

Book Reviews

(1960–1970), but it is convenient to have them gathered together. The author divides them into: ‘Some origins of American technology’; ‘The generation of new technologies’; ‘Diffusion and adaptation of technology’; ‘Natural resources, environment and the growth of knowledge’. Many of them contain historical material but others concern only modern problems. They are all of importance and each is a scholarly production. They will be of interest to a wide range of readers interested in the social impact of technological advancement, and can be warmly recommended to them.

GERT PREISER, *Allgemeine Krankheitsbezeichnungen im Corpus Hippocraticum*, Berlin and New York, W. de Gruyter, 1976, pp. xix, 138, DM. 86.

Reviewed by Vivian Nutton, Ph.D., Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine, 183 Euston Road, London NW1 2BP.

The early writings in the Hippocratic Corpus employ a variety of terms for disease, and scholars from Roman times on have tried to explain the different usages, especially of the words *nousos* and *nousema*. An anonymous student of the second century A.D. distinguished them as afflictions of the whole and part of the body respectively; and more recently Fridolf Kudlien has defined *nousos* as a general term for disease and *nousema* as the particular for a disease with an internal cause. Now in this careful study, Gert Preiser returns to the opinion of Galen that there is overall no essential distinction between them, although occasionally, in particular contexts, they are used with specific meanings to give greater clarity. But these meanings are not fixed, and, even within the same tract, the author may not be wholly consistent.

Preiser has perhaps more sympathy with those modern philologists who define *nousos* as illness and *nousema* as the state of being ill, and he suggests that by comparison with words similarly formed in *-ma nousema* indicates the result of the onset of disease. The word itself would be a new coinage of the early or mid-fifth century B.C. (rather early, I think, to be called “sophistic”), possibly invented to describe disease without the demonological connotations of *nousos*; the author of *On the sacred disease (nousos)* is at pains to stress that it is not sacred and merely one of the many ailments (*nousemata*) which afflict mankind. But the new word did not drive out the old, and the subtle ontological distinction between the disease itself and the result of the onset of a disease was never consciously formulated in Greek—the abundance of overlapping synonyms for disease in both Greek and English cannot produce the precise clarity of German with its preference for word-formations from a single root. It may also be doubted whether *nousos* carried as many overtones as the literary and poetic parallels collected by Preiser suggest—as he himself knows, stylistic fashion, a desire for elegant variation, and an exuberant delight in new coinages are equally important. As Wilamowitz pointed out fifty years ago, there is a constant striving among the Hippocratic writers for variation by means of synonyms; and there is a fixed terminology only for strictly medical phenomena.

Preiser’s negative conclusions are valuable, if only as a check on too broad generalizations, but, expanded in a beautifully printed book, with all quotations in Greek and in German, they are endowed with an importance and a price that they do not warrant. A long article or publication as an Academy *Abhandlung* would have drawn

Book Reviews

enough attention to them and to the linguistic parallels available in the files of the Hamburg Hippokrateslexikon. If this were ever to be published, philological and terminological studies of the Hippocratic Corpus would be greatly forwarded, and much time and energy would be spared from the investigation of a narrow and partial range of synonyms.

MARY P. WINSOR, *Starfish, jellyfish, and the order of life. Issues in nineteenth-century science*, New Haven, Conn., and London, Yale University Press, 1976, 8vo, pp. [5 11], 228, illus., £10.50.

Dr. Winsor examines closely the investigation in the early nineteenth century of what appeared at first to be examples of simple animal life. At this time affinities between species were widely accepted, and the non-evolutionary view of lower invertebrates, such as the sea urchin, the starfish, and jellyfish (Cuvier's Radiates), is discussed at length. She is concerned with the work of, amongst others, Cuvier, C. G. Ehrenberg, Johannes Müller, T. H. Huxley, and of Louis and his son Alexander Agassiz whose collection of annotated reprints has provided this book with a considerable amount of new information. Of necessity, the text contains technical detail, but a glossary, the author's lively style, and the illustrations make it comprehensible and absorbing. In any case the history of any scientific topic makes demands on the reader, who must be expected to comprehend basic issues if he is to understand the evolution of a concept.

Little has been written on this aspect of nineteenth-century biology, yet the subject of invertebrate taxonomy as investigated in its first few decades was a significant feature of pre-Darwinian thought: natural classification revealed an orderly and unchanging world demonstrating pattern and design. Dr. Winsor, however, has researched only part of her topic as concerns both the internal or technical and intellectual, and the external or social dimensions. Nevertheless, she has opened up a fascinating and significant area, which both she and others can excavate further.

MICHAEL E. HOARE, *The tactless philosopher, Johann Reinhold Forster (1729–98)*, Melbourne, Hawthorn Press, 1976, 8vo, pp. xvi, x, 419, illus, Aus. \$15.95.

Dr. Hoare, a historian of science, has written the first full-length biography of Forster, whose varied activities test the versatility and breadth of anyone describing his life and work. He was a naturalist with Cook, an agriculturalist, ethnologist of the Antipodes and Antarctica, anthropologist, theologian, oriental philologist, linguist, geographer, geologist, and naturalist. He has, however, been overshadowed by his famous son, Georg, outstanding in eighteenth-century German scholarship, a revolutionary and a scientist, and has been actively neglected and even slandered. He seems to have had a difficult personality and, lacking tact, his relations with society were never secure. This should not, however, prevent an accurate appraisal of him and his work. The author devotes himself to this end, in particular dealing assiduously with Forster's later career in Germany that has been less closely examined. In all, he provides an excellent book and as Forster's interests have not been explored fully, there is room for further study of him by experts in the various fields of knowledge he cultivated.