

Book Reviews

of these case studies ably do; but having done this, to go beyond reductive explanations the historian must then ask why some people from the group elected to embrace that particular medical option while others did not. We also need to know much more about how public pronouncements about healing deployed in highly politicized arenas correspond to more private belief and behaviour. Most of these studies draw exclusively on public rhetoric, much of it highly polemical; yet one clear message of the new social history has been that such public pronouncements must not be read as exhaustive or unproblematic representations of reality.

The essays brought together in these volumes are a promising springboard for future work on alternative medicine. What is in these ways most promising, though, is an appealingly subversive subtext that runs through both collections. All the contributors wish to move away from a preoccupation with orthodoxy in medical history, but they remain unable to wrench free from the problem that unorthodox medicine received its definition from what it was not—that is, orthodox. Cooter, in an intriguing essay that explores “just how cosmologically alternative were the alternatives” (p. 75), uncovers multiple layers of overlap between orthodoxy and fringe, and many of the other contributors do the same less systematically. Indeed, the best of these essays all display uneasiness with the fact that abolishing the orthodox/unorthodox duality also tends to undercut the rationale for volumes of historical scholarship devoted to separatist studies of unorthodox medicine, however heuristically valuable such works are. Medical orthodoxy, after all, was a concept that the historical actors themselves not only invented but also disputed. It changed over time, as Porter’s contrast of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Britain underscores, and over place, as comparison of nineteenth-century Britain with America would amply reveal, and it was always fuzzy. In the final analysis, perhaps what these two collections should most urge upon us is a history not of *either* orthodox medicine *or* alternative medicine, but a more fully integrated history of healing. If, as both editors argue, the concerns of the present are one leading motivation for studying the expressions and meaning of alternative medicine of the past, then this tack is doubly attractive, for it also holds the promise of relevance. Dismantling a rigid dichotomy between orthodoxy and heterodoxy, after all, may be one of the most helpful ways for us to better understand the pluralism that is so distinctly emerging as a hallmark of post-modernist medical culture.

John Harley Warner, Yale University

CYNTHIA EAGLE RUSSETT, *Sexual science: the Victorian construction of womanhood*, Cambridge, Mass., and London, Harvard University Press, 1989, 8vo, pp. 245, £15.95.

The number of new books that have appeared in the past few years on the general topic of the social construction of the feminine within science is staggering. Titles by Elaine Showalter, Emily Martin, Betteann Kevles, Anne Fausto-Sterling, and Susan Suleiman come quickly to mind, but these are only the best and most frequently cited. Now Cynthia Eagle Russett, a distinguished historian of American science at Yale (*Darwin in America*), has turned her hand to the question of the “Victorian construction of womanhood” and has provided the reader—male and female—with a solid, well-written introduction to the basic questions of how (and perhaps even why) nineteenth- and twentieth-century science needed to place the woman within specific categories. It is the biological sciences (and to a lesser extent such social sciences as anthropology) which take centre stage. And Russett deals with these questions from the late nineteenth to the mid-twentieth centuries with a great deal of style and intelligence. This is especially true with her discussion of the erosion of the “Victorian paradigm” with which she concludes her study. What is important about this study is that it is not merely a “horror show”. Indeed, in her presentation of the phrenologists and their image of the feminine we have a pragmatic example of how a scientific institution (phrenology) encouraged women to reach into spheres of activity (such as medicine) hitherto denied them, even when the theoretical basis of such “liberalism” was the innate difference between men and women.

This study rests heavily on existing work by a wide range of social and intellectual historians. And this is the real strength of Russett’s study—it summarizes and orders a mass of material

Book Reviews

from a wide range of secondary sources. While it tries for a comprehensive overview, it does rely heavily on the Anglo-American experience. Like Peter Gay's study of middle-class sexuality, Russett's work will be mined for a great deal of insightful material, but it also has some rather substantial drawbacks. For this presents the reader who is interested in the continental parallels with certain rather complex questions which are not really dealt with except by analogy with the "Victorian" (i.e., Anglo-American) substance of the book. Let me take one example. In a well structured chapter on "women and the cosmic nightmare" Russett cites Stephen Jay Gould on Gustave Le Bon and quotes his label of Le Bon's work as "the most vicious attack on women in modern scientific literature". She then notes: "In fact, Le Bon would face stiff competition for the title from writers like Cesare Lombroso or P. J. Möbius" (190). The problem with such off-hand remarks is that they lump together very different representations of the feminine with very different national and cultural traditions. Le Bon's anti-feminist rhetoric, which is closely related to his anti-Semitic views, grew out of French social science of the late nineteenth century (see Robert Nye on this topic) and had very little to do with Lombroso's self-defensive posture as an Italian Jew and as a forensic psychiatrist cum anthropologist. Möbius in turn stood in quite a different tradition, the pseudo-philosophical and rhetorical tradition of Schopenhauer and Nietzsche. In shorthand terms: Le Bon was a French social scientist with all the pretensions of a natural scientist using the rhetoric of positivism; Lombroso was a clinician who wanted to be a social scientist and used the rhetoric of the new positivistic social sciences to defend his status as a Jewish insider; and Möbius was a "modernist", using the "new" rhetoric of philosophical speculation in his science. While the images may all be "vicious attacks on women", and of that there is little argument, it would be helpful to see these figures as discrete and different. What is missing from Russett's study is a sense that the definition of gender is multifaceted. Russett examines the image of the "female" as generated by the "male" and assumes that the self-image of the male is constant and unchanging (in any given period) or in the articulation of what seems to be "identical" views about the feminine. This leads the reader to wonder about the complexity of the images of the feminine generated by the monolithic phallogocentric science, without asking whether the male scientists involved in this project were truly as homogeneous as Russett (and many other historians) assume.

In this study Russett is sketching a broad set of developments in the idea of the woman within the ideas and institutions of nineteenth- and twentieth-century science. For the detailed analysis of the motivation and meaning of this symbolic language within the world of the individual scientists studied, one can go to the rich range of her sources.

Sander L. Gilman, Cornell University

PIETRO CORSI, *Science and religion: Baden Powell and the Anglican debate, 1800–1860*, Cambridge University Press, 1988, 8vo, pp. ix, 346, £32.50/\$54.50.

The Reverend Baden Powell, as Pietro Corsi points out in this impressive new study, was the first prominent Anglican to fully support the *Origin of species*. From the late 1830s onwards, Powell had tirelessly advocated advanced positions in philosophy, theology, and science. He campaigned to reform Oxford University, where he was professor of natural philosophy for many decades. Yet Powell has been largely bypassed by the recent blossoming of work on early Victorian science, much of which is still focused exclusively on Darwin.

Beyond providing the first modern study of Powell himself, *Science and religion* also opens up new perspectives on the more general subject indicated in its title. Powell's career is of special interest here, for he began in the conservative evangelical Hackney phalanx, and ended as perhaps the most liberal clergyman of the period. Indeed, if there is a problem in using Powell as a case-study, it is that his positions were not widely shared among the rank and file of the Anglican clergy. Although Corsi recognizes this, it is easy to get the impression that the messages from early Victorian pulpits were much more liberal than they really were.

Corsi's understanding of the intellectual controversies of the period is unrivalled, and his analysis points up important figures and issues which await study. This is especially evident in