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The years of the reign of King Louis XIV correspond to the golden age of the congregation. In the eighteenth century, the congregation suffered internal division between Jansenists and Jansenist opponents; the 1745 chapter of the congregation took a firm position against Jansenism. The eighteenth century also saw a decline in vocations, although numbers were rising again by the 1770s. Most of the canons were priests, and parish work was the most frequent occupation. Brian praises Petit’s work for many things, not the least of which is its inclusion of what ex-canons did after the National Assembly dissolved the congregation in 1790.

An archivist, Petit was for a long period conservator at the Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève in Paris and more recently has been a rare book librarian at the Bibliothèque nationale de France. In his introduction to this volume, Petit explains that he devoted seventeen years of research to gathering the information needed. He points out what is and is not included in this prosopography: this is an alphabetical catalog of the 5352 members of the congregation for the years 1624–1789. Each entry includes names with variant spellings; dates of birth, religious profession, and death; functions or offices and appointments held; and indications of where to find more information on a canon. The volume also provides a useful table of dates of profession, a chronological necrology, indices of places, and a map showing where the 119 houses of the congregation were located. The northern half of France was more endowed with these houses than was the south. Although Petit adds a bibliography of both primary and secondary sources he has used, he does not mention works published by the canons themselves. This is indeed the subject of his current research, and he promises that such a bibliographical volume will be forthcoming to accompany the present work.

At first glance, this large volume looks no more tantalizing than a telephone directory. Yet it is a reference work full of significant information for any scholar interested in religion and society in early-modern France, and it certainly belongs in any serious research library.
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On November 10, 1979, at a meeting of the Pontifical Academy of Sciences commemorating the centennial of Einstein’s birth, Pope John Paul II delivered a speech that also discussed Galileo’s trial and condemnation by the Inquisition in 1633. John Paul II admitted candidly that church officials committed not only errors but also wrongs; and he proposed boldly that the Galileo affair is highly instructive and ought to be studied more deeply because it embodies the lesson
that science and religion are harmonious, and not incompatible as claimed by
traditional accounts. Accordingly, in 1981 he appointed a commission to study
the affair, which for a decade sponsored publications, conferences, and other
projects. Finally, on October 31, 1992, at a meeting of the academy occasioned
by a conference on complexity in natural science, the commission’s coordina-
tor, Cardinal Paul Poupard, formally reported on its conclusions, and the pope
made a new speech on Galileo. The pope did more than accept Poupard’s
report, declare the commission’s work completed, and reiterate the views of his
earlier speech. He explicitly praised Galileo’s biblical hermeneutics over that of
his theological opponents and insightfully connected the Galilean principle of
separation of scriptural interpretation and natural-scientific investigation to the
epistemology of complexity.

This is the tip of the iceberg studied in this book. It examines the docu-
ments found in the archives of the Vatican Secretariat for Nonbelievers, the
Pontifical Council for Culture, and Poupard’s personal papers. There are at
least thirty-seven such documents, consisting of letters, reports, and drafts of
speeches. Although a few of these were known, the great majority were pre-
viously inaccessible to scholars. In this book, many documents are quoted in
full or in part. They can be utilized even by scholars who will reach different
conclusions. For such reasons, this book is welcome and deserves to be trans-
lated into English.

The book has other merits. It establishes the key historical facts of this thir-
teen-year episode and formulates several well-argued theses. For example, the
commission met only six times between 1981 and 1983. For the next six
years, its four autonomous sections continued the work they had projected
then, but the commission as a whole was completely inactive. In May 1989,
John Paul II asked Poupard about the commission. It took Poupard a month
to reconstruct the situation, with the help of the chancellor of the academy.
This papal inquiry led to the realization that the commission had done all it
could be expected to do, and so its work should be formally concluded.

Furthermore, the book does not shy away from evaluating the historical
accuracy and philosophical validity of the documents’ contents, as well as
the appropriateness of various ecclesiastic actions. The evaluations are
respectful, nuanced, and generally positive, but the book advances several
criticisms. For example, it argues plausibly that neither the commission nor
the higher authorities ever understood the complexity of the Galileo affair;
the difficulty of the task of re-examining it; the need to invest considerable
resources of time, personnel, and money; and the need to coordinate the sev-
eral aspects studied by the four separate sections.

Moreover, the book begins with a destructive criticism of several influen-
tial anticlerical accounts of the Galileo affair predating 1979. Then it ends
with an attempt to refute several post-1992 critiques of the Church’s actions
and pronouncements during 1979–92.
To conclude, this is an important book. Its documentary aspect is invaluable; its historical interpretations are well documented; its philosophical critiques are well argued. To be sure, I have a few reservations. For example, the authors display the same attitude toward Poupard’s and John Paul II’s 1992 speeches, namely mostly positive with a few criticisms; but this is too indiscriminate and is tenable only for the papal speech, whereas Poupard’s report is filled mostly with errors. Similarly, the authors’ criticism of some writers (e.g., Bertolt Brecht) is irrelevant; of others (e.g., James Reston) unnecessarily long; of still others (e.g., Antonio Beltrán Mari) too superficial. But such reservations do not undermine my generally favorable impression.
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There is no lack of historical studies of the Roman Studium Urbis, otherwise known as the Sapienza, the university founded in the Papal State in 1303 by Pope Boniface VIII. With the secular unification of Italy in the nineteenth century, the Italian state took over its historical site and later took over the name of the Sapienza as well. In the book considered here, it is the papal Sapienza that is the subject of attention.

The School (or Collegio) of Theology, together with those of medicine and law, governed the papal Sapienza, as they issued academic degrees, and thus they have claimed much of the attention from historians. This book by Candida Carella, however, concentrates on the teaching of philosophy in seventeenth-century Rome, which was affected by events such as the burning at the stake for heresy of Giordano Bruno, followed by the consignment of Copernicus’s De revolutionibus to the Index in 1616, and the trial and condemnation of Galileo in 1633.

This volume, which is based on a doctoral thesis in philosophy for the State Università di Roma “La Sapienza,” cuts a careful path through the course of that troubled century by concentrating on a considerable amount of previously unpublished documentary material. The first part of the volume discusses the institutional factors that affected the teaching of philosophy in the seventeenth-century Studium Urbis, such as its subordination to medicine, law, and theology. Furthermore, the nearby Jesuit Collegio Romano offered a structured course in all branches of neo-Aristotelian philosophy that not only tended to empty the lecture halls of the Sapienza but also was frequently considered by its academic authorities as an essential philosophical school, leading one student in 1652 to complain about the impossibility of obtaining