

mainly the former of these two threads. There, he speaks with deep understanding of Rudolph's marginalization within Austro-Hungarian society as an example of the loss of influence of European liberalism, caught between rising conservatism and social democracy towards the end of the century.

Robert H. Keyserlingk
University of Ottawa

Patrick Brantlinger, ed. — *Energy & Entropy: Science and Culture in Victorian Britain*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1989. Pp. vii, 352.

This collection of essays is drawn from the pages of *Victorian Culture*, primarily from the Autumn 1984 special issue on science and culture in nineteenth-century Britain. Thirteen papers (plus a lengthy editorial introduction) deal with a wide range of topics, from medicine to mathematics, and geology to physics. Aspects of the Victorian crisis of faith appear in many of the chapters and are of special concern in discussions of physics and public health. By design, the collection omits material on Darwin and the problem of evolution. By chance, it includes nothing on astronomy, a topic of considerable interest to the Victorians, and one which has received a great deal of attention in the history of science community. By the same token, no author deals specifically with chemistry during this era.

As a social historian concerned with nineteenth- and twentieth-century science, I find only a few of these papers to be of value. Richard Yeo examines "Science and Intellectual Authority" using Chambers' *Vestiges* as a case study. His focus is tight, the analysis controlled and informed by social-historical categories that entail a clear understanding of the social system and the groups that comprise it. Those who are interested in the professionalization of Victorian science must reckon with Yeo's arguments. At mid-century, science remained a part of the common culture and professionalization (as both a social and cognitive process) "part of disputes about the proper form of natural knowledge" (27).

In a complex and methodologically self-conscious essay (it is the only paper in the collection to explicitly discuss methods), Harvey Becher explores "The Intellectual Origins and Post-Graduate Careers of a Cambridge Intellectual Elite, 1830-1860." Using the techniques of prosopography, Becher focuses on the top ten wranglers (honors graduates) over a thirty-year span. Honors, at Cambridge, were restricted to the classics and mathematics until the Natural Sciences and Moral Sciences Tripos were introduced, in 1851. Becher's discussion has important implications for a number of historiographical problems in both the history of science and the history of literature as well as the "decline of Britain" debate. This paper will repay careful attention by scholars who are not afraid of numbers.

Greg Myers discusses "Nineteenth-Century Popularizations of Thermodynamics and the Rhetoric of Social Prophecy." His far-ranging analysis forcefully reminds us that along with evolution, thermodynamics provided the **other** most important science-based metaphor employed by Victorians both in England and in America. In addition, the discussion of Roderick Murchison by James A. Secord and David K. van Keuren's

analysis of Augustus Pitt-Rivers will be of interest to historians who deal with the impact of culture on the organization and scope of science.

Beyond these five papers, social historians will find little from which to choose. On the whole, the volume represents a clearly defined tradition (and genre) in the field of intellectual history. The emphasis is on culture rather than science, with religion playing the role of *éminence grise*. Further, in nine of the thirteen essays, individuals rather than problems are the focus of attention. Given the journal in which they appeared, these papers are not (by definition) comparative. The exception is Myers. This imposes a limitation that many historians would find excessively restrictive. Comparative analysis of the development of science often produces fruitful and stimulating findings. In form, these papers represent a kind of genteel tradition: neat expositions of clearly defined topics crafted with an eye toward elegance and style. There are, however, difficulties with problem selection and context (historiographical and, in a sense, scientific).

A casual comparison of recent volumes of *Victorian Culture* and *Isis*, published by the History of Science Society and subtitled *An International Review Devoted to the History of Science and Its Cultural Influences*, makes these differences clear. *Isis* papers explore not only traditional topics such as intellectual influences, but aspects of the social history of science as well. The latter are often organized using categories that might include gender or class and concerned with problems such as the dynamics of professionalization, the structure and nature of scientific communities or the politics of science policy. Frequently, they are also comparative. These papers generally address clearly defined historiographical concerns and, perhaps most importantly, *science* rather than *culture* is the primary concern.

For the most part, then, the essays in the Bratlinger volume represent a very different tradition from that which informs the new social history of science. While some of the fare contained in these pages is stimulating, much is not. It seems inevitable that the split between the culture of science and the culture of the humanities that began in Victorian Britain should, at length, make itself felt at the level of historical scholarship.

John Lankford
University of Missouri at Columbia

Thomas Brennan — *Public Drinking and Popular Culture in Eighteenth-Century Paris*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988. Pp. xiv, 333.

Thomas Brennan's book joins a growing collection of studies of eighteenth-century Paris, its people and culture. A generation ago, the urban historian's focus was fixed mostly on such large-scale matters as social structure, demography and the nature of popular revolt. More recently, largely as a result of the vogue of popular culture, interest has shifted to the micro-sociology of city life. Thus, Daniel Roche's comprehensive portrait of the consumption patterns and culture of the people of Paris; Arlette Farge's various studies of street life in the French capital; David Garrioch's detailed examination of social interaction among the Parisian *menu peuple*; and Robert