

cardamom, cloves, mace, mint leaves, and vinegar (p. 281) and a portable sugar with lemon, a “medieval Kool-Aid” (pp. 53, 284); as well as several rich recipes for hummus (pp. 378–82). In the latter part of the manuscript, there are instructions for making handwashing compounds, soaps, incenses, and aromatic oils, as well as recipes for storing fresh fruits and using them off-season. For ease of reference, Nasrallah provides a rich glossary and an easy-to-use general index at the end of the book.

The fact that I grew up in Cairo eating several of these dishes—particularly pickled eggplants, preserved lemons, *mulūkhiyya*, *bāmiya*, *fūl*, and *kishk* (prepared almost in the same way as described in the book)—is a testament to an enduring and impressive culinary heritage. Egyptian cuisine today is often dismissed or neglected by experts, who perhaps see it as too limited or simple compared to neighboring regions. But the recipes in this book show a culture that was once, and still is, deeply inspired by and connected to Turkic, Greek, Iraqi, Persian, Levantine, and even South Asian food cultures. One of Nasrallah’s main contributions here, therefore, is to spark interest in further study of Egypt’s culinary culture—both historic and contemporary—and to give attention to its distinct tastes, ingredients, tools, and techniques.

One minor suggestion would have been to offer a few more details or hypotheses on *muzawwar* (“false”) or *muzawwarāt al-buqūl* (“vegetarian”) dishes which often make an appearance in medieval Islamic cookbooks (pp. 184–92). In *Kanz al-fawā'id*, these dishes were clearly intended for the sick who required lighter fare. But in the context of fourteenth-century Egypt, with its significant Coptic Christian population, *muzawwar* foods (and other meatless and dairy-free recipes in the book) might also have been consumed or devised by Copts who followed their church’s mostly vegan fasting for much of the year.

Overall, Nasrallah’s edition is a pleasure to read. The organization is easy to follow, the notes full of important information, and the color pictures suitable and complementary. *Kanz al-fawā'id* brings medieval Cairene and Egyptian history to life and will serve as a critical primary source not only for food historians but also those interested in medieval Islamic trade, agricultural, consumption, and social history.

FEBE ARMANIOS  
MIDDLEBURY COLLEGE

---

*Philosophy and Medicine in the Formative Period of Islam*. Edited by PETER ADAMSON AND PETER PORMANN. Warburg Institute Colloquia, vol. 31. London: THE WARBURG INSTITUTE, 2017. Pp. vi + 308. \$80 (paper).

This volume of essays is the product of a conference held at the Warburg Institute in March 2013, at which the contributing authors initially presented their work on the intersections of philosophy and medicine in the Islamic world. The essays predominantly examine the “formative period” of Islam, beginning with the period of Graeco-Arabic translations in the ninth century till the end of the eleventh century. The articles are only loosely connected, with each piece exploring the connection between philosophy and medicine within the works of an author or set of authors. There is, however, much material on the Arabic reception of Greek debates, and worthwhile contributions to our understanding of the ninth- and tenth-century engagements with the Greek tradition ranging from medicine and philosophy to *kalām* and *adab*.

The book begins with a survey of some “Philosophical Topics in Medieval Arabic Medical Discourse: Problems and Prospects” by Peter Pormann (pp. 10–33). Pormann examines discussions on the mind–body problem, medical epistemology, and the genre of raising doubts (*shukūk*) across a range of medical authors and their texts. Although the essay does not provide a deep sense of any one author’s mature position(s) on any topic, it does allow readers to see the richness of philosophical discussions found in medical works, including commentaries on the Hippocratic *Aphorisms*. Next (pp. 34–47), Oliver Overwien’s insightful essay, “Hippocrates of Cos in Arabic Gnomologia,” examines two gno-

mological texts, one attributed to Ḥunayn ibn Ishāq and the other a selection from an earlier eleventh-century work from Baghdad, *Ṣiwān al-ḥikma* (Cabinet of wisdom). Overwien shows that these texts included Hippocrates and passages from his works in their collections of ethical sayings of philosophers. Moreover, the material was consciously edited and organized, and had no simple direct forebear in any extant Greek text. And even though there are some overlaps in the presentation of Hippocrates across both these works (e.g., citations from the *Aphorisms*, a focus on lovesickness, and articulating the “relationship to the king”), the presentations are different enough that their creators should not be seen as mere “compilers, but authors in the true sense of the word” (p. 47). I would have loved to have seen how these authors engaged with their local contexts, or even Arabic poetry, to compile their gnomologia, and perhaps Overwien will address (or has addressed) this in another publication.

Rotraud Hansberger’s “Length and Shortness of Life between Philosophy and Medicine: The Arabic Aristotle and His Medical Readers” (pp. 48–74) examines the Arabic reception of Aristotle’s treatise of that name from his *Parva naturalia*. She shows that what for Aristotle was a purely philosophical text became significantly medicalized over the course of its Arabic recension, with an interest in the preservation of health and the attainment of the natural potential life of an individual. James Montgomery’s “Al-Ġāḥiẓ, *Falsafa*, and Hippocrates Arabicus” (pp. 75–103), on the other hand, focuses on what the brilliant Baghdadi litterateur and intellectual, al-Jāḥiẓ, thought about the Greek materials in Arabic, particularly philosophy and medicine. Montgomery wonderfully exposes the problems in the dominant interpretation of al-Jāḥiẓ as a critic of the Graeco-Arabica, instead revealing the debate- and *majlis*-centered nature of many of his famous works. He presents al-Jāḥiẓ as thoroughly steeped in the Graeco-Arabica who may have even modeled his celebrated *Kitāb al-Ḥayawān* upon Hippocratic medicine. The work is best seen as “a theological exploration and expansion of the Hippocratic approach to observing, cataloguing and reading disease,” wherein al-Jāḥiẓ is “the physician of his society [... who] can bring the hidden to light and save his society from forever being consigned to hellfire for their wanton misreading of God’s signs” (p. 103). Montgomery shows that *kalām* for al-Jāḥiẓ has “two branches: one is the study of nature (i.e. creation)—*naẓar* and *falsafa*; the other is the study of God (i.e. the Creator) and the prophethood of Muḥammad—*dīn*.” His critique of Greek philosophers was thus solely that they “neglected the proper study of God” (p. 93).

Gregor Schwarb’s “Early *Kalām* and the Medical Tradition” (pp. 104–69) investigates the precise engagement of pre-Avicennan *kalām* with the medical tradition. Unlike Hansberger, Schwarb focuses on how the medical and philosophical traditions, with their commitment to inherent natures, were treated as one tradition by these scholars. Even though the *kalām* scholars did not engage deeply and systematically with medical “terms, arguments and concepts,” focusing instead on “isolated ideas extracted from their medico-philosophical context,” their engagement, nonetheless, “left its distinctive marks and scars in school-internal debates and had a significant impact on systematic exposition of *kalām* doctrines” (p. 143).

Each of the next two pieces examines the works of Abū Bakr al-Rāzī. Pauline Koetschet, in “Abū Bakr al-Rāzī on Vision” (pp. 170–89), carefully analyzes al-Rāzī’s critique of the extramission theory as found in his work *al-Shukūk ‘alā Jālīnūs* (Doubts against Galen). She shows, convincingly, that al-Rāzī marked a crucial first step in challenging extramission theory and in defending a Platonized version of Aristotle’s intromission theory that was consistent with the new findings of Galenic physiology and anatomy. “The Consolations of Philosophy: Abū Zayd al-Balḥī and Abū Bakr al-Rāzī on Sorrow and Anger,” by Peter Adamson and Hans Hinrich Biesterfeldt (pp. 190–205), on the other hand, investigates the possibility of al-Rāzī’s intellectual debt to an unnamed philosopher from Balkh, as suggested by Ibn al-Nadīm in his *Fihrist*. They uncover an eerie similarity between Abū Zayd al-Balkhī’s *Kitāb Maṣāliḥ al-abdān wa-l-anfus* (Benefits for souls and bodies) and al-Rāzī’s *Kitāb al-Ṭibb al-rūḥānī* (Spiritual medicine) in passages dealing with sorrow and anger. The essay does not make any definitive claims but it certainly provides some fodder for those who identify Abū Zayd as the Balkhī of the *Fihrist*. Like Schwarb’s essay, Adamson and Biesterfeldt also end their essay with a translation of a text (Schwarb also includes the edited Arabic text).

In “Beyond the Disciplines of Medicine and Philosophy: Greek and Arabic Thinkers on the Nature of Plant Life” (pp. 206–17), Aileen Das examines the nature of plant life in the treatises on plants from

the natural scientific corpus of the Ikhwān al-Ṣafāʾ and Avicenna. She shows that both authors saw the question of soul and faculties of plants to lie at the intersection of physics and metaphysics, and both used medical material to understand the nature of plant life, revealing that, even for Avicenna, the “separation between medicine and philosophy” was not so strict (p. 217). Elvira Wakeling’s “Al-Ṭabarī and al-Ṭabarī: Compendia between Medicine and Philosophy” (pp. 218–54) similarly highlights the interpenetrations of medicine and philosophy. She does so by examining both how two medical works—*Firdaws al-ḥikma* (The paradise of wisdom) of ʿAlī ibn Rabban and *al-Muʿālaǰāt al-buqrāṭiyya* (Hippocratic treatments) of Abū al-Ḥasan Aḥmad—bring together philosophical and medical materials in their works and how the reception of these works by later scholars indicates that these texts “moved freely across the boundaries between the disciplines” (p. 218).

The debate between Aristotle and Galen on whether the heart is the ruling part of the body played a significant role in medieval debates between philosophers and physicians, and this is the topic of Badr el-Fekak’s “Cosmic, Corporeal and Civil Regencies: Al-Fārābī’s Anti-Galenic Defence of Hierarchical Cardiocentrism” (pp. 255–68). El-Fekak examines al-Fārābī’s defense of Aristotle against Galen’s critiques, highlighting particularly al-Fārābī’s firm commitment to the Aristotelian position for its implications for political rule and cosmic hierarchies. Raphaela Veit’s “The *Small Canon of Medicine* (*al-Qānūn al-ṣaǧīr fī l-ṭibb*) Ascribed to Avicenna” (pp. 269–80) is a short essay that briefly compares the approach, structure, and content of *al-Qānūn al-ṣaǧīr* to the original and deems it most likely that “the *Smaller Canon* was not compiled by the great Master himself” (p. 276). Finally, the collection concludes (pp. 281–94) with an essay by Hans Hinrich Biesterfeldt entitled “Alī ibn Rīdḡān on the Philosophical Distinction of Medicine,” which returns to the original inspiration of the volume, Galen’s *Quod optimus medicus sit quoque philosophus* (That the Excellent Physician is also a Philosopher), by presenting the Fatimid physician as “a true heir to Galen’s ideal of philosopher-physician” (p. 283). Biesterfeldt argues that this is so because across his programmatic texts “all the principal aspects of Galen’s ideal of the philosopher-physician are prominently displayed [. . .]: (1) the claim that the student of medicine should have a comprehensive training in *all* philosophical subjects, (2) within these, the particular role of *logic* as an instrument for philosophy and medicine, and (3) the *ethical* implications of the doctor’s philosophical way of life” (pp. 285–286).

Some individual essays are thought provoking and provide much material for further consideration (e.g., the essays by Montgomery, Koetschet, and Schwarz); others resemble preliminary surveys more than deep analyses. In this way, the volume does not really come together as a whole, and the introduction similarly does not aid the reader in arriving at major general claims about medicine and philosophy during this period. There is one trope, unfortunately, that plagues the essays and their conception in general. As made clear in the title, the focus is purely on the formative period, and defended as such because the editors claim this is the period “in which we find the largest number of philosopher-physicians” (p. 1). This claim is never empirically defended, however. It also calls to mind long-standing (false) assertions about the decline of philosophy, science, and medicine after 1100. Moreover, the editors make their claim despite the fact that there were at least a dozen or more commentaries composed on book one of Avicenna’s *Qānūn* during the long thirteenth century (1180–1310). If we include the authors of other medical works or commentaries who engaged then with philosophy, or scholars who engaged with medicine in their philosophical, theological, and literary works, the number increases significantly. At least some authors from this long century should have been included in the collection to counter the common misperception about the decline of erudite philosopher-physicians in the postclassical period (there are a few who would challenge Ibn Rīdḡān to be the heirs of Galen’s philosopher-physician ideal from this period). Despite the above, however, there is much to commend in this volume, and those working on the intersections of medicine, philosophy, physics, *kalām*, or *adab* will find many of the essays fruitful and insightful.