

Book Reviews

establishments for recognition of Scottish degrees, and the slow decline of the Scottish, clinically-based medical curriculum as its laboratory-based German counterpart rose to displace it in popularity. The final chapter on the twentieth century gives a valuable account of the development of state medicine in Scotland, including a section on the Highlands and Islands Medical Service, and the smooth introduction of the National Health Service from 1948.

The book has its faults. Hamilton seems happier when recounting the cut and thrust of medical politics and is less convincing on public health and poor law medical aid, where more detailed research might have been an advantage. A surprising omission is the cottage hospital movement which brought in-patient care to most rural communities in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. There is only a very cursory account of improvements in the care of the mentally sick, in which Scotland played an important part in the nineteenth century. In the pre-eighteenth-century chapters, the author fails to relate changes taking place in Scotland to the rest of the British Isles or to place Scotland in the perspective of Europe as a whole. In spite of these criticisms, the work is essential reading for all those wishing to understand major trends in British medicine to the present day and is likely to remain the standard short work on Scottish medical history for some time to come.

Stephanie Blackden
Wellcome Fellow in the History of Medicine
Edinburgh University

Volume commemorating the 75th anniversary of G. A. Lindeboom, Amsterdam, Medisch Encyclopaedisch Instituut, 1980, 8vo, pp. viii, 219, illus., Dfl. 30.00 (paperback).

It is appropriate that Professor Lindeboom's pre-eminent stature as the leader of the study of medical history in the Netherlands should be celebrated by not one but two volumes of *Festschriften*. His seventieth birthday was greeted with the volume *Circa Tiliam*, and now his seventy-fifth birthday by this republication of seventeen articles dedicated to him, and first issued in *Janus* 1980.

Perhaps Professor Lindeboom's greatest achievement is his major biography of Herman Boerhaave in 1968, together with further volumes of studies on him; and the British reader is particularly grateful that these works were written in English. But, as the continuation of the listing of his published works here reveals, it would be a mistake to suggest that Lindeboom's scholarly activity has been limited to Boerhaave studies.

Most of those who have paid tribute to him in the present volume have offered articles (in English and German) in Lindeboom's own special period, the eighteenth century, and his own special area, medicine in the Netherlands. Outstanding amongst these is one by Antonie Luyendijk-Elshout of Leiden entitled 'Samuel Musgrave's attack upon Stahl's and Boerhaave's doctrines in 1763'. The title is self-explanatory, but it belies the excitement of the contents; exemplary in approach and presentation, this paper is to be highly recommended. Richard Toellner of Münster, also taking a biographical theme, offers a very good study of Haller's early visit to England (1727), and the effect on him of the English adoration of Newton and of science. Similarly noteworthy is H. A. M. Snelders's piece on 'Lambertus Bicker (1732–1801): an early adherent of Lavoisier in the Netherlands'.

The contributions in German are more of a mixed bag. Professor Rothschild writes on the self-evident value of medical history, producing a diagram which comfortingly shows how medical history surrounds and embraces all other medical studies. D. A. Wittop Koning makes a reconstruction of the matriculation list of Harderwijk, and brings to our attention the existence of a composite listing of all the disputations, orations, and doctoral theses of the Dutch universities, drawn up by Professor van der Woude at Amsterdam. Marielene Putscher offers a consideration of Karl Jasper's view of Van Gogh as a schizophrenic, which she has subtitled 'illness and art' (*Krankheit und Kunst*).

But finally, let me take issue with one of the authors. Professor Leibowitz here contributes to a familiar tradition of attempting the impossible: retrospective diagnosis, this time of Lessing's final illness. As Leibowitz himself tells us, the contemporary postmortem report stressed a

Book Reviews

feature which “today has no place in the pathology of coronary disease”, while it did not even mention the coronary vessels, which play “a decisive role” in the disease Leibowitz claims to have diagnosed. In his retrospective diagnosis, therefore, Leibowitz has to ignore evidence which *is* given, and invent evidence which is *not* given. Just how great a discordance is required between our medical categories and those of eighteenth-century physicians before we will learn to abandon this fruitless game? Our categories and their categories are quite simply incommensurable.

All in all, this is an interesting set of articles, the best of which are thematically related to Lindeboom’s own interests. We await the next volume, this time celebrating his eightieth birthday.

Andrew Cunningham
Wellcome Unit for the History of Medicine
University of Cambridge

JÓZSEF ANTALL, *Pictorial history of European medicine and pharmaceuticals*, Budapest, Corvina Kiadó, 1981, 4to, pp. 22 + 92 plates, [no price stated].

After a fifteen-page history of medicine with special reference to Hungary, Dr. Antall provides ninety-two colour plates of paintings, drug-jars, surgical instruments, medallions, wax and ivory models, and other relics relevant to the history of medicine and pharmacy. Nearly half of the items reproduced are in the Semmelweis Museum of Medical History, Budapest; the rest are from other European collections. At least a dozen have already been reproduced in Dr. Antall’s *Pictures from the history of medicine* (1973).

Each item is accompanied by a brief text *en face*. The text is intended as “a guide or chatting partner who will show [the reader] around some of the relics of European healing”, but few gallery-guides are as concise as this. The pictorial language of obsolete medicine is, if possible, even more arcane than the written language, but here the reader who looks to the text for elucidation of the image will find little help. What is the emblem on the reverse of the medallion issued in honour of Tommaso Rangoni (no. 41), and what is its relevance? Why is a mustard-pot (no. 17) decorated with a Turk’s head? Why do the three Maries in a painting in the Esztergom Museum have drug-jars made of turned ivory (no. 13), whereas all the actual jars illustrated in the book are ceramic? A painting attributed to Leonardo da Bressanone (no. 12) is reproduced to illustrate the “stiff, bandage-like method of swaddling, which is fortunately no longer in use”: what, then, was its rationale? More consideration of such questions of iconography would increase the usefulness of these illustrations to medical historians.

Nevertheless, for various reasons we are indebted to Dr. Antall for publishing these valuable items. Collectors and curators of ceramics will be pleased to find illustrations of dated and attributed Hungarian wares (67–72), while historians should find in the pictures an approach to fellow-feeling with medical practitioners of the past. To mention one example: no. 55 is a Bolognese portrait of a Dominican nun in the pharmacy of which she presumably had charge, and the details are carefully composed to express and justify her faith in the therapeutics which it was her vocation to administer.

William Schupbach
Wellcome Institute

GRETA JONES, *Social Darwinism and English thought. The interaction between biological and social theory*, Brighton, Sussex, Harvester Press (New York, Humanities Press), 1980, 8vo, pp. xiv, 234, £22.50.

If social Darwinism had not existed someone, according to Greta Jones, would have invented it. A search for biological underpinnings to the social sciences had begun long before Darwin’s time, and all the crucial intellectual ingredients of evolutionary theory were well-established aspects of social thought by the middle of the nineteenth century. In this respect then, the *Origin of Species* did not inaugurate a new epoch in national ideology. So what, asks Jones, did Darwin’s book do? Her answer focuses on a new, post-Darwinian generation of social theorists who explicitly claimed to base their work on biological principles. Expectations already raised,