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

https://doi.org/10.1017/S002572730004936X Published online by Cambridge University Press

set Turner's ideas in their contemporary context, while the rather Whiggish separation of his various areas of interest militates against a proper understanding of his intellectual development.

The book is particularly weak on medical history, of which its author virtually disavows any firsthand knowledge: even its account of Turner's religious and social ideas, however, is disappointingly pedestrian and old-fashioned. Its intended audience is a puzzle. At one point, the author professes the work to be aimed at "the non-specialist reader", but it is difficult to see how many of these are likely to gain access to it at the very high price at which it has been published. On the other hand, scholars resigned to paying such prices for scholarly monographs might reasonably expect better value for their money than they are offered here.

Michael Hunter
Birkbeck College, University of London

PIERO CAMPORESI, *The incorruptible flesh: bodily mutation and mortification in religion and folklore,* trans. Tania Croft-Murray and Helen Elsom, Cambridge Studies in Oral and Literate Culture, Cambridge University Press, 1988, 8vo, pp. ix, 286, £25.00/$44.50.

Piero Camporesi, historian of culture and professor of Italian literature at Bologna, here examines cookery books as well as recondite texts, sermons as well as Pharmacopoeias. Instead of investigating the "high culture" of the academies and the great thinkers, he prefers the voices of unknown small-town intellectuals who offer a more accurate reflection of popular mentality and who knew well the hopes and fears of the illiterate plebs. His attention is focused particularly on the seventeenth century, inasmuch as it is the fullest in contradictions. On the one hand, Kepler and Galileo were affirming scientific knowledge, the mathematical reasoning that gave order to the world; on the other, there was the triumph of the baroque and of irrationalism, where the logic of life mastered the logic of theology as well as of science. The object of this book, as in the earlier *Il pane selvaggio* (1980), *Il sugo della vita* (1984), and *Le officine dei sensi* (1985), is the human body, not so much in its social practices (food, dress, hygiene, etc.) as in the collective imagination which, centring on the body, reveals obsessions with life and death, desires for survival on earth and in heaven. The key to this voyage of the imagination, Camporesi suggests, is that of the world turned upside down: society is oppressed with wars, famine, plagues; it thus yearns for a paradise where man can live for ever in peace and plenty, in the full vigour of the body, not just of the spirit.

The reviewer can only agree with Peter Burke's statement in his preface that Camporesi's essays are "almost impossible to summarise because they do not offer arguments so much as images". They do this in a prose rich in citations and overflowing with rhetorical force, attracted by the prodigious and the repulsive. Camporesi himself admits it is a difficult way of telling a story. He demands of his reader an attention and sensitivity greater than those required by a traditionally-structured book: he invites him to follow an approach that is both extraordinarily creative and aware of our own modern ideas on the body and its metaphors.

But we are here talking about an English translation of a book published originally five years ago; and in it the challenge thrown down by Camporesi appears even harder, and more interesting. How will the non-Italian reader, with his own specific cultural background (e.g. non-Catholic, Protestant), react to the "phantasmagoric images" conjured up by the author? The question comes up straight away, even in so valiant and bravura a translation as Tania Croft-Murray's. I wonder why, in the very title, the flesh, which in the Italian was "impassible", should now become "incorruptible" (rightly translated in chapter 2). The two terms are not equivalent in either language. As Camporesi explains, only the person who is aware of the corruption, rather than the incorruptibility, of the flesh can become an "impassible saint", i.e. capable of distancing himself from suffering, but also of enjoying completely the pleasures of the senses. In the impassibility beyond this world promised by the preachers of the seventeenth century there was no rejection, abnegation, or disdain of bodily pleasure: in fact they exalted it. The subtitle, *Bodily mutation and mortification . . .*, is not found in the original. Like other

https://doi.org/10.1017/S002572730004936X Published online by Cambridge University Press