

Christianity in late medieval Europe, and a more integrated intellectual view of medieval physicians. Readers are warned against considering the case of Arnau as unique and exhausting every possible relationship between medicine and religion. Nor should this historical exploration be restricted to medicine, for a general change in attitude towards nature involved every intellectual area in late medieval Europe.

In sum, Ziegler's stimulating monograph has opened up a new and promising area for historical research. His exemplary analysis of the case of Arnau de Vilanova offers other scholars a good model with which to examine from the same perspective other relevant cases of medieval physicians, not only Christian, but also Jewish and Muslim.

Jon Arrizabalaga,
CSIC, Barcelona

Heinz Schott and Ilana Zinguer (eds), *Paracelsus und seine internationale Rezeption in der frühen Neuzeit: Beiträge zur Geschichte des Paracelsismus*, Brill's Studies in Intellectual History, vol. 86, Leiden, Brill, 1998, pp. xii, 274, Nlg 170.00, \$111.00 (90-04-10974-9).

Ole Peter Grell (ed.), *Paracelsus: the man and his reputation, his ideas and their transformation*, Studies in the History of Christian Thought, 85, Leiden, Brill, 1998, pp. ix, 351, Nlg 195.00, \$128.74 (90-04-11177-8).

These volumes on Paracelsus's legacy both arise from conferences organized by their editors: Grell's was held in Glasgow in 1993, Schott and Zinguer's took place in Bonn and Heidelberg during 1995. Of the two books, Grell's offers the more coherent package; one that will recommend itself to teachers of medical history in English-speaking countries. All of its thirteen articles are in English, there is a

consolidated bibliography, and much of the book is devoted to situating its own contents within the broader framework of the literature on Paracelsus. By contrast, Schott and Zinguer's book is distinctively European in orientation, with five articles in German, five in French, and one in English. There is no combined bibliography, and the editors have little to say explicitly about where their book fits into the "big picture" of Paracelsus studies. Despite these drawbacks, however, I suggest that for those who can afford both, Schott and Zinguer should be read in tandem with Grell. To show how they complement each other I will focus on three main themes which their contents collectively address: the historiography of Paracelsus studies, studies of Paracelsus, and the reception/appropriation of Paracelsus, especially during the century after his death.

Unsurprisingly, the articles which explicitly focus on historiography are all in Grell's book. Stephen Pumfrey offers a critical review of recent, largely Anglophonic secondary literature. He highlights the ongoing confusion over the labels "Paracelsian" and "Paracelsianism" (which, it may be noted, are used uncritically in several articles in both books), and concludes that they are best thought of in terms of ideological debates about the proper relations between science and religion. A similar approach is taken by Andrew Cunningham, who shows the futility of trying to reach the "real" Paracelsus, stripped of layers of projections fashioned by later authors, as well as by the subject himself. These projections have taken many forms over the intervening centuries. J R R Christie shows how Edinburgh chemists were hailing Paracelsus as a founder of their discipline in the mid-eighteenth century, while Dietlinde Goltz finds similar rhetorical claims among nineteenth-century British occultists and twentieth-century Swiss psychotherapists. Her survey of scholarly historical literature from the last hundred years shows that

most of this is by German doctors idealizing Paracelsus as a forerunner of their own practices. Heinz Schott takes this further by arguing that the occult and religious content of Paracelsus's writings is reflected in modern psychosomatic medicine. By contrast, Herbert Breger focuses on leading "Paracelsians" of the seventeenth century and suggests that their willingness to identify with a Paracelsian (i.e. non-mechanistic) style of thought may have something to do with their individual personalities and ways of dealing with their emotions.

While several authors (mostly in Grell) question the possibility of ever knowing the "real" Paracelsus, others (particularly in Schott and Zinguer) seem to have no difficulty in studying what this historical figure believed and wrote about. Lucien Braun (Schott and Zinguer) takes Paracelsus's concept of "matrix" as a way into analysing his rhetorical style and structure of thought. Gunhild Pörksen (Schott and Zinguer) argues that Paracelsus considered vision the most important sense, the eye being the central organ of scientific knowledge, while Ute Gause (Grell) examines the relationship between his understanding of God's light and its implications for heavenly magic. Hartmut Rudolf (Grell) shows how Paracelsus's concept of the Eucharist provides a context for his anthropology, which according to Udo Benzenhöfer and Karin Finsterbusch (Schott and Zinguer), was distinctly anti-Semetic in tone.

Authors in both volumes appear to agree that later reactions to "Paracelsianism" (however this may be construed) can be properly understood only in ideological terms. Hugh Trevor-Roper (Grell) provides an extremely useful overview of the European political and religious context which suggests why it was chiefly Calvinist doctors who identified with the Paracelsian cause between 1600 and 1650. Allen Debus (Grell) names the best-known of these figures, as well as drawing our attention to

Spanish and Turkish physicians who came to Paracelsian ideas in the latter part of the century. All but two of the remaining articles focus on individuals at the level of city and court. Stephen Bamforth, Ilana Zinguer and Didier Kahn (all in Schott and Zinguer) take a fresh look at chemical medicine in the French court, Bruce Moran (Grell), Frank Hieronymus, Joachim Telle and Joseph Levi (Schott and Zinguer) consider the impact of Paracelsian doctrine in German-speaking cities, while Grell himself shows how Danish doctors stripped Paracelsianism of its radical elements before taking it on as a state orthodoxy. The two articles which do not fit neatly into this overall summary are Roland Edighoffer's study of a Paracelsian enigma in the *Chemical wedding* of Christian Rosenkreuz (Schott and Zinguer), and Francis McKee's account of the influence of Paracelsianism on seventeenth-century cookery books (Grell).

In sum, these collections demonstrate the lively state of Paracelsus studies at present and the important contribution that historians of medicine are making to this field.

Penelope Gouk,
Wellcome Unit, Manchester

Michael Hunter (ed.), *Archives of the scientific revolution: the formation and exchange of ideas in seventeenth-century Europe*, Woodbridge, Boydell Press, 1998, pp. xiii, 216, £45.00, \$78.00 (0-85115-553-7).

What we know about the history of science and medicine depends on how we know it. We are necessarily reliant on surviving records. Those historians who work on the period conveniently called the Scientific Revolution are relatively fortunate in this respect, since they benefit from a rich seam of archival resources, many of which have been made widely available by means