

Book Reviews

sortes lindeboomianae, which will introduce the non-Dutch monoglot to a new cast of characters, from Albert, a sixteenth-century barber-surgeon who drew up a death-certificate, to the cancer pseudo-therapist Jules Samuel (1888–1975), and including many doctors whose international careers are far from predictable, such as A.G. van Onsenoort (1782–1841) and Peter Pincoffs (1815–72). The latter was born in Rotterdam, worked in Brussels, Dresden, Manchester, and Chorlton (not Charlton)-upon-Medlock, founded the Medical Association of Constantinople, established a vaccination centre in Beirut, settled in Naples, and died in a shooting accident (?) in Germany. Again, we learn that one doctor wrote plays, another was taxed at so much, and a third never attended conferences. Thus, Lindeboom's fully rounded portrayal of the profession will assist in the frustration of partisan writers who try to fob off their readers with stereotypes or caricatures.

W. Schupbach
Wellcome Institute

ROBERT JOLY (editor, translator and commentator), *Hippocratis De diaeta*, Corpus medicorum graecorum, I.2.4, Berlin DDR, Akademie Verlag, 1984, 8vo, pp. 332, M.98.00.

For almost a quarter of a century, Professor Joly has worked on problems concerned with the text and interpretation of a work in the Hippocratic Corpus, *On regimen*. His first major study appeared in 1960, and he published an annotated edition in the Bude series in 1967. His CMG edition, in which he acknowledges the considerable assistance given him by Dr Simon Byl, is thus in more than one sense the fruit of mature reflection. The actual Greek text shows little change from that of 1967, but elsewhere there are many improvements. The apparatus criticus is avowedly fuller and more accurate, the discussion of the various Latin versions, some of which go back to late antiquity, is more extensive, and the discussion of influences and dating somewhat more subtle than before. The Hippocratic connoisseur will find much to his liking; an elegant French translation, a mass of valuable information on dialectal and stylistic usage, an excellent index, and valuable remarks on the *recentiores* of Book IV. For all this one can but express profound gratitude.

Yet much still remains to be done. The commentary, with its excessively philological bias, says almost nothing about the medicine of the treatise; the importance of dreams in Greek medicine, for which this treatise is our earliest substantial witness, is scarcely discussed; and the whole social and intellectual context of the treatise disappears from view. Far too often, too, the discussions of date and influences end with a dogmatic conclusion that is not warranted by the fragility of the evidence put forward. The ease with which generally sound scholars can reach diametrically opposed positions on such matters suggests a need for a fundamental re-examination of many of the pre-suppositions of Hippocratic studies. In this context it is regrettable that more space was not given to a discussion of the most daring of modern hypotheses about this treatise, that of W.D. Smith, who in 1979 proposed that this was the very work of Hippocrates that elicited Plato's approval. Even if this theory is wrong - and few have since been found to support it -, Smith's arguments raise more basic questions about our criteria for "genuine" Hippocratic treatises than is apparent here. Given the space allocated to the refutation of the views of others, it is sad that, in this instance, the reader is merely referred to another journal for arguments on such a central issue.

Vivian Nutton
Wellcome Institute

CHARLES LICHTENTHAELER, *Der Eid des Hippokrates, Ursprung und Bedeutung*, Cologne, Deutscher Ärzte-Verlag, 1984, 8vo, pp. 392, illus., DM148.00.

The Hippocratic *Oath* is the most famous of all medical documents. It is regularly cited in modern discussions of medical ethics, and has served as one of the foundations of the Western tradition of medical deontology. Yet its complexities have often escaped those who have