

Book Reviews

Omissions are minor. English readers might miss a reference to Charles Singer, 'A review of medical literature of the Dark Ages', *Proc. R. Soc. Med.*, 1917, 10: 107–60, which contains, (p. 133), a *Prognostica vera e libro Galieni*, which should be added to the list on p. 103, cf. also *Med. Hist.*, 1970, 14: 96–8. The text on falconry medicine, certainly written before 950, which was published by Bernhard Bischoff, (*Anecdota novissima*, 1984, pp. 171–82), should perhaps also have been included, given the laudable decision to describe texts on veterinary as well as on human medicine. Finally, it is worth noting that good photostats of many of the manuscripts of Dark Age medicine, including part of the now destroyed Herten manuscript, were made by Sigerist and can now be consulted at the Institute for the History of Medicine in Baltimore. All in all, the Centre Jean-Palmerie must be congratulated on an excellent and most useful collaborative work.

Vivian Nutton
Wellcome Institute

PIERRE DE SPIEGELER, *Les Hôpitaux et l'assistance à Liège (X^e–XV^e siècles): aspects institutionnels et sociaux*, Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège, Fascicule CCLIX, Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 1987, 8vo, pp. 225, illus., [no price stated], (paperback).

The first modern study of medieval Liégeois hospitals, this is a well-researched, thoughtful and scholarly addition to the growing list of regional monographs on institutional poor relief in the Middle Ages. The area chosen is particularly interesting, moreover, in that it possessed well-established communal forms of relief (the so-called *tables des pauvres*) as well as hospitals. Much of the terrain is now well-trodden. The author underlines the longevity and durability of hospital foundations; their multiplicity (15 in a city of about 20,000 in the late fifteenth century); the chronology of their foundation (the origins of most lie in the late twelfth and thirteenth centuries); and their diversity (there is from early on a leper-house, while later provision extends to the insane and to plague victims). As is regrettably usually the case with such monographs—if inevitability so, given the nature and shortcomings of the evidence—the reader learns less about the recipients of charity than about the institutions which catered for them and the buildings which housed them. Poor relief prevails over the poor themselves, and the mustiness of the ledger wins out over the aroma of flesh and blood. Nevertheless, Dr de Spiegelers does squeeze his material hard to extract something of the human from often unpromising sources. There are some excellent passages in particular on the religious communities who came to take over the running of the hospitals. These communities were especially numerous in this area and had some unusual developments—many of the female groups converting into *béguines*, for example. Dr de Spiegelers also highlights the tardiness of the “medicalization” of these hospitals: a number became crowded out with pensionaries, while the advent of medical personnel was late by standards elsewhere in Europe. The conclusion that prior to this hospitals were not medical institutions at all is perhaps a little shaky, in that, by his own admission, “l’organisation quotidienne demeure la grande inconnue”, but it tends to fall in with other analyses. Moreover, his analysis of charitable benefactions in wills confirms the widely-held view that piety and communal exigencies, rather than social need, were the dominant motivating factors behind the creation and support of charitable institutions. When faced with a social crisis, charitable institutions simply could not cope. Seemingly the most fragile aspect of medieval hospitals was precisely that which related to the provision of care for the poor and needy.

Colin Jones
University of Exeter

DAVID C. GOODMAN, *Power and penury: government, technology and science in Philip II's Spain*, Cambridge University Press, 1988, pp. xii, 275, illus., £30.00/\$44.50.

In December 1561, writing to Gabriele Fallopio from the court of Philip II in Madrid, Andreas Vesalius recalled gloomily “the very happy life I enjoyed while teaching anatomy in

Book Reviews

Italy, true nurse of talents . . . I [now] can foresee no possible opportunity for performing dissection—here I cannot easily obtain even a skull.” Vesalius’ complaint underlines the decline and decadence—after a promising start—of Spanish science in the second half of the sixteenth century, a phenomenon often commented upon and usually attributed to social and cultural factors peculiar to Spain. *Power and penury* is restricted to assessing the involvement of the Spanish crown in this period with technology and natural science, even though the topics Goodman chooses to consider all have implications for the broader phenomenon to a greater or lesser degree: the occult, cosmography and navigation, shipbuilding and gunnery, mining, and the organization of medical services. The crown, he argues, was concerned to develop an indigenous technology, and while forced initially to import foreigners, Italians and Germans (Vesalius was a Fleming), hoped to make Spain technologically independent; but, he concludes, its plans had little success.

To explain the failure of these efforts, Goodman looks to economic causes and dismisses social or cultural explanations: “poor economic rewards may well have been the main reason for the crown’s shortages in military physicians, pilots and gunners The failure of the treasury . . . was the most important reason for Spain’s limited technological achievement.” This may indeed be a *part* of the explanation for Spanish scientific decline, but it is not easy to be sure, for Goodman’s argument is impressionistic rather than rigorous, and Vesalius’ complaint suggests, after all, that money was not the answer to every problem. Nor was Spanish achievement quite so low as it is portrayed here. If Goodman had chosen to discuss civil architecture—surely just as much technology as marine or military engineering—he would have confronted a conspicuous success: the construction of the Escorial (1563–84) by Juan Bautista de Toledo and Juan de Herrera (both *Spaniards*), which involved engineering accomplishments of the first order. In this case, as in that of Vesalius, achievement or its absence depended on royal (or social) priorities, not merely money.

Hence, while the author’s exploration of archival materials has certainly enriched our knowledge of those topics he has addressed, and restricting his attention to the crown has allowed him to argue convincingly for royal interest, it remains doubtful whether the crown’s involvement with science and technology should be studied in isolation from general tendencies within the rest of Spanish society. In a 1983 article from which this book has grown, Goodman wrote: “The discussion of patronage of science soon leads to a consideration of social values More research is needed on the social estimation of the sciences in the late-sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.” It is a pity that *Power and penury* does not pursue its author’s earlier insights.

Michael McVaugh

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

WHITNEY R. D. JONES, *William Turner: Tudor naturalist, physician and divine*, London and New York, Routledge, 1988, 8vo, pp. 223, £35.00.

For all readers of C. E. Raven’s *English naturalists from Neckham to Ray* (1947), the four chapters on the mid-Tudor divine and naturalist, William Turner, must be among the most memorable. Raven wrote about Turner with the authority of a fellow-botanist, the sympathy of a fellow-churchman, and the intellectual curiosity of a true scholar. Yet he hardly said the last word about his subject, and one would welcome a book which brought Turner’s intellectual and ecclesiastical milieu more fully to life, investigating the influences to which he was subject, the pressures that dictated the development of his career, and the interrelationship of his different activities. What Turner deserves is the kind of treatment recently given to his near-contemporary, William Harrison, in G. L. R. Parry’s illuminating study, *A Protestant vision: William Harrison and the Reformation of Elizabethan England* (1987). By comparison, it can only be said that W. R. D. Jones’s new book is a great disappointment—superficial, unimaginative, and dull. Though the reader will be able to use this work to supplement Raven’s study concerning both the detail of Turner’s life and the content of his books, all of which are summarized at length, he should not expect very much more. Only a cursory attempt is made to