

## Book Reviews

JEAN CANTLIE STEWART, *The quality of mercy. The lives of Sir James and Lady Cantlie*, London, Allen & Unwin, 1983, pp. vii, 277, illus., £9.95.

The author's account of her grandfather's work, both as a surgeon and as the pioneer of voluntary first aid services in Britain, is based on her desire to record his achievements as examples of Christian virtue – "the story of man's duty to his neighbour".

The early chapters are devoted to an account of James Cantlie's upbringing in the north-east of Scotland, graduation in medicine from Aberdeen University in 1873 and subsequent appointment to Charing Cross Hospital as demonstrator in anatomy. Here he developed his interest in the teaching of the principles and practice of first aid, formed a voluntary medical staff corps representing the London teaching hospitals, and extended his lecturing to virtually all classes of the civilian population, in association with the St John's Society.

Between 1887 and 1896, the Cantlies were in Hong Kong, where he practised as a surgeon. His involvement in the founding of Hong Kong Medical School, his meetings with Sun Yat Sen, Yersin, and Kitasato are described, together with his interests in tropical diseases. On returning home, Cantlie launched the *Journal of Tropical Medicine*, was involved in the founding of the London Postgraduate Medical School and the School of Tropical Medicine, and continued his work in the organization of first aid services.

Paradoxically, as a result of the achievements of the VAD nurses during the 1914–1918 war, the professional nurses were led to establish a College of Nursing in order to regulate and protect their status.

Much of this account makes pleasant and interesting reading, but the author's habit of capriciously juxtaposing facts which are either unrelated or of markedly unequal significance, is irksome and suggests that she does not always appreciate the scientific significance of her material. This is not a critical historical study but a loving account of two people who devoted their lives to Christian medical principles and achieved a great deal. We must thank the author for recording the story of their work.

B. I. Williams  
The Wellcome Trust

NELLY TSOUYOPOULOS, *Andreas Röschlaub und die Romantische Medizin. Die philosophischen Grundlagen der modernen Medizin*, (Medizin in Geschichte und Kultur, ed. K. E. Rothschild and R. Toellner, vol. 14), Stuttgart and New York, Fischer, 1982, 8vo, pp. viii, 259, DM. 58.00 (paperback).

The readers of the classic histories of medicine by Julius Pagel, Garrison, and Diepgen will find little that is positive or even informative about Andreas Röschlaub (1768–1835). It is only with the reassessment of German Romantic medicine of recent years that Röschlaub, at the time one of the movement's most celebrated and controversial figures, is beginning to emerge from a curious combination of obscurity and notoriety. This work of reassessment and indeed rehabilitation by Erna Lesky in an article of 1954 on Cabanis, in two articles (1967 and 1969) by John Neubauer, and in a significant sequence of contributions in the 1970s by Guenter Risse, is now joined by Nelly Tsouyopoulos's major study of Röschlaub.

In an opening section, Dr Tsouyopoulos shows how Röschlaub's fate in the histories was determined first by the heated divisions within *Naturphilosophie* and then, decisively, by his rejection together with the whole of Romantic Medicine as a wildly speculative aberration by Rudolf Virchow (1865) and others in favour of the new scientific medicine. Her study is the first to do justice to the full spectrum of Röschlaub's work and thought, which ranged coherently from hygiene, through theoretical medicine to practical therapy and its consequences for the organization of clinical practice and the medical profession, a very different picture to the conventional one of a confused Brunonian obscurantist.

The two seminal influences on Röschlaub were Adalbert Marcus, who ran a teaching hospital in Bamberg and under whom he studied from 1793, and John Brown, whose views he adopted for his doctoral thesis of 1795. Contrary to the popular view, what attracted Röschlaub to Brown was not some simplistic formula but a dynamic and unified conception of health and sickness embedded in a single life process. This meant that for Röschlaub physiology was con-