

## Book Reviews

nineteenth century as a *Lehrbuch*, then the preface and introduction were written by the physiologists of the Romantic period. This view leads to the provocative and, I think, convincing hypothesis that the transition from “Romantic” to “scientific” physiology was characterized more by continuity than by discontinuity. To substantiate her hypothesis, the author analyses several problems in the establishment of physiology as a science. In a chapter on the problem of how to gain knowledge of nature, she shows that physiologists used Kant’s as well as Schelling’s writings in a heuristic way, without accepting their philosophical systems. Furthermore, Dr Lohff convincingly demonstrates that Schelling was not an anti-experimentalist, but integrated experimentation within his concept of science. For the physiologists, this provoked discussion of topics like the value of experimentation and the relations between empiricism and speculation, and perception and knowledge (*Wahrnehmung und Erkennen*).

The only irritating aspect of this book is that Dr Lohff completed her manuscript in 1985, so she does not take several more recent studies into consideration. She writes, for example, that Kant’s influence upon the sciences is more assumed by historians than precisely analysed (p. 14). This position cannot possibly be upheld after the compelling analyses of Timothy Lenoir, Frederick Gregory, and others. In conclusion, however, Brigitte Lohff has given us a very rich study with many new insights into that dazzling period between 1795 and 1830.

Michael Hagner, Medical University of Lübeck

L. S. JACYNA (ed.), *A tale of three cities: the correspondence of William Sharpey and Allen Thomson, Medical History Supplement 9*, London, Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine, 1989, 8vo, pp. xxviii, 181, illus., £16.00 (UK & Eire), £21.00/\$32.00 (overseas, incl. p&p), from Professional & Scientific Publications, BMA House, Tavistock Sq., London WC1H 9JR (0-85484-090-7).

*A tale of three cities* is a fine demonstration of the value edited letters of noteworthy persons can have for historians. L. S. Jacyna has done historians of medicine a very considerable service by editing and publishing an extensive selection of the correspondence of William Sharpey (1802–1880) and Allen Thomson (1809–1884), two distinguished and influential Scottish anatomists and physiologists. The letters of these two men richly illuminate medical teaching, medical politics, especially of professorial positions, and physiological research in mid-nineteenth-century Britain.

Found in the Library Store of Glasgow University in 1973, the correspondence is part of Glasgow’s large collection of papers of the Thomson family. It runs from 1836 to 1877. The occasion for its beginning was the removal of William Sharpey from Edinburgh in 1836 to take up the position of Professor of Anatomy and Physiology at the University of London, a post he held for 38 years. His friend and partner in extra-mural teaching in Edinburgh, Allen Thomson, became a private physician to John Russell, sixth Duke of Bedford, and then pursued teaching opportunities in Edinburgh. In 1848 he became the Professor of Anatomy at Glasgow University and held this position for 29 years. Thus the three cities referred to in the title are Edinburgh, Glasgow, and London.

The majority of the letters are from Sharpey to Thomson although the collection also includes drafts and copies of Thomson letters as well as a limited number of letters by other individuals. Jacyna indicates that Thomson probably gathered together the letters and documents as sources for an obituary he was writing of Sharpey. A complete calendar of all the correspondence is included as an appendix to this volume.

Jacyna’s skill as an editor is clear in his lucid and informative introduction to the book, in the selection of the 99 letters presented, and in his identifying and explanatory notes accompanying each letter. It is notable, as Jacyna indicates, that Sharpey and Thomson made their livings by teaching and not by practice. Thus they are representatives of a type of medical man already established in France and Germany before mid-century but late in coming to Britain. Discussions of teaching positions for themselves and others and the politics of obtaining such posts predominate in many of the letters and give a real sense of career strategies and opportunities. The letters also afford important insights into the advent of microscopes in

## Book Reviews

anatomical and physiological research in Britain, a subject not well explored by historians. *Inter alia* a reader learns about a host of other topics including the collection of research materials, the making of specimens for teaching purposes, and medical publishing. One subject on which the letters are somewhat unforthcoming is the correspondents' personalities. Two good friends who feel free to exchange confidential information is as much a sense as we get.

I recommend this collection of letters to all interested in nineteenth-century medical teaching and science. Jacyna deserves our gratitude for making this correspondence available and for his care in editing.

Caroline Hannaway, Francis C. Wood Institute for the History of Medicine,  
College of Physicians of Philadelphia

SHIRLEY ROBERTS, *Sir James Paget: the rise of clinical surgery*, Eponymists in Medicine, London, Royal Society of Medicine Services, 1990, 8vo, pp. xi, 223, illus., £12.95, £7.95 (paperback).

Sir James Paget (1814–1899) was arguably the most famous medical man of Victorian England. Born in obscurity in Yarmouth, Paget rose to international eminence as a surgeon and medical scientist. He was highly visible in the mid-Victorian years as one of Queen Victoria's surgeons, President of the Royal College of Surgeons, and Vice-Chancellor of London University. He is known today for his classic descriptions of Paget's disease of the bone (*osteitis deformans*) and Paget's disease of the nipple.

Readers hoping to find in this book a study of Sir James Page's surgical and scientific career may be disappointed, for it devotes almost no space to the "clinical surgery" promised in the title. Rather, this book examines Paget's life in much broader terms: his family background, education, early career and professional success. The work covers essentially the same ground as that treated in Stephen Paget's edition of *The memoir and letters of Sir James Paget*, published in 1902 and long out of print. Roberts's book is thus welcome for making Paget's life story readily available to readers.

Roberts relies on the 1902 volume and in addition draws on two collections of Paget letters and documents to round out the portrait of Paget's life and career. Strangely neglected are the secondary works published since 1902 on Paget, medical science, and medical politics. For example, Roberts cites R. D. French's important work on the Victorian anti-vivisection movement and gives a brief account of the controversy as it touched Paget's life. But the scientific and political issues of vivisection are never confronted. In another matter, Roberts seems not to have consulted the modern work on the discovery of *Trichina spiralis* and the conflict between Sir Richard Owen and the young James Paget. Paget recognized the tensions between himself and Owen in the matter, but Roberts says merely that Paget "was content to share his success with Owen, who had the honour of naming the organism. Fortunately, there was no enmity between Paget and Owen as a result of the *Trichina* episode" (p. 51). Here, as elsewhere, the conflicts of personal and professional life are glossed over for the sake of an admiring and optimistic view of this Victorian medical man's work and experience.

The author puts forward the thesis that Sir James Paget was the first modern professional, a man who embodied "the spirit of true professionalism among medical practitioners" (p. ix). But without offering evidence of an alternative professionalism (or of a lack of professionalism) among Paget's colleagues, this thesis can carry little weight.

This book offers little that is new to historians of medicine, historians of science, or social historians. Nor does it address the historiographic issues that might interest professional scholars. The book also lacks the scholarly apparatus of full footnoting—perhaps an effort to avoid an excessively academic appearance. In the process, many assertions about Paget's attitudes, ideas, and achievements go unsupported. The book does, however, offer a pleasant and readable account of an important Victorian surgeon's life for the interested lay person. And the accompanying pictures, many of which have not been published before, are wonderful.

M. Jeanne Peterson, Indiana University, Bloomington