

intended to compile the latest ornithological knowledge, based upon Dresser's detailed study of specimens. Although Dresser's name was on the title page as the sole author of this book, it was made possible by a large network of collectors from across Europe. McGhie goes into great detail regarding the painstaking process of collating the necessary material, describing the relationships between Dresser and his many collaborators and rivals, with some individuals such as Richard Bowdler Sharpe (1847–1909) falling into both categories. In this respect, *Henry Dresser and Victorian Ornithology* adds to the growing literature regarding the cultures of natural-history collecting, and the interactions between diverse individuals and networks that produced knowledge of the natural world.

McGhie explicitly compares his biography of Henry Dresser to Jim Endersby's book *Imperial Nature* (2008), on the career of the botanist Joseph Hooker (p. 4). There are some similarities, in that both books take the life of an individual and situate it within the wider context of nineteenth-century natural history. However, while Endersby's work speaks to the historiography of professionalization, Darwinism and empire, *Henry Dresser and Victorian Ornithology* places a much greater emphasis on the specifics of Dresser's life. While McGhie's approach serves as a thorough case study, the broader relevance of Dresser's activity could have been developed further in places. For example, Endersby highlighted the pains which Joseph Hooker took to avoid the tainted label of 'professional', despite holding a paid position for his botanical work, preferring to be considered a 'philosophical naturalist'. A similarly nuanced approach towards Dresser's status, spanning the worlds of metropolitan commerce and science, may have served as an instructive counterpoint.

Among the primary attractions of Dresser's books, funded by private subscription, were the beautifully detailed illustrations of birds. To those accustomed to more austere academic monographs, with a limited number of images due to copyright law and its attendant expense, it will be refreshing to find that *Henry Dresser and Victorian Ornithology* reproduces a great many of these illustrations in full colour. Aside from the aesthetic advantages, these images are useful in helping the reader to differentiate between the multitudes of species named in the book, many of which will be unfamiliar to the casual birdwatcher (particularly those that are now extinct).

An erroneous reference to 'Austen's *Jane Eyre*' (p. 10) is unfortunate, but otherwise McGhie has been meticulous in his approach, tracing the threads of Dresser's life across several continents. This book should be of value to those interested in both the congruities and peculiarities of ornithology within nineteenth-century British natural history.

MATTHEW WALE
University of Leicester

HEATHER ELLIS, *Masculinity and Science in Britain, 1831–1918*. London and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017. Pp. 240. ISBN 978-1-137-31173-3. £66.99 (hardcover)
doi:10.1017/S0007087418000869

In the late 1850s and early 1860s, the physicist John Tyndall spent much time exploring the Alps, combining mountaineering with scientific observation. After reading Tyndall's *Mountaineering in 1861: A Vacation Tour* (1862), the barrister and mountaineer Alfred Wills observed that the book was 'bold, manly & suggestive & will do good – and I am glad indeed when I find a true man of science uttering straightforwardly what many think but will not say' (British Library, BL63902-874E-10-51). For Tyndall, the arduous physical performance associated with mountaineering was a highly effective vehicle for establishing his authority as a man of science, and he published several books that combined science and travel. Yet, as Heather Ellis argues in *Masculinity and Science in Britain, 1831–1918*, Tyndall's performance as a 'true man of science' formed part of a construction of what it meant to be a man and a scientific practitioner in the nineteenth century, which was neither straightforward nor stable. Ellis promises an in-depth examination

of how British male scientific practitioners navigated an unstable masculine ideal, which did not always square easily with the changing roles of scientific theorists and practitioners.

As the title hints, Ellis focuses much of the book around the British Association for the Advancement of Science (BAAS), which was founded in 1831. Ellis examines the changing structure of BAAS annual meetings, and the ways the meetings and their attendees were portrayed and discussed, both privately and publicly. For example, in Chapter 2, ‘The changing public image of the “man of science”, 1600–1830’, Ellis shows that the performance of gender was important for men in the BAAS, regardless of whether women were allowed to attend the scientific and social aspects of the meetings or not. Through attempts to reinvent the image of the ‘man of science’ and the BAAS, gender norms were also significant for men in relation to other men. Was the ‘true man of science’ a recluse, an aristocrat, an experimentalist, a gentleman or something else? Chapter 4 – “‘An effete world’: gendered criticism and the British Association’ – suggests that attempts to create an aristocratic atmosphere at the BAAS, for example by inviting women, evoked criticisms of theatricality and foppish self-display. The question of authenticity gained further traction through discussions on meritocracy and science.

Ellis makes an interesting observation, that because much of the present scholarship on the relationship between gender and science has focused on retrieving forgotten and marginalized voices, primarily female, there has been less attention devoted to examinations of how gender norms affected men and their scientific practice. The reason for this is fairly obvious, of course, as historians of science, technology and medicine generally left the practice of writing internalist hagiographies of the white, rich male ‘geniuses’ in the previous century. Yet, as Ellis rightly points out, this does not mean that studying masculinity and science is outdated. In fact, by exploring how there was no set and easily defined masculine way of embodying scientific practice, Ellis illustrates that gender and science were both unstable categories entangled in a continuous renegotiation throughout the nineteenth century.

However, this is not as novel an argument as it is made to be. For a work on gender and science, this book suffers from a surprising lack of engagement with the historiography on masculinity and science, as well as on nineteenth-century science more generally. This is particularly clear in Chapter 5, ‘Thomas Carlyle, the X-Club and the hero as man of science’, where Ellis puts the spotlight on the Red Lions and their role in developing the friendship circles of men who would later be known as the X-Club. This and the following chapter would have benefited from an engagement with books such as Ursula DeYoung’s biography of John Tyndall, *A Vision of Modern Science* (2011), and Bernard Lightman’s *Victorian Popularizers of Science* (2007), which both detail Huxley and Tyndall’s fascination with Thomas Carlyle. Some engagement with the *Osiris* special issue on *Scientific Masculinities* (2015) edited by Erika L. Milam and Robert A. Nye, and in particular the article by Michael Reidy, ‘Mountaineering, masculinity, and the male body in mid-Victorian Britain’, would also have expanded and strengthened Ellis’s otherwise interesting arguments. Although there are parts of *Masculinity and Science in Britain, 1831–1918* which *BJHS* readers are sure to find interesting, well written and clear in argumentation, the book does not fully deliver on its promise of providing the first in-depth study of British scientific masculinity in the nineteenth century.

NANNA KATRINE LÜDERS KAALUND
University of Cambridge

JANET BROWNE (ed.), *The Quotable Darwin*. Princeton, NJ and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2018. Pp. xxix + 348. ISBN 978-0-691-16935-4. \$24.95 (hardcover).
doi:10.1017/S0007087418000870

The Quotable Darwin is the latest installment of a series that includes *The Quotable Feynman* (2015), *The Quotable Jung* (2015) and *The Quotable Kierkegaard* (2013), among others.