this collection. He does, none the less, have some interesting things to say, not the least of which being his reminder that folk models are, on some occasions, at least as coherent as the analytical models constructed by sociologists.

In summary then, this is a useful and challenging collection of papers, addressing a complex and important topic from a variety of directions. As such, it is impossible to do it justice in a brief review. I can think of few practising sociologists who would not benefit from a critical and open-minded engagement with the issues raised herein. One can only look forward to the volume which will hopefully result from the second Surrey conference.

Richard Jenkins
University College of Swansea


'Schools' of sociology are rare enough to be counted on the fingers of one hand. Although there are a few other examples — from social anthropology, economics and political science — the coming into being of such collective and tightly integrated scholarly enterprises is rare enough to demand explanation. This important collection is the product of the Groupe d'Etudes Durkheimiennes, based at the Maison des Sciences de l'Homme in Paris. It is a study, in twelve original essays, of the institutionalization of Durkheimian sociology in France. Six of the authors are French; four North American. All take a scholarly approach to the history of sociology, using original sources.

The editor's introduction delineates the Durkheim circle and sets out the main themes. The 'school' was integrated around the Année Sociologique, which Durkheim founded and edited. The other key figures in this network were Mauss, Bouglé, Hubert, Fauconnet, Richard, Simiand, Halbwachs and Bourgin. That several are not household names reflects the interdisciplinary character of the network, extending into philosophy, linguistics, aesthetics, history of religion, geography, economics and law. For all Durkheim's supposed sociologism, he was exceptionally encouraging of links with other disciplines. The structure of the school was rather like a web with Durkheim at the centre. Many members did not know one another, and the journal (particularly in its very extensive book reviewing function) was the main collaborative activity.

Perhaps the most interesting chapter after the first is an intellectual self-portrait by Marcel Mauss, written in 1930 when being considered for a chair at the College de France. This again brings out how deeply involved the Durkheimians were in work of other disciplines. Mauss's own Le Don is read today more by anthropologists and unjustly neglected by sociologists. Other chapters analyse in detail the location and influence of the Durkheimians within the French university system. The focus is more on Durkheim's associates than on Durkheim himself, which renders the account all the more valuable since their role has in the past been less clear. Detailed attention is given to the work of Hubert on folk religion, Lapie on social mobility, Bouglé on philosophic rationalism, Simiand on economic history, and the influence of Halbwachs in the second generation in ensuring the survival of the Durkheimian influence.

The strongest impression one gains of the sources of strength of the group lies in its deep intellectual seriousness and commitment, with an overriding emphasis on inter-related research and breadth of interdisciplinary perspective. Influence within the French university system was also important, but central figures such as Mauss and Simiand were academically marginal for much of their careers. Is it not unlikely that such a phenomenon will occur again?

Martin Bulmer
London School of Economics

Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics Hubert L. Dreyfus and
Paul Rabinow The Harvester Press 1983 231pp. £4.95 (paper)

For those who have struggled to come to terms with the ideas of Michel Foucault and have found the writings of some of his commentators even more impenetrable than that of the man himself, help is at hand in the form of an excellent book by Dreyfus and Rabinow. Writing clearly and cogently the authors manage to do justice to the significance and complexity of Foucault's challenging, but sometimes elusive ideas, whilst giving them a remarkable coherence and intelligibility. The book is organized chronologically and is, thus, able to mark the developments and changes in Foucault's thinking as well as to summarize his major themes and concepts. However, Dreyfus and Rabinow are not merely concerned with exposition. Part of their project is to tackle some of the questions that continue to bedevil an understanding of Foucault's work. These are particularly concerned with its relationship to structuralism and the status of the knowledge-claims Foucault produces through his own methodological archaeology or genealogy.

Although Foucault himself has denied any affinity with structuralism, Dreyfus and Rabinow argue that his earlier work is a form of quasi-structuralism, although it never fully embraced that form of analysis. This explains why Foucault's own work is unable to escape some of the pitfalls he identifies as central problems for the various human sciences, and which his analysis claims to be able to avoid. In Dreyfus and Rabinow's view this is partly due to Foucault's early insistence that discourse should be treated as autonomous but also to his failure to acknowledge the importance of non-discursive practices on discourse. However, this difficulty is resolved in later work where the frame of reference is extended, also in his more recent books, Foucault's emphasis on knowledge-power enables attention to be directed to the epistemological status of his ideas.

As Foucault's work is very much 'in progress', Dreyfus and Rabinow conclude their arguments not with a list of criticisms or evaluations but, as is fitting, with a series of questions and dilemmas which seem to emerge from it. Since the final chapter is, in fact, an afterword by Foucault himself, we must conclude that this impressive book can claim his approval.

Unfortunately, it is not possible to be as enthusiastic about Cultural Analysis by Wuthnow et al. This mainly comprises descriptions of the central concerns of the writers Peter Berger, Mary Douglas, Michel Foucault and Jürgen Habermas. However, there is little which is novel or stimulating here and even the criticisms seem to be derived from other secondary sources. Compared to the Dreyfus and Rabinow text it is rather dull.

The aim of the book is to look at four major contributors to a sociological analysis of culture, the argument being that in their own ways each of the authors selected have moved beyond the traditional dualist and reductionist approach. Such a claim, while hardly original, would be acceptable if the authors had not extended it to suggest that this means a new and distinctive approach to the analysis of culture is emerging. The problem here is that since the theorists chosen come from four distinct intellectual traditions, the work examined here focuses on different levels and kinds of culture as well as utilizing different concepts and methodologies. In fact, these authors seem to have little more in common than their rejection of past efforts at cultural analysis. This hardly constitutes grounds for claiming that, together, their contributions comprise an innovatory framework. Unlike the book by Dreyfus and Rabinow, Cultural Analysis therefore fails to fulfill its promise.

Mary Maynard
University of York

Social Research in Developing Countries Martin Bulmer and Donald P. Warwick (eds) John Wiley & Sons 1983 383pp. £19.50