found in the very fine edition of Christiane Deluz (Paris, 2000)? This is not to suggest that there is not a very great deal of value to be found in the *mouvance* of this most fluid of medieval works, whose "textual isotopes" (in Iain Higgins's memorable phrase) provide such useful evidence of the heterogeneity of late-medieval reading practices. Pinto's avowed purpose, however, is to discover the extent to which *The Book*'s author "was acquainted with that great medieval civilization" of the Arabic-speaking Islamic world (p. 57), in which case use of the earliest versions of the text would have been more prudent. A further limitation in Pinto's study appears in her use of modern French and English translations of Arabic travel literature in place of scholarly editions (ibn Battûta, p. 22 n. 43; ibn Fadlân, p. 32 n. 67; ibn Jubayr, p. 24 n. 51).

In a passage that recalls the efforts of Asín Palacios to provide an Islamic context for Dante's evocation of a universe moved by the power of divine love, Pinto recalls the writings of the early-thirteenth-century Andalusian philosopher ibn al-'Arabi, who wrote that the devout heart contains within it "a temple for idols, and the pilgrim's Ka'aba, and the tables of the Torah and the book of the Qur'an" (quoted by Pinto, p. 43). Pinto writes that "ibn al-'Arabi's footsteps seem to have been followed by the author of *Mandeville's Travels* when dealing with other religious beliefs" (p. 43). As several scholars (most notably, Andrew Gow) have observed, however, the ecumenism of *The Book of John Mandeville,* remarkable as it is, has one very pronounced limitation: that is, its passionate anti-Judaism. I point out this discrepancy, not because it invalidates Pinto's project, but because it highlights what a detailed study of *The Book of John Mandeville* in the context of the *rihla* genre actually *can* accomplish: that is, comparative insights into how different cultures resolve the competing demands of cultural diversity. That would be a project truly worth doing.

Suzanne Conklin Akbari, University of Toronto

Riccardo Quinto, *Scholastica: Storia di un concetto.* (Subsidia Mediaevalia Patavina, 2.) Padua: Il Poligrafo, 2001. Paper. Pp. 477; 6 black-and-white figures and tables. €30.99.

This book is made up of four chapters. The first three, each of which is followed by an appendix containing sources or further information, originally appeared as articles in *Medioevo* in 1991, 1993, and 1996. The first chapter is dedicated to uses of words with "scholastic" as a root from Latin antiquity to the end of the thirteenth century. Quinto intends first of all to discredit the assumption that the category "scholasticism" developed in the Renaissance with a polemical meaning in relation to medieval culture. On the one hand, a "scholastic" culture also existed in the Renaissance; on the other, the terms *schola* and *scholasticus* (as adjective and substantive) have a continuous history from antiquity. More importantly, polemical and ideological uses of *scholasticus* and *scholastice* were already in use in the twelfth century: Gerhoch of Reichersberg opposed *scholastice legere* to *ecclesiastice legere;* Peter of Vienna and Walter of St. Victor, *scholastici doctores* to *ecclesiastici doctores.* Although Thomas Aquinas did not see a contrast between Christian and scholastic culture, Bonaventure did perceive a contrast between *theologia scholastica* and *theologia mystica,* a position followed by Gerson.

The second chapter is dedicated to Joachim of Fiore and humanism. The teaching of the *magistri scholarum,* based on a literal reading of Scripture, was recognized and respected by Joachim, but only with the intervention of *doctores spirituales* would it be transformed into a more profound and truly salvific spiritual understanding (p. 103). Quinto sees in Joachim "some themes destined to develop much further, and to be interpreted in a more acutely polemical way" (p. 104). With Gerson, the distinction between *scholastica theologia* and *mystica theologia* acquired a clearly ideological connotation: "theology, namely,

knowledge of God and of the truths of faith, found its own highest possibility not in the exercise of the intellect but in affective union with God through moral conversion" (p. 115). With Gerson, we can backdate by about a century the polemical use of *theologia scholastica,* normally placed not earlier than the fifteenth century, and reexamine the idea that antischolastic movements are particularly characteristic of the humanist environment. What would be seen as the negative characteristics of scholastic culture by Erasmus and Cornelius Agrippa—litigiousness, showing off, technicality and abstruseness of vocabulary, linguistic barbarism, and absence of a critical sense—were already pointed out by Gerson.

In the third chapter, from Luther to the eighteenth century, Quinto reviews the negative vision of medieval culture in Reformed circles and the reevaluation of its philosophical inheritance, particularly of Aristotelian metaphysics, in some Lutheran universities. This reevaluation was initiated through Jesuit and Spanish humanist scholasticism, whose representatives were called "neoscholastics" by some Protestant historians in the 1720s. This constituted the German scholasticism that represented *Schulmetaphysik* up to the time of Kant. Quinto then examines the construction in Catholic circles in the years before and after 1520 of the conceptual pairing of *theologia scholastica* and *positiva,* which played a part in the Catholic attempt to propose a theology capable of integrating into the tradition the philological-historical skills required by humanists. *Theologia positiva* is that new theology, which presented a historical and literary approach and demanded a return to the Fathers, while scholastic or speculative theology was seen as a medieval tradition of applying philosophy to discussion of theological arguments. Further on, Quinto considers the works of two Catholic historians, Richard Simon and Louis Ellies Du Pin, who analyzed the "scientificness" (from a historical perspective) of the approach taken by "scholastic theologians" to the sacred text and who rendered—not surprisingly—a diverse, but on the whole negative, judgment on it. Given that the works of Ellies Du Pin were much used by Johann Brucker in his *Histoire critique de la philosophie* (1742–44), it is possible, according to Quinto, to reconstruct "a firm link between ecclesiastical learning, systematic theology, and philosophical historiography in the medieval period" (p. 288), concerning which the Catholic and Protestant positions were not necessarily opposed. The chapter closes with an analysis of the *Discours sur la théologie positive et scolastique* of the Benedictine Rémi Ceillier. While he did not condemn scholastic theology in itself, and recognized the role of Thomas Aquinas in reconciling the scholastics with the Gospel, he repeated the classic humanist complaint that scholastic works lowered literary standards and thus the emotional, moral, and aesthetic involvement of the reader. He believed that the Fathers, the humanists, and the moderns transmitted the authentic Christian tradition; medieval scholasticism thus disappeared, according to Quinto, "into the black hole of history" (p. 295).

The fourth chapter confronts the question of how historians of medieval philosophy from the eighteenth century to today—in particular, Maurice De Wulf, Martin Grabmann, Friedrich Ueberweg, Nicola Abbagnano, L. M. de Rijk, Georg Wieland, and Juliusz Domański—have understood their own role, especially in relation to the various notions of scholasticism they have maintained. Quinto assesses the positions and ideological background of these historians with balance and critical awareness, recognizing the particular achievement of each in the development of a self-conscious approach to the discipline. In this chapter and in the epilogue that closes the book, the author puts forward his own notion of scholasticism, wishing both to respect medieval usage and to help frame contemporary research in the history of medieval philosophy. The key interpretative concept for Quinto is the characterization of scholastic culture as distinguished by its theoretical character and by its links with the university world. From this derives the impossibility of continuing to use the notion "scholastic" as a historiographical category that encompasses

a homogeneous historical unity, belonging exclusively to the medieval period, that is, "medieval philosophy"—a usage that has, in fact, already been largely abandoned in recent decades in specialist studies. It also follows that there is a Middle Ages that is not scholastic and a scholasticism (or better, more than one) that is not medieval. Finally, "scholasticism" needs to be differentiated by disciplinary perspective, according to which there is no "scholasticism" per se, not even a "scholastic philosophy," but a "scholastic theology," "scholastic logic," "scholastic law," etc.

The method employed by Quinto is multidisciplinary. On one side, he makes ample use of the technical instruments of historical lexicography, whether engaging in quantitative research or in analyzing the changing meanings of words that involve "scholastic," particularly in relation to connected or contrasting concepts. On the other, he puts emphasis on the institutional and didactic practices of the medieval schools, with their precise technical vocabulary. He also analyzes and questions the ideological and historiographical assumptions explicit or implicit in the activity of individual authors whom he examines.

In conclusion, this is a work of great breadth and learning within many different spheres. A few details struck me in reading: limited synthesis in the third chapter, a certain discontinuity between the third and fourth chapters, and limited attention in the fourth chapter to studies of the history of medieval philosophy in the Francophone area by comparison with those in the German language. These are not crucial, however. The book is of great usefulness in fostering a critical sense of the ambiguities and historical conditioning behind the notion of scholasticism as well as the richness and value of it in both the past and the present.

Luisa Valente, Università di Roma

Larry Scanlon and James Simpson, eds., *John Lydgate: Poetry, Culture, and Lancastrian England*. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 2006. Pp. vi, 314. $65 (cloth); $30 (paper).

The point of departure for this collection is the accurate assertion that Lydgate is both marginal and central: marginal in that he has long been consigned to the ranks of minor poets, yet central, given the size, range, and ambition of his poetry and prose and their relevance to an astonishing range of individuals and institutions in fifteenth-century England. The collection's goal is to remedy the neglect into which Lydgate has fallen, "by taking [him] seriously as a major poet" (p. 6) and in so doing to fill a gaping hole in our understanding of Middle English literary history. With that aspiration, this smart and shrewdly assembled collection joins the ranks of a number of recent books and essays reassessing Lydgate's significance, particularly by viewing him as more than just a propagandist for the Lancastrian cause and by countering earlier, often dismissive, judgments of his literary value.

That Lydgate has received remarkably little critical attention is a clear point in favor of this volume, and by way of introduction the coeditors provide a cogent account of the causes for that neglect, tracing Lydgate's critical fortunes and usefully placing his critical reception within the context of the broader fate of Middle English literature. Scanlon and Simpson show that as early as the sixteenth century Lydgate rated as little more than Chaucer's foil, was further relegated to obscurity by post-Reformation and humanist anti-Catholicism, and fared no better at the hands of nineteenth-century philologists (whose editions, nonetheless, made his works available to us) or twentieth-century formalists. By 1932 most of his writings had been published, but the first monograph on Lydgate did not appear until 1952 (Walter Schirmer's *John Lydgate: Ein Kulturbild aus dem 15. Jahrhundert*) and the second not until the publication some twenty years later of Derek Pearsall's