

Book Reviews

time. Modern film and contemporary cinema are doubtlessly permeated with Freud's discontented daughters; Bronfen would have strengthened her case by explaining why Hitchcock and Cronenberg are more performatively hysterical than his. Even so, "performing hysteria" has not often been the subject of interpretation so astute as found here, this despite medicine's awareness that the hysteric "performs her illness" as a diva sings her opera. Hysteria's subjectivity, history, and abundant case histories have engaged many students; far fewer its performance and broadcasts, strong and weak.

Bronfen's sense of hysteria's cultural profile follows close on. Except among feminists, hysteria's histories (surely in the plural) have usually been monodisciplinary piecemeal presentations rather than broad transdisciplinary canvases on which the hysteric's condition is laid out. Hysteria's Gothic implications (i.e., Gothic fiction, Gothic sensibility, Gothic film, the world of Frankenstein and Dracula) have long been known and interpreted, "especially the Gothic text as a paradigmatic example of the family's romance" (p. 153). Yet her interpretations are always fresh. The material Bronfen presents on Karl Jaspers is new and worthy of even more treatment than she provides here, in part because nostalgia has been so ineptly configured in relation to health and disease. But the insistence that hysteria's performing history—its "broadcasts"—belongs in these discussions is by far the most original part.

It would be wrongheaded to construe *The knotted subject* as irrelevant to the history of medicine. Just the opposite is true: it represents a triumph for this subject. Here, in effect, is a well-informed authoritative cultural critic claiming that she cannot do *without* the history of psychiatry. The history of medicine is insufficient as a totalizing account in itself, but hysteria's profiles, Bronfen suggests, *must* begin in medical speculation. Despite Freud, little changes in our century regarding the

paradoxes of hysteria. Yet just a generation ago cultural critics flaunted their indifference to medicine; now they start *ab ovo* with it. Perhaps Foucault predicted all this in his archaeologies of madness and histories of the clinic.

No grand theory lurks here about hysteria's transformations throughout history, yet everywhere *The knotted subject* brims with critical insight couched in attractive prose. Although pushing 500 pages this is no dull Burtonian repository composed in the cast of Germanic thoroughness. Students of hysteria's eternal mysteries who read it will be persuaded that its cultural profile has been enlarged. Someone who can do this in the aftermath of the twentieth-century hysteria industry deserves praise.

G S Rousseau,
De Montfort University, Leicester

Jonathan Andrews, "*They're in the Trade ... of Lunacy/They 'cannot interfere'—they say*": the Scottish Lunacy Commissioners and lunacy reform in nineteenth-century Scotland, Occasional Publication, No. 8, London, Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine, 1998, pp. 108, £8.00 (0-85484-0680).

Despite lacunae in the manuscript archive which might have modified the official version of events provided by printed publications, Jonathan Andrews has done an excellent job of providing a balanced, well referenced account of the Scottish Lunacy Commission. He unpicks previous, and generally hagiographical, accounts, drawing helpful comparisons throughout with the work of its English counterpart. The early identification of a lack of uniformity in the local Shrievalty's supervision of asylums, and the latter's opposition to centralized intervention, for example, clearly mirror the experience of

Book Reviews

Lord Shaftesbury's Lunacy Commission. Previous government attempts to introduce rate funded district asylums in Scotland, like those of the 1808 English County Asylums Act, had also been resoundingly defeated on a localist agenda.

Andrews pauses briefly over the 1855–57 Scottish Lunacy Commission inquiry which led to legislation and the establishment of a full-time Lunacy Commission. This was initiated by the American reformer Dorothea Dix, supported by the Duke of Argyll, and the Home Secretary, Sir George Grey. The appointment of two English Lunacy Commissioners onto this Inquiry, albeit one of them a Scotsman, and indeed the Duke of Argyll's nephew, was deeply unpopular. Many thought that they had set out to do a job on the Scottish system, in much the same way as they had on Bethlem Hospital. Many Scots were proud of the charitable basis of their Poor Law and subscription hospitals, and were fundamentally opposed to the introduction of a Commission. Mr Podsnap's comment on Commissions in *Our mutual friend*, "No! Never with my consent. Not English", could just as well have applied to Scotland. There was widespread disquiet at the Commission's introduction, and after five years, there were formal representations to Government for its discontinuance.

This monograph tracks the developing composition and influence of the Scottish Board, profiles the individual commissioners and teases out their specific contributions. Andrews successfully captures the tension between Scottish national pride which was opposed to the importation of anything English, and the need to puff those elements of their mental health system which were seen as specifically Scottish.

He pays particular attention to the debate over the single care of lunatics and idiots boarded out in the community, drawing on the work of Harriet Sturdy. He discusses the Commission's promotion of boarding out, and identifies the impact of wider hereditarian concerns about the way it was

implemented. Notably this occurred in its attempts to prevent the transmission of idiocy by restricting boarding out to certain age groups. Andrews explores the contemporary debate about the relative merits of the Gheel and cottage systems, again teasing out the divergence of individual opinions from the Commission's published views.

It is hard to escape the feeling, after reading this monograph, that there were more similarities than differences between the Scottish and English Commissions. Nevertheless, Andrews has provided an excellent account, fleshing out our understanding of lunacy administration north of the border and the different emphasis which the Scottish Commissioners placed on many of the same issues.

Nick Hervey,

Guy's, King's and St Thomas' Hospitals'
Medical and Dental School (GKT)

Hilda Kean, *Animal rights: political and social change in Britain since 1800*, Reaktion Books, 1998, pp. 272, £19.95, \$29.95 (hardback 1-86189-014-1).

Today, animals (non-human ones, that is) have, according to Hilda Kean, "become an integral part of political, as well as cultural and social life" in Britain (p. 7). The major political parties now routinely include animal welfare issues in their election manifestos. Our television screens are full of heroic pet rescuers and rescuees, protestors at animal cruelty and endangered wildlife. Toyshops have become menageries of little plastic personalized creatures. Kean asks, implying answers in the affirmative will follow, whether we can make sense of "all this", and whether exploring the history of opposition to animal cruelty and the incorporation of animals into our cultural