

and the work of Peter of Ulm (fl. 1423). How such surgical texts might have been used is dealt with in part by Vollmuth. His study of medicine among the *Landsknecht*, the mercenary German infantry who fought in Europe in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, concentrates mainly on the latter period. What medical assistance was available seems at first to have been minimal (the artillery also acted as wound attendants), although by the 1560s regular provision for some medical attention was made for all the troops, not just the officers. Vollmuth compares the evidence of surgical manuals and archival documents with nine books of regulations or advice to future commanders. Of these the most important are the anonymous *Kriegsordnung* of c. 1527, and Leonhart Fronsperger's *Von kayserlichem Kriegsrechten Malefiz und Schuldhaendlen Ordnung und Regiment*, printed at Frankfurt am Main in 1566. Those, like the reviewer, unfamiliar with the German armies of this period will welcome the long chapter on their organization and development, but they may also feel that a comparison with the medical services being developed at the same time in France, Spain, or England would also have helped to define more closely the significance of Vollmuth's theme.

Vivian Nutton, Wellcome Institute

FAYE MARIE GETZ (ed.), *Healing and society in medieval England. A Middle English translation of the pharmaceutical writings of Gilbertus Anglicus*, Wisconsin Publications in the History of Science and Medicine No. 8, Madison, University of Wisconsin Press, 1991, pp. lxxiii, 378, £29.95 (0-299-12930-6).

To Faye Getz goes the credit for having identified and studied a hitherto unknown Middle English adaptation of Gilbertus Anglicus's *Compendium medicine* which has been recorded, so far, in fifteen manuscripts, all written within a fifty-year period in the fifteenth century. It is not a translation of the whole of the vast *Compendium*, a fact which will not be clear to those unfamiliar with the latter, but, rather, a fairly systematic selection of therapeutic measures drawn from the Latin source. It remains a substantial work, albeit of very limited novelty, and Faye Getz, as an experienced medical historian, is able to provide a rich introduction with excellent bibliographical references. When it comes to the presentation of her text (the version found in Wellcome MS 537), however, Getz does herself less than justice. The edition teems with errors and, whilst many of them are of a very minor kind, their frequency and accumulation lead to frustration at the thought of their being perpetuated by innocent users of the book.

The very first word of the edited text contains a transcription error, of the sort which is found on almost every subsequent page (in the first sixty pages I noted as many errors and sampling elsewhere confirmed the incidence). The critical apparatus is inconsistent in what it records (except, apparently, for its silence concerning the scribe's clearing of dittographies). The commentary is just as worrying: its first quotation from an important witness, London B.L. MS Add. 30338, inauspiciously contains three transcription errors and thereafter scarcely a quotation from this MS is made with complete accuracy. The quotations from the Latin Gilbertus are no less alarming: the first invents a noun "caloritas" for "caliditas", misunderstands "causis" for "calidis" (*ca.*) and perpetrates the form "gravitur". The next quotation fails to recognize abbreviations and presents us with "feni" for "feniculi" and "petrosi" for "petrosilini". Further quotations print "melanolicos cibos" for "multos cibos" (29/13), "postulabitur" for "prestolabitur" (29/13), "noctiva" for "nociva" (112/19), "aggravatius" for "aggravativus" (123/18), "quam" for "quoniam" (190/18), "humoris" for "humorum" (190/18), and, more entertainingly, "transversus aut tranquillus somnus non est" for "tamen verus aut tranquillus somnus non est" (216/14). Neglect of the meaning of the Latin goes so far as to allow the print's "calor" to stand in a description of jaundice (225/1) where it is perfectly obvious that the sense requires "color". The attentive reader will thus find much to disconcert or confuse him. On the positive side, the glossary is very good, though in the case of unfamiliar compound medicines like "arregon" it would have been useful to provide references to such standard pharmaceutical texts as the *Antidotarium Nicolai* where a full account of the ingredients can be found. Appended to the edition is a useful list of plants by genus.

Despite its inaccuracies, the volume contains a great deal of useful material which will help to promote the study of medieval medicine, though it is perhaps ironic that by the end of the book the

Book Reviews

impression of unfinished business persists. A proper description of the Middle English manuscripts and a much more detailed exposition of their relationship remain essential desiderata. One can accept the decision to print a single witness, but preference for the Wellcome MS over all the others would have been more comprehensible if a fuller picture of their character had been allowed to emerge. The description of the MS itself unfortunately displays the same kind of inaccuracy as bedevils the edited text. The question of common sources, a vital problem in any consideration of the vernacular English writer's procedure, is obscured by the fact that the editor divulges nothing concerning Gilbertus's sources, yet his incorporation of significant portions of Salernitan texts such as Roger Frugard's *Chirurgia* or Johannes Platearius's *Practica brevis* is a salient feature of the *Compendium*. Although the editor has compared the 1510 print with London, B.L. MS Sloane 272, the textual tradition is not discussed and my own impression is that the text of the print is susceptible of much improvement. Another omission which calls for future remedial work is the complete lack of any reference to Anglo-Norman (the single reference to "Norman French" on p. xvii is antiquated and inaccurate)—no mention of Rothwell's extensive work on the linguistic concurrence of Anglo-Norman and English, no awareness that major medical treatises in Anglo-Norman existed almost two centuries before the work studied here, no acknowledgement that over a third of the lexical items asterisked in the glossary as being first usages not in the MED, or unique usages not in MED or OED, already appeared in Anglo-Norman in the thirteenth century. We must be grateful for Faye Getz's labours, whilst regretting that in the ten-year interval following its acceptance as a PhD thesis her study has not been more carefully revised.

Tony Hunt, St Peter's College, Oxford

GERHARD ENDRESS and DIMITRI GUTAS (eds), *A Greek and Arabic lexicon: materials for a dictionary of the mediaeval translations from Greek into Arabic*, Fascicle I, Leiden and New York, E. J. Brill, 1992, pp. xxxii, 96, Gld. 40.00, \$23.00 (90-04-09494-6).

Over the past 150 years many editions of eighth- to tenth-century Arabic translations of Greek texts have included valuable Greek-Arabic glossaries. As materials increase, so also, of course, does their potential usefulness, and it is precisely this potential which the editors of *A Greek and Arabic lexicon* seek to exploit. Conceived over a decade ago, the work represents an effort to unify and analytically present all the material found in the various glossaries of Graeco-Arabic translations.

This first fascicle of the *Lexicon* is of a very high critical standard. The editors have wisely opted to include only texts for which the original Greek survives, so that all the materials in the *Lexicon* reflect actual documented correspondences, with speculations (however attractive) based on Arabic versions of lost Greek texts being entirely excluded. Published materials have been carefully checked before inclusion, and the inevitable imbalance dictated by the range of usable glossaries has to a great extent been redressed by making use of unpublished ones donated by various colleagues, and by preparing new word-by-word glossaries for important texts in areas for which material would otherwise have been very thin, or even non-existent. The texts thus covered here for the first time include Aristotle's *Physics*, *Categories*, and *Meteorology*, and Book III of his *De partibus animalium*, Porphyry's *Eisagoge*, Euclid's *Elements*, and Galen's *De theriaca ad Pisonem*, and in all, nearly fifty translated Greek texts have been incorporated into the editors' materials.

The main body of the *Lexicon* is arranged according to Arabic roots, and within each entry one has immediate and easy access to the range of Greek words and expressions (with English definitions) which a given Arabic word translated. Where passages of text are of some particular interest, they are cited rather than just referred to, with the Arabic given in transcription. A Greek-Arabic glossary (Part B), keyed to the Arabic entries, enables one easily to find any Greek word mentioned in the *Lexicon*, and there are also indices of Greek proper names and transliterated words, variant Greek and Arabic passages, and Greek quotations.

The importance of this work cannot be overemphasized. In essence, researchers are presented with a clear analytical assessment of materials crucial to lexical studies in Classical and Middle Arabic and Classical and Middle Greek, and a corpus from which all future studies of the Arabic translation movement will derive profound benefit. This benefit will of course be very great in