Book Reviews


The social gulf between the labouring people and the middle and lower classes in Victorian England was considerable and one of the aims of this anthology is to promote an understanding of class relationships, as important then as it is today, and to identify the turning-point between the old and the modern. The pieces chosen illustrate the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century literature created by those of the upper and middle classes who explored the world of the poor and the destitute, their historical, literary or sociological content being of special importance. More significant, however, is the state of mind and attitudes that are illuminated by these writings.

They are arranged chronologically, 1866 to 1913, and each has a brief introduction. The fourteen authors selected include C. R. Sims, Charles and William Booth, Rider Haggard, Jack London, C. F. G. Masterman, and Stephen Reynolds. There is also an introduction and a brief bibliography.

This book will be useful background reading for those researching the social history of medicine. A cheap students' version would be a valuable addition to any reading list in this field.


This popular study of the doctor-patient relationship in antiquity affords a competent summary of modern research, with occasional comments on the significance of particular ideas and practices for modern medicine. There are useful observations on the "Janus-face of the doctor" (his ability to harm or heal), the importance of the patient's belief in his cure, and the ethical influence of the Hippocratic oath; and the pages on the Methodist sect are far more sympathetic to its practical theories than most recent writers have been. But there are also curious errors: Erasistratus came from Ceos, not Cos as on p. 157; it is most unlikely that Scribonius Largus, fl. A.D. 50, was already influenced by Christian ethics, p. 207; and Julius Caesar's grant of Roman citizenship to all doctors has nothing to do with the provision of medical treatment for the army, p. 190.

A work of haute vulgarisation depends on the quality of its sources: some of them are excellent (Sigerist, Edelstein, Below, and Cohn-Haft), but there is no mention of Deichgräber's Medicus Gratusos or of Gourevitch's studies of medical deontology, Mélanges de l'École française de Rome 1969, 1970, and the account of Roman medicine is strangely unbalanced. Rufus gets only half a page, Galen not much more, and post-Galenic medicine is dismissed in a sentence, despite the concentration of its writers on practical therapy and despite their valuable descriptions of the external factors limiting their success. Like E. D. Phillips' Greek medicine, which is in many ways its English counterpart, this book has many virtues, but it lacks the historical discrimination to describe adequately the more complex relationships between doctor and patient in the Roman world, and the necessary stamina to cope with the bulk of the Galenic corpus.
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