

concern with explanation: Bouwsma cites Eisenstein but does not ask whether typography might have fostered the greater concern with literal meaning in texts and with orderly, straightforward unrhetorical presentation of arguments that he sees as increasingly normative among the elite.

While essays of this sort should not be tied by all the requirements of a scholarly monograph, Bouwsma's willingness to eschew citations for many of his quotations (and in many instances even to leave their authors anonymous) left this reader wanting a firmer documentary base. Some of the endnotes refer in a shorthand form to books not previously cited, and a number of the primary sources referred to can be found in neither the notes nor the "Bibliographical Note" which substitutes for a full bibliography. Most readers will encounter material here with which they are not familiar and find less help than would be ideal in order rapidly to follow up on the author's comments.

This book will find a valued place in the library of all scholars of the era and in the studies of all advanced undergraduate students interested in early modern cultural history. Thanks to Yale's sensible pricing (US \$29.95), its acquisition in hardcover can be recommended to all.

A misdating of the Edict of Nantes to 1585 is the only substantive error in this carefully edited book.

ALAN ARTHUR, *Brock University*

J. H. Elliott and L. W. B. Brockliss, eds. *The World of the Favourite*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1999. Pp. xv, 320.

A great mantra of gender and cultural studies has been "the personal is the political." The volume at hand, which deals with the place in early modern political culture of the figure variously known as the *valido*, *privado*, favorite, *premier ministre*, or minister-favorite, might be expected to offer an ideal assay of both that maxim and its presumed converse, "The political is [or at least can be] the personal." The introduction, concluding remarks, and seventeen essays in this volume, initially derived from a conference held in 1996 at Magdalen College, Oxford, probe the conjunctions and disjunctions in the private and public worlds of the early modern monarchies through the *valido*, who, in I. A. A. Thompson's formulation, "emerged in the window of transition between a private and a public bureaucracy . . . between the *Respublica Christiana* and *raison d'état*" (p. 23).

With the single exception of the management of patronage, there was no precise common ground in the "world of the favourite." Clearly, close personal ties to the monarch might matter, and proximity and frequent access might be both favor's cause and its effect. In the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, Elizabeth's several creatures (even though none monopolized favor), who are discussed by Paul E. J. Hammer, certainly operated within that framework, as did Concino Concini and his wife Leonora, a team, treated in the brief contribution of

J.-F. Dubost, who worked the favor of Marie de Médicis. Linda Peck, examining early Stuart court culture, insists that “intimacy was the key to the power of the favourite” (p. 63). But what, then, is made of Ronald Asch’s focus, Matthäus Enzlin, “the most important counsellor of Duke Friedrich of Württemberg” (p. 96), who worked mostly at home in Tübingen, no less than twenty miles from the court in Stuttgart? Somewhere in between was Robert Cecil, the focus of Pauline Croft’s characteristically shrewd contribution, whose concern about his place at court and in the royal affections was acute, but who was never the royal favorite *tout court*, and whose trump card was always his doggedness and mastery of affairs. “The term minister-favourite will not really fit” (p. 93), she says, but then again it cannot be discarded.

Cecil’s position is paradigmatic of the instability, both synchronic and diachronic, of the *privado*. One axis of variation, as has been noted, is the continuum stretching from the pure bureaucrat to the personal minion, although one contributor, Antonio Feros, goes so far as to deny that any distinction existed: the favorite and the prime minister (and all intermediate possibilities) “referred to the same court character” (p. 206). Another variable is the favorite’s relation to other loci of power. As Elliott notes in his trenchant, entertaining but too brief look at that model of the role, Olivares, the count-duke built up a network of patronage in spite of the grandees — just the opposite of the practice of his predecessor, Lerma; that was, of course, impossible in the “Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth,” according to Antoni Maczak, and fatal to the Danish favorite Griffenfeld, according to Knud J. V. Jespersen.

This lability of place and identity was reflected, to use Feros’s title formulation, in the “contrasting faces” of the favorite/minister: by turns “a promoter of absolutism” and “an obstacle to enhancing royal power” (p. 210). Jean Bérenger, whose pioneering article in 1974 on the minister-favorite helped inspire this collection, similarly argues in his contribution here that by the 1660s the role of the *valido* was simultaneously and inconsistently viewed as both a “tyranny” and a “usurpation of absolute monarchy” (pp. 160–61). The minister-favorite was, according to several contributors (esp. L. W. B. Brockliss, pp. 288–89), a lightning rod, deflecting enmity away from the monarch. But there was also a cost to the monarch. The private element in the minister-favorite elided into the ideologically fraught realm of necessity and *raison d’état*, as Thompson (p. 100), Elliott (p. 120), and Brockliss (p. 289) argue. As Blair Worden’s contribution on English dramatic representations of the favorite demonstrates, and Feros’s chapter strongly seconds, the favorites did not lack for enemies.

To its considerable merit, this collection also addresses the positive view of the favorite: David Wootton’s essay considers Francis Bacon, whose notion of *privados* as *participes curarum* was among the earliest to develop; Jonathan Brown very usefully surveys pro-favorite iconic representation in France, England, and Spain; the favorites’ self-image and apologists are also commented on by Feros and Orest Ranum. But the favorites’ moment was brief: so it is argued by the heaviest hitters (Bérenger, Brockliss, Thompson), and implied by the design of the

volume, with its sections on the “emergence” and “twilight” of the favorite. As net liabilities, minister-favorites were largely jettisoned in the later seventeenth century. M. Fumaroli’s contribution on Louis XIV’s undoing of Fouquet meticulously traces the signal instance of how and why this was done. But the sense that the *privado* was the creature of a historical moment is counterbalanced by the notion that the political favorite is a recurrent phenomenon: James M. Borden writes on the favorite *avant la lettre* in fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Spain, and Brockliss (pp. 301–2) points to the favorite’s afterlife in the eighteenth and even nineteenth centuries.

The numerous contributions gathered here are necessarily and often commendably brief, although a few could have done with more development. Inevitably, the contributors disagree, and at times the editors allow them to descend into logomachies, as well as substantive disputes, that engender confusion about the subject itself. The only proposition that seems never to be denied is that the *privado*/favorite/minister was a patronage boss. (Peck is especially instructive on this point.) Some readers may regret that there is surprisingly little treatment, for an Anglophone volume, of the British side of this phenomenon, particularly the case of Buckingham. But the volume is admirably tied together by the one extended contribution, Brockliss’s “Concluding Remarks.” Thanks to these, the volume may hold the scepter over the subject for as long as Bérenger’s article has done.

MICHAEL MENDLE, *University of Alabama*

Zakiya Hanafi. *The Monster in the Machine: Magic, Medicine, and the Marvelous in the Time of the Scientific Revolution*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2000. Pp. xii, 272.

Zakiya Hanafi’s study of the monstrous in the early modern period is as difficult to categorize as its subject itself: the abnormal and liminal, the marginally or wholly unclassifiable “bodies” produced by the cultural categorization of nature. Its inspiration seems to lie in the growing interest in the material dimension of culture rooted in the body, and in medical discourses about the body, that has grown up alongside the New Historicism. Its contribution to these areas of investigation is a solid one, especially since it focuses on relatively neglected scientific discourses mostly, if not wholly, grounded in early modern Italy. It also includes a medical/biographical study of Giambattista Vico, the one major figure discussed.

The book’s opening survey of the prehistory of the monstrous in the early modern period provides a useful introduction to the subject, although in too small a space to produce a truly thorough exploration of the transition from the sacred monster of antiquity and the early works of Aristotle, Pliny, Cicero, and Augustine to the rationalistic discourses of the new science. As a result, it fails to provide a sufficient foundation for a truly systematic consideration of the category of the monstrous, which readers will not find in Hanafi’s somewhat erratic and occasion-