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Shigehisa Kuriyama's Expressiveness of the Body is a delight to read for anyone wishing to get a fresh look at the anthropology and history of the body, 'Chinese medicine,' and the occidental traditions of medicine that can be traced to Galen and the Hippocratic writings. The book is not only imaginative and insightful in content, but also well written and richly illustrated. It is divided into three parts: styles of touching, styles of seeing, and styles of being. The major theme of the book thus concerns ways in which the body is perceived and ways in which perceptions of the body are expressed, and this is done by comparing and contrasting themes of interest in the medical practices and theories that evolved in the geographic regions of China and Greece.

The first part of the book concerns the topic of the author's doctoral research on pulse diagnostics in Greek and Chinese medicine, completed thirteen years earlier. Kuriyama identifies as sources of 'classical Greek medicine' treatises spanning from the Hippocratic writings of the fifth to sixth century B.C. to the works of Galen, composed five hundred years later, and he points to an important change that occurred within this time span: the emergence of pulse diagnostics. The emergence of the notion of 'pulse' is closely linked to Greek anatomical knowledge, says Kuriyama, to "the swell and fall of the artery." By contrast, the Chinese 'pulse' *mo* (or *mai*) is not primarily related to the activities of the heart but conceived as "a multiplicity of vital streams." Also, Kuriyama continues, while Greek medicine distinguished between structure and function—artery and pulse—, the Chinese *mo* encompasses both: "The *mo* moves" and is simultaneously that which "dams up the nourishing *qi*." The gist of the argument is straightforward: "The Chinese doctors knew the body differently because they felt it differently." They also used a different language for speaking about touch. Kuriyama contrasts Galen's attempt to speak in terms of "crisp categories, such as size, speed, rhythm, and frequency—the geometrical logic of space, time, and number," with what modern Europeans called "fanciful metaphors" of the Chinese. Thus, Herophilos and Galen described touch with an emphasis on rhythm, which Kuriyama contrasts to "the world of palpation in China—a dense, tangled mesh of interrelated, interpenetrating sensations."

Part II, which is about styles of seeing, continues with contrasting particular aspects of the body in European and Chinese medical traditions: the emphasis on
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muscularity, which is correlated with individual agency and wilfulness, is opposed to the interest in colour, *se*, or more generally, in the appearance and facial expression of a person, which recalls the contemplation of flowers. Kuriyama's observations can be viewed as providing a further facet to a theme raised earlier by Haudricourt, who traced the Occidental notions of agency to the middle Eastern pastoral life style and contrasted those with the attitude of the Chinese agriculturalist.

Part III opposes the emphasis on blood-letting as an important cure in European medical traditions, which stems from "an equation of life and blood," to that on wind and breath in Chinese ones. Not that Kuriyama only draws contrasts - he points to the importance of pneuma in classical Greece and to that of blood in China; his focus is on the relative emphasis on certain culturally specific concepts for describing the body and notions of self.

As becomes apparent from the above, Kuriyama's comparative stance allows him to highlight distinctive aspects of the medical traditions he discusses. He does not account for the various medical traditions in the two geographic areas of China and Europe in a chronological way nor does he show much interest in working out what exactly the tensions were between the different traditions, what the interdependencies and how complexities in change were brought about. He likes to jump across the ages, and although he often acknowledges that changes took place over time and shows awareness of the variation between different traditions within one cultural complex, one nevertheless feels uneasy about the way in which text excerpts from very different traditions and ages are collected in support of a particular argument. Such comparison culturalises difference and essentialises culture.

One could quibble about details. Thus, when Kuriyama says Chinese physicians used terms coined in the Han dynasty "confidently and consistently for two millennia," and contrasts this with the "demons that haunted the European pulse taker," he does not seem to draw a distinction between word form, which may well have remained unaltered, and word meaning, which certainly was modified even if those changes may not have been overtly discussed. Moreover, one may question whether the visual representation of the pulses in a seventeenth-century Japanese edition is a product of culture transfer or whether, as Kuriyama seems to assume, it was contained already in the writings of its thirteenth-century author, Shi Fa. Or, in the light of Vesalius' depiction of muscles, one should point out that *jin* in early medical writings had the meaning of 'muscle' (rather than 'sinew'), which may be taken as an indication that ideas of individual agency prevailed also in China before correlative cosmology became predominant. There are other details of this kind which attract the attention of the specialist but do not seem to be a matter of concern to Kuriyama himself. Having said this, it is important to value the book for what it does rather than finding fault with what it does not claim to do. The book is highly recommended for whoever wishes to enjoy an imaginative approach to the history of the body.