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Nearly 30 years ago Rupert Willis advocated that pathologists should understand more embryology and embryologists more pathology. Such ideas must surely be even more true today. Descriptive embryology has been transformed into sophisticated developmental biology and this science has lessons for all other areas of biology and medicine. This book is a lucid and beautifully illustrated account of the current status of developmental biology. Any pathologist, particularly histopathologist, who wishes to expose himself to contemporary developmental biology would find it difficult, in my view, to find a better text. The early chapters introduce the basic processes of development and the organisms used by experimental developmental biologists such as Drosophila and the nematode Caenorhabditis. Mammalian development is very well covered. Later chapters describe the cellular and molecular biology of developmental processes including good accounts of homeobox genes and the molecular basis of development and differentiation. My only criticism is that the author has not emphasised Willis's view that pathological processes can be of value in understanding development and differentiation, but then it is perhaps for pathologists to educate developmental biologists (and other basic scientists) to this possibility.

**PA HALL**


This is a largely historical treatise which takes as its premise that it is not possible to understand present and future concepts of lung cancer without understanding how concepts have developed in the past. It is aimed at medical and paramedical readers who deal with one facet of this disease and who wish to have a better overall perspective. The compilation of the monograph was funded by the Council for Tobacco Research USA Inc.

It begins with 12 historical vignettes taking us from the first description of fatal lung disorders in Schneeberg miners in 1556 up to the first comprehensive American monograph on primary malignant growths of the lungs and bronchi in 1912. There then follow chapters on a variety of aspects such as histopathology, classification, cytopathology, aetiology, precursor lesions, and hormonal syndromes. A considerable number of original title pages are reproduced as illustrations, which is of extremely doubtful value, especially as the quality of these and some of the other figures is poor.

No doubt anyone addicted to the study of medical history would find this fascinating and it would be a useful source of background information to be held in medical libraries for consultation by anyone who has to lecture on the subject of lung tumours. I cannot envisage many individual pathologists or pathology departments, however, splashing out for this book.

I am also not sure I agree with the basic premise of the necessity to understand the past, although I do agree that we should not ridicule as "wrong" interpretations which are made in the light of the accepted body of knowledge at any point in time. We are always open to similar criticisms from future generations.

There are some questions left unanswered. Firstly, why would someone with the brilliant name Theophrastus Bombastus von Hohenheim choose to be known as Paracelsus, and secondly, if this is volume I, what is going to be in volume II?

**JULIE CROW**


This book supposedly provides a thorough review of the research literature on *Candida albicans* during 1953-1985 and fills a key gap. What gap? This literature has been critically and comprehensively covered in two editions of the superb monograph by Frank Odds (1979 and 1988) and in the earlier monograph by Winner and Hurley (1964). No mention is made of these works, or of the 1985 volume by Bodey and Fainstein on candidiasis, but these constitute the standards against which any new work must be measured.

If there is no discernible need for this new work, can its existence be justified on the basis of originality or intrinsic merit? Hardly. It is a confusing hodge-podge of miscellaneous topics and published data, lacking unifying or coherent presentation and critical commentary. The text reads as though a motley collection of annotated reference cards had been stapled together. The book contains only two illustrations. Choice of chapter headings are confusing and at times baffling. Entire paragraphs appear out of sequence and at times in unrelated sections.

In this reviewer's opinion, the book is ill-conceived, poorly assembled, misinformed, outdated, and inadequate. It should never have been published.

**DWR MACKENZIE**


This book is a non-illustrated compendium of mycotic diseases, with human and myco-human infections given roughly equal prominence. It has a brief introduction about host defences against fungal infections. The varying immunodeficiency states are discussed in moderate detail with respect to individual infections.

The main sections are on candidiasis, cryptococcosis, aspergillosis, the phycymycoses, and "others" including the chromomycoses. A chapter on antifungal agents, and a publication addendum (written in May 1989) complete the monograph. We should be grateful to Dr Smith for his accumulation of data. Thirty seven per cent of the pages in his book are references (which total over 1800). Clinical, diagnostic, therapeutic, and taxonomic aspects of the mycoses are well tabulated.

If I have any criticisms—and perhaps the second edition can take note—the naming of references in the text blocks its flow (try numbers instead); and there is a lack of subheadings to guide the reader through the paragraphs, though this no good. I shall find it very useful for information on clinical mycology.

**SB LUCAS**