

Book Reviews

mainly on the corrective mechano-therapeutics that he advocated and the various mechanical appliances that he devised. It is not possible to determine from this book how much of the clinic's reputation actually hinged on Schulthess's social stature, and on the fact that he co-founded and helped to edit the *Zeitschrift für orthopädische Chirurgie*.

Much of this book is devoted to recalling the names of Switzerland's orthopaedic worthies (which grossly distorts both their national and international stature); to listing the distinguished visitors to Schulthess's clinic (which misrepresents its contemporary importance); and, above all, to furnishing a pristine and wholly uncontextualized account of Schulthess. Lacking an index, and written without much attention to chronology, the book may fascinate past and present members of the staff of the Schulthess Institute, but it is of little use to historians.

Roger Cooter and Bill Murphy
University of Manchester

WILLIAM BUDD, *On the causes of fevers (1839)*, edited by Dale C. Smith, Baltimore, Md., and London, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1984, 8vo, pp.xii, 164, £9.55 (paperback).

William Budd, best known as an epidemiologist, was a Victorian provincial physician of enthusiasm, sensibility and intelligence, who might well have served (in fact as well as fiction) as a model for the Lydgate of *Middlemarch*. In a period of struggle early in his career, in 1839, having produced theses on rheumatic fever and on the spinal cord, and conducted experiments on emphysema, Budd entered for a prize scraped together by the Provincial Medical and Surgical Association. The prescribed subject, continued fever, was indicative of current practical and theoretical concerns. William Davidson won with an exposition of compromise solutions, which Budd himself, characteristically, called "well overloaded". Budd came second with a "philosophical" analysis making approving reference to such authors as J. C. Prichard and Henry Holland. This essay almost brazenly presented the framework of his later views, including his dependence upon analogy, his rejection of "inclusive" modes of reasoning including the statistical, and his use of smallpox as the type of all epidemic disease. Budd's later publications show not so much changes of view as his efforts to find means of substantiation congenial to his contemporaries, who, like the judges of 1890, pressed for "facts". Until Smith's discovery of the essay, all this had to be inferred from Budd's own later use of its contents. The manuscript (80 pp. as printed) is anonymous, but, as Smith clearly shows, there can be no doubt as to its authorship. It is not simply the essay as submitted, but carries the judges' comments (rather scanty) and more lavish annotations made at different times by Budd himself. Smith's meticulous editing brings out the interest of the manuscript as a working document. His introduction (39pp.) gives Budd his honourable but not unique place in the early evolution of the distinctions between the different forms of fever, and an afterword (42 pp.) accurately recounts British developments after 1839. Smith does not attempt to give access to the contemporary mind, nor is he interested in all Budd's views. Instead, he points to the "clarity and modernity" of Budd's account of typhoid, and applauds his superior understanding of scientific reasoning. Budd's philosophical tendencies could have been more fully accounted for; Smith's commentary and the essay itself do, however, clarify the lines of influence between French and English-speaking investigators of fever, especially Budd himself. The elaborate care spent on this document can only be attributed to Budd's importance in the run-up to the germ theory and the triumph of bacteriology. In a broader sense, perhaps, it can be justified by the ramifications of the controversies over the nature of fever, and by the persistent low quality of most of the existing secondary literature.

Margaret Pelling
Wellcome Unit for the History of Medicine, Oxford