

Book Reviews

what is known as ‘Arabian Medicine’” (p. VII). Recent research, however, shows more and more that one cannot speak of a medieval Jewish medicine proper. Jewish physicians studied the Arabic medical works which are based on the Galenic medical tradition. A good example is Maimonides, who according to Jewish scholars, made such a great contribution to medieval medicine. But it now clear that he was totally dependent upon the medieval Islamic medical tradition. The term “‘ushnah” (lichen, p. X) should have been explained to the reader. Maimonides’ “own collection of Aphorisms” (p. XI): this collection can hardly be called his “own”, since most of them are based on Galen. The computation (p. XIV, n. 52) “19 Av 1515 (=A.D. 1204)” is unclear; is it according to the Seleucid calendar?

As for the fragments, the following bibliographic references can be supplied: al-Rāzī, *K. al-Ḥāwī*, edition Hyderabad, 23 vols, 1952–1974 (fragment no. 106); al-Kindī, *K. Kimiyā al-‘itr wat-taṣ’idāt*, ed. K Garbers, Leipzig, 1948 (no. 358); Nicolaus Damascenus, *De plantis, five translations*, edited by H J Drossaart Lulofs and E L J Poortman, Amsterdam, 1989 (no. 364); M Dols, op. cit., pp. 69–72 (no. 571); GAS III, pp. 94–5 (no. 908); GAS III, pp. 66, 128 (nrs. 943–944); Ibn Zuhr, *K. al-taysir*, ed. M al-Khourī, Damascus 1983 (no. 1122).

There are a number of typographical errors and errors in transcription; some of these are: no. 365 (index, p. 123) “fanāfis asqālīnūs” = “fanāqīs asqībiyūs” (Gr: *πάνακες Ἀσκληπιείου*), Asclepian Panakes; *idem* “fanāfis hamrūniyūn” = “fanāqīs khīrūniyūn (*πάνακες Χειρώνιον*), Cheironic Panakes (see Dietrich, *Dioscurides Triumphans* III, 48); no. 1068 “jalap” = “julāb”, cf. nrs. 1222, 1419, 1578 “juleb” (rose-water syrup).

I would like to conclude by noting that some of the fragments catalogued by Isaacs have been published recently; for nrs. 584, 621, and 1596 see J Naveh—Sh. Shaked, *Magic spells and formulae*, Jerusalem, 1993, pp. 220–6, 238–42.

Gerrit Bos, Wellcome Institute

Mehdi Mohaghegh (ed.), *Kitāb al-shukūk ‘alā Jālīnūs li-l-ṭabīb al-faylasūf Muḥammad ibn Zakarīyā al-Rāzī*, Tehran, Institute of Islamic Studies; Kuala Lumpur, International Institute of Islamic Thought and Civilization, 1993, pp. 18 (English), 280 (Arabic and Persian), Rs. 3000.

The great Muslim philosopher and physician al-Rāzī (d. 313/925) was the author of numerous outspoken tracts criticizing the ideas of others or refuting doctrines he considered to be methodologically flawed. Most of these are now lost, but one that has survived is also one that certainly must rank among the most important: *Doubts concerning Galen*. In this work he criticizes twenty-six books by Galen on a variety of grounds: inconsistency within the Galenic corpus, contradiction with al-Rāzī’s own thought or clinical experience, and possible copyists’ errors. In the main, his comments appear to reflect an impatience with shortcomings in intellectual rigour—wherever they may appear, but especially in works likely to be accepted on authority—rather than commitment to a specific intellectual school. There is much of importance in this book, but particular attention may be drawn to al-Rāzī’s long first chapter (Arabic text, pp. 3–24) on Galen’s *De demonstratione*, now lost in both the Greek original and the Arabic translation.

The editor provides introductions to the text in English, Arabic, and Persian. The first two reproduce identical articles previously published on the book,¹ and so do not really introduce this edition. The Persian introduction updates and extends these articles, and so is more useful. It emerges that all three extant MSS have been used to establish the text, with MS 4573.22 from the Kitābkhāna-i Malik in Tehran serving as a base text. All three MSS are dated by their colophons to the eleventh century AH/seventeenth century AD,² and from the frequency with which they err together the editor concludes that they must come from a single older MS (Persian introduction, p. 67). The textual tradition is not only late, but also corrupt.

An edition based on such a manuscript tradition is clearly a task requiring, first, great

Book Reviews

care in collation, selection of readings, and collection of testimonia, and second, a full *apparatus criticus* to show how all this material has been used. Here, however, no effort has been made to establish the relative authority of the MSS, there are no textual notes to the Arabic text, and the Persian introduction's list of emendations made to the Malik manuscript (*ibid.*, pp. 91–4), while admittedly better than nothing at all, still leaves the reader with no way to assess how certain drastic changes have been justified, or to see how often readings in the other two manuscripts have been tacitly overruled by the editor. In some cases it seems that the readings in the MSS have been rejected because a modern printed edition of a text cited by al-Rāzī has something different; Mohaghegh in fact advises the reader as much (*ibid.*, p. 68), but never identifies the places where he has proceeded in this fashion.

The text bears many editorial mistakes and typographical errors, and the quotations from Galen fare rather badly. In some cases the quoted text is incorrectly marked; in others the fact that the passage is a quotation has been missed entirely. None of the quotations has been verified or otherwise located within the Galenic corpus. The index has missed over fifty references to Galen,³ as well as a number of those to Hippocrates,⁴ Plato,⁵ and Aristotle;⁶ the table of contents omits nearly half of the chapters, and indeed, in some cases chapter titles are run into the text as part of a sentence.

The text published here is without any doubt whatever an extremely important one, and considering that two previous plans to edit it both came to naught, one must certainly be grateful to the editor for its final appearance in print. In light of the problems indicated above, however, it must also be said that *Doubts concerning Galen* is still not available in the accurate and critical edition essential for serious further work on the text. An English translation would be most desirable, given the relevance of the work to scholars of ancient medicine and philosophy. This would provide an opportunity not only to sort out the many textual problems, but also, and more importantly, to pursue a dimension of Galenic medicine that has so far attracted little attention among historians of ancient Greek and medieval Islamic medicine and philosophy.

Lawrence I Conrad, Wellcome Institute

¹ Mehdi Mohaghegh, 'The *Kitāb al-shukūk 'alā Jālinūs* of Muḥammad ibn Zakariyyā al-Rāzī', in Wael B Hallaq and Donald P Little (eds), *Islamic studies presented to Charles J Adams*, Leiden, E J Brill, 1991, pp. 107–16; the same in Arabic in *Journal for the History of Arabic Science*, 1991, 9: 5–14.

² See Fuat Sezgin, *Geschichte des arabischen Schrifttums*, III, Leiden, E J Brill, 1970, p. 77.

³ The following corrections and additions (page:line) should be noted. Read 18:10 for 18:20; delete 36:13 and 64:20; add 1:8, 10:13, 42:12, 47:15, 61:17, 22, 23, 68:22, 69:5, 71:3, 72:4, 7, 11, 14, 18, 73:1, 15, 74:1, 5, 16, 20, 75:7, 12, 19, 76:1, 3, 5, 7, 20, 77:2, 14, 18, 78:1, 9, 12, 18, 22, 79:2, 5, 9, 11, 18, 23, 80:6, 83:5, 9, 84:6, 20, 21, 85:4, 8, 12, 16, 20, 87:3.

⁴ Add 76:6, 77:1, 78:10, 81:1.

⁵ Add 68:16, 20.

⁶ Add 61:19, 20; for 69:13 read 69:14.