

Book Reviews

lesser award of the red ribbon. He claims that no attempt was made to relegate Toussaint to the shadows and that Pasteur supported his award of the Vaillant prize of the Académie des sciences in 1883. But, of course, the grand prize remained Louis Pasteur's. The different emphases of Debré and Geison reflect their aims. Geison's main concern is to show the gap between the practice of research, and the presentation and uses of findings in professional discourses and wider cultural politics; Debré is more concerned with following the successful trajectory of Pasteur's research programme. That said, Debré does cover the wider context of events, including Pasteur's debate with Jules Guérin and subsequent trials of the vaccine in Hungary, Germany and Italy.

On rabies, Debré also covers the three contentious issues raised by Geison: the two "private patients" treated before the famous case of Joseph Meister, Roux's unease at the way the treatment was developed, and how Pasteur was swept up in the reaction to his innovation. Debré seems to see no significance in why Pasteur did not publish details of the first two vaccine trials. With Meister, he suggests that Léon Say prompted early publication of the results, and makes the nice point about the politics of the episode. Meister was from Alsace and it did not go unnoticed that Koch and his School were unable to help a citizen of a province taken over in the Franco-Prussian War. Roux's responses to the rabies work and his fraught relationship with Pasteur are discussed, though Roux's objections and those of others, such as Michel Peter, tend to be presented as obstacles to the inevitable triumph of Pasteurian ideas. That said, Debré makes exposés of his own, taking details from Loir of the deaths after treatment of Jules Louyer and Joseph Smith and how these were handled by the investigating authorities. Further evidence is presented to support the general point that "Pasteur was obsessed with his fame for posterity" (p. 426) and to show how he

cultivated the roles of master and hero. Debré does detail the many controversies that surrounded Pasteur's work and does not shy away from the great man's failures and changes of mind. Yet, it is always Pasteur who was honest, intellectually bold and willing to learn from his mistakes, in many ways the ideal Popperian scientist. Thus, it is perhaps no surprise that Debré fails to connect with Geison's work, which comes, of course, from a quite different historiographical tradition.

Michael Worboys,
Sheffield Hallam University

Lawrence J Friedman, *Identity's architect: a biography of Erik H Erikson*, London, Free Association Books, 1999, pp. 592, £17.95 (paperback 1-85343-471-X).

The title of *Identity's architect* may be read in a number of interlinked ways: how Erik Salomsen became Erik Homburger, who became Erik Erikson, who forged one of the most "successful" concepts of twentieth-century psychology, "identity", and how this in turn shaped how many individuals—patients, practitioners and the general public—came to be identified and identified themselves. The manner in which these three elements mutually illuminate each other make Friedman's book not only an outstanding work of biography, but also of cultural and intellectual history.

As we learn from this meticulously researched and richly documented study, Erik Erikson was born to Karla Abrahamsen, who was Jewish and Danish. He never knew who his father was, and uncovering the secret of his paternity became a lifelong quest. With his mother, he moved to Germany, and was legally adopted by her second husband, Theodor Homburger. Erikson initially wanted to be an artist. He followed his friend Peter Bloss to Vienna. Through Bloss, he entered Anna

Freud's circle, which led him to take up a post at Hietzig school, where he grew interested in child psychology and pedagogy. He had an analysis with Anna Freud and trained as a psychoanalyst. Erikson later confided to Robert Lifton that his training in Vienna had an element of "thought reform" not unlike Maoist "totalism" (p. 357). Contrary to the widespread portrayal of Erikson's work as originating from psychoanalysis, Friedman demonstrates that the leitmotifs of his work—his concern with the self and its relations to society and the cosmos—were already articulated in his early journals in the 1920s, drawing heavily from German Romanticism, before he encountered Freud. In 1930, he married Joan Serson, who increasingly displaced Anna Freud as the central figure in his life. In 1933, he emigrated to America, where he took up a career as a psychoanalyst.

Despite having no formal degrees, he prospered in the largely medicalized world of psychoanalysis, as well as in academia, eventually becoming a professor at Harvard, where he shaped the careers of generations of prominent intellectuals. At a time when fidelity to psychoanalytic dogmas was tightly policed and deviancy was punishable with professional ostracism and character assassination, Erikson managed a complicated tightrope act, developing heterodox ideas whilst remaining within the fold. In 1944, the Eriksons' fourth child Neil was born with Down's syndrome, and immediately placed in an institution. Friedman demonstrates that this devastating event, as Joan Erikson acknowledged, played a critical role in the genesis of Erikson's normative concept of human development, the eight stage life-cycle. Commencing with *Childhood and society*, Erikson's writings were increasingly successful, and became significant not only in psychoanalysis and psychology, but also in American culture at large. "Identity crises" proliferated throughout Western societies. As an

immigrant writing in a second language, he became widely feted as a cultural intellectual and social prophet, at times self-consciously styling himself after Gandhi, the subject of his 1969 book.

In 1890, William James wrote that most psychologists turned their personal peculiarities into universal rules (*The principles of psychology*, vol. 2, p. 64). Friedman compellingly demonstrates the manner in which Erikson utilized his personal experience and family life as the paradigm of his theories. However, he does not do this in a manner which reduces one to the other (one of the ironies that he shows is the discrepancy between Erikson's late autobiography and his theory of the life-cycle), and his attentiveness to the cultural and intellectual contexts that shaped and were shaped by Erikson's work explains why Erikson's concepts came to have such a widespread resonance and echo. Thus if Erikson regarded his own experiences as paradigmatic, it was the manner in which his work was taken up by its readers which conferred an exemplary status on them, in turn creating Erikson as a celebrated and emblematic figure.

Not least among the fields which have been affected by Erikson's work are those of history and biography, and his 1958 *Young man Luther* came to be seen as one of the primary texts of the psychohistory movement. Though flawed as a work of scholarship, Friedman demonstrates how this work owed its success to the manner in which it drew from Erikson's lifelong quest for an answer to the question of his paternity, his struggle to attain authentic expression, and how it implicitly addressed contemporary American social concerns of finding authenticity in an age of conformism. The reconstruction of such intersections not only demonstrates the reasons for Erikson's success, but also shows the manner in which psychological concepts and psychologists themselves

Book Reviews

have come to have such a prominence. Thus this work is recommended not only to those with an interest in the life of Erik Erikson, but also to those interested in the history of psychology and psychoanalysis, and the cultural and

intellectual history of the twentieth-century.

Sonu Shamdasani,
The Wellcome Trust Centre for
the History of Medicine at UCL