Medical history has recently been growing as a field of study due to the strong advancements occurring in modern medicine. Many have studied the progression of modern medicine from the Middle Ages through to the Renaissance, but little attention has been given to the true effectiveness of medicine right before it was transformed within the 16th and 17th centuries. In analyzing the success of medieval medicine on the patient, we can start to understand the evolution of healing since the first recitings of the Hippocratic Oath. Through the use of popular medieval texts like Steve Hill, The Mirror of James Boig, and The Medieval Women’s Guide to Health, this research will look at whether the learned or common healing practices in the medieval ages (religion, astrology, humorism, and midwifery) were effective. The thoughts of other historians are split between whether or not these practices were actually successful, but it is through the documented opinions of the patient for us to find the truth. Although it is difficult to know whether or not the patients’ judgments have been altered by bias, there are still efforts being made to find the true voices of these hidden in the medieval contracts that still survive.

Common Healing

The Process of Gaining Knowledge for Common Healers:

- Common healers had little to no schooling, they learned by being either apprentices to other healers, or, in some cases, used the growing number of texts in the vernacular (that some have written based off learned techniques) to gain their knowledge (ie: Steve Hill,?)
- It is difficult to trace back information on the practices of common healing since many of these physicians did not write down their practices; this research is only based on the written texts that could be salvaged
- One of the most popular forms of common healing that has been written about from the Medieval Ages is midwifery

Effectiveness of Midwifery in Medieval Ages

Midwifery was a very controversial topic amongst common and learned healers. It was thought to be cursed or evil since many men did not know what went on when females were giving birth. They thought it mystical, and thus thought only women should deal with a woman’s problems.

- One of the popular anti-feminist texts of the time was The Mirror of Jaume Boig, written by a physician who writes heavily against women and womanly ailments in general.
- The first medicinal text that survives is the Medieval Women’s Guide to Health, thought to be written by the first woman professor of medicine, Trotula.
- The text goes in depth about the different ailments; reasons for these issues, and their treatments for the female body.
- Images of the different ways a baby can be in the wrong position during childbirth are provided.
- A deep analysis about the health of the female body and how it differs from men is given.

I relied heavily on this text, as it was the only complete work of common healing I could find written in a script of Middle English I could read. Of course this does not represent the actual knowledgebase and success of common healing; it does give a taste of the fact that common healing (though not written down and was thought lowly upon by others) was effective.

Patient’s Perspective

With the archive I am using being so spotty and difficult to interpret (since many of the authentic learned texts are in Latin), it is difficult to solidify whether or not both of these groups had effective methods of healing patients. That is why I turned to the records of the patients to decide if there was an answer.

What I found:

- It was popular between physicians and patients to draw up contracts to set the terms of payment, the duration of treatment, and the criteria for recovery (usually allowing the patient some say over these). Occasionally they also specified the patient’s role in the treatment (ie: special diets)
- It was common practice (and law in places like Bologna) where the physician was not paid until the patient was healed
- It was common for patients to bring their physician to court because the illness would come back or because the physician was paid too soon
- Many patients would ask for the input of other healers on their illness and treatment to see whether or not they are truly healed
- Because of this, the patient bias towards healers in general could have been very skewed. Other physicians may have lied to bring more business to themselves, the patient may not have enjoyed the treatment so they would say they are not healed...

The determination for ‘effectiveness’ was solely on the patient, thus it is quite a relative experience for every patient.

Conclusion

With the effectiveness of modern medicine being so high, it is difficult to perceive a time when the chances of surviving an illness was a chancy as getting a seven when rolling dice. Although learned physicians were trained for up to ten years in university, the experience was solely lecture and theory based more than anything else. The studying of the stars, the humors of the body, and even one’s urine did lead to certain acknowledgments of the way a body worked; but the practices were far from perfect. Even with actual concoctions, the measurements were so tedious and variable it was difficult for complete success. The incorporation of God as a healer may have quelled the anxiety a patient may have or lead them to believe a miracle has happened, adding to the belief there was effectiveness of these practices. Common healers worked by experience and word of mouth, but the increasing literacy and use of print in texts, like The Women’s Guide to Health may have benefited those that could afford a copy. The documentation of actual healing examples are far spread and scarce, but through the contracts between healer and patient, historians have been able to piece together that learned doctors were not any better than common doctors, or vice versa, due to the heavy contribution of the patient’s experience with a sickness. Though the path to the answer of this question is still foggy from inconsistent textual remains and strong bias of patients, it can be concluded that both were effective in some way, but not nearly as effective as the times to come once the Renaissance started to blossom.
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