



EVENTEENTH-



ENTURY



NEWS

SPRING - SUMMER 2013

Vol. 71

Nos. 1&2

Including

THE NEO-LATIN NEWS Vol. 61, Nos. 1&2

SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY NEWS

VOLUME 71, Nos. 1&2

SPRING-SUMMER, 2013

SCN, an official organ of the Milton Society of America and of the Milton Section of the Modern Language Association, is published as a double issue two times each year with the support of the English Departments of Texas A&M University.

SUBMISSIONS: As a scholarly review journal, *SCN* publishes only commissioned reviews. As a service to the scholarly community, *SCN* also publishes news items. A current style sheet, previous volumes' Tables of Contents, and other information all may be obtained via our home page on the World Wide Web. Books for review and queries should be sent to:

Prof. Donald R. Dickson
English Department
4227 Texas A&M University
College Station, Texas 77843-4227

E-Mail: scn@tamu.edu
<http://www.english.tamu.edu/scn/>

ISSN 0037-3028

SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY NEWS

EDITOR

DONALD R. DICKSON

Texas A&M University

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

James Egan, University of Akron
Michele Marrapodi, University of Palermo
Patricia Marie García, University of Texas
E. Joe Johnson, Clayton State University

EDITORIAL ASSISTANTS

Megan N. Pearson, Texas A&M University
Rebecca A. Matheson, Texas A&M University

CONTENTS

VOLUME 71, NOS. 1&2 SPRING-SUMMER, 2013

- Frédérique Aït-Touati, *Fictions of the Cosmos: Science and Literature in the Seventeenth Century*. Trans. Susan Emanuel.
Review by ELENA LEVY-NAVARRO..... 1
- Daniel Shore, *Milton and the Art of Rhetoric*.
Review by ANTHONY WELCH, 4
- Danielle A. St. Hilaire, *Satan's Poetry: Fallenness and the Poetic Tradition in Paradise Lost*. REVIEW BY ADAM SWANN 7
- Calvin Huckabay and David V. Urban, *John Milton: An Annotated Bibliography, 1989-1999*, ed. David V. Urban and Paul J. Klemp.
Review by LARRY ISITT 11
- Ewart Oakeshott, *European Weapons and Armour From the Renaissance to the Industrial Revolution*. Review by EDWARD M. FURGOL 12
- C. J. Cook, ed., *The Palfrey Notebook: Records of Study in Seventeenth-Century Cambridge*. Review by BOYD M. BERRY 15
- Chris R. Kyle, *Theater of State: Parliament and Political Culture in Early Stuart England*. Review by MARC SCHWARZ..... 17
- C. F. Goodey, *A History of Intelligence and "Intellectual Disability."*
Review by MARÍA G. NAVARRO..... 20
- Jayne E. E. Boys, *London's News Press and the Thirty Years War*.
Review by NICOLE GREENSPAN..... 22
- Raingard Esser, *The Politics of Memory: the Writing of Partition in the Seventeenth-Century Low Countries*.
Review by JOSEPH M. MCCARTHY..... 25
- Eva Johanna Holmberg, *Jews in the Early Modern English Imagination: A Scattered Nation*. Review by WILLIAM E. ENGEL..... 28
- M.A. Katritzky, *Healing, Performance, and Ceremony in the Writings of Three Early Modern Physicians: Hippolytus Guarinonius and the Brothers Felix and Thomas Platter*. Review by CELESTE CHAMBERLAND..... 31

Elaine Murphy, <i>Ireland and the War at Sea: 1641-1653</i> . Review by EDWARD M. FURGOL.....	34
David Worthington, <i>British and Irish Experiences and Impressions of Central Europe, c. 1560-1688</i> . Review by JAKUB JANIK	36
C.D. Dickerson III, Anthony Sigel, and Ian Wardropper, <i>Bernini: Sculpting in Clay</i> . Review by LARRY SILVER	39
Sarah McPhee. <i>Bernini's Beloved, A Portrait of Costanza Piccolomini</i> . Review by LARRY SILVER	41
NEO-LATIN NEWS.....	44

Frédérique Aït-Touati. *Fictions of the Cosmos: Science and Literature in the Seventeenth Century*. Trans. Susan Emanuel. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2011. ix + 261 + 6 illus. 45.00. Review by ELENA LEVY-NAVARRO, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN AT WHITEWATER.

A visit to our local bookstore—if, indeed, we are lucky enough to have one—will find books placed into apparently discrete categories: not only science, health, and the metaphysical, but also fiction and nonfiction. *Fictions of the Cosmos* reconsiders a body of scientific literature from the seventeenth century in order to show how these texts helped to create just such distinctions. The journey that the reader takes in *Fictions* may not reveal strange moon-men or lion-like fleas, but it does reveal what can be equally strange to many of us: the poetics at the heart of scientific texts. Drawing on theorists of science, Bruno Latour and Michel Serres, who have effectively made science strange to us in productive ways, Aït-Touati underscores the tools, both poetic and mechanical (optical), that were used to distinguish the fictional from the nonfictional, the literary from the scientific, or what she terms the “fictionalizing narrative” from the “factionalizing” [factualizing] one (193-96). In the process, Aït-Touati raises profound theoretical issues for literary scholars in particular, including, of course, literary scholars of the seventeenth century. If a certain form of poetics served, ultimately, to legitimize these factualizing narratives at the expense of what were coming to be seen as fictionalizing ones, then what form of poetics promoted very different ways of thinking?

The book covers much of the seventeenth century, from Johan Kepler’s *Somnium* (*Dream*), published in 1634, to Robert Hooke’s *Micrographia*, published in 1665. It focuses on a subgenre of narrative literature—the lunar journey that has its origins in Lucian’s satirical odyssey, *True History*. In the three sections that comprise the book, Aït-Touati traces how Kepler first uses the lunar journey in his *Dream* in order to help his readers envision his alternate view of the universe (a heliocentric one, made visible by the assistance of optical—and literary—tools); next, how subsequent writers begin to use this same narrative structure as a useful “thought-experiment” with some relationship to factuality; and ultimately, how Robert Hooke uses these same tools to persuade the reader that the most acceptable form of

evidence of a factual universe is precise mechanical representations, created through the steady hand of the scientist who seeks to reproduce accurately what he sees in his microscope (all rendered for the reader through the tools of publishing, including the tools of engraving). In the last section, Margaret Cavendish's *The Blazing World* is analyzed as a radical text, which rejects the optical tools of Hooke and the Royal Society, even as it asserts the authority of its own fictional lunar journey. In concluding with Cavendish, Ait-Touati achieves what she set out to demonstrate: namely, that this period, and these texts, have given rise to the division between the factual and the fanciful, the scientific and the literary.

In the above summary, I have focused on the word that is insistently used throughout—"tool." Ait-Touati uses the word for those optical instruments, like the telescope and microscope that were invented in this period, as well as for various forms of the poetic. Literary tools employed by the writers include the genre of the lunar journey, borrowed from Lucian, and the classical rhetorical figures like *ekphrasis*, employed in the careful description of astronomical bodies. The word is a tricky one. Initially, it might seem to serve the radical purpose of exposing the dependence of the scientific on more than their optical instruments. As the book progresses, the word becomes increasingly more limiting so that it can almost seem to "discipline" the poetic, much as *Micrographia* is said to do in developing its own "uninterrupted chain" of association (173).

The final chapter is necessary to make this point, as it insists on reading Cavendish's text as a "radical" rejection of the Royal Society, as given voice in Hooke's *Micrographia*. At once describing her as a radical totalitarian, who wants to proclaim her own ominipotence and with it the ominipotence of the vanished royal order, "the Duchess," as Cavendish is insistently called, is characterized as asserting an outmoded literary universe, which is now viewed entirely from the perspective of this (early) modern factualizing tradition. Here, some of the polemical implications of conceptualizing the poetic as a "tool" comes to the fore, as her literary work is measured largely in terms of its response to the immediate social context. What only remains is to show how she "ironically" employs the same tools that she rejects in her "enemies." In conclusion, we are told, "Beyond the

radical rejection of instruments implied by Cavendish's epistemology, our analysis has revealed a recuperation of these same instruments at two levels: they serve the Empress and participate in the construction of a novel about absolutism; and (ironically) they furnish the model for a poetics of fiction founded on exaggeration and enlargement of the figures of scientific discovery" (190). By this point in the book, the other ways in which this journey could be understood—utopian, allegorical, and satirical, have been effectively marginalized, precisely because the utilitarian has been foregrounded. As such, the reader is directed to think primarily in the hypermodern terms that are seen as having been invented in the period.

In the introduction, she notes that she preferred to examine "*literary fiction* that will soon be called the *novel*," rather than dramatic or poetic texts that have similar themes (8). What is lost in the process can be hinted at in the discussion of the earliest text, Johann Kepler's *Dream*, a text that is a hybrid according to the later categories of fiction and nonfiction. One suspects that a deeper consideration of Lucian's own lunar journey, including a consideration of the transmission of the text in humanist circles and the traditions of interpretation that circulated around it, would have offered a very different perspective on the "cosmopoetics" that is the exploration of the book. Ait-Touati explicitly dismisses the "utopian" and "satirical" dimensions of Lucian, even as she does not explore the tradition of the dream narrative as it might touch on Kepler's *Dream*. Kepler's text is itself divided into two sections, where the journey is seen as setting the stage for the more descriptive astronomical section that follows. The journey is for the most part seen as a preface to the arrival, in which the reader is rewarded with the detailed astronomical account of the moon. Her focus is evident in her appreciation: "Kepler's originality lies in his combination of the two, to make a fabulous journey to the moon in the mode of Lucian the basis for real astronomical reflection. In doing so, he gives the lunar fiction an epistemic weight—an ontological weight, as we will see—which it did not have before" (23).

One can only dream of what alternate journey could be taken if it did not limit itself to "literary fiction" as defined by the later development of the novel and thought, instead, of the cosmopoetics of a *Paradise Lost*. How might it change our sense of the poetics, if

we were to consider the multiple perspectives? The subject and object are simultaneously exaggerated and diminished, as we are encouraged to look through very different poetic forms, which even includes the “optic glass” of a Galileo, the “Tuscan artist,” standing either (or simultaneously on both) the mountain top of Fesole *or* the valley of Valdarno, the high and low that, from the perspective of these heavenly lands, are both neither? Of course, this more confusing, subjunctive poetics is not the subject of *Fiction of the Cosmos*, nor should it be, if the purpose is to focus on the genesis of the categories that are more obviously dominant today. This book will be much discussed in years to come, and we can thank the author for demonstrating once again that the literary, if not expansively understood poetics, is present on those different bookstore shelves if we just have the right tools to see it.

Daniel Shore. *Milton and the Art of Rhetoric*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012. xii + 203 pp. \$95.00. Review by ANTHONY WELCH, UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE, KNOXVILLE.

Milton, writes Daniel Shore, “dons his singing robes to take care of business” (10). In this elegantly argued new study of Milton and rhetoric, Shore portrays the poet as a determined pragmatist, ready to use every tool at his disposal to persuade others to his point of view—even, and perhaps especially, at those moments when Milton claims to renounce the arts of rhetoric. Where some Miltonists have stressed the poet’s antirhetorical tendencies—his iconoclasm and otherworldliness—Shore’s Milton shows surprising ideological flexibility. He is acutely conscious of his changing audiences, and he is quick to adapt his self-presentation to their needs. Shore hopes to persuade Miltonists to read his writings less as evidence of his most cherished beliefs than as shifting tactical arguments addressed to specific audiences and occasions. To do so, Shore ranges across nearly the whole corpus of Milton’s poetry and prose, uncovering the rhetorical strategies behind Milton’s most seemingly antirhetorical gestures. As Shore explains, “I am not leveling the accusation of insincerity or, worse, of lying outright. My accusation (the wrong word) is rather that he is a polemicist and poet, a maker of persuasive fictions, and that his

otherworldliness stands among the many spectacular and indeed persuasive fictions of his own making" (11).

The self-correcting parenthesis in that last sentence might remind readers of Stanley Fish, for whom it is a favorite trope—as in his *How Milton Works* (2001): "one's identity (precisely the wrong word) is relational" (253); "the observer (exactly the wrong word) resonates to a value and a vision that already constitute him" (565). In other ways, too, Fish often sets the terms for Shore's argument. Shore begins by dividing Miltonists into two camps: those who believe that Milton rejected the worldly business of rhetorical persuasion (this group is "nearly ... a sect of one," namely Fish) and "the prevailing school" of readers who view Milton as a polemical activist, bent on engaging his enemies and changing minds (2). Shore brings the two camps together by acknowledging the antirhetorical postures observed by Fish, but viewing them as weapons in the arsenal of the activist Milton, who uses them as so many tools of persuasion. Fish's scholarship provides the inspiration (or provocation) for several of Shore's chapters. Like Fish, Shore grounds his arguments on a close, rigorous analytical parsing of Milton's syntax—as against the more contextual and archival approach of other scholars interested in Milton's polemical rhetoric, such as Sharon Achinstein and David Loewenstein—although Shore draws at key moments on the writings of both classical rhetoricians and Milton's contemporaries.

Chapter 1 explores Milton's habit of dividing his readers into two groups: the enlightened few who already agree with his views and the depraved fools who will never be convinced by them. In Shore's view, this trope, far from being a gesture of resignation or despair, an acknowledgment that persuasion must fail, is itself a rhetorical strategy. Milton invites his readers to join the ranks of a praiseworthy elect, to seek the author's applause and avoid his abuse, and, in the process, to become "a certain kind of reader—the kind that will receive his arguments favorably" (24). This trope is at work in especially complex ways in Milton's *Eikonoklastes*, Shore suggests, which attacks Charles I's *Eikon Basilike* for using much the same strategy of disclaiming rhetoric as part of a covert agenda of persuasion.

Chapter 2 takes up Milton's frequent pose of writing under external coercion or constraint. Shore argues that Milton uses such claims to

“ward off the charge that he acts from self-interest” (49) and to model himself on St. Paul, the divine servant who put his oratory in the service of God. Shore concludes with a shrewd account of *Paradise Lost* as a sustained critique of such arguments from necessity: “the pleasant savory smell / So quickened appetite,” says Eve to Adam, “that I, methought, could not but taste” (*PL* 5.84-86). In Chapter 3, Shore takes on Fish’s influential claim that Milton’s prose writings try to portray his interpretation of Scripture as no interpretation at all, but simply an effort to tear away the superfluous layers of interpretation that *other* writers have imposed on its self-evident meaning. For Fish, Milton’s self-effacement reflects his fear of distorting biblical truth; for Shore, it is a practical rhetorical strategy, a tool used to conceal his own acts of interpretation from his wary readers.

Shore’s fourth chapter argues that Milton is widely misunderstood as an iconoclast. In Shore’s view, Milton does not wish to tear down false gods but instead to expose, hollow out, and disenchant them: “idols cannot simply be put away; they must be kept on public display as a record of their past infamy” (95). Even as Shore subtly traces the many ways in which Milton lets his ideological opponents collapse under their own falsehood, one might question the lack of distinctions here between the pagan gods of antiquity and the more urgent threat of Catholic or Laudian idol-worship. Shore acknowledges that Milton’s lifelong intolerance of Roman Catholicism found common cause with those idol-breakers who sought “to remove sin by removing the matter of sin” (99).

Moving deeper into *Paradise Lost*, Chapter 5 analyzes a complex epic simile describing the Satanic serpent in Book 9, who, likened to a classical orator, “Fluctuates disturbed” (9.668) as his temptation of Eve reaches its great peroration. Shore skillfully traces the scene back to ancient accounts of the trembling bodies of Cicero and other great Greco-Roman orators before they began speaking. Unlike theirs, Satan’s stage fright is a strategic fiction meant to seduce his credulous audience. Chapter 6 addresses a different kind of imitation in *Paradise Regained*, which sets out to “construct a new rhetoric of exemplary action” based on “mimesis rather than instrumental reason” (125). Paradoxically, Jesus’s actions in the poem are both unique and iterable, acting as a model for future human choices and reimagining the

idea of *imitatio Christi* in an era that saw the “erosion of imitative and exemplary traditions” (142).

In a coda, Shore daringly reads *Samson Agonistes* as Milton’s last great rhetorical effort to win over his ideological opponents. Arguing that Milton addresses the work not only to his fellow dissenters but also to the “Royalist and Anglican elites” who persecuted them, Shore proposes that Milton wrote the poem as a veiled threat: an attempt to bring those elites to the negotiating table by painting a picture of what will happen if the new regime fails to bring about “the social and discursive conditions that would make violence unnecessary” (148; 162).

One wonders whether England’s ruling authorities would be prepared to identify in this way with the Philistines—and whether, in reading about the horrors wrought by “a single misguided enthusiast, one who is merely ‘persuaded inwardly’ that his motions are from God,” they would hold out much hope for a negotiated peace with the radicals they feared (160). Shore’s portrayal of Milton as a pragmatic bridge-builder, seeking comity between the Restoration regime and its dissenting minority, will be hard for some readers to accept. But throughout the book, Shore makes a bold case for approaching Milton’s writings not so much as documents of hard belief but as practical tools of persuasion, “less as expressions of commitments rooted in his soul than as ways of coping with and influencing the contingencies of Interregnum and Restoration England” (10). Shore’s own rhetorical style, furthermore, is a model of clarity and aphoristic elegance. His sharp-eyed close readings will prompt Milton scholars to rethink the poet’s strategies of self-presentation and the rhetorical occasions that prompted them.

Danielle A. St. Hilaire. *Satan’s Poetry: Fallenness and the Poetic Tradition in Paradise Lost*. Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press, 2012. x + 246 pp. \$58.00. REVIEW BY ADAM SWANN, UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW.

It is becoming increasingly challenging to find things unattempted yet in *Paradise Lost* criticism, and nowhere is this truer than in studies of Satan and the fallen state. St. Hilaire is under no illusions about

her entrance into an already crowded field, opening the book with the recognition that “beginning a reading of *Paradise Lost* with Satan these days is a difficult approach, if only because so much has already been said on the matter” (2). While critics who focus on Satan tend to do so in order to determine how his characterisation affects the success of Milton’s theodicy, St. Hilaire “sidestep[s]” these readings, instead proposing that “we may read Satan as a kind of centre to the poem ... [because] the act of writing poetry—and epic poetry in particular—is a distinctly fallen activity, not because it is somehow evil, but because the language in which poetry speaks is a product of the fall” (3).

While Regina Schwartz suggested that *Paradise Lost* is an “an attempt to participate in divine creation by mimicking divine language,” St. Hilaire argues that the epistemological (and therefore linguistic) consequences of the Fall “make such a mimicry impossible” (16). Rather, the poem’s “redemptive gestures reside in its construction of a fallen poetics,” the model for which is initially located in Satan (16). Critical readings of Satan’s creativity tend to fall into two types: the first, represented by Schwartz, interprets Satanic creation as sterile, repetitive compulsion, while the second finds its archetype in Stanley Fish’s suggestion that Satan’s creativity is merely an illusion. St. Hilaire offers an alternative: “because Satan’s activity in the poem has very real effects on Milton’s world, that activity is indeed creative, or, more specifically, re-creative” (17).

The central moment of Satan’s re-creation is, of course, his declaration that the angels are “self-begot, self-rai’d / By [their] own quickn’ing power” (*PL* 5.860-1), and St. Hilaire engages in an illuminating and extended close reading of this passage. As elsewhere in the poem, Satan speaks in this passage primarily in questions, and in a nice turn of phrase (just one of many), St. Hilaire observes that “the medium of a question, which may imply an answer but which nevertheless does not itself declare one, opens up a gap in discursive logic wide enough for the Archfiend to slip through” (26). If not rhetorical, Satan’s questions are nevertheless unanswered, and so we see that “Satan rejects the search for answers, preferring the lack of knowledge implied by his questions, at the moment of his revolt in book 5” (31). For St. Hilaire the absence of knowledge is central to Satan’s self-creation, and in declaring “we know no time when we

were not as now" (*PL* 5.859) Satan "recreates himself negatively, in that moment seizing a power that had hitherto been yielded only by God ... [Satan] can create, but his creation is negative, invested with existence in the world only through its relation to the very power that it rejects. This is what makes Satan not only a poetic figure, but a figure for poetry" (38).

Poetry is Satanic for St. Hilaire due to the distinction between divine and fallen language: the former does not require interpretation since "its meaning is ontologically connected to its utterance," while the latter "does not bring understanding or communicate anything directly," and so is "something whose form begs us to understand it but ... cannot actually yield that understanding" (49). Poetic voices are therefore necessarily fallen, since if they communicated divinely they would all "sing the same song" (50).

This leads to the crux of the book's argument regarding *Paradise Lost's* relationship with its poetic tradition: the poem's self-identification as "unattempted" (*PL* 1.16) rather than "new" or "better" suggests that, like Satan, the narrator "can only establish his newness through a negative formulation ... his poem is significant precisely because it is *not* other poems" (50). With Hegelian dialectic and Gadamerian hermeneutic horizons in the background, St. Hilaire proceeds to unpick Milton's poetic allusions in an extended section of close reading which is arguably the strongest, if the most self-contained, section of the book. Tracing the trope of the bleeding tree through Homer, Virgil, Ovid, Dante, and Tasso to its modulated manifestation in *Paradise Lost*, it becomes evident that "Milton's allusions are expressions of difference" (81), not sameness.

Having established that fallen language is predicated on separation rather than sublation, St. Hilaire proceeds to examine Eve's temptation in book 9. Eve interacts with Satan in the same way Milton does with his literary forbears: they use the same techniques as their predecessors but to different ends. Eve's first words to Satan are questions ("What may this mean? Language of Man pronounc't / By Tongue of Brute, and human sense exprest?" (*PL* 9.553-554)), and this "recognition of particularity is thus for Eve, just as it was for Satan, the beginning of her fall, the moment that initiates her self-creation" (122). We thus see how Eve "adopts Satan's form of language—the question, but

because that questioning is rooted in the negative, her use of Satanic language necessarily produces something different" (119). She answers Satan's questions with more questions of her own, and in doing so "recreat[es] herself according to her own ideas, her own arguments, her own choice" (130).

Adam's fall, too, is characterised by questions. St. Hilaire astutely picks up on parallels between Adam's self-questioning after the judgement in book 10 and Satan's soliloquy in book 4: "Adam attempts to reason through his situation with a long series of questions, which lead him, like Satan, to accuse God for making him and to reflect on the fairness of God's terms and his own responsibility for falling" (191). St. Hilaire hears in Satan's lament "my self am Hell" (*PL* 4.75) an already stony heart finally hardened by the inability to escape subjectivity, and Adam is only brought back from this brink by the intervention of Eve. Eve serves as the other Adam sets against himself, which allows him to recover his intersubjectivity (128). For St. Hilaire, the embracing of intersubjectivity is a crucial facet of Milton's soteriology, and the discovery of a Paradise within Eve, happier far is not a sin but a necessity, since "in the absence of God after the Fall ... love of the individual becomes the means to redemption" (201-2).

While *Satan's Poetry* is a valuable addition to *Paradise Lost* scholarship, it is not flawless. St. Hilaire's argumentation can be uneven; at times, her concern for linking ideas back to their previous iterations leave her occasionally labouring a point, while at the other extreme, the chapter which treats Milton's interaction with poetic tradition, in itself the most effective section of the book, is rather awkwardly integrated into the overall argument. Nonetheless, *Satan's Poetry* offers a fresh and insightful reconsideration of the epistemological and ontological causes and consequences of fallenness in *Paradise Lost*.

Calvin Huckabay and David V. Urban. *John Milton: An Annotated Bibliography, 1989-1999*. Ed. David V. Urban and Paul J. Klemp. Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press, 2011. xv + 488pp. \$100.00 (cloth). Review by LARRY ISITT, EASTERN WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY.

David Urban, in conjunction with further editorial work and advice by Paul J. Klemp, has produced this crisply annotated Milton bibliography of 2411 numbered entries of articles, books, reviews, collections, illustrations, translations, collections, and dissertations from 1989-1999. I am always amazed at the meticulous work involved in assembling reference volumes of this type whose editors must run an exhaustive marathon of sorts in gathering, editing, sorting, writing and re-writing the hundreds of entries. Urban inherited the partly done work upon Calvin Huckabay's death, and then began the process of reviewing, editing and lengthening Huckabay's annotations, adding hundreds of new ones, as well as finding and including annotations missed in previous Huckabay volumes. The annotations are substantively longer than in previous Huckabay bibliographies, thus giving readers a better sense of the selections.

A bibliography should be attractive in appearance, spacious, not cramped, actually inviting reading; and this bibliography scores high. Duquesne's copy editors are to be commended for choosing the large format, 6.5 x 9 inches, which is a delight: clear font, wide white margins all around and in-between the two-columns on each page. A well-done bibliography on any subject should above all assist researchers laboring to assemble all relevant materials to their ends; and this Milton collection exemplifies the very pinnacle of such efforts.

The bibliography is organized in nine sections—(1) Bibliography, (2) Biography, (3) Editions, (4) Translations, (5) General Criticism, (6) Criticism of Individual Works, (7) Style and Versification, (8) Criticism of Editions, Translations, and Illustrations, and (9) Fame and Influence. On virtually every page the impression of fullness of annotation is there—most of the entries, maybe 80%, average from 75-125 words. Representative of the longest entries is no. 1166, William B. Hunter's essay, "*Paradise Lost*: Passionate Epic," at 170 words. No. 1448, Jason P. Rosenblatt's "*Torah and Law in 'Paradise Lost'*" is 135 words of comment, followed by the locations appended of nine

reviews (a practice uniformly followed throughout for books). For a few entries, usually foreign, only the author and work appear when abstracts were not available. Although the Preface sets out the general process Urban set up in culling the materials from around the world, his rationale for determining length of annotations is not given.

My sense of this volume is that the Milton community should be greatly appreciative of how much labor Urban has saved them in researching the greatest poet in English. And to the point, the index is especially useful and impressive in the labor it took Duquesne's indexer to cull and arrange the annotations by number under each author listed. The listings of poems and prose under Milton's name are arranged so that it is easy to locate the entries under the various heads. Of the poems, dozens of entries occur under the names of the epics and major poems (e.g., *Lycidas* has 122 entries); and prose entries are plentiful (*Areopagitica* has 82 entries). If one wishes to find all of the annotations touching on Milton's view of, say, "Antinomianism," "Arianism," or "Arminianism," there in the index under his name they are listed as the first three of many topical arrangements of subject matter.

Ewart Oakeshott. *European Weapons and Armour From the Renaissance to the Industrial Revolution*. Rochester, NY: The Boydell Press, 2012. Xviii + 288 pp. + c. illus. \$28.45. Review by EDWARD M. FURGOL, MONTGOMERY COLLEGE-ROCKVILLE, MD.

Oakeshott has written an engaging book of great use to scholars and students of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The book demystifies the material culture of an important aspect of the military and tournament activities of early modern European.

The book is not a monograph, nor is it textbook; instead it is a reflection of decades of study of the written and physical record of an essential component of European history. The author's expertise is in swords, and they certainly predominate in the book, accounting for six of the fourteen chapters. However, he also addresses other weapons—handguns, staff weapons, and other edged weapons—in four other chapters. The discussion of matchlocks and wheel locks is particularly instructive, but the absence of any treatment of flintlocks

is an unfortunate omission, and entirely belies the “*to the Industrial Revolution*” reference in the subtitle.

The strength of the book lies in its analysis of edged weapons generally, and swords specifically, as well as about armor and helmets. As one reads the portions on l’arme blanche/white weapons/edged weapons, one gains a greater appreciation as to why they retained high status, which reflected on the soldiers equipped with them. Many have encountered men who “trailed the pike,” and here we learn why they marched in that fashion and the reason for its prestige. Likewise the four chapters on armor and helmets explain much that is normally ignored or hidden. His linking of changes in the appearance of armor to men’s fashions (especially before 1600) is particularly useful. Likewise his discussion of the development of tournament armor and helmets, which came to predominate the field of full armor from ca. 1560, serves historians well. The bulk of the book dwells, appropriately enough given the author’s background, on swords. In those six chapters one can readily follow the alternations of blade and hilt design across the period, and in different countries. Here one encounters a depth of knowledge that would literally take a lifetime to replicate. One aspect that should have received greater attention is the weight of the objects that Oakeshott discusses. That information would have allowed the readers to gain a greater appreciation of the huge demands on human strength in fighting either in war or on the tournament field. Alternatively, he constantly refers to collections where one can see the artifacts. (Perhaps the Higgins Armory in Worcester, Massachusetts, is the only substantial collection overlooked.) For those seeking greater understanding by viewing actual examples the book’s illustrations deliver a real service. Oakeshott has a decided aesthetic prejudice against munition armors, which means that assemblages of artifacts, such as that in the Graz Arsenal, hold no interest for him. That may also explain his total omission of horse armor or barding, which served a strictly functional purpose only relieved by the heraldic surcoats that sometimes covered it.

The book has many sound attributes. It is extremely well illustrated, both with the author’s drawings and photographs that truly illuminate the text. As Oakeshott states several times, an image provides a far better basis of discussion than a cascade of words. Lamentably, there

is one image missing that for those lacking a detailed knowledge of armor would have proved a godsend; that is an illustration diagramming the pieces of a suit of armor. Oakeshott, despite his expertise in swords, provides precisely that type of image for them. In the case of armor it is annoying to have recourse to other sources to follow the author. His provision of a timeline that links arms and armor makers to events, rulers and culture is a good addition. While a great depth of learning sustains the work, there are no footnotes. Each chapter has a bibliography, which makes finding sources for a particular topic easy. The quality of writing, save for the necessary profusion of technical terms makes the book highly accessible and stimulating.

Why is a thirty year old book important? It represents the culmination of nearly half a century of thorough study into the subject by a collector still considered one of the leaders in the field. Its new availability in paperback makes it affordable. If you do not live near one of the great collections (for instance, the Royal Armouries, The Wallace Collection, The Oakeshott Institute in Minneapolis, MN, Higgins or the Metropolitan Museum of Art, or the Viennese Hofburg), you will have a reliable reference with this book.

Given the subject, the book has an obvious audience in students of military history. As one the depth of material impressed me so much that I will suggest this book as additional reading for my students. The references to the connections between fashion and armor designs, as well as his comparisons of armor wearers in paintings with pieces of armor, suggested that art and costume historians would also find the book a useful standby. Likewise his discussion of owners and makers of armor provide useful information for court and industrial historians. Literary historians, who may lack much background in this aspect of material culture, will find the author's illustrations beneficial. While other books may survey the same material, many may have a more derivative origin as opposed to Oakeshott's expert eye informed by years of study. If one had room for only a single book on the subject, this volume should be it.

C. J. Cook, ed. *The Palfrey Notebook: Records of Study in Seventeenth-Century Cambridge*. Woodbridge, UK: Boydell Press, 2012. 770 pp.
Review by BOYD M. BERRY, VIRGINIA COMMONWEALTH UNIVERSITY.

The Palfrey Notebook was created by George Palfrey while a candidate for the M.A. at Sidney Sussex College Cambridge (1623). According to Prof. C. J. Cook, the editor of the volume, Sidney Sussex was established initially as an anti-Roman training ground and “conforming Calvinist” institution. By “conforming Calvinist” I think of a compromiser, what Cook most frequently terms “moderate,” someone retaining most features of Calvin’s theology but not his views on predestination (11), thus, avoiding becoming dissenters. Calvinists are commonly thought to have opposed monarchy in the struggles of the seventeenth century in England; yet some alums and staff, active when Palfrey was at Sidney Sussex in 1623, were conforming Royalists in the 1640s, i.e. during the Civil Wars (22).

If that is mildly surprising, Professor Cook’s rich editorial remarks propose that Palfrey’s notebook is a remarkably surprising document. It suggests that educationally these conforming Calvinists trained soon-to-be Calvinist preachers from Jesuit materials, despite the terms of the founding of their college. And, finally, Prof. Cook draws together important similarities between Palfrey’s studies and William Harvey’s writing to form a concrete example of the ways that Puritans interested themselves in what was then known as natural philosophy, which we today know as physics and mechanics (38). In three introductory chapters, Prof. Cook makes his case.

In chapter one, Cook initially devotes three short sections to 1) the physical notebook, 2) George Palfrey, and 3) the social and intellectual context of reformation England (8); the latter being the most interesting. First, he points out that the notebook is unique in three ways. First it is focused exclusively on curricular matters rather than personal responses; second, it is comprehensive; and third it presents what is basically a Jesuit curriculum. In short Palfrey, trained as a “conforming Calvinist” and an anti-Roman agent produced a seeming contradiction. In sketching a preliminary biography for Palfrey, Prof. Cook notes that he was not ejected by Parliamentarians as, for juicy example, Robert Herrick was after the Civil Wars; again, suggesting

some of the “moderate” complexity Cook finds in the notebook.

The curriculum which Cook brings out had two parts: the first is restricted to basics (trivium. . . quadrivium, etc., which perhaps Palfrey taught undergraduates [each one teach one]) (8). The second is much more profound and advanced and also that part of the curriculum most heavily owing to Jesuit sources and approaches. Palfrey took an M. A. when he completed that second “scholastic.”

Turning to the historical context, Cook notes that despite the reformist platform of its founding, by definition the curriculum at Sidney Sussex was somewhat old-fashioned, because scholastic. In Palfrey’s case, the focus was on Aristotle and observation of nature. The College operated on the pre-print, oral manner of disputations, orations, and lectures. Although the universities nationally reflected and responded to the growing optimism and flexibility in the English nation in their instruction, Sidney Sussex remained “moderate” because inflexibly scholastic, a Puritan establishment. Two prominent Masters of the College, friends of William Perkins, were noted for hostility to Catholics (15). Cook notes, again, the ways the Calvinists of Sidney Sussex were “pragmatic conservatives” upset by failures of “personal piety”(i.e. pranks) in students and elsewhere. “They wished to avoid discord and indiscipline and their Puritanism is a reflection of that wish. But they were also prepared to compromise convictions to maintain peace and unity. . .” (18). “It would be a mistake to view either the Calvinists of the English universities or the Jesuits of being blindly conservative” (37). Cook’s omni-directional exposition attempts to make that case.

In chapter two, Cook explains why a scholastic curriculum based on Aristotle would have attracted the academic Calvinists. Their rivals, the Jesuits, had won recognition educationally, and their adopted system, “Scholastic Aristotelianism,” provided, as they thought, the framework that established clear criteria of academic excellence, of theological truth, of political certainty. And Aristotelian natural philosophy was an essential element of that framework” (64).

In chapter three, Cook weaves the writings of William Harvey in with the mix of the second scholastic writers, with particular emphasis on Jacobus Zabarella’s work. On the continent, Aristotle was reinterpreted in ways appealing to conforming Calvinistic writers who were

“led by their anxiety to identify predestined salvation” (74). Partly as a result of interest in natural magic and in election, there emerged a “revised Aristotelianism,” the product of an urge to “reform . . . the system” rather than to replace it (81). Cook’s presentation clarifies both the resemblance and the differences; concerning but one point he urges, “Zabarella uses deduction, and Harvey anatomical demonstration” (87) to arrive at much the same result. In general, the aim was to unify; “both sense and reason, employed separately, had their limitations, and to overcome them a rational scheme was required to determine the significance and use of particular observations” (90). In other words, Harvey and the scholastic writers found ways to integrate physical observation with the results of scholastic analysis.

In sum, Cook’s short and snappy thesis appears to be that “conforming Calvinists” adopted Jesuit manuals, a thesis which Cook would probably complicate; but most of the presentation appears to derive from Zabarella, who does not appear in this argument as a member of the Jesuits. Still, Prof. Cook has raised a number of issues concerning the history of science, of what he terms “scholastic writers,” as well as adding to the History of the University of Cambridge and Elizabethan education. Boydell Press is to be commended for undertaking the substantial work of publishing this volume.

Chris R. Kyle. *Theater of State: Parliament and Political Culture in Early Stuart England*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2012. X + 276 pp. \$60.00. Review by MARC SCHWARZ, UNIVERSITY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE.

For most Stuart historians parliament is an institution where laws are passed and where debates of great importance take place. These attributes are of tremendous importance, but Chris Kyle illuminates for us a much broader portrait of parliament, especially by bringing to life the character of the sessions and the nature of the environment in which the houses met. In fact, the author views parliament as a kind of political theatre, inhabited by actors, and viewed by the public much like a show on a stage.

The parliament that Professor Kyle describes for us is one teeming with hundreds of members and so noisy that MPs could often not

hear what is said. It is an unruly body, often greeting speeches with silence, shouting, stamping of feet and putting those it dismisses to shame. (The author sees a possible connection between the debates and behavior of MPs with their grammar school educations.) Moreover, the house is open to the outside, hears the goings on from various courts and is filled with clerks and other officials. This, as Kyle significantly demonstrates for us, is what parliament was really like.

Amongst those present were also scribes, writers of newsletters and members acting as diarists, all trying under trying conditions to provide a glimpse of what was being said. There was reluctance to divulge parliamentary proceedings, but there was a thirst from the country for such information, so newsletter writers and others provided it to patrons of various sorts, while members took down proceedings for their own benefit. As Kyle notes the desire for news of parliament increased steadily in the early seventeenth century as issues before the county became more pressing. This is a key factor in indicating that the houses had become the center of interest and venue of importance for dealing with the public's business.

Kyle presents more evidence for parliament's centrality by citing the lobbying efforts of many guilds, localities, and individuals to try and influence parliament through petitions and lobbyists to favor legislation they supported. The author might have mentioned that this process had a precedent in the lobbying efforts of those returning Marian exiles who gathered at the opening of Elizabeth's first parliament to persuade the members to adopt a settlement in keeping with their reformist outlook. The techniques of the Puritan opposition under Elizabeth I offer a valuable backdrop to the efforts of interest groups in the early seventeenth century.

Lastly, Professor Kyle turns to the other side of the coin by discussing how parliament and particular members essayed to influence the world outside of Westminster. He considers such developments as the printing of individual speeches, proclamations and committee activity as evidence of this desire. Moreover, the fact that copies of the Protestation of 1621, for example, though torn out of the commons journal by the king himself, still circulated is another reminder of parliament's impact. As he puts it, parliament had entered the public sphere.

In these discussions the author is lucid and informative. Yet there are times when the reader receives more information than he needs. For instance, in dealing with news writers, correspondents and diarists, the number of examples he provides is unnecessarily long as if he is determined to give each one its due. Likewise the number of interest groups, such as merchant companies, that he describes seems to be too many and too repetitive. In addition, during the larger part of his monograph he is dealing with an "institutional" study of parliament so that the chronological context of the developments he describes are sometimes confusing and unclear. For Kyle the 1620s are the critical period, but it is not until the end of the book that he sets his studies clearly within this time frame.

The conclusion to *Theatre of State* begins rather abruptly by detailing the career of Sir John Eliot, thus singling out a particular MP which he has not done before. The meaning of this is unclear until we learn that Eliot is chosen as an exemplar of the kind of MP who can be identified with and utilized the procedural changes to advance his cause. Such activities as his made the 1620s with its eight parliaments and contentious issues a forerunner of the 1640s. Thus many of the of the themes of the 1620s saw their fruition in the Long Parliament.

However, in dealing with parliament Professor Kyle has said too little about the house of lords which itself was transformed just as the commons in the 1620s. He does take note of the significant revival of the use of impeachment, starting with that of Bacon in 1621. This was an important development, but it was the political activities of the lords that especially showed its transformation. There was, for example, the creation of an opposition party led by Lord Saye and others which challenged the crown and helped pass the petition of right without modification. Moreover the upper house had significant influence and patronage in relation to the commons. Thus the lords took center stage at times as well.

This being said, Professor Sykes has provided scholars with an important study of the workings of parliament, its impact on the political nation culture, and the nation on it. The book is well written and is copiously researched. At times in its proliferation of evidence it loses its way, but it is a very valuable addition to early Stuart parliamentary studies.

C. F. Goodey. *A History of Intelligence and "Intellectual Disability."* *The Shaping of Psychology in Early Modern Europe*. UK / USA: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2011. 388pp. £35, \$69.95. Review by MARÍA G. NAVARRO, SPANISH NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL (CSIC).

A History of Intelligence and "Intellectual Disability" examines how the concepts of intellectual ability and disability became part of psychology, medicine and biology. Focusing on the period between the Protestant Reform and 1700, this book shows that in many cases it has been accepted without scientific and psychological foundations that intelligence and disability describe natural or trans-historical realities. The author, C.F. Goodey, has been investigating the history of "intellectual disability" for more than 20 years. He has developed his research while teaching at Ruskin College, Oxford, the Open University and the University of London among others.

Goodey has a strong hypothesis with a clear theoretical potential. He makes his research following historical conditions, accepting temporal restrictions and analysing concepts from a semantic point of view (in different fields as for example the psychology, biology, medicine and even philosophy of the mentioned period). Consequence of this research is not only a critique of the presumptive natural signification of intelligence and disability but a new approach with educative, political, social and psychological implications. He demonstrates that the topic he presents to debate and public critical thinking is in truth related to the social origins of human self-representation. It is in this sense how we should understand the current debates on intelligence.

Another important argument is that intellectual disability is a notion developed through dilemmas around predestination and free will in Protestant theology. However, it is important to not forget that this diagnostic is not equivalent to the author's claim to regard intelligence and intellectual disability as historical contingences.

The book is well structured. Having in mind that the author has accepted certain historical reconstructions focusing his attention on the political, social, psychological and even medical and educative dimensions of the concepts he presents to analyse, we can say that the book is extremely serious in his general plan. Limitations and contradictions of a historical genealogy of "intelligence" and "disability" as

natural or trans-historical realities will permit the author to test his hypothesis about the radical contingency of our dreams about human intelligence and the particular nightmare of this dream is its absence.

Divided into eight parts, *A History of Intelligence and "Intellectual Disability,"* has the subtitle *The Shaping of Psychology in Early Modern Europe*, the theoretical hypothesis and the historical framework are constituted by eighteen chapters in which the notion of disability is presented as part of socio-economic structures, medical histories, status and forms of power and even as phenomenon that implores a kind of ethics of exceptionality. This history of intelligence and "intellectual disability" shows in its passionate eighteen chapters that the very salient and notable history of human self-representation is also a history of exclusion and dishonour for testing the rule of human nature through classification and abnormality. Goodey presents in this work the notion of "intellectual disability" as a product of certain historical idiosyncrasies as the very important demand from a marketized bureaucracy that each of us answers to individually. To be more precise, the author affirms that "the microcosm-macrocosm picture of man's place in the universe, a central feature of medieval cosmology, has been transformed in the modern era into a picture where the horizontal axis of time replaces the vertical one of space, and a future godlike human intelligence replaces God himself as its point of aspiration" (39). But the gravity of this assertion is accompanied by long-term, cross-cultural elements: Goodey presents a complex map since the ancient Greeks to the history of intelligence and disability in European socio-economic structures, the important religious texts that present intelligence (also called "wit") as a self-referential mode of bidding status and conduct manuals in which it is clear how honour, grace as related to intelligence occupied a juxtaposed place with the corresponding concept of disability, etc. The definitions of these notions are important because they are part of the history of medicine: following this theoretical frame doctors have written descriptions of intellectual states and their relationship to the structure of body and brain. The last chapter describes the influence of this strong sixteenth and seventeenth discourse on the philosopher John Locke in his comments on "idiots" and "changelings." As we know the idiot was for Locke not a changeling as the idiot lacked the fundamentally human

capability to abstract. Goodey also analyses the influence of Locke's doctrine on the eighteenth-century theories of behaviour and modern educational practices: "Locke replaces an organic, behavioural and provisional model of foolishness with one that is disembodied, intellectual, and permanent" (326).

Researchers and scholars interested in studying intelligence and lack of intelligence in periods before the twentieth century will find this book one of the most relevant works.

But as intelligence is a peculiar idea maybe many researchers will continue asking why our modern understanding of "intellectual disability," a contingent and accidental notion, crystallised around 400 years ago and what that implies for us in our current century, not only in Western but in the whole world. I am sure it will continue to be contingent and accidental but in what sense and what kind of human beings are currently classified by these notions? Is also animal's intelligence part of the scenery about the lack of intelligence we should analyse? How does Goodey's thesis about the contingent and accidental definition of disability, intelligence and lack of intelligence affect our new and future conceptions of human self-representation and animal representation? Reading this book will give you some answers but it will also increase the number of questions.

Jayne E. E. Boys. *London's News Press and the Thirty Years War*. Woodbridge: Boydell, 2011. x + 338 pp. \$99.00. Review by NICOLE GREENSPAN, HAMPDEN-SYDNEY COLLEGE.

With *London's News Press and the Thirty Years War*, Jayne Boys builds upon the growing interest of historians and literary scholars in international news. Through detailed examination of the periodical press between the 1620s and 1640s, and meticulous research into the areas of contemporary print, news, and political cultures, Boys seeks to demonstrate "the interplay between high domestic politics, international relations and London news publication" (2). The book is divided into three sections. The first broadly treats the development of print and news cultures in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Chapter 1 focuses on the popular interest in and market for

news, while chapter 2 expands the discussion to news networks on the continent. Chapter 3 explores the beginning of English periodical news and the creation of a syndicate of publishers to enable the production of regular news coverage. Chapter 4 tackles the commercial side of news and the role of publishers, discussing such issues as labour and apprenticeships, the size of print runs, and the costs of production. Taken together these chapters present a lively account of the development of the periodical press and offer a dynamic exploration of a vibrant news culture.

The second section, comprising chapters 5 and 6, examines the roles of editors and readers in shaping periodical news. Editorial practices such as contextualizing international news, numbering and dating weekly issues, and addressing readers were among the strategies used to attract audiences. Boys also shows how these techniques evolved over time, as readers became more familiar with the conventions of printed news and international news reporting.

The third and final section treats politics, licensing, and the press during the reigns of James I and Charles I. Boys supports recent scholarly efforts to rehabilitate James's political and foreign policies, arguing that the king "was aware of the power of words and sought to influence public opinion" (209). Though not always successful, James, with his licenser Sir Francis Cottington, tried to make sure that the news press generally supported his policies and did not print material that could challenge his goals. Charles, however, adopted a "*laissez-faire* approach to the press" (211) and did not concern himself with public opinion until it was too late. From the outset of his reign, through the ill-fated campaigns against Spain and France, the suppression of newsbooks between 1632-1638, and the outbreak of civil war in Britain, Charles "simply did not appreciate the desirability of telling his side of events, nor see the need to persuade" (268).

Boys examines news and print culture from a variety of perspectives, including those of production and distribution, the development of editorial practice, the influence of high politics, and the significance of periodicity. This multiplicity of angles highlights the rich context for the development of news culture. On the other hand, at times these discussions can seem disconnected from one another. For example, the general overview of international news networks more provides a

backdrop for the discussion of the London press rather than embeds London news networks in their international context. Much of the source material on news relating to the Thirty Years War is the English newsbooks themselves—what Boys refers to as “internal evidence” (49). International news channels and trade in news on the continent could be linked more firmly to the specific news networks in early Stuart London and printed news production on the war.

Boys has a strong command of the events of the Thirty Years War and early Stuart high politics. It should be noted that readers are expected to possess a similar degree of familiarity. People, political events, government policies, battles, and diplomatic negotiations in Britain and on the continent are regularly mentioned without identification, definition, or indication of their significance. This expectation of familiarity seems to extend to scholarship as well. References to disparate points and arguments frequently are contained, without distinction, in a single footnote, which can be confusing and sometimes misleading. Problems with clarity are evident in other ways. The prose itself often can be imprecise or unclear; such issues as the overuse of pronouns, dangling modifiers, and run-on sentences can render meaning opaque. At times the difficulty seems more conceptual. There seems to be some confusion between licensing and registering texts, for example, and in discussing revisionist and post-revisionist debates over early modern censorship the differences between these positions tends to be unclear. Perhaps this is why Boys appears to support both revisionist and post-revisionist arguments (91).

In spite of these caveats, Boys sheds considerable light on the ways in which English newsbooks borrowed, adapted, and moved away from continental (particularly Dutch) models. In addition to increasing our understanding of the development of English periodicals, the monograph also helps explain the fascination with and establishes the importance of international news in early Stuart England.

Raingard Esser. *The Politics of Memory: the Writing of Partition in the Seventeenth-Century Low Countries*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2012. xi + 364 pp. \$163.00. Review by JOSEPH M. MCCARTHY, SUFFOLK UNIVERSITY.

Chorography, a genre combining physical description and natural history of a region with information on local history and antiquities, was made popular in the Low Countries in the sixteenth century with the publication of the Italian merchant/scholar Ludovico Guicciardini's *Descrittione di tutti i Paesi Bassi*. The following century saw a remarkable efflorescence of chorographies both in the Dutch Republic, which produced a total of fifty urban and rural chorographies (among which five lavish works devoted to Amsterdam were published in the years 1662-1665) and in the Spanish Netherlands where the Habsburg court commissioned works for the urban centers, regions and provinces of the South. The genre declined at the end of the seventeenth century perhaps due to the solidification of the two Netherlandish states after the end of the Eighty Years' War in 1648.

In *The Politics of Memory*, Dr. Raingard Esser, professor of Early Modern History at the University of Groningen, studies the process by which these chorographies were produced with special attention to the historiographical discussions that accompanied them and calls attention to the need for revising Arnaldo Momigliano's distinction between historical writing as narrative and antiquarian research as descriptive. Her study has two aims: first, to analyze historiographical conventions, approaches and methodologies in chorographical writing to see how they change over time, and second to use Aleida Assmann's concept of "political memory" to study the development of different historiographical traditions in the Protestant North and the Catholic South so as to contribute to the current interest in "cultures of memory" and "memory studies."

The core of the work is two sections of three chapters each, one section devoted to the chorographies of the northern cities of Amsterdam, Haarlem and Nijmegen, the other to those of the southern cities of Antwerp, Leuven and Geraardsbergen. A third section deals with regional chorographies. In this comparative treatment, Amsterdam has pride of place because of its importance as the political and commercial

center of the Dutch Republic, one of the most important metropolises in the western world. The seventy-five pages Esser devotes to it is greater than the total of pages accorded to the other five cities under consideration and nearly matches the eighty-eight pages given over to the analysis and description of regional chorographies. Aptly titled "The Jewel in the Crown," the treatment of Amsterdam is organized around the chorographical milestones erected by three major figures, Johannes Isacius Pontanus (1611), Olfert Dapper (1663) and Caspar Commelin (1693). Each of these authors is discussed in terms of his presentation of city images and iconography, origin myths, the Dutch Revolt and religious diversity/immigrants. Their efforts describe an arc from the classically trained historian, Pontanus, writing in Latin and relying on the conventions of ancient authors, to the publisher, Commelin, writing in Dutch and displaying an antiquarian fondness for visual images of heraldic objects, coins, monuments and other artifacts. In the course of the century, the question of the Batavian origins of the Hollanders, so vital to Pontanus, became of mere formality of presentation in Commelin, the treatment of the Dutch Revolt fossilized, and the insistence on the cultural and confessional uniformity of the Amsterdammers evolved into consideration of cultural and confessional diversity as one of the city's key assets. The pattern of description and analysis having been established with the Amsterdam case study is repeated through each of the other parts, so that a truly comparative study of the preparation, networks and methods of the various authors and of such themes as urban/regional nature and origins, population variations and religious tradition emerges.

From these comparisons, Esser ventures a variety of useful observations and conclusions. Southern chorographies tended to be written in Latin by clerical elites and fewer in number than northern chorographies, perhaps in part because the southern Netherlands conveyed a message of community by way of pageants, processions, images, art and architecture rather than writing. The South also saw the emergence of a distinctively Catholic historiographical approach in which hagiography and an emphasis on "tradition" and continuity became increasingly normative. Where Northerners conceptualized "time" and the movement of history in terms of change and periodization, the notions of description and continuity favored by Southerners

created an impression of timelessness in which the Eighty Years' War and its results could be ignored. In both North and South, analysis and interpretation of evidence gradually gave way to its collection and description, a move toward antiquarianism. Literary style and persuasion gave way to quotes, footnotes and critical apparatus. While in the northern Netherlands vernacular literary works were emphasized and local literary, scientific and political figures were lionized, Southern Catholics worked at the standardization of religious belief and practice in a context of world history "made" by the Habsburgs. Differences in presentation and approach could also be attributable to the availability or lack of availability of intellectual networks to individual chorographers. The sophistication of the work of chorographers who had been to university and discussed methodology with one another was of a distinctly higher level than that of chorographers who worked in isolation, especially if they were amateurs. There is evident also some difference between eastern and western regions. Amsterdam's triumphant middle-class commercialism and trumpeting of her leadership role in the Dutch Revolt was countered in the chorographical productions of the somewhat disenfranchised and fractured Eastern provinces by emphasis on their aristocratic past and historical links with the Holy Roman Empire (as opposed to Burgundian and Habsburg rule).

A brief summary cannot begin to do justice to the extent and subtlety of Esser's analysis and insights. So close a reading of the Dutch chorographers of the seventeenth century, conducted with full attention to the historical context and building upon recent studies of individual chorographers and their work is necessarily of critical importance and anyone studying Dutch history, historiography, civic identity, and the shaping of group memory will find reading this book an extremely stimulating and rewarding exercise.

Eva Johanna Holmberg. *Jews in the Early Modern English Imagination: A Scattered Nation*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2011. vi + 180 pp. \$114.95/£52.00. Review by WILLIAM E. ENGEL, SEWANEE: THE UNIVERSITY OF THE SOUTH.

Eva Johanna Holmberg's methodical treatment of what seems to have been thought about contemporary Jews in early modern England is a noteworthy addition to Ashgate's series on "Transculturalisms, 1400-1700." The underlying assumption of this straightforward study is that Jews were good indicators of what might be thought of as "the present state of the world" insofar as they "made the places they inhabited seem either multicultural and cosmopolitan or corrupt and vice-ridden" (151). The recorded descriptions and observations of Jews, as well as details concerning how host states, cities, and centers of trade dealt with members of this "scattered nation," provide a lens through which a wide range of notions about the customs, moralities and policies of the day can be seen and assessed.

Among the distinctive features of this study is its abductive approach to cultural historicism. Declining to assert either the "bottom-up" thinking associated with inductive inquiry (constructing propositions derived from specific examples) or the "top-down" method of deductive reasoning (where a certain conclusion is reached from one or more general statements), Holmberg works from the available data descriptions to reach reasonable conclusions that help account for the appearance of the textual record itself. Specifically, rather than assembling the extant data to make a sweeping and definitive claim about early modern ideas about Jews, this book systematically presents the often contradictory descriptions found in travelers' accounts, diaries, and itineraries, and secondarily in treatises on diet, disease, foreign universities, and the topography of London. The argument sensibly presumes that these records are not immediately legible documents of the way things in reality were but that they reflect mediated accounts serving a variety of purposes. For, in the end, as Holmberg claims, "these writings and views cannot be easily categorized as being either anti-Semitic or philo-Semitic" (3). As a result of this judicious approach to the data, Holmberg's steady unfolding of the observational accounts reaffirms the extent to which Jews, as late as the seventeenth

century, still were considered by the English to be a source of “continuing wonder and study,” whether affirming the righteousness of the Christian Faith or seeking to discover how, despite dispersion and expulsion, they continued to thrive (4).

Unlike Achsah Guibbory’s *Christian Identity: Jews and Israel in Seventeenth-Century England* (2010) which focuses on the political uses of the dominant metaphors associated with the tribulations, triumphs, and institutions of the ancient Hebrews, *Jews in the Early Modern English Imagination* contends that accounts of Jews abroad and in the Holy Land formed a rich cache of information about their customs, beliefs, and physical presence that could not be scrutinized first-hand in England. This book centers on how the English and Scots reported back to their countrymen about what they encountered while traveling in the Low Countries and the Mediterranean—especially Italy and North Africa—as well as in the Levant and Arabic East. The underlying thesis is that the active process of “imagining the Jews” is bound up with the production of “culturally shaped and conditioned ideas about Jews in England” (5), such that contemporary Jews are taken to be the subject of imaginative storytelling. This paves the way for a critical “engagement with cultural knowledge” insofar as imagination during this period “participated in the process by which all information was transmitted” (6).

Consistent with this cultural historical assessment of imagination informing Holmberg’s study, readers are reminded that both early modern travel as well as travel writing “owed much to pilgrimage and crusade narratives,” and that travel writing, as such, had as much to do with a journey into alien lands as it did with providing “a venue for writing a traveler’s life” (8). Implicit in this literary activity was the desire to attract new patrons and new readers through one’s narrative project, thus fashioning and sometimes fixing for oneself an authoritative, and at times pious, identity. Holmberg’s own narrative relies on what amounts to a roll call of the expected, fairly well-known and easily accessible sources: Biddulph’s *Travels*, Blount’s *Voyage into the Levant*, Boorde’s *Introduction of Knowledge*, Coryate’s *Crudities*, Moryson’s *Itinerary*, Nicolay’s *Navigations into Turkie*, Purchas’s compendious *Pilgrims*, and Sandys’ *Journey*. The requisite passages about Jews from Nashe and Browne are also cited. Several instructive

glimpses of Jews abroad from less well known sources include works by John Weemes, Hebrew scholar and exegete; Philip Skippon, the distinguished soldier who fought for the Palatinate on the continent and then later for the Parliamentarians at home; William Prynne, Puritan polemicist extraordinaire; and the indefatigable Scots traveler, William Lithgow, who claimed to have covered 36,000 miles on foot. Corroborative secondary studies by scholars in related fields pepper the book throughout, most notably David Katz, Elliot Horowitz, and James Shapiro,

Although there are occasional references to English drama (Shakespeare's Shylock and Marlowe's Barabas naturally) and theatrical conventions (such as the development of the racial "Jewish nose," and how red beards came to be associated with Jews owing to this characterization of Judas in medieval spectacles), this is not a book about stereotypical representations of Jews in the usual sense. Instead it concerns matters such as why Jewish ceremonial apparel, so different from the garments customarily worn by English Protestants, would have been viewed with suspicion—"probably because of the easy comparison to Catholic liturgical paraphernalia" (79). Reasonable guesses like this one prompt Holmberg to propose, abductively, that the Jewish body "seems to have been produced to fit the needs and narratives following from writers' various agendas" (128).

With so much careful attention to making reasonable inferences about early modern reports on the appearance, clothing, customs, and demeanor of Jews, it is unfortunate that the only illustration accompanying this volume is on the dust jacket. Most libraries, as part of the accession process, remove such jackets prior to shelving new books in the stacks. Thus the opening sentence ("The image adorning the cover of this book ..."), for most readers will be an ekphrastic description of a dignified if egregiously turbaned Jewish cloth merchant. They will not be able to be edified by or contemplate in detail the picture unless they go to John Stell's 1585 English translation of Nicolay's account of the people and geography of Turkey. And second, it is unfortunate because more illustrations could have served to buttress further Holmberg's overarching assumption that "Jewish practices and bodies were interpreted with the help of widely shared cultural knowledge of English men and women" (9). At all events this

book does achieve the author's main goal of recovering a broad range of ideas "attached to Jews and the information that was circulating about them" prior to their 1656 readmission into England (2). Owing to the steady stream of data presented about the ways in which both preconceptions and lived experience influenced how Jews were imagined in the seventeenth century, this book will be a useful and reliable resource for students of cultural history, social anthropology, travel literature, and especially diaspora studies.

M.A. Katritzky. *Healing, Performance, and Ceremony in the Writings of Three Early Modern Physicians: Hippolytus Guarinonius and the Brothers Felix and Thomas Platter*. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2012. xiv + 451 pp. \$134.95. Review by CELESTE CHAMBERLAND, ROOSEVELT UNIVERSITY.

In the predominantly oral and visual culture of early modern Europe, theater, ceremony, and festival served as ubiquitous reminders of civic order and the rhythms of the Christian calendar. While the didactic and entertainment purposes served by such modes of performance have been well-documented by theater historians, M.A. Katritzky's engaging monograph, *Healing, Performance, and Ceremony in the writings of Three Early Modern Physicians* adds a welcome new dimension to existing knowledge of early modern performance culture. In her assessment of the extensive body of source materials associated with three German-speaking physicians, Hippolytus Guarinonius and half-brothers Felix and Thomas Platter, Katritzky explores the largely heretofore overlooked relationship between the medical marketplace and theatrical events. Inasmuch as *Healing, Performance, and Ceremony* clearly showcases Katritzky's expertise as a theater historian, it also incorporates an innovative analysis of urban culture and the economies of healthcare in late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century Europe.

In her analysis of the three physicians' private journals, medical treatises, and descriptions of the theatrical events they encountered across Europe, Katritzky seeks to identify the ways in which early modern medical practice was profoundly shaped by the culture of performance. She argues that physicians were especially receptive to

theatrical culture due to the longstanding synergies between performing and healing. Public dissections, healing rituals, such as the Royal Touch, and spectacles associated with so-called monstrous humans were Europe-wide elements of medical culture that reinforced the role of medical practitioner as performer.

Rather than relying on broad generalizations about the identity and worldview of medical practitioners, Katritzky's study offers a compelling and nuanced assessment of the ways in which the physicians' divergent religious affiliations and educational experiences shaped their perceptions of and reactions to the performances they witnessed. Based in Basle, the Platter brothers' Lutheran background and career ambitions led them to positions of prominence in their native city and Protestant courts elsewhere in Europe. Felix Platter's official duties as court physician to the Margrave of Baden, in particular, often involved travel to witness spectacles, such as the 1598 wedding of Count of Hohenzollern and Franziska von Salm. Platter's comprehensive accounts of such events will be of particular interest to cultural historians, especially those seeking further insight into the intrigues of court life. As Katritzky demonstrates, the Platters' highly formalized journal descriptions typically included a wealth of detail about architectural space, stage effects, and masquerade costumes that is often absent from official chronicles.

Whereas the Platter brothers' work was clearly influenced by their status at court and Felix's professional ambitions, Guarinonius' worldview was profoundly shaped by his devout Jesuit background and his desire to establish a distinctly German, Catholic medical tradition. Less comprehensive in his description of the festive events he attended, Guarinonius' accounts focused more explicitly on the public health implications of court festivals, which he generally associated with the dangers of overconsumption and intemperance. Guarinonius' tendency toward moralizing, moreover, clearly influenced his perception of many of the court festivals and carnival celebrations he attended as a "convenient path to hell" (99). Despite his censure of professional and courtly performances, Katritzky demonstrates that Guarinonius tended to be more receptive to availing himself of religious drama and music in the advancement of his public health career.

Katritzky's deft analysis of the varying ways in which socio-religious context informed physicians' relationship with performance culture is supplemented by the inclusion of lengthy source-text translations in the final two chapters of her monograph. Previously unavailable in English translation, this resource will undoubtedly be of great interest to scholars seeking further insight into topics ranging from the Italian *commedia dell'Arte* to traditions of Jewish ceremony. This final section of *Healing, Performance and Ceremony*, moreover, includes a rich selection of illustrations representative of early modern court life and the iconography of theatrical traditions. Though somewhat underutilized in Katritzky's analysis, these images provide a rich visual record of the context of performance culture in which physicians and other early modern medical practitioners would have participated.

Although Katritzky's broad expertise in theater history is evident in her solid command of literary play texts and the conventions of performance, her background in medical history is less extensive, as evidenced by the rather cursory way in which her analysis associates physicians with the "top of the early modern healthcare provision pyramid" (6). Katritzky's study, moreover, glosses over the highly contentious term "quack." As medical historians such as Harold Cook, Margaret Pelling, and Andrew Wear have demonstrated, the term "quack" was rooted more in the physicians' desires to reinforce occupational boundaries than in the perceptions of patients who tended to select practitioners based on their pocketbooks and through word of mouth. A more nuanced assessment of the multivalent identities of medical practitioners and the composition of the quack troupes she discusses throughout her monograph would enrich her contextualization of the medical marketplace.

Inasmuch as Katritzky's assessment of so-called quacks is somewhat less developed than other elements of her analysis, *Healing, Performance, and Ceremony* offers an inventive and insightful synthesis of medical and theatre history that will undoubtedly be of great interest to generalists and specialists alike. Her engaging and highly detailed assessments of the socio-religious dimensions of physicians' career ambitions and interactions with the prevailing culture of performance, moreover, opens an important new window into the shaping of early modern medical identities that has long been overlooked by scholars of medical history.

Elaine Murphy. *Ireland and the War at Sea: 1641-1653*. Rochester, NY: Boydell & Brewer, 2012. xiv + 253 pp. + 3 maps. \$90.00. Review by EDWARD M. FURGOL, MONTGOMERY COLLEGE.

Murphy has produced a solid work on an important aspect of the Wars of the Three Kingdoms (in Great Britain and Ireland, 1639-53). It will serve as the foundation for those wanting to learn more about the maritime struggle involving the Irish Confederates and English parliamentarians and their successor regimes.

The volume derives its value from a thorough survey of the primary and secondary sources covering Irish and English history. The author presents her findings in three parts. The first, a narrative history of the wars, takes up two-fifths of the book. It clearly depicts the intricacies of the maritime struggle involving the forces of the English parliament/Commonwealth, Irish Confederates and Royalists, and English Royalists (the fleet of Prince Rupert). To quickly mobilize a naval force that could hamper reinforcing and supplying their opponents, and to weaken them economically the Irish Confederates licensed privateers. They never developed a naval force rivaling that of the London governments, who also licensed privateers but more as an adjunct to summer and winter (warship) guards than as the foundation of their naval power. While the Irish privateers took between 450 and 1,900 prizes (Scots and Dutch vessels, as well as primarily English ones), their interest was profit first, followed by economically destabilizing their opponents. They avoided all involvement with military operations. In contrast the English warships, even when not sailing under specific orders from London to support land operations, recognized that their intervention could transform the situation ashore and hasten the defeat of their enemies. Furthermore, the state warships, their hired armed-merchant ship counterparts and allied privateers, not only interdicted Irish confederate commerce, but also blockaded ports, which the Irish Confederate privateers could not risk because that would have made them easy targets for the more powerful ships of the summer and winter guards. The second portion (61 pages) analyzes different topics, such as the value of maritime activity to the opposing powers, the types of ships involved, the results of commerce raiding on all sides, and the involvement of individuals as part or whole owners of leased

ships and privateers. As Murphy rightly observes the English ships benefitted from both the central and local leadership having the strategic goal of defeating their enemies in Ireland that would be achieved by the implementation of local activities (whether blockading ports, convoying supplies and men, cruising for prizes and privateers, and supporting campaigns ashore). The reliance on privateers prevented the Irish Confederacy from copying that approach. More mysterious was Prince Rupert's inaction, when he had a Royalist fleet in Kinsale in 1649. Perhaps the indiscipline and desertion noted by Murphy was more serious than she portrays given the prince's aggressive nature? The third section (72 pages) consists of six appendices providing details on opposing forces, prizes taken by both sides, losses and ownership of armed-merchantmen and privateers.

Murphy has followed the remit of detailing the war at sea around Ireland very well, but perhaps too literally. She rightly observes that mercantile losses did not destroy the economy of the Irish Confederacy. Since the Confederate government derived its revenue partially from customs, as well as from shares in prizes, is there any way to determine whether those rose or fell as a result of captured shipping? In light of the (perhaps widespread) avoidance of condemning prizes in Irish Confederate admiralty courts, did the government's share balance its presumed loss of custom revenues? While the numbers of their privateers' captures are specifically listed, with around 1,500 more speculated about, what impact did that have on English shipping and custom revenues? What percentage of English shipping fell victim to Irish Confederate privateers? Murphy cites concerns from London and the outports about the menace, but was it more perceived than actual? One does not have the sense that their depredations combined with Prince Rupert's ships came close to unraveling the financial basis of London. Furthermore (and especially given the Confederates close ties with the ports of Spanish-controlled Flanders), how successful were their privateers compared with the "Dunkirkers," who preyed on Dutch and French ships? Hopefully in the future, Murphy will place her findings in the context of commerce warfare in mid-seventeenth-century Europe. Finally, what legacy did the Irish operations have on the English navy, especially in the First Anglo-Dutch War? Officers may usually be traced, thus one should be able to find out

what proportion of the Commonwealth Navy officers had served in Ireland. Also how many of the ships that served there continued in the fleet? In addition, one of the differences between the English and Dutch in their first war was the avoidance of the former on armed-merchantmen, and the latter's reliance on them. Was that fundamental shift in centuries of English practice due to experience gained from the naval war in Irish waters?

Ireland and the War at Sea has several attractive features. These include three maps that allow one to easily follow the events. Likewise the works cited appear not only in footnotes, but also in a bibliography. Finally, there are general and ship indices, which allow those interested in individuals or specific ships to find them rapidly. The absence of illustrations, particularly of a Dunkirk frigate (which Murphy thoroughly defines), and the various types of warships and merchant ships is lamentable. *Ireland and the War at Sea* should attract readers and historians with diverse interests. Obviously, military historians and those with a desire to learn more about the wars in mid-seventeenth-century Ireland will find the book useful. It should also attract those with an interest in administrative history, Confederate and Parliamentary political networks, and the maritime history of England due to the details provided in the appendices. In other words it would be a mistake for those studying the period to dismiss the book as one solely for those examining armed conflict.

David Worthington. *British and Irish Experiences and Impressions of Central Europe, c. 1560-1688*. Ashgate, 2012. xxii + 232 pp. £65.00. Review by JAKUB JANIK, JAGIELLONIAN UNIVERSITY, KRAKÓW, POLAND.

Though "Central Europe" remains relatively unexplored terrain for most western historians, in the recent years the history of Eastern and Central Europe is receiving increased attention. David Worthington's book introducing his readers to British and Irish experiences in Eastern Europe in the early modern period is a welcome contribution to this field. From this point of view it is noteworthy that a scholar from the University of the Highlands and Islands, in Dornoch, Scotland, is analyzing the links between the British archipelago and Central

Europe to help recover this territory for western historians.

The main body of the work is divided into six parts: an introduction (with a note on the specialist terminology of the region), five chapters, a conclusion, bibliography, and an index. The explanation of terminology, which also gives us the exact area of his interest, and the methodological approach towards dates and place names provide important background. The figures used in book, although connected with the topic, seem mostly to serve an aesthetic purpose, but the two tables play a more relevant role. The first one (on place names) is a great reference tool for an area with such a complicated history as Central Europe. The second table (on British and Irish staff at Jesuits institutions) was also useful and the book would have benefitted from similar tables and reference data in other chapters. What makes this volume differ from other works is the thematic approach towards the topic.

The introduction explains that the main goal of *British and Irish Experiences and Impressions of Central Europe* is to show a broad and more comparative (not solely national) perspective of the visitors from the Isles to Central Europe. In the author's own words: the "aim of this book is simply to elucidate how a particular circle and wider network emerged, and to set this in a wider context of emigration and exile, as well as one, more broadly, of contemporary writing about Central Europe in the English language" (3). Whether the goals signaled in the title have been achieved in reference to both 'Experiences' and 'Impressions' will be discussed. In the introduction Worthington establishes the time frame of his work and provides background for the Irish, English, Scottish and Welsh presence in Central Europe prior to 1560. This thematic structure set up in his introduction is the same pattern used throughout the book, which is very helpful for the potential reader.

The first chapter—"Commentators and Comparisons"—offers a somewhat wider introduction to the early modern period in connection with the book's topic. It focuses on accounts of Central Europe written by the people from the British Isles: both those who had never been there and those who had visited parts of the vast territory. Additionally it brings information on the Leslie family circle, a Scottish family, which played a very important role in the history of the Scottish presence in central Eastern Europe. We can find here examples of the

possible parallels between the Isles and the continent, a short analysis and enumeration of grand-tourists and their destinations, and finally the possible contacts for travelers with the Leslie family.

In chapter two, "Court and Crown," Worthington explores the nature of the diplomatic schemes and affairs between the most important political player in the region (the Habsburgs) and the archipelago. This part of book is divided into three sections that cover three distinct periods in international relations: the Tudor era, the years between 1618-1660, and finally the reign of last two Stuarts in England. It is clear that this division is seen mainly from English-Scottish-Irish-Welsh perspective but the analysis reveals to us mutual connections.

Chapter 3, "Cavaliers and Christendom," brings forth the discussion of several topics connected with soldiers from the archipelago (mostly from Scotland), who were recruited to fight in Central Europe in the mentioned period—often against each other on opposing sides. First of all, the author deals with those who had changed armies (transfers mainly from the Polish to Habsburg service); next he analyzes the nature of the military service of islanders in the Imperial forces (mainly by enumerating personal examples) to finish with very interesting accounts examples of those whose families took transplanted themselves in Central Europe and who are seen from a broader perspective.

Chapter four, titled "Calvinists, 'the Curious' and Commerce," as Worthington suggests at the beginning of his work, should be analyzed together with the final chapter on "Catholic Colleges and Clergy" since both of them deal with "religious and intellectual aspects of British and Irish expatriate life in the region" (18). Indeed, Chapter 4 is an attempt to analyze a network of contacts and fact of the complex presence of people from the archipelago in Central Europe from this point of view. Divided into three parts it refers to Protestants, so called Mavericks of all sorts (who were seeking patronage in this area), and finally to commercial matters. The last chapter shows to some extent the other side of the coin focusing on Catholics connected with the Islands, who ventured to these areas of Europe. The author devoted this part of his book to the Jesuits and other orders (mostly Franciscans and Benedictines).

The conclusion to *British and Irish Experiences and Impressions of Central Europe, c. 1560-1688* is in my opinion a literary attempt to

carry the author's interests beyond the main time area of the work. However it should have contained a summary of the main questions of the work to truly form a proper conclusion. Finally the useful bibliography shows us the difficulties of research (various languages etc.) and huge amount of work which had to be done in order to create such a book.

To sum up I must say that David Worthington's work is a very interesting and a much needed study of the history of Central Europe. In this case it is even more important because of its comparative perspective of the region. Moreover, *British and Irish Experiences and Impressions of Central Europe* is well written and offers interesting thematic approaches towards the problem, a cleaver structure, and a detailed portrait of the archipelago people in Central Europe. However one would be a bit disappointed if one expected descriptions or more direct evidence of British and Irish "Impressions" of Central Europe (as suggested by the second part of the title): the limited number of such impressions is a limitation to the book which became mainly a kind of enumeration of the Islanders (and theirs 'Experiences') in the region. Still, many will find Worthington's work engrossing and useful in further research.

C. D. Dickerson III, Anthony Sigel, and Ian Wardropper, *Bernini: Sculpting in Clay*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012, 416pp. + 437 color, 35 b/w ill. \$65.00. Review by LARRY SILVER, UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

Habent sua fata expositiones. Sometimes it takes a harmonic convergence to make a truly memorable museum exhibition. First of all, it usually takes close museum partnerships to share expertise and costs as well as core objects for loans. Then it takes a major topic to prompt lenders from near and far to send precious art objects for this special occasion, because the larger cause will reward the risk. When C.D. Dickerson III of the Kimbell Museum in Fort Worth acquired a missing masterpiece by Gianlorenzo Bernini for his collection, he teamed with Metropolitan Museum sculpture curator (now director of the Frick Collection) Ian Wardropper to make it the cornerstone

(and cover image) of this exhibition. But that core work was a *modello*, a preliminary model for a large sculpture of the Fountain of the Moor (1653; Piazza Navona, Rome, no. 13) by the acknowledged master of the Roman Baroque. Comparable studies in clay were needed to complement this centerpiece, and the large collection of Bernini terra cotta *bozzetti* (sketches) at the Harvard Art Museums were essential; moreover, those objects recently formed the objects of scientific technical examination by the third collaborator, Anthony Sigel, published in the *Harvard University Art Museum Bulletin* (1999). European lenders then offered generous examples—not only from major museums across Italy but also from London's Victoria and Albert Museum and the renowned Hermitage Museum in Saint Petersburg. Out of such strong seedpearl grew this remarkable exhibition, fifty-two objects in all (only three did not travel), each one documented with color photos, close-ups, and x-radiographs in a richly illustrated and handsomely produced volume by the Metropolitan Museum. Dickerson and Sigel wrote the authoritative entries, and they even reject several of the objects from the Bernini oeuvre, assigning them to named assistants in the workshop or anonymous associates. The objects are organized in a combination of topics, part chronology, part by subject and purpose of the final works (Fountains, Chapels and Saints, Equestrian Monuments) as well as some larger projects. So this exhibition nearly compiles a complete catalogue raisonné, akin to the oil sketches studied by Julius Held of Bernini's older contemporary Rubens. It will stand as a monument of scholarship long after the close of the exhibition.

Unlike Michelangelo, whose creative process remains chiefly in the form of figural drawings, Bernini fashioned his sketches in clay for large-scale ensembles, eventually composed constructively out of multiple blocks of marble. In some cases, especially the angels on the Ponte Sant'Angelo, multiple models survive. The essays in the catalogue trace how Bernini learned about clay modeling (Dickerson) and how he utilized this process with his workshop in fashioning his creations (Andrea Bacchi). Wardropper considers the relationship between these models and related drawings in his creative process; the exhibition features forty-one drawings, itemized by Wardropper as well, which are integrated into the entries as they were integrated into the planning. Final essays by Tomaso Montanari and Steven

Ostrow consider the evaluation of these models and their collecting.

The catalogue not only provides a subtle blend of technical research with serious visual analysis and judgment of authorship, but it also provides clarity in its defining these elements. Sigel appends a “visual glossary” of terms and components that clarifies the kind of close inspection he does as a conservator. Here textures and surfaces, including fingerprints receive due attention, and the reader even receives a primer in how to read the evidence of x-radiographs.

Thus a beautiful, unrepeatable exhibition of fragile creations by a major sculptor (and draftsman) receives fully appropriate pictorial and scholarly commemoration. This lasting investigation, the work of both curators and conservators, has generated a catalogue that can only be regarded as definitive. Bernini studies will never be the same, especially the artist's use of *modelli*.

Sarah McPhee. *Bernini's Beloved. A Portrait of Costanza Piccolomini*. New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2012. ix + 260 pp. + 124 illus. \$45.00. Review by LARRY SILVER, UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

When art historians write biographies, they generally stick to their last and limn the lives of artists and their “development” (early, middle, late). Seldom do they examine the sitters for portrait images in any depth, let alone do investigative reporting. Yet Sarah McPhee's new book performs exactly that kind of sleuthing, and its findings are fully revisionist. Her chosen artist, moreover, is the major creative talent—in sculpture, architecture, and drawing, among other media—of Baroque Rome and its succession of papal patrons: Gianlorenzo Bernini (1598-1680).

At the height of his powers, Bernini carved an astonishingly informal marble bust of a buxom young woman turning to her left (1636-37; Florence, Bargello). Her seemingly spontaneous movement reinforces parted lips, open blouse, and slightly disheveled hair, dropping a stray curl onto her neck. Scholars have long identified this sensual female as the sculptor's mistress, Costanza Bonarelli. She even graced the poster of a magnificent exhibition of those “speaking likenesses” that celebrated *Bernini and the Birth of Baroque Portrait*

Sculpture (2008) at the Getty Museum.

To this received wisdom Sarah McPhee offers a bracing corrective in a full biography of both the sitter and the rare Bernini bust. From its Prologue, this book crisply delineates the received legend—including an angry disfiguring of the woman's face by an angry Bernini—and then proceeds to present the revisionist historical account, complete with full appendixes of documentation (148-214). Intimate in presentation, this portrait was made with love, for a presumed Costanza, wife of a fellow sculptor, Matteo. Reversed Pygmalion echoes suffuse the legend of Bernini and his mistress.

But as McPhee reveals, Costanza was born a Piccolomini, descended from a noble Siena family that produced its own pope, fifteenth-century Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini/Pius II. If her own cadet family branch from Viterbo was impoverished, Costanza still used the family seal on her will. Documents confirm Costanza's dowry and her 1632 marriage to Matteo Bonucelli of Lucca, an assistant of Bernini at St. Peter's. Payment to Matteo stops in early 1639, after the slashing of Costanza's face for a dishonor probably occurred the previous year—the result of Costanza's infidelity with Bernini's own younger brother Luigi. Costanza was then placed in a house for wayward women (fully described by McPhee, pages 51-56) in late 1638 before she returned to her husband the following spring. Such events recall both violence and vendetta in the earlier biography of Caravaggio, celebrated bad boy of the Baroque.

But these documented facts of the case, except for correcting the garbled name of Matteo from Bonarelli to Bonucelli, offer few surprises. Greater revelations, however, follow in this well researched book. Matteo then worked in the 1640s to restore ancient statuary for Camillo Pamphilij, the pope's nephew, busy building the Villa Doria Pamphilij. Through this patron, Matteo seems to have collected but also befriended Nicolas Poussin, then in his prime as a Roman classicist painter, plus other expatriates painters in Rome. When Diego Velázquez visited Rome in 1649-50, he commissioned Matteo to produce gilded bronze lions and other bronze casts for the king of Spain. Prosperous Matteo Bonucelli purchased a large house in 1649 and made a will, opened at his death in 1654.

Widowed Costanza became a mother in 1657, and her daughter carried the Piccolomini name. She also became a noted dealer in paintings, displayed in her home gallery, and her circle of patrons included two associates of the new Chigi pope. McPhee uses inventories to reconstruct Costanza's picture stock (93-106), and she uses her will to document her denouement: death late in 1662; sumptuous burial at S. Maria Maggiore with thousands of masses on her behalf; and disposition of her estate by those papal associates acting as executors (one of them, Domenico Salvetti, owned his own collection of Bernini studies in terra cotta and drawing studies, pp. 120-24). McPhee also ascribes the identity of two painted women by Justus Sustermans as Costanza (numerous others are documented), and she carries on the story of the daughter, Olimpia Caterina.

In the end, Sarah McPhee has reconstituted a remarkable life of an unknown woman who "had the determination to learn to read and write, to make her way out of poverty through marriage, to survive sexual assault or embrace adultery, to withstand illness and imprisonment, to build a business with her husband and to carry it on for eight years after his death" (137-38). We now know Costanza Piccolomini as never before, thanks to McPhee's old-fashioned archival research, wide-ranging curiosity, and commitment to put flesh on the bones of a prurient legend. The resulting original and significant scholarship brings not only Costanza but also her contemporary city of Rome into vivid, almost sculptural relief.

NEO-LATIN NEWS

Vol. 61, Nos. 1 & 2. Jointly with SCN. NLN is the official publication of the American Association for Neo-Latin Studies. Edited by Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University; Western European Editor: Gilbert Tournoy, Leuven; Eastern European Editors: Jerzy Axer, Barbara Milewska-Wazbinska, and Katarzyna Tomaszuk, Centre for Studies in the Classical Tradition in Poland and East-Central Europe, University of Warsaw. Founding Editors: James R. Naiden, Southern Oregon University, and J. Max Patrick, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee and Graduate School, New York University.

◆ *Petrarch and St. Augustine: Classical Scholarship, Christian Theology and the Origins of the Renaissance in Italy*. By Alexander Lee. Brill's Studies in Intellectual History, 210. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2012. x + 382 pp. \$177. Petrarch's *opera* is extensive, that of Augustine is extraordinarily vast, and the literature on both is vaster still. To bridge them successfully is a significant undertaking. Over the past fifty years, scholars have attempted this task, from classic studies by Charles Trinkaus (often discussed here) to more recent ones such as C. Quillen's *Rereading the Renaissance: Petrarch, Augustine and the Language of Humanism* (1995) and M. Gill's *Augustine in the Italian Renaissance: Art and Philosophy from Petrarch to Michelangelo* (2005). In a new study, Alexander Lee argues that "Petrarch's thought on moral questions was derived principally from the writings of St. Augustine" (24). Lee contends that Petrarch, rather than being philosophically inconsistent as is often suggested, was especially influenced by Augustine's early works, most notably the *Soliloquies* and the *De vera religione*, which provided him with an interpretive method for incorporating classical literature and philosophy into Christian moral theology.

Lee examines the relationship between Augustine and Petrarch by way of different themes: Petrarch's approach to literary imitation; the place of Augustine in the *Secretum* regarding reason, will, and the *meditatio mortis*; Augustine's influence regarding the themes of the vir-

tuous life and friendship as found in Petrarch's *De otio religioso*, *De vita solitaria*, and the *De remediis utriusque fortune*; and finally the connection between Augustine's *De doctrina Christiana* and Petrarch's conception of eloquence and moral philosophy.

Ronald Witt, in his important *In the Footsteps of the Ancients: The Origins of Humanism from Lovato to Bruni* (2003), argues that Petrarch reoriented a pre-existing movement of imitating ancient style by giving it a religious purpose, thus uniting classicism and Christianity, and was inspired by Augustine in this effort. Lee's study advances this argument by showing that it was Augustine's early works which provided Petrarch with a systematic framework for moral philosophy, giving him a consistency generally considered lacking. As Augustine in his early writings reconciled Christianity and classical thought, Petrarch, in knowing and following these writings, did the same. That is, Petrarch was first an Augustinian in his fundamental principles and then read classical works through the lens of the early Augustine, enabling him both to imitate classical style and incorporate those sources according to his purpose. While this may lead one to consider Petrarch occasionally inconsistent in his use of the ancients, at times Stoic, at other times Peripatetic, nonetheless, Lee argues, understanding his foremost adherence to Augustine reveals that his approach to classical literature was inherently consistent.

For example, Lee's study of Petrarch's *De otio religioso* shows that whereas classical and Christian authors tended to approach the topic of *otium* from the point of contrasting the active and contemplative lives, Petrarch understood *otium* in an interior sense of seeking the apprehension of truth and turning from obstacles and desires opposed to this. This is the perspective found in Augustine's *De vera religione* and distinguished Petrarch from other Renaissance humanists such as Salutati, who approached the topic more traditionally. In regard to Petrarch's *Secretum*, Lee argues that rather than confusing Stoic and Augustinian thought, Petrarch's familiarity with Augustine's *De vera religione* and *Soliloquies* allowed him to advance "the view that virtue could be attained through the rational pursuit of self-knowledge and the re-orientation of the self towards God by means of cognition" (96). In this, he was fundamentally different from Salutati and Valla, who held to the primacy of the will over the intellect. While both

positions are found in the works of Augustine, Petrarch adheres to Augustine's early theological writings, whereas Salutati and Valla are more in line with his later writings which questioned the power of the intellect and gave priority to the will.

In his final chapter, Lee examines the connection in Petrarch's writings between eloquence and moral philosophy. The "eloquence and wisdom" theme has often been taken as representative of humanism in general, and Petrarch has been considered as either inconsistent in his approach or generally supporting eloquence over moral philosophy. Lee argues that once one recognizes the fundamental importance of Augustine's *De doctrina Christiana* to Petrarch and the way this work adapts "a Ciceronian rhetorical theory to a Christian purpose" (290), one discovers that Petrarch is neither inconsistent nor places eloquence above moral philosophy. For Lee, Petrarch began with Augustine and adopts those parts of classical authors and thinkers which were consistent with Augustine, rather than beginning with classical sources and validating them with Augustine. His use of the early Augustine as the lens for reading classical works reveals a consistency interpreters of Petrarch have missed. Petrarch is thus an "Augustinian humanist" (353).

Lee's work is thoughtful, and his distinction between the works of Augustine followed by Petrarch and those followed by Salutati and Valla is insightful. By choosing a thematic approach, he illustrates the Augustinian influence on Petrarch effectively. He adjusts Ronald Witt's description of Petrarch's place in the development of humanism as someone who gave a previously classically oriented movement a new Christian direction, by explaining how this new direction was a particular kind of Augustinianism not always followed by later humanists. Why they did not adhere to Petrarch's kind of Augustinianism is not made clear. If humanists such as Salutati followed the later works of Augustine due to different principles already fixed in their mind, then there must have been even more fundamental influences than Augustine.

While it is true that Petrarch can be considered an "Augustinian humanist," as Lee refers to him, so can most other humanists to one degree or another. One is hard pressed to find a humanist who opposed Augustine. Besides humanists, thinkers as disparate as Aquinas,

Scotus, Ockham, Erasmus, Luther, and Descartes are all followers of Augustine. Augustine's writings are so voluminous, with some themes accentuated at times, other themes at different times, and his reputation so great in Western history, that he served as The Authority as no other western thinker has. For Lee, the determinative question is, which works of Augustine did they follow? This book is a valuable contribution to our understanding of Petrarch and his place in Renaissance humanism. (Bruce McNair, Campbell University)

◆ *Érasme typographe: humanisme et imprimerie au début du XVI siècle.* By Alexandre Vanautgaerden. Preface by Jean-François Gilmont. Travaux d'Humanisme et Renaissance, 503. Brussels: Académie royale de Belgique, and Geneva: Librairie Droz, 2012. XIV + 632 pp. Every so often, one comes across a book that could only have been written by one person. This is one of those books. The author, Alexandre Vanautgaerden, recently named director of the Bibliothèque de Genève, served for fifteen years before that as curator of the Erasmus House in Anderlecht, outside Brussels. Here he had a chance to pursue his interest in the early printed editions of Erasmus, which had occupied him for his doctoral thesis, allowing him to revise the thesis into the book being reviewed here.

Erasmus is one of those authors for whom one wonders if anything really new can be said, but Vanautgaerden has shown that it is indeed still possible to do so. The goal of the book is to show how one of the most important authors of the Renaissance used the new print medium to control not only how his books were presented, but also how they would be read. Vanautgaerden rightly offers priority to the *éditiones principes*, with the intention “se baser sur une enquête matérielle pour établir le lien entre le contenu des ouvrages, les idées nouvelles et la forme des livres. Pour le dire en latin, écrire une biographie d'Érasme, non *ex Erasmo*, mais *ex Erasmi libris*” (4). In other words, print is viewed not as a neutral medium, but one which is bound inexorably to the ideas expressed in it and which must be taken into account in the interpretation of these ideas.

For his earliest publications, Erasmus lacked the stature and influence to control how his material was presented. Like other humanists at the beginning of the fifteenth century, he saw the book as an object

with which to seek patronage, but his printer, Thierry Martens, was not able to get him where he wanted to go as his ambitions grew. He found a new printer, Josse Bade in Paris, who was able to produce for him a superior product, but as his ambitions continued to rise, he went to Venice to work with the best, Aldus Manutius. Here he found what he was looking for, a press with adequate financing, a group of correctors who could help him in his work, connections to important libraries, and a director with a distinguished presence in the world of letters. He stayed with Aldus for ten months in 1508 and learned from him how to write in the print shop, rather than in scholarly seclusion. And he was able to see clearly that a printed book could be organized so that its exterior form (its *mise en page*) reflected its interior make-up (the ideas it carried), by controlling the title page, the setting of the text, prefatory material, indices, etc. The years 1514-1516 proved especially formative: here, in working with the printer Johann Froben, Erasmus came to understand that printing could be seen and used as a form of rhetoric, serving as a type of delivery (the fifth and final part of rhetoric) that helped take the reader where the author wanted him or her to go. This became especially important in his polemical works, where he reprised his technique of writing in the print shop to get his views into print in record time.

As one would guess from its sheer size, an enormous amount of work has gone into this book, which rests on the sort of detailed analysis of primary source material that one would hope to find accompanying the bold thesis Vanautgaerden has proposed. Erasmus's edition of Tertullian, for example, is studied at length because Vanautgaerden was able to find the material he needed to see how the editors and printers worked: the medieval manuscript annotated by the editor, the markings that guided the imposition of type, and the final printed product. What was observed here was compared to the *Life of St. Jerome*, where Erasmus's manuscript has survived, with the notes for the printer intact. This shows how Erasmus marked up the text to underline its rhetorical structure, in such a way that it accords well with our modern notions of paragraphing.

One of the most surprising conclusions in this book is the direct result of Vanautgaerden's careful attention to the relevant primary source material. Aldus Manutius was Erasmus's ideal printer, but

he only stayed with him for a few months, and when he returned to northern Europe, Erasmus never succeeded in finding Aldus's equal. So what he could not find, he invented. We have a mental picture of Thierry Martens and Johann Froben as humanist printers like Aldus, but this is in good part a picture that Erasmus created, working on prefaces for them, writing letters in Latin which they signed and sent out but could not read, and so forth. Martens and Froben are therefore revealed as printers first and humanists second, with it now being clear that the Latin works circulating under their names were not written by them.

As one would hope for a work on this topic, *Erasme typographe* is nicely produced and generously illustrated with literally dozens of illustrations. In addition to five hundred pages of text, the book also contains a list of the *editiones principes* of Erasmus's works, a secondary bibliography that covers fifty double-columned pages, a handy list of key typographical terms in French with their equivalents in five other languages, and three separate indices. By the time the reader has finished, he or she has little choice but to accept Vanautgaerden's conclusion: "Si l'humaniste est parvenu à s'imposer comme une des figures majeures dans l'Europe du premier tiers du XVI^e siècle, c'est parce qu'il a su dominer aussi le medium de l'imprimerie. La supériorité d'Érasme sur son temps n'est pas qu'intellectuelle, elle est également technique" (495). (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

♦ *Controversies*. By Desiderius Erasmus. Edited, translated, and annotated by Clarence H. Miller. Introduction by Clarence H. Miller and James K. Farge. *Collected Works of Erasmus*, 82. Toronto, Buffalo, and London: University of Toronto Press, 2012. xxxvii + 361 pp. *Controversies* presents Erasmus's final arguments in a battle with the theologians of the University of Paris, especially with their elected leader, Noël Bédard, that had lasted a decade. Bédard and Erasmus were arguing over both content and form—should the text of the Latin Vulgate Bible be maintained? Should the scholastic method continue to be used for the study, teaching, and interpretation of Christian doctrine?—but the conflict over method was the fundamental one. Erasmus argued for a humanistic approach that used philological criticism on the Bible and preferred the works of the early church Fathers

to those of the medieval theologians. Bédā defended the scholastic method, which used systematic dialectic to explore God's revelation to humanity and stressed the obligation to pass on to future generations a tradition of dogma, moral teaching, and popular devotions.

Erasmus's relationship with the University of Paris was a long one. In 1495 he went there to study theology, although he never took a degree. His work was well known there and problems went back a decade from the publication of the work being reviewed here. The theology faculty refused Erasmus permission to publish his *Paraphrase on Luke* in Paris, after which he began an extensive correspondence with Bédā that reveals a great deal about Bédā's deep-seated antipathy to humanist method and Erasmus's defence of that approach. Both men tried, but the gulf between them was too deep and there was never a meeting of the minds; in fact, their exchange passed from private (more or less) letters to published polemic, culminating in 1531 with the *Determinatio facultatis theologiae*, a short book containing the Paris faculty's formal censures of 175 propositions drawn from various works of Erasmus. Erasmus replied the next year with his *Declarationes ad censuras Lutetiae vulgatas sub nomine facultatis theologiae Parisiensis*. A young Dominican friend, Ambrosius Pelargus, offered suggestions to Erasmus on revising the *Declarationes*, many of which he accepted. It is this revised, second version that is translated and annotated in the present volume.

Even the editors are forced to admit that "[r]eading the *Declarationes* is hardly an exhilarating or even very satisfying experience" (xxxii), noting that other of Erasmus's polemical writings are clearer or more theologically substantive. Nevertheless this treatise is valuable as a record of what Erasmus and Bédā were arguing about, organized clearly and free of the personal spite that mars much humanist invective. The *Declarationes* is also valuable for the insight it sheds into the methodological divide between humanism and scholasticism, which was one of the key intellectual issues of the day.

The Collected Works of Erasmus is by now a well-established operation, and this volume follows the structure and conventions of the series. The translation reads well, the notes are adequate for a first reading of the text, and there are two good indices, one general, the other of scriptural citations. All in all, the volume meets the expectations of those who are familiar with the series—and that is no small

achievement. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Jérôme Fracastor, La Syphilis ou le Mal Français. Syphilis sive Morbus Gallicus.* Edited and translated by Jacqueline Vons, with Concetta Pennuto, Danielle Gourevitch, and Jacques Chevallier. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2011. civ + 168 pp. 37 euros. Between 1869 and 2009, i.e., for 140 years, no complete French translation of Fracastoro's poem *Syphilis sive Morbus Gallicus* has been published, but then within two years two new editions with introduction, translation, and notes have appeared: one in 2009 by Christine Dussin as vol. 152 of the series "Textes de la Renaissance" (Paris: Éditions Classiques Garnier, 209 pp., 32 euros) and the present one by four scholars, each of whom is responsible for separate sections. The lion's share falls under the responsibility of J. Vons, Associate Professor of Classics and the History of Medicine in Tours, who wrote the second part ("La genèse de la *Syphilis*," pp. xlv-li) of chapter II ("Le médecin et son poème: la *Syphilis* de Fracastor") and chapters III ("Un poème des temps modernes," pp. liii-lxxvii) and IV ("La fortune du texte," pp. lxxix-xci) of the introduction, the facing translation (2-84), and the notes (87-118); she also contributed three of the four "Annexes" (I: Glossary of medical terms, pp. 121-25, II: Three Letters of Pietro Bembo to Fracastoro, pp. 127-31, III: Scaliger's remarks on the *Syphilis* in book VI of his *Poetics*, pp. 133-38) and compiled the bibliography (143-66). C. Pennuto, Maître de Conférences in Latin and the History of Medicine also in Tours, wrote the first part ("Éléments biographiques," pp. xxxix-xlvi) of chapter II and chapter V ("La tradition éditoriale et la présente édition," pp. xciii-ci) of the introduction and is responsible for the Latin text, whereas D. Gourevitch, historian of medicine at the École pratique des hautes études, contributed chapter I ("La syphilis, une maladie aux noms multiples," pp. xv-xxxvii) of the introduction, and the dermatologist J. Chevallier, Annexe IV (139-42), a brief assessment of the work of "Alfred Fournier, syphiligraphe, latiniste et directeur de la «Collection choisie des anciens syphiligraphes»," who published the last French translation of the *Syphilis* in 1869.

The four authors are especially interested in the importance of Fracastoro's poem for the history of medicine and the venereal diseases. The introduction mainly deals with these points, whereas the

literary aspects and the poetic evaluation of the text are of secondary importance. Accordingly meager is what Vons has to say in chapter III on the heroic and didactic aspects of the poem and on the presentation of the discoveries and the New World. Nowhere does she discuss the relation of the *Syphilis* to classical Latin poetry (except for a few references to Lucretius); nowhere does she explain the structural models of the *Georgics* and, in the third book, of the *Aeneid* and the Argonautic tradition; nowhere does she direct the reader's attention to Fracastoro's skilful manipulations of his main models and the way in which he seems to avoid and nevertheless includes the true causes of infection; and nowhere does she situate the third book within the literary history of the poems on the discovery of the New World, because she has not taken pains at all to make herself familiar with the relevant literature in languages other than French: for instance, she does not know (and does not quote in the bibliography) W. Ludwig, "Neulateinische Lehrgedichte und Vergils *Georgica*," in *From Wolfram and Petrarch to Goethe and Grass. Studies [...] L. Forster* (Baden-Baden, 1982), 151-80 (repr. in *id.*, *Litterae Neolatinae. Schriften zur neulateinischen Literatur* (Munich, 1989), 100-27); H. Hofmann, *Studi Umanistici Piceni* 6 (1986): 175-81 and 7 (1987): 169-74; C. Goddard, *Studi Umanistici Piceni* 16 (1993): 185-92; R. Monreal, *Studi Umanistici Piceni* 23 (2003): 179-89; J. E. Ziolkowski, in *Altro Polo*, ed. A. Reynolds (Sydney, 1984), 57-73; F. Cairns, *Hum. Lov.* 43 (1994): 246-61; R. Frank, *IJCT* 9 (2004): 524-34; on *Syphilis* and the poems on the discovery of the New World and Fracastoro's sources: G. Gliozzi, *Adamo e il nuovo mondo* (Florence, 1976) (also in French translation [!]: *Adam et le Nouveau Monde* (Lecques, 2000)); H. Hofmann, in *The Classical Traditions and the Americas*, ed. W. Haase-M. Reinhold (Berlin and New York, 1994), 420-656 (esp. 427-29); G. Eatough, *Selections from Peter Martyr (Repertorium Columbianum V, Turnhout, 1998)*, who provides a new text of *Dec.* I and III 4 with translation and detailed commentary (Vons does not quote the 1966 facsimile reprint of the edition (Alcala de Henares 1530) but only that by B. Gauvain (Paris, 2003), with French translation, not indicating that it contains, as Eatough's *Selections*, only *Dec.* I and III 4). Her text of Scaliger's *Poetics* in App. III is taken from the first edition (Lyons, 1561) and not from the critical edition in 6 vols. (Stuttgart, 1994-2011) with German translation and commentary by M. Fuhrmann, L. Deitz,

and G. Vogt-Spira (the bibliographical entry on p. 162 is wrong and incomplete and shows that she has never seen that edition), and in her discussion of Scaliger's admiration of Fracastoro's poem (lxxix ff.) she neither refers to nor profits from W. Ludwig, "Julius Caesar Scaligers Kanon neulateinischer Dichter," *Antike & Abendland* 25 (1979): 20-40 (repr. in *id.*, *Litterae Neolatinae*, 220-41) nor I. Reineke, *Julius Caesar Scaligers Kritik der neulateinischen Dichter* (Munich, 1988). The bibliography is a mess, lacunose and abounding in incorrect citations (Scaliger wrote an *Oratio pro M. Tullius* [sic] *Cicerone contra Des. Erasmus* [p. 162 and lxxix n.1], cf. Gourevitch speaking of Grünpeck's treatise "la pestilentiali [sic] scorra" [p. xxxiii]), and in some sections there is neither an alphabetical nor a chronological order.

For the text, C. Pennuto claims to present the "première édition critique française du poème" (ci), based on the first four printed editions (Verona, 1530; Rome, 1531; Paris, 1531; Basel, 1536), of which Rome, 1531, obviously prepared under Fracastoro's supervision, is the best: it corrects the misprints and omissions of the *editio princeps* and adds a list of its own misprints. But instead of printing an emended text of Rome, 1531, Pennuto quotes in the *apparatus criticus* all the printing errors of the four editions that are so obvious that one asks why the reader is being bothered with those *quisquilia*. On the other hand (I only give some examples from book I), she makes new mistakes, misreading *f-* as the long *s-* (1,260 *sors* instead of the correct *fors*), writing *pulluerant* (1,341) instead of *poll-*, and prints *perditus* (1,271), *genus* (1,272), and *Tum* (1,360) whereas the Cominiana (1718, ²1739) and the modern editions have the better readings *protinus*, *pecus*, and *Ut*, but she does not say—something that would be more important than the *apparatus* with the mere typographical errors—when and where these readings have appeared for the first time. Also her punctuation, which basically follows that of Rome, 1531, "a été quelquefois modernisée avec la plus grande prudence" (ci): not always for the better, as is shown by 1,171, *uerum etiam Sol ipse nouum, quis credere possit, curret iter* (better:—*quis credere possit?*—) or 1,273-76, where she prints (defying her own translation):

*A stabulis latas ad pabula pastor
ducebat, tum forte alta securus in umbra
dum caneret tenuique gregem mulceret auena.*

Ecce aliquam tussis subito irrequieta tenebat.

A better syntactical structure and understanding is gained by punctuating as the editions since the Cominiana have done:

*A stabulis lætas ad pabula pastor
ducebat: tum forte, alta securus in umbra
dum caneret tenuique gregem mulceret auena,
ecce aliquam tussis subito irrequieta tenebat.*

Finally, the 240 notes (87-118), numbered consecutively in the translation and not according to books and lines, which makes finding information quickly difficult, are of very mixed quality and often refer only to the notes in Dussin's 2009 edition or in Eatough's 1984 commentary instead of providing information on what Dussin and Eatough have written there. On the other hand Vons does not comment on many important aspects, especially in the stories of the *iuuenis Cenomanum* and Ilceus and in book III, so that the reader does not get any help toward a better understanding of the poem and has to consult Eatough's commentary, where he or she gets much better information and explanations than in the book under review.

The summary, therefore, cannot be positive: the four authors did not provide a satisfying text, omitted discussions of many important aspects and features of the poem, and did not succeed in explaining it to a modern readership on the basis of the results of the research of the last decades. They could easily have found that literature in the annual "Instrumentum Bibliographicum" of *Humanistica Lovaniensia*, but were obviously not able to read German (there is no single trace of the reception of a learned contribution in German) and consulted studies in languages other than French only sporadically. The result is that it would have been better not to have published the book in this form. Did too many cooks spoil the broth? (Heinz Hofmann, University of Tübingen)

◆ *Epistolæ*. By Stephanus Brodericus. Edited by Petrus Kasza. Bibliotheca Scriptorum Medii Recentisque Aevorum. Budapest: Argumentum Kiadó - Magyar Országos Levéltár, 2012. The Bibliotheca Scriptorum Medii Recentisque Aevorum was founded by László Juhász in 1930. Before it was suspended in 1946, it had run to no less than 36 volumes. It took the Institute for Literature of the Hungarian Acade-

my of Sciences until 1976 to resume publication and start with a “series nova.” In 1985 László Szörényi became general editor, assisted from 1988 onwards by Klára Pajorin. One of the major ongoing projects is the publication of the complete correspondence of the Hungarian humanist and diplomat Andreas Dudith (1533-1589). No less interesting is the publication of the letters written by or addressed to that other Hungarian bishop and diplomat István Brodarics, or Brodericus (*ca.* 1480-1539). Soon after he had crowned his studies in Italy with a doctorate in canon law at the University of Padua, he served as a diplomat in Poland as well as in Italy. Having been appointed Royal Chancellor in 1526, he accompanied King Louis II on his campaign against the Turks. He escaped from the disaster at Mohács, and a few months later he gave an eyewitness account of that famous battle in his *De conflictu Hungarorum cum Solymano Turcarum imperatorem ad Mohacs historia verissima* (ed. by Peter Kulcsár in the BSMRA, s.n. 6, 1985).

The edition under review contains 349 letters in total, of which no less than 254 are written by Brodericus himself. They are mostly of a diplomatic nature and addressed to kings and princes (Sigismund I, King of Poland; Ferdinand, Archduke of Austria; Francis I, King of France; Louis II, King of Hungary; Mary, Queen of Hungary; Pope Clement VII). Other correspondents include leading humanists such as Pietro Bembo, Andreas Cricius, Aldus Manutius, and Erasmus.

The text of the letters is based on both manuscripts and printed editions; hence it would have been nice if the editor had provided us with a complete list of these sources. At the beginning (5-17) the editor has given a chronological list of all the letters, but it would surely have been interesting to have also an alphabetical list of all the writers or addressees of letters, and/or a system in the index of names that allows the reader to see immediately how many letters were written by or addressed to that person. The Latin texts are carefully edited and are accompanied by copious and pertinent annotations. Only a few typos or other errors have crept in (e.g., p. 110, l. 23: *ceasarem* instead of *caesarem*; p. 111, l. 42: *De rebus Barensis* instead of *Barensibus*), so that one can conclude that this volume, elegantly bound in a readable format, has been prepared according to the highest standards. For the introduction and commentary, however, it would have been a good idea to have had the English idiom checked by a native speaker. A

final remark: the manuscript of the epitaph for Brodericus composed by Nicolaus Olahus, which on p. 605 is reported to be lost, is currently preserved at the University Library of Budapest, H. 46, fol. 23. (Gilbert Tournoy, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven)

◆ *Theriobulia*. By Johannes Dubravius. Edited, translated, and annotated by Alexander Loose. Spolia Berolinensia, 32. 2 vols. Hildesheim, Zurich, and New York: Weidmannsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 2011. Alexander Loose's edition of Johannes Dubravius's *Theriobulia* is a welcome addition to the growing body of Neo-Latin literature in circulation. The *Theriobulia* is a fascinating, somewhat unusual Neo-Latin mirror of princes, written by the Bohemian humanist Johannes Dubravius in 1518 for the then twelve-year old Louis II, king of Hungary and Bohemia. In it, various animals advise their king, the lion, how to lead his life and how to govern. A vernacular poem of his fellow-countryman Smil Flaschka of Pardubitz, entitled *Nová Rada*, was Dubravius's most important model. However, in his Neo-Latin animal parliament, Dubravius also incorporated many references to numerous classical and humanistic texts.

Alexander Loose's work, derived from his doctoral dissertation, comprises an edition, based on four available printed texts, with a facing German prose translation. The introduction contains an overview of the sources used, a survey of the structure of the work, and an analysis of the metrical and prosodic features. The commentary offers a detailed source analysis, explains the animal symbolic, and places the work in its historical context. The appendix, finally, contains the edition and translation of the prefaces to the first four editions of the work and a German translation of the Old Bohemian model text *Nová Rada*.

Loose's introduction provides information about the author, the historical context, and literary sources and models. A considerable part of the introduction is devoted to a discussion of the vernacular model *Nová Rada* (convincingly identified as the vernacular model referred to by Dubravius himself as *libellus patrio sermone scriptus*), in which tetrapods and birds instruct their king, the lion, in matters of life and government. Although this discussion illuminates a significant background to Dubravius's animal parliament, one wonders a little

at the need for a lengthy explanation of the title *Nová Rada*, when, as Loose himself later comments, it is doubtful whether Dubravius understood what exactly was new (*nová*) about his vernacular example. The structure of the introduction could also have been made more reader friendly by adding a short summary of the *Theribulua*, which would be helpful before reading the section on models and sources. The section on ancient Greek and Latin sources would benefit from a short paragraph explaining the relevance of texts, passages, and sentences of ancient authors used by Dubravius.

In general, however, the author must be praised for his critical introduction to the *Theribulua*. Loose highlights how Dubravius combined elements from his vernacular model with classical and Neo-Latin influences. He convincingly argues that Dubravius used the fourfold division, structured by the cardinal virtues, of Martianus Capella's *De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii* (to which Dubravius had previously published a commentary) as an outline for his *Theribulua*. Its four main parts are devoted to *prudentia*, *iustitia*, *temperantia*, and *fortitudo*. Further, Loose's discussion of the most important sources for the main themes of the animals' speeches and the characterisation of the individual animals offers a valuable background to the work. Finally, Loose deserves praise for his conscientious analysis of the metre of the work.

Loose's translation gives an accessible prose rendition of the Latin. Copious notes in the commentary illustrate the wealth of classical and contemporary allusions and references.

The next edition of Dubravius's work would benefit from a more in-depth discussion of the relationship of the *Theribulua* to Medieval Latin animal literature, such as fables and animal epics. For example, it would be interesting to learn how Dubravius's work compares to the thirteenth-century *Speculum sapientiae*, a Latin collection of fables which was translated into English, German, and Czech. Similarly to Dubravius's work, it was structured according to four virtues: *prudentia*, *magnanimitas*, *iustitia*, and *modestia*. A second Medieval Latin work, the tenth-century animal epic *Ecbasis cuius captivi per tropologiam*, contains an animal parliament at the court of a lion king that may offer interesting comparative material. The present author believes that a discussion of this medieval tradition would add an interesting nuance to the already

impressive analysis of the *Theriobulia* given by Loose. (Nienke Tjoelker, Ludwig Boltzmann Institut für Neulateinische Studien, Innsbruck)

♦ *Obras completas*, vol. 15. Por Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda. *Sobre el destino y el libre albedrío*. Introducción filológica, edición crítica, traducción y notas de J. J. Sánchez Gázquez; *Demócrates*. Introducción filológica y edición crítica de J. Solana Pujalte - Introducción filológica, traducción y notas de I. J. García Pinilla; *Teófilo*. Introducción filológica, edición crítica, traducción y notas de J. M. Núñez González; Estudio histórico de S. Rus Rufino. Excmo. Ayuntamiento de Pozoblanco, 2010. Este volumen decimoquinto de las obras del insigne humanista pozoalbense nos ofrece el texto original, traducido, anotado y comentado de tres tratados dialogados, a cargo de cuatro filólogos latinos de acreditada solvencia de las universidades de Almería, Córdoba, Castilla-La Mancha y Oviedo, precedidas de un amplio estudio histórico. Concluye con un índice onomástico de los tres tratados y otro de fuentes del primero de ellos a cargo de T. López Muñoz, y con el índice general. El volumen supera de ese modo las setecientas páginas, con una doble numeración: una en números árabes para la edición que se repite en la traducción, y otra en números romanos para el estudio e introducciones, bibliografías e índices, además de algunas páginas dedicadas a resúmenes sin numerar.

El estudio histórico general trata sobre la recepción de Aristóteles en el siglo XVI a través del tomismo, aplicada de forma particular a Sepúlveda y más concretamente a las principales cuestiones antropológicas planteadas en estas tres obras, que son situadas en el contexto del cisma religioso europeo, de la conquista del Nuevo Mundo, y de la labor de la Inquisición en España: el dilema entre la libertad y la predestinación unido al valor las obras frente a la fe para la salvación del hombre, la posibilidad de una guerra moralmente justa, y la legalidad de emitir falsos testimonios en un juicio. La expresión y la puntuación están poco cuidadas, y las erratas y lapsus delatan una falta de revisión impropias de la colección. Por señalar alguna: “para ilustra” (XI), en una frase que debería ir precedida de pausa fuerte tras la referencia a la nota a pie de página; “expuesta Tomás” (XXXVI); “permanecen en ocultos” (LIV).

Las ediciones críticas cumplen con los criterios filológicos exigibles, están bien traducidas, y sus introducciones incluyen la obligada descripción de las ediciones previas (y manuscritos en el caso del *Demócrates*) y de los criterios seguidos en la edición. Sin embargo han sido realizadas y reunidas sin que apenas se perciba alguna coordinación entre los distintos autores o a través del consejo editorial de la Colección. Ello se refleja, entre otras cuestiones, en la falta de un criterio uniforme para las introducciones, que no siempre incluyen el comentario de las fuentes, de los criterios seguidos en la traducción, del contenido o del estilo del tratado; en la presentación de los resúmenes sinópticos que figuraban en anteriores ediciones; en las alternancias de u/v para la /u/ consonántica en latín, y de abreviaturas y siglas como cf./cfr. y THLL./ThLL, o en añadir o no coma tras los títulos de artículos y de capítulos de libro en la bibliografía. Son raras las erratas tanto en las ediciones (“dícula” en p. 55), como en las traducciones (“eiusquue” en p. 196).

En algunos casos falla la correspondencia entre el texto latino y la traducción, como en las dos primeras páginas del cap. VI del *Demófilo*. Por lo demás, la calidad material del volumen sigue siendo tan excelente como en anteriores volúmenes, tanto la encuadernación, tapas y papel, como la impresión. Incluye asimismo ilustraciones de varias ediciones de cada uno de los tratados.

El libro resultará de gran interés para todo aquel interesado en la historia del pensamiento filosófico en la Europa del siglo XVI, pues, gracias a la edición y traducción de estos tres tratados, contamos con un texto latino más fiable, y accesible en traducciones fiables, y los distintos estudios introductorios y anotaciones proporcionan además una valiosa información adicional. (Joaquín Pascual Barea, Universidad de Cádiz)

◆ *Declamationes Sullanae*, pt. 2: *Introductory Material, Declamationes III, IV, and V*. By Juan Luis Vives. Edited by Edward V. George, with notes to Declamation IV by Edward V. George and Anna L. E. Hinkle. *Selected Works of Juan Luis Vives*, 9. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2012. \$146 / 105 euros. A German proverb says: “Gut Ding will Weile haben” (“It takes time to do things properly”). More than twenty years ago, in 1989, Edward George published the first two of

Vives' *Declamationes Sullanae*, with a helpful introduction. Beyond a few elements from this original introduction repeated here, George does particular service in pointing, in the second part of his introduction, entitled "Influential Antecedents," to three sources: Quintilian, Erasmus's *Institutio principis Christiani*, and earlier editions of Sallust. However, it is not entirely clear to me why this second part, dealing with Vives' "calculated attention to three sources in particular," could not form a unity with the fourth one, entitled "Vives and the Sources," in which Vives' impressive knowledge of ancient sources is briefly illustrated. One small remark here: on p. 5, n. 15, George quotes a passage from the 1513 edition of Sallust's *Opera*, in which he reads: *Moris autem erat ut iuvenes sese exercuerunt* ...; normally one expects to read *exercerent*, and that is indeed the reading provided by other editions, such as Venice, 1513 and 1514, or Lyons, 1514, which can be found on the internet.

The edition of the Latin text here is mainly based on the first Antwerp edition (1520) and the revision by Vives (Basel, 1538) on the one hand, and on two later editions of Vives' *Opera omnia*: Basel, 1555 and Valencia, 1782-1790. The editor has even occasionally used a recent Spanish edition of 1940, which obviously depends directly on the Valencia edition—as can easily be deduced from printing errors such as *eundem erat* for *eundum erat* (64/18) in both editions—and does not contribute one single better reading. Unlike the previous volume in the series (see my review—badly mangled by modern technology—in *NLN* 2008), the Latin text here is most carefully edited, the *apparatus criticus* is pertinent, and the commentary is always to the point.

Of course a few typographical and other errors have slipped through. Thus the editor most of the time follows, or at least mentions, the corrections proposed by the printer of the 1538 volume in his *apparatus criticus* (e.g., p. 34/1); however, he fails to do so on p. 36/19-20, where the verb *amittere* is required at the end of the sentence: ... *decimationes, quibus malebant complures milites puniri quam militandi morem et disciplinam, qua et steterat haec res publica et futura erat sempiterna*. The printer had pointed out this omission in his list of corrections: *quamquam verbum Amittere ab ipso Autore deletum videbatur, cum prius loco eius quid est Puniri, esset positum* ("although the word *Amittere* was apparently deleted by the author himself, whilst it was originally placed

where *Puniri* now stands”).

Another minor point relating to the translation and the commentary: on pp. 154-55, n. 55 explains the sentence *Iuppiter, et tu eam vocem securus accepisti; quatenam igitur te movent?* In this note the editor seems to doubt that it is to be considered an apostrophe to Jupiter. In my view, since there is not only *tu* in the first part, but also the singular in the adjective *securus* and in the verb *accepisti*, and again *te* in the second part of the sentence, a slip on the part of Vives is out of the question. Thus, instead of translating “Jupiter! And you listened to him ...,” it might be more appropriate to translate: “You too, Jupiter, listened to him ...” (“too” meaning together with the senators who had remained silent). On p. 199 the editor translates *At libentius extra Romam agit Sulla quam Romae* in the following manner: “But then Sulla orders exile beyond Rome more willingly than exile at Rome.” Is the meaning not simply: “But Sulla prefers to live outside Rome to living at Rome”?

A most interesting feature which caught my attention is the fact that the editor systematically adapted the future active participle in the future active infinitive to its subject (34/21, p. 96/12, p. 114/7, p. 160/9, p. 262/17), in some cases following V. Since all previous editions (HWB) always present that form as invariably ending in *-um*, one is inclined to accept that young Vives was convinced that the future active infinitive, exactly as its passive counterpart does, remained indeclinable. And this brings us to another question: in the first volume of the *Selected Works of Vives* (ix-x), the editorial principles for the entire series were established. These included the adaptation of the orthography to the system of the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*. But how far should this adaptation go in matters grammatical? If solecisms, such as the erroneous use of *suus* instead of *eius*, are not corrected (see for instance George’s edition of the *Pompeius fugiens* in *SWV* 1, p. 126 and p. 128), should the editor not limit himself to drawing the attention of the reader to this anomaly in the use of the future active infinitive but leaving it uncorrected?

Nevertheless, all in all, this critical edition, along with the translation and commentary, is carried out according to the most exacting standards. It is rounded off with a double index, one of persons and another of classical and Neo-Latin sources, each of them covering

both parts of the *Declamationes Sullanae*, the current one and the one published back in 1989. A superb piece of work! (Gilbert Tournoy, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven)

◆ *The Kaleidoscopic Scholarship of Hadrianus Junius (1511-1575): Northern Humanism at the Dawn of the Dutch Golden Age*. Edited by Dirk van Miert. Brill's Studies in Intellectual History, 199. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2011. xii + 319 pp. 99 euros. Hadrianus Junius (1511-1575), or Adriaen the Jonghe, is one of those unjustly forgotten humanists of the early modern Netherlands. Born in the Dutch city of Hoorn, he was active in the period between the death of Erasmus in 1536 and the foundation of the University of Leiden in 1575. Praised in his own time as 'the second Erasmus', he was neglected by research until Chris Heesakkers drew attention to him in his inaugural lecture *Tussen Erasmus en Leiden: Hadrianus Junius en zijn betekenis voor de ontwikkeling van het Humanisme in Holland in de zestiende eeuw*, in this volume presented in an English translation as *From Erasmus to Leiden: Hadrianus Junius and His Significance for the Development of Humanism in Holland in the Sixteenth Century*. Rightly, this 'grand old man' of Junius scholarship receives pride of place in this volume, which is opened by its editor, Dirk van Miert, with an Introduction on Junius and Northern Dutch Humanism. He locates Junius between other early humanists such as the schoolmasters Alexander Hegius, Petrius Tiara, and Gulielmus Gnapheus (spelled "Gnapaeus" in this book).

Junius was a versatile man, a physician, classical scholar, translator, lexicographer, antiquarian, historiographer, emblemist, school rector, and Latin poet as well—a man with a real 'kaleidoscopic scholarship.' Not all of his subjects are treated in this book. His historiographical works are treated by Coen Maas ("Hadrianus Junius' *Batavia* and the Formation of a Historiographical Canon in Holland"), who gives Junius's history of the Low Countries its place in earlier and later historiography, and by Nico de Glas ("Context, Conception and Content of Hadrianus Junius' *Batavia*"), who by closely reading the text shows its genesis, actual content, and probable aim.

The classical scholar Junius is treated by the editor himself ("Hadrianus Junius' *Animadversa* and His Methods of Scholarship"). The *Animadversa* was a genre of philological (often textual) notes

to several classical authors. Van Miert shows how Junius made his *Animadversa*, and he also shows that some of his conjectures and emendations have survived the ages and are now in the *apparatus critici* of modern editions, while others (deservedly or not) have fallen into oblivion. Chris Heesakkers investigates “Junius’ Two Editions of Martial’s *Epigrammata*” and draws out the problems concerning these two editions, which are often confused. In these editions, Junius turns out to be a scholar with only a scant philological method.

The lexicographer—of course this lexicography is related to classical scholarship—is treated by Toon Van Hal (“A Man of Eight Hearts: Hadrianus Junius and Sixteenth-Century Plurilinguism”). Van Hal discusses the multilingual dictionary *Nomenclator*, opening the way toward further research on Junius’s lexicographic scholarship.

Junius was an important emblemist as well, as is shown by Ari Wesseling (“Devices, Proverbs, Emblems: Hadrianus Junius’ *Emblemata* in the Light of Erasmus’ *Adagia*”) and Karl Enenkel (“Emblematic Authorization—*Lusus emblematum*: The Function of Junius’ Emblem Commentary and Early Commentaries on Alciato’s *Emblematum libellus*”). Enenkel analyzes the functions of Junius’s ‘self-commentary’: Junius added a substantial commentary attached to his own emblems, to elucidate their idiosyncratic inventiveness and to establish a norm for the images, even if the woodcutters or printers would make a mess of them.

Although the image of Junius presented is not complete—the physician, translator, school rector, and Latin poet are more or less neglected, and the editor has chosen not to give a biographical overview of Junius’s life—this volume by Van Miert has added to our knowledge of early humanism in the Netherlands in general and of this humanist in particular. Junius had a vast knowledge—kaleidoscopic indeed—and he was innovative and influential on several subjects, almost as much as Erasmus had been in other respects. (Jan Bloemendal, Huygens Institute for the History of the Netherlands, The Hague)

♦ *Obras completas*, vol. 6: *Escritos varios*. Por Pedro de Valencia. Jesús María Nieto Ibáñez, coordinador. León: Universidad / Instituto de Humanismo y Tradición Clásica, 2012. 661 p. Comienza el presente volumen con una Presentación de Jesús Paniagua Pérez y

un Prólogo de Luis Gómez Canseco, seguidos de una Introducción y unos Criterios de Edición para textos en castellano (los aplicados a textos latinos se recogen en las páginas que preceden al escrito *De tuenda valetudine*). Se cierra con un Índice de nombres propios.

Doce son los escritos de Pedro de Valencia publicados en este libro, de distinta temática y extensión. Y diez los autores que han realizado las diversas ediciones y los estudios. De ahí las diferencias existentes en el tratamiento de los mismos, en la amplitud de los estudios introductorios y en su organización, en una “falta de uniformidad” que se aclara convenientemente en la Introducción (21). Los varios intereses y ocupaciones del humanista extremeño y su valía quedan reflejados en estas obras de tema médico, técnico, pedagógico, político y literario, aderezadas con abundantes referencias a fuentes antiguas, medievales y contemporáneas.

De esos doce escritos, tres están redactados en latín: *De tuenda valetudine*, régimen de salud, con introducción por Eduardo Álvarez del Palacio, y edición y traducción por Antonio María Martín Rodríguez; *De hebraeorum coro*, sobre esta medida de peso, a cargo de Raúl Manchón Gómez; y los *Humanae rationis παραλογισμάτων illustriora exempla*, conjunto de errores de filósofos, por Avelina Carrera de la Red.

Las restantes obras de Pedro de Valencia aquí editadas están escritas en castellano. Son las *Advertencias para la crianza de los príncipes, cuando pequeños, contra el abuso de procurarlos callar con espantos*, con estudio introductorio y edición de Jesús María Nieto Ibáñez, que se ha encargado también de la *Descripción de la justicia en ocasión de querer Arias Montano comentar las leyes del Reino* y del *Parecer sobre una cátedra en Salamanca*, junto con la edición de la *Dedicatoria a la Reina doña Margarita de su libro intitulado De las enfermedades de los niños*, con introducción de Raúl López López. Nieto Ibáñez se ha ocupado además de revisar y adaptar a las normas de la colección las ediciones de Abdón Moreno García de la *Descripción de la pintura de las virtudes* (introducción de Dolores Campos Sánchez-Bordona), y de los *Ejemplos de príncipes, prelados y otros varones ilustres, que dejaron oficios y dignidades y se retiraron*, de los que ha hecho igualmente la introducción. Se completa el volumen con las *Cartas a Góngora en censura de sus poesías*, editado por Manuel María Pérez López con introducción del mismo y de Juan Matas Caballero; la *Carta e informe de Pedro de Valencia sobre los escritos del padre Alonso*

Sánchez y el doctor Jerónimo Hurtado, a cargo de María Isabel Viforcós Marinas; y el escrito *Sobre la Guerra de Flandes de Jerónimo Conestaggio*, por Raúl López López.

En el libro se hubiera podido buscar más uniformidad y evitar repeticiones de referencias bibliográficas y otras reiteraciones como la que afecta al resumen de contenidos del *De tuenda valetudine*. Hay también erratas en las citas de las notas, en la puntuación y la ortografía del castellano, y en algunos títulos de obras latinas, como “*Cantroversiarum Medicarum et Philosophicarum libri decena*” (31).

Dos observaciones relativas al léxico y la literatura de la medicina latina: la primera, sobre el escrito *De tuenda valetudine*, donde se traduce *Cibo ... iam concocto* (56) como “el alimento ... ya guisado,” cuando el término *concocto*, tecnicismo médico de corte celsiano y pliniano, hace referencia a la cocción del alimento en el estómago. La segunda, sobre el autor denominado Celio utilizado como fuente en los *Ejemplos de príncipes ...*, que no es, como se indica en la introducción correspondiente, Celio Aureliano, escritor médico del siglo V, sino Celio Rodigino, autor de las célebres *Antiquae Lectiones* (Venecia, 1516), donde efectivamente se localiza el ejemplo de san Antonio Anacoreta recogido por Valencia (libro 10, cap. 4).

En cualquier caso, es este un interesante volumen que da a conocer unos escritos sin duda provechosos para filólogos e historiadores. (María-Teresa Santamaría Hernández, Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha)

◆ *Discourses of Power: Ideology and Politics in Neo-Latin Literature*. Edited by Karl Enenkel, Marc Laureys, and Christoph Pieper. *Noctes Neolatinae / Neo-Latin Texts and Studies*, 17. Hildesheim, Zurich, and New York: Georg Olms Verlag, 2012. xxxvi + 338 pp. As Anthony Grafton and Lisa Jardine reminded us twenty-five years ago in *From Humanism to the Humanities: Education and the Liberal Arts in Fifteenth- and Sixteenth-Century Europe* (Cambridge, Mass., 1986), a humanist education prepared the student for a particular career, one that focused around government service. From Petrarch onward, humanists served in both secular and church chancelleries, and as diplomats, courtiers, and church officials. The link between humanism and power produced a mass of texts with political and ideological

content, generally in Latin, since this was the language of power in the early modern period. With this connection in mind, the three scholars who edited this volume organized a conference on 'Ideological Discourses in Neo-Latin Literature,' held at Leiden University from the 26th to the 28th of November, 2009, with support from Leiden and Bonn Universities and from the Dutch government. The papers presented here were originally delivered at the conference and revised for publication.

The volume contains the following essays: Karl Enenkel, "Introduction"; Marc Laureys, "Bibliography"; Anita Traninger, "Arenas of Anger: The Uses of Declamation in Early Modern Political Discourse"; Christoph Pieper, "Die vielen Facetten des Sigismondo Malatesta in der ideologischen Poesie des Hofes in Rimini"; Karl Enenkel, "The Politics of Antiquarianism: Neo-Latin Treatises on Cultural History as Ideology and Propaganda"; Han Lamers, "The Imperial Diadem of Greece: Giovanni Gemisto's Strategic Representation of 'Graecia' (1516)"; Thomas Haye, "Der Türkendiskurs im anonymen *Dialogus de capta Rhodo* (1523)"; Roswitha Simons, "Umsturz, Irreligiosität, Kulturzerstörung, Diskursverschränkung in der Reformationspolemik des Johannes Atrocianus"; Marc Laureys, "Van Rossum *ad portas*: Girolamo Faletti's Evocation of the Guelders Wars in His *De bello Sicambrico*"; Ronald W. Truman, "Ideological Discourses in Sixteenth-Century Spanish Treatises on Government"; Diana Stanciu, "Sovereignty and the Censure of Aristotle in Jean Bodin's *Methodus ad facilem historiarum cognitionem*"; Coen Maas, "Was Janus Dousa a Tacitist? Rhetorical and Conceptual Approaches to the Reception of Classical Historiography and Its Political Significance"; Robert Seidel, "Aliena sequens regna, deserui mea': Antipfälzische Polemik im Medium lateinischer Centonendichtung"; Beate Hintzen, "Der Fürst im Nachruf: Zu Aktualisierung und Instrumentalisierung antiker und zeitgenössischer ideologischer Muster in den Nekrologen des Martin Opitz"; and Robert von Friedeburg, "Wars with Books: From Which Point Onward Should We Employ the Term 'Ideology' with Respect to Our Sources?" Floris Verhaart has also supplied a useful *index nominum*, which closes the volume.

As one would hope, a number of very interesting topics are touched on in these essays: the use of ancient sources to solidify

an ideological position in political discourse (Pieper and Maas), the capacity of emerging fields like book history to help clarify how the meanings of words like ideology evolve over time (von Friedeburg), the relative rolls of Latin and the vernacular in humanist political discourse (Seidel), the importance of the idea of a crusade against Turkey as it appears in both little-known (Haye) and well-known (Enenkel) sources, the role of propaganda (Laureys and Lamers), and the need to be alert for an evolution of thought in the writings of the same theorist (Stanciu, in reference to Jean Bodin). The classic weakness in a collection like this is coverage: conference organizers can encourage their participants to do certain things, but in the end they have to take the papers that are offered, which seldom provide a continuous narrative about their subject. In fairness a great deal of ground is covered here, from the fifteenth to the seventeenth centuries, in Italy, Germany, France, England, Spain, and the Netherlands, in genres ranging from epic, cento, dialogue, and historiography to elegy, declamation, and theoretical tracts. Enenkel's introduction is also useful as an effort to provide commentary on topics that are not developed at length in the essays—civic humanism, the role of Plato and Aristotle in early modern political discourse, and Machiavellianism, *inter alia*. In the end it is not fair to approach a volume like this as if it were a companion to early modern political thought; if it is evaluated for what it is—a collection of essays on an important topic in Neo-Latin studies—it succeeds admirably. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *De laudibus Monasterii Westphaliae metropolis*. By Oleg Nikitinski. Società di studi politici, Biblioteca di cultura europea, 3. Naples: La scuola di Pitagora editrice, 2012. 247 pp. As those who attend the congresses of the International Association for Neo-Latin Studies know, a delightful tradition has evolved at the organization's triennial congresses in which the head of the local organizing committee offers a keepsake to the participants. The keepsake is a book that in some way evokes the Neo-Latin culture of the city hosting the congress. For the 2003 meeting in Bonn, Beate Czaplá, Marc Laureys, and Karl August Neuhausen produced *Bonna solum felix ... : Bonn in der lateinischen Literatur der Neuzeit* (Cologne, 2003); *Companion to the History*

of the *Neo-Latin Studies in Hungary*, edited by István Bartók (Budapest, 2005), appeared in conjunction with the 2006 congress in Budapest; and the organizers of the 2009 meeting in Uppsala provided facsimile editions entitled *Nova literaria Maris Baltici & Septentrionis* and *Three Dissertations under the Presidency of Anders Celsius* (Uppsala, 2009). The book under review here was given to the participants of the 2012 IANLS congress in Münster.

This volume works a little differently from its predecessors. The congress organizer, Karl Enenkel, who holds the chair in Medieval and Neo-Latin Philology at the University of Münster, went to one of his Seminar associates, Dr. Oleg Nikitinski, and asked him to prepare a book that would survey the Latin culture of the area in the language in which that culture developed. *De laudibus Monasterii Westphaliae metropolis* does just this, drawing from the writings of the principal Westphalian humanists of the fifteenth through the seventeenth centuries: Rodolphus Langius, Hermannus Buschius, Joannes Murrnellius, and Ferdinandus de Furstenberg. These men are not exactly household names, even in the community of Neo-Latinists, but as Nikitinski shows, they maintained relationships with many of the most important figures in European culture, including Rudolf Agricola, Gian Lorenzo Bernini, Desiderius Erasmus, Marsilio Ficino, Aldus Manutius, Politian, Lorenzo Valla, and countless others. The book also contains information about the Schola Paulina, one of the oldest in Europe, which will interest historians of humanist education. Also included are autobiographies of Ferdinandus de Furstenberg and Bernardus de Mallinckrodt and observations about their stays in Westphalia by Justus Lipsius, Pope Alexander VII, and Queen Christina of Sweden.

After reading this volume, the reader is unlikely to conclude that Münster is in danger of eclipsing Rome or Leiden as a center of Neo-Latin culture. But it quickly becomes clear that the area has for centuries offered intellectual delights that equal its culinary ones, perhaps not so refined as those of Paris but solid and substantial, well worth sampling and lingering over. The book itself reinforces those delights, on several levels. It is nicely produced, with well-chosen photographs and facsimiles of manuscripts and early printed books. Nikitinski's prose is another delight, fluent and graceful, well able to carry forward

its argument yet by no means somber and serious: see, for example, the sections headed “Visio Caroli Enenkelii,” “De birotis,” and “De tabernis vinariis et cauponis.” I do not know what the organizers of the Vienna congress in 2015 have in mind for those who will attend that meeting, but I do not envy them the task of following in the footsteps of this volume. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Dialectical Disputations*. By Lorenzo Valla. Edited and translated by Brian P. Copenhaver and Lodi Nauta. 2 vols. The I Tatti Renaissance Library, 49-50. I + 397 pp., 591 pp. *Commentaries on Plato*, vol. 2: *Parmenides*. By Marsilio Ficino. Edited and translated by Maude Vanhaelen. 2 vols. The I Tatti Renaissance Library, 51-52. lxii + 286 pp., 408 pp. *Dialogues*, vol. 1: *Charon and Antonius*. By Giovanni Gioviano Pontano. Edited and translated by Julia Haig Gaisser. The I Tatti Renaissance Library, 53. xxvii + 403 pp. *Poems*. By Michael Marullus. Translated by Charles Fantazzi. The I Tatti Renaissance Library, 54. xx + 475 pp. Cambridge, Mass. and London: Harvard University Press, 2012. \$29.95. The six volume reviewed here represent the 2012 harvest for the I Tatti Renaissance Library, now clearly established as the preeminent series for the publication of texts and translations in Neo-Latin studies.

The *Dialectical Disputations* is an excellent example of Lorenzo Valla (ca. 1406-1457) in action. Only the boldest, most original thinker could expose as a forgery a document that was vital to the papacy's place in the temporal power structure or erect a new Christian morality on, of all things, Epicurean foundations, but if Valla could do these things, why not attack Aristotle and the entire scholastic intellectual structure that dominated university life in his day? The problem as he saw it was that professional philosophers had strayed from the proper standard, which was a clear understanding of the classics as a repository of common usage in speaking and common sense in thinking. Everything one needs to know is freely available in the classical texts, but by neglecting and misinterpreting the ancient documents, especially Aristotle, the scholastics have created bizarre neologisms and habitual deviations from classical norms of speech that impede understanding, leading instead to abstruse formalisms and meaningless abstractions. What matters is not whether an argument follows some abstract

rule, but whether it works, and for it to work, the speaker or writer must have control over the full range of rhetorical tools. Dialectic is important, but only when properly practiced and subordinated to oratory. As set forth in the *Dialectical Disputations*, Valla's method did not have much of a direct influence in his lifetime—he was asking too much, too fast, in his call for reform—but his eclecticism and pragmatism have resonated richly within the history of philosophy over the succeeding centuries.

The *Parmenides* in many ways has proved to be the most controversial of Plato's dialogues, since it seems to attack a crucial part of Plato's philosophy, the theory of the Ideas, and then explores a series of relationships between unity and multiplicity without offering a clear conclusion about what the exploration means. Proclus and the Neoplatonists argued that the dialogue was essentially a religious text, offering an initiation into the highest principles of the universe hidden beneath its apparent contradictions. At the end of the fifteenth century, Marsilio Ficino (1433-1499) published another commentary to the *Parmenides*, one that is deeply indebted to Proclus but not enslaved to it. Ficino's commentary incorporated the *Parmenides* into his belief that a series of divinely inspired theologians transmitted an "ancient theology" from Persia, Egypt, and Greece into Christianity, with Plato sitting at the center of this tradition and Aristotle being excluded from it, a position that put him at odds with Pico della Mirandola, among others. As Vanhaelen points out in her introduction, Ficino's debt to the medieval scholastics was greater than he would want to admit, but he did stay firmly within the Neoplatonic tradition, stressing the similarities rather than the differences between Proclus and Plotinus, looking for agreement rather than contradiction between the *Parmenides* and the *Sophist*, and attempting to reconcile the content of Plato's *Parmenides* with Parmenides' *Poem*. Modern scholarship handles these points differently, but that in no way diminishes Ficino's importance within the history of philosophy.

The other two volumes under review here move from philosophy to literature. The *Dialogues*, by Giovanni Pontano (1429-1503), are among the most important Neo-Latin representatives of this genre. They are deeply embedded within the humanist culture of Quattrocento Naples, especially the gatherings generally described (anach-

ronistically) as the Accademia Napoletana or Accademia Pontaniana. *Charon* is set in the underworld of classical mythology and scrutinizes the problems and follies of humanity, with a focus on fifteenth-century Italy. *Antonius* is a Menippean satire named for the recently deceased Antonio Beccadelli; in it his friends revisit favorite topics that they had enjoyed discussing with him. Each discussion is precipitated by a crisis (an impending war in Italy, Beccadelli's death), but the crisis merely provides a context for a free-flowing conversation within the Neapolitan sodality. The dialogues are set out of doors, which allows a freedom of movement reinforced by the arrival of outsiders who are not members of the group. The conversation ranges freely but comes "back again and again to certain themes, presenting them from different points of view and with different emphasis, like musical variations played in different keys and at different volumes" (xvi). Religion, poetry, and language are among these recurring themes, with the latter being particularly important as the interlocutors labor over definitions, offer puns, pounce on solecisms, and play with etymologies. This is the preeminent humanist literary game, with *variatio* being the principal desideratum.

One of the regular participants in these Neapolitan gatherings was the Greek émigré Michael Marullus (*ca.* 1453/4-1500), who shared with Pontano an interest in the poetry of Lucretius. Marullus was an accomplished poet, with the volume under review here offering a text and translation of his verse corpus. First there is a collection of 199 epigrams, which is noteworthy for both the variety of meters used in it and the range of themes found there, extending from love poems and funeral laments to a series of invectives directed in particular against Poliziano, whom Marullus hated. The other major work presented here is Marullus's *Hymns to Nature*, which belongs to a genre of theogonic poetry that begins with Hesiod and the Homeric Hymns and extends through Cleanthes, Callimachus, and Proclus. In these poems Marullus descends systematically through the various hierarchies of being, presenting a universe in which Lucretius is as present as Plato and the Neoplatonists. Marullus is occasionally obscure, but the strictures of Julius Caesar Scaliger are too harsh: we have here a poet who is well worth reading, whom Ronsard imitated and who appears later still in George Eliot's *Romola*.

As is customary in this series, each volume contains a working Latin text accompanied by a readable English translation, an introduction, brief textual notes, a substantive body of content notes adequate to allow an initial reading of the text, and a basic bibliography. This year's group offers a nice mix of literary and philosophical works, including several basic texts in the Neo-Latin corpus. As usual, I am eager to see what next year will bring. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)