poetry, and illustrates what that method, rigorously applied, can do. Demonstrating impeccable scholarship throughout the work, Professor Smith has shown the serious reader of Du Bellay a way of studying *Les Regrets* and other Renaissance texts. More fashionable critical approaches ignore this method at their peril.

The study is usefully supplemented for scholars by the inclusion of Du Bellay's *Poematum libri quatuor*, the *Tumulus Henrici secundi* (relatively inaccessible Latin poems, provided with English translations), the *Xenia, seu illustrium quorundam nominum allusiones*, and finally, an important autobiographical elegy, all of which considerably enhance the value of this addition to the series of "Etudes de philologie et d'histoire" published by the Librairie Droz.

LANE M. HELLER, *The University of Western Ontario*

Isaac Casaubon. *De satyrica Graecorum poesi et Romanorum satira*. Ed. Peter E. Medine. 1605; facsimile rpt. Delmar, N.Y.: Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints, 1973. Pp. xvii, 356. \$20.

In the absence of any modern edition or English translation of Casaubon's treatise on satire and the satyr-play, a facsimile reproduction serves primarily to increase accessibility, as Peter E. Medine has clearly been aware in preparing this volume, which contains a highly readable text, handsomely reproduced, and a brief businesslike introduction. Medine provides a sketch of Casaubon's life, understandably indebted to Mark Pattison's authoritative biography, as well as a cursory account of the controversy over the origin of satire to which this essay, conclusively identifying satire as a native Roman genre, constitutes the definitive contribution. Apart from a rather capricious outline, no substitute for Casaubon's comprehensive chapter headings, there is little concerning the work itself. For the most part, the reader is left on his own with the text, and while this satisfies the main object of getting it into his hands, he might be forgiven for wondering whether the editor believes that the essay deserves a wider readership for any but historical reasons.

Despite its substantial influence, direct and indirect, upon literary theory, as manifested most notably in Dryden's *Discourse on satire*, when the work is judged, as it must be, from the vantage point of modern scholarship, its importance is indeed strictly historical. Many of its arguments have long since been taken for granted (a measure of its impact), others superseded. Yet in practice an active historical sense need not be sustained as a reminder that the essay is still worth reading, and herein lies the reason why its reissue is to be welcomed warmly rather than dutifully.

Casaubon's treatise shows us a mind of extraordinary capacity and sensitivity presiding over its subject with unobtrusive mastery. Not only does he have the full range of classical literature and scholarship at his fingertips, as the resourcefulness and aptness of his citations demonstrate, but he organizes his unwieldy material with such skill that his thoughts seem to unfold spontaneously. And because the argument is so carefully controlled, he can digress to emend an obscure text, for example—without distorting the shape of the whole. The general harmony of form and content is typified by the dichotomous structure: the case for the independence of satyr-drama and satire is fundamentally reinforced by treating each

in a separate book. But there are formal effects with less obvious influence on the presentation: thus Aristotle's *Poetics* figures in both the opening and concluding chapters.

The keen aesthetic sense which this subtle management of structure reveals expresses itself in other ways. Despite the heavily antiquarian emphasis, one occasionally meets with genuine critical insights, such as the observation concerning Euripides' *Cyclops* that the intermediate *ethos* of the satyrs (between Odysseus and Polyphemus) is reflected in the action, since they are set free, but "aliena virtute" and "casu fortuito" (p. 216). Also remarkable is Casaubon's power of description. The first chapter's account of the origin of satyr-drama, for example, contains some singularly vivid passages, and when he subsequently analyzes a classical engraving of a Bacchic scene in relation to written authorities—an unconventional and imaginative undertaking—he proves adept at depicting intricate detail with absolute clarity.

A strong case might be made, I think, allowing for the peculiarities of Renaissance Latin, in support of Scaliger's opinion (as reported by Pattison) that Casaubon's style is excellent. Within the limits set by its purpose, it is energetic and various, frequently elegant, and always fluent. His command of idiom is impressive, and he is capable of using figures of speech sensitively to influence tone, as when he dismisses Isidorus' misunderstanding of satire with good-humoured tolerance: "sed e faece haurit bonus Isidorus, ut saepe" (p. 279).

The almost personal relation with Isidorus palpable here implies not only intimacy, but involvement, and there are more direct expressions of the personal elsewhere: religious references, evincing a strong but not overbearing piety; occasional flashes of humour, apparently for its own sake; and, particularly, passionate though judicious indignation against fellow scholars, usually those who have espoused the derivation of satire from the satyr-play. When such outbursts employ, as they sometimes do, irony and other rhetorical devices, they acquire a satirical quality, and this suggests another dimension to Casaubon's involvement in his material.

It is hard to resist the impression that his scholarly interest in satire has its roots in temperament. Certainly it extends beyond this essay, which indeed was written to accompany his edition of Persius. Casaubon planned an edition of Juvenal; he also edited Theophrastus' *Characters* and Suetonius' *Lives*, works which, while hardly satire, do deal in manners and morals, the stuff of satire. This proves nothing, of course: all sorts of authors received his scholarly attention. Towards the end of his life, however, Casaubon became, briefly, a religious pamphleteer, and while the role was not of his own choosing, one suspects that it may have suited him better than he would have cared to admit. He would probably have been similarly displeased to think that, for all the soundness and originality of his scholarship in his own day, his special affinity with his subject would play the greatest part in keeping his essay on satire alive for future readers. But perhaps not.

RICHARD W. HILLMAN, *University of Toronto*

Harry Loewen, *Luther and the Radicals*. Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfred Laurier University Publications, 1974. Pp. 208. \$3.50 (paper). \$5.95 (cloth).