that there should be generalizations with which all will not agree. Surviving records can be used to support quite contrary conclusions. Thus the bishops' visitation books certainly bear witness to the prevalence of clerical incontinency, but they are also evidence that up to the very end it was frowned upon, and when discovered was punished. St Thomas More is cited as a witness to the widespread immorality of the clergy, but, in a famous passage, he claimed that the English secular clergy 'is, in learning and honest living, well able to match, and . . . far able to overmatch, number for number, the spirituality of any nation christian'. Again Mgr Hughes argues that the rank and file of the parish clergy were markedly ignorant, because so few ever went to a university, and outside the universities there was nothing that could be called education. This seems to underestimate the value of the many schools and colleges of every grade, usually presided over by university men, that were a common feature of most countries. Were they hopelessly inefficient? They seem at all events to have reached a high standard in Latin. How else can one account for the phenomenal popularity of such Latin works as More's *Utopia*, that went through four editions in its first two years? Or the eagerly-read works of Erasmus? Was it only the higher clergy, with their university training, who read these books? The provincial chapter of the Dominicans of Lower Germany (the Netherlands), held in 1531, found it necessary to forbid all but masters of theology and inquisitors to possess or read the works of Erasmus. 'If an elegant style (*ornata dictio*) delights the young, let them read Cicero, Quintilian and our own blessed Jerome, Lactantius, Cyprian, Augustine and the rest.' Evidently these young Dominicans knew enough to appreciate Erasmus as a stylist; were they exceptional? Is there any evidence that the theological studies were any less efficient? Again, because the layfolk were largely illiterate, does it follow that they must have been ignorant of the great truths of faith? The walls and windows of their churches were filled with pictures that were far more educative than the printed word. These are some of the multitude of questions that come to mind under the stimulus of these fascinating pages. Here is a book that every thinking Catholic should read, and if it arouses a desire for further knowledge there are the same author's three great volumes on the *Reformation in England*, with a bibliography that will keep any ordinary person busy for a lifetime.

GODFREY ANSTRUTHER, O.P.

WILLIAM HARVEY: HIS LIFE AND TIMES; HIS DISCOVERIES; HIS METHODS. By Louis Chauvois. (Hutchinson's Medical Publications; 25s.)

DE MOTU CORDIS. By William Harvey. Translated by Kenneth J. Franklin. (Blackwell Scientific Publications; 17s. 6d.)

Dr Chauvois has reached the stage of life when one's immediate goal no longer has the hypnotic effect of one's earlier years. The result is a leisurely account of the life and work of the author's hero, seasoned with personal reminiscences and ending with a poem written at Harvey's tomb.

The biographical sections, which occupy the major part of the book, are written with enthusiasm and imagination, although some of the mannerisms are unfortunate: for example, Harvey's favourite beverage is described as 'Monsieur Coffee' in the chapter summary and 'Milord Coffee' in the text. The account of Harvey's scientific achievement, however, is less satisfactory. Right from the time when he was newly appointed to the coveted Lumley Lectureship at the College of Physicians in London, for which his duties included occasional dissections 'for five days together, as well before as after dinner; if the bodies may last so long without annoy', Harvey taught his theory of the circulation of the blood. In this he was opposing the traditional teaching, derived from Galen, that the veins, arteries and nerves were three distinct systems of vessels based respectively on the liver, left heart and brain. Dr Chauvois, in an imagined meditation by the youthful Harvey at Padua, gives a good account of the strength and weaknesses of this traditional teaching, although when he says that the impurities in the blood were supposedly expelled from the *right* side of the heart he is repeating a modern error; Harvey gives the correct version in his introduction to *De Motu Cordis*. The author goes on, in one of the best parts of the book, to examine the claim sometimes made in Italy that Cesalpino ought rightly to be regarded as the discoverer of the circulation. Cesalpino was an Aristotelian, and, although he had most of the necessary evidence at his disposal, the circulation he envisaged involved flow from the heart during waking hours and flow back to the heart during sleep.

According to Dr Chauvois, Harvey owed his success to his basing his scientific method 'on experiment only, experiment a thousand times repeated'. Although there is some truth in this view, by itself it seems to the reviewer to leave unexplained Harvey's almost unique position in the history of medicine. Colombo long before him had practised and preached the virtue of constant experimentation. Besides, in *De Motu Cordis*, Harvey himself uses other forms of argument; for example, he draws the age-old parallel between the microcosm and the macrocosm when he compares the heart to the sun.

If on the other hand we take the view that the kernel of Harvey's argument is to be found in the very rough estimate he makes of the quantity of blood transferred from the veins to the arteries across the heart (a quantity which he finds to be very great), his striking success

becomes understandable. Simply by multiplying the number of heart-beats in half-an-hour by the amount of blood transferred at each beat, Harvey sketches an unanswerable argument in support of his conviction that much of this blood must find its way back into the veins. It is perhaps significant that Dr Chauvois's short bibliography does not include any of the post-war discussions of Harvey's method.

A few errors were noted: Harvey's quotation of Laurentius is taken from Chapter XI of Book 9, not Chapter III of Book 5 (p.36); the second edition of Spigelius's works was printed by Blaeu, not Blacu, and contains not quotations but whole works by other authors (p.177); the apparent direct quotation on page 197 is in fact a paraphrase; and there are a number of blemishes in the translations from Harvey's Latin which may be due to the passages having been first translated into French.

Professor Franklin is no stranger to historians of science, and he has now given us a careful transcription of *De Motu Cordis* together with a thoroughly reliable translation. Harvey's classic is one of the few great scientific treatises which can be reprinted, as Professor Franklin has done, without notes or commentary; and by doing this he has given us the opportunity of making up our own minds about the key to Harvey's greatness.

MICHAEL HOSKIN

THE POETRY OF LIVING JAPAN. An Anthology with an Introduction by Takamichi Ninomiya and D. J. Enright. (John Murray: Wisdom of the East Series; 8s. 6d.)

In reviewing Mr Enright's little book, there is no point in making the usual complaint of any critic faced by an anthology: why has X been left out and Y put in? Given the enormous output of modern Japanese poetry, Mr Enright has done well to confine his attention to those poets who use a form of *vers libre*, the *shintaishi* or 'new-style poetry' proclaimed by his dustjacket, thereby excluding the practitioners of traditional forms better known to the west, *tanka* and *haiku* (the latter, incidentally, having seventeen syllables and not fifteen as stated in the introduction). Within his limits, Mr Enright has chosen well—or rather Professor Ninomiya and Mr Enright have, since the translation is a joint effort, the Japanese professor providing the rough copy and Mr Enright furbishing and repolishing. Nevertheless the reader is given a rather disturbing impression that the anthology has all been written by one man: so many of the poets seem to fall too readily into Mr Enright's own easy colloquial, stumbling here and there, but on the whole speaking with one voice.