



Minerva Access is the Institutional Repository of The University of Melbourne

Author/s:
Coleman, D

Title:
[Review of the book Making Entomologists: How Periodicals Shaped Scientific Communities in Nineteenth-Century Britain, by Matthew Wale]

Date:
2023-09

Citation:
Coleman, D. (2023). [Review of the book Making Entomologists: How Periodicals Shaped Scientific Communities in Nineteenth-Century Britain, by Matthew Wale]. Isis: international review devoted to the history of science and its cultural influences, 114 (3), pp.670-671

Persistent Link:
<https://hdl.handle.net/11343/344593>

Matthew Wale. *Making Entomologists: How Periodicals Shaped Scientific Communities in Nineteenth-Century Britain.* (Science and Culture in the Nineteenth Century.) 231 pp., notes, bibl., index. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2022. \$55 (cloth); ISBN 9780822947516. E-book available.

Rich in detailed archival research, Matthew Wale's important book conducts a lively survey of a wide selection of very dissimilar periodicals, all devoted to the single science of entomology. His aim is to show how these periodicals both reflected and shaped communities of entomologists from the 1830s until the late nineteenth century, a period that saw the earlier practices of natural history, based on local and seasonal observations, challenged by the rise of biology and systematic classification. Inspired by the work of Benedict Anderson, Wale examines the imagined communities of readers, contributors, and editors produced by these periodicals. Editors were the key drivers, shaping communities according to their own set of values. Two editors are of note—Edward Newman (1801–1876) and Henry Stainton (1822–1892)—and three periodicals are discussed extensively—the *Zoologist*, the *Entomologist's Weekly Intelligencer*, and the *Entomologist's Monthly Magazine*. Drawing on the rich archives associated with these editors and periodicals, Wale replaces the usual nineteenth-century professionalization narrative with a rich and varied social topography of scientific practice and participation. He does this in part by his close attention to language, teasing out the shifting

meanings of terms such as “collector,” “amateur,” “professional,” “entomologist,” and “dealer.” Tracking these various terms as they pivot around the notion of the “gentleman,” Wale explores how different individuals, as well as different groups of practitioners, sought to consolidate their scientific authority.

Making Entomologists is divided into four chapters focused on four key practices: observing, corresponding, collecting, and classifying. Observation was the key methodology of Gilbert White’s *Natural History of Selborne* (1789), a book read widely when cheap editions began to appear after 1829. Edward Newman, editor of the long-lived *Zoologist* (1843–1916), believed firmly in White’s methodology, not least because the recording of natural history through close observation was a democratic activity, one that could be performed by rich and poor alike. With the *Zoologist* purposefully designed as “A Popular Miscellany of Natural History” (p. 51), Newman invited everyone to contribute, regardless of educational level. Furthermore, the rapid expansion of the print marketplace through cheaper, steam-powered production meant that White’s restricted focus on the parish of Selborne could be replaced by an entire nation of observers. Having failed once in his ambition simultaneously to address both “popular” and more scientific audiences, in the *Zoologist* Newman got the balance right—and the periodical thrived.

The next editor considered is the wealthy Henry Stainton. He was a distinguished entomologist with his own extensive networks of correspondents, and his *Entomologist’s Weekly Intelligencer* (1856–1861) testifies to the long-standing role of letters in scientific communication. Like Newman, Stainton aimed at a balance between popular and learned. He also boldly welcomed wide participation in the *Intelligencer*, arguing that “entomologists are not drawn from the wealthy, but rather from the working classes” (p. 65). When it came to observation, “a Spitalfields weaver” was just as likely to supply something new as “Oxford and Cambridge put together” (p. 67). Costing a penny each week, powered by the latest publishing technologies, and freed from the “taxes on knowledge”—duties levied on paper, advertising, and radical political content—the *Intelligencer* circulated natural history knowledge at an unprecedentedly fast speed (p. 74). Correspondents’ fieldwork practices filled each issue, offering information as to the how, when, and where of collecting. Wale gives us a detailed picture of the fieldwork practice and self-identity of several artisan correspondents, including the Sheffield razor grinder James Batty (1831–1892), a skilled collector who captured, bred, and identified numerous species of Lepidoptera.

The next chapter examines collecting practices, as mediated through the periodicals, with a view to understanding how the boundaries of community were negotiated, with practitioners determining inclusion and exclusion by actively defining their identities in relation to each other. Continuing with Stainton’s *Intelligencer*, Wale shows how the popularity and accessibility of its weekly industrialization of correspondence led to a similar industrialization of specimen exchange, whereby collectors advertised and then traded their surplus specimens for those of other practitioners. While exchange by penny post (from the 1840s onward) was hugely beneficial for working-class folk tied to place, it led to the unraveling of the periodical’s community, with questions of trust arising around debates over exactly what was admissible as “science” (p. 99). In the end, exchanges led to so many fraught and acrimonious accusations of ungentlemanly conduct that Stainton abruptly shut down the *Intelligencer* in 1861.

True to the book’s methodology of following a particular practice to understand how identities were constructed, Wale’s final chapter focuses on systematic classification and its role in distinguishing between a true entomologist and a mere collector. The construction of a more exclusive kind of scientific community can be seen in the *Entomologist’s Monthly Magazine* (1864–present), which marketed itself to members of the aristocracy and the church. Working-class collectors were precluded by a method of endorsement, and the content aimed at a smaller, more select coterie of scientific entomologists.

Deirdre Coleman

Deirdre Coleman is the Robert Wallace Chair of English and Redmond Barry Distinguished Professor at the University of Melbourne. Her most recent book is Henry Smeathman, the Flycatcher: Natural History, Slavery, and Empire in the Late Eighteenth Century (Liverpool, 2018).