

acters, so that they can inject a modicum of feeling in their writing. But the feeling is always someone else's feeling.

It is a prize for the dead to have spoken that way, but heaven help us if we, the living, should speak with such life. In their search for the respect that cold impartiality brings, many academic historians have employed consciously and unconsciously distancing techniques, whereby their laudable enthusiasm for their subject is squelched, underplayed, and obscured. Unemotive language is a form of unnatural constraint, of over-control, of holding back, of dampening fascination and diminishing intimacy.

Neutral academic writing of history also dehumanizes its characters. Their very personalities can fade into unreality. More and more this effect is being accomplished, partially at least, by a relatively new invention—the phenomenon of the unidentified, unattached, speakerless quotation—simply inserted without a “Blake said,” “Smith said,” or “he or she said.” This form of quotation integration may seem to be more efficient, but in the end it is not, for it introduces a dislocation into the prose and ultimately a chop, because readers instinctively look to see who spoke and when they cannot find out, they often stop reading and file through the footnotes. Even then they will usually be disappointed by the description of the speaker. And so there is the paradox of something worth saying by a voice not worth mentioning.

One of the great attributes of this book is its sensitive control of literary works about the province. Possibly

the next step is to use these literary modes, even if ever so slightly, as models of how to combine substance with engagement.

All of this said, one cannot underestimate the foundational contribution of this new history of British Columbia. If there be truth in this review, however much the form of academic writing may modify for the sake of its own survival, it can never be meaningful without the painstaking groundwork Barman has so clearly demonstrated here.

David C. Jones
University of Calgary

Geoffrey Cocks and Konrad H. Jarausch, eds. *German Professions, 1800-1950*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990. Pp. ix, 340. \$63.00 Cdn, cloth.

This is a welcome addition to the growing literature on the professionalization of German academic occupations, edited by two of the pioneers in this field. Geoffrey Cocks published one of the first studies in English in 1985, with his analysis of professional psychotherapists during the Third Reich. In so doing he helped to initiate what has now almost become a glut in the critical literature on modern German medicine. Konrad Jarausch is the author of several pace-setting papers and an authoritative

volume on the professionalization of German lawyers, teachers, and engineers from the Second Empire to the early decades of the Federal Republic.

This book contains essays by American, British, and German scholars on predominantly academic or at least upper-class groupings, such as engineers, the officer corps, and industrial chemists. Social groups definable not by professional criteria but by other marks such as gender are also included, as is apparent from Jill Stephenson's enlightening piece on women and the German professions between 1900 and 1945. But despite a trenchant theoretical introduction by Jaraus, who outlines the current accomplishments in this area of research as well as the outstanding problems, the volume makes no attempt to address professions systematically, as, perhaps, in a ranking predetermined by society, nor does it comply with uniform standards of professionalization, deprofessionalization, or, for that matter, reprofessionalization. Thematically, a few of the articles seem somewhat far-fetched; for example, I had trouble situating Anthony La Vopa's piece, "Specialists Against Specialization: Hellenism as Professional Ideology in German Classical Studies." What is commendable here, however, is the beginning of a broadening of approaches, in terms of a much-needed departure from concentration merely on upper-class or academic professions. Centring on these in the past had been understandable: the higher, more established, and prestigious a profession, the more developed were its occupational or vocational criteria in terms of

ethics, outward composure, and economic goals. Such codification was usually fixed in written form, and hence offered itself to facile analysis by scholars. Happily, this volume now presents studies on female public school teachers, non-academic engineers, and non-university-educated women, alongside the more accomplished and socially respected.

The book contains several good insights into the problems of interrelationship between educational processes and professionalization. It would be important here to point to the exclusive piece on primary-school instruction, Joanne Schneider's article on Bavarian women public school teachers. Still, in keeping with the traditional focus on the higher professions, there is much more on university education. Here Kees Gispen's paper on the transformation of engineers' training from a basic functional level to more sophisticated university education is enlightening; this process was a cause as well as a consequence of the emergence of the technical universities (*Technische Hochschulen*) from their former state of polytechnics under Wilhelm II. This theme is echoed in the study of German architects by Vincent Clark, and of industrial chemists by Jeffrey A. Johnson. While Claudia Huerkamp reiterates what she has written elsewhere about the interpenetration of medical faculties and German physicians' professional advances, Jill Stephenson graphically rehearses the halting progress of female students at German universities. Altogether, then, this book may be read with profit by students of modern German social his-

tory, as well as by those more particularly interested in the mutual interaction of professionalization on the one side, and education on the other.

Michael H. Kater
York University

Kirsten Drotner. *English Children and Their Magazines, 1751-1945.* New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1988. Pp. x, 272. \$27.50 U.S.

British children's literature is receiving a great deal of scholarly attention these days. In the last four years, at least six books dealing with various motifs in Victorian-Edwardian juvenile publications have appeared in Britain and the United States. This book by Kirsten Drotner, a Danish cultural sociologist, is the most comprehensive of the new studies. Its breadth, plus its detailed analysis of many significant periodicals for the young, make this a welcome contribution to the study of popular culture and the history of childhood.

In the course of this ambitious study, the author endeavours to meet several objectives. A prime concern is to account for the gradual inclusion of all classes of British children into what Drotner calls "real childhood" (p. 237). Drotner uses this term to refer to a period in time when virtually all children—including the poorest children of the working classes—were

free from the demands of wage labour (thanks to child labour laws) and were exposed to extended periods of formal schooling (because of compulsory education). "Real childhood" also entailed a reasonable amount of leisure time and a small amount of pocket money. Drotner argues that in 1751, when John Newbery launched the pioneering *Lilliputian Magazine*, only children of the privileged classes enjoyed this condition; but by the 1920s, when newsstands were heavy with illustrated weeklies like the *Schoolgirls' Friend* and the *Magnet*, most young Britons could be classified as citizens of the republic of "real childhood."

Drotner's concept of "real childhood" is provocative and far-removed from the rather Whiggish notions of childhood that characterize traditional surveys of children's literature. "Real childhood," as Drotner depicts it, was not an entirely felicitous condition for those experiencing it. She contends that, from the 1850s onwards, children and adolescents were increasingly isolated from the realities and the responsibilities of the adult world. The young were ghettoized, as it were, within a larger society.

Drotner refers to this process of isolation as the "structural paradox of childhood and youth." It was a paradox, she says, that involved "a discontinuity between the juveniles' present situation and their future station, a separation of personal learning and social use" (p. 45). Allegedly, the paradox caused frustrations and anxieties among those who were caught in the limbo of "real childhood." Hence the social and psychological importance of