

## Renaissance and Reformation Renaissance et Réforme



Bodin, Jean. *Methodus ad facilem historiarum cognitionem*.  
Ed., trans., and comment. Sara Miglietti

John McClelland

Volume 38, numéro 1, hiver 2015

URI : <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1088696ar>

DOI : <https://doi.org/10.33137/rr.v38i1.22787>

[Aller au sommaire du numéro](#)

Éditeur(s)

Iter Press

ISSN

0034-429X (imprimé)

2293-7374 (numérique)

[Découvrir la revue](#)

Citer ce compte rendu

McClelland, J. (2015). Compte rendu de [Bodin, Jean. *Methodus ad facilem historiarum cognitionem*. Ed., trans., and comment. Sara Miglietti]. *Renaissance and Reformation / Renaissance et Réforme*, 38(1), 147–150.  
<https://doi.org/10.33137/rr.v38i1.22787>

The old debate about the Thirty Years War as a religious war continues in the *Research Companion*. Lucien Bély takes for granted that Gustavus Adolphus led Sweden's intervention "on the grounds that he was defending Protestantism" (89). His co-contributors disagree. Nor would all agree with Maria Baramova that "it is common knowledge that the Thirty Years' War was fundamentally the teeming armed conflict between Protestants and Catholics that was forestalled in the sixteenth century" (116). Helfferich combines the war's "cross-denominational alliances" with the observation that "all parties tended to focus their primary concerns not on the general well-being of their co-religionists, but on their own territorial power and territorial churches" (153). In a chapter devoted to the debate, Cornel Zwierlein asserts rather convolutedly the "co-presence" (235, 242) of a religiously "normative" and a politically "functional-analytical" (232) justification for the war. In plain terms, he seems to argue for a combination of religious and political motivations, in which the latter were dominant.

The *Research Companion* demonstrates the intensive scholarly engagement with the Thirty Years War that has taken place since 1984. As a complement and supplement to *Europe's Tragedy*, it reinforces the complexity of the war as an abidingly significant field of research. Ideally, the volume will inspire a new generation of scholarship.

HILMAR M. PABEL

Simon Fraser University

**Bodin, Jean.**

***Methodus ad facilem historiarum cognitionem*. Ed., trans., and comment. Sara Miglietti.**

Testi e Commenti 15. Pisa: Edizioni della Normale, 2013. Pp. 792. ISBN 978-88-7642-459-5 (hardcover) €70.

In her very first sentence, Sara Miglietti succinctly summarizes the "Bodin problem": he is "un autore più spesso citato che letto" (an author more cited than read). Already at the 1929 quinqucentenary of his birth it was asked—rhetorically but pointedly—if anyone would swear to having read "d'un bout à l'autre *les six livres de la République*." Though this neglect is unfortunate, it is not surprising. Our acquaintance with the author of the *Methodus*, of *La*

*république*, and of the *Démonomanie des sorciers* most likely began with our reading other more famous authors who read and quoted him. Despite the intrinsic interest and continued importance of his thought, despite too its impact on his contemporaries (thirteen editions of the *Methodus* between 1566 and 1650), Bodin did not make it into the “Great Books” series assembled in the 1950s at the University of Chicago. Happily, there has been, since the work of Pierre Mesnard, J. L. Brown, and Beatrice Reynolds in the 1930s–1940s and especially in the last two decades, a rapidly increasing interest. (On the current state of Bodin studies, see Turchetti’s entry in the *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*: <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2015/entries/bodin/>.)

Miglietti’s book consists primarily of a transcription of chapters 1–9 of the *Methodus* (in the second, 1572 edition clearly indicating the 1566 variants) with a facing Italian translation. The tenth chapter—Bodin’s own listing of his sources—and the “Index rerum memorabilium” that Bodin added in 1572 are wisely left untranslated. The main body of the work is preceded by four pages of preliminaries and by a very searching forty-four-page “Introduzione” which is completed by a ten-page “Bibliografia” and a five-page “Nota al testo.” Miglietti is a very scrupulous editor; the volume would have benefitted from an *index nominum* of her own making.

Miglietti was motivated by “una triplice mancanza”: the lack of a modern edition of the Latin text indicating the variants between 1566 and 1572; the lack of an annotated Italian translation based on a reliable Latin text; and the lack of a study devoted to the evolution of Bodin’s thought in the period 1566–76, i.e., between the first edition of the *Methodus* and the publication of *La république*. It is the first and third of these “mancanze” that will be her particular concern in the introduction, since previous editors/translators/commentators have not fully understood the nature of these changes and not fully grasped the relationship between the two primary states of the *Methodus* and the great work that followed it.

To deal first with the translation itself, it is obviously difficult to reproduce in any modern language the concision and syntactic effects available in Latin. Miglietti, none the less, does come closer than other translators. For example, in chapter 4 (202–03) Bodin summarizes opposing critiques of Guiccardini’s style in symmetrical clauses that end, respectively, with the two words that sum up the criticisms, “prolixior” and “brevissimus.” Without disjoining the Italian syntax Miglietti replicates the concision and mirrors Bodin’s effect by ending

her clauses in “prolisso” and “stringato” (condensed), conveying a better sense of the original than do the more verbose Mesnard (1941) and Reynolds (1945). Similarly, in a strongly written sentence with a forceful verb and marked by internal rhyme and alliteration (“Ex quo perspicuum [...] esse delatam,” 466), Bodin tells us that the loss of individual liberties to dictatorship is so obvious we do not need history to confirm that it happened. Although Miglietti’s translation lacks the intensity of the original, here again her version is less diluted than the others.

On the other hand, in chapter 5 (298–99) Miglietti twice mistranslates *ustiones*, “searings, burnings,” i.e., burning at the stake, as “guerre civili” (civil wars). She thus misrepresents what the historian Sleidanus actually meant, has Bodin implicitly denying the existence of the Peasants’ War, and forces herself to confuse an obscure Bavarian named Caesar Leo, cited by Bodin as the only German burned at the stake during the Reformation, with the twelfth-century duke of Bavaria, Henry the Lion (n. 244).

Miglietti believes Bodin was born into a “modesta famiglia” (Turchetti says his father was “a wealthy ‘master tailor’”) and forced to seek a free education, first at the hands of the Carmelites and later at the Collège Royal; this in turn made him advocate, in the 1559 *Oratio de instituenda*, for the founding of a free “collegio pubblico” for deserving young men who lacked financial means. Similarly, she argues, when he moved from teaching Roman law at Toulouse to being a lawyer at the Parlement de Paris, he saw law not as an abstract subject but as a “concreto strumento” for dealing with serious problems having repercussions for the kingdom’s equilibrium (Reynolds believes that this realization had come to him already in Toulouse). Thus was born in his mind the need for laws that were relevant to the contemporary context and the insight that the only way to frame these laws was by comparing all the legal systems of the past. Bodin’s goal was to make law into an art, a regulated discipline, but since history was to be the source of that regulation he was faced with the “necessità di *historiam in artem redigere*” (11; the need to turn history into a regulated discipline). The *Methodus* is thus an exploration of history and historiography, using law as the heuristic device.

Miglietti’s focus is on the significance of the changes—mostly additions—that Bodin made between the first and second editions. She argues that the book’s supposed “defects,” particularly the heterogeneous character of the later chapters, have to be understood in their relation to the largely neglected first edition

(*inter alia*, the six hundred or so *aggiunte* made in 1572 can be explained as the minimum necessary for Bodin to obtain a renewed *privilège*). The great merit of Miglietti's introduction lies in the close analysis she has made of the book's structure and of the text itself: a minor suppression in 1572 reveals Bodin's hardening attitude towards the Huguenots; a few words added here and there show what he has been reading or the social and intellectual contacts he has made. But she devotes the largest section of the introduction (35–44) to understanding how in the *Methodus*, between 1566 and 1572, Bodin developed his concept of sovereignty as "puissance absolüe et perpetuelle d'une Republique," the idea that is the cornerstone of the *Six livres* that appeared four years later. From all points of view Miglietti's edition of the *Methodus* will serve Bodin studies in very good stead.

JOHN MCCLELLAND

Victoria College

University of Toronto

**Bokdam, Sylviane.**

*Métamorphoses de Morphée. Théories du rêve et songes poétiques à la Renaissance, en France.*

Paris : Honoré Champion, 2012. 1185 p. ISBN 978-2-7453-2356-9 (relié) 190 €.

Dans le français du XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle, le terme « songe » désigne toutes les formes d'activité de l'esprit qui s'exercent durant le sommeil ainsi que les images produites par cette activité. Par extension, le terme peut s'employer dans un sens métaphorique pour désigner des produits de l'esprit présentant les caractères présumés de l'image onirique. Il désigne enfin une forme littéraire qui s'est peu à peu codifiée en genre. Dans un volume dense de plus de mille pages, Sylviane Bokdam tente de comprendre pourquoi et comment une expérience humaine se constitue en forme poétique, afin de déterminer quel rapport elle entretient avec les thèmes et problématiques qui s'y inscrivent.

Une première partie présente les conceptions théologiques, métaphysiques, psychologiques et médicales qui constituent l'arrière-plan sur lequel le XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle pense l'expérience du rêve. La philosophie, la théologie ou l'onirocritique s'interrogent sur le rapport entre les images oniriques et leur référent (concret ou idéal), sur leur signifié (vrai ou faux) et sur leur origine