is the claim that in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries continental universities like Salerno and Leiden taught little but Paracelsianism.

There is much useful material in this volume, and it will doubtless be consulted widely for biographical information on English royal doctors. But it is neither as comprehensive nor as accurate as one might wish, and the author's general understanding of the history of medicine in this period is shaky.

Vivian Nutton,
The Wellcome Trust Centre for the History of Medicine at UCL

Monica H Green (ed. and trans.), *The Trotula: a medieval compendium of women's medicine*, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania, 2001, pp. xviii, 301, illus., £38.50, US$55.00 (hardback 0-8122-3589-4).

There can have been few books so long awaited that, when published, have borne their considerable weight of learning so lightly. In 1985, John Benton argued that the most celebrated of all female writers on medicine, Trotula of Salerno, Chaucer's "Dame Trot", was a mirage. The tract that circulated widely under her name was nothing less than a composite assemblage of three different treatises, none of which, he believed, had a female author. His suggestion was taken up by Monica Green, fresh from her Princeton doctorate on late antique and early medieval gynaecological texts, who, with the agreement of Benton's widow, proposed to edit and translate this corpus. It could scarcely have been foreseen that this would entail a near total re-examination of medieval gynaecology, and a substantial revision of Benton's hypothesis.

The name Trotula appears to be a slang form (cf. *Articella*) and is not found in the earliest manuscripts. It may derive from Tro(c)ta, a common female name in early Salernitan records, and a healer of this name is also mentioned in the "Trotula" ensemble for a cure of a young woman. She is likely to have been the author of two, as yet unpublished, medical compilations, which include several recipes also found in *Treatments of women*, one of the three different works that make up the "Trotula" ensemble. The others are *Women's cosmetics* and *The conditions of women* (the latter also extant in an earlier version, *On the diseases of women*). Any or all of these texts may appear by itself, in whole or in part, in different redactions, and in other collections in a wide variety of European languages. Green's masterly unpicking of this complex puzzle is only summarized here, and those wishing to see the enormous labour that has gone into a few introductory pages must turn to her articles in *Scriptorium* 1996 and 1997, and the selection of her articles, *Women's healthcare in the Medieval West*, Ashgate, 2000. Together, text, translation and manuscript studies are indispensable for anyone interested in the development of medieval ideas on gynaecology.

The key to unravelling the mystery lies in the different approaches to theory and practice in the three treatises, *The conditions of women* is more theoretical, aware of the classical learned tradition of Galen and Arabic medicine; *Treatments* shows almost no interest in theory, and avoids many of the standard terms and explanations of learned medicine; *Cosmetics*, written by a man, makes considerable use of information from women, including Muslims. Style and content differ considerably between the three. But Green goes further in her deconstruction by relating their origin to the early stages of Salernitan medicine and to the complex intellectual and social background of Salerno. Building on the work of Patricia Skinner, she shows how the mingling of Greek, Latin, Arabic and even Jewish culture allowed the various original authors the opportunity to draw on different sources of information. *Treatments* explicitly refers to information gained from

(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