

The Quantification of Bodies in Health

This page intentionally left blank

The Quantification of Bodies in Health: Multidisciplinary Perspectives

EDITED BY

BTIHAJ AJANA

King's College London, UK

JOAQUIM BRAGA

University of Coimbra, Portugal

SIMONE GUIDI

National Research Council, Italy



United Kingdom – North America – Japan – India – Malaysia – China

Emerald Publishing Limited
Howard House, Wagon Lane, Bingley BD16 1WA, UK

First edition 2022

Editorial matter and Selection © 2022 Btihaj Ajana, Joaquim Braga, and Simone Guidi.

Individual chapters: © 2022 the authors Published under an exclusive license by
Emerald Publishing Limited.

Reprints and permissions service

Contact: permissions@emeraldinsight.com

No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, transmitted in any form or by any means electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without either the prior written permission of the publisher or a licence permitting restricted copying issued in the UK by The Copyright Licensing Agency and in the USA by The Copyright Clearance Center. Any opinions expressed in the chapters are those of the authors. Whilst Emerald makes every effort to ensure the quality and accuracy of its content, Emerald makes no representation implied or otherwise, as to the chapters' suitability and application and disclaims any warranties, express or implied, to their use.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN: 978-1-80071-884-5 (Print)

ISBN: 978-1-80071-883-8 (Online)

ISBN: 978-1-80071-885-2 (Epub)



ISOQAR certified
Management System,
awarded to Emerald
for adherence to
Environmental
standard
ISO 14001:2004.

Certificate Number 1985
ISO 14001



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

Contents

List of Figures and Tables	vii
About the Contributors	ix
Introduction	
<i>Btihaj Ajana, Joaquim Braga and Simone Guidi</i>	1
Part I: Body Quantification and Subjectivity: Philosophical Perspectives	
Chapter 1 Body, Media and Quantification	
<i>Joaquim Braga</i>	15
Chapter 2 I Quantify, Therefore I Am: Quantified Self Between Hermeneutics of Self and Transparency	
<i>Lorenzo De Stefano</i>	29
Chapter 3 Quantified Care: Self-Tracking as a Technology of the Subject	
<i>Alessandro De Cesaris</i>	49
Part II: Body Quantification: Historical and Empirical Perspectives	
Chapter 4 From the UK Welfare State to Digital Self-Care: Historical Context of Tracking Public Health and Quantifying Bodies	
<i>Rachael Kent</i>	71
Chapter 5 Metrics of the Self: A Users' Perspective	
<i>Btihaj Ajana</i>	93

Chapter 6 <i>Whose Bodies? Approaching the Quantified Menstruating Body Through a Feminist Ethnography</i> <i>Amanda Karlsson</i>	119
---	-----

Part III:

Body Quantification and Mental Health

Chapter 7 <i>#Wellness or #Hellness: The Politics of Anxiety and the Riddle of Affect in Contemporary Psy-care</i> <i>Ana Carolina Minozzo</i>	137
--	-----

Chapter 8 <i>Me Apps: Mental Health and the Smartphone</i> <i>Zeena Feldman</i>	157
---	-----

Part IV:

Body Quantification and Smart Machines

Chapter 9 <i>The ‘Smart’ AI Trainer & her Quantified Body at Work</i> <i>Phoebe V. Moore</i>	181
--	-----

Chapter 10 <i>Towards a Quanto-Qualitative Biological Engineering: The Case of the Neuroprosthetic Hand</i> <i>Laura Corti</i>	195
--	-----

Index	213
-------	-----

List of Figures and Tables

Fig. 5.1.	Length of Use.	98
Fig. 5.2.	Frequency of Use.	98
Fig. 5.3.	What Do You Monitor?	99
Fig. 5.4.	Why Track?	100
Fig. 5.5.	Privacy Notice by Quantcast.	113
Fig. 5.6.	Privacy Options by Quantcast.	113
Table 6.1.	Overview of Collection of Empirical Material.	126
Table 8.1.	Googling for Mental Health.	164
Table 8.2.	Google Play Store Search.	165
Table 8.3.	Android Dataset: Apps Across All Three Keywords.	165

This page intentionally left blank

About the Contributors

Btihad Ajana is Professor of Ethics and Digital Culture at the department of Digital Humanities at King's College London. She is a former Marie Curie Fellow at the Aarhus Institute of Advanced Studies. Her academic research is interdisciplinary in nature and focuses on the ethical, political and ontological aspects of digital developments and their intersection with everyday cultures. She has written on the effects of technology on issues of identity, embodiment, governance and cultural representation. She is the author of *Governing through Biometrics: The Biopolitics of Identity* (2013) and editor of *Self-Tracking: Empirical and Philosophical Investigations* (2018) and *Metric Culture: Ontologies of Self-Tracking Practices* (2018). Ajana is also a filmmaker and uses film as a way of exploring social issues while bringing scholarly ideas to wider audiences. Her most recent films include *Quantified Life* (2017), *Surveillance Culture* (2017), and *Fem's Way* (2020).

Joaquim Braga is a Researcher and Professor at the Department of Philosophy of the University of Coimbra. He is also a Member of the Research Unit Institute for Philosophical Studies. His research activity covers the fields of Aesthetics, Picture Theory, Philosophy of Technology, Modern and Contemporary Philosophy, with a special interest in symbolic thought. His works include, among others, *Die symbolische Prägung des Bildes. Zu einer Kritik des Bildbegriffs nach der Philosophie Ernst Cassirers* (2012), *Rethinking Culture and Cultural Analysis – Neudenken von Kultur und Kulturanalyse* (2013), *Leituras da Sociedade Moderna. Media, Política, Sentido* (2013), *Símbolo e Cultura* (2014), *Bernard de Mandeville's Tropology of Paradoxes: Morals, Politics, Economics, and Therapy* (2015), *Antropologia da Individualização. Estudos sobre o Pensamento de Ernst Cassirer* (2017), *Conceiving Virtuality: From Art to Technology* (2019), *Teoria das Formas Imagéticas. Ensaios sobre Arte, Estética, Tecnologia* (2020).

Laura Corti is a PhD Candidate in Science and Engineering for Humans and the Environment at Campus Bio-Medico University in Rome. She is part of the Research Group Qua-Onto-Tech (Qualitative Ontology and Technology) at the University of Florence and of the Research Unit Philosophy of Science and Human Development at the Campus Bio-Medico University. Currently, her research is focussing on the philosophical issues of introducing qualities, such as sensation or emotions, into expert and robot systems. Her main research topics are post-phenomenology, philosophy of science and ethics of AI and Robotics.

Alessandro De Cesaris is a Post-doc Research Fellow at the University of Turin. He is also scientific collaborator at the Collège des Bernardins in Paris (Department of *Humanisme numérique*). He coedited a collective volume on Hegel's logic (2020) and wrote essays in Italian, French, English and German on his main research interests: Classic German Philosophy, Media Theory and Anthropology of Technology. His current research project is focussed on the notion of 'hyper-modernity' and on the socio-technical imaginaries connected to the Information Revolution.

Lorenzo De Stefano is a Teaching Assistant in Theoretical Philosophy and in Ethics and Theory of Big Data at the Department of Humanistic Studies, University of Naples Federico II. His research interests focus on metaphysics, phenomenology, philosophical anthropology and philosophy of technology. He holds a PhD in Philosophical Sciences from the University of Naples Federico II and was a Visiting Researcher at Eberhard Karls Universität of Tübingen, Albert-Ludwigs Universität of Freiburg and Johannes Gutenberg-Universität of Mainz. His current research interests are concerned with the anthropological, ontological and ethical aspects of emerging technologies.

Zeena Feldman is a Senior Lecturer in Digital Culture in the Department of Digital Humanities, King's College London. Her research examines the ways digital communication technologies impact analogue concepts – for instance, belonging, mental health and food. She has published widely, including in the *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, *Information, Communication & Society*, *Celebrity Studies*, *TripleC*, *The Independent*, *OpenDemocracy* and *The Conversation*. She is Co-editor, with Deborah Lupton, of *Digital Food Cultures* (2020) and Editor of *Art & the Politics of Visibility* (2017). She runs the Quitting Social Media project, which explores digital overload and detox.

Simone Guidi is a Researcher at the CNR-ILIESI (Italy). In 2019–2020, he was an Assistant Professor in Philosophy at the University of Coimbra and is a Full Member of the same University's Instituto de Estudos Filosóficos. He received his PhD in Philosophy from the University Sapienza of Rome. His research deals with the History of Modern and Contemporary Philosophy, and particularly with the genesis of the Cartesian mind-body dualism. He is the Managing Editor of the international journal of philosophy *Lo Sguardo*. He received the Italian National Scientific Qualification (ASN) as Associate Professor and as Full Professor of History of Philosophy.

Amanda Karlsson is currently working as an External Lecturer at the Institute of Communication and Culture, Aarhus University in Denmark. She recently completed a PhD project on women's engagement with period-trackers. She has a background in media studies and her research interests revolve around the socio-technical practices of everyday life and the effects of technologies on these. She focusses on topics such as the quantification of bodies through digital technologies, how various digital technologies ascribe meaning to life transgressions and

how we come to understand these entanglements and intertwinelements of digital communication, privacy, embodiment, gender and data.

Rachael Kent is the Founder of Dr Digital Health consultancy and corporate wellbeing (<https://www.drdigitalhealth.co.uk/>), and a Lecturer in Digital Economy & Society Education at the Department of Digital Humanities at King's College London. Having empirically researched the impact of digital technology on mental and physical health for over 15 years, her first book '*The Health Self: Digital Performativity and Health Management in Everyday Life*' is forthcoming with Bristol University Press. Her research regularly appears in press and podcasts including *BBC News*, *Forbes Magazine*, *The Independent*, *Runners World*, *BrainCare*, *Metro UK* and *Metric Life*.

Ana Carolina Minozzo is a PhD Researcher at the Department of Psychosocial Studies at Birkbeck, University of London and holds undergraduate and post-graduate degrees in Psychoanalytic Psychology and Psychosocial Studies at the same university. Her research crosses the fields of medical humanities, continental philosophy, eco-feminism and psychoanalytic theory in relation to diagnoses and experiences of anxiety in and outside of the clinic. She is also a Clinical Practitioner in the field and part of the Psychosis Therapy Project (PTP) in London, UK.

Phoebe V. Moore is Associate Professor of the Futures of Work at the University of Leicester, School of Business. She is a globally recognised expert in digitalisation and the workplace. Her most recent book *The Quantified Self in Precarity: Work, Technology and What Counts* (Routledge 2019) is a ground-breaking piece, analysing the use of wearable tracking technologies in workplaces and the implications for human resources and working conditions. She is a Policy Advisor and Commissioned Author who works with several institutions in the European Union including the European Safety and Health Agency; the European Parliament; the United Nations International Labour Organization; and the Chartered Institute for Personnel Development on the integration of big data, artificial intelligence systems, and old and new technologies into workplaces and spaces, and the risks and benefits these pose for working people.

This page intentionally left blank

Introduction

Btihaj Ajana, Joaquim Braga and Simone Guidi

Over the last decade, we have witnessed rapid development and widespread of digital tracking devices, apps, and platforms, together with the emergence of global health movements, such as the Quantified Self. Millions of people around the world are now routinely using such technologies to track, document and analyse their physical activities, vital functions, and daily habits, all with the aim to assess and improve their health, productivity, and wellbeing. And with the current Covid-19 pandemic, the uptake of such technologies has accelerated, as tracing apps, biometric techniques (such as temperature monitoring, thermal imaging and facial recognition) and health data gathering and analysis have become important *dispositifs* for managing the pandemic at the governmental and personal level.

At the heart of such fast-growing trends lies the *quantification of the body* deemed as a key element in both medical practice and personal self-care. Although the latest developments in metric and tracking technologies have dramatically expanded the scope and reach of body quantification, quantification itself, as a process, is not unique to the current era and its technological prowess but is inherent in the history of modernity itself. As Noji, Kappler, and Vormbusch (2021, p. 261) argue, ‘the history of modernity is also the history of increasing instrumental knowledge about the human body and its “health status”’. And generally, people have long reflected on the state of their bodies and health for centuries using analogues devices and diaries (Sysling, 2019, p. 108).

From a historical perspective, quantification became all the more important thanks to Galilei and particularly to Newton, the first to conjugate mathematical reasoning and strict observations based on measures of natural facts and phenomena. But such development could not have been conceived and introduced without a preliminary work of application of measurability on a key place of ancient natural philosophy, that is, the human body. A special kind of body among the bodies that constitute the physical world, the human body is such that – in the wake of the Vitruvian view of a *physis* structured by proportions – classic philosophy made of it the ‘natural parameter’ for the measurement of nature. According to the Roman architect, Vitruvius, even human artefacts had to follow ‘an exact system of correspondence to the likeness of a well-formed human being’ (Vitruvius, 1999, p. 42).

In no way both modern natural scientists and epistemologists could approach nature through abstract signs and measures without a preliminary reduction of the body to a quantitative model. It is no accident that they could find in medicine a rising tradition of natural philosophy that, since the early seventeenth century, started quantifying the human body by measuring the physiological processes which structure living organisms. Santorio's famous weighing chair is only one perspicuous example among the many early modern attempts to convert the body into a quantifiable being, by measuring it through specific instruments. And while the body reflects a view of the natural world, it tests *in corpore* a new approach to observations and a new way of scientific reasoning, based on instruments and signs rather than on qualitative remarks.

By converting the body into the language of measurement and quantification, early modern medicine treats the body as the border territory where two contrasting concepts of nature and natural science oppose one another: on the one hand, the ancient idea that nature is intrinsically qualitative and intelligent-like, so that it can be understood just within its inner logic, identifying hidden relationships, proportions, and connections in it. On the other hand, the new idea that nature must be examined and anatomised by placing it on the table of artificial ways of reasoning, as signs and numbers are.

Hence, early modern medical quantification of the body provides a pivotal condition for the new epistemological approach of modern science, and it constantly accompanies its evolution in parallel. No quantifiability of natural phenomena could be complete and plausible without the quantification of the body. By measuring the microcosmos of the body, early modern quantification of nature sought to make plausible that mathematics could be applied everywhere in the natural world. On this basis, in the modern age, the qualitative dimensions of natural phenomena are gradually supplanted by their measurable quantitative dimensions, so that, as Isaiah Berlin recalls, 'only the measurable aspects of reality were to be treated as real' (Berlin, 1956, p. 17). As such, the concrete possibility, opened by medicine, of immediately converting the living body into numbers has also contributed to enhancing the idea of *Mathesis* as a metaphysical key for a comprehensive (and often deductive) understanding of the world. This is a pillar of the modern worldview from which even contemporary post-positivistic mathematisation of the world stems. But if it is true that a mathematised science, as well as an algorithmic society, cannot exist without measuring nor without the instruments that facilitate the conversion of the world into numbers, such an apparatus cannot be effective if our natural medium, the body, is not already (and problematically) made homogeneous to the quantification system. This is why early modern medicine, before philosophy or physics, has been responsible for making of such a convertibility of mathematics and reality something obvious.

As is known, over the history of modern philosophy one can find many important instances of such a modern tendency to see mathematics as a universal logic, able to embrace everything. Among the many well-studied cases, two examples would be adamant. According to John Locke, for instance, the applicability of numbers to 'everything that either doth exist or can be imagined' (Locke, 1979, p. 205) reveals its universal character, founded on its unwavering and unique unity

to organise human mind and human thought. Thus, the number ‘is that which the mind makes use of in measuring all things that by us are measurable’ (Locke, 1979, p. 209). Likewise, Locke’s opponent, Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz developed his infinitesimal calculus with the broad goal of mathematically standardising the mathematical understanding of the transformations that occur in the world. And with his *Machina Arithmetica* (1685), Leibniz intended to empirically materialise a universal method, liable to convert the laws of reason into the laws of calculation. In addition to providing the detection of errors that could affect reason, Leibniz’s arithmetic machine aimed to extend calculability beyond the natural limits of the human mind, making of reality something intrinsically predictable and deducible in terms of geometric-mathematical reasoning.¹ At the same time, the Leibnizian arithmetic machine aimed, according to a fully functionalist principle, to free human beings from the arduous task of performing the calculation for themselves. Although manipulated by human workers, the technological imperative was for the machine to free itself from the ‘hand’ to nurture the ‘mind’. Such imperative can be seen as a precursor to the need of designing automated technological means, as in today’s digital culture and the burgeoning developments in Artificial Intelligence.

Despite such metaphysical and epistemological outcomes, the idea of nature as intrinsically quantitative and quantifiable remains inherently based on the pillar of the quantifiability of the living body and its processes. To the point that, in the late eighteenth century, one can find interesting cases of a recovery of the ancient idea of the body as a natural unit of measure, now conciliated with the modern conception of measure as intrinsically mathematical and algebraic. It is especially the case of Étienne Bonnot de Condillac, who, in his *La Langue des Calculus* (1798), undertakes a true philosophical panegyric about the scientific virtues of algebra as an exceptional and perfect non-arbitrary symbolic language. One of the uniqueness of his book lies in the relevance that the French author attributes to the relationship between calculation and bodily action. Right in the first chapter, entitled *Du calcul avec les doigts*, Condillac asserts that, originally, calculus refers to a human operation carried out with the fingers, just as language in general has action as its first reference (Condillac, 1877, p. 7).

The 10 fingers of human hands are, therefore, in Condillac’s analogical reasoning, the starting point for imagining a series of numerical units and thanks to which it becomes possible to perform linear mathematical operations and represent them for ourselves. Going further in his kinesiological approach, the author states that all forms of calculation can be reduced and explained by means of two opposite movements performed by fingers: the successive opening of the fingers to count (add or multiply) is equivalent to ‘numération’ [numbering] and, conversely, the successive closing of the fingers to subtract or divide is ‘dénomération’ [denumbering]. From this analogical point of view, to open the fingers then means

¹Worth noting here, however, that Leibniz was a great defender of the irreducibility of the ‘essence of life’ to the mechanical model. For him, quantification and mechanisation explain how life happens, but not why (see Leibniz’s notion of *vis viva*).

to add, and to close them means to subtract – which is the same as to say that a sensory-motor act supports a mental operation that is specifically mathematical.

The analogue relationship of calculus with the body and the actions performed by it is particularly emphasised when Condillac, in another chapter of *La Langue des Calculus*, sustains that the measurement of space is one of the first tasks that human beings perform. In his words, nature itself has endowed us with an organic measurement faculty, which is why it is only necessary ‘to count the steps, the feet, the inches, to be able to imagine several other forms of measurement’ (Condillac, 1877, p. 110).² Before these formulations, in his famous *Traité des Sensations*, Condillac had already attributed a superlative cognitive function to touch, since, according to him, it is the haptic senses that truly give unity and objectivity to the phenomena apprehended by other sensory modalities. Condillac’s sensualism is replete with a mathematical view of nature and beings; indeed, it highlights, above all, the *esprit systématique* that the Enlightenment philosophical thought inscribed both in natural sciences and in the humanities.

However, the core alliance between technology and science established in early modernity reaches a new level with the technological invention of artefacts with integrated mathematical measurement systems – as was the paradigmatic case, for instance, of the invention in the early eighteenth century of the mercury-in-glass thermometer. Soon these artefacts became impregnated with instrumentalist approaches to reality. Equating organisms and quantifiable beings greatly favours biological determinism and anthropological comparison methods anchored in measurement and quantification processes. In the nineteenth century, theories of biological determinism supported several forms of body quantification, such as those of anthropometry, a technical approach to human measurement and classification founded by the French police officer, Alphonse Bertillon, in the 1880s. While craniometry promised a cataloguing and ranking of human races, Cesare Lombroso’s criminal anthropology of *l’uomo nato delinquente* tried to locate the genetic and hereditary background of delinquency. At the end of the century, and with Francis Galton’s psychometry, further attempts were made to standardise the relationship between body and mental faculties, with the aim of quantifying the alleged intelligence level of each human being.

While scientific research continued to explore new possibilities of quantification and invest in new tools to achieve such goals, some of twentieth century philosophical

²What springs to mind here is ORLAN’s *MesuRages* (1974–1983), a performative artwork in which the French artist uses her body as a unit of measure (ORLAN-corps) [ORLAN-body] to measure public spaces and cultural institutions, including Centre Pompidou in Paris, Saint-Pierre Museum in Lyon and the M KHA in Antwerp. *MesuRages* is not only about ‘mesure’ [measure] but also ‘rage’, the artist’s anger at the dictum of ‘man as the measure of all things, as found in the teachings of the ancient architect Vitruvius and illustrated by Leonardo da Vinci in his famous drawing of the Vitruvian man’ (see, http://www.reactfeminism.org/nr1/artists/orlan_en.html). Through *MesuRages*, ORLAN ritualistically inscribes the female body onto public spaces and cultural institutions, occupying that which has been historically and exclusively dominated by male power.

thought attempted to break away from quantitative ideals and positivist heritage, showing how the body is irreducible to calculation and measurement techniques. ‘Measurability belongs to the thing as *object*’, argues Martin Heidegger (2001, p. 98) who also adds that ‘measurability means calculability, that is, a view of nature guaranteeing knowledge of how we can, and how we must, count on its processes’ (p. 104). For Heidegger, the body is unmeasurable to the extent that it cannot be perceived as a simple object, that is, as something that allows itself to be entirely represented, mediated, and quantified. On the contrary, what makes objects measurable, according to Heidegger, is not only a technologically supported human capacity, but also the very ‘thing’ dimension of objects.

Regarding the field of medical care, Hans-Georg Gadamer, in *Über die Verborgenheit der Gesundheit*, radicalises the Husserlian phenomenological distinction between the ‘living body’ (*Leib*) and the ‘lifeless body’ (*Körper*) – in the latter, the body is considered as merely a physical object – and Heidegger’s account of the body’s immeasurability, arguing that health cannot be subjected to conventional technical measurement processes. If there is any form of measurement, according to Gadamer, this can only be an internal and subjective measurement, felt through the symbiotic relation of the body with the individual’s own states of mind (Gadamer, 1993). The reason is that, for Gadamer, quantitative conventions – like those of scientific measurement techniques – do not cover the true states of somatic equilibrium, which, according to him, obey a kind of natural measure inherent to the body itself and which is not, in turn, translatable by any numerical system. Being sick and feeling sick are, consequently, two different states. Likewise, George Canguilhem (1991) believes that it is the patient’s perspective that defines the *experience* of being sick. He argues that

medicine always exists *de jure*, if not *de facto*, because there are men who feel sick, not because there are doctors to tell men of their illnesses [...] Health is life lived in the silence of the organs. (Canguilhem in Diaz-Bone, 2021, p. 295)

This, in a way, gestures towards the importance of the individual/patient rather than only science and medical expertise in defining what health and sickness are in the first place, a standpoint that is a heart of contemporary movements such as the Quantified Self, biohacking and so-called ‘personal science’ (Wolf & de Groot, 2020) whose primary aim is to regain individual autonomy and reclaim agency from the clutch of medical expertise and its ‘one size fits all’ approach.

Canguilhem, and later on Foucault, devoted much effort to scrutinising and unpacking the normativities and assumptions underpinning life sciences and medical understandings of what is healthy, what is normal and what is pathological. Their work, which resonates in recent literature on self-tracking and body quantification, has been instrumental in removing the veil of positivism to uncover the link between discourse and medicine, the effects of social and political forces on science, and the relationship between ‘power’ and ‘knowledge’ in the health system. One key lesson to be drawn from their analyses is that no science or technological process is neutral or value free. Every system and every practice,

whether social, political, scientific or personal tends to be imbued with a set of norms and values that are derived from various sources and pre-existing rationalities. The quantification of the body is no exception. That is not to say that the individual has no agency in terms of negotiating and appropriating the values and norms of a given practice. But often, consciously or unconsciously, one tends to be ‘oriented’ towards particular norms or conventions that are not wholly self-generated but originating from external sources and standardised measures – for instance, the recommendation to eat five vegetables or fruits a day and walk 10,000 steps per day which became the baseline for healthy active lifestyle. A similar argument could be made vis-à-vis the design of self-tracking devices and apps, which is mostly decided by technology companies themselves who introduce and embed new standards and categories which determine what is measured and why (Cappel, 2021, p. 240). As Diaz-Bone (2021, p. 305) postulates,

The categories (and algorithms) have been implemented by technology companies and the resulting categories and data are in many cases neither controlled nor understood by users or adopted to their health practices and their health situation. The underlying measurement conventions are invisible for users and in case the data is transferred to the provider of the app, there is also an informational asymmetry in data analysis and its economical exploitation.

Herein lies one of the challenges and limits of contemporary forms of digital body quantification and self-tracking. Despite the promise of individual autonomy and agency, users are still bound by the design choices of product developers, by existing norms around health and by the market forces of data capitalism. Self-quantification and tracking practices thus sit at the ‘fulcrum between self and external control, the objectification of the self, and regulation in accordance with social norms of “health”’ (Hille, 2016). This is why building one’s quantification and tracking tools has become a major preoccupation for the techno-savvy members of the Quantified Self community who rely on their own technical skills to find ways to circumvent both the medical system as well as the tech industry. However, for the everyday general user, relying on commercial products is not so much a choice but an inevitability.

Moreover, body quantification and tracking technologies have become increasingly intersected with surveillance and control mechanisms, not only within governmental institutions and private organisations but also at the personal, intimate level. We now use biometric fingerprints and facial scans to unlock our smartphones or log into our bank accounts; we use MobilePay to purchase our groceries; fitness trackers, such as Fitbit, to log and analyse daily exercise; period trackers, such as Clue, to manage fertility and menstrual health; voice recognition to interact with virtual assistants such as Amazon’s Alexa; contact tracing apps and thermal scanners to detect and contain the spread of coronavirus; and soon, Covid-19 vaccine passports and biometric immunity status apps to access pubs and restaurants, travel across borders, and return to work premises. A very recent

survey by YouGov (2021)³ in the UK revealed that most British people support Covid-19 vaccine passports despite privacy concerns and the potential of such systems to create and exacerbate forms of discrimination, exclusion and inequality. The Covid-19 pandemic has, indeed, normalised surveillance even further and made the quantification and tracking of the body all the more routine.

It is with this background and these issues in mind that this multidisciplinary volume proceeds to tackle the quantification of the body in its various contexts, shedding light on some of the key ontological, ethical, political, and aesthetic issues that arise out of the complex intertwining of bodies and measurements. By bringing together both established and emerging authors working at the intersection of philosophy, sociology, history, psychology, and digital culture, this book provides multi-layered and nuanced analyses of the various facets of quantification and self-tracking practices, offering a critical engagement with the ways these practices are reshaping our relation to health and our bodies. The book is divided into four parts, each of which addresses specific angles and themes, including subjectivity and perception, Cartesian dualism and embodiment, gender and the quantification of the female body, wellbeing and mental health, as well as Artificial Intelligence and prosthetics. By addressing these overarching themes through a variety of theoretical lenses and empirical examples, the book makes a useful and unique contribution to existing literature, highlighting what is at stake in today's ever-growing culture of quantification and tracking.

PART I, Body Quantification and Subjectivity: Philosophical Perspectives, opens with Joaquim Braga's chapter which explores the imaginary of the body underpinning the self-tracking ideology, linking this to relevant philosophical debates. According to Braga, the classic way of understanding the body in Western thought comes from a combination of two complementary approaches: on the one hand, the body is taken as a subject of representation, and on the other, it is considered as an articulation metaphor. Both these notions contribute to seeing the body as an artifact, leading to a constant misunderstanding of it through a 'paradigm of visibility' and through, what Braga calls, 'metaphors of appearance' (the body as a natural semiotic being, a *vera icona*) or 'disappearance' (the mediated body as disembodied and dematerialised). Contemporary body quantification lies, for Braga, in substantial continuity with such misconception of the body and its materiality, which was already preminent before the rise of wearable technologies (for instance in pre-digital concepts of virtual reality or virtual space). In such a technological imaginary, quantification reinforces a Cartesian model which reduces the body to a mere object of information. In response, Braga exhorts to understand the body as an open and active intersection of possible mediations, and to consider it not just as a passive being or an inscription surface of events (as Foucault himself defined it) but as an autonomous meaning-maker that is irreducible to the mere status of an 'object'. Chapter 2 by Lorenzo De Stefano is dedicated to examining the interplay between self-tracking practices and subjectivity.

³See, <https://yougov.co.uk/topics/politics/articles-reports/2021/04/12/covid-certificates-where-do-public-stand>.

It provides philosophical reflections on the cultural phenomenon of the Quantified Self and the extent to which this phenomenon contributes to the making of new subjectivities as well as forms of 'de-subjectivation'. Drawing on Material Engagement Theory, Heidegger's take on the 'question of technology' and Foucault's 'Technologies of the Self', De Stefano highlights how recent techniques and practices of self-tracking have unlocked new ways of self-analysis and introspection which extend and remediate former practices, such as confession and journaling. While such developments are contributing to enhancing our understanding of the self and deepening awareness of the body and its vital functions, they are also encouraging a reductionist perspective that is driven by data and numbers. These developments are, as such, cultivating a 'quantitative aesthetics of individual existence' that is underlined by deeper biopolitical and technocratic phenomena, according to De Stefano. What is at stake, in this sense, is the way self-tracking practices can lead to a de-subjectivation of the user whereby data and apparatuses end up acquiring more power and agency over the life of the subject. Chapter 3 by Alessandro De Cesaris continues the discussion on the forms of subjectivation involved in self-tracking practices, asking what kind of 'self' is being produced through the subject's personal engagement with tracking activities. The focus of this chapter is placed on the extent to which self-tracking practices and quantification devices can be regarded as 'care of the self', in the Foucauldian sense, and how 'design' is the way of thinking that shapes the interaction between users and their devices. Self-tracking, as such, is seen as a product of design, understood as a specific way of conceiving, and organising the interaction between the subject and technical objects. This raises, again, questions around notions of autonomy and empowerment since users, according to De Cesaris' analysis, no longer track themselves per se, but instead, they are tracked by digital devices that act as prosthetic extensions of their bodies, enabling automated quantification. Ultimately, the question becomes whether self-tracking practices can be considered as a form of 'delegated subjectivity' or whether such practices allow the subject to overcome automation and passivity.

PART II, Body Quantification: Historical and Empirical Perspectives, begins with Chapter 4 by Rachael Kent which provides a historical account of health tracking and body quantification in the UK. This chapter aims, in particular, at showing the impact of neoliberal policies on public health and its ideological residues in today's practices of self-management of health. According to Kent, the implementation of the neoliberal policies is responsible for reorganising the very notion of public health and the National Health System established after World War II. The core of such policies can be found in the relocation of responsibility for health from public institutions to individuals themselves, all under the narrative of 'liberating' people from the alleged intrusion of the state. Some of the effects of neoliberalism have been the increasing privatisation of health institutions and the rise of 'healthism', that is, the political discourse of lifestyle correction and health moralism. From this phase, which reached its apex with the Great Recession in 2008, the responsabilisation of individuals for their healthy or non-healthy behaviours comes together with a moralisation of health. The latter identifies a direct link between economic and social factors and