

shows the significance, for the guild members, of being appointed members of the tribunal. It also describes the most important medical individuals in Navarre between the fifteenth and eighteenth centuries.

Sánchez Álvarez shows how professional regulation was one of the areas where the Navarrese institutions, both civil – the government of the kingdom or the Navarrese court – and professional, fought to maintain their independence from the central powers. This meant that, although the Navarrese *Protomedicato* tribunal was based on the Castilian model, its course did not run parallel to it.

There is no doubt that this book will be an essential work of reference for any future studies which may be carried out on the world of medicine and the medical institutions in the ancient Kingdom of Navarre.

For all healthcare historians, reading this work will be worthwhile for its reconstruction of the past from archival sources, and because it is a perfect example of the confrontation of the different institutions in the shaping of the healthcare professions in Europe. The powers-that-be are often said to have watched over the preparation and training of healers because of the enormous effect of their work on society. Sánchez Álvarez's work shows that there were other, more covert vested interests among individuals and the local or general politics of the kingdoms.

**Pilar León-Sanz,**  
University of Navarra

**Andrew Cunningham,** *The Anatomist Anatomis' d: An Experimental Discipline in Enlightenment Europe*, *The History of Medicine in Context* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010), pp. + xxiv + 442, £65.00, hardback, ISBN: 978-0-7546-6338-6.

Anatomy for centuries has been *a* if not *the* central discipline of medicine. Unsurprisingly, it has thus also been a key topic of medical historiography. But when we have to

recommend some few modern general books to non-specialists and students, there is only a small number to choose from. With regard to the Renaissance, my choice would be Andrew Cunningham's monograph from 1997. But what about the following 'long' eighteenth century (1650–1800)? Up to now, there was hardly a book that could claim to cover this period in a substantial and general manner reflecting actual scholarly interests. Cunningham now has published a volume on this period hoping 'that one day this book might actually be read by students' (p. xxii). Are his hopes justified?

As the author stresses, this book is not primarily concerned with the history of the body, nor with anatomical discoveries or the relationship between anatomy and art. It is about the discipline of anatomy, about the elements and especially the various forms of practice that constituted this discipline. It thus reflects current approaches in the history of science and science studies to describe scientific disciplines and identities as a set of shared practices and beliefs. Cunningham's approach is not fundamentally new; it is, however, new in its wide-ranging application to eighteenth-century anatomy. Chapters One, Two and Four offer a wealth of information on practical matters such as anatomical theatres, careers and courses, acquisition and preservation of bodies, methods of producing illustrations, various topics of controversy, etc. Many of the sources are, quite understandably, well known and the account, therefore, rarely offers unexpected interpretations. Given the vast range of topics it necessarily remains often on a rather descriptive level. Its merit lies in its sensible arrangement and the pan-European view that takes into account the conditions mainly in Great Britain, France, the German-speaking countries, Italy and the Netherlands. Cunningham's overview shows many similarities but also differences in anatomical practice: some careers depended partly on dynasty, some entirely on merit; some courses were held in a very traditional style, some in a Vesalian or other manner; at some places there was an abundance of bodies,

at others there was evident shortage, etc. These similarities and differences neither prevented nor sufficiently secured the establishment of anatomy as a single discipline.

What, then, constituted the core of the discipline of 'old anatomy' (as Cunningham calls it)? The answer is given in the subtitle and the third and fifth chapters of the book: the notion of anatomy as an experimental discipline with various sub-disciplines. This is the main, novel and important argument of the book (partly already published in an article in 2002–3). Cunningham quite convincingly shows that our modern conceptions of anatomy and physiology have led us to regard every case of vivisection as an early instance of experimental physiology, where in fact they belonged to anatomy which was an experimental and far richer discipline in the early modern period than today. All the experiments undertaken were anatomical because they started from anatomical structures and properties instead of physiological questions. The scholars consistently called them 'anatomical experiments' and considered them as part of their anatomical investigations. 'There was no such enterprise or discipline or activity as experimental physiology. It did not yet exist. It was created only in the years just after 1800' (p. 155). Physiology was not an experimental but a purely theoretical discipline; anatomy delivered the facts, and physiology the interpretation. In a similar manner, generation, pathology and comparative anatomy have to be considered as sub-disciplines of anatomy as their modes of investigation were anatomical: Morgagni's great work, for instance, was based on anatomical facts, not clinical signs. All these sub-disciplines were only transformed into new single disciplines at the end of the eighteenth century.

In my view, Cunningham's argument is essentially right and a major contribution to our understanding of the history of anatomy. His broad coverage of time and topics and his emphasis on tradition and the 'seismic series of events' (p. xxi) in revolutionary France has,

however, led him to underrate the diversity and dynamic of the second half of the eighteenth century. The terms 'physiological experiments' and 'experimental physiology' were not first used in the early nineteenth century, as he argues, but well before that (for example, in Tissot's 1755 preface to Haller's treatise on irritability; the *Lettre sur un cours de physiologie expérimentale*, mentioned p. 164, was in fact published in 1771). Haller performed various experiments that were clearly physiological in their design, and he considered physiology not as a purely theoretical discipline. This critique does not, however, diminish the importance of Cunningham's argument that seems to hold true for the majority of anatomists and physiologists.

I hope and am quite confident that the author's wishes will come true and that this book will be read by students (and scholars alike). It is the best general book on eighteenth-century anatomy we have. It is very well researched, truly informative, brilliantly argued and, last but not least, highly readable.

**Hubert Steinke,**  
University of Bern

**Fay Bound Alberti, *Matters of the Heart: History, Medicine, and Emotion*** (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), pp. xii + 228, £25.00, hardback ISBN: 978-0-19-954097-6.

Fay Bound Alberti's new monograph, *Matters of the Heart: History, Medicine, and Emotion*, is an admirably concise narrative of the conjoined histories of heart, brain, and soul from the seventeenth century to the present. Alberti enters literary territory previously covered by literary historians such as Robert Erickson and Kirstie Blair who were also interested in cultural discourses of the heart. But there is little overlap with earlier studies because Alberti adds a genuinely medical focus through a series of short chapters on advances in cardiac physiology and pathology, and on figures such as John Hunter, felled in