

## Book Reviews

for undertaking so ungrateful and time-saving a task. It is with the centuries prior to the nineteenth that the difficulties begin, and here a lack of harmony between aims and methods becomes apparent. The compilers do not directly specify their aims, although they imply that their work provides “un tableau d'ensemble de l'activité des hippocratistes” (p. III). But such an aim is stultified by lack of annotation and biographical information (compare in this respect the series *Catalogus translationum et commentariorum*). On the other hand, the work is not, in the strict sense, a bibliography, either critical or descriptive (it will not be clear to bibliographers what is meant by “entrées bibliographiques simples (c'est-à-dire non critiques)” (p. 1). The attempt to give titles in full, very commendable in itself, becomes pointless when the source, or the copy, from which this information is taken is not given. This practice would have saved grave confusions, such as that between items 158, 159, and 161. Copies of this item exist in the British Library, the Bibliothèque Nationale, and the National Library of Medicine, and comparison with the published catalogues of these institutions indicates what has gone wrong. There are a number of such duplications, for example 5 = 4, 11 = 10, 57 = 55, 251 = 250, 262 = 261, 296 = 287, 335 = 301 (this originates from a mistake in the British Museum catalogue, which is very unreliable on Hippocrates), 421 = 415, 481 = 479, 491 = 490, 498 = 496, 495 = 485, 494 = 486. All these could have been weeded out: as it is, the user is running a risk unless he is prepared to check each item himself, in which case he might do better to begin with the published catalogues themselves. This is particularly true for the admittedly difficult area of incunabula: here the user must, at the very least, check each item in Klebs.

The work is therefore best regarded as a finding list, although even this use is unnecessarily limited by the absence of any index of texts: what after all is technology for? Such an index would also have explained the presence of mystifying items such as 185, 290, 292, and 528 (in each case the explanation will be found in Durling's *Catalogue*). A selection of locations, too, would have helped, as well as being methodologically desirable in the way indicated above. Among the aids to the reader are name-pseudonym lists, particularly useful for fifteenth- and sixteenth-century authors, though here again the usefulness is unnecessarily marred by lack of adequate combing and of biographical annotation. Thus there are inconsistencies between the two lists, between lists and text, and between lists, text, and author index, which the reader may further explore in the cases of Constantine and John Lascaris and of Rinuccio-Aretinus-Griffolini (see item 37). On the subject of authors, the user needs to have it explained to him what Peter of Abano has to do with the *Articella*, or Dietrich Ulsen with any Hippocratic work.

The user should therefore be wary, but he will find the work a convenient tool for some purposes. It is a useful checklist for the modern period, and a rough guide to what was printed about Hippocrates in earlier centuries and still exists in (some) modern libraries. It should certainly be bought by all academic libraries.

Iain M. Lonie

Wellcome Unit for the History of Medicine, Cambridge

TREVOR H. LEVERE (editor), *Editing texts in the history of science and medicine* (Papers given at the 7th annual conference on editorial problems, 1981), New York, Garland Publishing Co., 1982, 8vo, pp. 190, illus., \$17.00.

The five authors contributing to this symposium approached their subject in very different ways, varying from the general to the particular. The most general, and most generally interesting, was adopted by Stillman Drake in 'Dating unpublished notes, such as Galileo's on Motion' and by Armand Beaulieu in 'Problèmes d'édition de la correspondance d'un homme prodigieux: Marin Mersenne'; both authors deal with fundamental aspects of editing such as might be encountered in any field but with particular reference to their individual subjects. Drake's is a splendid example of exposition and a fascinating account of an extremely tricky problem; Beaulieu's is more elementary, though useful, and might be supplemented by the Chantilly symposium of 1975 (*Revue de Synthèse*, III, nos. 81-2, 1976).

Totally different in approach is Linda Voigts' 'Editing Middle English texts: needs and issues'. This is centred on medical texts, and begins with brief comments on problems of

## Book Reviews

language; this is followed by a little on texts available, followed in turn by a long discussion of the taxonomy of such texts and a defence of the study of “academic” or “learned” vernacular texts. There is much to be learned here, although the author has not attempted a coherent study. Bert S. Hall devotes himself to considering problems of understanding and interpreting mostly published texts in the history of late medieval technology (nothing medical here); while Bernard Cohen’s ‘Thrice revealed Newton’ is a detailed history of the publication of Newton’s writings from 1687 to 1980. This is an excellent introduction for the novice (although, curiously it omits several seventeenth- and eighteenth-century publications), but, of course, there is nothing of specifically medical interest here.

The historian of medicine would profit from Drake’s exceptionally cogent account, from Voigts’ specialized analysis and, for correspondence, from Beaulieu’s survey.

Marie Boas Hall  
Tackley, Oxford

WALTER PAGEL, *Paracelsus. An introduction to philosophical medicine in the era of the Renaissance*, 2nd rev. ed., Basle, Karger, 1982, 8vo, pp. xii, 404, illus., SFr. 139.00.

Pagel’s *Paracelsus* is a monument of European scholarship and humane sympathy. Its first edition, 1958, supplied not only the key to the understanding of many aspects of non-Galenic medicine in the Renaissance but also an interpretation of Paracelsus’ life and personality that sought to free him from the reproach of being mystic, mad, or both. The reappearance of this fundamental book in a second, revised edition can only be welcomed, but with one serious reservation. The revisions comprise a new foreword, a collation of passages cited from Huser’s edition with those of Sudhoff, and twenty-five pages of corrections and addenda, mostly giving precision to some of the events of Paracelsus’ life and, in particular, stressing his links with earlier gnostic thinkers like Konrad von Meigenburg. The revisions offer a perspective of a generation of Paracelsus scholarship in miniature, and will undoubtedly prove of great value. Yet there is no indication in the text itself to refer the reader to any corrections, and he must therefore peruse the book with one finger constantly on the errata. This would hardly be acceptable in a cheap reprint; to be asked to pay well over £50 for this represents an insult to the purchaser and an injustice to the author, for it prevents the book’s diffusion among those who need it most, teachers and students of the history of medicine and of renaissance thought.

Vivian Nutton  
Wellcome Institute

GEOFFREY HOLMES, *Augustan England. Professions, state, and society, 1680–1730*, London, Allen & Unwin, 1982, 8vo, pp. xiv, 332, £18.50.

Professor Holmes’s book, jam-packed with information and enlivened throughout with vivid personal cameos and dry wit, invites a major rethink in our approaches to the history of the professions. The alliance of the sociology of the professions with “modernization theory” has encouraged us to think of “professionalization” as essentially a nineteenth-century development, associated with the abolition of the *ancien régime* or “Old Corruption”, the Industrial Revolution and its needs, the career open to talent within the liberal state, the Victorian ethos of service and duty, the tides of Progress and Reform. For the traditional liberal professions, the landmarks of professionalization are pointed out by sociologists and historians in the nineteenth-century constitutional spring-cleans: new state regulations, competitive entry, often through written examinations and formal certification, the shift from oligarchy and nepotism to more open self-disciplining and policing of standards, and so forth. But the nineteenth century is also the epoch when skills which, in traditional society had been mere trades, or for amateurs, such as the occupation of magistrate, nurse, schoolmaster, or architect, attained organized, public, professional status for the first time, signalled by the founding of their own chartered corporations or associations. Much valuable work in the historical sociology of medicine – e.g., by Holloway, Waddington, Scull, and the Parrys – implicitly or explicitly follows these models.

Professor Holmes, by contrast, claims – with a convincing battery of evidence – that the real watershed in the history of the professions had occurred a whole century earlier. He takes into