungen zu Aretaios von Kappadokien, Abhandlungen der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse*, by FRIDOLF KUDLIEN, Nr. 11. Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur in Mainz, 1963, pp. 86, DM. 8.

A study devoted to Aretaeus, one of the most neglected of Greek medical writers, is always welcome. A major reason for this neglect, happily corrected by the volume under review, goes back to antiquity itself—he is mentioned by name by only a small handful of writers not all of whom can be precisely dated. Judging from the extant literary evidence, Aretaeus was virtually unknown to his contemporaries, both actual and presumed, even though his surviving writings seemingly suggest that he was a latter-day follower of the pneumatic tradition stemming chiefly from Archigenes. The analysis and validity of this traditional interpretation, supported in the main by Max Wellmann and his followers, forms, so to speak, the central theme of Dr. Kudlien's study. More precisely, the first of the two chapters (pp. 7–41) is devoted to establishing and dating the medico-historical background presupposed in Aretaeus' writings and in the few references to him. Chapter II (pp. 41–83), primarily philologi-

cal in nature, contains a variety of textual emendations and various observations on the syntax and dialectal peculiarities of Aretaeus' style.

The key to the many difficulties concerning his background and the reluctance of the ancients to mention him by name, lies in satisfactorily establishing his dates. After a brief *résumé* of the problems confronting modern scholarship and a survey of previous efforts to date and locate Aretaeus in terms of his pneumatically-oriented physiology and pathology, Kudlien turns directly to the slender evidence. The two data usually relied on in this regard are Aretaeus' alleged borrowings from Archigenes and an explicit reference in Dioscorides, *De simplicibus medicamentis*, II, 119 (vol. III p. 298, ed. Wellmann).

Because of uncertainty surrounding Archigenes' dates and doubt concerning the reliability of the 'parallels' between him and Aretaeus found in Aetius and others, Wellmann's contention that Aretaeus was a slavish imitator of Archigenes must be revised. The other prop to Wellmann's argument consisted in an involved interpretation of the afore-mentioned passage in Dioscorides. As Kudlien shows (pp. 18-21) the faulty text-tradition of the principal MSS. in which this, probably interpolated, passage occurs, provides little support for a precise *terminus post quem*. There are, however, further data, not previously utilized, by means of which a plausible date can be assigned. A careful reading of the text reveals internal evidence sufficient to prove conclusively that Aretaeus was a contemporary of Dioscorides and Erotian, i.e. the middle of the first century A.D., 'in jene ausserordentlich fruchtbare vorgalenische Epoche antiker Medizin' (p. 22).

The remainder of the first chapter is a careful development of the central thesis, sustained by a close examination of the relevant texts. Insofar as evidence permits, Aretaeus' contributions were not always consistent with prevailing pneumatic doctrines. This also helps to explain the silence of his contemporaries and the misleading nature of the so-called 'parallels' on which Wellmann so heavily relied in his attempt to impose a uniformity on the pneumatic writers which later scholars have failed to confirm.

Chapter II is an imposing but restrained display of philological competence that bolsters the author's main contentions on nearly every page. Two indexes greatly facilitate reference to an exemplary study and one which will be required for all future students of Aretaeus and the pneumatic medical writers.

JERRY STANNARD

*The Armed Forces Institute of Pathology. Its First Centenary 1862-1962*, by ROBERT S. HENRY, Washington, D.C., Office of the Surgeon-General of the Army, 1964, pp. 422 + xxi, illust., \$4.25.

This book is published to mark the centenary of the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology in Washington and traces its growth from its foundation as the Army Medical Museum in 1862 to the present day. From the outset the members of the staff appear to have possessed a sense of purpose and dedication which has enabled the Institute to achieve world-wide recognition in many fields of Pathology.

Apart from its statistical information the work contains much that is of general, historical and biographical interest. It was in 1862 during the American Civil War that Brigadier William A. Hammond established the Army Museum in order that specimens of wounds inflicted in war could be satisfactorily preserved. Since that time the collection has grown enormously but it has always remained in Washington.