ties of this deity and the fearsome grandeur of the *odium Dei* (xv). In showing how Milton and his successors struggled to interpret the mystery of the divine will, and how they strove to bring human life more fully into line with their vision for it, this essay collection is a worthy tribute to Michael Lieb’s scholarly career.


Describing this as an “intellectual biography” was an astute decision on the part of author and/or publisher. The book’s greatest virtue is its ability to guide the reader through the staggering diversity and frequent complexity of Leibniz’s thought—from ethics to logic, from physics to theology, from math to metaphysics. Even some of the more rarefied aspects of Leibniz’s theorising are explained with great clarity and one would not have to be especially familiar with the subject to enjoy this volume. Antognazza is to be especially commended for tracing the gradual development of Leibniz’s ideas. As she puts it, his was a “labyrinthine” intellectual odyssey (90) but it is still eminently possible (though far from easy) to plot the trajectories of some of his most influential contributions (the theory of monads, for instance) back to his more youthful work and conjectures. Leibniz always dreamed of producing a grand philosophical synthesis. He never came close to achieving this goal but, as this book clearly demonstrates, there was more systematisation and coherency to his life’s work than is sometimes allowed.

Another accusation routinely levelled at Leibniz is that he was something of a dreamer. Antognazza rejects this characterisation and insists that he usually had his “feet firmly on the ground” (100). For Leibniz, utility was extremely important. He wanted to improve the world in practical ways. This is a refreshing adjudication. Leibniz adored the realms of pure mathematics and abstruse metaphysics but, as Antognazza reminds us, he also weighed into debates about Louis XIV’s foreign policy and spent a great deal of time conjuring up schemes to drain water from the Duke of Hanover’s mines. It can
sometimes seem that Leibniz dipped his toe into too many different philosophical pools but the very ambition of his project was itself the result of a straightforward aspiration: to improve the human condition to the greater glory of God. Leibniz saw no obvious or necessary division between the study and the workaday world: the one fed the other.

Mention of God leads us to the other major strength of this volume. It is very good on Leibniz’s religion. Antognazza argues (and she is absolutely right) that Leibniz’s faith was foundational. He saw no contradiction in accepting both contemporary mechanistic physics and the basic tenets of Christianity. Others paid lip-service to such tenets: Leibniz seems to have believed in them passionately and while he was a life-long irenicist many of his theological stances (a firm Trinitarianism, for instance) were anything but radical.

Antognazza has produced a rounded portrait of Leibniz the thinker and some of the themes developed here (that his “respect for the past … differentiated him so clearly from most of his great philosophical contemporaries” (33), for instance) are very welcome. Not that the author neglects Leibniz the man. The structure of this book is rigorously chronological and the reader will discover all the highlights of Leibniz’s travels and career. The sections on the younger Leibniz are particularly rewarding, and while the great man cannot be said to have lived a spectacular life, he still emerges as an interesting, even endearing, figure. Antognazza often focuses on Leibniz’s frustrations: scrambling for position, trying to get noticed, growing increasingly infuriated with the tasks (that long stint as a librarian, for example) that put bread on the table but distracted him from his true passions. There are also some excellent sketches of the various regional intellectual milieus through which Leibniz strode (or stumbled), and the account of the so-called calculus wars (who had invented what? and when? who had plagiarised whom?) is great fun.

This book works on many levels. It will be of greatest interest to those who specialise in seventeenth-century intellectual history, especially those who seek to understand the heady brew of confusion and optimism that defined post-1648 Germany. It deserves a much wider audience, however. It is accessible enough to charm the general reader and it would also be the perfect volume to put in the hands of a bright
undergraduate student who is thinking about pursuing a doctorate on Leibniz or a related topic. He or she would learn three valuable lessons from these splendid pages. First, mastery of the sources is crucial. Second, we should never forget just how astonishingly fertile and star-studded the intellectual world of the seventeenth century could be. Early in Leibniz’s career (in 1671) a copy of his Hypothesis physica nova arrived on the doormat of the Royal Society in London. Four people were invited to report back on the contents: Robert Boyle, Robert Hooke, John Wallis, and Christopher Wren. That’s about as stellar a cast as the Republic of Letters was ever likely to produce, though it should be noted (and we should all thank Antognazza for this nugget) that Hooke did not like it very much and neither Boyle nor Wren bothered to read it. Enter the third lesson for our budding graduate student: it sometimes takes a while to be appreciated. Persistence is everything, and, as this well-researched, sure-footed biography reveals, Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz was nothing if not persistent.


As might be expected of a book with a title such as this volume has, there is, in the opening chapter, a discussion of Pope, Gay, and Arbuthnot’s Three Hours After Marriage. That discussion nicely displays the ambivalent attitude of people living during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries towards antiquarianism. The play makes light of an actual antiquarian, Dr. John Woodward of the Royal Society, but, as Craig Hanson points out, the play’s authors were by no means “turning their backs on the classical past” (13). Pope translated the Iliad and the Odyssey. Gay, according to Hanson, “worked throughout his career to formulate an appropriate modern response to ancient classical forms,” and Arbuthnot “published a treatise on ancient measures, weights, and coins.” Hanson tells us that these three Scriblerians only aimed to discredit men who engaged in a “muddled [as opposed to meaningful] dialogue with the past,” but there is also much discussion of some-