

## Book Reviews

earlier literature by Kühn and by Littré are notoriously imprecise, and editions that rest solely upon their authority are rightly to be suspected.

More serious criticism can be directed at the criteria for inclusion. There is no clear policy for reprints, and some authors, whose works cover Greek science as well as Hippocratic medicine, are very inadequately represented. Hence important studies of C.R.S. Harris, E.D. Phillips, and, in particular, G.E.R. Lloyd (oddly indexed under L1 as separate from L) find no mention here. Second, the qualification required to gain a biography is obscure. Most of the information is taken from Hirsch, and rarely illuminates, while major scholars like Robert Joly or W.H.S. Jones are passed over. Jones is given his date of birth, but not that of his death (1963).

These failings reveal the origin of this Hippocratic bibliography in a love of Hippocratic books rather than in a working library of Hippocratic scholarship. On its own terms it is a much better compilation than any of its rivals; it is more honest and more generous in its provision of information. It is attractively printed, although not without the occasional garbling of Latin, and easy to use. It deserves a wider reception than its unusual provenance is likely to afford it.

Vivian Nutton  
Wellcome Institute

PAUL MORAUX, *Der Aristotelismus bei den Griechen*, II, Berlin and New York, W. De Gruyter, 1984, 8vo, pp. xxx, 825, DM. 468.00

This book is a sumptuous in its scholarship as its price suggests. It treats in great detail the reaction to Aristotle among philosophers of the first two centuries of the Christian era, both in Rome and in the world of the Greek East. It covers not only those who claimed to be followers of Aristotle or who commented upon his writings, but others, like the Stoics and neo-Pythagoreans, who flatly opposed many of his views, or who, like Galen, claimed a philosophical eclecticism. Throughout, Professor Moraux displays an impressive command of the primary sources and a solidity of judgement, e.g., on the identity of Alcinous/Albinus, p. 441f.

For medical historians, this volume contains essential reading on Galen, not just about his own views, but also on his teachers and even on his philosopher-patients. The final section, pp. 687–808, is devoted entirely to Galen and to his formulation of the relationship between medicine and philosophy, and will be of lasting value. But it should be stressed that this is, deliberately, not a study of Galen's philosophy or medicine as a whole, although it offers many valuable insights to that end; it is restricted to Galen's relationship to the Aristotelian tradition of philosophy, which, it might be argued, took second place, at least in Galen's rhetorical formulation, to his attachment to Plato. Thus Galen's "philosophy of nature" is examined primarily for its Aristotelian biases, and Galen's medical and pharmacological theories are not mentioned, although the latter, in particular, throw some light on his ideas about elements and mixtures.

In exchange we are given the most detailed study of Galen's logic, both as an independent activity and as an essential part of the make-up of the ideal doctor, on which Jonathan Barnes, in a forthcoming paper on the *Method of healing*, has much to say. Galen himself believed that he had made his most important contribution to philosophy in the area of logic, especially in his views on demonstration and on the criterion of truth. Professor Moraux shows how much in this Galen depended on his teachers and on Aristotle himself, and how far his concerns reflected the interest of contemporary Aristotelians. Second, attention is drawn to Galen's works on ethics, so often forgotten or treated as protopsychological tracts. It is argued that Galen's selfconception as being unique in his interests in ethical problems is exaggerated, yet, at the same time, not totally wrong, Galen's insights from his own medical experience do seem to extend the standard discussions, and to make the investigation of the good life a little less abstract.

Like many other specialists in ancient philosophy who have come to Galen in the last ten

## Book Reviews

years, Professor Moraux has a high regard for the old windbag from Pergamum, and his conclusions on Galen's eclectic philosophy of nature emphasize his adherence to a "high scientific ideal", p. 791. It is a tradition to which Professor Moraux himself adheres (see his comments on modern university standards in his preface), and of which this book is a worthy monument. All Galenists will have to read and take issue with this book, and weigh up, e.g., the doubts expressed, p. 775, on the validity of the Arabic summary of *De moribus*, or the hints of Galen in Plotinus, p. 808. It only remains to wish the author good speed with his next volume, which will contain a detailed account of the one contemporary of Galen whose counterarguments are still left to us today, Alexander of Aphrodisias. He and Galen, according to the Arabic tradition, shared the same teacher, cf. pp. 361–364, but their conceptions of Aristotle and of the importance of the Aristotelian tradition were far different. Professor Moraux has firmly set Galen in his place within Aristotelian scholarship, and one can only look forward, with admiration and with eagerness, to the next volume. Despite its price, this book should be on the shelves of every library with claims to learning, if only as an example of the force and variety of the legacy of Aristotle in which we all share.

Vivian Nutton  
Wellcome Institute

ROBERT A. NYE, *Crime, madness, and politics in modern France. The medical concept of national decline*, Princeton University Press, 1984, 8vo, pp. xv, 367, illus., £32.40.

When a French politician advocated the transportation of recidivists in the late nineteenth century, he alluded to the Paris commune and the large proportion of communards who had been compulsive petty criminals. He found statistics readily available to confirm his view. The recalcitrant offender was not only a parasite, a social nuisance, but also a potential danger to the social order. His effective treatment was then a matter of social necessity; the ethics of punishing and reforming individuals was simultaneously a question of national defence. Moreover, this question was conceived in increasingly clinical terms. Thus, an expert demanded the elimination of the criminally insane "simply out of the spirit of social preservation and with as little anger as when we are killing a rabid dog."

Such arguments occurred within a new conjuncture of medicine, law, and politics of critical importance for social thought and policy in and beyond France. Robert Nye's book, a collection of interlocking essays, traces both the practical implications of these criminological and psychiatric debates, and the constitution of a new shared language of social pathology—the assumed common ground from which disagreements departed. There was to be a complex movement, a negotiation, between positive sciences and law; points of compromise and reconciliation. Medicine sought to establish its place ideologically in and against classical jurisprudence, and professionally as the expert witness of the courts.

In an interesting discussion of the disputes between French and Italian criminology (ch. 4 'Heredity or milieu . . .'), Nye discusses the Lombrosan theory of born criminals. Criminal anthropology in Italy had allotted itself the role of judging scientifically those primordial creatures who were marked out by simian stigmata on their bodies and who were morally incapacitated from birth. It would preside before the law, separating those who were and were not fit to plead. Only some "defendants" could be treated as subjects responsible for their actions, others were helpless beasts. Lombrosanism, in short, amounted to a drastic assault on the hegemony of the legal profession over the law and the very crudity of this attempted "coup" severely limited its legislative gains. Nye shows how from the very first international congress of criminal anthropology in Rome in 1885, French theorists were to offer a scathing critique of the excesses of Italian hereditarianism. For in France the greater ideological and practical accommodations made between doctors and lawyers helped secure their mutual vested interests more effectively and also followed more easily from the strength and pervasiveness of Lamarckianism in French thought.

Despite all the difficulties and rivalries, there was to be a certain *rapprochement* between punishment and medicine. Strange juxtapositions of sociology and biological determinism