

of cranial and facial bones, and Berengario's treatise does not discuss the latter. Dr Lind tells us that Berengario is probably a dialectal corruption of his true name, Barrigazi, as entered on his will and testament, although Berengario is spelt "Beregario" throughout the last 80 pages of his translation, presumably a printer's error. Carpi is a small town near Bologna.

If treatises on 'Wounds of the head' were a feature of surgical works from the time of the Hippocratic corpus, Berengario expanded the subject in pioneering a separate monograph, being inspired by his successful treatment of Lorenzo Medici, Duke of Urbino, for a compound cranial fracture and, by his students' requests for information on this and other case observations. Considered by Dr Lind to be "the most important work on cranio-cerebral surgery of the early sixteenth century" and regarded by Malgaigne as the most important of Berengario's writings, the monograph is significant for clinical reports on named individual patients observed and also treated surgically by him, including instructive unsuccessful histories. There were six subsequent editions, the last in 1728. The classification of fractures, their symptoms, signs, diagnosis, and prognosis are thoroughly debated, and treatment by medical means is emphasized before accepting surgery in defined circumstances. The descriptions of operative techniques and the detailed illustrations of instruments (here reproduced in facsimile), including the brace trepan for the first time, comprise a fundamental leap forward and were to form the basis of works on the subject for many years subsequently.

At the least, Berengario's detailed monograph will intrigue and impress neurosurgeons, traumatologists, students of the surgical armamentarium, and social historians of the sixteenth century. The translation is preceded by an introductory essay and a select bibliography; it is well-printed and modestly priced.

John Kirkup, Bath Medical History Group

MIRKO D. GRMEK, *La première révolution biologique: réflexions sur la physiologie et la médecine du XVII^e siècle*, Paris, Payot, 1990, 8vo, pp. 358, (paperback).

The leitmotiv of this wide-ranging book is the emergence of quantification in the study of life sciences in the seventeenth century. In that century, according to Grmek, biology and medicine underwent a deep transformation, namely, the introduction of both experimental method and mechanical views.

The topic of the first section of this book is the importance of experiments in medicine. It opens with an essay dealing with ancient medicine's failure to produce consistent quantitative investigations. This, according to Grmek, was due to the fact that ancient medicine was based on the notions of qualities and humours—which could not be subject to "real" measurement. According to the author, a revolution occurred when the "Galilean method" was introduced in medicine. Galileo is the topic of the second essay, which, surprisingly, deals with the Italian scientist's personality and not with his "method". The remaining two chapters of the first part explore Santorio's and Harvey's "successful" quantitative investigations.

Grmek, who denies any importance to the plurality of versions of Renaissance Galenism and Aristotelianism, maintains that the emergence of the mechanical view of life was a watershed in physiology. This is the topic of the second part, entitled 'La machine vivante'. The chapter devoted to the beast-machine theory is not particularly original and is somewhat oversimplified: mechanical philosophy is considered a homogeneous conception of nature and is radically opposed to the qualitative (i.e., Aristotelian and chemical) views. Finally, Descartes' belief in *calidum innatum* is simply dismissed as a mistake. Some interesting considerations are contained in the essay dealing with Giorgio Baglivi's views of the living fibre, which in fact can hardly be described as mechanical. The most original and useful essay of the book is the one devoted to Edme Mariotte's controversy with Jean Pecquet and Claude Perrault about the seat of vision. Here Grmek rightly emphasizes that Mariotte's "incorrect" theory that the seat of vision was the choroid prompted important researches in the physiology of vision.

The last part of the book, dealing with medical practice, is more discursive than analytical. It contains the often-repeated statement that in the seventeenth century the university medical curriculum was merely obscurantist and that the "new medicine" flourished in connection with scientific academies.

Book Reviews

Although the author attacks the teleological view of history of science, he does not escape the temptation of describing the development of science—and medicine—as the history of scientific discoveries. He pays very little interest to the broader intellectual milieu of scientific and medical activities.

Antonio Clericuzio, University College London

A. RUPERT HALL, *Henry More: magic, religion and experiment*, Blackwell Science Biographies, Oxford and Cambridge, Mass., Basil Blackwell, 1990, pp. xii, 304, £30.00 (0-631-17295-5).

Henry More was to a large extent a peripheral figure in the history of the scientific revolution of the seventeenth century. As a Platonist and a theologian, his main field of concern was with metaphysics and the relationship between man, nature, and the deity. Consequently, he produced no original work of scientific investigation, nor did he labour in the laboratory to produce experimental evidence to support his scientific speculations. Nonetheless, as this timely and full-length biography shows, More is a figure central to our understanding of the complex origins of the scientific revolution in seventeenth-century England. The first half of the book is devoted to an extremely useful introduction to the Platonic philosophy which so clearly helped to shape More's intellectual preoccupations from the 1640s onwards. In the second half, Hall guides the reader through the far murkier waters of the questionable influence of More upon the subsequent development of the new science in England, with particular emphasis on the role played by More in the dissemination of Cartesian mechanism in post-Civil War England. The most original chapters here are probably those which deal with the extent of More's influence upon Isaac Newton (less, perhaps, than previously understood), though all of them provide novel insights into More's relationship with the burgeoning scientific movements of the period. The most disappointing aspect of Hall's biography for many readers, however, is surely its typically "internalist" rejection of a non-scientific dimension to More's life and thought. Thus, no reference is made to the religious and political background against which More composed his re-assessment of Cartesian mechanism in the 1650s. Even more worrying, however, is Hall's treatment of More's views on witchcraft and the supernatural, which, though not totally discredited as the thoughts of an eccentric, are nonetheless held up as evidence of More's "naivety" and "illogicality". The fact that More lived in a world devoid of "modern" standards of rational or logical enquiry is conveniently overlooked, and no attempt is made to integrate More's views on ghosts and witches with the wider scientific concerns of his age. This lack of appreciation for another dimension to More's thought beyond the purely "scientific" or "rational" is a cause of disappointment and unfortunately detracts from what is otherwise an impeccably learned biography of a key figure in the intellectual history of seventeenth-century England.

Peter Elmer, Harlaxton College, Grantham

THOMAS LAQUEUR, *Making sex: body and gender from the Greeks to Freud*, Cambridge, Mass., and London, Harvard University Press, 1990, 8vo, pp. xiv, 313, illus., £19.95.

This book caused excitement among publishers at the 1990 Frankfurt Book Fair—and not just for its clever title. It is a substantial, original and interesting book about the history of ideas about sex differences.

Formerly these were regarded as biological or fixed, proving that woman is either imperfect man or his opposite. Laqueur shows how even basic anatomical discoveries and observations are not free from social influences; how alleged "differences" have changed over the centuries; how the views on the subject in any society have been used and exploited for personal and political ends; and how almost everything that might be said about sex—however sex is understood—already has in it a claim about gender and power. In Laqueur's view, "Sometime