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The origins of the recorded history of occupational medicine are usually dated to the time of Hippocrates (c460 BCE–c370 BCE).1 2 Hippocrates’s admonition to his followers to observe the environment of their patients was complemented by his descriptions of the diseases of certain occupations including those of metallurgists, fullers, tailors, horsemen, farmhands, and fishermen.1 2 Before Hippocrates in the history of occupational medicine, reference is sometimes made to the fact that the study of the diseases of occupations is as old as man and his work; in certain texts considerable attention is paid to the work and related hazards of primitive and prehistoric peoples.3 The transition in the history of occupational medicine from prehistory to the recorded history of Hippocrates, however, passes over a body of writing with acknowledged relevance to the general history of medicine, the Egyptian papyri.4 These writings have special relevance to the recorded history of occupational medicine as well.

Importance of Egyptian medical papyri

There are eight major ancient Egyptian medical papyri—Kahun, Edwin Smith, Ebers, Hearst, Erman, London, Berlin, and Chester Beatty—dating from c1900 BCE to c1200 BCE.4 The relevance of these papyri to the history of other medical specialties—for example, the Ebers Papyrus to medicine,4 5 the Kahun, Berlin, and London papyri to obstetrics and gynaecology,4 5 and the Edwin Smith papyrus to surgery and orthopaedics6 is well established. Nevertheless, the importance of these papyri to the history of occupational medicine has been largely unexplored.

Of particular importance is the Edwin Smith papyrus. The extant copy of this papyrus was transcribed c1600 BCE in the XVIII dynasty of the New Kingdom.4 This copy was buried with its owner in a rock tomb at Thebes and unearthed in 1862 by grave robbers who sold it to the accomplished British Egyptologist Edwin Smith (1822–1906).4 6 Smith’s daughter donated the papyrus to the New York Historical Society on his death, and it is now housed at the New York Academy of Medicine.4 Professor James H Breasted (1865–1935) completed the definitive study of the papyrus in 1930.7

The Edwin Smith papyrus is a roll over 15 feet long with writing on both sides consisting of 22 columns or nearly 500 lines of text.7 The text contains 48 illustrative cases dealing with various traumatic and accidental injuries to the head, face, neck, arms, chest, shoulder, and spinal column, in that order. Each case is arranged in logical, quite modern fashion including a descriptive heading or provisional diagnosis, results of examination, diagnosis, prognosis, treatment, and glosses on archaic terms used.7

Although the current copy dates from c1600 BCE, the scribe at that time was clearly copying from a much older document. Judging from the nature of the glosses introduced to explain archaic terminology, the original document may be dated as early as c3000 BCE to c2500 BCE.4 7 On this basis, the papyrus has been attributed by some to the most famous of early Egyptian physicians, Imhotep (c2780 BCE).6 7

Imhotep was the chief vizier to the pharaoh Zoser, who was the first king of the Third Dynasty of the Old Kingdom. In addition to filling this lofty administrative position, Imhotep was known as an astrologer, priest, architect, and engineer of the step pyramid at Sakkara and as a surgeon.5 8

Injuries at the pyramids

As a physician and an administrator concerned with a major construction project, Imhotep would have been in a position not unfamiliar to some physicians of occupational medicine of today. It is known that the work crews on the pyramid were subject to injuries moving and lifting the great stone blocks and that they received medical care.8 It is postulated that Imhotep took advantage of this position as administrator-engineer-physician to study systems...
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atically the injuries sustained by the workers during the construction of the pyramid, and that these observations formed the basis for the papyrus which later became the Edwin Smith document.6 7 Certainly, some cases in the Edwin Smith papyrus would be consistent with descriptions of occupational trauma to workers engaged in heavy construction.

If this is correct it seems evident that Imhotep confronted many of the same occupational injuries that face modern industrial physicians. Particularly intriguing from the point of view of occupational medicine is the final case described in the papyrus which deals with back pain7 (figure).

TITLE
Instructions concerning a sprain of a vertebra [in] his spinal column.

EXAMINATION
If thou examinest [a man having] a sprain in a vertebra of his spinal column, thou shouldst say to him: “Extend now thy two legs [and] contract them both [again].” When he extends them both he contracts them both immediately because of the pain he causes in the vertebra of his spinal column in which he suffers.

DIAGNOSIS
Thou shouldst say concerning him: “One having a sprain in a vertebra of his spinal column. An ailment which I will treat.”

TREATMENT
Thou shouldst place him prostrate on his back; thou shouldst make for him... Unfortunately for modern medicine the case is incomplete. To this day, the answer to the appropriate management of back pain remains a major enigma in occupational medicine. “Plus ça change, plus c’est la meme chose.”

In sum, it appears that the ancient Egyptian medical literature has considerable relevance to occupational medicine. Perhaps we should even regard the Edwin Smith papyrus as the first manual of occupational trauma and Imhotep as the grandfather of occupational medicine.
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