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century AD, and its relationships with two other tracts, the *Mulomedicina Chironis*, perhaps written about the same time, and the *Mulomedicina* of Vegetius, written in the first half of the fifth century. But there are also illuminating comments on earlier veterinary authors, including Celsus, and a long section on Greek influence on Pelagonius. Adams suggests that he himself translated one major Greek text, Apsyrtus, and incorporated passages from him into his book. There are also here important notes on the consequences of the recent (re)discovery of a very early manuscript of Pelagonius for the reconstruction of the text and, in general, for an understanding of the ways in which medical texts were transmitted in Antiquity. At least one long section of the *Ars* is shown to come from a different source.

From an individual’s life and times we pass in chapters VI and VII to a survey of Pelagonius’ (and others’) names for disease and for anatomy. Adams ranges widely, especially in Latin, to show how gradually a technical vocabulary was being created and transmitted. He notes apparent changes over time in certain key words; e.g., *morbus* and *passio*, or *causa* taking on the meaning of “medical case”. What is striking is not just the development of technical terms, but the wide range of influences that bear on this development, from popular words to more specific Greek-based formulations. Adams’ methodology here can with profit be extended to all aspects of Greek medicine, not just that confined to animals.

The final section, over 200 pages long, deals with the language of Pelagonius, syntax, word order, word formation, and vocabulary. Adams concentrates largely on two questions; the extent to which Pelagonius’ Latin can be classed as “vulgar”, or, alternatively, as “technical”. His conclusion, based on a substantial revision of Fischer’s Teubner edition, is that Pelagonius, far from writing vulgar Latin, carefully employs a variety of stylistic tricks, although inevitably using at times some popular terms that could be understood by his potential audience of healers and horse-lovers. Adams has some sound words about the use of metaphor in the creation of new technical terms, as well as about their fluidity.

A short epilogue (perhaps too short) brings together many of the more general points argued in the rest of this long book. Adams believes that Pelagonius was, like Celsus, on the borderline between professional and layman, familiar with some technical writing and with some experience of dealing with sickness. But he had substantial limitations. His use of Apsyrtus suggests that he had little interest in anatomical technicalities, and in his copying from earlier writers he often sacrificed accuracy for brevity. There was a growing technical veterinary vocabulary, although little that suggests a veterinary profession in any meaningful modern sense, and even those technical terms would have been widely accessible to laymen keen on horses.

This is a big book (almost series of books, for even Adams admits to two) in every sense of the word. It is thus a pity that its index, of Latin words, Greek words, and subjects, is slight, and that its list of chapters, save for that to chapter VIII, is confined solely to the initial chapter headings, and gives little indication of the riches to be found within them. A list of subheadings would have served as a more useful guide to what is a major piece of scholarship on ancient medicine in general, and on veterinary medicine in particular.

Vivian Nutton, Wellcome Institute


It is a pleasant duty to welcome the publication of the above work which inaugurates the

390
second stage of the international project to produce a new collection, text, translation and commentary of the fragments and testimonia relating to Theophrastus. Sharples’ volume is the first of nine projected by various authors. Each of them will provide a commentary upon a different part of the collected texts edited by a consortium of scholars and published in two volumes in 1992 under the guidance of W W Fortenbaugh. The present commentary covers texts 328–435 contained in the second volume which are concerned with human physiology, zoology, and botany and are roughly the Theophrastean equivalent of pp. 436–789 of Bekker’s edition of Aristotle. The state of our knowledge of these three areas is not uniform. In botany (texts 384–435), Theophrastus’s works have comprehensively survived. In zoology (texts 350–383), by contrast, only one treatise, *On fish*, is preserved in manuscript (together with a few summaries of short treatises). Human physiology (texts 328–349), where we have some surviving books and some second-hand reports, occupies the intermediate position. Because of this disparity in the state of our evidence for these three topics, Sharples concludes that a general introduction would not afford a suitable opportunity for an extended discussion of methodology and wisely provides instead separate introductions to each section, each of which provides an overview of the relevant sources and an elucidation of the pertinent doctrines. He does, however, make some additional points, which are not only germane to the present volume, but also affect the study of Theophrastus generally. He very properly warns against the danger of false perspectives in assessing the relationship of Theophrastus to Aristotle; stresses the uncertainty, already existent in Antiquity, as to whether certain works were by Aristotle or by Theophrastus, and reminds us of the tendency of later ancient authors to work from *compendia* which, since they combine material from a number of different sources rather than from the original works of authors whom they actually even cite by name, affords considerable scope for misunderstandings. This is a work of fine, generous and widely ranging scholarship. It is rendered even more useful by the bountiful provision of indices. In addition to the General Subject Index, there are indices to the texts, viz. of principle terms in Greek, and in Latin, of titles of works referred to in the texts, and of persons and places referred to in them, as well as indices to the commentary listing the texts discussed or cited and (ancient) persons mentioned. Sharples’ *Commentary* will undoubtedly serve as the bench-mark to which it is hoped the forthcoming eight volumes will successfully aspire.

James Longrigg,
University of Newcastle upon Tyne


Galen’s writings provide a complete medical philosophy. His tightly integrated and comprehensive system came to represent the very embodiment of Greco-Roman medical knowledge and dominated medicine throughout the Middle Ages and beyond until the beginning of the modern era. In philosophy Galen was influenced primarily by Plato, Aristotle and the Stoics; in medicine by the writings of Hippocrates (or what he conceived to be such) and by the anatomical and physiological researches of Herophilus and Erasistratus. Amongst Platonic influences, that of the *Timaeus*, with its discourses upon the nature of the human soul, sense perception, the composition and operation of the human body and its disposition upon the diseases to which it is prone is especially apparent. To this work Galen, it appears, devoted two different treatments, a *Compendium* (*Compendium Timaei Platonis*), which contains short accounts of other Platonic dialogues as well and partially survives in an Arabic translation, and a *Commentary* (*In Platonis Timaeum*...