

Book Reviews

Med. 1984, 315–324. But I have found nothing of significance omitted in discussions of the older literature, whether it be on Stoic logic or on the theories of a later “Galenist”, Nemesius of Emesa.

There are also discoveries still to be made, particularly relating to the transmission of the manuscripts of Galen. For example, the celebrated Italian humanist, Politian, writing from Venice on 20 June 1491, informed Lorenzo de’ Medici in Florence of what he had seen at Padua in the library of Dr Pier Leoni (d. 1492); “ha certi quinterni di Galieno de dogmate Aristotelis et Hippocratis in greco, del qual ci darà la copia a Padova, che si è fatto pur frutto” (*Prose volgari*, Florence, G. Barberà, 1867, *Lett.* XXX, p. 78f.). Politian’s editor, Isidoro del Lungo, rightly identified the tract as *On the opinions of Hippocrates and Plato*, but not the actual manuscript. The solution to the problem is, however, not hard to find. Politian’s report of his visit was not polite reminiscence; he was acting as agent for Lorenzo and also hinting that Leoni might be willing to sell his rarity. By 1582, when cardinal Sirleto was interested in buying up what remained of Leoni’s library, this manuscript was no longer there, see L. Dorez, *Revue des bibliothèques* 1894, p. 74; 1897, pp. 83 and 92, nos. 189–190. Since the manuscript in the Laurentian library in Florence, Plut. 74.22 = L is the only codex of this tract that is so battered as to be described as “certi quinterni”, we may suppose that Lorenzo took the hint and acquired the stray gatherings from Leoni. They were still together when Caius copied them in 1543, for his notes, now in Eton College Library, show that both L and the few leaves now in Caius’ own college, MS 47/24 = C, formed part of the same volume in the Laurentian library. Indeed, Caius’ is the mysterious hand, first observed by Professor De Lacy, that added references to the Aldine edition in both L and C. Although one should not speak ill of the dead, it is highly likely that it was John Caius who removed the opening folios of L and brought them back with him to England via Basle, where in 1544 he published from them the *editio princeps* of Book I. The damaged state of the Laurentian manuscript would have presented an open invitation to steal a few pages “ad usum editorum”, and the culprit might be miles away before ever his crime was detected. Caius was not the first or the last seeker after manuscripts to fall prey to temptation.

This sidelight on the past serves as a mere footnote to the history of this Galenic treatise, and in no way detracts from the great value of this magnificent edition. The printers, the staff of the *Corpus Medicorum* and, above all, Professor De Lacy are to be congratulated on a great achievement.

Vivian Nutton
Wellcome Institute

BLAS BRUNI CELLI, *Bibliografía Hipocrática*, Caracas, Ediciones del Rectorado, Universidad Central de Venezuela, 1984, 8vo, pp. 507, illus., Bs. 180,00 (paperback).

Hippocratic bibliography is in fashion. Following on Maloney and Savoie’s *Bibliographie Hippocratique* of 1982 and Gerhard Fichtner’s computerized bibliography of the *Corpus Hippocraticum* of 1984 comes this lavishly illustrated bibliography by Dr Bruni Celli. Its entries are arranged in alphabetical order, usually of the author or editor, but 2779 is oddly entered under Mahomet II. There is an index of modern names, an index relating as far as possible individual Hippocratic texts to the appropriate entries, an index of towns and printers, and an index of major Hippocratic topics. There are many illustrations, taken with one exception from the author’s own collection, of the frontispieces of significant editions or studies, although regrettably their quality is not always such as to reveal the signatures of their former owners. Several authors also receive a brief biography or a date of birth. Finally, each entry concludes with a series of references to the source from which the entry was derived.

These additions make this by far the best Hippocratic bibliography to use, although it is still far from perfect, and for individual treatises Fichtner is better organized. It incorporates the information given by Maloney and Savoie—not always for the best, see the spurious entry 1106, which is 1105 in another guise—but by listing its sources of information, it enables the reader to check the reliability of each entry. This is a great advantage, for the citations of

Book Reviews

earlier literature by Kühn and by Littré are notoriously imprecise, and editions that rest solely upon their authority are rightly to be suspected.

More serious criticism can be directed at the criteria for inclusion. There is no clear policy for reprints, and some authors, whose works cover Greek science as well as Hippocratic medicine, are very inadequately represented. Hence important studies of C.R.S. Harris, E.D. Phillips, and, in particular, G.E.R. Lloyd (oddly indexed under L1 as separate from L) find no mention here. Second, the qualification required to gain a biography is obscure. Most of the information is taken from Hirsch, and rarely illuminates, while major scholars like Robert Joly or W.H.S. Jones are passed over. Jones is given his date of birth, but not that of his death (1963).

These failings reveal the origin of this Hippocratic bibliography in a love of Hippocratic books rather than in a working library of Hippocratic scholarship. On its own terms it is a much better compilation than any of its rivals; it is more honest and more generous in its provision of information. It is attractively printed, although not without the occasional garbling of Latin, and easy to use. It deserves a wider reception than its unusual provenance is likely to afford it.

Vivian Nutton
Wellcome Institute

PAUL MORAUX, *Der Aristotelismus bei den Griechen*, II, Berlin and New York, W. De Gruyter, 1984, 8vo, pp. xxx, 825, DM. 468.00

This book is a sumptuous in its scholarship as its price suggests. It treats in great detail the reaction to Aristotle among philosophers of the first two centuries of the Christian era, both in Rome and in the world of the Greek East. It covers not only those who claimed to be followers of Aristotle or who commented upon his writings, but others, like the Stoics and neo-Pythagoreans, who flatly opposed many of his views, or who, like Galen, claimed a philosophical eclecticism. Throughout, Professor Moraux displays an impressive command of the primary sources and a solidity of judgement, e.g., on the identity of Alcinous/Albinus, p. 441f.

For medical historians, this volume contains essential reading on Galen, not just about his own views, but also on his teachers and even on his philosopher-patients. The final section, pp. 687–808, is devoted entirely to Galen and to his formulation of the relationship between medicine and philosophy, and will be of lasting value. But it should be stressed that this is, deliberately, not a study of Galen's philosophy or medicine as a whole, although it offers many valuable insights to that end; it is restricted to Galen's relationship to the Aristotelian tradition of philosophy, which, it might be argued, took second place, at least in Galen's rhetorical formulation, to his attachment to Plato. Thus Galen's "philosophy of nature" is examined primarily for its Aristotelian biases, and Galen's medical and pharmacological theories are not mentioned, although the latter, in particular, throw some light on his ideas about elements and mixtures.

In exchange we are given the most detailed study of Galen's logic, both as an independent activity and as an essential part of the make-up of the ideal doctor, on which Jonathan Barnes, in a forthcoming paper on the *Method of healing*, has much to say. Galen himself believed that he had made his most important contribution to philosophy in the area of logic, especially in his views on demonstration and on the criterion of truth. Professor Moraux shows how much in this Galen depended on his teachers and on Aristotle himself, and how far his concerns reflected the interest of contemporary Aristotelians. Second, attention is drawn to Galen's works on ethics, so often forgotten or treated as protopsychological tracts. It is argued that Galen's selfconception as being unique in his interests in ethical problems is exaggerated, yet, at the same time, not totally wrong, Galen's insights from his own medical experience do seem to extend the standard discussions, and to make the investigation of the good life a little less abstract.

Like many other specialists in ancient philosophy who have come to Galen in the last ten