

## Book Reviews

member of a class. The suggestion that the perfect world which Hodgkin was striving to bring about might have an order not accessible to Hodgkin himself is not seriously entertained. That there might be secular historical forces at work of which Hodgkin might be the instrument, not the commander, does not enter the Quaker purview.

Christopher Lawrence  
Wellcome Institute

MICHAEL COLLIE, *Henry Maudsley: Victorian psychiatrist. A bibliographical study*, Winchester, St Paul's Bibliographies, 1988, 8vo, pp. xvii, 205, illus., £30.00.

Henry Maudsley (1835–1918) has remained strangely elusive despite his apparent familiarity. Quoted at will, and usually with disapproval, by modern commentators, he provides the archetypal image of the Victorian alienist. But behind the twelve principal books and 80 or more articles, reviews, and pamphlets there is very little else to grasp. There are some letters, the usual obituaries, the minutes of the Medico-Psychological Association (MPA) and a brief autobiographical fragment, but no biography of note and some large lacunae. While therefore it may seem odd that a professor of English should choose to write a *bibliographical* study of an “organic” psychiatrist, it should nevertheless be welcomed. After all, Maudsley wrote of Shakespeare “Testimonied in his own Bringingsforth”, so why not bring forth Maudsley in his own writings. They are the essence of the man, in all their stolid grandeur, and their often convoluted style and repeated contradictions (as well as their second-hand rarity) make them less than accessible today.

Professor Collie regards his study as a “work of recovery and restoration”, and he has written a “longish, [79 pages] non-specialist introduction outlining the main events of Maudsley’s career”. The bibliographical details have all the attributes beloved of the first-class book-dealer’s catalogue (“*Front cover* Five blind-stamped rules at top and bottom”) as well as the alchemical mysteries of pagination (Collation [A]<sup>4</sup> B–Y<sup>8</sup>; 172 leaves (21.6 × 14); [i]–viii [l]–333 [334–6]). He has also summarized 54 of the signed articles, and this detail is an admirable strength of the book. Two appendices include an autobiographical piece, written about 1907, and part of Maudsley’s contribution—on therapeutics—to Reynold’s 1866 *System of medicine*. There is no doubt therefore that the work of recovery (including some nice photographs) has been thorough, and will be indispensable to future analyses of Victorian psychiatry.

The disappointment of this work is the lack of references. There is an index of course and a brief ‘Selected reading list’, but many statements, especially in the introduction, are left unsupported. We are told of a letter to the *Daily Telegraph* claiming that Maudsley knew the Ripper (p.xvi). We are told “there was no point in looking back in time to anything before 1867” (p. 25) and that “novelists read his works with greater attention than he reads theirs” (p. 68). This is perhaps allowable as an imaginative recreation of a life, but a documentary life, as Schoenbaum’s Shakespeare, need not be thus adorned. The constant use of the phrase “must have” illustrates the problem. Much that Maudsley said—in the minutes of the MPA and before an 1877 Select Committee—was recorded verbatim, so why not quote directly?

Nevertheless, the facts remain indispensable. There is a most useful discussion of the relation between Maudsley’s work and that of Gissing and Meredith—both the subjects of previous bibliographies by Collie—and an elucidation of the public role of the law report in a world of hidden psychiatry. Maudsley’s key first work, *The physiology and pathology of mind* (1867) also emerges as the book no one else quite dared to write. Now that someone has dared to write the first book about Henry Maudsley, it may be possible to begin a true historical evaluation of his much maligned profession.

T. H. Turner  
Hackney Hospital, London

MARIO LANCIK, *Der Breslauer Psychiater Carl Wernicke. Werkanalyse und Wirkungsgeschichte als Beitrag zur Medizingeschichte Schlesiens*, Schlesische Forschungen, Veröffentlichungen des Gerhard-Möbus-Instituts für Schlesienforschung an der Universität Würzburg e.V., Bd. 2, Sigmaringen, Jan Thorbecke, 1988, 8vo, pp. 98, illus., DM 26.00.

## Book Reviews

Wernicke's aphasia, Wernicke's encephalopathy, Wernicke-Mann hemiplegia, Wernicke's area, Wernicke's bundle, Wernicke's fissure . . . : such monuments to the localization of mental disorders in cerebral pathology are familiar to every student of psychiatry and higher cortical function. In this workman-like, if brief, biography, Lanczik shows how Wernicke exemplified the achievements of the German-Austrian materialist traditions pre-eminent in the study of "nervous diseases" in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. A Silesian, trained in the neurological clinics of Griesinger's Berlin and Meynert's Vienna, Wernicke was singularly well-qualified, and well-placed, when he took up his professorship in Breslau in 1885, to capitalize on the geographical advantages which made this university town open to both Prussian and Austro-Hungarian influences. Convinced that psychological states and processes could be localized to precisely demarcated areas of the brain, Wernicke went beyond meticulous clinical and anatomical description, of which he was a master, to classify and schematize his observations, and thence to over-simplify them. Lanczik pays little attention to the rumblings of dissent from strict cerebral localization in the medical literature of Wernicke's time. He confirms, however, that shortly after Wernicke's death, when the rumblings had swelled to a roar, the dogmas of localization fell into disrepute. Wernicke's many distinguished pupils—Bonhoeffer, Heilbronner, and Liepmann, among them—made plain that his lasting contribution lay in his masterly observations, which called for supplementation and systematic interpretation rather than the rejection of all localization, as the anti-materialist critics would have it, as so much "cerebral mythology".

With recent advances in the study of higher cortical function in the neurosciences, principally in the field of vision and perception, the pendulum has swung back towards "materialism". But analysis is at a different level to that practicable in Wernicke's time and the focus is now not on cortical areas but on their cellular architecture, functional organization, and neurochemical and neurogenetic correlates. With the emergence of a new precision in the description of cortical structure and function, clinical observation and its interpretation in the light of the "new" neuroanatomy has become even more instructive. We would do well to follow Wernicke's lesson in this regard.

This little book, in cataloguing the distinctive contributions of Wernicke, with a sketch of their subsequent history based on a modest selection of the voluminous sources available, demonstrates the need for broader intellectual biography which would illuminate a decisive chapter in the history of the search for a physical basis of mind.

Elizabeth Whitcombe  
Birkbeck College

SYDNEY A. HALPERN, *American paediatrics: the social dynamics of professionalism 1880–1980*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, University of California Press, 1988, 8vo, pp. xi, 228, \$27.50.

Not least of the reasons for welcoming this sociological study of American paediatrics is the author's firm belief that medical specialization (seen as a variant of professionalization) "is best explained through genuinely historical inquiry" (p. 160). Although, in reality, only scant attention is paid to the wider socio-economic, political, and intellectual contexts within which American paediatrics developed, this book's historically grounded, rigorous analysis of the evolution of career strategies and structures in paediatrics is a model of its kind. Drawing largely on paediatricians' own statements of the nature and purpose of their speciality, Sydney Halpern exposes the conceptual discontinuities over time and provides jargon-free explanations for the underlying social processes.

Despite the untypical origins and character of this non-organ based specialism, the contours of the specialization process present few surprises. Deceptively, perhaps, Halpern's exposure of the means by which paediatricians established their place in the medical division of labour, organized professional associations, secured status, captured markets, and consolidated their knowledge and power bases conforms to a familiar pattern. Moreover, in discussing these phenomena, Halpern reveals herself a pluralist, as willing to acknowledge the catalytic, and