

is famous for his statistical approach to therapies, known at the time as the “numerical method of Louis”. First published in 1832, it was highly praised by many physicians in Britain. Indeed one elderly English physician said in the 1830s that it was by far the most important advance in medicine during his lifetime. But Surrage, while admiring Louis’ lectures on diseases of the chest, seems not to have heard of the “numerical method” either from Louis or anyone else in Paris. It suggests that Louis’ method was out of kilter with the ideas of the Parisian medical establishment.

It is often a thankless task to write an introduction to a diary. Many editors content themselves with a few biographical details. Here, however, Diana Manuel has written a long and absolutely excellent introduction which cannot be recommended too highly. She has managed to write what is, in effect, a broad, scholarly and very readable survey of European medicine and medical education in the 1830s without in any way eclipsing the importance of the diary itself. It is this, as well as the exceptional diary that makes this such a notable addition to the series of supplements to *Medical History*. And I guess that Surrage would have been delighted by his editor.

**Irvine Loudon,**  
Wantage, Oxon

**Mart J van Lieburg** (ed.), *Isidore Snapper’s notes for memoirs 1889–1973: the autobiographical recollections of ‘the champion of bedside medicine’*, Rotterdam, Erasmus, 2004, pp. 239, illus., €35.00 (paperback 90-5235-172-4).

When Hitler came to power in Germany in 1933, the Nazis at once ensured that Jewish physicians, medical scientists and teachers of medicine would be removed from their posts. The same removal of Jews took place in Austria following the Nazi occupation in 1938. In countries bordering Germany there was much discussion amongst Jewish medical men as to their course of action. In Holland, for example, there were those who thought that in the forthcoming war, which all foresaw, their

country might be able to maintain the neutrality of 1914–18. Isidore Snapper, a distinguished Jewish research worker and professor of medicine in Amsterdam, thought differently. He was perceptive enough to predict that Jewish physicians in Holland might suffer the same fate as those in Germany and elsewhere and he prudently emigrated to the United States in 1938.

*Notes for memoirs* was written in the two years that preceded Snapper’s death in 1973 at the age of eighty-four. It is derived from a pile of papers written in English in his characteristic shorthand. It describes first his early education in Amsterdam, his pre-clinical education and his clinical years between 1908 and 1911. After clinical experience with A A Hijmans van den Bergh, the pioneer of bilirubin research and with Pel, of the Pel-Ebstein fever that occurs in Hodgkin’s Disease, he became at the age of thirty the youngest professor appointed in Amsterdam. For the next twenty years he was recognized as a superb teacher and research worker who did particularly important work on bone disease.

Moving to New York in 1938, he was encouraged by the Rockefeller Foundation to take a post as professor of medicine at the Peiping Union Medical College in China, where he stayed until the outbreak of war with Japan after Pearl Harbor. Here he continued his interest in bone disease, rickets being particularly common among his Chinese patients at that time. He was highly regarded by his Chinese colleagues who saw him as a true professor since he had a bald head, indicating that he read under a lamp every night. He also wore spectacles, which meant that he even read the small print of the articles. Finally his *embonpoint* showed that he had been invited to many consultations about rich patients.

After Pearl Harbor he then had an interesting odyssey being exchanged for Japanese diplomats. After a long journey through South Africa and England, he arrived in the United States in 1942. There he worked first in the War Department in Washington and then in 1944 became a clinician, teacher and research worker in the Mount Sinai Hospital in New York. He then moved in 1952 to the Cook County Hospital in Chicago. Chicago, however, was not congenial

to him and in 1953 he moved to the Beth-El Hospital in Brooklyn, a community hospital which he transformed into an academic institution before he retired in 1965.

Snapper's notes include his own idiosyncratic views on medical education, as well as comments on medicine and medical life in the modern world. He is described as "the champion of bedside medicine"—there were however many others of his era who would deserve that title. Clearly the editor has had difficulties with Snapper's English, which cannot have been easy to transcribe. There are many errors. For example when Snapper describes his delight, after his Chinese episode, in rediscovering "Ladburys chocolate", surely it was Cadburys. Nevertheless, this is an admirable autobiographical account of the career of a fascinating Dutchman who inspired all who benefited from his teaching. As the author states, it will be a vitally important source for the scientific biography of Snapper still to be written.

**Christopher Booth,**

The Wellcome Trust Centre for the History of  
Medicine at UCL

**Sonu Shamdasani,** *Jung and the making of modern psychology: the dream of a science*, Cambridge University Press, 2003, pp. xvi, 387, £50.00, US\$75.00 (hardback 0-521-83145-8); £18.95, US\$28.00 (paperback 0-521-53909-9).

This remarkable book has been out for some time and so this review aims both to re-iterate some of what its achievements are as well as reflecting on the lessons that historians and biographers might learn from it. That Shamdasani has done an enormous amount of close reading of both primary and secondary texts is not surprising for those of us who have read his earlier publications; he was fortunate in the case of Jung because he has not merely read Jung's already published works, he also had access to material not seen before, all of which figure in the book in differing ways and to differing purposes. Shamdasani makes charmingly clear what his methodological loyalties are: they are to the jazz musicianship of Ornette Coleman and John

Coltrane and the peculiar and cubist writings of Jorge Luis Borges and Fernando Pessoa. So the hope is going to be that he can tell his scholarly story in the form of spacious, almost free form, music and words: that a minimum of interest will be taken in the merely biographical and the maximum in historical context, historical contingency and often hilarious historical twists and turns. To put it at its simplest, he takes a person, or an idea of a person, or a fantasy of a person called "Jung" and shows us that this "Jung" never existed, except in the mythologies required by others. These others are not playing jazz, not seeing, for example, the myriad ways in which Jung—an actual Jung—insisted on the elusive nature of almost all psychological matters and loathed the way that his ideas were formalized, restricted and traduced. Jung was on the jazz side; "Jung" was deprived of all that openness and became a mere frozen version of a complex past. Again, to be simple: I have read "Jung", I teach "Jung", I have even judged "Jung" and "Jungians". I now see that I knew nothing.

The key thing that Shamdasani does is carefully to locate his subject within the explosion that was the psychological sciences from the late nineteenth century onwards. And the aim of "psychology", starting in those decades, was to be nothing less than the unification of all the other human sciences, the completion of the circle. It had to be learned—immensely learned—to even begin to get close to that and Jung himself thought of a lot of his work as premature because of that learned aim and its burdens. (Shamdasani evokes very nicely some of the layout of Jung's personal library as a means of showing the reader just what a scale the book collecting and the reading had to be on). Crucially, if the desired homogeneity did not come about, leading to many "psychologies" all jostling together—well, for the moment, so be it. To speak of Jungian psychology in the singular was to miss the whole point, just as later in his career Jung was to be infuriated by the corrupt way that his studies of introversion and extraversion, his studies of psychological types, the complex grounds for his work on religions, were co-opted and simplified and