

DIVISION OF THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

PASADENA, CALIFORNIA 91125

TROTULA, WOMEN'S PROBLEMS, AND THE PROFESSIONALIZATION
OF MEDICINE IN THE MIDDLE AGES

John F. Benton



HUMANITIES WORKING PAPER 98

© John F. Benton December 1983

Revised November 1984

ABSTRACT

The professionalization of medicine in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries led to an exclusion of women practitioners from the best paid and most respected medical positions. Male doctors controlled the teaching and theory of women's medicine, and their gynecological literature incorporated male experience, understanding and learning. The treatises attributed to Trotula, which survive in nearly 100 manuscripts, were the most popular texts used by academic physicians in the later Middle Ages.

Although Georg Kraut's Strassburg edition of 1544 treats the treatises of "Trotula" as a single, unified work, three separate texts circulated in the Middle Ages, and on stylistic and other grounds it is likely that each was written by a different author. Reasonably solid evidence demonstrates the existence of a woman physician at Salerno named Trota or Trotula, but she was not a magistra (as is often asserted), and it seems that she did not write even one of the three texts attributed to her. Instead, she produced a Practica from which extracts appear in a Practica secundum Trotam, which survives as a single manuscript in Madrid, and in De aegritudinum curatione in the Wrocław (Breslau) Codex Salernitanus.

This paper is to be published by the Bulletin of the History of Medicine in 1985.

TROTULA, WOMEN'S PROBLEMS, AND THE PROFESSIONALIZATION OF MEDICINE
IN THE MIDDLE AGES

John F. Benton

In the course of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries the practice of medicine in the Christian West moved from a skill to a profession, with academic training based on authoritative learned literature, with degrees and licenses, and with sanctions against those who practiced medicine without a license. Traditional folk remedies continued to be used, of course, and the actual delivery of babies was exclusively the domain of midwives and female attendants, but increasingly the health-care of well-to-do women was supervised by academically trained physicians. The universities did not, of course, produce enough graduates to fill the medical marketplace, but medical schools nevertheless provided the standards and the concepts which determined the nature of professional practice. Since they were excluded from university education, women were thereby barred from the formal study of medicine and from professorial positions, as well as from the most lucrative medical practice. There were, naturally enough, regional variations in this development, and these generalizations apply more completely in northern Europe than in the south, particularly southern Italy and Spain.

Once universities had been granted a role in medical licensing, female practitioners could easily be prosecuted as charlatans, and though women provided most of the direct, bedside care of other women, it was to male physicians that wealthy couples turned for consultation on such matters as sterility or care during pregnancy. The theoretical understanding and scientific investigation of women's medicine was therefore a near monopoly of men. Overwhelmingly, the gynecological literature of medieval Europe was written for a male medical audience and was a product of the way men understood women's bodies, functions, illnesses, needs and desires. For those women who could afford professional medical care, the most fundamental questions of their health and illness were defined by men.¹

The process I have just described as occurring in the Middle Ages was repeated in the United States with remarkable consistency in the early twentieth century, as the country altered its rural and frontier medical practices and incorporated its new immigrants. At the beginning of the century the ratio of physicians to total population was three times what it is now, and many physicians were products of unaccredited medical schools. Midwives delivered approximately half the babies born in the early years of the century, and women were extensively involved in non-professional health-care for their families and neighbors. Women were excluded from many medical schools and were discriminated against in others, so that in 1900 only 5 percent of the students in regular medical schools were women, though 17 percent of those in homeopathic schools were female.

In the light of these facts, it can be seen that the early twentieth-century campaigns against midwives and for "regular" professional medicine practiced by licensed medical school graduates worked against any significant role for women in medicine except nursing, and even obstetrics and gynecology became overwhelmingly male domains. Today, while the percentage of women students in medical school is now approaching 30 percent, still only 12 percent of board-certified gynecologists and obstetricians are women. In the United States as elsewhere the professionalization of medicine has meant that the scientific investigation and treatment of women's bodies has been largely in the hands of men.²

I have cited this modern experience not simply as an example of a "structural regularity in history" but because it is difficult to understand much of the secondary literature on the legendary figure of Trotula without appreciating the social context in which historians have written about women in medicine.

Two questions have long dominated discussions about Trotula: did a medieval female physician named Trota or Trotula really exist, and if so, did she write the widely distributed gynecological treatises attributed to her? In this paper I hope not only to answer, but to go beyond, these long-standing questions. If a re-examination is now appropriate, it is in good part because the intellectual and social climate has been changed by notable women like those with whom I am about to differ.

The modern history of Trotula was shaped by Kate Campbell Hurd-

Mead, who took her medical degree at the Women's Medical College of Pennsylvania in 1888. A gynecologist and president of the American Medical Women's Association, she published an article on "Trotula" in Isis in 1930 and devoted a major chapter to her in A History of Women in Medicine from the Earliest Times to the Beginning of the Nineteenth Century, which she published in 1938. Dr. Mead made a founding heroine of Trotula, whom she called "the most noted woman doctor of the Middle Ages": "To any woman doctor of the twentieth century . . . there would seem to be no good reason for denying that a book having such decidedly feminine touches as Trotula's was written by a woman. It bears the gentle hand of a woman doctor on every page."³

Dr. Mead's work inspired Elisabeth Mason-Hohl, a Los Angeles surgeon, who in 1940 delivered her presidential address to the American Medical Women's Association on "Trotula: Eleventh-Century Gynecologist" and in the same year published a translation into English of most of the work attributed to her.⁴ With such eminent sponsorship as this, there is little wonder that Trotula is one of the honored guests in Judy Chicago's feminist work of art, The Dinner Party.

In the later Middle Ages the most popular treatises on the diseases, medical problems and cosmetics of women were attributed to an author generally known as Trotula. Commonly two treatises were distinguished, known as the Greater Trotula or Trotula major and the Lesser Trotula or Trotula minor, but the situation is more complex than that, for three different units were presented under these names. One tract, beginning Cum auctor, is concerned exclusively with medical

matters and is often called Trotula major. The authorities cited in this work include Galen, Hippocrates, Oribasius, Dioscorides, Paulus, and "Justinus."⁵ A second tract, beginning Ut de curis, is largely concerned with medicine, though it includes a good deal of cosmetic information too. It repeats a number of topics treated in Cum auctor and cites no ancient authorities, but refers to Copho of Salerno, Magister Ferrarius (the name of a family of physicians at Salerno in the twelfth century), the women of Salerno, and Trota or Trotula herself. Both treatises deal predominantly, but not exclusively, with medical matters concerning women. A third tract, called De ornatu, deals almost exclusively with cosmetics, beauty aids, dentifrices, depilatories, body odor and so on; it cites no authorities except unnamed "women of Salerno" or "Saracen women." Ut de curis and De ornatu are often lumped together in the manuscripts as Trotula minor. Other manuscripts present all three tracts together as a single, undifferentiated work, and manuscripts of this type appear as early as the second quarter of the thirteenth century.⁶

The contents of these treatises shows that all three were either written at Salerno, the most important center for the introduction of Arabic medicine (and therefore Galenism) into Western Europe, or under the influence of Salernitan masters. A survey of the existing manuscripts suggests two further things about their origins. In the first place, no manuscript of any of these texts has been discovered which can be dated much before 1200, a fact which speaks strongly though not conclusively against composition before the latter part of

the twelfth century. Secondly, in some of the earliest manuscripts the three tracts appear separately from each other, and commonly anonymously, indicating that they were not thought to have a common author, or even any identifiable author.

In one of the two earliest manuscripts of any of these texts I have studied, which on paleographic grounds may be attributed to the early thirteenth century (or possibly the very end of the twelfth century), Cum auctor appears with De ornatu but without Ut de curis. This manuscript, from southern France, is headed Liber de sinthomatibus mulierum and does not mention Trotula in either its text or rubrics.⁷ Another manuscript of approximately the same date contains Ut de curis without the other two texts; this is the earliest manuscript of these texts I have seen which contains the name of Trotula in its rubrics.⁸ In a manuscript of the second quarter of the thirteenth century which once belonged to Richard de Fournival, Ut de curis is followed directly by De ornatu, creating the usual form of Trotula minor, but Cum auctor does not appear at all.⁹ In some ten manuscripts De ornatu appears without the other two treatises. The origins of these three texts are to be found in the separateness of their manuscript histories, not in their eventual unity.

Stylistically Cum auctor differs so markedly from Ut de curis that I conclude they had different authors. For instance, in Ut de curis twenty-five sentences begin with the word Sunt (Sunt quedam mulieres, Sunt quedam, Sunt et alie, etc.), while in Cum auctor no sentence uses this construction. The third treatise, De ornatu, begins with a

preface, Ut ait Ypocras, followed by the main text, Ut mulier levissima et planissima. While the first two tracts always use the first-person plural, this treatise occasionally uses the first-person singular and in its original form addresses a female audience directly; it seems to me clear that it was written by a different author from either of the first two. This author, in fact, refers to himself as a man. The introduction which normally begins De ornatu when it appears with other texts is an abbreviated variant of the prologue to the independent treatise which survives in a mid-thirteenth century manuscript from southern France as well as in later manuscripts. In this prologue the author or compiler refers to himself in the masculine gender, quotes Persius, and says he is publishing his work because women have many times asked him for advice on beauty aids. The rubric of one fifteenth-century manuscript identifies the author as "Ricardus medicus expertus," perhaps meaning Ricardus Anglicus, sometimes known as Richard of Salerno.¹⁰ The edited prologue follows in an appendix.

Most manuscripts of the three tracts make no distinction of authorship. In their rubrics the scribes commonly attribute the texts to "Trotula" or "Trota," treat the author as a woman, and sometimes identify her as a "healer from Salerno" (sanatrix Salernitana) or something of the sort. Such information shows us what scribes believed to be the case, but rubrics are a notoriously poor source of biographical information. In the sixteenth century the situation became even more muddled, for the editor of the editio princeps, Gebrg Kraut, created a single work from the three medieval treatises at his

disposal, rearranging material from Cum auctor, Ut de curis and De Ornatu under chapter headings he thought appropriate.¹¹ Practically all of the material which appears in the manuscripts is in the printed text, but in an arrangement of Kraut's creation. He thereby obliterated the stylistic distinctions in the material and for centuries confused readers, who thought they were reading a unified work by a single author. All later editions followed or indeed pirated Kraut's edition of 1544, to which he gave the title De passionibus mulierum or The Diseases of Women.

The Trotula texts were extremely popular in the thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth centuries; in fact, separately or together they became the most widely circulated medical work on gynecology and women's problems. I am aware of nearly one hundred extant manuscripts containing one or (usually) more of these three texts, and there are doubtless others to be found. A Latin verse translation was written in the thirteenth century, an Irish translation in the fourteenth, and in the fifteenth century works attributed to Trotula were translated or rewritten into French (both prose and verse translations), English, German, Flemish and Catalan.¹² By the end of the thirteenth century the name of Trotula had become famous. In the Dict de l'Herberie of Rutebeuf, a medical charlatan making his spiel tells his audience that he has been sent by "ma dame Trote de Salerne," "the wisest woman in the whole world."¹³ Chaucer put her in distinguished company as one of the authors included along with Tertullian, Heloise, Ovid, Chrysippus, and Solomon in the "book of wikked wyves" from which the Wife of Bath's

fifth husband used to read.¹⁴

No one seems to have doubted that the works attributed to Trotula were written by a woman until 1566, when Hans Kaspar Wolf of Basel in his edition declared that De passionibus mulierum was the work of Eros Juliae, a Roman freedman of the first century A.D.¹⁵ This particular bit of unsupported nonsense was the first salvo in a continuing attack on Trotula's existence, or at least on her gender. Wolf's position has been frequently criticized, however, and historians of medicine have regularly included her in lists of women physicians.

Today the question of Trotula's identity remains a subject of controversy, with three major positions being championed. The first and most widely repeated is that Trotula is a well-documented historical figure who lived in the eleventh century and who is sometimes cited as a member of the faculty of the medical school of Salerno or the first woman professor of medicine. According to the retrospective World Who's Who in Science, she came from the Ruggiero family of Salerno, was born about 1050, and was married to a physician named Joannes Platearius.¹⁶ Other authors say that she flourished around 1050, rather than being born then. Sometimes we are told that she died in 1097, and Mason-Hohl adds that she was followed to her grave by a funeral procession two miles long. One could hardly ask for more precise identification, if in fact these statements are based on solid evidence.

The second position, advanced by Conrad Hiersemann, a student of the great German historian of medicine, Karl Sudhoff, is that there was

an eleventh or twelfth-century physician and author with a name like Trotula, but this author was in fact a man named Trottus. This position is based on a famous manuscript of Salernitan medical texts, once in Wrocław (Breslau) and now apparently destroyed, in which passages from an otherwise unknown author are identified by abbreviations such as Tt and most particularly Trot, followed by abbreviation marks which Hiersemann interpreted as representing the masculine -us ending.¹⁷

The third position, recently brought forward by Professor Beryl Rowland, is that the name Trotula is not that of a real person but is related to the French verb trotter, to run about (as in the proverb besoin fait vieille trotter), and is echoed in the names of Trota-conventos, the old procuress in the Libro de Buen Amor of Juan Ruiz, and of the Dame Trot of English nursery rhymes.

The widespread use of the word "Trot" and its associations with expertise in feminine matters may explain why a number of manuscripts variously treating of women's diseases came to be ascribed to her. Although women doctors certainly did exist in the Middle Ages, there appears to be no firm evidence that Trotula was one of them. . . . My own findings do not add another proverbial nail; they tend to deprive her even of her coffin.¹⁸

Here I will argue that there is something wrong with all three of these positions. First of all, I have to say that the commonly presented biography of an eleventh-century Trotula is a tissue of ill-founded assertions created largely by enthusiastic amateurs and local

historians.

With respect to the statement that Trotula came from the Ruggiero family of Salerno, I can find no author who cites a scrap of medieval evidence. The idea may have been based on the assumption that since the Ruggiero family was extremely important, Trotula should have come from it and therefore did. As far as I have been able to determine, the first person to assert that Trotula was a Ruggiero was Enrico or Heinrich Baccus, a German printer in Naples in the early seventeenth century, who wrote a Nuova descrizione del regno di Napoli (Naples, 1629). In his list of the leading people produced by Salerno he included "Trotta or Trottole di Ruggiero, who wrote a book concerning the diseases of women (de morbis mulierum) and another on the composition of medicines (de compositione medicamentorum)."¹⁹ This unsupported assertion by Baccus probably lies behind a similar statement made in 1817 by Fr. Nicolà Columella Onorati in a biographical dictionary of illustrious men of the kingdom of Naples. Columella Onorati needed no more evidence than a hand-written note in his personal copy of the Diseases of Women which identified the author as "Trottula of the Roggeri family of Salerno, distinguished equally for its antiquity and its nobility."²⁰ And so it has gone, with assertions repeated until they became accepted as unquestioned fact.

As for the idea that Trotula was the mother of Matthaëus Platearius (supposedly the author of a twelfth-century herbal named Circa instans), and therefore the wife of Joannes Platearius, this was

a conjecture, clearly labeled as such, of that prolific but unreliable nineteenth-century historian of the medical school of Salerno, Salvatore De Renzi. De Renzi noted that Circa instans (as printed) refers to the mother of Mattheus and Joannes Platearius as a physician, and assuming that it was unlikely that there would have been two distinguished women physicians in Salerno at the same time, concluded that Trotula and the mother of the Platearius brothers were probably the same person. That supposition could bear no weight unless it was buttressed by other evidence (which it has not been), and it would have no force at all unless it seemed likely that Trotula lived at the same time as the wife of Joannes Platearius. De Renzi, I should add, did not consider that Trotula, in his opinion surely author of the "Trot" selections in the Wrocław Codex Salernitanus, was also the author of the Trotula major and minor. Those works he considered compilations made by someone about 1200 who used the work of an eleventh-century physician named Trotula.²¹ My point here is not that De Renzi was wrong or that his statements are inherently improbable, but that his assertions were not supported by solid evidence. As we shall see, his conclusion that "Trot" was a female physician of the period of Hochsalerno and that the "Trotula" treatises were written around 1200 is probably correct.

And so we come to the third alleged biographical datum, the assertion that Trotula lived in the eleventh century, in fact, in the mid-eleventh century. This idea stems from a passage in the Ecclesiastical History of Ordericus Vitalis, who reports that Ralph

Mala-Corona, a worldly cleric and skilled physician, visited Salerno sometime before 1050 and "found no one there as learned as he in the art of medicine except a certain learned woman" (sapiens matrona).²² Again, the principle of economy has been applied. How many learned women can there have been at Salerno? Knowing the name of but one, historians have assumed without supporting evidence that this sapiens matrona was Trotula. And once one felt confident, however unjustifiably, that Trotula lived in the eleventh century, one could then build on this assumption. De Renzi cited as an example of the appearance of the name "Trota" in the eleventh century a reference to an act of 1097 in which Roger (Ruggiero), lord of Castello di Montuori, made a donation to the monastery of Cava, releasing the usufruct of his mother Trotta.²³ Mead repeats the reference, adding that Trotta "may have died the same year."²⁴ This statement in turn appears to be the basis for Mason-Hohl's assertion that Trotula died in 1097. For her colorful detail about the funeral procession two miles long, I can find no evidence whatsoever.

As for the third position, that there never was a female physician named Trotula or Trota and that her myth was a response to the semantic pull of the word trot and in association with the traditional figure of the Old Whore who appears in Ovid, the Roman de la Rose, etc., this view seems to me quite unnecessary, since it ignores the evidence for the existence of an actual person named Trota or Trotula. Let us now see what we can learn about such a person from reasonably solid evidence.

First of all, the woman's name "Trota" was common in Southern Italy and specifically in Salerno in the period which interests us.²⁵ The membership rolls of the confraternity of the cathedral of Salerno from the eleventh to the thirteenth century contain references to some seventy women named Trota or Trocta.²⁶ None of these women, alas, was named as a physician or as the wife of one, though another woman, Berdefolia, was identified as a physician or medica.²⁷ The obituary rolls also mention a man with the intriguing family name of Trotulus.²⁸ Trotula as a diminutive means "little Trota," "dear Trota" or even "old Trota"; moreover, the form could be used in creating a book title, a point to which we shall return. Given the frequent use of the name Trota, we should not be surprised to find that the physician who interests us bore that name, and there is no reason to think that it is derived from the verb for "trot." In fact, references to Old Trot, etc. may well receive some of their force from the existence of the Trotula texts.

What evidence is there for the existence of a woman physician named Trota or Trotula? The one reasonably solid piece of evidence on which attention has focused up to now appears in Ut de curis. In the form of this text given in the two oldest manuscripts known to me, this treatise tells us how a physician named Trota made her reputation. An unnamed girl was supposed to be "cut," we are told, because of misdiagnosed wind or gas in the uterus. "Hence it came about that Trota was called -- so to speak -- a female master (Unde contingit quod Trota vocata fuit tanquam magistra)"; she took the girl into her home,

treated her with a bath in which mallows and pellitory had been cooked and with a plaster made of radish juice and milled barley, and this cured her.²⁹ The same story appears in two manuscripts of the second and third quarters of the thirteenth century, where the physician is named "Domina Trotula" and we are told that she was called "quasi magistra" -- "as if she were a female master." ³⁰

The point of this story is, of course, that a woman effected a gynecological success not achieved by men. It is evidence of Trota's reputation, but it also reveals how unusual her situation was. Magistra, a feminine form of magister, is an unexpected word in a medical context, perhaps even a neologism, and tanquam calls attention to its rarity; as one dictionary tells us, tanquam is "used to introduce the application of a term to something which is not properly so called."³¹ In other words, a woman was not properly a master, but Trota's reputation was so great that an unusual term had to be created to express her situation as a female near-equivalent to men who held that position.

From this anecdote we may turn back to the now lost Wrocław codex, which on paleographic grounds can be dated about 1200. This manuscript contained an extremely important compendium of extracts called De aegritudinum curatione, made up of the work of a group of well-known Salernitan masters named in rubrics and marginal annotations, Joannes Afflacijs, Copho, Petrocellus, Platearius (whichever member of the family wrote the Practica brevis, which is excerpted here), Bartholomeus and Ferrarius, plus a series of extracts attributed to an

author designated in the rubrics as "Trot´," "Tt," or some similar form. In addition, many passages bear no indication of authorship; some have been shown to come from the Viaticum of Constantine. Conrad Hiersemann, who prepared a careful edition of the extracts labeled "Trot´," pointed out that there is no correspondence between the remedies attributed to "Trot´" and those in the Trotula texts known to him, and that except for one prescription for vomiting to induce a woman to expel a still-born fetus, none of the extracts labeled "Trot´" has anything to do with gynecology, obstetrics or the specific interests of women. This observation provides a form of negative support for his conclusion that the Trot´ of the Wrocław codex should be considered a male physician.³²

On the basis of these extracts Hiersemann concluded that the therapy advocated here was never "senseless" and that the author was a "skilled practitioner who practiced scarification, phlebotomy and physical medicine lege artis." He also noted one curious distinction in the labeling of these extracts.³³ When the scribe of the Wrocław manuscript identified his selected passages with abbreviated names entered in the margin, usually these names were preceded by the initial M, meaning magister. Thus we have "M.J.A." for "magister Joannes Afflacijs," "M. Plat´" for "magister Platearius," "M. Bart´" for "magister Bartolomeus." Once or twice the M was omitted, but in practically every case it was there. But for one set of entries an M never appeared, and that was for "Trot´". If we are to judge from this consistent practice in De aegritudinum curatione, "Trot´," whoever she

or he was, was not a master.

Up to this point, then, the only evidence historians have had testifying to the existence of an actual practitioner named Trota or Trotula or anything of the sort is the passage in Ut de curis about Trota acting tanquam or quasi magistra and the ambiguous Wrocław manuscript. To this material can now be added a previously unnoticed text. It appears in a manuscript, now in Madrid, which was written by a northern French or English scribe about 1200. The Madrid manuscript is therefore contemporary with the Wrocław codex and with the oldest manuscripts which contain Cum auctor or Ut de curis.

The Madrid manuscript is an easily portable physician's handbook containing a collection of Salernitan medical texts, including several translations by Constantine the African and a treatise by Johannes de Sancto Paulo, a Salernitan physician and author whose work also appeared in the Wrocław manuscript;³⁴ it closes with a work identified in the margin in the scribe's hand as Practica secundum Trotam and in its later (early thirteenth-century) rubric as Practica secundum Trotulam. This treatise begins "According to Trota in order to bring on menstruation when a woman cannot conceive because of its retention" (Secundum Trotam ad menstrua provocanda quorum retentione mulier concipere non potest) and continues for four folios with remedies and medical advice concerning gynecology, the care of children, beauty, and a large number of topics which concern men as well as women, such as vomiting, insanity, scrofula, piles and snake-bite. In a number of the chapters the masculine gender is used to refer to the patient.³⁵

The most remarkable feature of this text is that almost half of the material which appears in the Practica secundum Trotam is also to be found in De aegritudinum curatione. Two of these chapters are in paragraphs which were labeled "Trot'" in the Wrocław codex. With one exception, the others appear in sections where no author was given, or appear at the end of chapters, after the work of a named author has ended. A comparison of the two texts makes it clear that a large amount of the anonymous matter in De aegritudinum curatione is by the author of the Madrid Practica. Much of this previously anonymous material is specifically concerned with women and appears under such headings as "Ad menstrua restringenda," "De purgatione mulieris post partum," and "De albificanda facie." Hiersemann's most convincing non-paleographic reason for concluding that "Trot'" was male is therefore eliminated.³⁶

A full discussion of the nature of the Practica secundum Trotam and its relationship to De aegritudinum curatione must await the publication of the new text. On the basis of the comparison I have made, it seems safe to say at this point that since the "Trot'" selections in the Wrocław manuscript and the text in the Madrid manuscript both contain identical passages and yet each contains chapters not in the other manuscript, both were drawn from a larger work, a "Practica" similar in its form to those of Platearius and Bartholomeus. The Madrid manuscript is quite explicit in attributing this work to a woman, Trota, whose name is twice spelled out in full.

The scribe of the Wrocław manuscript always abbreviated this name,

but I am not convinced that his abbreviation indicates that he thought the author was a man, and it seems to me likely that Hiersemann was mistaken in interpreting the abbreviation as a masculine -us ending. Hiersemann describes the mark which interests us as "sometimes a comma, sometimes a flourish, sometimes a line." I suggest that it is a simple mark of suspension, a common scribal practice to indicate that a familiar name had not been completed, just as the same scribe wrote "Plat~" for Platearius, "Petro~" for Petrocellus, "Ferr~" for Ferrarius, etc.³⁷ Hiersemann made the mistake of concentrating on the abbreviation of one name alone, rather than taking account of the scribe's abbreviation of other names, and he was probably influenced by finding no passage marked "Trot~" which showed a particular concern for women's medicine or appeared in the treatises attributed to Trotula. Faced with the evidence of the Madrid text, the abbreviation used in the Wrocław manuscript does not constitute a sufficient reason to argue that "Trot~" was male.

Three chapters of the Practica secundum Trotam provide a problem of attribution. These chapters (De conceptu, De matricis humiditate, and De vicio viri) appear in De aegritudinum curatione as one long chapter ascribed to "M[agister] C[opho]." Stylistically this material differs from the other chapters in the Practica secundum Trotam; it is more fully developed and theoretical, and it uses the verb precipere three or four times, a word which does not appear elsewhere in Trota's chapters. Since the Practica of Copho has not survived, the attribution of the Wrocław manuscript cannot be verified, but it seems

reasonable to assume that either Trota or the author of the Madrid summary of her work borrowed this material from Copho.³⁸ These same three chapters appear as the final three chapters in most manuscripts of Cum auctor. Since the author of Cum auctor shows no other evidence of familiarity with the Practica secundum Trotam, it seems to me likely that these chapters were borrowed from Copho rather than from Trota. The authors or compilers of the three "Trotula" treatises drew upon a number of earlier works, but there is no compelling evidence that the Practica secundum Trotam was one of them.³⁹

On the whole, the remedies prescribed in the Practica secundum Trotam differ from those in the three texts attributed to Trotula which we have considered earlier. When the subject matter in the Practica is the same as that in one of the three other treatises, it commonly is less complex and differs in the materia medica prescribed, and when the remedies are reasonably close, there is still a distinct difference in wording which suggests the independent repetition of a common prescription. Cum auctor and Ut de curis are both far more systematic and fully developed gynecological works; they present a more "learned" level of academic medicine than the Practica, which on the whole seems to represent the traditions of empirics and midwives.

It is the evidence of the Madrid manuscript which will allow us for the first time to write with some confidence about Trota as an historical figure in the history of medicine. Rather than citing that text in further detail, here I will only summarize the more general conclusions I have reached from reading the available material. I

begin with the evidence that in the eleventh and twelfth centuries there were a number of women healers in Salerno, the frequently cited mulieres Salernitane, and that some of them were distinguished for their medical skill. We have already met Berdefolia medica; Ordericus Vitalis tells us of an eleventh-century sapiens matrona who greatly impressed Ralph Mala-Corona, a noted physician in his own land; Matthaeus Platearius cites his mother as a physician, and we have no reason to think that these references are all to the same person or that they are in any way exhaustive. The methodological error of De Renzi -- and even more obviously of others who have gone beyond his lead -- was to assume that the scattered evidence which has survived from the past was produced by a very limited cast of characters, so that a fact here and a reference there can all be used to write a biographical sketch, without the necessity of a close demonstration of the relationship of the different parts.

The texts of the Practica secundum Trotam and the "Trot'" sections of De aegritudinum curatione together establish that Trota produced a larger Practica, which is now lost. She very likely was, as Hiersemann said of his masculine "Trottus," a skilled and sensible physician, but the missing M in the Wrocław manuscript suggests that she was not accorded the title of master. Since her Practica shows some influence from the work of Constantine and incorporates chapters from Copho, she may be considered to have been active in the twelfth rather than in the eleventh century; indeed, she may still have been alive at the end of the twelfth century when the Madrid and Wrocław manuscripts were

written. Though her work was obviously valued at that time, as those two manuscripts (as well as the reference in Ut de curis) show, it was apparently not copied in later centuries and was replaced by more learned, complex and theoretical medicine.

Two pieces of evidence, each uncertain, suggest a relationship between Trota and Johannes Furius, a little-known physician who probably lived in the twelfth century. In a section on the care of the eyes in De aegritudinum curatione which Hiersemann prints as the work of "Trot'," there is a reference to a cure used for fifteen years by Johannes Furius. This is the only reference to a contemporary in any passages attributed to Trota, and if it is indeed hers, it could help to date her work.⁴⁰ Johannes Furius is cited in the "German Bartholomeus," a macaronic German-Latin medical work which has preserved traces of material no longer extant in Latin. Several manuscripts contain a recipe for a depilatory which Johannes Furius is said to have sent to "his friend, called Cleopatra." What makes this reference intriguing is that the recipe is a German version of one which appears in Latin in the Practica secundum Trotam.⁴¹ With this text in mind one wonders if Johannes and Trota were in fact colleagues and if she was known familiarly by the name claimed by the author of a late antique or early medieval work on gynecology which was attributed to Cleopatra, medica reginarum.

The texts which can be attributed to Trota with reasonable security strongly suggest that she did not write the three widely circulated treatises which have so long been attributed to her. These

treatises are difficult to date more precisely than to sometime in the twelfth century, or possibly very early in the thirteenth. As stated before, the earliest manuscripts were probably written at the beginning of the thirteenth century, or just possibly in the closing years of the twelfth. Cum auctor draws heavily on the work of Constantine, the reference to Ferrarius shows that Ut de curis must have been written after the beginning of the twelfth century, and De ornatu quotes from the preface to Hippocrates' Prognostica in the translation attributed to Constantine and given wide circulation by its inclusion in the Articella. It seems to me likely that all three works were composed not long before the time of the earliest existing manuscripts, that is, in the late twelfth century, or possibly at the very beginning of the thirteenth. No manuscripts have been found from the early or mid-twelfth century, and I have found no reference to these treatises in twelfth-century library catalogues.⁴² Moreover, no author before the thirteenth century cites "Trotula" or quotes from these texts. For example, Bernard of Provence, who wrote at the end of the twelfth century, cites the mulieres Salernitane more than a dozen times, without ever mentioning the name of Trotula, and the recipes he attributes to these women are quite different from those which appear in the treatises.⁴³

There may be some significance in the fact that one of the earliest manuscripts seems to come from southern France. Salerno was sacked by Emperor Henry VI in 1194 and in the thirteenth century the university appears to have been in a period of decline. Both

Montpellier and Paris benefited from the decline of the Italian city as a center for medical education. It would be plausible to imagine that Salernitan masters or students brought these works with them to Montpellier or produced them there, and that from Montpellier they made their way to northern France and to England, the center of their greatest popularity and diffusion in the thirteenth century.⁴⁴

The authors of these three treatises were probably men. Since men controlled the academic medicine of the time, this supposition is a natural one, and it is supported by some evidence in the texts themselves. Though in late manuscripts adjectives referring to the author in the preface to Cum auctor use feminine endings, in the earliest manuscripts that preface is written without any grammatical indication of the gender of the author. The distancing implicit in the way the author writes about their diseases (suarum, earum, in eis) and says that the treatise was composed "largely at the request of a certain woman" (maxime cuiusdam mulieris gratia) suggests to me that the author was male, though these points are hardly conclusive. This author has little to say about childbirth itself and comments that it had been concealed from him how the empirical remedies used by midwives (such as a magnet held in the right hand) actually work.⁴⁵ If this tract was indeed written by a woman, I can find nothing in the text to indicate it. The longer, original form of the prologue to De ornatu shows that the author or compiler of this treatise was a man. Though it de curis contains no specific phrasing indicating the gender of the author, the fact that Trota was cited in the third person does imply

that she was not the author of the tract.

If Trota was not the author, how did these treatises come to bear her name? In his editio princeps Georg Kraut noted his belief that the treatise was called Trotula because her name appeared in the text.⁴⁶ On this basis, however, Ut de curis could as well have been named after the better documented Copho or Ferrarius, and one must remember as well that eventually Trotula major and Trotula minor came to be applied to all three texts, though only one mentions the name of Trota.

"Trota" is the name used in the text of the Madrid Practica, and it is apparently the form originally used in the anecdote in Ut de curis; "Trotula" is the form used with overwhelming frequency by the scribes and rubricators who wrote the headings and explicits of the Trotula texts. It was common practice to form book titles in this fashion, so that the Summa of Angelus Carletti was known as the Angelica, that of Roland of Parma as the Rolandina, etc. One early thirteenth-century manuscript makes it clear that Trotula is the name of the work through its rubric: "Summa que dicitur Trotula."⁴⁷ Though the evidence is sparse and subject to dispute, it appears that the name of a real twelfth-century author, Trota, was applied to a set of texts, the Trotula major and minor, in the thirteenth, and that by a process of back formation, the diminutive Trotula was then thought to be the proper name of the author.

The evidence of the manuscripts suggests that the name given to these texts was not a simple accident produced by the presence of the name Trota in Ut de curis. When these three texts devoted to women's

medicine were brought together early in the thirteenth century and the gender-specific prologue to De ornatu was dropped in the compilation, it is not unreasonable to conclude that they were deliberately labeled with the name of the best known female physician of the previous century in order to give them greater credibility or acceptance.

Though they bear the name of a female author, I must say that throughout these three treatises I see no evidence of "the gentle hand of a woman" or that the medicine prescribed, as another writer has said, is "remarkable for its humanity."⁴⁸ The major sources of Cum auctor are the Viaticum and Pantegni of Constantine, and as we have seen, some material was probably borrowed from Copho; other medical treatments advocated here are similar to those one finds in the work of male doctors such as Platearius and Bartholomeus. The heavy baggage of Galenic theory, which treats women as "imperfect" and deficient in "innate heat" when compared with men, provides a conceptual frame of mind absent from the simple, non-theoretical treatment of the Practica de Trota.⁴⁹ In Cum auctor and Ut de curis bleeding is prescribed for such conditions as excessive menstruation, and in this respect those treatises differ significantly from the Practica secundum Trotam, where bleeding is not prescribed for any gynecological problem. As had been advocated since the time of the ancient Egyptians, in the Trotula major and minor (and in the work of Trota) the womb is to be moved about by subfumigation, that is, having the patient sit over the smoke of sweet or foul-smelling substances. Poultices of various sorts of dung, cupping on the groin or pubis, and pessaries and douches made of such

substances as pitch, honey, weasel oil, nutmeg and cloves are frequently advocated. As far as I can tell, with a few exceptions it would be a coincidence if a remedy prescribed here did some good, and many were unpleasant or even harmful.

Academic medicine may even have been more harmful than the empiric practices of Salernitan herbalists, since it was more influenced by theory and farther removed from its practical roots by reliance on classroom instruction and the written treatise. To the degree that the mulieres Salernitane were skilled in herbal medicine and were the source of treatments advocated in these treatises, their "traditional" and occasionally effective medicine, tested by experience, was deformed and sometimes rendered dangerous by the process of literate transmission by academic physicians and professional scribes writing for an equally academic audience. Surely the best way to learn herbal medicine was from direct instruction. In manuscripts the symbols for ounces, drams, and scruples were confused with careless abandon (thus at times leading to the recommendation of massive overdosing with powerful herbs) and errors in transcription were common. In the copying of these texts, for example, through a misreading fisalidos was transformed into siseleos, directing later doctors, if they followed their instructions, to prescribe mountain brook-willow rather than drop-wort, a mistake which could not be made by herbalists working directly with the plants.⁵⁰

At the beginning of this paper I said that learned medieval works on gynecology were largely written for men and contained the ideas of

male physicians. Cum auctor and Ut de curis were written specifically for an audience of other physicians, and that audience was overwhelmingly male. The man who wrote De ornatu says in his prologue that he composed the work because women had often asked him for advice. He intended that treatise, which by our standards is only marginally medical, for a female audience. In its original form, recorded in the manuscripts which contain the long version of the prologue, the author addresses a female reader directly with such phrases as "ut sudes" and "ablus te optime," but in the text which became standard these second-person forms were changed to the third person.⁵¹ The readers of all three treatises were normally male, for these Latin texts circulated with other works used by medical school graduates, and the owners which have been positively identified were men or (usually) male institutions. In the fifteenth century when vernacular gynecological and obstetrical treatises were written with an audience of women in mind, we find that some of these new texts differ from the Latin Trotula and pay more attention to the practical obstetrical problems which concerned female practitioners.⁵²

A striking feature of the three treatises which have traditionally been attributed to Trotula is that they were so frequently copied and so widely disseminated. The existence today of nearly one hundred manuscripts shows that they became the standard gynecological texts of the late medieval medical profession, though I can find no evidence that they were assigned as school texts in any university. Indeed, the multiple reprintings of the sixteenth century demonstrate the continued

importance of the works into the early modern period. Though a few of the earliest manuscripts are anonymous, later copyists, owners and readers assumed that they were dealing with texts written by someone named Trotula or Trota, and until Wolf's misguided and unconvincing attribution, no one doubted that these treatises were written by a woman. Trotula was, moreover, cited as an authority by such medical writers as Peter of Spain, better known as Pope John XXI.

This authoritative use of treatises ascribed to a woman occurred at the very time that licensed women physicians were incredible rarities and university masters were prosecuting women for practicing medicine without a license. For example, in 1322 the masters of the Parisian medical faculty argued successfully that just as a woman was disbarred because of her sex from practicing law or testifying in a criminal case, there was all the more reason that she could be prohibited by law from the practice of medicine, "since she does not know through the letter or art of medicine the cause of the illness of the ill."⁵³ English physicians wanted a blanket prohibition against women in their field and in 1422 petitioned Parliament requesting the enactment of a statute which would bar men from practicing medicine without a university degree, under pain of imprisonment and a fine of 40 pounds, and would insure "that no Woman use the practyse of Fisyk undre the same peyne."⁵⁴

How did treatises attributed to a female author become accepted and widely diffused texts among male physicians at the same time that those same physicians were attempting to drive women from the practice of

medicine on grounds of professional incompetence? In the first place, though we have reason to think that these treatises were produced by men, the idea that they were written by a woman from Salerno was plausible. In its early years as a medical center, Salerno may be thought of as a highly favored health spa where both men and women practiced medicine (probably frequently as members of the same family) and taught it to others, making what use they could of the learning of the Greeks and Arabs. Though some of these early physicians were clerics, this educational activity was not based institutionally in a cathedral or monastic school. In the twelfth century medical licenses were granted by neither the church nor an organization of masters, but by royal officials; as a decree of Roger II in 1140 stated, "henceforth anyone who wishes to practice medicine should appear before our officials and judges, to be evaluated by their judgment." Since no clerical status was required for such licenses, it seems likely that they could be granted to women. Records still extant from the fourteenth century show that at a time when the Parisian doctors mentioned above were arguing that a woman might easily sin by killing a patient through her ministrations, women in the Kingdom of Naples received licenses occasionally. For example, in 1307 a woman with the intriguing name of "Trotta de Troya" was granted a license to practice surgery. From a perspective north of the Alps, if a woman skilled in medicine was to be found anywhere, it would most likely be in southern Italy.⁵⁵

The frequency with which Trotula's gender was stressed by scribes

and rubricators suggests that it was not only plausible that a woman should have written these treatises; more important, it was desirable. Men knew little about feminine physiology and some were intensely troubled by their ignorance. In De secretis mulierum, a late thirteenth or early fourteenth-century vulgarization of questions raised by Albertus Magnus, the author deals with the most elementary anatomical questions and tells of a man who confessed to him that once after intercourse he found his abdomen covered with blood, which "frightened him greatly, and he did not know the cause." This basic sexological handbook, which makes use of information to be found in the treatises attributed to Trotula, illustrates something of the nature of medieval male curiosity about female sexuality.⁵⁶ Since male physicians did not make intimate examinations of female patients and were normally not present at childbirth, their need and desire for information must have been acute.⁵⁷ Yet a fellow male, even an older and more experienced physician, could not provide that information with authority. A great advantage of the treatises attributed to "Trotula," even though they reveal nothing that could not be found in other Salernitan works, is that they appeared to be written "from the woman's point of view." This point was made with striking force by the author of a scientific encyclopedia of the second half of the thirteenth century, Placides et Timéo, also known as Les Secrés as philosophes. The author of this curious dialogue tells us that physicians "who know nothing, derive great authority and much solid information" from Trotula, partly because she could speak of what she had "felt in

herself, since she was a woman" and partly "because she was a woman, all women revealed their inner thoughts more readily to her than to any man and told her their natures."⁵⁸

The modern reader who, like the author of Les Secr es as philosophes, wants to know the medical views of a medieval woman is more fortunate than the medieval public, for the works of Hildegard of Bingen have now been printed. This twelfth-century Benedictine abbess corresponded with popes, emperors, bishops and abbots, and was a candidate for sainthood in the thirteenth century. She was also the author of two works which deal with medicine in a highly personal way. Though they do not focus exclusively on "female medicine," they do deal with such subjects as sexual relations, childbirth, and prediction of the character and physical characteristics of offspring. These books were presumably intended originally for use in Hildegard's own monastery, and their circulation in the Middle Ages was always limited; today three manuscripts of the Subtilitates exist, and of the Causae et curae only one manuscript remains.⁵⁹ It is an ironic fact that the treatises attributed to "Trotula" flourished, while the Practica of Trota and the medical works of Hildegard remained practically unknown.

The position I have presented here is that the professionalization of medicine in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, combined with the virtual exclusion of women from university education, prevented them from entering the best paid and most respected medical positions. Male doctors controlled medical theory, though not the day-to-day practice of women's medicine, and their gynecological literature incorporated

male experience and understanding and the academic learning available to males alone. Though it appears that Cum auctor and Ut de curis first circulated anonymously and that De ornatu was prefaced by a prologue written by a male author, by a process which remains obscure these three texts were brought together and attributed to a female author, and once this change had occurred, no reader could know that these works were not authentic. By including in their medical compendia these treatises falsely attributed to Trota, medieval physicians thereby unwittingly excluded women even further from participation in their own medicine. Though the treatises of "Trotula" bear a woman's name, they were the central texts of the gynecological medicine practiced and taught by men.

In the Middle Ages a female medical author seemed a believable figure, though one best imagined in an exotic locale. But in the sixteenth century Wolf considered that such a woman could not have existed and in the 1920s Hiersemann created the phantasm of "Trottus" from the flourish of a pen. Mead and Mason-Hohl, however, knew in their bones that women could practice medicine and teach it to others. A fresh study of the manuscripts, especially of the Madrid Practica, provides evidence for the existence of an expert woman physician named Trota, but also shows, ironically, that she was not the author of the three treatises commonly attributed to her. Thus my investigation fully supports Mead and Mason-Hohl in their faith in an historical Trota, even though it rejects their imagined biography. Seen in a fuller historical context, it should come as no surprise that Trota's

career was limited by the social forces of her own day, that she produced a Practica quite different from the treatises usually attributed to her, and that when the term "master" was applied to her as a woman, it was with a reservation, tanquam magistra.

Appendix: Original Prologue to De ornatu

Ut ait Ypocras in libro quem de scientia pronosticorum edidit,
 "omnis qui medicine artis studio seu gloriam seu delectabilem amicorum
 copiam consequi desiderat, rationem suam regulis prudentium adeo munire
 studeat,"¹ ne in singulis ad artem medendi spectantibus inermis
 5 reperiat et rudis. Quod si facere neglexerit, loco glorie et fame
 dedecus et infamiam, loco amicorum quamplures sibi acquirat inimicos.
 Sic etiam efficietur, ut a quibus in foro salutari debet et medicus
 appellari, eis ridiculum fiat in publico, et neque ab eis medicus
 appelletur. Huius intuitu rationis, ego his regulis mulierum quas in
 10 artificiali decore faciendo sapientes inueni, meam adeo in tantum
 munui rationem, ut in singulis ad ornamentum faciei et aliorum
 membrorum muliebrum doctus reperiar. Ita ut cuilibet mulieri nobili
 uel gregarie de huius artificio aliquid a me querenti, iuxta suam
 qualitatem et modum conueniens sciam adhibere consilium, ut et ego etiam
 15 laudem et ipsa optatum consequi ualeat effectum. Sed quoniam, ut ait
 Persius, "scire meum nichil est, nisi me scire hoc sciat alter,"² ideo,
 hoc exemplo motus, uolo que de hoc artificio noui et efficaci opere
 probaui, litteris commendare et in compendiosum scriptum redigere. Quo
 mediante, quod in mente habeo in aliorum ueniat usum et iuamen.

1 ait PL dicit OS; post libro add. suo S; edidit om. S 2 seu¹ om. S
 3-4 rationem ... studeat om. Q 3 prudentium L prudentum PS; post
 prudentium add. etiam L; post adeo add. se P 4-5 inermis ... si POL
 ne rudis reperiat et si rudis hoc S 5 et fame om. S 6 quamplures
POL plures S 7 etiam PO quod L om. S; debet OLS deberet P
 8-9 eius ridiculum fiet ... appellatur S appeletur scripsi; eis fiat
 r. in publico L; eis fiat r. in populo et plebis abittio P; eis fiat
 r. in populo et plebis abiectio Q 9 Huius OS hoc PL; his regulis POL

uolens aliquas experiencias S 10 sapientes POL facetas S;
 adeo om. S; in tantum om. LS 11 post singulis add. tam S; ornamentum POL
 ornatum S; et aliorum L quam ceterorum S 11-12 faciei ... membrorum
om. PO 12 muliebrium POL mulierum S; reperiatur POL reperiatur S; Ita
S Ista L om. PO; ut POL om. S; cuilibet POL cuiuslibet S 13 uel
 ... huius POL seu gentili et de eius S; a me om. O; suam S sui POL;
 14 sciam POL suum S; et² om. S; etiam L om. POS 15 ipsa OLS
 ipsam P; optatum POL exoptatum S; ualeat POL ualet S; Sed POL Sit S
 16 Persius POL Proferius S; meum POL teum S; me POL om. S; hoc OL
 meum P tuum S; alter PO alterum L aliter S 16-17 ideo ... motus POL
om. S 17 que POL itaque S 17-18 et ... probaui PO om. LS 18 Quo S
 Quod POL 19 in¹ om. O; post habeo add. et S; usum et iuuamen PO
 usum L notitiam S

[N. B.: Differences of word order are not indicated.]

Paris, B.N. lat 16089, fol. 113 (c. 1250) = P; Oxford, Exeter College

35, fol. 227v (XIV¹) = O; London, B.L. Harley 3542, fol. 97v

(XV¹) = L; and Salzburg, Museum Carolino-Augustinum 2171, fol. 180

(XV med.) = S

1. Prognostica, trans. attributed to Constantine the African, preface,
 printed in Articella (Venice, 1492), fol. 40.

2. Sat. 1.27: scire tuum nihil est nisi te scire hoc sciat alter.

NOTES

* Revised version of a paper presented at the Joint Meeting of the Medieval Association of the Pacific and the Medieval Academy of America, Berkeley, Calif., 9 April 1983. I am grateful to the Division of Humanities and the Social Sciences of the California Institute of Technology for financial assistance in procuring microfilms and photographs. I have benefitted greatly from the corrections and suggestions generously offered by Joan Cadden, Monica Green, Will T. Jones, Luke Demaitre, Paul Oskar Kristeller, Berthe Marti, Michael McVaugh, George Pigman, Irwin J. Pincus, Margaret Schleissner, Eleanor Searle, and Daniel Sheerin. None of these scholars is responsible for the errors which remain. I am particularly grateful to Richard H. Rouse of the University of California at Los Angeles. He does share my responsibility, for I have relied continually on his paleographic skills and judgment for the dating and localization of manuscripts.

1. For a recent prosopographical study based on references to some 125 women who practiced medicine as midwives, surgeons, miresses, etc., see Danielle Jacquart, Le Milieu Médical en France du XII^e au XV^e siècle (Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1981), pp. 47-55. Pearl Kibre, "The Faculty of Medicine at Paris, charlatanism and unlicensed medical practice in the later Middle Ages," Bull. Hist. Med., 1953 27: 1-20, remains a fundamental source for the study of the exclusion of women from the practice of medicine. For the larger setting, see Vern L.

Bullough, The Development of Medicine as a Profession: the contribution of the medieval university to modern medicine (Basel and New York: S. Karger, 1966).

2. For a critical review of recent literature see Martha H. Verbrugge, "Women and medicine in nineteenth-century America," Signs, 1976, 1: 957-72. For the details in this and the preceding paragraph see also Frances E. Kobrin, "The American midwife controversy: a crisis of professionalization," Bull. Hist. Med. 1966, 40: 350-63; William G. Rothstein, American Physicians in the Nineteenth Century (Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1972), pp. 300-301, n. 5; and Barbara Ehrenreich and Deirdre English, Witches, Midwives, and Nurses: A History of Women Healers (Old Westbury, N. Y.: The Feminist Press, 1973). On the development of male midwifery (unknown in the Middle Ages), see John S. Haller, Jr., American Medicine in Transition, 1840-1910 (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1981), pp. 150-91.

3. Quotation from Kate Campbell Hurd-Mead, "Trotula," Isis, 1930, 14: 364-65. It is evident that the editor of Isis, George Sarton, accepted this seriously flawed article for publication without being convinced by it, for when submitting a revised text, Mead wrote to Sarton on 3 January 1930: "I only hope you will be converted to my theories about Trotula and become one of her champions." See her correspondence in the Sarton collection at Harvard University, 6MS Am 1803 (1022), and George Sarton, Introduction to the History of Science, 3 vols. in 5 (Washington: Williams & Wilkins, 1927-48), 2: 242-43. The contemporary

treatment of Trotula by Dr. Melina Lipinska is more cautious and restrained than Mead's; see her Les Femmes et le progrès des sciences médicales (Paris: Masson et cie., 1930), pp. 27-30.

4. The lecture was published as "Trotula: eleventh century gynecologist," Med.Woman's J., 1940: 47 349-56, the translation as The Diseases of Women by Trotula of Salerno (Hollywood, Calif.: The Ward Ritchie Press, 1940).

5. Most early manuscripts read Justinus, Justinianus, or something of the sort; Paris, Bibliothèque nationale (B.N.) lat. 7056, ff. 77-86v (= Ms. A) cites Copho at this point (f. 78vb), but it is the only early manuscript I know to do so. Perhaps the name of Justus, a contemporary of Galen and the author of a Gynaecia, appeared originally, in which case all of the authors cited in Cum auctor would have been ancient authorities. In the second chapter of the introduction, the author says the text is based on material from Hippocrates, Galen and Constantine the African (A, f. 77rb); other manuscripts frequently replace the name of Constantine with that of Cleopatra. One should not be overly impressed by the author's learning; most of the ancient citations are to be found in the Viaticum and Pantegni of Constantine the African.

6. Cambrai, Bibliothèque municipale ms. 916, a northern French collection of medical texts, presents all three tracts as a single unit on ff. 228v-242v, with the rubric: Incipiunt Cure Trotule.

7. Paris, B.N. n.a.l. 603, ff. 55-59v. I have not yet seen Erfurt, Wissenschaftliche Bibliothek, Amplonian Q 204, which contains De ornatu on ff. 78v-79v and Cum auctor on ff. 95v-97, both in hands described in the catalogue as twelfth century; see Wilhelm Schum, Beschriebendes Verzeichniss der Amplonian Handschriften-Sammlung zu Erfurt (Berlin, 1887), pp. 461-63.
8. London, British Library (B.L.) Sloane 1124, ff. 172-178v; the opening rubric is Incipiunt capitula Trotule in the same hand as the rest of the text, though the chapter headings were never added. The manuscript is contemporary with B.N. n.a.l. 603, cited above.
9. New York Academy of Medicine ms. SAFE, ff. 77-82. This important manuscript, which once belonged to the Drabkins, is described in Caelius Aurelianus, Gynaecia, ed. Miriam F. Drabkin and Israel E. Drabkin, Supplement to the Bulletin of the History of Medicine, 13 (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1951), pp. v-vi. Though the Drabkins state that the manuscript "seems to be a copy of the very volume that de Fournival had in mind," Prof. Rouse is convinced that it is the manuscript owned by Richard de Fournival (who was licensed to practice surgery) and which he may have inherited from his father, physician to Philip Augustus. For the history of the manuscript and the transmission of the text, see L. D. Reynolds, Texts and Transmission: a survey of the Latin classics (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983), pp. xxxvii and 33-34.
10. Paris, B.N. lat. 16089, f. 113; Oxford, Exeter College 35, f.

227v; London, B.L Harley 3542, f. 97v; and Salzburg, Museum Carolino-Augusteum 2171, ff. 180-180v. In the last manuscript the text is headed: Incipit tractatus brevis et utilis. De decoratione et ornatu mulierum Reichardi medici experti. In all four manuscripts the text has been badly distorted in transmission, and my edition is conjectural in places. The possibility that Ricardus Anglicus was the author is worth exploring further. Munich, CLM 444, f. 208 also contains this prologue, but I received a microfilm too late to include its readings in this edition.

11. Kraut was a physician from Hagenau. His edition appeared as Trotulae curandarum aegritudinum muliebrum . . . liber in Experimentarius medicinae (Strassburg: apud Joannem Schottum, 1544), pp. 3-35. Paulus Manutius labeled his reprinting of this work as nusquam antea editus, corrected the chapter numbers of his edition, but otherwise changed little else and used no new manuscripts in Medici antiqui omnes (Venice: Aldus, 1547), ff. 71-80v. Other editions, such as those of Benedictus Victorius, Empirica (Venice, 1554), pp. 460-525 and Hans Kaspar Wolf, Harmonia Gynaeciorum (Basel, 1566), cols. 215-310, and their numerous reprintings, repeat the text of the Kraut edition with occasional misprints or "corrections." I have consulted and compared the copies in the National Library of Medicine, Bethesda.

12. The Latin verse translation is printed in Salvatore De Renzi, Collectio Salernitana, 5 vols. (Naples, 1852-59; rpr. Bologna: Forni Editore, n. d.), 4: 1-24. An Irish translation of Cum auctor, preceded

by a translation of De gradibus dated 1352, has been edited by Winifred Wulff as A Mediaeval Handbook of Gynaecology and Midwifery in Irish Texts: Fasciculus V, ed. John Fraser, Paul Grosjean, and J. G. O'Keefe (London: Sheed & Ward, 1934), pp. 12-54. There is a French translation in Paris, Bibl. Ste-Geneviève 1057, f. 20ff. (which I have not seen), a literal prose translation in Paris, B.N. ms. fr. 1327, ff. 61-117 (closely related to the Latin of the N.Y. Academy of Medicine ms. cited in n. 10), and a verse translation in Cambridge, Trinity College O.1.20, cited by Paul Meyer in "Les manuscrits français de Cambridge," Romania 1903, 32: 87-90. The fifteenth-century German translation by Dr. Johann Hartlieb exists in many manuscripts, including Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Institute of the History of Medicine, ms. 3, ff. 69-109v; see Henry E. Sigerist, "Johannes Hartlieb's Gynaecological Collection," in Science, Medicine and History: Essays in Honor of Charles Singer, ed. Edgar A. Underwood (London, Oxford University Press, 1953), 1: 231-46. There is a Catalan translation of De ornatu in a fifteenth-century manuscript, Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional 3356, ff. 1-32v, accompanied by a Catalan translation of a work of erotica, the Speculum Alfoderi; see A. Paz y Mélia, "Trotula, por Maestre Joan," Revista de archivos, bibliotecas y museos, 1897, 1: 506-12. An English translation appears in two fifteenth-century manuscripts, Oxford, Bodley ms. 483, ff. 82-117 and Douce ms. 37, ff. 1-42. Beryl Rowland's Medieval Woman's Guide to Health: The First English Gynecological Handbook (Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 1981) is not an edition of this work, but of another gynecological treatise in B.L. Sloane 2463. I have no idea why

she calls that text the "first." The Flemish Liber Trotula (Brugge, Stadsbibl. ms. 593), published by Anna Delva, Vrouwengeneeskunde in Vlaanderen tijdens de late middeleeuwen, Vlaamse Historische Studies (Brugge: Genootschap voor Geschiedenis, 1983), is a very free translation and adaptation.

13. "La plus sage dame qui soit enz quatre partie dou monde" in Oeuvres complètes de Rutebeuf, ed. Edmond Faral and Julia Bastin, 2 vols. (Paris: A. & J. Picard, 1959-60), 2: 276-77.

14. Wife of Bath's Prologue, ll. 676-685; of the authors whom Chaucer cites here, the Stoic philosopher Chrysippus alone seems out of place as the author of a work a fourteenth-century student of women might have read.

15. Harmonia Gynaeciorum, cols. 215-216.

16. World Who's Who in Science, ed. Allen G. Debus (Chicago: Marquis - Who's Who, inc., 1968), p. 1688.

17. Conrad Hiersemann, Die Abschnitte aus der Practica des Trottus in der Salernitanischen Sammelschrift "De Aegritudinum Curatione", Inaug.-Diss. (Leipzig: Institut für Geschichte der Medizin, 1921), p. 6.

18. "Exhuming Trotula, Sapiens materna of Salerno," Florilegium, 1979, 1: 52; the word materna in this title is presumably based on a misreading of the word matrona in Ordericus Vitalis. Rowland repeats her argument in Medieval Woman's Guide, pp. 3-6. In her book, p. 49,

n. 14, she cites Edward F. Tuttle, "The Trotula and Old Dame Trot: a note on the Lady of Salerno," Bull. Hist. Med., 1976, 50 : 61-72 and says that he "reaches conclusions very similar to my own." In fact, in his intelligent and useful article, Tuttle says that "Trotula" was "in all probability the name of a Salernitan matrona or midwife" (p. 68, n. 28) and urges caution "in relating Dame Trot to Trotula" (p. 72).

19. I quote from the seventh printing, Naples, 1671, p. 156, from a copy kindly supplied by Dr. Thomas Waldman. A somewhat expanded version appears in a Latin translation, Nova descriptio regni Neapolitani, reprinted by J. G. Graevius in the Thesaurus antiquitatum et historiarum Italiae, Neapolis, Siciliae, etc., vol. 9, part 1 (Leiden, 1723), col. 42. I have no idea what work on the compounding of medicines Baccus may have had in mind.

20. Biografia degli uomini illustri del regno di Napoli, 10 vols. (Naples, 1813-26), 4: s.v. "Trotola."

21. Salvatore De Renzi, Storia Documentata della Scuola Medica di Salerno, 2nd ed. (Naples, 1857; rpr. Milan: Ferro Edizioni, 1967), pp. 194-208; this is a revised version with additions of Coll. Sal., 1, 149-161. There is no modern edition of Circa instans. On the passages used by De Renzi to support his argument, see Walter Starkenstein, "Ein Beitrag zur 'Circa instans'-Frage," Archiv Gesch. Med., 1935, 27: 375-76. The Starkenstein manuscripts have recently been acquired by

the Library of the New York Botanical Gardens; see Eugenia D. Robertson, "Circa Instans and the Salernitan materia medica," (unpubl. diss., Bryn Mawr College, 1982), pp. 104-6. I am grateful to Mrs. Lothian Lynas for sending photographs of these manuscripts which allowed me to verify that the mother of the Platearii was not called a magistra in these passages.

22. The Ecclesiastical History of Ordericus Vitalis, ed. Marjorie Chibnall, 6 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969-80) 2: 28 and 74-76. Though it is frequently said that Ralph visited Salerno about 1059, the eodem tempore which provides that date refers to the year when Ralph left Marmoutier and became a monk at St. Evroul, not to the time of his visit to Salerno. Ordericus gives contradictory information about the date of Ralph's monastic profession at Marmoutier; he probably became a monk somewhere between 1052 and 1055 (see pp. 28 and 76). Ralph's time of study (and also warfare?) in Italy apparently occurred well before he retired from the world, perhaps in the 1030s, when the Normans established their power at Aversa. Charles H. Talbot, suggests, probably incorrectly, that sapiens matrona should be translated as sage-femme in "Dame Trot and her progeny," Essays and Studies, 1972, 25: p. 1. Michel Salvat, "L'accouchement dans la littérature scientifique médiévale," Senefiance, 1983, 9: 92, shows that the term sage-femme only appeared in the later Middle Ages, and so Ordericus could not have had it in mind when he wrote in the twelfth century.

23. De Renzi, Storia documentata, pp. 198 and XXXIX, document 42,

citing Arch. Cavense Arca D. no. 152. Document 43 refers to a Trotta in 1105 who was the sister of a physician named Landulfo.

24. Hurd-Mead, A History of Women in Medicine from the Earliest Times to the Beginning of the Nineteenth Century (Haddam, Conn.: The Haddam Press, 1938; rpt. Dover, N. H.: Longwood Press), p. 128.

25. In late Latin "trocta" means "trout," which is what trotta still means in Italian today. "Trout" seems an odd baptismal name for a woman, and as a proper name it may have had some other origin.

26. Necrologio del Liber Confratrum di S. Matteo di Salerno, ed. Carlo Alberto Garufi, Fonti per la storia d'Italia (Rome: Tip. del Senato, 1922).

27. Ibid., p. 62. George W. Corner, "The rise of medicine at Salerno in the twelfth century," Ann. Med. Hist., n.s., 1931, 3: 14, is in error in saying: "The Registers and Obituary of the Cathedral, which name many doctors and women of all ranks, do not apply the title medica to a single woman."

28. Ibid., pp. 110, 134. Though it might be imagined that there is some connection between Trotulus and Trotula, it must be stressed that there is no evidence at all that the Trotulus of the necrology was a physician.

29. London, B.L., Sloane 1124, f. 173 and N. Y. Academy of Medicine ms. SAFE, f. 77v: "Unde contingit quod Trota vocata fuit tanquam

magistra, cum quedam puella propter ventositatem debuit incidi quasi ex ruptura laborasset, et admirata fuit quamplurimum." Cf. Kraut ed., Trotulae, chap. 20.

30. Leipzig ms. 1215, f. 66v and Ms. A, f. 82ra. Some later manuscripts have "quasi magistra operis" or "quasi magistra huius operis." It seems to me likely that tanquam was the original form, later replaced by quasi, which means almost the same thing.

31. Oxford Latin Dictionary (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), s.v. tamquam.

32. August W. E. Theodor Henschel discovered the codex and published an unfortunately faulty text of De aegritudinum curatione in De Renzi, Coll. Sal., 2, 81-386. Hiersemann's edition of the "Trot" excerpts in his Leipzig dissertation, Abschnitte aus der Practica des Trottus, pp. 10-21, is a distinct improvement. See pp. 7-8 for the points made here. For a description and analysis of the manuscript see Karl Sudhoff, "Die Salernitaner Handschrift in Breslau," Arch. Gesch. Med., 1920, 12: 101-47. Sudhoff dated the manuscript 1160-70, but on the basis of the photographs Sudhoff published, Prof. Rouse prefers a slightly later date, in the period 1185-1215, though more likely in the late twelfth century because of the small, compressed size of the script. In his opinion the writing is that of northwest France or Norman England. The crude, "Romanesque" style of the miniatures also suggests composition in the twelfth rather than the thirteenth century.

33. Hiersemann, Abschnitte, pp. 7 and 9.
34. The Liber de simplicium medicinarum virtutibus of Johannes de Sancto Paulo, which appears anonymously in the Wrocław manuscript, is edited by Georg Heinrich Kroemer, Inaug.-Diss. (Leipzig: Institut für Geschichte der Medizin, 1920); the text in the Madrid manuscript is his Flores dietarum, ed. Hermann J. Ostermuth, Inaug.-Diss. (Leipzig: Institut für Geschichte der Medizin, 1919). Johannes was active as a physician in the twelfth century; see Ernest Wickersheimer, Dictionnaire biographique des médecins en France au moyen âge, 2 vols. (Paris: E. Droz, 1936, rpt. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1979) 2: 480-81.
35. Madrid, Biblioteca de la Universidad Complutense, Ms. 119 (formerly 116-Z-31) 119), ff. 40-44v. I would not have been aware of the existence of this extremely important text if it were not for the reference to it by Guy Beaujouan, "Manuscrits médicaux du moyen âge conservés en Espagne," Mélanges de la Casa de Velázquez, 1972, 8: 199 (here called a copy of the Trotula minor). I am grateful to Dr. Cecilia Fernandez Fernandez for permission to see the manuscript in November 1983 and to have a microfilm prepared. I intend to publish an edition and discussion of the Practica and a description of the manuscript elsewhere.
36. As examples of correspondence between the Practica (P) and De aegritudinum curatione (DAC), I will cite here only the passages edited by Hiersemann, Abschnitte, with the differences in italics: 1. P (fol.

142): "Ad vomitum restringendum, accipe oleum et acetum et simul bullias, et ibi spongiam intingas et pectori apponas, et restringetur."

DAC (p. 15, ll. 19-20): "Ad vomitum restringendum, accipe oleum et acetum et simul bullias, deinde spongiam intingas et pectori superponas, et restringetur"; 2. P (fol. 141v): "Ad cancrum, si in gingivis vel labiis fuerit. In principio loca patientia lavabis, et postea fricentur cum albumine ovi desiccato et subtiliter pulverizato, et hoc assidue facias, et sanabitur." DAC (p. 13, ll. 37-39): "Ad cancrum, si in gingivis vel labiis vel dentibus fuerit. In principio loca patientia bene cum aceto lavabis, et postea fricentur cum alumine subtiliter pulverizato; hoc assidue fac et sanabitur cancer."

37. Abschnitte, p. 6. Unfortunately Sudhoff did not publish a reproduction of the hand which wrote De aegritudinum curatione (see Sudhoff, "Salernitaner Handschrift," p. 191) and the lithographic reproductions appended to August Henschel, "Die Salernitanische Handschrift," Janus, 1846, 1: 40-84, 300-68 are also of no help. Henschel had no doubt that "Trot" should be expanded to Trotula; on this and the abbreviation of the other names see pp. 329-30. When Hiersemann wrote his dissertation, he was not an experienced paleographer or medievalist, but a twenty-eight-year old medical student. Sudhoff, his dissertation director, accepted the reading of "Trotus" in "Salernitaner Handschrift," p. 128, but seemingly with caution.

38. Coll. Sal. 2, 342-43 = Practica, fols. 142v-143. The work which

De Renzi publishes as that of Copho in Coll. Sal. 4. 415-505 does not correspond to anything attributed to Copho in De aegritudinum curatione and was probably written by Archimatheus; see Friedrich Hartmann, Die Literatur von Frdh- und Hochsalerno und der Inhalt des Breslauer Codex Salernitanus, Inaug.-Diss. (Leipzig: Institut für Geschichte der Medizin, 1919), pp. 14-15.

39. On the sources of "Trotula" see Hermann Rudolf Spitzner, Die Salernitanische Gynäkologie und Geburtshilfe unter dem Namen der "Trotula," Inaug.-Diss. (Leipzig: Institut für Geschichte der Medizin, 1921), pp. 29-36. The question needs to be re-examined after an edition of the texts has been established. Spitzner (p. 29) cites a couplet from the Regimen Salernitanum which appears in chap. 29 of the printed text and which should help to date the work, but this passage does not appear in any of the manuscripts I have collated and must be considered an addition.

40. Hiersemann, Abschnitte, p. 12, lines 39-48; see also p. 22. The passage is in a section on the care of the eyes which is not labeled "Trotula," but which follows another which is.

41. Christian Graeter, Ein Leipziger deutscher Bartholomaeus, Inaug.-Diss. (Leipzig: Institut für Geschichte der Medizin, 1918), pp. 48-49, quotes this passage: "Ein meister hiez Johannes Furia, der schreip sîner friundinne, diu hiez Cheopatra (sic) diese erzenfe. Er sprach" The recipe in the Practica secundum Trotam appears in almost

precisely the same words in De aegritudinum curatione in De Renzi, Coll. Sal. 2, 145.

42. For example, in the twelfth century the monastery of Saint-Amand owned copies of pseudo-Cleopatra's Genecea and of the "liber Muscionis de pessariis," but no "Trotula"; see Gustav Becker, Catalogi Bibliothecarum Antiqui (Bonn, 1885; rpr. Bruxelles: Culture et Civilisation, 1969), p. 233. There is also no reference to her in Karl Sudhoff, "Die medizinischen Schriften, welche Bishof Bruno von Hildesheim 1161 in seiner Bibliothek besass, und die Bedeutung des Konstantin von Afrika im 12. Jahrhundert," Arch. Gesch. Med., 1916, 9: 348-56.

43. "Commentarium Magistri Bernardi Provincialis super Tabulas Salerni" in De Renzi, Coll. Sal., 5, 269-328. For example, the recipe of asses' dung he attributes to the women of Salerno (p. 287) has no parallel in "Trotula." De Renzi found only one parallel passage worth noting (p. 273), a short recipe which does appear almost verbatim in later manuscripts of De ornatu and in the printed version, chap. 61. But this recipe is not in B.N., lat. 16089 or B.L., Harley 3542, which I consider to represent the primitive form of the treatise. Many recipes were added to De ornatu in later manuscripts, and this one must have been borrowed from Bernard.

44. On the rivalry of Salerno and Montpellier and movement between the two see Karl Sudhoff, "Salerno, Montpellier und Paris um 1200," Arch.

Gesch. Med., 1928, 20: 51-62.

45. "Notanda quedam que sunt phisicalia remedia, quorum nobis virtus est occulta, que ab obstetricibus profuerunt"; ms. A f. 80rb or Kraut ed., Trotulae, chap. 16.

46. See Kraut's marginal note on p. 27 of the Strassburg edition (chap. 20). This is also the opinion of Tuttle in "Trotula," pp. 65-66.

47. On the adaptation of authors' names to titles see Paul Lehmann, Mittelalterliche BÜchertitel, Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Kl., 2 vols. (Munich: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1948-1953), 2: 14. The manuscript cited is B.N., lat 7056 (Ms. A), f. 77. The same rubricator introduces De ornatu on f. 84v as Alius tractatus qui dicitur minor Trotula and makes a clear analogy with the Rogerina of Roger Baron; see f. 75: Tractatus qui dicitur minor Rogerina. Tuttle, however, has argued in "Trotula," pp. 66-67 that "Trotula" was probably the author's name and that Trotula major and minor are equivalent to the Priscianus major and minor.

48. The second quotation is from Susan Mosher Stuard, "Dame Trot," Signs, 1975 1: 538.

49. The issue of Galenic theory itself does not, of course, indicate male authorship, since the thought of people of both sexes is normally

dominated by the available theory of their times. On the role of Galenic theory in ancient medicine and the treatises of "Trotula" I have benefited from the dissertation on gynecology from Galen to Trotula which Monica H. Green is preparing at Princeton University.

50. Fisalidos is the reading in ms. A, f. 77vb, siseleos that of the Kraut ed., Trotulae, chap. 1. On the two plants see The Herbal of Rufinus, ed. Lynn Thorndike (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1946), pp. 135 and 298.

51. See B.N., lat 16089, f. 113 and B.L. Harley 3542, f. 97v. In the second, fifteenth-century manuscript "ut sudes" remains in its original form, but "ungas" was corrected by the original scribe with a mark of deletion and a superscript t and "te" was overwritten to read "se." Ms. A, an early manuscript of the version which brings all three treatises together, has third-person forms throughout.

52. See the texts published by Delva and Rowland cited in n. 12 above. Delva argues that the Flemish Liber Trotula was written for an audience of midwives by a practicing midwife critical of male university masters (pp. 30-34). The author of the English text Rowland edited (B.L., Sloane 2463, ff. 194-232) states that it was composed for the benefit of women ("and that oon woman may helpe another in her sykenesse & nought diskuren her previtees to such vncurteys men" -- p. 58), but Rowland makes far too much of the unusualness of this work, for much of it is a literal translation of Roger of Parma; see J. H. Aveling, "An Account of the Earliest English Work on Midwifery and the Diseases of

Women," Obstet. J. Great Britain Ireland, 1874, 2: 73, and the severe review by Faye M. Getz in Med. Hist., 1982, 26: 353-54. The Middle English translation of Trotula states that it was written in English because it was intended for women: "Because whomen of oure tonge donne bettyr rede and undyrstande thys langage than eny other and every whoman lettyrde rede hit to other unlettyrd and help hem and conceyle hem in her maledyes, withowtyn shewyng here dysese to man, i have thys drauyn and wryttyn in englysh" (Bodley, Douce 37, f. lv, quoted by Rowland, p. 14). The French verse translation of Trotula in Cambridge, Trinity College O.1.20 is also addressed to women, beginning (fol. 214): "Bien sachiés, femmes . . ." It is a quite literal translation. In the fifteenth century Giovanni Michele Savonarola wrote a work in the vernacular specifically for midwives; see Il trattato ginecologico-pediatico in volgare "Ad mulieres ferrarienses de regimine pregnantium et noviter natorum usque ad septennium," ed. Luigi Belloni (Milan: Società Italiana di ostetricia e ginecologia, 1952).

53. Henri Denifle and Emile Chatelain, Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis, 4 vols. (Paris, 1889-97), 2: 266: "cum nullam causam infirmitatis infirmorum per litteram vel artem medicine cognoscat"; cf. Kibre, "Faculty of Medicine at Paris" (note 1 above), p. 8. This argument was put forward by John of Padua, surgeon to King Philip IV. Male authorities were most concerned with female practitioners who posed an economic threat to the male medical establishment. Prof. Michael McVaugh has kindly called to my attention the case of a Catalan

woman from near Sant Cugat del Vallès who had learned from a visiting medicus how to examine urine, take the pulse, and give advice. She swore that she sent cases of abscesses and quartan fever "ad medicos maiores." This early fourteenth-century rural nurse was permitted to continue her practice on condition that she not use charms and not give medicine. See Josep Perarnau i Espelt, "Activitats i fórmules supersticioses de guarició a Catalunya en la primera meitat del segle XIV," Archiu de Textos Catalans Antics, 1982, 1: 67-72.

54. Rotuli Parliamentorum, 6 vols. [London, 1767-1777], 4, 158. The ordinance against charlatanism which was enacted in response to this petition dealt with qualifications rather than gender; see ibid., p. 130, no. 11.

55. On the institutional and intellectual history of Salerno, see Paul Oskar Kristeller, "The School of Salerno," Bull. Hist. Med., 1945, 17: 138-194 [reprinted in Kristeller, Studies in Renaissance Thought and Letters (Rome: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 1956), pp. 495-551], esp. pp. 146n, 148n, 164, 171-172. In "Learned Women of Early Modern Italy: Humanists and University Scholars" in Beyond Their Sex: Learned Women of the European Past, ed. Patricia H. Labalme (New York: New York University Press, 1982), p. 102, after questioning the existence of Trotula, Kristeller adds that "in Salerno, Naples, and the rest of Southern Italy, we do find a number of women, beginning in 1307, who received royal licenses to treat specified diseases." Michael McVaugh kindly pointed out to me the license of "Trotta de Troya" in Raffaele

Calvanico, Fonti per la Storia della Medicina e della Chirurgia per il Regno di Napoli nel periodo Angioino (a. 1273-1410) (Naples: L'Arte tip., 1962), pp. 124-25.

56. On De secretis mulierum see Lynn Thorndike, A History of Magic and Experimental Science, 8 vols. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1923-1958), 2: 739-45, 749-50; his "Further Consideration of the Experimenta, Speculum Astronomiae, and De Secretis Mulierum Ascribed to Albertus Magnus," Speculum, 1955, 30: 427-43; Brigitte Kusche, "Zur 'Secreta Mulierum' Forschung," Janus, 1975, 62: 103-23; and Helen Rodnite Lemay, "Some Thirteenth and Fourteenth Century Lectures on Female Sexuality," Inter. J. Women's Studies, 1978, 1: 391-400. See Alberti Magni De Secretis Mulierum (Amsterdam, 1740), p. 17 ("utrum menstruum fluat per anum . . . aut per vulvam") and pp. 104-5 for the post-coital blood; material from "Trotula" is cited as being from a "documentum" on pp. 109-11.

57. In the case of Jacqueline Félicie heard at Paris in 1322 and discussed above, her lawyer argued that "it is better and more decent that a woman who is wise and trained in the art should visit a sick woman and see and inquire into the secrets of nature and her private parts than a man, who is forbidden to touch the hands, breasts, stomach, feet, etc. of women," Chart. univ. Paris., 2: 264 and Kibre, "Faculty of Medicine at Paris," p. 11. Richardus Anglicus makes quite a point of the fact that he was not present when a patient and the attending obstetrix attempted to insert a pessary he had prescribed;

see Karl Sudhoff, "Der 'Micrologus'-Text der 'Anatomia' Richards des Engländers," Arch. Gesch. Med., 1927, 19: 232-33.

58. Claude A. Thomasset, ed., Placides et Timéo ou Li secrets as philosophes, Textes Littéraires Français (Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1980), pp. 133-34. Though Thomasset understandably makes much of this passage, which he says reveals "à la lettre . . . une attitude capable de bouleverser le monde médiéval" [see his Une vision du monde à la fin du XIII^e siècle: Commentaire du dialogue de Placides et Timéo, Publications romanes et françaises, 161 (Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1982), pp. 160-61], it is likely that for the author himself these words are empty rhetoric. I can find no evidence that the author of the dialogue actually read any of the works attributed to Trotula. The passage quoted is used to support the statement that women desire intercourse more when they are pregnant than at any other time, an assertion which does not appear in any of the texts of "Trotula." Moreover, later (p. 148) the author of the dialogue refers to that growth which such physicians as "Ypocras, Galien et Trotules" call molla, though this term itself is not used in any of the treatises attributed to Trotula.

59. On Hildegard, see Thorndike, History of Magic and Experimental Science, 2: 124-54. Hildegard von Bingen, Heilkunde, trans. Heinrich Schipperges, 4th ed., (Salzburg: Otto Müller Verlag, 1981) contains corrections to Paul Kaiser's faulty Latin edition of the Causae et curae (Leipzig: Teubner, 1903) in its translation. Peter Dronke writes

evocatively of Hildegard's life and thought and cites the most recent literature in Women Writers of the Middle Ages: a critical study of texts from Perpetua (+ 203) to Marguerite Porete (+ 1310) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), pp. 144-201, but a fully satisfactory study of Hildegard's views on sexuality remains to be written. In his translation and discussion of a passage crucial for understanding Hildegard's treatment of intercourse, Dronke mistakes the closing of the womb over the seed which it has just received for contractions which accompany the sexual act before its climax; see ibid., pp. 175-76.

[Revised 26 November 1984]