

far too little understanding of naturopathy in its historical contexts. In my view, Cayleff's monograph is most effective when it is most ambitious.

In many ways, though, the book is surprisingly narrow in its focus. Although Cayleff hints at the social, political, economic, and geographic contexts that shaped American naturopathy over more than 150 years, for example, her work relies almost exclusively on materials—newspapers, journals, conference reports, memoirs, and some archival sources—emerging from within the naturopathic movement itself. This creates a somewhat distorted picture of what the world beyond the movement looked like. Naturopaths may, for example, have accused allopathic doctors of all manner of harmful conduct; attacked “authoritarian” forces in the federal, state, and local governments; and lamented the consequences of rapid urbanization and industrialization. Cayleff could have done a better job of contextualizing these kinds of comments, which were, at least in part, the public relations strategy of a movement struggling to create professional autonomy and legal protections for naturopathic practitioners. In short, naturopaths and their opponents were each equally engaged in a propaganda war, and this should be clearer. In focusing so much on the perspective of leading voices within the naturopathic movement, Cayleff misses an opportunity to explain where naturopathy fit in to the larger historical context that shaped it.

There are some other aspects of Cayleff's monograph that should have been further developed. From the beginning, Cayleff acknowledges the debt that American naturopaths had to their German counterparts, but she does not go nearly far enough. First of all, many of the early proponents of naturopathy that Cayleff discusses were, themselves, German immigrants. And this helps to explain why core terms in the movement—including “naturopathy” itself—are basically translations from the German. The title of the specialty magazine founded by Benedict Lust, for example, is a rough translation of the German *Naturarzt*, which was also the name of a naturopathic magazine first published in Germany in 1863. Therapeutic and diagnostic practices like the sitz bath, Kneipp cure, and iris diagnosis, to name a few, were not “borrowed” from the German tradition. They were the direct application of therapies pioneered and used in Germany. And while Cayleff acknowledges this in some places, in other places she does not, as is the case with her discussion of the “Unity of Disease” theory allegedly pioneered by Louis Kuhne in the early twentieth century.

Despite these issues, *Nature's Path* is an entertaining and illuminating work that will be enjoyed by those readers interested in American naturopathy, and the social history of medicine more generally.

Avi Sharma

Avi Sharma studied European and global history at the University of Chicago. He is presently a research fellow and assistant professor at the Center for Metropolitan Studies at the Technical University of Berlin. He is the author of numerous articles on the history of health, environment, and urbanism in Germany.

Paola Zambelli. *Alexandre Koyré in Incognito.* (Biblioteca di Galilaeana, 5.) xxii + 288 pp., bibl., index. Florence: Olschki Editore, 2016. €32 (paper).

Alexandre Koyré (1892–1964) is one of the most important historians of science of the twentieth century, and his bold views on the philosophical background of scientific thought have always aroused both interest and controversy. It is therefore not surprising that scholarly work devoted to his life and career is animated and, in recent years, very intense. Since the late 1960s, Paola Zambelli, a distinguished historian of astrology and Renaissance philosophy, has worked extensively on Koyré and translated a few fundamental texts into Italian. With her present book, she highlights several unknown events in Koyré's life, and her effort to contextualize them within the intellectual development of the Russian historian has led her to some original, though not always convincing, conclusions. Unfortunately, the structure of *Alexandre Koyré in Incognito* makes it an effortful read. In fact, some of the chapters have been published as separate

articles before, and as a result, the narrative sometimes lacks fluency. Despite these shortcomings, this is an important book that anyone interested in the life and work of Koyré should carefully study.

The book focuses on Koyré's little-known political background, his cultural milieu and academic connections, and his association with Jewish intellectual circles. Zambelli has built her narrative around an extremely rich documentary thread that is based on findings, many of which were not previously known, discovered in American, French, German, and Russian archives. The most striking aspect emerging from these documents is Koyré's early sympathy for Russian revolutionary movements. In 1907–1908, Koyré actively collaborated with the Socialist Revolutionaries and he was arrested twice. With the outbreak of the Russian Revolution, Koyré maintained his political views, but there is no firm evidence of his relations with the Bolsheviks. On the other hand, as late as 1919 he was known in France as “comrade Sacha,” and French intelligence suspected that he was a spy. Koyré's early scholarly career in Germany (with Husserl) and in Paris reveal a completely different trajectory. It is well known that at that time, Koyré privileged the central role of philosophical and religious ideas in the history of philosophy, which would have been difficult to reconcile with Bolshevik sympathies. This period, ending around 1923, is examined by Zambelli in the second part of her book. She explores in detail Koyré's apprenticeship with Husserl in Göttingen, and with Bergson, Levy-Bruhl, and Gilson in Paris, and argues convincingly that his interests in the various thinkers and periods of the history of philosophy took shape owing to his frequent and intense meetings with these scholars.

The third part of the book is devoted to Koyré's wanderings during the 1930s and the 1950s. Zambelli does not make any sharp distinction between Koyré's interest in the history of science and in the history of philosophy, though the reader gets the impression that philosophy was by far his primary concern. There are several examples of this. The author hints (on p. 192) that some unidentified conflict with George Sarton—who, contrary to Koyré, proposed history of science as an autonomous discipline—hindered Koyré from contributing to the collection of essays published on the occasion of Sarton's sixtieth birthday. I wish Zambelli had explored this further because as far as I know, Sarton and Koyré admired each other despite their completely different approaches to the history of science. As much as philosophical studies remained of paramount importance throughout his career, it should be noted that Koyré developed an interest in the history of science as early as the 1920s and that Héléne Metzger admired his contribution on Renaissance occult philosophers and naturalists and asked Koyré to join the Centre de Synthèse in 1935. In June of that year Aldo Mieli invited him to deliver a lecture on Galileo before the Académie Internationale d'Histoires des Sciences, and it is reasonable to believe that Metzger and the historians of science at the Centre influenced Koyré to begin to explore the history of the scientific revolution less cursorily. Only scattered traces of these interests, however, appear in Zambelli's reconstruction, and it is sometimes difficult to understand when and how Koyré became one of the most influential historians of science of his time.

Zambelli surveys Koyré's little-known militant activities within the Parisian Comité pour la défense des droits des Israélites en Europe Centrale et Orientale (1934), which explains his enduring friendships with distinguished Jewish scholars like Héléne Metzger, Hannah Arendt, and others, and hint at the possibility that he might have been involved in secret intelligence (p. 172). Zambelli insists on the importance of the parallel courses Koyré delivered in Paris and Cairo between 1933 and 1941 when he hoped to gain a position as a professor of philosophy. While in Cairo, following the suggestion of De Gaulle, Koyré decided to move to New York to the École Libre des Hautes Études, where the activities were not merely cultural but were also aimed at supporting French émigrés as well as the resistance against the occupying forces. Zambelli shows that Koyré was particularly engaged in this latter role. It is in this context that Koyré corresponded with several American scholars and universities, creating the ideal background for his later appointment to the Institute for Advanced Studies at Princeton. At the end of the war, Koyré expected some sort of recognition from the French government for his service to the nation, but his proposal to create a chair in the history of scientific thought at the Collège de France was rejected. It was only after his appointment as a fellow at the Institute for Advanced Studies in 1953 that his institutional authority in France grew.

Zambelli's book brings to light extremely interesting aspects of Koyré's life and political views. Even though her reconstruction tends at times to overemphasize the importance of the philosophical influences on Koyré's approach to the history of science, the sources she explores considerably extend our knowledge of his cultural background. Furthermore, the wealth of unpublished and little-known documents makes her work a most valuable addition to the literature.

Marco Beretta

Marco Beretta is Professor of History of Science at the University of Bologna. He is the author of La rivoluzione culturale di Lucrezio (Carocci, 2015), editor of Lucretius's De rerum natura: editio princeps (1472–73) (Bononia, 2016), and coeditor, with Maria Conforti and Paolo Mazzarello, of Savant Relics: Brains and Remains of Scientists (Science History, 2016). Together with Paolo Brenni, he is currently preparing a catalog of Lavoisier's collection of instruments.

Pascal Schillings. *Der letzte weiße Flecken: Europäische Antarktisreisen um 1900.* 448 pp., figs., bibl., index. Göttingen: Wallstein Verlag, 2016. €39.90 (cloth).

A recurrent theme in the history of polar exploration and science is the tension between international cooperation and national rivalry. Although the inhospitable character and sheer vastness of the polar environment proved a powerful argument for cooperative scientific endeavors—the first International Polar Year was organized as early as 1882, and three more have been held since then—they also provided the backdrop for such bitterly fought contests as that between Robert Scott and Roald Amundsen to reach the South Pole.

This ambivalence is mirrored by historical studies of Antarctic science. By and large, they focus on the explorers and expeditions of one particular nation; the exceptions to this rule focus on the International Polar Years.

Pascal Schillings offers a different approach in the book under review here, and on the basis of which he received his Ph.D. from the University of Cologne. He juxtaposes two expeditions to Antarctica, which were both framed as national endeavors. More specifically, he revisits the history of the German Antarctic Expedition led by Erich von Drygalski on the *Gauss* and of the British Antarctic Expedition led by Robert Scott on the *Discovery*. Both expeditions set out almost simultaneously in 1901 and cooperated closely, ensuring they would collect complementary and compatible data.

Of the five main chapters, the first two reconstruct the historical contingencies that ultimately led to a readiness by the British and German states to support the two expeditions financially. Schillings emphasizes how national prestige was invoked in order to convince potential sponsors of the merits of exploring Antarctica, but that this did not stand in the way of coordinating the expeditions' research programs—for example, when agreeing on certain types of instrumentation, setting specific dates on which measurements should be undertaken simultaneously, or drawing on the same suppliers of specialized equipment.

Schillings then moves on to describe the expeditions themselves. He focuses on how data was collected under the extreme circumstances the participants confronted both at sea and in the Antarctic itself. Drawing from later scientific publications by expedition members, he identifies the strategies employed to guarantee that the results of measurements would be unambiguously interpretable. Schillings subsequently addresses the issue of how the results of the expeditions were relayed to the various British and German audiences. A final chapter gives an overview of the continued development of Antarctic exploration until the 1920s.

Taking his cue from Katrin Knorr-Cetina and her concept of different “epistemic cultures” in science (Harvard, 1999), Schillings introduces the term “exploratory cultures.” He identifies two specific types: geographic and scientized [*verwissenschaftlicht*]. According to Schillings's model, adherents of the former