with which the debate turned towards the reliability of the witnesses and the social consequences of accepting their statements. As the witnesses were predominantly women (sometimes poor women), the supposedly scientific accounts degenerated into arguments as to whether supporting or gainsaying the testimony in question would help or hinder the maintenance of patriarchy and hierarchy. Virtually all the medical experts (even the Mesmerists) believed that women should be kept in a subordinate position. Only the doctors who supported the possibilities of late births, notably the Paris physician, Antoine Petit, showed any sympathy for the reliability of female intelligence, and, significantly, Petit, a bachelor renowned for his charm, was to be accused by his colleagues of professional impropriety.

Assessing the value of Lindsay Wilson's work is very difficult, for, despite the title, it is not just a study of female diseases or even quasi-female diseases (i.e. pregnancy). In fact, the book ranges over a variety of topics, such as the emergence of medical jurisprudence and the professionalization of science, in which the activities of women *tout court*, not just their diseases, seem to have informed specific male-determined eighteenth-century developments. Moreover, only one (predominantly) female disease is actually examined: convulsions. Not only do the chapters on Saint-Médard and Mesmer deal with women subject to fits, but a separate penultimate chapter looks at the medical discussion of convulsions over the century. On the other hand, there is much in the book that historians of medicine will find stimulating. It has become customary (with the work of Toby Gelfand in particular) to see the eighteenth-century Paris surgeons and physicians on different sides, the former representatives of modernity, the latter of tradition. Wilson demonstrates that this is a false dichotomy when attention is focused, not on the two groups' relative spheres of influence within the medical marketplace, but on the way the marketplace was to be policed. Physicians and surgeons joined together to support or oppose patient (especially female patient) power, just as they joined together to uphold or undermine the hitherto dominant Baconian ethic of science which stressed as its goal the mastery of nature. Similarly, it has become customary (again thanks to Gelfand, and the work of the *Annalistes* on the Société Royale de Médecine) to see the medical relationship of the provinces to the capital as one of dependence. Wilson's general chapter on the vapours (based primarily on study in the Society's archives) gives the lie to such Tocquevillian prejudice by demonstrating that provincial physicians and surgeons had their own views of the disease's cause. Whereas those in the capital, used to administering to the rich, believed that convulsions were the result of female idleness and soft-living, their country cousins, more used to poorer patients, attributed the malady to female sexuality and religiosity.

On balance, then, this is an important book, which is marred by its discursive nature. Throughout, the reader is continually struck by assertions and speculations that cry out for further expansion. Is it really the case, for instance (pp. 4–5), that the medical profession's heightened concern about unlicensed practitioners simply reflects the fact that corporate society was in crisis? My own feeling would be that medical corporatism in particular is in crisis because of the *inflated* number of empirics. Or again (p. 166), is it really true that women flocked to Saint-Médard and Mesmer as a protest against social subordination and ostracism. After all, the supposedly predominantly female constituency in either case might be a literary fiction, an invention of the establishment anxious to give the impression that acolytes were weak-willed and insubordinate. Lindsay Wilson's readers will admire her originality, applaud the careful and unprejudiced way that she makes use of gender as the organizing principle of the work, but wish that she had written at greater length.

Laurence Brockliss, Magdalen College, Oxford

CAROLYN D. WILLIAMS, *Pope, Homer and manliness: some aspects of eighteenth-century classical learning*, London and New York, Routledge, 1993, pp. xi, 220, £37.50 (0–415–05600–4).

There are some books with no direct connections to the history of medicine that should not be passed over by medical historians, and this is one of them. In a brief monograph, as witty as it is erudite, Carolyn Williams illuminates the perplexing and contested boundaries of gender in the early eighteenth century by exploring the nuances of Alexander Pope's translations of the *Odyssey* and the *Iliad*. A double interest lies therein.

For one thing, what was the Augustan world of polite letters to make of the warrior culture of the Homeric epics? As Williams deftly shows, eighteenth-century values prized "manliness", setting off the "manly" against the effeminate, the childish, and the brutal. Yet the literary *mores* of the *Spectator* era also felt equivocal about the parade of martial virtues, seeing macho bellicosity as an outmoded and hopefully obsolescent mark of barbarian savagery. Thus, Williams demonstrates, Pope was concerned to praise more a mental than a physical manliness. Such views obviously ramify with a medical milieu which increasingly emphasized that the ultimate determinant of human nature lay less in gross anatomy or the humours than in the nervous system and the brain.

For another thing, the very notion of "manliness" came exceedingly close to the bone for Alexander Pope, a dwarfish man (he probably suffered from Pott's disease, tuberculosis of the spine) who could speak of "this long disease my life". If Pope could never hope to be manly in the martial sense, he could at least aspire to a certain literary manliness. The question as to whether satire (the pen is mightier than the sword) was an appropriately masculine deployment of wit clearly raised issues (skilfully handled by Williams) respecting medical and psychological understanding as to whether literature was a form of healthy discharge, perhaps of spleen, or an introverted species of psychopathology. Pope's fear of being unmanned, Williams shows, led to a parade of muscular mockery, spiteful caricatures of homosexuals, and an enigmatic misogyny. All readers disposed to the view that it is important to study medical ideas as they permeated the general culture will find rich rewards in this intriguing work.

Roy Porter, Wellcome Institute

ULFRIED GEUTER, *The professionalization of psychology in Nazi Germany*, transl. Richard J. Holmes, Cambridge Studies in the History of Psychology, Cambridge University Press, 1992, pp. xxi, 335, £35.00, $54.95 (0–521–33297–4).

Ulfried Geuter's book, published in Germany in 1984, was widely admired. It was a meticulously researched study, involving a mass of original evidence, tracing an academic discipline and professional expertise during the Third Reich, and making two highly-charged claims. First, contrary to received opinion, the Nazis did not largely destroy the subject of psychology—with its leaders going into exile; rather, the Wehrmacht's interest in personnel selection enabled psychology to expand as an occupation and, in 1941, to achieve for the first time academic independence from philosophy with the creation of a state examination or professional diploma. Second, the subject's advancement under the Nazi state established the institutional basis from which it grew in the post-war period. These arguments contributed on a larger canvas to the historiography integrating the Third Reich into a continuous narrative of German history rather than isolating it as an anomaly. The book had a striking impact on the German psychology profession itself and proved to be a landmark of reinterpretation.

English-language readers will warmly welcome this translation. The author has also taken the opportunity to cut some detail and make small revisions. The book will have an audience among all those concerned with science, the professions, and the state. Its organizing theme is professionalization, the way in which academic specialists struggled for the academic and occupational development of a once marginal subject. This goal involved continuous negotiation with other interests—academic, professional (the medical profession notably and successfully resisted the growth of clinical psychology), industrial, state, and military. The goal was realized, Geuter argues, primarily because it addressed the armed services' need for using manpower efficiently, especially in selecting officers for training. Significantly, he suggests, as war became total war in the East, officers in effect selected themselves in the field, and the psychologists' success in achieving a separate examination in 1941 was followed almost immediately by the army's discontinuation of psychological testing.

Beyond these arguments, however, Geuter firmly attends to the wider context, that is, to the purposes and nature of German power. Here his thorough empirical research—in archives, with oral history, in occupational journals—is of decisive importance. He poses specific questions regarding the activities of psychologists, for example, when they tested deportees and prisoners of war for the