

and symptomology of fever, as heat (subjectively felt rather than objectively measured) together with delirium came to prominence as key signifiers within a nerve-centred medical cosmology, one in which fever was also increasingly gendered feminine. Part 3 begins with 'Facts', a dense chapter which charts the rise of lesion-based understandings of disease, particularly in relation to the inchoate distinction between typhoid and typhus, as well as the rise of poisons and toxicology as a model for conceptualising fever. 'Naming the Wild' explores the key role of fever, particularly malaria, in the imperial project, while 'Numbers and Nurses' considers the triumph of temperature as the defining quality of fever and the implication of this for patient management and treatment. Finally, Hamlin concludes with a single chapter, 'Machines, Mothers, Sex and Zombies', in which he demonstrates how the concept of homeostasis served to rob fever of much of its dread, as it came increasingly to be seen as a natural and necessary consequence of the body's own immune system and as heat came to be regarded as a cure not a killer. In this chapter Hamlin also considers the shift of fever into the realm of childhood, a matter to be managed by mothers as much as nurses, as well as the twentieth- and twenty-first century's use of fever as a metaphor and a model for everything from sexual desire to biological annihilation.

More Than Hot is a wonderfully compelling and hugely valuable contribution to medical history. Hamlin has set himself a remarkable task and has accomplished it with considerable aplomb. It is richly detailed and exceedingly knowledgeable; every page positively drips with research and ideas. Occasionally, some chapters can overwhelm the reader with names, narrative and nuance. This is particularly true as Hamlin moves into his established area of expertise in the nineteenth century. Also, while this is primarily an intellectual history, it also aspires to cultural analysis. However, because of the sheer quantity of work needed to disentangle the intellectual dimensions of the story, the cultural aspects sometimes feel a little slender by comparison. The material on Mme de Sévigné, sensibility and intersubjectivity in Chapter 4, for example, could easily have been extended to half a chapter or more. But such observations are less an indication of any oversight on Hamlin's part than they are of the fascinating nature of the material. This book has been keenly anticipated by many scholars for some time and I very much doubt any will be disappointed. *More Than Hot* already promises to be a classic of medical history.

Michael Brown

University of Roehampton, UK

doi:10.1017/mdh.2015.72

Frédéric Charbonneau (ed.), *La Fabrique de la modernité scientifique: Discours et récits du progrès sous l'Ancien Régime* (Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, Oxford University Studies in the Enlightenment, 2015), pp. xiv + 248, £64.33, paperback, ISBN: 978-0-7294-1161-5.

How did the discourse of progress first emerge? What role did the scientific texts of the Ancien Régime play in this process? How did the Enlightenment read some of these medical, anatomical or philosophical texts? These are some of the questions addressed in this collective volume, edited by Frédéric Charbonneau. Through its nine splendid contributions (which can be found summarised at the end, alongside a very useful thematic index), the book traces the way in which some key figures of the so-called Scientific Revolution – specifically those related to the anatomical and medical sciences – were

transformed into icons of scientific progress. From Andrea Vesalius to the Montpellier doctor Théophile du Bordeu, from Descartes to Newton, and from Cyrano de Bergerac to the Comte of Buffon, the book explores the collective elaboration of the discourse of progress and the coming about of scientific hagiography as part of that process. Along these lines, the book should not only be of interest to the historian of medicine or science, but also to the general historian, the philosopher of history, and to all those concerned with the practicalities required to give the living conditions of certain individuals the fictional character of a universal history of glory.

Whilst the first chapter is consecrated to the re-editing of Vesalius' work, *De Fabrica*, Chapter 2 explores the interpretation and reception of Harvey's discovery of the circulation of blood. In the case of Chapter 3, Frédéric Tingley examines the case of one of the most famous disciples of Gassendi, Cyrano de Bergerac, whose logic of discovery was mainly based on the idea of serendipity. In Chapters 4 and 5, Josiane Boulad-Ayoud and Joël Castonguay-Bélanger deal with the different ways in which both René Descartes and Isaac Newton were portrayed during the Enlightenment. In his own chapter, Frédéric Charbonneau explains how the term 'progress' came to be applied to the sciences in the mid-eighteenth century. In the examples provided by contemporary dictionaries, he argues, the word suffered a sort of re-signification and acquired a particular historical meaning, rather than being limited to the technical improvement of a specific science or art. Like other contributors, Charbonneau also makes use of academic obituaries to explain how these texts constructed a certain notion of individual and collective progress. After all, what seems to be at stake here is not simply the anticipation of what we will later refer to by the expression of 'ideology of progress', but rather the constitution of a historical expression in which the singularity of events – those of a given life, for example – seems to serve a more general purpose: that of science.

There is, however, a very thin line between the historical reconstruction of the narrative of progress employed in the hagiography of some modern figures and the twenty-first century appreciation of those very same authors. Catrione Seth, for example, who explores the mechanisms of self-fashioning used by Tronchin, a doctor *à la mode*, seems also to be interested in defending the place of this doctor in the pantheon of history – especially when she attempts to show the essential role that Tronchin played in the transformation of eighteenth-century medicine: from a science of observation to a science of intervention. The same kind of misunderstanding regarding the 'contribution' of another figure comes up in the chapter on Buffon. In this case, Swann Paradis, gathering information from different obituaries, comes to the conclusion that the *intendant* (Director) of the *Jardin du roi* 'could also equally be listed as a (neglected) icon of progress in Natural History, at least in what has to do with his contribution to the disenchantment of animal descriptions' (194). This is a very different point of view to those expressed in some other chapters. For Alexandre Wenger, for example, the question is not so much the discussion of Théophile de Bordeu's real contributions, but rather of how he was turned into an icon of modern science while he was still alive only to be side-lined and then abandoned in the historical discourse of scientific progress.

All in all, this is more than a book on eighteenth-century ideas of progress. By focusing on new sources, like obituaries and eulogies, the book also explores the coming into existence of a new historical narrative that goes far beyond the realm of science and medicine. Wenger is right again when he claims that, after some degree of detachment from the biographical genre (undoubtedly motivated by the interest in collective stories – of peoples, of classes, of mentalities), there has been a certain historiographical *retour*

to personal narratives. The tensions between the singularity of personal events and the universality of biographical reports, between real and fictional lives, come into being in this splendid book as part of a more general reflection on the uses of history and the many different ways in which the eighteenth century invented the figure of the martyr of science as part of a new discourse of progress.

Javier Moscoso

Institute of History,
Centre for the Humanities and Social Sciences,
CSIC, Spain

doi:10.1017/mdh.2015.73

Howard Chiang (ed.), *Historical Epistemology and the Making of Modern Chinese Medicine* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2015), pp. xvi, 276, £70.00, hardback, ISBN: 978-07190-9600-6.

Decades ago, the story of Chinese medicine's transformation in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries would have been told as an encounter between tradition and modernity, with a pioneering Western medicine reforming a hidebound Chinese medicine until it was fit to survive in the modern world. But scholars of Chinese history have long since moved away from such 'impact–response' and 'tradition–modernity' narratives, as Paul Cohen dubbed them, recognising that great as the impact of Western powers was, reformers in China did more than respond; they drew equal motivation from Chinese sources. The Euro-American pattern was not the only way to become modern. In the case of Chinese medicine, recent histories have shown that before the early twentieth century Chinese doctors for the most part were not looking to Western medical treatises for a new paradigm. Instead, they were selectively using Western knowledge to answer questions important in Chinese medicine: questions about the circulation of bodily essences and the dangers of stasis, for example, or the relationship between fire and water qi in the body. Current scholarship also shows that twentieth-century regimes compelled the biomedicalisation of Chinese health care not because Western medicine was effective but because it was *modern*, the medicine of the rich and powerful nations that the Chinese elite aspired to.¹

The essays in *Historical Epistemology and the Making of Modern Chinese Medicine* build on this literature, examining changes in what has constituted authoritative knowledge in Chinese medicine and analysing how political and intellectual currents have contributed to them. Most of the contributions centre on China in the period from the mid-nineteenth century to the mid-twentieth. A few (Kuang-chi Hung on ginkgo biloba; Judith Farquhar on metaphysical debates in the 1980s; Leon Antonio Rocha on recent English-language manuals about acupuncture fertility treatments) examine Chinese medicine in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries, and in Japan and the West. Together they present an image of the relationship between modern Chinese and Western medicine that is much more interesting than the old tradition–modernity dichotomy. Both forms of medicine have been in flux in the modern period, and they have evolved together, sometimes in conversation, sometimes in opposition, sometimes in a kind of symbiosis.

¹ Bridie Andrews, *The Making of Modern Chinese Medicine, 1850–1960* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2014); Sean Hsiang-lin Lei, *Neither Donkey Nor Horse: Medicine in the Struggle over China's Modernity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2014); Kim Taylor, *Chinese Medicine in Early Communist China, 1945–63: A Medicine of Revolution* (London: RoutledgeCurzon, 2005).