

the antelope is “shedding a tear!” (p. 210). Rousseau used jungle imagery, in popular media often an apparent ratification of colonialism, to critique predatory “civilization.”

Theories of atavism, inescapable in much late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century literature and imagery, preoccupied many modernist artists; these studies suggest how varied their responses could be. Noting recurrent images of “wife capture” in popular literature, Larson suggests that visions of the brutal prehistoric (or anthropoid!) male making off with women evoked sexual selection. Sexual selection turns up in several chapters, including a fascinating discussion by Phillip Prodger of Darwin and Ruskin on aesthetics and James Krasner’s examination of illustrations that accompanied the original publication of *Tess of the D’Urbervilles*, which reads both image and text through the lens of sexual selection.

Krasner’s discussion of Thomas Hardy also considers the influence of eugenics, as does a chapter by Brauer, who argues that the “framing” of the First International Eugenics Conference, in 1912, by portraits and pedigrees of Darwin and Galton suggested that both were “progenitors” of eugenics, obscuring important differences between them.

The notion of “Darwinisms” emerges regularly. Postrevolutionary artists in the Soviet Union in the 1920s, according to Pat Simpson, embraced a volatile mix of Lamarckianism and Darwinism, envisioning “the body as inheritably trainable” (p. 243) in service of the ideal of evolution of a Taylorized worker, a “living labor machine” (p. 228).

A final chapter, by Sara Barnes and Andrew Patrizio, brings the book full circle, from Janet Browne’s early observation that “science, at its very heart, is about making visible the invisible” (p. 20) to Paul Klee’s dictum that “art does not reproduce the visible; rather it makes visible” (p. 288), from nineteenth-century encounters with geologic time to contemporary technologies in art and in science for seeing the microscopic and the impalpable.

I have a few minor quarrels with *The Art of Evolution*. The book includes many well-chosen images, but some would have been more legible had they been larger. There are several jarring typographical errors: Margaret Mead’s name is misspelled (p. 304), and the artist Charles R. Knight appears as “Charles Henry Knight” (p. 8). A thematic rather than chronological organization might have helped to tie related themes, movements, and characters together. Many of the authors offer their own summaries of Dar-

win—and, as Larson says, much depends upon “which Darwin one is talking about” (p. 14); after all, the people discussed draw very differently from Darwin—and from Lamarck. Still, it feels redundant.

These are minor problems, though, in a stimulating, sometimes surprising, often brilliant, and generally valuable book that offers fresh perspectives and new ways of seeing.

CONSTANCE ARESON CLARK

**João Magueijo.** *A Brilliant Darkness: The Extraordinary Life and Mysterious Disappearance of Ettore Majorana, the Troubled Genius of the Nuclear Age.* xxi + 280 pp., illus., index. New York: Basic Books, 2009. \$27.50 (cloth).

It is not easy to review a book that tries to be, at the same time, a eulogy of Ettore Majorana, a popular book on early nuclear physics, a best-selling mystery, a Victorian-style travel book, and a review of myths and conspiracy theories regarding Majorana’s life and disappearance—and all of that in a style and language that, rather than popular, is far too often vulgar and offensive. Certainly readers of *Isis* will be disappointed to see how some active scientists (in this case Magueijo himself) disregard the scholarly work done by professional historians of science when they try to popularize science and its history.

*A Brilliant Darkness* reads, in some of its chapters, like a travel book, following João Magueijo’s efforts to discover some yet unrevealed secret in the “mysterious” life of Ettore Majorana. Those travels take us to Sicily and Rome, where we meet old members of the Majorana family, as well as the streets and buildings related to his life and career. The Italian reader may take offense at the patronizing way the author deals, at times, with Sicilian and Italian culture—in a manner resembling some nineteenth-century European explorers in their accounts of primitive tribes—while the scholar will be disappointed by the fact that these trips never take him to archives or to serious research materials.

The book offers a reasonably good review of the fictions abounding around the figure of Majorana. To keep the reader interested, Magueijo explains each of these myths and conspiracy theories in a very attractive way, only to dismiss them with the argument that there is no evidence to support any of them. He does so, however, in a style that nonetheless leaves open the possibility that some conspiracy theory may actually be true—especially when he claims, at the very beginning

of the book, that Majorana could still be awarded the Nobel Prize since his death was never proved and, therefore, he *might* still be alive.

As for the popularization of science, Magueijo tries hard to explain Majorana's science and the complexities of nuclear physics with the help of simple visual aids, including electrons that look like spermatozoa. I'm not sure, however, that the reader who needs the almost childish explanations found in Chapter 2 can easily follow the intricacies of Chapters 25 and 26.

JAUME NAVARRO

**Peter Paret.** *The Cognitive Challenge of War: Prussia, 1806.* x + 164 pp., illus., bibl., index. Princeton, N.J./Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2009. \$22.95 (cloth).

The four chapters of this short book, originally presented as the 2008 Lee Knowles Lectures, explore "response to innovation in war" (p. 1). Specifically, Peter Paret dissects Prussia's reaction to the twin defeats of Jena-Auerstadt at the hands of Napoleon. "No other army had been defeated as severely as the Prussians" in 1806, says Paret, "and in response no army broke as quickly with the past, or perhaps as sharply" (p. 102). In Kuhnian terms, which Paret eschews, Napoleon inaugurated a revolution in warfare. How did Prussia react?

After an introductory chapter on the disaster at Jena-Auerstadt, Paret devotes one chapter each to literary and artistic responses, political and institutional reforms, and, finally, conceptual analysis—the "cognitive challenge" of his title. No one familiar with Paret's *oeuvre* will be surprised to learn that Carl von Clausewitz, the Prussian military officer and philosopher, appears in all three analytical chapters.

Chapter 1 sets up this analysis by demonstrating that the Prussian military and civilian leadership failed to comprehend the revolution in warfare embodied in the French army of 1806, which Napoleon said was the best he ever led. Once engaged, the Prussian leaders could not adapt on the run. The second chapter, on literary and artistic responses to the defeat, is perhaps the most original and the most controversial. Paret continues his recent work in the history of art, arguing in this case that artists such as Christian Gottfried Geissler and writers such as Friedrich von Schiller and Heinrich von Kleist "[broke] down the social and emotional isolation of war" (p. 68) by interpreting it for the Prussian people. But this begs the question of whether the artists and writers apprehended the

war correctly or even usefully and whether the public they addressed understood their work. To make that argument, Paret must himself interpret these artists and writers. But this removes the modern reader by two degrees of separation from the events themselves, depending first on the artists and writers and then on Paret to interpret what happened. Paret's answer to this concern is that Clausewitz, the real focus of this book, read Schiller and, by extension, absorbed the other artistic and literary currents that swirled about the defeated Prussia.

Chapter 3 is more traditional, tracing the history of the famous Prussian reform movement through the remainder of the Napoleonic era and into the postwar conservative reaction, in which Clausewitz wrote his masterpiece, *On War*. The last chapter builds on Paret's argument that "some of the pragmatic responses to the problems raised in 1806 . . . became steps toward an understanding of war in its totality, war as such" (pp. 104–105). Here he compares the two great students of Napoleonic warfare, Clausewitz and Antoine-Henri Jomini. Paret credits Jomini with more insight and analytical power than is normal in such comparisons, but Clausewitz nonetheless emerges as rising above all others to "the cognitive challenge of defeat" (p. 77). While Jomini wrote about warfare, Clausewitz wrote about war.

Clausewitz posited three kinds of theory: utilitarian or prescriptive, pedagogic, and cognitive. Clausewitz's cognitive theory of war, including his most famous insight—that war is a continuation of politics by other means—drew much of its power from the disaster at Jena-Auerstadt. While Jomini tried to explain how Napoleon had won, Clausewitz tried to understand the fundamental nature of war. In doing so, he constructed a profound and timeless analysis that transcends the defeats of 1806, even the revolution of Napoleonic warfare. Paret's achievement in this elegant extended essay is to show how *On War* emerged not just from the wreckage of Jena-Auerstadt, but also from the political, social, artistic, and literary context in which it was conceived.

ALEX ROLAND

**Nicolaas Rupke.** *Richard Owen: Biology without Darwin.* xxiv + 344 pp., illus., tables, bibl., index. Revised edition. Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press, 2009. \$29 (paper).

The Natural History Museum in London recently unveiled its Darwin Centre, the most significant expansion of the museum since it