By far the most intriguing part of the book is contained in passing references to the religious significance of mathematics and its history. Ramus’s conversion from a positive to a negative view of the Greek mathematical tradition, Goulding notes, closely paralleled his religious conversion from Roman Catholic to Protestant. Surely it is no coincidence that Catholic Ramus’s praise for tradition, and acclaimed authorities like Euclid who handed down true knowledge through the generations, was replaced by Protestant Ramus’s call for a return to an unadulterated original purity. The connection between mathematics and faith becomes even more suggestive if we consider that in the same years Christopher Clavus was laying the foundations for the great Jesuit mathematical school, famous for its close and fierce adherence to Euclid. This suggests that the stakes in the debates over mathematics and its history went well beyond questions of the reform of the universities and straight to the heart of the religious divisions that were tearing apart Western Christendom. One would have liked to hear much more about this, but even as it stands the book provides intriguing clues on the interrelationship of mathematics and faith at a time of religious struggle.

Defending Hypatia is a book of meticulous scholarship, based on a close reading of difficult and—in some cases—largely forgotten texts. Goulding does a commendable job of tracing the complex relationships among them. Indeed, he exhibits a natural affinity to the humanist practices of textual recovery and criticism. The end result is a study of relatively narrow focus but impressive depth, which can serve as a starting point for a broader study of the place of mathematics in the religious and cultural life of the Renaissance.

Amir Alexander
University of California, Los Angeles


Originally published in French in 2004 under the title La Genèse théologico-politique de l’État moderne, Bernard Bourdin’s study of early modern political theology takes as its point of departure the controversy that erupted in the aftermath of the Gunpowder Plot. During the period 1606–1610, King James I of England engaged Cardinal Robert Bellarmine in a wide-ranging, no-holds-barred controversy stemming from the issue of the loyalty owed by Roman Catholic subjects to their sovereign. A great deal of ink was spilled on both sides addressing questions concerning the source of princely power, the constitutional authority of natural law, the “two kingdoms” of spiritual and temporal rule, the distinction between a visible and an invisible church, the relative merits of royal versus papal ecclesiastical supremacy, as well as the definition of catholicity and possible grounds for religious toleration. Bourdin situates his inquiry with particular reference to two conflicting accounts of the secularization thesis by German scholars: Carl Schmitt’s Politische Theologie (1922) and Hans Blumenberg’s Die Legitimität der Neuzeit (1966). In order to buttress his strong affirmation of the theological sources of modernity Bourdin interacts extensively with scholarship of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries—indeed on this particular theme one is not in the least surprised to find oneself in the company of S. R. Gardiner, Henri-Xavier Arquilliére, John Neville Figgis, Ernst H. Kantorowicz, and Francis Oakley. Bourdin’s book is a vigorous foray into a theme of longstanding interest among scholars of early modernity, and unabashedly reasserts the derivation of modern concepts of sovereignty and liberty from profoundly theological presuppositions: clearly Schmitt rules here. Throughout the monograph there is a strain of implicit agreement with recent revisionist historiography of “re-enchantment” such as one finds, for example, among the historians of the so-called “Long Reformation” with their dismissal of the anachronism of the secularization thesis, or in Charles Taylor’s argument in A Secular Age (2007).

Bourdin’s monograph consists of six chapters. The first three set the stage with a survey of the theological implications of the Henrician and Elizabethan claims to royal headship of the Church of England, an account of James’s encounter with Presbyterian resistance, and an exploration of the distinctively irenical streak of his ecclesiastical policy. The later chapters explore Bellarmine’s political ecclesiology in light of papal claims to indirect temporal jurisdiction, James’s hermeneutics of scripture in his Trew Law of Free Monarchies (1598), and their sharp controversy over the conflicting claims of royal and papal authority in the Apologie for the Oath of Allegiance (1608). Bourdin traces an interesting parallel and contrast between the responses of “Puritan Jesuits” and “Gallican royalists.” There are a few slips of diction and typography, some no doubt owing to the vagaries of translation. Reference is made to a “conciliatory” form of church government where the sense of the passage plainly demands “conciliar,” and to the “Episcopal Church” where “episcopacy,” in the Scottish context, would be considerably less anachronistic; the outmoded and imprecise term “Anglican” is employed throughout the discussion of Tudor church politics; the claim that both Adam Blackwood and William Barclay “became French” is slightly jarring when their shift of allegiance to another sovereign is clearly the event in question. At one point the author confuses William Cecil with his son Robert (p. 54). This reviewer is obliged to admit to being somewhat disconcerted by the discovery that half of a chapter devoted to describing the political theology of Richard Hooker consists largely of a summary of a portion of the argument of the his own monograph, Richard Hooker’s Doctrine of the Royal Supremacy (1990), which links Hooker’s defense of the royal headship of the English Church with his
christological, trinitarian, soteriological, and ecclesiological presuppositions. Numerous selected quotations from the works of Hooker, Archbishop John Whitgift, and the Disciplinarian Puritan Thomas Cartwright—some twenty in number—are, without exception, quoted verbatim from this monograph without acknowledgment of their source in the notes.

This complaint aside, Bourdin’s study is stimulating and interesting, and curiously timely for all its close attention to scholarly debates of generations past. Perhaps historiography, rather like Friedrich Nietzsche’s account of history itself, is subject to some deep pattern of eternal recurrence. The current vigorous debate among historians of early modernity concerning the secularization thesis—‘enchantment’ versus ‘disenchantment’—certainly raises once again some of the foundational questions concerning the origins of modern political theory. According to participants in this early seventeenth-century debate about the loyalty oath, one man’s secularization of ecclesiastical authority is another’s sacralization of the civil power. When viewed through the lens either of recent challenges to the Weberian thesis among historians of the Reformation both in England (Alexandra Walsham) and on the continent (Jonathan Clark), or of an inversion of traditional readings of the Counter-Reformation in favor of a Catholic contribution toward a secularized modernity, any serious attempt to re-engage with the profoundly theological substance of two such eminent early modern political theorists as James and Bellarmine can only be greeted with gratitude.

**Torrance Kirby**
McGill University


This book advances an intriguing thesis regarding gift-exchange in modern European social thinking. According to Harry Liebersohn, notions of gift-giving that were abundant in the premodern era declined by the early nineteenth century, but subsequently revived and came to a full fruition in Marcel Mauss’s wide-ranging study, _The Gift: Forms and Functions of Exchange in Archaic Societies_ (1925; English translation, 1954).

The thesis is explored in five sections, each focusing on a major tradition of European thought. The first chapter sets the stage by looking at the nineteenth-century utilitarian critique of the traditional gift, which viewed it as an epitome of corruption rather than a primary social bond. Next Liebersohn turns to earlier periods and to the liberal tradition (Thomas Hobbes, Adam Smith), which in his reading emerges as a broad approach that not only advanced notions of possessive individualism and self-interest but also was cognizant of the value of gift offering and mutual exchange—an understanding that in the nineteenth century re-emerged among German historical economists. Chapter three delves into theories of primitive communism, focusing on the civic humanism of Adam Ferguson, the evolutionary theory of Lewis Henry Morgan, and its subsequent elaboration by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. While offering a powerful alternative to the liberal vision of self-interest, this tradition, with its formulation of altruistic archaic communities devoid of politics, power, or conflict, further diminished European thinking about gifts. Chapter four focuses on the innovativeness of the founders of modern anthropology who, based on their explorations of rituals that resonated with acts of gift exchange, articulated a far more nuanced account than the one entailed in either utilitarian models or communitarian schemes of societal evolution. In the Indian potlatch documented by Franz Boas, the sexual favors of the Banaros (New Guinea) described in the work of Richard Thurnwald, and the Kula in Bronislaw Malinowski’s study of communities in the Trobriand Islands, these anthropologists found competition, power, status, and self-interest interwoven into and sustained by acts of gift exchange that created ties of commitment and obligation. The final chapter rounds up the treatment of a return of the gift with a discussion of Mauss, placing his ideas in the context of existing accounts of gifts as well as the politics of the postwar period, his personal life, and especially his close and intimate ties with intellectuals in France and abroad. A thinker rather than an explorer immersed in fieldwork, Mauss’s innovation and originality ultimately resided in his synthesis of an enormous amount of research into a single whole, pinpointing the dynamics of gift exchange as a generalized and globalized principle rather than a distinctive, localized form of exchange.

Focusing as it does on major thinkers across large tracts of time, the book provides a concise if disparate exposition rather than a full-scale study of thinking about gifts since the seventeenth century. Questions linger about the wider diffusion of ideas and notions of gifts among lesser-known thinkers or even the populace at large, and about the dissemination of ideas about gift giving in looser and more intricate forms, and in a broader range of literary genres and texts. The argument about the retreat of thinking on gifts in the face of liberal and communitarian thinking appears overstated and overlooks subtle notions of gifts and gift-exchange that permeated the traditional but still pervasive understanding of “generosity” or even the novel concept of “altruism.” Nor is it clear, given the inven
tiveness of anthropological thinking on gift-exchange, that these formulations amounted to a “return” to earlier articulations of the gift. Whether what we observe is the waning and subsequent return of notions of the gift, or more properly the shifts and mutations of a set of ideas involving gift-giving and reciprocal obligations, remains an open question.

For all this, the book provides a perceptive account that traces the genealogy of an idea commonly associated with a single modern thinker, Mauss, and places it in its broader intellectual context. It offers an important perspective on the gift as an idea and a construct, point-