

investigation of the Harveian antecedents of Glisson's concept of irritability, and a number of seminal essays on different aspects of J. B. Van Helmont's work: his concept of disease, his concept of "Gas", and a long study and translation of his concept of "biological time".

Pagel was a historian of the old school who believed, together with H  l  ne Metzger, that "L'Historien doit se faire contemporain des savants dont il parle" and, moreover, believed that good scholarship could make this possible. On reading these articles now, however, we can see that for all Pagel's excellent scholarship and exquisite sensitivity to the concerns of his subjects he always remained fully aware of his own role as a historian writing in and for the twentieth century. Underlying his repudiations of whiggishness in the history of science and his pleas to see early scientists "as undivided wholes and not dissected in order to save what is 'useful' and to discard what is not" is a firm conviction that history is of fundamental importance for the present. Pagel's passion for the past and its relevance to tomorrow burns in all of these essays but it is most explicit in the first essay in the collection, 'Julius Pagel and the significance of medical history for medicine' (1951). Here Pagel provided us with an "adapted translation" of the introductory chapter of his father's *Einf  hrung in die Geschichte der Medizin* (Berlin, 1898) and so perhaps the father spoke for the son when he ruminated ruefully upon "the deplorable lack of encouragement which there is" for the history of science and medicine. Undaunted by this, they continued to believe that "history is the best link between past and future". Yet, Pagel *p  re et fils* believed in "historical truth", a notion which many historians would now be embarrassed to defend. Today, the historian does not seek truth but merely interprets; he is content to argue for what might have been possible. There is not one privileged History, just many possible histories. It might strike such historians *   la mode*, therefore, as somewhat na  ve to write, as Pagel did, "Learn history in order to learn from history". However, no historian could deny that while reading these essays by a great writer of history one is learning historiography in order to learn from historiography.

John Henry  
Edinburgh University, Science Studies Unit

HOWARD S. BERLINER, *A system of scientific medicine. Philanthropic foundations in the Flexner era*, New York and London, Tavistock Publications, 1986, 8vo, pp. x, 190, \$29.95 (\$12.95 paperback).

The origins of the Flexner report and the relations of capital, philanthropy, and scientific medicine will probably long remain a focus around which American historians will orbit. The latest body to appear in this gravitational field is Howard Berliner's *A system of scientific medicine*. At the outset it can be said that this study is, by and large, well written, lucid, and a good tale. It is broad in the explanatory factors it invokes, and detailed in its use of archival material. These things, plus its relative brevity and unexceptional price, make it an invaluable work for teaching purposes. Berliner's approach is Marxist and, with reservations, he makes an excellent job of arguing that the scientific turn taken by American medicine was not unique to that subject, but part of a more general change in the labour process determined by capital, which, in the case of education in general and medicine in particular, used philanthropy as the intermediary.

Only briefly, and disastrously, does Berliner juggle with the history of ideas. Vacillating uncomfortably between social constructivism and realism, he treats the reader on successive leaves to a relativist indictment of the late nineteenth-century capitalist construction of disease, in which "People were not unhealthy because of the system of production under which they laboured and the relations of production engendered by that system, rather they were sick because of germs, which could be identified and eliminated" (p 79), followed by a realist ticking-off for the ignorant scientific boffins, "The conventional understanding of germ theory, as opposed to the scientific understanding was . . . mechanical and reductivist" (p 81). The problem being "scientists of the time exaggerated the importance of specific aetiology" (*ibid.*), Whig history is by no means the prerogative of the positivist.

There is a further and rather curious thing about this book, it has appeared within a well-populated historical field yet fails to address any of the other literature and interpretations.

## 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