

status is more thoroughly described than in the earlier studies of Horstmanshoff and Gourevitch, although she reaches much the same conclusion. Her analysis of where and how Galen treated his patients is clear, and she makes many good points about the public nature of medical practice. Even a private sick room might be thronged with relatives, servants, and casual visitors. One will gain much of value for the understanding of ancient medical practice from this book, which displays a much greater sensitivity towards the historical context than does Schlange-Schöningen's recent German study of Galen's life and times. Dr Mattern is also to be congratulated on not confining her search for Galenic material to what is contained in the standard edition of Kühn.

But this is also a book dominated by the catalogue of cases to the exclusion of almost all else, and much of it reads like an excellent spreadsheet, extremely valuable but missing out much that cannot easily be quantified. The preface states that the book is not about medicine, but about healing and how the act of healing is represented, a formulation that is ambiguous in many ways. If I understand Mattern aright, she is interested in the way in which Galen describes his cases for his readers, comparing his methods with those of the writers of the Gospels or the Hippocratic *Epidemics*, who also relate tales of the sick. But many subtleties escape notice, and not enough is made of the very different character of the three groups of *Epidemics*, and their diverse origins and purposes. She also compares Galen's descriptions with those on the Asclepian healing tablets, although without mentioning Gironé's wider survey of ancient healing inscriptions, or, perhaps more relevant still, Lucian's account in his *Alexander* of the healings of this false prophet. A reluctance to become involved with medicine also prevents Mattern from developing further even her good insights. Medical time, for instance, is very different in Antiquity from now: the patient's past in Galen rarely extends backwards beyond a few hours or days, and is very different from a modern patient record

that might go back years. The anonymity of patients may also have something to do with ancient methods of record keeping, as well as with the oral nature of most of Galen's presentations. How many modern doctors can recall, often after some years, the names even of their striking cases?

This is a book by an ancient historian, and it shows in a lack of attention to the actual language and text of Galen. It is not just that Tabiae, p. 55, has long been recognized as Stabiae, but very little is said, despite the title, about Galen's actual rhetoric of healing, which I would define as a strategy for convincing the patient, or the actual language used. The medical importance of conviction and trust—a major theme, especially in Galen's commentaries on the Hippocratic *Prognostic* and *Prorrhetic*—is largely left on one side. The references to the gestures of healing, a part of ancient rhetoric, are likewise under-exploited (cf. F Gaide, *Manus medica*, 2003). Galen's rhetoric, i.e. his language and his use of a variety of means to gain the patient's assent, has been remarkably little studied, although it must have contributed a great deal to his success with his patients and with subsequent generations. This book goes some of the way to explaining that success, but it still leaves much for others to do before we have a proper understanding of Galen's rhetoric of healing.

**Vivian Nutton,**

The Wellcome Trust Centre for the  
History of Medicine at UCL

**Alejandro García González** (edición crítica y comentario), *Alphita*, Edizione Nazionale 'La Scuola Medica Salernitana', 2, Florence, SISMEL—Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2007, pp. xii, 608, €68.00 (paperback 978-88-8450-262-9).

**Isabelle Mandrin**, *Griechische und griechisch vermittelte Elemente in der Synonymenliste Alphita. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der medizinischen*

*Fachterminologie im lateinischen Mittelalter*, Lateinische Sprache und Literatur des Mittelalters, Band 44, Bern, Peter Lang, 2008, pp. xvi, 256, £35.30 (paperback 978-3-03911-463-4).

If we look for forerunners of today's medical dictionaries and venture beyond the watershed which was the invention of printing with moveable type in Europe, we may well conclude that the medieval work of which we have just been given the first truly critical edition might be considered their ancestor. It differs from earlier glossaries (where difficult, obsolete or foreign words are explained) in its etymological approach. It is here that I would see a suggestive link to other works connected with the School of Salerno, and, in spite of the lack of incontrovertible evidence, it makes good sense to claim the *Alphita* for Salerno. This prototype medical dictionary runs to approximately 1300 entries, comprising mainly materia medica, but also diseases, and some anatomy. The early Carolingian *Glossarium Ansileubi* shows clearly the *modus operandi* of the compiler: he drew on passages in medical treatises where the word in question (usually Greek or obsolete) was immediately followed by an explanation. (The medical portions of this glossary were edited by a Danish pioneer in the history of ancient science and medicine, Johan Ludvig Heiberg, as *Glossae medicinales*, although Isabelle Mandrin seems to think that this is an independent work.) For almost every entry, the *Glossarium Ansileubi* provides fuller source references to the works excerpted there than does the *Alphita*; and because its excerpts are often considerably longer, it is easier for us to track down the source exactly. In the *Alphita*, less than 10 per cent of entries come with the name of an author. Much to our surprise, Alexander of Tralles is the one who gets the lion's share, 64 of a total of 120 (according to Alejandro García González). This can only be seen as a testimony to the importance and wide circulation of the Late Latin translation of this sixth-century Greek author. (Parts of Alexander are also present in the *Passionarius*

*Galieni* or *Garioponti*, whose make-up does not seem to be clear to either Mandrin, p. 20, or García González.)

It is a remarkable coincidence that two young scholars should publish their reshaped dissertations, both centring on the *Alphita* (the first major contributions after more than 120 years), more or less at the same time. García González's is the more comprehensive work; he not only provides us with a new Latin text (which must be hailed as the first critical edition ever) and a thorough study (in Spanish) of the transmission (a total of sixty manuscripts, of which he selected eight as the basis for his edition and consulted a further fourteen; Mandrin, in contrast, speaks of "rund dreißig Handschriften" (p. 4), without giving details). He also comments on every single entry in the last major part of his study (pp. 330–575), where the material is arranged in true alphabetical order (the *Alphita* was content with grouping its entries according to the first letter of the word). Elements of a succinct commentary are already in Mowat's 1887 edition.

Mandrin, on the other hand, provides a more detailed and focused discussion of selected entries (Teil II: Begriffsuntersuchungen, pp. 27–206, running to 65 chapters with a somewhat higher number of lemmata, "etwa hundert", p. 24); in other words, her choice was restricted to a small fraction of the total approximately 1300 entries. Apart from the text published, for the first time, by Salvatore de Renzi in 1854, and Mowat, she uses but one manuscript, clm 615 (thirteenth to fourteenth century, García González's M, certainly not the oldest surviving manuscript); Mandrin's second manuscript (pp. 4f.) of the *Alphita*, Prague, National Library VIII-H-34, fifteenth century, does not appear to transmit this text at all (and is therefore not listed by García González), and she quotes it from the dictionary of medieval Latin from Bohemian sources. Mandrin remained unaware of another manuscript in the Prague National Library which does transmit the *Alphita*, X-H-23 (García González, p. 111). She also moves the Sloane collection from

London to Oxford (p. 4). Mandrin has three indexes (words; authors and book titles; and subjects, pp. 221–47), but, for example, Medea, quoted as an author in an entry of the *Alphita*, appears in the first and not in the second, while other authors figure in both. One regrets that García González offers nothing quite comparable (but there is an index of persons, works, and places, pp. 597–602, and one of manuscripts, pp. 603f.) because such indexes allow us to start from what we consider correct forms of Greek and Latin words or book titles and thence go on to the medieval entry, where what we meet has often been distorted beyond recognition.

An example of such a distortion, due to imperfect knowledge of palaeography, is *methasm criticus*, which Mandrin chooses as the lemma of her entry, taken from de Renzi's edition based on two Paris manuscripts collated for him by Daremberg. Mowat printed the slightly better *methasin creticum* (as did the *Dictionary of medieval Latin from British sources*, 1781c). An edition should surely restore *metasincriticum* or *metasincriticum* written as one word, because there is no Greek noun *methasis* meaning “disease” (and Mandrin's *methasm* is neither Greek nor Latin). Let us compare what both scholars have to say in their commentaries (García González: p. 480a; Mandrin: pp. 151–3). Both refer to Cassius Felix chapter 8 (as did Mowat), and although Mandrin cites the new edition of this author by Anne Fraisse (Paris, 2002), she does not seem to have consulted it, giving, like García González, Rose's page and line (Leipzig, 1897, probably quoted from the *Thesaurus linguae Latinae*, since Fraisse divides the text into paragraphs as well as chapters). The phrase the two authors quote from Cassius Felix occurs there in fact twice, at 8.4 and 46.17 (the word itself also at 53.2; there is a complete concordance of Cassius Felix, published by Fraisse and Maire), but it has nothing to do with the mistaken explanation in the *Alphita* (Greek was definitely not the forte of the Salernitans) as *morbum determinans siue sanans*. Likewise, both authors refer to Dioscorides (García

González to *Materia medica*, 1.38, Mandrin to 4.153.3), but the “remarkable parallel” (“auffallende Parallele”) that Mandrin identifies is, after all, only an occurrence of the same word *metasunkritikos*. Her report of the readings in the Latin Dioscorides (Dioscorides Longobardus) is not, in fact, correct, because the earliest manuscript, clm 337 (tenth century), online since 28 November 2006, has *metasi(n)criticum* (*metasim cretica* is the wording in the Lyons 1512 edition of the alphabetical medieval Dioscorides, the version that could have been used by the compiler of the *Alphita*). Both seem equally unaware that Book One of the Latin translation of Dioscorides, available at the time the *Alphita* was composed, should be used in the 1938 edition by Mihăescu, listed in the *Index librorum* of the Munich *Thesaurus linguae Latinae*. *Metasunkritikos* is correctly linked to Methodist medical writers by Mandrin (following the *Thesaurus*), but it is not confined to them, and the edition of the fragments of the Methodists by Manuela Tecusan should have been consulted and referred to in a footnote of Mandrin's discussion of Methodist concepts. The *poroi* between the atoms that make up the human (and animal) body are not, as Mandrin believes, “openings” (“Öffnungen”), but rather paths (*meatus, uiae*, see Forcellini s.v. *metasincriticus*) which may become blocked by being too narrow (*stegnosis*) or may be too wide (*rhusis*), interfering in either case with the health of the individual. It is not surprising (as Mandrin thinks, p. 153) that we meet the adjective in Caelius Aurelianus, because Caelius Aurelianus was, after all, translating the works of the *princeps methodicorum* (as he calls him) Soranus. All this palls by comparison when we read the translation for *metasincriticus* in the *Dictionary of medieval Latin from British sources*: “that defines without curing a disease”, printing as part of the Latin *Alphita* text “morbos determinans sine sanans”—evidently dog Latin, and perhaps not even British! (Mowat had printed, of course, *siue sanans*.)

In our cyber age with access to bibliographies online (both for classics and for medieval studies), the number and quality of omissions present in both García González and in Mandrin is astonishing; the ones I consider the most serious concern newer editions of Latin texts, like the Dioscorides mentioned above, of Philumenus and Philagrius (Mihăileanu 1910; now also Masullo, 1999, for Philagrius), of Marcellus (Empiricus), whom Mandrin quotes in the 1889 edition by Helmreich, (which used only one manuscript, from Fulda, now in Paris), of the 1999 edition of Theophilus *de urinis* by Sonya Dase, and García González's serious oversight of Peter Stotz's five-volume *Handbuch zur lateinischen Sprache des Mittelalters*, to which he should have referred for phonetic changes (rather than Biville). His minute subdivisions of the bibliography (pp. 324–9 and 577–94) do not help the reader. (Stotz acted, by the way, as thesis supervisor for Mandrin and is the current editor of the series, where three volumes of *Physica Plinii Florentino-Pragensis* appeared some twenty years ago which could also have been consulted to advantage, like Önnersfors's *Physica Plinii Bambergensis*.)

García González's book is the first in a series called *Nova collectio Salernitana*, a national (Italian) edition of Salernitan writings comprising the texts found in de Renzi's five-volume *Collectio Salernitana* and edited by that scholar (who was no philologist) almost singlehandedly; now, there is a "commissione scientifica" of nineteen scholars of international repute. García González's volume is indeed welcome and marks a tremendous step forward, but is still marred by a number of imperfections, some of which could have been avoided before the work was committed to print. Similar reservations must be made for Mandrin, a book that contains good work but does not make full use of older studies that should have been consulted.

**Klaus-Dietrich Fischer,**

School of Historical Studies, Institute  
for Advanced Study, Princeton, NJ

**Girolamo Fracastoro**, *De sympathia et antipathia rerum, Liber I*: edizione critica, traduzione e commento **Concetta Pennuto**, Studi e Testi del Rinascimento Europeo, 31, Rome, Edizione di Storia e Letteratura, 2008, pp. cii, 358, €58.00 (paperback 978-88-8498-383-1).

**Concetta Pennuto**, *Simpatia, fantasia e contagio: il pensiero medico e il pensiero filosofico di Girolamo Fracastoro*, Centuria, 5, Rome, Edizioni di storia e Letteratura, 2008, pp. xx, 526, €55.00 (paperback 978-88-8498-384-8).

In 1546 the Giunti press in Venice published as a single book two philosophical tracts by the Veronese physician Girolamo Fracastoro—*De sympathia* and *De contagione*. The second of these explored the contagion of specific diseases that then afflicted Europe—plague, syphilis or the *morbo gallico*, leprosy, scabies, a disease of spots the size of lentils that historians now maintain was typhus, rabies, phthisis (or possibly tuberculosis), and others. From the historical evaluation of these diseases, Fracastoro developed a theory of contagion that analysed diseases according to three specific modes of dissemination—by contact, by contact as well as through contamination of another substance such as cloth (*fomes*), and by distance. This second tract had a profound impact on medical thought and the subsequent questioning of Galenic and Renaissance ideas of disease from the mid-sixteenth to the end of the seventeenth century. Almost to the complete neglect of *De sympathia*, this tract has engaged medical historians ever since, despite Fracastoro's remarks in his dedication to the Farnese cardinal and passages in both tracts that argue for a close interconnection between the two works: *De symphatia*, a work of natural philosophy and physics, underpinned Fracastoro's theory of contagion.

In two companion works, Concetta Pennuto has now addressed this oversight in the history of medicine and philosophy. The first is a