BOOK REVIEWS

Isaac Abrahamszoon Massa. **A Short History of the Beginnings and Origins of These Present Wars in Moscow under the Reign of Various Sovereigns down to the Year 1610.** Translated and with an introduction by G. Edward Orchard (Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1982). Pp. 235, 15 pp. introduction.

Reviewed by Joaneath Spicer
University of Toronto

This is the first published translation into English of the remarkable account written by Isaac Massa (1586-1643) of the tumultuous "Times of Troubles" experienced by the author first hand during his sojourn from 1600 to 1609 in the Muscovite capital as a young Dutch merchant apprentice. Professor Orchard of the Department of History at the University of Lethbridge has produced a very readable translation (infrequent references to the Dutch are contained in the notes) of the manuscript (The Hague, Koninklijke Bibliotheek) as presented to Prince Maurice. Also included are letters from Massa to the States General dated 1614, 1618, and 1619. The straightforward informative introduction is devoted essentially to establishing a corrected biography of this enterprising Haarlem merchant within the context of contemporary events and to characterizing Massa's text and style.

Beyond the historical chronicle, one is struck, especially in the letters appended here (two are from Archangel), by the fascinating observations pertaining to the circumstances, nature and motivations of Dutch commercial interests. Though the editor's interests lay elsewhere, this could have provided an excellent opportunity to test the related issues raised in a more general sense in such works as V. Barbour, **Capitalism in Amsterdam** (1950), D.W. Davies, **A Primer of Dutch Overseas Trade** (1961) or more recently A. Attman, **The Struggle for Baltic Markets: Powers in Conflict 1558-1618** (1979). Neither is there any mention of I. Lubimenko's **The Struggle of the Dutch with the English for the Russian Market in the Seventeenth Century** (1924), a theme behind many of Massa's pronouncements. Nevertheless this is a very welcome publication.

A famous portrait of Massa painted by Frans Hals in 1626, shortly after the sitter's return from his fifth and penultimate journey to Moscow, hangs in the Art Gallery of Ontario.

Mauritshuis. **Dutch Painting of the Golden Age from the Royal Picture Gallery, The Hague.** Exhibition catalogue under the supervision of Hans R. Hoetink (1982-83).

Reviewed by Joaneath Spicer
University of Toronto

This notable exhibition comprising forty paintings will be on view at the Art Gallery of Ontario from 1 October until 11 December 1983, having made a tour of American museums since opening at the National Gallery in Washington in April 1982. This will be an exceptional occasion to enjoy a fine representative selection of Dutch seventeenth century paintings highlighted by works by Rembrandt van Rijn, Johannes Vermeer, Jan Steen, Frans Hals, and Jacob van Ruisdael.

Within the catalogue, discussion of the individual paintings is preceded by three introductory essays: the first, on the public career of Count Johan Maurits van Nassau (1604-1679) for whom the Mauritshuis was built as a residence between 1633 and 1644; the second, on the house itself, an extremely elegant example of baroque domestic architecture initially designed by Jacob van Campen, concluding with remarks on the restorations begun in 1982 which in fact prompted this tour of selected works; and the third, on the history of the collections. The paintings have been astutely chosen to reflect the range of subject matter within Dutch art. Thus portraiture, landscape and genre predominate though with significant inclusions of still life, architectural and religious themes. Nevertheless, while Vermeer's miraculous **Head of a Girl** is included, his **View of Delft** and a number of other favourites such as Rembrandt's **Saul and David** have unfortunately not been permitted to travel. Some visitors to the exhibition will find the works chosen a little uneven.

This group of paintings is not only inherently attractive in itself; it also throws a surprising light on the collection of Dutch paintings in the permanent collection of the Art Gallery of Ontario, which in turn sheds light on the exhibition. A perfect example is provided by comparison of Frans Hals' **Head of a Boy**, painted circa 1620/25, with the famous portrayal of the Dutch merchant **Isaac Massa** dated 1626 (AGO) which clarifies the scope of Hals' experimentation during the pivotal decade of the 1620's. The ease and naturalness mask the innovations made in these two works. The brilliant bravura of Hals' revolutionary brushwork, detaching itself from the form described, is demonstrably sketchier and more open in the casually conceived **Head**, possibly a study of the artist's young son, while far more structured, even in the juxtaposing of complementary colours, in the more formal, commissioned portrait of **Massa**. The vivid animation which sets Hals' portraiture apart is due as well to a capturing of the transient moment, expressed on the one hand in Massa's parted lips and nonchalant, expansive pose as he twists around in his chair to take control of his space. This is the first example of this characteristically Halsian exploration of body. Hals invented the broadly smiling portrait, surely influenced by his early love for jovial genre subjects. Certainly the frequent great good humour of his subjects stands out against the sobriety of most Dutch portraits.

In Rembrandt's portraits, particularly of men, this commonly takes on an equally characteristic quality of high seriousness (as opposed to neutral sobriety). In the earlier of the two magnificent **Self-Portraits** from the Mauritshuis, the one painted circa 1629 when the artist was 23, we see what might be called an exploration of inner space, expressed through the mystery of half shadows and carefully angled side lighting which throws the slightly furrowed brow (contrast Massa's clear countenance) into subtle relief, implying a quiet thoughtfulness and inner life quite at odds with Hals' typical exuberance.

Henry of Ghent. **Lectura Ordinaria Super Sacram Scripturam.** Edited by R. Macken, O.F.M. (Henrici de Gandavo **Opera Omnia** XXXVI). Leuven: University Press, and Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1980, XXXI, 291 pp.
Henry of Ghent. **Quodlibet X.** Edited by R. Macken, O.F.M. (Henrici de Gandavo **Opera Omnia** XIV). Leuven: University Press, and Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1981, CXXVI, 331 pp.

Reviewed by J.V. Brown
University of Windsor

Raymond Macken is a very determined man. Some who have not had both the privilege and the pleasure of knowing him intimately (as this reviewer has) might even say that he is obsessed with the project that has occupied his attention since the early 1970's: The Critical Edition of the **Opera Omnia** of Henry of Ghent, a Belgian, the secular master in the Faculty of Theology at the University of Paris between the years 1276 and 1292. Macken is not only determined to give the world a critical edition of the works of Henry of Ghent, but is determined to see the project through to completion during his own lifetime! To the works that he has already given us, two magnificent heuristic volumes – **Bibliotheca Manuscripta,** I and II – and **Quodlibet I**, Macken now adds his edition of one of the longest **Quodlibets** issuing from Henry's pen, **Quodlibet X**, and a reissue of a work of somewhat doubtful authenticity, though it is attributed to the solemn doctor in several important lists of his works, the **Lectura Ordinaria Super Sacram Scripturam.**

The **Lectura Ordinaria** was first published in 1972 in that series known as **Analecta Mediaevalia Namurcensia,** and it has been "adopted" for the Critical Edition of the **Opera Omnia.** It exists in only one manuscript of the late 13th or early 14th centuries, probably written at Paris, which was most certainly at one time in the library of Henry's contemporary, Godfrey of Fontaines. It is described by Macken with the care that we have become accustomed to expect from him. The work is in the **Hexameron/De Hebdomadibus** tradition, being a commentary on **Genesis I, 1-3.** The work is attributed to Henry of Ghent in a note written on the manuscript itself in a medieval hand. Macken examines the issue of the appropriateness of the attribution, but does not propose a definitive answer. Certain themes in the **Lectura Ordinaria** are also to be found treated in the same way in the **Quodlibeta** and in the **Summa Quaestionum Ordinariarum:** the eternity of the world, for example, and the seventh day of rest. There are also, apropos of the common subjects, quotations coming from the same sources: Jerome, Plato, Avicenna. Likewise, the adversaries are the same in both works: Aristotle (on necessity), for one.

Two features of the work are particularly worth noting. The **Lectura Ordinaria** has all the appearances of not being **in toto** a work of Henry's own composition, unlike the **Quodlibeta** and the **SQO,** which are certainly from his own hand. It appears to be rather either a **reportatio,** or a work dictated by Henry on the basis of some student's notes. The second feature worth noting is that, while the **Lectura Ordinaria** is a commentary on the six days of creating, it begins with **two** introductory items and also has a **second** commentary on the third day. It is probable that the author of this work intended to give a set of "ordinary lectures" on the whole Bible, although the author indicates in the text itself his intention to treat the other books of the Bible after Genesis with greater brevity. If this is indeed a work of Henry, it was written probably around 1275-1276, as he began his teaching career at Paris. If the work is not a work of Henry of Ghent, then all we can say is that it is at least no later than 1306. The manuscript is in all probability a good one. It was left to the Sorbonne by Godfrey of Fontaines and it is in the same hand as the base manuscript chosen for the critical edition of **Quodlibet I.**

Does the work come from the hand of Henry? Macken will only say (p. XXI) that the work is attributed to Henry in the manuscript in a hand very nearly contemporary; that there are resemblances in content, style and editorial items between it and the authentic works of Henry; that he has not found anything to indicate that it is not Henry's work. In this reviewer's opinion, further scholarship is not likely to lead to anything that will resolve the issue one way or the other.

The edition of **Quodlibet X** permits of no such convenient summary. The "critical study" which precedes the text of this **Quodlibet** is itself 120 pages long! Here we can only summarize and try to indicate the often subtle nuances of some of Macken's conclusions. The problems of textual criticism show an extreme complexity. Manuscripts of the work are to be found all over Europe and, as is the case with the critical editions of the **Opera Omnia** of Aquinas, Albert the Great, Scotus, Ockham, etc., as more and more information becomes available, the task of the editor becomes that much more difficult. Problems which in the past did not exist, or at least were only hinted at, now surface with a vengeance when the full 29 manuscripts of **Quodlibet X** are subjected to careful analysis.

Compare this situation with the situation of the **Lectura Ordinaria,** or of the **Commentary on the Physics** attributed also to Henry of Ghent where there is only one manuscript in each case!

Macken obviously knows his way around in the thicket of the texts of Henry. He knows everything that has been done and everything that has been written in the area. He is familiar with all the procedures in use in the 13th century, especially prevailing practices in the university setting for the reproduction and diffusion of texts; the role played by authors, copyists and university stationers in these processes; the distinction obtaining between an autograph and an apograph and that between the university **exemplar** and its copy; the techniques of **peciae.** Finally, there is Macken's knowledge of the infinite variety of concrete cases requiring extreme prudence on the part of scholars. Such prudence is commendable in the case of a text as complicated as **Quodlibet X.** Wherever hesitation is possible in the face of alternatives, Macken gives only what he feels is the correct view; he never closes the door on another possibility. Macken's "critical study" provides the apprentice editor with a wealth of information, advice, warnings and suggestions.

What are the main conclusions of Macken's study? **Quodlibet X** is to be dated shortly before Christmas 1286. Two of its twenty-nine manuscripts can be traced back to the fourteen-**peciae** Parisian **Exemplar** mentioned in the Paris Taxation List of 1304. This **exemplar** most certainly dates from 1287. However, Macken has also identified a manuscript which introduces us to a tradition independent from the university tradition. This is manuscript no. 19 (Paris, **Bibl. Nat., lat. 15.350).** This manuscript is in fact a collection of unrelated pieces, among which we find the complete **Quodlibets VII** through **XII** of Henry and abridged versions of **Quodlibets XIII** to **XV.** It may be considered as completing the collection of **Quodlibets I** through **VI** found in ms. Paris, **Bibl. Nat., lat. 15.848.** Since the two volumes belonged to the Library of Godfrey of Fontaines, careful attention ought to be paid to manuscript 19. It contains a very early copy of a first redaction of **Quodlibets VII** through **XII,** and what is more, this text has a number of editorial corrections, varying in length, written in the margins in a hand different from that of the first copyist. Now, it is almost invariably the case that such corrections are found in manuscripts which depend on the Parisian **Exemplar.** Moreover, these corrections were not made from the **exemplar** or from the manuscripts derived from it; Macken proves this incontrovertibly. On the contrary, it is the **exemplar** which depends on manuscript 19. We note finally that the corrections are particularly numerous for **Quodlibet X** and this is the reason why Macken has chosen to edit this **Quodlibet** before the others.

What conclusion are we driven to here? The most natural explanation, and the one which seems best to account for the facts of the case, is that the collection of manuscript 19 belonged to Henry, who had it recopied in his first redaction by a professional copyist, and that he then corrected this version in his own hand. Godfrey of Fontaines would have acquired the version after the death of his colleague. It should be noted, however, that Macken does not give this explanation as categorical; there are still other possibilities. There is more. There is a Polish manuscript (Pelplin, **Bibliothèque du Séminaire Duchownego,** ms. 33), number 22 on Macken's list, which contains **Quodlibets V** through **XI** in a version which locates it between ms. 19 (the text corrected by Henry) and the **exemplar.** We are probably dealing here with a direct copy of the apograph: that is to say, with a text produced by a copyist, employed by Henry and sent to the university stationers so that the **exemplar** might be established. It is easy to understand how manuscript 19 itself, with so many marginal additions - which sometimes could not even be separated from the text - would not be sent in that condition to the corporation of **Libraria.** For this purpose, a clear and readable text would have been necessary. The purpose of all this paleographical research is to enable Macken to choose those manuscripts which are to be collated in their entirety for the critical edition.

From what we have said here it is easy to see in what direction he is headed. The manuscripts are classified according to the Mogenet method (see the table on p. XXXIV). Manuscript 19 (=A) is selected as the base manuscript to be controlled by the apograph (represented by manuscript 22 = U) and by those five manuscripts (S,C,H,T and O) which give the best witness of dependency on the Parisian **Exemplar.** Two manuscripts which show evidence of the **Exemplar** in 9 **peciae** have been collated only for the first **pecia** (R, V). There is a tenth manuscript found in the table of **Sigles** (p. CXXVI): Paris, **Bibl. Nat., lat. 15.358** (=D). It is collated with the other manuscripts for the first **pecia,** but it disappears from the text thereafter. The explanation for this disappearance is to be found on p. CI. The Badius edition of 1518, perhaps the most often cited edition of the **Quodlibeta,** has been collated for the first **pecia** in order to show its place among the manuscripts. The same has been done for

manuscript D because it stands in close relationship to the Badius edition, as the critical edition of **Quodlibet I** shows. The collation for the first **pecia** also shows that D is in the 14 **peciae exemplar** tradition. It adds nothing however to a critical edition of **Quodlibet X.** It is an item of passing interest only because there is some evidence that it was used when putting together the Badius text.

Quodlibet X has been created according to the same principles as were used in the case of **Quodlibet I.** It takes up 309 pages, however, compared to the 233 of the earlier **Quodlibet,** even though there are 42 questions in **Quodlibet I** and only 17 in **Quodlibet X.** It is obvious, then, that in many instances there is considerably greater development of the theme in **Quodlibet X** than was the case with **Quodlibet I.** The 17 questions may be grouped as follows: The sacrament of penance (1-4); the body of Christ and the bodies of the saints (5-6); The distinction between **esse** and **essentia** in creatures (7); substance and accidents (8-9); and problems relative to man (10-17), general (10-15) and special (16-17). The general problems concern the powers of the soul (10), intelligence (11), the will (12), intelligence and will (13-15). The special problems deal with duties of a master in his teaching (16) and of the recourses to justice one has when one is subjected to injustice (17). We will direct a few remarks to these themes.

Whereas **Quodlibet I** deals particularly with theology, this **Quodlibet** devotes only 8 questions to the sacred science. More remarkable still, these 8 questions receive relatively short shrift, except for question 5 which is more philosophical than theological: "Whether the body of the living Christ and of the living Peter are of the same species?" This question takes up 77 pages. Question 7 takes up 52 more. It asks if, in denying the real distinction between **esse** and **essentia,** we compromise the creation of finite being. Question 9 takes up 34 pages. It asks if a substance can be a sufficient cause of its accidents. The other questions are less drawn out. But we can note that it is those questions which are of primarily philosophical interest that are the most closely scrutinized and corrected by Henry in ms. 19.

With a text as well put together as this one, based as it is on the highly scientific principles elucidated in the "critical study", we can unravel fairly easily the doctrinal densities, especially of a philosophical variety, of **Quodlibet X.** The **apparatus** which accompanies the text is highly detailed. The **apparatus criticus** directs us to study all those corrections made by Henry in his first redaction (ms. 19). The **apparatus** of citations gives numerous indications of the sources used by Henry and of those modern editions and studies which deal with them.

In spite of the presence of a number of minor printing faults, which the reader can easily correct, Macken is to be congratulated. In a somewhat amusing aside in a letter to this reviewer (though Macken, to be sure, finds the matter anything but funny), the editor explains how these printing errors came about. He corrected the proofs and returned them to the printer. Where a passage was corrected in several places, the printer, instead of just making the corrections, retyped the whole passage, introducing new errors in place of the old! This "corrected" version was what went to press. **Plus ça change** ....At the end of the critical study, there are plates containing reproductions of folio samples from different manuscripts of **Quodlibet X.** Three of them, plates V through VII, are from manuscript 19, the manuscript containing the corrections possibly made by Henry himself. A look at these three plates is indeed worthwhile. The enormity of the task is what confronts us. A love of service to the cause of the solemn doctor alone would make anyone want to take it on.

Herman Bakvis: **Catholic Power in the Netherlands**. McGill-Queen's University Press: Kingston and Montreal, 1981.

Reviewed by David M. Klinck
University of Windsor

This book is one of many studies by political scientists in recent years on the subject of voter motivation in modern democracies. Professor Bakvis argues against the model of party identification, a concept popular among political scientists, according to which an individual tends to vote for a particular party because as a child he was conditioned by his parents to identify with that party, with its slogans, its images etc. Such a model, having originated among American political scientists, may be applicable to the United States, Professor Bakvis feels, but following the lead of W. Phillips Shively, he argues that as far as Western Europe is concerned, how one votes is determined by the subculture to which one belongs, rather than one's family. And in Western Europe, unlike the United States, political parties are purely instrumental: pale reflections of the subcultures whose interests they are defending. According to Professor Bakvis, as long as subcultures remain organized and cohesive, elector behavior will tend to remain constant and reliable. Significant electoral change tends to occur only as the result of large-scale changes within subcultures. Professor Bakvis conceives of a subculture, or at least a West European subculture, as a cohesive ideological, or more usually, **religious** unit within a state. Actually, as can be discovered in one of Professor Bakvis' footnotes, he has a hunch that religion is the single most important factor affecting voter behavior in all western states, even in Canada and the United States.

In order to illustrate his thesis, Professor Bakvis has devoted himself in his book to the study of the history of the Catholic community or subculture in Holland during the 20th century, and to the interaction between this community and the Catholic (political) Party, from the inception of political democracy in Holland at the end of World War I until the demise of the Catholic Party in 1980. We are presented with the picture of a comparatively closed society (until the 1960s) of several million (3.7 million in 1947) Dutch Catholics, living a quite insulated life within a comprehensive range of their own institutions; imbued with a sense of their own uniqueness; and fearful of an alien, hostile Protestant majority (Catholics comprising 30-40% of the total Dutch population). With the advent of political democracy, Dutch Catholics, in keeping with their insularity, established their own exclusive political party which would defend their identity. Consequently between 1918 and 1963 from 85% to 90% of Catholic voters consistently voted for the Catholic Party, giving it one of the largest blocks of seats in the Dutch parliament and allowing it to participate in almost every coalition goverment from the end of World War I on. No other Catholic party in any other European state has been able to command such loyalty from Catholics.

According to Professor Bakvis, the driving force behind the maintenance of this very cohesive isolationist group mentality and behavior was the Dutch Catholic clergy, above all the very authoritarian Dutch hierarchy. Even as late as 1954, in a well-publicised Mandement, the bishops reiterated the ban on belonging to non-Catholic organizations, listening to socialist radio programs, and reading non-Catholic newspapers, and ordered that communication with the non-Catholic majority occur only through official church-sanctioned agencies. And, Professor Bakvis argues, it was primarily the drastic reversal of the Dutch hierarchy's stand, beginning in the late 1950's, even before Vatican II, that was responsible for the sudden opening up of the Dutch Catholic community, for the spectacular triumph within it during the 60s and 70s of pluralism, liberalism and democracy, as well as for the demise of the Catholic Party between 1963 and 1980. Once the bishops had proclaimed that the spheres of religion and politics were quite separate, that the doctrines of the Church could not be identified with the programs of a particular political party, the reason for the existence of the Catholic Party disappeared.

The term "elite" crops up so often in this book, with regard largely to the Catholic clergy, that one may well wonder if Professor Bakvis is not on the verge of arguing for the crucial role of elites in the maintenance of subcultures and therefore, political party stability, or conversely in engineering change in subcultures and therefore in political parties. And at this point a certain reservation arises in the mind of this reviewer about Professor Bakvis' book. Professor Bakvis' account of the fate of Dutch Catholicism during the twentieth century is too mechanical, too schematic. Dutch Catholicism is seen too much from the perspective of political science model-building. Although the subject matter of his book is the history of Dutch Catholicism during the twentieth century, Professor Bakvis displays a lack of sensitivity to the concrete, historical element, to the rich, earthy fabric of

which Dutch Catholicism, like any other human association, has been composed; to the tensions and passions that have wracked Dutch Catholicism during the twentieth century. And yet references to these tensions keep cropping up in the book: to the tensions between middle-class Dutch Catholics and urban working-class Dutch Catholics, to the appearance of social Catholicism within the ranks of the clergy, to dissatisfaction among certain clergy and intellectuals with the Church's conservatism (the subject of Edward Schillebeeckx is just touched upon), to the de facto establishing of ties between Dutch Catholics and the non-Catholic world in twentieth-century Holland.

Catholicism everywhere during the 19th and 20th centuries has experienced continuous anguish and turmoil as the Church, fraught with confusion and contradiction, has tried repeatedly, with less than complete success, to come to grips with the heritage of the great intellectual, economic, social and political revolutions of the past two hundred years or so. The resulting oscillation, for example, between the rigorous conservative stance taken at Vatican I and the seeming reversal of this at Vatican II, is indicative of a community which is unsure of itself, which senses that its foundations are not solid; and which is trying desperately to do something about it. And certainly this has been true for Dutch Catholicism, where an extreme (even for Catholicism) conservatism was to be followed by a spectacular flowering of liberalism during the 1960s and 70s. Professor Bakvis' study would have been improved if he had taken this rather gripping drama more fully into account. Professor Bakvis' very able analysis of the decline and fall of the Catholic Party between 1963 and 1980 (Chapter Five) stands as the best chapter in the book.

REMERCIEMENTS

Le premier Colloque sur les études néerlandaises à Montréal a été réalisé avec l'appui des organisations suivantes:
Le Secrétariat d'Etat, Direction du multiculturalisme, Ottawa
Le Ministère des Communautés culturelles et de l'Immigration du Québec
Le Consulat général de Belgique à Montréal
Le Consulat général des Pays-Bas à Montréal
La Chambre de Commerce Canada-Pays-Bas (Région Québec)
Container Express Inc.
Gestinfo Inc.
H. Mommelberg, président de Pracht of Canada Ltd.
KLM, Lignes Aériennes Royales Néerlandaises
John de Kuyper & Son (Canada) Limited
Molson Breweries
Montreal Mobile Canteen Ltd.
Naarden International (Canada) Ltd.
Parrish & Meimbecker Ltd.
Raptim-Canada Ltée.
Sabena, Lignes Aériennes Belges
Scangift Limited
Talens CAC, Ltd.
Guy Tombs Ltée