surtout pour le XVIIIe – a été dicté par son champ d’intérêt particulier: “A corollary preoccupation that has guided my choices from the outset has been the desire to shed light on the political theories of Montesquieu and Rousseau, by showing how their arguments are rooted in earlier French thought” (p. 14). Personne n’oserait mettre en doute l’importance et l’intérêt de ces deux grands penseurs en matière politique – d’ailleurs chac un a réalisé à sa façon une admirable synthèse des idées de ses prédécesseurs, mais le lecteur, après avoir assisté au long cheminement des rapports entre la philosophie et l’état, après avoir suivi la discussion relativement complète des XVIe et XVIIe siècles, se sent quelque peu frustré de ne pas trouver une discussion semblable du XVIIIe, peut-être une esquisse de synthèse pour le siècle des lumières. Le titre annonçait: “The Renaissance to the Enlightenment”; mais où sont Voltaire, les philosophes et les physiocrates? L’auteur a bien tenté de prévenir l’objection: “Many of these themes find a denouement in the ideas of other important thinkers of the Enlightenment – Voltaire and Diderot, Helvétius and the Physiocrats. To work out all of these denouements, however, is a matter for another book” (p. 14). Cela est sans doute juste, mais fallait-il pour autant passer sous silence ces penseurs importants tout en consacrant plusieurs pages à l’abbé de Saint-Pierre? N’eût-il pas mieux valu faire une brève synthèse des lumières plutôt qu’une étude détaillée de quelques auteurs? Ou peut-être aurait-il fallu que l’auteur précisât dans le titre le rôle fondamental qu’elle voulait faire jouer à Montesquieu et à Rousseau.

Cette réserve mise à part, nous nous devons de remarquer que l’ouvrage de N. Keohane est fort bien documenté, la bibliographie présentée à la fin du livre peut grandement servir le lecteur désireux d’approfondir une question spécifique. Ajoutons que, dans la très grande majorité des cas, l’auteur rend justice aux idées des penseurs qu’elle discute. Faute de place, il nous est impossible de rendre compte de chacune de ces discussions, tout au plus pouvons-nous souligner au passage celle de Montesquieu et de Rousseau où les idées de l’auteur nous paraissent les plus originales; les études sur Pascal et Nicole sont également dignes de mention, tandis que celles sur Vauban, Boisguilbert et Fénelon se contiennent de rapporter ce qui a été écrit ailleurs. Mais finalement, il est inévitable, dans ce genre d’ouvrage, que certaines études soient plus originales et plus valables que d’autres.

Alors, quel jugement faut-il porter sur le travail de N. Keohane? Selon nous, ce livre est fort utile dans la mesure où il attire notre attention sur la contribution mal connue du XVIIe siècle en matière politique, et sur les nombreux rapprochements qui existent entre les trois siècles, surtout à l’intérieur de la tradition dite individualiste. On comprend mieux, à la lecture de ce livre, le rôle grandissant de l’individu et de ses droits dans l’établissement de l’état moderne en France.

GEORGES-L. BÉRUBÉ, Université de Saint Thomas


The title gives a clear indication of the scope of the study carried out by Dr. Lewis. It embraces, to quote the author, “Aristotelian and Scholastic kinematics and the
contribution of the Merton school to that topic and to natural philosophy in general.” The problem that stimulated his research was the question of the extent of Galileo’s familiarity with the advances initiated in the early fourteenth century by a number of natural philosophers at Merton College, Oxford. He therefore sought to determine whether the concepts and methods introduced by them were common knowledge among scholars in Italy in the period 1570–1620. To achieve this purpose he made a detailed study of the published writings of natural philosophers who taught or studied during this period at the Universities of Pisa and Padua and the Jesuit Collegio Romano. The nature of the Merton tradition and the extent of its early influence is discussed, followed by an analysis of the published work, in its relation to kinematics, of selected scholars at each of the centres listed above.

Chapter II discusses the publications of such prominent Merton scholars as Thomas Bradwardine, William Heytesbury, Richard Swineshead and John Dumbleton. Particular attention is directed to the definitions of different types of motion, such as those that would today be designated as uniform, uniformly accelerated and non-uniformly accelerated. The introduction of algebraic language to make these definitions more precise, and the use, by those who followed the original members of the group, of geometrical diagrams may be looked upon as the beginning of mathematical physics. The identification of velocity, rather than space traversed, with the intensity of motion and in consequence its treatment as a continuously variable quantity is regarded as particularly significant, since it led to the concept of uniform acceleration. The so-called Merton “mean-speed theorem,” while applicable to all varieties of gradual intensity variations, allows, when applied to temporal variations in velocity, the determination of the distance traversed in uniformly accelerated motion. Another point emphasized is that members of the Merton Group questioned the possibility of reaction when one body acts on another, although earlier natural philosophers apparently accepted the concept as valid. Debate on this subject is found in many writings of the Merton Group and disputation concerning the nature of reaction was common among natural philosophers for many years. Many later treatises refer to the opinions of, and the conclusions reached by individual Mertensians and these references attest to the continued influence of the Group. The topics mentioned above have been selected as the most pertinent to the discussion in the following chapters, but Chapter II gives a much more complete account of what the author regards as the Merton traditions.

Dr. Lewis’ search for relevant material revealed that natural philosophers at the three centres – Pisa, Padua, and the Collegio Romano – published little during the half-century 1570–1620, and that most of the work that was published was of no interest in the context of kinematics. His judgement of the extent of the influence of the Merton tradition at the Collegio Romano at this time is based exclusively on the Commentaria of Francesco Toledo (1532–96), the De communibus principiis of Benito Pereira (1535–1610) and the Disputationes of Francesco Swarez (1548–1617). Among teachers and colleagues of Galileo at the University of Pisa only one, Francesco Buonamici, whose De motu libri X contains references to subjects discussed by members of the Merton Group, is given serious attention. Of philosophers who began teaching at Pisa during the interval after Galileo ceased teaching there but before he went to Padua, no one with the exception of Fortunii Liceti, who also later went to Padua, was found to have published anything of interest in the present context. Relevant material in the publications of those natural philosophers who were
at Padua during the period 1570–1620 was taken from the *De rebus naturalibus libri* XXX and the *In libros physicorum commentarii* of Jacopo Zabarella and the *Libri ad scientiam de natura attinentes* of Francesco Piccolomini, as well as from the works of Liceti who has been mentioned previously. The general conclusion reached by Dr. Lewis is that some awareness of the subjects treated, of the arguments used, and the conclusions reached by members of the Merton Group and those who followed them did persist in late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century Italy. However, he found that in very few cases were there any direct references to the original writings and that in general there was no recognition of the Merton group as such. Knowledge of their work had probably been gleaned, not from a study of the original publications, but from commentaries by scholars of the late fifteenth and early sixteenth century. In many cases the original arguments were imperfectly understood.

An interesting and valuable appendix to Dr. Lewis’ book calls attention to published works of younger contemporaries of Galileo. These he had not considered earlier because they did not fit the criteria that he had applied in his selection of works to be used. He discusses this material, although in less detail than that in the works originally selected, and finds in it definite indications that he might have underestimated the influence of the Merton Group. For example, these publications indicated that the “uniformly diffirm action of natural agents” was a widely accepted thesis, although interpretations of it varied greatly. The use of the isosceles triangle to represent uniformly diffirm distributions was also found in several cases. However, he remained uncertain whether this was due to the influence of the “calculatores” rather than to the fact that the scholars concerned were primarily mathematicians. On the whole the evidence presented does make it appear likely that Galileo’s contemporaries had some knowledge of the Merton tradition, if not of the Merton Group and their original publications.

How great was Galileo’s debt to the Merton tradition? Dr. Lewis’ research cannot give a definitive answer to this question. He has presented evidence showing that in this period (1570–1620) it was a part of generally accepted knowledge that natural agents produce uniformly diffirm distributions of intensity. On the other hand, little evidence was found of the use of the Merton concept of velocity as the intensity of motion. Rather the Aristotelian concept that qualitative intensity is analogous to space in locomotion and not to velocity was preferred. Natural philosophers including the Merton group were primarily interested in why natural phenomena occurred. Why did a body fall to the earth? Galileo was an observer and primarily interested in how it fell. Based on his observations of the motions of falling bodies and of projectiles he arrived at two general conclusions. The first was that all bodies fall freely with the same constant acceleration, and the second was that the acceleration of a projectile due to its weight is the same as if it were falling freely. He further concluded that an object, prevented from falling but otherwise free to move, would, if set in motion and then freed from motivation, continue to move without acceleration i.e. in a straight line with constant velocity. The Merton concept of velocity as intensity of motion gave rise to that of uniform acceleration in natural motions. Evidence that, among Galileo’s contemporaries, the Aristotelian concept of motion was much more widely accepted than the Merton concept lends support to the empirical character of his laws of motion. In any case Galileo’s importance as a physicist is due to the emphasis he placed on experiment. He maintained that the results of logical discussion must be
tested by carefully devised experiments. Also that only such experiments could reveal the true character of natural phenomena. He was in fact the first true experimental physicist.

Dr. Lewis’ careful analysis of the publications that he selected as relevant to his immediate purpose and his extensive and well-arranged bibliography will be most valuable to the student of natural philosophy in Italy during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. He has limited his studies almost entirely to works with some interest in kinematics. His work should encourage research into other fields of Merton influence and investigations of broader scope into the accomplishments of natural philosophers in Renaissance Italy.

E.J. ALLIN, University of Toronto


Numerous attributes recommend Puritans and Libertines: sophisticated literary detection, a judicious balance of impressive scholarship and creative interpretation; numerous, appropriate quotations from the writers under consideration (with translations); a range of nearly two centuries of literary and historical events; a selection of details that imaginatively personifies the Reformation.

Puritans and Libertines advocates the thesis that universal literary values explain the effectiveness of acculturation between France and England: "... the French literary tradition normally responded to experiences which were directly accessible to English minds, if not fully shared by them." The evidence for this assertion is developed throughout the book especially in those chapters which discuss Marot, Wyatt, Ronsard, Aubigné, Viau, Shakespeare, Milton, and Donne. There are numerous examples. "Many of Milton’s syncretic effects in Paradise Lost," we are informed, "are prefigured in Ronsard." Another connection between these two is the theme of Grecophilia in Ronsard’s plans for Charles IX’s education and in Paradise Regained. Milton and Marot also share literary techniques ("the subordination of neoclassical impulses to religious obligations") as do Marot and Shakespeare ("lack of esthetic constraint," "bold power to improvise"). The French Reformation, Richmond remarks, disrupted society and disoriented its poets. These "eccentric and intense distortions," he insists, were transported to England and in them "the English Renaissance poets found their best resource."

How this new literary movement originated and consequently spread to England is explained in chapters on Marguerite d’Angoulême and Anne Boleyn. As the "mother-when the Reformation," Marguerite personified two of the several themes Professor Richmond discusses: (1) literary acculturation, especially literary precedents, between England and France which the author considers more significant than the Italian influence in sixteenth-century England and (2) the attempt through her Heptameron to "evoke the new pattern of social relationships precipitated in the sixteenth century by the collision of the Renaissance and the Reformation with medieval survivals." The Queen of Navarre’s influence touched her contemporaries (Anne Boleyn in particu-