

Book Reviews

typeface transcription. Part II has a black-letter text of 348 pages, plus 2½ pages of 170 corrections by Turner, after which come 21 pages of modern notes. Part III has a text of 89 pages, uncorrected by Turner, plus 4½ pages of modern notes. Some notes from Part I are repeated and occasionally elaborated upon. The volume concludes with glossary, bibliography (rather confusingly entitled 'List of References') and seven additional reference indices on the whole volume.

As an introduction, replacing the biography in the previous volume, is a ten-page assessment of Turner's status as a scholar, aiming to give an insight into his style and contribution to botany and medicine in the sixteenth century; in such a large volume perhaps a few more pages could have been given to this discussion, which can only whet the reader's appetite. The editors' intention is that "he will be considered not so much for what he contributed as for what he was: warts and all" (p. 8). Whether they achieve this in such a short space is a moot point.

Although Turner wrote in English so that his work could be used by those without knowledge of Latin, he is frequently vague in the medical usages of plants, especially in the drug quantities to be prescribed. As the editors explain, Turner was "nearly always more vague than his principal sources" (p. 13). This will be frustrating to medical historians and also surprising since Turner was a practising physician. It is emphasized that Turner was selective in the medical conditions included in his work (pp. 13–14); thus historians must not use this *Herball* as a definitive source for sixteenth-century medical treatment. We must also appreciate that Turner wrote his *Herball* over a period of many years and, as the editors point out, he sometimes contradicts himself within it (p. 14). It must be remembered that, first and foremost, Turner was a clergyman; as Whitney Jones says: "in his duty to explore the natural causes of disease and treat the sick accordingly he must never forget that illness may also come through the direct agency of God—in whose hands the ultimate success of any remedy must always rest" (*William Turner*, Routledge, London, 1988, p. 101).

Useful alphabetical, reference indices (pp. 781–846) are included in the same order as in the previous volume. In Index I and Index IV information from Parts II and III of the *Herball* is treated separately, whereas the other indices combine such material. Consistency would have been an advantage. As with the earlier volume, I feel that for ease of reference it would have been better to re-order the indices as indicated in the review of that volume.

Included is a three-page glossary; the list given is not identical to that in the previous volume but one feels that where words are repeated but given a slightly altered meaning, this may be a case of "change for change's sake"—odd since both volumes were published in 1995 and presumably edited at approximately the same time. For example: "barbarous" in Part I is given the meaning "not classical or pure, uneloquent" but in Parts II and III "(of writers and writing) not classically pure".

Despite any minor criticisms, the re-presentation of the whole of Turner's *Herball* for the first time in over 400 years is a commendable achievement. Turner would have been immensely proud of those members of the teaching staff of his old school in Morpeth, who have edited both volumes. This is a work which will be useful to botanists, medical historians and also to modern medical researchers, who are now returning to the study of early literature in the search for medical remedies.

Elizabeth Lazenby,
Medicinal Plant Research Centre,
University of Newcastle upon Tyne

Gerhard Endress and Dimitri Gutas, A Greek and Arabic lexicon (GALex): materials for a dictionary of the mediaeval translations from Greek into Arabic, Fascicle 4, Handbook of Oriental Studies, vol. 11, Leiden and New York, E J Brill, 1997, pp. 160, Glossary, pp. 42, Nlg. 97.50, \$57.50 (90-04-10489-5).

This volume comprises the fourth fascicle of the authors' first volume of their magisterial

Book Reviews

dictionary. This instalment, covering the words *ilâ* to *inna*, maintains the impeccable scholarly and production standards set by the previous fascicles, and one notes that the list of sources consulted continues to expand.

This fascicle is noteworthy for its domination by a few important terms. The *maşdar* and substantive *amr*, for example, requires an entry of 40 pages (pp. 356–95) describing 49 different ways in which the word was used in translations from Greek. The last 73 pages are devoted to the orthographically similar terms *an*, *ann*, *in*, and *inna* (pp. 408–80), with more to come in the next fascicle. As in previous instalments, the sophistication and clarity of the authors' presentation of difficult material continues to impress.

Two areas for which this lexicon will be of particularly great value struck this reviewer as worth stressing. One has to do with cases in which a Greek text survives only in an Arabic translation. In such a situation, what, for example, is one to make of the term *ama*, which in medieval Arabic almost always denotes a slave-girl or a bondmaid? From *GALex*, however, one will find (pp. 407–8) that the Arabic word translates not only such anticipated Greek terms as *therápaina*, *doulê*, and *oikétis*, but also and more specifically an *oikonómos*, referring to a stewardess responsible for managing a household.

The second area is the tremendous contribution this work will make to our understanding of the textual traditions of both the original Greek works and the Arabic translations. The cumulative indices now list close to 1,000 variant passages in both Greek and Arabic texts, including thirteen important medical works by Hippocrates and Galen, al-Râzî's *Hâwî*, and Ibn al-Bayţâr's *Jâmi'*—all this already in a work that will require at least one more fascicle to reach the end of the first letter of the Arabic alphabet.

It is especially encouraging to note the pace at which fascicles of the work are appearing in print. Long delays in research of this kind are of course perfectly understandable; it is all the more gratifying, then, for medical historians and

others for whom this lexicon will be most important to be able to anticipate its completion before the first volumes fall out of date.

Lawrence I Conrad, Wellcome Institute

Johannes Koder, *Gemüse in Byzanz. Die Versorgung Konstantinopels mit Frischgemüse im Lichte der Geoponika*, Byzantische Geschichtsschreiber, Supplementary vol. 3, Vienna, Fassbaender, 1993, pp. 131, no price given (3-900538-41-7).

Professor Koder regards this new book as a “by-product” of his studies for a commentary on the *Book of the Eparch*—a Byzantine collection of the regulations governing the guilds of Constantinople. However, it is, in fact, an original study of vegetables as food in Constantinople from the sixth to the twelfth centuries. The work is based upon a chapter of the Byzantine treatise *Geoponica*—a collection of writings on agriculture dedicated to the Byzantine Emperor Constantine VII (913–959). The core of Koder's book is chapter 12 of the original text, with a German translation, a list with comments on the vegetables mentioned there, as well as three main essays on the vegetable supply in Constantinople (pp. 67–74), the harvest and supply of vegetables during the year (pp. 75–84), and cooking information (pp. 85–94). There is also an additional essay entitled ‘Überlegungen über die Getreideversorgung in Konstantinopel im Mittelalter’ (Thoughts about the cereal supply in Constantinople during the Middle Ages).

The textual history of *Geoponica* has not been precisely established. Some scholars (such as E Lipshiz) have regarded it as dating from the tenth century. Others (such as P Lemerle) have argued that it was edited in the tenth century, and that it was in fact, based on the agricultural compilation of Kassianos Bassos of the sixth century. Unfortunately, because of this uncertainty, the chronological borders of the study are somewhat shaky. Although Koder agrees with Lemerle's view