

ing of something intended to be read in the Liturgy), Bartholomew of Trent, Rodriguez of Cerrato, Gerard de Frachet's *Vitae Fratrum*, the depositions of witnesses for St Dominic's canonization, the account of him by Blessed Cecilia, Dominican nun and one of his best-loved spiritual daughters, the description of his ways of prayer from an early manuscript, the primitive Constitutions of his Order given in full, besides shorter documents such as the Bull of Canonization, papal documents and others concerning the Order. Each section is headed by an introduction.

The whole work is done with scrupulous and most scholarly precision. The *Libellus* is given in full, with the additions made by Humbert de Romans included, but in italics. Passages from other thirteenth-century writers amplifying any statements of Jordan's follow each passage in smaller type, thus making a coherent whole. The three coloured illustrations from the Codex Rosianum are delightful.

PSYCHOMATIC PATHOLOGY. A Short History of the Evolution of Medical Thought. By Pedro L. Entralgo. (Harvill Press; 12s. 6d.)

Whilst medicine has always been 'psychosomatic' in one way or another, this has not always been true of pathology, understood as scientific knowledge concerning disease. This is understandable because explanation tends to be more distant and theoretical in its attitude, and therefore less faithful to the make-up of the patient than the immediate work of the practising doctor. All the same, such practice can never be independent of some 'idea' concerning the disease of the person who receives medical assistance.

Having made this initial statement Dr Entralgo postulates a 'psychosomatic pathology' which gives careful consideration to the psychological and somatic aspects of the illness as well as to the personal condition of the patient as a living rational individual endowed with freedom and inwardness, and the author emphasises that such psychosomatic pathology was made possible through the work of Freud.

The conclusions of the book do not appear altogether cogent to me and very much open to discussion. Freud's work seems to me in this context no more than a milestone on the road of the evolution of medical thought, and in spite of Freud and in spite of Dr Entralgo, 'psychosomatic pathology' seems to me as far away as ever. Actually I still doubt its necessity or even possibility, if Entralgo's own definition of pathology, given above, is adhered to. With Dr E. F. Caldin I believe that it is an error to consider science as the one great source of truth, an error which has become common at a time when philosophers and theologians have fallen into disrepute. 'Genuine clinical medicine' (I follow Dr Entralgo's quotation of Diaz) 'is that carried out by one

human person in the presence of another human person', and it is certainly essential to keep always in mind the body-soul unity of man. This being said, I believe however that the art in medicine will always have to supplement scientific knowledge, and that pathology will ever and essentially remain somatic. So long as we are aware that pathology furnishes but part of the 'explanation', psychosomatic medicine will be well able to thrive with somatic pathology as one of its foundations. Such psychosomatic medicine (the term used in its full anthropological sense) is indeed not something to be hoped for in the future, and it is certainly not to be considered as yet another speciality in the making. Psychosomatic medicine is medicine itself, as it is and must be practised by the true family doctor at all times.

In spite of these arguments with their conclusions, the book appears to me most highly commendable. It is eminently thought-provoking, and, as Dr E. B. Strauss says in the foreword to it, it makes fascinating reading in its brilliant outline of the evolution of medical thought. In this I found two points of particular interest: the history, through the ages, of the relationship attributed to disease and sin at various periods, and secondly the quotation from Plato's *Charmides*. The words 'And the treatment of the Soul, my good friend, is by means of certain charms, and these charms are words of the right sort', seem to me to shed new light on the importance of 'the doctor's bedside manner' which it has become fashionable to ridicule in an age that does not any longer appreciate its importance.

On the technical side an index and more consistency in giving dates and in the numbering and lettering of paragraphs would make for easier study of the book. These however are minor details in a book which is otherwise excellently produced.

K. F. M. POLE

D. H. LAWRENCE: NOVELIST. By F. R. Leavis. (Chatto and Windus; 21s.)

As the earlier decades of the twentieth century recede and belong increasingly to literary history, it is becoming obvious that D. H. Lawrence was one of the great English novelists. Mr E. M. Forster made this claim for him as early as 1930 but his opinion has been a minority one, and too often consideration of Lawrence's work has been made an occasion for asserting the critic's moral or technical superiority. A gifted English regional writer, producing one fine novel, *Sons and Lovers*, and then assuming the mantle of prophet and lapsing into incoherence and boredom and dealing with themes which invited the attention of Bow Street—it is a depressing reputation and it will