

overwork and the hot moist climate. Even the most productive of American imperialists, as Anderson shows, were laid low by “tropical neurasthenia” and the disease called “philippinitis”.

This experience strikes a familiar note in relation to the British and Dutch susceptibilities in India, Africa and the Dutch East Indies, and Anderson’s *Colonial pathologies* draws productively from the insights of much of this excellent post-colonial literature. Anderson’s Philippine case study uncovers a new dimension of the colonial process by re-considering colonial medicine as a web of interconnecting practices, people, technologies and ideas that dynamically link metropole with colony. This movement of ideas and people has profitably allowed for a balanced appreciation of the “experience of empire” in a far too neglected part of the world.

Perhaps it might have been useful to provide a brief account of late-nineteenth-century Spanish sanitation measures and how these, and Spanish science more generally, were effectively denigrated and denied by American secular and Protestant colonialists. Moreover, some mention might have been made of efforts by European-trained Filipino physicians to reform their own people’s sense of hygiene, which began well before the arrival of the Americans. Overall however, this is a fantastic book which is richly nuanced, meticulously researched and wittily written.

**Raquel A G Reyes,**

School of Oriental and African Studies  
University of London

**Kavita Sivaramakrishnan,** *Old potions, new bottles: recasting indigenous medicine in colonial Punjab (1850–1945)*, New Perspectives in South Asian History, New Delhi, Orient Longman, 2006, pp. xiv, 280 Rs 795.00 (hardback 81-250-2946-X).

The history of medicine in colonial India has been largely examined through the lenses of British colonial sources. Apart from sporadic articles and some edited volumes with relevant

contributions, there are few sophisticated book-length studies of indigenous medicine during the period of British rule. Kavita Sivaramakrishnan’s book signals a new point of departure for the field, dealing in a rigorous way with a period that has been marked as revivalist for indigenous medical spheres, yet can also be understood as one of significant marginalization in the context of state support for western medicine. There is currently a new wave of in-depth scholarship that critically examines indigenous medicine in India primarily through vernacular language sources, and this is one of the first such works to find publication.

Sivaramakrishnan takes the Punjab as the arena for her analysis, beginning with the time preceding its annexation by the British in the mid-nineteenth century until just before the Partition of India and the formation of Pakistan. The author’s main task is to unravel the complex strands of identity politics that shaped the corporatization, professionalization and representation of Ayurveda in the region. The first three chapters set the scene in terms of changing patronage patterns for indigenous medicine under the British administration and the rise of urban publicists. The political contexts of Ayurvedic revival are pursued through detailed analyses of the fall-out from the plague epidemic, debates surrounding the regulation of medical education and practice and contestation over collective representation, the formation of a literary canon, and language politics. Throughout the narrative, the politicized and contested nature of Ayurvedic mobilization is at the fore. Demonstrating the benefits of a regionally centred study, a significant outcome is that she renders obsolete the common idea of an India-wide revival of Ayurveda as a “Hindu” science. Rather we see how Sikh practitioners reconstructed Ayurveda as “Desi Baidak” in a fashion that precisely denied this religious dimension.

The analysis is sustained by thorough archival work and the scrutiny of vernacular language sources. The author’s familiarity with Hindi, Urdu and Gurmukhi, the principal languages of the region, give her the tools to examine conjointly different streams of mobilization and give the reader an entry point to the broader

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 milieu? 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

**Elizabeth M Craik** (ed. and trans.), *Two Hippocratic treatises On sight and On anatomy*, Studies in Ancient Medicine, vol. 33, Leiden and Boston, Brill, 2007, pp. viii, 183, €89.00, \$120.00 (hardback 978-90-04-15396-9).

In this book, Elizabeth Craik turns her expertise to two of the shortest treatises in the Hippocratic Corpus, providing each with a new edition of their Greek text, and comprehensive discussion, translation and commentary. *On sight* preserves a brief, largely surgical manual on the treatment of various eye conditions, while *On anatomy* offers a concise description of the bodily organs within the human trunk. The second part of the book, dealing with *On anatomy*, having appeared first in *Classical Quarterly* (1998, 48: 135–67), is reprinted here with only cosmetic changes, but an appendix has been added to take into account the edition and translation of the text by Marie-Paule Duminil which was published in the interim.

To consider the Greek text first, Craik is here a generally conservative editor, and seeks to justify the transmitted text where possible. In the case of *On sight* in particular, its uniform surviving tradition has suffered manifest corruption throughout, but Craik offers a fuller appreciation than previous editors of the stylistic oddities of this tract, and avoids postulating corruption where there may indeed be none. The possibly fragmentary form in which these texts have come down to us offers scant basis for confident reconstructions, and Craik is consistently wary of imposing unsupported interpretations upon the text, providing a welcome corrective to the more invasive approach of some of her predecessors. But when required, intelligent and plausible emendations extract sense from nonsensical and difficult passages, most notably in *On sight* at p. 38.14, p. 40.14–15, p. 42.16, p. 44.3–4, and p. 44.15–17, and in *On anatomy* at p. 126.3. These constitute a significant improvement in places which have baffled previous editors. Craik does not claim to recover the exact terms of the original, but aims to produce appropriate meaning, represented by a plausible Greek text. One suggestion concerns *On sight*, p. 44.15, where, in a generally corrupt