doing justice to Freud's text, to Schreber's text, and to a few others, less memorable, besides, Chabot baulks at the prospect of writing the history of the real, whether it be of psychoanalysis or of individual texts – all he allows psychoanalysis to aspire to is the narrative history of fiction, in place of the historical reconstruction of (psychic) reality. Reading as a literary critic does, regarding Freud as the literary critic at work with texts that speak, Chabot produces a finely textured version of Schreber's memoirs, hinging his interpretation around the injustice the Senatspräsident suffered, his fear of succumbing (both mortally and sexually), and his preoccupation with domination and submission. Chabot discerns autonomy and justice as the central themes of Schreber's paranoiac system. Yet Chabot wishes to link this up with bits and pieces of psychoanalytic *theory* which mesh well with this reading – such as the American analysts Erikson's and Lichtenstein's concern with the sense of identity and self-worth. However, the small change of these concepts, enticing him into a vapid jargon, does not match his sensitive literary discernments – one cannot but feel that the second tier of his argument, that literary studies and therapeutic interpretation both depend on a psychology, does not match the subtleties of his own dialogue with the text. Chabot's book is a sensitive guide to the book that our most famous madman left behind, but it offers little in the way of providing a single foundation for literary studies and psychoanalysis, nor does it keep at bay the arbitrariness so often encountered when this or that psychological theorist tries out his hand on whatever text comes to hand. Other theorists, particularly those following Lacan, have discovered that psychoanalysis is essentially a verbal exercise, without feeling the need to underpin the new-found affinities of psychoanalysis and literary studies with a psychology of autonomy and self-determination, to which Chabot clings as the symbol of humanistic individualism. So even the discerning Chabot lets his "vulgar" psychological side dominate the central sections of the book. Where he is most stimulating is in following out the implications of the "relativistic" assumption that "for psychoanalysis, the Real is a construct, a reading . . ." (p. 147). On the other hand, Balmary urges the revision and overthrow of the Freudian myths of guilt and secret desire, so that in any given biography the causal power of the unequivocal Real may be revealed. What these two interesting essays demonstrate is that raking over the history of psychoanalysis, whether in search of Freud's lost past, or of the genuinely psychoanalytic method, requires giving an answer to the question: what is the Real of psychoanalysis? The absence of a real answer does not allow one to avoid tackling it.

John Forrester
King's College, Cambridge

G. MALONEY and R. SAVOIE, *Cinq cents ans de bibliographie hippocratique (1473–1982)*, Quebec, Editions du Sphinx, 1982, 8vo, pp. v, 289, $Cdn.30.00.

This is a chronological list of printed items relating to Hippocrates and the Hippocratic Corpus. It includes editions of Hippocratic texts, translations, commentaries, books and articles about Hippocrates and the Hippocratic writers. The occurrence of the name Hippocrates or derivatives thereof in a title appears to be a principal criterion for inclusion (thus polemical items which defend or attack "Hippocratic", i.e. orthodox, as opposed to Paracelsian, medicine are included, although such works often have little or nothing to say about Hippocratic texts); but it is not the only criterion, and in many cases the title alone does not make clear why a particular item is included. The work lists 3,332 items, arranged under each year. In most cases the information includes, for books, author (editor, translator), full title, place of publication and publisher, number of pages but not format; and for periodical articles, author, title, title of periodical, volume, and pagination. Sources are, apparently, existing bibliographies and published catalogues, but these are nowhere specified and the compilers give no indication of the amount of direct inspection involved or the numbers of libraries and institutions surveyed.

All of this would be fairly unexceptionable if the work were limited roughly to the period of modern philological scholarship on the Hippocratic Corpus. No checklist of such scope for that period exists, and the Hippocratic scholar should have nothing but gratitude to the compilers

for undertaking so ungrateful and time-saving a task. It is with the centuries prior to the nineteenth that the difficulties begin, and here a lack of harmony between aims and methods becomes apparent. The compilers do not directly specify their aims, although they imply that their work provides "un tableau d'ensemble de l'activité des hippocratisants" (p. III). But such an aim is stultified by lack of annotation and biographical information (compare in this respect the series *Catalogus translationum et commentariorum*). On the other hand, the work is not, in the strict sense, a bibliography, either critical or descriptive (it will not be clear to bibliographers what is meant by "entrées bibliographiques simples (c'est-à-dire non critiques)" (p. 1). The attempt to give titles in full, very commendable in itself, becomes pointless when the source, or the copy, from which this information is taken is not given. This practice would have saved grave confusions, such as that between items 158, 159, and 161. Copies of this item exist in the British Library, the Bibliothèque Nationale, and the National Library of Medicine, and comparison with the published catalogues of these institutions indicates what has gone wrong. There are a number of such duplications, for example 5 = 4, 11 = 10, 57 = 55, 251 = 250, 262 = 261, 296 = 287, 335 = 301 (this originates from a mistake in the British Museum catalogue, which is very unreliable on Hippocrates), 421 = 415, 481 = 479, 491 = 490, 498 = 496, 495 = 485, 494 = 486. All these could have been weeded out: as it is, the user is running a risk unless he is prepared to check each item himself, in which case he might do better to begin with the published catalogues themselves. This is particularly true for the admittedly difficult area of incunabula: here the user must, at the very least, check each item in Klebs.

The work is therefore best regarded as a finding list, although even this use is unnecessarily limited by the absence of any index of texts: what after all is technology for? Such an index would also have explained the presence of mystifying items such as 185, 290, 292, and 528 (in each case the explanation will be found in Durling's *Catalogue*). A selection of locations, too, would have helped, as well as being methodologically desirable in the way indicated above. Among the aids to the reader are name-pseudonym lists, particularly useful for fifteenth- and sixteenth-century authors, though here again the usefulness is unnecessarily marred by lack of adequate combing and of biographical annotation. Thus there are inconsistencies between the two lists, between lists and text, and between lists, text, and author index, which the reader may further explore in the cases of Constantine and John Lascaris and of Rinuccio-Aretinus-Griffolini (see item 37). On the subject of authors, the user needs to have it explained to him what Peter of Abano has to do with the *Articella*, or Dietrich Ulsen with any Hippocratic work.

The user should therefore be wary, but he will find the work a convenient tool for some purposes. It is a useful checklist for the modern period, and a rough guide to what was printed about Hippocrates in earlier centuries and still exists in (some) modern libraries. It should certainly be bought by all academic libraries.

Iain M. Lonie
Wellcome Unit for the History of Medicine, Cambridge

TREVOR H. LEVERE (editor), *Editing texts in the history of science and medicine* (Papers given at the 7th annual conference on editorial problems, 1981), New York, Garland Publishing Co., 1982, 8vo, pp. 190, illus., $17.00.

The five authors contributing to this symposium approached their subject in very different ways, varying from the general to the particular. The most general, and most generally interesting, was adopted by Stillman Drake in 'Dating unpublished notes, such as Galileo's on Motion' and by Armand Beaulieu in 'Problèmes d'edition de la correspondance d'un homme prodigieux: Marin Mersenne'; both authors deal with fundamental aspects of editing such as might be encountered in any field but with particular reference to their individual subjects. Drake's is a splendid example of exposition and a fascinating account of an extremely tricky problem; Beaulieu's is more elementary, though useful, and might be supplemented by the Chantilly symposium of 1975 (*Revue de Synthèse*, III, nos. 81–2, 1976).

Totally different in approach is Linda Voigts' 'Editing Middle English texts: needs and issues'. This is centred on medical texts, and begins with brief comments on problems of