

Book Reviews

interest, based as it is on the writings of Quintus Serenus, Pseudo-Apuleius and Sextus Placitus. But there are several unusual items rarely encountered elsewhere, such as the fascinating ceremonies for the cure of falling-sickness, for counteracting spells cast on people by means of wax images, and for preventing mice from destroying the grain harvest. On the whole the editor has treated the text with meticulous care and prodigious industry, but there are a number of places where more accuracy and attempts at emendation would have been desirable. What, for instance, do *diu sapen* (p. 108), *elevictus*, *eregarium*, *cappalatas* and *caba licit* mean? Since most of the text is written in intelligible Latin, one suspects that the transcription is at fault. This is certainly the case in the following instances: *eiusci* (p. 106) for *evisci*; *fleotorum* (p. 107) for *fleotomorum*; *suama* (p. 115) for *spuma*; *reilit* (p. 169) for *resilit*; *cuna* (p. 169) for *eunti*; *vocatur* (p. 186) for *vocatus*; *camas* (p. 188) for *cimas*; *Qua formicarum* (p. 193) for *ova formicarum*. And there are several others. On the whole, however, the editor has acquitted himself well in a complicated and difficult task, and he deserves high praise for undertaking it. The final result is well worth the labour he has expended on it.

ARNOLD THACKRAY and EVERETT MENDELSON (editors), *Science and values. Patterns of tradition and change*, New York, Humanities Press, 1974, 8vo, pp. viii, 251, illus., \$11.00.

The editors have planned this collection of essays by eight scholars as “. . . a modest beginning towards the task of understanding natural knowledge as a cultural enterprise . . .”. Dr. Thackray discusses ‘The Industrial Revolution and the image of science’; Charles Rosenberg, ‘Science and social values in nineteenth-century America: a case study in the growth of scientific institutions’; Roy MacLeod, ‘The Ayrton incident. A commentary on the relations of science and government in England, 1870–73’; D. V. A. Segre, ‘Social marginality and political legitimacy in nineteenth-century Madagascar’; James Bartholomew, ‘Japanese culture and the problem of modern science’; Peter Buck, ‘Western science in Republican China: ideology and institution building’; Charles Weiner, ‘Institutional settings for scientific change: episodes from the history of nuclear physics’; and Yaron Ezrahi, ‘The authority of science in politics’.

The cultural dimensions of science are now widely acknowledged, although there are still many social scientists and historians of ideas who do not recognize them. In order to illustrate them a variety of approaches are required and those employed here are but a part of the total number. Only by this method can the wide and complex canvas be tackled, for the object of the approach is to understand the various roles played by natural knowledge in different cultures and periods. The common link between the contributors is the use of the comparative method in their historical studies of natural knowledge, and it is fascinating, for example, to learn from the reception of western science by the non-western cultures. Each presents a scholarly article, adequately researched and annotated; unfortunately there is no index.

The editors and their collaborators deserve high praise for an excellent book that contributes importantly to an essential, yet under-studied, aspect of the history of science and medicine. Others may be inspired by it to tackle other aspects of a very large problem.