

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is influenced by Adrien Loir’s *À l’ombre de Pasteur* and makes use of the newly available laboratory notebooks and unpublished correspondence.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

Book Reviews

lesser award of the red ribbon. He claims that no attempt was made to relegate Toussaint to the shadows and that Pasteur supported his award of the Vaillant prize of the Académie des sciences in 1883. But, of course, the grand prize remained Louis Pasteur's. The different emphases of Debré and Geison reflect their aims. Geison's main concern is to show the gap between the practice of research, and the presentation and uses of findings in professional discourses and wider cultural politics; Debré is more concerned with following the successful trajectory of Pasteur's research programme. That said, Debré does cover the wider context of events, including Pasteur's debate with Jules Guérin and subsequent trials of the vaccine in Hungary, Germany and Italy.

On rabies, Debré also covers the three contentious issues raised by Geison: the two "private patients" treated before the famous case of Joseph Meister, Roux's unease at the way the treatment was developed, and how Pasteur was swept up in the reaction to his innovation. Debré seems to see no significance in why Pasteur did not publish details of the first two vaccine trials. With Meister, he suggests that Léon Say prompted early publication of the results, and makes the nice point about the politics of the episode. Meister was from Alsace and it did not go unnoticed that Koch and his School were unable to help a citizen of a province taken over in the Franco-Prussian War. Roux's responses to the rabies work and his fraught relationship with Pasteur are discussed, though Roux's objections and those of others, such as Michel Peter, tend to be presented as obstacles to the inevitable triumph of Pasteurian ideas. That said, Debré makes exposés of his own, taking details from Loir of the deaths after treatment of Jules Louyer and Joseph Smith and how these were handled by the investigating authorities. Further evidence is presented to support the general point that "Pasteur was obsessed with his fame for posterity" (p. 426) and to show how he

cultivated the roles of master and hero. Debré does detail the many controversies that surrounded Pasteur's work and does not shy away from the great man's failures and changes of mind. Yet, it is always Pasteur who was honest, intellectually bold and willing to learn from his mistakes, in many ways the ideal Popperian scientist. Thus, it is perhaps no surprise that Debré fails to connect with Geison's work, which comes, of course, from a quite different historiographical tradition.

Michael Worboys,
Sheffield Hallam University

Lawrence J Friedman, *Identity's architect: a biography of Erik H Erikson*, London, Free Association Books, 1999, pp. 592, £17.95 (paperback 1-85343-471-X).

The title of *Identity's architect* may be read in a number of interlinked ways: how Erik Salomsen became Erik Homburger, who became Erik Erikson, who forged one of the most "successful" concepts of twentieth-century psychology, "identity", and how this in turn shaped how many individuals—patients, practitioners and the general public—came to be identified and identified themselves. The manner in which these three elements mutually illuminate each other make Friedman's book not only an outstanding work of biography, but also of cultural and intellectual history.

As we learn from this meticulously researched and richly documented study, Erik Erikson was born to Karla Abrahamsen, who was Jewish and Danish. He never knew who his father was, and uncovering the secret of his paternity became a lifelong quest. With his mother, he moved to Germany, and was legally adopted by her second husband, Theodor Homburger. Erikson initially wanted to be an artist. He followed his friend Peter Blos to Vienna. Through Blos, he entered Anna