



Project
MUSE[®]

Today's Research. Tomorrow's Inspiration.

Philip J. van der Eijk. *Medicine and Philosophy in Classical Antiquity: Doctors and Philosophers on Nature, Soul, Health and Disease*. Cambridge University Press, 2005. Pp. 418. \$95.00. ISBN 0-521-81800-1.

This volume contains a collection of Philip van der Eijk's eleven previously published articles on the interrelations between philosophy and medicine in antiquity. The papers are as good as one can expect from the author, who has made already such important contributions to the study of ancient medicine as a highly valuable collection of essays by prominent scholars on historiography of medicine in antiquity (1999) and a two-volume edition of Diocles of Carystus' fragments (2001). This volume, dealing mostly with the classical period (Hippocratic corpus, Diocles, Aristotle) and with some figures of late antiquity (Galen, Caelius Aurelianus), will no doubt be welcomed by all the specialists in the field. To make the papers more easily accessible for students, the author provides English translations of all the quoted texts and an extensive introduction featuring recent developments in the study of ancient medicine. I will concentrate on the introduction, since it raises more doubts in me than all the other papers taken together.

Van der Eijk is very enthusiastic about the last thirty years, which are presented as highly innovative, and quite critical about previous scholarship, often characterized as naïve, anachronistic, old-fashioned, simplistic, positivist, presentist, etc. The new scholarship is much better, not because it finally superseded the antiquated editions such as Kühn's Galen (1821–33) and Littré's Hippocrates (1839–61) or finished *Corpus Medicorum Graecorum*, started 1901 by Diels—since it did not—but because it changed the approach to the ancient medicine from appropriating to alienating, from textual and content-oriented to contextual. “Postmodernism, pluralism, cultural relativism and comparativism” brought about healthy changes, “the distinction between ‘science’ and ‘pseudo-science’ has been abandoned as historically unfruitful” (6), so that now a historian of Greek medicine is freed from the belief of its rationality, its superiority over traditional healthcare systems and thus of its greater relevance for modern medicine. This change “has made the subject much more interesting and accessible to a wider group of scholars and students” (5–6).

I agree with van der Eijk that these developments have taken place, but disagree with him that they were beneficial for the study of ancient medicine or that they were as important in the field as he claims. As a matter of fact, I did not find in his papers any marked influence of the “new age.” The interaction of medicine and philosophy is a traditional topic in the classical scholarship, which is confirmed by the fifty-page bibliography including all the relevant studies of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. It is true that an average history of medicine was a success story, but van der Eijk's history of the recent research is even much more so. I am not sure that it is Derrida (or Lacan, or Bourdieu, etc.) who has to liberate us from our old-fashioned approach towards the “Greek miracle.” On the contrary, as J. Rist pertinently noted on the history of philosophy, “It is against this tyranny of the present, of the up-to-date and overconfident teacher of philosophy, whether he sells some brand of analysis, Straussianism, or Heideggerian existentialism, that a proper study of the history of philosophy, and of Greek philosophy in particular, can protect us” (J. M. Rist, “Taking Aristotle's Development Seriously,” in W. Wians [ed.], *Aristotle's Philosophical Development: Problems and Methods* [London 1996] 362).

If, however, postmodernism and cultural relativism are really doomed to win, this can easily lead not to the flourishing of the history of Greek medicine but rather to disregarding it for the sake of the other traditional healthcare systems—Sumerian, Hittite, or Assyrian—over which it has no superiority. Since we have not reached this age of equality, I can only recommend reading attentively all eleven articles of this collection.

Institute for the History of Science, St. Petersburg LEONID ZHMUD
Classical World 102.1 (2008)

Raffaella Cribiore. *The School of Libanius in Late Antique Antioch*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007. Pp. xi, 360. \$45.00. ISBN 0-691-12824-3.

Cribiore's new study of the school of Libanius offers a richly detailed view of the world of the late ancient classroom and the behind-the-scenes activities of one of its most famous teachers. It can be read most profitably, in my opinion, alongside Cribiore's own earlier study of ancient education (*Gymnastics of the Mind*, 2001) and A. F. Norman's translation of Libanius' speeches pertaining to education (*Antioch as a Centre of Hellenic Culture as Observed by Libanius*, 2000). I expect that the present book will have two main audiences. Those interested mainly in Libanius the man will develop a more rounded and sympathetic view of the performing sophist, political activist, and depressed old man known from the *Autobiography*, orations, and letters, while scholars of ancient education can expect to learn more about the administrative nuts-and-bolts of an ancient teaching career, from the application and admission process to diagnostic testing, progress reports sent to parents, letters of recommendation, and the creation and maintenance of a professional network. Many of these topics are discussed nowhere else in the scholarship on ancient education, and none at this level of detail. Cribiore's impressive coverage of the ancient sources and modern literature will help advance the scholarship on a number of key questions, some raised here for the first time. In addition, the comparisons drawn between Libanius' school and the schools of tenth-century Byzantium, sixteenth-century Paris, and today should encourage non-classicist historians of education to integrate Libanius and his school more fully into their own comparative and historical studies.

Two highly original discussions are of particular interest. In her treatment of the little-known *dokimasia*, a public scrutiny of the rhetorical abilities of graduates when they return home (84–88), Cribiore shows that the entire community, from artisans to the educated elite, felt that they had a stake in the student's success, and that their high expectations sometimes caused nervous students (including Libanius) to delay their homecoming. This public display was important both to the returning student and to the future enrollments of his teacher. In chapter 7, Cribiore weighs the importance of "complete training in rhetoric at a prestigious school" against "other factors (such as wealth and high social status)" (197) to a student's career prospects, basing her argument largely on letters of recommendation that Libanius wrote for his students. While such a letter might help the young man get his foot in the door, Cribiore shows that the in-person interview (222–25), not previously studied in detail, served to prove the applicant's capacity to take up the desired post. An appendix includes translations of over 200 letters related