

Oath. James' ace in the hole, the Bishops, were unable to save his regime or, in the end, their own.

Jackson's conclusions are neatly summarized in her final section. Among these the discovery of a specifically Scottish allegiance debate and the substantial contribution of Scots lawyers to intellectual culture are perhaps most important. Also significant is the inclusion of ideas like "pragmatism" and "adiaphorist" to a period and a people that have for too long been given over to mischaracterizations. Lastly, Jackson criticizes the capacity and enthusiasm for British history to undermine the study of a uniquely Scottish political and intellectual culture; a culture that was not British and certainly not English. The Scottish Enlightenment did not spring, fully-formed, from the head of David Hume; it had antecedents and a foundation at least as deep as this most unenlightened of periods.

Inclusive title notwithstanding, Jackson's book will not reach the best-seller list. This, however, is not a measure of her success. She has illuminated a poorly-understood period, and replaced voiceless caricatures with thoughtful individuals. For this service as well as the laborious unearthing of a new range of sources, *Restoration Scotland* is an important and instructive work.

Kathleen Wellman. *Making Science Social: The Conferences of Théophraste Renaudot 1633-1642*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2003. xviii + 461 pp. + 4 illus. \$39.95. Review by KAROL K. WEAVER, SUSQUEHANNA UNIVERSITY.

Kathleen Wellman's *Making Science Social: The Conferences of Théophraste Renaudot 1633-1642* traces the history of the seventeenth-century conferences led by Théophraste Renaudot to elucidate the characteristics of early seventeenth-century science, to show the connections between the conferences and the French Enlightenment, and to demonstrate the contributions that the conferences made to the development of the human and social sciences. Wellman recounts the biography of Théophraste Renaudot, the eccentric intellectual who led the conferences. A seventeenth-cen-

tury medical and social reformer, Renaudot brought intellectuals together to discuss a diverse array of scientific and social topics. He publicized these discussions by printing them as inexpensive reports as well as leather bound volumes. These reports are the primary sources that Wellman uses to consider seventeenth-century science. Wellman's exploration of the conferences reevaluates major ideas in the history of science, the history of gender and science, and the history of biology.

Historians of science have noted the contributions that scientific institutions made to the practice of science in the seventeenth century. Many scholars have described the significant role that the academies played in the development of science. Other scholars have concentrated on noble networks, and the ways these networks allowed women of the upper class to participate in science. While acknowledging these institutions, Wellman considers the conferences as important but forgotten subjects in the history of scientific institutions. She points out that, unlike state-sponsored academies like the Academie des Sciences, the conferences prized open and anonymous discussions of scientific topics.

Specialists in the history of science also emphasize the important influence that the mechanistic philosophy of seventeenth-century science had on the development of the social sciences during the eighteenth-century French Enlightenment and during the nineteenth century. Wellman contends that scholars must consider the connections that join the conferences' interest in the human sciences with the Enlightenment's emphasis on politics and economics. She asserts that the intellectuals who attended the conferences were predecessors of the French *philosophes* and presaged the scholars who participated in the Enlightenment republic of letters.

Wellman not only urges scholars to rethink their understanding of the history of scientific institutions and the connections between seventeenth-century science and the Enlightenment, but also insists that her readers reconsider the history of gender and science. Specifically, she states that historians who have stressed that the early modern period was a time when women participated freely in science have put forth a "simplistic" argument (360). On

the basis of the conferences' discussions of women, she contends that the early modern period was an era during which "science sustained the predominant gender roles" (360).

Wellman's analysis of seventeenth-century science also makes a significant contribution to the history of biology. She points out that traditional histories of the scientific revolution focus on physics, mathematics, and mechanics. Using the conferences as evidence, she asserts that historians need to be aware of the emphasis that was placed on the biological and natural sciences. She offers a new way to think about the scientific revolution in order to challenge "the history of science [which] has privileged astronomy and physics" and which has downplayed "the biological and natural sciences" (152). In Wellman's formulation of the history of the scientific revolution, "the role of Aristotle...would be far different if the biological sciences were seen as central" (152).

Unfortunately, Wellman's treatment of the history of medicine is not on par with her examination of the histories of science, gender and science, and biology. Specifically, Wellman denigrates some aspects of early modern medicine by considering it from the perspective of modern medicine. Despite this shortcoming, she does a fine job establishing the skeptical, humanitarian, utilitarian, and optimistic qualities of the medical discussions that took place among the members of Renaudot's group, and associates these characteristics with the Enlightenment's view of medicine.

Several audiences would benefit from reading Wellman's text. Historians of science, gender and science, and biology will find an engaging reconsideration of some of the most important debates within the history of science. Specialists in the history of France will also benefit from Wellman's investigation into the age of absolutism and the Enlightenment, and the conferences' connections to these two periods.