

Book Reviews

cannot tell, just by looking at it, what the *status* of the work is. Comparison with the Latin and with earlier translations reveals that it can lay claim only to being a “version”, and a very idiosyncratic one at that. Certainly it makes reasonably smooth reading, but if we are interested in what Harvey said or meant, it will still be necessary to go back to the Latin; and going back to the Latin reveals that Dr Whitteridge’s readings are sometimes questionable and occasionally downright wrong.

The editorial apparatus makes matters no clearer. Harvey’s text is pre-eminently *technical*, and it has a terminology to match. This applies to Harvey’s own extensive Preface as much as it does to the body of the text itself. If we fail to understand the account Harvey offers of his enterprise in the Preface, because it is expressed in technical language, then we are unlikely to make much sense of the hundreds of pages which follow (except at the most superficial level as a series of experiments and observations). Yet the technicalities of the Preface are left completely unexplained. Instead of glossing the text, Dr Whitteridge has simply glossed over the difficulties it presents to the twentieth-century reader. At least in the 1653 English version the technical terms were rendered into an equally technical English!

So the text has been briskly revamped, and the textual difficulties have been elided. An equally radical solution has been found for the problems presented by the very title of the book: Harvey’s *Exercitationes* has simply and boldly been transformed into *Disputations*. If this is what Harvey meant to call the book, why did he not do so? The two words are different because they mean different things: they are not synonyms.

It would seem that Dr Whitteridge undertook this project primarily because it is associated with that great name, Harvey. (Let us be honest, it would be hard to persuade a publisher to give this treatment to a seventeenth-century work on generation if it were by any other author.) But her working image of Harvey – as a modern scientist before his time – just is not broad or dispassionate enough for her to make much sense of this book, and it is remarkable that she nowhere offers any suggestion as to why anyone today should read it. Instead she apologises for it, as if it were the work of a great scientist in his dotage: Harvey had to “fall back on logical argument, and appeal to reason and probability to support his conclusions” (p. xxx). It is clear that this is far from the right way for a scientist like Harvey to go about things, in Dr Whitteridge’s view. The most she can offer to make the work seem significant is to pull out a tired old list of Harvey’s supposed “contributions to the future study of embryology” (p. lii). But whether “the future study of embryology” was in fact affected by these “contributions” of Harvey is an *empirical* matter; yet no evidence is offered to support the case. It is such a pity that so many chances have been lost here, and that we are still in need of an adequate new translation and edition of *On the generation of animals*.

Andrew Cunningham

Wellcome Unit for the History of Medicine
University of Cambridge

JACQUES POSTEL, *Genèse de la psychiatrie. Les premiers écrits de Philippe Pinel*, Paris, Le Sycomore, 1981, 8vo, pp. 312, [no price stated].

Jacques Postel’s *Genèse de la psychiatrie* traces the career of Philippe Pinel, and the development of his writings on madness, prior to the publication of the *Traité médico-philosophique sur l’aliénation mentale* in 1801. The approach which Postel, a practising psychiatrist, adopts in his study is that of the demythologizer. He is forthrightly critical in his analysis of Pinel’s famous act of unchaining the insane who were placed under his care at Bicêtre, seeing this much-heralded liberatory gesture as a minor episode in the context of Pinel’s own career, but one which became inflated with mythical significance as the substantive content of Pinel’s work on insanity was abandoned by successive French psychiatrists.

More than a third of this book consists of reprints of Pinel’s early writings, a fact which is signalled by Postel’s subtitle. These texts are introduced and interconnected by Postel’s commentaries; and although many of them have previously been published by other scholars in various journals, it is nevertheless convenient to have them assembled here in chronological

Book Reviews

order. As the book progresses, the ratio of Pinelian writing to Postelian commentary steadily increases, to the point where the final chapter consists largely of material from Pinel's *Nosographie philosophique* (1798) setting out a classification of neuroses which, according to Postel, is little more than a plagiarization of Cullen's work on the same subject.

Here the book ends rather abruptly. There is no conclusion to tie together the threads of the various commentaries or to connect this derivative classification of 1798 with the truly original one Pinel advanced in 1801 in his *Traité médico-philosophique*. The Pinel we are left with is a figure of mediocre intellect, fortunate in having friends in high places after Thermidor and willing to advance his career by engaging in a certain amount of political opportunism. While this portrait may well be accurate, and (together with Othmar Keel's recent debunking of Pinel's originality in the conception of histopathology) may serve to counterbalance the heroic Pinel of medical myth, it nevertheless leaves obscure the nature and causes of Pinel's celebrity in his own day. What is called for now is a critical appraisal of Pinel's many accomplishments – one that is animated not by hagiographic or iconoclastic urges but by an impulse for genuine historical understanding.

W. R. Albury

School of History and Philosophy of Science
University of New South Wales

ROBERT CASTEL, FRANCOISE CASTEL, and ANNE LOVELL, *The psychiatric society*, trans. by A. Goldhammer, New York, and Guildford, Surrey, Columbia University Press, 1982, 8vo, pp. xxiii, 358, \$32.40.

Working within approaches familiar to Anglo-Saxon readers via the *savoir/pouvoir* analyses of Foucault and the “police your own family” interpretations of Donzelot, the authors of this powerfully-written and elegantly-translated Jeremiad probe the psychiatrization of modern man, taking the United States as the most pathological case. From the mid-nineteenth century, psychiatrization grew in America like a cancer. In 1860, only 8,500 people were locked away in asylums; by 1955, 558,000 were. The psychiatric gaze successively put whole new sectors of society under the microscope. Early in this century came the psychiatrization of alcoholics, drug-addicts, and degenerates; between the wars came the psychiatrization of childhood; since the Kennedy era, it has been the psychiatrization of social work, of women, homosexuals, and ethnic minorities. Once psychiatry was individual and recuperative; increasingly it takes the form of group preventive surveillance. Once it was only for society's failures; now it is for the normal as well (in Arthur Burton's words, “psychotherapy is no longer for the diseased . . . it is freedom's approach to growth”).

Psychiatry has advanced almost unresisted because it is a wolf in sheep's clothing. Indeed, it has been able to wear a more and more liberal face. In particular, the campaign of massive deinstitutionalization from the 1950s, purporting to reintegrate the disturbed into the community, mirrored the great Pinelian gesture of liberating the insane. It has also worn a humane face, especially during the 1970s' phase of free clinics and community programmes, staffed by volunteer non-professionals, sympathetic to the values of the counter-culture. And it has marched under the banner of personal liberation. Above all, the new West Coast psychotherapies, such as EST, have trumpeted human potential and personal growth (in Anthony Clare's phrase, “now let's talk about *me*”). Do not be hoodwinked, however, warn the authors. American psychiatry, whatever its roots and well-intentioned idealisms, is irredeemably suborned and co-opted by the powerful for the purposes of social repression (even alternatives to psychiatry mutate into the psychiatrization of the alternatives). All American psychiatry is ultimately geared to adjusting citizens to lifestyles of efficiency, profitability, and conformity.

This vision of the penetration of psychiatric power is pessimistic. But the half-truths are as plausible as they are paranoid, even in their heads-I-win-tails-you-lose aspects (thus, it is argued, institutionalization was an evil, because American asylums were brutal; but deinstitutionalization has proved equally an evil, because it has been merely a vote-catching gimmick, cheese-paring on cash and care, courtesy of Thorazine; and, anyway, the community