

Book Reviews

irrelevant. Chemistry and the relations between science, technology, and industry are well surveyed by Crosland and Cardwell respectively. Forbes's essay on mathematical cosmography is not a comprehensive account but the story (albeit interesting) of a few German cartographers.

Compared with other recent collections of essays in the history of science, this volume parades no party line: witness the contrasting contributions of Schaffer and Heilbron, and the variety of attitudes shown to the work of Foucault. Each reader will therefore find it profitable to pillage eclectically from this book which by a variety of means generally succeeds in stimulating fresh debate on Enlightenment science.

J. B. Morrell
University of Bradford

PAUL POTTER (editor), *Hippokrates Ueber die Krankheiten III*, (Corpus Medicorum Graecorum, 12,3), Berlin, DDR, Akademie-Verlag, 1980, 8vo, pp. 150, M.42.00.

Diseases Book 3 is one of those texts on the Hippocratic Collection which have usually been regarded as products of the so-called school of Cnidus, and have accordingly been neglected by modern historians and editors alike. This was not always so: until the nineteenth century *Diseases 3* was valued for its descriptions particularly of those thoracic diseases which the author called peripneumonia and pleuritis. Boerhaave drew extensively upon it for his descriptions of pneumonia and pleurisy, and the text therefore has an integral position in the history of thoracic disease. Dr. Potter's edition is the first since that of Littré, and now becomes the standard modern edition of the text, as with other texts in this series. His text is constructed primarily from the two manuscripts Marcianus Venetus Graecus 269 and Vindobonensis Medicus Graecus 4 which modern research has demonstrated to be authoritative, and is excellent. Dr. Potter's decisions between variant readings are sound, and on the very few occasions when drastic intervention was called for, his emendations are convincing. The German translation gives clear guidance to Dr Potter's interpretation of the text. There is also an introduction, most of which is concerned with the manuscript tradition, a commentary, and a comprehensive word index.

The textual part of the introduction will interest the philologist rather than the historian, although there is tantalizing evidence that much work was done with the text during the late classical period. The relation between manuscripts which has been established for other Hippocratic texts is confirmed for this one, although there is, inevitably, some disagreement over the complex relations between the more recent manuscripts. Much of the detail might profitably have been omitted, though no doubt it ought to be available somewhere.

The commentary is concerned with the medical content of the work rather than with philological matters, and since Dr. Potter is a medical man as well as a classical scholar and a historian, one reads with considerable interest what he has to say. He believes that the author's "method is for the most part empirical . . . the source of his knowledge is experience". He renounces theory in describing this experience, and "because he was unable to give the real cause of any of the diseases described by him,

Book Reviews

he classified them on the grounds of their symptoms.” (pp. 60–61). In accordance with these assumptions Dr. Potter devotes much of his commentary to suggesting objective counterparts for the author’s description of symptoms. I believe that this is an unprofitable undertaking, and that the assumptions are false. No-one would want to deny that there is some correspondence between the author’s descriptions and nosological realities, but the theory-laden language, the high degree of selectivity, and above all the close parallels in both respects with other texts, show that the relation must be very indirect. Dr Potter’s comments, although interesting in themselves and potentially valuable, do not enlighten us about the nature of this relation nor about the kind of medicine which the author was writing.

Iain M. Lonie
Wellcome Unit, Cambridge

JEAN-LOUIS FLANDRIN, *Families in former times. Kinship, household, and sexuality*, translated by Richard Southern, Cambridge University Press, 1979, 8vo, pp. xi, 265, £14.50 (£4.50 paperback).

Professor Flandrin’s book is an excellent foil to the writings of Peter Laslett and the Cambridge Group which constitute the approach to family history and historical demography best known in the English-speaking world. Whereas the Cambridge group relies almost exclusively on what can be wrung out of historical vital statistics (registers of baptisms, marriages, and burials) for understanding demographic patterns, Flandrin casts his net more widely, making deft use of legal evidence, religious and moral advice books, proverbs, and even the evolutionary history of family names, alongside a solid core of statistics. Whereas the crusading Laslett has tended to dogmatize about *the typical* European, or, slightly more narrowly, North-West European family and household structure, Flandrin is more interested in the great diversity of living habits, systems of kinship support and patronage, family size, and moral prohibitions from area to area even within France (from which most of his examples are taken). Not least, where Laslett stamped on an evolutionary approach (seeing it as some kind of vestige of conjectural history), and stressed that in essential matters such as the primacy of the nuclear family, things were already much the same in 1300 as they were to be in 1900, Flandrin suggests that certain key shifts can be traced. One is the irresistible surge of *love* as the motor of marriage and family life, from the eighteenth century onwards. Before then, bonding was seen much more within a pattern of wider family and community responsibilities; and moral and ecclesiastical advice placed greatest stress upon the *duties* of spouses, and upon the distinction between the honourable estate of matrimony and, on the other hand, giddy romance or foul lust. Once the theme of *love* united family, emotion, and sexual desire, the family became a more private affair, and wider kinship and community ties were attenuated.

Another important line of inquiry pursued by Flandrin highlights a crucial divergence between English and French family-forming patterns. From the mid-eighteenth century in England, population galloped ahead because of earlier marriage and because a rising percentage of the population got married. Almost the reverse