medical texts of the period. The detailed evaluation of these recipes by comparison with scientific experiments on the plants used in the medical systems of, for example, India and Latin America then forms the second part of his argument.

Riddle shows that most ancient writers after Soranus did distinguish between contraception and abortion; the grey area was instead between delayed menstruation and very early abortion, especially since the woman’s word as to whether or not she was pregnant tended to be accepted. This means that drugs “to provoke the menses” could well have the same effect as those “to expel the foetus”. He concludes that the plant agents employed were not only safe, if correctly used, but also highly effective.

As with any book covering the period from ancient Egypt to the seventeenth century, it is possible to criticize this work for over simplifying issues which are the subject of heated debate within particular historical specialisms. The relationship between Egyptian and Greek medicine relies on a few ingredients in common and a couple of unidentified plants, followed by the conclusion that there must “have been a connection, albeit undocumented” (p. 76). On the ancient Greek material, Riddle’s discussion of myrrh as an anti-fertility agent in Soranus and Dioscorides refers to the myth of Myrrha, incestuously used by her father, and becoming the mother of Adonis, rather weakly arguing that “the plant became a rescuer of daughters caught in the distress of incest” (p. 58). The substance does not seem to have given much benefit to its mythical eponym. Here Riddle does not appear to be aware of the important work of Marcel Detienne on scent in Greek culture. Riddle also tends to see contraceptives and abortifacients where they may not exist; for example, in a discussion of the Hippocratic Diseases of women 1.78 he translates as “Potent uterine abortifacient” (p. 78) a phrase more accurately rendered “Able to expel the afterbirth”. Later he claims that Diseases of women “was not translated into Latin until the Renaissance period” and was thus “unavailable to the Western Middle Ages” (p. 81); this is not strictly true, as sections were translated into Latin in Ravenna in the fifth to seventh centuries AD.

It is also possible to question Riddle’s theory of knowledge. He suggests that information on effective plant contraceptives was transmitted within female networks, until these became separated from the world of university-trained physicians after the Middle Ages. This information was based on observation. However, he also provides eloquent testimony to the context within which the plants were used; not only in compound prescriptions, but also in conjunction with other methods such as amulets, pessaries, sexual positions and incantations. In such a context, how did our ancestors know which of the many elements was effective? Furthermore, were the right plants being used for the wrong reasons? The squirming cucumber has now been shown to have anti-fertility effects, but was it used in early contraceptive recipes on sympathetic magic principles, because of the way it ejects its seeds when the fruit dries?

As the argument accumulates, and more and more plants are identified as anti-fertility agents, the reader may well wonder what is left to eat if the human race is to continue. Riddle himself muses, “If garlic is a contraceptive or abortifacient, one might wonder why there is any population in the Mediterranean at all” (p. 38). By the end of the book, he observes that many anti-fertility plants are pot herbs, which could be served in salad; he proposes that, for a woman, salad “may have been her control over her own life and her family’s life” (p. 155). This gives a new culinary dimension to a woman’s right to choose. It is worth noting that the preface to the book includes a health warning against trying the recipes at home, in case of “unintended effects”.

Helen King, Liverpool Institute of Higher Education

RICHARD J. DURLING (ed.), Galenus Latinus II: Burgundio of Pisa’s translation of Galen’s ΠΕΡΙ ΤΩΝ ΠΕΠΟΝΘΟΤΩΝ ΤΟΙΩΝ “De interioribus”, 2 vols, Ars Medica Abt. II., 6/2A, 6/2B, Stuttgart, Franz Steiner, 1992, pp. 450, DM 178.00 (3–515–04363–2).

The De locis affectis, known as De interioribus in the Middle Ages, is Galen’s most complete treatise on diagnosis and pathology, written by the Greek physician in the last few years of his life (after 192 AD). It consists of six books: the first two are a methodological introduction, and the other four contain a description of diseases ranging from head to genitals. This work of Galen had a
great fortuna in Arabic and then in Western medicine, where it spread and circulated mainly in an anonymous Arabic-Latin version until the beginning of the sixteenth century, when it was again translated into Latin by Wilhelm Kopp of Basle, physician of the French king.

Probably at the same time in which the Arabic-Latin version was made, Burgundio of Pisa (d. 1193) translated the De loc. aff. from a Greek manuscript, which is today preserved in the Laurentian Library in Florence, plut. 74, 30. Durling identified this manuscript as the original of Burgundio’s translation by collation and analysis of the Greek tradition. Nigel Wilson confirmed this by recognizing Burgundio’s hand in the Latin annotations of the Laurentian manuscript.

Burgundio’s version is preserved in only five manuscripts, which are all independent and, therefore, useful for reconstructing the original text. It does not seem that this version had a wide circulation, like others of Galen made by this Pisan ambassador and translator. Nevertheless, it was known by Taddeo Alderotti (d. 1295), professor of medicine at Bologna, who used it to correct the Arabic-Latin translation. This conflation is preserved in six manuscripts, which are all independent, and printed in the first Latin edition of Galen by Diomedes Bonardus in 1490, and in the subsequent editions until the Giuntine of 1528. Durling carefully studied the extracts of Burgundio’s version made by Taddeo Alderotti, which have only a few good readings. However, they attest that this Greek-Latin translation had a place in medical teaching.

Burgundio’s version is edited by Durling on the basis of a complete study of its tradition and in a close comparison with Galen’s Greek text. Two apparatus and two indices (Greek-Latin and Latin-Greek) are provided. In the Greek-Latin apparatus five Greek manuscripts of the De loc. aff. are considered. Two other manuscripts seem to be independent (Milan, Ambrosian Library, Ambr. gr. 659 and 679), but this is not relevant for the Latin text.

Burgundio’s style and vocabulary are studied by Durling in the introduction. His translation of particles, conjunctions and demonstrative pronouns in the De interioribus, is compared with that of another version by him (De complexionibus) and of other medieval translations. Burgundio used some neologisms, which won later acceptance, possibly independently of him, and he seems to be a “cautious innovator”.

Durling’s work is an excellent edition and another fundamental contribution of this eminent scholar to the knowledge of the first Greek-Latin translators and to the study of the tradition of Greek medicine in the Western world.

Stefania Fortuna, University of Pisa

SANDER GILMAN, The Jew’s body, New York and London, Routledge, 1991, pp. xii, 303, illus., £10.99 (paperback, 0–415–90459–5).

“You Jews are so wonderfully clever and inventive, aren’t you?”, inquired (gushingly not snarlingly) an acquaintance of mine only the other day. Whether the pejorative twist to “clever” is (as is often said) peculiarly English, I’m not sure, but nevertheless the anti-Semitic implications of such “praise” clearly rejoin a long European tradition, as Sander Gilman shows us in The Jew’s body, a book which runs rather wider than its title suggests. Another line is that the Jews are highly prone to lunacy or, yet again, never truly creative—i.e. always both intellectually and socially parasitic. Gustave Le Bon took that view, which no doubt bolstered his confident insistence that Einstein had pinched the theory of relativity from him. The elaborated models which underpin such wearily familiar and obnoxiously repeated commonplace—all those confident assertions of the fixed “stigmata” of the Jewish “mind” and “body” (flat feet, “nostrilly” noses and “goggle eyes” or piercing stares feature prominently)—are traced through their dizzying fits and starts in this erudite inquiry. The book considers the effects of all this on both Jewish and gentile perception; it ranges from remarks about the early history of Christianity to the contemporary German novel; from Galton’s composite portraits of the essential face of the “Hebrews”, through the (as it were) “ethic cleansing” function of “nose jobs”, designed and sometimes eagerly accepted by assimilating Jews in America; from special “syphilitic” dangers to the haemorrhoid peculiarities of these “aliens in our midst”. The nineteenth and early twentieth centuries are the periods of particular focus, the eras in which a decisive new network of racial anthropological and degenerationist images was set in place.