

Book Reviews

about softening of bones and skeletal deformities. On the basis of autopsy, he concludes that the anatomical seat of whooping-cough (*coqueluche*) is neither the chest nor the stomach, but rather the upper part of the oesophagus, pharynx, and larynx. For most ailments, he finds little difficulty in diagnosis (the characteristic cough of *coqueluche* may be recognized before even seeing the child). On the whole, Astruc tends to be optimistic in his prognoses, provided, of course, that the ailment comes to the attention of a competent physician at an early stage. Treatment, following ancient wisdom, is first by regimen, then drugs, and, at last resort, surgery. In this regard, Astruc mentions use of the knife to free the *frein* or *filet* (adhesions of the tongue) and to incise the *grenouillette* (sublingual tumour). He advocates prompt blood-letting in inflammatory disorders (e.g. whooping-cough) and specifies the composition and doses of remedies.

Of the many ailments discussed, the final one – *état de Chartre* (literally “the condition of a prisoner”) – is, according to Astruc, “the worst disease that can befall a child”. Exhaustion and lethargy characterize the wasting condition that Astruc attributes to a combination of digestive disorders. He scorns the popular belief in witchcraft as the cause of *état de Chartre*, but acknowledges the condition as a composite of many ailments and the need for the physician to know all children’s diseases in order to diagnose this one. If *état de Chartre* derives from imperfectly cured venereal disease in the parents, Astruc recommends hiring a wet-nurse “at whatever price” (*à prix d’argent*) to undergo a course of mercurial frictions before nursing the affected child. The elegant physician of the French classical period knew how to reconcile therapeutic rationality with the inequities of the social structure.

Toby Gelfand
Hannah Chair of the History of Medicine
University of Ottawa

THOMAS H. LEAHEY, *A history of psychology: main currents in psychological thought*, Englewood Cliffs, N. J., Prentice-Hall, 1980, 8vo, pp. xii, 431, £12.30.

The U.S. undergraduate market in psychology has encouraged a series of “histories” over the last decade. This reflects the way courses in “History and systems in psychology” attempt to do justice to the diversity of psychological thought. Leahey’s *History* is written for this audience; but it should be said that it is lucid, readable, wide ranging, and avoids reduction to answers for multiple choice tests. Students, and non-psychologists, should enjoy this lively book. Medical psychology receives only passing comment; the main theme is firmly with the history of ideas.

The orientation derives from American experience of behaviourism. Part III is a valuable introduction to this movement, its varieties, and its highly evaluative discussions, of theory, method, and predictive ideals. Leahey tests Kuhn’s account of scientific development against these events; in conclusion, he addresses his colleagues, arguing for the existence – and desirability – of “psychologies” rather than a single systematic framework. In this context, the discussion of how the “cognitive psychology” umbrella has opened over a range of psychologies from the 1960s is clear and interesting.

From the European vantage, behaviourism’s twentieth-century dominance is overdone: varieties of psychology as diverse as phenomenological, Soviet-Pavlovian, and physiological receive scant attention. The same issue results in a changed level of analysis between the first two parts and Part III. Part I reviews philosophy from the Greeks to the earlier nineteenth century – “the background to psychology”. It is convention, which Leahey accepts, that central philosophical issues (being and becoming, essentialism and nominalism) lay the foundation for “psychology”; thus psychology, as such, has no specific history. The implications of this are not met here (or elsewhere) by discussion of criteria for distinguishing “psychological” thought or for considering the contribution of theology, jurisprudence, and political ideas. Even less is it possible to consider how everyday assumptions about human nature – including medicine – are themselves a form of psychology. Can one write “history of psychology” in this early period?

Part II describes “founding psychology” in the period 1860 to 1914. Psychology, as a modern body of knowledge, is “founded” in Wundt’s experimental programme, Freud’s study of the

Book Reviews

dynamic unconscious, and evolutionary theory's creation of a psychology of adaptation. Leahey has read widely in recent secondary sources; his account therefore stands out as a genuine attempt at synthesis (and is not a rehash of E. G. Boring; e.g., in the account of Wundt's ideas). But though there is reference to social change, the institutional discipline – and certainly explanatory social factors – receive little attention. The significance of the claim that "Wundt's long-term importance for psychology has proven to be institutional" (p. 182) is not followed through.

There are errors and misleading generalizations: Hume shows "the first glimmerings of the psychology of adaptation" (p. 113) rather than the preoccupations of the Scottish Enlightenment; Mendel is "an obscure Polish monk" (p. 153); from the fourteenth century "there was a long hiatus during which science did not advance" (p. 76); Spencer's work is minimized by the label "Lamarckian psychology" (p. 246). An antagonism between science and religion remains implicit and linked to progressivist assumptions (most damagingly, David Hartley's theodicy, the context for his association psychology, is not mentioned). It would surely be simpler to refer to "worldview" rather than "The Classical-Medieval-Renaissance Episteme" (p. 82). Such specific points aside, the overall structure around behaviourism is challenging. If indeed psychology can be called "humanity's attempt to understand the self" (p. 2), then much behaviourism hardly qualifies as psychology (Part III notwithstanding). It is said that "[James] Mill expounded his psychology for the purposes of reform. He was not a psychologist" (p. 45). Why should the same not be said about J. B. Watson?

Roger Smith
Department of History
University of Lancaster

CELIA DAVIES (editor), *Rewriting nursing history*, London, Croom Helm, 1980, 8vo, pp. 266, illus., £11.95 (£5.95 paperback).

This book combines a critical stance towards the writing of history with examinations of neglected areas of nursing history. It does not set out to be a new text, but it does hope to open the field to research. Several of the contributors have been nurses, and they aim to enable nurses to see and investigate their job in new ways.

In the first paper, after an introduction on past nursing history by the editor, Christopher Maggs examines the records of four provincial hospitals between 1881 and 1921, and contrasts the account drawn from them of the probationer nurse with the prescriptive account found elsewhere. The interdependence of the two in practice is stressed. This theme is continued in Katherine Williams's paper, in which she discusses nursing and medical views of the history of nursing published for the 1897 jubilee. She relates the differences to the conflicting interests of the two emerging professions. The system of training and control of nurses, and the separation between nursing and domestic duties in the hospital are discussed. Mitchell Dean and Gail Bolton's paper is very different. They situate mid-nineteenth-century nursing within the development of forms of control and administration of poverty, through the workhouses, hospitals, and in the homes of the poor. Nursing is seen as part of the "curative economy of the hospital, [which] placed discipline, regulation, normalisation and observation first" (p. 87). Celia Davies looks at nurse education in Britain and the U.S.A. in the next paper. The struggle to establish the training of nurses in each country up to 1939 is linked with differences in political and educational systems. Nursing education is seen as a casualty to the labour requirements of the hospitals and to an orthodoxy about the nature of the profession. Mick Carpenter's paper is on asylum nursing before 1914, which he sees as part of the history of labour. The custodial and disciplinary function of both the asylum and the nursing is stressed. The poor wages, long hours, and conditions of work, which were little different from the living conditions of the inmates, are linked with the growth of trade union consciousness and the formation of the National Asylum Workers' Union in 1910. The differences between men and women attendants in their pattern of employment and unionization are noted. Paul Bellaby and Patrick Oribabor discuss a contemporary survey of unionization of various types of nurses. They demonstrate the greater understanding possible if the history of nursing unionization and