

nor of political opinion (90). A fuller account of the place of that philosophic education and its relation to politics seems quite important. Vaughan quotes *De Cive* at length, in which Hobbes remarks that he “took up Philosophy for intellectual enjoyment,” until the political turmoil of his country became too threatening. At that point he put aside philosophy and turned his attention to the pressing practical needs of politics (14). But is peace an end in itself? It is at least plausible that Hobbes addresses those pressing political concerns so that he can reestablish an environment in which philosophers may pursue their intellectual enjoyments.

Behemoth Teaches Leviathan will be of special interest to scholars interested in Hobbes and to those willing to reassess the necessity of political education, of the preservation of proper political opinion, even in a free society. Vaughan’s analysis is very suggestive, too, for other readers whose interests lie not directly with political education but with the way the stories we tell about our history shape our public political ethos.

Sarah Hutton. *Anne Conway: A Woman Philosopher*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005. viii + 271 pp. \$75.00. Review by KAROL K. WEAVER, SUSQUEHANNA UNIVERSITY.

Sarah Hutton’s *Anne Conway: A Woman Philosopher* traces the life, philosophy, and intellectual development of Anne Conway using Conway’s own works and the relationships she had with leading intellectuals of her day. Hutton endeavors to use history and biography to understand Conway’s philosophy. While Hutton’s methodologies reveal significant information about Conway’s life, philosophy, and intellectual milieu, her employment of history and biography as analytical tools ultimately undermines her efforts to craft a full and successful story of Conway as a woman philosopher.

Hutton applies both biography and history in her quest to understand Anne Conway’s life and philosophy. Via biography, Hutton hopes to place Conway at the center of a circle of great thinkers. Hutton claims that Conway led this group and set its agenda. Hutton also utilizes “reconstructive archaeology,” which Hutton defines as “the history of her [Conway’s] philosophical activities . . . pieced together . . . from the intellectual circle she was fortunate enough to inhabit” (10). Thus, she considers Conway in relation to Henry

More, Francis Mercury Van Helmont, Thomas Hobbes, Margaret Cavendish, Robert Boyle, and many others. She also explores Conway's philosophical ventures into medicine, kabbalism, Quakerism, and numerous other topics. An especially interesting aspect of Conway's philosophical development concerned the effects that Conway's chronic illness had on her philosophy and her association with leading medical philosophers of her day. For instance, Hutton points out that Conway was drawn to Quakerism because she equated their persecution and suffering with the physical and psychological torment she endured as a result of her medical condition.

However, Hutton's use of biography and history results in mixed success. Virginia Woolf's statement, "Women have served all these centuries as looking glasses possessing the magic and delicious power of reflecting the figure of man at twice its natural size," fits Hutton's discussion of Conway and her intellectual associates. Due to the tremendous amount of information that Hutton provides about Conway's largely male intellectual companions, Conway gets lost in the text. When Hutton remembers to bring Conway back into the analysis and shows the reader how Conway directly influenced a particular philosopher, her book shines.

The historical approach that Hutton employed also led to limited success. Hutton rightly acknowledges that "my study perhaps has more in common with recent work in the history of science than with the history of philosophy" (13). In her conclusion, Hutton compares her own analysis of Conway with Carolyn Merchant's own examination. This comparison is a good start, but Hutton needed to do more to situate her work within the history of women in science and the history of gender and science. The reader of *Anne Conway: A Female Philosopher* will find a good, traditional history of Anne Conway's intellectual world. The scholar looking for an analysis of Anne Conway and her philosophy in relation to the latest trends in the history of women in science and the history of gender and science will have to look elsewhere.

David M. Turner. *Fashioning Adultery: Gender, Sex and Civility in England, 1660-1740*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. xii + 236 pp. \$55. Review by ELENA LEVY-NAVARRO, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-WHITEWATER.