politics of language and print culture in colonial India. Concerning archives, one wonders whether the study would be complemented by research conducted in the archival holdings now in Lahore, but pertaining to pre-Partition Punjab, to which the author seems not to have had access, and in all likelihood could not.

The “recasting” of the title is pursued at several levels in the work, but one dimension that is lacking concerns the “potions”. The relationships between forms of practice, such as diagnostics and therapeutics, and the changing social and political representations of indigenous medicine in these times and in this region remain obscure. Did the pursuit of a rationalized form of Ayurveda, advocated by some practitioners, and illustrated in this work by the projects to edit certain key Ayurvedic texts, parallel an editing out of certain practices, deemed “unscientific” in the new, modernizing milieux? Did the new institutional spaces for Ayurveda accommodate learning how to diagnose through pulse examination, for instance?

More also could have been written about the changing commodification and consumption of products branded as Ayurveda from the late nineteenth century, and the role that the middle classes had in these processes. One other key element in the revival of indigenous medicine in other parts of India concerned the shifting gender profile of professionalizing indigenous medicine in urban areas, whether in the form of birth-attendant training schemes or attention to reproductive health. But gender hardly features in Sivaramakrishnan’s analysis.

The importance of this work needs to be seen in the context of other works in the field. In this regard its regionalism is an advantage, while also possibly a limitation. The author’s sensitivity to the political contexts of revivalism in the representations of Sanskritic and regional traditions of Ayurveda is welcome and of great importance, but the bigger picture on indigenous medicine in South Asia in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries will not be found in this work alone.

Guy Attewell,
The Wellcome Trust Centre for the History of Medicine at UCL
passage, Craik punctuates with a full stop after the phrase oïdêmaton anôdunion, while the manuscripts punctuate before it. One way to avoid the resulting tautology (as acknowledged, p. 111) might be to keep the manuscripts’ punctuation, and to emend to oïdêmaton epodunion, deleting the following kai while keeping Craik’s emendations to the sentence subsequently. This would mark a transition to a new condition (i.e. “In the case of painful swellings . . .”) and make sense of the treatments newly introduced to counteract pain. I noticed only one possible error, at p. 44.2, where in the Greek text a comma is printed after oîs malista, but is interpreted in the translation (surely correctly) as coming before.

The introduction to On sight (pp. 3–27) and the discussion of On anatomy (pp. 155–68) seek especially to place these treatises within the wider context of the Hippocratic Corpus, of later Greek medicine and the history of ophthalmology and anatomy generally. In the case of On anatomy, a full survey and discussion of the evidence connecting the tract with the work of Democritus is offered. The thorny issues involved in linking groups of Hippocratic texts based on linguistic and conceptual parallels, or in tracing patterns of influence between ancient scientific texts, are fully acknowledged, and the evidence is treated with caution. Additional speculation on the origins and functions of these works is also found.

These various topics are addressed in more detail in the commentaries, in which particular attention is paid to linguistic analysis in relation to the Corpus, stylistic features, and assessment of these texts using the tools of modern ophthalmology and anatomy. Particularly welcome is the detailed discussion of the procedures of Hippocratic modes of therapy. Citations in Greek and Latin are helpfully translated in the commentary to On sight, though not On anatomy. The text is accompanied by three useful diagrams illustrating anatomical nomenclature of the eye and head, and the book is completed by two indices, one of passages cited and one general. It is perhaps to be regretted that no index of Greek words is included.

This is an excellent work of scholarship, accessible also to non-specialists, which provides a firm basis for further work on these two lesser known treatises. Its depth of analysis also makes a significant contribution to the study of the Hippocratic Corpus and the wider history of Greek medicine.

David Leith,
University College London


Franco Giorgianni’s new edition with translation and commentary of these two Hippocratic treatises appears thirty-six years after Robert Joly edited both texts for the Collection des Universités de France (Budé) and twenty-five after Iain Lonie published an exhaustive commentary on them that continues to be a reference and inspiration for scholars working on Hippocratic texts. Both writings, though transmitted separately in the manuscript tradition under the titles of On generation and Nature of the child, have unanimously been considered a single work on embryology since Émile Littre’s edition of Hippocrates’ Complete works. The text covers the human reproductive process, beginning with male and female seed and ending with birth.

Giorgianni’s book is based on the reworking of his 2003 Hamburg doctoral thesis. It contains a general introduction, a German translation facing the Greek text, a thirty-page commentary dealing exclusively with textual matters, an Italian translation, and three indexes (Greek words, general index, and index locorum). The book is completed by a bibliography and the reproduction of some pages of the Greek manuscripts used for the edition. Though this is mainly a philological work, besides the chapters on composition, authorship, tradition and