His method of working involves very close study of the texts in order to uncover the medical concepts of their authors. For example, when he analyses the vocabulary of disease, showing how diseases are described and named, his conclusions illuminate the question of the extent to which individual characteristics of the patient are thought to influence the symptoms and course of the disease. One chapter investigates how explanations of psychological illness can illustrate the ways in which the ancient Greeks saw reason, the intellect, and the emotions; others cover early surgery and the development of dietary theory.

Comparisons are drawn throughout between the content and form of ancient Greek medicine and that of other early cultures (Egypt, Assyria, Babylonia), the purpose being always to show what is specific to Hippocratic medicine. In particular, di Benedetto examines the early medical texts of the form "If x symptoms, then y therapy", and the significance of the slight variations on this found in Hippocratic medicine. His use of the "techno-therapeutic" treatises is equally careful; he first isolates their specific features, such as the format according to which each disease is described in the order name, symptoms, therapy, prognosis, or the concept of "sign" which links observed phenomena to internal causes, and then goes on to look at other Hippocratic texts to see where and how they differ. He rightly emphasizes that the individuality of each text and the range of ways of describing disease found within a single text must first be appreciated, before texts can be linked into groups and the development of particular concepts analysed.

As di Benedetto says, the earliest periods of Greek medicine have too often been over-simplified by the use of dichotomies, with treatises seen as "Coan" or "Cnidian", "by Hippocrates" or "by an inferior writer". This book should go a long way towards helping us to understand the complex medical reality of this important period.

Helen King
Department of Classics, University of Newcastle

DAVID HAMILTON, *The monkey gland affair*, London, Chatto & Windus, 1986, 8vo, pp. xvi, 155, illus., £11.95.

David Hamilton's account of the curious history of gland transplantation in the early decades of this century focuses on the career of Parisian surgeon Serge Voronoff (1866–1951). Hamilton sets Voronoff's rise to fame in the 1910s and 1920s firmly amidst the growing recognition of the role of the endocrine glands in the body and the popularity of organotherapy as a mode of treatment. In an era when most of the presumptive hormones had not yet been isolated or chemically characterized, transplanted glands were thought to supply a ready source of deficient hormones to recipients. Voronoff claimed to use monkey testes successfully to restore virility to ageing men.

Hamilton vividly portrays the ever-present tension between Voronoff's clinical evidence and the limitations of his experimental studies on animals. It was the agricultural implications, i.e. his claims for increased stock quality, that led to full assessment of his work and to evaluation of the limitations of his experimental design. Voronoff's assumptions began to be seriously questioned only after an international delegation evaluated his testes graft experiments on sheep in Algeria in 1927. The dissenting, unenthusiastic opinion of the British delegation, which included physiologist F. H. A. Marshall and geneticist F. A. E. Crew, is therefore of especial historical interest.

Hamilton points to Alexis Carrel's organ tranplantation work and expectations of both physiological and hereditary improvement of man and beast through scientific intervention as predisposing factors to Voronoff's "success" and to the extraordinary parallel career of "Dr"

John R. Brinkley (d. 1942) of Kansas. While Voronoff had orthodox training and held an appointment at the Collège de France, Brinkley was not fully qualified as a physician and may be characterized as a quack in his style of self-promotion. As in the case of Brinkley, the press was effective in promoting Voronoff's career. Hamilton points out that both Voronoff and Brinkley benefited substantially from public expectation of success at a time when transplant rejection was not yet a recognized biological phenomenon, and endocrinology was visibly struggling to establish itself as a science.

Hamilton's intent is to present a sympathetic but critical account of Voronoff's work and scientific times, explaining how optimism and limited knowledge of a given phenomenon may lead to scientific error. His engaging account is unfortunately marred by the lack of footnotes. Despite a bibliographic essay, this is a serious deficiency when evaluating a controversial subject. Variation in tone and overuse of "doubtless", "perhaps", "probably", and "may have" in the text remind us how much understanding of this era rests on interpretation and the viewpoint of the observer.

Nonetheless, Hamilton's reevaluation of this important and interesting episode points the way to better understanding of the early years of transplant surgery and to appreciation of the intensely heated debates that accompanied the rise of modern endocrinology. Clinical, histological, physiological, and chemical evidence vied for supremacy in the definition of this new speciality. We do not yet understand the full meaning of these debates or their significance in the establishment of a consensus as to what would constitute acceptable evidence in twentieth-century scientific medicine.

Merriley Borell
Tufts University School of Medicine

K. F. RUSSELL, *British anatomy 1525–1800. A bibliography of works published in Britain, America, and on the Continent*, 2nd ed., Winchester, St Paul's Bibliographies, 1987, 8vo, pp. xlix, 245, illus. £38.00.

This scholarly bibliography, which has established itself as a standard reference work on the subject, first appeared in 1963. It covers books on human anatomy published by British authors in Britain, America, and on the Continent, in all languages and editions. It also includes the works of European authors translated into English or printed in Britain in their original language. The new edition incorporates additional information on items that were elusive in the earlier searches; subsequent research by the author has resulted in the correction of biographical details and errors of collation and in the discovery of variant imprints and previously unrecorded editions.

The arrangement has not been changed; the numbering of entries remains the same, with letters after the numbers for additional entries. There are sixty-seven additions to the 901 items contained in the first edition; a major correction concerns the works previously ascribed to John Rotherham, which have now been reascribed to Andrew Fyfe, who carried out the major part of the work in their compilation. There are thirty-two plates, consisting mainly of reproductions of title-pages. The author's introduction provides a short history of the study and teaching of anatomy in Britain and an evaluation of many of the items cited.

Dr Russell, now Emeritus Professor of Anatomy and Medical History in the University of Melbourne, is to be commended on his completion of this revision, particularly as he has lived and worked so far from the major collections of books in his field. He acknowledges the help obtained from librarians everywhere and from library catalogues published in recent years, notably those of the National Library of Medicine and the Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine.

L. T. Morton