

Book Reviews

JOANNES MORSINK, *Aristotle on the generation of animals. A philosophical study*, Washington DC, University Press of America; London, Eurospan, 1982, 8vo, pp. viii, 184, £20.75 (£9.75 paperback).

The greater part of this book is devoted to a study of Aristotle's theory of heredity in the *De generatione animalium*. Morsink argued that Aristotle is there engaging in dialectical dispute against the pangenesis theory of inheritance as advocated in "Hippocrates" *On semen* and *On the nature of the child*, and that Aristotle's own explanation in terms of form provided by the male parent and matter by the female is advanced as a scientific hypothesis better able to explain the facts. Some scholars have gone wrong, Morsink argues, in emphasizing the simple form-matter theory of book 1 without due regard to the part played by "powers" (*dunamis*) from both male and female in the more complex theory of book 4; on the other hand, he claims, the theory of book 4 is a development of the initial theory of book 1 and not in effect a rejection of it.

In the first chapter of the work, Morsink argues that Aristotle's approach in *De gen. an.* is in accord with his remarks on the usefulness of dialectical argument to the scientist in *Topics* 1.2, but not in accord with the strictly inductive approach put forward in *Posterior analytics* 2.19. Nor is the conflict to be explained, he argues, in terms of Owen's contrast between *a priori* principles established by dialectic, on the one hand, and empirical observations on the other. Morsink himself offers no explanation of the conflict; he is clearly right to try to relate it to Aristotle's actual practice in a scientific treatise.

The book is well produced from typescript; I noticed a few minor misprints. At p. 120 line 11 "against" should be "gains".

R. W. Sharples
Department of Greek
University College London

MANFRED ULLMANN (editor), *Die Schrift des Rufus von Ephesos über die Gelbsucht*, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983, 8vo, pp. 87, illus., DM.60.00 (paperback).

Professor Ullmann continues his rehabilitation of the writings of Rufus of Ephesus, fl. AD 110, the only doctor of Antiquity to rival Galen as an author and clinician of genius. By careful scholarship he shows that from fragments in a Greek medical encyclopaedia, an Arabic summary preserved among the rubbish in the Cairo Geniza and another wrongly catalogued in Berlin, and a medieval Latin translation of the therapeutic sections, but wrongly ascribed to Galen, it is possible to reconstruct large parts of this lost Greek work on jaundice. He himself provides a German translation of the Arabic, but not, unfortunately, of the Greek or Latin; he offers a brief commentary also upon the Arabic, concentrating in particular on the drugs recommended, and discusses the place of Rufus' teaching on jaundice. One can have only praise for the quality of the detective work, which also, in passing, reveals that the so-called Arabic version of Galen's (lost) tract on the same topic is but a later compilation taken largely from *De locis affectis*.

The Latin version which is here printed was made from the Greek, and there is little reason to doubt that it was made by the famous translator, Niccolò da Reggio (fl. 1308–1345). But here Professor Ullmann's touch is less sure, and his discussion both of the translator and of the manuscripts omits much of significance. The work of Weiss, Thorndike, and Durling is passed over in silence, to say nothing of my recent (1979) discussion in my edition of Galen, *On prognosis*, pp. 23–39. The hard-to-find article of G. Pezzi, 'La vita e l'opera di Maestro Nicolao da Reggio', *Atti del IX biennale della Marca e dello Studio Firmano per la storia dell'arte medica*, 1971, pp. 228–233, adds much new archival information as well as many errors. The relationship between the two Cesena MSS., obscured by an error of Diels, was clarified in 1911 by Minor, and confirmed by Marinone, *Galeno, La dieta dimagrante*, Turin, 1973, and by me: MS. D is a direct copy of MS. E. A further manuscript of this treatise was revealed as long ago as 1909, by Boinet in his catalogue of the manuscripts of the Paris Académie Nationale de Médecine, MS. 51, fols. 324r–327v. This manuscript is a twin of Dresden Db 92–93, as I showed in K. Treu (ed.), *Studia codicologica*, 1977, pp. 331–340, and