empires and their relationship during Justinian's reign as well as providing an overview of the Persian wars themselves which prepares the reader well for the translation that follows. The translation contains footnotes to provide abridged observations for the purpose of clarity on events and characters by way of cross-referencing to other sections of this work. Greatrex does, however, point out that these notes are intentionally brief as it is the function of the separate commentary volume to provide more detailed observations and interpretations. These footnotes to the translation, like the commentary, steer a relatively neutral course through these topics, offering the reader options to consider and suggestions for further reading.

The translation also includes the same maps, city plans and battle diagrams as found in the commentary, which is helpful. In addition, like the commentary, this volume includes a full translation of Photius' summary of Nonnosus' work. There are only footnotes to the text here, in the same format as for the translation of *Wars*, leaving more in-depth observation to the commentary. Although a useful addition, this does feel a little out of place in the main translation and is a far better fit within the commentary, where Greatrex affords it much more detailed analysis. The translation volume concludes with a valuable index of places, people and titles.

Overall, these two volumes provide a resource-rich aid to students and scholars alike in a form that has not been available until now in the study of Procopius and will likely form the backbone for the study of *Wars* I and II in the future. It can only be hoped that Greatrex's approach to the translation and commentary on these first two books will be used as a model for the remainder of the Procopian canon.

David M. Kennedy
University of Exeter
Email: dk410@exeter.ac.uk

HANKINSON (R.J.) and HAVRDA (M.) (eds) **Galen's Epistemology: Experience, Reason, and Method in Ancient Medicine**. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2022. Pp. viii + 323. $99.99. 9781316513484.
doi:10.1017/S0075426924000223

The medical landscape of the second century CE was in many ways dominated by an epistemological dispute that had emerged in the Hellenistic period. The principals in conflict were the 'Rationalists' and 'Empiricists' who contested the proper methods of discovery and limits of knowledge acquisition. The young Galen studied in the shadow of authorities from both 'sects' (*haireseis*), and so it is within this fractious milieu that his epistemological commitments, syntheses and self-promotions must be understood. This collected volume brings together a group of leading Galenists who probe the physician's approach to the respective role(s) of reason and experience within the medical method. The 11 chapters herein (plus an introduction by Jim Hankinson, covering the state of the question over the past 40 years) provide fresh and important analyses of these questions as they play out across a wide range of Galen's writings and practice. Despite this variety, one of the volume's admirable strengths as a collection is its explicit cross-referencing and implicit dialogue among chapters. The result is a considered and coherent whole representing a substantial contribution to our finer understanding of how Galen attempted to 'synthesize' the methodologies of the rival medical sects of his day. Given restraints of space, this review compasses only those contributions which stood out to this particular reader, though all are estimable in their treatment of the materials.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. IP address: 18.118.253.87, on 17 Feb 2025 at 12:48:48, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426924000223

Inna Kupreeva (Chapter 2) sequentially anatomizes in a crisp and helpful way the major epistemological issues at stake within the Rationalist/Empiricist debate as conveyed by Galen in *On Medical Experience,* the earliest (*c.* 165/6 CE) of his several works on this sectarian conflict (most of which survives only in Arabic). Especially useful is Kupreeva's treatment of the soritical argument Rationalists deploy to deny Empiricist claims to 'technical' knowledge. Among other points of clarification, Kupreeva illuminates the major elements of the Empiricist programme that Galen is fundamentally on board with, particularly his admiration for their constancy of methodological application (by contrast to the slipshod commitments of many practising Rationalists). Jim Hankinson's contribution (Chapter 3) extends the focus on Galen's thinking about the correct relationship between experience and reason in the context of 'reasoned experience' (*peira diōrismenē*) as the appropriate method of medical discovery. Empiricists lack any justifiable means of uncovering (new) compound drugs: a major problem. Hankinson details the ways in which 'reasoned experience' leads the practitioner to establish, from singular test cases, the causal powers inherent in particular substances, thus permitting a reasoned approach to compounding drugs which is confirmed by experience.

Peter Singer (Chapter 6) raises the especially interesting question of 'inexpressible experience' within the clinical setting. Rather than concentrating on the patient's experience, a recent focal point of medical history, Galen is concerned with the limit of the *physician's* ability to communicate verbally the kinds of fine-grained distinctions between perceptual phenomena that are critical for the expert practitioner to recognize (for instance, minute discrepancies in the pulse). Importantly, *theoretical* frameworks provide direction for the practitioner that make direct perception legible (again, the pulse is helpful); in this way perceptual experience is significantly guided by logical structures, pointing out a substantial gap between Empiricist and Rationalist accounts of experiential knowledge. Orly Lewis (Chapter 7) centres *Differences of Pulses* to unpack Galen's methodological disputes with his rivals (here, the popular Archigenes) over matters wherein there existed considerable terminological and ontological overlap. Galen accuses his competitor of sloppy application of terms for different classes of pulse, but this failure ultimately stems from Archigenes' ignorance of the correct procedures for the classification and division of phenomena (as articulated in Galen's *On the Doctrines of Hippocrates and Plato*). For Lewis, Galen's critique reveals not only his own methodological habits, but casts an important light on alternative modes and models of categorization employed by his contemporaries. Lewis' chapter also neatly illustrates Singer's contention that proper terminological descriptions are critical for establishing horizons of expectation whereby practitioners might discern distinctions in perception that are too nuanced to express verbally.

Katerina Ierodiakonou (Chapter 8) shifts our attention to Galen's notorious philosophic eclecticism, taking up his engagement with Platonic, Aristotelian and Stoic theories of optics as a case study. In this chapter Ierodiakonou ably demonstrates the method whereby Galen upholds the Platonic account of vision (delineated in the *Theaetetus*) through a somewhat mercenary 'enrichment' via Stoic theories. That is, Galen is happy to strip particular elements from Stoicism (here, the cognitive discernment of physical change within the eye), while leaving behind the bulk of the Stoic cardiocentric framework, which Galen openly despises in light of his experience and experiments upon the brain and nervous system, that grounded it. David Kaufmann's contribution (Chapter 9) also deals with Galen's eclecticism, but turns our attention to the relationship between experience, reason and his 'moral epistemology'. Galen's autobiography traces a trajectory of moral improvement which cuts against the 'ambitious' programmes of Stoics and Epicureans, and instead models a graduated programme that moves from supervised ethical correction to one of self-scrutiny and introspection as the highest goal, as the

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. IP address: 18.118.253.87, on 17 Feb 2025 at 12:48:48, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426924000223

experience of the most challenging and nuanced moral challenges may not be transparent to the outside observer.

CALLOWAY SCOTT
University of Cincinnati
Email: scott3cw@ucmail.uc.edu

HARMAN (R.) **The Politics of Viewing in Xenophon's Historical Narratives** (Bloomsbury Classical Studies Monographs). London and New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2023. Pp. 231. £85. 9781350159020.
doi:10.1017/S007542692300099X

This book deals with passages where a historical actor actively sees something or creates something for others to see and the reader is implicitly or explicitly invited to view a situation. Such passages inject visualization into the reader experience, and Rosie Harman's subject is the political significance of visual material thus defined. Visualization engages the reader specially powerfully. Engagement can be from differing viewpoints, because different visualizations are evoked, non-visual material clashes with a viewpoint encoded visually or evoking a viewpoint automatically evokes alternatives. Differing viewpoints create conflict for the reader who engages with more than one side and, since visual engagement is emotional, conflicts are felt strongly and may be identity-related. Visual engagement also folds past events into contemporary experience, making their contemplation a way of engaging with current political problems. Harman postulates a reader minded to admire and identify with effective leaders. If the reader looks through the leader's eyes, this admiration is stronger, and the dissonance of conflicting viewpoints more disturbing. The reader Harman envisages is an implied reader constructed by Xenophon's texts and her investigation disavows interest in authorial intention: Xenophon's writings reflect their world, whether or not he was aware of this, and what they illuminate is the ideological framework of elite Greeks who wanted their cities to be powerful and Greek power to be exercised against putatively inferior non-Greeks. The *oeuvre* problematizes this framework (revealing inconsistencies in contemporary conceptions of Greek identity and relations with Persia) and effectively becomes a proxy for a crisis in the political environment of Late Classical Greece.

Exposition of these propositions involves readings of numerous passages from *Hellenica*, *Anabasis* and *Cyropaedia*. These are consistently sensible, perceptive and illuminating, and they are the book's great strength. I cannot list them all, but there is good identification and discussion of passages where seeing is clearly deliberately and perhaps unexpectedly thematized (for example, *Hell.* 4.5.6–10, 5.2.6, 5.3.16–17, 7.2.15; *Cyr.* 5.1.26, 5.4.10–11, 5.5.6–23, 8.1.42), the visual content and contest in *Hell.* 3.2.14–20 is well brought out, and the failure to control sight is rightly seen as reflecting larger weakness in *Hell.* 6.5.17–21 and (specially interesting) *An.* 6.3.10–23. The way that tactical discussions between Cheirisophus and Xenophon consistently involve them 'seeing' the situation separately does tend to frame them as contestants rather than collaborators. More could sometimes be said, for instance, about the contrast between Spartan reactions to Leuctra and the 'Tearless Battle' or the way the absence of the trope in *Hell.* 7.5.26–27 (after a campaign narrative in which visualization is important) reflects the eventual situation's lack of clarity. Another case is Alcibiades' return to Athens. This is a spectacular event (though lightly marked as such: Xenophon *could* have done things very differently), but the verbal analysis of Alcibiades' history and the blunt contrast between verbose defence and succinct condemnation effectively, and surely deliberately, blow away the visual aspect:

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. IP address: 18.118.253.87, on 17 Feb 2025 at 12:48:48, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426924000223