suggestively present to the user of this volume. Banish the hundreds of proper names to the index of proper names, and distinguish subject names there by italics. Expand subject terms in the directions of particularity and generality both. We are presently given fifty-one items indexed under Prosody (Metrics), but no entry for *couplet* (see, inter alia, #138, 228, 515). We are given entries for Meditation, Mannerism and Baroque, but not for *mimesis/mimetic* nor *metaphysical*. We are given Hermogenes (#248), and Prose, General (in the Index of Donnean works), but not *rhetoric*. We are given Satire and Allegory, and *Elegies* (with Donnean works), but not *sonnet* (e.g. #668, 794), *stanza* (1000), or *lyric* (e.g. #927, 1042) or *genre* (e.g. #205, 343, 683). We are given Derrida (#293) but not *deconstruction* (which might venture to include #338, 422). The term *structuralism* occurs a time or two in the text, but not in the index, *phenomenology* somewhat oftener, but never in the index. There is no index entry for *linguistic analysis* (e.g. #270, 274, 280, 466, 977, 1011), no entry for *play* (e.g. #640, 1007, 1019), no entry for *psychological criticism* (e.g. #227, 282, 475, 784, 833). There is an entry for Reformation, but not a general *history* entry where valuable and various works such as Mulder (#127), Joseph (#326), Cragg (#736), and Davies (#738) would be listed together. There is no index entry for *time*, *space*, or *imagery*.

There are remarkably few misprints, but most of those I note might give students some trouble. By Item number: 41, for "imminent," read "immanent"; 276, for "ingenius" read "ingenious"; 396/631/Index, for "Northrup Frye" read "Northrop Frye"; 396/711/779, for "elegaic" read "elegiac"; 450, for "resurrection," read "resurrection"; 476, for "essay," read "elegy" (?); 538, for "thusly" read "thus"; 552, for "expansiveness" read "expensiveness"; 567, for "doddles" read "doodles"; 732/Index, for "probablirist" read "probabiliorist"; bottom of p. 307, desperate syntax; 805, for "1637" read "1687"; 819/Index, for "Guilo" read "Giulio"; 936, for "andiplosis" read "anadiplosis"; 968, for "money scrivener" read ??; Index, for "Latitudianism" read "Latitudinarianism."

This scrupulous volume will immediately prove so useful that a second edition may be hoped for—with a more elaborate index. And what Renaissance scholar will not hope for a counterpart third volume in another decade?

GALE H. CARRITHERS, JR., *Louisiana State University*

Ronald F.E. Weissman. *Ritual Brotherhood in Renaissance Florence*. New York: Academic Press, 1982. Pp. xiv, 254. \$27.50.

Ronald Weissman sets the lay confraternities of Florence in the context of a society dominated on all levels by conflict, tension, suspicion, and betrayal. He describes Florentines as participants in dense networks of relations, in which friends, neighbors, and kinsmen were bound together by multiple ties: social, economic, familial, personal. These relationships all imposed competing claims, and no one could satisfy all of these claims. Even the home was no refuge from the tension of agonistic social relations, for family members also competed with one

another for wealth, honor, and political office. Everyone was forced to betray and be betrayed; for Weissman, the real patron saint of Florence was Judas.

The lay confraternities presented Florentines with an alternative model of social relations, one in which the unity of ritual brotherhood replaced the tense and fragmented world of everyday life. "The citywide confraternity offered Florentines the chance to escape, weekly or biweekly, into a community of single-stranded, low density social relations, where roles and status might not overlap and where, therefore, true brotherhood might be practiced without fear of guilt or duplicity" (p. 79). These confraternities undercut the usual associations based on class, kinship, and residence, and brought together people from different lineages, from all parts of the city, and from all classes above the poverty level. They hosted rituals that inverted normal social relations, obliterated status distinctions, and united all the confraternal brothers in a shared sense of equality, trust, and *communitas*.

It is possible to dispute this general interpretation. I, for one, feel that Weissman overstates the contrast: I am not convinced the Florentine social relations were quite so pathologically tense as he depicts them, or that confraternal relations differed so markedly from normal social ones. Weissman, indeed, is well aware of how patronage networks and other social bonds penetrated into the heart of the confraternities, though he nonetheless maintains that relationships within the confraternity differed in kind, and not just in degree of intensity, from relationships outside the confraternity.

There is no question, however, about the value of Weissman's statistical analysis of confraternal membership and participation. He has carefully worked through the best of the surviving records to produce demographic profiles of *laudesi* and flagellant confraternities. His profiles are based on very small samples, but they are nonetheless provocative. *Laudesi* confraternities were devoted to cultic celebrations in honor of saints and for the benefit of the community of the living and their dead. They attracted members who were fairly well established in the social world of Florence: members were typically independent artisans or minor guildsmen, representatives of whatever "middle class" can be said to have existed in Florence. In 1480, the average age of members of the *laudesi* confraternity of San Zanobi was nearly 54; 89% of them were heads of their households; 95% were married or widowers. In contrast, members of the flagellant confraternity of San Paolo came largely from the patrician families of bankers and international merchants; their median wealth was nearly three times that of the brethren of San Zanobi. They were younger: three-quarters of them joined before the age of 25, 58% were unmarried, and less than half were heads of households. They tended to leave the confraternity in their early 30's, when they got married; those who continued to be active members despite their marriage generally filled the top offices and led the group. The typical member of a flagellant confraternity was not, as has been commonly supposed, an old man preparing for death, but rather a young man preparing for a career in Florentine politics.

Despite these differences, the *laudesi* and flagellant confraternities of republican Florence were fundamentally similar in structure and function. They reproduced in miniature an ideal republic of brothers, undercut the divisive bonds of class, craft, and neighborhood, and offered a ritualized escape from the everyday

social order. By the middle of the sixteenth century, however, this had changed. According to Weissman, the political turmoil between the expulsion of the Medici in 1494 and their return for good in 1530 fatally disrupted the old forms of confraternal organization. When confraternal life revived in the sixteenth century, with the reformation of old brotherhoods and the foundation of new ones, confraternities took on a new form. Unlike the heterogeneous groups of republican Florence, which had celebrated humility and ritual brotherhood in rites of *communitas* and social inversion, the confraternities of grand-ducal Florence were homogeneous groups, based on parish, craft, or class bonds, which celebrated obedience through hierarchical ritual. Instead of undercutting the ties of friendship, kinship, and neighborhood, they sanctified them. The remaining city-wide flagellant companies became exclusive clubs for patricians; the *laudesi* confraternities became parochial or craft organizations.

There are some problems evident in this interpretation. For one thing, the chronology of the change is unclear: parish and craft organizations existed in republican Florence, though Weissman downplays their importance. For another, it is hard to see the difference between a confraternity in crisis, such as San Sebastiano in 1533, when only 27 of its 176 members attended meetings (p. 181), and a confraternity of the republican period, such as San Paolo in 1480, when only 104 of the 199 members were at all active and the average attendance at meetings was 36.5 persons (p. 134). More importantly, Weissman's narrow concentration on Florence obscures the fact that similar changes in confraternal organization were also taking place elsewhere in Italy. If confraternities in Venice and Genoa, Bologna and Perugia were also being reformed in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, should we be satisfied with an explanation of the history of Florentine confraternities based on local politics rather than larger religious issues?

At heart, Weissman is interested in Florence, not in religion. He treats confraternities as social not religious institutions. It is hard to see how confraternities (as Weissman describes them) differed from other institutions of male bonding, such as guilds, festive associations, or the Parte Guelfa. His confraternities are merely devices for satisfying social or psychological needs:

For Florentines about to broaden family and neighborhood centered networks and beginning to participate in the life of the city, the confraternity offered an introduction to the nature of citywide community, its republican institutions, and its civic values. And for older members, caught in the tense environment of competing obligations and extended networks, the confraternity offered the possibility of renewing and recreating a sense of obligation to broader communities (p. 161)

In fulfilling their function, the confraternities change to meet the changed needs of society; they passively assimilate domestic political changes or respond to decrees of the ecclesiastical hierarchy (p. 197).

By treating confraternities as institutions designed to meet social or psychological needs, Weissman misses their essential, religious nature. It is odd that the author of a study of a religious institution does not seem to take religion seriously. He does not see religious belief as an active force that can lead people to renounce commonly accepted social goals and the usual psychological satisfactions. He

does not see religious institutions as potentially forces for social change, rather than reflections of it. And so he does not see the reformed confraternities of Italy as the matrix in which were nurtured the aspirations towards religious reform that animated the Council of Trent. For the reformation of confraternities in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries was not just a matter of the kinds of organizational and demographic change that Weissman has so persuasively outlined. It was a spiritual reformation, one that proceeded in an uneven and piecemeal fashion before the Council of Trent, and only afterwards came to be regularized and directed by the ecclesiastical hierarchy. This spiritual transformation can be traced in a careful reading of confraternal statutes, a reading that treats them as devotional texts and seeks to recover their religious import. A study of confraternities as *religious* institutions would complement and in a sense complete Weissman's social history of the Florentine confraternities, and lead us closer to an understanding of the religious history of Renaissance Italy.

DANIEL BORNSTEIN, *The University of Michigan*

The Book of the Honeycomb's Flow by Judah Messer Leon. A critical edition and translation by Isaac Rabinowitz. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1983. Pp. 1xx, 604. No price given.

Students of fifteenth-century Italy will be interested in the existence of this curious work, which is moreover of some importance in the history of Jewish studies and in the history of rhetoric. Judah ben Jehiel Rophé was born sometime between 1420 and 1425, probably near Vicenza. He became a rabbi in Ancona, was licensed to practice medicine, directed a Jewish academy of the *studia humanitatis*, and received the title of Messer Leon from Frederick III in 1452. Subsequently he lived in Padua, Mantua, and Naples, fled Italy in 1495, and died in Macedonia about 1498. Among his works are Hebrew treatises on grammar, logic, and rhetoric, the latter of which has now been edited and translated into English with great learning and care by Isaac Rabinowitz. The volume is dedicated to the memory of Harry Caplan, who took much interest in its preparation.

Entitled *Sēpher Nōpheth Šūphīm*, or *The Book of the Honeycomb's Flow* (from Psalms 19:10), the treatise on rhetoric was apparently written in Padua in the late 1460's and was first printed in Mantua by Abraham Conat in 1475/6. The rhetorical theory it expounds is that current in Italy after the recovery of the complete text of Quintilian in 1416, but untouched by the knowledge of the Greek tradition that was being introduced by George of Trebizond and others during the course of the century. Messer Leon's sources are primarily Cicero's *De inventione*, *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, Quintilian, and Victorinus. He did not know Greek, but cites Aristotle from Averroes' Middle Commentary on the *Rhetoric* and from the *Rhetorica ad Alexandum*, which he presumably knew in one of the two medieval Latin translations. He also refers twice to Boethius' *De differentiis topicis* and twice to the commentary on *Rhetorica ad Herennium* attributed to Alanus. On the model of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* the treatise is arranged in four books, called "Gates," and treats all five parts of rhetoric.