late universal concepts while the historical sciences try to explain reality in its individuality.

History is written with a personal bias. Iglesia, more honest than most, recognizes the impossibility of writing about a historical event in a completely objective way. For him a bias is necessary to be able to select from the material available and to choose that which is important and significant. Iglesia is against those who pretend objectivity. He alludes to an American writer (C. H. Haring, whose book he reviews) and criticizes his "impartiality," which in fact disguises his bias against the Spaniards.

Iglesia wants to understand the personal bias of a Bernal Díaz writing about Cortés, or of a Columbus writing about himself. The result of this understanding is history at its literary best. The Columbus that emerges in his *The Man Columbus* is, as the title of the essay aptly indicates, a man, full of weaknesses, greedy and calculating, interested in obtaining gold to satisfy his own need and that of the king. [A man "... simple, dry, unemotional, hard, egotistical," who "sees the Indians as objects, as things that can be exploited for profit." The Admiral of the Ocean Sea is not really a Christian interested in providing the king with the means of conquering Jerusalem. Rather, he is trying to regain his lost possessions and honors taken away from him by Bobadilla.] This Columbus is quite different from the romantic figure created by writers such as Menéndez Pelayo, Humboldt and Washington Irving. Which is the real Columbus? I am drawn towards Iglesia's troubled and very human Columbus, a more believable and even admirable figure than the folk-hero of most textbooks.

The essay on Hernán Cortés is a penetrating study of the man through his letters to the king of Spain. All the characteristics of the conqueror of Mexico appear in this excellent portrait: the sober, restrained soldier, aware of the challenges and of his capacity to deal with them; the leader, able to gain friends among Spaniards and Indians alike; the idealist, full of admiration for the Aztecs and desirous to keep the empire intact, so that he could assimilate it into the Christian empire; the over-confident Cortés, whose blind faith in his own prestige and in the success of his enterprise made him unaware of the tensions that would eventually destroy the empire he had conquered; the ambitious servant of the king, striving to save the treasure obtained from the Aztecs; and the ferocious and destructive conquistador. The complete man emerges, one more human and credible than either Bernal Díaz del Castillo or Gómara managed to produce.

Iglesia's Spanish prose is a delight to read. It is clear, suggestive and entertaining. L. B. Simpson has captured these qualities in his excellent English translation. It is evidently the product of both a comprehension of the original text, and an understanding of the personality and intent of the author.

PEDRO R. LEÓN, *University of Toronto*

David Galloway, ed. *The Elizabethan Theatre II*. Toronto: MacMillans of Canada, 1970. Pp. xiii, 148. \$5.95.

For the last three summers Professor David Galloway has organized an international conference on Elizabethan theatre at the University of Waterloo and has edited the proceedings for MacMillans of Canada. Volume II, covering the 1969 conference, is a handsome book with eight good articles, a judicious introduction by Galloway himself, and an index.

It suffers, however, from a certain lack of focus. Only two of its papers are on the conference topic of Elizabethan acting companies, and these two do not include the most valuable of the papers nor the most provocative.

Most valuable because it considers new evidence in an area where facts are notoriously scarce is D. F. Rowan's examination of hitherto unnoticed drawings in the Inigo Jones/John Webb collection of Worcester College, Oxford. These depict plans and elevations for a theatre to combine a typically Elizabethan stage with a semi-circular, neo-Vitruvian auditorium. Their provenance and date are still uncertain, but Dr. Rowan speculates cautiously that they may provide a "missing link" between De Witt's drawing of the *Swan* in 1596 and Jones' designs for the *Cockpit-in-Court* about 1630, suggesting that the basic elements of the Elizabethan stage were constant throughout the fifty years between 1590 and the Civil War.

Speculation on this scale is questioned, however, in J. A. Lavin's provocative "The Elizabethan Theatre and the Inductive Method," which complains that theatre historians too often generalize from inadequate evidence and tend to ignore the special circumstances which surround each event. As a warning against dogmatism and shallow research, the complaint is salutary; but Lavin's conclusion that one should only generalize from sufficient evidence is a commonplace which begs the question that one can never be sure what evidence suffices in any particular instance and that (as Peter Davidson points out in his banquet speech) speculation even on "insufficient" grounds is a necessary activity of the humanist – and, I would add, the scientific – mind. It is an activity that frequently brings new evidence to light because, more often than not, research is a dialectic.

Trevor Lennam's careful compilation of facts about the Children of Paul's would have Lavin's approval, and R. A. Foakes' thesis that there were at least four distinct phases of Boys' Company tragedy in the decade after 1600 neatly defuses Lavin's objection that in the past Foakes has generalized too much about the parodic effect of child actors. Lise-Lone Marker's discussion of Elizabethan acting seems more open to Lavin's criticism, however, because her assumption that Elizabethan rhetoric books can be a guide to contemporary acting seems at first sight to repeat the errors now repudiated by Bertram Joseph. However, her thesis that Elizabethan *theorists* interpreted natural acting as imitation of an ideal or type, not as verisimilitude, seems to me incontrovertible; and her inference that this must have influenced acting to some extent is probable, if unproven. She does not generalize from the probability as Joseph did, but cautions that we have no evidence for specific performances and that great variety would be possible even within the rhetorical conventions.

The remaining papers cannot be discussed in Lavin's terms because they are not on theatre history. Samuel Schoenbaum considers legends about the relationship of Shakespeare and Jonson, and Bernard Beckerman analyzes *Measure for Measure* as an experiment foreshadowing *The Winter's Tale*. Both are good papers, but they illustrate the lack of common focus which makes this second volume inferior to the excellent *Elizabethan Theatre I*. I could wish, moreover, that Professor Galloway had queried the barbarisms of "flaunt" for "flout" (p. 93) and "disinterestedness" meaning "lack of concern" (p. 137).

R. B. PARKER, *University of Toronto*