Marguerite de Navarre's *Heptaméron*, François Rabelais's *Quart Livre*, and narratives by Bonaventure Des Périers, Noël Du Fail and Jacques Yver. As the subtitle suggests, the link between material culture and evangelical spirituality in the *Heptaméron* is the main focus of much of the book.

Drawing parallels between the composition of early modern art (Northern European painting in particular), decorative styles, narrative fiction, and evangelical teachings such as Luther's *Table Talk*, Catherine Randall posits that there was paradigm shift from an allegorical understanding of the world to a more subjective, metaphorical relation to objects. According to her, the evangelical ambivalence toward commodity culture was expressed in a distrust of materiality: objects and images were desacralized, but could be used to point the way to salvation. Indeed, not only are material objects seen to be re-oriented toward the metaphysical in evangelical narrative, but plain style is preferred to ornament, and storytelling and the *nouvelle* genre in particular are seen as part of sharing the *bonne nouvelle* or "good news" of the gospel.

The idea of analyzing material culture in Marguerite de Navarre's *Heptaméron* is fascinating and original, as is the notion that the work can be read as an evangelical narrative. Indeed, the close reading of *nouvelles* represents the most compelling parts of this study (though there is occasional confusion between tales in the *Heptaméron*, including some distracting numbering issues). The earlier sections on the visual arts are less nuanced and persuasive, leading one to wonder, in part, how much of what is interpreted as reformist aesthetics can be attributed to other factors.

NANCY FRELICK, *University of British Columbia*

Jean de Pins

Letters and Letter Fragments

Edited with commentary and notes by Jan Prendergrass. Travaux d'Humanisme et Renaissance CDXXXIII. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 2007. Pp. 392.

If one were inventing a minor humanist of the reign of François I, he might look very much like Jean de Pins. One of the younger sons of an aristocratic family of Languedoc, he studied at Paris, Bologna, and Pavia. After some years as councillor to the Parlement of Toulouse, he was briefly a member of the senate of French-occupied Milan before being posted to Venice as the French ambassador and then to Rome as ecclesiastical delegate (the ambassador was Alberto Pio of Carpi). He was consecrated as bishop of Rieux, and spent his last years as an absentee in Tou-

louse, enjoying the emoluments of the bishopric and the company of humanists. He owned nineteen Greek manuscripts, was the dedicatee of two Aldine editions, and corresponded with Erasmus. He published lives of Filippo Beroaldo the elder, St Catherine of Siena, and St Roch; and Latin versions of the *Romance of Paris and Vienne* and of Alain Chartier's *De Curial*—a list which suggests that he may have been readier to exercise his Latin style, which has been praised, than to say anything new. De Pins did good in his time: Richard Copley Christie said of him that in the years when he was able to help Etienne Dolet, “besides being the friend of all that was good among the authorities of the province, the city, and the university, he was adored by all the young students.” But set side by side with men like Pio and Dolet, he is undeniably a minor figure.

This edition of his correspondence is as complete as possible, though the editor knows of at least one unpublished letter which was not available to him. It presents 140 letters and fragments, most of them in Latin. They come from two major deposits, supplemented from the liminary epistles of printed books and a number of minor sources, printed and archival. One of the major deposits comprises de Pins' diplomatic despatches in French, to François I, Louise de Savoy, Antoine Duprat, and others: a couple of dozen in all, dispersed through a number of composite manuscripts in the Bibliothèque Nationale. The other is a seventeenth-century transcript, now at Nîmes, of 53 letters in Latin and some fragments; this was made from a larger collection, now lost, of his correspondence.

The diplomatic letters are all from Rome, written between May 1520 and January 1522 (his despatches from Venice are lost). They begin with de Pins' gracious reception by Leo X, who announced to him that he felt “aussi bonne et parfaicte affection” to François I “que s'il estoit son propre enfant ou nepveu charnel,” and end with his report of some premature rumours of the death of Adrian VI. The letters in Latin are more of a mixed bunch. Some are highly conventional: apologies for not having written sooner, expressions of modesty in the face of the exquisite Latinity of his correspondents, promises of friendship. Others have more to offer the reader, such as the story of the seizure of a letter of 1532 from Erasmus to de Pins by persons in Toulouse who expected its contents to be dangerously inflammatory, the correspondence by which de Pins got Dolet out of prison in 1534, or even the letter of 1514 in which de Pins, in his forties and busy with parliamentary affairs, tells a correspondent how anxious he is to engage a Greek tutor for himself.

The edition is attractively presented, as one might expect from its publisher, and makes a handsome companion to Jan Pendergrass's edition of the correspondence

of Antoine Arlier (Droz, 1990), another minor Languedocien humanist of the 1530s. The editorial material of the de Pins edition is in English whereas that of the Arlier edition was in French, but the microstructure is the same: each letter is prefaced by a short paraphrase by the editor; the Latin or French text is then presented, with occasional notes indicating corrections to the copy-text (these letters do not, however, present significant textual problems), and a series of endnotes. Many of the endnotes identify persons named in the text, sometimes demonstrating laborious research in French archives as well as a very wide range of secondary literature. An introduction sketches the outlines of de Pins' life, and there is an index of proper names, though not, regrettably, a subject index or an index to the Latinity of the texts, on which Pendergrass has some useful remarks in the endnotes to individual letters. This makes for an attractive layout, but it might have been preferable to print translations of the letters rather than paraphrases. Not every user of this book will be so interested in de Pins as to read it sequentially, and those who want quick access to his remarks on his translation of Cassius Dio, or on English diplomats in Rome, or on cosmetics, will not find this edition as easy to use as it might have been.

There are also one or two points where the paraphrases are open to question. What was the loathsome disease which made de Pins' joints hurt and his skin erupt in Venice? The diarist Marino Sanuto apparently called it the French disease, which suggests that he identified it with what we would call syphilis, and it is surely unduly cautious for the paraphrases to label it as "impetigo" or "gout." There is a more serious problem in the paraphrase of a letter of 1512 to one Orsières, commander of a troop of mercenaries operating near the de Pins family property. "According to an ancient proverb that is the family motto of all Orsières: *A military commander must have not only chaste hands, but also chaste eyes*. Orsières should now show that this is as much his family's tenet as his own." This paraphrases "Velim ... vetus illud dictum tibi saepe veniat in mentem, *praetorem non manus solum sed oculos etiam abinentes praestare debere*. Quod ut tibi minime est necessarium ... sic tuae totae familiae praeceptum esse putabis," and so on. Pendergrass has misunderstood *familia*, which here means "retinue," not family," and has then misunderstood *dictum*, which here means "saying," not "family motto": Orsières should remember the old saying that a praetor should keep his hands and also his eyes under control, not because he needs it to regulate his own behaviour but because it applies to his whole retinue.

It would not be fair to end this review on a negative note. Pendergrass has been working on de Pins since the 1980s, and has produced a learned edition which makes a solid, permanent contribution to knowledge. Any serious library holding

of books on the Renaissance will need to include this book, and it will be referred to by a wide range of scholars for many years to come.

JOHN CONSIDINE, *University of Alberta*

Ian Munro

The Figure of the Crowd in Early Modern London: The City and Its Double

New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005. Pp. 255.

Ian Munro's *The Figure of the Crowd in Early Modern London: The City and Its Double* is a wide-ranging and well-argued study of the complex relations among the city, the crowd, and the theatre in early modern London. "What is the city but the people?" asks the tribune Sicinus in *Coriolanus*. Munro asks us to take this question seriously. The book's introduction and first chapter outline his position in broad terms. The rapid population increase in early modern London, Munro argues, pushed England's capital city into a crisis in signification or legibility. In texts like Elizabeth's 1580 building proclamation and Stow's *Survey of London*, royal and civic authorities sought nostalgically to preserve the idea of a London that was ordered, rational, and knowable. The swelling urban population, housed in new and labyrinthine tenements whose construction threatened to efface the symbolic stability of the city just as their occupants' riotous potential posed an ever-present threat to royal and civic hierarchies of authority, rendered such ideas of the city incoherent.

In his approach to London as a symbolic construct, Munro links his work to such scholarly landmarks as Gail Kern Paster's *The Idea of the City in the Age of Shakespeare* and Lawrence Manley's *Literature and Culture in Early Modern London*. However, Munro is not just interested in the ideas (ideal or demonic) of the city, but also its physical bodies and spaces—in early modern London, ever more bodies in increasingly opaque spaces. Moreover, Munro conceptualizes the relationship between city and crowd in more sophisticated and productive terms than simple opposition. His primary conceptual model is that of deconstructive supplementarity: the space of the crowd is "a multivalent space that supplements the space of the city, disrupting, reinforcing, or otherwise transforming the social and symbolic dynamics of urban meaning." He also turns for conceptual models to Deleuze and Guattari's distinction between arborescent (hierarchically organized) and rhizomatic (heterogeneous and conglomerative) systems. "In the context of London," Munro writes, "and particularly in the context of London's sporadic but persistent unrest, arborescent models of population are superseded by rhizomatic models: the urban