

scientifically in the relevant files of the *Ministère des cultes*, the *Consistoire central* and the *Consistoire de Paris* — the latter two being the state-imposed governing agencies of Jewish life in France. Her discussion also draws upon an extensive pamphlet literature in an effort to get at the *mentalités* of religious reformers, and provides a good critical appraisal of early historical works, notably those of Leon Kahn.

To Piette, the first half of the nineteenth century saw the Jews moving decisively along the path of assimilation, beginning the communal disintegration which the liberal emancipators during the French Revolution had intended, and which increasing numbers of Jews came to fear. The process went furthest at the upper end of the social hierarchy. An examination of the Jewish bourgeoisie reveals a very high degree of social integration by 1840, particularly among the most affluent. Residential patterns, the proportion of the total community in various social groups, occupational distribution, wealth, and styles of life all show an increasingly close approximation with non-Jews and progressive involvement in the general society. Yet, as she notes, integration was by no means complete at the end of the period. The great majority of Parisian Jews were not bourgeois, and did not assimilate quickly. The data indicate a continuing separation from the surrounding society, although the Jewish particularities were slowly disappearing. In explaining this uneven pattern of assimilation, I would certainly emphasize, to a greater degree than in this work, how Parisian Jewry was an immigrant community — growing more than ten-fold in fifty years, and with a continuing influx, mainly from impoverished, traditional Jewish communities of Alsace and Lorraine. Following this *montée à Paris* Jews retained much of their previous identity, just as did Bretons, Auvergnats, Basques, and many others. On this point I think Piette could have profited from a reference to Louis Chevalier's idiosyncratic but stimulating *Les Parisiens* (1967).

The tendency has been to stress the weakness of Jewish identity in France, and the inexorable movement of Jews away from Jewish identification. A hurried reading of Piette's conclusion might seem to bear this out. But the evidence presented elsewhere in this work, as in that of Patrick Girard several years ago, suggests that all was perhaps not so rigidly programmed. Piette emphasizes the importance of the *consistoires*, which had a strong centralizing effect, facilitating the social integration of Jews while at the same time preserving Jewish institutions intended precisely to facilitate ethnic survival. Thus Jewish leaders by the end of this period wanted their own hospital, orphanages, schools, and charitable agencies — as with Catholics and Protestants — rather than relying upon those established by the state. Piette does not take up the argument of Simon Schwarzfuchs (whose *Napoleon, the Jews and the Sanhedrin*, published in 1979, is oddly missing from her bibliography) that the consistorial system prevented the fragmentation of French Jewry in the nineteenth century, ultimately weakening both extreme orthodoxy and extreme reform. She seldom goes far from her sources, and prefers to make judgements that are firmly grounded in archival records. While this sometimes limits her horizons, it has yielded a disciplined, judicious study, on which others, and perhaps the author herself, can eventually build.

Michael R. MARRUS  
University of Toronto

\* \* \*

TERRY PARSSINEN — *Secret Passions, Secret Remedies: Narcotic Drugs in British Society, 1820-1930*. Philadelphia: Institute for the Study of Human Issues, 1983. Pp. xii, 243.

When the publication of Terry Parssinen's *Secret Passions, Secret Remedies* was announced, I awaited it with great expectation. Following on the heels of an excellent article,

“Development of the Disease Model of Drug Addiction in Britain 1870-1926” (*Medical History*, 24 [1980]:3), co-authored by Karen Kerner, *Secret Passions* promised to be a valuable contribution to a growing body of research which includes David Courtwright’s *Dark Paradise*, H. Wayne Morgan’s *Drugs in America* and David Musto’s *The American Disease*. But *Secret Passions* failed to live up to expectations. While Parssinen presents a succinct and informative account of drug use, medical theory and government policy in Britain, one is left with an unsettling feeling of *déjà vu*. A clue to the dilemma appears on the book’s dust jacket where it is stated that Parssinen’s book is “the first such study by an American” — not, however, by anyone.

In 1981, Virginia Berridge and Griffith Edwards published *Opium and the People: Opiate Use in Nineteenth-Century England*, a far more in-depth, scholarly and analytical study of drug use in Britain — and which is incomprehensibly omitted from mention in Parssinen’s volume. The similarity of focus of the two books is apparent in the chapter headings: Berridge — “The Import Trade”, “Opium in Medical Practice”, “Opiate Use in Literary and Middle-Class Society”, “Opium and the Workers: ‘Infant Doping’ and ‘Luxurious Use’”. Compare with Parssinen — “The International Opium Trade”, “The Magic Healer: Opium as Therapeutic Agent”, “The Palace of Evil” (literary treatment of opiate use), “Mother’s Friend: Opium as an Escape”. A cursory glance at the text also reveals two passages quoted at length in Berridge (pp. 47 and 42) and Parssinen (pp. 49 and 50).

Perhaps Parssinen’s book is a more complete discussion of opiate use? Alas, this also cannot be said. *Secret Remedies* offers too little and assumes too much on the part of the reader and suffers from a dearth of secondary sources and contextual framework. For example, Parssinen cites “an interesting account of the opium murder of Mary Kirkbride of the village of Bennidendenck, Cumbria, in 1827” (p. 78, fn. 10) which can be found in the Lowther Manuscripts at the Cumbria County Record Office. Must the reader make the trip to find out about it? No — simply read Berridge (p. 82).

It is not clear to whom *Secret Passions* is directed. A general audience would require more information on public health legislation passed in the 1860s and 1870s than that it was “improving” (p. 77). A scholarly audience would appreciate a guide to further research, or at least a bibliography. To state, for example, that

It is by now a commonplace among social historians that nineteenth-century physicians were appropriating certain functions previously exercised by priests. As the new guardians of morality, they simply substituted new names for ancient evils: madness became mental illness; drunkenness became alcoholism; and the sin of Onan became masturbation (p. 101),

without citing Michel Foucault, Andrew Scull, Thomas Szasz or anyone at all makes for a text with little value, particularly when conclusions are debatable. Who, for example, would agree that Oscar Wilde was a “high Victorian moralist” (p. 66)?

Notwithstanding the problems raised above, and a number of disconcerting typographical errors (British morphia manufacturers sold off stocks, not socks in 1918 [p. 147]), *Secret Remedies* does have merit. The discussion of drug use and legislation from 1910 to 1930 is excellent — particularly with respect to the background and repercussions of the Defence of the Realm Act 40B (outlawing the sale of narcotics to soldiers) and the Dangerous Drugs Act of 1920. The comparison of British and American drug use is also a valuable contribution. On the whole, however, *Secret Remedies*, *Secret Passions* does not compare favourably with *Opium and the People*. One closes Parssinen’s book with the thought — So what’s new?

Cheryl KRASNICK  
Queen’s University