

### *Book Reviews*

which culminated first in the Apothecaries' Act of 1815 and then in the Medical Act of 1858. The two streams of reform which led to the Medical Act are interesting to follow, and it becomes clear, as Dr. Newman stresses, that 1858 should not be considered as the date which marks the beginning of the modern development of medical education in the British Isles. 'Medicine had been reforming itself before the Act: it continued to do so after it.'

Indeed, Dr. Newman traces with great care, from 1815 to 1858, the two streams of reform, one within the profession, as new knowledge becomes slowly integrated into medical teaching; the other external to the profession, which led to legislation. Both aspects of reform make fascinating reading, be it the progressive application to medicine of physical signs, chemistry and pathology, or the efforts to counter the unqualified practitioner and to register the qualified. The various attempts at legislation spearheaded by the colourful Thomas Wakley and the opposition which had to be surmounted are valuable lessons to be learned.

The last part of the book is concerned with the evolution of medical education in the second half of the nineteenth century. It 'is largely the history of how those responsible were forced into the decision, or rather to the conclusion, which was recorded in the Medical Act of 1886, that the aim was to produce a doctor who, on the day he was registered, would be a safe man to let loose on the public, competent to practise all branches of his profession'.

Dr. Newman's book should be read by everyone interested in medical education. Indeed today in various countries, in the U.S.A., Britain and France, to mention but three, there are signs that a new era of reform is on the way. 'The main difficulty in medical education', writes Dr. Newman, 'is not what to teach or how to teach it, but to make up one's mind exactly what one is trying to produce. Given a good potential student, what does one want to turn him into?' The answer to this question must be given before any worth-while change is brought about.

J. F. DELAFRESNAYE

*Kurze Geschichte der Psychiatrie.* ERWIN H. ACKERKNECHT. Stuttgart: Ferdinand Enke, 1957; pp. xii+99. DM. 12.

Psychiatry is not simply a medical speciality [writes Professor Ackerknecht, Director of the Institute of Medical History of the University of Zürich in his Foreword]. One hundred and fifty years ago Reil placed it beside internal medicine and surgery as one of the great medical disciplines. . . . But in this field one cannot yet sound those trumpets of progress which have made the general work of the medical historian so much easier. . . . Griesinger's melancholy statement that knowledge of mental illness was in the same state in his time as diseases of the chest before Laënnec [indeed one might add medicine before Harvey] is still substantially true.

Why has the history of psychiatry been neglected although, as the author says, it is of immediate interest and value for the practitioner—much more so than the history of other specialties? One reason is that it is only in part a medical discipline: philosophical, theological, social, legal and even literary forces have played their part in shaping it and still do. Further, as there is no accepted body of psychiatric knowledge to provide a secure vantage-point from which to survey the past, it would seem that the history of psychiatry can only be written by practising psychiatrists who can evaluate earlier contributions in the light of their own clinical experience.

Professor Ackerknecht's task is rendered more difficult by the absence, which he rightly regrets, of reliable preliminary and basic studies in the field; hence he has

## Book Reviews

had to base himself in part on the earlier studies of Kornfeld (1905), Kraepelin (1918), and Zilboorg and Henry (1941). He has orientated himself chronologically around what he considered representative 'great men'. Some of course would have made a different choice, but in so small a book one cannot complain if one finds many a favourite author missing.

Although it would be ungrateful to criticize in detail such a welcome effort in this fascinating and virgin field, it may be helpful to mention a few factual errors and discrepancies if for no other reason than that they may be amended in a future edition or translation. Thus, some authors are mentioned by their full name, others by surname only, others again by initials and surname, sometimes Latinized and sometimes mixed: for instance, 'Reginald Scotus' (p. 18) for Reginald Scot(t). This leads to an unevenness of presentation which is irritating to those who know and confusing to those who do not: as when Daniel Hack Tuke appears as D. H. Tuke (p. xii), Tuke (p. 70), and Hack Tuke (p. 89). Sometimes the year of an author's most important publication is given (almost never the title), in other places it is not given, even when a text is quoted (e.g. Kinsey, p. 4). On p. 2 Prichard is misspelt 'Pritchard' (but correctly spelt on p. 49). On p. 22 the title of Paracelsus's book—the main subject in the chapter 'Renaissance psychiatry'—is not 'Von den Krankheiten die der Vernunft berauben' but 'so die', even allowing for modernization of spelling. The date of the first edition of Robert (not Richard) Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy* is 1621, not 1624 (p. 27). 'McBride' should be Macbride, and he was not the inventor of the strait-waistcoat, an error traceable to Kraepelin (1918). Falconer (1789) and Haslam (1798) can hardly be claimed to have practised psychotherapy; nor is it true that 'Pinel banished fear from the psychotherapeutic arsenal' (p. 35), as he himself records the powerful quieting effect of threatening patients with the strait-waistcoat. In fact, what some of these later eighteenth-century and early nineteenth-century workers introduced was not psychotherapy in the modern sense of individual treatment but kindness as opposed to harshness in management. The first book on psychiatry for the use of students in England was written by William Battie in 1758, not 'Beattie, 1785' (p. 36). Perfect's first collection of case-histories was published in 1778 not 1787, nor was he remarkable for electrifying his patients (pp. 36, 97), a treatment established some twenty years earlier by John Wesley. Faulkner's tract (1789, not 1790) is hardly a 'systematic book' (p. 36), but was the blurb of a private madhouse keeper in London advertising his skill and establishment. On p. 49 'Gardner Hill 1829' should be 'Robert Gardiner Hill 1837'. The statement that in the middle of the nineteenth century 'asylum doctors were largely concerned with hopeless material' (p. 50) cannot be accepted; contemporary annual reports of asylums, at least in this country, show a rate of cure of up to 60 per cent of admissions. Feuchtersleben's book was published in 1845 not 1844 (p. 58). Fractures and dislocations resulting from electroshock can hardly be called 'spontaneous' (p. 98); however, the author's attitude to 'new physical treatments' is refreshingly historical, that is to say, unenthusiastic.

There are a number of printing errors, among which 'furchtbare' for 'fruchtbare' (p. 75) unhappily converts 'fruitful' to 'frightful'; and there is no index.

RICHARD A. HUNTER

*Storia dell'Iconografia Anatomica*. LORIS PREMUDA; pp. 235, with 138 plates; also Martello, Editore, Milan, 1957; price L4500.

The history of anatomical illustration has received, in recent years, less attention than