

Book Reviews

on the passions and errors of the soul, published in 1525. Such criticisms, however, do not detract from the main value of this book as a clear exposition in English of interesting and, in their own day, influential theories of the emotions.

Vivian Nutton, Wellcome Institute

GIOVANNI ALFONSO BORELLI, *On the movement of animals*, trans. Paul Maquet, Berlin, Springer-Verlag, 1989, 8vo, pp. xii, 469, illus., DM 248.00.

First of all, we want to compliment Dr Paul Maquet from Belgium for this highly accomplished translation of a difficult text. "Iatrophysics" is a concept in the history of medicine that is immediately associated with the Italian school of Borelli and Bellini. We only have to think of their influence upon such scholars as Archibald Pitcairne and Hermann Boerhaave, to evaluate the importance of Borelli's work *De motu animalium* in the history of science and medicine.

Giovanni Alfonso Borelli (1608–1679) was a contemporary of Malpighi during his stay at Pisa as a professor of mathematics. Malpighi was deeply impressed by Borelli's scientific methods of studying muscular movement in animals along the lines of mathematics, which had never been done before. We may assume that Borelli was interested in Malpighi's concepts of the structure of muscular tissue. These elements can be found in *De motu animalium*, which was published in two parts in Rome in 1680 and 1681.

A German translation of the first part of this work was prepared by Max Mengerhausen in 1927 and published in Leipzig in the series of *Oswalds Klassiker der exakten Wissenschaften*. To the best of my knowledge, no other attempts were made until Dr Maquet started his translation of the complete work, advised by several highly qualified Belgian scholars. No wonder the representative of Springer Verlag eagerly accepted the manuscript for a world-wide publication. It got what it deserved, a distinguished layout, a very trim and neat printing, a glossary, and Borelli's eighteen tables bound separately inside the back cover. May this book stimulate scholars to study Borelli again, not only for his importance to iatrophysicists, but also in relation to his Italian contemporaries. No library of scientific standing should miss this book!

A. M. Luyendijk-Elshout, Oegstgeest, The Netherlands

DONNA T. ANDREW, *Philanthropy and police: London charity in the eighteenth century*, Princeton University Press, 1989, 8vo, pp. x, 229, \$32.50.

The history of English philanthropy in the eighteenth century has long been both under-researched and under-conceptualized, a deplorable situation now largely put to rights, thanks to the perceptive thematic and chronological clarifications in Donna Andrew's intelligent, well-documented, and lucid monograph. One is above all glad to see that her interpretative framework is sufficiently ample to embrace the complex texture of motives and expectations surrounding Georgian charitable impulses. The desire to give, she points out, was often simultaneously pious *and* prudent; donors could seek to support the deserving, while being deeply, if also self-servingly, apprehensive that "throwing money after" the poor (to use an appropriate modern colloquialism) ran the risk of debauching them. Throughout this volume, Professor Andrew's judgements command respect because her understanding of charity is subtle, not simplistic.

It is a further strength of her approach that she appreciates that it would be anachronistic to insist upon rigid distinctions between those Enlightenment movements aimed to succour the poor and helpless (founding hospitals, lying-in charities, dispensaries, etc.) and those designed to "control" the dangerous classes (e.g., workhouses). In institutions such as the Lock Hospital and the Magdalen Hospital for penitent prostitutes, philanthropy and policing constituted two sides of a single coin. The paradox was expounded early in the century by Bernard Mandeville, who insinuated that truly Christian alms and benevolence would prove counter-productive, creating diabolical disorder, idleness and criminality.

Book Reviews

In this respect Professor Andrew is admirably sensitive to the impact of ideology and thus to generational shifts in the mood and direction of giving.* Around 1700, much hope was invested in putting the poor to work, and money was pumped into workshops and charity schools for that end. By the 1750s, with Britain committed to vast imperial wars, nurturing manpower (and womanpower) had assumed far greater priority, and health- and child-oriented foundations mushroomed. By the last decades of the century, and with the development of the political economy mentality, “dependency” and even over-population were surfacing as problems. Hence institutions such as the Foundling Hospital received less favour, and attention was directed into schemes for inculcating thrift, industry, and sobriety, and for the general moralization of the masses. This chronology is largely convincing, though in the light of it one would have liked to see some attention given to fluctuations in hospital and dispensary donations. Indeed, medical charities receive less attention throughout this book than they would seem to warrant.

Professor Andrew is skilful in her handling of often slender sources (as she admits, the public records of Georgian charities leave much to be desired). Further progress in understanding the social functions of giving will depend upon exploring the networks of philanthropic gentlemen and ladies, and merchants and their activities. Above all, the party politics of charity need investigation. I look forward to further studies from this author on the complex intertwinings of philanthropy, physics, and police.

* This point was earlier made in Betsy Rodger’s *Cloak of charity: studies in eighteenth century philanthropy* (London: Methuen, 1949), a still-useful pioneering work that, peculiarly, is nowhere mentioned in Andrew’s study. There are various other gaps in her citations, especially respecting works published in the 1980s, perhaps an indication of the long period that has elapsed since the completion of the Ph.D. thesis (1977) from which this study is derived. It is surprising, for instance, that E. J. Bristow’s *Vice and vigilance: purity movements in Britain since 1700* (Dublin: Gill & Macmillan, 1977) finds no mention. Likewise, much of the recent scholarship on eighteenth-century medical charities is not discussed.

Roy Porter, Wellcome Institute

SABINE SANDER, *Handwerkschirurgen: Sozialgeschichte einer verdrängten Berufsgruppe*, Kritische Studien zur Geschichtswissenschaft 83, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989, 8vo, pp. 383, illus., DM 78.00.

Up to now medical historiography has handed down a negative image of eighteenth-century German barber-surgeons (*Barbiere* and *Bader*). Georg Fischer’s harsh judgement in his classic *Chirurgie vor 100 Jahren* (1876, repr. 1978), argued from the view of an academic surgeon, has not been seriously questioned: according to Fischer the education of barber-surgeons was “desolate”, their “ignorance and crudeness” was “scandalous”, their social rank “among the lowest”, and their corporation “stupid” or “idle”. With Sander’s detailed work on “craftsmen-surgeons” (as she calls them), however, every aspect of this image is revised. Based on rich archival sources she reconstructs the training, daily work, economic and social situation, distribution and professional autonomy of the barber-surgeons in eighteenth-century Württemberg.

As Sander demonstrates from the records of the examinations for the title of a master, most barber-surgeons had clearly exceeded the prescribed nine-year period of training (three years’ apprenticeship plus six journeyman’s years), which was longer than the three years’ medical studies at a university necessary to be licensed as a physician. Moreover, it often included demanding services as an army-surgeon and anatomical instruction at a university. Inventories of tools as well as apothecaries’ bills show that the “craftsmen-surgeons” not only offered the services of shaving, blood-letting, cupping, and minor surgery, but also performed pharmacotherapy on a larger scale, using the same remedies as academic physicians. Though cures with internal remedies were officially forbidden to barber-surgeons, the authorities tolerated this practice, obviously because it was the only way to guarantee medical care: Sander has calculated a ratio of one physician to every 9,500 inhabitants compared to one “craftsman-surgeon” to every 600 inhabitants in mid-eighteenth-century Württemberg. In