

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 Turol, 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

Book Reviews

problems involved in relying on the standard edition of Galen, by C. G. Kühn, they have at times an undue faith in some more modern editions. Sometimes this does not matter: at 47 Albrecht in 1911 agrees with Furley and Wilkie, *Galen on respiration*, in 1984. But elsewhere there are problems. The text printed at 48 is that of Marquardt's Teubner of 1884, a monument of misplaced erudition, which differs substantially (and crucially) from the more recent editions of Brinkmann (1914) and Barigazzi (1966 and 1991). The text of 73, based on Mueller (1891), is far from certain: in line 6 τὰ should be deleted or, with Cornarius, followed by λεγόμενα; in line 7, I prefer εἰ instead of εἰς, and I should delete καὶ συλλογισμῶν in line 9. At 427 Lloyd's second suggestion should be adopted, as the one preferred in the text involves two ugly and unusual examples of hiatus. But these are relatively trivial observations, in no way detracting from an excellent piece of work.

It is also possible to see easily what Galen thought most important in Theophrastus—his logic, his botany, and some of his ideas on physiology. References to Theophrastus' views of disease and treatment come not from the Galenic Corpus but from other authors, medical and non-medical. Dioscorides, by contrast, takes over far more botanical information from Theophrastus than he openly avows—and when Galen cites Theophrastus to explain the meaning of a plant name in Hippocrates, he is not always accurate in his references.

In short, this will long be the standard edition of the fragments of Theophrastus. Its execution fully lives up to the hopes and expectations of the organizers of the project, and we look forward eagerly to the commentaries on the individual portions. If they are only half as good as this first course, we have a feast in store.

Vivian Nutton, Wellcome Institute

SIGRID OEHLER-KLEIN, *Die Schädellehre Franz Joseph Galls in Literatur und Kritik des 19. Jahrhunderts: zur Rezeptionsgeschichte einer medizinisch-biologisch begründeten Theorie der Physiognomik und Psychologie*, Soemmerring-Forschungen 8, Stuttgart and New York, Gustav Fischer, 1990, pp. 442, illus., DM 128.00 (3–437–11334–8).

In 1805, when Franz Joseph Gall travelled through Germany in order to demonstrate his new organology as a synthesis of anatomy, psychology and craniology, he caused a stir not only among colleagues in the medical profession, but also among philosophers and other intellectuals. Soon, Gall and his doctrine became the subject of anatomical and physiological treatises, as well as novels, dramas, and anecdotes.

In her comprehensive study, Sigrid Oehler-Klein has admirably attempted to reconstruct the complex and complicated story of Gall's reception. Her book consists of three major parts. The first is an extensive overview of Gall's doctrine. Given the historiographical standpoints of Owsei Temkin, Erwin Ackernecht, and Erna Lesky the author does not present any new insights, but she highlights some interesting details.

The second part places Gall in the scientific context of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century and gives a careful analysis of his relation to physiognomy. It also deals with the development of characterology in the nineteenth century as a consequence of Gall's localization theory. However, Oehler-Klein's remarks on the philosophical debate about Gall are not wholly convincing. While she analyses clearly G. W. F. Hegel's polemics against Gall, it is hard to understand why she deals with a difficult topic such as F. W. J. Schelling's objection to Gall's organology from the basis of rather superficial literature.

The third part is devoted to Gall's impact on literature. Here the author plausibly shows that Gall's doctrine was criticized as being representative of materialistic science. Romantic writers such as Joseph Görres, Clemens Brentano and E. T. A. Hoffmann caricatured organology in order to promote their own message in which they defended mythology or individual freedom against materialism and determinism. The author's conclusion that Gall was regarded as a protagonist of "official" science by these romantic poets and not as a charlatan is very important. It shows that Gall's popularity was based not only on his craniology, but also on the far-reaching consequences of his deterministic psychology. This carefully researched material on Gall's reception in literary circles forms the most instructive part of the book.