

past exposes him to the charge of seeking to dominate discourse in his chosen field." From these comments, one would suppose that Wolff had written a Foucauldian book. Yet in this 362-page text, I was able to find only three references to Foucault totaling about eight sentences. Wolff refers to Foucault in the same way he refers to many other scholars, to Benedict Anderson, for example, or even to Stephen Jay Gould or Rebecca West, when the context of his discussion seems to warrant it. Indeed, in one context in which Wolff refers to Foucault, the efforts of Venetian administrator Paolo Boldu to transform Morlach recruits by disciplining their "inapt" bodies, correcting their posture, and running a "calculated constraint . . . slowly through each part of the body" (272), it seems not merely appropriate to refer to Foucault, but almost required. Readers may make their own judgments, but in my view Congdon misrepresents the character of Wolff's effort by plucking a relatively minor element in Wolff's analysis and making it a basic theme of his review.

GALE STOKES
Rice University

Professor Congdon replies:

As Professor Stokes says, readers may make their own judgments.

LEE CONGDON
James Madison University