

Book Reviews

within the wider context of changing scientific ideas about the female body.

Helen King, University of Reading

Ivan Garofalo (ed.), *Anonymi medici: De morbis acutis et chroniis*, transl. Brian Fuchs, *Studies in Ancient Medicine* vol. 12, Leiden and New York, E J Brill, 1997, pp. xxx, 375, Nlg. 178.50, \$112.50 (90-04-10227-2).

Just over a hundred years ago Robert Fuchs published in a German periodical part of an unknown Greek tract on acute and chronic diseases he had found in a Paris manuscript, hence its common title of *Anonymus Parisinus*. Lacking both beginning and ending, it gives first the cause of each disease as suggested by earlier writers, then signs and symptoms, and finally treatments. Although its appearance created a stir at the time, it has since been rarely noticed, despite its potential importance for the study of pre-Galenic medicine. In making the first edition of this tract in book form, Ivan Garofalo includes new portions taken from manuscripts in Vienna and London, along with an English translation and introduction, and notes in the form of a second apparatus. All can be grateful that such a neglected text is now made more accessible, and those who know no Greek will be still more in Garofalo's debt.

When there is so much valuable material assembled here, it gives me no pleasure to say that this is a deeply flawed book. Garofalo has done the first part of the editor's task well; his collations, to judge from his work on the London MS, are accurate, and his choice of readings, his own emendations, and his listing of variants are generally competent, even if his use of brackets in the text to indicate both emendations and readings present in only one manuscript is confusing. But on almost every page, I have found discrepancies between text and translation, between text and notes, or between translation and notes; lines are omitted, or words included twice, without it being made clear whether these decisions

represent the views of Garofalo, the series editor (John Scarborough) or the translator, or are simply oversights. Variant spellings and translations appear on the same page, even on adjacent lines, p. 39, and the Greekless can have little inkling of the problems that lurk. The translator has difficulty with the technical terms of medicine and editorial technique (the preface is at times incomprehensible), and permits such nonsense as "dung of the aromas", p. 34 (which appears in the index of substances, p. 357, as "refuse of spices"). Misprints abound: there is one in each of the first two notes, and the bibliography, essential for understanding the notes, is filled with error and inconsistency. Dates and initials are given at will, and names and titles are mangled. The article referred to in note 73 does not appear in the bibliography; and those wishing to discover where Daremberg first signalled the importance of this text will not find it under Daremberg. The list of editions of ancient authors cited omits, p. 264, von Staden's *Herophilus* (despite the reference back on p. 266); puts the author cited throughout as An. Br. after Theophanes (because until 1991 he was usually called Vindicianus); and leaves the reader baffled as to the identity and, indeed, existence of Biz. Given that Biz appears at first alongside Paul in the notes, I surmised that this might be some Byzantine epitome, but the truth has to wait to p. 344, where Bizantium is revealed as an, as yet, unedited (Latin?) author of unrevealed date. By contrast, the index of Greek is relatively free from misprints.

The wider significance of this text for the study of ancient medicine is never brought out. In part, this is because the apparatus of notes (not always aligned with the text or translation) does not allow adequate exposition of parallel passages in other writers. Many of Garofalo's emendations depend on what they say, but he offers at best only the briefest of indications, and his method of citation inevitably will lead to confusion, especially in its near total avoidance of commas. Those wishing to follow up the references in the remarkable chapter 20 on religious enthusiasm as a disease should be warned that three of the authors do not appear

Book Reviews

in the detailed list, pp. 344–53; Byz is, of course, Bizantium; and *Def.* refers not to Rufus, as the unwary might think, but to pseudo-Galen, who is assigned a wrong volume number in K. on p. 349 (read: 19). But Garofalo gives little or no help on bigger problems in his introduction, where questions of sources and genres should have been more widely discussed than in a few lines. Instead, he talks mainly of authorship (rightly rejecting Herodotus in favour of an anonymous writer of the imperial age, but without arguing for the date, which is still controversial), and of manuscripts. Yet it is somehow typical of the carelessness shown throughout this edition (for which author, translator, and series editor must share responsibility) that the block diagram on p. xix does not correspond to the list that it is meant to represent and that immediately precedes it. Similarly, Garofalo numbers his chapters from 1, and notes that some manuscripts have chapter numberings (those in V are curiously described as “continuous but sometimes omitted”): what he does not reveal, but the dust jacket alone makes clear, is that in the manuscripts the numbering of the existing chapters begins at no. 13, an important fact in considering the composition of this interesting treatise.

Vivian Nutton,

Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine

Benvenutus Grassus, *The wonderful art of the eye: a critical edition of the Middle English translation of his De probatissima arte oculorum*, ed. L M Eldredge, East Lansing, Michigan State University Press, 1996, pp. xiii, 120, \$24.95 (0-87013-459-0).

The thirteenth-century oculist Benvenutus Grassus is known only for, and through, a single treatise: *De probatissima arte oculorum*, or *The wonderful art of the eye*. Yet that unique work spread his fame across Europe. Its original Latin version circulated in numerous copies, and was re-worked and augmented, a sure symptom of popularity and heavy use. It

was also translated very quickly into a number of vernacular languages. Two Middle English versions survive: one recension is represented by MSS Glasgow, University Library, Hunter V.8.6, and London, British Library, Sloane 661, and a second by Glasgow, University Library, Hunter V.8.16, and Oxford, Bodleian Library, Ashmole 1468. L M Eldredge’s critical edition is in fact only an edition of Hunter V.8.6, with some variant readings from the Sloane codex; where this recension omits passages found in the original, they are supplied in italics from the manuscripts of the second group, especially Hunter V.8.16. Though the result is a text which no medieval reader ever saw, such editorial strategies are appropriate for medieval vernacular texts, whose forms are seldom canonized.

Eldredge’s edition is impeccable, his notes and glossary very useful. Where the reader is likely to be somewhat disappointed is in the introduction covering Grassus himself, the nature of the text, the manuscripts, and the quality of the translation. There is much that is commendable in this introduction: the medical identification of eye diseases described by Grassus is fascinating, though Eldredge tends to interpret medieval pharmacology in terms of modern standards of efficacy rather than in the light of its own notions of the nature and power of drugs—about which Benvenutus Grassus was proudly well informed. The problems really lie in Eldredge’s treatment of Grassus himself, and in his lack of attention to the context of vernacular translation of medical works.

Grassus was an itinerant oculist, but also a man with considerable exposure to scholastic medicine. Oculists, being specialists, were considered low-caste practitioners, and yet Grassus writes in Latin, employs the categories of Galenic physiology, pathology and pharmacology with ease, and expects his readers to as well. This raises some very significant questions about the diffusion of Scholastic medical culture beyond the walls of the university, and its appropriation by practitioners who were not necessarily university-trained—a subject very subtly