chapters leaves the reader puzzling over the practicalities of historical writing. How many historians write text first and add footnotes afterwards? Is this less laborious than putting them in as one goes along?

Anne Hardy

HILARY MARLAND (translator and editor), *Mother and child were saved: the memoirs (1693–1740) of the Frisian midwife Catharina Schrader*, with introductory essays by M. J. van Lieburg and G. J. Kloosterman, Amsterdam, Rodopi, 1987, 8vo, pp. 88, illus., Dfl. 25.00 (paperback).

This slim paperback makes available, for the first time in English, material from the notebook of the Frisian midwife Vrouw Schrader, who lived from 1656 to 1746 and conducted her last case when well into her eighties. Widowed with six children to support, she took up midwifery in 1693, apparently without previous training, like many others at that time. After her second marriage in 1713, she conducted very few deliveries until, on her second widowhood, she again became active, this time taking on a higher proportion of complicated cases. The translator’s introduction should be read before the notes by M. J. van Lieburg (on her biography and the social background), and G. J. Kloosterman (on the obstetric aspects of her work), since the relationship of the ‘notebook’ and ‘memoir’ then becomes clear. The ‘memoir’ as translated is a small selection, made by Vrouw Schrader herself, of over 3000 cases recorded in the original notebook. The Dutch edition contained more cases, but the entire ms has not been published. Many of its entries are brief and repetitive; its importance lies in its being a complete case record. Kloosterman has used evidence from the untranslated parts to make an assessment of her practice. By contemporary standards she seems to have been competent, losing only five to seven per cent of the mothers, although she manipulated and interfered a good deal, frequently stating she had to “make all the openings”. Perhaps the secret of her success was that she had mastered podalic version; probably other Frisian midwives were as little acquainted with this manoeuvre as the English midwives mentioned in Percival Willughby’s *Observations in midwifery*. Certainly she had no great opinion of her competitors, and when she herself needed help, she sent for a man-midwife. Her style is much more pedestrian than Willughby’s but any addition to the minute corpus of original records of obstetric practice in this early period is much to be welcomed.

Audrey Eccles
Association of Anaesthetists
of Great Britain and Ireland

HORACE W. DAVENPORT, *Fifty years of medicine at the University of Michigan, 1891–1941*, Ann Arbor, The University of Michigan Medical School, 1986, 8vo, pp. viii, 525, illus., [no price stated].

At the start of the twentieth century, the University of Michigan had one of the leading medical schools in the United States, and certainly among the finest rooted in a state university. It was at the forefront in curriculum reform, and upheld a research ideal at a time when some American medical schools were little more than diploma mills. Between 1891, when the physiological chemist Victor Vaughan became Dean, and the start of World War II, its faculty boasted such leading figures in American biomedical research as John Jacob Abel, Frederick Novy, Hugh Cabot, Arthur Cushny, and Udo Wile. A history of the school during these decades could be important both as a study of the operation and role of a state institution for medical education, research, and patient care within its local community, and as an exemplar of the transformation of academic medicine in America.

This volume is neither. It is instead principally a fragmented summary of the research and teaching of selected Michigan faculty members, organized with some attention to chronology into chapters that roughly correspond to academic departments. The study is proudly acontextual and makes little use of the available secondary literature; in the Preface the author
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says of the reader, “I can expect him to provide his own framework”. At the same time, Horace Davenport, Professor Emeritus of Physiology at Michigan, has an easy command of the material, and the reviews he presents of the publication of one or another faculty member are sometimes detailed and lucidly explained. Occasionally his accounts of medical life at Michigan, such as the fine description of clinical diagnosis and the laboratory at the turn of the century, are quite full. All this should recommend the book as a reference work, but its usefulness is greatly diminished by the lack of a subject index. Those interested in a particular Michigan faculty member, or in surveying broadly a certain field within academic medicine, will find the volume informative, but even those committed to the history of twentieth-century American medicine are likely to want to read it only selectively.

John Harley Warner
Yale University


In the spate of publications that accompanied Berlin’s 750th anniversary last year, Dr Winau’s book could have been overlooked, but it deserves some attention as a general survey of medicine in Berlin from the time of the Great Elector onwards. The author quotes in his preface only two previous attempts to write a general history of Berlin medicine: Julius Pagel’s 1897 publication, presented as a gift to the participants of the 15th German congress for internal medicine that year; and the first volume (1948) of Walter Artelt’s never-completed Medizinische Wissenschaft und ärztliche Praxis im alten Berlin, which went up to the end of the eighteenth century. While Pagel could still confidently state his intention to portray the medical developments in Berlin as “a faithful mirror of the continuously rising level of culture”, the historical events and historiographical critiques of the century since then have made this position unattainable.

The author acknowledges extensive reliance on the contributions of Heinz Goerke, Paul Diepgen and Manfred Sturzbecher, and assistance from Arleen Tuchman among others. This has resulted in a peculiar mixture of historiographical styles and foci. The clearest example is the shift from the more state-politically oriented chapters on the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries (in which Tuchman had a hand) to the more internalist account of the second half of the nineteenth century. Several historiographical revisions have been incorporated: institutional history, especially hospital history, figures large. Space is devoted to the 1848 “reform” movement, in which the spotlight is rightly somewhat diverted away from Virchow to include people like Salomon Neumann. Medical education and professional organization receive more attention. Interesting, in the first chapter, is the printed text of the Chur-Brandenburgische Medizinaleidikt of 1685. Besides the development of medical education within the universities, extramural facilities are discussed as well.

Most problematic is the section on medicine in the Third Reich. Working primarily from accounts by the Jewish and other “non-Aryan” doctors who traditionally formed a high percentage of Berlin practitioners and professors, Dr Winau has evaded the difficult task of accounting for the attitudes and deeds of the larger part of the medical population in Germany as a whole at the time. A few pages at the end of the section, on the career of Sauerbruch (1875–1951), do not compensate sufficiently for this omission. The book was perhaps too long in production to incorporate F. Kudlien’s Ärzte im Nationalsozialismus (1985), or to profit from the debates on the subject in various German journals between 1985 and early 1987.

As a general introduction to German medical historiography the book is useful; and the bibliography, although far from complete, is helpful. Those more interested in the cultural context of medicine, and the political significance of Berlin in the German-speaking world, are probably better referred to the numerous other historical publications that saw the light in 1987.

Godelieve van Heteren
Wellcome Institute