

Book Reviews

communication such as pictures or speech in the early modern period were more complex than is now usually assumed, and the medical perils of reading in the eighteenth century, as analysed by Adrian Johns, were thought to be far more pervasive than even Roy Porter has documented.

The third section takes on the print revolution of the nineteenth century, where Jonathan Topham, Eugenia Roldán Vera, and James Secord write of useful knowledge, progress and the dissemination of increasingly broad-based popularizations and other forms of public text. By the mid-nineteenth century, it is argued, most significant science was appearing in periodicals rather than books, and a noticeable demarcation between popular and élite had emerged. The authors here show very persuasively how writing and publishing helped in constructing the identities of science and scientists at this key time. The section is rounded off by an essay on the Victorian editors of Bacon and the new ideologies of the period, revealing just how far past practitioners of science and medicine have been committed to using print to establish the credentials of their own work. Several authors in fact touch on the issue of intellectual property and how the concept can usefully be regarded as inhering in the social arrangements that build up around the printed page.

In concluding this wide ranging, challenging and always thoughtful volume, Nick Jardine discusses the implications for the sciences of the quest for legitimacy through printed materials. *Books and the sciences in history* is an authoritative, learned, and thoroughly readable analysis that surely marks a milestone in the way we approach our subject.

Janet Browne,

The Wellcome Trust Centre for the
History of Medicine at UCL

Philip J van der Eijk, *Diocles of Carystus: a collection of the fragments with translation and commentary. Volume one: Text and translation; Volume two: Commentary*, Studies in Ancient Medicine, vols 22 and 23, Leiden and Boston, Brill, 2000–2001, vol. 1: pp. xxxiv, 497,

Dgl 235.80, US\$131.00 (90-04-10265-5);
vol. 2: pp. xlii, 489, Dgl 196.13, US\$109
(90-04-120-12-2) (set 90-04-1213-0).

It is rare for a collection of fragments with commentary to sustain a passionate reading from cover to cover commanded by a book. This one does it. The two compact volumes of Philip van der Eijk's new *Diocles* combine solid scholarship and a fine sense of textual detail with originality and power in the reconstruction of ideas, cultural climate and intellectual personality from predominantly doxographic material, and with reader-friendliness in the presentation of what could easily appear arid or esoteric. It makes thoroughly enjoyable reading, and not only for the specialist. Volume I contains the texts with apparatus and translation, a general introduction, a list of the fragments with informative synopsis of the general themes, indices which include one of verbatim quotations, abbreviations and concordances. Volume II is taken up by the commentary, with an analytical introduction, bibliography, an appendix, indices to the volume and an addenda et corrigenda.

Van der Eijk's edition supersedes by far the older one by Max Wellmann.¹ Along with new material it brings a radical shift in focus, general approach and specific strategies. The relationship between *Diocles* and Aristotle is an example of innovative historical reconstruction. Van der Eijk rejects traditional ideas of "teacher–disciple" influence, defended by influential scholars like Wellmann, Jaeger and others, in favour of a complex model of intellectual cooperation between equals. His perspective allows for divergence of opinion and a flexible chronology between the two thinkers—simple issues which have nevertheless imposed artificial and far-reaching constraints on scholarship so far. Unlike Wellmann, who treated *Diocles* as one among other members of a "Sicilian school" in Greek medicine and accorded him a minimal commentary,

¹Max Wellmann, *Die Fragmente der sikelischen Ärzte Akron, Philistion und des Diokles von Karystos*, Berlin, 1901.

van der Eijk is alert to “why” and “how” questions throughout but eliminates labels devoid of explanatory force, such as “Sicilian”, “Aristotelian”, “proto-Empiricist” or “proto-Sceptic”, choosing to treat Diocles as a free, “independent medical thinker” who achieved the first successful synthesis between theoretical and empirical principles in ancient Greek medicine. His approach belongs in the larger movement of debunking old textbook myths, such as that of a “Coan versus Cnidian” school of medicine, which have tended for a long time to blind scholars to the real problems posed by ancient testimonials. And this is the best way to do justice to one of the most prominent medical authorities of the Greek world in the fourth century BC. Diocles is indeed the first medical figure whose very broad array of interests and activities maps out for us an important link between the philosophical “schools” of Plato and Aristotle and the medical, so-called “Hippocratic”, tradition.

The commentary provides learned summaries of previous scholarship, thorough notes on terminology, interesting conjectures and ample presentations of textual difficulties, meticulous scrutiny of insoluble puzzles and balanced discussion of ambiguities. Alternative interpretations are always given equal attention. The evidence is never forced when knowledge is impossible to attain, as in identifying *materia medica* and disease entities or establishing chronology. Particularly relevant on methodological grounds are the elaborate analyses of doxographic modes of simplification and contamination, which are crucial for a correct appraisal of testimonials. So you learn in Fr 43b how the attribution of one idea to several authorities should have saved unnecessary research on “true” origins, and, in Fr 185–6, how analysis of one simple element—Diocles’ manner of reporting—dispels a plethora of speculations in scholarly literature.² Issues which bear on the evaluation of sources—transmission,

direct acquaintance, the aims of ancient authorities—are always in focus. Judgement on quotations, language and views attributed to Diocles is conducted with welcome scepticism. On the one hand, no cut-and-dry boundaries are drawn between “fragment”, “testimonium”, *ipsissima verba* and paraphrase or direct speech purporting to quote Diocles. Thus one gets the benefits of a non-committal guideline to terms possibly derived from Diocles without any of the disadvantages of an index. On the other hand, a healthy demarcation is made between Diocles’ views and the language which reports them and often carries doctrinal implications of its own. Scholarly positions adopted in the past are no less thoroughly subjected to scrutiny. There are plenty of insightful new interpretations of important material and elegant solutions to long debated problems; such is the beautifully developed comment on Fr 177, in which Diocles illustrates the view, asserted in the same work (Fr 176), that (some) causes (must?) remain unknown.

One strength of the commentary is the creation of an original section on “Context” for almost every piece discussed. Nothing of the kind was attempted by Wellmann. These sections offer introductions to the often difficult subject-area where the fragment belongs. Even when they are minimal, one still finds the relevant references to primary and secondary literature. The “Context” also makes available knowledge difficult to obtain, such as the lucid summary of Book 6 of Galen’s treatise on *Simples* or the descriptions of ancient diseases pieced together from

purport to reproduce Diocles and evaluating the reliability of what is attributed to him. Van der Eijk shows, very plausibly, how the doxographer has fabricated a “refutation” of Herophilus and other post-Dioclean authorities, which he attributes to Diocles. But I doubt that the refutation draws on “ingredients which, each individually, derive from Diocles’ thought” (pp. 84–5). General beliefs in the existence of four humours or *pneuma* are too vague; what would be needed is some specific view on them, especially on *pneuma* in relation to seed theory. The only possible Dioclean “ingredient” confirmed by another source, the view that seed originates in the brain and spinal marrow (cf Fr 41a and b), is annulled by the fact that the Anonymous also attributes to Diocles the rival view that seed originates in nutriment (pp. 30–31).

² Theory of an “elaborate refutation” of Archidamus by Diocles, II, p. 364. See also on Fr 51a–d (*anomalía* general cause of disease) or on Fr 40, which is guided by a systematic demarcation between two main hermeneutic tasks: finding out which parts

Book Reviews

several sources. There are also summaries of “Contents” for individual fragments. These are generally useful, especially for long pieces and intricate arguments, although some are repetitious and occasionally misleading. The commentary supplies an impressively rich network of parallels from the medical tradition prior to Diocles, especially the Hippocratic, whose selection is none the less discriminative.

I have one reservation concerning the presentation of the material. Along with the familiar “dubia” (“D”), the collection offers a class of “unnamed” fragments (“U”), where Diocles’ name is supplied either from a previous occurrence of the type “those listed above” or from an authorial formula which demonstrably includes Diocles, such as “the (four) ancients” of the Anonymous of Brussels. Creating a new category is felicitous: what recommends it is a frustrating problem of Dioclean scholarship, namely the collective, non-specific nature of a large part of the material. Views are often attributed to Diocles in groups of “typical ancients” comprising Hippocrates, Praxagoras, Herophilus, Plato, Aristotle and the Stoics. Since pointing out individual items in these collective creations cuts across all the kinds and degrees of uncertainty represented by “D”, “U” and doubtful attributions, it may have been even more felicitous to gather the “Collective” rather than the “Unnamed” testimonials in a separate class.

For a work of such complexity there are remarkably few misprints and errors. One could disagree on various details of translation and interpretation; object to the alternation of standard and small type, especially within one, two or three lines, or when the large print does not make sense without the small; or quibble about the thematic ordering of fragments where a “main theme” is hard to detect, or where provenance from Dioclean works—the criterion of Wellmann’s edition, wisely rejected by van der Eijk—still clashes with the thematic criterion. But eliciting comments and criticisms is proof of the book’s huge impact on the future of our studies, and the main point to be made is that from now on this will be the authoritative

reference edition of Diocles. Van der Eijk has produced an indispensable source-book for anyone working in ancient medicine which is a tremendous addition to the rapidly growing field of fragments literature.

Manuela Tecusan,

The Wellcome Trust Centre for the
History of Medicine at UCL

Volker Scheid, *Chinese medicine in contemporary China: plurality and synthesis*, Science and Cultural Theory series, Durham and London, Duke University Press, 2002, xx, 407, £18.50 (paperback 0-8223-2872-0).

Is inconsistency of practice and lack of systematization a sign of the inferiority of Asian medical systems? Is it a failure of contemporary practitioners to understand a more coherent ancient tradition, now shrouded by time? Or does the stunning array of modern and ancient theories and techniques available under the rubric of Chinese medicine allow creative freedom to the medical artisan, are they “flexible tools in the hands of skilled practitioners”? Working with some of the elders of Beijing’s medical community through the 1990s, Scheid brings his extensive experience as practitioner and medical anthropologist to a new analysis of the multiplicity of phenomena called Chinese medicine.

In six distinctive, yet interrelated essays Scheid explores many factors that have come to bear on the development of contemporary medical practice in China. With detailed and intimate description of such aspects of practice as case history writing, innovative theories and techniques, practitioner training and patient choice, Scheid places himself at the vanguard of a handful of researchers engaged in remedying the over-simplified portrayals of Chinese medicine inherent in common polarities: Western scientific theory versus Chinese pragmatic knowledge, tradition versus modernity or “holism” versus reductionism.

Arguing convincingly for the diverse nature of Chinese medicine and incorporating a concise