

anomaly”, since Britain, northern Europe, and New England experienced lower rates of mortality (p. 212). However, the author does not entirely rule out the possibility that there is a link between demography and grief, stating that “If at least 1 in 2 infants died, deep emotional attachment could not be expected . . . Rare events encourage more deeply felt emotional responses” (pp. 212–13).

Perhaps the greatest merit of *Children remembered* is its innovative juxtaposition and analysis of such diverse sources: rarely have historians used the quantitative evidence of death rates alongside the qualitative evidence of paintings and literature. Woods raises some thoughtful questions about the uses and pitfalls of these sources, stating that whilst poetry is a useful medium for conveying emotions, it cannot be assumed that the thoughts and feelings of the authors can “be simply and directly derived” from the texts by the historian (p. 103). Furthermore, the book is a treasure trove of information: Woods has included transcripts of all ninety-six poems, colour copies of eighteen of the paintings, and useful facts about the authors/artists, subjects, and purposes. Hopefully this will encourage scholars to make greater use of these kinds of sources, since traditionally diaries and correspondence alone have been used by historians of parent–child relationships. Likewise, the book is rich in secondary detail, containing meticulous accounts of the various works of historians, literary theorists, and sociologists. Occasionally, this information is a little overwhelming, since it can obscure the flow of the book’s central argument. A more significant concern relates to Wood’s methodology: readers may feel that it would have been better if the artistic sources had been analysed in a more thematic, qualitative manner, since they do not always lend themselves to statistical analysis. In particular, the charting of the number of times the word “grief” (and other similar terms) appeared in the poetry against the changing death rates (p. 215) is problematic, for this emotion can be conveyed in more subtle ways than through the use of the word itself. Moreover, this

method does not adequately distinguish between the expression and the feeling of grief: Woods implies that the absence or presence of the language of grief is evidence of the absence or presence of the actual feelings themselves, when in fact, there were probably many factors influencing authors’ choices of vocabulary and expression, such as moral and religious disapproval of excessive grief. Nevertheless, *Children remembered* is a valuable contribution to the historiography of childhood, death, grief, and emotions, and will surely be appreciated for its ambitious aims and interesting observations.

Hannah Newton,  
University of Exeter

**Leslie T Morton and Robert J Moore,**  
*A bibliography of medical and biomedical  
biography*, 3rd ed., Aldershot, Ashgate, 2005,  
pp. xi, 425, £85.00 (hardback 0-7546-5069-3).

This is Leslie Morton’s (1907–2004) last book. His name was immortalized in *Morton’s medical bibliography* (fifth edition published in 1991)—commonly referred to as *Garrison and Morton*—a standard reference work for anyone working in medical history. The first edition of *A bibliography of medical and biomedical biography* was published in 1989, and *A chronology of medicine and related sciences*, also by Leslie Morton and Robert Moore, appeared in 1997. Both these are valuable counterparts to *Garrison and Morton*.

The 1989 edition of Morton and Moore’s *A bibliography of medical and biomedical biography* was restricted to English-language publications, but references to relevant literature in many European languages including French, German and Russian were added in the following editions. There are 3740 biographies in the present edition compared with 2368 in the second edition. The entry for each individual includes birth and death dates, nationality and speciality, sometimes followed by a note of the main contribution to medical science (usually the

### *Book Reviews*

first description of a clinical sign or disease entity), or position held (for example, president of a royal college, university professor, or surgeon-in-chief to the army). This is followed by biographical references, including autobiographies. Occasionally relevant archival collections are also noted.

A drawback is a haphazard selection of entries that gives undue weight to certain periods and countries. A sample of the first 100 entries shows that half the names are British or North American, and more than 60 per cent of the persons listed were born after 1800. It remains unclear what criteria were used for selection. In the introduction the compilers warn “that the biographies of some distinguished persons are missing because they have still to be written or are represented by very brief accounts”. This is not necessarily

so. Several accounts of the French surgeon Thierry de Martel have been published yet they are not included. The same is true for the Russian psychologist Alexander Luria. It is surprising to learn that Trofim Lysenko was a “Russian geneticist” (p. 235). He in fact opposed genetics, which was banned in the USSR as a “bourgeois pseudoscience”. A surgeon-in-chief of the Red Army, Nikolai Burdenko is labelled “Russian neurologist” (p. 59). Yet, these are minor faults in what is an essential biographical and bibliographical guide to works in medicine and the biomedical sciences.

**Boleslav Lichterman,**

Institute for the History of Medicine,  
Moscow