

Review

Author(s): Lesley Ann Jones

Review by: Lesley Ann Jones

Source: *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 110, No. 1 (Spring, 1989), pp. 164-166

Published by: [The Johns Hopkins University Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/294961>

Accessed: 09-06-2015 17:35 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The Johns Hopkins University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The American Journal of Philology*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

uation, with the fragmentation of the unity of power, knowledge, and rhetoric. What connects the two, however, is their appreciation of the use and force of dialogue. In this we can see, I hope, the long-delayed influence of European scholarship on Anglo-American studies of Plato.

BARRY E. GOLDFARB

PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY

H. GRENSEMANN. *Knidische Medizin Teil II: Versuch einer weiteren Analyse der Schicht A in den pseudohippokratischen Schriften De natura muliebri und De muliebribus I und II*. Stuttgart, Steiner, 1987. Pp. 91 (Hermes Einzelschriften, H.51) DM 48.00.

In *Knidische Medizin Teil I (KMI)* (Berlin 1975) G. distinguished three chronological strata, A, B, & C, in the Hippocratic gynecological text *De Muliebribus (Mul.)*. Only A exhibited those characteristics (archaic vocabulary, simple therapy, little theory) he identified as Knidian, so although in the intervening period he has published an edition of the C chapters and his student Nicolas Countouris has done the same for the B chapters,¹ this monograph is the first that he could title *Knidische Medizin Teil II*. At the time G. published *KMI* a debate was in progress over whether it was possible to categorize the heterogeneous treatises of the Hippocratic Corpus (HC) into two distinct schools: Koan and Knidian. However, as it proved impossible to reach a consensus on what characterized a work as belonging to one school or the other, scholars of ancient medicine have since tended to minimize the distinction.² G. acknowledges this development when he remarks that he is more concerned with identifying the work of individual physicians within HC than he is with establishing the existence of a Knidian school (p. 7), but this apparent lack of concern over the validity of the label “Knidian” is belied in Part Three where G. attempts to attribute certain chapters to specific “Knidian” authors. This attempt, however, is incidental to his main purpose in *KMII* and should not detract from the value of the work as a whole. G.’s close comparison of similar chapters within *Mul.* and *De Natura Muliebri (NM)* brings to light several dis-

¹ *Hippokratische Gynäkologie. Die gynäkologischen Texte des Autors C nach den pseudohippokratischen Schriften De Muliebribus I, II und De Sterilibus (HGC)* (Wiesbaden 1982); Nicolas Countouris, *Hippokratische Gynäkologie. Die gynäkologischen Texte des Autors B nach den pseudohippokratischen Schriften De Muliebribus I und II (HGB)* (Med. Diss. Hamburg 1985).

² Cf. Wesley D. Smith, *The Hippocratic Tradition* (Cornell 1979), and A. Thivel, *Knide et Cos? Essai sur les doctrines médicales dans la collection hippocratique* (Paris 1981) esp. 40–110.

crepancies which might otherwise have gone unnoticed. Unfortunately, G.'s interpretation of these discrepancies is overly influenced by his desire to pinpoint individual authors, and he gives too little attention to how this body of material could have worked as a unity.

Unlike *HGC* and *HGB*, *KMII* is not a text, translation, and commentary of all the chapters in *Mul.* which make up the subject layer of the study. The main aim of *KMII* is to differentiate two chronological strata within A itself: the A1 and A2 series. G. finds corroboration for this division in the fact that all those chapters of *Mul.* he identifies as belonging to the later A2 series fall in the first 34 chapters of *NM* while all the A1 chapters of *Mul.* fall in *NM* Chapters 35ff., proving, he feels, that A1 and A2 were originally independent works. *KMII* provides a full text only for those chapters which fall in the A1 series.

The criteria G. uses to differentiate A1 from A2 fall into the same categories as those he used originally to differentiate A, B and C in *Mul.*, i.e., terminology, description of symptoms, etiology, therapy, and pharmacy. While it is unlikely that the B and C chapters ever circulated in an independent form, G.'s demonstration that *Mul.* was the product of more than one author, and more than one generation, was very persuasive. However, the differences G. notes between A1 and A2 are not of the same order as those between A, B and C—how could they be since G. had originally characterized the A chapters as a unity because of their similarity in style and content? In this case, rather than positing different authors with mutually exclusive theories to explain minor differences in etiology, therapy, and pharmacy, it would be simpler to assume one author who took account of variations in symptoms he observed from one patient to another. G. himself shows the extremes to which his approach could be taken when he suggests that A2 could be further divided into the works of Euryphon and Herodikos on the basis that some chapters mention only one pathogenic fluid and others two. This chinese box-like analysis assumes that an ancient physician would only ever be able to recognize one disease, give one explanation and provide one line of therapy.

One example will illustrate the flaws in G.'s method. G. claims that the most compelling evidence that A1 and A2 are the work of different authors is the presence in A2 of phlegm and bile as pathogenic agents (p. 68). He uses what he claims are accounts of the same disease (an ulcer on the genitals) in *Mul.* 64 and 63 as illustrative of A1 and A2 respectively (pp. 54–55). He allows that the chapters are the same in basic structure, symptoms and style with the exception that 64.1 gives as etiology only that the disease is caused by a putrefaction of the womb while 63 stresses that bile could be the cause of the illness. However, 64.3 explains further what it is that causes the putrefaction of the womb, ἡ δὲ νοῦσος λαμβάνει μάλιστα μὲν ἐκ τόκου, ἢν αὐτῇ τι διακναισθὲν ἐνσαπῆ, ἢ καὶ ἐκ τρωσμοῦ, καὶ ἄλλως ἀπὸ ταῦτομάτου, while 63.4 reads, ἡ δὲ νοῦσος λαμβάνει ἐκ τρωσμοῦ, ἥτις ἂν διαφθειράσα τὸ παιδίον ἐγκατασαπὲν

μη ἐκκαθαρθῆ, καὶ τὸ στόμα πῦρ ἔχει. λαμβάνει δὲ καὶ ἐκ τῶν ῥόων, κῆν ἐπὶ σφέας δριμέα ἦ καὶ χολώδεα, δάκνει. *Mul.* 63 describes a complication or exacerbation of the ailment, and then and only then cites bile as a causative agent. The etiology cannot be counted an exception to the general similarity of the two chapters.

Similar explanations can be made for all the differences that G. points out between A1 and A2—elaborations in etiology, therapy, and pharmacy in A2 all corresponding to more serious, or at least more complex ailments. On occasions (as in *Mul.* 63 and 64) the distinction could almost be characterized as that between systemic and topical complaints. This would explain the grouping of A1 and A2 chapters in *NM*. The more “systemic” illnesses are dealt with before proceeding to more “topical” complaints. There is, moreover, one positive piece of evidence to suggest that the A1 and A2 chapters of *NM* were always part of the same work. In *NM* 35ff. no mention is made of illnesses caused by abnormal flows of blood outside the menstrual flow. G. labels this omission “erstaunlich” (p. 56) as knowledge and treatment of such illnesses were prevalent in all other ancient Greek gynecology, but he does not attempt to explain it. The most probable explanation is that these illnesses had been dealt with in the first part of the work and did not need to be repeated in the second part.

G.’s work on *Mul.* has resulted in a superior text to that of Littré, and it is to be hoped that eventually the chapters published separately in *KMI*, *HGC*, *HGB*, and *KMII* will be assimilated and published together with a text of the A2 series.³ Overall, *KMII* is a very useful book, but I feel G.’s research will yield more interesting results when approached with the question, “Why did *these* observed symptoms give rise to *this* etiology, therapy, and pharmacy?” rather than attributing any and every discrepancy between chapters to different authors. After all, even the admitted compendium *Mul.* must have been felt to work as a unity by ancient physicians themselves.

LESLEY ANN JONES

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN

DAVID C. YOUNG. *The Olympic Myth of Greek Amateur Athletics*. Chicago, Ares, 1984. Pp. xii + 202. \$10.00.

David Young dedicates his book to the memory of Jacob Thorpe, the star of the 1912 Olympics, whose medals the International Olympic Commit-

³ A good text of *Nat. Mul.*—which G. himself uses—is Helga Trapp, *Die hippokratische Schrift De Natura Muliebri. Ausgabe und textkritischer Kommentar* (Phil. Diss. Hamburg 1967), though this too could be more readily available.