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cation for Galileo’s use of mathematics in physical science, and this is the main reason that these theories have recently come under scrutiny. Steven J. Livesey has contributed more to this field perhaps than any other scholar, with a series of studies and editions mostly of fourteenth-century Oxford theologians, including William of Ockham, John of Reading, and most recently Robert Graystanes. In the present book Livesey presents a critical edition, with introduction and facing-page English translation, of four questions on subalternation by the fifteenth-century Dominican friar Antonius de Carlensis of Naples, two from his Questions on the Sentences and two from his Questions on the Posterior Analytics.

While I have not read it against the manuscripts, I have found a few places where the edition might be emended, especially in the questions on the Posterior Analytics, which are edited from the single known manuscript. In several passages, for instance, Livesey prints arismetica (= arithmetica) instead of emending it to armonica (= harmonica), which the argument requires (pp. 44, 47; cf. p. 51); and in another he prints metaphysicus (= metaphysicus) instead of emending to mathematicus (p. 41). Other misreadings, misprints, or needed emendations I noticed in the Latin (excluding obvious variants in spelling) were convenienter instead of convenienter; subalternare instead of subalternari (both on p. 44); sine instead of siue (p. 45); plus instead of prius (p. 47); and abstrologia instead of astrologia (p. 52).

In general the translation is both accurate and readable, a balance difficult to attain with such technical and jargon-ridden texts. Only in a few passages does the sense of the Latin seem less than clear in the English. By providing a facing-page translation, Livesey has offered his understanding of the text while at the same time allowing us to come to our own conclusions.

Livesey has done a superb job in identifying the many sources and quotations used by Antonius (some of which are available only in manuscript), thereby locating him in relation to Hervé Natalis, Paul of Venice, Aegidius Romanus, Thomas Aquinas, and other scholastic writers on subalternation. Further, in the introduction Livesey briefly sketches Antonius’s treatment of subalternation (which was not especially novel) and compares it to that of another fifteenth-century Dominican, Dominicus of Flanders.

For Livesey, the significance of these questions lies more in their eclecticism than in any specific opinions or novel doctrines about subalternation that they might contain. But I think it also lies in their being part of the transmission (or mistransmission) and elaboration of medieval—and especially Thomistic—notions about subalternation, the mathematical sciences, and theology as a science, which would culminate in the modified Thomism of sixteenth-century Dominicans and of Jesuit teachers at the Collegio Romano. If these ideas about subalternation were not the direct inspiration for Galileo’s nature scientific method (as William A. Wallace would have them be), then at least they form the common tradition of Galileo’s Dominican and Jesuit opponents. With this edition of these questions by Antonius de Carlensis, we are one step closer to understanding that tradition.

W. R. Laird


In this admirable monograph, on the astrological and apocalyptic writings of the famous cardinal and scholar Pierre d’Ailly, Laura Smoller begins by drawing our attention to his subsequent influence on Christopher Columbus. It seems almost poetic justice that the continent to which modern astrology owes most for its survival should have been discovered by a man who voyaged in the astrological belief—inspired by a 1483 printing of d’Ailly’s works—that the end of time was at hand. But the intellectual world in which Columbus lived was not the old world in which his sources were conceived. Smoller is careful to avoid the all-too-common mistake of treating medieval and Renaissance astrology as an entirely seamless web, and she provides a careful account of the complex interrelations of late medieval astrology, Christian thinking, and the rational study of the world in general. This introductory material—balanced and well chosen though it may be—is of secondary importance. What makes her book so valuable is that it allows us to see into the mind of an individual, one immersed in a set of beliefs for which most of us can have no real sympathy. She shows how astrology appealed to him as offering a rational means of interpreting history and prophecy, and how it brought such ambitions into jeopardy by dragging with it the twin problems of free will and divine omnipotence.

Astral influence on the world was typically seen as an aspect of God’s plan for the world’s unfolding history. Academic astrology was not primarily a magical art—pace many a modern
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In the first case there were the personal horo-
scopes, medical practices, and so forth that con-
cerned the human individual, but it was on the
grand scale that d’Ailly invoked astrology’s
assistance. God acted on the world through sec-
condary causes and associated legitimate author-
ity, he thought, with certain signs. Brushing over
the logical connection somewhat, he argued that
the proper authority over the Church was a body
of wise Christian men, namely, the General
Council. Theologians remember him chiefly for
his conciliar theory and tend to view with unease
his defense of astrology as a form of natural the-
ology underpinning it. D’Ailly’s concern for the
Great Schism in the Church (1378–1414), how-
ever, was both a cause and an effect of his astro-
logical awareness. Smoller amply justifies the
thesis that the division in the Church led him to
take seriously the imminence of the apocalypse
and that he eventually turned to astrology to sup-
press his fears, becoming convinced in the
course of doing so that a Church council could
heal the rift.

Most of d’Ailly’s writings were the product of
the last ten years of his life (1410–1420), but he
was no novice then. Starting from a cautious
Thomistic stance, he grew increasingly enthusi-
astic, and by the time the Council of Constance
was convened (1414) the science—and in partic-
ular the theory of great conjunctions—had led
him to conclude that the End was not nigh.
Smoller traces his changes of heart, and the in-
fluences of writers who helped to bring them
about, with meticulous care. On the way she
raises numerous important questions. Why, for
instance, were there not more examples of ast-
rologico-historical writing in the fifteenth cen-
tury, in view of the fact that it could unite the
passing troubles of the Church with the grand
history of human salvation? What were the dif-
fferences between God’s time and astrological
time conceived to be? How best should one re-
late biblical utterances to astrological ones?
Smoller offers partial answers to these and many
comparable questions. She writes with econ-
omy—the main text of her book is under 130
pages, although its rich annotation is more than
half as long—and with good sense. Her book is
sufficiently general for it to be read as an intro-
duction to medieval astrology, but it is narrowly
focused where it matters. For the reader in a
hurry, the penultimate chapter, “Astrology and
the Postponement of the End,” is essential read-
ing, and a model of how to cross medieval in-
tellectual frontiers with impunity.

J. D. NORTH


More than four hundred years after his death,
Nostradamus continues to fascinate. His life and
writings have inspired an unending stream of
books and articles and even a recent feature film.
But much of this activity produces only imagi-
native fiction or groundless speculation. Pierre
Brind’Amour’s scholarly and engrossing book
returns Nostradamus to his historical context,
documenting the “Nostradamus phenomenon”
that made him for the last twenty years of his
life a European celebrity and best-selling author,
beset by plagiarists and literary pirates.
Brind’Amour cannot avoid entirely the “naive
but inevitable question”: Was Nostradamus a
prophet or a charlatan? The author modestly con-
cludes, without attributing to his subject the
power of clairvoyance, that one cannot deny his