

The first Frankfurter Psychoanalytisches Institut (see the contribution by Michael Laier) was headed by Karl Landauer and Heinrich Meng; its teachers also included Frieda Fromm-Reichmann, Erich Fromm, and Siegmund Heinrich Foulkes. After Berlin (1920), Vienna (1922), and London (1925), it was the fourth such institute to be founded. Unlike its counterparts, however, it did not offer a training course, but aimed at disseminating Freud's theories among "doctors, pedagogues, jurists, sociologists" (p. 51). Due to the influence of Landauer's analysis and Max Horkheimer, then director of the Institut für Sozialforschung at Frankfurt University, the institute had its location on the premises of the university, although it did not form a part of it. In 1933, both institutes were officially closed, because of "psychoanalysis, sociology, Marxism, 'Verjudung', and anti-Hitlerism. The library rooms were demolished, the books publicly burnt" (p. 64).

The Sigmund-Freud-Institut was founded against resistance similar to that which had destroyed its predecessor (contributions by Hermann Argelander, Falk Berger, Margarete Mitscherlich-Nielsen, and Emma Moersch). Mitscherlich—whom J H Schulz had told in 1942 that his "resistance against national socialism was an outcome of his latent homosexuality" (pp. 351–2)—encountered great difficulties after the war, particularly because of his efforts to expose the collaboration of doctors with the Nazis. We learn for instance that in 1952 the statutes of the Deutsche Psychoanalytische Vereinigung, headed by Karl Müller-Braunschweig, "saw no obstacle in making members of the NSDAP members of the DPV" (p. 352).

The book contains a wealth of information and minute details. A reliable name index further helps to make it a valuable working instrument. English-speaking readers may be particularly interested in the Frankfurt activities of pioneers, such as Frieda Fromm-Reichmann (by Ursula Engel), Erich Fromm (by Bernard Görlich), or Siegmund H Foulkes (by Sabine Rothe), who later played important roles in their countries of exile. There are

further biographical accounts of the key figures: Karl Landauer (by Hans-Joachim Rothe) and Heinrich Meng (by Tomas Plänklers), as well as Ludwig Edinger (by Gerald Kreft), a relative of Bertha Pappenheim, who was probably also her doctor, and whose daughter-in-law Dora Edinger made a name for herself as one of the first Pappenheim biographers; and of Kurt Goldstein (by Michael Laier), a great influence on Fromm-Reichmann, who dedicated her *Principles of intensive psychotherapy* to Freud, Groddeck, Sullivan, and Goldstein. Tomas Plänklers contributes a very interesting paper on the prehistory of the Goethe Prize for Freud, quoting at length from the minutes of the *Kuratorium*.

This book is what it is: a reader on the history of psychoanalysis in Frankfurt. Many of the details are perhaps of little interest or unintelligible to those not directly concerned or to the non-specialist. Some potential readers might find the book's length and the price prohibitive. But those who want to learn more about what the title promises will not be disappointed, although there are some defects. The host of repetitions, understandable in talks given on overlapping topics, is, nevertheless, annoying. A few of the articles are reprints (e.g. by Argelander, Berger, Plänklers) which have been printed exactly as they appeared originally—even to the style of quotations, and a reference to an appendix (p. 349) for which one looks in vain in the book.

Ernst Falzeder,

W Wilson Center, Washington DC

Lilian R Furst (ed.), *Women healers and physicians: climbing a long hill*, Lexington, University Press of Kentucky, 1997, pp. vii, 274, \$34.95 (0-8131-2011-X).

This collection of diverse essays promises to "fill gaps in our understanding" of women healers and physicians (midwives and nurses are excluded) and to provide "a unique comparative picture of women's struggles". It

Book Reviews

does neither. The twelve essays that make up the book range randomly over more than 2,500 years and are in no sense a comparative study. Each of the essays—whether on the healing power of medieval women, or the role of the blues in African-American women's literature, or on women doctors in Virginia Woolf's writing—is discrete and unrelated to every other essay. It is an example of a burgeoning genre of books that comprise independent articles on a very broad theme that are not peer-reviewed and are not closely directed or controlled by the editor. Although this practice has become a growth industry in Great Britain's medical-historical community, this volume is from an American press.

Most of the contributors are specialists in literature—ancient, medieval, Spanish, English, American, German, African-American—and come at the subject through a handful of examples in their fields of interest. A number break new ground, notably the excellent survey of women doctors in the ancient world by the classicist Holt Parker and the description of the use of the blues in healing among African-American women by the writer and poet Gunilla Kester. Some of the others add new insights and speculation about the complex interrelationships between women doctors and national environments in particular periods of history. Others report findings that have been explored elsewhere, such as Paulette Meyer's essay on women medical students in Zurich, and Regina Morantz-Sanchez's study of the controversial nineteenth-century gynaecologist Mary Dixon Jones.

The collection raises hard questions about how to advance our understanding of women's past role in medicine and healing. What is the "healing" depicted in the book's title if it omits midwifery, nursing, and many types of domestic medicine? Surely the boundaries between medicine, midwifery, nursing, and other healing need to be defined if such terms are to have any meaning. The historical evidence for many of the literary insights in the book, moreover, is at best thin and sketchy; the analysis based on such evidence is of necessity highly theoretical and speculative; and many of

the contributors seem to assume (falsely) that the principal purpose of tightened medical regulation in early modern Europe and later was to exclude women from practice. In the period since 1700, especially, where a great deal of archival and public records can be found, the time of scholars interested in women's role in the healing arts might better be spent in hard, empirical research rather than in excessive speculation over a few chosen literary texts.

This book will be of marginal interest to most historians of medicine. Among literary scholars, however, and those interested in the intersection of medicine and literature, it may perhaps find a wider audience.

Thomas N Bonner, Wayne State University

Eileen Crofton, *The women of Royaumont: a Scottish women's hospital on the western front*, East Linton, Tuckwell Press, 1997, pp. xx, 347, illus., £17.99 (1-898410-86-0).

The Scottish Women's Hospitals were conceived at a meeting of the Scottish Federation of Women's Suffrage Societies just a few days after the outbreak of the First World War. They were the brainchild of Dr Elsie Inglis, who saw the war as an opportunity to demonstrate what women could achieve in medicine unaided by men. Given her associations with the campaign for women's suffrage, it is perhaps, unsurprising that the War Office and the British Red Cross declined her offer of hospitals staffed entirely by women, but the French and the Serbians proved less prejudiced. Acutely conscious of the deficiencies of their medical services, the two countries eagerly accepted offers of a 100-bed hospital funded by voluntary donations.

This book is about one of those hospitals: the Scottish Women's Hospital at Royaumont near Paris, which took over in December 1914 the dilapidated buildings of the town's thirteenth-century Cistercian abbey. After a shaky start, owing to the damp, insanitary condition of the abbey, the French Red Cross