

labours and making up bills, the wait for deaths, weave in and out of the letters to Hampton in chance remarks. More unusual conditions, such as a gunshot wound, or how best to obtain good cow-pox matter, or the news that Richard sen. was successfully competing with other local practitioners, merited fuller discussion. The letters from home display hard-working medical men whose practice embraced a range of patients from the poor supported by the parish to respectable neighbourhood families. Along with a modest income from farm land, the profession provided the Weekes with a comfortable life and funds to send Hampton, and later Dick, to complete their medical training in London.

Hampton's letters detail his ups and downs as a boarding pupil with George Whitfield, St Thomas's resident apothecary. These are a treasure trove for anyone interested in medical education at a large London hospital in the early nineteenth century, although a dangerous foundation for sweeping generalizations. Hampton had already learned quite a bit from his father. In London he concentrated, occasionally to excess, on anatomy: his passion for dissecting, making preparations, and memorizing the minutiae of nerves, blood vessels, and muscles fills his letters to the exclusion of much about lectures or clinical practice at the hospital. The accounts of the dissecting room, with references to pupils constantly buying parts of corpses to study, vividly reveal how much discreet trading went on within St Thomas's walls. Hampton was moderately ambitious and sought (without success) the attention of such prominent medical men as Henry Cline, surgeon at St Thomas's, with hopes that he might be "advanced" in the profession. Hampton, a grind with a complacent disdain for many of the other pupils, was a rather pompous young man who was, nevertheless, seriously trying to extend his knowledge at a time when such extra work was not a legal requirement for medical or surgical practice.

Having read the Weekes' letters in manuscript, I can only praise John Ford's meticulous transcription of what are sometimes confusing scrawls. To reproduce the full text of each letter, with the original spelling and wildly erratic punctuation, was a wise decision. Not only has direct rendition reduced any unfortunate editorial interpretations of what the correspondents meant to a minimum, it retains the full flavour of the family's style and exuberance. At times, however, Dr Ford was too sparing with the editor's hand. Frequently, several of the Weekes wrote a single letter to Hampton, and the transitions from one person to another, usually clear in the manuscripts, are not always identified within the published texts, although the multiple authors are noted. Similarly, while Dr Ford painstakingly attempted to identify all of the people, places, shops and books mentioned, there are a few lacunae that reveal an understandable medical bias. For example, he has tracked down all the references to medical texts and given full citations in his notes, but overlooked the comment about Blair's *Sermons*. As the Weekes were not a particularly religious family, more information about this choice of reading could have been informative.

In his Introduction, Dr Ford provides vital background about the Weekes family, Hurstpierpoint and the organization of St Thomas's Hospital. Having visited the Weekes' homes, delved into record offices for details about the family's property, and read contemporary accounts of hospital education, Dr Ford conveys his own fascination with the Weekes' correspondence with simplicity and care. Readers should be warned, however, that this introduction is no substitute for the letters themselves. They convey nuances that no summary can capture and are, with no claim to literary merit, vastly entertaining.

Susan Lawrence
Ball State University

RAQUEL ALVAREZ PELÁEZ and RAFAEL HUERTAS GARCÍA-ALEJO, *¿Criminales o locos? Dos peritajes psiquiátricos del Dr Gonzalo R. Lafora*, Cuadernos Galileo del Historia de la Ciencia, No. 6, Madrid, Centro de Estudios Históricos, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1987, 12mo, pp. 331, [no price stated].

On 9 June 1933, Aurora Rodríguez, an anarchist militant of the Spanish branch of the League for Sexual Reform, shot and killed her daughter, whom she had conceived eugenically and raised to carry out her ideals. Hildegart, the rebellious daughter, was a feminist youth leader

and titular head of the League. This sensational murder involved the Spanish psychiatric community, as medical experts for both defence and prosecution, and as commentators for a shocked public. One of the latter was Gonzalo R. Lafora, whose archives on the Hildegart case and that of Gregorio Cárdenas, a Mexican serial killer, provide the raw material for this excellent study of forensic psychiatry and the social construction of madness.

The authors offer a Foucaultian analysis of the relationship between psychiatry and ideology, when the focus is the line that divides madness and criminality. Like Foucault, they are concerned to illuminate the ways in which psychiatric doctrine is implicated in the mechanisms of power.

The Hildegart case is the perfect medium for such an analysis, because the defence experts Sacristán and Prados, political liberals operating within a psychoanalytic domain, argued Aurora's madness, while the prosecution team, the conservative nationalists Vallejo and Piga, sought to establish her rationality. The root issues, of the perpetrator's responsibility and her threat to society, were those around which forensic psychiatry evolved in nineteenth-century France, as the authors explain.

As Aurora's trial proceeded, it became clear that the experts on both sides had difficulty in distinguishing the defendant's anarchist ideology from the ostensible disease, paranoia. Sacristán, following Kraepelin, further specified that Aurora suffered from megalomania, "subgroup social reformism" ("eugenic delirium", said Prados), a revealing diagnosis inasmuch as Sacristán, a member of the League for Sexual Reform, could well have been reckoned a follower of Aurora! Her danger to society was proved by her "aggressive" personality, and her antisocial behaviour in prison (she protested the conditions) was further proof of her illness. The authors observe that men holding similar views were not deemed aggressive; and that Aurora's advocacy of limiting male procreation to a three-year period by "temporary vasectomies" was patent evidence of madness/criminality to all male commentators, of whatever political persuasion. Right-wing newspapers seconded the prosecution's intimations that political extremism was the source of Aurora's depravity.

On an analytical level, perhaps the most important contribution of Alvarez and Huertas is their discussion of the interaction between psychoanalysis and Lombrosian biological determinism in the approach of Spanish psychiatrists to criminality and madness. Crime, by this dual criterion, was associated with both regressivity (in the social-Darwinian sense) and neurosis. Moreover, there was a perfect fit between the two approaches: psychoanalysts held that neurosis and criminality had a common source in infantile sexuality and the "beast" within, struggling against prohibited desires, notions easily related to Lombroso's conception of a criminal as a savage throwback to an earlier state of human society. Indeed, the authors could have clinched their argument with greater emphasis on Freud's Darwinian anthropology, replete as it was with recapitulationist logic. That psychoanalysis stimulated forensic psychiatry by providing a battery of theories and practical tests is amply demonstrated. Sacristán's Rorschach results on Aurora and Lafora's on Cárdenas (both reproduced) make clear the psychoanalytic interpretations of both psychiatrists, neither of whom were orthodox Freudians.

Thomas F. Glick
Boston University

DAVID ROSNER and GERALD MARKOWITZ (editors), *Dying for work: workers' safety and health in twentieth century America*, Bloomington and Indianapolis, Indiana University Press, 1987, 8vo, pp. xx, 234, \$35.00.

This collection of essays addresses one of the most neglected areas of medical history—the interaction between work and health—and as such it should be welcomed by anyone interested in the social history of medicine, health, and indeed labour. Quite rightly, the editors interpret issues of health and safety at work in America within a broader framework of class conflict and struggle over the labour process and the production environment. The first section of the book focuses on alternative approaches to industrial health problems, with chapters investigating