care of small children are the subject of the third part (p. 67-131). Here, Räuchle offers most insightful and nuanced interpretations. On grave reliefs, swaddled babies are often carried by wet nurses. Such depictions possibly signified the separation between mother and child caused by the former’s death rather than a sort of social distancing in real life. Both on vases and reliefs, the ideal mother was depicted as restrained in gestures and emotions. Maternal breastfeeding is hardly depicted at all. Again, this may rather symbolise the idea of restraining one emotion (sophrosynē) than reflect a reality (C. W. Marshall, “Breastfeeding in Greek Literature and Thought”, *Illinois Classical Studies* 42, 1 [2017], p. 185-201 believes that maternal breastfeeding was frequently practised in the Greek world). *Paideia* characterises the mother as an educational figure of socialisation (p. 133-187). For children in the pre-adolescent stage, Athenian mothers were mostly involved with religious and cultic education, while they were supposed to occupy themselves more with daughters than with sons. *Philia* is the title of the section on the role of motherhood in later life (p. 189-242): solidarity between generations, mourning about children preceding their mothers in death, the role of grandmothers (again, a topic which has never been properly studied in a monograph). The book is rounded off by an insightful synthesis, which offers nuanced observations on issues such as nature versus nurture (p. 243-262), an extensive and thorough iconographical reference list (p. 264-321), which by itself makes the book a *ktēma eis aeí*, and an admirably multilingual bibliography (p. 322-337). However, this bibliographical list is marred by the lack of references to Roman family studies, with names as K. Bradley, S. Dixon, J.-U. Krause, C. Laes, B. Rawson and V. Vuolanto being virtually absent. Childhood and families in the Greek world is an expanding field of research (witness the extensive bibliographical list by Ph. Lafargue, “L’enfant retrouvé : quinze ans de nouvelles recherches sur l’enfance en Grèce ancienne (2001-2015)”, *Pallas* 105 [2017], p. 257-294 or E. Griffiths, *Children in Greek Tragedy. Pathos and Potential*, Oxford, 2020). The scholarly world is still waiting for a good comparison between the Greek and the Roman world (J.-B. Bonnard, V. Dasen, J. Wilgaux, *Famille et société dans le monde grec et en Italie du v° au if° siècle av. J.-C.*, Rennes, 2017 is an excellent starting point). For any such future studies, the admirable monograph by Räuchle will be an essential point of reference.
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at present numbers 72 pages and roughly 640 titles (https://www.disabilityhistory-ancientworld.com/new-cover-page>). It may thus rightfully be asked whether Husquin’s book is more than just another contribution on a topic that seems to have been quite fashionable in scholarship of the last years. Rather than going systematically through the different chapters, I will pinpoint some outstanding features of a book that I indeed consider a work of major importance, not only for historians of disabilities, but also for the broader field of socio-cultural history. Husquin starts from a clear and outspoken thesis that is already pronounced in the title of the book. Ancient authors did have a concept of “bodily integrity”, and noticed that the human condition allowed some fellow humans for one reason or another to deviate from the standards or expected patterns. Such deviations were never categorised as “abnormal/abnormality” (a modern concept which implies measurability and standards), but were rather referred to as unpreferable conditions (a key text, cited on p. 309, in Cicero, *De fin. bon. et mal.* 3, 17: *quod est nemo, quin, cum utrumvis liceat, aptas malit et integras omnis partis corporis quam, eodem usu, inminutas aut detortas habere*). There are two important consequences to this choice. First, Husquin’s option belongs to the tradition of *histoire des mentalités*, which has strong foundations in the French scholarly world. As terms such as “handicap/disability” are absent from ancient thinking, the historian of *mentalités* should approach the past starting from the vocabulary and the mental framework of the time period concerned. Instead of compiling lists or chapters of what we commonly consider as disabilities nowadays from head to toe (the option of both Rose 2003 and Laes 2018, but also of important anthropological fieldwork as D. Neubert, G. Cloerkes, *Behinderung und Behinderte in verschiedenen Kulturen*, Heidelberg², 1994), the ancient concept of bodily integrity is Husquin’s central focus. The first part of her monograph deals with definitions, views and perceptions of “physical harm” (*atteinte physique*), followed by a section on the family (women, children, and slaves), and one on “the profession” (*métier*) of being a Roman citizen. Hence, the reader, perhaps quite unexpectedly, will come across large and extensive chapters on being a (fertile) woman (p. 121-146), slaves’ bodies marked by mutilation or maltreatment (p. 169-197), or the moulding and upbringing of infants (p. 147-168), as well as most relevant paragraphs on aesthetical concepts of beauty and ugliness (p. 33-53) and the *dignitas* of the Roman civilian (p. 227-273). A carefully compiled General Index (p. 351-353) makes it possible to also go through the book with the focus on “conventional” disabilities (note that the same approach is taken in the award winning volume by M. Rembis, C. Kudlick, K. E. Nielsen (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Disability History*, New York, 2018). At the same time, Husquin’s approach entails the danger of an almost endless expansion of the topics, with the obvious critique that some aspects have been missed out. Prejudice against people of colour or simply foreigners, heterophthalma, or the satiric attacks on people with foul breath or tooth conditions are just some examples that come to the mind. Second, by her approach Husquin will inevitably be susceptible to the accusation of ‘ableism’, which focuses on what is (clinically) missing and implies that the life of the disabled is somehow less complete (strong opponents of this ableism for disability history of Antiquity are *inter alios* E. Adams & E. J. Graham). I believe, however, that such critique would not do justice to Husquin’s nuanced approach. In all, she quite rightly observes that ancient writers indeed realised how certain conditions were permanently inhibiting and/or irregular in
the sense of their being less frequent. Though these writers’ approach to the issue sometimes (but surely not always) insinuated that such ‘non-able’ persons were less than complete or even subhuman, the modern scholar’s study of such statements in no way implies approval of such stances and prejudices (see also Chr. Laes, “How and Whether to Say ‘Disability’ in Latin and Ancient Greek”, in Chr. Laes (Ed.), A Cultural History of Disability in Antiquity, London, 2020, p. 1-14). Shying away from undue political correctness, Husquin does not hesitate to use terms as ‘handicap’ or ‘suffer from a disability’. I think she is perfectly entitled to do so, in a book the tone of which is profoundly human and open to the manifold experiences of la condition humaine. In my view, the use of words as ‘handicap/disability’ or rather straightforward terms as ‘blind’ or ‘deaf-mute’ is to be preferred above newly coined descriptions (see Laes 2018, p. 5 – the same viewpoint is taken by a disability historian as E. Kellenberger, who has an invested interest in pastoral work involving people with intellectual impairment; see, however, the somewhat ‘allergic’ reactions on my use of terms by C. Moss, “rev. C. Laes, Disabilities and the Disabled in the Roman World. A Social and Cultural History, Cambridge, 2018”, Bryn Mawr Classica Review 2018.10.18 or E. J. Graham, “rev. C. Laes, Disabilities and the Disabled in the Roman World. A Social and Cultural History, Cambridge, 2018”, Ancient History Online Reviews 2019.23). I wonder how many reviewers will take issue with sentences as “une femme qui aurait souffert d’un handicap” (p. 125), but really hope that this will not become the focus of their reviews. Husquin has a truly admirable knowledge of both the primary sources and the secondary literature, which translates into a rich multilingual bibliographic list. Reading, for instance, the sections on the supposedly ‘invalid’ emperors Caligula and Claudius (p. 276-302), one is struck by the most exhaustive way the historiography from the nineteenth century up to the present day is dealt with – all this combined with insightful comments and carefully formulated conclusions. Yet, at the same time, Husquin has strikingly overlooked some important works, which could have added to the discussions (I list alphabetically): C. G. Bien, Erklärungen zur Entstehung von Mißbildungen im physiologischen und medizinischen Schrifttum der Antike, Stuttgart, 1997; J. Draycott (Ed.), Prostheses in Antiquity, London, 2018; D. Engels, Das römische Vorzeichenwesen (753-27 v.Chr.). Quellen, Terminologie, Kommentar, historische Entwicklung, Stuttgart, 2007; A. Küster, Blinde und Taubstumme im römischen Recht, Cologne, 1991; C. Laes, “Writing the Socio-Cultural History of Fatness and Thinness in Graeco-Roman Antiquity”, Medicina nei Secoli 28, 2 (2016) p. 583-660; M. Schmidt, “Hephaistos lebt. Untersuchungen zur Frage der Behandlung behinderter Kinder in der Antike”, Hephaistos 5-6 (1983-84), p. 133-161; I. Weiler, “Zur Physiognomie und Ikonographie behinderter Menschen in der Antike”, in R. Breitwieser (Ed.), Behinderungen und Beeinträchtigungen/Disability and Impairment in Antiquity, Oxford 2012, p. 11-24; L. Wierschowski, “Kriegsdienstverweigerung im römischen Reich”, Ancient Society 26 (1995), p. 205-239. Another outstanding feature of this volume is Husquin’s full engagement with material aspects such as archaeology, art history, and inscriptions. Many epigraphists will envy her succinct yet most relevant discussion of the Puteoli inscription (AE, 1971, 88) on gravediggers – one of the only instances where certain people indeed seem to be excluded from a profession because of notable bodily features (deafness or muteness are for this reason not mentioned as such) (p. 98-101). Husquin also makes rich use of the osteological
finds by L. Capasso in Pompeii and environs, by P. Catalano and his team for the Collatina necropolis of Rome, as well as of documentation for Roman Britain [e.g. p. 132-135; 167-168]. This book comes with a conclusion which is as convincing and well written as the whole of the monograph. On the level of everyday life, family networks and social relations could improve the situation of the disabled, but at the same time integration into the wider community was not at all synonymous with what we would call wellbeing. As concerns views and perceptions, it is just not possible to discern ‘one’ attitude of Romans towards disabilities: social class, gender, philosophical background, and the eye of the beholder are key to contextualise and understand any statements on the matter. I feel that Husquin has perhaps been too cautious in rather strictly approaching “the Roman world”: a comparison, even briefly, with contemporary Jewish views, with the miracles of Jesus, or with early Christian standpoints on ‘perfect bodies’ (C. Moss, *Divine Bodies: Resurrecting Perfection in the New Testament and Early Christianity*, New Haven, 2019), might have given the readers a glimpse of a broader comparative view. In all, the book is carefully and almost impeccably edited, and comes at a most affordable price. It is a landmark study, which simply cannot be overlooked by any scholar studying the burgeoning field of disabilities in the ancient world. I would highly recommend it for classicists, for socio-cultural historians of Antiquity, and those readers with a broad interest for the history of the body in general.
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