One further aspect of the book deserves comment: there is evidence of sloppiness which considerably diminishes the study's value. The following sentence is to be found in chapter II (p. 24): "Since the general consensus of opinion now holds that the *Essays* defies synthesis, the belief in a thematic evolution of Montaigne's thought is accorded less and less of critical favor." Montaigne would not accuse the present reviewer of pedantry for decrying the outrageous tautology in the initial clause.

Tetel concludes his book by claiming that no comprehensive statement about the *Essays* can be made. In its stead, he presents a brief two-page summary of the influence of Montaigne on succeeding generations. In fact, a more fitting conclusion (limited by the narrowness of the study, to be sure) could have been and ought to have been written. To bring new and incomplete materials into a concluding chapter serves only to distract the reader and muddy the waters even more.

In a word, Tetel's book is of little use to those engaged in Montaigne studies, and one hopes that the promised volume on Montaigne and Italy will correct the many faults of its predecessor.

JOHN PRIESTLEY, *York University*

Albert Rabil, Jr. *Erasmus and the New Testament: the Mind of a Christian Humanist*. San Antonio: Trinity University Press, 1972. Pp. xviii, 190. \$6.

Not least among the results of the Erasmus project is the simultaneous appearance of articles and monographs based on the preparatory labours of the various translators. Professor Rabil's study is of this character. He shares responsibility for the Paraphrase and Annotations of Romans and Galatians with John Payne, whose fine contribution to the analysis of Erasmian hermeneutics appeared in the second volume of the *Scrinium Erasmianum* (Leiden: Brill, 1969).

The choice of title for Rabil's volume is unfortunate, for the title creates expectations that the book does not meet. In fact, Rabil has concentrated on the Pauline materials with which he is most familiar. These, Erasmus' several prefaces to the *Novum Instrumentum* of 1516 and following—in particular the *Ratio seu Methodus* of 1518—and a couple of the earlier works, notably the *Enchiridion*, constitute his principal sources. The paucity of references to the Erasmian handling of the Gospels, the absence of any specific consideration of the content of the *philosophia Christi*, which must lie at the very heart of Erasmus' relationship to the New Testament, are serious defects in a work whose title lays claim to a certain comprehensiveness. More technical questions of text criticism are also left aside. No information is given about the source of the Greek text of 1516 beyond a reference to bibliography (p. 93); and although Rabil devotes two of his six chapters to the methodology of the humanist scholar, he fails to grapple satisfactorily with the character of Erasmus' paraphrase.

The subtitle indicates the author's real interest. In proposing a study of Erasmus' intellectual development, Rabil's thesis is "that religion and humanism are the proper poles in relation to which . . . [this] . . . must be understood" (p. x). In presenting Erasmus' evolution as the resolution of the tension between these poles, Rabil is not breaking new ground. Throughout the first half of the book (chapters 1 and 2), his indebtedness to Johan Huizinga

and E. H. Harbison is quite apparent and duly credited. The essay's chief merits are that it has assembled much material and drawn attention to recent bibliography in numerous and ample footnotes. These last, indeed, may make for some readers the modest price of the volume.

The second half of the study offers more original material. In three chapters, Rabil draws upon his work on Romans and Galatians in a discussion of aspects of the Erasmian hermeneutical principles and method. A final chapter offers a contrast of "humanist religious consciousness and evangelical protestantism," in the form of a comparison of Erasmus' work with Luther's first Romans lectures (1515-1516). Because it is known that from chapter 9 until the end of the epistle Luther worked in the presence of the Erasmian text and notes, Rabil has found an original and interesting point from which to view the theological differences of the two men before the events of 1517 onwards.

In his sketch of Erasmus' hermeneutic (chapter 3), Rabil acknowledges his indebtedness to Payne and rightly observes that, although after discovering Valla's Notes on the New Testament Erasmus gives more heed than in the *Enchiridion* to the literal sense, the spiritual (both the allegorical and the tropological) receives the greater weight throughout his exegetical career. The reader may be misled, however, by Rabil's placing of the well-known distich on the four-fold sense of Scripture in the mouth of Nicholas of Lyra (p. 101, n. 3): although the latter cites it in his Postils on Galatians, its author has been identified by De Lubac (*Histoire de l'Exégèse Médiévale*, v.1/1, p. 23) as Augustine of Dacia, who first published it a half-century before Nicholas as a mnemonic device. In this same chapter, Rabil seems to imply an Erasmian distinction between the literal and historical senses (p. 109f.): to the best of my knowledge, these terms were used by him interchangeably.

Chapters 4 and 5, as has been said, draw upon the author's work as translator of Erasmus. The important and ever-increasing place accorded in the Annotations to Patristic exegetes is documented by a statistical survey of specific citations. One wishes, however, that he had carried his study a step further, and determined the weight of authority of the respective sources. Does the preponderance of Chrysostom in later editions, for example, imply a shift in interpretation, or merely reflect increased acquaintance by Erasmus the editor?

In the context of Erasmus' choice of Romans for the first of his running glosses, subsequently termed paraphrases (pp. 129-132), Rabil posits the existence of a Pauline revival in the early 16th century. That John Colet's Oxford lectures on Paul influenced Erasmus' own development is integral to Rabil's thesis; few readers will disagree with this point, but both the question posed by Rabil, and his solutions, are in need of revision. Is it true, as he argues, upon the apparent authority of Beryl Smalley, that "from the end of the Patristic period until the generation of Erasmus there were very few commentaries on Paul's epistle (p. 130)? Even a cursory glance at Stegmüller's *Repertorium biblicum mediæ ævi* will refute this assertion; and indeed, Rabil quotes Miss Smalley, this time more accurately, on the next page: "it is no accident that the two favourite books for commentators were the Psalter and the Pauline Epistles"! It is apparent that Rabil has confused the issue of biblical commentaries as such, and the critical study of the Greek original of the epistles: it is true that the latter was uncommon among mediaeval exegetes, but then John Colet himself did not read Greek. It is also not clear what relevance for the argument Rabil sees in the fact

that there were only (!) three Greek Psalters printed before 1500. As for the supposed fear of contamination of heresy implicit in Greek studies, one would suppose the same factor would have discouraged even more, though it did not, the study of Hebrew. Here Rabil is again misreading his source, this time W. Schwarz (*Principles and Problems of Biblical Translation*, p. 92f.). Schwarz makes his points—which are contestable in any case—specifically with reference to the early 16th century, not to the mediaeval period to which Rabil applies them.

Passing to matters less substantial, one must praise the editors for the very attractive presentation of this first monograph in their series. At the same time, Rabil's decision not to print a bibliography is regrettable; and the absence of a biblical index is a serious defect, as is his habit of citing Erasmus only by reference to the Leiden edition, without in most cases identifying the biblical passage under discussion. The abundant translations of the sources are a praiseworthy feature in an age when too few readers will be able to decipher the original; but in the notes one would prefer the Greek or Latin expression in question (e.g., p. 124, nn. 44, 46, 47, 49).

To conclude, although there are positive features to this study, its defects, together with its too frequent lack of originality, suggest that students would be better sent to the older studies Rabil himself has used.

R. GERALD HOBBS, *Institut d'Histoire de la Réformation, Genève*

Alexander Leggatt. *Citizen Comedy in the Age of Shakespeare*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1973. Pp. 167. \$10.00.

I believe that in the judging (sometimes called "reviewing") of books of criticism on the works of particular authors, of books purporting to investigate literary genres, and of books which set out to survey literary "periods" there are two questions which the reviewer should ask himself: first, is the task which the critic (or literary historian) has set himself worth doing and, second, if so, is the task well done? Of Professor Leggatt's book I would say that the answer is "Yes" to both questions. I would like to give an unqualified "Yes" to both these questions, for the book is finely written (without academic jargon), finely researched, and it displays a vast knowledge of the drama, stage conditions, and society of the times. But another question arises: how much of it is true? Or, to put it in other words: how much with all our patient, scholarly research and our imaginative attempts to put ourselves back into "the age of Shakespeare" do we really gain in true confidence that we know the age and have a "feeling" for it? Professor Leggatt I believe is well aware of this critical bugbear, for on the opening page of his "Introduction" he comes out modestly to define "citizen comedy": "For this writer it means comedy set in a predominantly middle-class social milieu" (p. 3). But Professor Leggatt is sensitive enough to his subject to realize that such simple definitions are indeed too simple; so he considers the matter at more length in his "Introduction," coming forward, for example, with the following:

It is most convenient, then, to define the social milieu of citizen comedy by exclusion. I have selected plays which do not deal predominantly with the court or the aristocracy,