

Book Reviews

or fail or partly work, and the disaster may or may not retain a large place in individual or community memory or their on-going life.

Robert Martensen,
Clendening Library, University of Kansas

Andrea Carlino, *Paper Bodies: a catalogue of anatomical fugitive sheets 1538–1687*, trans. Noga Arikha, *Medical History*, Supplement No. 19, London, Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine, 1999, pp. xvi, 352, illus., £32.00, \$50.00 (hardback 0-83484-069-9). Orders to: Tracy Tillotson, Wellcome Library, The Wellcome Trust, 183 Euston Road, London NW1 2BE, UK.

Andrea Carlino's new book addresses those elusive anatomical illustrations, the compound situs or flap anatomy prints and not, as the title implies, all anatomical fugitive sheets from 1538 to 1687. The flap anatomy was essentially a representational convention confined to the earlier sixteenth century, though debased copies and strange hybrids of alchemical-astrological-anatomical content were published well into the eighteenth. His catalogue section includes sixty-two entries with reproductions, often with their flaps raised in cases where he was able to locate an impression. He gives their current locations, most valuable for scholars in the field.

He begins with a history of Renaissance anatomical illustration and is curiously dismissive of previous authors, saying "The existing literature on the subject . . . belongs to a school of history that is rooted in the tradition of philology and erudition which . . . fails to address the questions that today can be asked". A major concern of his book, the purpose for which the flap anatomies were done, has in fact been addressed: in Ludwig Choulant's summary account of 1852, Fritz Weindler's work on

the gynaecological figures in 1906, Le Roy Crummer's cataloguing and his establishment of an iconological classification system in the 1920s which was later refined by L H Wells in the 1960s. Some of these writers favoured a popular orientation, suggesting that the prints might have been done for barber-surgeons, treatment guides for phlebotomies, their deterioration due to having been stuck up on anteroom walls of bathhouses and apothecary shops. Others hypothesized a professional audience such as medical students, the prints a cheap substitute for books similar to "the quiz compends of today", phasing out as books became cheaper. Confounded by the total lack of contemporary documentation on the edition-size, modes of distribution, costs of production, prices of prints and characteristics of the buying public, their explanations remained tentative.

Carlino also promises "an account of the commercial success and diffusion throughout Europe of the fugitive sheets", stating that "between 1538 and 1545 some twenty editions were published in Europe". The magnitude of this production, an essential basis for many of his arguments, strikes one as astonishing until one realizes that he has enumerated as separate editions impressions taken from the same block and often by the same printer, the sometimes minute changes in the brief text, the formatting of the letterpress, or the colour enhancements which were ordinarily added later.

One of Carlino's most intriguing claims is that "An analysis of the intellectual, religious and professional context in which [the type of image] was produced led me to identify a network of connections, spread all over Europe". Collaboration between printing workshops would be more effectively deduced by tracing the journeys of the blocks themselves from one centre to another. The mere diffusion of a printed image does not constitute a network.

Carlino is the first to consider the texts in

Book Reviews

detail, a valuable contribution and a positive demonstration of his “philology and erudition”. The images receive, by comparison, cursory treatment. It is only after repeated perusals that the reader grasps how simple the material really is, basically three male–female pairs dateable to 1539 and their derivatives: the De Negker–Vogtherr set from Strasbourg; the Sabio set from Venice; and the Goldenmundt set from Nuremberg (of which Carlino could not locate an impression). His chronological arrangement has merits, but one hankers for an amplified version of the old-fashioned classifications systems begun by Crummer and Wells. This could be done on three levels: the texts (which Carlino does to some extent), the image-type and its variations, and the original or recut state of the block.

The sheer multiplicity of images that are almost but not quite similar, that may or may not retain random oddments of their original components, that have been disfigured by usage or crude colour additions, that often are accompanied by interchangeable blocks of anatomical detail which vary from printing to printing and texts that vary as well, can tempt an author to generalize from pure desperation. Carlino deserves enormous credit for having so boldly taken on this mass of material, and a book that opens up so many lines of enquiry for future researchers is a fine accomplishment in itself.

Mimi Cazort,
Ottawa

Patrice Debré, *Louis Pasteur*, trans. Elborg Forster, Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998, pp. xxvii, 552, illus., £27.50 (hardback 0-8018-5808-9).

Patrice Debré’s biography of Louis Pasteur was published in France in 1994, with an English translation following in

1998. Between these two dates, Gerald Geison’s *The private science of Louis Pasteur* unsettled the genre of Pasteur studies with its account of Pasteur’s laboratory work, clinical practice and scientific news management. Like Geison, Debré’s account of Pasteur’s medical work is influenced by Adrien Loir’s *À l’ombre de Pasteur* and makes use of the newly available laboratory notebooks and unpublished correspondence. In the Preface to the English-language edition, Debré refers to “L’Affair Pasteur” that followed the publication of Geison’s book and suggests that his volume will help answer many of the issues raised in the debate. Debré’s biography is not hagiographic, but neither does it address the major points made by Geison. Also, readers will need to be careful as there are a number of errors that an author more familiar with the history of science and medicine would have avoided.

The nature of Debré’s contribution to “L’Affair” can be gauged from looking at two episodes central to Geison’s work: the anthrax vaccinations at Pouilly-le-Fort and the first use of rabies vaccine. Geison made two claims about anthrax vaccination that have become controversial. The first is that Pasteur did not use, as he reported, a vaccine attenuated by exposure to oxygen, and second, that Jean-Joseph Henri Toussaint’s contribution to this development remained unacknowledged. Debré’s story covers both points but with a different spin. He states without comment that Pasteur “borrowed from his students [Roux and Chamberland] a process [of antiseptic attenuation] that they themselves had taken from Toussaint” (p. 396). On the process itself, Debré merely observes that Pasteur chose the best available option and suggests that the key factor was how Roux and Chamberland made Toussaint’s methods reliable. On the question of credit, Debré points out that when Pasteur received the grand cordon of the Légion d’honneur for this work, Roux and Chamberland took the