

Book Reviews

PHILLIP DE LACY (editor, translator and commentator), *Galen De Placitis Hippocratis et Platonis Libri I-V*, (Corpus Medicorum Graecorum V 4, 1, 2), Berlin, DDR, Akademie Verlag, 1978, 8vo, pp. 359, 98M.

Reviewed by Vivian Nutton, M.A., Ph.D., Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine, 183 Euston Road, London NW1 2BP.

With this publication, Professor De Lacy, Emeritus Professor of Classics at the University of Pennsylvania, has brought forth the first fruits of many years of scholarly labour and more than fulfilled our hopes of its high quality. An important work of Galen has now at last received an edition worthy of its merits.

The overall plan of this edition is that the first two volumes contain the text and English translation, the last two a detailed commentary. Volume I, which begins with a long introduction on manuscripts, editions, the date and plan of PHP and on Galenic stylistics, continues with an edition of the Greek text of Books 1 to 5, a subordinate apparatus of variant readings and testimonia, and a facing translation. This translation, the first into a modern European language, reads fluently; and the text, which uses for the first time the oldest surviving MS., Berlin, Hamilton 270, as well as evidence from the church father Nemesius of Emesa and from the Arabs, is an immense improvement over the 1874 edition of von Müller. It is appropriate here to note the major contribution made to the text by Benedict Einarson, who, alas, did not live to see it in print: De Lacy's edition will stand as a fitting memorial to the selflessness of his friend. The collations of the various MSS. are accurate (I observe two minor errors: 78.21 Caius in mg.; *inciderit* Caius in versione: 78.23 add. Caius in mg.), the printing impeccable, and only the binding, which, in the reviewer's copy, was not properly stuck down, failed to live up to the high standards we have come to expect of Dr. Kollesch and her staff of the Corpus Medicorum in Berlin.

'On the opinions of Plato and Hippocrates' (PHP) is a rambling work, full of digressions, difficult to analyse, yet one of the most important in the Galenic corpus, for a variety of reasons. In the first place, it is an attempt to solve scientifically problems in human physiology and to draw "moral" or "philosophical" consequences from them: it is a philosophical meditation on the facts revealed elsewhere in *Anatomical procedures*. Although Galen's self-appointed task, to reconcile Plato's views on the tripartite soul with those of Hippocrates on the powers that control animal activity, seems to us essentially misguided – and Galen himself later rejected some of his Hippocratic evidence as spurious –, he was trying to bring scientific method into an area distinguished, so he alleged, only by modern philosophical madness. A lack of logic, a failure to appreciate the facts of life, and an uncritical adherence to the views of one's school, especially the Stoic, are here vigorously attacked and disproved by better logic (demonstrative or apodeictic method) and by the results of anatomical experiment. Galen's public dissections in A.D. 163 of the spinal vertebrae of animals showed beyond doubt that the brain, not the heart, controlled the nerves, and that it was the source of "psychic" power. The consequences of this for Plato's theory of the dominance of the "rational" soul over its "spirited" and "appetitive" parts are obvious: Plato stands confirmed against Aristotle and the Stoics in the rightness of his cerebrocentricity. Anatomy and Galenic commonsense are called in to redress the

balance of philosophical disputation.

Second, PHP gives us Galen's views on sensation and the emotions in considerable detail, although they are perhaps too often to be deduced from arguments attacking the Stoics rather than from any positive considerations. Galen reviews at length the medical evidence for the activities of the emotions and sense organs; he locates the "spirited" soul in the heart and the "appetitive" in the liver, adducing Hippocratic and anatomical proofs for Platonic theories. However, the consequences of this physiological differentiation for individual morality are not fully worked out until *On morals* and *The soul's habits follow the body's temperament*, and the debate is far too often left in a (to us) unsatisfactory limbo.

Perhaps the most valuable information to be gained from these first five books of PHP relates to Galen's great learning and to his broad interest in philosophy. His polymathic snobbery – even while at school he considered himself superior in learning to his teachers – and his enthusiasm for virtuoso displays of polemic and intellectual quotation tend to mar the flow of positive argument. But by choosing to quote large passages from Chrysippus and to pit Posidonius against Zeno and his followers he has managed to preserve large chunks of Stoic doctrine, especially on ethics and psychology, that would otherwise have been lost to us, not to mention the rare flowers culled from Hesiod, the Greek tragedians, and even Plutarch. Galen, it should be recalled, was educated to be a philosopher or a public lecturer, and his initial reputation in Rome was as a philosopher with a medical sideline. In no other work can this academic superiority of Galen be seen so well as in PHP, in its range and accuracy of quotation, its insistence upon proper methods of debate and its desire to synthesize medicine and philosophy. If, as has often been alleged, this fettering of medicine to logic and Platonic (and at times Aristotelian) metaphysics in the end deprived late-antique and medieval medicine of any creativity, PHP shows what could be achieved by a master of both disciplines.

If all that Professor De Lacy had done was to bring one of the most important treatises of the major medical author of antiquity once more to the attention of readers without the classical languages (and, it must be said, to very many of those with them), that would be service enough. But his introduction goes far beyond this. The section on morphology, syntax, and style will be of fundamental assistance to all future editors of Galen, and the sections on the manuscripts and transmission contain many surprises. In particular, the Arabic tradition, which is lucidly expounded by Gotthard Strohmaier, reveals that by the time of Ḥunayn (A.D. 809-873), an additional tenth book was known, possibly written by Galen himself at the very end of his life or appended by an over-eager librarian. As may be gathered from a quotation from it by Al-Fārābī, this tenth book, all trace of which has been lost in Greek, was a response to one MNDBRYS or MNDBWYS, who had attacked some of his earlier statements. Was this the "eminent sophist", Galen's opponent at Bk. III, ch. 1? Or was this another unfortunate, like Rufus of Samaria, whom Galen was not ashamed to criticize, unfairly, for the obscurity of his home town? Dr. Strohmaier gives us further new fragments and allusions, drawn from Ibn Riḍwān, Ibn al-Muṭrān, Rhazes, and Maimonides: unfortunately this edition was published too late to include references to the quotations embedded in Abū Sa'īd Ibn Baḥtīšū^c, 'On the treatment of diseases of

Book Reviews

the soul and body', ed. F. Klein-Franke, Beirut, 1977: fol. 78r = p. 63tr. = p. 168,4-8: fol. 88v = p. 83tr. = p. 278,14-18: fol. 88v-89r = p. 83tr. = V, p. 583,13-584,11 K.: fol. 78r = p. 64tr. = V, p. 648,1-5 K.: fol. 73v = p. 55tr. = V, p. 696,6-13 K.

De Lacy's comments on John Caius also require slight amplification. Where and how Caius obtained his manuscript of PHP is unknown: Müller calculated that it was in 1543, hinting at Italy and even Florence as the source. De Lacy's suggestion, p. 31, of Paris is unlikely, especially since, as far as is known, Caius travelled to England from Italy via the Rhine (cf. *De libris propriis*. p. 102 f., *De pronunciatione*, p. 19, ed. Roberts), with a very brief stay in northern France. The annotations in the Cambridge University Library copy of his edition and first version of Book I, Basle 1544, class-mark Adv. d. 3. 1, are indubitably in Caius' own hand, for several of the changes indicated to the Latin translation were incorporated in a revised edition in Caius' *Opera aliquot et versiones*, Louvain, 1556, pp. 329-355; e.g. p.78,22 = 1544, p. 339,20; quo cum a cordis spiritu ventriculus oppleretur: 1556, p. 332,21; quo cum ab eis spiritu opplerentur. It was the earlier version that was incorporated by Chartier in his 1679 edition, and after him by Kühn; and the more accurate revision was left in obscurity, without even a brief mention by De Lacy.

A more important, although understandable, omission from the elegant section on manuscripts and editions is a reference to the annotations made by Theodore Goulston (1574-1632) in his copy of the Basle edition of Galen, now in the Marsh Library, Dublin, class-mark P. 3. 2. 18. Unfortunately the first volume is badly mutilated and has lost the pages containing the first five books of PHP. It begins again at V, p. 544, 8 K., and thereafter contains a large number of emendations and copies of variant readings taken from a manuscript now lost, called by Goulston "Reg[gius]" [cf. J. Marquardt, *Scripta Minora Galeni*, I, p. vi]. Exactly what value is to be placed on these annotations awaits further investigation and the publication of the detailed collations in the second part of this edition.

A hundred years ago, Iwan von Müller, by the publication of merely the first volume of a projected edition and commentary on PHP, laid claim to the leadership of contemporary Galenic studies. By his first volume of this splendid edition and translation, Professor De Lacy has far outclassed his predecessor as an editor, collator, and translator. We look forward in eager expectation to the riches contained in subsequent volumes, and pray that Nemesis will not once again leave this mighty project incomplete.

BENNETT SIMON, *Mind and madness in ancient Greece; the Classical roots of modern psychiatry*, Ithaca, N.Y., and London, Cornell University Press, 1978, 8vo, pp. 336, illus., £12.25.

Reviewed by Vivian Nutton, M. A., Ph. D., Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine, 183 Euston Road, London NW1 2BP.

Dr. Simon, a practising psychiatrist with a continuing interest in the classics, uses his considerable familiarity with the literature of both specialities to examine ancient Greek views of the mind and by offering a number of models for ancient madness to suggest to modern psychiatry possible ways towards its own reintegration. He deals