

"Spandrels" Dissected

Understanding Scientific Prose. JACK SELZER, Ed. University of Wisconsin Press, Madison, 1993. xvi, 388 pp., illus. \$60 or £54; paper, \$19.95 or £18. Rhetoric and the Human Sciences.

While S. J. Gould and R. C. Lewontin's (1979) paper "The spandrels of San Marco and the Panglossian paradigm" has forever changed the old, unquestioningly "adaptationist" attitudes of most biologists, it is an unconventional piece of writing. As scientific prose, its dramatic energy and imagery render it a model to some readers and a case of puffery to others. But there is no doubting the paper's influence on the field of evolutionary biology: seminal, as they inevitably say. The paper is scarcely representative of scientific prose in general or of the *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London* (where it appeared in a collection on adaptation) in particular. Principally Gould's creation, it is, as he says in this volume of essays devoted to it, a distinctly personal "opinion piece" and as such falls outside the rules (whatever they are, and they are probably unnecessarily restrictive) of the "paper." Intended as a challenge to orthodoxy, it was deliberately crafted as a *tour de force*, leaving the interesting question whether its central message would have been so compelling if its exposition had been less polemical.

Here 16 experts in rhetoric, literary theory, and writing combine for a thorough scrutiny of Gould and Lewontin's paper in terms as diverse as those of intertextual fashioning, feminism, and deconstruction. At first sight one might not know whether to laugh or cry at the notion of this supercolliding of analytical theories. But this unique book is a great success, especially for the diversity of readings the authors give to the work under scrutiny. Parts will make anyone except a literary critic groan. Parts will make the average scientist squirm: scientific writing is supposed to be objective, nonpolemical and passion-free, isn't it? Should there—could there—be such a thing as a Marxist, feminist, you-name-it-ist scientific paper? (The answer is in the old joke about the southern Baptist who was asked if he believed in infant baptism. His answer: "Hell, yes, I've seen it done.")

One sees an interesting cross section of the readings of the different authors in their treatment of A. Seilacher, whose "constructional morphology," first expounded in 1970, arguably forms the principal conceptual basis of the paper. Gould and Lewontin used the eponymous spandrels as a specific "nonbiological" example

of this concept. D. Winsor (p. 134) finds that Gould and Lewontin extend Seilacher's evidence, transforming it into "evidence to prove their point (which they say is also Seilacher's own)." S. Wells finds them "lyric in the evocation of" Seilacher (p. 56), and G. Gragson and J. Selzer (p. 194) find Gould and Lewontin "salut[ing] among the living those few who are yet in the state of grace (e.g., Lande, Riedl, Seilacher, and themselves)." J. Fahnestock raises a charge of "mysticism" against Seilacher (p. 176). M. Rosner and G. Rhoades note Gould and Lewontin's statements that Seilacher was "generally sound" and "probably right" but complain that in setting up only this "single perspective" representing him as a hero they have failed to examine their own biases (p. 95). Gould in his closing commentary sees the spandrels metaphor as "the only truly original point in the paper" (p. 325).

After 14 chapters of analysis, Gould's final commentary is a disappointment. Written partly in a disingenuous, "I'm just a country boy from Harvard" style and loaded with classical tags and the obligatory references to baseball, it is almost a parody. But having been credited with (and mostly disavowing) all this refined literary accomplishment, he was placed in a tricky position.

Writing is where science (the organization of knowledge and explanation of causality) and art (the search for and expression of meaning) come together. It is something that no scientist can afford to neglect, because everything we write has layers of both structure and meaning, intended or unintended. However, whether expounding the old New Criticism or deconstruction theory, literary critics and rhetoricians tend to be ignored by scientists, who, if they pay any attention to their own writing at all, have been brainwashed into adopting a mode of impersonal declarative prose quite at odds with "fine" writing and subtlety of meaning. By analyzing a piece by one of us, these essays open up the otherwise forbidding world of textual analysis to the scientist-writer. It is a wonderful glimpse into that world (or worlds) and a challenge to ours.

Keith Stewart Thomson
Academy of Natural Sciences,
Philadelphia, PA 19103-1195



Biomedical Progenitor

Archibald Garrod and the Individuality of Man. ALEXANDER G. BEARN. Oxford University Press, New York, 1993. xviii, 227 pp., illus. \$49.95 or £35.

In this work of loving scholarship, Alexander Bearn has provided geneticists as well as a wider audience with the first full biography of Sir Archibald Edward Garrod, for the past 35 years recognized as the somewhat neglected father figure of biochemical genetics and the concept of human biochemical individuality. The key dates in this chronology are commonly set at 1908, the year Garrod delivered in London the Croonian Lectures published as *Inborn Errors of Metabolism*, and at 1958, 22 years after his death, the year when G. W. Beadle in his Nobel Prize lecture graciously recognized Garrod's seminal work. It would be easy to cast Garrod as a latter-day Mendel by virtue of his neglect by his contemporaries, and this is sometimes done. In fact, there is little similarity. Mendel was an obscure monk in an obscure town who published in an obscure journal a concept that the few who read it at the time failed to grasp. Garrod, as Bearn documents well, was for three decades a prominent figure in English medicine, ultimately, in 1920, succeeding Sir William Osler to the most prestigious position in English medicine, the Regius Professorship at Oxford. Garrod's message was widely heard and even to some extent understood, but it was not considered especially relevant to the medicine of the day. Whereas Mendel's message transformed a science, it was necessary for medicine and genetics itself to undergo substantial transformations before the full impact of Garrod's message became apparent.

Garrod was born in London in 1857. His father was a prominent physician, and the young Garrod developed in a rich intellectual environment. From his early years he displayed a strong interest in the sciences (as distinguished from the classics). There never seems to have been doubt that he would pursue a career in medicine. Graduating in 1885 from the course offered by the Royal Hospital of St. Bartholomew, he methodically took all the steps necessary to a place of prominence on the London medical scene. His medical scholarship was broad, his early publications ranging from "An introduction to the use of the laryngoscope" to "A treatise on rheumatism and rheumatoid arthritis." However, in due course he became much more interested in the chemical side of medicine, in those days mainly approached through studies of the