

Book Reviews

LOUIS DULIEU, *La médecine à Montpellier*, Vol. 1, *Le Moyen Âge*, Avignon, Les Presses Universelles, 1975, 8vo, pp. 386, illus., 150 F.

For several years Dr. Dulieu of Montpellier has been publishing articles on the history of medicine there. He has now produced the first of three volumes on this theme; the second will deal with the Renaissance and the third with modern times.

Probably the most important period for the history of medicine in Montpellier is the one under consideration here. The University of Montpellier, along with Salerno, was helping to disseminate and put into practical use the Greek medical learning that was being translated from the Arabic in the eleventh and twelfth centuries mainly in Toledo, and which was new to the West. Montpellier was already a reputable medical centre in 1137 and in the first part of his book Dr. Dulieu traces its development from this time. After discussing the origins, he proceeds to a description of the early medical school founded by statute on 17 August 1220, giving an account of the university itself, the chancellors, students, teachers, the teaching of medicine, the hospitals, the outstanding individuals associated with the school, the medical establishment and lists of graduating doctors in the twelve through fifteenth centuries. A brief conclusion shows how influential Montpellier was in Europe during the Middle Ages. The second part of the book contains a valuable register of Montpellier medical graduates up to the fifteenth century, and there are appendices listing medieval medical manuscripts in the Library of the Faculty of Medicine, and a bibliography.

Throughout, the book is beautifully produced, with ample illustrations, many of them never before published. This is clearly an important contribution to the history of universities, of medical education, and of the medieval period, quite apart from its excellence as a record of Montpellier's first four centuries of existence. Dr. Dulieu and his publishers deserve our warm thanks for their product, and we now look forward to the next two volumes.

H. TRISTAM ENGELHARDT, *jr.* and STUART F. SPICKER (editors), *Evaluation and explanation in the biomedical sciences*, Dordrecht and Boston, D. Reidel, 1975, 8vo, pp. vi, 240, \$28.00.

The First Trans-Disciplinary Symposium on Philosophy and Medicine was held at Galveston, Texas, from 9 to 11 May 1974, and this book which contains its proceedings, forms the inaugural volume of the publisher's projected series on philosophy and medicine. There are thirteen essays and the record of a round-table discussion; of the fifteen participants, only four are medically qualified. The material is divided into six sections: value and explanation; historical roots; philosophy of science in transition to a philosophy of medicine; ethics and medicine; concepts in medical theory; body and self; phenomenological perspectives; the role of philosophy in the biomedical sciences, contribution or intrusion. Most articles are documented and, in the case of the majority, critical comments on them by participants are included.

There has in the past been a considerable amount of interchange between medicine and philosophy, but "the formalization of issues and concepts in medicine" (p.1) has not previously engaged the attention of the modern professional philosopher. The importance of this book, and of the symposium upon which it is based, is, therefore, in the sustained investigation of philosophical issues in medicine by philosophers and

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