

Book Reviews

produce, which seems appropriate, somehow. As well as parts taken up with the catalogue of the records, manuscripts and books of the Society, there is an account of its history from 1819-1989 by Palmer. Although brief, this is excellent and includes the history of the collection itself and its relationship to other material in Glasgow and London. Several institutions have Hunter bits and, in a note (p. 32), Palmer puts his finger on what is really required. A single catalogue of all the Hunter-related "benefactions" would be of the greatest use.

Two final things come to mind. One is that catalogues which straddle the paper-object divide, like the Hunterian Society's, have not changed much. For example, compare its "Caricatures", "Cataract Knives" and "Coffin-Plate Rubbing" (p. 244) with headings found in the mid nineteenth-century catalogue of the Edinburgh University Museum of Military Surgery, such as "Balls, Missiles and Warlike Weapons", "Worms", "Casts" (unrelated) and "Drawings, Plans, Etc.". Secondly, all these classifications, old and new, exemplify Foucault's thematic elaboration on the Borges passage about the different classifications of animals in a certain Chinese encyclopaedia ("belonging to the Emperor", "stray dogs" and "drawn with a very fine camelhair brush"). Strange, yes, but in another sense entirely familiar when one knows the sub-culture and forms of life they refer to. In this case, it is setting the Society's "possessions" and "benefactions" to work in the business of maintaining the Hunterian tradition.

Mike Barfoot, Medical Archive Centre, Edinburgh University Library

STEPHEN TROMBLEY, *Sir Frederick Treves: the extra-ordinary Edwardian*, London, Routledge 1989, 8vo, pp. ix, 218, £19.95.

At the peak of his career, Sir Frederick Treves (1853-1923) was arguably the best known surgeon of his time. He wrote an autobiography but, tantalising, had second thoughts about publication and, at the last moment, to the dismay of his publisher, he retrieved the manuscript. After his death his wife, in accordance with his instructions, destroyed it along with his personal papers. As his first biographer, nearly seventy years later, Trombley explains the difficulties he faced, notably due to "the absence of the kind of intimate material which has become the cornerstone of modern biography".

Not only was Treves remarkably energetic and industrious, even by Victorian standards but he also enjoyed writing. As a consequence there is an abundance of published work available, to an extent that Trombley has listed nearly 400 articles, letters and books written by Treves, which make up a most useful bibliography. Moreover, by incorporating passages taken from Treves's writings into the narrative, the reader is given opportunities to appreciate his talents as a vivid and effective writer. Overall, the book offers an enjoyable and informative read, not only in the portrayal of Treves's character and professional attainments (his achievements as an abdominal anatomist and surgeon are, in fact, underestimated), but also concerning the social and political context of his life, as well as giving insights into his many interests outside medicine.

For the medical reader there are certain irritations. The variety and complexity of British medical qualifications, so familiar to home-grown doctors, present a minefield to the uninitiated and, in this book, have led to several false interpretations. In an exploration of Treves's motives for pursuing a career in surgery, surely his recognition of particular practical and intellectual talents and potential within himself should be seen as more important in determining his destiny, than any constraints imposed by the English class structure of the time. More seriously, the author has, occasionally, added certain embellishments; they may enhance the story line, but will undermine the confidence of even a junior student of clinical medicine. Thus chapter one opens with a romanticized description of the youthful Treves in general practice, in attendance on a young woman only a year older than himself, who is critically ill with anaemia. The idea is a good one but several inconsistent details render the clinical vignette flawed. "Her finger-nails, once shapely, have become brittle and concave. . . There is no doubt about the diagnosis: pernicious anaemia". In fact, Treves's description of this case which he

Book Reviews

reported in the *Lancet* of 1877 makes no mention of pernicious anaemia nor of koilonychia, a feature in any event not associated with pernicious anaemia.

Treves was a many-sided man whose achievements were considerable and varied. In addition to his published work, manuscript sources are available and, in the future, further study of these is likely to provide more understanding of what may seem contradictory elements in his personality. Trombley has made a good beginning.

Denis Gibbs. The Royal London Hospital

MARY BOYLE, *Schizophrenia: a scientific delusion?*, London and New York, Routledge, 1990, 8vo. pp. viii, 248, £35.00.

This carefully researched work seeks to destroy the concept of schizophrenia. The author's approach is one of self-confessed "social constructionism". This has the "annoying feature of turning attention away from a problem and onto those who are trying to deal with the problem". From the historical viewpoint Boyle wishes to set out "in some detail the story of the introduction, development and use of 'schizophrenia'". This is neatly done by criticizing the works of Emil Kraepelin, Eugen Bleuler, and Kurt Schneider as the main protagonists of the concept.

The remaining three-quarters of the book deals with the modern "fallacious arguments" used to support the concept of schizophrenia. Genetic research gets a quarter and seminal papers are pulled apart for their poor methodology. Her evidence is marshalled impressively. On the clinical side, it is a pity that, although her references are contemporary—as well as wide-ranging—there is no mention of how, for instance, brain imaging techniques have been used in the diagnosis of schizophrenia. More surprisingly, given that the author is a clinical psychologist, there is no attempt to deal with the issue of treatment. Why do people with schizophrenia get better with medication?

Although one of her four stated aims is to "discuss alternatives to the concept", her emphasis on the "functional rather than topographical properties of behaviour" is very provisional.

This erudite, provocative, if not convincing, work sorely misses reader-friendly end of chapter summaries and a proper conclusion.

Dominic Beer, Senior Registrar in Psychiatry, Guy's Hospital Rotation

SIMON BAATZ, *Knowledge, culture, and science in the metropolis: the New York Academy of Sciences, 1817–1970*, *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, vol. 584, New York Academy of Sciences, 1990, 8vo, pp. ix, 269, illus., \$55.00.

For much of the nineteenth century American intellectual energy was channelled into developing the vast resources of the country, and the few struggling scientific societies were largely concentrated in the three major urban areas, Philadelphia, Boston, and New York. Philadelphia was the leading intellectual centre, but even here the Philadelphia Academy of Medicine experienced a burst of energy shortly after the Revolution and then barely managed to survive until its revival in the 1840s.

As with most early American scientific associations, physicians played a dominant role in founding the Lyceum of Natural History in 1817, the forerunner of the New York Academy of Sciences. Of the three leading spirits, two were physicians, and nearly all of the original members were either graduates or faculty members of the local College of Physicians and Surgeons. For a few years the Lyceum experienced steady growth. The publication of its *Annals* in 1823 brought it into contact with scientists in America and Europe, and its membership reached 151 by 1825. By 1835 it had erected its own building, an event which marked a temporary peak in its activities. The Depression of 1837 and dissension among the membership forced the Lyceum to sell its building in 1843 and go into a period of decline. It was revived largely through the efforts of John William Draper, the dominant figure in the newly