

therapeutic idiolects on the other, and still maintain Jackson's continuity thesis. If such an endeavour requires different historiographical perspectives, Jackson's work nevertheless forms an essential and formidable resource.

Sonu Shamdasani,
The Wellcome Trust Centre for the
History of Medicine at UCL

Jonathan Andrews and Andrew Scull,
*Undertaker of the mind: John Monro and
mad-doctoring in eighteenth-century England,*
Medicine and Society Series, No. 11,
Berkeley and London, University of
California Press, 2001, pp. xxii, 364, illus.,
£24.95, US\$35.00 (hardback 0-520-23151-1).

Jonathan Andrews and Andrew Scull come at the social history of medicine from very different angles. Scull is a long-established figure known for his sweeping and controversial sociological theories based on historical material. Andrews is more junior, but has already made a distinguished contribution to the study of British madness between c. 1600 and 1900. His is closely archival work backed up by careful use of theories from various disciplines. At first sight, the pair might seem to be mismatched, but the collaboration that resulted in this book has proved highly successful. There is a tension between the approaches, but for most purposes that has proved productive. Indeed, the most stimulating sections are those where the authors disagree most, for, in contrast with most "textbook" expositions, both sides of a debate are expounded with equal vigour. The conclusions reached about prominent and emotive issues like alleged wrongful incarceration are balanced. One reason for the success of the collaboration is that both Andrews and Scull write extremely well and the style of this book is unusually lucid, readable and entertaining by the standard

of most academic works. Fifty engaging and informative text illustrations add to the appeal.

John Monro's career is already well researched. He was a visiting physician to Bethlem Hospital (Bedlam) in London, a successful private madhouse keeper, and a "society" physician. This book builds on existing scholarship by using evidence about some of the prominent cases in which Monro was involved to explore the wider context of mad-doctoring. The six substantial chapters deal with Monro and Bethlem; debates about lunacy in the eighteenth century, including Monro's public spats with William Battie; religion and madness, including Methodism and the case of Alexander Cruden (an excellent chapter); a short chapter on the madness of the Earl of Orford; one on the image and reality of keeping private madhouses; and a long concluding chapter on criminal insanity. Rather than relying on purely "medical" sources, the authors examine a wide range of materials, including visual images, diaries and family papers, to get closer to the experience of patients, their families and the wider community, as well as doctors. A rich and detailed analysis of the life and work of Monro is used as a way of exploring how people dealt with the mentally troubled in the eighteenth century. Monro is the focus, but the aim is to write about the mad business, professionalization of identification and treatment, attitudes towards the mad, madhouses and mad-doctors, the experience of madness among sufferers and observers, and medical understandings of the abnormal mind. Andrews and Scull capture very well the ambiguous definitions of mental disability, its Protean nature, and the deeply ambivalent attitudes among medical men and lay people alike towards mad-doctoring as a trade and profession.

There are small points that one might criticize. Some of the material has been recycled from other books by these two prolific authors. Other sections are familiar

Book Reviews

too. For example, much of the background material on issues like legislation will be thoroughly known to social historians of eighteenth-century medicine. The chapter on Earl Ferrers' and Nicholson's trials is principally narrative and does little to advance our understanding of the development of the insanity defence in the eighteenth century. At one level it is curiously old-fashioned, even if the analysis of social status and gender in determining the treatment of offenders is right up-to-date. Yet these reservations should not detract from a book that is often fascinating and original.

R A Houston,
University of St Andrews

Mark S Micale and Paul Lerner (eds), *Traumatic pasts: history, psychiatry, and trauma in the modern age, 1870–1930*, Cambridge Studies in the History of Medicine, Cambridge University Press, 2001, pp. xiv, 316, £40.00, US\$59.95 (hardback 0-521-58365-9).

It is not clear why it has taken five years for this collection of papers, originally given at a conference in Manchester in March 1996, to appear in print; but the delay is unfortunately timed. In the last seven years the historiography of trauma has been transformed, not simply by major historical studies by Allan Young and Ruth Leys, but by revisionist clinical writing on Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder. The main text of *Traumatic pasts*, despite some late retouching footnotes, is very much a product of the early 1990s, when young scholars explored trauma in the footsteps of Eric Leed and Elaine Showalter, using gender as their primary interpretative tool, and tended to project the PTSD model back into the past. The editors' blustering introduction, which dredges up a great many obscure works and ignores some central recent texts, cannot disguise that fact.

All the same, this is a welcome and

valuable book which adds significantly to our knowledge. Four sections look in turn at Victorian "travel and trauma", industrial trauma in the work place, *fin-de-siècle* theories of trauma, and the First World War; and, if there is occasional duplication, it is more than made up for by the steady accumulation of insight. A short review can touch on only some of the riches.

Once initial reluctance to accompany Drs Erichsen and Page on yet another railway journey had been overcome, I found Ralph Harrington thorough and useful on British "railway spine" literature, and Eric Caplan amiable and urbane on American. Harrington brings out the nuances of John Erichsen's position, while Caplan points up the ironic role of railway surgeons in pioneering psychotherapy.

By contrast, the section on industrial accidents and the German welfare state is disappointing. Neither Greg A Eghigian nor Wolfgang Schäffner provides the essential information needed by non-German readers and both write turgidly. Schäffner's chapter, which is full of lethal passages like "thus psychic trauma signifies probabilistic normalization", defeated me completely.

The theoretical section, however, is strong. Everyone who writes about the history of trauma already owes a substantial debt to Mark Micale and Paul Lerner for making the rich French and German literature accessible to their linguistically-challenged colleagues, and here Micale gives a fluent and authoritative review of Charcot's work on trauma, while Lerner sets Hermann Oppenheim's concept of traumatic neurosis firmly in the context of Wilhelmian medicine. In addition, Lisa Cardyn trawls effectively through the graphic American literature on female sexual trauma to show the reluctance of male doctors to probe the psychological causes of their patients' afflictions.

Finally, there is the Great War. In a valuable piece of revisionism, Peter Leese extends British "shell-shock" beyond the simplistic stereotypes popularized by Pat