

Book Reviews

second stage of the international project to produce a new collection, text, translation and commentary of the fragments and testimonia relating to Theophrastus. Sharples' volume is the first of nine projected by various authors. Each of them will provide a commentary upon a different part of the collected texts edited by a consortium of scholars and published in two volumes in 1992 under the guidance of W W Fortenbaugh. The present commentary covers texts 328–435 contained in the second volume which are concerned with human physiology, zoology, and botany and are roughly the Theophrastean equivalent of pp. 436–789 of Bekker's edition of Aristotle. The state of our knowledge of these three areas is not uniform. In botany (texts 384–435), Theophrastus's works have comprehensively survived. In zoology (texts 350–383), by contrast, only one treatise, *On fish*, is preserved in manuscript (together with a few summaries of short treatises). Human physiology (texts 328–349), where we have some surviving books and some second-hand reports, occupies the intermediate position. Because of this disparity in the state of our evidence for these three topics, Sharples concludes that a general introduction would not afford a suitable opportunity for an extended discussion of methodology and wisely provides instead separate introductions to each section, each of which provides an overview of the relevant sources and an elucidation of the pertinent doctrines. He does, however, make some additional points, which are not only germane to the present volume, but also affect the study of Theophrastus generally. He very properly warns against the danger of false perspectives in assessing the relationship of Theophrastus to Aristotle; stresses the uncertainty, already existent in Antiquity, as to whether certain works were by Aristotle or by Theophrastus, and reminds us of the tendency of later ancient authors to work from *compendia* which, since they combine material from a number of different sources rather than from the original works of authors whom they actually even cite by name, affords considerable scope for misunderstandings. This is a work of fine,

generous and widely ranging scholarship. It is rendered even more useful by the bountiful provision of indices. In addition to the General Subject Index, there are indices to the texts, viz. of principle terms in Greek, and in Latin, of titles of works referred to in the texts, and of persons and places referred to in them, as well as indices to the commentary listing the texts discussed or cited and (ancient) persons mentioned. Sharples' *Commentary* will undoubtedly serve as the bench-mark to which it is hoped the forthcoming eight volumes will successfully aspire.

James Longrigg,

University of Newcastle upon Tyne

Carlos J Larrain, *Galens Kommentar zu Platons Timaios*, Beiträge zur Altertumskunde vol. 29, Stuttgart, B G Teubner, 1992, pp. 272, DM 72.00 (3–519–07478–8).

Galen's writings provide a complete medical philosophy. His tightly integrated and comprehensive system came to represent the very embodiment of Greco-Roman medical knowledge and dominated medicine throughout the Middle Ages and beyond until the beginning of the modern era. In philosophy Galen was influenced primarily by Plato, Aristotle and the Stoics; in medicine by the writings of Hippocrates (or what he conceived to be such) and by the anatomical and physiological researches of Herophilus and Erasistratus. Amongst Platonic influences, that of the *Timaeus*, with its discourses upon the nature of the human soul, sense perception, the composition and operation of the human body and its disquisition upon the diseases to which it is prone is especially apparent. To this work Galen, it appears, devoted two different treatments, a *Compendium* (*Compendium Timaei Platonis*), which contains short accounts of other Platonic dialogues as well and partially survives in an Arabic translation, and a *Commentary* (*In Platonis Timaeum*

Book Reviews

Commentarius), which is frequently mentioned in his other writings. The latter work, too, is preserved only in fragments. A long passage from the third book was initially published by Daremberg in 1848 and was subsequently edited in the *CMG* in 1934 by Schröder and Kahle. In this book Larrain demonstrates that the reading of MS. scor. graec. Φ-III-11 (Revilla 230) pp. 123^r -126^v, whose subject-matter is concerned with problems regarding the soul, contains some thirty-five fragments derived from the first and second books of the *Commentary*. This excerpt reveals many correspondences with the *De Placitis Hippocratis et Platonis*. Larrain raises, only firmly to reject, the possibility that it was perhaps based on a *Timaeus* commentary by another author, who incorporated elements taken from the *PHP* (elements that the excerptor later separated out again). He points out that the excerpt contains throughout several sections statements that do not appear in this treatise and adds that correspondences with it should not in any case themselves occasion surprise because Galen, in places where he mentions his *Timaeus* commentary, himself refers to such parallels. The excerpt itself follows the thematic arrangement of the dialogue, i.e. Fragments 2–27, from the first book, are concerned with *Tim.* 42e8–46c, and Fragments 28–34, from the second, with *Tim.* 64a–e. In his commentary upon these fragments Larrain provides an impressively wide range of references to other ancient authors ranging from Homer to Chalcidius and the Arab translators. It is difficult, therefore, to understand why the medical authors are themselves accorded such extremely sketchy treatment (Galen himself and Oribasius apart), which at times diminishes the value of the commentary. To take a single example, in his discussion of those fragments (13–17) treated together by him under the general heading of ‘Das Nervensystem’, surely references to the Alexandrians, at least, would have provided valuable historical perspective?

James Longrigg,
University of Newcastle upon Tyne

Galien, *L'Âme et ses passions*, Introduction and translation by Vincent Barras, Terpsichore Birchler, Anne-France Morand, Preface by Jean Starobinski, Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 1995, pp. lviii, 155, FFr 130.00 (2–25–33926–4).

Galen's three ethical treatises preserved in Greek, *On the passions* and *On the errors of the soul* and *That the faculties of the soul follow the temperaments of the body*, have long commanded substantial interest beyond the circles of medical historians. Their subject matter, the control of passion, the extinction of error, and the influence of the mixtures of the bodily humours on psychic states, puts each of the works at the heart of the Ancient debate on the tasks of moral philosophy. Furthermore, Galen's methodological approach as exemplified in the first chapter of *On the errors of the soul*, continued to be an object of either approval or rebuke right into the eighteenth century. Starobinski's succinct exposition of the vicissitudes of Galenic methodology is perhaps the most original part of the book. Starobinski alludes to the major flaw in Galen's method which, as Osler had observed, was reflected in his failure to discover the circulation of the blood, notwithstanding his regular use of techniques similar to those employed by Harvey, i.e. dissection and live experiments, and his citation of water clock design as an illustration of the geometrical method. The absence of quantitative approaches in Ancient physiology, which partly accounts for Galen's failure to transport the methods of mechanical investigation to the study of the animal body, would certainly have warranted mentioning in this context.

Starobinski proceeds to discuss the attitude of the French Enlightenment to Galenic methodology (p. x). The doctors of the time were sceptical about Galen's *perfectionnements quantitatifs* (which were in fact purely qualitative sophistications—the *arithmétiser* of humoral pathology is no more “quantitative” than the numbering of critical days) *et les généralisations qu'il a voulu apporter à*