

Book Reviews

powerful vested interests, their research frustrated and their findings discredited. But the account of the differences between Stewart and Doll is a missed opportunity to explain one of the great rivalries in post-war epidemiology and, more importantly, to explore the ways in which divisions *within* epidemiology played into disputes over the health hazards of low doses of radiation.

David Cantor,
National Institutes of Health

L S Jacyna, *Lost words: narratives of language and the brain, 1825–1926*, Princeton University Press, 2000, pp. x, 241, illus., £28.50, \$45.00 (hardback 0-691-00413-7).

Histories of aphasia are torn between telling simple stories of discovery about the brain and stories of seemingly endless complexity about language and human uniqueness. In this book, Stephen Jacyna goes beyond this with a different way of reading medical texts, to make “a new genre of writing dealing with the relations between language and the human brain” (p. 3) itself into the historical subject. This genre is the place where many varieties of aphasia come into existence, along with a distribution of power and influence between patient and doctor, between science and medicine, between doctor and doctor, and between the values associated with mind and with matter. Many of his texts will in part be familiar to historians of neurology or physiological psychology, but he interrogates them as forms of writing in a way that is entirely new. The result is a highly reflective, historically meticulous study at two levels: an account of key sources in the formation of aphasia studies, and a model of the “linguistic turn” for medical historiography. It is an excellent book, crafted with respect to language in both content and form, which should be a

standard reference point in the history of neurology and neuroscience.

The book is not a systematic history of aphasia; indeed, it rather severely dictates what it will and will not discuss. First and foremost, it provides what literary scholars call “a close reading” of “classic” texts, as well as some not so classic, to show how much more they contain than empirical representations of nature. Thus it examines narrative form, voice, metaphor, visual imagery and so on—providing a commentary on the technology of verbal and visual expression during the process of a speciality creating itself. Successive chapters examine Jean-Baptiste Bouillaud’s and Jacques Lordat’s creation of the aphasiological case history; the reshaping of this literature as a “physiological understanding of language” (p. 54)—the context of Paul Broca’s work; the consolidation of a materialist discourse—the period of the localizers and “diagram makers”; John Hughlings Jackson’s contrasted focus on the “psychological” speechless man; Henry Head’s renewal of Jackson’s programme and scathing dismissal of the diagram makers; and the dissonant voices of Pierre Marie, Sigmund Freud and Henri Bergson. The account of Head’s enrolment of his patients, educated officers, into his medical science, is especially rich. The penultimate chapter turns to what, before 1900, was a much smaller body of writing, the possibilities aphasics provided for therapy rather than science.

Another theme runs through the book. Alongside the examination of the particulars of language, it discusses the way in which the literature of aphasia articulates the nineteenth-century debate over naturalism—the explanation of existence in natural-scientific terms. Jacyna richly explores the representation of the speaking man as man and the speechless man as nature. Yet, quite where the argument will go, without drawing in such topics as the history of linguistic theory implicit in accounts of aphasia, or the theological

Book Reviews

construction of “personality” as a category, and thus returning to a more traditional form of the history of ideas, is perhaps not clear. In the conclusion, when the author suddenly switches voice, we are invited to relate historical scholarship to “the enormity of the claims made for the modern brain” (p. 238).

Roger Smith,

Institute for History of Science and
Technology of the Academy of Sciences,
Moscow

Peter C Jupp and Clare Gittings (eds),
Death in England: an illustrated history,
Manchester University Press, 1999, pp. xiv,
290, illus., £45.00 (hardback 0-7190-5470-2),
£19.99 (paperback 0-7190-5811-2).

In charting changing attitudes towards death in England from Neolithic times to the present, this collection of essays addresses many themes relevant to medical history. Some of these are already well known, such as the gradual medicalization of death during the twentieth century. Others are less well known, such as the importance of the doctor’s role in ensuring a “good death”. But whatever aspect of medicine one may be interested in—doctor-patient relationships, the interface between medicine and religion, or public health—this book will be a fascinating source of information on the history of death.

In ten chronologically organized chapters, the volume investigates various themes associated with the public manifestation of death and the social practices surrounding it. In so far as their sources allow, the twelve authors examine attitudes towards the “art of dying”, what constituted a “good” or “bad” death, and how these perceptions were informed by religious beliefs in the afterlife. They investigate the public and private processes of grieving, how the body was prepared for burial, and

how the burial itself was undertaken. In exploring these themes, each author is sensitive to the changing intellectual and religious background, class differences, and the practical limitations of space, time and money that affected ways of dying.

The book is particularly fascinating for the variety of approaches it adopts. In part, this is determined by the sources. Thus the first two chapters—dealing with death in the Neolithic, Bronze, Iron and Roman Ages—are written by archaeologists who draw their conclusions from gravesites and their contents. The authors are scrupulous in pointing out that surviving gravesites are not always representative of popular attitudes to death, and that only the most general inferences can be made regarding ancient beliefs in the afterlife. The survival of Roman tombstone inscriptions from England and elsewhere certainly improves the situation. But one is still left wondering how far we can go, beyond mere description of material objects, before we are in the realm of speculation.

Chapter 3—dealing with death in the period 400–1150—is curious in that it deals first with pagan Saxon and Viking attitudes to death using mainly archaeological evidence, and then it turns to Christian practices during the same period using surviving written records. The contrast is stark. The written documents give a much richer picture, at least of beliefs if not practices, and provide a valuable tool for interpreting iconographic and other material evidence for early Christian perceptions of death.

Chapters 4 to 10 rely upon more obviously historical rather than archaeological sources, but here again an interesting variety of approaches is adopted. For example, Chapter 10 (covering the period 1918–98) relies upon changing mortality rates to emphasize the importance of medicine and public health for modern attitudes to death. Chapter 9 (1850–1918), by contrast, uses visual images to illuminate how different the Victorian way of dying