fragmentary parable morality, *The Cruel Debtor.* Of the prodigal son drama, however, only the German play is discussed, and little appears on its Tudor tradition in parable plays like *Acolastus* (translated by Palsgrave, and acted in Latin at Cambridge), *Pater, Filius et Uxor, Lusty Juventus* and so forth. Finally, the scanty early Elizabethan specimens are filled out by two continental Latin plays *ca.* 1540-49, Sixt Birck's *Sapientia Solomonis* (adapted for performance at Westminster in 1565-66), and Theodore Beza's *Abraham's Sacrifice* (translated by Golding in 1577), while George Buchanan's works, partly published and perhaps acted in England then, are left out.

The play-chapters themselves, bridged by biographical-historical information, consist of indifferent plot analysis, often substantively incorrect quotations, value judgments, some theme commentary and a discussion, using an 1873 English Bible, of dramatists' use of scriptural subjects. While the volume takes a novel perspective on Tudor drama, assembles much scattered data and studies generally unread plays, the analysis is incomplete and undercut by factual errors. For instance, Grimald's *Christus Redivivus* deals with the gospels' inconsistent versions of the sepulchre visit, but we are not told *how,* and in a simple mistake, Cleophas' wife instead of himself is said to stand out in the last act (90). In *King Darius,* Equity is wrongly described as a female (127-28), in *Cruel Debtor* a speech about Simulation is said to concern Flattery (129), and *Jacob and Esau* is termed a "theological and moral travesty," evidently because Jacob, a "Uriah-Heepish" Joseph Surface guilty of "deceit" in the candid birthright bargain, troubles the reader's "theological assumptions" (150-54). Finally, this volume, though by-passing some scholarship on the plays, occasionally presents already published ideas as if they were new: in the discussion of Tyndale's influence on Bale's *Three Laws* (45-46), for instance, certain of T. W. Craik's identical conclusions in his *Tudor Interlude* (74) are stated but unnoted.

IAN LANCASHIRE, *University of Toronto*

Richard Mulcaster. *Positions.* Abridged and edited by Richard L. DeMolen. New York: Teachers College Press, 1971. Pp. xii, 284. Cloth $6.95. Paperback $3.50.

One of the better series now appearing in the history of education is that issued under the general editorship of Professor Lawrence A. Cremin of Teachers' College, Columbia University. While neither limited to nor even specializing in the Renaissance and Reformation, eight of its forty-odd volumes touch directly on the period and another eight or nine, indirectly.

Catering to a broad university market, the series includes a variety of publishing forms: reprints of standard monographs, collections of documents, selections from authors.

Typical of one of these forms, the single treatise, is Richard L. DeMolen's edition of Richard Mulcaster's *Positions.* It has been abridged, losing mainly the lengthy chapters on physical education; some of its terminology has been modernized and a twenty-three page introduction has been added.

In the introduction we find an updated sketch of Mulcaster's life based on DeMolen's unpublished dissertation, and a summary of the *Positions.* The "most prominent English schoolmaster in the sixteenth century," best known for his long headmasterships of Merchant Taylors' and St. Paul's schools, is placed in the context of the civic-oriented and

humanist-inspired education of post-Reformation England.

Mulcaster is the champion of talent, the vernacular, the education of girls; a defender of public schools, of conferences between teachers, parents and neighbours, of teacher training in the universities, and a host of other progressive causes.

All this is nice to read about again, but beyond that what can one say? The question keeps recurring: is it really worthwhile to truncate a moderately sized book of interest to a reasonably sophisticated clientele? Despite its identification with future themes in British education, the *Positions* is a treatise with values more documentary than intrinsic; some of its basic usefulness is inevitably destroyed by even the most cautious knife. Surely, too, a student in history or English could find his way through its Elizabethan spelling and print, or at least he should, with a gentle shove from a learned preface to send him on his way.

In other words, a photographic copy of the original text of the *Positions* with an introduction would likely best serve the needs of most of its potential readers. Yet this is not what the market gives us. Rather in one and the same year it offers us this abridgment with an introduction, and by the hand of another publisher, Da Capo, an integral text without one! In the reprint industry the fallout from incoordinate blasts of activity continues relatively unabated. It should begin to trouble the partisans of uncluttered academic air.

Moreover, that integral reprinting can be done attractively and cheaply has been proven by the Scolar Press in England. Perhaps the editor of the commendable series "Classics in Education" would now do them one better by issuing unabridged texts of treatises such as Mulcaster's, photomechanically reproduced, with comments of a kind which, like Mr. DeMolen's, grace so many of its volumes.

JAMES S. HOCKLEY, *The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education*

Nathaniel Culverwell. *An Elegant and Learned Discourse of the Light of Nature.* Ed. Robert A. Greene and Hugh MacCallum. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1971. Pp. lvii, 216. $10.

Greene, MacCallum and the University of Toronto Press have combined to provide a handsome setting for Culverwell's 157-page-copious declamation. Not only physically fine, the book shows in its make-up thoughtful design for easy and satisfactory use. The forty-odd pages of notes have running keys to the page-numbers of origin. Square bracketed translations appear after those of Culverwell's quotations which he himself does not translate; this just might be supererogatory for readers with any interest in Culverwell, but better to err on the side of communication. The notes assay at a high density of information and occasional analysis. Note 64/p. 184, for example, reveals that what Culverwell has cited as "Vasquez" is a phrase of summary by Suarez of Vasquez on Aquinas. Similarly, his "sacred Oratour" might more properly have been styled something like 'Jewish sage,' since he *means* Philo, whose collocation with Chrysostom on a page of Grotius registered only approximately in Culverwell's mind (n.16/p. 191). A note rich in scholarship suggests that a term Culverwell misattributes to Aristotle, *ὀν ὀντων*, represents a fusion of a Platonic term with "the Biblical trope 'king of kings'" (n. 11/p. 179). That last invites questions as to whether