

Book Reviews

Macedonian tribe, whose name Tzetzes used instead of the unmetrical “Macedonia”. In the quotation, p. 55, from *On theriac to Piso*, a word which must postdate AD 204, Pinault fails to realize that the author (Galen?) used the semi-religious work “ἐπισπένδειν” (“let drops of incense fall”, an emendation already implied in the Latin of Kühn and made long ago by Cobet). The discussion of Aetius’ “zeal for theoretical consistency”, p. 56, is somewhat marred by the fact that the words complained of were those of Oribasius, two hundred years earlier. Irritating misprints abound, and at crucial times precision of language is lacking.

Non-arabists, however, will welcome the Arabic Lives in a clear English translation (but, p. 135, I prefer Filatus (Petos) as a “leading man”, not “king” of Cos; and, p. 140, *qiyas* (logic=Greek *logos*) is unduly restricted to “analogical reasoning”). However, readers are often left without proper help, or sent on a wild goose chase. There is no mention of Franz Rosenthal’s *History of Muslim historiography*, essential for understanding the whole genre of Arabic biography (cf. also *JHM*, 1973, 28: 156–65), or of the detailed examination of Ishaq’s chronology of Hippocrates (p. 101ff.) by Fritz Zimmermann in *Arabica*, 1974, 21. The Hippocratic sayings in both Lives should have been compared with those edited and translated by Carmela Baffioni in *Elenchos*, 1987, 8: 411–18. Contrary to p. 112, ar-Ruhawi took his tale of the cure for love-sickness direct from the pages of Galen (see *CMG* V 8.1, p. 54), and, given the notorious sloppiness of Levey’s edition, there is at least a suspicion that ar-Ruhawi’s doctor was indeed Erasistratus, not Aristotle. The European-wide reputation of al-Mubaššir’s collection of *Dicts and sayings* can best be traced in C. F. Bühler’s magisterial edition of the medieval English translation (Early English Text Society, vol. 211, 1941, repr. 1961), another work not cited here.

Most serious of all, although Pinault, p. 122, rightly posits a lost, and possibly Galenic, intermediary between the Greek and Arabic traditions, she is unaware that part of it has been in print (and in translation) for over thirty years. In *BHM*, 1956, 30, Franz Rosenthal published several sections of a Galenic commentary on the Hippocratic Oath (reprinted in his *Science and medicine in Islam*, 1990), which was later confirmed by Gotthard Strohmaier as a genuine work of Galen. Here is the missing link, and a major source for the Arabic understanding of the Hippocratic legend, but readers of this book will find no hint of its existence.

In short, Pinault has led us to the foot of an exotic mountain. There is a long way still to climb, but interesting views can be guaranteed to those brave enough to go further.

Vivian Nutton, Wellcome Institute

K. H. KRISHNAMURTHY, *A source book of Indian medicine: an anthology*, Delhi, B. R. Publishing Corporation, 1991, pp. xiii, 547. Rs 390 (81–7018–612–9).

This *Source book* is divided into the following nineteen subject sections: Ayurveda; the physician; education and learning; medical education; medical services; philosophical background; human constitution; principles of the human body (anatomy); life, sense, soul, mind; health, hygiene and happiness; dietetics, disease, medicine, pharmacology and pharmacognosy, surgery, society and medicine, topics of medical import from a few general classics; astrology and medicine, mantra sastra, music and medicine; historical background.

Each section gives numerous short Sanskrit citations in the Devanāgarī script, each followed by an English translation. The longer sections are subdivided, but this subdivision is not recorded in the contents page, so the serious user of this reference book will want to write his or her own fuller contents page. There is a moderately successful subject index.

The translator takes the admirable position of leaving Sanskrit terms in Sanskrit where there is no appropriate English term, and refrains from the awful—but common—practice of using modern medical terms to translate ancient and medieval Sanskrit terminology. On the other hand, the English is very clumsy:

jñānavatām api daivamānuṣadoṣāt kāryāṇi duṣyanti (p. 453)

Book Reviews

is translated as

Even for the knowledgeable, the tasks get vitiated by the blemishes of fate or the gods, or the human nature.

It is not impossible to divine what is meant here, but how much more idiomatically it could have been done:

Things go wrong, even for the wise, because of the iniquities of fate and of men.

The bibliographical control of source works is almost non-existent, although this is not always as disadvantageous as it might seem, since the citations are often from well-known Sanskrit texts which exist in standard vulgate editions. But to cite two lines of Sanskrit as being from the *Mahābhārata*, without giving any further indication of where the text appears in that vast epic is unhelpful in the extreme (see p. 4). Similar cases abound (e.g., the unlocated citation from the *Rāmāyaṇa* on p. 244). This laxness undoes whatever usefulness the book might have had as a bibliographical aid.

So what remains? *A source book of Indian medicine* is a very mixed bag. Browsing through the sections inevitably throws up some interesting and useful material. There are many provocative gobbits of Sanskrit medical lore to be found here. Where chapter and verse are given, this can actually contribute to scholarship. In many cases, however, the texts have to remain interesting curios, referable only to the present book.

The roman text in the work is poorly printed in a sans serif typeface throughout, which makes it very hard on the eye.

Dominik Wujastyk, Wellcome Institute

ALBERT DIETRICH (ed.), *Die Dioskurides-Erklärung des Ibn al-Baiṭār*, Göttingen, Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991, pp. 388, illus., DM 216 (3–525–82478–5).

In 1955 a previously unreported manuscript of an unknown commentary to Dioscorides was found in Mekka and bears the title: *Tafsīr Kitāb Diyusquridūs*. Dietrich provides the Arabic text, sample plates of the manuscript, a German translation, full notes, and indices in the Greek alphabet, Latin scientific names of plants, and Arabic transliterated plant names together with transliterations of Greek and other language names. His introduction is thorough. Each of Ibn al-Baiṭār's (Bayṭār in the *DSB*) entries are referenced to sixteen sources, including Galen, Ibn Ḡulḡul, and Dietrich's previous text, translation and notes to an anonymous Arabic commentary on Dioscorides produced in the late twelfth century (*Dioscurides triumphans*, Göttingen, 1988). Ibn al-Baiṭār travelled extensively from the city of his birth, Málaga, in 1204 ACE (according to Dietrich) and died in Damascus in 1248, having travelled throughout North Africa and parts of Asia Minor. Throughout his commentary, Ibn al-Baiṭār wrote of habitats that he had seen and of nomenclature from various regions. At times, however, he referred to "Indian" words that Dietrich identifies as being Persian.

Dietrich believes that Ibn al-Baiṭār researched these notes to Dioscorides before writing the larger work on simple medicines, the famous *Kitāb al-Ġāmi*, because the latter has some corrections to the *Tafsīr*. Besides eighteen chapters in the first three books there are marginal notes in a different hand. For example, there is an added note to Book I, chapter 1, to the effect that both Galen and Dioscorides knew of a white lily in addition to the blue Florentine lily. Dietrich believes that "probably" the manuscript is an autograph (p. 20).

Ibn al-Baiṭār was a critical observer. For example, in his commentary to *lugyūn* (transliteration of Greek *lukion*, I. 102, pp. 73–4), he explains that the tree is *ḥuḍaḍ* (in Arabic) and that one of two kinds in Dioscorides was known "to us at home in Spain". After delivering more details, he said this can be known to "one who was studied Dioscorides' text, has seen the tree in its habitat, and observed how the juice is extracted through cooking the root's inner