proportion. As we all know, a sense of proportion has not been one of the most striking characteristics of books on sex and sex-related subjects in the last fifteen years or so. *Sex in History* is a background book, not a crib, but one that I hope may give readers, both general and scholarly, something to think about.

A final note: Dr. Bullough says, "The subject of sex is far more complicated than the author is willing to admit." Not true. The subject of sex is far more complicated than it is *possible* to admit in a book of 150,000 words that deals with half a million years of world history.

Editor's Note: Bernard I. Murstein did not wish to reply to the review.

Herbert Hovenkamp. *Science and Religion in America, 1800-1860.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1978. xii + 273 pp. and Theodore Dwight Bozeman. *Protestants in an Age of Science: The Baconian Ideal and Antebellum American Religious Thought.* Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1977. xv + 243 pp. (Reviewed by RENNIE B. SCHOEPFLIN)

The influence of the Scottish Enlightenment on American thought has attracted considerable scholarly attention in recent years. Herbert Hovenkamp and Theodore Dwight Bozeman have contributed to our understanding by analyzing the way in which many nineteenth-century Americans assimilated Common Sense Realism and applied it to the control of science, especially the social and behavioral sciences.

In the first half of his book, Hovenkamp surveys the way in which new scientific ideas impinged upon areas of theology from 1800 to 1860. Freely summarizing secondary sources, he argues that because American theologians, philosophers, and scientists believed that nineteenth-century science threatened belief in natural and revealed theologies, they embraced Scottish Common Sense Realism and its Baconian philosophy of science to fight against the inevitable contradictions between science and religion. They attacked "metaphysical science" for its weak base of concrete facts and constructed analogical arguments to buttress natural theology. Unwilling to deny the supernatural basis of biblical stories, many such theologians rejected higher criticism and defended miracles. In the last half of his book, Hovenkamp uses examples from two nineteenth-century roots of cultural anthropology, ethnology and biblical studies (the scientific study of Bible lands, peoples, and texts), among other sciences, to illustrate the contradictions inherent in the attempts of nineteenth-century Americans to stem the tide of secularization by harmonizing religion with secularist science. Only rarely did contemporaries recognize the impossibility of harmony and advocate a subjective religion.

Although Hovenkamp occasionally brings new insights to an understanding of the interaction between science and religion in Pre-Darwinian America and draws attention to at least one relatively unknown arena of interaction, biblical studies, his book is seriously flawed. His categories of Protestantism—"orthodox," "evangelical," "conservative," and "liberal"—are hopelessly imprecise; and, failing to recognize that the Methodists and the Baptists became the two denominational giants by 1850, he incorrectly assumes that the written responses to "scientific issues" by college-educated Congregationalists, Presbyterians, and Unitarians adequately reflected the American response to science. Hovenkamp sees science as nonsupernatural, non-value-laden, uniformitarian, and *separate* from religion, and he whiggishly applies his definition to the nineteenth century, calling attempts to harmonize science and religion "fundamentally

absurd." Ignoring the natural theologies of Asa Gray, James McCosh, and George Frederick Wright, to name only three, he points to the death of natural theology after the 1850s as evidence of the inevitable result of harmonization.

In contrast to Hovenkamp's sweeping view of antebellum American science and religion, Bozeman focuses on a well-defined social group, the clergymen of "Old School" Presbyterianism, to illustrate the ways in which American Protestants used the Baconianism within Scottish Common Sense Realism to develop a "doxological science" that would curtail the profane tendencies of Enlightenment philosophy and science. As "Old School leaders . . . engaged in an extensive campaign to restore science securely to a religious correlation" (p. 72), they invested Francis Bacon with a heroic dose of Protestant piety and claimed the worship of God to have been the end of his "true science." To preserve the piety of science, the clergymen maintained the right to measure scientific findings against their standard of Baconian principles, and to declare findings unscientific if they failed to account for all "facts" or if the scientists became too hypothetical or arrogant in their claims. Unfortunately, Bozeman only glances at the way such censorship of phrenology and other sciences of the mind may have dampened early psychological interest in close correlations between brain anatomy and personality and slowed the tendency to explain mental phenomena in physical terms. He merely mentions the effect of such control on debates over polygenism, vitalism, geological time, and transmutation.

Confident that adequate defenses had been placed around science, many clergymen sought to secure positive correlations between science and revelation. They established strong analogical ties between geological catastrophism and biblical millenialism and even argued that the Protestant reformers' method of biblical study provided the methodological precedence for Baconian induction. Unsatisfied with these harmonies, they tried to unify science and religion by installing Baconian induction as the true method of biblical interpretation. Bozeman's study contributes substantially to an understanding of the complex relationship between Christianity and science in nineteenth-century America.

Both studies remind us of the significant impact that Baconian ideas exerted upon American natural and moral philosophers. They especially should capture the interest of behavioral scientists because they clarify the way in which the assimilation of Common Sense Realism by American moral philosophers directed their antebellum discipline to a study of the "moral and active" faculties of the mind ("faculty" psychology) and subtly controlled their research.

Editor's Note: Professor Bozeman indicated that he did not want to reply to the review. We received no response from Professor Hovenkamp to our offer to reply and so processed the review for publication after sufficient time had elapsed.

L. S. Hearnshaw. *Cyril Burt, Psychologist*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1979. xi + 370 pp. $19.50 (Reviewed by FRANZ SAMELSON)

Cyril L. Burt (1883-1971), like his contemporary John B. Watson, was a pioneer in the development of hardheaded, biologically oriented psychology. Both Burt and Watson believed strongly in empirical science, yet they took opposite positions on the nature-nurture issue. Each received wide acclaim (Burt was knighted in 1946—by a Labor Government!) but also became embroiled in public scandal. It was the scandal which