

this point is it really clear that with the *Chirurgia*, the opposite principle operated. The unwary reader might also assume that only asterisked words in the text have been corrected, though the notes reveal other unsignalled emendations, based on “the Latin” (i.e. Karl Sudhoff’s not entirely satisfactory edition). Details such as the sudden leap from fol. 225r to fol. 266r on p. 63 (II, III) are left unexplained. Criteria of inclusions and exclusions, though doubtless pragmatic, are unspecified: for example, why does the list of the *Chirurgia*’s chapter headings exclude the later French versions of Paris, BN ms fr. 1288 or Paris, BN ms. fr. 14827 referred to in David Ross’s unmentioned PhD thesis (‘Some thirteenth-century French versions of the *Chirurgia* of Roger of Salerno’, London University 1940, pp. 13–14)? It is also a little puzzling that no mention is made of the existence of this unpublished scholarly edition of the Trinity 0.1.20 version, even though Tony Hunt’s edition certainly supersedes it. But these are minor points, and the author’s energy and acuity in providing greater access to neglected medieval scientific material must be both welcomed and admired.

Linda M Paterson,
University of Warwick

Gundolf Keil (ed.), “*ein deutsch puech machen*”: *Untersuchungen zur landessprachlichen Vermittlung medizinischen Wissens*, Wissensliteratur im Mittelalter, vol. 11, Wiesbaden, Dr Ludwig Reichert Verlag, 1993, pp. xxiv, 616, illus., DM 118.00 (3-88226-539-6).

This is a volume whose title disguises its significance for scholars in a variety of disciplines. It deals with the transmission of medical knowledge in medieval vernacular texts, focusing primarily on the writings of Ortoolf von Bayerland, a Würzburg doctor active in the second half of the thirteenth century. After an introduction setting the author in the context of the most recent studies

of vernacular medieval medicine, the various authors show how his book was composed from earlier material and then itself dismembered and distributed among a variety of other compendia. His recipes turn up in a multitude of contexts and languages, and his sections on bloodletting, in sickness, health, and pregnancy, enjoyed an equally kaleidoscopic existence. In their turn, texts by other authors became associated with Ortoolf material, and circulated with it, primarily in the German-speaking areas of Europe, hence the publication here of many “new” texts on medicine.

But two contributions stand out of considerable interest for the Germanist or non-medievalist. Hilde-Marie Gross provides a detailed catalogue of medical compilatory manuscripts with illustrations, including all those with Ortoolf material. Her listing goes far beyond that of McKinney, *Medical illustrations in medieval manuscripts*, in both detail and accuracy, and any scholar wishing to seek illustrations of bloodletting, the medical zodiac, the colours of urine, must now start from the abundant information that is given here. Dr Gross organizes her material by topic, text, library, and type of illustration, and, with the help also of the very full indexes at the back of the book, finding an appropriate illustration is made simple. She gives an exhaustive and extremely valuable bibliography of each manuscript, that for Wellcome 49, 120, and 588 being more extensive than in Moorat’s catalogue.

One famous image discussed by Dr Gross is that of the “Woundman”, which survived well into the age of printing. In a separate study Erltraud Auer and Bernhard Schnell carry out a detailed investigation of this image, and publish a double edition of the text that most frequently accompanies it, sometimes in Latin, sometimes in German. They remind us that the production of images in a medical text served a practical rather than a purely artistic purpose, and they emphasize that text and image go together, and must be considered as a whole. Their readings, checked against Wellcome 49 and 290, are accurate, and their constitution of

the treatise impressive. However, they do not include instances where the image is found by itself, and recourse to MacKinney is still necessary.

Medieval vernacular medicine has for long been the Cinderella of medical history. With the publication of such major studies as this *Sammelband*, as varied and, at the same time, as coherent as the Ortolf material around which it is organized, historians familiar only with the more exalted productions of Paris or Padua now have no excuse for not attending to these more common but no less intellectual works.

Vivian Nutton, Wellcome Institute

Gerhard Endress and Dimitri Gutas (eds), *A Greek and Arabic lexicon (GALex): materials for a dictionary of the medieval translations from Greek into Arabic*, Fascicle 3, Handbook of Oriental Studies, vol. 11, Leiden and New York, E J Brill, 1995, pp. 96, Greek glossary, pp. 32, Nlg 80.00, \$45.75 (90-04-10216-7).

Endress and Gutas' monumental lexicon of the medieval Arabic translations from ancient and late antique Greek texts continues apace with the publication of this third fascicle (cf. *Medical History*, 1993, 37: 207–8; 1995, 39: 107–8). The editorial standard remains high, and the skill with which the various parts of the lexicon are simultaneously kept up to date is most impressive.

Two entries in this fascicle seem to merit special attention. The first, of most immediate interest from the philological perspective, is the extended entry (pp. 249–76, the longest in this fascicle) on the important and ubiquitous exceptive Arabic particle *illā*. This carefully subdivided corpus of data clearly illustrates the various ways in which the term was employed to render Greek constructions; though the use of the Arabic exceptive to translate Greek phrases neither exceptive nor exclusive in structure is well known, the extent to which this proves to have occurred is striking.

The second, of more general interest for the reception of ancient Greek culture in the medieval Islamic context, is the entry on the root 'lh, most commonly used to render terms relating to divinity and the godhead (pp. 307–19). It is well known that the medieval Arabic translators (both Christian and Muslim) needed to provide “theologically correct” translations, but the ways in which this was achieved are nevertheless of both interest and importance, especially in cases where an ancient Greek practice was either not understood at all, or was interpreted in line with eastern Christian customs prevailing at the time of the translation movement.

These examples simply illustrate the broad relevance of the *GALex*. Its materials not only document lexicographical patterns and techniques crucial for our understanding of translation technique and the proper comprehension of the Arabic translations themselves; they also provide an index to the vast array of issues and problems that arose as nascent Islamic culture came to terms with the heritage of antiquity. That it facilitates research in the latter as well as the former, and in such important new ways, is a tribute both to the significance of the work itself and to the scholarly and editorial skills of the editors.

Lawrence I Conrad, Wellcome Institute

Thierry Bardinet, *Les Papyrus médicaux de l'Égypte pharaonique*, Penser la Médecine, Paris, Fayard, 1995, pp. 591, FFr 180.00.

The situation regarding translations of the ancient Egyptian medical papyri into English is very far from satisfactory. There appear to be no English translations of the Hearst, Chester Beatty VI, Berlin, London papyri and the Brooklyn papyrus on snake bite. We are fortunate in having James Breasted's translation of the Edwin Smith papyrus on wounds, though published in 1930. Griffith's 1898 translation of the Kahun gynaecological papyrus into English was updated by Stevens in 1975. Iversen translated Carlsberg VIII into