

aimed to reduce pain in treatment, the author posits, they played a key role over time for the perceptive disunion of pain from the honorable attitude underlying its endurance.

There is a remarkable chapter suggesting an influence of botanic knowledge of grafting plants and of vegetal structures on surgical skin grafting since the late sixteenth century. We may add, however, that grafting plants already had a long history by that time, as had the study of inner vegetal structures, exemplified by pictures compiled in 1549 by Johannes Kentmann (for example, MS Fol 323, Duchess Amalia Library, Weimar, fol. 104^r). Petrarch's plant grafts, for instance, certainly had a considerable influence on consolidating the link of this practice, first described in cultivated circles in antiquity, with the humanistic culture of the social elite, as illustrated by the Countess of Artois, who possessed grafted plants in 1320 (William Ellis-Rees, "Gardening in the Age of Humanism: Petrarch's Journal," *Garden History* 23.1 [1995]: 22). In referring to botany, therefore, surgeons' writings intended to encourage their patrician audience to accept facial reconstruction as part of humanistic refinement. The woodcuts in Tagliacozzi's treatise emphasize this point by picturing a noble clientele in contemporary and antique-fashioned dresses and furnishings—an aspect unfortunately not sufficiently elucidated by the author, despite the central role he ascribes to Tagliacozzi and the many references to visual culture. Nevertheless, the assumed impact of botany on surgery is likely to be accurate.

The only criticism of this book, which displays considerable expertise, is that it could have gone into more detail on several of the many facets discussed—for example, the elucidation of the modeling process of the skin flap to the nose, the reference to specific pains that in Greek antiquity were believed to be necessary components of certain processes (170), or the statement that "women did not possess any public role" (46). However, is this a valid reproach to a monograph whose central aim was to follow the various trails that connected reconstructive surgery to early modern culture? The poor quality of the pictures occasionally hinders the reader's understanding of their analyses.

The book provides a stimulating analysis of a fascinating chapter in the history of health. It will find readers among those interested in the history of medicine and the sciences as well as of social and visual culture.

Dominic Olariu, *Gotha Research Centre of the University of Erfurt*
doi:10.1017/rqx.2019.287

Medicine, Religion, and Magic in Early Stuart England: Richard Napier's Medical Practice. Ofer Hadass.

Magis in History. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2018. xvi + 214 pp. \$89.95.

The astrologer-physician Richard Napier produced a vast archive of medical records, documenting thousands of interactions with patients and numerous conversations

with angels, especially Raphael. Drawing upon this mountain of material, Ofer Hadass writes a provocative intellectual biography. He aims foremost to rehabilitate Napier's "legacy," which has been tarnished by the "forces of a disenchanting world" (143). Specifically, he argues, the eccentric priest too often gets lumped together with all variety of occultists, some delusional, some malevolent, others fraudulent. Clairvoyants, Ambrose Bierce observes in *The Devil's Dictionary*, have the power to see that which is invisible to their clients—namely, that they are blockheads. Hadass sets out to demonstrate that Napier's clients were not blockheads, and that Napier was neither a charlatan nor a quack.

The book is easy to recommend for its attention to Napier's day-to-day medical practices: diagnosing ailments, prescribing elixirs and magical amulets, burning incense, letting blood, invoking spirits. This last topic is of special interest, I think, insofar as it most jeopardized Napier's reputation. And, as Hadass confirms, Napier wisely concealed these angel discourses, given that conjuration was a capital offense and, also, that Napier was a devout cleric. He died in mid-prayer. Hadass reads the angel conversations as "spiritual self-experiences much more than they were encounters with supernatural beings," which is a polite way of saying that he does not take Napier's word for it (13). Nor am I suggesting that he should, but that Napier thought he talked to angels is undoubtedly true, and this complicates Hadass's attempt to distance Napier from the notion of a "rustic Faustus" (60). We certainly do not get the impression that Napier lived a secret life as a Satanist, or even—for that matter—a rogue womanizer, like his mentor Simon Forman, but he did summon spirits. He sought answers from the astral realm, which inherently brings with it peril, if not a Faustian tint. Such was Meric Casaubon's point about John Dee. He suggested that Dee talked to devils, earnest in his Christianity but deceived. For better or worse, this same trepidation accompanies Napier down through the centuries.

A second concern: after skillfully reconstructing Napier's occult philosophy, Hadass strands it in the early seventeenth century, convinced that its fundamental tenets—vitalism, cosmic sympathy, belief in the existence of angels and devils, etc.—collapsed under the weight of the new science. Yet astrology flourished in the Enlightenment, and theosophy matured. Jane Lead conjured spirits. Emanuel Swedenborg projected himself to the astral plane. Even Samuel Johnson attended a séance. That experimentalism drifted apart from occultism is clear, but both maintained substantial explanatory power, which undercuts Frances Yates's thesis (defended by Hadass) that hermeticism somehow became new science.

Modern examples further punctuate the idea that Napier's occult tradition persists. Nancy Reagan, for instance, frequently consulted the astrologer Joan Quigley, mainly in an effort to protect her husband from harm. The gifted rocket scientist Jack Parsons tried to conjure spirits at the behest of Aleister Crowley and with the help of L. Ron Hubbard, founder of Scientology. By some accounts, he succeeded. And then there is the moldavite pendant industry and the Jupiter sigil business, both of which continue to

produce talismans very much like those Napier often produced. Put simply, reports of occult philosophy's demise have been greatly exaggerated. The task, therefore, is to sort out true from false promises and earnest from mercenary practitioners. This has always been the task, in fact, Napier's occultism included.

A final thought: to safeguard aura, one can buy a beaker of psychic vampire repellent from Gwyneth Paltrow's Goop store. The price is twenty-seven dollars, plus shipping, though shipping will be difficult at present. The website tells me "this item is sold out."

Ryan J. Stark, *Corban University*

doi:10.1017/rqx.2019.288

The Lynx and the Telescope: The Parallel Worlds of Federico Cesi and Galileo.
Paolo Galluzzi.

Scientific and Learned Cultures and Their Institutions 21. Leiden: Brill, 2017. xvi + 522 pp. \$159.

This book is an important revision to our understanding of the Lincean Academy, one of the earliest scientific societies, and the relationship between its founder, Prince Federico Cesi, and its most famous member. In particular, the author shows that Cesi was more a person of his times and that he and Galileo were less aligned than is generally presumed. The book concentrates on the period between 1611, when Galileo became a member of the academy, and 1630, when Cesi died; it thus ends before the publication of Galileo's *Dialogue Concerning the Chief World System*, and the subsequent trial.

Cesi founded the academy in 1603, dedicated to "a radical reform of received knowledge" (27) and convinced that "the alliance between the Catholic religion and the Aristotelian conception of the universe" was responsible "for the dramatic degeneration of knowledge and ethics" of his era (47). The prince was more interested in botany than in cosmology, but he was persuaded that the heavens were fluid and homogenous. This conviction came not from the heliocentric writings of Copernicus (which Cesi opposed because he was convinced that Copernicus believed in solid orbs) or the observations of Tycho Brahe; Galluzzi shows us that Cesi adopted such a conception because of the Neoplatonic writings of Bernardino Telesio. Repeatedly Galluzzi refers to Cesi's beliefs in astrology, alchemy, and natural magic as if they revealed Cesi's backwardness.

Did Cesi gain anything from his association with Galileo? Galluzzi maintains that after 1611 Cesi and his fellow Linceans "placed more emphasis on the direct observation of nature, on experimental practice and on mathematical speculations"; nevertheless, "these remained declarations of principle rather than models of research actually implemented" (59). In the latter part of the book, which focuses on Cesi's botanical