

Book Reviews

study of the career of L. Emmett Holt, is that the legitimization of paediatrics depended on several factors: the development of scientific medicine, a focus on prevention, Victorian family imagery, and an alliance of paediatricians and mothers. She is concerned with the “monopolization of access to medical information” but not with money, power, or with competition theory—at least not in the sense that these terms are used by Black and by the other authors in this collection.

Robert Baker
Union College, Schenectady

TEIZO OGAWA (editor), *History of pathology*. Proceedings of the 8th International Symposium on the Comparative History of Medicine—East and West, Tokyo and Osaka, Taniguchi Foundation, 1986, 8vo, pp. ix, 199, [no price stated].

This symposium was devoted to the history of pathology. In introducing the book of the conference, Russell Maulitz notes that its discussions centred on pathology’s social transformation and epistemological development, and on the *symmetrical* treatment of modern scientific pathology and folk pathologies. From the evidence presented here, however, most authors favour a single epistemological trail from ancient folk pathologies to modern scientific pathology; and there is little to suggest that folk pathologies persist today.

A number of authors try to evaluate older pathological ideas in terms of newer ones. For example, in his essay on intoxication in medieval China, Hiroshi Kosoto notes that, “it is impossible to grasp the real essence of medical history objectively unless the disease recorded in traditional literature can be confirmed from a modern scientific point of view” (p. 54). Consequently, Kosoto translates descriptions of intoxication in the *Chou ping yuan hou lun* into a modern toxicological terminology incapable of containing the cultural resonances of a medieval Chinese text. If, as Maulitz poses, the boundary between folk and scientific pathologies is porous, then for Kosoto it allows only a one-way flow, for old descriptions of disease “offer a great opportunity for digging out and confirming hidden truths that might, after all, contribute to the further development of science” (p. 54).

Others echo this approach. Hitoshi Igarashi rejects both the “notorious” doctrine of the four humours and nineteenth-century bacteriology as deficient explanations of disease, wishing to supplant them with what he terms a “sympathology” which seeks not only the annihilation of disease, but also ways of co-existing with it. Hsien-Chih Chang aims to show that the Four Great Physicians of the Sung dynasty in China led “Chinese medicine away from reality and into the realm of imagination” (p. 92). In his view, their “excessively theoretical style” only widened the gap between medical theory and practice and the study of anatomy. Finally, although Bou-Yong Rhi notes the concept of pathogenesis is problematic in both modern psychiatry and oriental medicine, he still tries to evaluate older Korean folk-ideas about mental illness in terms of modern science.

Most authors are content to provide partial explanations for the social transformation of pathology. Ulrich Tröhler discusses changing conceptions of pain in seventeenth-century Europe; for Tröhler what counted in this change were scientific, philosophical, and medical factors, so he notes bluntly, “The extent to which religion may have played a part is omitted here” (p. 191). Again, Akira Kajita only hints at a fruitful area of study in making the point that in Edo-period Japan, the Dutch, on whom the Japanese relied as transmitters of European culture, were reluctant to convey Paris medicine. Consequently, he claims, between the eighteenth and mid-nineteenth-centuries Japanese medicine was influenced mainly by that east of the Rhine.

Yumi Hosono asks a different question, “how people of premodern times viewed illness in terms of the society they lived in” (p. 124). This seems to me to question the aims of the preceding authors; to dispute whether one can legitimately apply scientific concepts to traditional societies. It also seems to question whether one can draw a simple historical path. Lay pathologies did not die with the emergence of scientific pathology, but this book does not try to account for their co-existence.

Book Reviews

I would also have liked to have known what Bürgel and Maulitz, who wrote the most interesting essays, make of the co-existence of lay and scientific concepts of pathology. Bürgel shows how Prophetic and Galenic systems intersected in Arabic medicine: orthodox Muslims were obliged to question whether rational, secular therapies were compatible with pious striving and trust in God's omnipotence. Prophetic medicine, according to Bürgel, shifted authority from the ancients to the Koran and to the Prophet. In an aside, he suggests that orthodox Muslims today face a similar question in regard to scientific medicine; indeed, the sayings of the Prophet (Hadiths) are sometimes invoked to legitimize such scientific practices as organ transplantation. Maulitz traces the development of American pathology to the early twentieth century, a tale of increasing technical complexity and sub-division. Unfortunately, there is no discussion of the pathology's impact on the doctor-patient relationship. The technical and social complexity of scientific pathology distanced pathology from clinical medicine, even as this very complexity facilitated the divergence of clinical from lay conceptions of disease.

David Cantor
ARC Epidemiology Research Unit, Manchester

BRYAN M. HIBBARD, *The obstetric forceps: a short history and descriptive catalogue of the forceps in the Museum of the Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists*, London, Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists [27 Sussex Place, London NW1 4RG], 1988, 8vo, pp. iii, 69, £2.00.

The introduction of forceps into obstetric practice is variously described as one of the great advances in obstetric care, or alternatively as an example of the brutal use of new instruments whose only purpose was to advance the cause of man-midwifery. The latter view was held by many eighteenth-century midwives who saw their business slipping into the hands of medical practitioners, and sometimes by modern historians reacting against what they see as the subsequent domination of childbirth by men, with their persistent tendency to intervene unnecessarily in a physiological process. Whatever one's views, however, there can be no doubt of the historical importance of obstetricians and their forceps.

The number of British and Continental designs which followed the publication of the Chamberlen model in the first half of the eighteenth century almost suggests that any obstetrician worth his salt had to have a pair of forceps to his name. Witowski, whose *Histoire des accouchements* was published in Paris in 1887, described mid-nineteenth-century obstetricians as "possessed with an incredible ardour for inventing instruments sometimes dangerous, often useless, but always ingenious". If you had your name attached to an instrument, you were tempted to use it whenever it was necessary and often when it was not; and your students learnt to do the same. But most of the designs were ephemeral. Today most of the ingenious and occasionally horrifying instruments of the past are where they belong, in historical collections. "Give me a pair of Kiellands and a pair of Wrigleys and I am content" was, as I remember it, the received obstetric wisdom in the 1950s, with Wrigleys only for general practitioners. The past proliferation of forceps does, however, provide an important clue to past practice. The massive intervention in normal or slightly delayed labours, which was such a feature of obstetric practice from the mid-nineteenth century to the 1930s, stimulated the production of new designs. Some inventions, such as axis-traction, were undoubtedly useful. In the hands of an experienced practitioner, forceps could relieve an enormous amount of distress and save maternal and infant lives. Their misuse, which admittedly occurred on a grand scale, is no reason to condemn them.

Bryan Hibbard, Professor of Obstetrics and Gynaecology at the University of Wales and Curator of Instruments at the Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists, has an unparalleled knowledge of this important and complex subject. With the judicious use of detailed tables, he has produced a guide to the collection in a text whose brevity may, at first