

## Book Reviews

promiscuity and extramarital sex. Given the nature and quality of the papers contained in this collection, the editors have dispelled any lag in German scholarship regarding the history of epidemics. To reach a wider audience, however, they should also consider translating the work into English.

**Guenter B Risse,**  
University of California, San Francisco

**W F Bynum and B Fantini** (eds), *Malaria and ecosystems: historical aspects. Proceedings of a Rockefeller Foundation conference, Bellagio, 18–22 October 1993, Parassitologia, 1994, 36(1–2)*, pp. 227, no price given.

The history of malaria has been dominated by the discoveries of Ronald Ross and Giovanni Battista Grassi, and the malaria eradication campaign of the World Health Organization. Much of this has tended towards the hagiographic or celebratory, although reviews of the malaria eradication programme have become increasingly critical. Recent literature on the history of malaria has been set within a framework which discusses the history of tropical and colonial medicine or military medicine. The *Malaria and ecosystems* volume, following a conference of the same name, builds upon this existing literature but attempts to take a more synthetic approach to the history of malaria by considering the inter-relationship of the disease, its pathogen and its vector in terms of the wider physical and human environment. The diversity of the essays in this volume highlights the value of such an approach. The authors vary widely in their backgrounds, and thus the papers are the work of historians, scientists and malariologists. While it was a conscious aim of the meeting and the publication to present papers which could contribute towards improving the current understanding of the world malaria situation, this has not detracted from the quality of the historical writing.

Most of the essays deal with the latter half of the nineteenth and the twentieth centuries,

but those by Mirko D Grmek and Julian de Zulueta also refer to the prehistoric and ancient period. Taken as a whole, the papers in this volume offer a valuable chronology of malaria ecology and attempts to understand and interfere with the ecological balance as a means to controlling or eradicating the disease. Emphasis is placed on the history of realizing and taking action against the malaria-carrying mosquitoes of the *Anopheles* group, but there are several useful comments on the chemotherapy of malaria and the importance of the general health and socio-economic circumstances of the human population at risk or affected by the disease. These are areas which are open for future study.

Five of the papers are concerned with malaria in Europe. These include work on laboratory research and field experimentation. Michael Worboys' article describes the etiology of malaria before Alphonse Laveran's discovery of the protozoan parasite, placing malaria in a wider discussion of nineteenth-century fever nosography. Mary Dobson and Bernardino Fantini provide detailed accounts of malaria epidemiology in England and Italy, including anophelism without malaria (Fantini), and the implications of understanding the species complex. The contributions on the European research are of particular interest since much of the recent work on tropical malaria has not reconsidered the work done in Europe and its effects on malaria in the tropics. The papers by John Farley, Paulo Gadelha and Randall Packard explore the early work of the Rockefeller Foundation and the League of Nations in malaria control between the two world wars. They demonstrate the antecedents of internationally sponsored global eradication campaigns. The conclusion from these papers is that the politics of international health influenced the interpretation of vector eradication trials, with significant consequences for the post-war anti-malarial campaigns. The papers on Asia and Africa are naturally selective, given the diverse malaria situation of these huge regions of the world. This is acknowledged by reference to the

## Book Reviews

importance of understanding local conditions, and the problems which arise by omitting to do so: the papers by William Bynum and David Bradley clearly illustrate this crucial point.

The editors are to be congratulated on producing a volume of conference papers which coheres around a complicated theme.

**Helen Power**, University of Liverpool

**Jacques Roger**, *Pour une histoire des sciences à part entière*, Paris, Albin Michel, 1995, pp. 475, no price given (2-226-07649-2).

Jacques Roger (1920–1990) was one of the leading French historians of science of the twentieth century, noted for the definitive studies of his countryman Buffon. As professor at the Sorbonne and Director of the *École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales*, the *Centre Internationale de Synthèse*, and the *Centre Alexandre Koyré*, Roger was unquestionably a force to be reckoned with amongst French historians of science. According to his publication list, appended to this selection of his writings, he was author of three books, editor of three series, editor of eight scholarly editions, and author of 139 papers, eight dictionary articles, and fifty-eight reviews. The selection of his writings offered here consists of nineteen papers, mostly in their original French, but some translated from English or Italian. There is also a most useful introductory essay on Roger's views on historiography and other matters, by his former student Claude Blanckaert; and an illuminating 'postface' by Jean Gayon, entitled 'De la philosophie biologique dans l'oeuvre historique de Jacques Roger'. An index should have been provided, however.

The central landmark for Roger's work was, of course, Buffon, on whom he was the acknowledged authority. It is remarkable indeed how an academic "empire" can be constructed by using one major figure as the focus of one's work and reputation. It has been done by others of course (for example Drake

with Galileo, Whiteside with Newton). But in such cases there has nearly always been more to it than that (e.g. Drake's experimentalism, Whiteside's mathematical expertise). For Roger and Buffon, the success seems to have flowed from his use of Buffon as a means to get a grip on the whole of the life sciences (and medicine) and the earth sciences of the eighteenth century, also extending backward and forward in time so as to embrace such Renaissance figures as Jean Fernal, and nineteenth-century topics such as eugenics. Moreover, Roger developed general ideas about the way history of science should be written. His ideas on this are stated in his paper 'Pour une histoire historique des sciences', part of the present collection.

The underlying theme of this essay is the establishment of a clear distinction between the work of the "scientist-historian" and the "historian of science". As may be imagined, Roger's sympathies lay with the latter, and he takes the reader through what are today standard arguments for the avoidance of whiggism and historiographic anachronism. In this essay, and others in the anthology, one can clearly see the French tradition of history of science—stemming from the likes of Duhem, Metzger, and Koyré—firmly underpinning Roger's writing. In fact, his work has a strong "history of ideas" character, though not overtly Lovejoyian in character, being without the "unit idea" doctrine. Even so, it was *ideas* (in people's heads), and the way in which they developed and influenced others, that were of paramount significance for Roger. Often the ideas that interested him were as much philosophical as scientific, though he did not count himself a philosopher.

However, as Blanckaert and Gayon explain in their very useful introduction and postscript, which summarize Roger's thought in a synoptic way that has not, I think, previously been available in the literature, there was a somewhat curious aspect to Roger's crusade against historiographical anachronism. Supposedly there were certain recurring "thèmes fondamentales" in history of science—perhaps analogous to what Holton