

DOES NOT CIRCULATE

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2009 with funding from
University of Toronto

HOLD FOR
BINDING



*Renaissance
and
Reformation*

VOLUME IX · 1972 NUMBER 1



Renaissance and Reformation is published 3 times a year (September - June)
© the Toronto Renaissance and Reformation Colloquium
the Victoria University Centre for Renaissance and Reformation Studies (CRRS), 1972

Editor

Julius A. Molinaro

Associate and Book Review Editor

R. W. Van Fossen

Editorial Committee

C. Edward Rathé (York University)

H. R. Secor

J. H. Parker

S. Drake

J. K. McConica

Subscription price is \$3.00 per year. Back volumes are \$3.75 (\$1.25 per no.). Manuscripts should be accompanied by a self-addressed, stamped envelope and follow the revised edition of the MLA Style Sheet.

Manuscripts should be addressed to:

The Editor

Renaissance and Reformation

Department of Italian & Hispanic Studies

University of Toronto

Toronto 5, Canada

All communications, including notices of changes of address, enquiries and subscriptions should be sent to:

Leslie T. McCormick

Business Manager

Renaissance and Reformation

Erindale College

3359 Mississauga Road

Clarkson, Ontario, Canada

All communications concerning books should be sent to the Book Review Editor at the same address.



Contents

2

Two Classical Myths in *Don Quijote*
PETER N. DUNN

11

Reform and Revolution Among Sixteenth Century Radicals
EDWARD J. FURCHA

23

Reformation History Research in German-Speaking Switzerland
FRITZ BÜSSER

28

BOOK REVIEWS

ELIO GIANTURCO: Robert Schwoebel, ed. *Renaissance Men and Ideas*

IAN LANCASHIRE

Jacques Heers. *Fêtes, Jeux et Joutes dans les Sociétés d'Occident à la Fin du Moyen Age*

ELLIOT ROSE

Thomas Rogers Forbes. *Chronicle from Aldgate: Life and Death in Shakespeare's London*

PETER V. MARINELLI

Patrick Cullen. *Spenser, Marvell and Renaissance Pastoral*

ANNE LANCASHIRE

Reinterpretations of Elizabethan Drama: Selected Papers from the English Institute

Ed. Norman Rabkin

RUSSELL M. BROWN

Robert Kimbrough. *Sir Philip Sidney*

J. K. McCONICA

Germain Marc'hadour. *Thomas More ou la sage folie*

JANE COUCHMAN

Barbara C. Bowen. *The Age of Bluff: Paradox and Ambiguity in Rabelais and Montaigne*

MARIA PICCHIO SIMONELLI

A. D. Scaglione. *Ars Grammatica*

FLORINDO CERRETA

David Orr. *Italian Renaissance Drama in England Before 1625*

DAVID CAST

D. S. Chambers. *Patrons and Artists in the Italian Renaissance*

OLGA Z. PUGLIESE

Charles D. Tarlton. *Fortune's Circle: A Biographical Interpretation of Niccolò Machiavelli*

J. I. CHICOY-DABÁN

Adrienne Schizzano Malden. *'La Celestina' Studies: A Thematic Survey and Bibliography
1824-1970*



I had better explain, to begin with, that I am approaching myth from its literary side, as an established pattern of significant narrative, which forms either the whole work or an important part of it. The examples which I am going to discuss are the myth of the Age of Gold in *Don Quijote*, and the Descent into the Underworld, in relation to *Don Quijote*. The notion of a lost 'Golden Age' of moral innocence is inescapably linked with consideration of man in nature and in society, and the confrontation of nature and art, since merely to imagine primordial innocence is to remind oneself of all possible dichotomies between the self and its world, the I and the other, time and eternity. To picture such a state with verbal art is to launch words in pursuit of a meaning which will embrace 'then' and 'now,' beginning and end. A pathetic vision, since our words and their syntax reflect the flux and the evanescence of 'now' - we might as well try using water to dam a river! And it easily transforms itself into a figure of hubris, drawn out by the impetus of its own rhetoric and moral certitude. So it imitates and becomes an emblem of that very lapse from unity which it seeks imaginatively to repair or to transcend. If such a vision of the past be made to constitute a mirror for the future as it so easily can, it will present a dangerously simple image for a broken and complex world. A dynamic counterpoint to this separation of the one and the many, will and action, can be discovered in the Descent into the Underworld, by the hero of epic, and especially in the *Aeneid*. It achieves its effect by being placed in the historic journey of an individual to his goal, and in the circle of a destiny which consummates itself in a will which is beyond history. If dichotomies cannot be mended, they can be joined in a dynamic friction which is at the root of our sense of tragedy.

In order to see these themes in due perspective, we should start by considering the heroic history of *Don Quijote* in its relation to classical epic. In making his parody of the novels of chivalry, Cervantes regarded them as a remote and degenerate descendent of epic poetry. He was influenced, of course, by the contemporary discussions of the novel in terms of the *Poetics* of Aristotle, whose commentators judged that prose fiction could legitimately be assigned to the epic genre, and should follow the prescriptions laid down for epic. *Don Quijote*, then, has not one, but two principal literary correlatives - the novels of chivalry, whose language, conventions, personages, motivations and actions are drily mocked throughout, and the epic prototypes themselves, the *Iliad*, the *Odyssey* and the *Aeneid*.

In theory, Cervantes, like other writers of his time, accepts the Byzantine romance as paradigm for the long narrative form in his own day, though this third kind is formally indistinguishable from the novel of chivalry. In his own practice he attempted a large-scale romance of this kind only once, in the *Persiles y Segismunda*, published after his death. He hoped it would be his best work, but it is easier to annotate than to enjoy. If the Byzantine romance was taken as the ideal form of the novel of chivalry, it was so by virtue of being the demythologized prose epic of the late classical world. Free from interventions by the gods, the protagonists could work out a destiny appropriate to their virtue, courage, constancy, and understanding of themselves and of nature. Of course, it could readily be Chris-

tianized, since its structure and joyful resolution, which derive from New Comedy, require no readjustment to a providential order (*Persiles y Segismunda* ends both with marriages and a journey to Rome). The undirected journeyings of Don Quijote in *Part I*, and the multiplicity of secondary narratives give the appearance of Byzantine structure. But Cervantes's narrative art is an exceedingly complex one which confronts fiction with reality, and which continually opens new ironic distances between author, fiction, characters, and supposed narrators. Thus the simplistic design of both the chivalresque and the Byzantine romances are dissolved in conflicting points of view.

No novel can be structured exclusively around points of view, however, and as the prototypes of extended modern fiction are superseded in Part I of *Don Quijote*, a different mode of narrative organization is needed for Part II, and this is achieved by establishing a closer analogy with epic. This is not an abrupt departure, for Don Quijote had already compared himself with epic heroes in the earlier part. The windmills (I,8) are comparable to Briareus, and the dark night with its terrifying sounds of rushing water and infernal machinery (I,20) which are later traced to the fulling mills, recall a similar passage in *Aeneid* III when Aeneas and his men spend a fearful night on the Cyclopes' coast, or perhaps, a later one when Aeneas skirts the edge of Tartarus with its horrors (*Aen.* VI). There are many other Virgilian echoes in this First Part.

More important is Don Quijote's discourse on the Age of Gold, prompted by his reception among goatherds who make him welcome at their simple meal. Though not epic in origin, this speech reveals, through belief in a mythical past, a moral basis for heroic action. We may note its cadenced rhetoric, its internal consistency, and its external incongruity. It is beautifully expressed, and has abundant antecedents in antiquity. But this elegy for the primitive life is declaimed in the presence of representatives of real pastoral simplicity - the goatherds who munch their acorns and do not understand a word of his speech, and Sancho Panza, another simple fellow who cannot wait to abandon simplicity and become a king or, at least, a count. This counterpoint is further enriched as the episode leads into the pastoral tragedy of Grisóstomo and Marcela. Marcela has refused to marry, preferring to become a shepherdess. She is so beautiful and accomplished that all the young men of the area have fallen in love with her and turned shepherds so as to be near her, and the valley echoes with the sound of their melancholy love songs. One of them, Grisóstomo, who was pre-eminent in grace and poetry, has committed suicide. Marcela appears at his burial and makes an impassioned plea for freedom, in which she denies any responsibility either for his desiring her or for his death. To put it in current jargon, she has simply refused to be a "sex-object." Thus Don Quijote's evocation of the myth of primordial innocence is exposed to some searching criticism. The Virgilian eulogy is heard, but not understood, by modern counterparts of those ignorant Arcadians whom Philostratus called "acorn-eating swine," and it is followed by a tragic example of the futility of seeking moral harmony in Nature. All that Renaissance Platonism which declared that true love is harmony of souls, and desire for a goodness which beauty merely represents corporeally, founders on the rock of Nature itself. Not the will only, but the body and the feelings demand their freedom. We might say that for man to indulge his nostalgia for the state of Nature is to desert the state of Grace. Or, on a less purely theological plane, that those men and women who became shepherds and shepherdesses for the sake of love, abandoning their husbandry and their social ties and duties, forgot the true relation of

art to life. For, in the Senecan sense, that is art which enables Nature to be lived with; virtue is an art. "For virtue is not Nature's gift; to become good is an art" (*Letter to Lucilius*). It is scarcely necessary to stress the authority of Seneca in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. Let us simply bear in mind, first, that the four stoic virtues of justice, prudence, temperance and fortitude can only be fully exercised by man in society and, second, that the great inventions of man – the arts of medicine, husbandry and government – are those which improve upon Nature. To desert Art for Nature is as dangerous as mistaking Art for Nature, as Don Quijote does. He began this sequence of episodes by discoursing on the Golden Age, in a beautiful rhetorical solo, created by verbal art to replace the world in front of him. This is the characteristic mode of operation of his mind; his every action has a literary precedent. So, since the representatives of rustic simplicity cannot understand him, they mutely contradict him by their presence.

Don Quijote, Marcela and Grisóstomo, each in their own way are seduced by alluring fantasies of innocence. Don Quijote left home, sword in hand, to reestablish the reign of peace and justice. Marcela and Grisóstomo listened to the siren voices of Nature: freedom, independence, love. The opposing voice – service, submission – is not heard. Marcela, only daughter of the most respected family, had been cared for by her uncle, a priest, who gave her complete freedom to choose. Her condition was exemplary, and she chose to escape what she might have called this "repressive toleration." She becomes an impersonation of Diana-Hecate, and the episode ends as she flees into the darkest part of the wood, with Don Quijote anxious to follow her. Grisóstomo, the brilliant student just graduated from Salamanca, who had composed songs and plays for the corporate religious festivals of the village, becomes her sacrificial victim and chooses pagan burial at the foot of a crag. The retreat from the order of Grace to that of Nature is carefully specified. If Don Quijote enacts the comedy of delusions about external reality, Marcela and Grisóstomo present the tragedy of delusions about freedom. The balance of comedy is restored in the following chapter when Don Quijote's usually docile horse Rocinante is attracted by some mares who have been put out to pasture near by. The owners knock Rocinante down with their staves, and then give a beating to Don Quijote and Sancho when they intervene. But before that happens, the mares themselves give the sorry horse a blunt refusal by kicking and biting. So, those creatures who are "privileged" to partake in the state of Nature are not exempt from the frustrations of existence. Cervantes leads us with characteristic irony to the meadow where Rocinante trots hopefully to the mares, in a classical *locus amoenus*:

...vinieron a parar a un prado lleno de fresca
 hierba, junto del cual corria un arroyo
 apacible y fresco; tanto que convidó, y
 forzó, a pasar allí las horas de la
 siesta, que rigurosamente comenzaba a
 entrar.

(They halted in a meadow, rich in fresh grass,
 beside which ran a pleasant and refreshing brook,
 which invited them, or rather induced them to
 spend the sultry hours of midday there.)

Reading *Don Quijote* 1, 11-15 as a whole we see the development of a single theme: Man

in Nature, Art as an accommodation between Nature and himself. This accommodation may break down whenever he allows his imagination to present to him ancient myth as if it were fact, or when he overvalues art, and so fails to discriminate between it and life. This is not simply a matter of a middle-aged eccentric mistaking bad novels for historical truth, but of interpreting the rhetoric of myth, its exemplary past tense, as a challenge to present action and future achievement. The accommodation can also give way to destructive unbalance when man so distrusts the arts of civilization that he attempts to purge them from his social reality. With Don Quijote, literature has deliberately been made into a visionary counterreality instead of a reflection of reality; with Marcela and Grisóstomo, the flight into nature has unknowingly turned life into a tragedy where real beings are claimed by the chthonic powers they impersonate. Not until the Nineteenth Century do numbers of people seriously deny that man exists harmoniously with nature in society, only so long as tragedy keeps its distance on the stage, and so long as utopian madness is confined to comic books. If the myth of the Age of Gold is, for Don Quijote, the quintessence of utopian idealism, by virtue of which every new disaster blossoms into new and more extravagant rationalizations, the descent into the cave (II, 22-23) reveals the inner contradictions of that idealism. Or, to put it differently, Don Quijote, the exemplary imitator of fictions and creator of his own drama, is made to contemplate the destruction of his models, while still believing in his triumphant imitation of them. But before talking of that, it would be well to note some features of the structure of the two parts of the novel.

Part I, we have observed, combined the characteristic rambling movement of the novel of chivalry with interwoven autobiographies in the manner of Byzantine romance. It was fitting that the references to epic should be allusive, like outcrops from the geological past of the novelistic form. Part II has a tighter unity, perhaps because Cervantes had been criticised for his digressions in the earlier volume, as we are told he was (II, 3, 44). Part II is more explicit in its use of epic motifs within a well marked pattern of journey and return. As in Part I, Don Quijote sets out and returns home, but the two journeys of the first part are replaced by a single sally in the second, which encompasses the whole book. The knight's purpose becomes more sharply defined – first, to find and to do homage to Dulcinea, and then, after her “enchantment” by Sancho, to restore her to her rightful shape. The effort to make him return home passes from the Priest and the Barber to Sansón Carrasco who, in a limited way is Telemachus to Don Quijote's Odysseus. Such a resemblance as this is hardly precise, but the fact is that it would not suggest itself at all without other, more powerful motifs. The country house of the Duke and Duchess, in its piling of illusion upon illusion, in the transformations of persons that occur there, in its substitution of magic for the normal workings of nature, powerfully recalls the island of Circe. At the same time, the Duchess's hunting attire, the ritual washing that Don Quijote is subjected to, and later, the elaborate pantomime in which the so-called Altisidora pretends to die of love for Don Quijote and is then resurrected amid flames, recalls in a disjointed way the episode with Dido in the *Aeneid*. The episode immediately preceding the arrival of Don Quijote and Sancho at the Duke's estate is that of the mock shipwreck. There, on his arrival, Don Quijote discovers that his fame has preceded him, because the Duke and Duchess have read Part I – which recalls the experience of Aeneas at Carthage, and of Odysseus among the Phaeacians after his shipwreck. The Phaeacian games in the *Odyssey* and those at Drepanum in the *Aeneid* might have had their comic counterpart in *Don Quijote* if the hero had

gone to the jousts in Zaragoza as he planned to do. But Avellaneda had in the meantime published his spurious Second Part; his false Don Quijote had gone to Zaragoza with the result that the "real" Don Quijote changes his itinerary (II, 52). One could add more details of this kind, but we have said enough, I think, to show that the episode of the Cave of Montesinos is not an isolated allusion to the motifs of classical epic.

Don Quijote's determination to descend into the cave is his own: no one obliges or advises him to do it. His is an odyssey of self-will. He heard about the cave and its legends from an acquaintance on the road, and for his companions the visit is a picnic. Don Quijote, however, remembering the fantastic adventures of the knights of romance is immediately seized by a sense of mission, and to Sancho's expressions of fear he replies:

Ata y calla... que tal empresa como aquesta,
Sancho amigo para mí estaba guardada.

(Bind me and keep quiet... for such an
enterprise as this, Sancho my friend, was
reserved for me.)

Cervantes isolates this sense of mission by attending to the circumstantial detail with curious precision. The cave is a real geographical location, and the time of day is specified: they arrive at two in the afternoon. The terrain, the names of the plants which Don Quijote hacks away with his sword, how the rope is tied around him, how many fathoms of it are paid out before it slackens, how long, by the reckoning of his companions, he spent below ground, all these are faithfully recorded. This is no mythical edge of the world and no supernatural token is needed in order to pass through. A flight of ominous birds knocks him down, but we are on solid ground, and the time is the time as told by the clock. Don Quijote is hauled up, asleep. Then, after they have eaten, at four o'clock under an overcast sky, he tells what he saw. With unobtrusive care, Cervantes has done more than conventionally set a scene; he has established a tone of precision, clarity and veracity. The master illusionist has said, "Look, there's nothing up my sleeve."

Don Quijote's dream world takes us to "the most beautiful, pleasant and delightful meadow nature could create or the liveliest human imagination conceive," - the *locus amoenus* again. There is a palace with crystal walls, where he is welcomed by Montesinos, is shown Durandarte lying on a sepulchre, and observes Belerma with a train of ladies who mourn with her. There are characters from well-known chivalric ballads, and one of these poems tells how, after being mortally wounded in battle, Durandarte implored Montesinos to cut out his heart and carry it to his beloved Belerma. Finally, Don Quijote sees his own Dulcinea transformed into a country wench, who sends her companion to him to pawn a skirt for the sum of six *reales*. Again, we observe the soberness of detail and the clarity; but now it is the typical obsessive clarity in which the dreamer, helpless and impassive, watches his inner tragedy figuratively played before him. Like all bad dreams, this one is full of absurdities and incongruities which may be funny to anyone except the dreamer. Don Quijote's sense of mission on descending into the cave is confirmed by Montesinos; they have been waiting for him, these many centuries, for this exploit was reserved by Merlin for him alone. Rousing Durandarte, Montesinos presents the saviour Don Quijote, but Durandarte answers, in a weak voice,

y cuando así no sea... cuando así no sea, oh primo!,
digo, paciencia y barajar.

(And if that should not be, if that should not be,
cousin, I say: patience and shuffle the cards.)

In a single phrase the prophecy of the great Merlin (one of the unquestioned potentates of Don Quijote's waking fantasy) is cast in doubt, and the noble Durandarte has expressed his resignation in the language of a tavern gambler who is suffering a losing streak. "If Don Quijote is to be my saviour," he seems to say, "my losing streak will continue forever." In this vision, doubt intrudes upon Don Quijote's fantasy of a greatness reserved for him alone, and vulgarity corrodes these romantic monuments on whom he has modelled his life. It is one thing for a ballad to tell how the dying hero, in a symbolic gesture of selfless passion, ordered his friend to cut out his heart and send it to his lady. It is quite another matter for that friend to tell Don Quijote how he did it, in realistic terms: struggling with the knife which (as can be expected of a dream knife) has a point but no edge, riding five hundred miles with the heart in his saddle bag, sprinkling it with salt so that it wouldn't smell too bad, giving it to Belerma. Belerma is now in eternal mourning, but only four days a week, to a regular schedule. Time has interfered with eternity. The reason for her rationing her grief is not explained, but it can be found in ballads which show her as pert and flighty towards Durandarte. Don Quijote, for obvious reasons, never cites these ballads, but his picture of this femme fatale - sallow, big-mouthed, flat-nosed, gap-toothed - would be recognizable to any physiognomist as the portrait of a shameless hussy.¹ There is travesty of Don Quijote's expressed conviction that knight errantry is a kind of priesthood, for Montesinos carries a rosary, every tenth bead of which is the bigness (Don Quijote tells us, with exemplary lack of exaggeration) of a *medium* ostrich egg, and he is dressed like a priest in some anti-papist comic opera, while the women (supposedly ladies of the court of Charlemagne) wear turbans on their heads. Against Don Quijote's religion of love and beauty, the ugly treacheries of love thrust themselves into the dream. The tragicomic climax comes when he sees Dulcinea, not as he has imagined her to be (imagined is not the right word, since she has become too ethereal for imaginative representation, rather *La gloriosa donna della mia mente*), but as the country wench that Sancho caused him to believe in only a few days ago. If truths which have been suppressed can avenge themselves in the fantasy, so can the commonplace which has been compelled for too long to play the role of the sublime.

Don Quijote is clearly perplexed by what he has seen. Even he, who saw evidence for enchanters in windmills, sheep, inns, and disappearing libraries, can hardly have expected such absurdities as these. And he has come back to the surface without accomplishing anything. Odysseus was also disappointed: he learned nothing from either Proteus or Teiresias that he did not already know. His experience in Hades was rather the purging of rage and vainglory through his encounter with the dead, and then the knowledge of a fear greater than any this life can inspire as he flees from the Medusa. Aeneas alone can look forward with knowledge of the future stream of events, but still with a certain distaste, and without elation. Perhaps Cervantes profited from Vergil's complex attitude towards Aeneas. For as Aeneas becomes a new man after Book VI to the extent that he has a manifest destiny to fulfill, he also becomes more problematic and less humanly attractive, more tragically isolated, a man sacrificed to a cause. Don Quijote puzzles over the meaning of his vision, and Cervantes lets us

see his doubts. But when those irresponsible artists, the Duke and Duchess, contrive illusions, and rob him of his freedom to interpret reality, they make it possible for other qualities – courage, intellectual curiosity, generosity, eloquence, (and, most notably, those four stoic virtues) to flourish in a world of adversity which he did not bring about. The descent into the cave – that Hell, as Sancho significantly calls it, more than once, – and the attempted duel with the lion, by reason of their pure folly, come nearest to disinterested courage. Cervantes turns Vergil around, enlarging his hero's appeal to our sympathy as he delegates his authorial manipulations to other characters in the story and exposes to vulgar curiosity Quijote's weaknesses.

The myth of the Golden Age, with its nostalgia for a lost innocence is, for Don Quijote, a program to be realized in the future. He is a soldier of apocalypse, since apocalypse is the reflection ahead of us of the original perfection of the cosmos. The form of epic imitates the pattern of the eternal return, the myth of cosmogony, but it also celebrates the splendor of an individual through a linear sequence of episodes. *Don Quijote* takes this familiar structural image of life as a journey, within the equally familiar archetype of the ordeal or exile-and-return, as initiation into a new mode or level of existence. The descent into the underworld is at the point where curved and linear intersect, where the individual sees himself in the timeless perspective of his culture and his race, and draws a charge of moral energy from that moment of intersection. Odysseus and Aeneas acquire energy in knowing that there is a level of justification on which their end and their beginning will meet. But the task of the epic poet is more complex than this: he has to allow the hero to justify himself to his mission and to his view of the eternal realities of reward and suffering, but also he must justify to the hero his future burden. The greatness of Vergil is seen in the way that Aeneas is not easily convinced. If Rome is to be built, must there be more mutilations like that of Deiphobus, more betrayals like that which he dealt to Dido? When Aeneas finally slays Turnus, Vergil illuminates his savagery with images of fire and fury which recall the destruction of Troy, and we can see that this fear has also been justified. Don Quijote awakes with strange ambiguous words on his lips:

Dios os perdone, amigos; que me habéis quitado de la la más sabrosa y agradable vida y vista que ningún humano ha visto ni pasado. En efecto, ahora acabo de conocer que todos los contentos desta vida pasan como sombra y sueño, o se marchitan como la flor del campo. ¡Oh desdichado Montesinos! ¡Oh mal ferido Durandarte! ¡Oh sin ventura Belerma!

(God forgive you, my friends, for you have snatched me from the most delightful existence and the most agreeable prospect that any human ever beheld or enjoyed. Now indeed I know that all the joys of this life pass like a shadow and a dream, and wither like the flowers of the field. O unhappy Montesinos! O sorely wounded Durandarte! O luckless Belerma!)

Luckless, indeed; and luckless Don Quijote who must not only be the figment of his own imagination to the end, but also must create fictional worlds for the Duke and Duchess, for

Cide Hamete, for the anonymous chroniclers, and for that mysterious absence, Cervantes. He will not found cities or change men; but he will create an empire of the imagination where reality is transformed into a book. That is his misery and his splendor. As for his desire to "disenchant" Dulcinea, Montesinos and the rest, that is mistaken and yet, in the reader, this is precisely what his dream has done, in opposing empirical reality to the enchantment of romance. Here we can see another point of contrast with Homer and Vergil. The great Achilles is now no more than a disgruntled shade who would rather live as a slave than be a dead hero, so Odysseus has to learn not to be seduced by glory. Aeneas turns his back on past happiness so as to carry out the plan of the gods. Don Quijote's dream is quixotism seen from behind the mask; it does not represent the accommodation of personal energy and suprapersonal destiny which is exemplified in the epic hero, nor does it point to any final end which might consummate or transcend the beginning.

Do observations such as this suggest an interpretation of the book which would confirm our post-Romantic modes of pessimism? Does Cervantes leave us with the picture of man adrift in a world without purpose, imposing on reality whatever order his autonomous imagination can devise, discovering continuity and direction only in retrospect, like the bright erratic path of the vulnerable snail? Our reading of the earlier episodes which hinged upon Don Quijote's speech about the Age of Gold has already implied what the answer might be. Now we must give full weight to *who* Don Quijote is, for he is not an everyman, or even any man, but a role created and acted by Alonso Quijano, which ceases to exist when Alonso Quijano recovers his wits. Thus the story of the knight has a 'before' and an 'after': *Don Quijote*, the novel, is the story of Alonso Quijano both before and after it is the history of Don Quijote the personage. In the last chapter of Part II, Alonso Quijano awakes from sleep and cries out:

Bendito sea el poderoso Dios, que tanto bien
me ha hecho! En fin, sus misericordias no tienen
límite ni las abrevian ni impiden los pecados
de los hombres.

(Blessed be Almighty God who has granted me such great
favor! Indeed, his mercies know no bounds, nor are
they limited or hindered by the
sins of men.)

Don Quijote has ceased to exist either as reality or as fantasy. The fictional models of heroic virtue are renounced, as he who once was but no longer is Quijote abjures the false books. For Quijano, as for Cervantes, the only true Book and unambiguous Word has declared what the final end is to be, and that end is not the revelation of the Cave of Montesinos. Cervantes's creature has to be stripped of worldly glory, after the pattern of epic, and the only true mission for him, which is beyond fiction and role, is to make a Christian end of his life. The Cave is reserved for those literary phantoms that have haunted the mind with false images of power and glory and love, where fantasy is tortured by reality. When the knight was awakened after his emergence from the cave, we recall, he reproached his companions for robbing him of 'la más sabrosa y agradable vida y vista que ningún humano ha visto ni pasado'. Now he has to reprove them for flattering his former delusions and taking his mind away from the truth: 'déjense burlas aparte' ('stop fooling'). Thus, if

we are attentive, we discover here, at the conclusion of the book, the epic of Alonso Quijano the Good in which all the rest, the history of Don Quijote, has been a marvelous *peripeteia*. The wanderings and adventures of our *hidalgo* have taken place in the interval between two sickbeds: that of the poor country gentleman in Part I, chapter I, and the brief recovery of the same poor gentleman in Part II, chapter 74, as the sickbed is about to become a deathbed. So the novel has circled back to find its end in a *telos* after all. The adventures of *Don Quijote* were the chronicle of Alonso Quijano's journey through a Hades where, like Odysseus, he is at last purged of vainglory and, like Aeneas, he turns his back on the past and submits to a higher will. Cervantes, like Vergil, risks losing our sympathy at this point, and many readers have rebelled against the hero's death, in the odour of sanity. The danger in being solemn about Don Quijote's follies and enthusiastic about his idealism, or weeping over much for his misfortunes, is that we may find ourselves living a romance of chivalry, abandoning grace and reason for the siren-song of nature, and the uncharted wilderness of fantasy. Don Quijote is created by the feverish dream of Alonso Quijano, and the whole tale was told by a lying Moorish enchanter. The death of Alonso Quijano breaks the spell and the enchanter has ceased to exist. If he has bewitched us, our reading of *Don Quijote* becomes a dream in Montesinos's cave. The reader, insofar as he plays the role of Don Quijote, must assume, as his hero does, the most exacting role of all - the disillusioned spectator of himself.

To conclude: these two myths are complementary emblems of human experience, and Cervantes deploys them in a way which enables us to see the relatedness of the beginning and the end of his story. The one serves to reveal how vulnerable to fantasies is the will to act in society; the other creates a psychological space in which the self can scrutinize its guiding fictions and the accommodations of being and role in the deepest levels of personality. Their literary value lies in their power to reveal depths in the life of the hero, and in the life of the novel.

University of Rochester

Notes

- * This is an abbreviated and altered version of a lecture given before the North Central Conference of the Renaissance Society of America, held at Canisius College, Buffalo, N.Y., in April 1971. The original title was "Cervantes and Classical Myth."

- 1 The evidence for this assertion will soon be published elsewhere.

My task in this paper is to explore some of the paths taken by so-called Radicals of the sixteenth century and to analyze their respective stance.¹ If such pursuit will allow for any conclusions, I shall draw them toward the end of my paper in hopes that these might stimulate further investigation and lead toward constant reassessment of our own position amidst the reforms and revolutions of our own day.

Allow me then to define briefly the key terms as I intend to use them. Neither "reform" nor "revolution" per se imply violence, even though we will have to concede that the use of force or coercion may be present in these processes of change. I do not wish to suggest either that reform and revolution can be readily separated and viewed as distinct or that, on the other hand they *must* be mutually exclusive. However, for the purpose of this paper an idea or activity is held to be "reformatory" in nature when it builds upon widely held ideas and rests on well established practices or institutions, accepts inherited authority in principle, yet seeks to reshape or redefine existing life patterns on the basis of some degree of re-alignment of authority.

"Revolutionary," on the other hand, is taken to mean "overturning what is by offering in its place something that is not yet." The authority principle invoked in the latter case is usually novel or at least altered to such a degree that it does not correspond to any previously acknowledged authority, be it the church, councils, socio-religious or political structures.

Thus, most so-called magisterial reformers of the 16th century might be classified as reformatory in their ideas and methods because of their essential acceptance of inherited authority in one sphere or another. Even among Radicals of the same period men may be found whose position is more akin to reformatory patterns than it is to revolutionary ideas since they are willing to abide by some widely accepted source of authority. In many instances, on the other hand, a clear distinction between reformatory and revolutionary stances is well-nigh impossible. A given man often challenges a source of authority in one sphere of life while accepting unchallenged a traditional authority pattern in another.

To mention but one, I might refer to Caspar von Schwenckfeld, a lay theologian of his day. His acceptance of Scripture as a binding authority is largely within the context of the existing socio-religious framework and not unlike Luther's e.g. In his anti-sacralism, however, he proves revolutionary enough to qualify among his contemporaries as a "spiritualist" who comes dangerously close to heresy.

Thus selecting representative Radicals of the 16th century whose reformatory or revolutionary activities could be readily examined proved much more difficult than might be supposed at first glance. For one, generalizations normally accepted as useful in providing a handle with which to classify an otherwise heterogeneous lot of men proved to be unsatisfactory. This left the alternatives of either proposing new terms as for example "Regenerative Reformers," if regeneration appeared to be a primary concern of a given number of men, or of dealing with specific reformers and focusing on definite pamphlets of theirs which could be described as reformatory or revolutionary in nature.

The latter alternative is chosen as the most productive. Of the many Radicals then who

bear careful scrutiny and renewed evaluation, I have chosen Thomas Muentzer, Caspar von Schwenckfeld and Sebastian Franck, for reasons which will be apparent in the course of this paper.

The first is almost a "natural." Revolutionary spirits in East and West have found in him a kindred soul and have widely hailed him a "father of revolution."² Our own reasons for selecting him may however prove to be largely unrelated to conventional evaluations made on the basis of contemporary judgement or on a superficial reading of his letters and sermons which are alleged to have incited peasants and/or noblemen to revolt. It is our contention that the most revolutionary contribution Muentzer made to his age and to subsequent developments in the church can be found in his Liturgical Reforms, clearly set out in the *Deutsches Kirchenamt* (Easter, 1523) and in the *Deutsch-Evangelische Messe* (1524).

Were we to focus on a single revolutionary concept in Schwenckfeld, on the other hand, his *Stillstand* appears to be a valid starting point. This dramatic decision to abstain publicly, as it were, from celebration of the Lord's Supper implies in my estimation a rejection of Luther's insistence that any valid encounter with God can and must take place in the visible company of the "communio sanctorum."³

The revolutionary element in Franck's writings is undoubtedly his "spiritualism" which enabled him to become the progenitor *par excellence* of the concept of religious tolerance.⁴ To a large measure Franck also suggested some of the avenues by which later generations were to find bridges to religions other than the Christian faith in answer to the question how the God of all men reveals himself on a scale wider than could be encompassed by the Judaeo-Christian tradition. We shall face this issue later in our discussion. At this point, however, we must turn our attention to a brief historical sketch of the growth of the concepts of reform and revolution in the writings of the three Radicals mentioned above. It may not be out of order beyond that point to look for a possible theology of revolution which ultimately underlies the variously stated "manifestoes" of revolution or reform.

Let us begin somewhat arbitrarily, with the years 1522-23. At this point, some five years after Luther's *Thesenanschlag*, the novelty of priests leaving Mother Church by defiantly breaking vows of celibacy and obedience, of printers challenging the "institutions" of Medieval Europe through underground publications of annotated Bibles and bold theological pamphlets had slightly worn off. A more serious second stage of reform had begun - less dramatic perhaps, but more significant in the long run than the former phase, in that it was given a delineation of "fronts" within the obviously diverse evangelical camp. Positions had to be consolidated on grounds that might be acceptable within the terms of Christian tradition or could at least be subject to the authority of the working of the Holy Spirit.

In Germany, Luther had broken virgin ground with his major pamphlets of 1520, notably, *The Babylonian Captivity*, *An Open Letter to the Christian Nobility* and *A Treatise on Christian Liberty*.⁵ Through these he had alerted the questing minds of his age to the far-reaching prospects of reform. But apart from the immediate challenge to a narrowly conceived view of Papal authority in matters religious and political, Luther does not appear to have intended 'revolution' in our use of the term.

How far, in fact, he wished to remain dissociated from such overthrow of existing authority is apparent in his rejection of Carlstadt and the "Bilderstürmer" on the one hand, and of the peasants on the other, when they sought his support in their demands for justice and for a fairer share of the land which they tilled.

In Switzerland, another major area of ferment, issues were clarified in the Zürich Disputations in which Zwingli pleaded for the support of the City Council in his endeavour to reform the entire nation. His *67 Theses or Conclusions* and the subsequent "*Exposition and Substantiation of the Conclusions*" are brilliant testimony of the far-reaching peaceful nature of the Swiss reform movement. Anabaptist and Catholic opposition notwithstanding, Zwingli was able to lead his people onto new plains by largely treading former paths which he simply sought to clear of all the outgrowth of the Middle Ages.

The fascinating discovery a twentieth century observer makes when viewing these events in the sixteenth century lies in the fact that political, social and economic problems and consequent unrest, brought about by unresolved issues, are clarified, attacked and often overcome by no more or less potent a weapon than recourse to spiritual renewal in terms largely of Biblicist reform. As we shall see in the case of Thomas Muentzer, a most profound influence is exerted by his liturgical reforms which somehow become the password of revolution since these are coupled with prophetic vision and zeal and an absolute demand on the commitment of all those who accept them as a viable alternative to the historical (hence "dead") faith of Christendom at large.

Thus it may be said in reviewing the history of the period under discussion that the process of alignment and consolidation, apparent not only in the areas mentioned, but indeed elsewhere, fully affected all strands of a largely Feudalist-oriented Europe. Whether nobleman or burgher, priest or peasant, everyone seemed to sense at least the magnitude of the movement toward change. By 1524-25 some of the sparks that had been nursed for about a century of sporadic unrest broke into full flame in the Peasants' Revolt.⁶ Actual incidents of the revolt are recorded for May 1524 in the region of the Black Forest. Within a year of this date the revolt reached its climax, notably around Muehlhausen, a town with which Thomas Muentzer was intimately connected. By August 1525 the uprising is stayed, not without considerable bloodshed, destruction of invaluable treasures and a definite re-alignment of positions along lines that could hardly have been anticipated by any one.

We have given this cursory sketch of events in order to see the work of Muentzer, Franck and Schwenckfeld in the proper environmental context, but must now press on to a more detailed overview of the work of each of these three men.

Our starting point for Thomas Muentzer (1438-1525) is his writings recently published in a critical edition by G. Franz.⁷ These are in some way supplemented by contemporary sources pertaining to the Peasants' Revolt.⁸ The most apparent discrepancy in these is the relatively unrevolutionary style of much that Muentzer wrote, contrasted, however, in the contemporary sources by the widespread reputation he enjoyed as an allegedly revolutionary spirit. The discrepancy is not too readily explained. One may venture a guess, namely that Muentzer is drawn into the maelstrom of unrest and revolt because of his sympathetic voice on behalf of the oppressed. When he addressed his "beloved brothers at Stolberg" in an effort to dissuade them from "mischievous rebellion" (July 18th, 1523) no one apparently heeded the title but everyone obviously noticed such statement as this, that "the rightful reign of Christ must come about after the glory of this world is laid bare. Then the Lord shall come to rule and to push the tyrants to the ground." And again, how melodious in the ears of the frustrated and oppressed peasants must have sounded the words further on in the same document, "What the world despises, God lifts up, and what appears to be foolishness, is wisdom with him," etc. (paraphrasing I Cor. 1, 15-18).

Apart from the occasional encouragement to be bold and to make good use of the entrusted talents, Muentzer's writings contain little that is inciting violence or rebellion. On the other hand, his sermons and pamphlets are pregnant with prophetic fervour and rich with allusions to the prophetic writings of Holy Scripture. He sees himself as the one who is entrusted with the "sword of Gideon" (May 9, 1525). And some adherents, writing him that same month address him as "Christian protector of God's word."

Some of the writings of the years 1524-25 show a persistent effort to distinguish between the good seed and the evil that has sprung up like weeds (*Schriften*, p. 225). Yet, even in the context of the *Protestation oder Erbietung*, in which the admonition appears, Muentzer's concern is more with inward change than it is with outward forms. At the same time allusions to impending disaster appear in some of his correspondence of July 1524. In a letter of 22nd July addressed to Schoeßer Zeiss reference is made to prepare for action.

To clarify what he means he writes, "... he who wishes to be a stone in the new church must risk his neck." It may be noted that by August 3, 1524, he had secretly left Allstedt. By August 15th he wrote from Muehlhausen. Is he there in order to "risk his neck" for the kingdom of God, or has he come, as traditional scholarship has maintained, to lead the revolt? I am inclined toward giving him credit for trying to bring the gospel of peace without false compromise. According to his letters certainly, he does not want to be a troublemaker in the sense of being a violent revolutionary. His sword is the pen (*Schriften*, 449-50). He certainly wields it with authority.

The two segments of society which he attacks most forcefully are the priests and the princes. In terms of his own age such attacks are revolutionary in themselves, for he appears to be undermining the very pillars upon which Medieval society built its structures. Thus his *Exposition of the Book of Daniel* – perhaps the most unified of his works – is also the most political of all his writings. The pamphlet is actually a sermon preached before Duke John of Saxony, his son and the chancellor G. Brueck. With great skill Muentzer appeals to the secular arm of society since (so he alludes) the ecclesiastical arm has failed the people. The blame for all troubles in the land is laid at the doorsteps of a corrupt Church (*Schriften*, 242 ff). Unyieldingly Muentzer drives the wedge between prince and priest, church and state. Does he speak from knowledge of things to come? Will he resort to violent deeds if and when his prophetic utterances remain unheard?

Apart from the fact that Muentzer is found among the peasants in Muehlhausen at the height of the unrest we shall likely never know conclusively from his own pen what his ultimate stance was on the matter of violent revolution.

As we suggested above, however, his liturgical writings appear to provide a clue to our understanding of Muentzer's theology of revolution. In an introductory note to his *Kirchenamt* of 1523 (*Schriften*, p. 25), he contends that the office is appointed to "lift the lid under which the light of the world was kept hidden" and to serve unto the "destruction of all the glorious ceremonies of the godless."

His stance is clear. The attack against a corrupt priesthood is all the more poignant in that Muentzer provides the people with intelligible expressions of praise and with divine psalms whose meaning they can understand. By such means he aims to expose the falsehood of the other. How revolutionary for his age such revision of the existing liturgy (believed to have been unchanged from the beginning) really was, becomes apparent when we compare Muentzer's *German Mass* of 1524 with the *Roman Mass* and Luther's *Ordnung*

of 1523. With the exception of a few responses, the Latin is replaced throughout by German readings and prayers. The most striking innovation, however, is to be found, no doubt, in the act of preparation for worship. Here Muentzer orders the priest's confession to be made in silence, and instead of the celebrant's "mea culpa," Muentzer designates the worshipping people to pray for forgiveness on the celebrant's behalf.

As Luther had done, so Muentzer introduced communion of bread and wine for all the people. But unlike Luther he places the entire act in the context of the people's celebration in their own tongue. To dismiss the experiment too lightly would be doing a grave injustice to Muentzer. It was not developed merely for the sake of experiment but, as he himself stated it, to "help a poor degenerate Christendom recover" by providing people everywhere with the pure milk of the gospel instead of the dragon's milk they had been fed by the priests (*Schriften*, 163-64).

It may be noteworthy in passing to observe that he never intended even this improved order to be absolutely binding and that he worked on the principle that Scripture, when used in liturgy, must be translated more according to its meaning and intent rather than according to the letter.

Caspar von Schwenckfeld (1489-1561), approaches the upheaval of his day differently. His noble birth and lay status in terms of theological training may partly account for the differences. Contemporary sources, who are favourably inclined toward him depict him as a gentle person. He is personally acquainted with the leading Reformers of his day and can boast of intimate associations with Anabaptists and Radicals alike. Yet, to my knowledge, he stays clear of any major confrontation, makes no known reference to the Peasants' Revolt, but instead devotes himself to practicing what might be termed spiritual nurture. Why then include him in a discussion on revolution and reform? At least three reasons come to mind.

The first is his avowed reliance on Scripture as source from which the early church drew its inspiration. In this regard he comes close to Luther's principle of "sola scriptura." Unlike Muentzer, however, Schwenckfeld does not draw on the prophetic aspects of the Bible as much as he relies on the Johannine and Pauline writings, the Wisdom literature and especially the Psalms which he musters for the purposes of promoting the growth of the Christian man.

A second reason is found in a concept at the very heart of the nobleman's life work, viz. the claim that regeneration or rebirth is essential to the new man (the man in Christ). Repeatedly Schwenckfeld writes of this insight.

In short, in order to enter the kingdom of heaven one must undergo a change, a conversion, a mortifying of the sinful, evil desires of the flesh. St. Paul calls it 'a dying unto sin' (Col 3.11), the Lord Christ, 'a denial of self' (Jn. 3.3). I say that the flesh must be reshaped, reformed, renewed within. Yes, a new sap must be poured into the old tree if it is to bear good fruit. In heart and mind we must be changed, humbled, transformed. (*The Life and Mind of a Christian*, 1560).⁹

The new man in Christ is normative in Schwenckfeld's theology, "He is certain of his faith, sealed with the Holy Spirit, secure from eternal death." (The Steps in Regeneration).¹⁰ "His origin is to be found in Christ, the seed, of which the children of God are born" (*Of the Regeneration and Origin of a Christian*).¹¹

The third reason is somewhat more difficult to appreciate in a brief account like ours. Nonetheless, it becomes apparent in the above-mentioned "Stillstand" (abstention from outward participation in the sacramental rites of the church of his day), which in turn reflects a tendency in Schwenckfeld to "spiritualize" the experience of the presence of the living Christ in the hearts of regenerate (true) men.¹²

Taken together, above reasons go a long way in accounting for the nobleman's reformatory activities. In each of the theological tenets which he discusses, he draws on Scripture and Tradition but reserves the right to judge the value of what he has received with the aid of the Holy Spirit of God within him. The revolutionary implications of such an authority principle are far-reaching. While he himself may be judged to have stayed within the boundaries of the Church Catholic, many of his adherents found it difficult to acknowledge any visible authority. Once dissociated from the awareness of the presence in man's life of the living and overarching reality of God, a stance such as Schwenckfeld's is a gate to relativism in matters spiritual. In terms of a medieval world view the nobleman accordingly appears to be highly revolutionary.

Sebastian Franck (1499-1542), on a wider basis perhaps than the other two radicals under discussion, has contributed significantly to the climate of opinion that eventually was to permeate Western Christendom and seems to have reached full bloom in our own generation. In many ways, Frank 'has come of age' long before his time.

The presuppositions underlying his thought are intricately interwoven. As did Schwenckfeld and to some extent Muentzer, Franck drew on the negative theology of Medieval mystics, notably among them, Meister Eckhart and Tauler. From the latter he undoubtedly borrowed the distinction "outward - inward" man. The influence of the *Theologia Deutsch* can only be conjectured but hardly denied.¹³

In his philosophy of history, Franck seems to be guided by Joachim of Fiore. There he found the seed of the prophetic expectation of an imminent beginning of the age of the Spirit. The effects of such a view of history are apparent in a number of ways, but most prominent, in Franck's negative attitude to institutional Christianity and in his insistence that God is to be worshipped in spirit only.

Whatever other sources such as the writings of the Humanists of his day and the ideas of Anabaptists, et. al. may have helped form Franck's thinking, the actual revolutionary impact of his work seems to have centered in his understanding of and attitude to the world, in his concept of Scripture and Spirit and in his ecclesiology. While other theological tenets such as his concept of God are significant to the total picture, they may be disregarded for the purpose of this paper.

Franck's *Chronica* of 1536¹⁴ is clearly his most important contribution to the revolutionary climate of his day. Its very philosophy challenges the value scale of much of the historical writing of the era by demanding that all events be measured in terms of their "spiritual" content. Franck denies for example the validity of comparing orthodoxy and heresy. He further contends that all events can be assessed only after a careful reading of the sources (in other words, that there be a measure of objectivity). In the last analysis, however, he questions the possibility of evaluation at all on the grounds that the operations of the Holy Spirit can be discerned only by the Spirit.

Such argumentation inevitably led Franck to a basic scepticism, for in a real sense he denied to men the ability to discern or judge the divine reality in the events of history. This

scepticism, in turn, illuminates Franck's attitude to the world. He sees the world basically as the demonic power, set over against God and intent on claiming the allegiance of man. In his *Paradoxa* (published in 1542) he writes,

“Die Kirche Christi kann mit der Welt weder eins sein noch in Frieden leben ...”. And further on in the same context, “The world is like a perverse spider and like lime, since she sets afire what she is supposed to extinguish and since even honey is poison to her and the word of peace appears to be stirring trouble (aufruhrerisch)”. (*Paradoxa*, Wollgast edition p. 370 and 372ff)

At this very point the difference between the priest Muentzer and the “burgher” Franck is most glaringly apparent.¹⁵ In the pamphlet, *Von de Werelt, des Duyvels Rijcke*, (published 1618) Franck expresses disapproval of the vulgar masses whom he describes as “common, newly-wise, rough, like a stubborn bull,” etc. (Fol. 41). One is not altogether unmindful of the present scene when one reads a description of their behaviour as “childish and plebejan” (kindisch Poebel) (Weltbuch, xxxviii). The only effective means against being swept away by this torrent, that he is able to suggest, is to maintain the nobility of the soul *i.e.* to set oneself apart through a life “grounded in God.”

Muentzer, on the other hand chose to mingle with the masses. Some of the Anabaptists of the day, by contrast, opted for withdrawal from the world. Franck insists over against either of these extremes to choose the world as the testing ground in which ultimately the outward figure (or ‘image’) of the inward reality has to be overcome by true reflection, proper perspective and a striving after the celestial essence. “Risk it all and cling to the kingdom of God,” is his challenge to the men of his age.¹⁶

A second factor operative in Franck's understanding of God's activity among men is his concept of Scripture. Unlike Luther, but similar in intent to Muentzer, Denck and others (and more precisely than these), Franck develops the argument that Scripture is a book which is protected by seven seals against false interpretation.¹⁷ In itself therefore Scripture cannot be conducive to salvation. The children of light alone, because they are under the aegis of God, are capable of benefiting from its allegories. Apart from the Spirit who acts as the hermeneutical agent, as it were, Scripture to Franck is no more than the paper pope which Luther had made it. He insists that the spirit of Scripture is hidden in the letter in order that “no swine may stumble over it and that no uncircumcised may come upon this secret.”¹⁸

What Franck seems to say is obviously that Scripture partakes of the duality of all things: it is hidden, yet revealed, material, yet spiritual, human, yet divine. The key to its right understanding is the Spirit. Again we have come to one of the revolutionary insights of the sixteenth century. Its impact, as we are all aware, did lead, on the one hand, to developments that were destructive of human community, but, on the other hand, to creative self realization of a deeply spiritual level.

Not unrelated to these two concepts is Franck's Ecclesiology. In a popular song he ridicules an apparent anomaly, *viz.* the existence of at least four churches each of which demands recognition for one specific reason or another. Over against their foolish claims, Franck sets those individuals who seek the kingdom of God instead. Their narrow path is the true ‘imitatio Christi’ – the acceptance of Christ's humility and patience and a readiness to bear rejection by the world.¹⁹

In a more profound *theological* vein, the Ecclesiology reflected in the *Song of the Four Churches* is rooted in the currents of thought which carry with them a deep-seated anti-institutionalism and a clearly expressed aversion to visible human constructs of any kind.²⁰ Even Luther, as we well know, speaks of the hidden church as distinguishable from the church in its earthly manifestations. But Luther is fully aware, all the while, of the historicity of that church. Franck, on the other hand, polarizes the two aspects of the Church by positing them as opposites: the church of the Spirit vs. the visible church. To the latter he ascribes a distinct place in the scheme of things by allowing that she served a useful purpose at the time of the Apostles, but has long since lost her value in the divine plan of salvation. The argument is forcefully presented in the *Letter to Campanus*:

“Therefore, I firmly believe that the outward church of Christ, including all its gifts and sacraments, because of the breaking in and laying waste by Antichrist, went up to heaven right after the death of the apostles and lies concealed in spirit and in truth. I am thus quite certain that for fourteen hundred years now there has existed no gathered church nor any sacrament.”²¹

In denying any validity to the visible church of his day, Franck has taken the full consequence of his stance against the visible church, its ministry and purpose. He has in some sense become fully secularized.²² It is undoubtedly this radical turning away from the structure of the church which led Troeltsch to the observation that Franck comes closest to the ancient teaching of Mysticism which advocated the third kingdom or the ‘*evangelium aeternum*.’²³

To sum up our main observations on Franck to this point, we venture to say that he is forced to deny the possibility of reform. At best he could have argued for the restitution of the Church, that had disappeared from earth by AD 131. In actual fact, however, he opts for revolutionary change in his concepts of God as the one who has no name (*Paradoxa*, 3)²⁴ in his attitude toward institutions and the manner in which he argues for a Christianity which is liberated from the Law (*Paradoxa*, 18).²⁵

Fascinated by the duality of everything, Franck seeks to walk the ‘*via paradoxa*’ of a sort of evangelical existentialism, illuminated by the inner light rather than being dependent on the knowledge of Christ. Whether or not such a life style allows for a viable theology of revolution, shall be one of our concerns in the second part of this paper.

It may be too rash a judgement on scant evidence such as we have mustered for this paper, to speak of a common *theology of revolution* other than in embryo. Nonetheless, the vents we have traced thus far and the responses we have elicited from three Radicals, (allegedly out of the main stream of sixteenth century transformations, yet colourful and distinct) – seem to suggest a common theological orientation. Thus it may be said that the Radicals under review participate in a world view which does not deny the existence of God nor does it necessarily diminish the significance of man. Even Franck who in some sense is the most pessimistic of the three on that score, speaks of encounter and interaction between God and spiritual men. We may conclude then that a prominent primary characteristic of these Radical theologians (others of their day could easily be included here), is no doubt the acknowledgement and acceptance of authority; an authority – be it noted – that rests

neither with the Pope, nor in the Councils, nor even in Scripture as a collection of writings, but solely in the being and nature of God as he manifests himself in the new man.

Such an authority principle invites disaster. Yet, it is at the same time the affirmation of the possibility of the presence of God's kingdom here and now in a manner that transcends any one structure. Out of this conviction Muentzer for one could exhort his listeners "you must not doubt; God shall destroy all your opponents who dare persecute you."²⁶ For this reason also he could equate the word of God "living in all the elect" to a mother "giving milk to her child."²⁷

I venture to suggest that recourse to such understanding of authority helped Radicals reach an understanding of corporate worship which was largely unfettered by inherited patterns, yet capable of incorporating these in a living liturgy as long as they expressed the worshiper's response to God. The object of such worship was "to declare Christ with-in us by the activity of the Spirit - as he has been proclaimed by the prophets, was born, died and rose - as he reigns together with the Father and the same Spirit, forever making students of us."²⁸

Free from the compulsion of tradition or law yet able to paraphrase a basic Christian credal formula, Muentzer here propagates a valid criterion of a theology of revolution as he engages in creative interpretation of the past in order that the experience of his life be an authentic and active living-out-of and living in the presence of Christ.

There is yet a third element, shared by the Radicals, which may be taken as an important ingredient of a theology of revolution. It is the conviction, frequently stated, that the Church of Christ can respond to the aspirations and needs of a people in transition. To enable such response the Radicals promoted action which would risk the uniformity of socio-political structures and forsake the literalism of Scripture and Ecclesiastical tradition in search of the unity of the Spirit. This unity, of course, found various expressions, hence led to a diversity which was often taken to mean disunity. Nothing could be farther from the expressed intention of these men. When Franck enumerated the paradoxes of life he assumed an all-transcending unity which held together conflicting ideas or warring nations in the history of Christendom. Similarly, Schwenckfeld's brotherhood of the regenerate was never intended to form the nucleus of another church, but simply to make concrete the spiritual nature of the body of Christ. Both men were misjudged by their age and greatly maligned throughout subsequent centuries. We may easily appreciate therefore why Muentzer has been branded to the present day as inciter of revolt, enthusiast and arch spiritualist. All such testimony to the contrary, his writings would lead one to believe that he fell victim to his prophetic zeal and the circumstances of his presence among the rebelling peasants of Muehlhausen at the height of the Peasants' Revolt. He was there likely to help initiate the rule of justice among the oppressed and illiterate - a rule for which he worked, preached and suffered, even though he had no illusion as to its presence among the men of his day.²⁹

How then are we to assess the contribution by sixteenth century Radicals from the vantage point of the twentieth century? Without equivocation it may be said that they were not primarily interested in re-formation.³⁰ They thought and acted rather from an inherent pessimism regarding existing institutions and patterns of authority. In a real sense they were caught in the dilemma of acknowledging the reign of God yet having to admit that this rule could not be contained in or delineated by the structures of their day.

Needless to say, their theological starting point was lost to the majority of their generation, for the magisterial Reformers, on the one hand, were still largely medieval men who ultimately took refuge in existing structures and attempted reform through compromise. Militant elements, such as the peasants, on the other hand, were prone to take the kingdom of God 'by force.' Under stress, they opted for anarchy – seeking to control power – rather than allowing the recreative forces to bring about the much needed revolutions that would make all things new. In neither camp was there any room for an adequate theology of revolution, a theology that implied commitment to an ultimate concern (to use a Tillichian phrase), allowing at the same time that any awareness of and response to such concern must needs be ambiguous. The Radicals who undoubtedly came closest to a theology of revolution experienced the consequences of the ambiguity of all human existence. They were made fools for Christ; yet, who is to say that their foolishness came to naught?

Conclusion

Harvey Cox argues in his *Secular City* (p. 107) that we live today in a period of revolution without a theology of revolution. If this were the case, we would have reached again a state of 'utter despair' (to use Luther's term) or 'complete meaninglessness' to say it in a Tillichian phrase. Perchance, the theological starting point of the Radicals of the Sixteenth Century offers a possible way out of the dilemma of our day. In other words, the admission – impossible as it may appear to be – that no revolutionary change can be effected which does not begin with a change of heart must be at the centre of any renewing process that acknowledges the activity of God in the affairs of men. The most enduring legacy which the Radicals have left to subsequent generations closely follows this insight, for they recognized that ultimately all human systems and creeds have to be seen as addenda – the mirages of men in the wilderness – and that God alone holds the key to abundant life. To grasp this truth, it would appear, is to be a true revolutionary, for such a stance demands a radical assessment of the human situation as we find it at any given moment in history and an admission of utter dependence in matters of ultimate concern.

University of British Columbia

Footnotes

- 1 A precise delineation of the "Radicals" invites controversy. Without taking sides in the ongoing debate, I would refer the reader to G.H. Williams, *The Radical Reformation*, Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1962; Heinold Fast, *Der linke Fluegel der Reformation*, Bremen: Schuenemann Verlag, 1960; Ernst Troeltsch, *Die Soziallehren der Christlichen Kirchen und Gruppen*, Gesammelte Werke, I, Tuebingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1912. Troeltsch above all, and after him a host of North American scholars, has provided useful categories of distinction.
- 2 Recent authors who have dealt with Thomas Muentzer in one way or another are the following: E. Bloch, *Thomas Muentzer, Als Theologe der Revolution*, Stuttgart 1960; H. J. Goertz, *Innere und Aeußere Ordnung in der Theologie*

Thomas Muentzers, Leiden: Brill, 1967; Eric W. Gritsch, *Reformer Without a Church: The Life and Thought of Thomas Muentzer, 1488 to 1525*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967; Also, by the same author an article entitled "Thomas Muentzer's Theology and Revolution," M.Q.R. 43 (April 1969) and *The Authority of the Inner Word*, Yale dissertation (1959); Thomas Nipperdey "Theologie und Revolution bei Thomas Muentzer," A.R.G. Vol 54 (1963).

- 3 The problem has been with the church ever since, found adherents and equally fervent opponents (Ritschl-Schleiermacher) and certainly is a live issue in today's struggle between the Pentecostalist movement and those who seek renewal within the church as we know it.

- 4 Meinulf Barbers, *Toleranz bei Sebastian Franck*, Bonn: Roehrscheid, 1964, is the latest critical study on the subject known to me.
- 5 Characteristically, the *Letter to the Nobility* was written in German, the other two treatises, however, appeared in Latin since the former was intended for the people, the latter two, on the other hand, were designed for the use of theologians.
- 6 For a history of the Peasants' Revolt cf. G. Franz, *Der Deutsche Bauernkrieg*, Munich-Berlin: 1935 (reprint, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, Darmstadt: 1968). Cf. Also, G. Franz, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Bauernkrieges*, W. Buchgesellschaft, Darmstadt: 1963. The author cites documents which go back to 1423 and show signs of conflict between nobility and peasants.
- 7 Thomas Muentzer, *Schriften und Briefe*, (hence, *Schriften*), ed. G. Franz, in *Quellen und Forschungen zur Reformationsgeschichte*, XXXIII, Guetersloh: 1968.
- 8 Cf. G. Franz, *Bauernkrieg und Quellen zur Geschichte des Bauernkrieges*.
- 9 Cf. E. J. Furcha and F. L. Battles, *The Piety of Caspar Schwenckfeld*, Pittsburgh: 1969, p. 34.
- 10 *Ibid.*, p. 15
- 11 *Ibid.*, p. 28
- 12 Since about 1526, Schwenckfeld did not participate in any celebration of the Lord's Supper. In at least two documents (of 1528 and 1559 respectively), he states his reasons. Cf. Furcha-Battles, *op. cit.* p. 104 ff.
- 13 Cf. G. Baring, "L. Haetzers Bearbeitung der Theologia Deutsch, Worms 1528" in *Z.F.K.*, 70, 1959. The author argues that the influence of the anonymous writer of this work is widespread and cannot be rated too highly.
- 14 A fuller title is, *Chronica, Zeytbuch und Geschichtbibell von Anbegin bis in dies gegenwertig 1536th year.* etc., recently reprinted by the Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, Darmstadt, 1969.
- 15 I am insisting on this distinction even though both men were ordained. Muentzer never really abandoned the office of a minister of word and sacrament, whereas Franck's major contribution to the 16th century is primarily in the "secular" sphere.
- 16 Cf. *Paradoxa*, 187-189, Wollgast edition, p. 319 ff. A frequently recurring term is Gelassenheit - tranquility, equilibrium which he suggests as the best attitude to adopt in the effort to overcome the world.
- 17 *Das Verbuetschiert mit 7 Siegeln verschlossene Buch* (1539). The opposing forces that have to be countered are fear of men, human understanding, human counsel and human strength, human skill and godlessness or love of world. The inner struggle may be accomplished within man through rebirth, baptism and circumcision in the spirit.
- 18 *Sechsbundert Dreyzebn Gebot und Verbot*, Ulm, 1537, (last page). Similarly in his *Paradoxa*, The outward word is merely a "figure of and introduction to the inward word." Cf. particularly Sections 115-125 (Wollgast edition pp. 192-208), and frequently elsewhere.
- 19 "Of Four Opposing Churches, Each of Which Hates and Condemns the Others" (1531), quoted in H. Fast, *Der linke Fluegel*, p. 246. Similar songs were apparently popular. Cf. one by Berner, a Schwenckfelder of sorts, quoted by Wackernagel, *Das Deutsche Kirchenlied*, V, No. 790.
- 20 Cf. G. Müller, *Die Römische Kurie und die Reformation*, p. 19 ff. The author observes a widespread, anti-curialist feeling in Germany at the outset of 1524. He cites the laughter and derision with which the Papal nuncio Rorario e.g. was received in Nurnberg and refers to Strasbourg whose Council had passed anti-Roman legislation.
- 21 *Letter to Campanus*, in *Spiritual and Anabaptist Writers*, ed. William and Mergal, p. 149. I have slightly modified their translation to correspond better to the German text.
- 22 M. Barbers, *Toleranz*, p. 62 states the case succinctly as follows: "Fuer Franck der jeder sichtbaren Kirche jede Berechtigung abspricht, von seinen Voraussetzungen her absprechen muss, sind die Sakramente schlechthin Aeusserlichkeiten ohne jedwedem Hintergrund, magische Zeichen, die eine unsichtbare Gnade andeuten wollen... So musste Franck sich von der Kirche ... abwenden; jeder sichtbaren Kirche absagen, um zur einen, unsichtbaren Kirche Christi zu gelangen."
- 23 *Soziallehren*, p. 888. By way of an aside it may be noted that in 1528 Franck married a sister of one of the so-called godless painters of Nurnberg.
- 24 Wollgast edition, p. 22
- 25 "The just (believers) have no law," Wollgast edition, p. 303 ff. Similarly also, *Paradoxa* 232 and 233 and 216/17.
- 26 Muentzer, *Exposition of the Book of Daniel*, Schriften, p. 258 (my translation).

- 27 Muentzer, *Prague Manifesto*, in *Schriften*, p. 497 (my translation).
- 28 Muentzer, *German-Evangelical Mass, Preface*, in *Schriften*, p. 167 (translation mine).
- 29 Muentzer, "A Letter to the Council of Nordhausen" (after Aug. 15, 1524). *Schriften*, p. 575 (my translation). Muentzer concludes, "The peace of God be with you ... that you may receive truth and righteousness which the world has not received ... by his grace he teaches us to seek after the highest good."
- 30 This must be said even though earlier in the paper we suggested that Schwenckfeld in some of his concepts stood closer to the Reformers than he was to Radical theology.

Working Bibliography

- M. Barbers, *Toleranz bei Sebastian Franck*, Bonn: Roehrscheid, 1964.
- G. Baring, "L. Haetzlers Bearbeitung der Theologia Deutsch, Worms, 1528," in *Z.F.K.*, 70, 1959.
- E. Bloch, *Thomas Muentzer als Theologe der Revolution*, Stuttgart: 1960.
- H. Fast, *Der linke Fluegel der Reformation*, Bremen: Schiinemann Verlag, 1962.
- Sebastian Franck, *Chronica, Zeytbuch und Geschychtbibel*, (reprint Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, Darmstadt: 1969).
- Sebastian Franck, *Paradoxa*, Wollgast edition, Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1966.
- Sebastian Franck, *Sechsbundert Dreyehen Gebot und Verbot der Juden*, Ulm: 1537.
- Sebastian Franck, *Das verbuetschiert mit 7 Siegeln verschlossene Buch*, 1539.
- Sebastian Franck, *Van der Werelt, des Duyvels Rijcke*, Gouda, 1618.
- G. Franz, *Der Deutsche Bauernkrieg*, Munich-Berlin: 1935 (reprint, Wiss. Buchgesellschaft, Darmstadt: 1968).
- G. Franz, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Bauernkrieges*, Darmstadt: 1963.
- E. J. Furcha & F. L. Battles, *The Piety of Caspar Schwenckfeld*, Pittsburgh: The Pittsburgh Theological Seminary: 1969.
- Gedenkschrift zum 400-jaebigen Bestehen der Mennoniten (1525-1925)*, Karlsruhe: Schneider Verlag, 1925.
- H. J. Goertz, *Innere und Aeussere Ordnung in der Theologie Thomas Muentzers*, Leiden: Brill, 1967.
- E. W. Gritsch, *Reformer Without a Church: The Life and Thought of Thomas Muentzer, 1488-1525*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967.

- E. W. Gritsch, *The Authority of the Inner Word*, Yale Dissertation, 1959.
- M. Luther, *Works of Martin Luther*, Philadelphia Edition, Vol. II, 1943.
- G. Mueller, *Die Roemische Kurie und die Reformation, 1523-1534*, Guetersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1969.
- Juergen Moltmann, "God in the Revolution" (a paper presented at Turku, 1968).
- Thomas Muentzer, *Schriften und Briefe* (Schriften) ed. G. Franz, Quellen & Forschungen, 1968.
- T. Nipperdey, "Theologie und Revolution bei Thomas Muentzer," *A.R.G.* Vol. 54 (1963).
- John K.S. Reid, *The Authority of Scripture*, London: Methuen & Co., 1957.
- Corpus Schwenckfeldianorum*, ed. C. D. Hart-rafft, Schwenckfelders of America, 1907ff.
- H. Scheible, ed. *Das Widerstandsrecht der Deutschen Protestanten, 1523-1546*, Guetersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1969.
- P. Tillich, *The Courage to Be*, New Haven: Yale Press, 1952.
- E. Troeltsch, *Die Soziallehren der Christlichen Kirchen und Gruppen*, Ges. Werke, I. Tuebingen: 1912.
- G. H. Williams & A. M. Mergal, *Spiritual & Anabaptist Writers*, L.C.C. XXV, 1957.
- G. H. Williams, *The Radical Reformation*, Philadelphia: Westminster, 1962.
- H. Zwingli, *Zwingli Hauptschriften*, Fritz Blanke, et al. (eds.), Zurich: Zwingli Verlag, 1947.

By Fritz Büsser

A report on the state of research into the Reformation in German-speaking Switzerland can begin with a very positive assertion: Compared with other epochs of Swiss history (intellectual, cultural, political and economic), the subject of the Reformation in the Swiss Confederation has been and is being studied with exhaustive thoroughness. The same claim can be made by comparison with corresponding work in other countries, not excepting Germany with its leading role in the history of the Reformation. To begin with, the list of source compilations and publications series on the Reformation theme in German-speaking Switzerland is most impressive. Furthermore, the number and rank of scholars who have engaged in such study is of a high order. There is scarcely a significant historian or theologian (thinking especially of the systematic theologian and church historian) who has not concerned himself intensively with the theme of the Reformation. Consequently the state of Reformation research in German-speaking Switzerland is very far from being underdeveloped.

Zwingli

Notwithstanding the claim made above, it is by no means the case that Swiss research in the field of Reformation history is without further tasks to fulfil. On the contrary, a closer look conveys the rather one-sided impression that the Reformation in German-speaking Switzerland is limited to what concerns the single Reformer, Huldrych Zwingli, and even more narrowly, to the less than twelve years of his activity in Zürich.

It is of course acknowledged that there was a Reformation outside the bounds of Zürich: in Bern with Haller, Capito, Zurkinden, and Niklaus Manuel, in Basel especially with Oekolampad, in St. Gallen with Vadian and Kessler, in Glarus with Tschudi, and in the Drei Bünden with Comander, and so forth. Yet apart from a few local and personal interests, the non-Zürich Reformation has been virtually eclipsed, both at home and abroad, behind the figure of Zwingli as the real founder of the Reformed Church. As Gottfried W. Locher in particular has affirmed, this interest in Zwingli and especially in his theology has 'reached unexpected proportions and intensity' throughout the whole world during the past decade. One reason among others for this is the fact that, in his own way, he pursued a clear path through some central themes which enjoy tremendous currency today; so that the attentive ear may detect his Reformed voice even amidst the ecumenical choir. To such themes belongs the now much discussed socio-ethical responsibility of the Church and its role in the sphere of social crisis, representing an oft-neglected yet abidingly effective motif in the Zürich reformation. Another theme is his emphasis upon the Spirit in relation to the written and preached Word, although this runs counter to the trend of hermeneutical discussion during the last decade.

Precisely this welcome development, however, should not obscure the fact that there are still many obvious research projects concerning Zwingli himself. This holds in the first place

*Address delivered at the 1971 annual general meeting of the Zwingli-Verein in Zürich. Translated from the German by W. James S. Farris of Knox College, University of Toronto.

for Zwingli's actual literary works. When Emil Egli and Georg Finsler in 1905 took up the task of producing a critical edition of *Huldreich Zwinglis Sämtliche Werke* in the context of the *Corpus Reformatorum*, they hoped to be able to complete their work by the 400th. anniversary of the Zürich Reformation, *i.e.* in 1919. Two world wars hindered the carrying out of the plan, so that out of the three series of the total work, only the second (the correspondence) had been completed by 1971. The first series (comprising the theological, ecclesiastical and political books and writings of Zwingli in chronological order), covering the period up to 19 August 1530, has been printed; and the remainder, to the death of Zwingli, is practically ready for the press. The third series (marginal glosses and exegesis) has scarcely proceeded beyond the editing of Zwingli's exegetical writings of the Old Testament. This means that we are still lacking a critical edition of the exegetical writings on the New Testament, an edition of the notes taken on Zwingli's sermons on the Old and New Testaments first discovered a few years ago by Leo Weisz, as well as an edition of his hymns. For a meaningful use of such a large literary residue there is a definite need also for an index of persons, subjects, Biblical references, citations from Church Fathers and classical figures, etc.

The situation regarding works about Zwingli is similar. Admittedly we now have, alongside the older works by Stähelin and W. Köhler, the four-volume biography by Oskar Farnier which was completed by Rudolph Phister in 1960. The biographical works by Fritz Schmidt-Clausing and Martin Haas are likewise valuable supplements. But in respect of a clarification of all biographical details (for example, Zwingli's academic career), and in particular Zwingli's theology in relation to his involvement in the political sphere, the research is not far advanced. As far as the theology in general is concerned, the best work today is being done by J. V. Pollet and Gottfried W. Locher. In 1950 J. V. Pollet, a Dominican from Paris and honorary doctor of the Theological Faculty of the University of Zürich, contributed to the *Dictionnaire de Theologie Catholique* a full exposition of Zwingli's theology, based on all previous research and a thorough knowledge of sources, thereby introducing the 'conciliar turning-point' in the Catholic picture of Zwingli. Locher, a systematic theologian in Bern, published the first volume of his *Theologie Huldrych Zwinglis im Lichte seiner Christologie* in 1952, followed by a more wide-ranging summary exposition in the article "Zwingli" in the third edition of *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*. Since then he has written an essay, "Grundzüge der Theologie Huldrych Zwinglis im Vergleich mit derjenigen Martin Luthers und Johann Calvins, Ein Ueberblick," not to mention numerous individual research articles. A twofold basic approach characterizes Locher's work: on the one hand he brings sharply to attention the Biblical elements and therewith the Christology, as the centre of Zwingli's theology (*i.e.*, binding himself more closely to the patristic and scholastic background than to the humanistic); on the other hand he sounds the note of Zwingli's independence as a reformer over against Luther.

In this regard an apparent counterpart to Locher has arisen in recent years in the person of Christoph Gestrich. In his dissertation, *Zwingli als Theologe*, the latter addressed himself intensively on the one hand to the subject of 'faith and spirit according to the Zurich reformer' that is, to spiritualism as the central concept of Zwingli's theology; on the other hand, against Locher and other more recent Swiss Zwingli scholars, he renewed the comparison with Luther, raising it to a methodological principle. Gestrich maintains that since Zwingli's own presuppositions nowhere become clearer than in the comparison with Luther,

he will 'not side with those who out of a false favoritism for Zwingli presume to exclude Luther from their purview.' Neither Locher nor Gestrich give a standard exposition of Zwingli's theology. With their opposing views they should be able to pose the most incisive problems for further research into Zwingli's theology; they should on the one hand raise anew and more fundamentally than formerly the question of the patristic and scholastic backgrounds - asking after the influence not only of Augustine, but also of Laktanz, not only of Thomas but above all of Duns Scotus. Especially, however, there is indicated a need for a more thoroughgoing comparison of Zwingli's theology - both as a whole and in individual questions (scriptural principle, Christology, Paulinism, doctrine of predestination) - with that of Erasmus, the Baptists, the Catholic opponents, and of course Luther.

All of this does not suggest that a great deal of routine work has not already been accomplished toward giving a complete picture of Zwingli's theology. In the field of Zwingli research we must not overlook Rich's work on the beginnings of Zwingli's theology, Schmid's work on divine and human justice, the thorough research of Pfister on the problem of original sin and the salvation of elect heathen, nor Köhler's great monographs on the conflict over the Lord's Supper and Church discipline. In the same category are the more recent specialized works by Goeters, Rogge, and Kohls on the meeting of humanism and Reformation in Zwingli and his movement, and certain works on Zwingli's attitude toward the Baptists, to liturgy, and to religious art.

On the subject of Zwingli's political involvement, his part in the shaping of Zürich and Swiss politics, the discussion in recent years has turned toward the problem of "theocracy," or, more concretely, to the question concerning how far Zwingli, as a 'leading member' of the 'Secret Council,' had determined the fortunes of Zürich over the years through a blend of spiritual and worldly government. On this matter also there are basically two contrasting views. There is first that of Leonhard von Muralt (namely, in the *Kommentar* and in the introductions to the volumes of the critical Zwingli edition which he prepared, in the political writings, and in several essays), supported by the independent and original research of his disciples, M. Haas, J. Spillmann, R. Hauswirth, W. Jacob, H. Morf, F. Staub, and H. Meyer. These came to the conclusion that there was no 'Secret Council in the sense of a stable and clear-cut institution in which Zwingli played the leading role, or virtually that of regent.' Although it may be true that for all important questions of a private or public sort affecting the Church, politics, Zürich, Switzerland, there were designated prescriptions or secret orders, and although Zwingli had a major role in these secret circles, laying down or sanctioning the prescriptions, the secret circles nevertheless had only an advisory function in such matters. The final decision always lay in the hands of the Small or the Great Council.

In contradistinction from v. Muralt and his disciples, Ekkhard Fabian put forward findings 'based on a broader foundation of sources' reverting to the concepts of earlier historical accounts by Hundeshagen, H. Escher, A. Farner, W. Oechslis and others. Fabian is strongly convinced that in Zürich, from August 8, 1523 to December 9, 1531, there was a constitutionally-founded Secret Council in which Zwingli was so significantly involved that probably a greater part of the correspondence of the 'anonymous individuals' was (co-)authored by Zwingli. Fabian would therefore like to see this correspondence edited within the scope of the critical Zwingli edition (*Corpus Reformatorum*).

To supplement this German-language work we have also the English exposition by Robert G. Walton dealing with Zwingli's theocracy. Finally one is happy to report that the

Senior Assistant at the *Institut für schweizerische Reformations-geschichte*, U. Gabler, is working intensively on a long-standing concern of Zwingli research: he is preparing an updating of Finsler's *Zwingli-Bibliographie* from 1897 to the present day, which will not only include all independent works and essays, but at the same time critically review their content.

Bullinger

If the state of Zwingli research appears comparatively favourable, though short of ideal, the picture worsens as soon as we turn to Zwingli's disciple and figure of comparable rank, Heinrich Bullinger. The life work of Bullinger (1504-1575) remains today largely unknown in spite of the fact that as theologian and churchman he not only guided the fortunes of the Reformed Church of Zürich and the Reformed part of Switzerland during nearly 45 years, but together with Calvin and Beza built a Reformed Europe. (Emil Egli spoke of Bullinger as a patriarch 'who made his presence felt on all sides, everywhere planting Reformed life and nurturing it by word and deed. His was a genuine Reformed mission carried throughout almost all Europe'). Thus, though Bullinger was at least of as great historical and theological importance for the Swiss Reformation as Zwingli, his life's work remains still largely unknown. His more than one hundred and twenty printed works, with few exceptions, remain in printings of the 16th and 17th centuries. The last comprehensive exposition of Bullinger, that of Carl Pestalozzi, dates from 1858.

Fortunately, however, the long-sought Bullinger-Renaissance is gradually coming to view. In recent years individual works have been appearing, e.g., on the young Bullinger (Blanke), and more significantly about individual aspects of Bullinger's theology (Staedtke on the theology of the young Bullinger, P. Walser on the doctrine of predestination, E. Koch on the theology of the *Confessio Helvetica posterior*, H. Fast on Bullinger and the Baptists, W. Hollweg on Bullinger's *Hausbuch*). Finally in 1966 the *Zwingli-Verein* in Zürich and the *Institut für Schweizerische Reformationsgeschichte der Theologischen Fakultät der Universität Zürich* took up the task of systematic research and editing of the complete literary residue of Heinrich Bullinger. At the moment a bibliography of the printed works of Bullinger, prepared by Joachim Staedtke, is in print and the manuscript of the first volume of the tremendous Bullinger correspondence is at least ready for the press. Supported by the *Schweizerischer Nationalfond für Wissenschaftliche Forschung*, the institutions mentioned above are planning a summary edition of Heinrich Bullinger's correspondence as well as study editions of his theological and historiographical works. The principal publication here will clearly be that containing the correspondence, both from and to Bullinger, which by itself is more comprehensive in scope than that of Luther, Zwingli, Calvin and Vadian together, and which today, after centuries of collating (by such persons as J. J. Breitingger, J. H. Hottinger, J. J. Simler, Emil Egli, Tr. Schiess) includes more than 12,000 items, with the prospect that it may become still more extensive. With regard to the historical and theological works, selected editions of about twelve volumes is anticipated in either case.

This intensive preoccupation with Bullinger increasingly facilitates research into the full range of circumstances surrounding him: the political, social and economic conditions in Zürich and in Switzerland after Zwingli's death, and particularly the role of his theological and ecclesiastical co-workers. Over a hundred years ago, in the excellent series *Leben und*

ausgewählte Schriften der Väter und Begründer der reformierten Kirche a description of the lives of Vermigli and Jud appeared alongside that of Zwingli and Bullinger. Besides these, however, there worked in Zürich such men as Pellikan, Joh. Rud. Stumpf, Rud. Gualther, Wilh. Stucki, J. J. Breitingen, and Joh. Wolf, to name only a few. All of these men would deserve in their own right to be rescued from oblivion, but the more so in the interests of a complete understanding of Bullinger's times. A look into the remarkable *Pfarrerbuch* of the Canton of Zürich or the recent, extremely thorough work *Die evangelische Pfarrerschaft des Kantons St. Gallen* by H. M. Stüchelberger, might stimulate further biographical and perhaps also sociological works about the origins and intellectual development of Reformed pastors. No less important would be the treatment of numerous issues such as the relations of Zürich (Council and Clergy) to the other protestant regions of Switzerland, as well as to Germany, France, and England. Other issues would include the position of Zürich (including a comparison with that of the other protestant strongholds) concerning the great political and ecclesiastical problems of the 16th century, e.g., the Schmalkaldic War, The Council of Trent, the Religious Peace of Augsburg, and the like.

Apart from the wishes which have been mentioned here in connection with Zwingli and Bullinger, still other major tasks are posed, such as new publications covering many known and unknown events of the Zürich and Swiss Reformation history available for research both at home and in archives and libraries abroad, publications of sermons from the time of the Reformation (those of Stumpf, Gualther and others), summary and individual bibliographies, and not least, research into many linguistic problems peculiar to the Reformation era. In addition to this, as H. C. Peyer has observed, social and economic themes relating to both Zürich and Switzerland as a whole should be brought more strongly to the fore, as well as research into the relationship of the principal Reformed centres to their subject territories, the Reformation in the rural congregations, and the creation of a Swiss patrician class in the protestant strongholds.

Locher, for his part, would like to extend the range of Zwingli's *Sämtliche Werke* beyond the death of the Reformer on October 11, 1531, up to 1536. Since Leonhard von Muralt and his colleagues have completed a most thorough research into the relations of the Zürich Reformation to the Swiss Confederation up to the outbreak of the Second Kappel War, Locher considers it necessary to examine more closely the crisis of the Zürich Reformation and its resolution, as well as the subject of Zwingli's posthumous influence. In addition to the detailed theological research referred to above, he wishes to produce a study-handbook of Zwingli's works, a complete translation of Zwingli's letters, works concerning late Zwinglianism, and finally on the controversies between Zwinglians and Calvinists, especially as these occurred in the Netherlands.

University of Zürich

Robert Schwoebel, ed. *Renaissance Men and Ideas*. New York: St. Martin Press, 1971. Pp. 137.

The present publication falls in line with a series of analogous symposia on the Renaissance (Kristeller-Wiener, Helton, Werkmeister), which attest to the vogue of that cultural epoch among the general public, and fulfill the needs of academic readerships. Perhaps the distinctive feature of *Renaissance Men and Ideas* is that all the papers except two were written by scholars recruited from the ranks of the historical craft – i.e., specialists in political, religious, scientific, intellectual, and artistic history. The editor, Robert Schwoebel, is professor of history at Temple University, and has to his credit a brilliantly original volume on an unusual theme: the *Renaissance Image of the Turk*. Schwoebel's own contribution to the present symposium deals with "Pius II and the Renaissance Papacy" (pp. 68-79). It is a model of judicial impartiality, a lesson in historical objectivity, a prime instance of "contextual" interpretation. Professor Schwoebel has thoroughly grasped the nature and the intrinsic requirements of the problem he has set out to solve. It is the following: "What were the lines of the papal policy directed against the Turks, and how is it feasible for us to understand the basis for the course of action (or inaction) which the Quattrocento pontiffs followed?" "For this purpose," Professor Schwoebel writes, "it is not enough to evaluate the pontifical record with an alien set of standards, whether those standards be those of the humanistic critics of the popes, or of Luther, or of modern historians" (p. 70).

The following paper, that of Professor Seigel, on "Renaissance Humanism: Petrarch and Valla," is characterized by an extremely ingenious, and, in my opinion, exact interpretation of the *voxata quaestio* of Valla's *De vero bono*. The remarks set forth on pp. 17-20 (closely related to Professor Seigel's view of the role of rhetoric in Renaissance humanism: see his *Rhetoric and Philosophy in Renaissance Humanism*) are worthy of being pondered upon with special attention. Professor Rudolph Hirsch's paper on "Renaissance and the Spread of Humanism in Germany" brings in heretofore uncollected (and important) factual and statistical information which shows that "although the contribution of German presses to the spread of classical and humanist learning did not compare, in the fifteenth century, with the Italian production, it was (like that of France and that of the Low Countries) by no means as negligible as it is currently assumed to be." Professor Hirsch has had the very clever idea of examining the membership records of the German Merchants in Venice (*Fondaco dei Tedeschi*). These records reveal that among the names listed are those of the patri- cians whose families played (or were to play) outstanding roles in the development of German Humanism: such names, for instance, as Martin Behaim, Willibald Pirckheimer, Hermann and Hartmann Schedel, Marcus Welser, Konrad Peutinger. For the purpose of demonstrating his major point, Professor Hirsch grounds himself on Albrecht von Heyb's *Ebebuch*, which, having been printed in 1472, went through no less than 13 editions between that date and 1520. Professor Hirsch notes that the *Ebebuch* contains an astonishingly wide number of selections from classical and humanistic authors (the tabulation given on p. 33 shows 22 classical authors, and 14 Renaissance humanists). Professor Hirsch's conclusion is that "the example of the *Ebebuch* belies the assertion that only a very few enlightened German readers at the end of the fifteenth and at the beginning of the sixteenth

centuries were at all familiar with considerable reaches of classical literature" (p. 36).

With Professor Edward Rosen's paper on "Copernicus and Renaissance Astronomy" we pass on to the history of science. It is a masterly piece of *haute vulgarisation*. Rosen's account of Copernicus' explanation of the absence of the annual stellar parallax, for instance, is so limpidly clear that any untutored undergraduate, unexposed as yet to any training in astronomy, would have no difficulty in understanding it. Dispelling the idea, not infrequently encountered, which attributes to Copernicus an assertion which he never made, i.e., that of the infinity of the universe, Rosen underscores the fact that that infinity was first proclaimed by Thomas Digges in England and by Giordano Bruno in Italy.

Professor Donald M. Frame (the most outstanding American *montaigniste*) takes his readers into the heart of a fascinating intellectual labyrinth with his paper on "Montaigne on the Absurdity and Dignity of Man." It is a contribution full of the subtlest and most sensitive discriminations and parallelizations. Most interesting are Professor Frame's remarks on the difference between Montaigne's view of "the absurd" and the conceptions of the same *Weltanschauung* formulated by modern existentialist thinkers like Sartre and Camus. Frame's admirable knowledge of the chronological evolution of Montaigne's thought, his indisputable conversancy with the variants of the successive editions of the *Essais*, enable him to clarify some important heteromorphisms and dialectical mutations of his Author.

Professor Lewis Spitz, whose *Religious Renaissance of the German Humanists* has become a classic in the field, discusses "Luther as Scholar and Thinker" (pp. 82-94). Professor Spitz rightly points out that Luther, a man of many books, is not associated, in the memory of posterity, with a single work of his own (as Machiavelli with the *Prince*, More with his *Utopia*, Castiglione with the *Courtier*, for instance). Luther's name is, instead, linked with a translation, that of the Bible, into German. Spitz is concerned with Luther's exegetical rules relating to the Scriptures; according to Spitz, the one overriding hermeneutical principle followed by Luther is that the true prophetic spiritual meaning of the sacred texts can only be understood in terms of the reformer's Christology. From Spitz' analysis there emerges the fact that there are three different ways in which Luther uses the term *Vernunft* (Reason). As Spitz emphasizes, this is a sector of Luther studies characterized by vast dissent among religious historians (pp. 91-92).

In fact on "Machiavelli" (pp. 54-65) Professor Felix Gilbert stresses the fact that a discussion of this political thinker is, at the present time, particularly seasonable and opportune because there seems to be a singular affinity of our epoch with the issues and problems which beset the Machiavellian era, and on which Machiavelli meditated. Gilbert's plea in defense of the meticulous, microscopic methods adopted by modern Machiavellian scholarship in matters involving structural, textual, and semantical problems is appropriate and enlightening. Speaking of the first aspect (the structural one), Gilbert writes: "The question of the structure of the *Prince* is important, because, dealing with it, modern scholarship tries to determine whether the last chapter of the work, with its appeal for the liberation of Italy from the barbarians, constitutes an integral part of the *Prince*, or is a later, somewhat rhetorical addition. If we accept the latter hypothesis, we would not be justified in giving too much weight to the role of nationalism in Machiavelli's thought" (p. 63). Gilbert views as pivotal Machiavelli's emphasis on the criterion of "length of life of a state," and correctly links it with Machiavelli's admiration for Rome.

The last paper of the symposium, by Mrs. Roslyn Brogue-Henning, discusses the role of

"Music Culture in Renaissance Society" (there is a doctoral thesis by Professor Karl Anton on this very subject, deposited, in MS., with the Harvard University Library; I doubt whether Mrs. Brogue-Henning knew of it). Mrs. Brogue-Henning's contribution focusses on Castiglione's *Courtier*. She underlines the affinities of the *Courtier* with Plato's *Symposium* and the *Republic*. Her account of Socratic dialectic shows a lucid comprehension, as does her construal of Castiglione's concept of grace (it would have been rewarding to pursue the history of this concept as far as Tasso and beyond). The term *nonchalance* renders the Castiglionesque *sprezzatura* better than "disdain," or "carelessness."

Finally, a few words of eulogy to the St. Martin Press for the fine way in which the Symposium is printed and for the scrupulous conscientiousness with which the proof-correcting was done. I have noticed only one misprint (on p. 110: *Xenephon*, for *Xenophon*). In a book containing so many non-English names, this is a truly exceptional record of editorial precision.

ELIO GIANTURCO, *Hunter College, New York*

Jacques Heers. *Fêtes, Jeux et Joutes dans les Sociétés d'Occident à la Fin du Moyen Âge*. Conférence Albert-le-Grand 1971. Montréal: Institut d'Études Médiévales, 1971. Pp. 146.

The twenty-first published *Conférence Albert-le-Grand* (devoted to medieval philosophy, theology and history) concerns late medieval festivals, games, plays and competitions. Jacques Heers' recent *Précis d'histoire de Moyen Âge* (1968) and *L'Occident aux XIV^e et XV^e Siècles* (1970), and his fifteenth-century Genoese socio-economic studies, make for a useful non-literary perspective on these phenomena. His two aims are to discuss them as manifestations "d'une certaine psychologie collective" that affirms or castigates society's order of values and beliefs; and to illustrate the social groups that organize, and are reinforced by, these festivals.

The first of four chapters argues that *fêtes* are historically significant in affirming society's power hierarchy and socio-political values. On the highest levels there are imperial, royal and papal entries and festivities (with civic triumphs including open-air tableaux); on a lower, tournaments, hunts and the rites of knighthood and chivalric fraternities. Society's corresponding *spiritual* beliefs were likewise buttressed by *fêtes*: liturgical ceremonies, Christianized seasonal festivals, the "dance liturgique" (rhythmically choreographed ecclesiastical processions), the "fêtes expiatoires" of the Flagellants and *Bianchi*, and (French and English) religious drama.

As the collective mind is infinitely divisible, so are its values and *fêtes*, however, and Heers shows in the last two chapters how the latter reflect the self-interest of special groups competing within and against society. Family units, the *maisons*, the *alberghi*, reinforced internal solidarity in wedding or funeral feasts. Parish neighborhoods had their sporting competitions and processional festivals; religious fraternities came together in spectacle-filled banquets; the Chester and York guilds expressed professional cohesion through the cycles, and even political parties like the Armagnacs and Bourguignons defined themselves festively by special array. Such rivalry often festered into violence, threatening social values, and *fêtes* like the Feast of Fools and theatrical farces affirmed

values so individualistic that they undermined the social order that other *fêtes* supported. This schizophrenic character is further complicated by carnivals, masques and dancings, which expressed a collective medieval penchant to evade even group social interests for a realm of fantastical disguises.

Clearly Heers' thesis, that medieval *fêtes* fill all roles that society collectively or otherwise thought worth playing, is uncontroversial. Readers will appreciate, however, his dashing comprehensiveness, his unexpected yoking together (as *fêtes*) of seemingly unrelated practices, and his multi-faceted exemplification. Narrowness in scope, though, appears, for the title is a misnomer (Germany, Spain and the Low Countries are seldom mentioned) and Heers avoids using extant play-texts. Also, his emphasis on a collective mentality using *fêtes* for power valuably, if unpleasantly, balances Huizinga's unmentioned theory of autonomous, intrinsically desirable play.

This book, for English readers, has one obvious, depressing fault: serious innocence regarding scholarship on English Corpus Christi drama. Because Heers depends wholly on W. Marriot's *Collection of English Miracle Plays* (1838), J. J. Jusserand's *Histoire littéraire du peuple anglais* (1896), and an unpublished thesis by one of Heers' Paris students (thirteen such theses are used), the dozen-odd pages on the English plays are riddled with errors. For instance, the northern cycles did not, like Canterbury, attract crowds from London (74); the Towneley cycle was not given annually by the Woodkirk canons, and the *Ludus Coventriae* is not from Coventry (75); the cycles do not depict stereotyped caricatures, "maladroit, peu nuancé" (96). By one distortion Heers identifies *fêtes* as instruments of popular power. He incorrectly argues the Chester and York guilds so excluded the church from control of their cycles that the clergy opposed them with the more religious, rural "Woodkirk" and "Coventry" cycles, and that ultimately the guilds bore their financial burden unwillingly, to avoid public discontent – the people demanding, as Rome its *panem et circenses*, the plays as a right (75, 95-97).

If such misconceptions represent current continental scholarly opinion, someone should immediately translate Chambers, Craig, Gardiner, Salter and Kolve, or rewrite Jusserand. When Toronto's Centre for Medieval Studies has for six years sponsored touring revivals of these cycle plays, the dissemination of such views by Montreal's *Institut d'Études Médiévales* is sad testimony that more than politics separates *les deux nations*.

IAN LANCASHIRE, *University of Toronto*

Thomas Rogers Forbes. *Chronicle from Aldgate: Life and Death in Shakespeare's London*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press. (Canada: Montreal, McGill – Queen's University Press) Pp. xx, 251. \$11.

The parish records of St. Botolph without Aldgate between 1558 and 1625 are rich in detail far beyond the average of their kind. As such they are jam for the London antiquarian, an essential though possibly misleading source for the demographer in an age of spotty material, a temptation and a snare to the social historian. Professor Forbes – who, by the way, is a professor in the medical school at Yale – has been tempted to write a work of demo-

graphy and social history out of this single source. His material is undoubtedly interesting. His tables of life expectancy and so on would have been more valuable if they had been published a few years ago, before demography in England became the professional branch of historical research that it is now. St. Botolph's, Aldgate, was one of the poorer out of about ninety tiny parishes in the crowded capital; it provides a statistical sample that is woefully inadequate and not at all random, and apart from infant mortality there is no way of matching its births to its deaths. A poor quarter naturally contained a high proportion of transients, and the records reflect this fact without giving us any real power to measure it. The figures are not without value, but they are already on the point of becoming out of date.

We can still be grateful for the (comparative) wealth of detail. Most parish registers, when they even survive from this date, record the bare names of those baptized, married and buried; in these, a succession of unusually gossipy clerks (not, apparently, ministers) kept what was almost a journal of parish events – in fact, as Professor Forbes calls it, a chronicle. A “small-beer chronicle,” of course. Professor Forbes quotes extensively; there is no room for quotation here, and odd sentences could not do justice to the cumulative effect of all these ordinary happenings, petty excitements and family tragedies.

History is a hobby interest to Professor Forbes, and he makes some statements that are calculated to make a historian wince. I think he might have noticed that he has accepted about three widely differing estimates of the population of London for the same period. It is easier to excuse his mistaking a “pottle” (which is half a gallon) for a “bottle” (p. 28). A “swaddler” (p. 10) is certainly not a Methodist preacher (in 1600!), and a pursuivant is as likely to be a petty police officer as a herald. “Newhaven” (p. 125) is Le Havre in France. In Chapter 7, on “Care of the Indigent Sick,” he gives a traditional, folklore picture of the effects of the Dissolution of the Monasteries and of Tudor enclosures which can only be accepted nowadays with serious reservations. Absence from church (p. 30) was indeed taken to imply Roman Catholicism, but it was the absence, not the catholicism, that was punishable by law, and there was nothing illegal about burying catholics in the parish graveyard. One minor error is the direct result of treating this unique set of records as if they were typical: he states (p. 31) that keeping the records was the main duty of a parish clerk. In fact it was not his duty at all, but the minister's. The multifarious duties of a parish clerk need not concern us, but I may mention that it was the custom in London to employ much better educated men than elsewhere, usually musicians. If keeping the records *had* been their duty, other London parishes might have provided material as rich as this one. Our knowledge of life and death in Shakespeare's London might have been more securely based than Professor Forbes, for all his enthusiasm and industry, has been able to make it.

ELLIOT ROSE, *University of Toronto*

Patrick Cullen. *Spenser, Marvell and Renaissance Pastoral*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970. Pp. lx, 212. \$7.

The remarkable vitality and variety of pastoral is the focus of this intriguing book. It makes an important addition to the literature on the subject.

Professor Cullen's central concern is to isolate two different kinds of pastoral, to which he gives the names Mantuanesque and Arcadian. In orientation, the first of these is moralistic, dualistic, otherworldly, allowing no opening to the human potential for love or ambition, committed totally to the life of individual withdrawal and contemplation, and hence inimical to the city as the very emblem of corrupting worldliness. By contrast, the second is triadic (Professor Cullen does not use the word but he might have, since there are neo-Platonic influences at work here): it finds a middle ground between the Mantuanesque extremes of spirit and flesh, worldliness and holiness, and it seeks in more relaxed fashion to admit and regulate passion, to confer dignity upon the virtuous active life in the world, and to postulate, after the usual pastoral withdrawal, a return to the city as the proper sphere of human societal existence. The author leads his readers through these schematic distinctions in a crisp and authoritative introductory chapter, calling with ease and familiarity upon classical, French, Italian and Spanish pastoral models, and being wholly persuasive about it in the process.

The distinctions Cullen makes are useful and valid; when they are applied to the *Shepherd's Calendar*, they support his contention that, far from being monolithic, rigid or static, pastoral is capable of embracing widely varied, even contradictory, intellectual positions and modes of experience. Indeed, the chief stress throughout the book is on the essential importance to pastoral of dialectic: phrases like "multiform ambivalence," "plurality of values," "the exploration and counterbalancing of attitudes, perspectives and experiences" keep the viewpoint constantly before us. Critics before Cullen have customarily sought to find a unified, single and exclusive pastoral perspective in the poem. He himself takes a course that is more attuned to the nature of the pastoral form, and which admits diversity of outlook for the sake of meaningful complexity. For example, he reveals the moral eclogues as attempts to explore a position rather than to come to a conclusion in which either one or the other of the debating shepherds is proven "wrong." As proponents of unyielding and extreme positions (Mantuanesque age versus Arcadian youth, for example), the rustic debaters with their total commitment and limited vision subject themselves constantly to an irony as penetrating as it is gentle. This kind of reading has two effects: it focusses attention on the comic aspects of the poem (the naive vanity of the shepherds provides an ironic distancing which qualifies their more extreme judgments) and, to my mind at least, it has the further effect of making the poem an altogether more *dramatic* thing than it has been previously considered.

An even more interesting dramatic touch is added by Cullen's analysis of the love theme in the eclogues, where Colin Clout figures finally as a self-absorbed neurotic who fails as both poet and lover and terminates as a "distortion of aged Mantuanesque wisdom" in loveless solitude. The analysis is compelling and it seems perfectly in keeping with what we have come to know of pastoral as a form that accommodates a whole spectrum of attitudes and counsels moderation in all things. (It also accords with what we know of Spenser's attitudes in *The Faerie Queene*, especially Book III.)

The fluidity of the genre is one of its most attractive assets, as it finds value now in contemplation, nature, simplicity and solitude, and now again in activity, art, complexity and society. The choice between the two can never be simple and Marvell's treatment of their inherent complexity is notorious. While the core of Professor Cullen's book is clearly in the two elaborate chapters devoted to Spenser, the slightly more than fifty pages devoted

to Marvell's complex simplicities are no less densely crammed with information. Briefly, the author finds the same awareness of these dual pastoral traditions in Marvell's lyrics, both the Christian lyrics and the amorous pastorals, among the last of which he classifies the Mower poems. Here again, he reveals a refreshing tendency to ignore the esoteric excesses of some contemporary analyses of Marvell and banishes to some really frightening footnotes his disagreements with their positions, which he paraphrases or quotes pretty fairly. There are some excellent and lucid pages on "The Garden" as a synthesis of many diverse Renaissance attitudes (think of the highly localized, partisan and embattled explications one has read in favor of Neoplatonism, Hermeticism, etc. and one appreciates Cullen's sanity all the more); and his reading of the Mower poems in terms of pastoral comic tradition and love psychology provides a needed counterbalance to the barrage of Eden-analogues to which we have been treated in recent years.

A caveat: unfortunately, in these later chapters, a tendency in Cullen's style which has peeped up earlier (pp. 37-8) now comes alarmingly and fully to the fore: the doing of an argument to death through battering insistence and hammering repetition (see especially pp. 175-6 and 193-5). The intensity of the explication, frequently unrelieved by humor, wit or levity, reflects more and more the impersonal and relentless style currently cultivated by the literary journals; nothing is suggested, everything is asserted, propounded. A pity; in an otherwise Arcadian production, it is one of the few Mantuanesque blemishes, other minor ones being misprints on pages 13, 26, 60 and 112.

PETER V. MARINELLI, *University of Toronto*

Norman Rabkin, ed. *Reinterpretations of Elizabethan Drama: Selected Papers from the English Institute*. Columbia University Press, 1969. Pp. x, 205. \$6.

This volume of essays illustrates the unhappily increasing tendency of contemporary criticism of Elizabethan drama to examine not Elizabethan plays themselves but criticisms (including theatrical performances) of the plays. This criticism of criticism can at best reveal personal and social biases in previous interpretations of dramatic works, and alert us to the possible biases in our own interpretations; but too often it becomes either a mere recitation of others' critical views or a psychological or sociological study instead of a literary or dramatic one. Nevertheless, more and more of it appears: perhaps inevitably, as the backlog of literary criticism grows and begs to be comprehensively ordered (as in Schoenbaum's remarkable *Shakespeare's Lives*), and as the social sciences increasingly envelop the humanities.

Here we have both the good and the bad. Jonas Barish leads off with an informative, perceptive commentary on the critical perspectives of Archer, Artaud, and Brecht, and points out that every age interprets the literature of the past according to its own preoccupations. This begs the question: is Elizabethan drama therefore necessarily, as Barish believes, superchameleon-like, or are we the chameleons, we citizens of the variable mid-twentieth century? Max Bluestone next overwhelms us with citation of some 80 studies of *Doctor Faustus*, in a heavy, 56-page demonstration of the play's ambiguity. The essay, though painstaking, and bibliographically useful, comes to life only when Bluestone approaches the drama itself

directly; and unfortunately he does so less frequently than his avowed intention of "locating" the play in stage spectacle would indicate. Robert Hapgood contributes sketchy notes, occasionally useful as performance data, on various Shakespeare productions. Daniel Seltzer, "Shakespeare's Texts and Modern Production," makes two important points: that all dramatic performances are necessarily limited, single interpretations of the works concerned, and that dramatic "paraphrases" such as the noted Peter Brook production of *King Lear* teach us largely not about the original plays but about the social and philosophical times of the productions. J. R. Brown is predictably persuasive on the merits of theatre-centred dramatic criticism.

Stephen Booth, unlike his fellow contributors, confronts a play directly: but, oblivious to his probable 1969 biases, offers an interpretation – of *Hamlet* as a coherent play of incoherence – which, though provocative and detailed, presupposes a very restrictive consciousness of genre, and of different value systems, on the part of the Elizabethan audience, and (in spite of plays like *The Old Wives Tale*) a linear, causal sequence in its expectations. He also ignores the presence of contradictory values in Elizabethan plays besides *Hamlet* (e.g., *Duchess of Malfi*, *Malcontent*, *A Mad World My Masters*).

The volume as a whole, especially Rabkin's introduction and Hapgood's article, is at times irritatingly trendy. In these days of frequent physical audience participation in theatrical productions, talk of the non-physically "included spectator" may seem new – but take away the jargon, and what do we have but what we have always had: the response of the audience, as a group and as individuals, to the dramatic work in question. As for Hapgood's subtitle, "The Polyvision Exhibition, Czechoslovakian Pavilion, Expo 67, Montreal": perhaps Hapgood has been having to spend too much time lately demonstrating to skeptical students the relevance of Elizabethan drama.

ANNE LANCASHIRE, *University of Toronto*

Robert Kimbrough. *Sir Philip Sidney*. New York: Twayne, 1971. Pp. 162. \$4.95.

This is the one hundred and fourteenth book in the Twayne English Authors Series, and the fact that this study has been preceded by works on such lesser Renaissance figures as Dekker, Daniel, and Drayton serves as a continuing indication that Sidney's writing has never received critical attention proportionate to its influence on English literature. (This is due in part, of course, to the commanding historical figure that Sidney the man has always presented.) It was not until 1961 that the first full-length study of the poetry appeared, not until 1962 that Ringler finally provided us with accurate texts of the poems. And, even though the last decade has gone a long way toward remedying this neglect, Kimbrough can still justly claim that his is the first work which attempts to provide a complete overview of Sidney: poetry, fiction, criticism, and life. Kimbrough insists that an understanding of the latter is important in dealing with Sidney's art, but fortunately this premise does not lead him back to the old clichés of the biographical critics. (In particular there are none of the speculations about an "underlying reality" that for so long diverted critical attention from the poetry of *Astrophel and Stella*.)

Instead one of the strongest features of this study lies in its discussion of "voice" in

Sidney's works, by which Kimbrough means the use there of fully dramatized personae. This approach provides valuable insights into the *Old Arcadia*, and it is of special utility in dealing with the subtleties of *Astrophel and Stella*: "The voice [in these poems] is 'real,' but it is not really Sidney's, though, of course, the ultimate control is his" (114). Surely this distinction is, as Kimbrough argues, an important one. Indeed, I find myself wishing that he had followed its implications further; he ably demonstrates the utility of the approach through a discussion of Sonnet 10 and then moves into other territory. And, though it is a minor point, one wonders how Kimbrough can posit a distinction between Sidney and Astrophil in his discussion of the sequence, when he equates their statements on poetry elsewhere ("Sidney uses two terms which are pertinent: in the *Defence* he calls this quality 'energia' and in Sonnet 15 of *Astrophel and Stella* he calls it 'inward tuch,'" p. 103).

The most interesting and provocative section of the book lies in its discussion of the *New Arcadia*, where Kimbrough suggests that the work, rather than having been cut off by Sidney's death, was consciously put aside as a result of a growing awareness in its author of the conflict between his art and his life. Kimbrough believes that because Sidney's artistic progress in the *New Arcadia* (which he views as more sequel to, than revision of, the *Old Arcadia*) is toward greater verisimilitude, an inevitable conflict arose:

Paradoxically, the *New Arcadia* became so completely independent, so independently real ... that Sidney became self-conscious about the implications of his writing: the circumscribed comic world of the *Old Arcadia* could not be accommodated in a world in which death also dwelt. (146)

This view of Sidney deliberately laying his pen aside ("in disgust") is attractive because it gives the unfinished work a kind of finality. But it is also highly speculative, subject only to negative proofs ("[Sidney] left no indication whatsoever that he intended to return to this revision," p. 142), and it must be recognized as such.

I have emphasized the discussion of "voice" and the treatment of the *New Arcadia* partly because they are the most innovative ideas in a book that does not, after all, seek to be innovative. Ultimately the strengths and weaknesses of the work are those of most studies in the Twayne series. Both reader and author share an awareness of a restricted amount of space in which to cover a substantial amount of material. Whenever Kimbrough does take the time to deal with specific poems or passages, the discussions are always rewarding enough to make one wish for more. At the same time the book devotes space to basics (the Petrarchan tradition in sixteenth century England, what it meant to be a poet-courtier under Elizabeth) in a way that will make it invaluable to advanced undergraduate and graduate students (and consequently to course reserve lists). The scholar will find only a little in this work that will be new to him, but he should be pleased to find so much brought together in a convenient volume which will serve as a readable, informed introduction to Sidney.

RUSSELL M. BROWN, *Lakehead University*

The series, "Philosophes de tous les temps," has already given students of the Renaissance a number of useful studies of important figures, each organized around "Présentation, choix de textes, biographie, bibliographie." In 1969 they published one of the last works of the late Pierre Mesnard, "Erasmus ou le christianisme critique," and we are fortunate now to have a similar brief study from the well-known author of *L'Univers de Thomas More* and a major contribution to More scholarship, *The Bible in the Works of Thomas More*. The present book is a fine introduction both to the personality of More and to the extensive studies of his life and work, and it is marked by the distinctive and engaging qualities of the abbé Marc'hadour, who is surely the most devoted scholarly disciple of More in this century.

The book is divided into two general sections, the "Présentation," an extended essay on More and the world in which he lived, and the "Choix de textes" (pp. 132-80) designed to illustrate More's life and reputation down to the present day. A brief chronological register of More's life follows, with a "Bibliographie essentielle." This last is devoted to the canon of More's works in order of composition up to the publication of the Leipzig *Opera omnia* in 1689, a very useful guide, since the general bibliography of modern work on More can be abstracted from a number of other bibliographical sources, many of which are listed on page 183. It should be added, however, that the author discusses many of the modern works in the course of his biographical *présentation*. In a few pages devoted to "L'actualité de Thomas More" he indicates some of the most recent developments beginning with the launching of the Yale edition, in a fashion that recalls the character of his journal, *Moreana*.

The biographical essay itself begins with an account of the setting of More's life, and introduces the English humanist with his work on Pico, a link to continental thought and the European setting. The friendship with Erasmus follows, with the 'catholic epistles' to Dorp, Oxford University, a monk, and Germaine de Brie. Each of More's major works is presented cogently and perceptively, with an account of the major contributions of modern scholarship, and the developing personality of More kept in the foreground. The ongoing chronology of contemporary events may at times confuse the general outline of the author's essay, but there are also gains from this rather eclectic approach, since in addition to the familiar milestones of More's life, it allows him to indicate the involvement of the continental community in the general story. It is a fundamental contention of Marc'hadour that, with More, "La valeur propre de son témoignage réside dans l'union profonde de sa pensée avec celle de la société qui l'entoure." The texts of the latter half of this study are chosen to illustrate this theme, and range from his rhetorical compliment to Henry VIII on the occasion of his coronation, to his own epitaph. The general portrait is of the devout and philosophical More rather than that of More the lawyer, politician and statesman, although these aspects of his history are not neglected. If the hagiographic interest is marked, it is also critical and unapologetic. The book is not intended to be more than an introduction for the intelligent but uninformed general reader, and it will be useful not only for the public for which it is primarily intended, but for students of More who wish to refresh their understanding of many of the critical and historical problems surrounding that complex personality.

Barbara C. Bowen. *The Age of Bluff: Paradox and Ambiguity in Rabelais and Montaigne*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1972. Illinois Studies in Language and Literature 62. Pp. viii, 168. \$9.

Professor Bowen has written this admittedly tentative but most welcome study to help a fairly broad audience of "friends, students and scholars of French Renaissance literature" appreciate, rather than disparage, the disorderliness they will find in the works of Rabelais, Montaigne and their contemporaries. She opposes what she sees as the continuing tendency, especially of French critics, to consider the literature of the period as an imperfect preparation for the symmetry, order and balance of classicism. She is, of course, not alone in this opposition, as her references to a number of recent critics, some of them French, indicate. (Absent, surprisingly, are Auerbach and Pouilloux.) What is new is her attempt at a synthesis and her contention that the aesthetic unity of the period is to be found in the widespread use of the technique of "bluff," "the result of one or more of the techniques mentioned - paradox, enigma, argument, antithesis and ambiguity - used in a conscious effort to disconcert the reader."

Professor Bowen first looks at techniques of bluff in a number of minor writers, paying particular attention to the tension between apparently serious subject matter and frequently playful tone in the *Dialogues de Guy de Brués...*, to the "discrepancy between external appearance or language and internal reality" in the *Dialogues du Démocrite* of Jacques Tabureau du Mans and to the extreme exploitation of contemporary taste for ambiguity in the *Cymballum Mundi* of Des Periers.

The two major chapters are devoted to detailed analyses of episodes from the first four books of Rabelais, taken in order of their publication, and from Montaigne's *Essais* in their 1595 order. The author finds that Rabelais' bluff techniques changed in emphasis in successive books, from the lighthearted and straightforward bluff of *Pantagruel* through the more subtle, persuasive and integrated paradoxes of *Gargantua* to the *Tiers Livre*, a sort of "theory and practice of bluff." The *Quart Livre* is the most successfully ambiguous (it makes the least sense), as Rabelais excels in the creation of "action" episodes out of nothing or out of words. For Professor Bowen, Montaigne is, primarily, neither a moralist nor a self-portraitist, nor is his a "livre de bonne foi"; rather, he is "the creator and user of paradox, ambiguity and *bontade*," a preoccupation which is evident from the beginning to the end of his work. The significant development is in his ability, by the third book, to link the moral, intellectual and aesthetic planes in a coherent metaphorical structure (cf especially "Sur des vers de Virgil"). Montaigne is "using ambiguity himself in a constantly entertaining manner to make us aware and ashamed of our own ambiguity in thought and action."

For the moment, the author has limited herself to the treatment of technical, stylistic aspects of a vast subject and to the raising of "fruitful questions" (among others, her use of the word "ashamed" with reference to Montaigne's reader). As for Professor Bowen's reader, he will want to inquire further as to how, and why, so many writers of the period (though by no means all) thought their asymmetrical, disordered, paradoxical and ambiguous representations of reality might please and/or instruct their disconcerted readers.

JANE COUCHMAN, *York University*

A. D. Scaglione. *Ars Grammatica*. The Hague-Paris: Mouton, 1970.

This relatively short book, each page of which is the fruit of long and dedicated research, is divided into four chapters. The first is a historical and bibliographical introduction, the second studies the Latin subjunctive, the third the Italian subjunctive and the fourth is devoted to Alberic of Montecassino and the ablative absolute. The book ends with an appendix which includes a review of Henry Desmond's book (*The 'De Grammatico' of St. Anselm: The Theory of Paronymy*, 1964), previously published by Professor Scaglione in *Romance Philology*, XIX (1966). The appendix is conceived as a sort of conclusion. To a certain extent, however, it may also represent an invitation to interpret the preceding chapters as a critical response to several basic questions already singled out by A. Scaglione, when he first tried to organize into an organic whole the imposing quantity of gathered materials. Many a reader, as a matter of fact, will be impressed by the amount of data Professor Scaglione has been able to include in his remarkably lucid treatment of a complicated matter. In the first chapter, he manages to give, in about thirty pages, a complete, precise picture of the history of the discipline, with a full assessment of the merits and the limitations of the scholars who preceded him, from the beginning of the last century to the present. The first chapter, in my opinion, should be of interest not only to linguists, but to any student of Classical and Romance languages. The other chapters are more technical and specialized. The specialization is apparent from the very choice of the subjunctive, both in Latin and in Italian, as well as the ablative absolute, as subject matter. Through the study of the subjunctive, Professor Scaglione succeeds in documenting and dating the predecessors of certain forms (e.g. *erint*, pp. 57-63), that is to say, to write "history" in the fullest sense of the term, by going over the whole range of the Latin grammarians, from the 2nd to the 17th century, with a quick glance at the 18th and 19th centuries. It is, therefore, a discriminating selection which allows Professor Scaglione to establish a connection between the Latin normative tradition and that of the Italian grammarians. In Italian, A. Scaglione, always searching for a sense of the history of the discipline, starts from the first *Grammaticibetta* (which is perhaps by Alberti, but certainly of the 15th century) and goes as far as the studies of the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century, in order to conclude that, in opposition to what happens for Latin, "the grammar of the Italian vernacular remained, after the Cinquecento, more often than not in the hands of *mestieranti*, little curious, and less capable, of deep commitment and fresh starts" (p. 130). The chapter devoted to the ablative absolute according to Alberic of Montecassino is more limited in scope, but still very perceptive. One can recommend this valuable contribution of Aldo Scaglione to the study of *Ars Grammatica* as a model combination of erudition and critical sophistication.

MARIA PICCHIO SIMONELLI, *Boston College*

David Orr. *Italian Renaissance Drama in England Before 1625*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1970. Pp. ix, 141. \$6.

Professor Orr is convinced that a reassessment of the major source-studies like those of Baldwin, Gregg, Muir, and others, examined collectively rather than separately, yields evi-

dence which contradicts the commonly accepted notion of a preponderant Italian influence on English drama. He argues that the Italian dramatic texts that can be positively identified as sources used by the English playwrights are so few as to raise serious doubts about their purported impact. For similar reasons, Orr is inclined to minimize the role usually assigned to Italian theorists like Cinthio in shaping English drama. Instead, he would propose the old theory that the Italianate plays are not necessarily of Italian derivation but a consequence of the lesson learned from Plautus, Terence, and Seneca without Italian intermediaries. Thus, in both countries, comedy and tragedy exhibit similar structural patterns because the same models were followed. But can the same be said to explain the emergence of new types like tragicomedy and pastoral drama? Orr's answer is that even these hybrid forms can be viewed as products of similar preconditioning forces operating in both countries, namely, medieval religious and popular drama.

Appealing as this novel approach may be, one has the distinct feeling that, owing to its positivistic orientation, it overlooks the elusive nature of cultural interrelations, which often defy statistical evaluation. The validity of the author's findings seems to be lessened, furthermore, by his partiality to authorities who lend support to his viewpoint at the expense of the exponents of Italian influence, often rejected without sufficient reason. More objectionable is the unceremonious acceptance of obsolete source-studies whose information is very frequently erroneous. Such a procedural flaw tends to render even more provisional the character of the author's conclusions. More careful proofreading might have helped reduce the numerous misspellings in the Italian texts and the bibliographical inaccuracies that mar this otherwise provocative book.

FLORINDO CERRETA, *University of Iowa*

D. S. Chambers. *Patrons and Artists in the Italian Renaissance*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1971. Pp. xxxv, 22. \$7.95.

The increased interest of students, at both the graduate and undergraduate level, in the history of art has persuaded publishers that there is a market for books on art that go beyond the simple, illustrated biographies of artists and periods. The volume under review, by Dr. David Chambers, Lecturer in Renaissance Studies at the Warburg Institute, is just such an example of the newer, more academic publications. Published as one in the series "History in Depth," it takes as its subject documents, and documents on a problem that clearly could be, or should be, a crucial element in our understanding of the development of Renaissance art. Such a subject is mired in problems. Beside the art of the Renaissance, or the material provided by the writings of the Renaissance, what documents can tell us is often meagre and frustratingly unhelpful on the very points that are of most interest. What Dr. Chambers has provided, and it is an achievement that should by no means be underestimated, is a collection of such material that is not only comprehensive but that can serve to indicate what and how much we have of such documentary evidence about the working of artists in the Renaissance.

Dr. Chambers divides the material into four general categories - clerical, guild, civic and what is called "princely and private patronage" - that, to quote the author "have been gov-

erned more by the species patron than the species artist." The earliest document reproduced is one that announces the competition for the Cupola of Florence Cathedral in August, 1418; the latest is a petition by Titian to Doge Leonardo Loredan of January, 1516. Most, if not all, of this material was published in the "splendid quarries" of the nineteenth-century collections of documents. But these collections are generally unobtainable, the documents in them are untranslated and often unedited, and what in effect Dr. Chambers has done, in assembling, editing and translating the documents he includes, is to re-evaluate, if not almost to rediscover them for us. The translations are careful and honest, indicating clearly what and how much is necessarily arbitrary in such translations. The brief introductions to each document serve to place them in both general and specific contexts in a way that is helpful to the student and informative to the scholar. Both well-known and lesser-known names appear: Isabella d'Este, Ludovico Gonzaga, Lorenzo de' Medici; Jacopo della Quercia, Raphael, Titian; Neri di Bicci, Tommaso de' Rossi and Domenico di Michelino. The result is a book that will be of great use alike to scholars, teachers and students of Renaissance art and history.

DAVID CAST, *Yale University*

Charles D. Tarlton. *Fortune's Circle: A Biographical Interpretation of Niccolò Machiavelli*. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1970. Pp. 159. \$6.95.

The classic biography of Machiavelli by marchese Roberto Ridolfi¹ is generally credited with having destroyed definitively the myth of Machiavelli's immorality. Ridolfi's view of Machiavelli as a poet-politician, whose analysis of Italy's political tragedy is intimately bound up with his personal tragedy on losing his secretaryship in 1512, has been developed in a recent biography in English. The author, Professor Charles D. Tarlton, stresses to an even greater degree, the human plight of Machiavelli, seen by him as an innocent victim caught in Fortune's circle.

Sensitive to the general imaginative structure of Machiavelli's works,² Tarlton sees the symbol of Fortune, in particular, not only as a central force in Machiavelli's concept of history, but as the pivotal point of his life experience as well. In each chapter of his biography he provides a cross-section of Machiavelli's life from a different standpoint (for example, that of Machiavelli "The Loyal Public Servant," of the relationship between Machiavelli and "Conspiracies," and between Machiavelli and "Women"), and in each of these separate discussions he inevitably focusses on the trauma brought about by Fortune in 1512. Professor Tarlton has thus replaced the traditional and arbitrary organization according to external chronology with a dissecting structure by means of which he is able to magnify the events that are truly significant for Machiavelli's inner life.

In the preface to this impressionistic psychograph, Tarlton explains his methodology as one which discards absolute objectivity as an impossible goal. Insights into Machiavelli the man then are to be derived from his writings, rather than from historical data (as, for example, in J.R. Hale's biography³), for Machiavelli's political and literary works, based as they are on experience, must consequently be autobiographical. However these works do not simply reflect their author. For Tarlton they are repeated instances of a therapeutic self-analysis by means of which Machiavelli endeavoured to explain to himself his own

failure and that of Florence. Thus in these works the biographer seeks no system of thought, but rather the original personal suffering which lends heightened meaning to the political theories themselves. Accordingly, Machiavelli's advocacy of violence is seen as an expression of his feeling of vengeance towards the tyrants who had excluded him from active political life, and his admiration for such powerful individuals as Cesare Borgia, the archetype of success, becomes a projection of his own aspirations to aggrandize his insignificant political achievements. In his proposal for the establishment of a national militia, Machiavelli was attempting to defend himself and to find stability in a world precariously ruled by Fortune. Tarlton interprets Machiavelli's political dreams thus: "In a strong sense, in postulating his ideal state Machiavelli was constructing, whether he knew it or not, a state which would never repeat what had been done to him by Florence and the Medici. In such a state he would have been given sufficient authority and monies to carry out his responsibilities, his interests at home would have been protected while he was away, he would have entered the foreign courts with pomp and respect, his diplomacy would have had behind it the force of wealth and military might of a reformed Florence" (p. 149). Seeking escape with loose women (and not only through literary utopias) Machiavelli becomes for Tarlton, as he had for Ridolfi, "a sadder, more tragic figure than is commonly imagined" (p. 135).

Tarlton points out that Machiavelli's fiery style and heroic tone, as well as his themes, are indicative of a pent-up energy. To give the flavour of Machiavelli's patriotism and of his protests against Fortune, Tarlton has effectively prefaced each chapter with a quotation in English from Machiavelli's various works. (In some instances, unfortunately, references to the title of the particular works have been omitted. Perhaps another oversight worthy of mention is the consistent misspelling of Savonarola's name.)

In spite of its relative brevity, the book includes a good introduction to the political situation in Machiavelli's time and some considerations on the major problems of Machiavelli criticism too. However Tarlton's main contribution lies undoubtedly in his existential approach which does not strain the facts in order to support discoveries of Freudian complexes and similar psychoanalytic theories. From this fine intuitive interpretation Machiavelli emerges, not as an eccentric or a pathological case, but as a very human man caught in a live drama.

OLGA Z. PUGLIESE, *University of Toronto*

Notes

- 1 Roberto Ridolfi, *Vita di Niccolò Machiavelli* (Rome, 1954). English translation by Cecil Grayson (Chicago, 1963).
- 2 See Tarlton's excellent article, "The Symbolism of Redemption and the Exorcism of Fortune in Machiavelli's *Prince*," *Review of Politics*, XXX (1968), 332-348.
- 3 J. R. Hale, *Machiavelli and Renaissance Italy* (London, 1961).

Adrienne Schizzano Malden. *'La Celestina' Studies: A Thematic Survey and Bibliography 1824-1970*. Metuchen, N.J.: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1971. Pp. x, 261. \$7.50.

The book by Dr. Mandel has as its main purpose to serve as a useful labor-saving research tool for every serious student of Roja's *La Celestina*. This objective is accomplished very

well through the combination of a comprehensive bibliography with a thematic survey which renders more useful the bibliography.

In the survey, the author had to limit herself, for editorial reasons, to abstract only those studies which, in her opinion, are of some significance. Nevertheless, Dr. Mandel generously gives the reader not less than two hundred and eighty-three abstracts out of a bibliography which lists four hundred and fifty-three titles. Their short descriptions in the survey vary in length depending on the size and importance of the work being epitomized, but I find the summaries of those studies with which I am well acquainted accurate and long enough to give the reader a fair understanding of the contents of the article or book in question. A good example of the author's skill in the technique of abstracting could very well be her account of Lida de Malkiel's voluminous book *La originalidad artística de 'La Celestina.'* To summarize in a meaningful manner a book of this calibre is not an easy task, but Dr. Mandel has succeeded in doing so in about seventeen pages. No abstract in the book – as the author states in the Introduction – should be a substitution for the actual reading of the book or article summarized, but the survey can certainly help a researcher by guiding him or her as to which books or articles should be consulted when studying a particular aspect of Roja's work.

Most of the abstracts are given out in parts assorted into the following seven main aspects that could interest a researcher:

- 1 Author, authorship, and date of composition.
- 2 Editions.
- 3 Sources and tradition.
- 4 The influence of *La Celestina* in Spain and elsewhere.
- 5 *La Celestina* as a work of art.
- 6 Ethical values.
- 7 The historic moment of *La Celestina*.

The inconvenience arising from dividing the abstracts into portions which appear in different sections of the book is obviated by giving in the Bibliography the references to those sections.

Although the book does not go beyond the limits of a bibliographical work, the author points out in the Introduction three main contributions that are still to be made by scholars in the field of *La Celestina* studies, namely: a) a definitive critical edition; b) "a series of linguistic tests imposed on works of clearly identified young authors – preferably but not necessarily of Roja's own time – which would determine whether sharp changes can occur in a growing writer over a period of, say, five or ten years"; and c) a study of the tension set up in a text between its overt declarations and its actual effect.

The book leaves, unfortunately, much to be desired in so far as its actual realization is concerned. I find in the Bibliography that the information given in the listing of titles could in some instances be more specific and clearer, by adding, for example, that the book in question has been published as an Annex to the volumes of a particular journal. This is the case of Castro Guisasaola's *Observaciones sobre las fuentes literarias de 'La Celestina,'* published by the *Revista de Filología Española*. In several cases, the brackets which are supposed to give all the chapters in which the particular contribution is abstracted do not include all they should. The cross-indexing contains more than one hun-

dred inconsistencies in the titles of works or journals, paging and names of authors, besides a few errors in the titles; there are also a couple of instances of poorly divided Spanish words. Happily, the inconsistencies are, however, for the most part easy to detect by an intelligent reader. These deficiencies – which perhaps are to a great extent typographical errors – do not, nevertheless, diminish the intrinsic value of Dr. Mandel's book.

J.I. CHICOY-DABÁN, *University of Toronto*

STAFF CHANGES

Professor R. W. Van Fossen (English) will assume the duties of Associate Editor in addition to his position as Book Review Editor, replacing Professor M. R. Maniates (Music). Walter Dedi, Editorial Assistant (Reformation), recently left the University of Toronto to take up pastoral duties in Milan where he will continue to act as European representative of the Victoria University Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies.



