

Book Reviews

ascribed in the later of its two MSS. to Bartolomeo de Varignana and accepted as such by Dr. Siraisi (cf. also *Isis* 1977, pp. 33–39). In the list taken from its preface and printed as Appendix 2, the commentator describes Galen's method of dividing up the art of medicine, illustrating it with examples of individual treatises. Since he expressly notes where a tract no longer survives, it is fair to assume that he knows of the others. Almost all his examples come from early versions – there is no certain use of Pietro d'Abano's contemporary translations from the Greek, – and it is thus surprising to find a reference to the very rare *De disnia* (Kühn VII, 753–960). This was not translated into Latin before Niccolò in 1345, and if this is the book cited by the commentator, he cannot be Bartolomeo, who died c. 1321, and Dr. Siraisi's arguments from this treatise (cf. p. 449) collapse. But there is one further possibility, that the author gained his knowledge of *De disnia* from cross-references within Galen. But with one exception, they were either unknown in the medieval West or not translated before Niccolò (so *De diebus creticis*, Wellcome, MS. 286, fol. 77^{rb}) or were given in another form (*De malo anhelitu*, *De inspiratione* [as in Pietro's version of *De marasmo*, Galen, *Opera*, 1490, sig. tt.ii^{ra}], *De mutatione anhelitus*). However, in the version of *De locis affectis* that begins "Loca nominant" allusions to the work are in the form "*De dipsnia/disnia*" (e.g. Wellcome, MS. 286, fols. 101^{ra}, 104^{ra}, 106^{ra}, 107^{vb}). This version was known to Taddeo (and hence cannot be, as the Wellcome colophon says, by Niccolò), for he used it as the control in the MS. discussed by Dr. Siraisi on p. 102. It is just possible that the commentator derived enough information from these references to include it in his list, but since he may refer to at least two other versions by Niccolò, I prefer to jettison the evidence of a single late colophon and consider that the author, at least of the preface, had read *De disnia* after 1345 and that he was not Bartolomeo.

Even if we discount this commentary, Dr. Siraisi's study is both challenging and informative. Her first book told us a great deal about medieval Padua: her second has performed an even better service for Padua's greatest Italian medical rival.

Vivian Nutton
Wellcome Institute

LUKE E. DEMAITRE, *Doctor Bernard de Gordon: professor and practitioner*, Toronto, Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1980, 8vo, pp xii, 236, \$18.00.

M. Demaitre is an industrious, earnest, and enthusiastic fellow. He shows this by printing a long list of primary sources (which he has *consulted*, but not read), an ample index of authors, some of whom, as the footnotes prove, he has neither consulted nor read, and an impressive catalogue of Bernard Gordon's works, eighty-three in all, most, on analysis, reducible to the *Lilium Medicine* and extrapolations from it.

As befits a man of ambition, he proposes to "present a comprehensive analysis of Bernard [Gordon's] scholarship". But, like the youth who planned to swim the Atlantic and changed his mind because the water was cold, he craves the reader's indulgence in the next sentence for not pursuing this aim. He has decided against "comparing Gordon's views with preexisting tradition or with the thought of his contemporaries" because "inherent in this purpose are certain pitfalls, of which I am apprehensively aware". So he foregoes the comprehensive analysis and exhorts us "to find comfort, with Bernard Gordon, in the opening maxim of the Hippocratic *Aphorisms*: 'Life is short, the Art long'". You can say that again, brother.

This book, therefore, is "the first instalment of a more exhaustive investigation". How he is going to carry this out without taking heroic doses of ginseng is a problem, because he intends at the same time to edit the *Lilium Medicine* and translate it into English, to edit Arnould of Villanova's *De considerationibus operis medicine*, to edit Gordon's *Tractatus ad faciendum sigilla*, to edit Gordon's instructions for adolescents, to edit the *De Tyriaca* and *De Marasmode* [sic], to make a detailed examination of Gordon's place in medical deontology, and to explore Gordon's indebtedness to the *Centiloquium* of pseudo-Ptolemy. This reviewer has forgotten the rest. But there is no doubt that, like his forbear, the Klondyke gold-digger, he is staking out his claims and warning others to keep off.

The first chapter deals with Gordon's biography, education, and teaching career at Montpellier. There is much blah-blah about what he may "conceivably", "presumably",

“possibly” have studied, but not one word about the medical tradition at Montpellier, about the curriculum, the length of the course, the prerequisites for mastership, and so on. There is not one new idea or fact in it, but there are plenty of errors. Demaitre says Gordon was educated by the Cistercians, ignorant of the fact that the Cistercians had no schools and were forbidden by their Statutes to accept and teach students. He says that the argument proving Gordon’s French nationality “while ingenious . . . is based on a misreading of the *Lilium’s* prologue”. It is not a misreading. It is a direct translation of the text in the 1480 edition, an edition listed in Demaitre’s own book. He says that the earliest confirmation of Bernard Gordon’s death may be a notarial document dated 1330, in which Bernard is mentioned as “formerly an outstanding teacher of medicine in Montpellier”. Demaitre takes this to mean that Gordon was already dead. He fails to notice what the document goes on to say: “Bernard, being the younger, declares . . . that whatever shall be done on this occasion by his cousin, William, shall be considered as if done by himself”. This does not sound as if Bernard were dead. Far from it. The document continues: “he is living (abitante) in the area of Provence”. In this connexion one might have thought that Demaitre would have investigated the fact that Gordon had a cousin, a physician and canon of Asti, which is in Italy, and looked into the possibility that the Gordon family might be Italian. On page 27 Demaitre says that Gordon’s master died “Apparently of a stroke”: on p. 35 he says the same master “bled to death”. On p. 35 he says Henri de Mondeville composed his surgery at the request of Bernard Gordon, quoting Nicaise as his authority. He then says, in a footnote, that it may have been composed at the request of William of Brescia, quoting Wickersheimer. A glance at Pagel’s edition of Mondeville would have provided the answer. But secondary sources are so much easier to handle, are they not? On p. 24 the sentence “cor est vite domicilium” is dismissed by saying “The reference is probably to Alfred [of Sareshal] *De motu cordis*.” And when it occurs again on p. 66, he repeats the same phrase. He is too lazy to find out. In the same way, he quotes the *Clarificatorium* of John de Tornamira at second hand, quotes incipits and colophons of manuscripts from other writers’ articles, takes over, lock, stock and barrel Diepgen’s assessment of Gilbertus Anglicus and John of Gaddesden, and even quotes Chauliac’s view of Gaddesden in a French translation.

The texts from the *Lilium* that festoon his pages suggest that Demaitre has some acquaintance with Latin. But what that Latin means, alas, oftentimes escapes him. This is a decided handicap in one who proposes to translate the whole of the *Lilium*, and does not augur well for his semi-literate readers. The whole passage on p. 28 needs re-translation: *in sompno* is not the same as *in sompno*. “Tempore cursus primi” (p. 29) does not mean “at the time of the first lecture”. It refers to a course of lectures which a bachelor was bound to give under the supervision of a master as a preparation for his own higher degree. “A decano preclari studii” (pp. 33 and 85) does not mean “by the dean of the distinguished studium”. “Excuso me” (p. 67) is not the same as “Excuse me”. “Ista questio est determinata a nobis cum solemnitate” does not, as Demaitre affirms, “strongly suggest a formal commentary”. It refers to a public disputation on one question and one question only. The passage on p. 134 is incompletely and incorrectly translated, whilst “acus quadrata” has nothing to do with “size”.

This failure fully to comprehend his texts leads Demaitre to make faulty transcriptions. “Multa monstra et peccata, sicut sunt Pygmaei” is absurd (p. 5). It should be *terata*. “Diffuse late quoque” (p. 39) should be “diffuse lateque”. “Opuscula diu est propter istud opus” is pure nonsense; emend to “opuscula diversa preter istud opus” (p. 73). “Argentum unum” (twice, p. 87) should be “argentum vivum”, that is, mercury. “Fringatur” (p. 162) should obviously be “stringatur”, and “caudela” (p. 135) should just as obviously remain as it is and not be emended to “candela”! Lack of patience prevents correction of other mistakes on pp. 90, 93, 99, 109, 139, and so on. After all, it is not a reviewer’s duty to dispose of an author’s garbage, but merely to forewarn the unwary that all that glitters is not gold. Demaitre ties himself in knots trying to prove what a marvellous scholar Gordon was, though he dealt mainly with “common, useful and practical ideas,” and vigorously rebuts the charge that he was “Arabist”. He praises his standard of ethics, while quietly suppressing Gordon’s advice to test poisonous medicaments “on people in hospitals and on the Friars Minor in case they should prove fatal”. In short, Gordon was, “whilst perhaps not a genius”, an erudite author who “avoided the extremes of

Book Reviews

academic rationalism and mystical empiricism” (whatever that is). The Conclusion to the book, which reads like an obituary notice in a parish magazine, should be read by all who find joy in pomposity. The fact is, that were Gordon to be seriously compared with writers like Peter of Abano or Taddeo Alderotti he would appear like a parrot in a cage of singing birds.

C. H. Talbot
Wellcome Institute

NICOLE GONTHIER, *Lyon et ses pauvres au moyen-âge (1350–1500)*, Lyons, Editions L’Hermès, 1978, 8vo, pp. 271, illus., F.51.00 (paperback).

This study is inspired by a desire to reveal those who have been “hidden from history” using whatever documents are available for the period. Relying heavily on wills, church archives, and fiscal documents, Gonthier has skilfully reconstructed the changing material situation of the poor, as well as the place of poverty in the medieval world-view. Gonthier’s central thesis is that by the sixteenth century a new attitude towards the poor had emerged in Lyons which took a critical moral stance towards them, denigrated their usefulness and value in the social order, and portrayed them as dangerous and potentially subversive. She contrasts this with the prevailing belief of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries in the religious significance of poverty and the acceptance of the large numbers of “Christ’s poor” who filled the city. Those with property and money were exceedingly generous in their charity, often in the form of handouts (food, clothing, money) at their funerals or on the anniversaries of their deaths.

Gonthier detected unease about the poor beginning in the fifteenth century, partly because of their association with revolt and insurrection in times of economic hardship but also because of their role in spreading epidemics. The fear of contagion, she suggests, played a significant role in the willingness of the citizens of Lyons to allow the secular town administration to take over the task of organized poor relief from small, scattered religious foundations and individual bequests. Thus, for Gonthier, secularization and centralization went hand in hand with a hardening of attitudes towards the poor, and feeling that poverty indicated failure rather than a gift from God. Thus the rich, in a period of prosperity, felt entitled to their wealth, and no longer used elaborate bequests to the poor as a route to salvation.

The strength of this book is the way in which the economic, demographic, social, and cultural aspects of poverty are woven together to form a vivid and detailed narrative. Its weakness lies in its lack of rigorous analysis and in the limitations of a local study which needs to be put in a more general context for its full significance to emerge.

L. J. Jordanova
Department of History
University of Essex

ELI SAGAN, *The lust to annihilate. A psychoanalytic study of violence in Ancient Greek culture*, New York, Psychohistory Press, 1979, 8vo, pp. viii, 231, \$12.00.

“Thus the Greeks, the most humane men of ancient times, have a trait of cruelty, a tigerish lust to annihilate . . .” said Nietzsche, correctly. “Why?” asks Sagan. A child can weather the storms of the Oedipal situation if he has received adequate love and reassurance from his parents – reassurance that vengeance, castration, annihilation is not what he need expect for his unacceptable feelings and misbehaviour. He may become a loving and humane adult, not a paranoid who sees the world as a place to kill or be killed, where human nature is competition and war is inevitable.

From such simple formulation of personality development and political philosophy Sagan proceeds to evaluate Greek culture through the Classical period. The *Iliad* exhibits a failure to work through Oedipal aggression. Homer’s presentation condemns the revolt against legitimate authority and condemns the reversion to barbarism represented by cannibalism and human sacrifice, but in the process it approves the “normal” violence of the society. Yet there is a clear strain of rejection of sadistic violence in favour of love. Effectively, the ambivalence about the