

## Book Reviews

---

*Hippocrates*, vols. 5, 6, with an English translation by Paul Potter, The Loeb Classical Library 472, 473, Cambridge, Ma., Harvard University Press, London, William Heinemann, 1988, 12mo, (vol. 5) pp. xiv, 333, £9.95, (vol. 6), pp. xv, 361, £9.95.

The Loeb Hippocrates resumes again after half a century with Professor Potter's translation of six works on internal diseases, *Affections, Diseases I, II, and III, Internal affections*, and the *Appendix to Regimen in acute diseases*. Since only the last has ever before been turned into English, those who know no Greek (or who have difficulty with the dark sentences of the Hippocratic Corpus) will have at last the opportunity to read some of the most medically interesting texts of the Corpus. A considerable sampling of the English suggests that this is an extremely accurate rendering which will not misled the unwary. Since most of these texts have been recently reedited in German theses, Professor Potter has been able to dispense with long codicological surveys, and a substantial amount of emendation. Where he has felt the need to alter the text, his changes are usually sound.

In its first purpose, then, of making accessible in English translation more of the Hippocratic texts, the new Loeb has succeeded admirably. Comparison with the rival French Budé series, however, reveals the weaknesses of the Loeb format. The useful brief indexes of diseases, symptoms, and drugs, at the end of volume 6, are no substitute for a discussion in footnotes or an appendix, and at times the non-medical reader will be as much at sea with the terminology as if he was faced with the original Greek. Even when the translation is accurate, an explanatory note would have set out why a word or phrase should be translated in this way or that. The difficulties that lurk in the opening paragraph of *Diseases I* should have been explicated further, for the text is obviously corrupt and also suggests that some passages have been lost from the book as it has come down to us. It is not at all easy to understand "what is all [in medicine] and what is one" (pp. 100–1) in this context.

This austerity is also confined to the introductions, where the reader might have expected a little more on the general organization of these works (VI,3 suggests that, at one point, the two texts in question were adjacent in a manuscript, and were wrongly divided), and on their place in Greek medicine (V, p. 94, Bacchius is dated at least a generation too late). While one can appreciate the editor's wish to break away from the traditional topic of the Hippocratic question (which in part explains Jones's decision to end his work on the Loeb Hippocrates), an opportunity has been missed to bring modern debates to the attention of a wider public. But this is perhaps to carp unduly, for there can be no doubt that in fulfilling the first task of a Loeb editor, of making accessible to the Greekless the writings of the Greeks in a fluent and accurate translation, Professor Potter deserves considerable thanks. Not least, because his two volumes make it even harder for students of Greek medicine to concentrate on only a handful of supposedly genuine Hippocratic texts.

Vivian Nutton, Wellcome Institute

HEINRICH VON STADEN, *Herophilus: the art of medicine in early Alexandria*, Cambridge University Press, 1989, 8vo, pp. xliii, 666, £75.00, \$140.00.

This large and long-awaited volume is worth every penny of its expensive price. It is not only that its 293 texts, all translated, mark a vast advance on Dobson's 78 of 1925, and an *apparatus criticus* to each extract shows exactly the basis for each fragment in Greek or Latin: this philological precision is matched by a great range of exegetical skills. Whether by commentary, footnote, or introductory discussion, the reader is led to a whole panorama of Greek medicine and medical problems. The achievements of every known Herophilean are fully considered (although here the testimonia are merely listed, not given in full), and there are appendices on some late medieval spuria. At the other chronological end, there is a succinct account of

Egyptian medical ideas and their possible influence on Herophilus and the other Greek doctors who practised in Alexandria by Egypt in the third century BC.

The prefatory discussions are perhaps the most valuable of all, for they relate Herophilus to a much wider context. They offer judicious surveys of the development of Greek anatomy (von Staden rightly emphasizes the frontier colonialism of early Alexandria, and accepts the tradition that Herophilus and Erasistratus vivisectioned criminals), therapeutics, ophthalmology, pharmacology, and Hippocratic exegesis (where he rightly insists, against Wesley Smith, on the importance of Herophilus in the tradition of Hippocratic commentary). If at times von Staden's careful analysis of all possible hypotheses makes one wish for a punchier summary of Herophilus' achievements that less committed students might read, his self-discipline is a necessary warning of the fragility of theories based on disconnected fragments, and, occasionally, on others' misunderstandings. By laying the groundwork so carefully, he has made it possible for other historians to ask bigger and more profound questions about ancient medicine and about our knowledge of it. Together with Garofalo's similar, if less sophisticated, collection of *Erasistratea*, this book transforms the academic study of Hellenistic medicine. In more than one sense it provides the essential link between the Hippocratic Corpus and the Roman medicine of Rufus, Soranus, and Galen.

The few criticisms that follow in no way diminish this considerable achievement: T8 is better as a *dubium*; T134 and T221 are Renaissance fakes, depending, respectively, on T132 and T220; T197b, from a Renaissance author, probably depends on T197a; AP17–18 are ostensibly genuine, cf. Galen, XIV.687; HE14 hides a reference to Hippocrates, not Heraclides. It is unfortunate that von Staden was unable to include a new fragment from Galen, CMG Suppl. Or. IV, pp. 68–69, which lists Herophilus among doctors of distinction, as in T10 and T16. The significance of the inclusion of Herophilus (and other Herophileans) among the portraits in Vienna, med. gr. 1, and, although with less claim to attention, in Oxford, Bodley *e Museo* 19 (= MacKinney, no. 44), is missed. A medieval artist included Herophilus in his gallery of doctors in Dresden, Db 92–93, but without adding a name; and the note on T229 might have queried the traditional identification of a terracotta figure in the Naples Museum with Herophilus. The texts and translations are usually sound: at T75,4, read “lecanen” (“pot”, an otherwise unknown [slang?] word for skull, but cf. “testa”, “tête”) for the unintelligible “mecanen”; and I still prefer von Arnim's punctuation of T280. The index mistakes the Hippocratic commentator Dioscorides of T270 for the more celebrated pharmacologist.

These minor corrections do not in any way detract from the value of this impressive work of (unfashionable) philological scholarship. It amply repays whatever effort the prospective reader is prepared to put in, and even the specialist will learn a great deal from it.

Vivian Nutton, Wellcome Institute

*Arnaldi de Villanova opera medica omnia IV: Tractatus de consideracionibus operis medicine sive de flebotomia*, edidit Luke Demaitre, et praefatione et commentariis hispanicis et anglicis instruxerunt Pedro Gil-Sotres et Luke Demaitre, Seminarium Historiae Scientiae Barchinone, University of Barcelona, 1988, 8vo, pp. 307, (paperback).

Under the careful eye of Luis Garcia Ballester, Juan Paniagua, and Michael McVaugh the project to edit the complete medical works of Arnald of Villanova proceeds slowly but surely. This project is especially to be applauded by historians of medieval medicine. At a time when there are precious few plans to bring out such major new editions in the field, this enterprise underlines the continuing need to make more accessible the manuscript sources of medicine in the Latin West. In focusing upon Arnald of Villanova the general editors are bringing to life a figure whose writings—as this new edition is making all the more apparent—touch upon nearly every major aspect of learned medicine in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Moreover, one cannot fail to be impressed by the care and attention that is being paid to each volume in the series, a series that is fast becoming a model of first-rate scholarship. This, the most recent volume in the series, is the fifth to appear so far. Another seven volumes are nearing