

Doyen-Higuet meticulously outlines the complex transmission history of both the *Hippiatrica* and the *Epitome*. In the book itself a preliminary history of the text and its authors is provided, followed by a detailed outline of all the known redactions and the manuscripts that preserve them (pp. 39–196). This is repeated in an expanded, detailed way in the CD: the first part includes an analytical plan of each redaction of the *Hippiatrica*, while the second part dealing with the *Epitome* compares the arrangement of material in both texts, the internal arrangement of chapters within the *Epitome*, a collection of the recipes of the *Epitome*, an exploration of parallel passages between the *Epitome*, the *Hippiatrica*, the *Geoponica* and Latin hippiatric texts, and finally a discussion of possible sources of the *Epitome*.

This work will be of great interest to specialists of ancient veterinary texts and especially those concerned with the complex transmission history of the *Hippiatrica* and the *Epitome*. I fear it has little to offer to anyone else, as the largest part of the substantial text is purely technical. However, it certainly whets the appetite for the forthcoming edition, translation and commentary (though it is not stated when they are likely to be published) as they will make another highly interesting Byzantine technical text available and illuminate the workings of medieval compilers and editors.

Dionysios Stathakopoulos,
King's College London

Edward Grant, *A history of natural philosophy: from the ancient world to the nineteenth century*, Cambridge University Press, 2007, pp. xiv, 361, £40.00, \$70.00 (hardback 978-0-521-86931-7); £14.99, \$24.99 (paperback 978-0-521-68957-1).

Edward Grant is one of the world's greatest authorities on medieval science. In the book under review he brings together his lifelong research on medieval science to reflect on the

relation between natural philosophy and science. Grant constructs an illuminating history of natural philosophy, which he considers to be a discipline distinct from theology, mathematics and mixed mathematics. The chronological scope of the narrative reaches from around 3500 BC to the nineteenth century, but the book has a strong emphasis on the Middle Ages and the importance of this period for the Scientific Revolution. The central thesis for which the book argues is that “the most profound change in natural philosophy occurred in the seventeenth century. It involved a union of the exact sciences and natural philosophy, a phenomenon that has received relatively little attention in the vast literature about the meaning and causes of the Scientific Revolution” (p. xii). The outcome of this union, so Grant continues his argument, was that “natural philosophy, once regarded as largely independent and isolated from mathematics and the exact sciences, became significantly mathematized. In this mathematized form, natural philosophy became synonymous with the term science” (p. xii).

The book derives its scope and central thesis from a disagreement between Grant and the historian Andrew Cunningham on the nature of natural philosophy. On multiple occasions, including an “open forum” discussion between Grant and Cunningham in the journal *Early Science and Medicine* (2000, 5 (3): 259–300), Grant had the opportunity to take issue with Cunningham's views. In the book under review he returns to these issues repeating most of his arguments against Cunningham's thesis on the nature of natural philosophy. Cunningham's view on the identity of natural philosophy is that it is about God and His creation. “For the whole point of natural philosophy was to look at nature and the world *as created by God*, and as thus capable of being understood as embodying God's powers and purposes and of being used to say something about them” (Andrew Cunningham and Perry Williams, ‘De-centring the “big picture”’: *The Origins of Modern*

Book Reviews

Science and the modern origins of science, *Br. J. Hist. Sci.*, 1993, **26**: 407–32, p. 421). Grant's response is to insist on the separation of natural philosophy from theology. He generalizes that "the penetration of substantive religious material into natural philosophy was minimal during the late Middle Ages. For the most part, medieval natural philosophers focused their attention on the study of natural phenomena in a rational and secular manner" (p. 261).

Within the space of this review I will limit my brief comments to Grant's reaction to a second, but related aspect of Cunningham's thesis. Cunningham has insisted on the rejection of the concept of "scientific revolution" which placed, or rather misplaced, the origins of modern science in the seventeenth century. For Cunningham, natural philosophy and science, an "invention" of the nineteenth century, are two mutually exclusive endeavours. Grant's reaction is to return to the use of the concept of "scientific revolution" and to the restoration of continuity between the Middle Ages and the Scientific Revolution. However, his rejection of Cunningham's thesis depends here on the ambiguity of the term "science". The medieval mixed mathematical disciplines were, of course, also *scientiae* (in their own terms), and Grant chooses to understand the term in this sense. Therefore, the central thesis of the book that the Scientific Revolution was about the fusion of the exact sciences (or mixed mathematics) and natural philosophy is for Grant an argument against Cunningham's thesis. An uncoincidental consequence of Grant's view is that endeavours such as medicine and alchemy—of which he only occasionally points out whether they were considered part of natural philosophy—are again pushed to the margins of the description of the Scientific Revolution. But perhaps this is somewhat unfair to Grant's book. With it, Grant joins the ranks of those historians (such as John Schuster and others, including Cunningham) who have pointed to the neglected importance of the category of natural philosophy for an understanding of the

changes in natural knowledge practices in the seventeenth century. Although the polemical context may have introduced more ambiguities (such as that of the term "science") than one would have wished, the book should, without hesitation, be applauded for this important contribution.

Sven Dupré,
Ghent University

Carole Rawcliffe, *Leprosy in medieval England*, Woodbridge, Boydell Press, 2006, pp. xiii, 421, illus., £60.00, \$105.00 (hardback 1-184383 2739).

After many case studies of hospital history, this book is an eagerly awaited synthesis of the history of leprosy in England. The author, a specialist in English society and its medical practices at the end of the Middle Ages (her *Medicine and society in later medieval England* [Stroud, Alan Sutton] appeared in 1995), offers a panorama of this disease which even today remains emblematic of the "dark" Middle Ages. Invited to London in 1994 by the Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine, I had the opportunity to read a paper on the process and challenges of the historiographic construction of this image since the Enlightenment (see 'Contagion and leprosy: myth, ideas and evolution in medieval minds and societies', in L Conrad and D Wujastyk [eds], *Contagion: perspectives from premodern societies*, Aldershot, Ashgate, 1999, pp. 161–83). Imagine my delight to see my thoughts being used for an updated approach to the subject, avoiding the "worst leprosy of the historian"—anachronism.

The first chapter 'Creating the medieval leper' is thus fundamental for the analysis as a whole and guards against the risk of misinterpretations. It reveals an original mind with a thorough knowledge of the whole range of bibliography—medical, missionary, literary and, finally, historical—produced until the present. Walter Scott or Ellis Peters could have been added to this troupe. For it is always