

## MEDICINE AND PHILOSOPHY

R. WITTERN, P. PELLEGRIN (edd.): *Hippokratische Medizin und antike Philosophie. Verhandlungen des VIII. Internationalen Hippokrates-Kolloquiums in Kloster Banz/Staffelstein vom 23. bis 28. September 1993.* (Medizin der Antike, 1.) Pp. xii + 654. Hildesheim, Zurich, and New York: Olms Weidmann, 1996. Cased, DM 138. ISBN: 3-487-10037-1.

This collection of thirty-nine papers is the first volume in the series *Medizin der Antike*. (The second, J. C. Wilmanns, *Der römische Sanitätsdienst*, has already been reviewed in *CR* 47 [1997], 381–2.) It is subdivided into three parts: Part I deals with interrelations between the Hippocratic Corpus and ancient philosophy, Part II with ‘interpretations’, and Part III with textual tradition. Most of the contributions are in German, French, and English, three are in Italian, and one is in Spanish.

Of the two editors, W. has not contributed a paper herself. P.’s is ‘Aristote, Hippocrate, Oedipe’ (pp. 183–98), in which he investigates Aristotle’s knowledge and concept of medicine. He starts from the premiss that, although Aristotle’s father was a doctor (allegedly physician to the Macedonian king Amyntas), he only mentions Hippocrates once, and only two other doctors—Syennesis of Cyprus and Polybus—by name.

Although medicine is present both in Aristotle’s family background and as a classical example for philosophers since Plato, Aristotle’s attitude towards it has not been the subject of extensive research so far. In his paper, P. looks at Aristotle’s *Politica* and *Ethica Nicomachea* as well as *de Sensu* and *de Respiratione*. In *EN*, Aristotle emphasizes the rôle of the unforeseen in medicine, but also the importance of practical experience, e.g. in his remark that one does not become a doctor from reading the *συγγράμματα*. P. then discusses the nature of the latter, suggesting that they may include some of the best-known works in the Hippocratic Corpus.

Deploying passages from *Sens.* and *Resp.*, P. discusses the question of the subordination of one science to another. Thus medicine fulfils one criterion for a subordinate science, insofar as its principles are derived from natural philosophy, and it is the physicist who makes the principles of health and illness intelligible. However, since diseases are not natural realities, being against nature, medicine is not subordinate to physics. It is a practical science, and its principles can be explained by their relation to the theoretical science of physics, of which medicine is not a part.

The argument of the last section of P.’s paper, regarding relations between the lineage of Hippocrates and the Macedonian court, is less convincing. First of all, it is questionable whether various later traditions about descendants of Hippocrates can be taken as serious evidence. Moreover, Hippocrates’ grandson, supposedly doctor to Alexander’s wife Roxana, is not mentioned by the main sources on Alexander, and Critobulus is mentioned—though not as a Coan Asclepiad—by Q. Curtius (9.5.25), not Arrian (8.18.7). (There is no eighth book in Arrian’s *Anabasis*.) He is the same doctor as the one whom Arrian (6.11) calls Critodemus. P. argues that, given the links the descendants of Hippocrates had with the kings of Macedon, Aristotle’s father would have been an outsider at the court. Therefore, he suggests, the absence of Hippocratic medicine from Aristotle’s writings could be

an ‘Oedipean’ protest against the monopoly of the Coans, and against family tradition in general.

The other contributions in Part I are by A. Thivel, M. F. Ferrini, F. García Novo, D. Nickel, L. Ayache, N. Tsouyopoulos, C. Farragiana di Sarzana, N. Demand, S. de Brocá/M. R. Cubells/J. Zaragoza (a joint paper), V. Langholf, G. Susong, U. Hirsch, A. E. Hanson, W. Spoerri, M. Lopez-Salvá, A. Roselli, P. J. van der Eijk, J. Lens-Tuero, J. Jouanna, D. Manetti, and A. Debru. Unfortunately Lens-Tuero’s paper appears not to have been copy-edited, and has been left with some irritating linguistic flaws, such as lower-case ‘Hippocratic’, ‘Spartan’, etc., the repeated use of ‘igualitarism’, and phrasings such as ‘here we have affair with fattened meat’. These make what would otherwise be an innovative and stimulating paper rather hard work.

The papers in Part II are by V. P. Comiti, J. Redondo, J. A. López Férez, A. López Eire, L. Villard, O. Wenskus, M. T. Gallego Pérez, S. Föllinger, E. Lieber, W. D. Smith, and V. Nikolova. Jordi Redondo, ‘Sprachlich-stilistische Bemerkungen zu den rhetorisierenden Schriften des Hippokratischen Corpus’ (pp. 343–70), investigates the influence of rhetoric visible in *Flat.*, *de Arte*, *VM*, and *Nat.Hom.* The four treatises in question show an interpenetration of Atticisms and Ionicisms and, according to R., are more subject to tensions, caused by the innovations of a developing *koiné*, than the language of e.g. *Epid.* I and III. R. comes to the conclusion that the treatises were written within a short time of each other, and suggests re-dating: c. 390 B.C. for *Flat.*, a slightly later date for *de Arte* and Chapters 1–7 of *Nat.Hom.*, and c. 350 for books 8–24 of the latter and *VM*.

Also in Part II, Elinor Lieber’s paper, ‘The Hippocratic “Airs, Waters, Places” on Cross-dressing Eunuchs: “Natural” yet also “Divine”’ (pp. 451–76), explains a condition, described both by the Hippocratic author and by Herodotus, as haemochromatosis. Positivist endeavours such as retrospective diagnosis had been outlawed for some time, but L.’s is one of several recent papers which seem to signal a return to that approach.

In Vassilka Nikolova’s ‘A Hypothesis on Dichotomic Essence of the Hippocratic Doctrine’ (pp. 491–509), ‘dichotomy’ refers to what she calls ‘exoteric’ and ‘esoteric’ knowledge, the latter rendered by her as ‘dynamic psychotherapy’. Ignoring any controversy regarding the validity of the *Oath* as a Hippocratic document, N. uses it as evidence for secret teachings, which she interprets as the technique of inducing hypnosis, and the use of ‘parallel brain functioning’ for understanding symbols. The paper merits a mention here for the way in which it illustrates the dangers of imposing the concepts and language of psychotherapy on a culture entirely different from the one in which they were created.

Whether by chance or design, the contribution following N.’s—and the first of Part III—is Armin Hohlweg’s ‘Seelenlehre und “Psychiatrie” bei dem Aktuaros Johannes Zacharias’ (pp. 513–30) in which H. investigates Zacharias’ concept of *ψυχικὸν πνεῦμα*. The paper is an example of how ideas about the health of the soul or mind can be studied profitably within their own socio-historical framework.

The other works in Part III are by C. Santing, H. F. J. Horstmanshoff, T. Rütten, J. Pigeaud, and S. Byl with B. Vancamp. The contributions are followed by an *index locorum* and a list of participants. The varied nature of the papers precludes an overall verdict, but the collection will certainly be of interest to historians of ancient medicine, scholars of Graeco-Roman philosophy, and classical philologists.

Wellcome Unit for the History of Medicine,  
University of Cambridge

C. F. SALAZAR