apparatus and notes, following standard practice. In the longer second part, which covers those chapters for which titles are given in the pinax but not found in P, the editors use what they describe as a 'mosaic' format, mixing close comparison of the various Latin adaptations of Soranos, translations of Greek and Latin adaptations, and summaries of related texts; different methods are used for each chapter, depending on the sources available. This is a meticulous exercise in which the editors use to good effect the unrivalled expertise in Soranos' thought and prose which they have gained in their work on the first three volumes. The editors demonstrate how comparison of the pinax with Caelius, Mustio, and Aetius Book XVI allows us to reconstruct changes not just in the content, but also in the classification of Soranos' material. Different strands of the *Gynaecia* tradition altered the chapter order; here, Soranos becomes a point of entry into discussions of how technical material was reclassified and reorganized in manuals of this kind, and it would have been useful here to look at the practice in other fields of knowledge in antiquity. The editors argue, for example, that Soranos' attitude to the practicalities of surgery mean that he would have placed his section on the speculum right at the end of Book 4; this was followed by those who translated his work into Latin, but a later compiler was then responsible for moving it back immediately after the chapter on abscesses, a move which could be taken to imply that its employment was specifically for this condition. When reconstructing the lost chapter on clitoridectomy, the editors argue that Caelius recommends a far less extensive surgical removal than does Mustio, while Aetius gives an anatomical description of the organ (taken from Book 1 of Soranos) which the Latin versions omit. It is possible, they suggest, that Mustio and Aetius are describing a different pathological condition to that given in Caelius.

The volume ends with an index of all the medical and philosophical writers mentioned by name, and an extensive index of significant words. The complete Budé edition is thus a very valuable tool, particularly in its combination of philological study and contextualization of the work, and the editors are to be congratulated on their endeavours.

University of Reading HELEN KING

A MEDICAL MISCELLANY

A. Debru, N. Palmieri (edd.): *Docente natura. Mélanges de médecine ancienne et médiévale offerts à Guy Sabbah*. Pp. 329. Saint-Etienne: Publications de l'Université de Saint-Étienne, 2001. Paper, €30. ISBN: 2-86272-230-8.

The *docente natura* of the title comes from Cicero (*Leg.* 1.26), who attributes the discovery of the arts to the teaching of nature. The volume, with contributions from fifteen authors, is an *hommage* to the historian Guy Sabbah, who was the driving force behind the establishment of a research centre for Latin medical literature at the Centre Jean Palerne.

Following the dedicatee's pronounced commitment to textual studies, the majority of the contributors have chosen a philological or linguistic approach, while the remainder deal mainly with the use and transmission of texts. Two-thirds of the contributions are in French, four are in Italian, and one is in German, and despite the

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.339 Published online by Cambridge University Press

subtitle, most are focused on antiquity (including one paper on veterinary medicine). The great range of topics makes it impossible to provide an overall description of this Festschrift, but an outline of a small selection of the contributions should give an idea.

F. Biville examines the terminology used by Latin authors to describe the organs involved in producing the voice and speech. Although this belongs to the sphere of anatomy and physiology, the texts used are not necessarily by medical authors, the oldest source being Lucretius. B. adduces both philosophical (Seneca, Aulus Gellius, Cicero) and medical (Celsus, Pliny, Caelius Aurelianus, Vindicianus) writings for his examples. The former appear to concentrate on the nature of voice and sound, or the link between breath and nutrition, while the latter deal with nosology and therapy, only the fourth-century Vindicianus providing a description of the vocal apparatus. Even writers on rhetoric and metrics (Quintilian, Terentianus Maurus, Martianus Capella) apparently took an interest in how the voice and speech are produced.

A closely related semantic field is investigated by A. Debru in her contribution about the creation of a technical terminology for respiration in Latin. The main authors whose works serve as sources are again Cicero, Celsus, Pliny, and Seneca, and the vocabulary used in this context divides into the four lexical groups of *anima*, *spiro*, *halo*, and *flo*. An example for the creation of new terminology is the neologism *respiritus* coined by Cicero in *ND*. While Celsus uses only the group *spirare*/*spiritus* for respiration, a great diversity of expressions is to be found in Pliny and Seneca (in the latter's case, also in the context of descriptions of his own asthma).

In a rather playful paper, D. Gourevitch leaps from references to the 'bones' in the elephant's heart (in Galen's account of his dissection of the animal) to the disease called 'elephant' (*elephas*). She touches only briefly on the naming of diseases, going on to discuss ideas of contagion, as the disease in question appears to be a form of 'leprosy'.

The passages containing medical topics in Fronto's correspondence with Marcus Aurelius, Lucius Verus, and Antoninus Pius form the basis of I. Mazzini's contribution, which compares the descriptions—practically all of symptoms and therapy—with medical writings. The aim is to determine the extent of medical knowledge among Fronto and his circle, and M. comes to the conclusion that what Fronto and his correspondents write is in line with the information found in medical authors (the Hippocratic Corpus, Celsus, Galen, etc.), but also that the (often time-consuming) therapies described are typical of those which would have been used for patients from the upper classes.

Another topic of philological interest is dealt with by P. Skoda, who examines the Greek terms for 'antidote'. Although there are three categories of words—those derived from *alexein*, those with the prefix *anti-*, and terms using the privative *a*—many of these are ambiguous. The only nouns that can be said to denote the meaning of antidote exclusively and unequivocally are *alexipharmakon* and *antipharmakon*, while *antidotos* can mean both antidote and remedy.

As these examples should illustrate, the variety of subjects will make this volume worth reading for classicists of different fields, in particular for philologists. (Further topics include citations from medical texts in medieval MSS, Cassius Felix and Methodism, and Jerome's references to Hippocrates and Galen.) Those not belonging to the small number of scholars of ancient medicine, for whom it will obviously be of interest, should not be discouraged by the subtitle and thereby miss a stimulating book.

Department of History and Philosophy of Science, Cambridge C. F. SALAZAR

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.339 Published online by Cambridge University Press