62 reads "Cooke (1936)", and p. 230 note 1 reads "Harrison (1982-1976)", but neither is to be found in the bibliography. In one instance (p. 47 notes 93 and 94) the footnotes are incomplete. Despite these shortcomings in the published volume, the author has in this study not only catalogued terms and texts relating to divination and magic from the ancient northwest Semitic world but also interpreted them within the context of what we know of the society and general world-view at that time and place. The practices that are to be seen emerging in this particular area of the ancient Near East are fundamental to our understanding of the role and practice of magic and divination to later centuries when they came to be viewed as competitors to more "rational" approaches to the maintenance of health.

Emilie Savage-Smith,
Wellcome Unit for the History of Medicine,
University of Oxford

GER Lloyd, Adversaries and authorities: investigations into ancient Greek and Chinese science, Ideas in Context Series, Cambridge University Press, 1996, pp. xvii, 250, £40, \$54.95 (hardback 0-521-55331-8); £14.95, \$19.95 (paperback 0-521-55695-3).

The collection of essays brought together here represents Lloyd's "preliminary forays" into the field of comparative studies of the development of science in China and Greece between 300 BC and 200 AD. The conclusions may be speculative and tentative, but Lloyd makes a highly persuasive case for the necessity of studying the two areas together, in order to counter any assumption by specialists in either subject that there is something inevitable in the way that that culture "did" science. In the process, he argues for a level of comparison which moves well beyond simply identifying a concept, such as Greek "humoral theory", then looking for a single equivalent in Chinese culture. Even where the two cultures may have studied the same things, they did so

out of different interests, asking different questions. In using each to test conjectures about the other, Lloyd investigates such topics as the claims of science, the uses of methodology and epistemology in persuasion, and the concepts of cause and of the infinite.

Throughout the book, Lloyd emphasizes the agonistic, confrontational character of Greek science. However, he resists setting this up against an opposed Chinese "irenic" science, always aiming at consensus, and instead looks at the style and social context of intellectual exchanges in both cultures. Because Greek scientists needed to attract followers-and paying pupils—they needed to create a climate of rivalry, to counter claims made by others, and to show that they were the best on offer. Individuals could move freely from group to group, in contrast with Chinese scientists who had a lifelong commitment to one group. Greeks asked what the underlying units of everything were—and produced so many conflicting answers—because in the competitive context in which science operated each individual needed to produce his own theory and show it was better than those of the competitors. One way of doing that was to start with explaining the basic constituents of the universe, from which everything else would then follow.

Lloyd insists that we need to move beyond any apparent similarities or differences between the styles of science in the two cultures to ask why these were present. The "why" relates to the audience which scientists needed to persuade. In China, the audience was the ruler. Particularly in the Han period, the ruler insisted on a single orthodoxy; as the guarantor of harmony between heavens and earth, he supported the synthesis of yin/yang and the five phases. Studying the heavens and ensuring an accurate calendar were concerns of the Chinese ruler, but not of the fiercely autonomous Greek city state; Greek scientists' insistence on the superiority of theory over practice can be seen as a necessity rather than a real choice because, regardless of the political system under which they lived, they had little chance of influencing their rulers.

Lloyd asks who claimed to possess specialist knowledge of the body, and what it was used for. In both cultures the body was seen as a symbol of order. In Chinese medicine there was a greater interest in the social hierarchy of organs, but also the free flow of qi was seen as essential for health. Analogies between body and state were used to show that political health depended on the ruler's virtue flowing freely to his subjects through good advisers and ministers. A doctor should know about how order is best achieved in both body and state; to persuade a ruler that his suggestions were worth hearing, a doctor would be best advised to use idioms of rule in his references to the body. Greek medicine, Lloyd argues, was under real threat from those who saw it as having a success rate no higher than chance; Greek doctors' insistence that they knew the causes of disease was a strategy to save medicine. Dissection was used in China for forensic purposes; there was no point using it in the Greek way, to resolve anatomical disputes, since the body was seen in dynamic terms rather than as a set of stable structures. Dissection remained controversial in the Greco-Roman world, Lloyd argues, because it was incorporated into the cultural patterns of competitive display; Galen even records bets being taken on the outcome.

The essays presented here show how far Lloyd has already achieved his stated goal of the "deparochialising of the history of ancient science". His forthcoming monograph *Tao and Logos*, being written with his collaborator Nathan Sivin, remains eagerly awaited.

Helen King, University of Reading

Hilde de Ridder-Symoens (ed.), A history of the university in Europe. Volume II: Universities in early modern Europe (1500–1800), Cambridge University Press, 1996, pp. xxv, 693, £65.00, \$95.00 (0-521-36106-0).

This is the second volume of a four-part history of the university in Europe which addresses itself to the "role and structures of the universities seen against a backdrop of changing conditions, ideas and values". The project is officially sponsored and the authors are well-known educational and intellectual historians.

Striking the right balance is notoriously difficult in undertakings of this kind. In this case, comparison is invited with the stable of Cambridge Histories, especially perhaps with such volumes as the *History of Renaissance philosophy* edited by Charles Schmitt. In the present reviewer's opinion, this book does not reach anything like the standard of the better Cambridge Histories, and is not remotely in the same league as the volume edited by Schmitt.

Some of the difficulties of this book relate to problems of definition, especially in deciding what institutions fall within its scope. This problem is not ignored, but no consistent solution is adopted, with the result that some borderline institutions are included, but other arguably more deserving cases hardly mentioned. Therefore, in the definitive listing of 184 universities (pp. 90-4), some illustrious schools are included, whereas the high schools of university type existing at places like Berne, Lausanne and Zurich are not. Inevitably the criteria of selection tend to operate against centres of higher education provided for dissenting minorities, yet these were often more intrinsically effective and important than neighbouring universities. Ambiguities over defining university institutions are sometimes reflected in the text. For instance, as already noted, the schola Carolina in Zurich is excluded from the listing of universities, but some prominence is given to Conrad Gessner, who is described as having spent much of his career as a professor of medicine at the university of Zurich.

The text contains some good runs of material on such topics as the geography of the system, teaching careers and student life. With respect to the crucial, albeit intractable, territory of the day-to-day intellectual affairs of the faculties, the text is much less effective. Intellectual history attracts a great deal of coverage, but the overwhelming emphasis is on