l'ancienne théorie humorale (p. xi), preferring the simpler Hippocratic model. Starobinski concludes that the non-Galenic systems of the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries—from Paracelsus to Hahnemann—were no less speculative and dogmatic than Galenism itself, even Cartesian mechanism which, albeit discarding Galen's teleology, stuck to *constructions hypothético-déductives*.

In their introduction the authors give a brief exposition of Galen's ethics and moral psychology. According to them, Galen adopted the Stoic scheme of passions, but used the Platonic hierarchy of the parts of the soul to oppose their psychology. The authors make the interesting suggestion that, for Galen, the tripartition of the soul is paralleled by similar patterns in anthropology (p. xxxvii). However, they are not clear about the relationship between errors and passions in Galen, failing at times to make the distinction between the two meanings of ἁμάρτημα, i.e. error deriving from a failed exercise of rational judgement and error in the more general sense, including those failures of rational judgement which result from its subordination to passion (V,2f. Kühn).

By reducing the punishment of wrongdoers to a purely legal issue, the authors avoid the question whether physiological determinism and morality can be reconciled. This represents one side of the ambiguity pointed out by Starobinski (p. xxvi): determinism can be used as a means of excuse, as for medieval sufferers from melancholy accused of being sorcerers, but likewise to justify harsh punishments required to rid the *corps social* of incorrigible wrongdoers. It would still have been useful for the general reader to be given references to the Stoic attempts at reconciling fate and morality (e.g. Cicero, *On fate*, 39 ff. and Aulus Gellius, *Attic Nights*, VII, 2).

The translations are readable and reliable, only that τὰ δὶς δύο τέτταρα εἶναι (V, 59 Kühn) ought to be *que deux fois* (and not *et*) *deux font quatre* (p. 44). These treatises had been made accessible in French before (by van der Elst in 1914 and Daremberg in 1854, respectively). The present translators, however, had more recent critical editions at their disposal and found an eminent historian of ideas to persuade a broader public to take an interest not only in Galenism, but also in Galen's own writings, which laid the foundation for one and a half millenia of science and scholarship. This fortunate combination makes their book an important contribution to the popularization of Galenic studies.

David Linden, Christ Church, Oxford

Olav Thulesius, *Nicholas Culpeper: English physician and astrologer*, New York, St Martin's Press, 1992, pp. xi, 210, illus., £45.00 (0–312–07543–X).

Nicholas Culpeper was born in 1616 and raised in Sussex. He was sent to Cambridge intended for the Church but had to leave when he attempted to elope with an heiress, an adventure that came to a tragic end when the girl was killed by lightning. He was then apprenticed to a London apothecary but he chose not to become a Freeman of the Society of Apothecaries. Instead he settled in Spitalfields where he practised medicine describing himself as a student of physic and astrology. The contemporary profession regarded him as a credulous astrologer and quacksalver.

Culpeper was an unorthodox practitioner of medicine but his prolific writings reflect the orthodox medicine of his time. He had a command of Greek and Latin and he translated the books of a number of European medical writers, his aim being to provide the English with "the whole Model of Physick in their Native Language". He was viciously attacked for his translation of the *Pharmacopoeia Londinensis*. This, the official formulary compiled by the College of Physicians, was intended for the welfare but not the information of the common people.

This book by Olav Thulesius is the first modern full length biography of Culpeper. The author reviews the writings and observes that if we remove the shell of mystical astrology a core

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0025727300061482 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of important achievements becomes evident. Culpeper is described as an outstanding exponent of seventeenth-century medicine and one brave enough to question tradition.

A problem arises with the author's fictional treatment of Culpeper's career. A brief biography was published by Culpeper's amanuensis William Ryves in 1659. Ryves tells the story of the elopement but stated there were reasons for not naming the heiress and her identity remains unknown. Thulesius without any supporting evidence introduces a romance between Culpeper and Judith Rivers, the daughter of Sir John Rivers. Ryves informs us that Culpeper was wounded when serving with the parliamentary forces. There is nothing in Ryves or elsewhere to support the account given in this book of Culpeper acting as a field surgeon at Edgehill and being wounded at Reading when serving as a captain of foot. The brief statement by Ryves that Culpeper fought a duel and fled to France is exaggerated into a narrative of a duel with the royalist John Compton and a visit to Riolan and Gassendi during the short sojourn abroad.

In his Epilogue Thulesius states that wherever parts are added that are not supported by biographical data this has been indicated in the chapter notes. He does so for Culpeper's war service, the duel and the imagined trip as a boy to London. Other matters, such as the assumed relationship with Judith Rivers and the numerous imaginary conversations, are woven into the text in such a way that the reader will have difficulty separating fact from fiction. Biographical sources for Culpeper are scarce. Thulesius has chosen to fill the gaps by guess-work and invention.

M P Earles, Eltham, London

Sandra Cavallo, *Charity and power in early modern Italy: benefactors and their motives in Turin, 1541–1789*, Cambridge History of Medicine, Cambridge University Press, 1995, pp. xv, 280, illus., £45 (hardback 0–521–46091–3); £17.95 (paperback 0–521–48333–6).

Turin in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries makes for an unsual case history in terms of both place and period. What Dr Cavallo demolishes is any notion that the growth of a centralized "absolutist" state brought about a rational centralized system of welfare provision. The complex of changes which she analyses through the imaginative use of unusual documentation stands in delicate balance with some quite remarkable continuities. Rather than the replacement of haphazard private initiatives by centralized public institutions, she identifies (p. 3) a public dimension in traditional forms of provision which has perhaps been obscured by rather crude assumptions that religious motivation made traditional acts of charity private. The boundary between the public and private spheres was therefore a matter of wide and often creative overlap. She carefully acknowledges that there was indeed a shift away from personal and voluntary charity as the princely state asserted itself at the expense of the "smaller world" traditions of the city-state, but this happened only in the mid-eighteenth century and without particularly enlightened results. Even at that late stage, the process was not accompanied by "secularization" but instead preceded by a belated expansion of the role of the Church, virtually a century after the Council of Trent (pp. 118–20). Moreover, Dr Cavallo demonstrates that these late changes are not an indication that traditional structures and mechanisms had somehow been overwhelmed. On the contrary, what is striking about the author's findings is the sheer scale of traditional provision, particularly at times of crisis.

Between 19 May and 30 June 1587, the urban authorities distributed 28,000 lbs of bread (p. 60). The devastating plague of 1630 resulted in the Council having to provide food rations for 3,000 people from the public purse: this in a city population of 15,000 (p. 54). The fascinating—and persuasive—explanation of the durability of "civic" traditions is their lack of rigid categorization in the treatment of the poor. This is surely a fundamental point in the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0025727300061482 Published online by Cambridge University Press