

Book Reviews

described, and there are three excellent chapters on the history of 'Hospitals', 'The Medical Profession and the State', and 'Towards World Health'.

The only criticism which might be levelled at this work is that it is perhaps over-weighted with names, many of which are of minor importance, whilst others, such as Sherrington—'the greatest philosopher of the nervous system', Gregor Mendel—whose discoveries laid the foundation of the increasingly important topic of human genetics (to which no reference is made in the text), A. E. Garrod and Gowland Hopkins—amongst the founders of the modern biochemical concepts of disease, and many others, are omitted.

Yet this is carping criticism of a first-rate *Short History of Medicine* which should be compulsory reading not only for the sixth form of Grammar Schools, but also for every medical student and teacher.

COHEN OF BIRKENHEAD

A Directory of English Country Physicians 1603–43, by JOHN H. RAACH, PH.D., M.D., London, Dawsons, 1962, pp. 128, 215.

Those of us who know Dr. Raach's work on early seventeenth-century physicians have awaited this book with some eagerness. Written in the form of an alphabetical directory, it provides a handy check-list of physicians who were practising outside London between 1603 and 1643; it thus supplements the small list of physicians to be found in *Munk* for that period. Unlike *Medical Practitioners . . . in the Diocese of London* by Bloom and James, this book does not include surgeons, for the author believes there is a clear-cut division in function between physician and surgeon. As the present reviewer argues elsewhere, this may be an arbitrary distinction in practice, and this list includes men such as Annoot and Belke who were surgeon and apothecary, respectively, by training; in any case the author is quite wrong in saying (p. 11) that the licensing Act of 1512 'regulated only the men of physic'; there was attached to the original bill a 'Memorandum that surgeons be comprised in this Act like as Physicians'. The introduction to the *Directory* is generally inadequate and it is a pity that Dr. Raach did not give us a more general survey of the field rather than a mere list that must stand or fall by its accuracy. If we look at the index for Exeter (p. 99–100), for example, we find that there are signs of faulty work. Richard Spicer mentioned there cannot be found in the body of the book at all (he was, in fact, M.D. (OXON) 1622 and F.R.C.P. in 1624). John Gostlin is to be found (p. 50), although with a slightly different spelling, but the biography is defective; the tentative dates for his practice at Exeter are clearly given as 1607–19 in the *Dictionary of National Biography* and Venn, neither of which are cited; the dates given by the author, of Gostlin's practice at Cambridge, are meaningless in that they contradict his own earlier dates and give Gostlin nine extra years of life; it is misleading to show Gostlin as 'B.A., M.D. (OXON)' for he was educated at Cambridge where he took his M.D. in 1602 and merely incorporated it at Oxford ten years later; the Harley manuscript cited tells us nothing to the point and Foster is here unreliable. Thomas Edwards (p. 43) is given forty-one years' extra life for the author misquotes the authority he cites which gave 1665 as the date of the death, not of Edwards, but of his grandson. John Norris (p. 69) raises a question wider than that of accuracy, that of method. The author quotes Norris's will as authority for his being a physician but does not mention that he called himself 'Dr. of Physic' and is presumably the man who took B.M. at Oxford 1587 and married in Exeter in 1596. The two Thomas Marwoods (p. 65) similarly here lack the Padua M.D.'s they were reputed to have. Are these omissions deliberate, because the

evidence has been rejected, and has such rigour been applied to all other identifications? The form of presentation makes it impossible to tell which authority backs which facts without checking every one individually. Similarly, is the complete omission of many other practitioners deliberate? For example, the Rutland MSS which are cited in the case of Athall (p. 24) have references to at least three other practitioners who do not appear in the *Directory*. There is also a vast amount of work still to be done, apparently, in checking published material; in Devon, for example, the Marriage Licences give us Dr. Frederic Wanhop, Clement Cheriton and John Punten, and Parish Records John Newton and Richard Dewe. A study of wills would add many more, such as John Lees 'physician' in Cheshire, and in revealing such humble men as these and Nicholls and Peryam (in the article above) would, I think, correct Raach's picture of a profession in which three-quarters had been to university. The converse of this question, of course, is what evidence indeed is there that all those in the *Directory* with degrees did in fact ever practise? The strict academic requirements for the study of medicine had been somewhat eased at Oxford and Cambridge so that Medicine there, like Law in London, may have been a fashionable study for gentlemen who hoped never to be so badly off that they would actually have to practise. This point is particularly relevant to the case of the seventy odd men listed here at Cambridge and Oxford. In that such wider questions have been raised this book, then, may serve a valuable purpose, and if used with caution it could provide a convenient starting point for further inquiry, preferably a series of co-ordinated searches on a local basis, county by county. Until we can answer such basic questions about the personnel of the medical profession in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, discussion of medical practice at that time is bound to be inaccurate.

R. S. ROBERTS

Funfzig Jahre Neuropathologie in Deutschland, 1885-1935, edited by PROF. DR. W. SCHOLZ, Stuttgart, G. Thieme Verlag, 1961, pp. 123, illus.

Between 1885, when Weigert became Director of the Pathological Institute in Frankfurt, and Spielmeyer's death in 1935, German neuropathology had great achievements to its credit. In recognition of such a notable half-century, the World Federation of Neurology has recently commissioned this account of the men who in Munich, Heidelberg, Frankfurt and Hamburg so impressively advanced our knowledge of cellular pathology in the nervous system. Successive chapters are concerned with Carl Weigert, Ludwig Edinger, Franz Nissl, Alois Alzheimer, Alfons Jacob and Walter Spielmeyer. There are also chapters on the Berlin group (who include Oskar and Cecile Vogt, Max Bielschowsky and Korbinian Brodmann) and on Kraepelin's role in advancing neuropathological studies.

The scientific work of these men is the more remarkable when it is considered that the majority of them, and of their most productive pupils, were at the same time busy clinicians and clinical teachers. Nissl is the outstanding example of this—hence his predilection for the night hours if research was to be done or discussed. As Spatz points out in his biographical notice of Nissl, fewer substantial contributions came from morbid anatomists and other non-clinicians during that period than from psychiatrists and neurologists. Gudden had set the pattern, which fitted the circumstances of the time.

Many of the men commemorated in this little work evidently had hard, struggling lives, chequered with personal hardships, unjust discrimination, academic disappointments, and restricted facilities. Nevertheless they accomplished so much that