

philanthropic bodies such as the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial and the Commonwealth Fund in promoting this supposedly scientific study of the child (p. 9).

The book proceeds more or less chronologically, and is divided into three parts. The first, covering the period from the early 1890s to 1910, deals with topics such as G Stanley Hall and the Child Study Movement. As Smuts reminds us, at least in the early part of his career, Hall was regarded as a “bold innovator, the apostle of scientific psychology, pedagogy, and child study, the esteemed founder of a psychological laboratory, professional journals, and new institutions” (p. 42). The second section, embracing the years 1910 to 1921, discusses, *inter alia*, the founding of the US Children’s Bureau and the Iowa Child Welfare Research Station. The latter is noteworthy not least because, as the author suggests, its aim was to study “the development of normal children” and as such its establishment marked a “crucial turning point in the history of scientific child study” (pp. 117–18). The final section carries the story through the “Children’s Decade” of the 1920s and concludes with the fate of the Children’s Bureau during the early New Deal. While there is an epilogue which briefly discusses what subsequently happened to the various movements dealt with, there is no conclusion gathering together the book’s themes, which is rather disappointing.

Even so, in certain respects this is undoubtedly a highly impressive piece of work. The author has succeeded in bringing together a huge volume of material and the juxtaposing and inter-weaving of the various child study movement histories is in places extremely illuminating. The book is also clearly laid out and well-written, and for all these reasons will almost certainly serve as an important research resource and reference point for some time to come.

None the less, it does have drawbacks. Perhaps because of the volume of material involved, analysis too often gives way to narrative and description. Although the author

is clearly aware that these are not unproblematic ideas, there is no extended discussion of, for example, what might constitute the “normal” in child development, nor, indeed, of what was “scientific” about the various movements under discussion or that they might want to view themselves in this particular way. And while it is possible to see an argument for American exceptionalism, was it really the case, as Smuts claims, that there were “no counterparts in Europe for the reform-minded scientists, women social reformers, and parent-education enthusiasts who led the child study movements in this country” (p. 10), or that there were no community child guidance clinics in Europe until 1929? The educational psychologist William Boyd and the psychiatrist Emanuel Miller, just to take two British examples, were both running child guidance clinics before 1929 (and without the aid of the Commonwealth Fund) as well as contributing more generally to child study.

Ultimately, then, this is a book which provides an important starting point for further research projects rather than one which has the final word to say on the movements it so admirably describes and whose histories it so carefully narrates.

John Stewart,

Glasgow Caledonian University

Susan P Mattern, *Galen and the rhetoric of healing*, Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 2008, pp. x, 279, £36.50, \$55.00 (hardback 978-0-8018-8835-9).

This is a sprightly book, with a misleading title. It situates Galen within the agonistic culture of his day by means of a detailed investigation of the 358 or so cases mentioned in his works (to which one might add the reminiscence of the case of Pausanias at AA XV.4, and that of the philosopher at *De motibus dubiis* 7.24). The author focuses on Galen’s attempts to gain power, success, and control over his patients, whose social

status is more thoroughly described than in the earlier studies of Horstmanshoff and Gourevitch, although she reaches much the same conclusion. Her analysis of where and how Galen treated his patients is clear, and she makes many good points about the public nature of medical practice. Even a private sick room might be thronged with relatives, servants, and casual visitors. One will gain much of value for the understanding of ancient medical practice from this book, which displays a much greater sensitivity towards the historical context than does Schlangenschöningen's recent German study of Galen's life and times. Dr Mattern is also to be congratulated on not confining her search for Galenic material to what is contained in the standard edition of Kühn.

But this is also a book dominated by the catalogue of cases to the exclusion of almost all else, and much of it reads like an excellent spreadsheet, extremely valuable but missing out much that cannot easily be quantified. The preface states that the book is not about medicine, but about healing and how the act of healing is represented, a formulation that is ambiguous in many ways. If I understand Mattern aright, she is interested in the way in which Galen describes his cases for his readers, comparing his methods with those of the writers of the Gospels or the Hippocratic *Epidemics*, who also relate tales of the sick. But many subtleties escape notice, and not enough is made of the very different character of the three groups of *Epidemics*, and their diverse origins and purposes. She also compares Galen's descriptions with those on the Asclepian healing tablets, although without mentioning Gironé's wider survey of ancient healing inscriptions, or, perhaps more relevant still, Lucian's account in his *Alexander* of the healings of this false prophet. A reluctance to become involved with medicine also prevents Mattern from developing further even her good insights. Medical time, for instance, is very different in Antiquity from now: the patient's past in Galen rarely extends backwards beyond a few hours or days, and is very different from a modern patient record

that might go back years. The anonymity of patients may also have something to do with ancient methods of record keeping, as well as with the oral nature of most of Galen's presentations. How many modern doctors can recall, often after some years, the names even of their striking cases?

This is a book by an ancient historian, and it shows in a lack of attention to the actual language and text of Galen. It is not just that Tabiae, p. 55, has long been recognized as Stabiae, but very little is said, despite the title, about Galen's actual rhetoric of healing, which I would define as a strategy for convincing the patient, or the actual language used. The medical importance of conviction and trust—a major theme, especially in Galen's commentaries on the Hippocratic *Prognostic* and *Prorrhetic*—is largely left on one side. The references to the gestures of healing, a part of ancient rhetoric, are likewise under-exploited (cf. F Gaide, *Manus medica*, 2003). Galen's rhetoric, i.e. his language and his use of a variety of means to gain the patient's assent, has been remarkably little studied, although it must have contributed a great deal to his success with his patients and with subsequent generations. This book goes some of the way to explaining that success, but it still leaves much for others to do before we have a proper understanding of Galen's rhetoric of healing.

Vivian Nutton,

The Wellcome Trust Centre for the
History of Medicine at UCL

Alejandro García González (edición crítica y comentario), *Alphita*, Edizione Nazionale 'La Scuola Medica Salernitana', 2, Florence, SISMEL—Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2007, pp. xii, 608, €68.00 (paperback 978-88-8450-262-9).

Isabelle Mandrin, *Griechische und griechisch vermittelte Elemente in der Synonymenliste Alphita. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der medizinischen*