home as well as for working in factories? More pressured by teachers or parents? Or were they actually physiologically less suited to education? Similarly, Cruickshank fails to analyze why mothers worked, when she discusses the factors affecting infant and child health. This is a topic which has been well explored by women's historians and some consideration of it would have saved her from an analysis that leaves the reader with the impression that it was short-sighted, at best, and selfish, at worst, for mothers to work, rather than a course of action dictated by economic need.[1]

Each of these books provides us with important information about children's lives in the nineteenth century. For this reason, they are important works. They are well-researched and well-docu- mented studies. Their lack of attention to broader social and theoretical concerns makes them disappointing, however. If Cruickshank and Behlmer had gone beyond the recounting of facts and information to an analysis of Victorian attitudes and values (an analysis that needs to be done by class and gender), they would have produced studies whose significance would have gone beyond the chronicling of living conditions, reform activities, and legislative debates, to the presenting of nuanced views of the attitudes and behaviour of working- and middle-class Victorians.

Gay L. GULLICKSON
University of Maryland, College Park

* * *

LINDA L. CLARK — *Schooling the Daughters of Marianne*. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 1984. Pp. ix, 224.

Linda L. Clark has written a thorough history of the process of socialization of girls in modern French primary schools. By an exhaustive study of the textbooks, a sampling of teachers' diaries and inspectors' reports, a look at notebooks kept by pupils and analysis of special questions for girls on examinations for certificates of primary schools, as well as thorough knowledge of education legislation, especially as it applied to girls' schools and women teachers, Clark has filled in a missing chapter in the history of French education. Building on the exemplary work of Françoise Mayeur, who was the first to focus on the study of girls' education in the current boom in French education history study, Clark chose to look at primary schools of the Third Republic because "it was in the primary school that the majority of French men and women experienced the process of acculturation designed for them either by the state authorities ... or by officials presiding over the competing and largely Catholic private schools" (p. 2).

Clark poses a series of four questions at the outset:

1. What did educators find distinctive in the personalities of girls and women?
2. How did textbooks depict a woman's responsibilities within the family and her relationship to husband, parents, and children?
3. What relation was envisioned between women and the larger world; between the domestic foyer and the forum of work, politics, and community life?
4. Finally, have the answers to the preceding questions changed significantly since the 1880s? (p. 3)

In a tightly-argued 169-page text, supplemented by copious and useful notes, she makes an admirable effort to answer each question.

---

1. In particular, see Louise A. TILLY and Joan W. SCOTT, *Women, Work, and Family*, (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1978); and Erna Olafson HELLERSTEIN, Leslie Parker HUME, and Karen M. OFFEN, eds., *Victorian Women: A Documentary Account of Women's Lives in Nineteenth-Century England, France, and the United States*, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1981).

Clark points out that the ideas about woman's nature had changed little since the work of Fénélon in the seventeenth century. Both Catholic and secular authorities agreed with the notion that feminine minds and bodies were different from and weaker than those of men. Nature, they believed, compensated for these weaknesses by endowing women with the qualities of industry, neatness, and thrift so that they might be quietly occupied with their homes. Significantly, Clark reminds us, women's differences did not make them inferior human beings. Their domestic functions were "no less important to the public than those of men" because men's success and the education of children were dependent upon women's performance of their duties (p. 19).

Despite bitter controversies in many other areas, anticlerical and Catholic authorities were in remarkable agreement about woman's nature and the consequent need to specialize education for girls. Both groups supported the "separate sphere" approach to education which was reinforced by the nineteenth-century sentimental view of women's unique and morally superior qualities, as opposed to the liberal tradition of the eighteenth century which emphasized the equality and essential similarity of the sexes. The textbooks reflected these opinions in lessons which attached importance to woman's place inside the home, contrasted explicitly to man's exterior role. The lessons were indicative of the separation of home from work place that had become increasingly common during the nineteenth century, even if less widespread in France than in other more rapidly industrializing countries, and also confirmed the ideology of "separate spheres". But, as Clark insightfully points out, while school intended to reinforce women's commitment to domesticity, rather than free them from it, the acquisition of literacy and disciplined work habits and the knowledge that financial need might make employment necessary did carry the potential for diverting some women from the foyer (p. 59).

Despite the heavy emphasis on woman's place, Clark does point out that for girls and single women paid employment outside the home or work on the family farm were the norm. And, while educators counselled that thrift was the married woman's solution to a squeezed family economy, even they conceded the necessity of married women's wages in extreme cases. I would add that the proscriptions against women's paid work were more insistent in France precisely because a higher percentage of married women worked in France than in any other major Western nation. As Delphine Gay de Girardin pointed out in *Lettres Parisiennes*, "One only makes laws against women's ambition in countries where ambition is women's passion" (p. 240).

Clark also accurately points to the limited social mobility promised to boys and girls in the textbooks despite the persistent changes effected in their living conditions by the impact of urbanization and industrialization. But, I think Clark overstates the case for similarity when she concludes that the textbook image, that the main reward most women reaped from working was provision for basic individual and family needs, was simply one aspect of the lesson for both sexes that most children should expect adult lives comparable to those of their parents (p. 104). I believe the texts show that boys and girls were gradually socialized to identify with the gender-differentiated models which made boys look to personal achievement for satisfaction while girls were encouraged to find validation in serving the family. The resulting pattern: "Papa lit, Maman coud" was the ultimate outcome of the change in values.

Laura S. STRUMINGHER
University of Cincinnati

* * *

RACHEL G. FUCHS — *Abandoned Children. Foundlings and Child Welfare in Nineteenth-Century France*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1984. Pp. xvii, 357.

As the lives of unknown French men, women and children in the last century have been rescued from neglect to become an acceptable and ever-demanding agenda of social history, it is hardly