

## 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

## Book Reviews

the three chapters on “the species question” in the decades before Darwin. Here the discussion leaves the roads well-trampled by historians of evolution, and brings to light many important but hitherto unread works that bear directly on the question. He emphasizes the importance of continental discussions of the origin of species, thus connecting this study with his recent *The age of Lamarck* (1989). Just how widely read these continental works were remains debatable, and in general the audiences for the texts dealt with here could benefit from further discussion. Certainly the French and German texts had an effect on key figures like Lyell and Powell himself. Further attention to the medical world—the subject of Adrian Desmond’s *Politics of evolution*—would support Corsi’s insistence on what he calls “the French threat”.

*Science and religion* sets a new standard of historical sophistication for its subject. It provides a much-needed picture of a major figure, and illuminates wider debates about philosophy, science, and faith.

J. A. Secord, Imperial College, London

RUTH HARRIS, *Murder and madness: medicine, law, and society in the fin de siècle*, Oxford Historical Monographs, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1989, 8vo, pp. x, 366, illus., £30.00.

This book represents a major contribution to the history of forensic medicine and the sexual stereotyping of men and women late in the nineteenth century, both within medicine and in society generally. It is an Oxford doctoral thesis, inspired by Roger Smith’s pioneering *Trial by medicine: insanity and responsibility in Victorian trials* (1981). Some readers may find objectionable the author’s feminist interpretations of psychiatrists’ motives, especially the conclusion which speculates that medical willingness to view female patients and female criminals as biologically-driven minors was a response to the eruption of feminism in late nineteenth-century France. But the book’s painstaking analysis of dozens of cases from the Paris courts over the period 1880 to 1910 gives it an authoritative tone that will not easily be challenged.

Harris’s argument is that the courts’ classic imputation to the accused of responsibility and rationality, and the measured weighing out of retribution, were overturned by the rise of the first biological psychiatry in the nineteenth century, a rise to which Jean-Martin Charcot, a non-psychiatrist, contributed with his theories of hysteria. This “first” biological psychiatry (not Harris’s phrase) saw women in particular as driven by the force of Nature, especially by their easily excitable nervous systems, rather than by reason. Consequently, psychiatric opinions in court heavily emphasized “hysteria” and “degeneration” as explanations for female crimes of passion, and the female defendants were almost invariably acquitted. Thus it is fair to speak of a certain “medicalization of morality” (p. 18), very much culture-bound and quite without the support of genuine scientific findings, to which psychiatry and neurology contributed their share in the nineteenth century.

In chapter four we reach the archival material, in a discussion of legal procedure and medical intervention. The stage at this point is dominated by Paul Brouardel, the most influential forensic medical figure of his day. Chapter five, on “women, hysteria and hypnosis”, attempts to show how doctors’ firm opposition to lay hypnotizers (“magnetizers”) was motivated by concern about keeping women “pure” from the sexual advances of Jewish and working-class hypnotists, indeed by protecting physicians themselves from their own baser impulses. Here Charcot’s Salpêtrière school is chastised, the master’s own doctrines portrayed as a “refined stage in the medical ‘pathologization’ of women” (p. 203). Just as doctrines of anti-feminism were knocked by Third Republic liberals from the hands of the Catholic Church, Charcot and his disciples, according to Harris, scooped them up and carried them further. Now, whether Charcot and his pupils were any more anti-woman than the average middle-class male of the time remains to be seen, but Harris offers a number of specific interpretations of proceedings in the Salpêtrière that future scholarship will wish to confront.

The real core of the book comprises the next two chapters, on “female crimes of passion” and “alcoholism and the working-class man”, the basis of each being largely archival. A further