side of physicians' efforts at "professionalization" (p. 173) and laid the journal open to charges of charlatanry. I found this argument unpersuasive. To be sure, there were indeed voices raised against the practice of self-medication by patients, as Nicoli points out, and it requires no great stretch of the imagination to suppose that such considerations would find common cause with opposition to charlatanry. Yet considered against the background of the large and growing genre of medical advice literature, much of which contained recipes for home remedies, and in the context of the flourishing marketplace for medical products and services of the late eighteenth century, much of which was conducted by physicians themselves, Lanteires' efforts scarcely seem either unusual or likely to attract much censure. This rather small quibble aside, I think Nicoli has done us all a great service by making this most interesting publication more widely known.

Thomas Broman,
University of Wisconsin–Madison

Misia Sophia Doms, "*Alkühmisten*" *und* "*decoctores*"*: Grimmelshausen und die Medizin seiner Zeit*, Beihefte zu Simpliciana, vol. 3, Bern, Peter Lang, 2006, pp. 248, £32.10, €45.80, $54.95 (paperback 978-3-03910-949-4).

This is a study that relates to issues of medical "intertextuality" (defined in the broad sense of textual influence and allusion) in the work of the German Baroque author Hans Jacob von Grimmelshausen (1621/22–1676), best known to English readers as the creator of the satirical *Simplicius simplicissimus*. The main questions are these: how far do the concepts of health, sickness, prophylaxis and therapy expressed by Grimmelshausen through the figures and narrative voices within his writings correspond to medical understanding and debate in his own day? And do the episodes and satirical comments related to his characters indicate personal criticisms of medical theory and/or practice? The book thus takes a place among other efforts to explore the relation between literature and medicine. In many of these the focus is upon establishing the meaning of illness within a specific time and place or upon determining the role that medicine plays in constructing particular themes and structures. Doms, however, selects another, more specific, task—to determine the most likely sources for the medical elements in Grimmelshausen's writings and to ascertain something of his own medical-critical views. While some light is shed in relation to the first undertaking, the second, Doms admits, remains obscure.

Although careful not to assume too much about Grimmelshausen's personal knowledge of individual medical texts, Doms maintains that there is enough evidence to suggest connections, directly or indirectly, to a variety of medical sources. These include more or less contemporary German language texts and translations, especially those falling into the genre of advice literature, as well larger, more encyclopaedic medical accounts. Grimmelshausen must also have been aware of older, well-established texts such as the *Regimen of health* (his source, Doms thinks, for information about the six non-naturals and diet), and earlier sixteenth-century works, especially the pharmaceutical texts of writers like Christof Wirsung, Hieronymus Bock, Johann Coler, Walther Ryff, Lorenz Fries, and Hieronymus Brunschwig. References to Paracelsian medicines stem most likely from Oswald Croll's *Basilica chymica* (1609).

A passage from Grimmelshausen's *Satyrischer Pilgram* indicates that he viewed medicine as divided into five parts: *physiologica* (human anatomy, physiology including the theory of humours and temperaments), *hygiaena* (the six non-naturals), *aethiologica* (causes of illness and concepts of disease), *simiotica* (symptoms and courses of illness, also diagnostic practice), and *trapestica* (methods of treatment, including diet, medicaments, and surgery), and the main part of Doms's study follows these divisions.

In none of Grimmelshausen's writings are there descriptions of medical proceedings that contradict the medical practices of his time, although there are instances in which he uses satire to illustrate contemporary controversies

https://doi.org/10.1017/S002572730000257X Published online by Cambridge University Press

regarding medical opinion and procedure. Yet, even here, Doms is hesitant to draw any clear conclusions, and simply acknowledges the difficulties in determining the focus (for example, treatments themselves or the persons and/or professions offering them) of satirical attacks. Nevertheless, while unable to make absolute judgements concerning Grimmelshausen's evaluation of Galenism, Paracelsianism, and learned medicine, it is clear that he regarded a balance of humours and attention to the six non-naturals as fundamental to health. His characters also reveal a mistrust of iatromagic and sometimes relate Paracelsian approaches to avarice and deceit. Most interesting are the instances in Grimmelshausen's stories in which health and illness are related to a person's moral situation. This pertains as much to the treatment of one's own body as to the relation between the physician and the sick. Anabaptists, for instance, reach a more advanced age because their moral commitments help shape a healthy body. Given the varieties of causes of illness, including miasmas, contagions, an imbalance of humours, immoderation as well as divine affliction, Grimmelshausen seems to have concluded that diagnosis, prognosis, and therapy required a lot from the physician making healing as much a disciplinary as an ethical challenge.

Bruce T Moran,
University of Nevada, Reno

A W Bates, *Emblematic monsters: unnatural conceptions and deformed births in early modern Europe*, Clio Medica 77, Wellcome Series in the History of Medicine, Amsterdam and New York, Rodopi, 2005, pp. 334, illus, €68.00, $85.00 (hardback 90-420-1862-3).

In this engaging book, Alan W Bates surveys monstrous births in Europe between 1500 and 1700. The book has two central arguments. First, based on internal evidence and modern knowledge of birth defects, Bates argues that the accounts of monstrous births in early modern broadsheets, sermons, tracts, and learned journals describe real cases and that their authors strove to be as accurate as possible. Second, these monstrous births were interpreted in the framework of the emblem tradition that was all the rage in early modern Europe. In turning monstrous births into emblems, early modern Europeans interpreted them as signs or portents. They did not invent monsters to make a point, but they believed that God did so.

Bates's first chapter sets out parallels between emblems and accounts of monsters. The second addresses the popular literature on monsters, such as broadsheets, ballads, and chapbooks, while noting that these works also appealed to elite audiences. The third addresses how monsters were treated in learned works, including "wonder books", as well as medical and natural philosophical treatises; the fourth chapter discusses accounts in late-seventeenth-century scientific journals. In the fifth chapter Bates examines early modern theories of how monsters were formed, while in the sixth he addresses the life-cycle of monstrous humans, including those, such as conjoined twins, who might survive and even prosper. The seventh chapter compares early modern descriptions with modern birth defects to demonstrate that the former are medically plausible accounts of real individuals.

The strength of this book is in the later chapters, when Bates brings his medical expertise to bear. Aware of the dangers of retrospective diagnosis, he makes a convincing case that the deformities described in broadsheet, learned treatise, and journal correspond to known types of birth defect: that descriptions of a child with a cat's or rabbit's face, for instance, far from being fanciful, refer to a cleft lip. The frequency of types of conjoined twins in early modern accounts corresponds with modern clinical observations. An appendix provides a lengthy (though not exhaustive) list of documented monstrous births in Europe from 1500 to 1700, and hazards retrospective diagnoses. By following monsters from cradle to grave (and even to anatomical preparation), Bates reminds us that they were subjects, sometimes long-lived, as well as objects to be described and interpreted.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S002572730000257X Published online by Cambridge University Press