

## Book Reviews

The author's account of the gestation of this book will ring bells for many readers. Stimulated by an interest in speech disorder and the modern practice of speech therapy, he looked for theoretical beginnings in the seventeenth century. This led to his questioning the assumption that nothing "useful" existed before then. Once he found the early modern precursors themselves had a mass of precursors in the previous century, he wisely decided not to carry on running up a down escalator but to go straight to the classical sources instead—the Hippocratic *Aphorisms* 6.32, the pseudo-Aristotelian *Problems* 11.30 and a number of Galenic texts—and to research their ensuing transmission and receipt from there. Two classificatory systems for speech defects emerge: one according to the alteration of sounds conceived as elements of a grammatical system, and another conceived organically on the basis of injured constitutions. Similarly, Wollock identifies alternative methods of treatment, one social-psychological which concentrates on training and the treatment of symptoms (from which speech therapy grew), and another which was that of the physicians who used medicine instead because they saw speech defects as symptomatic of underlying diseases.

Speech disorder is situated in the unstable no-man's-land between body and mind in the dualistic routines of modern medical thought. Its earlier conceptual history is therefore a territory which all serious practitioners as well as students of the organic origins of speech—especially "normal" speech—ought to explore. Our response to Wollock's painstaking mapping of it, a project which looks like half a lifetime's work, should be gratitude. The scholarship is worn lightly, and Wollock has an enviable ability to make the texts accessible, whether he is describing the grand scheme of humours and temperaments or the fine detail of interpretative problems over terminology.

Theoretical problems arise. Some may argue that the frame of contemporary theoretical reference (limited to Chomsky and Cartesianism versus behaviourism) is too narrow. Wollock's concluding judgement—that

the ancient tradition is "more appropriate to its object" than the Cartesian one—sounds like golden age utopianism as long as it is not connected to any further investigation of contemporary possibilities. Secondly, although the author gives every indication that he wants to avoid positivism or presentism, he does not really dig speech disorder in itself (as opposed to the various diagnostic approaches) out of the hole allotted to it by modern medicine. Partly this is an inevitable concomitant of choosing to organize material according to sources: no smoke without fire, no source-text without a stable referent. Perhaps too, in spite of the sterility of the medical model and the origins of therapy rather in a rhetorical model of "elocution", it is just common sense that speech disorder is socially constructed to a less radical degree than (say) mental disorders. Be that as it may, Wollock limits the force of his own anti-positivist intentions by not looking much beyond melancholy to illustrate the way discourses on speech disorder became "blurred" with others during the late Renaissance and early modern period. A look at the monstrosity literature would reveal speech disorders there too, associated with an even wider and more diffuse set of abnormalities and cultural significances. Perhaps they still are?

Few people can claim to have solved similar problems of historical method, and the praise is not intended to be faint. Such problems will emerge from the debates which can now take place thanks to Wollock's foundational work.

C F Goodey,

Institute of Education, University of London

**Armelle Debru and Guy Sabbah** (eds), *Nommer la maladie. Recherches sur le lexique gréco-latin de la pathologie*, Mémoires XVII, Centre Jean-Palmerne de l'Université de Saint-Étienne, 1998, pp. 244, FFrs 120.00 (2-86272-128-X).

The Centre Jean-Palmerne adds another useful volume of medical history to its distinguished series of *Mémoires*. Most of the new arrival's

## Book Reviews

predecessors in the field have been confined to Latin texts from Antiquity and the early Middle Ages; here there is consideration of Greek material as well. The main theme is clear from the title. Most ancient authorities in the Hippocratic-Galenic tradition considered naming the disease essential, both intellectually and therapeutically. They bequeathed a large and florid vocabulary, many of the nuances and developments of which have yet to be fully mapped. That task becomes a good deal easier, of course, in the age of the CD-ROM and the data-base—the *Thesaurus linguae latinae*, the PHI disk of Latin literature and, not least, *Esculape*, which is being developed at the CNRS as a corpus of Latin pathological terms and is both described and put through its paces near the end of the present volume. Juxtaposing medical and non-medical texts, several early papers in the collection have specific lexica in their sights—of, among other disorders, catalepsy (Françoise Skoda, who nicely punctures Galen's claim to terminological innovation here), incubus, intestinal obstruction and diabetes (Anna-Maria Urso), various vocal disorders (Frédérique Biville), and epilepsy—under the grammatically puzzling designation *morbus maior* (the comparative argued by Anna Orlandini to be in effect a superlative). Two highly worthwhile contributions of a different kind might seem to have strayed in from some parallel collection, *Nommer le remède*. Patricia Gaillard-Seux surveys recipes for glaucoma involving the green lizard. Alain Touwaide proposes that Isidore of Seville's account of snake poison (*Etymologiae* xii.4) reveals a more creative and coherent engagement with ancient medicine than the bishop is often given credit for. Of equal interest, but closer to the book's ostensible theme, is a demonstration by Anne Fraisse of the ways in which Cassius Felix's Hellenism paradoxically enriched Latin medical vocabulary. The volume also includes a brief if unfocused account of Caelius Aurelianus as medical philologist (Françoise Gaide), and a survey of the lexical interplay of human and veterinary medicine in Pelagonius (by Valérie Gitton), which does not, however,

add much to the sixth chapter of J N Adams's magisterial *Pelagonius and Latin veterinary terminology in the Roman empire* (1995). The volume concludes with a bibliography compiled by Danielle Gourevitch of works on Latin pathology.

**Peregrine Horden,**

Royal Holloway, University of London

**Annette Müller, *Krankheitsbilder im Liber de Plantis der Hildegard von Bingen (1098–1179) und im Speyerer Kräuterbuch (1456). Ein Beitrag zur medizinisch-pharmazeutischen Terminologie im Mittelalter, I: Textband, II: Indexband*, Schriften zur Wissenschaftsgeschichte, 2 vols, Hürtgenwald, Guido Pressler, 1997, vol. 1, pp. 239, vol. 2, pp. xvii, 557, DM 380.00 (vol. 1: 3-87646-083-2; vol. 2: 3-87646-084-0).**

This is a comparative study of the lexicon used for the therapeutic indications of *materia medica* in the *Liber simplicis medicinae* by Hildegard von Bingen and in the *Speyerer Kräuterbuch* (completed in 1456), derived, at least in part, from a twelfth- or thirteenth-century German translation of the *Liber*. The textual data from the sources are presented in the second volume in four lists: (1) contains indications (in Latin or German in alphabetical order, with references) and therapeutic agents; (2) gives the activity attributed to the *materia medica* with the original text, with references if different from those in list 1; (3) contains a translation of list 1 in German or Latin, as appropriate (again with references); and (4) provides synonyms of list 1, if any. In addition there are three more lists which give the *materia medica* with Latin or German names in alphabetical order, with indications; the Latin or German names and their variants or synonyms; and botanical or pharmacological explanations in alphabetical order of plant names in Latin or German.

Volume one analyses this material from a lexicological point of view, with medical considerations (ancient and modern) when they