

establish the significance of the term “through the experimental context in which it was used’. Surely all three fields can be united when we ask not how *ideas* change but how *people* have different ideas.

Roger French  
Wellcome Unit for the History of Medicine  
Cambridge

NANCY G. SIRAIISI, *Taddeo Alderotti and his pupils*, Princeton University Press, 1981, 8vo, pp. xxiii, 461, £17.80.

This is an important and much-needed book. By concentrating on Taddeo Alderotti (c. 1210–1295), professor of logic and medicine at Bologna, and six known pupils (Gentile da Cingoli, Bartolomeo da Varignana, William of Brescia, Dino del Garbo, Mondino de’ Luzzi, and Pietro Torrigiano), Dr. Siraisi has uncovered some of the foundations of the medieval medical curriculum and set academic medicine in a proper context. She considers with admirable caution the crucial role of this group in introducing the latinized Galen and Avicenna into the syllabus, propounding human anatomy as essential for the doctor, and adapting medicine to contemporary philosophical issues and training. Their writings, which vary from a commentary on Aristotle’s *Economics* to practical medical compendia and from an explication of modern poetry to *quaestiones* on sex, display the different emphases within the group, but also an overall hardheadedness. Their appreciation of the limits of medicine and philosophy is particularly impressive. Dr. Siraisi not only widens our knowledge of medieval academic medicine but also destroys many scholarly myths in passing, either by her silence (Mondino’s call to Venice) or succinct criticism – Henri de Mondeville’s studies at Bologna (pp. 51–52, although Henri, pp. 476, 481, ed. Pagel, needs a comment), and Hewson’s attribution to Dino of a *quaestio* on the generation of the embryo (p. 200). There are two appendices, one a valuable register of *quaestiones*, and a good bibliography with a select list of MSS. The holdings of the Cesena library, noted but not seen by the author, deserve more attention. Not only do they contain more material from Taddeo’s circle than is given here, but most of it was collected by one man, see G. Baader, ‘Die Bibliothek des Giovanni Marco da Rinini’, in K. Treu (editor), *Studia Codicologica*, Berlin, 1977, pp. 43–97.

Dr. Siraisi’s touch is less sure on civic than on university matters. Despite p. 36, the evidence is against the hiring of Taddeo as a civic physician at Bologna: rather he belonged to a wider group eligible to be called on by the state to examine cases of death and injury, and who were then paid for each case attended. Although being included was a sign that one had arrived, this examination was perhaps more of a duty than a privilege: it should also be distinguished from the common obligation of all doctors at Bologna to notify any illegal injuries, see E. Dall’Osso, *L’organizzazione medicolegale a Bologna*, Cesena, 1956.

The group’s standing can also be measured in financial terms. The salary offered by Venice to Taddeo in 1293, 47 lire gr., is the second highest known (a mysterious Anselmo (da Genoa?) is offered 50 l.gr. in 1296, also to teach and practise), while that proposed by Venice in 1321 to Bartolomeo, 40 l.gr. for a two-year contract to give medical assistance and instruction, is also exceptionally high, four or five times the average, see G. Monticolo, *I capitolari delle arti Veneziane*, Rome, 1896, doc. 148. Monticolo, doc. 90, also needs comment, as it apparently shows Bartolomeo as doctor to the count of Gorizia in early 1311, although this is probably a scribal or transcriptional error for his son, Guglielmo.

As Dr. Siraisi shows, Taddeo’s circle is important in the history of Galenism, pp. 100–106. It had a far greater knowledge of Galen than was available to Vincent of Beauvais, and made considerable use of it. Yet paradoxically, Bolognese Galenism by its success may have reduced substantially the impact of the more accurate and extensive versions of Niccolò da Reggio (fl. 1308–45). Niccolò’s largest translation, of *De usu partium*, 1317, – the alternative date, p. 101, derives from Mrs May’s attempt, *more Thadei*, to reconcile the truth with a typical slapdash error by Sarton – is not known to Taddeo’s pupils, and, indeed, his versions are never cited in their writings, with one dubious exception, a commentary on *De interioribus* [*De locis affectis*]

## Book Reviews

ascribed in the later of its two MSS. to Bartolomeo de Varignana and accepted as such by Dr. Siraisi (cf. also *Isis* 1977, pp. 33–39). In the list taken from its preface and printed as Appendix 2, the commentator describes Galen's method of dividing up the art of medicine, illustrating it with examples of individual treatises. Since he expressly notes where a tract no longer survives, it is fair to assume that he knows of the others. Almost all his examples come from early versions – there is no certain use of Pietro d'Abano's contemporary translations from the Greek, – and it is thus surprising to find a reference to the very rare *De disnia* (Kühn VII, 753–960). This was not translated into Latin before Niccolò in 1345, and if this is the book cited by the commentator, he cannot be Bartolomeo, who died c. 1321, and Dr. Siraisi's arguments from this treatise (cf. p. 449) collapse. But there is one further possibility, that the author gained his knowledge of *De disnia* from cross-references within Galen. But with one exception, they were either unknown in the medieval West or not translated before Niccolò (so *De diebus creticis*, Wellcome, MS. 286, fol. 77<sup>rb</sup>) or were given in another form (*De malo anhelitu*, *De inspiratione* [as in Pietro's version of *De marasmo*, Galen, *Opera*, 1490, sig. tt.ii<sup>ra</sup>], *De mutatione anhelitus*). However, in the version of *De locis affectis* that begins "Loca nominant" allusions to the work are in the form "*De dipsnia/disnia*" (e.g. Wellcome, MS. 286, fols. 101<sup>ra</sup>, 104<sup>ra</sup>, 106<sup>ra</sup>, 107<sup>vb</sup>). This version was known to Taddeo (and hence cannot be, as the Wellcome colophon says, by Niccolò), for he used it as the control in the MS. discussed by Dr. Siraisi on p. 102. It is just possible that the commentator derived enough information from these references to include it in his list, but since he may refer to at least two other versions by Niccolò, I prefer to jettison the evidence of a single late colophon and consider that the author, at least of the preface, had read *De disnia* after 1345 and that he was not Bartolomeo.

Even if we discount this commentary, Dr. Siraisi's study is both challenging and informative. Her first book told us a great deal about medieval Padua: her second has performed an even better service for Padua's greatest Italian medical rival.

Vivian Nutton  
Wellcome Institute

LUKE E. DEMAITRE, *Doctor Bernard de Gordon: professor and practitioner*, Toronto, Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1980, 8vo, pp xii, 236, \$18.00.

M. Demaitre is an industrious, earnest, and enthusiastic fellow. He shows this by printing a long list of primary sources (which he has *consulted*, but not read), an ample index of authors, some of whom, as the footnotes prove, he has neither consulted nor read, and an impressive catalogue of Bernard Gordon's works, eighty-three in all, most, on analysis, reducible to the *Lilium Medicine* and extrapolations from it.

As befits a man of ambition, he proposes to "present a comprehensive analysis of Bernard [Gordon's] scholarship". But, like the youth who planned to swim the Atlantic and changed his mind because the water was cold, he craves the reader's indulgence in the next sentence for not pursuing this aim. He has decided against "comparing Gordon's views with preexisting tradition or with the thought of his contemporaries" because "inherent in this purpose are certain pitfalls, of which I am apprehensively aware". So he foregoes the comprehensive analysis and exhorts us "to find comfort, with Bernard Gordon, in the opening maxim of the Hippocratic *Aphorisms*: 'Life is short, the Art long'". You can say that again, brother.

This book, therefore, is "the first instalment of a more exhaustive investigation". How he is going to carry this out without taking heroic doses of ginseng is a problem, because he intends at the same time to edit the *Lilium Medicine* and translate it into English, to edit Arnould of Villanova's *De considerationibus operis medicine*, to edit Gordon's *Tractatus ad faciendum sigilla*, to edit Gordon's instructions for adolescents, to edit the *De Tyriaca* and *De Marasmode* [sic], to make a detailed examination of Gordon's place in medical deontology, and to explore Gordon's indebtedness to the *Centiloquium* of pseudo-Ptolemy. This reviewer has forgotten the rest. But there is no doubt that, like his forbear, the Klondyke gold-digger, he is staking out his claims and warning others to keep off.

The first chapter deals with Gordon's biography, education, and teaching career at Montpellier. There is much blah-blah about what he may "conceivably", "presumably",