

Book Reviews

differences between such “technical terms” and everyday vocabulary. However, this general definition is modified to explain what should presently be understood under “medical Latin”. Even if there are cultural and social differences between ancient and modern medical languages, “medical Latin” will be a term used to denote a “Fachsprache”, i.e., a variety of language used by those with a special medical knowledge. This first chapter ends with an introduction to the above-mentioned four authors, including a summary of the works studied. After this extensive account, a much shorter catalogue of other medical texts is included.

The second chapter deals with lexical borrowing. With his exhaustive account of the Greek terms used by the four authors, Langslow shows that the borrowing of Greek terms is commonly overestimated, for instance, in the case of Cassius, apparently the most Hellenizing author, Greek borrowings are never more than 45 per cent of all the medical terms considered. But Greek terms are used in very different ways by the authors, and Langslow establishes a precise typology depending on the presentation of the Greek term in the text and on its integration in the technical vocabulary.

Semantic extension, phrasal terms, and compounding and affixal derivation are covered in the following three chapters. Here the results of the research show very clear distinctions among the lexical fields he distinguishes (anatomy, pathology and therapeutics); for example, specific semantic dimensions are closely related to anatomy. Concerning phrasal terms, they seem to have a basic unmarked word order. Langslow suggests that exceptions to this order may be explained by contextual or stylistic factors.

The last chapter is probably the most suggestive part of the book because it provides very interesting possibilities for the use of such semantic study. By making comparisons between the alternation of

simple technical terms with clausal expressions, Langslow goes further to deal with some syntactic features and shows how important the combination of both fields can be, above all to determine the style, nature and age of the works studied.

The author must be praised for combining the tasks of a linguist with those of a classicist. His work is therefore intended for those with knowledge both of Latin and linguistics. Nevertheless, the book and the three indexes included in the appendix will be used as an essential reference tool for future research.

Pilar Pérez Cañizares,
Braunschweig

Christine F Salazar, *The treatment of war wounds in Graeco-Roman antiquity*, Studies in Ancient Medicine, vol. 21, Leiden and Boston, Brill, 2000, pp. xxvii, 299, illus., Nlg 138.83, \$78.00 (hardback 90-04011479-3).

Attempts to examine this subject are few indeed. E Gurlt, *Geschichte der Chirurgie*, 1898, is one (a text not cited by Salazar). More well known perhaps is G Majno, *The healing hand*, 1975. Both, however, are not devoted exclusively to the treatment of war injuries, and Majno's text deals with wound therapies from Greece, China, Egypt, and India. Salazar's text, a revised version of her doctoral thesis, can be said to break new ground. It is divided into three parts. Part One examines wounds and their treatment. This is the meat of the text, and within its five chapters Salazar provides a lucid survey of the source material, the physical aspects of treatment, as well as surgical management provided by armies, experts, and laymen. Part Two is an aesthetic relief. Concentrating firstly on the *Iliad*, the wound as symbol is carefully analysed. Wounding enables the victim to attain heroic status (Alexander the Great being

Book Reviews

one such example discussed in a separate chapter). The injury becomes stylized and subservient to this ideal. Part Three examines the archaeological record. It is unfortunately rather short, and the sections on arms and armour and surgical instruments were better placed in Part One.

The conclusion is one and a half pages, and Salazar excuses this because of the book's "multi-disciplinary approach", for it is "obviously impossible to provide an overall conclusion other than stating that the topic of wound treatment in antiquity is of far greater interest than most scholars assume" (p. 248). This is fudging.

Eight figures are included. Figure 5, showing Roman surgical instruments, is not provided with a scale. And two illustrations from plaster-casts of Graeco-Roman gems are very similar (figures 6 and 7a show essentially the same treatment given to a thigh injury). On page 49, Celsus's description of the *Diocleus cyanthiscus*, the "spoon of Diocles", a remarkable and impractical device for large arrowhead extraction, is summarized. But the citation is given on page 102. In the index locorum, Galen is cited both by work but also without indication of the work. Non-Galenists (and Galenists, for that matter) have to hunt the text in question. And why is it still felt necessary to transliterate Greek? Thus, "probing" is rendered "μηλῶσις/*mêlôsis*" (p. 48), which cannot help the Greekless reader. There is also no excuse nowadays to refer to pseudo-Galenic works as Galenic. *De fasciis (on bandages)* is so listed (p. 52). In reference to trepanation, "Galen [*sic*] writes in his *Introduction . . .*" (p. 46). Galen did not, but Salazar could have made use of *In Hipp. epid. III, comment.*, 25.14–21, Wenkebach, where Galen emphasizes the need to protect the dura mater from the trephine and lists the varying effects of skull fracture.

Although Salazar states that it is "necessary to examine the topic in its totality" (p. xxiv), her text, for reasons of space alone, cannot approach this goal in

the way she intends. This is not meant to disparage; on the contrary, the topic is fascinating and merits further investigation. This book provides an excellent start.

Julius Rocca,
Karolinska Institute, Stockholm

Alfrieda and Jackie Pigeaud (eds), *Les Textes médicaux latins comme littérature. Actes du VI^e colloque international sur les textes médicaux latins du 1^{er} au 3 septembre 1998 à Nantes*, Centre Cælius, Pensée médicale et tradition, Institut Universitaire de France, Université de Nantes, 2000, pp. 389, FFr 200 (paperback 2-86939-156-0).

Selecting as a conference theme medical texts in Latin as literature was a bold decision, not least because many of them, being recipe collections, lectures, or compendia of data, are far removed from what most people would think of as literature. Informative case-histories or authorial reminiscences are almost entirely lacking, and few medical writers have any pretensions to stylistic elegance.

The result was, perhaps, predictable. For all their many virtues, few communications live up to the organizer's programme as announced in his own contribution, and almost anything seems to count as literature, from the rhetoric of prefaces and the genre of medical epistolography to suffixes of adjectives and the translocation of pages in a manuscript. There are studies of all the major Latin medical writers, and of some of the minor; one essay is devoted to medicine in literature, the *History of King Apollonius of Tyre*, and one to Cornelius Celsus' references to writing in its implications for literacy and, more surprisingly, in therapy, where reading can be both recommended as part of the process of healing and deprecated as a source of physical ills. The contributions cover some post-classical authors, Du Laurens,