simplification of the genre into the condensing of history into notebooks of examples sowed the seeds of its destruction. There were also new challenges from politics, philology, and the increasing knowledge of the wider world. As the eighteenth century dawned the humanist idea of history as philosophy teaching by examples finally gave way to the wider horizons of the Enlightenment.

This book wears its wide-ranging erudition lightly. While not as readily digestible as Carr's *What is History*, it provides a welcome short introduction to Renaissance historiography written in an accessible style without compromising the scholarship. Of its three hundred or so pages, a sixth is consumed by an extensive bibliography of primary and secondary works which provides a comprehensive survey of the available literature for those whose interest in Renaissance historiography is whetted by this introduction. Of the pages devoted to the text, around a third of the space is taken up by providing the original Latin of Grafton's translated quotations as voluminous footnotes. This will make it valuable for teachers and students of Renaissance historiography alike. The origin, structure, and length of the text mean that it cannot provide a comprehensive study of the subject area, and it is strongest on the sixteenth-century humanist scholars about whom Grafton is such an authority, while the decline of the *ars historica* in the seventeenth century is examined somewhat perfunctorily. The emphasis here is firmly on history within the universities, producing texts predominantly in Latin. It is instructive to consider how Renaissance academic historians theorised their discipline in the light of Daniel Woolf's recent work on how the results of the historians' endeavours were read and internalised beyond the academy. More consideration might have been given in the final chapter to the extent to which the burgeoning interest in history among non-academics and the increasing tendency to write in the vernacular contributed to the decline of the *artes historicae*. Nevertheless, despite these minor quibbles I would thoroughly recommend this book as overall a valuable contribution to the field of historiography.

JAN BROADWAY, *Queen Mary, University of London*

Luke Demaitre

Leprosy in Premodern Medicine: A Malady of the Whole Body

Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007. Pp.vii, 279.

The story of the counterfeit leper, unmasked when the reddened glue he attached to his face to resemble the lesions of leprosy was washed away, is one of the more

memorable tales found in Luke Demaitre's *Leprosy in Premodern Medicine: A Malady of the Whole Body*. This account, along with the stories of the poor associating with lepers in the hope of becoming lightly infected in order to beg, help Demaitre demonstrate that pre-modern attitudes toward leprosy were not monolithic. The diagnosis of leprosy could be both fought and sought, depending on the circumstances. However, this exploration of the relationship between poverty and the diagnosis of leprosy is only part of Demaitre's larger story of the *judicium leprosororum* and the increasingly important role played by medieval medical practitioners in this procedure.

Through his earlier pioneering articles on medical texts, Demaitre has done much to redeem the reputation of the medieval medical practitioner. In *Leprosy in Premodern Medicine: A Malady of the Whole Body*, he builds upon this previous work, arguing that pre-modern physicians came to see leprosy more as a disease of the body and less as an affliction of the soul. The light footprint of Leviticus found by Demaitre in medical texts is not surprising; what is more interesting is his analysis of the shifting sands of medical epistemology. Demaitre points out that in the medical literature from 1300 to 1600 discussions of the theoretical foundation of the disease widened while those of the practical applications declined. He argues that at the heart of this change was the growing importance of physicians in the *judicium leprosororum*. Increasingly cast as the final arbiters in disputed diagnoses, over time medieval physicians broadened the scope of possible signs of leprosy, thus enabling them to have more diagnostic flexibility in dealing with a disease so protean in its manifestations. In turn, this helped enhance their professional credibility. Avicenna's interpretation of leprosy as a cancer of the whole body was more compatible with this approach, as opposed to Galen, who saw the disease as a product of an imbalance in a single member. Thus, Demaitre argues that leprosy came to be seen as a malady of the whole body—hence the title of this book.

The real strength of this work rests not so much in this conclusion, but rather in how Demaitre uses medical texts and public documents to trace the intellectual history of leprosy from Hippocrates, Galen and Aretaeus of Cappadocia, Avicenna and Constantine the African, to Bernard de Gordon, Guy de Chauliac and Paracelsus. Along the way he follows the nomenclature of leprosy from ancient Greece to early modern Europe, which takes the reader on an interesting journey that demonstrates how diagnostic complexity, religion, folklore, history, and observation influenced the nomenclature of this disease. This linguistic history of leprosy is the strongest section of the book and helps Demaitre integrate the elite and popular conceptions of the disease.

What emerges from these sources is that when it came to leprosy, pre-modern practitioners demonstrated remarkable diagnostic acumen. Written in 1290, Arnau de Vilanova's explication on the manifestations of the disease would fit comfortably in a modern medical textbook. The range of the physical characteristics of leprosy from polar tuberculoid to polar lepromatous, which are associated with the progression of the disease from a localized to a more generalized condition as the bacterial load increases and the cellular immunity declines, means that both Galen and Avicenna were in some sense right; leprosy begins as a local disease, but can evolve into a malady of the whole body. What Demaitre's sources reveal is that pre-modern physicians understood this, but were reluctant, for both practical and political reasons, to confirm the diagnosis of leprosy until it had become lepromatous. In a conclusion that is perhaps a bit too Whiggish, Demaitre wants to assign this likely pragmatic decision to an epistemological shift rooted in the increased rationalization of medicine.

Leprosy in Premodern Medicine builds upon the work of F.O. Touati and other revisionist historians in helping rehabilitate the image of the medieval response to leprosy. Unfortunately, this book suffers greatly in comparison to Carole Rawcliffe's *Leprosy in Medieval England* (2006). Although Demaitre confines his analysis to the western Continent and Rawcliffe writes only about England, they cover much of the same material: the myths surrounding the medieval leper, the relationship between the body, the soul, and leprosy, the business of diagnosis, the battle against the disease and the role of segregation. Rawcliffe's treatment of these topics is more thorough and more readable. Although *Leprosy in Premodern Medicine* also suffers from an annoying lack of documentation, especially in regard to the secondary literature and manages as well to explore the epistemology of pre-modern medicine without mentioning neither Kuhn nor Foucault, Demaitre does demonstrate that the pre-modern understanding of leprosy was remarkably nuanced.

KATHERINE ROYER, M.D., *California State University Stanislaus*

Catharine Randall

Earthly Treasures: Material Culture and Metaphysics in the Heptaméron and Evangelical Narrative

West Lafayette, Indiana: Purdue UP, 2007. Pp. ix, 354.

Earthly Treasures examines the relationship between visual culture, material objects, and reformist aesthetics in a number of early modern French texts, including