

archetypes did have empirical virtues. And, of course, Owen achieved remarkable scientific successes, as with his work on the New Zealand moas, the Madagascar aye-aye, and the great apes.

Was it a defect in Huxley's opportunistic character that caused him to turn against Owen, initially his patron? By Rupke's account, it may seem that, from a psychological perspective, it was Huxley who was the malevolent, malicious, scheming, character; whereas Owen has traditionally been regarded thus. Or should we see the contest as "structural" rather than "personal"? Rupke does not quite answer this question. As is often the case with biographers, he begins to identify with his subject. Or at any rate, he appears to make every effort to represent Owen in the best possible light. This is a valuable counterweight to "Darwinian" historiography; but the reader may be left uncertain as to really what was at the bottom of the Huxley-Owen feud.

The lack of a definite answer to this question notwithstanding, we have in *Richard Owen* a major contribution to the history of nineteenth-century biology, written with a stylistic felicity that many a scholar whose first language is English should envy. I am delighted that the author has been appropriately acknowledged by his recent appointment to a chair at Göttingen. I am truly saddened that we have lost him from the community of historians of science in Australia.

David Oldroyd,
University of New South Wales

Mark S Micale (ed.), *Beyond the unconscious: essays of Henri F. Ellenberger in the history of psychiatry*, transl. by Françoise Dubor and Mark S Micale, Princeton University Press, 1993, pp. xii, 416, £32.50, \$49.50 (0-691-08550-1).

It became one of the commonplaces of the new professional history of medicine in the 1970s and 80s that in-house historical

scholarship was Whiggish, judgmental, triumphalist and unscholarly. In truth, such judgments were often wide of the mark (saying little for the ability of historians to assess the history of historiography dispassionately). Surveying the history of psychiatry, a vast amount of first-rate research and interpretation was being carried out at that time by those whose primary allegiance was to psychiatry itself. In Britain, Ida Macalpine and Richard Hunter stand out, as, in a French-language tradition, does Henri Ellenberger. Perhaps Anglo-American scholars might feel that they had some excuse for not being too familiar with Ellenberger's work, since most (with the exception of *The discovery of the unconscious: the history and evolution of dynamic psychiatry* (New York, Basic Books, 1971)) was long available only in French. This excuse no longer applies, thanks to Mark Micale's admirable collection of Ellenberger's essays, extremely competently translated into English with a lengthy introduction by the editor that addresses Ellenberger's complete historical *oeuvre*.

Ellenberger was a fascinating individual. Born in 1905 in Africa, the son of Swiss Protestant missionaries, he obtained most of his training and early psychiatric practice in France. But he felt a distaste for the dominant French intellectual milieu—it somewhat snubbed him as an outsider—and a characteristic allegiance to Swiss culture, while being unable to live in his native country. His subsequent removal to the Menninger Clinic in Kansas set up theoretical tensions (as a dynamic psychiatrist, Ellenberger was eclectic in his learnings). Eventually he successfully squared the circle by migrating to Montreal, where he could have the best of both worlds, the Old and the New.

Not surprisingly, Ellenberger's historical explorations also avoid any single unambiguous fealty. *The discovery of the unconscious* was in a sense a homage to Freud, since it traced the prehistory of Freud's key concept. Yet by showing that ideas of the unconscious long predated the master, and

hence that Freud's thinking was merely one variation upon concepts of the unconscious that had been developing since Mesmer and branching into the work of Moritz Benedikt, Janet, Jung and others, Ellenberger also thereby displaced Freud from his customary position at centre-stage, at the same time as paying him homage.

As Micale emphasizes in his luminous Introduction, much of Ellenberger's historical work was, in this very manner, a mode of creative displacement (possibly reflecting his own migrations). Regular history privileged psychiatrists; Ellenberger responded by pioneering the history of their patients, writing major studies of "Anna O", "Emmy von N" and Jung's Helene Preiswerk, not just from the pathographical viewpoint but emphasizing how much these gifted patients positively contributed to the raw materials of Freudian and Jungian theory.

Similarly, traditional history had centred upon hysteria as a female diagnosis. As long ago as 1968, Ellenberger was writing a critical study of Freud on *male* hysteria. If Germany and Austria had achieved the limelight, for organic and dynamic psychiatry respectively, it was Ellenberger who correctly emphasized, in 'The scope of Swiss psychology' (1957), that, in population terms, the world's greatest psychiatric matrix was, beyond question, Switzerland—spawning such diverse figures as Bleuler, Piaget, Binswanger, Minkowski, Rorschach, and of course Jung (whose career reveals some interesting parallels to Ellenberger's). And all these pioneering forays are nicely philosophized in an essay of 1961, 'Psychiatry and its unknown history'.

Such unknown dimensions were exemplified in practice by his piece (1954) on Rorschach, which delved behind the familiar pioneer of the inkblot test and examined one of the great psychiatric diagnosticians. And likewise by his study of Gustav Fechner, the experimental psychologist who in a unique manner sought to bridge German Romanticism and the new biologicistic materialism.

Multilingual and enviably cultured, Ellenberger wrote with scholarly scrupulosity

and an eye for the unconventional. None of the essays reproduced here is of merely historico-biographical interest; all continue to have something to say to the ongoing concerns of historians of psychiatry. We should be grateful to Mark Micale for generously giving his time and talents to make the work of a too little known historian more widely available.

Roy Porter, Wellcome Institute

John S Haller, Jr, *Medical protestants: the eclectics in American medicine, 1825–1939*, Carbondale and Edwardsville, Southern Illinois University Press, 1994, pp. xix, 340, illus., \$49.95 (0-8093–1894–6).

In nineteenth-century America three groups of physicians enjoyed substantial public support—the regulars, homeopaths, and eclectics. This important study is the first book-length history of the eclectic movement, the most successful professional offspring of botanical medicine. Haller's thesis is that eclectics believed they were "authentic protestants, saving therapeutics from the errors and extravagances of orthodox medicine" (p. xv) and "intent on establishing a role for a native and more practical system of medicine independent of Europe's medical savants" (p. xvii).

When the heroic medicine of the regular physicians provoked a lay rebellion in the 1820s, many Americans turned to traditional botanicals. The greatest beneficiary of this movement and the leading force in lay medicine in the 1830s was Samuel Thomson, an itinerant botanical healer who devised a system of botanical self-medication and user support groups. Thomson published a book on domestic botanical medicine in 1825, organized a large and active sales force, and sold his book and drugs widely.

Wooster Beach, a regular physician, wrote a domestic botanical "reformed medicine" book in 1833 called *The American practice of medicine*, which also became very popular. According to Haller, Beach rejected