the *Aeneid* have been punctuated clumsily and read with scant regard for the subtleties of the Latin (C. puts it less coarsely, but see e.g. pp. 63–4 on 2.772–5, 3.147–53). With C.'s discussion of Lucretius, for whom synaesthesia represents a crucial intersection of idiom and argument (cf. pp. 165–73), I do not engage, not wishing to blunt the edge of his argument with the deafness of my own gaze (for you too can try a little synaesthesia; cf. p. 87 for 'dumb sight'). It is no surprise that the printed text is clean (not perfect, but by modern standards, good) and C's foreign languages are rendered accurately. Occasional luxuries, such as author-names and line-numbers for *TLL* references, are surprisingly absent, and an *index rerum* would have helped. But the book is a delight to use (as most evidently it was to write too); when discussed by C., poetic Latin is a complex, inventive, exciting, creative idiom, as it should be and too rarely is in the hands of commentators. It is very much to be hoped that C.'s next book is on a topic equally suited to his enviable range of talents.

*Dalnacroich, Ross and Cromarty* NICHOLAS HORSFALL
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni272

## IDEAS OF DISEASE

G. E. R. Lloyd: *In the Grip of Disease. Studies in the Greek Imagination*. Pp. xxii + 258. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003. Cased, £25. ISBN: 0-19-925323-4.

After some twenty-five years of cross-cultural explorations in the comparative history of science in ancient Greece, China, Egypt, and Mesopotamia, Geoffrey Lloyd in the present book returns to the subject which he pioneered and opened up in such an impressive and stimulating manner in his publications of the 1970s and early 1980s. Yet *In the Grip of Disease* is not so much a history of Greek medicine in the narrow, intellectual-scientific sense. Rather, it deals with attitudes to, and perceptions and representations of disease as found in predominantly non-technical Greek (and Roman) sources, such as epic and lyric poetry (Homer, Sappho), religious literature (e.g. the healing narratives associated with the cult of Asclepius), Greek tragedy and historiography, philosophy (Plato, Aristotle), didactic poetry (Hesiod, Lucretius), and oratory (Aelius Aristides)—sources which all reflect non-specialist beliefs and expectations in the area of health, disease, and healing, and thus testify to what L. refers to as 'the Greek imagination'. In particular, L. is interested in the impact of ideas about disease as held both by professional Greek physicians (such as the Hippocratic writers) and laymen on other areas of Greek thought about more general issues, such as good and evil, mind and body, causation and responsibility, the divine and the human, pollution and purification, the natural and the supernatural, reason and the emotions, and the individual versus society. Thus the work is concerned with the interface between various discourses (e.g. the secular and the sacred, the natural and the cultural, medicine and politics) and with the ways in which concepts and ideas are associated, transferred, and transformed from one domain to another (e.g. notions such as *pharmakos*, *katharsis*, or the idea of 'sickness of the state', 'therapy of the soul', etc.). Though not explicitly comparative, the work is clearly informed by recent results of social and medical anthropology—the study of health and healing in its specific social and cultural setting—and by the comparative history of health and disease as studied by L. and others. One of the

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni273 Published online by Cambridge University Press

most fundamental of these results is the insight that there often is great diversity, both between societies and within specific societies, in the ideas held about disease and healing and about the criteria determining authority and competence in this area; and this diversity translates in different and often competing individual and collective responses to pathological phenomena, leading in turn to varying forms of organized and institutionalized healing practices and healthcare 'systems'. As far as the Greek world is concerned, the corollary of this pluralistic approach is that what has come to be known retrospectively as medical 'science' or 'rational medicine' represented only a small part of the ideas and practices regarding health and disease found in Greek society. Indeed, one of L.'s recurring preoccupations throughout the various chapters is the way in which competing claims to authority and expertise in matters of health and disease were established, justified and put across (e.g. in temple medicine, philosophical medicine, and rhetoric). These are important issues and, although some of them have been treated before (by L. himself, *inter alia*), it is illuminating to find them integrated into a cogent and comprehensive argument. L. writes with characteristic lucidity and elegance, and the result is a refreshing and inspiring study of experiences of health and disease in ancient Greece, which convincingly demonstrates the relevance of the study of ancient medicine for the understanding of classical society and culture at large.

After an opening chapter dealing with methodological, esp. anthropological perspectives (e.g. the distinction between illness and disease, or between the 'learned' and the 'popular'), the discussion is divided into seven further chapters, ranging chronologically from archaic Greece via Greek tragedy, Herodotus and Thucydides, Plato and Aristotle through to late antiquity (with Christianity being briefly considered in the Epilogue). The Hippocratic writings themselves are discussed in Chapter 3, and Alexandrian medicine and Galen are touched on (rather briefly) in Chapter 8. This is followed by an Epilogue that draws together some of the threads that lead from antiquity to the present day. With the exception of the introductory and final sections, each chapter concludes with a selection of relevant passages from primary texts illustrating the points made in the earlier part of the chapter. These texts are printed both in Greek (or Latin) and facing English translation (the latter in many cases produced by L. himself for this volume). This format makes the book particularly suitable for teaching purposes (I used the book myself for a seminar-based undergraduate course on ancient medicine at Newcastle). And indeed, although it is not explicitly stated for what sort of audience this book is intended, the Preface tells us that it has arisen from a lecture series which L. has given in Cambridge. This is confirmed by the fact that the book has hardly any footnotes, and the bibliography, too, is very selective—though its rationale is somewhat unclear, for it is not really targeted at the introducee. Throughout the whole work, there is a certain ambivalence regarding the intended audience, for although relatively light in terms of scholarly apparatus, this is not by any means a book for beginners. The argument is sophisticated, and considerable familiarity with the material (and with L.'s earlier work), as well as the methodological problems, certainly helps the reader to appreciate the issues properly. Thus the fact that relatively little attention is given to the Greek medical texts in the strict sense (such as the Hippocratic Corpus) makes it difficult for the non-expert to appreciate the points made about the tension between the 'learned' and the 'popular'; and Chapter 8, with the rhetorical title 'After Aristotle: Or Did Anything Change?', covers within twenty pages an enormous amount of ground while arguing the rather bold thesis that, for all the developments in anatomy, physiology, and therapeutics of the Hellenistic and Imperial period, there were no

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni273 Published online by Cambridge University Press

significant changes in general attitudes to disease in Greek society at large—a claim which is thought-provoking to the specialist reader, though perhaps somewhat demanding for the non-expert. (It would have deserved mention, in this chapter, that the relevance of the medical discourse to philosophies like Stoicism and Epicureanism was enhanced by their materialist concepts of the soul, making it even easier to 'construe' evil as disease and philosophy as cure). Those familiar with L.'s earlier work will recognize many characteristic ideas and tendencies (e.g. his preference of the concept of 'analogy' over 'metaphor', which he regards as an unhelpful tool), but will also perceive interesting new developments in his thinking on a number of issues, particularly the bold—though admittedly somewhat speculative and sketchy—connections he makes between past and present, history of ideas and sociology of science. A minor disadvantage that will disturb some Hippocrates experts is his use, in the section of texts, of W. H. S. Jones's notoriously unsatisfactory Loeb-edition, even for treatises where other critical editions are available. That these things matter becomes clear in text 3.13 (from the Hippocratic *Prognosticon*), where L. follows Jones in omitting the statement that the doctor should examine 'whether there is something divine in diseases': these words are preserved in the manuscripts but were suppressed by Jones on the ground that they did not accord with the allegedly rational spirit of Hippocratic medicine—a relic of that old positivistic approach to Greek medicine which L.'s work at large, and this study in particular, has been encouraging us so strongly to abandon.

*University of Newcastle upon Tyne* PHILIP VAN DER EIJK
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni273

## ATTITUDES TO ABORTION

K. KAPPARIS: *Abortion in the Ancient World*. Pp. viii + 264. London: Duckworth, 2002. Cased, £40. ISBN: 0-7156-3080-6.

Konstantinos Kapparis surveys abortion in the world of Greece and Rome over the course of the thousand years from 500 B.C. to A.D. 500, and, while he admits at the outset that his primary interest is with Classical Athens, he does not ignore the wealth of information from other times and places within the Mediterranean context (p. vii). K.'s fulsome collection of testimonia and many of his judicious interpretations are a welcome expansion and elaboration of Enzo Nardi's *Procurato aborto nel mondo greco-romano* of 1971, for issues involving abortion continue to swirl around us in the early twenty-first century. Particularly important is K.'s recontextualization of the Hippocratic *Oath* as a statement against all abortive practices that by no means represents a minority view of the Pythagorean sect, as Ludwig Edelstein once proposed, but rather a more mainstream sentiment that frowned upon interference in a pregnancy that had proceeded beyond the initial mixing of parents' liquid seed into a 'flow-out' (*ekrhysis*).[1] Once the fetus was formed

[1] L. Edelstein, *The Hippocratic Oath*, *Bulletin of the History of Medicine*, Suppl. 1 (Baltimore, 1943), reprinted in O. Temkin, C. L. Temkin (edd.), *Ancient Medicine* (Baltimore and London, 1967), pp. 3–63. Edelstein's interpretation of the *Oath* was cited among 'ancient attitudes' in *Roe v. Wade*, 410 US 113, 93 S. Ct 705, decided by the United States Supreme Court in January 1973.

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni273 Published online by Cambridge University Press