First, the *Scuole Grandi*, of which the best-known, thanks to Tintoretto, is San Rocco. The oldest of them started as societies for flagellation in the thirteenth century when that activity was accounted pious rather than perverse, but by the sixteenth century they were turning into something like modern service clubs, except that the recipients, as well as the donors, of relief were members.

Secondly, the great hospitals – the *Incurabili*, the *Derelitti*, and the *Mendicanti*, for the poor as well as the sick – founded to meet the harsh challenges of plague, famine, and vagrancy during the sixteenth century. By the century's end, these, along with a number of lesser institutions, had virtually eliminated begging from Venice.

Thirdly, the Jewish banks. After a number of vacillations of policy, the Venetian government in 1573 compelled the Jewish community to provide loans to the poor at a non-profitmaking 5 per cent, but also forewent its own taxing powers, in effect substituting the Jewish banks for the *Monti di Pietà* which performed the same function on the mainland.

Of the wider issues Dr. Pullan raises, perhaps the most interesting is his rejection of a strict dichotomy between "Catholic" and "Protestant" social policies. Discrimination in the bestowal of relief and encouragement of the poor to support themselves were principles advocated as much by Catholics as by Protestants, and the one really "Catholic" attitude found in Venice – the belief that making a donation to charity conferred some spiritual merit on the donor – does not seem to have made much practical difference.

But to make any generalizations on the basis of the Venetian example is hazardous, since Venice, as this study abundantly demonstrates, was exceptional in many ways, even as compared with its own subject territory on the mainland, and interesting for that very reason. Dr. Pullan writes from a knowledge of the Venetian archives that is, to a non-initiate, nothing short of awe-inspiring, and every student of Renaissance social policy will learn much from his findings.

N. WICKENDEN, *University of Alberta*

Fredi Chiappelli. *Nuovi studi sul linguaggio del Machiavelli*. Firenze: Le Monnier, 1969. Pp. 192.

In 1952 Fredi Chiappelli published an incisive monograph on Machiavelli's language, focusing primarily on the style of the *Prince*. The new work under review – which in some ways is perhaps even more penetrating and revealing than the first – deals with the origins and formation of Machiavelli's peculiar stylistic structures, whose history, of course, can be traced only by searching the writings belonging to the earliest period in the Florentine Secretary's varied career. Chiappelli restricts his investigation to a three year span, July 1498–July 1501, as yet not seriously studied by scholars. The results of his minute analysis support the thesis he sets forth at the outset: No stylistic fracture exists between the secretarial and diplomatic writings on the one hand and the masterpieces of later years on the other. This is so even though – no doubt – one can see the style gradually becoming, through an ongoing process of refinement, more finely guarded and effective, while rhetorical devices are ever more consciously and knowingly employed for precise effects.

A brief introductory chapter (pp. 1-11) places in their historical context the heterogeneous writings belonging to the period chosen; a second one (pp. 11-22) defines the means available for a stylistic characterization, which are essentially the numerous corrections made by Machiavelli himself on his manuscripts (each correction obviously reflects a conscious, symptomatic stylistic choice). Two chapters (pp. 23-49) investigate the vocabulary, both in terms of the repertoire of words normally available in the environment of the young Machiavelli, and with regard to the latter's attitude toward latinisms, technical terminology, foreign words, etc., which at the time could be employed to increase and vary the resources of ordinary Tuscan.

The rest of the volume (eleven short chapters condensing a great deal of material) is an analysis of syntactic structures, particularly of the various sentence types (hypothetical, concessive, causal, etc.). It is by means of this decomposition that one can observe in depth the genetic process which was to produce the terse and skillful syntactic architecture characterizing the great prose of the *Prince* and the *Discourses*.

Chiappelli's approach, based necessarily on a thorough classification of the data, is constantly guided by the need to interpret «gli istituti grammaticali in quanto operano dentro la coscienza del Machiavelli e caratterizzano concretamente la sua personalità». The method employed is, on the whole, traditional and modern syntactic theories remain foreign to it. The results, however, show what every good linguist should know, namely that a multiplicity of approaches is possible, and that different methods can yield equally good fruit.

The book is in every regard eminently readable, and certainly provides – together with the earlier monograph by the same author – an exemplary means for a full understanding of the linguistic identity of Machiavelli both at the time of his skillful *negotia* and, further, of his later productive *otia*.

GIANRENZO P. CLIVIO, *University of Toronto*

Jacques Grévin. *César*. Edition critique avec Introduction et Notes par Ellen S. Ginsberg. Textes Littéraires Français, 179. Geneva: Droz, 1971. Pp. 185.

César is the second modern play to treat of the assassination of Julius Caesar, and the first to do so in the vernacular (Grévin's teacher, Marc-Antoine Muret, had composed, ca. 1544, *Julius Caesar*, a Neo-Latin tragedy). It is also one of the earliest classical tragedies written in French. The play was performed February 16, 1561 (n.s.), and, along with Grévin's comedies, was published in Paris almost a year later. Reprinted twice in the next half-century, like all French dramatic literature before Corneille, it was then consigned to several centuries of oblivion.

Professor Ginsberg's intention has clearly been to provide us with "everything we always wanted to know about *César*." The relatively short text (1103 lines) is accompanied by a judiciously selected *apparatus criticus* drawn from, *inter alia*, Grévin's own annotated and emended copy of the first edition. Copious notes give relevant source materials, and there is both glossary and bibliography. Grévin's important "Brief discours pour l'intelligence de ce theatre," in both its complete and truncated forms, precedes the text, and is itself pre-