

Book Reviews

It has footnotes and a bibliography but a historiographical chapter would have been invaluable for teacher and student alike. More particularly, Berliner does not situate his work in relation to E. Richard Brown's *Rockefeller medicine men*, which appeared in 1979. This provocative work Berliner acknowledges, saying: "Despite the clearly dominant role that Rockefeller played in the transition from a sectarian to a scientific medical education system, it is surprising that only . . . [Brown] . . . has specifically told this story" (p 4). There are a couple of points about this: first, Brown did not tell a "story" but gave an interpretation; second, Berliner's book in structure and argument seems, to me, to be very close to Brown's. Berliner has worked and published on this material for many years, and there seems a curious failure on his part to advance the debate. Although Berliner deals at length with some things, such as the Chicago episode, which are only outlined by Brown, he never suggests where he differs from him or agrees with him, where he would change the emphasis and so forth. A Marxist not engaging in dialectics is a very strange business indeed.

Christopher Lawrence
Wellcome Institute

JOSEF-HANS KÜHN and ULRICH FLEISCHER (editors), *Index Hippocraticus, Fasc. I, A-Δ*, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986, 8vo, pp. xxxiv, 200, DM. 155.00 (paperback).

After over thirty years of preparation by members of the staff of the Hamburg Thesaurus Linguae Graecae, the first volume of the *Index* to Hippocrates has finally appeared. The tardiness of publication has not been without substantial benefit, for, as the introduction reveals, a growing consciousness of the deficiencies of earlier Hippocratic scholarship led to the complete rethinking and reworking of the original plan. What is modestly labelled an *Index* is now major work of learning in its own right, far removed from a computerized concordance.

The preparation of this first volume involved little more than a total revision of the manuscripts of the Hippocratic Corpus, a list of the most significant being in the Introduction, and a re-edition of the whole text. The deficiencies of Littré's editing are made clear, and the superiority of more scientific editors amply demonstrated. Secondly, each entry includes a translation of the term into Latin, as well as a lexicographical breakdown of the various uses of the word. Most important of all, each entry also includes not only major variants in the text of the passage cited, but also emendations and conjectures. From this it is possible to determine the value of the citation far more accurately than from a straightforward reference, and the reader can judge for himself whether a suggestion for emendation was judicious or not.

What benefits will this *Index* bring to Hippocratic studies? First, and most obvious, it will become easier and safer to determine which treatises, by their very vocabulary, are anomalous in terms of date and, perhaps, of medical theories. Second, it becomes possible to see how far later interpretations of Hippocrates, and particularly that of Galen, were founded on misconceptions or on what a modern Hippocratic editor would term an inferior reading in the manuscripts. Finally, the assemblage of so much material will further the difficult task of understanding the world of early Greek medicine, in which the famous name of Hippocrates has often served to mask just how little we actually know of the medicine and medical ideas of Classical Greece.

All that remains to be done to is congratulate the editorial team on their labours, and to express the hope that the second fascicle will not be long delayed.

Vivian Nutton
Wellcome Institute

FRANÇOIS DELAPORTE, *Disease and civilization. The cholera in Paris 1832*, trans. by Arthur Goldhammer, Cambridge, Mass., and London, MIT Press, 1986, 8vo, pp. xvii, 250, £30.00.

The cholera pandemic of 1832 has exercised a predominant influence over historians in the past thirty years, at the expense of later outbreaks in Britain and on the European continent. Thus François Delaporte's *Disease and civilization* competes with a large field, including Louis Chevalier's justly celebrated works on Paris. At the outset, our hopes are raised that old material will be analysed in new ways, for Delaporte was a student of Michel Foucault, as is reflected in