

## Book Reviews

references in this volume, was not always accurate and that by the time he contributed the veterinary medicine chapters to Laignel-Lavastine's comprehensive history two years later, he had removed this paragraph from the section on plagues and contagions in the middle ages which otherwise closely follows his previous volume. This was possibly done with a little help from his medical history friends, who earlier in the same volume wrote of the Black Death: "Sous forme de peste bubonique (peste noire) et surtout de peste pulmonaire, elle tuait au troisième ou quatrième jour".

If finally, unlike Twigg, we were to consult primary sources, one obvious choice would be Guy de Chauliac (c1300–c1370), who actually lived through the outbreak and survived his attendance on the victims. He distinguished, in separate chapters, between what he called "carboncle anthrax" and other "pustules sanguines, mauvaises, et corrompues", and the great plague (peste). And although "carboncle anthrax" was not necessarily in all cases identical with the anthrax of today, his accurate and detailed descriptions spell out his awareness of one important difference ignored by Twigg; the anthrax pustule and other "carboncles" are primary lesions, whereas in the plague of 1348–50 the buboes were a secondary phenomenon appearing after the initial onset of disease.

For all its statistics and effort, Twigg's case is less than convincing, especially if anthrax is to be put forward as a viable alternative. Much stronger arguments are needed to dissuade historians from identifying the Black Death as bubonic plague alternating with pneumonic plague, as has been observed in modern outbreaks in Manchuria, Transbaikalia, and the Kirghiz Steppes, where bubonic plague occurs during warm weather followed by pneumonic plague during the winter. Pneumonic plague is known to be highly contagious man-to-man, unlike either bubonic plague or anthrax, and to spread with great rapidity in modern outbreaks. Such an explanation would obviate the need to consider too radical changes in the biological behaviour of the vectors and the organism, and in accepted beliefs. At the end of the book, one is left with the impression that the material here presented might have made for an amusing and stimulating essay but that as a book it is a misplaced effort and hardly justifies the claims of the blurb that it is a "revolutionary new examination" making a "convincing case" for rejecting plague in favour of anthrax as the true identity of the Black Death. Convincing, no. Provocative, yes—*vide* the length of this review.

Lise Wilkinson  
Department of Virology  
Royal Postgraduate Medical School

PHILLIP DE LACY (editor, translator, and commentator), *Galen De Placitis Hippocratis et Platonis* (Corpus Medicorum Graecorum V 4, 1, 2), Berlin, DDR, Akademie-Verlag, 1984, 8vo, pp. 222, M. 65.00.

This, the third volume, completes Professor De Lacy's splendid edition of one of Galen's most important texts (see this journal 1980, 24, p. 99f., and 1981, 25, p. 101). It contains a detailed word index, addenda and corrigenda, and, most valuable of all, a commentary expounding points of medical, philosophical, and stylistic significance. No student of Galen can afford to be without it, for it throws light on to all corners of Galen's activity, especially his philosophical interpretations of medical topics. There is throughout an enviable economy of words and argument, which sets out clearly the commentator's own views, while at the same time pointing to where further discussions and comparative material might be found. The newcomer to Galen may read De Lacy's fluent translation with pleasure; the more advanced reader will be encouraged to seek out more and to think deeply about the problems raised by Galen's interpretation of man.

Naturally enough, in a work of such long gestation, one can add references to recent discussions that, of necessity, were unknown to the editor, e.g. add to the note on p. 380, 13–19, W. D. Smith's discussion in his *The Hippocratic tradition*, and to the comments on Galen's relationship with the Aristotelian tradition and with Alexander of Aphrodisias, pp. 664–666, Paul Moraux's account of Galen in his *Aristotelismus*, II, and my article in *Bull. Hist.*

## Book Reviews

*Med.* 1984, 315–324. But I have found nothing of significance omitted in discussions of the older literature, whether it be on Stoic logic or on the theories of a later “Galenist”, Nemesius of Emesa.

There are also discoveries still to be made, particularly relating to the transmission of the manuscripts of Galen. For example, the celebrated Italian humanist, Politian, writing from Venice on 20 June 1491, informed Lorenzo de’ Medici in Florence of what he had seen at Padua in the library of Dr Pier Leoni (d. 1492); “ha certi quinterni di Galieno de dogmate Aristotelis et Hippocratis in greco, del qual ci darà la copia a Padova, che si è fatto pur frutto” (*Prose volgari*, Florence, G. Barberà, 1867, *Lett.* XXX, p. 78f.). Politian’s editor, Isidoro del Lungo, rightly identified the tract as *On the opinions of Hippocrates and Plato*, but not the actual manuscript. The solution to the problem is, however, not hard to find. Politian’s report of his visit was not polite reminiscence; he was acting as agent for Lorenzo and also hinting that Leoni might be willing to sell his rarity. By 1582, when cardinal Sirleto was interested in buying up what remained of Leoni’s library, this manuscript was no longer there, see L. Dorez, *Revue des bibliothèques* 1894, p. 74; 1897, pp. 83 and 92, nos. 189–190. Since the manuscript in the Laurentian library in Florence, Plut. 74.22 = L is the only codex of this tract that is so battered as to be described as “certi quinterni”, we may suppose that Lorenzo took the hint and acquired the stray gatherings from Leoni. They were still together when Caius copied them in 1543, for his notes, now in Eton College Library, show that both L and the few leaves now in Caius’ own college, MS 47/24 = C, formed part of the same volume in the Laurentian library. Indeed, Caius’ is the mysterious hand, first observed by Professor De Lacy, that added references to the Aldine edition in both L and C. Although one should not speak ill of the dead, it is highly likely that it was John Caius who removed the opening folios of L and brought them back with him to England via Basle, where in 1544 he published from them the *editio princeps* of Book I. The damaged state of the Laurentian manuscript would have presented an open invitation to steal a few pages “ad usum editorum”, and the culprit might be miles away before ever his crime was detected. Caius was not the first or the last seeker after manuscripts to fall prey to temptation.

This sidelight on the past serves as a mere footnote to the history of this Galenic treatise, and in no way detracts from the great value of this magnificent edition. The printers, the staff of the *Corpus Medicorum* and, above all, Professor De Lacy are to be congratulated on a great achievement.

Vivian Nutton  
Wellcome Institute

BLAS BRUNI CELLI, *Bibliografía Hipocrática*, Caracas, Ediciones del Rectorado, Universidad Central de Venezuela, 1984, 8vo, pp. 507, illus., Bs. 180,00 (paperback).

Hippocratic bibliography is in fashion. Following on Maloney and Savoie’s *Bibliographie Hippocratique* of 1982 and Gerhard Fichtner’s computerized bibliography of the *Corpus Hippocraticum* of 1984 comes this lavishly illustrated bibliography by Dr Bruni Celli. Its entries are arranged in alphabetical order, usually of the author or editor, but 2779 is oddly entered under Mahomet II. There is an index of modern names, an index relating as far as possible individual Hippocratic texts to the appropriate entries, an index of towns and printers, and an index of major Hippocratic topics. There are many illustrations, taken with one exception from the author’s own collection, of the frontispieces of significant editions or studies, although regrettably their quality is not always such as to reveal the signatures of their former owners. Several authors also receive a brief biography or a date of birth. Finally, each entry concludes with a series of references to the source from which the entry was derived.

These additions make this by far the best Hippocratic bibliography to use, although it is still far from perfect, and for individual treatises Fichtner is better organized. It incorporates the information given by Maloney and Savoie—not always for the best, see the spurious entry 1106, which is 1105 in another guise—but by listing its sources of information, it enables the reader to check the reliability of each entry. This is a great advantage, for the citations of