

Book Reviews

astrological and magical medicine. The account of the rise of the Arabic medical tradition also devotes attention to the emergence of Syriac as a language of scientific discourse, and later the diffusion of the tradition into Byzantium and India is discussed.

The illustrations are of course of special importance. These are all exceptionally well-presented, and include not only miniatures, diagrams, and sketches from manuscripts, but also medical instruments, weights, seals, balances, and views of monuments, markets, apothecaries' shops, and traditional medicine still in practice in the Islamic world.

A problem that such a work can hardly avoid is the fact that the desire to include the most significant artefacts and draw attention to the most important highlights of medieval Islamic medicine tends to give the impression that this is representative of the face of medicine with which most people were familiar. It is well, then, to recall that the material in this book was typical of a highly urbanized medical culture to which the vast majority—peasants in the agrarian countryside—probably had little access. And this observation in itself begs the question of how effective medicine could have been in a tradition that in both its Greek and Arabic dispensations arbitrarily classified both illnesses and therapeutic strategies under rubrics that clearly had little to do with the true nature of the problem and the measures required to combat it. The sophisticated medical compendia of leading figures like al-Majūsī and Ibn Sīnā were certainly important in their medieval context, but in many cases could not have helped a doctor's patients; the medieval hospital was a major step in the institutionalization of medical structures, but could never have played more than a minor role in the delivery of medical care.

But such are the perennial difficulties of presenting pre-modern medicine to a public rather than specialized audience. The

institutions and individuals whose labours are represented in this work are to be congratulated for bringing to fruition a truly monumental contribution to the field.

Lawrence I Conrad,
Wellcome Institute for the History
of Medicine

Hippocrates, *Places in man*, edited and translated with introduction and commentary by Elizabeth M Craik, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1998, pp. xxiii, 259, £45.00 (0-19-815227-2).

One of the earliest texts of the Hippocratic Corpus, and one of the most intriguing is *Places in man*, *περὶ τόπων τῶν κατὰ ἄνθρωπον*, *de locis in homine (Loc.)*, which, in its description of the body *a capite ad calcem* and adumbration of empirical (animal) dissection, serves, one might say, almost as a model for more sophisticated treatises. According to Craik, it “has everything: ‘factual’ information, scientific reasoning, clinical practice, ideological statements” (p. 13).

Although relatively neglected in recent years, the key study of this text by K Schubring (1941), R Joly's Budé edition (1978), and its inclusion in the Loeb series of Hippocrates (P Potter, 1995) illustrate a recrudescence of interest well served and augmented by Craik's edition. A lucid introduction sets *Loc.* within the context of its time, tradition and reception. The text, derived from Joly's edition, is clearly set out, the translation accurate and vigorous, the commentary thorough. There are two appendices, the first dealing with the question of affinities between *Loc.* and other relevant texts in the Corpus, including *VM*, *Art.*, *Flat.* and *Aff.* In this regard, I would have expected mention of *Morb. II* and *Carn.* The second appendix provides useful anatomical diagrams. There is an index of

Book Reviews

authors and texts together with a general index. A comprehensive bibliography is included (where Potter's translation of *Loc.* is given as Loeb vol. 7, but in the Abbreviations is correctly cited as vol. 8).

Craik argues, correctly, that *Loc.*, "was initially composed as a single unified work by . . . one author" (p. 24), perhaps "an older contemporary of Hippocrates" (p. 29). There were later textual additions and emendations by other hands. The interplay of pre-Socratic (among other) influences allowed for a number of possible interpretations, creating a template upon which later medical theories and practices could be deduced or inferred.

Anatomy is a chief feature of this text. The number of sutures of the skull is said to vary; more sutures mean a healthier head (6.1). Craik's explanation of this anomaly does not entirely convince (p. 121). Three membranes protect the eye (2.2). Craik states that these "seem to be accurately described" (p. 105). It depends, of course, on exactly *what* is being described; here the lack of a *developed* anatomical vocabulary enjoins caution. The brain's meningeal covering is of two layers (2.3). Craik states that the terminology of thick and thin to describe these is "somewhat simplistic" (p. 105). However, such a description of the inner meningeal layer as λεπτός is accurate and was not bettered by Galen. In this instance, anatomical terminology aptly met the demand of anatomical investigation. And it should be noted that the *nature* of the other layer is not *explicitly* stated unless it can be inferred from the description immediately preceding of the thick (παχύς) membrane of the eye.

Loc. well illustrates the development in the Hippocratic Corpus of medical theory and practice, of informed speculation interspersed with nuggets of fact. This edition is an invaluable guide and merits a prominent τόπος on the bookshelf.

Julius Rocca,
Karolinska Institute, Stockholm

Guigonis de Caulhiaco (Guy de Chauliac),
Inventarium sive chirurgia magna, volume one: Text, ed. Michael R McVaugh, *Studies in Ancient Medicine*, vol. 14, I, Leiden, E J Brill, 1997, pp. 486, \$216.00 (90-04-10706-1).

Guigonis de Caulhiaco (Guy de Chauliac),
Inventarium sive chirurgia magna, volume two: Commentary, prepared by Michael R McVaugh and Margaret S Ogden, *Studies in Ancient Medicine*, vol. 14, II, Leiden, Brill, 1997, pp. 438, \$178.00 (90-04-10784-3) (set 90-04-10785-1).

"Like an inventory of goods for his heirs". Thus Guy de Chauliac described his book on surgery (completed 1363), which marks the culmination of a medieval tradition of writings on surgery, being the most complete and most scholarly work in the genre. This book arose out of a need to complete the work of Margaret Ogden (d. 1988), who had planned to publish a commentary to the English version of the same text (*The cyrurgie of Guy de Chauliac*, Early English Text Society (EETS), 1971). Her notes on points of translation will be published by the EETS at a later date. To McVaugh alone, however, is due the edition of the bulky original Latin version (465 full pages of text), and he contributes most of the notes.

McVaugh places Guy in the context of medical writers (and in particular surgeons) and Western European medical education. Guy quotes (helpfully giving chapter and verse) from a vast array of authorities; the list of them (vol. 2, pp. 3–15) can in itself serve as a useful bibliography for medieval medicine. Guy was able to exploit both the resources of the medical school of Salerno and the library of the popes in Avignon, to which Nicholas of Reggio had sent the latest translations of the works of Galen; some of the texts quoted are no longer extant, such as the translation from Greek of Galen's *Methodus medendi*, books I–VI. Guy showed great discernment in his choice of authorities, preferring, in the case of