

Book Reviews

directory, and part methodological guide. As the author points out in the preface, there exist few general works on science historiography in any language, let alone Spanish. This volume fills that void, but it does so unevenly.

Divided into sections on the study of science, theories of history and of history of science, scientific and medical historiography, current historiographic debates, the social history of scientific knowledge, and research methodology, the book offers a cornucopia of names, ideas, and places. We are reminded that understandings of science and of history are protean, hotly debated, and context- and actor-specific. The author discusses the triumph of interpretation over historical facts; the influence of the Vienna Circle, the Annales school, and Henry Sigerist; Robert Merton's insights on the popularity of hydraulics; the Karl Popper-Thomas Kuhn polemics; and Auguste Comte's three levels of development of human knowledge. Many others in this hit-parade of historians of science are mentioned only in passing (often in long lists of scholars), so that only the reader with prior knowledge of the work of Georges Canguilhem, for example, can appreciate the brief references to him. More troubling is the absence of scholars who have influenced the study of science from gender and race perspectives, such as Donna Haraway and Evelyn Fox Keller, particularly in a volume that promises attention to current debates. These imbalances limit the usefulness of this book as a graduate textbook of science historiography and give the reader the sensation of being caught in a battle between depth and inclusiveness.

At its core, nonetheless, this remains a textbook, complete with dictionary definitions of science and elegant discussions about the object of the history of science including not just scientific events, but the entire set of circumstances in which they take place. Barona also draws on Helge Kragh's historiographic work to explain the anachronistic and relativistic dilemmas of studying scientists in their own epochs, thus "presupposing the existence of something called science" (p. 44). Such explanations are interspersed with selective information about

sources, individual-scholars, research institutions and funding, some of which is long outdated.

The book's last, shortest, and oddest chapter discusses research methodology, going from prosopography to experimental history of science to electronic search engines in just ten pages. Barona neatly resurrects scientific biography to its rightful post-hagiographic place, but he skips through other approaches such as discourse analysis. The overall sensation created is that semester's end is upon us, and we must hurry through the last topic.

While this volume inspires new admiration for the task of synthesizing historiography, especially in a field that draws from so many perspectives, the book remains idiosyncratic. It also prompts the question of whether all the details that need to be learned in a graduate history of science course—who's who, who's where, who says what, and how they do it—belong between the covers of a single volume.

Anne-Emanuelle Birn,

New School for Social Research, New York

Jon Arrizabalaga, John Henderson, Roger French, *The great pox: the French disease in Renaissance Europe*, New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 1997, pp. xv, 352, illus., £25.00 (0-300-06934-0).

The authors of this splendid history admit that they are adding to an already massive literature in the medical history of *lues venerea*, and they announce in the title that they will focus on just the Renaissance European phase of the story. They similarly declare quite a different perspective from that of the last major survey, Claude Quézel's *Le mal de Naples*, in English translation, *A history of syphilis*, for they sympathize with neither the French chauvinism nor the modern physician's perspective. This is a fiercely historicist volume, driven by exhaustive and careful review of the production of learned Renaissance texts about a new, or newly important, illness phenomenon.

Book Reviews

This book begins with a brief introduction of a debate that frames it, the sudden appearance or recognition in the 1490s of a serious, painful, hideous, chronic affliction, a phenomenon that spawned immediately a range of brief proclamations, academic debates, and ephemeral treatises reporting therapeutic experiences and/or qualifications of some ambitious physicians. The epidemic in progress was also immediately one of texts, especially texts challenging in both small and great ways established medical authority. Many of these text-bound manifestoes, as is well known, were gathered into volumes or collections, first in the 1560s, by which time some medical consensus had emerged, and again later in the eighteenth century, when revision to older themes trained attention to the material, physical origins of a disease. By the nineteenth century, *lues venerea* had become a unique, ontological reality bearing reasonably stable clinical features. From that second era of text-synthesis emerged a vigorous debate that these three historians see as a tired, old, anachronistic frame to the Renaissance story. Both the temptation to see the French disease or great pox as roughly equivalent to syphilis, and pursuit of the ultimate or proximate biological origins of the micro-organism that causes syphilis are, in their view, misguided scholarly enterprises. Instead the causes of concern and debate in the first post-Columbian century, as well as the social and medical responses to the new problem, are far more interesting than these other irresolvable research programmes.

Even given this stance and objective, the book will not disappoint those with less lofty interests. Of poxes, pustules, pains, sores, ulcers, unguents, steams, purges, and all the miscellaneous afflictions, treatments and social or religious revulsion in the face of a growing burden of “incurables” the study is exceptionally rich in detail. The book follows the phenomena observable only in sixteenth-century sources, beginning with increasing alarm and the gradual identification of the problem as a sexually associated disease. Readers will find extensive and rewarding detail about early sufferers in some prominent Renaissance courts, riveting

description of early treatment protocols, and a wealth of new and unusual sixteenth-century illustrations. A substantial and important segment of the book then examines new archival materials, first tracing the origins of an orchestrated Catholic philanthropic response to the hypervisibility of scruffy, ulcerated beggars, complete with graphic discussion of how social attitudes and policy coalesced into institutions and iconography, or took shape and identity in appearance and costume. There are even graphs comparing male patients admitted to Rome’s famous hospital for incurables that simultaneously chart the extent to which ragged dress coincided with various admission-qualifying symptoms (groin abscesses, sores, scabs [syphilitic?], gummata, pains, pustules)! Finally, the cumulative erudition of three expert historians of Renaissance medicine turns to clarify many of the long-vexed issues of contagion theory and other challenges to Galenism that underlay the confused and confusing reactions of Renaissance practitioners before a nauseating, largely uncontrollable drama called the great pox.

In sum, this is a convincing, rewarding and authoritative account of the first century of one or more disease phenomena in Europe, sufferings that surely include those secondary to human treponemal infection, today called syphilis after the sixteenth-century poem of Girolamo Fracastoro. Despite the overt and repeated protests that the authors make, they clearly believe that something actually happened, that the phenomena associated with the “French disease” were not merely the product of an epidemic of medical uncertainty in a new era of print, nor the reflection of new, pious attention to the ever-suffering masses. Never do they assume that victims of the great pox were always present, then suddenly seen, because other larger changes in medicine—so beautifully teased out in these pages—altered the subject and object of medical gaze. Essentially and ironically Arrizabalaga, Henderson and French have thus breathed new life into the tired old questions that they disdain.

Ann G Carmichael, Indiana University