THE BEGINNING OF PSYCHIATRY IN THE 16TH CENTURY
A STUDY OF TWO NOTABLE CONTRIBUTORS ON THEORY AND PRACTICE, PIETRO POMPONAZZI (THEORY) JOHANNES WEYER (PRACTICE)

by

Liny Engler Lyss
B.S., Chico State College, 1961
M.S., University of California, San Francisco, 1962

DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

HISTORY OF HEALTH SCIENCES

in the

GRADUATE DIVISION

(San Francisco)

of the

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

[redacted]

Psychiatry was much slower in developing than scientific medicine, as the psychological problems of man became confused with those of theology and theosophy during the Middle Ages. The Christian Church, by claiming the exclusive right to administer to the soul, insulated the soul against any possible invasion of the inquiring scientist.

Two Renaissance physicians, Pietro Pomponazzi, (1462-1525), and Johan Weyer, (1515-1588), with their contributions to psychology and psychopathology, laid the foundation upon which medical psychiatry was able to develop later.

Humanism with its renewed interest in the Greek language and the classics, with its emphasis on life on this earth, and its belief in the dignity of man, acted as a catalyst in the study of Platonism and Aristotelianism.

Pomponazzi, a Paduan Aristotelian, regarded his master's system of nature, as the only basis for rational reasoning, and insisted upon using the empirical method of positive analysis, in place of the method of abstract speculation, used by his predecessors, and his contemporary the Florentine Platonist Marsilio Ficino (1433-1499).

As a true scholar in the pursuit of the truth, Pomponazzi, in his main work De immortalitate animae, (1516) reached the conclusion that there is an inseparable relationship between body and soul, and that the "intellectual",

"sensitive", and "vegetative" soul is the same soul only under different aspects. With this conclusion Pomponazzi had rediscovered Aristotle's view of the soul" "Soul and body are one as the wax and the form into which it is impressed are one." Pomponazzi in his effort to establish a more scientific psychology of man drew a clear line of distinction between philosophy and theology, in arriving at his naturalistic view of man. Man became observable, and his mind open for examination.

By the time Johan Weyer practiced medicine, Humanism had crossed the Alps, and under the leadership of Erasmus (1466-1536) took on a new direction. Erasmus felt that classical, spiritual, and patristic scholarship should not be an end in itself, but of service to religion. Unfortunately, the Protestant leaders were not the inheritors of the humanistic tradition of tolerance and free intellectual inquiry. The years during which Weyer practiced medicine and wrote his main work, De praestigiis daemonum (1563), were years plagued by moral, religious, intellectual, economic, political, social and cultural crisis. Suspicion and superstition were rampant, even the Church called upon civil power to assist in a crusade against witches and sorcerers. Rational thought had little chance to develop, and to express one's view publicly was to risk one's life.

Weyer, a physician educated at Paris and Orléans, became primarily interested in the psychology of mental illness. Like Pomponazzi, Weyer looked

for natural reason to explain all phenomena, fighting superstition wherever he encountered it. Weyer was unable to approach the problem of mental disease without dealing with daemonology and the Inquisition. Confessions of witches and their crimes were so prevalent that the sheer number of them became objective proof of their reality. He was fully aware that many of these accused "witches" were mentally ill persons, and he insisted that the physician, and not the theologian, or lawyer, was best prepared to deal with their problem. Weyer realized the need for moral treatment (today's psychotherapy) instead of capital punishment.

With his vivid and individualized descriptions of his patients behavior, and his nonjudgemental matter-of-fact approach in dealing with psychotic behavior, Weyer deserves to be called the first clinical psychiatrist. His greatest contribution to psychiatry is, that he incorporated it into medicine.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To the departmental staff: Ms. Mabel Emmons and her assistants, Ms. Mary Parish and Ms. Maria Matthews, whose friendliness and helpfulness was always appreciated.

To Ms. Nancy Zinn, history librarian, and Ms. Blanche Long and Ms. Charlotte Root, librarian assistants, for their interest and service.

To my friend Claire Still, librarian, Lane Library, Stanford University, for helping me trace documents.

To Ms. Dorothy Norris for editing and typing my manuscript.

To Ms. Marion Kalkman, Professor Emeritus, and Professor Leonard Schatzman, Ph.D., for their continued interest in my work.

To Professors Ilza Veith, Ph. D., and Otto Guttentag, M.D., and to Professor Gene Brucker, Ph.D., for his expert guidance on my reading on the Renaissance period in Italy and the Netherlands.

To J. B. deC. M. Saunders, M.D., Chairman of the History of Health Sciences Department, University of California, San Francisco, for inspiring me to undertake this study, for his guidance, and for his assistance with Latin translations.

To my late father, who stimulated early in my life my interest in philosophical problems.

INTRODUCTION

To write a book about the Beginning of Psychiatry in the sixteenth century is no simple task, for it cannot be told as the history of medicine and surgery can be told, by mentioning individuals and their accomplishments. The development of psychiatry as a medical discipline is relatively new and occurred many centuries after the development of scientific medicine. To trace its beginning is an intricate path and is closely tied to cultural, theological, philosophical and jurisprudential development.

Some of the earliest concepts of disease were that swarming spirits of the air entered man's body, and it was the exorcist's, (priest-physician), duty to expel the noxious spirits by incantation. These spirits originally were of equal rank, and as civilization and religion became more complexly organized, spirits were divided into orders or ranks of hierarchy. With the growth of dualism the classes were further arranged in two opposite camps, under presiding and evil dieties. In Hippocrates' time, (fifth to fourth century B.C.), a scientific doctrine of medicine began to encroach upon old beliefs. As is evident in the treatise On the Sacred Disease, (classified under the name of Hippocrates in the Hippocratic collection), an attempt was made to explain that diseases which were held to be of divine origin, in reality had natural causes like any other disease:

> They who first referred this malady to the gods appear to me to have been just such persons as the conjurors, purificators, mountebanks, and charlatans now are, who give themselves out

> for being excessively religious, and as knowing more than other people. Such persons, then, using the divinity as a pretext and screen of their own inability to afford any assistance, have given out that the disease is sacred.

Man evidently was not yet ready for such a rational approach, and the humoral theory was not conducive to scientific progress in discovering causative factors of mental disease. Because of predominant social beliefs, physicians for a long time had few or no objections to priests treating the mentally ill.

The similarity of the sixteenth century Mantuan physician Pietro Pomponazzi's, (1462-1525), painstaking effort to explain the human soul within its naturalistic context, and Johan Weyer's, (1515-1588), complaints about the inability and dishonesty of some monks and priests in practicing medicine by abusing the patient's confidence, sounds very similar to the one quoted in the Hippocratic treatise two thousand years earlier. There appears to have been no progress made in attempting to understand mental illness. From a thing of many good and evil spirits, mental disease gradually evolved into a thing of the spirit, of the soul. Christianity as an institution aided the self-regulation of mind, body, and soul but, by claiming the exclusive right to administer to the soul, it insulated the soul against any possible invasion of the inquiring scientists.

The main focus of this study is on two Renaissance individuals, Pietro Pomponazzi and Johan Weyer, both physicians, whose contributions in theory and practice laid the foundation upon which medical psychiatry was able to develop.

An attempt is made to recreate some of the dynamics of their time by

including political, cultural, theological, philosophical and jurisprudential forces which helped foster the mass mania of the sixteenth century and made a scientific investigation of the human mind and mental illness difficult. Special emphasis is given to the three major Renaissance currents of thought, Platonism, Aristotelianism and Humanism, and their effect on medical education and medical practice.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

Medical Education and Medical Practice from 1475-1600 in Western Europe: with Emphasis on the Universities of Padua, Paris and Orléans

1. University Education and Humanism

According to Stephen d'Irsay, the great new ideas of the fifteenth century did not originate in the universities, but rather from Humanism. He sees the universities as having become an indispensable organism of social life: they were responsible for educating professionals.[1] But Humanism exerted a great influence on the universities. From now on, one finds two opposing currents: the conservation of Scholasticism on one hand and the integration of new disciplines such as literature and philology, on the other.[2] Humanism in Italy was not confined to the recovery and dissemination of ancient texts only; it made an impact on education. Humanists believed in the relation between education and individual freedom. One of the goals of education was to make man freer and to further his individuality. Paolo Vergerio's, (1370-1444), treatise The Qualities of a Free Man, (1404), reached forty editions in less than a century, which is an indication of how seriously education was regarded as an instrument in developing free men. The influence of Humanism on education grew rapidly not only in elementary and secondary education but especially in the education of professionals in universities.[3]

Some of the newer universities became true literary centers, such as the ones of Florence, (1349), Pavia, (1361), and Pisa, (1343). This influence made itself felt in other branches of learning. "After the middle of the fifteenth century, we find an increasing number of professional jurists, physicians, mathematicians, philosophers, and theologians who cultivated humanistic studies along with their own particular fields of study."[4] With the fall of Constantinople in 1453, many Greek and Byzantine scholars came as refugees to the West, especially to Italy where many universities established chairs for the teaching of Greek. In Padua Leonicus Thomaeus was installed to expound Aristotle and Plato, in their own tongue.[5]

Kristeller emphasizes that the common notion that Scholasticism was superseded by Humanism is not true. As early as the fourteenth century, the humanists began to "...call their field of learning the humane studies befitting a human being, (studia humanitatis)."[6] From this statement originated the false conception that Renaissance Humanism was basically a new philosophical movement representative of a new Weltanschaung.[7] In reality the name "studia humanitatis" was applied to grammar, rhetoric, poetry, history and moral philosophy, and was so called because of certain expressions found by the humanists in Cicero and Gellius.[8] Scholasticism and Humanism lived side by side throughout the Renaissance. Aristotelianism continued the medieval tradition, which is evident from the large number of commentaries written during this period.

> Scholars hostile to the Middle Ages considered this literature an unfortunate survival of medieval tradition that may be safely disregarded, whereas the true spirit of the Renaissance is expressed in the literature of the humanists. Medievalists, on the other hand, have largely concentrated on the earlier phases of scholastic philosophy and... sacrificed the later scholastics to the criticism of the humanists and their modern followers, a tendency that has been further accentuated by the recent habit of identifying scholasticism with Thomism.[9]

This is the reason why so many modern scholars condemned the Aristotelian philosophers of the Renaissance as followers of a dead past. "...they include both scholastics and humanists in a summary sentence that reflects the judgement of seventeenth century scientists and philosophers. Only a few famous figures such as Pietro Pomponazzi (1493-1541) seem to resist the universal verdict."[10]

2. The University of Padua

Due to its adherence to Averroism, the University of Padua had acquired the reputation of being a heretical institution by the end of the fourteenth century. The Latin Averroist movement began in Paris in the thirteenth century, then shifted to Padua early in the fourteenth century, where it had especially close connections with the teaching of medicine. "It set out by expressing a secular and anticlerical spirit and by undertaking a destructive criticism of Thomism and Scotism, the thirteenth century synthesis of science and religion."[11]

Medicine and Aristotelian philosophy, (as translated, interpreted and

modified by the Arabs), that became so characteristic of Italian science, appears first in the writings of Taddeo Alderotti of Florence, (1223-1303),[12] who taught at Bologna. By the fourteenth century the teaching of logic and natural philosophy was well established at Padua, and by the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries "...further influences were received from Paris in the field of natural philosophy and from Oxford in the field of logic."[13] An unbroken tradition of Italian Aristotelianism can be traced from the latter part of the fourteenth century, through the fifteenth and sixteenth, far into the seventeenth centuries.[14]

By the end of the fifteenth century, the University of Padua "...reigned supreme, not only in the arts, literature and philosophy, but as the center of the scientific renaissance."[15] Almost from its beginning it played an important role of intellectual thought.

The deep influence of Pietro d'Abano, (1250-1316), which affected even Dante, was continued by Gentile da Foligno, (d. 1348), Giorgio Valla, (fl. 1450), Ermalo Barbaro, (d. 1493), and Alessandro Benedetti, (1460-1525), down to the opening of the sixteenth century to prepare the way for the rise of medical humanism, and the development of a progressive and critical spirit was to establish the medical school as the greatest glory of Padua.[16]

During the sixteenth century Padua University had become the undisputed leader of medical education. This rise to fame was not only due to its famous teachers, but largely to the protection it enjoyed from the Venetian government, under whose control it came in 1405. In spite of the restrictions imposed by the decrees of Trent, the Venetian Republic remained one of the most

tolerant communities of Europe. Books prohibited by the Index were bought, printed and sold freely.[17] That the University of Padua even retained its independence from papal domination during the Counter-Reformation is evident in its bypassing of the request of taking the oath. The Pope at this time was unwilling to allow the granting of doctorates without the recipients taking the oath to the Catholic Church. The Venetian government again demonstrated its independence by simply inventing an alternative degree. "In 1597, it was decided that in such cases the professors instead of meeting at the Sacred College to examine the candidate, should meet in the house of the Count Palatine, that the examination should take place there and the diploma be issued in the Count's name. Both forms of the doctorate were equally valid."[18]

Both the Universitas juristarum and the Universitas artistarum were autonomous, each with its own organization and administration officials. This tradition originated in 1262, as is evident from records.[19] "Both these student councils had power to treat with the Republic of Venice in all matters of university business."[20] The University was outside papal domination and enjoyed from its beginning a certain immunity from papal infringements. Under the tolerant government of the Venetians, the University enjoyed academic freedom.

During the fifteenth century, under the influence of the fast growing printing industry, Venice became a true center of humanistic activity,[21] which is evident in Bernardo Giustiniani's statement that "...the purpose of learning and the reward of true philosophy is not to make man more learned but to

make him better."[22] This expectancy to improve man through education sounds similar to Paolo Vergerio's objectives and goals of education a few decades earlier.

The rise of medical humanism at the University of Padua was rather slow. It started to bear fruit in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. The strict adherence to Aristotelian philosophy, as well as the conservative philosophical tradition of Venice, can at least partly be blamed for the late development of Humanism. The greatest impetus to humanistic learning came from the printers, who first were regarded as being injurious to the manuscript business. The first books were printed in Italy in 1465, and between this date and 1475, presses were set up in many cities in Italy.[23] With printed texts more readily available, translations became more frequent. The printing of Latin editions began in Venice in 1476, (biological works and Aristotle's De Anima), and in Padua in 1472.

3. Medical Humanists at the University of Padua

Paduan medical humanists exemplified the Renaissance ideal of developing all of man's capacities. Their contributions go beyond the field of medicine. Some fit Castiglione's description of The Courtier. Some express self-confidence unheard of from physicians during the medieval period. They trust their own observations and conclusions and do not hesitate to correct errors by their predecessors.

The "first" medical humanist was Nicolo Leoniceno, (b. 1428), a student

and later professor at Padua University, who translated Hippocrates and Galen from Greek into Latin, and opposed Avicenna and the Arabic School. The controversy was his De Plinii et aliorum in medicina erroribus, published in 1492. This work is his chief service to science, for he points out errors made by Pliny in his Natural History, particularly those in botony and anatomy. He also critically reviewed the writings of Avicenna, Mondino, Gentile de Foligno, Theophrastus and Theodoric,[24] whose writings were up to this time all regarded as sacrosanct. A storm of disapproval broke out against Leoniceno, who courageously stood his grounds and did not retract his statement. He had great admiration for Galen, whose anatomical teachings he followed.[25] Pietro Pomponazzi, (1462-1524), a student and later on a professor of the University of Padua, is not regarded as a humanist, but rather as the last of the schoolmen and, in a sense, the first of the Aristotelians, but deserves to be mentioned with the free "spirits" of the Renaissance. "...unmixed with streams from any source except his own, undergoing inward changes not less complete and not less significant than those which, in other minds are brought upon it from elsewhere...."[26]

Bouwsma seems to agree that Pomponazzi somehow belongs to the medical humanists of the Renaissance:

> Behind his naturalism seems to lurk a characteristically Renaissance concern with the significance of the experience in this life, on the part of a soul itself conceived as mortal, of phenomena which are born mature, and decline in time. Viewed rationally, even Christianity was, for him, no exception to the general rule that all things are subject to change and decay.[27]

Girolamo Fracastoro, (1478-1553), a burgeoning genius of the Renaissance, a physician with many interests and skills, was a student at Padua University, "...and took all knowledge as his province, and, while medicine was his chief passion, he also studied astronomy, mathematics, physics, geology, geography, botany and wrote poetry."[28] Some of his fellow students were: Andrea Navagero, later known as a distinguished historian; Gaspare Contarini and Pietro Bembo, who became cardinals, and Nickolaus Copernicus, (1473-1543), who became a fine physician, and only after his death known as an astronomer. Pomponazzi was one of Fracastoro's professors and encouraged him to seek natural explanations for all physical occurrences.[29] While still a student, Fracastoro was appointed tutor in anatomy. Besides practicing medicine, later he was an accomplished writer and is especially known for two of his works.

His poem, Syphilis sive morbus gallicus, (1530), was dedicated to his friend Cardinal Bembo.

> The poem describes the plight of Syphilis, a shepherd, who was smitten with this disease because he blasphemed the sun god. This name may have been the creation of Fracastoro's fancy, or he may have coined it from the Greek word σίφλος, meaning shameful, hideous, repulsive. It had a tremendous success and changed the name from French disease or French pox to Syphilis. One hundred editions of the poem are known: 42 Latin, 29 Italian, 13 English, 9 French, 5 German, and one edition each in Spanish and Portuguese.[30]

This tremendous success is probably just as much due to the diffusion of what appeared to be a new disease which swept from 1490 on over Europe, India, China, Japan and eventually over the whole world. It was called the

French disease or French pox, because it was transmitted by the French army, (which was composed of mercenaries of many nations), when Charles VIII invaded Italy in 1494.[31]

Fracastoro has been described as the father of the seminal theory of disease for his work De contagione et contagiosis morbis et eorum curatione, (1546). This work is written by a shrewd observer with a sharp logical mind, but there was not yet a method by which he could prove his seminal theory of disease.

Another work, Homocentrica seu de stellis, (1535), was a serious scientific work written as a preparation for the greater work of Copernicus, De revolutionibus orbium coelestium, (1543), which revolutionized astronomy, and with it both science and philosophy.[32]

Jerome Cardan, (Gerolomo Cardano, 1501-1576), was a contemporary of Fracastoro, of equal fame, but more of a controversial figure. As a medical student he studied at the universities of Pavia and Padua, and he was elected rector at the age of twenty-four, (as indicated earlier, the students at Padua elected their own rector). He was rejected as a member by the College of Physicians on grounds of his illegitimate birth, which infuriated him so much that he wrote a book to castigate his enemies, De Malo Recentiurum Medicorum Usu Libellus, (1536). In this work Cardan not only gives a first clear account of typhus fever, which he named morbus pulicaris, or flea-like disease, but he emphasizes to his colleagues who refused his admittance to the College of Physicians, seventy-two errors made in common medical practice.[33]

Cardan's interests were broader than medicine, which can easily be detected from the large list of books he published. "Cardan's busy brain produced enough to fill seven thousand pages of folio."[34] Two of his non-medical works are: Ars Magna, (1545), his mathematical masterpiece,[35] and De Subtilitate, which was a sixteenth century outline of science and ran seven editions. The great corpus of his medical writings occupies four huge volumes of Spon's 1663 folio edition of the Opera Omnia.

Cardan's autobiography, De Vita Propria Liber, is regarded by his biographer Morley not as a biography but rather as a dialogue of an old suffering man.[36] Mrs. Burr, in summarizing Cardan's contribution to his time, describes him as a man different from his contemporaries, a man with a new scientific impulse.[37]

Andreas Vesalius, (1514-1564), appeared in Padua in 1537, as a graduate student. He looked at himself as a restorer so that "...anatomy will soon be cultivated in our Academies as it was of old in Alexandria."[38] When Vesalius was ready for formal medical education he went to Paris; however, what he wanted most was dissection and instruction at the dissecting table, which he did not get at Paris.[39] After approximately three years in Paris, he left without graduating and returned to Louvain, where he was granted permission to conduct an anatomy. Over a dispute on whether one should incise a vein on the affected or unaffected side of the body in therapeutic bleeding, Vesalius disagreed with an older influential colleague who defended the Arabic version while Vesalius, a budding humanist, accepted the Greek version. As a result, Louvain could hold

no future for the aspiring anatomist who left Louvain to go to Padua.

> On 5 December 1537 the faculty of the University of Padua, after examining Vesalius, granted him... the degree of Doctor of Medicine cum ultima diminutione, which represents "with highest distinction."...On the following day after performing a dissection he was nominated by the "Illustrious Senate of Venice" as Professor of Surgery, an appointment which at that time bore the responsibility of teaching anatomy as well.[40]

> The sight of a professor descending from his academic chair to dissect and demonstrate personally on the cadaver was something entirely novel.... Few anatomical works up to this time had been illustrated, and of those that were, the illustrations were little more than symbols or decorations. Indeed, many of the leading physicians of the day were actively opposed to the illustration of the printed word, on the grounds that this had not been done in classical times and would degrade scholarship.[41]

To clarify his anatomical discussions, Vesalius introduced charts delineating veins, nerves, etc. "To protect his interest and to prevent the students from employing inferior charts, Vesalius was led to publish his drawings."[42] The six plates now are known as the Tabulae Anatomicae Sex. They were an instant success. His most famous publication is the Fabrica or, by its full name, De Humani Corporis Fabrica Libri septem, Basilea, 1543.

The history of anatomy is divided into three periods: the pre-Vesalian, the Vesalian and the post-Vesalian Period -- "a tribute to the genius of this great anatomist."[43] The Fabrica marks the beginning of modern science; many of the illustrations in it were developed from sketches of Vesalius himself. The Renaissance saw the emergence in the realm of art of a new dogma of aesthetic theory which stated that a work of art is a direct and faithful repre-

sentation of natural phenomena."[44]

Artists played an important role in the development of anatomy, "Art had gone scientific."[45]

> Although the publication of the Fabrica...in 1543 marked a new era in anatomical illustration, numerous instances of collaboration between physician and artist in a field of mutual interest had occurred. Leonardo da Vinci (1452-1519) doubtless began his anatomical investigation in pursuit of better pictorial representation, but his insatiable curiosity soon overcame his artistic instincts and led him into scientific investigation. The textbook which he had planned in collaboration with the anatomist Marcantonio della Torre (1481-1512) was never completed, but had it been published it would have revolutionized the sciences of anatomy and physiology.[46]

Vesalius, like Leoniceno, aroused great controversy: "I hear that many are hostile to me because I have held in contempt the authority of Galen, the prince of physicians and preceptor of all; because I have demonstrated that some fault is actually discernible in his books."[47]

Vesalius, like Leoniceno, had a remarkable quality to be able to stand up for his own conviction and not to follow slavishly the teachings of the Graeco-Roman physicians, whose teachings were held sacrosanct for so long.

After Vesalius left Padua, other anatomists famous in their own rights continued to further the anatomical tradition at the University of Padua. Realdo Colombo, (1516-1559), a pupil of Vesalius, is known especially for his discovery of the pulmonary circulation.

Gabriele Falloppio, (1523-1562), educated at Ferrara but who taught at Padua, professed himself to be a student of Vesalius, "...not in the schools

listening to his voice but in the library... having read his writings diligently and having given them thorough consideration."[48] Even though Fallopius is full of praise for Vesalius, he discusses errors made by Vesalius in his work Observationes anatomicae. Fallopius introduced several anatomical terms; the best known are the Fallopian tubes and the Fallopian canal for the facial nerves.

Another great Paduan physician and professor of anatomy, Girolamo Fabricius ab Aquapendente, (1537-1619), built the first anatomical theatre at his own expense.[49] Fabricius, who was Harvey's teacher, published a series of notable anatomical and physiological works beautifully illustrated with copper plates. De formato foeti is a magnificent embryological study of fetus in man and several animals. His De vernarum ostiolis contains the first illustration of the valves. Like Vesalius, he was a surgeon and anatomist and also published an Opera chirurgica, a work of the greatest significance to the history of surgery.

It is obvious that these Paduan physicians had as their prime objective to improve medical and surgical care of patients, and became anatomists secondarily only to reach their set goal. Humanism emphasized the importance and uniqueness of the individual, and in medicine as in other fields an effort was made to understand the human being as a whole.

Vesalius' ambition was to restore the whole field of medicine, which he felt was torn apart by "...fashionable doctors aping the Romans in despising the work of the hands", and of course by the ruin of all the sciences by the invading Goths.[50] Vesalius, a medical humanist, hoped to reestablish The

Golden Age of Greece in medicine,[51] by reestablishing comprehensive medical care which includes diet, drugs and surgery, the triple method of treatment.[52]

Major points out that toward the end of the sixteenth century the great age of Paduan anatomy came to an end because anatomy had progressed as far as it could. The dissecting room no longer attracted the best minds; they were now drawn toward the new science of physiology.[53] Sigerist emphasizes that with William Harvey, (1578-1657), a new period started, "...function now, instead of structure stood in the foreground of interest. Fabrizius already had refused to be content with purely morphological views, he invariably inquired as to the function of the organs he described."[54]

While it is true that Harvey's discovery of the circulation of the blood, (1619-1625), made progress in physiology possible, the statement that "...function now, instead of structure stood in the foreground..." sounds unconvincing and is incongruous with Vesalius' statement:

> I did not intend at all to set one instrument of medicine above the others since the aforesaid triple method of healing can never be disunited and belongs in its entity to a single practitioner; and that he may properly pursue this aim, all parts of medicine have been established on an equal footing and so constituted that the individual parts are brought into use the more fruitfully, the more it joins cumulatively with the forces of all.[55]

As is evident from Vesalius' reasoning, he was not separating anatomy from physiology; he regarded both as the "...foundation and essential preliminary art of medicine."[56] He was very concerned that surgery was practiced

too often by ignorant barbers. He studied the human body and its structure primarily to enable him to become a more effective surgeon, and not to create a new science of anatomy. Vesalius saw himself first of all as a complete physician directing his attention to the areas in medicine which were weak and needed strengthening.[57]

This statement makes it clear that there was no separation of anatomy and physiology in the sixteenth century and, with Harvey's discovery of the circulation of the blood, a change of emphasis rather than a new direction took place. The temptation to see progress in a consecutive orderly fashion bears within itself the fallacy of using anachronistic thinking.

> The new classicism and the medical humanists had placed in the hands of Vesalius the powerful and important tools of literary criticism and no Renaissance scientist equaled him in his philosophical appreciation. It was this union of humanist aspiration with the spirit of scientific research which made the Fabrica what it is and established once and for all, almost fortuitously, that authority must yield to original investigation.[58]

The medical humanists of Padua helped not only medicine but, as in the cases of Cardano and Fracastoro, were actively involved in the recovery of the Greek mathematicians. They were empiricists enquiring into methodological problems and, as a result, discovered new insights, as in the case of Pietro Pomponazzi. (See Chapter III).

Copernicus, as discussed earlier, studied medicine with Fracastoro in Padua and his studies in Canon Law prepared him for lifelong ecclesiastical

duties which were secondary to his function as a physician.

Galileo, (1564-1642), first studied medicine at his father's request until convinced that geometry was more to his liking.[59]

> In Leonardo the penetrating, in the Italian mathematicians and physicists of the sixteenth century, in Copernicus, Kepler, and Galileo, such a science had indeed come of age....[60] The conception of the nature of science, of its relation to the observation of fact, and of the method by which it might be achieved and formulated, that was handed on to his successors by Galileo, was not the work of the new seekers after a fruitful method. It appears rather as the culmination of the cooperative efforts of ten generations of scientists inquiring into methodological problems in the universities of Italy. For three centuries the natural philosophers of the school of Padua, in fruitful commerce with the physicians of its medical faculty, devoted themselves to criticizing and expanding this conception and method, and to grounding it firmly in the careful analysis of experience. It left their minds with a refinement and precision of statement which the seventeenth century scientists who used it, did not surpass in all their careful investigation of method.[61]

Padua's medical humanists differed greatly from humanists like Juan Luis Vives, (1492-1540), and Francis Bacon, (1561-1626), who sought the method of a new science in the rhetorician's art of persuasion, recognizing no useful knowledge in the investigations of the mathematicians of their day. "Their combined onslaught helped to shake men's faith in the complacent academic traditions of the school...."[62]

Humanism, which directly influenced education at the University of Padua, in return was also given a new direction under the influence of Padua's scientific tradition.

4. The Universities of Paris and Orléans

Stephen d'Irsay must have had mainly the northern universities in mind when stating that the great ideas did not originate in the universities but rather from Humanism. Erasmus, who attended the College of Montague in the University of Paris to study theology, had this to say: "I carried nothing away from it but a body infected with disease, and a plentiful supply of vermin."[63]

Juan Luis Vives, who attended the University of Paris in the early sixteenth century, expresses similar feelings: "The students are taught nothing, but to rave with mad fury of words...." Vives, like Erasmus, had during his stay at Paris joined the humanistic circle, which only increased his anxiety. "The change was so odious to me that often I turned away from the thought of the better humanist studies, so that I might persuade myself that I had not spent so many years to no good purpose...."[64]

Guillaume Bude, (Budeus, 1467-1540), who held the first place among French men of letters, (but whose interests were more philological than religious, social or political), had studied at the University of Paris and at Orléans. Nevertheless, he persuaded Francis I, (1530), to set up his Lectures royaux, (College de France), in Latin, Greek, Hebrew and mathematics, to the great disappointment of the Sorbonne.[65]

François Rabelais, (1492-1553), an admirer of Bude and Erasmus and a well established physician and professor of medicine, attacks the outmoded education at the University of Paris with sharp Gallic wit in his work Gargantua.[66]

The reason for this discontent with the teaching at Paris University, (at the beginning of the sixteenth century), becomes evident when one looks at the statutes by which the university was still governed. They were the unchanged statutes that Cardinal d'Esouteville, the papal legate, had given to the university in 1452, "...and remained entirely unmodified by the influences of the Renaissance. An attempt was made to change the situation in 1579 with the edict of Blois which promulgated a scheme of organization for all the universities.... though productive of unity of teaching, [it] did nothing toward the studies themselves." With the beginning of the seventeenth century "...the University of Paris seemed at an end, and its forty colleges stood absolutely deserted."[67]

While the University of Paris was less and less able to attract students during the latter part of the sixteenth century, the Jesuit College de Clermont in Paris developed from a modest school to the leading educational establishment.[68] The Jesuits profited by the conservatism and immobility of the university, and during the second half of the sixteenth century they had not only the monopoly on lower but also on higher education. The Jesuits contributed greatly toward the improvement of education. They used classical learning as the basis for education, as did the Trilingual Colleges of the humanists, and had a progressive attitude toward sciences.[69]

A brief review of the development of the University of Paris is helpful in understanding the almost continuous difficulties it has had from its foundation until the end of the sixteenth century. Paris and Bologna are the only two original universities; all the others were organized after either Paris or Bologna.

> Both arose approximately between 1270 and 1300 out of different sides of a wonderful deepening and broadening of the stream of human culture which may be called the Renaissance of the twelfth century. In Italy this Renaissance found its expression most conspicuously in a revival of the study of Roman law... in France it took the form of a great outburst of dialectical and theological speculation...at Bologna the student-guild eventually established complete supremacy over the magisterial body, to which alone belonged the right of admitting new masters or (in the modern phrase) "granting degrees."[70] ...At Paris the chancellor claimed the right to issue ordinances or regulations for the government and discipline of the masters and scholars....The only full professors recognized at Paris were the doctors of theology.[71]

Out of fear that theology students might be attracted to other careers, Pope Honorius III, in 1219, forbade the teaching of Roman law at Paris.[72] This decision happened to be injurious to scientific study and even to that of Canon Law. The University of Orléans was founded by emigrating students from Paris in 1228-29, due to the conflict between students and teachers with the chancellor and the city of Paris.[73] Pope Gregory IX, in 1235, authorized the school of Orléans to teach Civil Law.[74] While the University of Paris became the center of the studies of theology, the University of Orléans became the greatest law school in France.

As a political power the University of Paris reached its maturity during the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries. It prided itself on being above all secular jurisdiction including that of the Parlement, the king's court.[75] "In the last year of the fifteenth century Louis XII rode armed into the university precincts, revoked the right of cessation,...brought the university to heel."[76] Also the French Wars of Religion, 1562-1598, had a disastrous effect on the

University of Paris. The upper and middle classes whose sons were able to attend the university, welcomed the intellectual and spiritual concepts of Protestantism, while the University remained a conservative Catholic-oriented institution. In the Paris of Erasmus, Vives, and Rabelais the University of Paris was still inhospitably medieval, with a harsh disciplinary regime, crowded quarters and appalling food.[77]

The University of Orléans was also faced with political problems, (1405); the government threatened to cut its revenues, (ses bien temporels), in case of noncooperation.[78] This crisis affected the quality of teaching and learning adversely, but by the end of the fifteenth century its financial situation was greatly improved and its reputation as a law school firmly established.

While at first only a law school, the University later offered courses in medicine. No record appears to be available of the exact date when the medical school was started, but from a decision made by the Provost of the city of Orléans in 1556, we learn that physicians of the medical school were also responsible to teach the apprentices of apothecary, barbers and surgeons as well as responsible to inspect apothecary shops.[79]

Orléans was a popular campus for German students, who enjoyed special favors. Each German was regarded as a nobleman, regardless of his status at home. A remarkable library was available for German students. However, the University of Orléans was never able to compete in fame with the Medical School of Montpellier.

Even though the University of Paris was known for its stronghold of

conservatism, its medical school enjoyed the prestige of being the medical school of the capital. But regardless of its name and influence in northern Europe, the conservatism of the university extended to its medical school, and "...placed the study of medicine at a considerable disadvantage in relation to the great progress...being made, notably in the universities of Italy."[80] Teaching continued in the old Arabic translations of Aristotle's writings, which were strongly influenced by the Alexandrian Peripatetics, and by a further bent characteristic of themselves, adopted the Platonic interpretation of Aristotle's version.[81] At the University of Padua the Greek translations, which were much truer translations than the Arabic ones, were used from 1472 on.

Among the French leaders of medicine during the first half of the sixteenth century were Jacobus Sylvius, or Jaques Dubois, (1478-1555), professor of anatomy, and Johann Guinther of Andernach, (1487-1574), one of Vesalius' more important teachers. Both, prior to teaching anatomy at the University of Paris, had devoted themselves to humanistic studies.[82]

Guinther had taught Greek at Louvain and established a reputation as an anatomist, not by dissecting but by translating Galen's work on anatomical procedures entitled De Anatomicis Administronibus, (1531).[83] Jacobus Sylvius, also a linguist until he studied medicine at the age of fifty-two, owed supreme allegiance to Galen, which at times made him remark that any structure found in contemporary man which differed from Galenical description could only be due to a later decadence and degeneration in mankind.[84] But much credit goes

to Sylvius for systematizing anatomical knowledge and for a rational terminology of the muscles of the body.[85]

Only occasional anatomies were conducted. They were held in the basement of the Hôtel de Dieu, since no dissection room was provided in the Rue de la Boucherie, where the medical school obtained its own buildings in 1477. "...a candidate for the bachelor's degree was formally required to display a knowledge of anatomy which he gained largely from textbooks and the study of disarticulated bones when he could obtain them."[86] In 1514, Nicolo Leoniceno's translation of Galen's work was published at Paris and seized upon with enthusiasm.

Jean Fernel, (1497-1570), a professor of medicine at Paris, had interests similar to those of Cardano at Padua. He had taken his M.A. degree at Paris at the age of twenty-two, and was invited to remain to teach dialectics. He declined the offer, realizing that his education had been influenced by the prevailing Scholasticism at Paris where Humanism was still suspect. He spent five years studying privately the writings of Cicero, Aristotle and Plato. After these private studies he entered the medical school at the age of twenty-seven.

Fernel's interests remained wider than medicine. He designed an astrolabe and other instruments, to the neglect of medicine and his practice. Only at his wife's pressure did he sell his mathematical library and dispose of his instruments and redirect his energies toward medicine.

His works reflect the versatility of his interests and knowledge: De natural parte Medicinae, (1542), dealt with functions of the healthy body. De vacuandi Ratione, (1545), urged moderation in bleeding, (a still widely used treatment

method in his time). De abiditis verum causes, (1548), attacked astrology and magic.[87] De lues venerae curatione was published posthumously in 1579.

Fernel had also started a system of medicine, but was unable to complete it. Most of it appeared in his Medicina. As a physician Fernel was very successful. In 1566, he was appointed physician-in-chief to the king. As a professor in the medical faculty he soon became its chief luminary but in 1550, he gave up teaching to devote all his time to his large practice.

5. Medical Education during the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries

At the Universities of Padua, Paris and Orléans medical education began with the "studium generale", which consisted of undergraduate arts courses still firmly based in the study of the trivium, (grammar, rhetoric and logic), and the quadrivium, (arithmetic, geometry, astronomy and music). Between the years 1593 and 1604 the following texts were read in the lectures on the Humanities at Padua:

> Aristotle's Rhetoric and the Greek Epigrams; Cicero's Topics and Sophocles' Oedipus Tyrannus; Cicero's Questiones Tusculanarum, In Somnium Scipionis, and some work of Demosthenes; Aristotle's Poetic; the first book of the Odes of Horace; Livy. The books prescribed for the lecture on logic were those of Aristotle's Posterior Analytics. In the course on moral philosophy of Aristotle, his Ethics were read, and once, his Politics. It will be noticed that the writings of Plato do not figure in the list.[88]

When all regular courses were completed, the student had to take an oral examination and if he passed it successfully, he was invited for further

questioning by the Senate in a formal ceremonial disputation. Before graduating, (B.A. degree), the student also had to partake in a Latin disputation open to the public.[89] After completion of all these requirements, he qualified for specialized study of medicine or philosophy, or both.

The medical textbooks used in most universities during the fifteenth century were: Avicenna's Cannon, Galen's Ars Parva, Dioscorides, and the Aphorisms of Hippocrates. "Prior to 1514 the texts were for the most part derived from the medieval Arabic tradition, that is, from the writings of Moslem physicians and their commentators or from translations of the works of classical authors necessarily corrupted by passages from Greek into Syriac, Syriac into Arabic and thence into obscure Latin."[90] But after 1514, this changed rapidly, as soon as Galen's and Hippocrates' works were translated directly from Greek into Latin by the Paduan Leoniceno, as discussed earlier.

That the curriculum for medical students at Paris was similar to that at Padua is evident in the letters of Gargantua to his son Pantagruel, who studied medicine at Paris. But, as mentioned before, Paris continued using the Arabic translation of Aristotle, while Padua used the Greek translation from 1472 on.

> I intend and will have it so, that you learn the languages perfectly; secondly, the Latin; and then the Hebrew, for the Holy-Scripture's sake; and then the Chaldee and Arabic likewise and that thou frame thy style in Greek in imitation of Plato; and for the Latin after Cicero....Of the liberal arts of geometry, arithmetic and music, I gave thee some taste when you were little and not above six years old....As for astronomy study all the rules thereof. Let pass, nevertheless, the divining and judicial astrology...as being nothing else plain abuses....[91]

Gargantua also recommends the natural sciences to his son: "...fail not... to pursue the books of the Greek, Arabian, and Latin physicians, not despising the Talmudists and Cabalists; and by frequent anatomies, get thee the perfect knowledge of that other world, called the microscosm which is man."[92]

Gargantua encourages his son to measure what he has learned by comparing his knowledge with that of others: "Thou canst do no better, than by maintaining public theses and conclusions in all arts, against all persons whatsoever..."[93]

While Plato was not on the reading list at the University of Padua, this was different at Paris. Gargantua reminds his son: "I take much delight in the readings of Plutarch's Morals, the great Dialogues of Plato...." Gargantua also proudly points out how much progress has been made in only one generation: "I see robbers, hangmen, freebooters...of the very rubbish of the people, more learned now than the doctors and preachers were in my time."

The study of herbs for the use in medicine was part of medical education.

> ...passing through certain meadows, or other grassy places, beheld the trees and plants, comparing them in the books of the ancients, such as Theophrast, Dioscorides, Marinus, Pliny, Nicander, Macer and Galen, and carried home to the house great handfuls of them...for herborizing.[94]

According to Rabelais, the students also visited: "...drugists, herbalists, apothecaries, and diligently considered the fruits, roots, leaves, gums, seeds, the grease and ointments of some foreign parts, also how they adulterated them." The students also went to see jugglers, tumblers, mountebanks, and quack-

salvers, and considered their cunning, their shifts.[95] According to humanist tradition, athletical exercises were not neglected.[96]

6. Northern Humanism and the Reformation

By the beginning of the sixteenth century "Humanism" had crossed the Alps. Students from northern nations who studied in Italy brought Humanism back with them. Other factors of equal importance involved in its spread were: the expansion of trade with the north, the development of printing, and the French and Spanish invasion of Italy. Northern Humanism took a new direction, even though this was not intended by the humanists of the early sixteenth century. The groundwork of the study of Greek and Latin and, to a lesser degree, of Hebrew, was already done by the Italian humanists. The northern humanists carried this tradition even further, especially the studies of Hebrew.

> Given the temper of the age, it was inevitable that biblical studies would soon be affected by the mounting interest in language, and such enterprises as the Complutensian Bible in Spain (begun 1502) and Erasmus' Greek New Testament (1516) are early examples of a movement which soon extended to vernacular versions of the Bible and critical editions of the Fathers.[97]

Northern Humanism reached its zenith in Erasmus, (1466-1536), an erudite, cosmopolitan professional, who lived and taught in several countries. "Erasmus brought to maturity the humanistic endeavor to draw from all wisdom."[98] Erasmus emphasized the importance of the pagan literature, and suggested that some of the pagan authors might be read as a preliminary training to the study of

Scripture: "...for they are often good moral teachers, they approach as closely as possible the prophetic and gospel pattern."[99]

Erasmus left the monastery at Steyn because classical letters more and more attracted his interest. But Erasmus at no time left any doubt that he regarded Humanism's function to be of service to religion, and that scholarship, classical, scriptural and patristic, was no end in itself, but helped man to a better life.[100]

Erasmus, like Lorenzo Valla, (1405-1457), and Pico della Mirandola, (d. 1494), among others before him, believed that man should have an opportunity to develop freely all sides of his nature. He emphasized moral philosophy more than logic or metaphysics. His conception of happiness included wealth, pleasure, health and beauty as well as piety and virtue.

In the north, just as in Italy, the humanists regarded Plutarch, Cicero and Seneca as examples. Plutarch's Lives was enormously popular reading, but the characteristic of many humanists was their special effort to imitate Cicero's style.

> Ethics during the Middle Ages had been treated in the context of theology, but the new interest in pagan thinkers enabled Erasmus and his contemporaries to treat the subject on its merits....Erasmus tended to keep classical, that is pagan, erudition distinct from Christianity in the Adages,[101] and thus for some time this little manual of some 150 pages, was the best known source of what came to be known as the 'philosophy of Christ' (it ran into 30 editions in twenty years). Its brevity and direct appeal made it literally the handbook of thousands, and the adverse opinion of men as diverse as Luther (1483-1546) and Loyola (1491-1556) would have been less violent if the book had been less influential.[102]

One year after the publication of the New Testament in Greek, (1516), Luther posted his 95 Theses on the door of the Wittenberg Cathedral. "The Theses were written in Latin and in the manner of medieval Scholasticism as a challenge to academic debate."[103] His primary target of attack was the sale of indulgences. Luther, who was convinced that he was a lost soul, believed that only God can forgive sins. In 1520, Luther published a pamphlet, The Appeal to the Christian Nobility of the German Nation:

> There has been a fiction by which the Pope, bishops, priests, and monks are called the 'spiritual estate'; princes, lords artisans, and peasants are the 'temporal estate'. This is an artful lie and hypocritical invention...all Christians are truly of the spiritual estate, and there is no difference among them, save of office...baptism, gospel, and faith, these alone make spiritual and Christian people...we are all consecrated as priests by baptism as St. Peter says: 'Ye are a royal priesthood, a holy nation' (I Pet. ii 9).[104]

This justification of faith led to a denial of the central Catholic doctrine of works:

> ...only the priest had the God-given power to secure for the laymen remission of punishment for sin. In the 'Appeal to the Christian Nobility' he swept aside the distinction between clergy and laity and declared the priesthood of all believers.[105]

Pope Leo X, (1513-1571), responded to Luther with a bull condemning his teachings. After Luther burnt the bull, Pope Leo excommunicated him. Emperor Charles V also passed a sentence of outlawry against Luther at the famous session of Worms.

The difference between the humanist reasoning of Erasmus and the revolutionary position of Luther can easily be seen in a letter Erasmus wrote to Jodocus Jonas on Luther, on May 10, 1521:

> I greatly wonder, my dear Jonas, what god has stirred up the heart of Luther, in so far as he assails with such license of pen the Roman pontiff, all the universities, philosophy, and the mendicant orders....
>
> For when in itself an issue is a matter of bitter truth to very many, and when in itself a turbulent issue usually leads, by long experience, to violent upheavel, it were better to mitigate through curteous treatment on issue sharply its very nature than to add ill will to ill will.
>
> What purpose did it serve, therefore, to act in a contrary way and to expose certain matters in such a way that at first sight they were even more offensive than when seen at closer and steadier range? What was achieved by raging with such fierce outcries? If it was against those he desired to correct, his method must be attributed to imprudence; but if it was against those he wished to provoke to evil everywhere, his method should be attributed to impiety. Moreover, although it is the part of the experienced steward to dispense the truth, that is bring it forth when the occasion demands, and to bring forth enough of it, and to bring forth what is suitable for each, he poured out everything at the same time in so many pamphlets cast forth headlong, divulging everything and making public even to cobblers what is usually treated among the learned as mysterious and secret; and frequently by some unbriddled impulse, in my opinion, at least, he is carried beyond what is just. For example, he calls the whole philosophy of Aristotle the death of the soul, when it was sufficient to remind theologians that they are too entangled in Peripatetic, or rather sophist, philosophy.[106]

To Plutarch, Cicero and Seneca the northern humanist added St. Peter and St. Paul to the list of exemplary writers worthwhile to be emulated. Reminding that Christ himself was prudent, courteous and gentle, Erasmus emphasizes that:

> Peter, in the Acts of the Apostles, with words that are gentle and loving not abusive, adds so great a multitude as the first fruits of the Church.[107] He does not scream at those who killed Christ, he does not magnify in dreadful language their wicked madness....Paul becomes all things to all men, so he might win all to Christ, instructing his disciples to teach with all gentleness, not estranging anyone by harshness.[108]

Erasmus criticizes Luther for not entrusting himself to the judgement of "most clement Leo and of Emperor Charles V, by far the noblest and most gentle prince of the faith."[109] Erasmus expresses concern at the hate which Luther engenders.

> I have been forced at times to wish for evidence of the evangelical spirit when I saw Luther, but especially his supporters, strive with skill, as it were, to involve others in hateful and dangerous affair....What was the need to make mentione, so often invidious, of my name, when the case by no means demanded it? I have advised Luther in a private and sealed letter; it was soon printed at Leipzig.[110]

Erasmus warns that discord must be avoided for it will be ruinous for all. But he still was not in favor of Luther's suppression, only that he be corrected so that he can gain the approval of the Church. Erasmus supported the suppression of monasteries, and called for an end to the domination of the clergy and profitable abuses, but to attack the Church or remold received theology was far from his thoughts.

More than theology was at issue in Luther's revolt; the Catholic Church at the time was in a worldly state. The papacy was involved in politics, and the

Rome that Luther visited was plagued with intrigue and corruption. A new idea evolved, the idea that the State is of divine origin:

> Twenty times in the prolix writings of 1529, 1530 and 1533, Luther reverts to the idea that it was he who had been first to recognize the absolute power of princes as plainly justified by God. 'Our teachings', he stated vehemently in 1525, 'have accorded to secular sovereignity the plentitude of its rights and powers, thus doing what the popes have never done nor wanted to do.'[111]

Luther conceded more and more extensive rights to the State, even the right to investigate the sanctity of the Church. He allowed the State to control the teachings of the church, and gave it authority to expel heretics.[112] A new concept evolved: "The power of the prince is delegated by the divine power. The whole world is, therefore, divinely ordered. The haughty indifference with which the idealist of 1520 regarded it is no longer acceptable after 1530."[113]

Part of Luther's success was that in the name of good Germans he attacked practices of Italians. The following oration given in Ingolstadt in 1492, by Conrad Celtis, (1459-1508), humanist and the first German to be crowned with the laurel, throws some light on prevalent national feelings even before Luther was known:

> ...considering that you bring not honour but dishonour to our empire if you neglect the study of literature only to rear horses and dogs and pursue ecclesiastical preferment.... Do away with that old disrepute of the Germans in Greek, Latin, and Hebrew writers....Even now when after the draining of marshes...our climate is more cheerful and our land populated with famous cities, we still fail to dislodge the leaders of that robber crew.[114]

> Assume, O men of Germany, that ancient spirit of yours, with which you have so often confounded and terrified the Romans and turn your eyes to the frontiers of Germany; collect together her town and broken territories....In the east also powerful peoples live in slavery, the Bohemians, the Moravians, the Slovak and the Silesians, who all live as it were separated from the body of Germany. And may I add the Transylvanian Saxons who also use our racial culture and speak our native language. In the West is France, which is so friendly and bountiful towards us by reason of the immortal virtue and incredible wisdom of Philip, Palatine of the Rhine.[115]

It is not difficult to imagine that Germans harboring such national feelings were delighted to support Luther's attack on the Italians.

Luther had freed those who followed him, by casting off the yoke of the Pope and the Church, but in replacing it with that of the Prince and the State were they really freer than before? It was only the great and near-great German princes who took advantage of the Lutheran movement to assert themselves. The knights, a lower class than the princes, were caught in the squeeze of rising prices which made it difficult for them to maintain aristocratic standards of living. They had no hesitation in enriching themselves by appropriating ecclesiastical holdings when Luther challenged the established order. These incidents led to the "Knights War" in 1522.[116]

The German peasants, influenced by the ideology of Luther's Reformation, made demands for change in 1524, in what is known as the "Twelve Articles":

> ...the custom has hitherto been that we have been held for villeins (semi-serfs); which is to be deplored, since Christ hath purchased and redeemed us all with His precious blood (Isa. liii.; I Peter i.; I Cor. vii.; Rom. xii.), the poor hind as well as the highest, none excepted. Therefore do we find

> in the scripture that we are free; and we will be free (Eccles. vi.; I Peter ii.)....[117]

Luther's reaction to the Peasant Rebellion was not sympathetic at all, and he turned against them. He was horrified at what the peasants' leaders pretended to have found in his translation of the Bible. This attitude endeared him even more so to the princes.

Another repercussion of Luther's ideology was the proliferation of church groups or sects and the appearance of denominations such as the Anglicans, Calvinists, Anabaptists and others. Each man was to find God's universal law within his own conscience according to these new teachings.

The Anabaptists were regarded as a special threat for, just contrary to Luther's teachings, they asked their members to forswear an alliance with the State.[118] They challenged the way of community life. They were pacifists, believed in religious liberty, the separation of church and state, and in complete abstentation from public life. Only a few carried Luther's statement that "a Christian is beyond laws" to its logical extreme of anarchism. It was feared that if they became too numerous, Protestants would be unable to take up arms against Catholics, and the Germans could not resist the Turks. And numerous indeed they did become. From a report by Menno Simons, one of their later leaders, we learn what happened to them after the imperial meeting at Speyer in 1529, when Catholics and Protestants concurred that the death penalty should be inflicted upon them:

> Some they executed by hanging, some they have tortured with inhuman tyranny, and afterwards chocked with cords at the stake. Some they roasted and burned alive....Others wander about here and there, in want, homelessness, and affliction, in mountains and deserts, in holes and caves of the earth. They are hated, abused, slandered and lied about by all men.[119]

The strain of living in hiding places did show in some individuals like Muentzer, who dreamed of devouring the carcasses of the oppressors. Some set dates for the Second Coming of Christ around 1533. Pacifism succumbed; armed with swords they marched into markets in Munster, Westphalia, and expelled Catholics and Protestants.

> Some of them began to revive the eccentricities of the prophets and the immoralities of the patriarchs. Some ran around naked in imitation of the prophet Isaiah who walked naked as a sign... At Munster the New Jerusalem the aberation took the form of a reinstatement of polygamy....Catholics and Lutherans combined to exterminate the New Jerusalem.[120]

All the years of idealism and nonviolence were discredited by this ugly episode and "...because a handful of fanatics run amock the whole group was besmirched. Historians of the Reformation did little more than recount the aberrations of the saints rampant."[121]

Bainton points out:

> If only Lutheranism could have been subject to the stimulus of the criticism and competition of the sects, it could never have become so complacent and allied to the established order.[122]

Under the protection of the princes, Lutheranism obtained imperial recognition. At the same time in the Netherlands Charles V tried to root out heretical sentiments in the defense of God's honour, and to strengthen his own power. His "edict of blood" was intended to frighten citizens away from heresy, but just the opposite happened. The spectacle of the martyrs suffering death by fire won many over to the new heresy.

Anabaptism, which developed in Switzerland and down the Rhine valley, spread fast in the Netherlands. Its growth was helped by the growing capitalist economy, and the economic depression which plagued the second half of the sixteenth century.[123] The Anabaptist movement has been little more than an episode in the history of the Netherlands, but during this time many were burnt or drowned because of heresy. Several thousands tried to leave the country, but many of them were arrested and returned by force. The Anabaptists made room for Calvinists, who began to penetrate the Netherlands between 1550 and 1560; they, too, were kept in check by the repressive measures of the authorities but had a better chance of resisting. Anabaptism had great appeal to the lower socio-economic class, while Calvinism appealed more to the middle and upper classes.

The eastern region of the Netherlands, during the period of strenuous resistance to the advancing Burgundian-Habsburg power, directed its attention eastward. "The gentry of Guelderland intermarried with those of Clèves and Jülich. An eastern language was in the process of formation during these years,

in competition with that of Flanders-Brabant-Holland."[124]

To describe the Renaissance as the period that broke with the medieval past and heralded the new scientifically oriented modern age, is a very inadequate description of a highly complex and contradictory period. Even though there is some truth in the above statement, the Renaissance was mainly a time of moral, religious, intellectual, aesthetic, economic, political, social and cultural crises. When, after his death, Copernicus' work was published which proved that the planets, including the earth, revolve around their own axes and move in orbit around the sun, the long held concept of man being the center of the universe had to be changed. This new theory was not only of astronomical interest but also of philosophical importance. Sarton points out: "It is a strange paradox that at the time when man was beginning to conquer nature, he was obliged to drive himself from the center of things; in proportion as he grew wiser he had to make himself smaller."[125]

What was regarded for so long as fundamental truth, (Catholic faith and concept of universe), now was questioned and rejected by many. Wars had devastated land and property, and suspicion was rampant. It is against this background of social fear that the witch-hunt was again intensified. Reverend Cotton Mather's sermon, A Discourse on Witchcraft, (Boston, 1689),[126] demonstrates better than any other statement of the theory of witchcraft the concept of witchcraft at this time:

> Witches are the Doers of strange things. The cannot indeed perform any proper Miracles....They do things which transcend the ordinary Course of Nature, which puzzle the ordinary Sense of mankind. Some strange things are done by them in a way of real production. They do really Torment, they do really Afflict those that their Spite shall extend unto....For the most part they labour to robb Man of his Ease or his Wealth; they labour to wrong God of His Glory....We read in Ephes. 2,2. about the "Prince of the power of the air". There is confined unto the Atmosphere of air a vast Power, or Army of Evil Spirits, under the government of a Prince who employs them in a continual Opposition to the Designs of GOD: The name of that Leviathan, who is the Grand-Seigneur of Hell, we find in the Scripture to be Belzebub. Under the command of that mighty Tyrant, there are vast legions and Myriads of Devils, whose Business and Accomplishments are not all the same. Everyone has his Post, and his Work; and they are all glad of an opportunity to be mischievious in the World....they rage upon their neighbours; And especially two acts occur hereunto. The First is, Their Covenanting with the Witches. There is a most hellish League made between them, with various Rites and Ceremonies. The Witches promise to serve the Devils, and the Devils promise to help the Witches....The second is their Representing of the Witches. The Devils, when they go upon the errands of the Witches, do bear their names; and hence do Harmes too come to be carried from the Devils to the Witches.[127]

To prove that witchcraft really exists he argues:

> Some argue that they never saw any Witches, therefore there are none. Just as if you or I should say, We never met with any Robbers on the Road, therefore there never was any Padding there....We have the testimony of Scripture for it...by way of Assertion or Allusion: in the Oracles of God.[128]

For historical proof he mentions the Witch at Endor, in I Sam. 28.7.

> They that will believe no Witches...what do they think of law in Exod. 22.18. Thou shalt not suffer a Witch to live?... we have the testimony of Experience for it. What will those

> incredulous, who must be the only ingenious men, say to this? Many Witches have like those in Act. 19.18. Confessed and shewed their Deeds. We see those things done, that it is impossible any Disease or any Deceit should procure. We see some hideous Wretches in hideous Horrours confessing, That they did the Mischiefs. This confession is often made by them that are owners of as much Reason as the people that laugh at all Conceit of Witchcraft: the exactest Scrutiny of skillful Physicians cannot find any Distraction in their minds. This Confession is often made by them that are apart One from another, and yet they agree in all the Circumstances of it... some will produce the Engines and Ensignes of their hellish Trade, and give the standers-by an Occular Conviction of what they do, and how. There can be no judgement left of any Humane Affairs, if such Confession must be Ridiculed: all the Murders, yea, and all the Bargains in the world must be meer Imaginations if such Confessions are of no account.[129]

With suspicion rampant and such vague and contradictory statements of what constitutes witchcraft, it is not surprising that thousands of innocent men and women were accused of practicing witchcraft.

Protestantism was furthered by the humanist criticism of abuses in the Catholic Church. Unfortunately, the Protestant leaders were not the inheritors of the humanistic tradition of tolerance and free intellectual inquiry. Intellectually Protestantism was not a rationalistic movement but rather a religious revival movement. Even though Humanism attracted an increasing number of followers, the group of humanists was still a rather small elite group of men with a common interest in the classics, but also with a common growing concern about religious abuses, political manipulations and social injustices. Trilingual colleges were founded around 1530, in several countries, (Corpus Christi of Oxford, and Busleiden's college at Louvain). Erasmus served as a "cornerstone

of Humanism'' in northern Europe. His influence can be detected in the writings of humanist contemporaries.

References

CHAPTER I

Medical Education and Medical Practice from 1475-1600 in Western Europe: with Emphasis on the Universities of Padua, Paris and Orléans

1. Stephen d'Irsay, Histoire des Universitiés, (Paris: Editions Auguste Picard, 1933), p. 7.

2. Ibid., p. 7.

3. Ibid., p. 100.

4. Ibid., pp. 100-1.

5. John Herman Randall, Jr., Introduction to "On the Immortality of the Soul", in The Renaissance Philosophy of Man, ed. Ernst Cassierer, Paul Oskar Kristeller, and John Herman Randall, Jr., Phoenix Books, (11th im., Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1948), p. 259.

6. Paul Oskar Kristeller, Renaissance Thought, Harper Torchbooks, The Academy Library, (New York: Haper and Row, Pub., 1961), p. 110.

7. Ibid., p. 111.

8. Ibid., p.110.

9. Ibid., pp. 114-5.

10. Ibid., p. 115.

11. John H. Randall, Jr., "The Development of Scientific Method in the School of Padua", in Renaissance Essays, ed. Paul Oskar Kristeller and Phillip P. Wiener, (New York: Harper Torchbooks, Harper and Row, 1968), p. 220.

12. Fielding H. Garrison, An Introduction to the History of Medicine, (4th ed. rev., Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders Co., 1929), p. 162.

13. P. Duhem, "La tradition de Buridan et la science italienne au XVI siecle", in his Etudes sur Leonard de Vinci, III, Paris, 1913, pp. 113-259, in Paul Oskar Kristeller, Renaissance Thought, (New York: Harper Torchbooks, The Academy Library, Harper and Row, Pub., 1961), p. 164, n. 65.

14. Kristeller, Renaissance Thought, p. 113.

15. J. B. deC. M. Saunders and Charles D. O'Malley, The Illustrations from the Works of Andreas Vesalius of Brussels, (New York: The World Publishing Co., 1950), pp. 15-6.

16. Ibid., p. 16.

17. Ludwig Puster, "The History of the Popes", Evans, F. I. Antrobus et al, London and St. Louis, 1898-1953, XVII, 331, in William J. Bowsma, Venice and the Defense of Republican Life, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968), p. 122.

18. Jacobus Facciolatus, "Fasti Gymnasii, Patavini", Padua: 1757, p. 222, in Gweneth Whitteridge, William Harvey: and the Circulation of the Blood, (New York: American Elsevier Inc., 1971), pp. 13-4.

19. Muratori, in Hastings Rashdall, The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages, ed. F. M. Powicke and A. B. Emden, (new ed., London: Oxford University Press, 1958), p. 237, n. 3.

20. Gweneth Whitteridge, William Harvey: and the Circulation of the Blood, (New York: American Elsevier Inc., 1971), p. 9.

21. Bowsma, op. cit., p. 86.

22. Patricia Hochschild, "Bernardo Giustiniani, A Venetian of the Quattrocento", unpublished doctoral dissertation, Cambridge, Mass., 1957, 18-9, in Bowsma, op. cit., p. 86.

23. Garrison, op. cit., p. 194.

24. Ralph H. Major, A History of Medicine, (Oxford: Blackwell Scientific Publications, 1954), I, 375.

25. Ibid., pp. 374-5.

26. Andrew Halliday Douglas, The Philosophy and Psychology of Pietro Pomponazzi, ed. Charles Douglas and R. P. Hardie, (Hildesheim, Germany: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1962), p. 2.

27. Ernst Cassierer, "The Individual and the Cosmos in Renaissance Philosophy", trans. Mario Domandi, (Oxford: 1963), p. 108, in William Bowsma, Venice and the Defense of Republican Life, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968), p. 163.

28. Major, op. cit., p. 377.

29. Ibid., p. 377.

30. Ibid., pp. 377-8.

31. Frederick F. Cartwright, Disease and History, (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1972), pp. 58-9.

32. Major, op. cit., p. 378.

33. Ibid., pp. 379-80.

34. Jerome Cardan, The Book of my Life, (De Vita Propria Liber), trans. Jean Stoner, (New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., Inc., 1930), p. xiii.

35. Anna Robeson Burr, "The Autobiography", (Boston: Hughton Mifflin Co., 1909), in Jerome Cardan, The Book of my Life, (De Vita Propria Liber), trans. Jean Stoner, (New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., Inc., 1930), pp. xii-xiii.

36. Cardan, op. cit., p. viii.

37. Ibid., p. viii.

38. Saunders and O'Malley, op. cit., p. 16.

39. Ibid., p. 14.

40. Ibid., p. 16.

41. Ibid., p. 16.

42. Ibid., p. 16.

43. Major, op. cit., p. 404.

44. Saunders and O'Malley, op. cit., p. 22.

45. Ibid., p. 22.

46. Ibid., pp. 22-3.

47. Ibid., p. 13.

48. Major, op. cit., pp. 410-2.

49. Ibid., p. 412.

50. J. B. deC. M. Saunders, "Andreas Vesalius, 1564-1964 -- His Work and Inspiration", Journal of the American Medical Association, Vol. 192, No. 2, April 12, 1965, p. 127.

51. Ibid., p. 127.

52. Ibid., p. 127.

53. Major, op. cit., p. 414.

54. Henry E. Sigerist, The Great Doctors, trans. Eden and Cedar Paul, (New York: Dover Publishing Inc., 1917), p. 141.

55. Andreas Vesalius, De humani corporis fabrica, Basle, 1543, praefatio, F* 2 verso, in J. B. deC. M. Saunders, "Andreas Vesalius, 1564-1964 -- His Work and Inspiration", Journal of the American Medical Association, Vol. 192, No. 2, April 12, 1965, p. 130.

56. Ibid., p. 127.

57. Ibid., p. 127.

58. Ibid., p. 128.

59. John Herman Randall, Jr., "The Development of Scientific Method in the School of Padua", Journal of the History of Ideas, Vol. I, 1940, p. 177.

60. Ibid., p. 177.

61. Ibid., pp. 177-8.

62. Ibid., p. 178.

63. Encyclopaedia Britannica, (9th ed., Philadelphia; J. M. Stoddart & Co., 1876), VIII, 454.

64. Foster Watson, Juan Luis Vives, El Gran Valenciano, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, Humphrey Milford, 1922), p. 17.

65. Richard Copley Christie, Etienne Dolet: The Martyr of the Renaissance, (London: McMillan and Co., 1880), p. 137.

66. W. A. Coupe, J. A. Scott and R. W. Truman, The Continental Renaissance 1500-1600, ed. A. J. Krailsheimer, (Baltimore: Penguin Books, Inc., 1971), p. 302.

67. Britannica, op. cit., XXIII, 902.

68. Ibid., p. 902.

69. Coupe, Scott and Truman, op. cit., p. 88.

70. Hastings Rashdall, The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages, ed. F. M. Powicke and A. B. Emden, (new ed., London: Oxford University Press, 1936), I, 18-9.

71. Friedrich Heer, The Medieval World, trans. Janet Sondheimer, A Mentor Book, (New York: New American Library, 1961), p. 247.

72. Rashdall, op. cit., II, 143.

73. d'Irsay, op. cit., p. 132.

74. Ibid., p. 131, n. 4.

75. Heer, op. cit., p. 250.

76. Ibid., p. 250.

77. Ibid., p. 247.

78. Nicolas de Baye, I, 124, in d'Irsay, op. cit., p. 207.

79. Dr. C. A. E.r Wickersheimer, La Medecine et les Medecins en France, A l'époque de la Renaissance, (Paris: A.Maloine, Editeur, 1905), pp. 76-7.

80. Saunders and O'Malley, op. cit., p. 13.

81. Douglas, op. cit., pp. 10-3.

82. Saunders and O'Malley, op. cit., p. 13.

83. Ibid., p. 13.

84. Ibid., pp. 12-3.

85. Ibid., p. 13.

86. Ibid., pp. 12-3.

87. Major, op. cit., pp. 420-2.

88. Whitteridge, op. cit., p. 37, n. 3.

89. Ibid., pp. 6-7.

90. Saunders and O'Malley, op. cit., p. 13.

91. François Rabelais, Pantagruel, trans. Sir Thomas Urquart and Peter Motteux, (Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., William Benton Pub., 1952), chap. VIII, p. 82.

92. Ibid., p. 82.

93. Ibid., p. 82.

94. Ibid., p. 29.

95. Ibid., p. 29.

96. Ibid., p. 30.

97. Coupe, Scott and Truman, op. cit., pp. 21-2.

98. Crane Brinton, John B. Christopher and Robert Lee Wolff, A History of Civilization, (8th print., Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1958), I, 453.

99. Erasmus, The Enchiridion, trans. Ford Lewis Battles, in Advocates of Reform from Wycliff to Erasmus, ed. Matthew Spinka, (London, 1953), in Desiderius Erasmus, Christian Humanism and the Reformation, ed. J. Colin, (New York: Harper Torchbook ed., Harper & Row, pub., 1965), p. 9.

100. Desiderius Erasmus, Christian Humanism and the Reformation, trans. and ed. J. C. Colin, (New York: Harper Torchbook ed., Harper & Row, pub., 1965), p. 11.

101. Coupe, Scott and Truman, op. cit., p. 390.

102. Ibid., p. 390.

103. Brinton, Christopher and Wolff, op. cit., I, 496.

104. Documents of the Christian Church, ed. Henry Bettenson, (New York, 1947), pp. 265, 270-1, in Brinton, Christopher and Wolff, op. cit., pp. 498-9.

105. Ibid., p. 499.

106. Erasmus, "Letter to Jodocus Jonas on Luther", op. cit., pp. 152-3.

107. Ibid., p. 154, n. 4.

108. Ibid., p. 154.

109. Ibid., p. 158.

110. Ibid., p. 159.

111. Lucien Febre, "Luther's Destiny", in Early Modern Europe: 1450 - 1650, ed. Norman F. Cantor and Michael S. Werthman, (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1967), p. 79.

112. Ibid., p. 79.

113. Ibid., p. 80.

114. Conrad Celtis, "Public Oration Delivered in the University of Ingoldstadt", trans. Leonard Foster, in The Renaissance and the Reformation 1300-1600, ed. Donald Weinstein, (2nd print., New York: The Free Press, 1965), p. 122.

115. Ibid., p. 124.

116. Brinton, Christopher and Wolff, op. cit., pp. 502-3.

117. E. B. Bax, The Peasant's War in Germany, (New York: 1899), pp. 68-9, in Brinton, Christopher and Wolff, op. cit., pp. 502-3.

118. Roland H. Bainton, The Reformation of the Sixteenth Century, (8th print., Boston: The Beacon Press, 1962), p. 100.

119. Ibid., p. 102.

120. Ibid., p. 106.

121. Ibid., p. 106.

122. Ibid., p. 107.

123. Pieter Geyl, The Revolt of the Netherlands (1555-1609), (New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1958), p. 56.

124. Ibid., p. 62.

125. George Sarton, "The Quest for Truth: Scientific Progress During the Renaissance", in The Renaissance: Six Essays, (New York: Harper Torchbooks, The Academy Library, Harper and Row Pub., 1962), p. 62.

126. "The Theory of Witch-Persecution", ed. George L. Burr, in Original Sources of European History, Trans. and Reprints, (Philadelphia: The Department of History of the University of Pennsylvania, 1897), Vol. III, No. 4, p. 2.

127. Ibid., pp. 2-3.

128. Ibid., p. 4.

129. Ibid., p. 5.

CHAPTER II

A) The Life and Medical Works of Johan Weyer

1. Childhood

Zilboorg states that as one studies the life and peruses the writings of Weyer, one gains the impression that a new man, a new type of individual, has entered upon the scene of medicine and medical philosophy.[1] What made Weyer different, if indeed he was different? What influenced and shaped his personality during his formative years? These are important questions which cannot be answered with certainty for little, if anything, is known of his early life. This biography is an attempt to trace some influences that appear to have made an impact on young Weyer.

Johan Weyer* was born to Theodor Weyer and his wife, Agnes, née Rhordam, late in 1515 or early in 1516. His father was a native of Zeedam but at the time of Johan's birth lived in Grave on the Meuse in northern Brabant.[2] Of his father we know only that he was a wholesale merchant dealing in coal, hops and slate.

Little is known of the young Johan other than that he had two brothers named Arnold and Matthias. It is very likely that all three boys attended one of the

---

* One finds Weyer's name spelled in several fashions: Wier, Weier, Wier, Wierus, and the Latin Piscinarius derived from Wier. Both his main work, the German version of De Praestigiis Daemonum, and his Artzney-Buch are signed Johan Weyer and his sons, as well, continued to spell the name the same way.

community schools which had sprung into being as the steady increase in the number of merchants, shopkeepers and haberdashers required some mastery in reading, writing and simple arithmetic.

There is a very good reason to believe that in the towns of the sixteenth century rudimentary education was provided on a fairly large scale, either through private instruction or community schools.

> We know of a municipal ordinance dealing with the community schools in Zwickau (Saxony), that recommended that certain students be selected who would be capable of learning Latin, while the others would pursue their studies no further.... The content of this first level of instruction was based on practical considerations. Once the child had mastered the rudiments of reading, he was given texts which taught him all that he had to know....The contract of a schoolmaster of a small German town in 1544, fixed fees that the students were to pay in order to learn how to read and write; for those who wanted, in addition to learn how to count and to write a clerkly hand, the rates were to be negotiated by the master and the parents.[3]

It is very probable that young Johan attended one of the above-mentioned schools prior to being sent to J. H. Colen's famous trilingual school[4] "Herzogenbusch". Records indicate that Johan was an intelligent and able student.[5] Many merchants of the sixteenth century, out of necessity, were polyglots, but they were not in command of Latin, which was still the exclusive language of scholars and humanists. Johan was well versed in Greek and Roman classical literature, as well as in Hebrew, and had considerable knowledge of the Scriptures, as is evident from his writings. That Weyer was a pious Christian is evident from both his conduct and his writings. Schools seasoned their lessons with a "bit of moral instruction in the form of a

catechism, which took the place of more formal religious instruction".[6]

> In this century "which wanted to believe", humanity could not but submit to the domination of an omnipresent religion, which dictated how each individual was to order his life and affected his way of viewing the world....God's name appeared in all documents. Every letter of exchange, without exception, began with the words Laus Deo; charter parties never mentioned a ship without adding, "May God protect it."...Business success, familial well being, escaping a shipwreck or a plague unscathed - and good fortune was always attributed to the intervention of God and His Son, His holy Mother and His saints. It goes without saying that the fear of Hell was a very important element in this faith.[7]

It is reasonable to assume that Weyer was raised by pious, conventional churchgoing parents, a pattern he adhered to all his life. Weyer often wrote about how true Christians ought to behave. When speaking of the humanity Sultan Saladin extended to prisoners of the Crusades, Weyer exclaims: "If only Christian cities could teach the kindness of a barbarian...!"[8]

Jeannin stresses:

> Traditional religious beliefs were still strong, one hesitates to speak of a secularization of culture (although such things as the widening gap between the Christian ideal and political realities or the humanization of art, particularly in its sources of inspiration, do indeed point in this direction.)[9]

The belief of a world peopled with demons was still accepted as a reality. Weyer was no exception; he seems to accept the devil as inferential. The word "devil" was used as a byword in the sixteenth century, just as we use "virus" or "infection" today. It denoted a number of obscure concepts and a still greater number of things of the nature of which man was totally ignorant.[10]

Practices rejected by Erasmus and his humanist followers, such as relics,

cults devoted to saints and pilgrimages, still dominated the religious life of merchants.[11] Weyer was a merchant's son and, as Jeannin points out, the sixteenth century merchant was extremely devoted to his family...for the family, the guardian par excellence of tradition, was to a large extent identified with the firm.[12] It would be naive to expect that all merchants' families fit one mold, yet general information is helpful in trying to understand Weyer as a man of his time and his class. Weyer's gentle, kind, courageous and tolerant personality traits suggest that he was brought up in a warm secure family atmosphere. Also Weyer's respect for, and understanding of, women suggests a close and healthy relationship with a mother, or mother figure during his childhood.

Obviously not enough information is available about Johan Weyer and his parents to draw a definite conclusion about environmental influences on his personality. Yet the information available regarding merchants' lives during Weyer's lifetime helps to throw some light on what his young years might have been like.

2. The Beginning of Weyer's Medical Education

In the summer of 1532, Weyer at age seventeen became Agrippa's private student in order to prepare himself for admission to the University of Paris. Weyer calls Agrippa "mein Lehrer und Hausherr".[13] Binz interprets the relationship as that of the son of a well-to-do merchant, and a teacher in dire need of money. "...to be able to send one's son to the university, and, in addition, to provide him with a first rate preceptor...was a sign of great wealth."[14]

The reasons why Agrippa was chosen preceptor by Theodor Weyer are not known, nor is it known why Agrippa consented to accept the responsibility of taking young Weyer as a private student and providing him with room and board, (a custom widely practiced at the time). There is no doubt that Agrippa was a well-known man, one of the most learned of his age, and an able physician; therefore was he not an ideal choice as preceptor for young Weyer who wanted to become a physician? Agrippa also had a doctoral degree in law and theology. "Only a handful of his contemporaries had a reputation for erudition and boldness of thought and expression that could be compared to Agrippa's...."[15]

Theodor Weyer's selection of Agrippa as preceptor for his son throws some light on Weyer's father, of whom so little is known. The raging controversy over Agrippa's work De vanitate, published in 1531, apparently was not disturbing to him, as it was to so many of his contemporaries; otherwise he would not have entrusted his son to him. De vanitate is an elaboration of Agrippa's denial of the power of human reason to achieve truth. It is also an attack on the occult sciences and their authorities, as well as a denunciation of abuses in contemporary society, both secualr and ecclesiastical. De occulta philosophia was written when he was young and fascinated with occultism; De vanitate was written twenty-one years later when Agrippa, influenced by Florentine mysticism, had turned away from occultism. What stirred the controversy was that both books were printed and published at the same time. Agrippa was again accused of being a sorcerer.[16]

Dominican hatred of Agrippa dated from the time when, as advocate of the

city of Metz, (1518), he had successfully defended innocent victims from the accusations of the implacable Dominican, Nicolas Savin. These were the turbulent years of Luther's Reformation. It was in Metz that the Reformation tried to gain a foothold in France, which created much hostility and unrational behavior.[17] Agrippa was forced to leave Metz; Savin had his revenge.

Witch persecution started in the fifteenth century as a reaction against threatening signs of the growing social and political instability of the established order, not just as a psychopathological bent in theology. The church and the state reacted with a sort of "persecutory mania". All opposing forces, regardless of their origin, were labeled and cussed as being the devil, a rationalization well adapted to the tradition of the day.

> One of the earliest books which throws light upon the methods of the persecutions is the Formicarius, or "Ant-Hill", of the Dominican theological professor, Johannes Nider... about 1437... its fifth and final book is devoted to "witches and their deceptions."[18]... Despite the efforts of the Dominicans, it was with much difficulty that the new terror of witchcraft and the persecution based on it were spread throughout Europe. In Germany, especially, the Inquisition charged with the task found themselves hampered by skepticism. In 1484, therefore, they turned their steps toward Rome for help,... they won from the Pope, Innocent VIII, a bull which once for all closed the mouths of doubters and compelled the cooperation of the German authorities, both ecclesiastical and lay...[19] even when armed with the papal bull, the German Inquisitors found their preparation incomplete. Immediately on their return from Rome they set themselves at the compilation of a hand-book which should leave no judge an excuse for laxity - an exposition of witchcraft and a code of procedure for the detection and punishment of witches... called Malleus Maleficarum.[20]

The Malleus became the standard text for witch persecutions for more than two centuries.

Weyer stayed with Agrippa from the summer of 1532 until the beginning of 1534, when he was admitted to the University of Paris to pursue his medical studies.[21] Agrippa had many friends and admirers who had helped him or protected him on various occasions, so at this time, by the end of 1532, he lived in a comfortable home in a nice neighborhood in Bonn.[22] Little is known about Weyer's relationship with his famous teacher other than that Weyer at all times spoke respectfully of his master, refuting all wild legends which had been circulated about him.[23] One senses some of the excitement young Weyer must have felt upon discovering and copying in secrecy Trithemius' Steganographia, an unpublished work on occult knowledge.[24] Young Weyer appears to have been less bothered by this work than the Congregation of the Index which forbade its publication.[25] Of the sorcerers mentioned in the book he dryly remarks, "They must have made light [laughing] of these wild pretentions of having power over spirits, being able to obscure the stars, and make the elements work in their favor."[26]

The relationship between student and teacher appears to have been a complementary one. By creating a propitious intellectual climate, Agrippa provided an ideal situation for the development of a young, intelligent, questioning mind. Later, as a physician, Weyer continuously formulated new questions and tried to find possible answers; indeed he was a keen observer, able to apply gained knowledge in practice. Agrippa's teaching fell on fertile ground; Weyer

became an outspoken opponent of witchcraft persecution and his main work is De Praestigiis Daemonum.

From Wyer we learn that Agrippa sometimes did not leave his warm study for eight days, yet still was very well informed of what was going on, for he received letters from learned men every day.[27] To walk Agrippa's dogs on a leash appears to have been frequently Weyer's duty.[28] Later, when Agrippa was accused of living with a devil disguised as a black dog, Weyer simply stated, "I cannot say enough how astonished I am, that men of importance can think, talk and write such nonsense, based on stupid gossip."[29]

Years later Weyer himself was accused of being a sorcerer and one of Satan's subjects. This accusation was based on the fact that Weyer was a pupil of Agrippa, (accused by the Dominicans of being the greatest sorcerer of his time),[30] and had Weyer not admitted to having Agrippa's dog on a leash? This accusation was not made by some confused ordinary man, but by Jean Bodin, a contemporary of Weyer, with the reputation of a great lawyer. This indeed reveals a great deal about the prevailing "Zeitgeist". One can appreciate the difficulty of educating the public when learned men themselves were so confused. Or was it simply a convenient method to deaden an unwelcome opponent's voice?

Early in 1534, Weyer left Bonn for Paris but stayed only a few months before moving on to Orléans.[31] According to Zilboorg, Weyer was employed to look after the sons and the nephew of the Queen of Navarre, whom he followed to Orléans.[32] Binz mentioned that Weyer went to Orléans to become a preceptor of the King's private physician's (Natalis Ramard) two sons and a grandson.

Neither Zilboorg nor Binz gives the source of the information. When Weyer returned to Paris the boys were with him. Weyer received his doctoral degree from the University of Orléans in 1537.[33] What Weyer did during the next eight years is unknown.*

3. Johan Weyer's Years as a Physician

In 1545 we find Weyer employed as a physician of the city of Arnheim, the chief town in the Province of Guelderland. Arnheim's financial situation was so weak that it could not pay Weyer's salary of 100 Carolus Gulden. Emperor Charles V added 18 Reiter Gulden, and the rest was made up by wealthy citizens. By 1550 the financial situation of the city was even worse and the position of city physician could no longer be supported.[34] Weyer found himself without work, and the city of Arnheim without a physician for a full year. The financial ruin of the city was the result of the decades of contest over Guelderland by the House of Austria and Count Charles of Egmont, a native of Guelderland.[35]

Duke William of Jülich-Clèves-Berg, who for a short time was also Duke of Guelderland, asked Weyer to become his court physician. Protestantism gave princes greater independence; therefore Duke William for a while considered

---

* The eight years after Weyer's graduation remain a puzzle. A misunderstanding that Weyer had left for a long trip was created by Melchoir Adam's short Vita printed in Weyer's complete edition of 1660. A translation error started the misunderstanding. Book II, Chapter XV reads: "I have seen Tunis... I remember Fez...." The translator took these for Weyer's own statements, whereas Weyer was describing Johannes Leo's trip.

entering the Smalkalden League which had become the bulwark of German Protestantism,[36] but the Emperor discouraged him from doing so.

With peace reestablished, Duke William of Jülich-Clèves-Berg had ambitious plans for his people, such as establishing a school system, improving the judiciary system, and upgrading administration by attracting intelligent and able men to his court.[37] Weyer was one of the new men the duke employed as his private physician. Very likely the duke knew Weyer from his work in Arnheim. The duke's decision to employ Weyer was a very wise one for both parties involved. "The duke was an enlightened man who not only approved of Weyer's increasingly liberal views, but on many occasions gave him active support."[38]

Weyer remained in this position for thirty years and with the duke's protection was reasonably safe in writing his main work, De Praestigiis Daemonum, a book of great scholarship containing not only medico-psychological details, but also judicial, theological and historical information. He dedicated this work, published in 1563, to Duke William.

With so many of its members falling prey to heresy in the Netherlands, France and Germany the Catholic Church started its Counter-Reformation. Refusing to compromise on theological questions with Protestants, it supported the old dogmas. Many abuses of practice were censured and as protection from Protestant ideology an Index was prepared, listing books which Catholics should not read. The ecclesiastical court of the Inquisition was given power to punish delinquents for lapses of faith and conduct.

With the publication of De Praestigiis Daemonum, Weyer's name was put on the Index as an auctores primae classis, but even when his name was put on the list of auctores secundae classis, the reading of his main work remained forbidden. In 1590, his status was reverted to auctores primae classis and remained there until removed only at the beginning of the twentieth century.[39]

Not all Catholics were in agreement with the decision to put Weyer's name on the Index. The book was immensely popular and was already reprinted in 1564, by Oporinus in Basel. This edition has a printed note of approval, written by the Benedictine Abbot of Hovaeus at Echternach and two physicians, Ronsseus in Gouda and Ewich in Duisburg.[40] The name of the abbot is only signed with his initials. "I prefer to conceal the name of this very learned, virtuous and highly respected theologian, in order not to provoke those theologians that take pride in adorning themselves with titles and hats."[41] One can easily read the confusion, frustration, anxiety, threat and hostility of Weyer's time between the lines.

The third edition was printed in 1556; this new edition also has a printed statement of approval by a preacher, Karl Gallus in Hamm, and the lawyer Kaspar Barchtold. The latter sent his statement to the "herzoglich braunschweigischen Rat".[42]

A German translation of De Praestigiis by J. Fuglin, Von den Teuffeln, Zaubern, Schwartzkunstlern, Teuffelsbeschwereren, Hexen, oder Unholden und Giftbereitern, was published in Frankfurt, 1566. Weyer was unhappy with Fuglin's translation, which he claimed to be inaccurate. By 1567,

his own translation into German was published in an effort to make it available to as many readers as possible. Weyer was as much an educator as a physician. This edition gives no name of the printer nor the place where it was printed.[43] In 1568, and again in 1577, new editions of De Praestigiis were published. This time another statement of approval was added by a physician, Theodor Zwinger in Basel, a nephew of Oporinus the printer. The printing of the last edition occurred in 1583.[44]

In 1577, his work De Ira Morbo, (disease of wrath), and its philosophical, medical and theological cure, was published. Weyer dedicated it to the Duke of Neuenahr, Moers, und Bedburg.[45] The Pseudomonarchia Daemonum was published the same year. This work contains various descriptions of Satan as perceived by men in present and past times. Binz interprets it as Weyer's attempt to write a satire on man's incredible gullibility. De Pseudomonarchia was incorporated in his main work, De Praestigiis, in its fifth edition. The publication of all these books tells us clearly that Weyer, from the beginning of his appointment as private physician to Duke William, was primarily concerned with patients suffering from mental disease. Weyer was fully aware that to be able to help these patients he first must demonstrate that they were ill, not criminals. It was impossible to approach the problem of mental disease without dealing with daemonology and the Inquisition. The wars between Catholics and Protestants and the resulting suspicion of each other was fertile soil for witchcraft to thrive on.

Weyer's books indicate that he was a relentless, compassionate worker,

defending innocent patients, educating the public and its dukes to whom he dedicated his works; yet daemonology did not disappear in his time. The widespread fear of witches caused their persecution, and the fear of persecution was at least partly responsible for the mass psychosis which reached epidemic proportion. From the comments in support of Weyer printed in each additional edition of De Praestigiis, we learn that Weyer was not the only one pleading that reason should prevail, but those who were courageous enough to support him officially were few when compared with those who disapproved. His courage to speak up reminds one of a candle burning fearlessly in a dark, cold and stormy night.

Weyer's writings were not exclusively devoted to medico-psychological topics, for he was also an accomplished clinician. De commentitiis jejuniis, a small treatise on a case of supposed miraculous fasting, was printed in 1577, and again in 1582. It is not only a beautiful demonstration of Weyer's ability to observe, but also a description of how Weyer's family became involved in diagnosing this case.[46] It is written in a respectful, but delightfully humorous way. De Lamiis Liber, a small abstract of his main work, was published in 1577, and dedicated to Duke Arnold von Bentheim-Tecklenburg.[47] In 1582, it was reprinted combined with De commentitiis jejunis.[48]

Weyer's best known medical text is his Artzney-Büch, written in German and published in 1580. It is dedicated to the widowed Duchess Anna of Bentheim-Tecklenburg.[49] That this work was also popular is evident from its reprint three years later, and again in 1588, the year of Weyer's death.

A small treatise, Medicarum Observationum rararum Liberi, was published in 1567, and reprinted in 1588. It is dedicated to Antonius Hovaeus, Benedictine Abbot in Eternach, a lifetime friend of Weyer, who wrote the supporting statement for Weyer's first edition of De Praestigiis.[50] Weyer's Opera omnia was published in Frankfurt in 1660. It contains mainly abstracts from his other works and has no index and preface.[51]

Weyer certainly found himself in a difficult situation, but for his protector the political situation was even more precarious. Educated according to Erasmian principles, the Duke believed in the Catholic Church and wished to keep the Church united in his land. It was therefore with growing concern that he followed the proliferation of Protestant sects. The Duke's firm conviction that it is an individual's right to decide for himself in religious questions made him decide that members of sects be permitted to live in his territory so long as they kept quiet and did not become a public nuisance. While attending the meeting of the Reichstag in 1555, Duke William became well acquainted with the Protestant princes, and he sympathized with many of their views. After he returned from the Reichstag he planned to instigate a reform based on Erasmian principles.

The Duke's conservative approach might not have been entirely his free choice. He was married to a Habsburg, the daughter of Emperor Ferdinand I. He also must have remembered the Geldric War with Charles V when, after the death of childless Count Egmont, young William of Jülich-Clèves-Berg, (at Egmont's wishes), was also made Duke of Guelderland. Charles V, not disposed to give up his rights secured by the treaty of Gorinchen, fought William and made

him surrender his claims of Guelderland in 1543. This War had done great damage to the country.

Duke William must have felt all these pressures when, on his way to the Reichstag in 1566, he suffered a stroke that left him partly paralyzed and at times emotionally disturbed.[52] Weyer was ordered to be at the duke's disposal at all times. This close relationship with the ailing duke was the reason that Weyer became involved in political decision making. The Duke of Alba saw in Weyer a dangerous enemy and suggested that Weyer be removed as the duke's private physician. One can appreciate the difficult situation in which Weyer suddenly found himself. Contrary to the Duke of Alba's recommendation, Weyer remained in his position as court physician, but efforts by officials loyal to Spain were made to reduce Weyer's influence on the duke's decision making. In 1568, the Duke of Alba sent Johann Baptista von Taxis to Duke William's court to observe and to report any individuals suspected of heresy or openly antagonistic toward Spain. The aging duke was upset and protested through his counsel to Brussels, but to no avail. Around 1580, only a handful of individuals still opposed the Spaniards, among them the duke's unmarried sister, his two daughters and Weyer.[53] It must indeed have been a very sad day in Weyer's life when, after an absence of twenty years, witch persecution was resumed in the province of Jülich-Clèves-Berg in 1581. The aging duke under all these pressures became increasingly mentally disturbed, and it is believed that in order to get the duke's signature to authorize persecution somebody actually guided his hand.[54] In the year of Weyer's death in 1588, Cardinal Granvelle

wrote: "The Catholic religion should defend itself...but it will achieve the better results by preaching, by the reforme of discipline and the good example of the clergy...."[55]

The choice of Weyer as his court physician was a wise one made by Duke William; the two men were of the same age and had much in common. During the thirty years that Weyer was at the Duke's court they developed a very satisfactory relationship of trust and mutual respect.

Also Weyer's wives showed an interest in his work and, as mentioned by Weyer, sometimes assisted in his work.

Weyer was married twice. His first wife was Judith Wintgens; she died in 1572. Of his second wife Henriette Holt, Weyer proudly stated that being a good Christian she was free of all superstition. By his first marriage Weyer had four sons and a daughter: Theodor, Heinrich, Galenus, Johannes and Sophie.[56] With the effects of the Dutch Rebellion and the Counter-Reformation affecting his life so adversely, it is a consoling thought to know that Weyer had children he was fond and proud of.

Theodor, his oldest son called "Dietrich", became a lawyer. He studied in Geneva, Padua, Bologna, Paris and Cologne. He later on was a legal advisor in Kurpfalz and was sent as an ambassador to France, England and Denmark. In 1575, he was made governor of Kaiserslautern.

The second son, Heinrich, studied medicine. With his older brother Theodor he attended the same universities at the same time.[57] He practiced medicine first in Lemgo, then in Cologne and in 1570, he became private

physician to the Duke of Coblenz and Treves. From an entry in the medical Decanatsbuch 1491-1624,[58] we find a report dated August 2, 1565, in which the firing of Heinrich Weyer, Privat Dozent is mentioned. The reason for this drastic step is discussed. The medical faculty at the University of Cologne had the reputation of being very conservative and traditional. Heinrich was accused of deviating too much from traditional teachings of medicine, and more specifically he did not adhere to Aristotle's and Galen's teachings.

The third son Galenus, (whose name indicates that somebody in the family showed respect to Galen), also studied medicine at the universities of Florence, Padua and Montpellier, and became private physician to Duke William's son Johann Wilhelm. We hear of Galenus in an autopsy report after the young Duchess Jacoba, (wife of Johann Wilhelm),[59] was poisoned.

The youngest of Weyer's sons became a landowner, (gentleman farmer). From a letter mailed to the Count of Berg, we learn that his home and property had repeatedly been burglarized, his tenants robbed and his cattle abducted. According to Johannes these crimes were committed by Count Berg's soldiers and he asked the Count, who was an admirer of his father, to protect him from these marauding soldiers.[60]

Weyer died in February, 1588, in Tecklenburg, where he was called for medical advice when the duchess became ill. He was buried in the chapel of Tecklenburg Castle. The church has since disappeared and so has his grave. The disappearance of his grave is symbolic of the disappearance of his name for nearly two centuries.

It is always helpful to reevaluate labels given by historians; they do not always give credit where credit is due, and sometimes lavish recognition on those who may not deserve it. Such was the case with Weyer and Paracelsus, who were contemporaries. There is no doubt that Weyer's contributions by far surpassed those of Paracelsus, especially when measured by their respective applicability to their time, and in their ability to improve the quality of life. Zilboorg's statement that a new man, a new type of individual has entered upon the scene of medicine and medical philosophy, is only partly true. Johan Weyer was still a traditional Galenist; what makes him different from past and contemporary physicians is that he had the "right" blend of humanism and naturalism so helpful in his pioneer work in psychiatry.

B) The Life and Medical Works of Pietro Pomponazzi

Pietro Pomponazzi was born at Mantua on September 16, 1462, to Giovanni Pomponazzi.[61] His father's surname* originated from the name of a village in the Mantuan "cantada", and his family for two hundred years had enjoyed the protection of the house of Gonzaga.[62] Nothing is known of his mother's family nor where Pietro grew up. Of his father it is known that we was a professor of astrology at the University of Bologna,[63] and since astrology was a subject taught in medical schools he may well have been a physician. One can assume that Pietro spent some of his youth in Bologna. The house of Gonzaga belonged to the sovereignty of the Duke of Este, distinguished patron of literature and art who, as the head of the Guelf party, received at different periods the sovereignty of Ferrara, Modena, and Reggio, (location of Mantua).

Pietro studies medicine at the University of Padua, receiving his doctoral degree in 1487, at the age of twenty-five. Soon after he was named extraordinary professor of philosophy at Padua and became professor ordinarius in 1495.

Pomponazzi's teaching career at Padua was interrupted by a political play of alliances quite worthy of the age of Machiavelli. Louis XII, to make sure that his invasion of Italy would be successful, formed the League of Cambrai, (1508),

---

* One finds Pomponazzi's name spelled in different fashions: Pietro Pomponacci, Petrus Pomponaccius, Pierre Pomponace, Petrus (Mantuanus) Pomponaciis, Pietro (di Mantova) Pomponazzi, Petri Pomponatii.

with Ferdinand of Aragon, Pope Julius II, and the Emperor Maximilian as patrons, against the rich but militarily weak Republic of Venice.[65]

The members agreed that they would divide the lands the Venetians held in the lower Po Valley. All went as desired at first, but the members of this league did not trust each other and each one looked for his own advantage only. As soon as Ferdinand had taken the Neopolitan towns he wanted, he deserted Louis. The Pope, frightened that France and the Empire might squeeze him out entirely, quickly formed another "Holy League", (1511), with Venice and Ferdinand, (they were later joined by Henry VIII of England and the Emperor Maximilian), against France and Louis XII was defeated.

Alfonso d'Este, (1486-1534), on the formation of the League of Cambrai was appointed supreme commander of the papal troops by Pope Julius II. After the Venetians had sustained considerable losses they made peace with the Pope and agreed to join him against the French. Alfonso d'Este was invited to cooperate with the new alliance, but when he refused they declared war against him.[66]

Due to these conflicts, the University of Padua was temporarily closed in 1509, and Pomponazzi, a citizen of Mantua and subject to the Duke of Este, went to teach at Ferrara. It was at Ferrara that Pomponazzi's views on De immortalitate animae took final form, yet the treatise was not published until 1516, by which time Pomponazzi was teaching at the University of Bologna where he had moved after only three years at Ferrara.

Pomponazzi was fifty years old when he accepted the position as professor of philosophy at Bologna, (1512), where he remained until his death in 1525.[67]

The same year the city of Bologna was incorporated into the Papal States by Julius II.[68]

When Pomponazzi's best known work, De immortalitate animae, was published by Bononiae at Bologna in 1516, an uproar broke out among the clergy, who persuaded the Patriarch and the Doge of Venice to burn the book and proclaim the author a heretic.[69] A copy of De anima was sent to Pomponazzi's patron, Cardinal Bembo, a former student of Pomponazzi's at Padua, to be condemned in Rome. Bembo declared it free of heresy, and Leo X, (who loved a good fight), encouraged both sides in the controversy.

Pomponazzi was asked to write an Apologia,[70] which was published in 1518 at Bologna. It was a better book than the first, (De anima); Pomponazzi replies with passion, and is prepared to die for its truth. A year later the Reformatori of Bologna reappointed Pomponazzi to his chair for a term of eight years at double the salary.[71]

In 1519, in response to Niphus' voluminous defense of Thomas Aquinas, Pomponazzi wrote a Defensorium.[72] In his work De Fato (III), written about 1520, (Basel, Opera, 1567), Pomponazzi states that a philosopher "...is held up to ridicule by all; is taken as a fool and faithless person; is persecuted by the Inquisition, and is laughed at by the multitude."[73] Pomponazzi was fifty-four when his first work, De anima, was published in 1516, and even though he concluded his essay with the contention that the immortality of the soul, like that of the eternity of the world, is a neutral problem since neither its affirmation nor its denial can be demonstrated by natural reason, he was publicly

attacked by several theologians and philosophers.

Pomponazzi has written other works of equal importance to the De anima but, probably discouraged by the reaction to his first work, did not publish them. De incantationibus and De fato, both written about 1520, were published posthumously by a Protestant in exile in Basel in 1556 and 1557, respectively.[74]

Kristeller points out that a large body of unpublished manuscripts is preserved, and that the most important among them are questions on Aristotelian and other problems.[75] Pomponazzi lived in the very heart of the Renaissance period but he does not appear to have been influenced by the new discovery of Plato, as were Plethon, Marsilio Ficino and Pico della Mirandola.

Platonism and Aristotelianism reached a new phase with the humanistic movement. Ficino, (1433-1499), the Florentine Platonist, in his Theologica platonica, makes an attempt to prove the immortality of the soul. Ficino puts mind over sense,[76] and reasons that because man possesses reason, he is unable to attain happiness, that is, find perfection.[77] This conclusion compromises the perfection of man and contradicts the general ontological principle that no natural desire can be in vain. Ficino, referring to this principle, asserts that the human soul must attain knowledge and enjoyment of God, if not in this life, then in after life.[78] Ficino attacked traditional Averroism with its restricted conception of human nature which minimized all that is personal and individual.[79]

The Paduans opposed this Florentine Platonic Humanism with Aristotelian naturalism fitting well with their scientific interests. Pomponazzi, like Ficino,

dedicates his main work, De anima, to the problem of immortality. He leaves revelation and miracles aside and remains entirely within rational limits in his discussion of immortality. Pomponazzi reasons that in no way, according to Aristotle, does the human intellect have any operation entirely independent of the body,[80] and that there is no reason to assume any higher activity of the human mind which would bring it into contact with purely intelligible entities. Pomponazzi disagrees with Ficino's concept of immortality as a perfect life after death, but replaces it with the concept of a participation in immortality during the present life.[81] Ficino adheres to the conventional opinion that immortality serves to reward virtue and punish vice. Pomponazzi rejects this concept also; he declares reward of virtue to be virtue itself, and punishment of vice to be vice itself.[82]

Pomponazzi rejected Platonic religious modernism and remained an Aristotelian student in the direct line of the scholastic tradition, which earned him the reputation of being the last of the scholastics and the first of the Aristotelians.[83]

Pomponazzi's method of reasoning is that of a scholastic, and not always easy to follow. His style in writing is cut-and-dried and does not have any of the elegance we find in other humanist writers, as for example in Juan Luis Vives' A Fable of Man.[84] He remains an absolutely private person, only the reasoning of a scholar comes through in his writings. It is difficult to picture him as a family man with two children. He was married three times, which was not unusual at a time that accepted death during childbirth as a "normal" risk.

Pomponazzi remained a student all his life, pursuing truth in a quiet scholarly manner. He was a very careful, thorough thinker. Once convinced that his idea was right, he defended it courageously, regardless of the consequences, which subjected him to criticism and censure.

Of his works only the posthumously published Incantationibus was placed on the Index of Prohibited Books because of its implied criticism of miracles.[85] That Pomponazzi's treatise De immortalitate animae was not condemned by the church authorities may at least partly be due to the protection he enjoyed from some of his former students and colleagues at the University of Padua who were now cardinals. The work was dedicated to Cardinal Contarini, godfather of one of Pomponazzi's children. Cardinal Bembo declared he found no offending material in the book. Furthermore, Bologna was located in the papal states and many clergymen attended Pomponazzi's lectures and found nothing offensive in what he taught.

Pomponazzi was a widely respected scholar. When he died one of his pupils, Ercole Gonzaga, brought the remains back home to Mantua and a monument to Pomponazzi was erected there.[86] Ercole Gonzaga later became a cardinal and president of the Council of Trent.[87]

References

CHAPTER II

A) The Life and Medical Works of Johan Weyer

B) The Life and Medical Works of Pietro Pomponazzi

1. Gregory Zilboorg, A History of Medical Psychology, (New York: W .W. Norton & Co., Inc., 1941), p. 207.

2. Carl Binz, Doctor Johan Weyer, (Berlin: Verlag von August Hirschwald, 1896), p. 1.

3. Pierre Jeannin, Merchants of the Sixteenth Century, trans. Paul Fittongoff, (New York: Harper and Row, Pub., 1972), pp. 80-1.

4. Binz, op. cit., p. 1.

5. W. Teschenmacher in his Eulogia vivorum, qui familia, nobilitate... in Binz, Doctor Johan Weyer, p. 1.

6. Jeannin, op. cit., p. 81.

7. Ibid., pp. 129-31.

8. Gregory Zilboorg, The Medical Man and the Witch, (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1935), p. 129.

9. Jeannin, op. cit., p. 129.

10. Zilboorg, A History of Medical Psychology, p. 212

11. Jeannin, op. cit., p. 132.

12. Ibid., p. 123.

13. Binz, op. cit., p. 18.

14. Jeannin, op. cit., p. 114.

15. Charles G. Nauert, Jr., Agrippa and the Crisis of Renaissance Thought, (Urbana: Illinois Studies in the Social Sciences, The University of Illinois Press, 1965), p. 322.

16. Ibid., pp. 208-11.

17. Zilboorg, A History of Medical Psychology, p. 204.

18. George L. Burr (ed.), "The Beginning of the Witch Persecutions", in Original Sources of European History, Trans. and Reprints, (Philadelphia: The Department of History of the University of Pennsylvania, 1897), Vol. III, No. 4, p. 7.

19. Ibid., pp. 7-8.

20. Ibid., p. 10.

21. Binz, op. cit., p. 17.

22. Ibid., p. 18.

23. Johan Weyer, (Opera omnia Amstelodami, 1660), pp. 108-11, 260, 625-29, in Nauert, Jr., Agrippa and the Crisis of Renaissance Thought, p. 323.

24. Binz, op. cit., p. 19.

25. Reusch, Der Index der verbotenen Bücher, 1885, II, 182, in Binz, Doctor Johan Weyer, p. 20.

26. Binz, op. cit., p. 19, (author's translation).

27. Ibid., p. 19.

28. Ibid., p. 18.

29. Ibid., p. 19.

30. Jean Bodin, Refutation des opinions de Jean Wier, in De la demonomanie des sorciers. Antwerp, 1586, p. 375, in Zilboorg, A History of Medical Psychology, pp. 236-7.

31. Zilboorg, A History of Medical Psychology, p. 208.

32. Binz, op. cit., p. 20.

33. Ibid., p. 20.

34. Ibid., p. 23.

35. Encyclopaedia Britannica, (9th ed., Philadelphia, J. M. Stoddart & Co., 1876), II, 544.

36. Britannica, op. cit., V, 360.

37. Binz, op. cit., p. 23.

38. Zilboorg, The Medical Man and the Witch, p. 111.

39. Zilboorg, A History of Medical Psychology, p. 233.

40. Binz, op. cit., p. 183.

41. Ibid., p. 183, (author's translation).

42. Ibid., pp. 183-4.

43. Ibid., p. 183.

44. Ibid., p. 184.

45. Ibid., p. 139.

46. Ibid., pp. 132-9, (author's translation).

47. Ibid., pp. 166, 184, (author's translation).

48. Ibid., p. 184, (author's translation).

49. Ibid., p. 185, (author's translation).

50. Ibid., p. 185, (author's translation).

51. Ibid., p. 185, (author's translation).

52. Ibid., p. 186, (author's translation).

53. Ibid., p. 159, (author's translation).

54. Ibid., p. 168, (author's translation).

55. J. H. Elliot, Europe Divided 1559-1598, (New York: Harper Torchbooks, Harper & Row, Pub., 1969), p. 145.

56. Binz, op. cit., p. 174, (author's translation).

57. Ibid., p. 174, (author's translation).

58. Ibid., p. 174-5, (author's translation).

59. Ibid., p. 177, (author's translation).

60. Ibid., p. 178, (author's translation).

61. Francesco Fiorentino, Studi sulla Rinascenza, Estratto dagli studi su Bernardino Telesio et Pietro Pomponazzi, (Padova: G. B. Paravia and Co., 1934), p. 9.

62. Ibid., p. 9.

63. Mario Emilio, Biographical and Bibliographical Dictionary, of the Italian Humanists and of the World of Classical Scholarship in Italy, 1300-1800, (Boston: G. K. Hall & Co., 1962), p. 1456.

64. Ibid., p. 1456.

65. Crane Brinton, John B. Christopher and Robert Lee Wolff, A History of Civilization, (8th print., Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, 1958), I, 538.

66. Britannica, op. cit., VIII, 492-4.

67. Paul Oskar Kristeller, "Pomponazzi, Pietro", in Encyclopaedia of Philosophy, (New York: The MacMillan Co., and the Free Press, 1967), vol. 6, 393.

68. Britannica, op. cit., VIII, 492-4.

69. John Herman Randall, Jr., Introduction to "On the Immortality of the Soul", in The Renaissance Philosphy of Man, ed. Ernst Cassierer, Paul Oskar Kristeller and John Herman Randall, Jr., Phoenix Books, (11th im., Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1948), pp. 274-5.

70. Apologia Petri Pomponatii Mantuani, (Bologna: 1518), Lib. III, cap. 2, in Randall, op. cit., p. 275.

71. Francesco Fiorentino, Pietro Pomponazzi: Studi storici su la scuola Bolognese et Padovano del secole XVI, (Florence: 1868), p. 38, in Randall, Jr., op. cit., p. 275.

72. Defensorium Petri Pomponatii Mantuani: Petri Pomponatii Mantuani Defensorium sive Responsiones ad ea quae Augustinus Niphus Suessanus adversus ipsum scripsit De immortalitate animae, (Bologna: Dononiae, 1519), in Randall, Jr., op. cit., p. 275.

73. Kristeller, op. cit., p. 392.

74. Ibid., p. 392.

75. Ibid., p. 392.

76. Paul Oskar Kristeller, "Notes and Documents: Ficino and Pomponazzi, on the Place of Man in the Universe", Journal of the History of Ideas, V, (Jan.-Oct., 1944), p. 223.

77. Marsilio Ficino, "Five Questions Concerning the Mind", trans. J. L. Burroughs, in The Renaissance Philosophy of Man, ed. Ernst Cassierer, Paul Oskar Kristeller, and John Herman Randall, Jr., Phoenix Books, (11th im., Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1948), pp. 207-8.

78. Ibid., p. 191.

79. Randall, Jr., op. cit., p. 258.

80. Pietro Pomponazzi, De anima, Book iii, text 39, in Randall, Jr., op. cit., p. 287.

81. Kristeller, "...Ficino and Pomponazzi...", Journal of the History of Ideas, V, (Jan.-Oct., 1944), p. 223.

82. Ibid., pp. 223-4.

83. Andrew Halliday Douglas, The Philosophy and Psychology of Pietro Pomponazzi, ed. Charles Douglas and R. P. Hardie, (Hildesheim, Germany: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1962), p. 2.

84. Joannis Ludovici Vivis Valentini, Opera omnia, (Valentiae: 1783), in "Fable About Man", trans. Nancy Lenkeith, in The Renaissance Philosophy of Man, ed. Ernst Cassierer, Paul Oskar Kristeller, and John Herman Randall, Jr., Phoenix Books, (11th im., Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1948), p. 387.

85. Kristeller, "Pomponazzi Pietro...", in Encyclopaedia of Philosophy, vol. 6, p. 393.

86. Ibid., p. 395.

87. Ibid., p. 395.

CHAPTER III

PIETRO POMPONAZZI: Philosopher, Physician and Scientist

Pomponazzi earned a doctoral degree in medicine, which was customary for teachers of philosophy in his time. The Faculty of Arts at Padua, unlike that at Paris, offered only a degree in medicine; the teaching of Aristotle, therefore, centered around his physical writings, his natural history and his scientific methodology. Until the appearance of Gianbattista da Monte, (1498-1552), who reintroduced clinical teaching, and Andreas Vesalius who reemphasized the need for comprehensive medical care, the medical profession was predominantly a philosophical occupation.

Influenced by his professor of metaphysics, Francesco di Nardò, Pomponazzi became a Thomist and as a student had already distinguished himself in discussions against the Averroistic pupils of Vernia.[1] With the succession of great teachers, Paul of Venice, (d. 1428), Cajetanus of Thiene, (d. 1465), and Nicolettus Vernia, (d. 1499), the University of Padua in the fifteenth century became known as the center in which ideas from all Europe were combined into a cumulative body of knowledge.[2] From the time of its introduction in Western Europe, Latin Averroism caused conflicts with Christian doctrines. During Pomponazzi's time, under the influence of Florentine Platonism and the humanistic emphasis on the dignity of man, Averroism again came under sharp

criticism. Vernia and Niphus, (1473-1546), were its last defenders and, under pressure from the humanist bishop at Padua, they abandoned some of the crudities of Averroes' view on the nature of man by either withdrawing Averroes' opinions, or by altering them so that they were beyond recognition.[3]

Padua provided a system whereby every professor was matched with an antagonist or concurrens of different views who lectured at the same hours.[4] Among Pomponazzi's antagonists were Niphus, Achillini, (1463-1512), and Francanciano, (exact dates not known), all Averroists. It was during these disputes with his antagonists that Pomponazzi gradually realized that his Thomistic view of soul and its relation to intellect was in need of revision and, with a painstaking effort, he started to reformulate his thoughts.

The students' favorite question of the time was "Quid de Anima?". The authorities used by the professors in discussing the nature of anima "intellectiva" and the relation between anima and "intellectus" were Averroes, (1126-c. 1198), Thomas Aquinas, (c. 1224-1274), and Alexander of Aphrodisias, (approx. 200 A.D.). During the first year of his teaching career Pomponazzi was a thoroughgoing Thomist and remained so for a number of years in the free academic atmosphere at Padua.[5] The disputes with the youngest of his opponents, Francanciano, in which Pomponazzi defended the Thomistic views held by his teacher di Nardo in particular appear to have shaken his Thomistic position.[6] The disputes were over the relation of the intelligences to the heavenly spheres since, for the Averroists, the intellect was also an "intelligence" and mankind its proper "sphere". Pomponazzi, during these disputes, became convinced that

a true substantial form cannot be separable from its matter.[7] But Pomponazzi, a true scholastic, was not ready to admit his doubts yet, nor was he willing to abandon Aristotelian tradition. In a slow painstaking effort he reexamined his Thomistic position.

A brief review of Aristotle's concept of the soul and the interpretation given to Aristotle's concept by his followers will help one to appreciate Pomponazzi's position in these disputes.

Aristotle's version of soul and body was that they are one, as form and matter are one: The soul of man is the form of his body, they are one as the wax and the form into which it is pressed.[8] Already the Stoics gave a bent to the Aristotelian version by mixing it with Stoicism. Two corruptions of Aristotle's concept of the soul sprang up within his school: The notion of the soul being a "separate substance", and the separation of "intelligence" from the soul.[9]

Douglas points out:

> The idea of the individual soul as a substance separate and self-existent, which prevailed with practiced uniformity in the orthodox schools from patristic down to modern times, can be traced historically through the theology of Augustine back to the influence of the Alexandrian thinkers who first expressed Platonic conceptions in the forms of the Aristotelian logic. So also with that separation of intelligence from the soul, which is so characteristic of the Arabians, and which gave rise to the fantastic speculations as to the real nature of human intelligence conceived as substantially separate from the soul of man, and to the interminable, because fictitious, question about the soul's participation in intelligence. This false abstraction was likewise derived from the Neo-Platonic metaphysics of those early discussions in which Arab Peripateticism took its rise.[10]

Alexander of Aphrodisias, considered to be the best of Aristotle's interpreters, was no exception. Even though a predecessor of Neoplatonism in the official sense, he interpreted Aristotle in accordance with the postulates of a metaphysical dualism. He called soul the "form of body" but reasoned that because the body also had a lower "natural" form, it was not the soul that made the body what it is. He further reasoned that while there were actions of the "whole man", there were also activities which belonged to the intellectual soul as such, and were not in the body.[11] Alexander accepted the idea that the soul of man exercised the function of rational thought but, influenced by the Platonic conception of soul, was unable to attribute this rational activity to man as man, as Aristotle had done. Alexander ascribed it to the influence from without and to the agency of a higher power and, by making this decision, he altered the true meaning of Aristotle's interpretation:

> The soul of man is the form of his body. Soul and body are one as the wax and the form into which it is impressed are one; the body is what it is only in virtue of the soul, as an eye is an eye only in virtue of the power of seeing, and an axe is an axe only in virtue of its power of cutting; the eye is the "pupil" and the vision.[12]

Alexander of Aphrodisias therefore became the father of the Arab notion of a separate intelligence.[13] Averroes carried the doctrine of "separation" a step further by declaring "passive intellect" in itself is one real thing, that intelligence cannot be attributed to the soul.[14]

Douglas points out:

> Averroes affirmed that universal reason was the only reason, denying to the natural being-man any share therein... assigning all the operation of thought in man to a super human principle of thought... thus, in its extreme development, dualism destroyed itself.[15]

Pomponazzi opposed the impersonal and collectivistic view of Averroism just as much as the Platonists Ficino and Pico, but where they "vindicated the dignity of the individual soul by elevating it in freedom above nature, Pomponazzi made the soul rather a natural inhabitant of an orderly universe."[16]

Thomas Aquinas dominated European thought for generations, except in northern Italy where during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries Averroes' doctrines were in vogue. In the tolerant academic atmosphere of Padua, both doctrines were taught and, as already mentioned, opposing views were taught at the same hour. The points at issue between Aquinas and Averroes were continuously discussed at Padua.[17]

Aquinas reworked the philosophies of his predecessors into a coherent view combining with it his own views and religious commitment. Philosophy for him was a natural type of knowledge open to all men wishing to understand the meaning of life experience. But Aquinas was primarily a teacher of sacred doctrines and not a philosopher. Even though he made no attempt to anchor his philosophical thinking on principles of religious belief, in a sense Thomism still is a "Christian philosophy" for his understanding of non-Christian philosophy was colored by his personal faith.[18]

Aquinas refuted Averroes' concept of separation of "intelligence" and the "soul" in his treatise, De unitate intellectus contra Averroistas.[19] Aquinas insisted that a scientific account of man must explain man as he is, that is, a thinking being, for by denying him intelligence, it becomes impossible to give an accurate scientific account of man.[20] He points at Averroes who had to introduce a metaphysicial principle "outside the nature of man to explain thought in man, and that obviously passed beyond the bounds of 'scientia naturalis'."*

While Averroes denied intelligence to the soul of man, Aquinas attributes intelligence to individual souls. Aquinas' own view is that the soul is capable of true thought and active intellect is a power of the soul -- of the soul which is the "form" of the body. According to him, the intellect is not related to the body precisely as are the inferior powers of the soul; he conceives intelligence as being an attribute of the soul, and the soul as the form of the body.** Aquinas did not rely on metaphysical speculations but followed rather a psychological mode of thought in forming his view on the nature of "anima intellectiva" and the relation between "anima" and "intellectus".

---

* "Manifestum est autem quad terminus considerationis naturalis est intellectus; secundum autem dictum Averrois intellectus non continuatur homini secundum suam generationem, sed secundum operationem sensus. Op. cit. f. 101 B.C." in Douglas, op. cit., p. 45.

** "Sic igitur per ea quae ex verbis Aristotellis accipere possumus usuque huc manifestum est quo ipse voluit intellectum esse partem animae, quae est actus corporis physici. (Op. cit. f. 98 c G, H.)....non solum Latini...sed et Graeci et Arabes hoc senserunt quo intellectus sit pars, vel potentia sive virtus nimae quae est corporis forma....Intellectus est portentia animae quae est corporis forma, licet ipsa potentia quae est intellectus non sit alicujus organi actus, quia nihil ipsius operationi communicat corporalis operation. (f. 101 a C, D.). Oportet igitur ipsum intellectum uniri corpori ut formam, non quidem ita quod ipsa intellectiva potentia sit alicujus organi actus, sed quia est virtus nimae, quae est actus corporis physici organi. (f. 102b A.); Cf. Summa, Qu. 84, Art. 2." in Douglas, op. cit., p. 48.

Aquinas' empirical and psychological point of view "swept away the speculative structure of Averroism."[21] The Dominicans of the thirteenth century considered the whole being of man as a unity and found the human soul to have three powers, (virtutes), distinguishable from each other: "vegetative", "sensitive" and "intellectual", yet remaining one soul.[22] But their method of thought was not carried through with consistency.

> Instead of abruptly distinguishing thought from sense-presentation, Albert and St. Thomas traced the action of intelligence through all the activities of the mind in graduated stages -- which to them, characteristically, were stages of more and more complete abstraction. Thus "common sense" brought the data of sense to a final unity of presentation; next, imagination wrought upon sense-presentation, a preliminary act of generalization followed, known as cogitatio or comprehensio, which was a comparison and a recognition of similarity (simile) without formation of a logical notion (universale); finally, general notions were formed in an ascending scale of abstractness, up to pure "forms," intellecta speculata.[23]

The medieval conception of physiological psychology was still dominant, which is evident in Gregor Reisch's Margerita Philosophia,[24] (1503). The concept commonly held at the time was that there were three ventricles in the brain:

1. The anterior ventricle was regarded as the sensus communis, (common sense), which received impulses from the sense organs, (sight, taste, hearing, touch, etc.). These were transmitted to fantasia, (fancy), or facultas imaginativa, (imaginatio -- imagination), for elaboration at the back of the ventricle. The facultas fantasia, (fancy or fantasy), was regarded as unreal imagination. Facultas imaginativa or imaginatio was regarded as

creative thought and real imagination.

2. It was believed that the anterior ventricle lead through a channel guarded by the vermis, (lit. "warm" -- choroid plexus), to the middle ventricle containing the facultas cogitativa, (thought), and the facultas estimativa, (judgement). Here it was believed that decisions were made. If the imaginatio was corrupted, naturally wrong decisions were made.

3. The third ventricle lying posteriorly was regarded as being the storehouse of memory, facultas memorativa.

Imaginatio, (imagination), in the sixteenth century was therefore understood to be the "mind" in the sense of the rational creative mind or through which it was understood was operated upon by the intellect of which it was regarded as being a part.

This is another example which clearly demonstrates that though some new insight may have been gained, change of traditional concepts never changes abruptly but rather in a slow evolutional manner.

Aquinas attached to the soul more than the form of the body, he sees it as a separate form, apart from the body.* Here Aquinas deviates not only from Aristotle's concept of body and soul being one as form and matter, but also from his previously held psychological mode of thought, by giving up his empirical

---

* "Nulla pars corporis potest diffiniri sine parte aliqua animae, et receduite anima nec oculus nec caro dicitur nisi acquirobe. (St. Thomas, op. cit. f. 102 a D.). And again -- Forma corporis non potest esse sine corpore. (Op. cit. f. 99 b. D.)" in Douglas, op. cit., p. 50.

analysis* and replacing it with metaphysical speculation similar to that of Alexander Aphrodisias. What actually had taken place was a continual process of adaptation in which basic ideas were gradually transformed and readjusted. Each individual and each age had a slightly new approach and values.

Pomponazzi: the last of the scholastics and the first of the Aristotelians

Pomponazzi did not come up with a drastically new method of inquiry; his naturalistic concept of man evolved gradually out of this largely traditional material. Pomponazzi, though not a humanist, was indirectly influenced by Humanism in its concentration on man and his destiny, but he refused to accept the comfortable and compromising modernism in religion.[25] Classical learning did not remove him from scholastic theology as was the case with Erasmus, nor was he confronted with fresh spiritual realities as in the case of Savonarola, both his contemporaries. Pomponazzi held on to his more sober vision of man's natural destiny.[26] Pomponazzi earned his reputation of being the last of the

---

* "It was as possessed of intelligence that soul was to St. Thomas something more than the form of body. Anima was forma corporis, but not qua intellectiva. On the contrary, intelligence was a power (virtus) of the soul (which was the form of the body), but in itself no sense a power of body. This was the distinction; 'Non enim dicimus animam humanam esse forman corporis secundum intellectivam potentiam (op. cit. f. 102 b D); Opportet ipsum (intellectum) uniri corpori ut formam, non quidem ita quod ipsa intellectiva potentia sit alicuius organi actus, sed quia est virtus animae, quae est actus corporis physici organici (op. cit. f. 102 b A); Ultima formarum, quae est anima humana, habet virtutem totaliter supergredientem materiam corporalem, scilicet intellectum. Sic ergo intellectus separatus est, quia non est virtus in corpore, sed est virtus in anima: anima autem est actus corporis.' (Op. cit. f. 99 a E.)" in Douglas, op. cit., p. 50.

scholastics and the first of the Aristotelians by refusing to abandon Aristotelian tradition and by applying the scholastic method of reasoning in arriving at a new naturalistic concept of man. In his work, De immortalitate animae, Pomponazzi starts out by discussing man's place in the universe:

> Now, I hold that the beginning of our consideration should be made here: man is plainly not of simple but of multiple, not of certain but of ambiguous nature, he is to be placed halfway between mortal and immortal things.[27]

This view was held by the ancient and medieval thinkers and was still accepted in Pomponazzi's time. His mind was so influenced by this concept that it molded his thoughts on every subject:

> ...the ancients spoke well when they established him between eternal and temporal things, for the reason that he is neither purely eternal nor purely temporal, since he partakes of both natures; and to him whose place is thus in the middle, power is given to assume whichever nature he wishes. Therefore there are three kinds of men to be found: Some are numbered with the gods, although these are but few; and there are those who, having subjugated the vegetative and the sensitive, have become almost completely rational. Some, from complete neglect of the intellect and from occupying themselves with the vegetative and sensitive alone, have changed, as it were, into beasts. Some are called normal men: and these are those who had lived tolerably according to the moral virtues; they do not however, devote themselves entirely to intellect, nor entirely to the corporeal faculties.[28]

Application of the Scientific Method in the Study of the Soul

It is not easy for the modern reader to appreciate the magnitude of the problem Pomponazzi was faced with. A firm believer in rational explanations

for everything, he gradually, over the years, became aware that Thomistic doctrines were primarily compromising and not leading to the truth he was seeking. Pomponazzi was at a mature age, (forty to fifty years), when preoccupied with the problem of mortality versus immortality of the soul. He was no anti-clerical revolutionary, but rather a deep and thorough thinker who in a painstaking effort was searching for the Truth. He did this at a time when only a few individuals started to question authorities who were regarded as sacrosanct for centuries.

In his discussion on the soul, Pomponazzi returns to Aristotle mentioning that:

> Aristotle in the second book of De anima and in the third chapter of the second book of De generatione animalium states that vegetative and sensitive operations 'cannot be performed without a corporeal and perishable instrument', and that therefore 'man assumes mortality'.[29]
>
> However, in knowing and willing, operations which throughout the whole book De anima and in the first chapter of the first book of De partibus animalium and in the third chapter of the second book of De generatione animalium, are held to be performed without corporeal instrument, since they prove separability and immateriality.[30]

The soul of man then according to Aristotle, Pomponazzi reasons, has two different aspects, the physical or, as Pomponazzi calls it, the material aspect, (anima vegetativa and sensitiva), and an incorporeal, immaterial aspect, (anima intellectiva), yet Aristotle also declared that the soul and body are one as form and matter, therefore Pomponazzi reasons the intellectual soul, (anima

intellectiva), must also have its corporeal aspects.* Pomponazzi is the first to question Aquinas' conclusion that man's soul could not possess the power of thought if it were the form of the body,** and therefore must be a selfsubsistent, "separate spiritual being".[31]

Pomponazzi realized that Aquinas' conception of selfsubsistent forms afforded a ready escape from the ambiguity and obscurity in which Aristotle had left the question of immortality of the soul. Pomponazzi felt that the question of mortality versus immortality of the soul was not settled by Aristotle. He reasoned that even if it were determined that soul was more than the form of a perishable body, the soul in this life still was dependent for knowledge upon its corporeal instrument.[32] He further reasoned that the individual soul comes only into existence with the formation of the body,[33] and he understood that therefore a further theory was developed which devised that the soul formed a "habit" of existence, during its embodied life, which perished after its separation from the body. It was also easy, if not satisfactory, to imagine the possibility of

---

* "Ex ea parte qua intelligent, secundum quid erit immortalis. (De Imm. viii). Secundum eas partes per quas anima intelligit non est materialis. (Comm. de An. f. 13). Intellectus...qua intellectus est, non depended a materia, neque a quantitate. (De Imm. viii)." in Douglas, op. cit., p. 59.

** " Si essentia nimae humanae sic esset forma materia, quod non per esse suum esset, sed per esse compositi sicut de abiis formis. (Op. cit. p. 102 b. E.)." in Douglas, op. cit., p. 53.

some entirely different mode in which the soul should acquire knowledge after separation from the body.*

Pomponazzi also disagrees with Averroes' concept that the universal reason is the only reason and denied the separate substantial existence of anima qua intellectiva.[34] This view Pomponazzi insists does not agree with Aristotle and is contrary to his opinion as can easily be proved by reading text 12 of De anima, Book i: "Knowing is either imagination or not without imagination";[35] and in text 39 of De anima, Book iii,[36] Pomponazzi insists Aristotle says most clearly "that there is no knowing without some phantasm."

Douglas points out:

> Now in the first place we shall find Pomponazzi agreeing with St. Thomas that intelligence, as such, is somehow independent of matter. We shall find him also saying, as we have already seen: ". . . Intellectui qua intellectus est accidit esse in materia," etc. We shall find him asserting "intellectum non dependere a corpore tanquam de subjecto"; but "secundum essentiam ipsum intelligere esse in ipso intellectu."[37]

Through the whole process of Pomponazzi's reasoning one gets the impression that he is convinced that the human soul can only have one mode of existence and that this mode is material, therefore mortal. But he is also a man of his time and the traditional concept of the duality of the soul is so dominant in his

---

* "Levi-ben-Gerson proposed to reconcile the Aristotelian doctrine of knowledge through the senses with the immortality of the soul by the supposition that knowledge and all growth are entirely stationary after death. (Cf. Franck, Journale des Savants, March 1869.)." in Douglas, op. cit., p. 54.

mind that he probably was not even aware of it, yet it delayed his next step. He reasons almost endlessly that if the soul is material, it is also mortal, but if it is immaterial it is also immortal.*

Pomponazzi reaches for an analogy to clarify how the soul which he regards as being one, can have two different aspects, a material and an immaterial. He compares it with the organ of sight which itself must be clear of the particular sensible property it is to apprehend. In other words, in order to perceive various colors, the eye must be in a neutral condition in relation to all colors, yet the eye has, nevertheless, other physical properties and certainly itself is physical.** Similarly the mind, therefore, must apprehend material things in knowledge and yet in itself be in a real way dependent on matter.*** From the selection of

---

* "Quaerit Pomponatius utrum anima sit mortalis, vel non; et primum quaderendum est utrum sit materialis, si enim est materialis est mortals, si est immaterialis est immortalis. Comm. de An. f. 130 r." in Douglas, op. cit., p. 28.

** "Materiale universaliter non impeditur per coexistentiam alterius materialis a cognitione; sic enim visus non cognosceret colores, cum visui sint conjunctae primae qualitates; sed bene per coexistentiam alicujus illorum quorum ipse est perceptivus impeditur; per rubedinem enim impeditur a cognitione aliorum colorum quorum et rubedinis est perceptivus. Op. cit. x p. 77." in Douglas, op. cit., p. 102.

*** " 'Si intellectus esse pura forma materialis, cum omnium formarum materialium est perceptivus, impediretur ab earum cognitione; at ipsum esse immaterialem probatum est, licet non simpliciter immaterialis sit; quapropter per coexistentiam formarum materialium non impeditur.' The result of this discussion is a clear distinction between knowledge and the conditions of knowledge, between the physical aspect of the act of knowledge and its cognitive value, in the case both of sense-perception and of knowledge generally. 'Revera intellectus humanus non potest intelligere nisi in materia sint quale et quantum sensible, cum non possit operari nisi ipse sit, ipseque esse non potest nisi cum dispositione convenienti; non tamen sequitur quod per tales

this analogy one senses that Pomponazzi is groping to find a biological explanation for the apparent dualism of the soul. In order to understand the relationship of the intellect, and the body, we must distinguish between being in the body as having the body for its organ of subject or substratum and depending on the body as having the body, its perceptions, and the imaginations for its object.[38] Pomponazzi is convinced beyond doubt that the human intellect cannot know anything without the perceptions or imaginations offered to it by the body, and this fact alone proved he insists that the intellect is not separable from the body.

Having arrived at this conclusion, Pomponazzi had no choice but to reject the concept that each person has two souls, one immortal and one mortal, an opinion Pomponazzi attributes to Plato. He also rejects Thomas Aquinas' opinion that the human soul has but a single nature and that it is absolutely, (simpliciter), immortal and only in some respect, (secundum quid), mortal. Pomponazzi explains:

> Since therefore that way is completely rejected which thinks that the intellective and the sensitive souls in man are distinct in existence, it remains that the intellective and the sensitive are the same in man....[39]

This statement is followed by a lengthy discussion in which Pomponazzi uses Thomas Aquinas' statements and refutes them one by one, mainly by quoting

---

dispositione intelligat, imo ut satis liquet non sequitur in sensu; name virtus visiva non videt nisi oculus sit calidus, non tamen per caliditatem vel aliquam aliam qualitatem realem videt, sed per speciem visibilem.' Op. cit. x p. 77. Cf. Comm. de An. II 120 9." in Douglas, op. cit., p. 102.

passages from Aristotle's Physica, Metaphysica and De generatione animalium.

Here Pomponazzi's reasoning takes a somewhat surprising turn. He speaks about the Scripture, explaining that its interpretation of the soul has preference over human reasoning since it was God-given.[40]

> But what for me is subject to doubt is whether these propositions exceed the natural limits, so that they presuppose something from faith or revelation, and whether they are in conformity with the works of Aristotle, as St. Thomas himself declares. But as the authority of so learned a Doctor is very great with me, not only in divinity but also in the interpretation of Aristotle, I would not dare to affirm anything against him. I only advance what I say in the way of doubt and not of assertion....[41]

This statement created a controversy among Pomponazzi's followers and critics, and was called by some the double truth. (See Chap. V).

Pomponazzi struggled to find a way to reconcile the rational vision of Truth with its biological condition. In his reasoning, he comes closest to Alexander of Aphrodisias' concept of intellect.

Alexander's writings dealing with human nature were translated into Latin and published in the late fifteenth century.[42] Pomponazzi in his commentary to De anima states:

> Alexander held intellect to belong to the things that are generated; but with some part of itself it agrees with things eternal, namely, in understanding and willing, which comes from its being a mean between the eternal and the non-eternal, and the first of material forms.[43]

Here Pomponazzi returns to his favorite arguments that of the middle position of man who, unlike the pure intelligences, always needs the body for its object and has no way of acting without the help of the images of sense or imagination:

> Now since nature proceeds in orderly fashion, as is said in Physica viii[44] between these two extremes, of not needing a body as subject or as object, there is a mean, which is neither totally abstracted nor totally immersed. Now this is the human intellect, which by all the ancients and moderns or almost all, is held to be halfway between things abstract and things not abstract,...[45] Whence it is said also in the Psalm, 'Thou hast made him a little less than the angels....' and a little farther, 'Thou hast established him above the works of thy hands, the sheep and the oxen,' etc.[46] And this way of knowing is that of which Aristotle spoke, in De anima i, text 12: 'If knowing is either imagination or not without imagination, it is impossible for it to exist without a body.'[47]

Pomponazzi concludes that since the human intellect is dependent on the body, (or needs the body for its object), and has no way of acting without the help of images of sense or imagination, it must therefore be considered absolutely mortal, and only relatively, or improperly speaking, immortal.

Douglas points out that it is not sure that Pomponazzi has read Alexander of Aphrodisias' Latin translation of 1480, but that he rather suspects that Pomponazzi only read second hand sources of Alexander.[48] According to Douglas,[49] Pomponazzi's psychology has a deeper root than Alexander's, since in an essential point he refuses Alexander's guidance. Pomponazzi's doctrine of man's participation in intelligence differs from Alexander's "Divine assistance". Douglas finds Pomponazzi "less dualistic and theological, more positive and humanistic than Alexander.[50] Pomponazzi concludes "that the soul is partly

material and partly immaterial, simpliciter materialis and immaterialis secundum quid; or, as he otherwise expresses it, de immaterialitate participat."[51]

The Beginning of a Naturalistic View of Man

As is evident from Pomponazzi's method of reasoning, he was a typical representative of the scholastic tradition, which earned him the reputation of being the last of the scholastics. By explaining that the "intellectual", "sensitive", and "vegetative" soul is the same soul only under different aspects,[52] and known to us only in body,[53] he returned to Aristotle's: the soul of man is the form of his body. Soul and body are one as the wax and the form into which it is impressed are one.[54] Pomponazzi refused to accept any other hypothesis of a soul changing under other conditions. His denial of immortality is based on this concept of the soul. He attempted to establish a more scientific psychology, in relating man to nature and by steering away from the dogmatic conception of body and soul. As a critic and logician he employed the method of positive analysis in place of the method of abstract speculation as some of his predecessors used. In using this naturalistic view of man, man became observable, and his mind open for examination in an empirical orderly fashion. Freud, as Pietro Pomponazzi long before him, limited himself only to the understanding of the soul's manifestations, to the psychic apparatus, in accordance with the strictest principles of scientific empiricism.[55]

What is evident from this survey so far is that during the sixteenth century men began more and more "to hold that science should be directed, not merely

to understanding and vision, but to a kind of understanding that might give power, action, and an improvement of the practical arts."[56] Pomponazzi's conclusion of viewing man as part of his naturalistic environment certainly was a step in this direction.

It is under Pomponazzi, his followers Giacomo Zabarella, (1535-1589), and Cesare Cremonini, (1550-1631?), that Italian Aristotelianism attained its greatest development during the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Kristeller points out that Aristotelian Scholasticism, just like classical Humanism, is fundamentally a phenomenon of the Renaissance period and that its roots reach back to the very latest phase of the Middle Ages.[57] The Paduan thinkers enjoyed much more academic freedom than their Parisian counterparts and, because they were not absorbed by theological issues only, much of their creativity concentrated on the problem of method as the paramount scientific task of the day.[58]

Humanism acted as a catalyst in the study of Platonism and Aristotelianism; its substance was not philosophical, but with its belief in the value of man, and in the revival of learning, it had deep and lasting implications and consequences in both. The groundwork of the study of Greek and Latin and, to a lesser degree, of Hebrew was already done by the Italian humanists, but especially the study of Hebrew was carried even father by the northern humanists, who started to translate the Bible. "The Greek New Testament was first printed in the Complutensian Polyglott (1514), but a delay in the publication enabled Froben of Basel to preoccupy the market with an edition hastily prepared by Erasmus

from very recent codices.''[59] It was inevitable that these studies of the Bible would kindle a renewed interest in religion.

The changes that occurred in Humanism as it crossed the Alps are clearly visible when one compares Johan Weyer's works with those of Pomponazzi. Both were physicians, Pomponazzi the Paduan educated, of Aristotelian tradition, and Weyer the northern medical humanist educated at the University of Paris and at Orleans. Pomponazzi's and Weyer's reasoning in some respects was beyond their time; the truth they proclaimed was rejected by many contemporaries and put their lives in jeopardy.

References

CHAPTER III

PIETRO POMPONAZZI: Philosopher, Physician and Scientist

1. John Herman Randall, Jr., Introduction to "On the Immortality of the Soul", in The Renaissance Philosophy of Man, ed. Ernst Cassierer, Paul Oskar Kristeller and John Herman Randall, Jr., Phoenix Books, (11th im. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1948), p. 269.

2. Ibid., p. 258.

3. Ibid., p. 259.

4. Ibid., p. 269.

5. Ibid., p. 269.

6. Ibid., p. 270.

7. Ibid., p. 270.

8. E. Zeller, Aristotle and the Earlier Peripatetics, English trans., (London: 1897), II, pp. 98 ff.; Aristotle De anima, trans. W. S. Hett, (Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 1934), Book II, 412a-413a, pp. 67-72.

9. Andrew Halliday Douglas, The Philosophy and Psychology of Pietro Pomponazzi, ed. Charles Douglas and R. P. Hardie, (Hildesheim, Germany: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1962), p. 10.

10. Ibid., pp. 6-7.

11. Ibid., pp. 24-5.

12. Zeller, op. cit., pp. 98 ff.; Aristotle De anima, trans., op. cit., pp. 70-1.

13. Douglas, op. cit., p. 36.

14. Ibid., p. 36.

15. Ibid., p. 40.

16. Randall, Jr., op. cit., p. 257.

17. Douglas, op. cit., p. 57.

18. Encyclopaedia of Philosophy, "Thomas Aquinas St., (c. 1224-1274)", (New York: The MacMillan Co., and the Free Press, 1967), vol. 8, p. 106.

19. St. Thomas, Opera, 1593, Vol. XVII in Douglas, op. cit., p. 44.

20. Douglas, op. cit., p.45.

21. Ibid., p. 49.

22. Ibid., p. 49.

23. H. Siebeck, Geschichte der Psychologie, (Gotha: 1880-84), pp. 8-10, 12, 14-17, 20, 23, 24, 28, 34, 36, 50-53, 186, in Douglas, op. cit., pp. 49-50.

24. Gregor Reisch, Margerita Philosophia, in Andreas Vesalius, De Humani Corporis Fabrica, (Basileae: Ex officina Ioannis Operini, 1543), Libri septem, Cap. I, p. 623.

25. Randall, Jr., op. cit., p. 268.

26. Douglas, op. cit., p. 1.

27. Petrus Pomponatius, Tractatus "De immortalitate animae", [On the Immortality of the Soul], trans., William Henry Hay II, pp. 1-2, 57, in Journal of the History of Ideas, Vol. V, Jan.-Oct. 1944, p. 240.

28. Ibid., p. 240.

29. Ibid., p. 240.

30. Ibid., p. 240.

31. Douglas, op. cit., p. 53.

32. Ibid., p. 54.

33. Ibid., p. 54.

34. Ibid., pp. 54-5.

35. Aristotle De anima, iI, 403a 8-9, in The Works of Aristotle, (Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., William Benton Pub., 1952), I, 632.

36. Ibid., iii 7, 431a 15-20, I, 663.

37. Douglas, op. cit., p. 55.

38. Petrus Pomponatii, "De immortalitate animae", trans. William Henry Hay II, Chap. VII in Randall, Jr., op. cit., pp. 299-302.

39. Ibid., Chap. VIII, p. 302.

40. Ibid., Chap. VIII, p. 303.

41. Randall, Jr., op. cit., p. 260.

42. Ibid., p. 267.

43. Petrus Pomponatii, "De immortalitate animae", trans. William Henry Hay II, Chap. IX in Randall, Jr., op. cit., p. 315.

44. Ibid., p. 315.

45. Ibid., p. 315.

46. Ibid., p. 315.

47. Douglas, op. cit., p. 5.

48. Ibid., p. 5.

49. Ibid., p. 5.

50. Ibid., p. 109.

51. Ibid., pp. 54-5.

52. Ibid., pp. 53-4.

53. Ibid., pp. 53-4.

54. Zeller, op. cit., pp. 98 ff.; Aristotle De anima, trans. op. cit., pp. 70-1.

55. Gregory Zilboorg, A History of Medical Psychology, (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1969), p. 489.

56. John Herman Randall, Jr., "The Development of Scientific Method in the School of Padua", in Journal of the History of Ideas, Vol. I, 1940, p. 177.

57. Paul Oskar Kristeller, Renaissance Thought, Harper Torchbooks/ The Academy Library, (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1955), p. 36.

58. Randall, Jr., "The Development of Scientific Method in the School of Padua", in Journal of the History of Ideas, Vol. I, 1940, p. 177.

59. Encyclopaedia Britannica, (9th ed., Philadelphia: J. M. Stoddart & Co., 1876), III, 560.

CHAPTER IV

JOHAN WEYER: Practitioner, Clinician and Scientist

Weyer from the very beginning of his education wanted to become a physician. Unlike his teacher Agrippa, and many of his contemporaries, he did not enter the medical profession via theological or juristic studies.

A brief review of the most pressing problems of Weyer's time is helpful in understanding why Weyer considered it his mission to educate not only the public but also his colleagues and superiors. Weyer's was indeed a turbulent age, when the Church called upon civil power to assist in a crusade against witches and sorcerers as being the worst and most dangerous of heretics. All heretics were regarded as potential sorcerers. Not all were believed to have entered into a definite pact with the devil, and if they repented they were imprisoned, but if they did not repent they were put to death.

This view was of some advantage to the Church for it helped to suppress heresy. The Protestants showed the same eagerness as the Catholics in their efforts to wipe out Satan and his servants.

At the Peace of Augsburg, (1555), it was declared that:

> ...no one should suffer in life and property for his religion; but to take a Lutheran, call him a sorcerer, confiscate his goods, and force him by torture to confess that he was led into errors by the devil himself, seems to have been too great a temptation

> for the prince-bishops who headed the 'counter reformation' in South Germany to resist.[1]

Peter Palladius, the first Danish Lutheran bishop, at the same time recommended to the members of his congregation that they seek out the so-called "wise" women by pretending an illness. Should these women use paternosters, holy water, or invocations of saints in trying to cure them, this would not only indicate that they were Catholic but witches also, and should be treated accordingly.[2]

To express new ideas publicly was to risk one's life, as Michael Servetus, (1509?-1533), found out. He had studied theology at Saragossa, law at Toulouse, and medicine at Paris. His name is associated with the discovery of the pulmonary circulation: he stated that the blood passes from the right to the left ventricle and not, as was commonly accepted, through the septum. Servetus published this discovery and his ideas of reform for the Church, (to advance simple, primitive Christianity), in his work Christianismi Restitutio, (1533).[3]

He was declared a heretic and was imprisoned by the Catholics. Servetus fled to Geneva, where he sought the protection of John Calvin. Servetus was arrested at Geneva, tried, and burned for heresy. His accusations were spelled out in thirty-eight articles. The main objection appears to have been to his view of the Trinity, which he explains as three distinct persons in the single essence of God, namely the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Servetus' description of the pulmonary circulation had no effect upon the physiological thinking of his time, and was not noticed until nearly a century and a half later.

> ...Calvin is to be regarded as the author of the prosecution, and in this and in the subsequent burning of Servetus his course met the approval of the most advanced theologians of the time. The idea that diverse religious views might be tolerated in the same political area made little headway during the sixteenth century.[4]

Rational thought as developed over centuries in the relatively free atmosphere of Padua had little chance to develop in the north during the sixteenth century which was plagued not only by religious but also by political and socio-economic unrest. Superstition and suspicion were rampant. In Weyer's time anything might have started a witch-hunt -- an old woman outdoors during a thunderstorm, an unusual number of flies and caterpillars, a severe prolonged winter, an especially dry summer, a dislike of a neighbor. Once a witch-hunt began, it soon became an avalanche, for some were forced under torture to denounce others. There was no protection by the law for the accused. The names of informers did not have to be published if the informer felt that he was putting himself in grave danger by witnessing a case.[5] An advocate was allotted, but he was chosen by the inquisitors and not by the accused, and was only allowed to plead when he conformed to the inquisitors' view.[6] It is not surprising that under these circumstances those accused of witchcraft were rarely defended by an advocate.[7] Confessions were brought about through torture. Some of the tools applied were thumbscrews, leg crushers, spiked wheels over which the victims were drawn with weights on their feet, boiling oil and burning sulphur were dropped on bodies, and lighted candles held beneath armpits; the accused confessed to be relieved of excruciating pain.

The suffragan Bishop of Trèves, a foremost opponent of Johan Weyer, is said to have burnt no fewer than 6,500 persons so that in some villages of his diocese there was scarcely a woman left.[8] Confessions of witches and their crimes was so prevalent that the sheer number of them became objective proof of their reality.

It is not surprising that Weyer, under these circumstances, became primarily interested in the psychology of mental illness. He analyzed the phenomena described in the Malleus Maleficarum, and declared these as symptoms of mental disease. He realized that a great deal of behavior dealt with by the Inquisition was not a theological nor legal problem, but rather a medical problem. He realized the need for moral treatment, (today's psychotherapy), and felt that the physician was best qualified to handle it. But Weyer was also aware that physicians had to rid themselves of the erroneous beliefs taught by the Dominican monks, (Sprenger and Kraemer), if they were to be able to help their patients effectively.

> Almost all the theologians are silent regarding their godlessness, doctors tolerate it, jurists treat it while still under the influence of old prejudices; wherever I listen there is no one, no one who out of compassion for humanity unseals the labyrinth or extends a hand to heal the deadly wound.*

---

* Dum itaque ad grauem hanc impietatum silentio conninuent Theologi plerīq̄ omnes: dum opinionū flasitatem in morboru causis, lorumique imijs curationibus tolerant medici: dum sententias ex persuasione, longa annorum serie praescriptione non tam ratione discussa, quam praedjudicio quodam usurpata, hic pronunciant iuriconsulti: dum denique neminem audiam, qui mortalium misertus, aut totum hunc Labyrinthum nobis apercue... (Basiliae, Ex officina Operiniana, 1577), De praestigiis daemonum, p. 4.

Johan Weyer: Practitioner, Clinician and Teacher

Weyer, like Pomponazzi, looks for natural reasons to explain phenomena, but Weyer is a practitioner who uses case histories, (of his own or his colleagues' patients), to get his message through. He continuously teaches but he is never dull. His messages are clear and easy to follow, for he uses a common sense approach.

The following cases are indications of the widespread preoccupation with the devil in Weyer's time, and are probably meant to be a message for the physicians treating patients who are supposedly possessed by the devil. Weyer mentions a case: one of his colleagues, (whom he considers an excellent physician), had treated a young man who was feeling very thirsty and was looking for something to drink, but all he could find was an apple. He bit into the apple with great gusto, when suddenly he felt that he was being strangled by the devil[9] for he experienced a sudden sharp pain, and also believed that he saw a black dog running away. Weyer states that he has seen a number of similar cases in which patients believed that they had been seized by the devil when choking with food. Weyer points out that by checking the patient's pulse and temperature the physician could have seen that the young man had a fever, and had had a tormented sleepless night before he ate the apple. Weyer emphasizes again and again that in order to help reduce superstition, physicians should not be so gullible. Weyer's fine humor often comes through when he discusses human weakness, but he always treats the patient with respect.

Weyer tells a story about his colleague Melanchton, who was successful in cheating the devil. One of his patients had the reputation of becoming possessed by the devil as soon as he came in contact with holy water.[10] Weyer's colleague, very doubtful of his patient's story, brought a bottle of water from his own house and sprinkled some of this water on the patient before anyone else did, and sure enough the patient became "possessed by the devil", (enraged).

Weyer mentions several cases in which patients had vomited foreign objects which they insisted had entered their bodies by witchcraft. Again he emphasizes that even doctors are believing such nonsense. He quotes a German physician, Jakob Millich, who had written a work on the devil as magician, and in the work explains that the devil can put objects through the pores of the skin into a person's body. Weyer states: "I insist that this is impossible, for the pores since their creation are very tiny and contracting, they cannot be stretched to permit the passage of objects like leather-strips, knives, etc. through them...."*

When the cases get more serious so does Weyer. He mentions a case where thirty children became rather acutely ill almost at once; the symptoms were vomiting, diarrhea and gastro-intestinal pain. They were seen by a physician who declared it a "normal" harmless disease.[11] The children's parents were

---

* Je soutiens que c'est une chose impossible que les pores au pertuis, lequels des leur premiere creation on ete faits par la nature petits et reserrez, puissent estre, sans inconvenient, tellements estendue par le diable, que par iceux il fasse passer du cuir, ou des cousteaux.... (Histoire des Illusions, Livre IV, chap. xv, p. 555.

of different opinion; they were convinced that their children were possessed by the devil, and therefore they called in an exorcist. During exorcism the children vomited large numbers of pins, glass, ceramic pieces, and torn material. Weyer states that incidents like this reinforce the belief in witchcraft. He mentions that a similar situation occurred in Rome[12] at the same time. He does not imply that suggestive power may have had something to do with the parental fears, but why would he even mention it, if it had not crossed his mind? Weyer points out that several innocent ladies were accused in this case; they were tried, found guilty and were burned at the stake. It is hard not to think that some of these symptoms were put on in order to get rid of some undesirable neighbors.

Weyer again uses this oportunity to teach the great importance of accurate observation in such cases, for when innocent people are accused he makes a painstaking but unemotional effort to show that the accusations do not make sense at all. To make it very clear what he means by accurate observations, he quotes the case of one of his patients who accidentally swallowed the pins while changing her baby's diapers.[13] When Weyer was called it was too late to remove them; the patient was at the time in pain and the pins were about four fingers below the throat. He remained with the patient and ordered beer, butter, and bread to facilitate the passage of the pins from the oesophagus to the stomach. He bedded the patient on her back on the floor, (to prevent obstruction). Next day when the patient was again in pain, he ordered bouillon and bread, and positioned the patient on her right side to facilitate the passage of the pins from the stomach into the small intestines. After two days the pins were recovered and only slightly bent.

To counter all the tales of people vomiting various objects, Weyer emphasizes that objects swallowed will only move in one direction, but should they be vomited they would be mixed with gastric juices, which was not the case in the incidents described. He calls all the talk about objects entering the body through witchcraft utter nonsense. Fortunately Weyer possessed solid medical knowledge in addition to his humanitarian qualities. One of his greatest assets, of course, was his keen talent of observation which is evident in his descriptions of clinical entites, even when a disease was new to him.* He practiced in true Hippocratic spirit by relying on his firsthand clinical observations and not on hearsay from the patient or his family. His quiet, kind, and considerate personality was another important asset, for it enabled him to establish therapeutic relationships with his patients with ease.

Johan Weyer: Pragmatist

Weyer was a good Christian but refused to mix religion with medicine. He had an inquisitive mind and always searched for natural reasons to explain phenomena. He did not support patients who claimed to have been healed when the Cross was made over them, or by contact with holy water; he insisted that

---

* "Weyer made an excellent description of scurvy, of quartan fever, and of the 'English sweat', of hydropsy, of occlusion of the neck, of the uterus, and of the retention of menstrual flow. He invented a speculum for vaginal examination." Gregory Zilboorg, A History of Medical Psychology, p. 208.

the Lord had given natural remedies. The belief in supernatural power, (such as healing by making a Cross), he insisted was only adding power to superstition and witchcraft.[14]

Weyer was also a humanist; Zilboorg points out that Weyer in thought and fact followed in the footsteps of Seneca. "Seneca wrote his De ira when he was Nero's preceptor and, like Weyer and his De praestigiis daemonum, he wrote it for the benefit of an emotionally disorganized generation."[15] Although pious, Weyer at all times remained reasonable and naturalistic; he attempted quite successfully to demonstrate that a number of injuries inflicted or suffered by witches were due to the use of drugs or poisons. He mentions that there are many "natural" drugs that will put a person in a long deep sleep, and during such time the individual can have all kinds of dreams he afterwards will believe have actually happened. Weyer has always just the right story at hand to prove his point:

> A tight-fisted woman had to hire several threshers and to stretch her food-budget she mixed darnell* with the rye flour when making dough for bread. After the threshers had eaten the bread, madness broke loose, and after a while they felt dazzled and weary. One after the other fell into a deep sleep with heavy snoring. This went

---

* Darnell: "The new bread wherein darnell is eaten hot causeth drunkenesse; in like manner doth beere or ale wherein the seed is fallen, or put into the malt." John Gerande, The Herball or Generall Historie of Plants, [enlarged and amended by Thomas Johnson, Citizen and Apothecary of London], (London: Adam Islip Joyce Norton and Richard Whitakers, anno 1636), Liber I, chap. 58, pp. 78-9.

> on for two - three days until the woman suddenly realized that it was her bread that caused all the troubles. She quickly baked some new bread.[16]

Weyer tells another story, probably to warn people about the effect of the belladonna plant. When a colleague of Weyer's was a student of medicine at Louvain, the librarian's child became ill after having eaten parts of a belladonna plant:

> The child mistakenly ate the belladonna fruit taking it for a cherry. The child first went into a fury, and no longer recognized his parents, but then slowly lost all vigor and vitality. Monsieur Brachel, professor of medicine, was called. By the time they found out where the child had been, and what he had eaten, he was already in such a deep (comatose) sleep that it was impossible to awaken the child for 24 hours. After he awoke he again recognized his parents but remained "sleepy" until medication common for such cases was given.[17]

Weyer at all times insists on searching for a natural cause even in cases where supernatural phenomena are supposed to be involved. The belief that witches could fly through the air, enter houses through chimneys, etc., he refuses to accept. Yet he points out that there are drugs which give a person the impression that he can fly and do things he otherwise is unable to do.

He quotes the writings of two authors who have written about "natural magic", (through drug effect): Jean Baptiste Porte Neapolitain,[18] who surveyed the effects of various drugs, and his fellow-physician Jerome Cardan,[19] who has written about the effects of anointments with medicated ointments.

> The ointment, as they claim is made of infant fat, ache, aconite, potentilla, and nightshade plants (belladonna and henbane).* Persons anointed with this ointment appear to be in a deep sleep, yet they have dreams (visual hallucinations) of theatres, beautiful gardens, banquets, lovely clothing, handsome young men, kings and magistrates. But some also see devils, crows, prisons, deserts, and experience agone of the mind, these experience violent dreams. They saw ache, chestnuts, fires, onions and cabbages; all this indicates turbulent dreams. While being asleep these people believe that they are taken into different regions and they experience a variety of feelings. I like to add that there exists an oil which puts people into a deep and long-lasting sleep. Take grains of darnell, henbane, hemlock, red and black poppies, water-purslain, take from each four parts, but from the belladonna only one part and make an oil from these ingredients and add a scruple of thebaic opium. Take (ingest) one to one-and-a-half scruple and you will be able to sleep for two days. I like to volunteer that there is also a liquor of which one or two drops are enough to put you to sleep. Take as many drops as hours you intend to sleep, but it is better not to make it public....[20]

Weyer explains that the ingredients in the liquor are the same as in the oil, except some mushrooms, (morel), are added. He warns that a person who uses the liquor must know that: "...he may feel completely isolated and be talking to himself and be answering his own questions, or he may fall into a very deep sleep."[21] Weyer wonders to what extent many of the so-called witches were women under the influence of drugs.

---

* Ache is a small wild celery; aconite, a poisonous plant of the crowfoot family, is today used as a cardiac and respiratory sedative; Potentilla, related to the rose family, has a five-finger leaf; the nightshade plants have their name from their sleep-inducing effect, (they include belladonna and henbane), and are used as narcotics today.

Weyer's Application of the Scientific Methodology in the Study of Psychopathology

In 1573 Duke William asked Weyer to accompany him on a trip to Koenigsberg. On the trip everybody talked about a miraculous, supernatural happening. One of the stories circulating was that a young girl in Unna was able to survive without eating food for long periods, (more than a year), and still feel well. Weyer, as always when he heard of such happenings which he called "utter nonsense", refused to believe it. He went to visit the fasting girl named Barbara Kremers. Weyer reported this case in detail in his treatise, De commentitis jejuniis.

Weyer, the keen observer, was fully aware that women sometimes suffer all kinds of imaginary symptoms, but he emphasizes that at times it is very difficult to decide if the symptoms are real or not:

> Some women have a need to pretend that they have all kinds of disturbing symptoms such as fainting spells, paralysis of extremities, severe cramps, blindness, inability to void, or voiding urine of unusual colors. They are kept in bed with excruciating pain....At times it is possible to convince them that the symptoms are not real, that they only believed them to be real. In most cases the members of their families are convinced that the illness is real, so that the physician is powerless.[22]

Weyer goes on explaining:

> There are symptoms similar to the ones just described, but somehow regarded to be of greater distinction, for their cause lies within the supernatural, and therefore is regarded to be exempt from the natural law. Life without nutrition and evacuation is impossible, regardless of all the wonderful tales

> circulating of females with a need for distortion of reality. If such a case is not exposed, it soon will create too much unhealthy publicity, especially should this "patient" fall in the hands of a man who wants to exploit the situation. Before long it will be called a miracle and people will undertake pilgrimages to see the suffering one. Men believing in the fantastic, soon will be found in all four faculties who will praise this miracle and publish it in newspapers, brochures and books.[23]

Weyer assesses the situation correctly but because he remains calm he is more convincing than Agrippa was, and he quotes a number of Biblical figures who were known to have fasted but only Jesus, Weyer insists, was able to fast for forty days. How could Barbara do better than Jesus, and still look so lovely and fresh?[24] Weyer the scientist reasons:

> The body continuously loses fluid through breathing, saliva, and perspiration, how could these functions continue if no fluid was replaced?...If it were true what they are saying, she should be emaciated...food is also necessary to keep the body at a normal temperature, and since she is no cold-blooded animal she would have died.[25]

The parents had asked Duke William to issue a certificate explaning that Barbara had taken no food nor fluid for thirteen months, and that she had never voided nor evacuated her bowels during this time. Weyer asked the Duke for permission to take the girl for a few days to his own home. To appease the parents, permission was given that her sister remain with her. Weyer, with the help of his wife Henrietta, soon revealed the truth, and soon both girls ate at the family table. The crutches also disappeared after Barbara had a few good back-rubs with oil.[26]

The aftermath of this story reveals again Weyer's kind and generous personality. Duke William, very upset about the whole swindle, wanted to punish the parents but gave in to Weyer's suggestion of sending the girls home at his cost and then writing to the magistrates of the city expressing to them how unfortunate it was that they were so gullible. They were ordered to burn all publications about the case written in Latin and German. "This ends the cheerful catastrophy of this comedy," [27] Weyer stated.

This was no isolated case; during the sixteenth century cases like this were fashionable, and high ranking persons such as Emperor Maximilian and King Ferdinand are known to have given presents to girls like Barbara Kremer.

In the spirit of a true researcher, Weyer tried out how long he could fast himself without ill effects; his record was four days. He emphasizes that he has nothing against fasting under normal conditions, but he was not letting people get away with treacherous fasting for sensational purposes.[28]

Weyer appears to lose some of his calm composure when he talks about some monks practicing medicine by encouraging superstition and belief in witchcraft:

> These are people who are ignorant shameless and wicked. I am not criticizing the good ones, for those I respect and honor. But some boast to know the sacred field of medicine.... They do not hesitate to give lies as answers, when sick people go to them for help. They believe in witchcraft and do not hesitate to blame honest innocent matrons as being the cause of disease....It is obvious that these supporters of the church are slaves of Beelzebub, who feels gloriously being so well served under the cloak of religion. [29]

Weyer also points out that this kind of medical practice is a very lucrative business, especially since people are so gullible. "These ignorant physicians seek the aid of saints even in cases where patients are bitten by a mad dog."[30] Weyer really lashes at them: "...they are so ignorant that they have to cover their stupidity and errors by referring to sorcery and the virtue of the saints."[31]

Weyer refutes superstition wherever he encounters it, the more weird the accusations the greater his effort to come up with some sound empirical data in support of his opposition.

In Weyer's time no theory of psychopathology existed, and one cannot but be amazed by his empirical matter-of-factness in approaching the psychopathological problems of his day, an approach which proved to be revolutionary in the history of medical psychology.[32] Weyer always cites his own experiences and observations, and shows a great ability in bringing out some chief trends in mental disease.

> I beg you to examine closely the thoughts of these melancholic people, their words, their actions and visions, and you will recognize to what extent all their senses are impaired by the melancholic humor in the brain. Their minds are affected, so that some think that they are animals and even try to imitate the voice and gesture of the animal; some think that they are pieces of earthenware and out of fear that they might be broken shy away from passers-by. Some are afraid of death, yet frequently take their own lives; others imagine themselves to be guilty of some crime and they tremble out of fear when somebody approaches them, they are afraid to be grabbed by the neck and made prisoners in order to be put to death by the law. There was also an old gentleman who suddenly would jump out of the bed, believing that he was being attacked by his enemies whom (so it seemed to him) he would overcome by force and lock up in the furnace....I have known a

> melancholic Italian who believed himself to be emperor and monarch of the entire world, a title that belonged to him exclusively, otherwise he had no other symptoms, he signed his letters, R.R. D.D. M.M. Rex Regum, Dominus Dominatum, Monarcha mundi....I have seen another who refused stubbornly to eat or drink, thinking that he was condemned. There are also those who are tormented by a guilty conscience.[33]

Weyer's description of these patients' symptoms reads like a modern textbook in psychiatry. They are classical pictures of schizophrenic fantasies, illusions, delusions and paranoia. It almost seems unlikely that Weyer could have met so many schizophrenic patients as a court-physician of Duke William. Could it be possible that Weyer worked as a physician in a mental institution during the eight years that we have no records of his activities? Weyer definitely gives the impression that he knew, had met, and had seen these patients personally. Possibly his work as a city-physician of Arnheim might have brought him in close contact with inmates of workhouses.

Although Weyer's wealth of clinical experience, paired with his clear empirical thinking, enabled him to bring out the chief trends in mental disease he established no theory and left no system. Felix Platter, (1536-1614), a Swiss physician, (anatomist and surgeon), is given credit for having made a classification of psychoses.[34] Platter spent some time actually living with mental patients in a dungeon where "...the maniacs and idiots of the town were interned and kept company with the insane."[35] But Platter's interest was primarily the classification of disease, while Weyer's primary concern was the human being and how his illness could be alleviated.

In Weyer's time Galen's humoral theory was still accepted, for it was only with Harvey's discovery of the blood circulation that it began to be replaced by a new physiology. "What was good for physiology was embarrassing for the contemporary medicine, which lost its traditional basis of health and disease."[36] In the ancient humoral theory, melancholy was said to be caused by an excess of black bile produced in the spleen. The psychologic symptomatology of melancholy could be, but was not necessarily, part of the symptoms of melancholy in antiquity.[37] Galen differentiated several kinds of melancholia:

1. the kind where black bile is distributed all over the body;
2. the kind where the disease is located in the stomach;
3. the kind where black bile accumulates in the brain.

Weyer, in keeping with contemporary thought, attempts to explain mental illness in terms of the humoral physiological theory:

> ...it is perhaps noted that the patient is disturbed, by nature, or by his illness, or because of some melancholic humor (since demons are extremely fond of working themselves into these humors through their clever somatic manouevres), or by some other malignant juice.*

It must be remembered that demon, devil and symptoms of mental illness were regarded as synonymous.

---

* ...si fortè aeger natura, uel exmorbo, aliunde humore melancholico (cui, uti aptae suis operationibus materiae non illibenter se insinuare solet demonium) aut alio succo maligno grauari uideatur, ut hic prius blande expurgetur medicaméto. De praestigiis daemonum, Liber V, Cap. XXVIII, p. 615.

Speaking of therapy, Weyer explains:

> ...he ought to be, first of all, gently purged by medication. Now Pomponazzi relates that in older times exorcists, who were also known as praecantatores, would purge the body of the obsessed of black bile before they started conjuring.* These patients are thus infested by double or multiple diseases; obviously somatic, originating with melancholic humors, and psychological, such as amentia, depression, anxiety, disgust with life and attacks of utter despair, by which the sworn enemy of mankind wears down human beings, and will heckle them with evil temptations, as one can see them in hell tearing at the liver of Titus like the eagle in the Prometheus myth. Conciliator says in a discussion of this problem that, once the evil humor has been expelled, patients suffering from obsessions stop doing eccentric things, as experience shows. Galgaradus, a most illustrious physician of Mantua has brought about a perfect cure in a woman, even though her furor had been the result of demonic agitation and she spoke in various tongues.[38]

It is passages like the one in which Weyer speaks of "demons working themselves into the humors", that make some of his readers think that Weyer believed in evil spirits. To him evil spirits simply meant illness. In his work De praestigiis Weyer has proved over and over again that he believes only in natural causes of disease. His own observations and descriptions of symptoms in mental illness sound modern; his attempt to explain mental illness with Galenic terms sounds clumsy and is a clear indication that Galenic humoral theory was no longer adequate, yet there was nothing else to replace it. Weyer is foremost a clinician

---

* Tradit enim Pomponatius, priscos exorcistas, quos praecantatores uocát, ante conjuratione, obsessorū corpora ab atra bile expurgasse. De praestigiis daemonum, Liber V, Cap. XXVIII, p. 615.

and teacher, and also a great humanist who, like Erasmus, Thomas More and Juan Luis Vives, turned his humanistic ideas toward the social and cultural issues of the day. He also shared their conviction that man has an obligation toward his fellow men.

Reclamation of the whole Field of Psychopathology for Medicine

There was no doubt left in Weyer's mind that many of the men and women accused and tried as witches were simply mentally ill persons. In his letter to Duke William Weyer states:

> Now indeed, if anyone should object that the Malleus Maleficarum has fulfilled his task, when he reads the ridiculous and, often even impious absurdities of this book by the theologians, Heinrich Kraemer and Johann Sprenger, and, setting aside all prejudice, compares it with this writing of ours, he will surely realize that I hold and defend an utterly different, even the very opposite opinion.[39]

Here Weyer refers to the Malleus Maleficarum, in which sexual aspects of witchcraft, and sexual ignominy occupy the central place in the system of demonologic psychiatry. After he had carefully studied the views of monks, lawyers and, unfortunately, also some physicians, Weyer blasts the whole devilish sexology as a grandiose piece of nonsense. As in all cases of important discussions, Weyer always researches what the classical writers and the Scripture had to say on the same topic; then he continues by adding his own opinion. Here he quotes the Greeks, Romans and Arabs and their interpretation of incubus and sucubus which represent a myth as old as mankind.[40] Weyer's own conviction is

that it is only a dream, and that the dream is caused by humors. He emphasizes again that women who volunteered information on having had sexual intercourse with the devil are mentally ill, and cannot be taken seriously. It is cases like these that make Weyer say that they are not a theological nor a legal problem, but rather a medical problem with which the physician is best equipped to deal.[41]

Weyer explains why his treatise De praestigiis, is more than a medical work:

> The subject, then, of this treatise of ours is partly theological, where artfulness and schemes of the devil are betrayed by the testimony of the holy writ, and where it is shown how they may most safely be avoided. It is also partly philosophical when Satan's vain plots and the corrupt mind of prophetesses are totally vanquished by natural reasons. Likewise it partly concerns medicine, where it is demonstrated that illnesses, their causes and symptoms, that until now have been imputed to witches occur through the law of nature. Partly it also pertains to jurisprudential opinion, since it deals with punishment, different to that of the past, of infamous wizards, witches and sorcerers, according to the nature and magnitude of the crime.[42]

Weyer has no doubt that many disagree with him. In his Epilogue he says: "I have no doubt...that many are going to condemn me for whatever work I publish. Most of these inadequate judges, are going to condemn what they do not understand."[43]

The letter Weyer wrote to Duke William when he sent him the manuscript of De praestigiis is a touching document of how two men -- one a ruler, the other a physician -- by working closely with each other were able to keep sanity in the dukedom of Jülich-Berg and Clèves at a time when outside its border insanity took over. Unfortunately, under the pressure of Philip II and the Duke of Alba,

the witch-persecutions in the dukedom of Jülich-Berg-Clèves were resumed in 1581 during the Counter-Reformation. (See chapter II).

> To you, Prince I dedicate the fruit of my thought. For thirteen years your physician, I have heard expressed in your Court the most varied opinions concerning witches; but none so agree with my own as do yours, that witches can harm no one through the most malicious will or the ugliest exorcism, that rather their imagination -- inflamed by demons in a way not understandable to us -- and the torture of melancholy makes them only fancy that they have caused all sorts of evil. For when the entire manner of action is laid on the scales, and the implements, therefore examined with careful scrutiny, then soon this is shown clearly before all eyes and more lucid than the day, the nonsense and the falsity of the matter. You do not, like others impose heavy penalties on perplexed poor old women. You demand evidence, and only if they have actually given poison, bringing about the death of man or animal, do you allow the law to take its course.
>
> When a Prince of such virtues protects me, then I have faith that I can make short work of the snapping teeth of insolent quarrelers; especially since it is certain that on my side stands invincible truth. I implore God, The Highest and Best, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, that He may profitably extend through greater employment of the Holy Spirit, what in His Benevolence He has so happily begun in your Highness, and to the flourishing happiness of your country. Your Highness' most obedient servant, Johan Weyer, Physician.[44]

The letter which Weyer sent to the emperor with his manuscript of De praestigiis is another testimony of Weyer's and Duke William's efforts of appealing for Reason and Justice in their troubled time:

TO THE MOST AUGUST EMPEROR OF THE WHOLE CHRISTIAN WORLD,* most serene Sovereigns, most illustrious Princes and Dukes, noble Counts and all those holding any magistracy, secular as well as ecclesiastics, this small book is a humble petitioner.

Most invincible Emperor, kings and princely men, to whom in rightful order and for most weighty reasons the King of kings and Lord of lords has entrusted the sword to curb with deserved punishment reckless disobedience of malefactors, indeed to defend vigilantly those who blamelessly submit themselves to the proper laws of the State, and in its name zealously to maintain the tranquillity of the lawfully established State: To you in unassuming language and with all obedience I reverently offer this poor suppliant of a book, imploring you from the depths of my heart, begging and most humbly beseeching that you do not fail to grant -- in those demonical deceptions, through which since the very beginning that first architect of universal evil spread such impenetrable darkness before men's eyes, in those things which with the aging of the world, that same artist, now experienced in a thousand ways has fashioned in the case of silly idiotic females, causing Christian Europe's most foul infamy, men's most gross error, the very common slaughter of innocents, surely an exceedingly serious wound to the conscience of the magistracy -- mercifully grant me your most obedient and humble subject, the time to set before you in these six books my opinion as it is. If it has no place in your last rank, I shall not be reluctant to suppress it as swiftly as possible, and then most willingly in a recantation to be "hissed and booed off the stage," ** if proved wrong by more vigorous reasoning and arguments. But if proved right by the logic of your judgement, I shall consider myself to have introduced a work of significance. I implore you no less earnestly that, with setting

---

* After the abdication of the Emperor Charles V in 1556, his son Philip II obtained Spain, the Netherlands, East Burgundy and parts of Italy. Charles' brother Ferdinand succeeded to his powers as Holy Roman Emperor and received the formal title on Charles' death in 1558. Since there is no date on this letter, it is not sure if it was written to Charles or to Ferdinand. Weyer mentions that enclosed with the letter are the six books of his manuscript De praestigiis. His book was not published until 1563.

** Used of an actor in Cicero Paradoxa stoicorum 3, 3, 26.

> aside the religion of antiquity but, with sympathy for an accepted opinion established by so many generations, a place be granted to my view whenever, in the kingdom, the provinces and dominions of your empire, the opportunity presents itself to ponder, judge and proclaim on those demonic causes and especially on the affairs of witches, hitherto surrounded by so much nonsense. In this manner just as I have very little doubt that this sort of devil's sport will be more clearly seen in the mind's eye, and that all who are truly Christian will recognize that their power is not so great, and so also less innocent blood will be shed, which from the beginning this murderer thirsts after most greedily. Likewise the structure of the community's peace, which under the author of these tragedies himself most strongly resents, will not be so put out of joint, and consciences will be pricked more rarely. Further, Satan's empire day by day will progressively collapse and the Kingdom of Christ will extend farther and wider.
>
> [45]
>
> Ioannes

Duke William and Weyer were enlightened men, educated in the Erasmian tradition of humanism and Christian faith. Both sympathized with Protestantism in some of its aspects, but remained Catholics. They deplored, as did Erasmus, the reintensified witch-hunt. They were not alone in their appeal for reason and moderation; they found supporters on the Catholic as well as the Protestant side. All supporters were well educated persons who did not take part in the mass mania of the time.

The intensity of witch-persecution varied greatly from one area to another; in some places it was a long-lasting epidemic, (Diocèse of Trevès),[46] in other places there were sporadic short epidemics, (Cologne).[47] Men and women were persecuted, in some areas more women than men, (Trevès).[48] Almost all the victims were executed on their own confession, extorted in the vast majority of instances by torture or the fear of torture. The uniformity of the confessions,

regardless of the geographical area in which they occurred, is clear evidence of the artificiality of many of these accusations. The power of suggestion no doubt played an important part in the large number of lonely, senile, elderly, mentally disturbed women who confessed voluntarily to crimes they had not committed.

Talking about illusions and imposters, Weyer says:

> The persons most likely being affected by these follies, are those who, due to their constitution and temperament obey willingly outside suggestions. These are the melancholics who even at a small loss become easily depressed, as Christostome has said: the power of anger has more power than all the actions of the devil: because all those who are subdued by the devil, are subdued by anger and sorrow.[49] The devil...in his cunningness likes to lead females who, due to their constitution are inconsistent in reasoning, gullible, malicious, impatient and melancholic because they are unable to control their emotions: especially some of the elderly, debilitated, stupid women with frequent change of mood.[50]

As always when discussing a topic, Weyer surveys the opinions of ancient writers on the subject: "Quintilian said that women are stupid....Valere... attributes them a silly intellect....Lactance...finds them apathetic."[51]

Weyer felt that women should be punished less than men, and many of the sources he surveyed agreed with him. Weyer mentions that: "Pliny in his eighth book of natural history points out that even the lion will not attack a woman as if nature had told him that women should be treated gentler."[52]

Zilboorg points out:

> The role of sex in the whole history of our civilizations and man's attitude toward woman's part in social life as one of the factors of social problems are thrown into painful relief in this piece of legalistic and theological literature of the early Renaissance. The

> Old World seems to have risen against woman and written this gruesome testimonial to its own madness. Even after she had been tortured and broken in body and spirit, woman was not granted the privilege of facing the world in a direct way. The witch, stripped of her clothes, her wounds and marks of torture exposed, her head and genital shaven so that no devil could conceal himself in her hair, would be led into court backwards so that her evil eyes might not rest on the judge and bewitch him....Never in the history of humanity has woman more systematically been degraded.[53]

While it is easy to prove that women were regarded as intellectual inferiors to men in all cultures except the Egyptian, it is much more difficult to prove that women were discriminated against because of sex alone during the witch-hunts in the sixteenth century.

The number of women accused of witchcraft versus that of men varied greatly from one area to another. It is easy to blame male discrimination and dominance only for woman's tragic lot during the sixteenth century. But when we ask ourselves in a rational way if the sixteenth century religious, cultural, socio-economic upheavals have been more unfavorable to woman than man, we ask a question that can scarcely be answered in view of the many factors involved, the practical impossibility of making a quantitative assessment, and the absence of any recognized standards by which a judgement can be made.

No historian is completely free of all bias; Zilboorg is a psychoanalyst in the Freudian tradition, which appears to have colored his emphasis of sex as being one of the main criteria for witch-hunt. More women than men volunteered to have committed crimes which in reality they never committed. They were executed not because of being women, but because of having confessed. Weyer

was aware of this fact and tried to explain why.

To Weyer, abnormal behavior was a fact to be understood and not behavior to be approved of or to be condemned. This attitude is truly professional. Weyer tried to understand what happened to an individual when his fantasies became abnormal:

> I could cite here an infinite number of examples in which you could see the senses involved in many ways, by humors and melancholic vapors which affect the basis from which all these monstrous fantasies spring.[54]

Diefenbach states that: "...it is a sad and undeniable fact that medical science, which is based on experience and astute observation, was just as 'infected' by the belief in witchcraft as the other disciplines, theology, philosophy and jurisprudence."[55] All four disciplines quote the Holy Script continuously, declaring each other to be wrong. Opponents even quoted the same passages, just giving them slightly different interpretations.

Agrippa would have been very pleased with his former pupil who so courageously continued in his tradition of defending innocent victims. But Weyer, unlike Agrippa, went about his task in a quiet unassuming manner.

Weyer, in a sense similar to Pomponazzi, saw man as part of nature, and as <u>individuals</u>, which is evident in his vivid descriptions of his patients. It is in <u>this</u> that Weyer made an outstanding contribution, for without <u>individualization</u> of human beings, medical psychology could not have been developed. He was a master in describing people as they are. Weyer was not shocked by disturbed

behavior, as were most of his contemporaries; he knew full well that there was a cause for it, and he looked for it as a naturalist, discarding the possibility of witchcraft totally.

Weyer's great contribution was in the field of psychology, unlike that of his contemporary Servetus, whose contribution was in physiology. Galenic humoral theory was unable to answer Weyer's questions, but rather confused him.

Progress is never made in one big leap forward, but rather in a series of small steps. There seldom is only one contributor who makes change possible, but rather many with small contributions. An individual, regardless of how progressive and advanced his ideas may be in some area, still remains a man of his time. This is true for Weyer.

Weyer appears to have been convinced that a physiological reason existed when fantasies became pathological. Again he surveys Iamblius' and Aristotle's ideas on the topic, as well as those of Marsilio Ficino, the Florentine neo-Platonist.

> In writing about dreams Aristotle says, that appearances during dreams find their way in the head through the instrument of sense, just like pictures....the "thought pictures" take on a variety of forms, some flee the warm effluent fumes, as well as the choleric warm and dry fumes, so that they move like a flame: those who evaporate from phlegm...cause dreams about water; but the black melancholic fumes cause horrible appearances like devils; and it is for this reason that the devil volunteers to rise with this matter, as if it was the most agreeable for his illusions....[56]

Here it becomes evident that Weyer borrowed his theory of devils being in

the black melancholic humor from Aristotle. Yet the term "devil" should not be taken literally but rather figuratively, in the sense of causing bad feelings and discomfort.

> Imaginiation represents the actions of reason under the function of the senses, it brings out fantasies which go much further than the sense, it goes beyond any senses....imagination is like a proteus* or a chameleon.[57]

Weyer, returning to these evil fumes, (devils), in the melancholic humor, further explains that the devil selects the person:

> ...the age, the sex, and other things internal and external new forms are conceived by the imagination, and sometimes are communicated to the seat of the intellect through the nerve... so that men even risk their lives, by telling that they have done or seen something which has never been seen or is not part of nature.**

Weyer always clarifies his theories by quoting actual case histories. He explains that he had a patient who would single out an individual and say that this person smelled of sulfur and pitch, when nobody else could smell it. The same patient also complained that his food was too hot with pepper, yet when others tasted it it was not hot. He also complained that his private parts were tormented

---

* Proteus: sea god in Greek mythology who attended Poseidon and had the power of changing his own form or appearance at will.

** Apres avoir choisi la complexion, l'aage, le sexe, au autres choses interieures et exterieures, par lesquelles des nouvelle figures, conceuës en la vertu imaginative, sont souvent souventfois communiques a l'espirit de la veue, par le nerf....tellement que les hommes osent bien assurer sur leur vie, avoir fait au veu les choses que no furent iamais veues, et ne furent iamais en la nature. Jean Wier, Les Illusions, Livre III, Chpt. VII, p. 308.

and inflamed and becoming gangrenous. Weyer assures his readers that in reality this was not so, yet the patient was convinced that he was right.[58] Weyer tried to find out why a person suddenly perceives things differently; he was aware that this patient somehow adjusted external things according to internal feelings, or images as he calls them.

Zilboorg points out that Weyer, with a striking perspicacity, asserts, as Freud and some of his followers have proved so much later, that some of the severe mental disorders represent in the waking state beliefs and convictions which normally occur merely in dreams and which normally are recognized as dreams.[59]

Weyer explains that women who volunteer to confess fantastic things should not be taken seriously, for what they talked about was not reality but a dream-like experience.

Weyer was the first to separate medical psychology from theology and reduced the clinical problems of psychopathology to mere simple understandable terms.

Withington states:

> ...with regard to the number of victims, even sober historians, such as Soldan, speak of millions but, if we take three quarters of a million for the two centuries 1500-1700, it will give you a rate of ten executions daily, at least eight of which were judicial murders.[60]

The witch-hunters believed that they just exercised their duties as pious Christians in carrying out the scriptural injunction: "Thou shalt not suffer a

witch to live."* The power of suggestion, as Weyer mentioned, had a great influence on the number of cases tried, and the number of cases tried must have had an influence on the judges' decisions. A small percentage of the victims tried were, of course, real poisoners. Weyer believed that those should be tried, but one should be careful not to confuse them with innocent sick people.

There is no doubt that witchcraft was the most pressing problem in Weyer's day and it is not surprising that psychology of mental illness became his main interest. Weyer pleaded repeatedly for the right and duty of medicine to intervene in such cases. He insisted that medicine was best prepared to deal with this problem, for only by means of rational observation and treatment, (moral treatment), could these women be saved from execution. He calls them by various names connoting compassion and regret: aniculae, mulierculae, retulae, dementiae delusue, miseriae. Weyer indeed deserves the right to be called the father of psychiatry.

---

* Exod. 22., 18.

References

CHAPTER IV

JOHAN WEYER: Practitioner, Clinician and Scientist

1. E. T. Withington, "Dr. John Weyer and The Witch Mania", in Studies in the History and Method of Science, ed. Charles Singer, (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1917), p. 194.

2. Johann Diefenbach, Der Hexenwahn: vor und nach der Glaubensspaltung, (Mainz: Druck F. Kirchheim, 1886), p. 299.

3. Ralph H. Major, A History of Medicine, (Oxford: Blackwell Scientific Pub., 1954), p. 491.

4. John Calvin, Opera, Vol. XIII, "Complaint of Nicholas de la Fontaine against Servetus, Process of 14 August, 1553, before the Lesser Council of Geneva", pp. 727-31, (French), in Original Sources of European History, Trans. and Reprints, (Philadelphia: The Department of History of the University of Pennsylvania, 1897), Vol. III, No. 3, p. 13.

5. Heinrich Kraemer and James Sprenger, The Malleus Maleficarum, trans. Montague Summers, (New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1971), Part III, Question IX, pp. 216-7.

6. Ibid., Part III, Questions X-XI, pp. 217-22.

7. Ibid., Part III, Questions XIII-XV, pp. 222-32.

8. Withington, op. cit., p. 197.

9. Jean Wier, Histoires des Illusions, trans. from Latin into French, Jaques Grevin, (reimpression de l'edition de 1579, Paris: Delahaye et Lecroisnier, Ed., 1885), Vol. I, Livre IV, Chap. XVI, p. 559.

10. Ibid., Livre IV, Chap. XVI, pp. 557-8.

11. Ibid., Livre IV, Chap. I, p. 487.

12. Ibid., Livre IV, Chap. VIII, pp. 520-1.

13. Ibid., Livre IV, Chap. VIII, pp. 520-1.

14. Gregory Zilboorg, The Medical Man and the Witch During the Renaissance, (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1935, p. 124.

15. Ibid., p. 129.

16. Wier, op. cit., Vol. I, Livre III, Chap. XVII, pp. 380-1, (author's translation from the French).

17. Ibid., pp. 381-2, (author's translation from the French).

18. Ibid., p. 377.

19. Ibid., p. 379.

20. Ibid., pp. 379-80, (author's translation from the French).

21. Ibid., p. 380, (author's translation from the French).

22. Carl Binz, Doctor Johann Weyer, (Berlin: Verlag von August Hirschwald, 1896), p. 133.

23. Ibid., p. 133, (author's translation).

24. Ibid., p. 134, (author's translation).

25. Ibid., p. 135, (author's translation).

26. Ibid., p. 136.

27. Ibid., p. 136, (author's translation).

28. Wier, op. cit., Vol. II, Livre VI, pp. 313-5, (author's translation from the French).

29. Ibid., (author's translation from the French).

30. Ibid., Vol. I, Livre II, Chap. XIX, p. 267, (author's translation from the French).

31. Ibid., Vol. I, Livre II, Chap. XVIII, p. 259, (author's translation from the French).

32. Gregory Zilboorg, A History of Medical Psychology, (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., Inc., 1941), p. 221.

33. Wier, op. cit., Vol. I, Livre III, Chap. VII, pp. 303-7, (author's translation from the French).

34. Josef Anton Häfliger, Felix Platter, Ein Arzneidrogen und Naturalien Sammler des 16. Jahrhundert, in Neuburger's Festschrift zum 80. Geburtstag Max Neuburgers mit 91 Internationalen Medizinishen Beiträgen, (Wien: W. Maudrich, 1948), p. 226.

35. Zilboorg, A History of Medical Psychology, p. 167.

36. Owsei Temkin, Galenism, (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1973), p. 157.

37. Esther Fisher-Homberger, Hypochondrie: Melancholie bis Neuroses Krankheiten und Zustandsleiden, (Berne: Huber, 1970), pp. 13-5.

38. Ioannis Wieri, De prasetigiis daemonum, (Basileae: Ex Officina, Operiniana, 1577), Liber V, Cap. XXVIII, p. 615, (author's translation).

39. Ibid., in Letter to Duke William of Jülich-Berg-Clèves, p. 5, (author's translation).

40. Ibid., Livre III, Chap. XIX, pp. 387-8.

41. Ibid., in Letter to Duke William, p. 5, (author's translation).

42. Ibid., in Letter to Duke William, p. 5, (author's translation).

43. Ibid., in Epilogue, p. 795, (author's translation).

44. Ibid., in Letter to Duke William, p. 6, (author's translation).

45. Ibid., in Letter to Emperor, p. 11, (author's translation).

46. Withington, op. cit., p. 197.

47. Diefenbach, op. cit., chap. 2, p. 115.

48. Withington, op. cit., p. 197.

49. Wier, op. cit., Vol. I, Livre III, chap. V, p. 298, (author's translation from the French).

50. Ibid., Vol. I, Livre III, chap. VI, p. 300, (author's translation from the French).

51. Ibid., Vol. I, Livre III, chap. VI, p. 301, (author's translation from the French).

52. Ibid., Vol. I, Livre II, chap. XVII, pp. 254-5, (author's translation from the French).

53. Zilboorg, A History of Medical Psychology, p. 161.

54. Wier, op. cit., Vol. I, Livre III, chap. XII, p. 308, (author's translation from the French).

55. Diefenbach, op. cit., chap. 2, p. 115, (author's translation).

56. Wier, op. cit., Vol. I, Livre III, chap. XIII, pp. 311-2, (author's translation from the French).

57. Ibid., Vol. I, Livre III, chap. XIII, p. 309, (author's translation from the French).

58. Ibid., Vol. I, Livre III, chap. XIII, pp. 311-2.

59. Zilboorg, A History of Medical Psychology, pp. 227-8.

60. Withington, op. cit., p. 208.

CHAPTER V

Contemporaries React to Weyer and Pomponazzi

Reaction to Weyer's Teaching

Weyer's attempt to free psychology from its ancient demoniacal clutch and to introduce medical psychology instead was a momentous step taken in the history of mankind. As always when new ideas, (concepts), evolve, many individuals feel threatened and rally to support the older ideas. Man's intellectual inertia also leads him to accept without question what he has been taught for so long, and to reject without proper examination newly proposed ideas. In Weyer's case these attitudes of course created conflicts with the old familiar views. If one adds to this "normal threat and inertia" the highly charged emotionalism, (mass-mania), of the majority of people, including many professionals of the sixteenth century, one can understand why Weyer's plea for a less emotional and more rational approach in the treatment of the mentally ill fell upon deaf ears. One has to remember that during Weyer's lifetime, and for more than a hundred years after his death, Catholics, Lutherans, Calvinists, Anglicans and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts were united in at least one aspect: their fanaticism in trying to eradicate witchcraft.

But Weyer was not without support from others. As the popularity of his work, De praestigiis daemonum, indicates, (six reprints and two French and

German translations during the twenty years after its first publication), Weyer's concern for the innocent victims was shared by many. The humanist circle was slowly but steadily growing, yet compared to the total population it was still a relatively small group. Weyer also wrote a German text of De praestigiis in order to make the book available to a greater reading audience, and also because he was very unhappy with the German translation of his work by Füglin, (location and printer unknown). As is evident from Weyer's dedications of his works, Duke William was not the only ruler supporting Weyer's efforts. Although the notes of approval printed in each book, (See Chapter II), show that Weyer was supported by some physicians, (Ronsseur, von Ewich and Zwinger), theologians, (Hovaeus of Eternach, Benedictine Abbot, and preacher Karl Gallus), and a lawyer, (Kaspar Borchtold), one must remember that to have one's name printed in one of Weyer's works was not without danger to one's life.

The sharpest criticism of Weyer's works came from lawyers and theologians who resented his intrusion into their fields. Weyer claimed that the law had no legal rights to punish sinners who confessed on their own. He held that these persons had not committed a civil crime, and he pointed out that the Bible said that repentence only was helpful in such cases: "...those who show repentence and disclose their wrongdoings to their brethren will be rescued from the devil's clutches by masses said for them."*

---

* Toutesfois il s'en repentit et desouvrit la maladie de son esprit à ses frères, lesquels retirerent à force de messes la scedule horst de la main du diable.

One of Weyer's most outspoken opponents was Jean Bodin, (1530-1596), a then highly respected lawyer and accomplished writer.* His criticism therefore carried weight. Bodin, a graduate of the law school at Toulouse, lectured there for a few years after his graduation.[1] At the age of twenty-five he published his first work, a translation of Oppian's Cynegeticon into Latin verse, with a commentary. "Almost immediately on its publication, the celebrated scholar Turnébé, [1512-1565], complained that some of his emendations had been appropriated without acknowledgement."[2]

Bodin became a prolific writer; the work which made him famous was his Republic, (1577). Another work published posthumously, (1857), shows that Bodin expressed much more idealism and tolerance in his writings than in practice.[3] His Colloquium Heptaplomeres de abditis rerum sublinium arcansis is written in the form of a discussion among seven learned men: a Jew, a Mohamedan, a Lutheran, a Zwinglian, a Roman Catholic, an Epicurean and a Theist. The conclusion reached by them was that they will live together in charity and toleration, and refrain from further religious disputation.[4] None of this idealism and pragmatism is evident in Bodin's "Refutation des opinions de Jean Wier", (thirty-four pages), at the end of his work De la demonomanie, (1581):

---

* Bodin was appointed secretary and counselor to Duke Alençon, (brother of King Henry VIII), and accompanied him to England to sue for Queen Elizabeth's hand. Encyclopaedia Britannica, (9th ed., Philadelphia: J. M. Stoddart and Co., 1876), III, 736.

> Johan Weyer, physician holds the view that witches and sorcerers should not be punished....which gives me an opportunity to respond not in hatred, but primarily in support of God's honor, which he attacks. Secondly, I intend to correct the opinion of the judges Weyer boasts have been influenced by reading his works, so that sorcerers apparently are only punished "lightly", and other judges who sentence the accused to death, are called hangmen, (bourreaux),* by them, which surprises me: such opinion can only come from either a very ignorant man or a wretched man.[5]

Here Bodin talks about the Duke-Bishop of Münster and Count Bernhard von Roesfeld who were greatly impressed by Weyer's works according to Binz.[6] Bodin emphasizes that Weyer, though only a physician, is not an ignorant but rather a wretched man who, with the help of his books, teaches a thousand damnable tricks of witchcraft and magic: "At the end of his book De praestigiis he has an inventory of the whole diabolic monarchy including the first and last names of 72 princes and 7,406,926 devils...."[7]

It cannot be denied that Weyer made an inventory of the whole "diabolic monarchy", but the purpose was not, as Bodin insisted, to teach damnable things; on the contrary, Weyer gave such a detailed account of pagan and Christian literature regarding demons in a sincere effort to clarify many misunderstandings. Weyer points out that much of the power ascribed to demons was falsely established by persons who made mistakes in translating these ancient writings. Weyer's arguments are always well chosen with a definite purpose.

---

* Author's parentheses.

He starts right at the heart of the problem with translations that dealt with Moses -- Exodus 22, 18, and similarly in Leviticus 19, 31 and in Deuteronomy 18, 10 -- namely, "Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live." Only after consulting with Andreas Masius, philologist, Weyer concludes that the Hebrew word Kasaph stands for poisoner, (Giftmischer), and not magician, sorcerer, (Zauberer), and that the offenders mentioned by Moses were true poisoners and not magicians or sorcerers, for they used pharmacological products to harm men and cattle.* Bodin takes sharp issue with Weyer on this topic and states that Weyer was wrong, and to prove it he reviews everything from Greek mythology to Aristotle, the scriptural writers, Cicero, Christian theologians, the Arabs and all lawyers.[8]

Bodin tries to attack Weyer's honor by quoting the law that states that a person using incantations cannot call himself a physician,** and by saying that God's law does not say that using incantations is only a deception, but that it states that it is a detestable impiety. He says of Weyer that:

---

* En fin i'ay adiousté la punition des empoisonneurs, en laquelle on donne lieu à la loy de Moyse, publié selon la volonté de Dieu, lequel a esté traduit en Grec par les septante anciens, et comme expliqué en la diverse signification des mots Hebrieux: Vous n'endurerez point vivre les empoisonneurs, au comme les Hebrieux disent, les empoisonneresses. Jean Wier, Histoire des Illusions, trans. from Latin into French, Jaques Grevin, (reimpression de l'edition de 1579, Paris: Delahaye et Lacroisnier, Ed., 1885), "Preface" par Jean Wier, Vol. I, p. xxxvii.

** La Loy premiere de variis cognit, aus medioss ff. dict. qui'l ne faut par appeler Medicin celui qui incantanit, qui imprecatus est, qui at vulgari verbo impostorum utar, exorcisanit; non sunt ista medicinae genera. Bodin, op. cit., p. 218.

> ...he talks sometimes of God and his law, an approach commonly used by Satan and his impostors....Under the cover of holy and sacred things, he tries to free these ungodly, irreligious persons.[9]

The difference in arguments between the two men speaks for itself and needs no interpretation, but one cannot help wondering if Bodin had really read Weyer's book carefully, or if he had just scanned it. Maybe Bodin was aware of the shallowness of his arguments and therefore made sure that everybody knew that Weyer, when living with Agrippa, had read the most detestable book that exists in the world, Trithemius' Steganographia. Weyer, admitting that he had read the work before he was nineteen years old, remarked dryly: "...thet they must have made light, (laughing), of the wild pretensions of having power over spirits, of being able to obscure the stars, and make the elements work in their favor."[10]

Bodin feels free to correct Weyer's medical view:

> Weyer must admit that as a physician he sounds ignorant (but of course he is not ignorant) when he conveniently pretends that these females suffer of melancholia, which does not at all agree with the wild qualities ascribed to the melancholic humor, which is said to influence man's behavior so that he becomes well behaved, poised, and contemplative, as the ancient philosophers have noticed, qualities which are as incompatible with females as fire and water are.[11]

Zilboorg points out that:

> ...the problem of the relationship between medicine and law is a very old one....but it was Weyer who was the first in the history of medicine to present a systematic criticism of that branch of the law governing the punishment of the mentally sick, and it was Bodin's questionable honor to be the first to

respond negatively to this legitimate demand of medicine.[12]

Bodin is very critical of Weyer's discussing legal problems but has no hesitation himself in discussing medical problems: "As a physician Weyer should know that men only can become melancholic and not women. Women are 'cold and humid' by nature... melancholia comes from heat and dryness...."[13]

Bodin concentrated on the problem that still plagues our courts today, namely on the divergence of opinions held by physicians versus those held by lawyers in criminal cases where a death sentence is mandatory, but in which a plea of insanity is recommended.[14]

Bodin is afraid that this may create misuse of the law: "...the thieves and robbers might always appeal for mercy by blaming the devils for their deeds...."[15]

Bodin rejects Weyer's statement that nothing is possible in law that is not possible in nature, as wrong and wholly impious.[16] A true dialogue between Weyer and Bodin was not possible, for this would have required both persons involved to listen to each other first, and Bodin appears to have been unwilling to listen. It appears that he had little respect for physicians, for he willfully directed criticism where it could be least defended: "...Cardan's judgement is just as inept as Weyer's, he wrote a horoscope for Jesus Christ and had it even published in Italy and France....what a ridiculous thing to do...."[17]

Another well-known opponent of Weyer was Martin Anton Delrio, (b. 1551), a Jesuit lawyer and theologian, who was as prolific a writer as Bodin. His main

work was published in Mainz in 1593.* Binz points out that though it was written a century after the Malleus Maleficarum, its content is just as superstitious as that of the Malleus Maleficarum, and the only difference is that the recommended tortures are slightly less cruel. Delrio introduces Weyer in the preface of his work, calling him a patron of witches and a heretic.[18] Even though Delrio does not introduce any new arguments against Weyer, his work appears to have been popular for during the next 150 years fourteen new editions were printed in different locations.

But there were also lawyers who agreed with Weyer, as is evident from a letter written by Kaspar Borchtold, (a lawyer), to a friend. Discussing Weyer's De praestigiis, he writes:

> It is so ingeniously sharp and well written, that all learned men in Burgundy and Belgium respect it as if it were a sacred thing.... and I must say no other book has ever given me that much satisfaction.[19]

In a public lecture given by Georg Gödelman, professor of jurisprudence in Rostock, (1584), that was printed,** we find that he not only fully supported

---

* Disquisitionum magicarum libri sex, quibus continetur accurata curiosarum artium et vanarum superstitionum confutatio, utilis theologis, jurisconsultis, medicis, philologis. Binz, op. cit., p. 88

** Gödelman's lectures on witchcraft probably appeared first in 1590, and were translated into German in 1592 by G. Nigrinus, a Hessian superintendent, and published in Frankfurt a. M. Binz points out that he is using the Latin editions of 1601 and 1676. Binz, op. cit., pp. 97-8.

Weyer's views, but to reinforce his address he quoted freely from Weyer's work. Gödelman questions the then held view that sorcery is a crimen exceptum* and therefore gives the judge great liberty in selecting appropriate punishment.[20] Gödelman also insists that confessions made under torture are meaningless, for who would not confess anything when tortured so cruelly?

To this statement by Gödelman, Delrio reacted violently. He quotes what he considers a classic story to prove the point he wants to make. After a nightly dance-meeting a witch flew home through the air, taking with her a young man. While flying over a lake she dropped him and he fell into the reeds which cut his face, and he dislocated both hips. The witch was found and executed. Proud of his story, Delrio asks: what would an impudent Weyer and Gödelman, and their oracles Luther and Melanchton say to this?[21] Bodin and Gödelman were highly critical of each other's view as lawyers.

Weyer was called many things. A Prussian, calling himself Duke de la Scala, accused Weyer of being a Waldensian and a Wyclif, which Weyer resolutely

---

* Diefenbach explains that during the Middle Ages sorcery was regarded as a crimen mixtum, (as were adultery, perjury and blasphemy), but was changed to a crimen exceptum during the years the Reformation took place. He further explains that during the Middle Ages jurisprudence was only responsible for the execution of punishment, but with the introduction of the Carolina,† it also became responsible for the criminal procedure, and it was this change that made witch-trials possible. Diefenbach also emphasizes that not the Church but absolutism of the State, (aided by the separation of the Church), which brought this change about. Johann Diefenbach, Der Hexenwahn: vor und nach der Glaubensspaltung, (Mainz: Druck F. Kirchheim, 1886), p. iv, (author's translation).

† Carolina: Criminal Code of Roman Empire under Charles V, est. in 1530.

denied. Dr. Johannes Brentz, (1499-1570), a famous Protestant theologian, disagreed with Weyer on many things but especially on his interpretation of the word Kasaph,[22] which made "Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live" obsolete. A Parisian mathematician Jacob Gohory[23] simply called Weyer a liar.

Weyer's message undeniably reached many educated people in various professions, locations, and of the Roman Catholic as well as the Protestant religion. Weyer's message split from the humanistic circle those members who were lacking in humanity.

A few people in Weyer's time were able to disagree with him without rejecting him as a person. Andreas Masius,[24] philologist, and a member of the Council of Clèves, criticized Weyer's De praestigiis in many ways but remained a loyal friend.

Weyer's name found its way into the Journals of the British House of Commons,[25] and King James I, in his work Daemonologie, accuses Weyer of being a sorcerer.

Almost one hundred years after Weyer's death an influential professor of jurisprudence and Geheimrat in Dresden, Benedict Carpzov,[26] (1595-1666), renewed the attack against the so-called protectors of sorcerers: Weyer, and another Paduan physician Petrus de Apono, as well as a Florentine lawyer Joh. Fr. Ponzinibur. In his chapter "de crimine sortileggi" of his great work Practica nova Imperialis Saxonica rerum criminalium, he states:

> There is no doubt that we find men from all "walks of life" ready to serve Satan and to defend his empire, by spreading devils feasts and fellowship, in trying to convince judges and other authorities that witches (sorcerers) were judged unfairly, and should never be given the death penalty. They hold this presumption, (as they like to believe) not without the most important reasons.[27]

Binz describes Carpzov as an orthodox Lutheran, (who had read the entire Bible fifty-three times), but who was in theory a Bodin and Delrio, and in practice a Sprenger and Kraemer.[28]

Physicians react to Weyer's theory of witchcraft

Even among physicians Weyer had vehement opponents. A Marburg physician Wilhelm Adolph Scribonius, (Schreiber), [fl. 1580], a contemporary of Weyer's, fully supports Bodin in calling Weyer a sorcerer and poisoner.[29] Unlike Weyer, he was on the side of the accuser and was called upon as a physician to witness water tests of witches. The accused persons' right hands were tied to their left big toes, and their left hands to their right toes which made any movements to swim impossible. Then they were thrown into deep water three times, and if they did not sink it was considered proof of guilt. How Weyer felt about these water tests we learn from Scribonius' statement: "Weyer, a physician, speaks of these tests in his sixth book...and declares the tests as meaningless since the results were not correct. I do not see any proof Weyer gives to substantiate his opinion...."*

---

* Scribonius' report to the mayor of Lemgo, 4 October 1583, Theatrum veneficis, p. 231. Binz, op. cit., pp. 84-5, (author's translation).

Hermann Neuwaldt, (ob. 1611), professor of medicine in Helmstadt, has the following to say about his friend Weyer:

> ...Johan Weyer, a man of great accomplishments in medicine and philosophy, cannot be convinced of the usefulness of water tests which he regards as pure superstition. I must admit that he feels pity for the sorcerers and defends them out of compassion and out of pious devotion, rejecting and laughing off their make-believe art: I cannot see it his way, for I rely on visual evidence and the authority of the holy Scripture.[30]

Johann von Ewich, (1525-1588), physician in Duisburg, later city physician and professor of medicine, was a personal friend of Weyer's. He admits that until he met Weyer he, like most physicians and lawyers of his time, was influenced by the opinion held by the majority of people:

> ... But now since my judgement has been strengthened by yours, I see the light, and know exactly where to go and what to do.... Fare well excellent Weyer, Hercules of our superstitious time....*

It is appropriate here to discuss briefly Weyer's opinion of Paracelsus, (1493-1541), his contemporary: "This rouster boasts to be the monarch of medicine, the inventor of true science, and that his sectarians hold him in high esteem, honoring and revering him."[31]

Talking about the lack of knowledge or plain ignorance of some of the surgeons, Weyer says that many deserve to be called sorcerers:

---

* From a letter of von Ewich to Weyer, 1 June 1563. Binz, op. cit., pp. 94-5, (author's translation).

> As the brainchildren of a certain Theophrastus Paracelsus, the scandal monger, who glorifies himself arrogantly in the smoke of a chemical fire, a slave of arrogance, presumption, and empty glory, who can do everything, for whom nothing is impossible, who yells and talks loudly, his mouth full of promises....They (his brainchildren) use the book he named Paragrammon, full of dirty and dishonest words.[32]

> I am not saying that chemistry is not an important part of medicine....I admit that through chemistry we extract and prepare spirits, oils, powders, salts, all helpful in healing disease....[33]

Duke William's surgeon Cosmos Slot, (a student of Vesalius'), trained a young surgeon Wilhelm Fabricius,[34] (also called Hildanus), who became one of the great surgeons of his time. Fabricius later on accepted a position as city physician of Bern, (1634). He mentions that while at Duke William's court he became friendly with Weyer. In his main treatise, Chirurgische Beobachtungen,* he takes a stand against torture. He donated to the city magistrate of Bern the skeleton of a male who had been tortured so badly that both of his collar bones were fragmented into many pieces.

Weyer's Followers

In 1584 Reginald Scot, owner of an estate in the dukedom of Kent, (England), published a treatise on the Discoverie of witchcraft. Binz points out that Weyer's influence is evident on almost each page. Scot uses quotes from Agrippa's and

---

* Fabricius mentions Weyer's name in the dedication of his treatise, Opera quae extant omnia, (Frankfurt: 1646), p. 9.

Weyer's works, of which he is an admirer. He calls Weyer the most famous and noble physician of his time. Scot dedicates his treatise to Sir Roger Manwood, Lord cheefe Baron of his Majesties Court of the Exchequer. Binz describes Scot as a quiet and very kind personality, willing to help the poor and oppressed. Scot's treatise was reprinted in 1651, 1655 and 1676. The following is an example of his style and expression from his treatise in the chapter where he talks about the Inquisitors:

> Howbeit they affirm that they will not tell all that might make to the manifestation of their holiness; for then should their owne praise stinke in their owne mouths. And yet God knoweth their whole book containeth nothing but stinking lies and poperie.[35]

Also in Germany, approximately at the same time, a treatise on Christian thought and sorcery was published in Heidelberg, (1585),* under the pseudonym Augustine Lerchheimer. The author was a Greek scholar and philosopher who at the time was rector of the University of Heidelberg; his real name was Hermann Wilken.[36] Binz points out that this writer is also very familiar with Weyer's works. Like Weyer, he pleads for reason to prevail instead of emotion, and Christian compassion instead of hatred.

Two Jesuit theologians deserve to be mentioned for having carried on Weyer's work. Adam Tanner, (b. 1572),[37] a very learned man and close friend of the naturalist P. Ch. Scheiner, in his treatise Theologica scholastica takes a

---

* Reprinted in Basel, 1593; Speyer, 1597; Zürich, 1627 and Frankfurt, 1654.

stand against tortures used, yet he still believes in witchcraft but is against death penalties. He was called a heretic because he spoke out for more humane treatment of witches.

In 1631 another Jesuit theologian, Friedrich von Spee,[38] published a treatise Cautio criminalis, seu de processibus contra Sagas liber, written for civil and church authorities. The name of the author is not mentioned, it is simply stated that the author is an orthodox Roman theologian. The book was printed in the Protestant city of Rinteln.[39] Apparently there was a big demand for this book since within a year a reprint was made. Also this work was written in Weyer's tradition, although von Spee was not as completely free of superstition as Weyer was. Spee never mentions Weyer's name.

After Weyer's and Spee's deaths, those who so courageously supported Weyer's views slowly were forgotten and Bodin's and Delrio's views triumphed for years to come. The sheer number of Weyer's opponents speaks for itself, and so does the fervor and vehemence with which he was criticized and attacked. Had he been a lesser man he would have been treated more kindly. The modern reader, to whom witchcraft is a thing of the past, may not so easily be able to appreciate fully Weyer's courage in fighting superstition and in pleading for rational instead of emotional reasoning. Only a very few of Weyer's friends and supporters were as free of superstitious beliefs as Weyer was. He was a truly great man.

Reaction to Pomponazzi's teachings

In studying the life and works of Pomponazzi and his contemporaries, one shares the renewed enthusiasm for antiquity and the readiness to look to the ancients to find answers to questions brought about by the then prevalent tendency to exalt the powers and significance of man. A good example of this attitude is Pico della Mirandola's, (1463-1494), treatise On the Dignity of Man, which was widely accepted as a humanistic credo: "...Thou constrained by no limits, in accordance with thine own free will, in whose hands we have placed thee, shalt ordain for thyself the limits of nature...."[40]

Pico della Mirandola, (Pomponazzi's contempory), unlike his teacher Ficino, refused to follow any particular thinker or school of thought, and as a universalist he refused to accept the theory of one truth only. Also in Lorenzo Valla's, (1405-1457), dialogue On the Free Will,[41] in which he points out the irreconcilability of reason and faith, or of philosphy and theology, one detects a new more critical modern spirit evolving, unheard of since antiquity.

Randall, Jr., in speaking of Pomponazzi, states: "...within his close-knit argument there burns a vision of man more akin to the insight of that other Florentine, Machiavelli, than to the rather sentimental piety of the academy...."[42] Pomponazzi and his follower Zabarella came closer to the biological Aristotle than any of their predecessrs. In restrained tones, Pomponazzi points out to his contemporaries a way of living based on the nature of man himself in the best Paduan tradition.[43] In agreement with the prevailing ideal of man's dignity and free

will, Pomponazzi explains that in accepting man's mortality, every man can have the end which suits him best: "...those who claim that the soul is mortal seem better to save the grounds of virtue than those who claim it to be immortal...."[44][45]

A brief review on the stand of the Roman Curia regarding education helps one to understand the reactions to Pomponazzi's work within the context of his time. The renewed interest in the study of the Greek language and the classics was shared by cardinals like Julian II, (c. 1398-1444), and Bessarion, (c. 1403-1466), as well as Pope Nicholas V, (1447-1455), who greatly encouraged the humanistic studies, hoping that the literary revolution might prove a powerful aid not only in promoting Christian culture but also in diffusing a more genuine Christian and Catholic spirit.[46] The views of Pope Pius II, (1458-1464), on education involved a decisive rupture with the traditions of medievalism in encouraging a reconciliation of the churches of East and West.[47] Nicholas de Cusa, (1401-1464), a German born cardinal, was an enthusiastic supporter of the plans for reconciliation and for regeneration of the Church. Lorenzo Valla derived guidance which led him to write the Treatise on the Donation of Constantine, (1440), from Nicholas de Cusa. In this treatise he proves that the claims founded by the Roman see upon that supposed grant reposed on forged documents and legendary fables. Valla, who possessed the qualities of an elegant humanist, an acute critic, and a free thinker, was called by Nicholas V -- not to be arraigned before the bar of Inquisition, but to have conferred upon him the post of apostolic secretary, a sign that humanism triumphed over orthodoxy and tradition. Valla's treatise on The Donation of Constantine marks the commencement of historical

skepticism,[48] but Valla thought of himself not as a heretic but rather as more orthodox than the orthodox.

After that promising period of attempts at regeneration of the Church, the popedom underwent drastic changes which under Alexander VI, (1492-1503), pursued mainly secular interests.[49] At no period in the history of the pontificate was its religious character treated so lightly. Julius II, (1503-1513), as discussed in chapter II, entered the League of Cambrai and after humiliating the Venetians, entered a "Holy League", (1511), with them and King Ferdinand of Aragon against France out of fear that France and the Empire might squeeze him out. Julius II used his energies mainly for the aggrandizement of the papal states, an endeavor he accomplished with success according to Machiavelli: "...there was no baron so petty as not to look with contempt on that popedom which now even a king of France regards now with respect."[50]

Never before in the history of the pontificate had the aims of the papacy been so completely in conflict with those of every European power. Dissenting voices made themselves increasingly heard in Germany, and the names of Johann Reuchlin,* (1455-1522), and Erasmus, (in his treatise The Praise of Folly, ((1511))), became associated with a movement questioning the doctrine and discipline of the Church, which opened the way for Luther.

---

* The first great German humanist, who introduced the study of Hebrew and in large measure also of Greek letters among his countrymen. During the years 1511-1516 he carried on a struggle against the monks of Cologne, in defense of the New Learning and of improved canons of textual criticism. Britannica, op. cit., XX, 503-5.

Although the Roman doctrine and discipline were still rigorously imposed on the Spanish people, King Ferdinand of Aragon forbid the promulgation of papal bulls in his provinces unless his sanction was obtained.[51]

Possibly in connection with the Spanish Inquisition, Leo X, (1513-1521), sent a bull out against Averroism for denying the immortality of the soul.* When Pomponazzi's De immortalitate animae was published three years later, an uproar broke out among some of the clergy, who tried to convince the Patriarch and the Doge of Venice to burn the book and proclaim its author a heretic.[52] A copy of the book was sent to Cardinal Bembo, Pomponazzi's patron in Rome, but he found no heresy in it.

The freedom of thought which during the revival of learning had passed relatively unchallenged within the pale of the Church, now became grounds for suspicion. In 1520 Leo X responded to Luther with a bull denouncing him as one seeking to revive the heresies of the Waldenses, the Hussites, and the Bohemians and aiming at the destruction of the Church.[53] The new Inquisition set up by Charles V in the Netherlands became exceedingly severe under Philip II and the Duke of Alba. Under the terrorism of the Inquisition, the free expression of thought was no longer possible without risking one's life. Pomponazzi's De immortalitate animae, due to the protection of influential friends, was never put

---

* See Conciliorum omnium collectio regia, Paris, XXXIV, 557, In Andrew Halliday Douglas, The Philosophy and Psychology of Pietro Pomponazzi, ed. Charles Douglas and R. P. Hardie, (Hildesheim, Germany: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1962), p. 67.

on the Index of forbidden books, but he was asked to write an Apologia by Leo X, who supported both sides and, as Randall, Jr. points out, loved a good fight.[54] Pomponazzi obliged, and published his Apologia in 1517. It was not apologetic at all, but rather with renewed conviction he defended his work with passion, ready to die for it. He refused to state that immortality can be demonstrated by reason:[55]

> A philosopher cannot do this; especially if he be a teacher, for in so teaching he would be teaching falsehood, he would be an unfaithful master, his deception could be easily detected, and he would be acting contrary to the profession of philosophy.[56]

Cardinal Contarini, a former fellow-student of Pomponazzi's, pressured Pomponazzi to a more exact analysis of the soul's functioning and to an interpretation of all doubtful Aristotelian passages.[57] In the Apologia,* intellect had become extended, like other forms, yet remained invisible. Contarini also questioned Pomponazzi about a possible localized organ for the intellect, but Pomponazzi had no answer; it remained for his follower Zabarella to point to "imagination" as the organ of intellect.[58]

---

* Apologia, Lib. I, cap. 3: "It seems to me that it can be said with sufficient probability... that the human intellect is extended in its knowing and willing; still it knows and reasons in terms of universals; nor does Aristotle contradict this view." In Francesco Fiorentino, Studi e Rittrati della Rinascenza, "la psicologia di Pietro Pomponazzi", (place unknown: Bari, 1911), p. 10.

A year after the publication of the Apologia, the Reformitori of Bologna re-appointed Pomponazzi to his chair for a term of eight years at a doubled salary.[59]

Niphus, Pomponazzi's chief antagonist concurrens at Padua and Bologna, was employed by the Pope to answer Pomponazzi. Initially he expounded Averroes' doctrine, but then yielded to ecclesiastical influence and defended the plurality and immortality of souls.[60] He must have been a frustating opponent for Pomponazzi, for his reasoning was inconsistent, he utilized indiscriminately Averroistic, Platonic or Thomistic arguments. In 1519, in response to Niphus' voluminous defense of Thomas Aquinas, Pomponazzi published his Defensorium.[61] As Fiorentino points out, Pomponazzi was an opponent on the one side of Averroes and on the other of Thomas Aquinas. He attacks Averroes' theory of oneness of anima intellectiva, as well as Thomas Aquinas' notion of the soul as a "separable form", and as immortal, and returns to the true Aristotelian premise. Pomponazzi reasons that the "intellectual", "sensitive", and "vegetative" soul is the same soul only under different aspects, and known only in body.[62] In his insistence that the human soul exercises reason always and only in dependence of the bodily instrument, (sense and imagination), lies his answer, namely that an incorporeal existence is impossible for the soul. Douglas points out:

> Within six years of the decree of the Lateran council condemning Averroism the strange anomaly was witnessed of the appearance of Niphus and Achillini to defend the immortality of the soul in the name of Averroism. . . . Niphus and Achillini did not hesitate to combine with an abundant use of Averroist phraseology about "eternal intelligence" the ecclesiastical formula of separate intellectual substances or souls.[63]

How much more admirable is Pomponazzi's effort in attempting to "...draw a clear line of distinction between reason and faith, philosophy and theology, and to establish the autonomy of reason and philosophy within their domains."[64]

That Weyer was familiar with Pomponazzi's writing is evident, since he mentions Pomponazzi's name in his De praestigiis daemonum, and this at a time, (Counterreformation), when mentioning Pomponazzi's name may have drawn unwanted attention. Pomponazzi's De incantationibus, written about 1520 and published posthumously in Basel in 1566 by a Protestant in exile, was put on the Index. Weyer's De praestigiis was published seven years later.

It is therefore surprising to find an ambiguous and confusing statement by Weyer about Pomponazzi in the epilogue of his work De praestigiis daemonum, (1577 edition):

> The contentious Peripatetics, in attributing to natural causes whatever is miraculous and wonderful in Holy Scripture, put forward with vehement obstinacy the reasons laid down by Plato and Aristotle.[65]
>
> The work "De Naturalium effectum causes, sive de incantamentis" of Petrus Pomponazzi of Mantua, the greatest and most famous philosopher of his time, full of abstract philosophy is necessary, or more accurately is unrolled so I may attack and sink it: lest, having been confirmed in the unconquerable fundamentals of Christian philosophy, I were to despise the truth of the word according to the Council of St. Paul, the elected vessel, who has warned us to see to it that no one exists who is caught by philosophy according to human rules and worldly principles and not according to Christ. Because in him dwells corporeally all plenitude of the Deity.[66]
>
> Also I should like to hope that Pomponazzi before he had savored his last breath, returned his soul to the singular mercy of God and did not remain an atheist (ἄθεος): indeed so he had, as is reported more than once by that

> distinguished ornament of medicine, Helidaeus of Forli, his former pupil.[67]

One wonders what message he is trying to convey: that of Pomponazzi a great philosopher, or that of Pomponazzi a man undermining Christian philosophy? It sounds strange coming from Weyer, whose messages are usually clear and easily understandable. Was it written by him? Did he write it under pressure? Was Weyer, Agrippa's student, truly alarmed by the dangers latent in a purely naturalistic approach? Nauert points out that despite Agrippa's "...avowed aim at purifying magic and of devoting at least two of the three books of De Occulta philosophia to natural magic, he never showed so radical a naturalism as did Pomponazzi."[68] But if Weyer was alarmed, why did three of his four sons study at Padua, Bologna, Florence, Geneva and Montpellier? Only the oldest son, (lawyer), studied for one semester in Paris.

Obviously more research is needed on Pomponazzi's and Weyer's other works and correspondence in order to find out how Weyer really felt about Pomponazzi.

Kristeller points out:

> Pomponazzi's influence, although not easily traceable, was considerable. The school of Italian Aristotelianism to which he belonged flourished for a hundred years or more after his death, and within this tradition his name remained famous and his views on such questions as the immortality of the soul and the unity of the intellect continued to be cited and discussed, if not adopted. The posthumous publication of several of his writings later in the century also gives testimony to his continued fame.[69]

During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries some of the freethinkers saw in Pomponazzi one of their forerunners. Kristeller points out that "...it is one thing to say that Pomponazzi and the Aristotelians held the same views as later freethinkers, and it is another to state that they represent an earlier stage in a development that was to produce the views held by the freethinkers."[70]

What Pomponazzi said is that the immortality of the soul cannot be demonstrated on purely natural grounds.

References

CHAPTER V

Contemporaries React to Weyer and Pomponazzi

1. Encyclopaedia Britannica, (9th ed., Philadelphia: J. M. Stoddart and Co., 1876), III, 736.

2. Ibid., p. 736.

3. Ibid., p. 736.

4. Ibid., p. 736.

5. Jean Bodin, "Refutation des opinions de Jean Wier", in De la Demonomanie des sorciers, (Paris: Jaques du Puys, Libraire luré, a la Samaritaine, 1582, avec privilege du Roy), pp. 218-9, (author's translation).

6. Carl Binz, Doctor Johann Weyer, (Berlin: Verlag von August Hirschwald, 1896), p. 70, n. 1-2.

7. Bodin, op. cit., pp. 218-9, (author's translation).

8. Bodin, op. cit., p. 218 - 9.

9. Ibid., p. 218, (author's translation).

10. Binz, op. cit., p. 19.

11. Bodin, op. cit., p. 227, (author's translation).

12. Gregory Zilboorg, A History of Medical Psychology, (New York: W. W. Norton and Co., Inc., 1969), p. 239.

13. Bodin, op. cit., p. 227, (author's translation).

14. Ibid., pp. 409-11.

15. Ibid., pp. 409-11, (author's translation).

16. Ibid., pp. 409-11.

17. Ibid., Livre I, chap. 5, p. 34, (author's translation).

18. Binz, op. cit., pp. 88-90.

19. Ibid., p. 72, (author's translation).

20. Ibid., p. 97.

21. Ibid., p. 97.

22. Ibid., pp. 77-8.

23. Ibid., p. 77.

24. Ibid., pp. 75-7.

25. James I, King of England, See Journals of the House of Commons, Bd. 22, Index 9 and 10 Geo II Parl. 2. Sess. 2, under witchcraft, in Binz, op. cit., p. 88.

26. Binz, op. cit., p. 91.

27. Benedict Carpzov, Practica nova Imperialis Saxonica rerum criminalium in partes III, 1635, Quaest. 48, no. 13 and 14, in Binz, op. cit., p. 91, (author's translation).

28. Binz, op. cit., p. 91.

29. Ibid., pp. 83-5.

30. Ibid., pp. 85-6, (author's translation).

31. Ibid., p. 95.

32. Jean Wier, Histoires des Illusions, trans. from Latin into French, Jaques Grevin, (reimpression de l'edition de 1579, Paris: Delahaye et Lecroisnier, Ed., 1885), Vol. I, Livre II, Chap. XVIII, pp. 260-1.

33. Ibid., pp. 260-1, (author's translation).

34. P. Müller, Rede etc., Arch. f. Gesch. d. Medicine, 1882, Bd. 6, in Binz, op. cit., p. 73.

35. Binz, op. cit., pp. 97-100.

36. Ibid., pp. 100-1.

37. Ibid., pp. 122-3.

38. Ibid., pp. 123-4.

39. Ibid., p. 123.

40. Giovanni Pico della Mirandola, "On the Dignity of Man", trans. Elizabeth Livermore Forbes, in The Renaissance Philosophy of Man, ed. Ernst Cassierer, Paul Oskar Kristeller, and John Randall, Jr., Phoenix Books, (11th im., Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1969), p. 225.

41. Charles Edward Trinkhaus, Jr., Introduction to Lorenzo Valla's "Dialogue on Free Will", in Randall, Jr., op. cit., p. 149.

42. Randall, Jr., op. cit., p. 268.

43. Ibid., p. 273.

44. Petrus Pomponatii, "De immortalitate animae", chpt. xiv, in Randall, Jr., op. cit., p. 274, n. 49.

45. Ibid., p. 274, n. 50.

46. Britannica, op. cit., XX, 335-6.

47. Ibid., p. 336.

48. Ibid., p. 336.

49. Britannica, op. cit., XIX, 518.

50. Britannica, op. cit., XX, 336.

51. Ibid., p. 337.

52. Randall, Jr., op. cit., pp. 274-5.

53. Britannica, op. cit., XX, 339-40.

54. Randall, Jr., op. cit., pp. 274-5.

55. Ibid., p. 275.

56. Ibid., p. 275.

57. Ibid., p. 276.

58. Ibid., p. 277.

59. Francesco Fiorentino, "Pietro Pomponazzi: Studi storici su la Scuola Bolognese e Padovano del secolo XVI, (Florence: 1886), in Randall, Jr., op. cit. p. 275.

60. J. F. Nourrisson, De la Liberté et du Hasard: essay sur Alexander d'Aphrodisias suivi du Traité du Destin et du Libre Pouvoir aux empereurs, traduit en Francias pour la première fois, (Paris: 1870, pp. 142-3, in Andrew

Halliday Douglas, The Philosophy and Psychology of Pietro Pomponazzi, ed. Charles Douglas and R. P. Hardie, (Hildesheim, Germany: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1962), p. 60.

61. Francesco Fiorentino, "Pietro Pomponazzi: Studi Storici su la Scuola Bolognese and Padovana, (Florence: 1868), cap. 4, in Douglas, op. cit. , p. 64.

62. Douglas, op. cit., pp. 53-4.

63. Ibid., p. 67.

64. Paul Oskar Kristeller, "Pomponazzi, Pietro (1462-1525)", in The Encyclopaedia of Philosophy, (New York: The MacMillan Co., and the Free Press, 1967), Vol. 6, p. 392.

65. Ioannis Wierus, De Praestigiis Daemonum, & incantationibus ac ueneficiis Libri sex, (Basileae: Ex Officina, Operiniana, 1577), pp. 795-5, (author's translation).

66. Ibid., pp. 795-6, (author's translation).

67. Ibid., pp. 795-6, (author's translation).

68. Charles G. Nauert, Jr., Agrippa and The Crisis of Renaissance Thought, Illinois Studies in the Social Sciences, (Urbana: University of Illinois, Press, 1965), pp. 252-3.

69. Kristeller, op. cit., Vol. 6, pp. 395-6.

70. Ibid., p. 396.

CHAPTER VI

Main Contributions Made by Weyer and Pomponazzi to Medical Psychology and Psychopathology

During the first half of the twentieth century historians had a tendency to view fifteenth and early sixteenth century scientific thought as the philosophical turning point, away from Aristotelianism toward Platonism.[1] This view can only be upheld by ignoring the naturalistic humanism initiated by Pietro Pomponazzi which culminated in Zabarella. Pomponazzi, a true Aristotelian, regarded his master's system of nature as the only basis for rational reasoning, and insisted upon using the empirical method of positive analysis in place of the method of abstract speculation used by Ficino and other Platonists. It is this insistance on using the empirical method only which is Pomponazzi's main legacy, for it became the foundation on which natural science and behavioral science could develop. Pomponazzi was critical of the accepted philosophies of his time. He pointed out that the notion of "separate soul" is purely speculative, and that the spiritual substances are only affirmed on metaphysical and theological grounds.[2] In insisting on the use of the empirical method of positive analysis he found, as did Aristotle before him, that the soul of man and his "intellectual" soul exist in body only.[3] Pomponazzi's conclusion directly opposed that formulated by St. Augustine centuries earlier: namely that

sensation is a mental, and not a physical, process and that the superior soul of spirit is in no way dependent on the body. While St. Augustine fused theology and psychology for centuries to come,[4] Pomponazzi drew a clear line of distinction between reason and faith, philosophy and theology, and established the autonomy of reason and philosophy within their own domains.[5]

Kristeller points out:

> In medieval Europe, Platonism as modified by Augustine was the prevailing trend in philosophy and theology up to the twelfth century, and remained an important secondary current long thereafter. Aristotelianism on the other hand became predominant in the thirteenth century, and retained much of its hold up to the sixteenth century and even afterwards. Yet from the fifteenth century on both Platonism and Aristotelianism entered a new phase under the influence of the new humanistic movement. Both currents, to be sure, continued the preceeding traditions of the Middle Ages, but at the same time they formulated the traditional problems and doctrines in novel terms and thus represent new stages in the history of those traditions.[6]

The chief representatives of Platonism and Aristotelianism were Ficino and Pomponazzi; both shared the preoccupation with the immortality of the soul. Under Ficino, Platonism became an intellectual movement with a religious direction, a combination of Christian and Platonic doctrines. Italian Aristotelianism reached its greatest development under Pomponazzi and his followers Zabarella and Cremonini. Aristotelian Scholasticism, like Humanism, was fundamentally a Renaissance phenomenon with its emphasis on this life, and its belief in the value of man. Humanism, which directly influenced education at the University of Padua, also gained a new direction under the influence of

Padua's scientific tradition. For three centuries the natural philosophers of the school of Padua, together with members of the medical faculty, inquired into methodological problems: "...it left their minds with a refinement and precision of statement which the seventeenth century scientists who used it, did not surpass in all their careful investigation of method."[7]

Pomponazzi, in his effort to establish a more scientific psychology of man, made an important contribution in directing science toward improvement of the practical art; in arriving at this naturalistic view of man, man became observable, and his mind open for examination. Pomponazzi's lifelong scholarly search for the truth is summarized in his statement made in his work De incantationibus: "It is ridiculous and foolish to pass by what manifests itself and can be recognized through reasoning by chasing after the uncertain dubious for which there are no satisfactory explanations."* (Author's translation).

Italian Humanism, which arose in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, can best be compared with what we call "liberal arts" today. But in a broader sense Humanism meant a turning away from the medieval traditions of ascetism and the preoccupation with theology, toward interest in man's life on this earth. The renewed interest in the Greek language and the classics was shared by the members of the Roman Curia, and under their influence freedom of thought was encouraged, especially during the fifteenth century. The uproar that arose from

---

* "...ridiculum enim et omnino fatuum est relinquere manifesta et quae naturali ratione probari possunt et quaerere immanifesta, quae nulla versimilitudine persuaderi possunt." De incantationibus, p. 9. sq.

some of the clergy when Pomponazzi's De immortalitate animae appeared, indicates the change that slowly took place from tolerance of free thought to suspicion of free thought.

As Humanism crossed the Alps, Erasmus "...became the foremost citizen of the Republic of Letters."[8] But Erasmus, a man with a social conscience, combined his love for the classics with that of respect for Christian values. Erasmus, aware of the wide gap between professed ideals and the corrupt practices, attacked the laxity of the clergy. A famous sixteenth century epigram states:

> Where Erasmus merely nodded, Luther rushed in;
> where Erasmus laid the eggs, Luther hatched the chicks;
> where Erasmus merely doubted, Luther laid down the law.[9]

Unfortunately the Protestant leaders were not the inheritors of the humanistic tradition of tolerance and free intellectual inquiry. The Catholic Church responded with a counter reformation. Refusing to compromise with the Protestants on theological questions, they supported the old dogmas. The Catholic Reformation was more than a mere negative defense; it was the beginning of a movement for spiritual renewal.

Johan Weyer, Pomponazzi's junior by fifty-three years, lived in a world quite different from that of Pomponazzi. During the second half of the sixteenth century, the north was plagued not only by religious but also by political and socioeconomic unrest. Superstition and suspicion were rampant. The Church called upon civil power to assist in a crusade against witches and sorcerers who

were considered to be the worst of the heretics. Rational thought as developed in Pomponazzi's time had little chance of survival in the north. To express one's ideas publicly was to risk one's life. It is not surprising that Weyer, under these circumstances, became especially interested in the psychology of mental illness.

Weyer, a physician educated at Paris and Orléans, like Pomponazzi looked for natural reasons to explain all phenomena. The time Weyer had spent as Agrippa's student was an ideal preparation for dealing with the problems of his superstitious age. Agrippa had lived in Italy longer than any of his contemporaries, and it was through him that Weyer was introduced to Hellenistic, Medieval and Renaissance thought. One feels that there exists a kinship between Pomponazzi and Weyer.

Weyer was unable to approach the problem of mental disease without dealing with daemonology and the Inquisition. Confessions of witches and their crimes was so prevalent that the sheer number of them became objective proof of their reality. Weyer realized the need for moral treatment, (today's psychotherapy), instead of capital punishment in these cases. His main contribution to medical psychology is that he liberated psychiatry from theological tradition, but the line of distinction between reason and faith was already drawn by Pomponazzi. Weyer was able to build on Pomponazzi's foundation.

Weyer was an excellent empirical observer, refuting superstition wherever he encountered it. Like Pomponazzi, he looks for natural causes of disease, and therefore makes an attempt to explain mental illness in Galenic terms. He

is convinced that there are some physiological reasons for some mental diseases, and therefore justifies that the physician is best qualified to treat these patients. Weyer kept case histories of his patients; his empirical matter-of-factness in approaching the psychopathological problems of his day certainly was revolutionary in the history of medical psychology.[10] His descriptions are classical pictures of psychotic behavior at a time when no theory of psychopathology existed.

Weyer was a Christian in the Erasmian tradition, quoting the Bible frequently, as was customary in his time. But Weyer was first and foremost a humanist, using an Aristotelian rational approach in problem solving. His ambiguous statement on Pomponazzi in the epilogue of De praestigiis, (1577), does not make sense. Continued research hopefully will clarify why Weyer made this statement, if ineed it is his.

Although the rise of medical humanism at the University of Padua developed rather late, its medical doctors and natural philosophers gave Humanism a new direction.[11] which made itself felt not only in northern Italy but, as in Weyer's case, in northern Europe.

References

CHAPTER VI

Main Contributions Made by Weyer and Pomponazzi to Medical Psychology and Psychopathology

1. John Herman Randall, Jr., "The Development of the Scientific Method in the School of Padua", in Journal of the History of Ideas, Vol. I, 1940, p. 182.

2. Andrew Halliday Douglas, The Philosophy and Psychology of Pietro Pomponazzi, (Hildesheim, Germany: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1962), p. 96.

3. Ibid., p. 76.

4. Gregory Zilboorg, A History of Medical Psychology, (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., Inc., 1969), p. 112.

5. Paul Oskar Kristeller, "Pomponazzi, Pietro, (1462-1525)", in The Encyclopaedia of Philosophy, Vol. 6, p. 392.

6. Paul Oscar Kristeller, "Ficino and Pomponazzi on Man", in Journal of the History of Ideas, Vol. V, Jan.-Oct. 1944, p. 222.

7. Randall, Jr., Ibid., p. 178.

8. Crane Brinton, John B. Christopher and Robert Lee Wolff, A History of Civilization, (8th printing, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1958), p. 454.

9. Ibid., p. 455.

10. Zilboorg, Ibid., p. 221

11. Randall, Jr., Ibid., p. 178.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aristotle. De anima. Translated by W. S. Hett. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1934.

_____. The Works of Aristotle. Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., William Benton Pub., 1952.

Bainton, Roland H. The Reformation of the Sixteenth Century. 8th printing. Boston: The Beacon Press, 1962.

Binz, Carl. Dr. Johann Weyer: ein rheinischer Arzt, der erste Bekampfer des Hexenwahns. Berlin: Verlag von August Hirschwald, 1896.

Bodin, Jean. "Refutation des opinions de Jean Wier", De la Demonomanie des sorciers. Paris: Jaques du Puys, Libraire luré, a la Samaritaine, 1582, avec privilege du Roy.

Bowsma, William J. Venice and the Defense of Republican Life. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968.

Brinton, Crane; Christopher, John B. and Wolff, Robert Lee. A History of Civilization. 8th printing. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1958.

Burr, George L. (ed.) "The Beginning of the Witch Persecutions", Original Sources of European History. Translations and Reprints. Philadelphia: The Department of History of the University of Pennsylvania, 1897.

_____. "The Theory of Witch-Persecution". Ibid.

Cantor, Norman F. and Werthman, Michael S. (eds.) Early Modern Europe: 1450-1650. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1967.

Cardan, Jerome. The Book of my Life, (De Vita Propria Liber. Translated by Jean Stoner. New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., Inc., 1930.

Cartwright, Frederick F. Disease and History. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1972.

Cassierer, Ernst; Kristeller, Paul Oskar and Randall, Jr., John Herman, (eds). The Renaissance Philosophy of Man. 11th impression. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1948.

Christie, Richard Copley. Etienne Dolet: The Martyr of the Renaissance. London: McMillan and Co., 1880.

Colin, J. (editor and translator). Desiderius Erasmus: Christian Humanism and the Reformation. New York: Harper Torchbook edition, Harper & Row, pub., 1965.

Coupe, W. A.; Scott, J. A. and Truman, R. W. The Continental Renaissance 1500-1600. Krailsheimer, A. J., ed. Baltimore: Penguin Books, Inc., 1971.

Diefenbach, Johann. Der Hexenwahn: vor und nach der Glaubensspaltung. Mainz: Druck F. Kirchheim, 1886.

d'Irsay, Stephen. Histoire des Universités Francaises et Étrangères: (Des origines a nos juers). Paris: Editions Auguste Picard, 1933.

Douglas, Andrew Halliday. The Philosophy and Psychology of Pietro Pomponazzi. Douglas, Charles and Hardie, R. P. eds. Hildesheim, Germany: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1962.

Elliot, J. H. Europe Divided 1559-1598. New York: Harper Torchbooks, Harper & Row, Pub., 1969.

Emilio, Mario. Biographical and Bibliographical Dictionary of the Italian Humanists and of the World of Classical Scholarship in Italy, 1300-1800. Boston: G. K. Hall & Co., 1962.

Encyclopaedia Britannica. 9th edition. Philadelphia: J. M. Stoddart & Co., 1876.

Encyclopaedia of Philosophy. New York: The MacMillan Co., and the Free Press, 1967.

Fiorentino, Francesco. Studi sulla Rinascenza, Estratto dagli studi su Bernardino Telesio et Pietro Pomponazzi. Padova: G. B. Paravia and Co., 1934.

Fisher-Homberger, Esther. Hypochondrie: Melancholie bis Neuroses Krankheiten und Zustandsleiden. Bern: Huber, 1970.

Garrison, Fielding H. An Introduction to the History of Medicine. 4th edition, revised. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders Co., 1929.

Geyl, Pieter. The Revolt of the Netherlands (1555-1609). New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1958.

Häfliger, Josef Anton and Platter, Felix. Ein Arzneidrogen und Naturalien Sammler des 16. Jahrhundert, in Neuburger's Festschrift zum 80. Geburtstag Max Neuburgers mit 91 Internationalen Medizinishen Beiträgen. Wien: W. Maudrich, 1948.

Hay II, William Henry. Translator of Petrus Pomponatius, Tractus "De immortalitate animae." Journal of the History of Ideas, V (Jan. - Oct. 1944), p. 240.

Heer, Friedrich. The Medieval World. Translated by Janet Sondheimer. A Mentor Book. New York: New American Library, 1961.

Jeannin, Pierre. Merchants of the Sixteenth Century. Translated by Paul Fittongoff. New York: Harper and Row, Pub., 1972.

Kraemer, Heinrich and Sprenger, James. The Malleus Maleficarum. Translated by Montague Summers. New York: Dover Publications, Inc. 1971.

Krailsheimer, A. J.(ed.) Coupe, W. A.; Scott, J. A. and Truman, R. W. The Continental Renaissance 1500-1600. Baltimore: Penguin Books, Inc., 1971.

Kristeller, Paul Oskar. "Notes and Documents: Ficino and Pomponazzi, on the Place of Man in the Universe." Journal of the History of Ideas, V (Jan. - Oct. 1944), p. 223.

_____, and Wiener, Phillip P. (eds.). Renaissance Essays. New York: Harper Torchbooks, Harper and Row, 1968.

_____. Renaissance Thought. New York: Harper Torchbooks, The Academy Library, Harper and Row, Pub., 1961.

Major, Ralph H. A History of Medicine. Oxford: Blackwell Scientific Publications, 1954.

Nauert, Jr., Charles G. Agrippa and the Crisis of Renaissance Thought. Urbana: Illinois Studies in the Social Sciences, The University of Illinois Press, 1965.

Rabelais, François. Pantagruel. Translated by Sir Thomas Urquart and Peter Motteux. Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., William Benton Pub., 1952.

Randall, Jr., John Herman. "The Development of Scientific Method in the School of Padua." Journal of the History of Ideas. I (1940), p. 177.

_____. "The Development of Scientific Method in the School of Padua", Renaissance Essays, (eds.) Paul Oskar Kristeller and Philip P. Wiener. New York: Harper Torchbooks, Harper and Row, 1968.

_____. Introduction to "On the Immortality of the Soul", The Renaissance Philosophy of Man. (eds) Ernst Cassierer, Paul Oskar Kristeller and John Herman Randall, Jr. Phoenix Books. 11th impression, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1948.

Rashdall, Hastings. The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages. (eds) F. M. Powicke and A. B. Emden. New edition. London: Oxford University Press, 1958.

Sarton, George. "The Quest for Truth: Scientific Progress During the Renaissance", The Reniassance: Six Essays. New York: Harper Torchbooks, The Academy Library, Harper and Row, Pub., 1962.

Saunders, J. B. deC. M. "Andreas Vesalius, 1564-1964 -- His Work and Inspiration", Journal of the American Medical Association, Vol. 192, No. 2, (April 12, 1965), p. 127.

_____, and O'Malley, Charles D. The Illustrations from the Works of Andreas Vesalius of Brussels. New York: The World Publishing Co., 1950.

Sigerist, Henry E. The Great Doctors. Translated by Eden and Cedar Paul. New York: Dover Publishing Inc., 1917.

Temkin, Owsei. Galenism: Rise and Decline of a Medical Philosophy. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1973.

Vesalius, Andreas. De Humani Corporis Fabrica. Basileae: Ex officina Ioannis Operini, 1543.

Watson, Foster. Juan Luis Vives, El Gran Valenciano. Oxford: Oxford University Press, Humphrey Milford, 1922.

Weinstein, Donald (ed.). The Renaissance and the Reformation 1300-1600. 2nd printing. New York: The Free Press, 1965.

Whitteridge, Gweneth. William Harvey: and the Circulation of the Blood. New York: American Elsevier Inc., 1971.

Wickersheimer, Dr. C. A. E.r. La Medecine et les Medecins en France, A l'époque de la Renaissance. Paris: A. Maloine, Editeur, 1905.

VVieri, Ioannis. De praestigiis daemonum et incantationibus ac ueneficiis Libri sex. Basileae: Ex Officina, Operiniana, 1577.

Wier, Jean. Histoires, disputes et discours des illusions et impostures des diables, etc. Translated from Latin to French by Jaques Grevin. Reimpression de l'edition de 1579. Paris: Delahaye et Lecroisnier, Ed., 1885.

Withinton, E. T. "Dr. John Weyer and the Witch Mania", Studies in the History and Method of Science. (ed.) Charles Singer. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1917.

Zeller, E. Aristotle and the Earlier Peripatetics. English translation. London: 1897.

Zilboorg, Gregory. A History of Medical Psychology. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., Inc., 1941.

_____. The Medical Man and the Witch during the Renaissance. Publication of the Institute of the History of Medicine, the Johns Hopkins University, 3rd series. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1935.