

Book Reviews

theories of matter were preferred at any given historical time. But one figure particularly makes a welcome appearance among these extracts and that is Oswald Spengler. Spengler could see, with considerable historical accuracy, that science itself should properly be seen as evolving out of prior religious precedents; but perhaps more strikingly he sensed that what he called "Western physics" was drawing near to the limits of its possibilities. In that sense Spengler makes use of many of the thinkers who are represented elsewhere in this volume and provides its theme. So much of nineteenth-century science performs this double act: the double act of advancing materialist explanations of phenomena, while at the same time rendering those phenomena even more mysterious. By completing, in Sections 5 and 6, their work by providing extracts from the life sciences, one of these being entitled "The Mystery of Life" the editors complete what by now has become a consistent thread in this volume. This leaves them open, rather intriguingly, to leave the last extract to Emile Durkheim, where the case is put for regarding scientific belief as analogous to religion.

The volume on historical studies is even more varied, but all students of nineteenth-century science must be grateful that it at last provides a home for a much-quoted but until now unavailable article: R. M. Young's "Natural theology, Victorian periodicals and the fragmentation of a common context". There are also useful reprintings, notably J. Farley and G. L. Geison on the Pasteur-Pouchet debate; J. Burchfield on Kelvin and the age of the earth; and E. Fee on the sexual politics of Victorian social anthropology. It is also very welcome that the editors have reprinted Paul Forman's piece on Weimar culture and the development of quantum theory, particularly since they managed to follow it with John Hendry's reply to the exciting, if occasionally misconceived, claims that Forman made in his original, and indeed seminal, article.

Both volumes will be particularly useful for students in these fields, and both follow the notion of science and belief, and indeed science *as* belief. This prompts the reflection that a good deal of the approach favoured by the Open University in this Darwin to Einstein course is one that seeks to expose the misconceptions that will accompany a purely materialist philosophy of life. Is it possible that the very nineteenth-century idea that religion has little to fear from science has found its latest advocate in the history of science courses of one of our most notable public services?

Michael Neve

Unit for the History of Medicine, University College London

MICHAEL HUNTER, *Science and society in Restoration England*, Cambridge University Press, 1981, 8vo, pp. xii, 233, £18.50 (£5.95 paperback).

The appearance of this book will be one of the most welcome events of this publishing year for historians of science. In view of the seminal importance of the Restoration period for British science, and the fierce scholarly campaigns which have been waged over the territory in the learned periodicals during the last generation, it is staggering that till now no general survey has been written. Dr. Hunter's book not only fills the gap, but fills it admirably.

Dr. Hunter has sensibly avoided writing either a narrative of the lives of late seventeenth-century scientists, or a chronicle of their achievements (there is not much

Book Reviews

here about scientific ideas or discoveries). Instead he tackles head-on in successive chapters the historiographical problems posed by Restoration science. What was its relationship to the natural philosophy of the Interregnum? What were the origins of the Royal Society? What was the importance of the Society during its first fifty years? How plausible is the Marxist-cum-Mertonian case that the development of capitalism and the accompanying needs of technology boosted interest in science and scientific advance? In its turn did science legitimize capitalism and an “opportunity society”? Did Puritanism, or Anglicanism, contribute to involvement in science? In its turn, how far was Restoration science used to buttress religion? Or was science a threat to faith (as also to humane letters and scholarly traditions of learning in the universities)?

These and other questions are discussed by Dr. Hunter with scrupulously accurate attention to arguments on all sides of the scholarly divide (no straw men – or women – here), and with a wealth of illustrative material of his own, much culled from unpublished archives – the testament to voracious reading and focused attention. If a middle course is steered on many of these issues, it is no wet compromise, but because the judicious Hunter (like the judicious Hooker) finds wisdom in many places, and constructs a golden mean of interpretation which surely does justice to the complexity of the age (the excellent critical bibliography raps some of the more one-sided versions of Restoration science over the knuckles). On issue after issue, Dr. Hunter is generous but balanced, praising, for example, the great merits of Charles Webster’s account of Interregnum science while properly alerting the reader to his partisan reading of the “betrayal” after 1660.

The medical historian might find here less of direct relevance to him than he expects. For Dr. Hunter has what seems a curious paradox to offer: that, though it was to a large degree in the bio-medical sciences that English science bloomed in mid-century, though the early members of the Royal Society included eminent biomedical men such as Thomas Willis, and though plenty of medical papers were printed in the *Philosophical Transactions*, in fact the London medical community related only rather fitfully to the Royal Society (Sydenham, for instance, did not join), and the Society did not contribute much to developments in medical science. Divided loyalties with the College of Physicians, and problems with professional identity may, suggests Dr. Hunter, have played their part in this.

Dr. Hunter has written a well-researched, closely argued, economical and lively book, essential reading for scholars and students alike. It is a pity that this well-produced volume (there are few misprints, except the now almost obligatory rendering of Charles Gillispie as Gillespie) of 230 pages should retail at the monstrous hardback price of £18.50.

Roy Porter
Wellcome Institute

NORMAN DAIN, *Clifford W. Beers: advocate for the insane*, Pittsburg, University of Pittsburgh Press, 1980, pp. xxix, 392, illus., \$19.95.

Clifford Beers (1876–1943) is remembered primarily as the author of an autobiographical study describing his own mental breakdown. Beers decided to write the book, entitled *The mind that found itself*, while in the manic phase of a manic-