

Book Reviews

medical men. The editors are, however, commendably cautious as to the possible existence and viability of a philosophy of medicine as an independent enterprise akin to the philosophy of science, which is an established discipline like the philosophy of biology. They do believe, nevertheless, that common ground exists between physicians and philosophers, and that, as Temkin has suggested, there is room for a consideration of medical logic, medical ethics, and medical metaphysics. But as well as a philosophy of medicine there is need for a philosophy *in* medicine: a critical analysis of basic concepts and presuppositions in medicine, and of its significance and limitations. This book deals with some of these and discusses models of explanation and systems of value in the biomedical sciences.

Although most of the papers should be read by historians of medicine, those of greatest interest to them will be Lester King's, 'Some basic explanations of disease: an historian's viewpoint', Chester Burns', 'Diseases versus healths: some legacies in the philosophies of modern medical science', and Engelhardt's, 'The concepts of health and disease', all of which are excellent contributions. Toulmin on 'Concepts of function and mechanism in medicine and medical science', given as a tribute to Claude Bernard, is also outstanding. The Round-Table Discussion is likewise profitable to historians. In fact they should all possess a copy of this book, although the price will probably be the usual deterrent.

The symposiasts concur that the philosophy *of* and *in* medicine are legitimate topics of study, for as Dr. E. D. Pellegrino concludes: "... Indeed without the engagement and the conjunction of medicine and philosophy, no viable or understandable image of man can be synthesized for our times. And, the absence of such a synthesis is a major deficit in contemporary culture." (p.234).

We can look forward to further volumes in this series, which are planned to encompass the analysis of philosophical problems pertinent to medicine, and we can congratulate the editors, the contributors and the publishers for what they have achieved so far.

M. I. FINLEY, *The use and abuse of history*, London, Chatto & Windus, 1975, 8vo, pp. 254, £4.50.

M. I. Finley, the distinguished Professor of Ancient History in the University of Cambridge, offers a collection of twelve essays; all but one have been published previously (1954–1972), and all except one have been revised, some drastically. This type of anthology usually lacks a central theme, so that in some cases the book's title is that of the first essay. Professor Finley, however, has two themes, which he follows closely throughout. First, as his title suggests, he is concerned with history itself and its relationships, for example, with anthropology and archaeology. The second is the history of Ancient Greece and Rome, to which half of his essays are devoted.

For the medical historian the second will be of importance if he is concerned with medicine of Classical Antiquity, for Professor Finley's writings will help to provide the general background essential for an adequate understanding of Greek and Roman medicine and science.

The first theme, however, is of value to all historians of medicine and the essays devoted to it here should be read by each one of them. Professor Finley's rigidly critical

Book Reviews

approach, which is a feature of all his writings, is salutary in itself. 'Archaeology and history' is especially pertinent, because the palaeopathology of medical history is the archaeology of ancient, medieval and of other types of history concerned with chronological periods. The palaeopathologist, like the modern archaeologist, is retreating into an increasingly complex technology, with fewer links with the historian. Many of Professor Finley's comments directed to archaeologists are also pertinent to palaeopathologists. In each group they must take more regard of the historian, who is concerned mainly with literary evidence, and with his way of working. At the same time the historian should understand the man who deals only with artefacts.

Another feature of Professor Finley's writings which often recurs is his frequent attacks on unhistorical methodology, especially the common one of interpreting the past in the light of subsequent, especially present-day, knowledge and events. 'Myths, memory and history' should, therefore, be compulsory reading for students, and elsewhere in this book the healthy scepticism of a renowned and exacting scholar drawing upon his wide experience of appropriate examples is exactly what the neophyte should be exposed to.

This is the type of book that tends to be overlooked by those involved in the history of medicine, because there is no medical material *per se* in it. There are, however, general principles and matters that concern all varieties of history, including medical history, and these are of great importance to a discipline seeking to better itself by insisting on impeccable scholarship and enlightened methods of historiography. One way of achieving this goal is to follow the teachings of men such as Professor Finley, and also the equally outstanding scholar of ancient history, Professor Arnaldo Momigliano late of University College London, to whom this book is dedicated and to whom one of the essays is devoted.

H. A. FEISENBERGER (editor), *Sales catalogues of eminent persons*, Volume 11, *Scientists*, London, Mansell with Sotheby Parke Bernet Publications, 1975, 8vo, pp. 296, £11.50 (\$29.00).

It has been difficult to select for this series auction sale catalogues of eminent doctors and scientists which contain a substantial number of books reflecting the individual's professional interests. This is because of the relatively few sales of this kind of collection held since book auctions began in 1676. First of all, the deliberate collecting of scientific books in large numbers is a recent phenomenon; second, physicians usually donated their libraries to institutions. The four catalogues selected for facsimile reprint here concern the libraries of Elias Ashmole, Robert Hooke, John Ray, and Edmund Halley, which were disposed of on 22 February 1694, 29 April 1703, 11 March 1707/8 and 20 May 1742, respectively. Each item is described very briefly in the space of one line and in the case of Hooke's sale the prices fetched are added in manuscript. The editor provides an excellent introduction in which he draws upon his unique experience with medical and scientific books.

It is of great interest to note the books that each of the four men had in their libraries and to discover the breadth of their interests. These catalogues are, therefore, valuable indicators of the man as well as of contemporarily available literature. The most important is probably that of Hooke because of his versatility, the richness of his