

Book Reviews

found out that, as a Jew, his aims were thwarted. Thus, he started working as a practical neurologist in Frankfurt and built up a private anatomical laboratory in order to continue his systematic and comparative studies of the brain. Only in 1914—four years before his death—was his Neurological Institute incorporated into the new University and Edinger made a professor.

Dr. Emisch's book is divided into two parts. The first deals with the biography, the second with Edinger's scientific contributions, in particular with his attempt to establish a psychology on anatomical grounds. The author is in the good position of being able to base her story on an unpublished autobiography of Edinger. Unfortunately, however, she restricts her historiographical viewpoint to Edinger's narrative. Consequently, the reader gets the impression that the historian does not know much more than her subject. She "believes" Edinger's remarks on the medical faculties of Heidelberg and Strasbourg, or on the status of neuroanatomy in 1880, instead of comparing them with other sources or with secondary literature. It is also regrettable that Dr Emisch did not compare Edinger's biography with those of other Jewish intellectuals.

In the second part the author plausibly argues that Edinger regarded his anatomical research as a service for psychology. The most important result of the book is that Edinger's combination of comparative anatomy and of studies in animal behaviour made him one of the early contributors to animal psychology. These passages are highly informative, but again one would have wished she had compared Edinger's approach with similar works by Theodor Meynert, Bernhard von Gudden, or Paul Flechsig. Despite these shortcomings the author has directed our attention to a very important figure in late-nineteenth-century brain research.

Michael Hagner, Georg-August-Universität, Göttingen

JEROME NEU (ed.), *The Cambridge companion to Freud*, Cambridge Companion series, Cambridge University Press, 1991, pp. x, 356, £40.00, \$59.95 (hardback, 0-521-37424-3), £12.95, \$17.95 (paperback 0-521-37779-X).

Freud as a philosopher! Perhaps the old man would have been pleased. When he was a student he admired Franz Brentano and understood the philosophical debates of his time as well as any physician. Jerome Neu, a philosopher at the University of California, Santa Cruz, has put together this, the most recent volume in the "Cambridge companion to major philosophers", series running from Aquinas to Spinoza (but including Marx and Foucault).

Neu, who has psychoanalytic training, has compiled a volume which truly serves as a "companion" to Freud. Not exactly a source book, not exactly a historical introduction, it provides in-depth essays on a series of topics which frame Freud's work. But he is not considered as a philosopher in the narrow sense of that word, for to do that would be to destroy the therapeutic dimensions of psychoanalysis and that Neu is unwilling to do.

Thus the only truly "philosophic" chapter is the last—David Sachs' answer to Adolf Grünbaum's critique of the scientific claims of psychoanalysis—and it is very much the exception. For, rather than seeing Grünbaum's presentation as part of a critical reception of the scientificity of Freud's work beginning with the initial critiques in the late nineteenth century and extending via Eysenck to Grünbaum (and beyond), Sachs focuses with intense philosophic scrutiny on Grünbaum's argument. Since this debate has been widely explored, Sachs' contribution is an interesting, yet minor note to the discussion. Having appeared first in *The Philosophical Review* in 1989, it is part of an on-going, rather technical dialogue which should have been broader for this purpose.

Other reprints, including Neu's own chapter on "perversion", Carl Schorske's brilliant, indeed classic, piece on the "psycho-archaeology" of psychoanalysis, and Richard Wollheim's deservedly widely cited piece on Freudian aesthetics provide broadly focused, intelligent overviews of the problems they address. They are inclusive rather than exclusive. However, in the light of recent work, especially that of William McGrath, Schorske's best known student, a piece on the young Freud and his interests—especially in philosophy—could have augmented this aspect of the volume.

Book Reviews

The remaining essays were all newly commissioned. Gerald Izenberg provides a balanced and readable account of the abandonment of the seduction theory (taking into consideration the newest discussions on this topic). Clark Glymour's piece reflects on Freud's relationship to nineteenth-century philosophy (including Franz Brentano) and neurology in terms of Freud's understanding of the mechanism of the nervous system. James Hopkins provides a solid, well balanced introduction to the *Interpretation of Dreams*. Sebastian Gardner limits his discussion of Freud's understanding of the unconscious within the specific discourse of psychoanalysis. Here some attention to the older discussion of the pre-history of the unconscious would have been in order. Bennett Simon and Rachel B. Blass introduce the Oedipus complex with all of the contemporary critiques, a theme echoed with sensitivity and depth in Nancy Chodorow's chapter on Freud's understanding of women. Jennifer Church raises the question of ethics and the problem of radical relativism often lobbed at Freud. The final two chapters, by Robert Paul and John Deigh, supply a balanced introduction to Freud's reading of culture.

As can be seen from this litany of material, this is a volume which can (and I suspect is) being used to provide the deep background for readings of Freud. With Freud now firmly among the philosophers, one hopes that further volumes in this series might address other such figures. A volume on Klein or Winnicott would seem appropriate. Here, too, a readership is present and a corpus which is complex enough to provide a focus for interested minds.

Jerome Neu and Cambridge University Press are to be complimented. They have given the reader a useful, well written (and well edited) volume which provides a relatively inexpensive supplement for student and teacher alike.

Sander L. Gilman, Cornell University

K. VAN BERKEL, M. J. VAN LIEBERG, H. A. M. SNELDERS, *Spiegelbeeld der Wetenschap. Het Genootschap ter Bevordering van Natuur-, Genees- en Heelkunde 1790–1990* [The Reflection of Science. The Society for the Advancement of Natural Science, Medicine and Surgery, 1700–1990], Nieuwe Nederlandse Bijdragen tot de Geschiedenis der Geneeskunde en der Natuurwetenschappen No. 40, Rotterdam, Erasmus Publishing, 1991, pp. 184, illus., NLG 79.50, \$45.00 (hardback, 90–5235–023–X), NLG 59.50, \$35.00 (paperback, 90–5235–022–1).

In 1990 the Amsterdam Society for the Advancement of Science celebrated its 200th birthday, and this is the book commissioned by the Society to commemorate the occasion. Much of it—about two-thirds—is an account of the activities of the Society in some detail, and this provides an appropriate revision and extension of previous commemorative volumes issued in 1915 and 1965. But the book is more ambitious than this: it attempts to use the history of the Society as a route into the history of science in general, and of Dutch science in particular: hence the title, *The reflection of science*.

The day-to-day history of the Society is handled in two substantial sections by van Lieberg (1790–1890) and Snelders (1870–1990); Klaas van Berkel provides the large introductory section, which seeks to clarify the overall development of the Society by examining its view of science and of its own tasks within science. The aims and work of the Society have changed enormously over the last two centuries, as has science itself. For some of the period at least, claims van Berkel, the fortunes of the Society reflect those of science in general. It started as an Amsterdam club for surgeons, concerned to elevate the trade of surgery to an academic discipline: the local surgeons' guild was kept very much at arm's length. The methods employed were the ones common to most eighteenth-century Enlightenment-generated societies: essay competitions, and the publication of the Society's deliberations. By the twentieth century, things had changed: essays had been abandoned, though lectures, demonstrations and publications continued, and the Society now actively subsidized research, travel and even professorships. It was no longer concerned exclusively with medicine, but embraced all subjects, especially the natural sciences. What had happened, and how did the Society deal with the changes?

The main change was, says van Berkel, the increasing influence of the natural sciences on the medical world, so that, by the last quarter of the nineteenth century, doctors and surgeons had