collected here were written in Italian by amanuenses and seem to have been intended for publication. A further 26 consultation letters are also included but these were seemingly confidential and not for publication. Most, but not all, of the cases begin with a letter of petition, a request for advice from a physician who describes the case. Torti, of course, had not seen most of the sufferers. The patients included many from the nobility, the clergy and a number of nuns. A wide range of illnesses was discussed: asthma, hysterical convulsions, palpitations, difficulty in swallowing and uterine sickness to name but the first five.

Torti was prolix but eschewed great displays of learning. Hippocrates and Galen are called on occasionally, but interestingly much more often Sydenham and Willis. There is plenty of evidence here that, when the case seemed to merit it, Italian physicians had no hesitation in palpating their patients' abdomens. For example a physician to a countess reported she had "obstructions in her pancreatic and mesenteric glands and vessels, which at present can still be felt on palpation" (p. 427). Torti proclaimed he had little time for theory. But of course all the theoretical assumptions of the early modern physician are here: the importance of the constitution, of temperament, humoral balance, regular evacuation and the centrality of diet for example. Torti was not afraid of drugs and exotic polypharmacy. One recipe for arthritis required, amongst other things, oats, China root, sarsaparilla, lobster tails and frog thighs boiled in a pullet's stomach (p. 293). Jarcho has provided a helpful introduction to a valuable window into early modern social and medical life in Italy. It will remain as a longstanding monument to his memory.

**Christopher Lawrence,**
The Wellcome Trust Centre for the History of Medicine at UCL

**Hippocrate,** *Épidémies V et VII*, vol. 4, pt 3, trans. Jacques Jouanna, annotations by Jacques Jouanna and Mirko D Grmek, Collection des Universités de France, Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 2000, pp. cxlviii, 349, FFr 460 (hardback 2-251-00490-4).

The Budé Hippocrates continues to inform and enlighten students of ancient medicine and of Greek. The latest volume, continuing an edition, translation, and commentary on *Epidemics* 5 and 7, breaks new ground in many ways. It is the first edition to contain a full report of the readings of all the major manuscripts, although the gain for the text is less than in previous volumes, since Wesley Smith's 1994 Loeb edition had already introduced many necessary changes from the standard vulgate of Littré. Jouanna offers a more disciplined text and a more careful and more extensive description of the manuscripts, as well as of the complicated history of these notes as we have them.

*Epidemics* 5 is a composite work, of at least two authors. Cases 1–50 are by one physician, cases 51–106 by a second man, writing between 358 and 348 BC. The latter block is repeated, with some, generally slight, variations in *Epidemics* 7: language and doctrine suggest that the author of these notes also wrote the notes in *Epidemics* 7 that are not in *Epidemics* 5, although, Jouanna argues, one cannot conclude that the compiler of *Epidemics* 5 copied directly from *Epidemics* 7 as we have them. Rather, in his view, both authors copied the same set of case notes, produced by one of them, into their own collections at different times. Hence, rather than co-ordinate both collections, as Ermerins did, to produce in both the exact wording of the original notes, Jouanna prefers to edit each separately to give an idea of the state of the text of each collection. This is probably a sensible procedure, although it leads to considerable duplication.

The second feature of importance is the discussion of the cases from a medical



https://doi.org/10.1017/S002572730006899X Published online by Cambridge University Press

viewpoint by the late Mirko Grmek. As he points out, *Epidemics* 5 and 7 are remarkable examples of ancient case-reporting, often giving sufficient detail to allow a precise modern diagnosis. In this respect they are in no way inferior to the more famous *Epidemics* 1 and 3, and show the Greek physician at the bedside in an extremely favourable light. Indeed, on at least one occasion a modern clinical finding about a disease allows an emendation of the text that might otherwise have escaped improvement. Both in the commentary and in the introduction, Grmek offers suggestions from his wide experience as to the particular condition under discussion, arguing, rightly, that medical documents like these need to be interpreted medically as well as philologically. Even if one does not agree with all his suggestions, they add considerably to our understanding of diseases in the ancient world.

These books also contain fragments of a wider attempt to understand the place of disease within the community. "Epidemic", suggests Jouanna, in the title means a general disease residing within a community, which can be identified by bringing together individual cases into a broader "constitution". This examines general climatic conditions and changes within the locality over a year which have an effect on the population, which in turn produces harmful changes within the individual's humours. The shared section of cases talks of "sufferers from melancholy", a rare term in the Hippocratic Corpus but here showing the gradual acceptance of this fourth humour.

These general "constitutions" are built upon a variety of cases from a number of practitioners. These books show debate going on within a group of physicians, and also with others who are travelling around Greece, just like the authors of the cases themselves. These doctors are not afraid to comment on their own mistakes, to indicate how in future they might do better; and to describe their own uncertainties when face to face with an ill patient. They form a contribution towards prognosis, although the favoured word here is rather "prorrhesis", which incorporates also the announcement of the forecast.

Anglophone readers will have to rely on Smith's Loeb for their understanding of these two books, and, for the most part, they will not be misled. (Jouanna's criticisms are far more concerned with the deficiencies of the Loeb format than with those of Smith's own scholarship.) But those with French will be wise to turn to the Budé, for the abundance of information and judicious guidance that it contains.

**Vivian Nutton,**
The Wellcome Trust Centre for the History of Medicine at UCL

**D R Langslow,** *Medical Latin in the Roman empire*, Oxford Classical Monographs, Oxford University Press, 2000, pp. xv, 517, £65.00 (0-19-815279-5).

This very welcome linguistical study of terminology in Latin medical texts is a revised and extended version of Langslow's 1991 Oxford thesis. Even if in the last thirty years interest in the study of ancient medical texts has considerably increased, works concerning medical language are still relatively infrequent.

Langslow's research is based on a corpus of four writers, namely Cornelius Celsus (first century AD), Scribonius Largus (first century AD), Theodorus Priscianus (fourth to fifth century AD) and Cassius Felix (fifth century AD). This large corpus is therefore adequate not only to establish general conclusions but also to show evolution in the use of medical language as well as stylistic tendencies in the authors.

The book is divided into six chapters. In the first one Langslow justifies the nature of the study. He gives a definition for "technical term" after examining the