Having reduced the power and the participatory scope of the nobility in government, Henry saw little reason to cement its loyalty by gifts of land or office. He almost never bestowed property outright before the monastic dissolutions, and did so only sparingly thereafter. In the end, Miller’s picture tells us as much about the King’s strength as about the ebbing position of his nobility.

Miller’s study is distinctive for its thorough research and its cautious interpretations, but also for its constricted scope. It is no surprise to see this author demonstrate once again her command of archival sources in, for example, reconstructing the details of an aristocratic career, and her conclusions are consequently very firmly supported. On the other hand, there are points where her argument is only implicitly linked to wider debates in published scholarship. The work fails to consider the nobility outside the narrow confines of political activity, leaving us to wonder if we can, after all, completely ignore the literature surrounding Lawrence Stone’s classic volumes, especially The Crisis of the Aristocracy of 1965, when considering the political crisis of the Henrician peerage. It fails also to discuss the political role of the peerage in relation to other groups or, some of the time, in relation to issues themselves. Thus, for example, while it peaks our interest to learn that Henry gave few rewards to his nobility, it would be more illuminating to know whether other groups fared any better from his largess. While it helps us to know when and to what extent peers served politically at court and in Parliament, we miss a discussion of their possibly partisan role on specific issues, or indeed, whether they perceived sufficient common interest to function at least some of the time as a coherent interest group.

In sum, then, the splendid calibre of Helen Miller’s scholarship is not always well served by her breadth of interest. Henry VIII and the English Nobility remains a lucid and authoritative commentary on a somewhat constricted approach to the subject.

ROBERT TITTLER, Concordia University


Odd as it may now seem, it was not until 1938 that one recognized a continuity in English humanist activity between the death of More and Fisher and the accession of Elizabeth. That recognition, made by Douglas Bush in the “obscure” pages of the University of Toronto Quarterly, sired the rich tradition of scholarship on the whole of Henrician humanism that has been upheld, in turn, by the likes of Zeeveld and Caspari; Ferguson, McConica
and Elton: John Guy and now Maria Dowling. If Dowling's *Humanism in the Age of Henry VIII* is any indication, these rich bloodlines still run strong, and the subject rests in competent hands.

Dowling writes with an assurance born of firm documentation, mature judgement and wise caution. She warns us at the outset not to assume that humanist scholarship swept the nation by storm. Though a few scholars warmed to the cause in Henry VII's reign, its success under Henry VIII had much to do with the receptivity of that prince, and of his first consort: it could well have been otherwise. Dowling also reminds us that humanism was never a unified "movement," but rather that its proponents divided fiercely over matters both academic and political. Controversy over Luther raged less between orthodoxy and reform than amongst humanists of evangelical and moderate bent, with the former group in royal disfavour. The split between Henry and Katherine again divided the ranks, with the Crown finding the radicals more useful in the subsequent break from Rome. That effort behind him, Henry's own and perhaps true theologically conservative stance led him to change course again and keep the radicals in check in the 1540s.

These issues surrounding the interaction of humanism and national politics lie at the heart of Dowling's first three (and most important) chapters, and free her to consider aspects of humanism outside the political arena thereafter. Subsequent discussions (on humanism and the schools, scholarly exchange 'cross Channel, humanism and the gentleman and then the gentle woman) obviously share a common concern for humanism itself, but are not tightly bound by connective themes. While not superseding the work of, for example, Kenneth Charlton or Joan Simon, Dowling's treatment of humanism and the schools remains comprehensive and admirably wary of enthusiastic claims for wholesale curricular reforms. Her treatment of "the wandering scholar" summarizes considerable evidence of humanist travel both to and from England. Yet her conclusion that England was not as isolated as it has sometimes been made to seem will appear bland to those hoping for more extensive investigation of continental influence on specific areas of humanist concern, and it is not Dowling's prime intent to explore the development of intellectual concerns as some others have done. Granted, for example, we learn of Fisher's debt to Reuchlin in inserting Hebrew into the curriculum of St. John's College, Cambridge, but this remains an isolated example of such exchange. Beyond that, she explodes the "myth" that Edward VI's education took place in a humanist nursery school organized by Katherine Parr, and tells us more regarding the humanist interests of Anne Boleyn, but Dowling's treatment of humanism in the education of gentle men and women largely summarizes and fortifies familiar themes.
Beyond breaking new ground in these respects, Dowling has summarized and brought up to date ideas that are fundamentally familiar, but has done so in an articulate, lucid and convenient manner. Should the work find its way into a soft-cover edition, we may confidently expect it to serve as standard fare on reading lists for advanced undergraduates.

ROBERT TITTLER, Concordia University


Recently the name of John Colet has received new attention from Renaissance scholarship. The founder of St. Paul's school and Dean of St. Paul's is well known for his educational work. He was a close friend of Erasmus and the confessor of Thomas More. Colet's intellectual inspiration encouraged other, more famous people in the pursuit of Renaissance educational objectives.

Until lately Renaissance scholars had largely ignored the necessity of theological studies to a fuller understanding of Renaissance humanism. Formerly the theology of the humanists prior to the Reformation was simply discarded as medieval scholasticism. The attention being given now to the theology of Erasmus and other Renaissance humanists has subsequently aroused new interest in John Colet.

John Colet's commentary on Paul's First epistle to the Corinthians has now been given to us in a new translation with a fully annotated text and an interpretative introduction. This new translation by O'Kelly and Jarrott has greatly facilitated this new Renaissance interest. It is the first new English translation from Colet's Latin text since the work of John Lupton in 1874. Prior to that time, there was only the transcription of First Corinthians by Peter Meghen, who was Colet's scribe. Like Lupton, O'Kelly has made his own transcription from Colet's holograph, which is located in Cambridge University Library under the designation Gg. iv. 26. While O'Kelly does not seriously fault the work of Lupton, his translation is a definite improvement. He has faithfully reproduced the Latin text except for obvious slips, contractions and abbreviations which are corrected in the body of the text and then the original forms recorded in notes. The Latin and English texts are on opposing pages whereas Lupton had followed his English translation with the Latin text. The principal biblical quotations and allusions have been identified. O'Kelly also has referred to Meghen's text, pointing out the variant readings that are particularly suggestive or significant. Since original punc-