

Book Reviews

was a significant force in the creation of the school's identity. Brödel created a style which is remarkably bold realistically, yet which, as he recognized, simplified the field to permit the viewer to see only what was intended. The authors of this handsomely produced volume describe Brödel's life in great detail on the basis of a large number of family letters. It is in fact more of a personal biography than a history of putting art in medicine. Nevertheless, there is a lot to be learned here, not least about Brödel's creation of a Department of Art Applied to Medicine and, effectively, the initiation of a school of medical illustration characterized by its distinctive style and techniques. There is no detailed analysis of Brödel's style here, no attempt to relate it to developments in art and illustration outside medicine. The small number of reproductions convey the flavour of Brödel's approach. This is a useful volume, a good read and not without surprises, not least the revelation of the friendship between Brödel and H. L. Mencken, one of whose characteristic observations accompanies the photograph on page 229.

Christopher Lawrence, Wellcome Institute

MURIEL LAHARIE, *La Folie au Moyen Age, XI^e–XIII^e siècles*, Paris, Le Léopard d'Or, 1991, pp. xii, 307, illus., 250 frs (2–86377–102–7).

SYLVIE LAURENT, *Naître au Moyen Age: de la conception à la naissance: la grossesse et l'accouchement (XI^e–XV^e siècles)*, Paris, Le Léopard d'Or, 1989, pp. v, 288, 250 frs (2–86377–086–1).

These two volumes show the continuing vitality of French studies of medieval medicine. Both range widely over a variety of texts, legal, historical, and theological, as well as medical. Medicine is not something for doctors alone, or a series of learned speculations, but deeply embedded in all aspects of medieval society. The belt of the Virgin Mary at Puy-Notre-Dame and the illustrations of the opening initial D to Psalm 52/53 ("Dixit insipiens"; "The fool has said in his heart") have as much to tell as the magisterial pronouncements of Peter of Spain or the canonist Gratian. Above all, there is a willingness to confront and interpret iconographical evidence, from psalters and ecclesiastical sculpture as well as from more familiar medical writings. Both books present in elegant French the results of some of the latest research to a general readership.

Laurent's study of pregnancy and birth is narrower in focus and shorter in length. It is also less satisfactory, in part because it covers ground already well trodden by others, e.g., by Jacquart and Thomasset in their *Sexuality and medicine* (1985: Eng. tr. 1988). It is weaker in its discussions of medical theories (with a curious over-emphasis on the Hippocratic Corpus, and some important omissions, notably Hewson's study on Giles of Rome [1975]), and its use of literary evidence is inferior to that in the more recent English books and papers by Mary Wack and Monica Green. The illustrations are largely taken from manuscripts in the Bibliothèque Nationale (no. 11, "Zodiac man" in Hebrew, is particularly striking), but the commentary and the references to other examples show little acquaintance with MacKinney's listings or, more pardonably, with Peter Jones' *Medieval medical miniatures* (1984). But there are many things to compensate—a good discussion of sexual desire in pregnancy, and of childbirth as a semi-public event. Infanticide is also treated with reference to a whole complex of medical, social, and religious ideas, and the problems of an unwanted pregnancy are expounded with due sensitivity, and with attention to legal records as well as denunciatory sermons.

Laharie's book is considerably longer (in terms both of the number of pages and of words on the page). It also considers a less familiar theme, going far beyond what Foucault had sketched in 1961. As befits a pupil of Le Goff and Jean-Claude Schmitt, Laharie is particularly good on the theological implications of medieval madness, not least the "holy fool", and on the symbolic nature of many accounts of madness. She catalogues at length the healing activities of saints, both before and after their deaths, from Acarius and Adelphus to Willibrod and Wulfram of Sens. Her discussion of the interrelationships between religious and medical cures (which she lists at length) could well be copied by others looking at medieval diseases. Her conclusion that the Middle Ages was no golden age of madness, as Foucault suggested, carries

Book Reviews

conviction, for she shows how, alongside ideas of the mad as in some way privileged or licensed by God, cared for within the home, there were always attempts to separate the mad into hospitals and “mad-towers”, to exile them or to canalise their madness into socially more acceptable bounds.

Whether on the follies of love, theological discussions of the access of the mad to the sacraments, notably baptism and the mass, or the spread of “court fools”, Laharie always has something interesting to say. But beyond France her expertise is scrappy. The list of names and dates of earlier writers on madness, pp. 117–120, will raise many eyebrows. She does not appear to know the most useful survey of madness in Antiquity (by J. L. Heiberg) or the directly relevant studies of madness in Byzantium (by Michael Dols) and in the Muslim world (Dols and Manfred Ullmann), both of whom discuss the changing role of the mad in relation to theology and to society. Many of her points were made already by Basil Clarke, *Mental disorder in Earlier Britain* (1975), a book far wider in its temporal and geographical scope than its title suggests. German medieval medicine is almost entirely absent, while the work of Michael McVaugh and Luis Garcia Ballester on medieval Spain is also neglected. Extending her gaze beyond France would have sharpened her perception of the different ways in which different societies reacted to the mad. But it would be wrong to end on a carping note, for Laharie has given us much food for thought, not least in her unusual selection of 82 plates, which range from the suicide of Judas, on a capital at Autun cathedral, to Turoid, the pet dwarf on the Bayeux tapestry, and from the visitation of an academic by the devil, to the cure of a frenetic (Laharie wrongly says “melancholic”) by St Louis. In this book, madness is truly seen within medieval society as a whole.

Vivian Nutton, Wellcome Institute

WILLIAM W. FORTENBAUGH et al. (eds), *Theophrastus of Eresus: sources for his life, writings, thoughts and influence*, *Philosophia Antiqua* 54, 2 vols., Leiden and New York, E. J. Brill, 1992, vol. 1, pp. x, 465, vol. 2, pp. viii, 705, Gld. 170.00, \$100.00 (set 90–04–09440–7).

Theophrastus of Eresus, student and successor of Aristotle, is one of the great unknowns of Classical Antiquity. Of the 289 titles ascribed to him by an ancient biographer, only a handful survives entire today, including his witty *Characters* as well as his major botanical treatises. The two volumes under review, the work of an international team of scholars over the last decade or more, mark a significant step forward. It is not only that they include far more texts than did Wimmer in 1862 (741 compared with 179), or that the references to parallel passages lead to even more relevant sources. For the first time it is possible to gain an overview of Theophrastus' *oeuvre* as a whole, and to trace his influence, in the Arab world as well as in the Greek and Roman. In addition, all the passages chosen are given an *apparatus criticus* of variant readings and conjectures, and, what is most important, an English translation. Future volumes will offer commentaries on the various sections of Theophrastus' life and work.

This is a remarkable achievement, and the whole team (and the typist) must be congratulated on an excellent piece of work. A careful reading of the introduction, in which the principles are set out on which the choice of texts was made, and familiarity through use will remove any initial surprise at the wide chronological choice of sources (going down to Pico della Mirandola in the late fifteenth century) and any irritation at an occasionally cumbersome reference system. It is good to have the Arabic material available alongside the Greek and Latin, and treated with the same philological care, for it adds appreciably to our understanding of the influence of Greek logic and science in the Middle Ages.

To attempt to review all the work of the team would be supererogatory, and my remarks will be confined to medical sources. The trawl for references is exhaustive, extending even to fragments preserved still only in manuscript, and the translations are uniformly excellent. At 100C I prefer “reason”, not “speech”, as the necessary concomitant of man, following the translation in N. Rescher, M. E. Marmura *Alexander against Galen on motion*, p. 69 (an edition that seems to have been unknown). Although the authors are well aware of the