



EVENTEENTH-



ENTURY



NEWS

FALL - WINTER 2013

Vol. 71

Nos. 3&4

Including

THE NEO-LATIN NEWS Vol. 61, Nos. 3&4

SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY NEWS

VOLUME 71, Nos. 3&4

FALL-WINTER, 2013

An official organ of the Milton Society of America and of the Milton Section of the Modern Language Association, **SCN** is published as a double issue two times each year with the support of the English Department at 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 at www.english.tamu.edu/scn/. 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
www.english.tamu.edu/scn/
and
journals.tdl.org/scn

ISSN 0037-3028

SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY NEWS

EDITOR

DONALD R. DICKSON

Texas A&M University

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Michele Marrapodi, University of Palermo

Patricia Garcia, University of Texas

E. Joe Johnson, Clayton State University

EDITORIAL ASSISTANT

Amanda Hendrix-Black, Texas A&M University

Taylor Trippe, Texas A&M University

CONTENTS

VOLUME 71, NOS. 3&4 FALL-WINTER, 2013

REVIEWS

- John Leonard, *Faithful Labourers: A Reception History of Paradise Lost, 1667-1970*. Review by ELIZABETH SKERPAN-WHEELER 73
- Richard J. DuRocher & Margaret Olofson Thickstun, eds., *Milton's Rival Hermeneutics: "Reason Is But Choosing."* Review by REUBEN SANCHEZ..... 75
- John Milton, *De Doctrina Christiana*. Volume VIII of *The Complete Works of John Milton*, ed. John K. Hale and J. Donald Cullington. Review by JOHN MULRYAN 81
- Stanley Fish, *Versions of Antihumanism: Milton and Others*. Review by ANGELICA DURAN 84
- Mary C. Fenton and Louis Schwartz, eds., *To Repair the Ruins: Reading Milton*. Review by ANTHONY WELCH..... 87
- Jonathan Shears, *The Romantic Legacy of Paradise Lost: Reading against the Grain*. Review by DAVID V. URBAN..... 90
- Laura Lunger Knoppers, *Politicizing Domesticity from Henrietta Maria to Milton's Eve*. Review by NANCY MOHRLOCK BUNKER 94
- Kathleen Lynch, *Protestant Autobiography in the Seventeenth Century Anglophone World*. Review by MARION A. WELLS..... 98
- Gillian Wright, *Producing Women's Poetry, 1600-1730: Text and Paratext, Manuscript and Print*. Review by JULIE D. CAMPBELL 101
- Judith H. Anderson and Jennifer C. Vaught, eds., *Shakespeare and Donne: Generic Hybrids and the Cultural Imaginary*. Review by GRAHAM ROEBUCK 104
- Daniel W. Doerksen, *Picturing Religious Experience: George Herbert, Calvin, and the Scriptures*. Review by ANNA LEWTON-BRAIN ... 108
- Wendy Beth Hyman, ed., *The Automaton in English Renaissance Literature: Literary and Scientific Cultures of Early Modernity*. Review by JESSICA WOLFE 110
- Lara Dodds, *The Literary Invention of Margaret Cavendish*. Review by LISA HOPKINS..... 113

Kate Narveson, <i>Bible Readers and Lay Writers in Early Modern England: Gender and Self-Definition in an Emergent Writing Culture</i> .	
Review by LISSA BEAUCHAMP DESROCHES.....	115
Derek Hirst and Steven Zwicker, <i>Andrew Marvell, Orphan of the Hurricane</i> .	
Review by GEORGE KLAWITTER.....	118
Reid Barbour and David Norbrook, eds., <i>The Works of Lucy Hutchinson</i> .	
Review by TANYA CALDWELL	122
Joyce Ransome, <i>The Web of Friendship: Nicholas Ferrar and Little Gidding</i> .	
Review by P. G. STANWOOD.....	125
Jennifer L. Airey, <i>The Politics of Rape: Sexual Atrocity, Propaganda Wars, and the Restoration Stage</i> . Review by JOSEPH PAPPA.....	128
Philip Major, ed., <i>Literatures of Exile in the English Revolution and its Aftermath, 1640-1690</i> .	
Review by KATHRYN VOMERO SANTOS.....	132
David Randall, <i>English Military News Pamphlets, 1513-1637</i> .	
Review by NICOLE GREENSPAN	135
Stephen Pender and Nancy S. Struever, eds., <i>Rhetoric and Medicine in Early Modern Europe</i> . Review by KARIN SUSAN FESTER	137
Susan Hardman Moore, <i>Abandoning America: Life-Stories from Early New England</i> . Review by WILLIAM J. SCHEICK.....	141
Eric Klingelhofer, ed., <i>A Glorious Empire: Archaeology and the Tudor-Stuart Atlantic World</i> . Review by WILLIAM J. SCHEICK	142
Enriqueta Zafra, ed. and Anne J. Cruz, trans., <i>The Life and Times of Mother Andrea/La vida y costumbres de la Madre Andrea</i> .	
Review by JULIO GONZÁLEZ-RUIZ.....	144
Pierre-Esprit Radisson, <i>The Collected Writings Volume 1: The Voyages</i> . Ed. Germaine Warkentin. Review by M. G. AUNE.....	147
Susan Hardman Moore, ed., <i>The Diary of Thomas Larkham, 1647-1669</i> .	
Review by CHRIS R. LANGLEY	150
Francis J. Bremer, <i>Building a New Jerusalem: John Davenport, a Puritan in Three Worlds</i> . Review by MARC L. SCHWARZ	153
Eamon Darcy, <i>The Irish Rebellion of 1641 and the Wars of the Three Kingdoms</i> .	
Review by MARTYN BENNETT	156
Sanjay Subrahmanyam, <i>Courtly Encounters: Translating: Courtliness and Violence in Early Modern Eurasia</i> .	
Review by TILLMAN W. NECHTMAN	159
NEO-LATIN NEWS.....	162

John Leonard. *Faithful Labourers: A Reception History of Paradise Lost, 1667-1970*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013. xviii + 853 pp. + 6 illus. \$299.00. Review by ELIZABETH SKERPAN-WHEELER, TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY.

At the beginning of his massive undertaking, John Leonard quotes Milton, who declared in *The Reason of Church Government* his ambition to “leave something so written to aftertimes, as they should not willingly let it die.” In this engaging study, Leonard constructs a deep acknowledgement of the readers, scholars, and critics who kept *Paradise Lost* alive for its first 303 years. As he explains at the outset, his “aim has been to write a book where readers can trace specific arguments from beginning to end without being sidetracked” (viii). In pursuit of this goal, Leonard presents an extended bibliographical essay, covering nine critical debates in eleven chapters (and two volumes). Limiting himself to “prose works of literary criticism written in English” (ix), he presents each debate with a critical eye, providing his own perspective and comment along the way. The result is a persuasive demonstration of the reasons why the “Milton industry,” as the historian Christopher Hill once called it, was and continues to be highly productive.

The nine debates focus on epic style (in three chapters), the genre of epic, epic similes, Satan, God, innocence, the Fall, sex and the sexes, and Milton’s universe. Each chapter includes prefatory remarks and chronologically presented subsections, divided by dominant theme. Chapters 4 through 11 also have formal conclusions. Through these chapters, Leonard marks the origins of some of the major moments in Milton scholarship, from the first comparison of Milton’s style to “organ music” (editor Daniel Webb in 1762) to the “Milton Controversy” of the first half of the twentieth century, which Leonard refigures as a rebellion against Victorian interpretations of *Paradise Lost*. Leonard also devotes serious attention to eighteenth- and nineteenth-century women readers of Milton, and identifies several breakthroughs in interpretation, such as C. S. Lewis’s distinction between primary and secondary epic (1942) and James Whaler’s introduction of the term *homologation* (1931) to describe the character of Milton’s similes, a perception that inaugurated the understanding of *Paradise Lost* as “an astonishingly coherent poem” (354).

Of all of these well-presented chapters, the eleventh—"The Universe"—stands out. It tells the story of a major false trail in Milton scholarship and its consequences up to the present day for our understanding of Milton's intellect and knowledge. As Leonard demonstrates, from Thomas Newton's edition of *Paradise Lost* in 1749 to the Modern Library edition in 2007, most writers on the subject have assumed that Milton's universe was Ptolemaic. Many have reproduced David Masson's 1874 diagrams derived from a 1610 edition of the thirteenth-century *De Sphaera* of Sacrobosco, giving powerful visual sanction to the idea. The assumption rests on only three lines of the poem: lines 481-83 of Book 3. These are the ones that describe persons who became friars on their deathbeds passing through the spheres. Noting that in 1734 the Jonathan Richardsons, father and son, read the lines as part of an extended satire, Leonard explains his overall intent in the chapter: "Much of my effort will be devoted to stripping away the encrustation of three centuries of scholarship to recover Milton's true universe from under all the layers of commentary" (707). This he does by examining three broad periods. In the first, from 1667 to 1749, readers recognized both Milton's satirical intent behind the lines in Book 3 and the scope of his imagination as he envisioned the possibility of multiple worlds. The second period begins with Newton's edition of 1749 and continues until 1855. Newton's mistake, as Leonard explains it, was missing the humor of those lines. Because Newton was "usually trustworthy" (731), many accepted his error. But the real problem begins in 1855 with Thomas Keightley's *An Account of the Life, Opinions, and Writings of John Milton*. From Keightley onwards, generations of critics have struggled to make Milton's poem accord with the Ptolemaic model, and in so doing have established the belief that Milton was anti-intellectual.

The chapter notes the small group of scholars and critics who persisted in seeing the influence of Galileo in *Paradise Lost*, and Leonard elegantly links Milton's lines about "other Suns" to recent discoveries of exoplanets (724). Most important, however, is Leonard's decision to present the chapter as a cautionary tale. Readers will note the number of prominent twentieth- and twenty-first-century scholars (Leonard does not exempt himself) who have accepted Newton's assumption without question. There is a moral to this story: scholars and critics are

“never in greater danger of going wrong than when consensus within the discipline convinces them that they are right” (819).

Above all, this is a study of how readers have shaped *Paradise Lost* through their interactions with the poem and each other. Leonard himself exemplifies this point. He filters each section through his own perspective in such a way that his voice distinguishes itself, often with considerable wit. This practice allows him to place his chronological presentation of criticism and scholarship in conversation with later work. In so doing, he keeps each idea in the context of the larger history of Milton studies. Given the length and scope of the project, it is inevitable that some topics were left out, notably political and historical readings and those based in the history of logic and rhetoric. Inclusion of these topics, however, would have detracted from the overall cohesion of the narrative.

The only true problem lies with the physical dimension of the book. It is divided into two volumes, and the publisher has placed the bibliography and index in the second volume only. As a result, readers must be in possession of both volumes when reading the first. This can be clumsy.

Faithful Labourers is a significant contribution to Milton studies. It will reintroduce many to the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century editors and critics, and remind current scholars of the debt they owe to previous generations. It will also be invaluable to students, both for the information it presents and as an object lesson in the need for bibliographical research. Leonard plans a sequel to bring the study into the twenty-first century.

Richard J. DuRocher & Margaret Olofson Thickett, eds. *Milton's Rival Hermeneutics: "Reason Is But Choosing."* Duquesne University Press, 2012. xxv + 278 pp. \$58.00. Review by REUBEN SANCHEZ, SAM HOUSTON STATE UNIVERSITY.

In their Introduction to *Milton's Rival Hermeneutics*, Richard J. DuRocher and Margaret Olofson Thickett offer a reason for this collection of essays: To counter the “critics of incertitude,” specifically Michael Bryson’s *The Tyranny of Heaven: The Rejection of God as King*

(2004), Peter Herman's *Destabilizing Milton: "Paradise Lost" and the Poetics of Incertitude* (2005), and Christopher D'Addario's *Exile and Journey in Seventeenth-Century Literature* (2007). Bryson's deconstructive approach warrants consideration and response, though not in this context as he is not a critic of incertitude. In an approach which seems a hybrid of new historicism and reader response, D'Addario does not focus on Milton (nor Hobbes, nor Dryden, the other ostensible subjects of his book) but on what he considers the incertitude of Milton's readers, then and now. The foremost proponent of incertitude, therefore, Herman considers Milton studies conservative because Miltonists view their subject as a "poet of certainty" (*Destabilizing*, 19). Further, Miltonists themselves make it impossible for other voices to participate in the Milton dialogue: "Master Miltonists who have endured a long and arduous apprenticeship acquiring this knowledge [a specialization in Milton] are unlikely to admit anyone who has not undertaken the same rigorous training to their community and graduate students shy away from such an imposing prospect, especially since the demand for Miltonists on the job market has been steadily declining. The end result is a self-selective group that has, at least in the past, tended toward theoretical conservatism" (19-20). Herman's description of Miltonists as insular and conservative does nothing to advance an argument for incertitude in Milton. Fortunately, the contributors to *Milton's Rival Hermeneutics* do not directly respond to the critic(s) of incertitude, for after the one perfunctory reference in the Introduction, incertitude as a subject simply vanishes, which is strategic and justified. The quality of this collection nonetheless serves to dispute the odd claim that Milton was profoundly unsure of himself and his work, to dispute as well the disparaging implications of the epithet "Master Miltonists." *Milton's Rival Hermeneutics* thus represents two major achievements: First, it exemplifies the significance and potential of the terms *hermeneutics* and *choosing* in Milton studies; second, it exemplifies the variegated nature of the responses Miltonists have to their subject.

The editors aptly place Susanne Woods' essay on rival hermeneutics at the beginning of this collection, for she makes clear what the term hermeneutics means as regards Milton studies. Woods's theme, liberty, concerns the reading process she describes; one must have the liberty to read and interpret, which results in a new "multivocality": "Milton

therefore necessarily offered his own poetry up for hermeneutic interpretation, inviting us to read his work as he in turn read the Bible, with simultaneous attention to what theme, genre, and style all reveal, and with appreciation of its multivocality, an important feature of his biblical reading” (3-4). Next, Diane McColley’s essay on the Nativity Ode demonstrates how hermeneutics applies to the poet himself as he must make choices when translating biblical texts such as Psalm 137, and whether or not he must retain the violence characterizing the Psalms. So too with the Nativity Ode, contends McColley, Milton must choose between the birth narratives of Matthew and Luke while adding elements to his poem not found in either gospel. Woods and McColley set the tone, as each argues that Milton chooses particular meanings to convey, chooses texts, even chooses sides, thereby reflecting the “reason is but choosing” organizing principle of this collection.

Gordon Teskey’s analysis of *Lycidas* begins with the commonplace assertion: *Lycidas* is one of the finest short poems in the English language. How many times did we hear this from our teachers in graduate school, or come across it in scholarship written during the mid-to-late twentieth century? Yet beginning with this sentiment allows Teskey to focus on how and why the poem has fallen on hard times: The character and quality of Milton’s pastoral elegy makes it too difficult a read for some modern readers. There is simply “too much” there: “The cubist juxtaposition of asynchronous time frames accounts for the difficulty of *Lycidas*: we seem to see too many surfaces at once. There is too much information for any single point of view to prevail and to arrange the others in due proportion with one another” (32-33). Hence the great and wonderful problem, I would add, of a work like *Richard II* and all the talk about perspectives and shattered glass and still-breeding thoughts tending to this, that, and the other. By overwhelming us, great writers like Shakespeare and Milton force us to address the big question: What is the value of art to we mortals who will, after all, die someday? Teskey traces the rise and fall of *Lycidas* in the public eye, from crucial, all-important short poem to poem derided for its Christianity and its classicism. Despite the modern negative assessments—mainly by non-Miltonists and by poets who frankly don’t seem up to the poem (my perception, not Teskey’s)—the poem remains crucial to us, and Teskey argues eloquently and persuasively

why. In doing so, he evokes the mood of the recent *Why Milton Matters* discussion. A rhetorical statement, *Why Milton Matters* infers Milton *does* matter: *Why* was argued powerfully, three different ways, by Fish, Wittreich, and Lewalski. Yes, *Lycidas* is indeed one of the finest short poems in the English language after all, Teskey reminds us, but every now and then we need to talk about *why*.

Herman contends the “paradigm shift” to a view of Milton as “a poet of deep incertitude” actually “results in large part from the failure of the English Revolution” (*Destabilizing*, 21). In a well-argued essay, Hugh Jenkins, without referring to him, proves Herman wrong. For Jenkins, Milton’s response to the failed revolution evinces certainty as regards his own ethos and poetics; Jenkins locates this certainty during the period when Milton wrote his Defenses, between 1651 and 1654 and, especially, when he refurbished the *First Defense* in 1658. I would date Milton’s confrontation with the threat of failure, however, to the beginning of his public prose. Being “church-outed” by the bishops early balances with Englishmen allowing “a captain back for *Egypt*” late and, twelve years later, with the implications of the second Declaration of Indulgence. One can appreciate, as well, how Milton’s choice to indulge in left-handed writing meant he had to delay writing the national epic. Focusing partly on Milton’s prose, Barbara K. Lewalski’s discussion of hermeneutics in *PL* shows how Milton sharpens his ability to interpret Scripture—and therefore how he becomes a better poet—through his work writing polemical tracts and, particularly, *De Doctrina* over many years: “In doing so he worked out principles for interpreting Scripture texts that allowed for his then radical positions and that later liberated his poetic imagination when he understood an epic based on biblical materials” (78). For Joseph Wittreich, the “interpretive choices” forced upon the reader of *PL* and *PR* ironically force the reader into “ever deepening quagmires of uncertainty, but which, even more ironically, pushes the reader toward poetic certainty and poetic truth” (102). By “uncertainty” Wittreich means “competing interpretation” (103), or elsewhere, “irresolution” versus “resolution” (104). Of course we find certainty/meaning in his writing—Milton put it there—though not one meaning for all, with the reading process thereby becoming “adventurous” and “redemptive.”

William Flesch focuses on the “narrative anxiety” the reader feels when he sympathizes with a character and wants/hopes the character “vindicated” as regards narrative truth, or “justice.” The first four pages of his essay comprise what he calls a “taxonomy” of *Hamlet*—and thereby reflects the methodology of the new historicism—intended “to show that very complex structures of character and plot can derive from the idea of vindication . . .” (137-38). But the focus on *Hamlet* serves as a preparation for the bard’s intention in *PL* “to justify the ways of God to men.” Milton’s narrative technique—which teaches the reader about “narrative judgment” (150), and which characterizes *PL* and *SA*—enables justification/vindication. In her feminist approach to *PL*, Teresa Feroli points out that although Milton intended the phrase “shee for God in him” to mean Man represents the *imago Dei*, one could actually read the phrase as implying “the latent potential for female authority” (160). Feroli shows how the Quakers Martha Simmonds and Margaret Fell, Milton’s contemporaries, argue against the hierarchical, gender-based distinctions implicit in the *imago Dei*; their writings, instead, call for a spiritual and political equality implicit in the *imago Dei*. One can take issue with Milton’s certitude, suggests Feroli, for while Milton infers spiritual and political equality—in his treatment of Eve, say—his position seems tenuous: “If only in theory . . . Milton would have to agree with Margaret Fell that ‘those that speak against the Woman and her Seeds Speaking, speak out of the enmity of the old Serpents Seed’” (181).

Olofson Thickstun’s close reading of *SA* posits the importance of community in affirming one’s spirituality, a position preached in both *PL* and *SA*. Specifically, through “conversation” the individual comes to terms with the significance of “fame” and “shame.” Albeit Satan is not the hero of *PR*, argues Stella P. Revard, he is nonetheless “an antagonist figure to the Son, engaging the reader’s attention to a parallel and almost equal degree” (206). The temptation/dialogue concerns Satan’s attempt to reveal or discover the true nature of Jesus and of Satan himself. DuRocher’s essay likewise addresses the issue of debate/dialogue in *PR*, characterizing the poem as conflicting hermeneutics. DuRocher focuses specifically on Satan’s offer to Christ of worldly knowledge in Book 4, particularly as the offer evokes the ideals—and the potential dangers for a typological reader—of the classical tradition.

Each of these eleven essays represents a competing, or rival, hermeneutics, one which contributes to the Milton dialogue. This is Milton scholarship at its best. In such a celebration of discourse, therefore, we may recognize the *main raison d'être* for this collection: A tribute to Mary Ann Radzinowicz, cited often in these essays for her influence as a teacher, scholar, and colleague. Some of the contributors to this collection were students of Radzinowicz: DuRocher, Olofson Thicks-tun, Flesch, and, I believe, Jenkins and Feroli—all Cornell graduates, where Radzinowicz taught until her retirement. These scholars nicely complement the other contributors, themselves colleagues and friends of Radzinowicz: Woods, Teskey, Lewalski, Wittreich, Revard, McColley—senior scholars whose accomplishments speak for themselves. *Milton's Rival Hermeneutics* shows what it means to have been trained as a Miltonist, to teach Milton, and to write about Milton; the book thereby pays homage to the teaching and scholarship of Radzinowicz and, by extension, to the teaching and scholarship of her student, DuRocher, who died in 2010. A fine tribute to DuRocher by Mary C. Fenton prefaces the collection.

I went to graduate school with Rich DuRocher, Marggie Olofson, and Billy Flesch, and, as she did for them, Mary Ann Radzinowicz directed my dissertation. Gordon Teskey was also one of our teachers at Cornell. In its mix of teachers and scholars at various stages of their careers, in its presentation of different and differing analyses, in its recognition and articulation of why Milton matters, *Milton's Rival Hermeneutics* helps us appreciate the meaning and value of the terms *rival*, *hermeneutics*, and *choosing* to Milton studies. More than that, this book honors the interest in and commitment to Milton exemplified by the contributors themselves, but most particularly by Mary Ann Radzinowicz and Richard J. DuRocher.

John Milton. *De Doctrina Christiana*. Volume VIII of *The Complete Works of John Milton*, ed. John K. Hale and J. Donald Cullington. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012. xc + 1263 pp. + 15 illus. \$375.00. Review by JOHN MULRYAN, ST. BONAVENTURE UNIVERSITY.

This massive, hugely erudite facing-page translation of the *De Doctrina Christiana* is a welcome addition to the Oxford works of Milton, although Milton's authorship of this text is, to my mind, still an open question. The editors are clearly anxious to attribute the text to Milton, as the polemical tone of their introduction makes clear: "Once rid of any doubts about authorship, we can trace Milton on every page; opinionated, feisty, and relentless" (xix).

The editors of the *De Doctrina* present a complex structural system adopted from Ramus, which is (supposedly) the model for the structure of the *De Doctrina*. Ramus's own success as a logician and philosopher was spotted: he made no lasting contributions to logic, and some of his "discoveries" turned out to be errors. He was most successful in creating new structures for the systematic theologies flowing from Calvin's *Institutes*, but since the author of the *De Doctrina* was not a Calvinist (see below), this system is not very helpful. The *De Doctrina* qualifies as systematic theology (cf. p. xxiii) insofar as it is organized under a list of topics rather than simple close reading of the biblical text. Of course the twentieth-century term "systematic theology" never appears in the text; I suspect it is applied to the *De Doctrina* to elevate the theological credentials of the author.

The editors contend that the Latinity of the treatise is superior to other systematic theologies of the time, a "fact" which "proves" Milton wrote it. I do not find it so. The Latin, by and large, is neither polished nor sophisticated in its syntax and is almost totally devoid of rhetorical ornament. It is also extremely difficult to translate. Take the phrase "non absoluta decernendi ratio" (56), which the first translator, Charles Sumner, renders as "contingent decrees." John Carey, the second translator, verbosely retranslates the phrase as "making decrees in a non-absolute way" and our editors, most absurdly, as "non-absolute decreeing" (57).

As for the translation it is, by and large, a sound one, although the authors' passion for accessibility and readability sometimes overrides

their judgment, especially when they break up the stately periods of the Latin that are maintained in the Sumner translation.

The introduction is generously long, covering all phases of the manuscript, including the interesting reservation of half the page (by the scribe Jeremie Picard) for further annotations by the author (xxiv). Some seven scribes have been identified (by Maurice Kelley, the guru of *De Doctrina* studies) as having prepared the manuscript, most notably Daniel Skinner and the above-mentioned Jeremie Picard, the latter involved in a complete revision of the manuscript.

This is the third English translation of the *De Doctrina*. The first in 1825 was by the translator-editor Charles Sumner, who tried to imitate the stately rhythms of Milton's Latin prose. The main flaws in Sumner's translation-edition were that he substituted translations from the King James version of the Bible rather than translate the biblical passages directly, and he "modernized" the paragraphing of the Latin text. The biblical citations were corrected in John Carey's translation (1973, in the Yale Prose), but Carey (or the press) muddied the waters in his own way by failing to provide a Latin text to measure against his translation. The Hale-Cunnington translation is accompanied by a full transcription of the manuscript. As noted earlier, Hale-Cunnington, straining for an accessible translation, often suppress the rhythms of the prose, distance the translation from the idiom of the original, and indulge in their own rhetorical cleverness. This is a facing-page translation, with Latin on the left and English on the right.

The work, whoever wrote it, is interesting in its own right. The preface (which is in the hand of Daniel Skinner) is attributed to Milton, but in an important article in *Milton Quarterly*, Gordon Campbell, Thomas Corns, John K. Hale, David I. Holmes, and Fiona J. Tweedie declare that there is "compelling evidence" that Milton's name and initials were added to the *De Doctrina* in the nineteenth century ("The Provenance of *De Doctrina Christiana*," 31 [1997]: 92). Each section of the work is intrinsically interesting; whether the structure of the *De Doctrina* follows a Ramist path is anyone's guess.

There are thirty-three chapters in the first book, and seventeen in the second. Space does not permit a full analysis of every section, so I will concentrate on a few. In chapter one, "What Christian Doctrine is," the author engages in self-contradiction: "One must seek this doc-

trine, therefore, not from the schools of those who philosophize, nor from human laws, but solely from the sacred writings, with the holy spirit as guide" (19). However, in an earlier passage from the epistle, he admits to studying "the shorter Systems of the theologians, and, following their practice, to distinguish appropriate topic headings" (5). Presumably Milton could not simply forget the theologians he had read when he approached the task of glossing the scriptures.

In chapter four, "On Predestination," the author parts from Calvin by limiting predestination to the Elect who are to be saved, but specifically rejecting Calvin's doctrine of reprobation, that some human beings are fated or predestined to be damned (71). In his chapter on the Son of God, the author denies that the Son is co-eternal with the Father: "God begot the Son by his decree, and likewise in time" (133). In the same chapter the author rejects the idea of the Trinity, as "grounded neither in scripture nor in reason" (149). Nor is the Holy Spirit co-equal with either the Father or the Son: he is "plainly lesser than both the father and the son, as being obedient and subservient in everything" ("On the Holy Spirit," 257). The other flagrant heresy found in the *De Doctrina* is the idea that the soul dies with the body: "I shall demonstrate that first the whole person, then every single part of him singly, is deprived of life. And this should especially be taken note of: that God threatened death to the whole person who sinned, without the exception of any part" (443). Also heretical but less flagrant is his defense of polygamy, on the basis that the twelve Hebrew tribes were drawn to it out of necessity and therefore cannot be said to have sinned (365). In Book Two in the chapter "On Good Works," the author fudges a bit by first stating that "The true worship of God is situated principally in zeal for good works" (905), but then we find that the source of good works is faith in God, not the individual's own merit: "Good works are those which we do when God's spirit is working within us, through true faith..." (907). Indeed, obeying the Ten Commandments is inferior to having faith in God: "therefore it is congruency with faith, not with the Decalogue, that must be deemed the form of good works" (ibid). Thus the author of the *De Doctrina* is consistent with St. Paul's focus on faith, not good works, but definitely heterodox in his mortalism (the soul dies with the body), anti-trinitarianism, and defense of polygamy.

In short, the *De Doctrina* is a learned and heterodox work, which may or may not have been authored by Milton. Since some of these views could result in one's being burned at the stake, one wonders why Milton would have given voice to them, during one of his darkest hours, "fall'n on evil days . . . In darkness, and with dangers compassed round" (*Paradise Lost* 7, 25, 27).

Stanley Fish. *Versions of Antihumanism: Milton and Others*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012. ix + 289 pp. \$90.00. Review by ANGELICA DURAN, PURDUE UNIVERSITY.

Stanley Fish's *Versions of Antihumanism: Milton and Others* is a collection of nine previously-published essays, three new ones (four, counting the Introduction) on Milton (seven essays), and essays on other authors and topics in early modern literature. The essays cumulate to support the "intentional thesis," which avers that "the answer to the very old question, 'What is the meaning of a text?' is: A text means that its author or authors intend,' period" (1). His book-long answer, in which he discusses primary texts and contemporary literary and cultural criticism, provides welcome critical insights and in some cases opportunities for readers to investigate the critical moorings that they possess and that account for their disagreements with some of his arguments and statements.

Readers familiar with and convinced by Fish's critical arguments might determine it apt to read the whole of the volume in order. After all, Fish has repeatedly argued that precise reproduction is impossible, perhaps most memorably in *Is There a Text in This Class?* (1980). In response to Stephen Booth's claim that he does not intentionally interpret Shakespeare's sonnets but rather describes them in his award-winning *Shakespeare's Sonnets* (1977), which features 75 pages of facsimile copies of the original Quarto text of *Shakespeare's Sonnets* (1609) and more than 400 pages of other textual apparatus, Fish avers that Booth's claim "is an impossible one since in order 'simply to present' the text, one must at the very least describe it ('I mean to describe them') and description can occur only within a stipulative understanding of what there is to be described, an understanding that

will produce the object of its attention" (353). Fish's counterclaim maintains with a cover-to-cover reading of *Versions of Antihumanism*. The "Introduction: Intention, Historicism and Interpretation" indeed *introduces* the logic and many of the topics and texts of the volume to imply the rationale behind the selection of these particular essays from among Fish's large critical publications. In the Introduction, Fish first addresses the most pertinent interpretive and analytical areas of historical and historicist readings (1-3), delves into intellectual history (3), reception history and presentism (4-5), and intentionalism vs. textualism (5-6), to hone in on his pithy application of the intentional thesis in "The Readings" subsection (6-19).

The previously-published essays—primarily from the 2000s, with the earliest, "Chapter 9: Authors-Readers: Johnson's Community of the Same," from 1984—are not organized sequentially but rather topically and methodologically, to develop the arguments of "Part I: Milton" and "Part II: Early Modern Literature." I was intrigued most by my own readerly response to "Chapter 5: Milton in Popular Culture." This chapter gains prestige by being featured in this collection, given its original publication as an "Afterword" to Laura Lunger Knoppers's and Gregory M. Colón Semenza's *Milton in Popular Culture* (2006). It read so differently to me in *Versions of Antihumanism* that I took my copy of *Milton and Popular Culture*, off my bookshelf, sure I would find that the chapter had been revised (to be more specific, reduced) only to find that it had not been. I was convinced "yet again" of the accuracy of Fish's assessment of the effect of presentation on reception.

Readers familiar with Fish's work might take another readerly tack in picking up *Versions of Antihumanism* and immediately jump to the three new chapters, to learn about the newest developments or applications of his approach: these readers will be rewarded with his signature aplomb and his ability to draw out the foundations of Milton's achievement in various works. The first chapter, "The Brenzel Lectures" (never delivered as lectures, according to the note on the first page), is the longest of the entire volume. Counterbalancing the complexity of his arguments are the helpful rhetorical and presentational maneuvers. He starts the chapter asking the governing questions, "Why read *Paradise Lost*? For that matter, why read poetry at all? What pleasure and/or instruction does it give? Is what it offers unique, or

can it be derived more easily and succinctly from other sources?" (23). He clearly demonstrates the pleasure he derives from the poetry of *Paradise Lost*, and explains how empiricism, feminism, theology, and other approaches factor into that pleasure, and that redounds on his claim of "the final rehearsal of Milton's great lesson, the lessons that however crowded and variegated the landscape of external events, the true landscape—the one whose composition really matters—is the landscape of the heart, the landscape of belief and conviction, the landscape of faith" (63).

Both of the other new chapters, "Chapter 6: How the Reviews Work" and "Chapter 7: The New Milton Criticism," warrant careful reading. I attend briefly only to the former here, given its attention to the very genre of this *review*, and given that both work towards the end of reminding readers that critical works, like reviews and Milton studies, should be held to the questions, "is it answerable to Milton's [or the text's] achievement? Is it on the right track or is it just horribly wrong?" (123). The article "the" in the title of Chapter 6 indicates that the topic will not be reviews *per se* but rather "the" reviews of his *How Milton Works* (2003). That book ends with an epilogue that also responds to his critics, although in that instance the critics are "friendly but acute" and the topic is broader, Fish's "works" not a specific work (561). In chapter 6, however, he primarily tackles "negative reviewers" of *How Milton Works* (120). He articulates some of the evasive maneuvers, hobby-horses, or plain errors that are pervasive in reviews of his work. Those include the persistence of anti-U.S. scholarship by British and Canadian scholars in particular, something that used to be more blatant. The cases that spring to my mind are the sets of reviews of Eleanor G. Brown's *Milton's Blindness* (1934) and of Stephen Booth's *Shakespeare's Sonnets*. He also provides examples of reviews that read like author attacks, rather than engagements with the text under review. My own model for productive and illuminating scholarly disagreement, serendipitously enough with some of Fish's works, is the concluding chapter of Richard Strier's *The Unrepentant Renaissance* (2012), which refutes Milton being a "theologically antihumanist poet" (255). It must be stated that Strier's success in engaging specifically with Fish, whatever his success in convincing his readers of Fish's errors, is in part a function of the length enjoyed by scholarly

chapters: reviews (like this one) on the other hand must work within a prescribed low word count. Two other charges against the reviewers of *How Milton Works* are the resistance to Fish's explications of Milton's textual strategies, such as puns, whose acknowledged presence might dismantle decorous visions of Milton, and Fish's indifference to "history and politics" (128). We gather more of Fish's perspective on literary criticism by his explication of the points and stakes of these two charges. I recommend the book for its careful readings of Milton and the other authors featured, and for its emphasis on facets of antihumanism that deserve the attention he gives them.

Mary C. Fenton and Louis Schwartz, eds. *To Repair the Ruins: Reading Milton*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 2012. xii + 436 pp. + 22 illus. \$58.00. Review by ANTHONY WELCH, UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE, KNOXVILLE.

To Repair the Ruins, a collection of essays drawn from the 2009 Conference on John Milton in Murfreesboro, Tennessee, derives its title from Milton's 1644 tract *Of Education*. "The end . . . of learning," Milton writes, "is to repair the ruins of our first parents by regaining to know God aright." The editors describe their volume as a project of restoration and repair: an effort to explore "the processes that play across the gap between a ruined world in need of repair and a world of the imagination that invites us to delight in the power of language to reflect our desire for a reshaped world and inspire us to the hard work of actually reshaping it" (4). More polemically, the editors frame this book as a reaction against the recent dominance of "historical and contextual" scholarship in Milton studies, with its emphasis on the author's political writings and engagements. These essays, they claim, herald a renewed critical interest in "close reading—historically and theoretically informed attention to Milton's poetic and rhetorical style—and in the history of that sort of reading" (1). It is always a challenge to shoehorn a diverse group of scholarly essays into a tight unifying theme or thesis, and one occasionally struggles to tell the difference between the historically informed literary analysis found in these pages and the contextual scholarship that the editors claim to

set aside here. But this collection brings welcome attention to Milton's poetry, its sources and contexts, the models of reading that it espouses, and the impact it has exerted on readers and artists over time.

The volume opens with three essays that address neglected aspects of Milton's poetry and its early reception. John Leonard recovers the literary criticism of James Burnett, Lord Monboddo (1714-99), a Scottish jurist and philosopher of language whose writings have been largely ignored by Miltonists. Leonard boldly suggests that Lord Monboddo's work on Milton, in particular his defense of the poet's "unnatural" syntax in *Paradise Lost*, makes him the "best close reader of Milton between Thomas Newton in 1749 and William Empson in 1935" (24). Milton's approach to literary inspiration and its relationship to divine truth is the subject of essays by William Shullenberger and Gardner Campbell. In an essay of remarkable sensitivity and insight, Shullenberger traces a complex dialogue between Milton's Nativity Ode and his *Elegia Quinta*, written a few months earlier in 1625. In startling contrast with the Ode's logic of "eschatological self-abnegation," the Latin elegy embraces a sensuous, naturalistic pagan vision that seeks meaning and value in the human imagination itself—a vision that was not to be realized again, Shullenberger suggests, until the poetry of the English Romantics. Campbell explores how *Paradise Lost* imagines heaven and divine creation in "Milton's Empyrean Conceit," showing that Milton views both the human imagination and the nature of poetic language as simultaneously creative and mimetic, an expression of the loving, flexible partnership between divine grace and human free will.

A second group of essays considers "the relationship between reading, self-examination, and action" in Milton's late poems (7). Reading *Paradise Regained* with an eye on Hegel and Gadamer, Ryan Netzley argues that Milton's poem rejects familiar models of readerly recognition and self-discovery, seeking instead to foster forms of reading, and loving, that move beyond all selfish expectations of "finding oneself" in a moral lesson or a decoded riddle (122). Further historicizing the act of reading in *Paradise Regained*, Vanita Neelakanta links the poem's portrayal of private devotion in the wilderness to the practices of the seventeenth-century prayer closet, with its tensions between secluded self-examination and public religious display. Giuseppina

Iacono Lobo investigates the treatment of conscience in *Paradise Lost*. Shaped by the Restoration politics of religious conformity and dissent, Milton's epic portrays the "horrors of a guilty conscience" and stresses the need to protect "liberty of conscience against all forms of external coercion" (175).

Three more essays delve into the local contexts and literary sources of the early poems. In "Milton's *Genii Loci* and the Medieval Saints," Alison Chapman shows how Milton's guardian spirits of the landscape in *Lycidas* and elsewhere use pagan mythology to evoke "the inherent sacredness of places" (197), while strategically displacing the local "cults" of medieval Catholicism: the saints' shrines, holy wells, and other sanctified places that dotted the landscape of early modern Ireland, Wales, and the West Country. Taking up the "two-handed engine" in *Lycidas*, Carter Revard traces this famous crux to 1 Chronicles 21.14-17, with its vision of the punishing angel witnessed by David on the threshing floor of Ornan the Jebusite—a discrete appeal to Charles I, Revard suggests, "to repent and reform as David did" by rolling back Laudian reforms (221). Shifting to Milton's sonnets, Sara Van den Berg revisits the mysterious identity of Sonnet 9's "Lady ... in the prime of earliest youth." Making an intriguing case for Mary Boyle Rich, a sister of the chemist Robert Boyle who at the age of thirteen refused a socially advantageous marriage arranged by her upwardly mobile Anglo-Irish father, Van den Berg suggests how Rich's biography might have shaped the two versions of Milton's poem published in 1645 and 1673, and explores how the 1673 sonnets evoke contrasting patterns of masculine and feminine virtue.

A final set of essays addresses the reading and reception of Milton from the early nineteenth century to the present. Joan Blythe skillfully traces the roles played by both Milton and Cromwell—and, in particular, Milton's *Defensio Secunda*—in the writings of François-René de Chateaubriand and Victor Hugo, as they grappled with questions of political authority and liberty in the aftermath of Napoleonic rule. Exploring Milton's reception in the visual arts, Wendy Furman-Adams's bountifully illustrated essay analyzes the portrayal of space and place in Milton's Paradise, as rendered by three artists whose work stretches from early industrial England to Mussolini's Italy: John Martin (1789-1854), Mary Elizabeth Groom (1903-58), and Carlotta Petrini

(1901-97). In a thoughtful final essay, Sarah Higinbotham describes her experience of teaching Milton to fifteen inmates at Johnson State Prison outside Atlanta. Probing the key terms “repair” and “impair” in *Paradise Lost*, Higinbotham applies those concepts to her students’ personal and aesthetic engagement with Milton’s poem—a reading experience, she observes, that was rooted in a “genuine, fundamental belief that reading great books is transformational” (355). The authors in this volume clearly share that belief, and although they have for the most part avoided Milton’s polemical prose, the wide range of approaches that they have found to illuminate his poetry fruitfully complicates any straightforward distinction between “close reading” and “contextual studies.” As a snapshot of recent work by both junior and senior scholars in the field, *To Repair the Ruins* speaks to the methodological vigor, diversity, and eclecticism of American Milton studies today.

Jonathan Shears. *The Romantic Legacy of Paradise Lost: Reading against the Grain*. Farnham and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2009. ix + 221 pp. £55.00/\$99.95. Review by DAVID V. URBAN, CALVIN COLLEGE.

In this helpful book, Jonathan Shears focuses on “the relationship between *Paradise Lost* and Romantic literature” and “the legacy that Romantic readings of *Paradise Lost* have held, and still hold, on the critical consciousness” (1). Respecting but consciously setting his argument against Lucy Newlyn’s *Paradise Lost and the Romantic Reader* (1993), Shears takes issue with the longstanding Romantic interpretation of Milton’s epic that emphasizes ambiguity and contraction as central to *Paradise Lost*, instead arguing that *Paradise Lost* should be read as a unified whole, with the poem’s component parts interpreted in light Milton’s “great Argument.” In the process, Shears contends that the Romantic reading of Milton’s epic is “a *misreading*—an unsystematic imposition of meaning on to Milton’s text” (6). Shears analyzes not only the Romantic tradition of reading *Paradise Lost* but also how the Romantics’ reading of Milton manifested itself in the literature of six major Romantic poets: Blake, Wordsworth, Coleridge, Byron, Shelley, and Keats.

Shears' introductory chapter effectively sets up the parameters of his larger study. Over and against the Romantic emphasis on ambiguity and contraction in *Paradise Lost*—an emphasis continued by twentieth century critics Denis Saurat, E. M. W. Tillyard, F. R. Leavis, A. J. A. Waldock, William Empson, Harold Bloom, Katherine Belsey, Stevie Davies, Newlyn, and, more recently, Gordon Teskey—Shears sees the poem as a unified whole that should be understood within the context of Milton's "great Argument" and the authorial intention behind it. Calling the "Romantic aesthetic" "notoriously fragmentary" (8), Shears asserts that the Romantic tendency to emphasize the part over the whole leads to misreading, or "reading against the grain" of Milton's intent. Shears sides with Barbara Lewalski in arguing that Milton's use of multiple genres makes his epic more complex, not indeterminate or inconclusive.

Chapter 2, "Milton in the Eighteenth Century," argues that Romantic misreadings of *Paradise Lost* were preceded by similar misreadings by eighteenth-century authors. Shears contends that Edmund Burke's *A Philosophical Enquiry into our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful* (1757) anticipates Bloom, Davies, and Teskey in Burke's emphasis upon the reader's imagination's ability to recreate poetry even as Burke downplays the importance of Milton's argument. Burke also emphasizes the sublime magnificence of Satan's character in Book 1 while ignoring *Paradise Lost's* moral purpose. Shears even suggests that Burke ultimately conflates the reader and Satan. And Burke's emphasis on the Satanic sublime was anticipated by John Dennis in *The Grounds of Criticism in Poetry* (1704). In contrast to Burke and Dennis was Joseph Addison who, in his 1712 *Spectator* essays on *Paradise Lost*, recognized that Satan's artistic grandeur was checked by the poem's larger moral purpose. Shears also sees Samuel Johnson's biography of Milton (1779) anticipating the Romantic view that Milton was of the Devil's party.

Chapters 3 through 8 each devotes a chapter on one of the six major Romantic poets' reading of *Paradise Lost* and incorporation of it in his own writings. Shears portrays Blake as a forerunner to postmodern indeterminacy, one who avoids foreclosure. Shears cautions against reducing Blake's relationship to Milton to a simplistic understanding of the famous "enigmatic assertion" (60) in *The Marriage of Heaven*

and Hell—spoken by the voice of the Devil—that “The reason Milton wrote in fetters when he wrote of Angels & God, and at liberty when of Devils & Hell, is because he was a true Poet and of the Devil’s party without knowing it.” Shears notes that for Blake, the notion of evil goes beyond the traditional understanding of Christian ethics and contains the “potential for imaginative growth” (61). For Blake, Satan’s choice to rebel was a bold foray into self-authorship; but Blake also reminds his readers that the Satanic “urge towards self-authorship” is both “fraught with difficulties” and “often accompanied by negative connotations” (62), as exemplified by Thel in Blake’s *The Book of Thel*. Shears asserts that Blake was not trying to simply turn *Paradise Lost* upside down; nonetheless, Blake’s emphasis on Satan’s powerful aesthetics focuses on a part of the poem that encourages readers to read against the grain of Milton’s intention and thus misread Milton’s epic.

Shears notes that early in *The Prelude* Wordsworth alludes to *Paradise Lost* to set up his epic poem of the self; but Wordsworth’s focus is not a stated argument but rather the development of his own imagination and its responses to nature. Shears observes that the fragmentary quality of *The Prelude* runs counter to the sustained argument of Milton’s epic. Wordsworth’s and other Romantics’ emphases on lyric poetry are on some level a response against Milton’s developed epic, which both Wordsworth and Coleridge read in a lyrical way. Shears also asserts that the fragmentary nature of Coleridge’s poetry is both inspired by and contrasts substantially with Milton’s great argument. Shears writes: “Coleridge’s inchoate reading of Milton’s epic promotes partial and lyrical experience, where [*Paradise Lost*’s] intelligibility depends on the ordered metaphysics of Milton’s complete story” (115). Shears highlights *The Rime of the Ancient Mariner* and *Kubla Khan* as works demonstrating both fragmentary forms and an emphasis on poetic not religious experience, works that reveal Milton’s presence even as their author self-consciously distances himself from Milton’s sustained Christian argument.

Shears argues that Byron, unlike Wordsworth and Coleridge, understood that *Paradise Lost* should be read primarily as a narrative, moral, and religious work and thus did not read against the formal grain of Milton’s epic. What concerned Byron about *Paradise Lost*, Shears suggests, was Byron’s belief that knowledge of God should

remain “beyond human powers” and that Milton’s epic displays presumption in asserting otherwise (123). Consequently, Byron reads against the ethical grain of *Paradise Lost*, particularly in his distaste for the clear-cut manner in which Milton has Satan—who always possessed free will—admit blame for his own transgressions. Such ethical clarity runs contrary to the ambiguous guilt of Byronic heroes like the eponymous protagonist of *Manfred*.

Shears argues that Shelley refashions *Paradise Lost*, undermining “any remaining notions of intentionality” (140). Discussing Milton’s Satan in *A Defence of Poetry*, Shelley causes *Paradise Lost*’s argument to be “gradually obscured behind the organizing principle of aesthetic merit” (141). And *Prometheus Unbound* contains “no drama”; rather, Shelley “reconstitutes the motif of Satanic revenge taken from *Paradise Lost* as a single moment in which that motif is rejected” (145). Moreover, Prometheus’ recantation of his curse against Jupiter may, through the work’s own characters, “be held open to multiple readings or interpretations” (145). *Prometheus Bound* thus resembles Blake’s *Milton* in its moral ambiguity, its dismissal of temporality and eschatology, and its anticipation of postmodern perspectives.

Finally, Shears contends that Keats, consistent with his poetic doctrine of “Negative Capability,” in a letter to John Hamilton Reynolds chooses to avoid the rational and ethical purposes of *Paradise Lost*, raising instead “the standard of a primal imaginative immediacy” (160), emphasizing aesthetics and imagination at the expense of Milton’s absolute depictions of good and evil. Similarly, Keats’ marginalia in his copy of *Paradise Lost* reveals a “neglect of Milton’s narrative” (171), and Keats’ own lyrical poetry demonstrates his fragmented reading of *Paradise Lost*, a reading that prevented his own ambition “to write the great post-Miltonic epic” (179).

In his concluding chapter, “Milton in the Twentieth Century,” Shears suggests that most prominent twentieth- and twenty-first-century readings of *Paradise Lost* continue the “interpretive decisions and commitments” of Romantic readings (181), citing Tillyard, Leavis, Waldock, J. B. Broadbent, Empson, Bloom, Newlyn, Christopher Kendrick, and Teskey as critics who, to a significant degree, follow the Romantic interpretive paradigms. Over and against such critics stand C. S. Lewis and Stanley Fish, with Lewis emphasizing Milton’s

epic intention and Fish emphasizing the corrective work of Milton's narrator, who consciously dissuades readers from reading "against the grain."

Shears' book distinguishes itself both in its substantive engagement with prominent Romantic interpretations and appropriations of *Paradise Lost*, and in its sustained tracing of three centuries of reading Milton's epic "against the grain." Significantly, although Shears is more a scholar of Romanticism than of Milton, his discussion of the historical sweep of Milton criticism is impressive, and readers hoping to better understand that sweep will profit from Shears' efforts. My only substantive criticism is that in some of his chapters on individual Romantic poets Shears tries to cover so many different works that in places those chapters risk losing the forest for the trees. And, although Mary Shelley not being a poet legitimately excludes her from Shears' book, I nonetheless mourn her absence and wonder what treasures Shears might have offered regarding her appropriation of *Paradise Lost* in *Frankenstein*. All in all, this study is well worth reading and one whose value extends to students and scholars of Milton, Romanticism, and the long eighteenth century in general.

Laura Lunger Knoppers. *Politicizing Domesticity from Henrietta Maria to Milton's Eve*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011. 223 pp. + 40 illus. \$95.00. Review by NANCY MOHRLOCK BUNKER, MIDDLE GEORGIA STATE COLLEGE.

Politicizing Domesticity from Henrietta Maria to Milton's Eve, by Laura Lunger Knoppers, identifies the Caroline royal family's great interest to the Victorian "cult of domesticity," a period in which "imagining the British past as a prototype of an idealized present" (1) was commonplace. Her investigation, grounded in Frederick Goodall's painting *An Episode in the Happier Days of Charles I* (1853), interprets the leisurely outing of King Charles and his family as similar to portraits of Queen Victoria, Prince Albert, and their children. The Introduction outlines the ways in which visual materials, literary texts, cookery books, and political writings are used as political propaganda in representations of Charles I and Henrietta Maria, Oliver

and Elizabeth Cromwell, and in the characterizations of Adam and Eve in John Milton's *Paradise Lost*. In recouping the seventeenth-century royal representation and the discourses that contested and opposed it, she interrogates the liminal space between domestic and monarchical images.

Chapter 1, "The scepter and the distaff: mapping the domestic in Caroline family portraiture," explores images of the royal family including the George Marcelline *Epithalamium Gallo-Britannicum* (1525), Van Dyck portraits of Charles I and Henrietta Maria with their two eldest children (1632), and Van Dyck portraits of the children alone (1632 and 1637). Newly wedded Charles I and Henrietta Maria are represented in the *Epithalamium* with right hands joined, in fashionable attire, and with allegorical figures of war and peace. Speech bubbles proffer the unity of marriage and glorify the Queen's virtue; the scene's message declares a public kingship and anticipates the dynastic expectations for this couple's offspring. Portraits show the vitality of "children as children, not simply as miniature adults" (26) attending to each other and positioned with the family dogs. The rich indoor scenes displaying family comfort, spousal affection, and parents in close proximity to their children exemplify the domestic ideal. These accessible representations make visible an intimacy British subjects relished and "mapped a gendered domesticity on to the royal couple" (27), one that later backfired as critique of the King's uxorious marriage.

The Frontispiece to *The Sussex Picture, or, An Answer to the Sea-Gull* (1644) carries an "allegedly incriminating portrait" that received Parliamentary comment (38). Controversy revolved around the King appearing to offer his scepter to his queen, but she refuses, and directs him to give it to the Pope. In addition to the religious and political ramifications of the image, the cleft staff, used for flax or wool and typical of women's work, symbolizes female authority. This image foregrounds the "assimilation" of Henrietta Maria as a wife who has "inverted household order by dominating her husband" (40) while destabilizing the representation of the male dynasty.

Chapter 2 "'Deare heart': framing the royal couple in *The Kings Cabinet Opened*" exposes the responses to *The Kings Cabinet Opened* (1645). Editing and selecting thirty-nine of the minimum of fifty-

seven letters captured after the battle of Naseby, Parliament published the letters to “shape public opinion against the king” by intimating disorder in his household and government (43). Presented as the intimate communication between the king and queen, the linguistic decision to use “cabinet” in the title heightens secrecy and elevates the intrigue of their exchanges. Deliberate printing decisions contributed to textual emphasis upon revelation and discovery of secrets, language that is part of parliamentary propaganda (43). The results of Parliament’s strategic efforts to select, translate, and edit the original letters debilitated the king’s effectiveness. Specifically, the letters appear to reveal the monarch’s pro-Catholic sympathies and excessive devotion to his wife. The six letters written by Henrietta Maria are placed mid-text, another subtle nuance of a foreign threat at the center of King Charles’s world.

“Material legacies: family matters in *Eikon Basilike* and *Eikonoklastes*,” Chapter 3, examines Charles I’s religious and private papers, and the king’s deathbed meditations, featuring both “dynastic succession and affective family bonds” in his writings (8). Knoppers explores the John Quarles and John Milton contrasting views of *Eikon Basilike*. Quarles embraces domestic privacy between the king and queen, eliminating the political content while Milton foregrounds the texts as public documents. In *Eikonoklastes* he rejects the “legacy Charles identifies for family and British subjects” (85). Contemporary readers’ marginalia reveals appreciation for the domestic language, minimizing the political legacy of the king’s book.

Chapter 4, “Recipes for Royalism: Henrietta Maria and *The Queens Closet Opened*,” discusses a cookery book put into print by W.M. but without the queen’s involvement. Stress on the secrecy of these recipes stirred interest in the queen’s domestic endeavors. Designed to reconfigure the public’s memory of the queen, the recipes identify neither her personal habits nor practices, but presents recipes and household activities similar to those of British genteel women. Markings in extant copies reveal that the recipe book invited readers to enter Henrietta Maria’s private arena by inscribing their own experiences, modifying recipes, and recording details of their own lives (107). The queen thus retains a nationalistic presence amidst the Protectorate government.

In Chapter 5, “Protectresse & a Drudge’: the court and cookery of Elizabeth Cromwell,” Knoppers highlights domesticity’s potential to legitimate sovereign power after the Protectorate and the return of Charles II. She addresses *The Court & Kitchen of Elizabeth* (1644), a cookery book that recalls Henrietta’s Maria’s *The Queens Closet Opened* by “satirizing the failure of Cromwellian imitation” (115). Vital Elizabeth Cromwell does not fit the name “drudge,” however, and her recipes show little difference from cookery books of the time, including the former queen’s. Elizabeth is presented as careful with money and resourceful in housewifely duties. Marginalia points out that her impersonation of the monarchy provides the public persona that the satiric cookery book attempts to repudiate.

“No fear lest Dinner Coole’: Milton’s housewives and the politics of Eden,” Chapter 6, refers to the will and household inventory of Milton’s widow, Elizabeth Minshull, addresses the material culture of the poet’s domestic space and probes representations of domestic practices in *Paradise Lost*. Minshull’s household management points to “not only industry, skill, temperance, frugality, but rational choice and freedom,” although Eve, in her “uniquely hybrid space,” demonstrates similar domestic accomplishments that lead to debate, separation, and the fall (145). Rewriting *Paradise Lost* as a rhymed royalist opera, *The State of Innocence* (1677), John Dryden’s “Edenic household evinces not the republican virtues of choice and reason, but courtly banter and witty flirtation” (162).

The Afterword revisits the Charles I and Henrietta portrait that began Knoppers’s study as taking on a new role when the “long seclusion of the widowed Queen Victoria brought a resurgence of republican sentiment” (165). The painting, made more popular by its version as an engraving, inspired a play, *Charles I* (1872), that portrayed a domestic cheer recognized as a fantasy of the past. *Politicizing Domesticity* shows the iconography of domesticity as a “powerful and contested tool of gendered propaganda” (165). This insightful study will appeal to scholars of political and cultural history, literature, book history, and women’s studies.

Kathleen Lynch. *Protestant Autobiography in the Seventeenth Century Anglophone World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012. xii+321 pp. \$99.00. Review by MARION A. WELLS, MIDDLEBURY COLLEGE.

Protestant Autobiography contributes in a number of important ways to current themes in early modern scholarship. By exploring the social and political contexts of the devotional autobiographical narratives she selects from the politically turbulent years of the seventeenth century Lynch offers an intricately historicized account of the “self” constructed in and through such writings. Lynch’s work engages with the ongoing exploration of self and subjectivity in early modern studies, as well as with more recent local explorations of the kinds of life-writing (especially devotional life-writing) that are hard to categorize within traditional genres. In addition, *Protestant Autobiography* emphasizes the extension of the developments in spiritual autobiography throughout the Atlantic Anglophone world; the book touches down in Bermuda, England, Ireland, and the colonies in North America, deftly weaving together developments in each location and highlighting the complex parallels among them. One of the most interesting issues that the book scrutinizes is the epistemological status of experience. As Lynch puts it in her introduction: “The spiritual experience was a narrated apprehension of an ontological state: I am saved” (28). The book surveys the contested uses of such spiritual experiences, arguing that because “experience is not a historically stable entity” it is necessary to attend closely to the particular cultural circumstances that make certain kinds of experiences validating and authentic (174). It is precisely the range and depth of Lynch’s historical sources that bring this challenging project to life in her book.

Chapter One introduces the vexed history of the reception of Augustine’s *Confessions* in the context of the polemics of conversion in 1620s England. The textual history of the translation of this text in English makes for a fascinating lens through which to read the clash between Protestant and Catholic claims to religious authority, and Lynch artfully draws attention to the ways in which the truth claims of Augustine’s text became politically contestable during this period. The inclusion of a study of John Donne against Augustine’s redactors in this chapter works especially well, given Donne’s own

conflicted relationship with the politics of conversion. Lynch considers two different kinds of conversions (from one church to another, and from life to death) in her reading of Donne's *Pseudo-Martyr* (1609) and *Devotions upon Emergent Occasions* (1624) and the depth of her contextual material gives these somewhat familiar texts a newly complicated resonance. In chapter Two Lynch juxtaposes two very different iconic figures: King Charles, whose *Eikon Basilike* establishes in exemplary form the political and social function of personal testimonies of belief; and Sarah Wight, "an empty nothing creature" (74) whose nonconformist text *The Exceeding Riches of Grace* (1674) used personal testimony from a very different platform. Lynch's discussion of Sarah Wight's spiritual authority necessarily engages with an exploration of the role of gender in the generation of personal testimony. The mutual imbrication of narrative, gender, and spiritual authority opens up some fascinating questions, which Lynch begins to address in her discussion of Wight's "embodiment of passive, patient receptivity throughout a time of spiritual trials" (85). As in Chapter Three, where Lynch also includes a discussion of the role of particular women writers, including most prominently the Baptist writer Jane Turner, a more sustained analysis of the role of gender in Lynch's chosen texts would perhaps have been helpful, if only to draw out in more a systematic way the connections between body, self, and narrative that the women writers help to complicate within Lynch's own text. At the same time, the decision to focus in Chapter Three on a particular year—1653—as what Lynch calls "a temporal micro-study" of the religious writing produced in a variety of contexts, including the Irish and North American ones, provides a fascinating cross-section of the genre of spiritual autobiography, and illustrates her central contention about the historical and cultural instability of spiritual experience as a validating principle brilliantly clearly. Chapter Four turns to the exemplary narrative of John Bunyan, *Grace Abounding to the Chief of Sinners* (1666), famously written from prison. The discussion of Bunyan allows Lynch to return powerfully to the epistemological questions about experience and knowledge that frame her book. She sees in his narrative a tension between the absolute power of God, and the "human agency that comes . . . from the obsessive examination of scriptures in a bid to understand the dictates of the divine" (183). As

Lynch emphasizes, Bunyan's epistemological uncertainty leads him to the radical and all but unthinkable question: "what if his belief were all a 'think-so too?'" (183). Lynch usefully complicates her exploration of Bunyan's narrative by placing it in the context of other personal narratives emerging from the Bedford congregation, including what Lynch sees as the normative narrative model of John Gifford, the church's first pastor, and the interestingly different experiential narrative of Agnes Beaumont, a member of Bunyan's congregation whose own narrative was influenced by a reading of his. In her discussion of the various accusations leveled at Beaumont (licentiousness, parricide), Lynch acknowledges that her experience "exposed the limits of radical religion's accommodation of women's experience" (215). The point is well taken, and Lynch makes it convincingly, but as with the earlier discussions of women's narrative a stronger theoretical system for explicating the gendering of religious experience and authority would give this aspect of the book greater power.

One of the strengths of this book is its meticulous attention to the details not only of the writing process but of the printing and circulation of texts as well. Lynch discusses in detail the involvement of printers and booksellers in the dissemination of material (especially important when the material is controversial), rightly considering the political and social implications of the changing structure of the printing world. Using this lens she is able to make more visible the work of less well-known figures (like Matthew Simmons, who printed Milton's *Areopagitica*) in constructing particular seminal works. "Can we not think of Simmons as also committed to the project in a principled way?" (272), she writes. This shift in focus is tremendously useful for thinking about the material, cultural, and political conditions in which texts get published in this period. The focus on the construction of the book itself as an artifact returns as a strong theme in the final, fifth chapter, in which Lynch analyzes the complex, evolving narrative by Richard Baxter, *Reliquiae Baxterianae* (published posthumously in 1696). In a fascinating study of textual and ontological instability Lynch shows how Baxter's "conception of the self was organic and evolving, enmeshed in the circumstances of its political, social, and ecclesiastical world" (148). These conditions are perfectly demonstrated by this posthumous work, which, as Lynch

points out, was given its title by editors, is missing its first eighteen pages, and refuses both linearity in its structure and a final ending. As Lynch shows, this fluid and palimpsestic work captures in its structure Baxter's view of the self as a work in progress; there is an intriguingly postmodern feel to his avoidance of decisive markers in his text as in his life: "Yet whether sincere Conversion began now, or before, or after, I was never able to this day to know" (269).

In summary, then, *Protestant Autobiography* is a meticulously researched, deeply learned study of an intriguing set of devotional narratives set against their particular historical contexts. It will be of great interest to historians and literary scholars alike in its attention to the mutual imbrication of historical event and personal narrative; since it explores in fascinating ways the intersection of self, narrative, and experience it also contributes to philosophically oriented inquiries about the nature of experience. Finally, the study attends in illuminating detail to the history of the book, providing this reader at least with a wealth of hitherto invisible information about the textual and publication history of a diverse selection of texts.

Gillian Wright. *Producing Women's Poetry, 1600-1730: Text and Paratext, Manuscript and Print*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013. x + 274 pp. + 5 illus. \$99.00. Review by JULIE D. CAMPBELL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY.

In this useful study, Wright focuses on five English poets, Anne Southwell, Anne Bradstreet, Katherine Philips, Anne Finch, and Mary Monck, thus covering figures from the seventeenth to early eighteenth centuries. Dedicating a chapter to each of these women, Wright contextualizes their lives, discusses pertinent manuscript and print practices, and provides detailed close readings of their poetry.

Although she incorporates biographical and paratextual information into her analyses, Wright argues that the scholarship of the 1990s with its focus on canon expansion and modes of writing, as well as more recent scholarship emphasizing the material and paratextual aspects of women's writing, should be less intently pursued; she instead

pushes for more focus on “the traditional stuff of literary criticism” (10). She asserts that “after several decades of intensive primary research” scholars should now “take as much account of form, ideas, imagery and genre” as they do of materiality (10), hence her attention to close readings. Regarding her choice of poets, Wright notes that the one factor setting them apart from other women writers of this period is that “in each case, they, or others close to them, were responsible for compiling *collections* of their poetry” (10). She argues that this distinction is important because “it is testament to the seriousness with which their writing was regarded, either by themselves or by their family and friends” (10). Additionally, she points out that in these cases one may track the “processes of negotiation, exchange and appropriation between manuscript and print through which, in different ways, these women’s poetry was constructed, shaped and disseminated” (15).

After warning that biography can be a risky tool when applied to women’s writing, Wright notes that biographical factors can indeed “help both to reconstruct the literary and social contexts for Southwell’s writing and also to decode the complex textuality of her manuscripts” (18). She examines Southwell’s two surviving manuscripts, Folger 198 and Lansdowne 740, asserting that the former, a miscellany, “presents a complex picture of Southwell’s literary connections” (45), which she explores. Regarding the latter, the Decalogue poems, she delves into the debate over whether they were meant for presentation to James I or Charles I, pointing out that “there is little definitive evidence either way” (47).

Assessing the responses of “Americanists and feminists” to Bradstreet’s poems, Wright considers how both groups seem to find them “embarrassing” (57). She argues that “reading the textuality of *The Tenth Muse*—its paratexts, its internal organisation, its generic selectivity—is essential to appreciating what Bradstreet’s earlier readers, in both Old and New England, valued in her poetry...” (59-60). She especially discusses at length “The Four Monarchies,” providing interesting considerations of Bradstreet’s print sources and generic contemporaries, helping the modern reader better understand the verse history in its historical moment.

Wright argues that Philips was different from English women writers who came before her because her *Poems* (1667) “represented the most varied and ambitious single-volume female-authored publication yet produced, and elicited unprecedented acclaim from both male and female readers” (98). She examines the posthumously published *Poems* of 1667 along with the Tutin, Clarke, Dering, and Rosania manuscripts, and *Poems by Several Persons* (1663), exploring the textual relationships among them. She concludes that tracking Philips’ development from Tutin through the rest “enables us to see how ... she built on ... early achievements, developing her sense of poetic agency and responding creatively to the challenges variously offered by the Restoration, her year in Ireland, and the traumatic publication of *Poems* (1664)” (145).

For Finch, Wright especially takes on the subject of agency, noting that “Anne and Heneage Finch worked together so closely that in many areas of their lives it can sometimes be difficult to distinguish one spouse’s activities from the other’s” (157). She also notes the potential influence of the poetry of William Kingsmill, Finch’s father, commenting on the commonalities in their writing. She explores Finch’s reading evident in her poetry, her affinity for Tasso, for example, and provides close readings of material from three manuscript collections and the print collection, *Miscellany Poems* (1713). Throughout, she pursues the thread of Finch’s authorship vs. Heneage’s editorship.

Finally, Wright considers the case of *Marinda* (1716), a miscellany dedicated to Caroline of Ansbach, compiled by Robert Molesworth from the poetry of his deceased daughter, Mary Monck. Noting that Monck is probably the least known of the poets considered here, Wright asserts that Monck’s “skilled, idiosyncratic and allusive poetry deserves a wider readership and more detailed scholarly scrutiny than it has so far received” (194). Particularly interesting is her examination of the European connections of Robert Molesworth and his sons John and Richard. She especially considers how John’s diplomatic career in Italy and his affinity for Italian writers may have led to the “idiosyncratic array of Italian poets translated in *Marinda*” (201).

In her conclusion, Wright points out that early modern women’s poetry “does not represent a single, unbroken narrative of progress” (241), but that one can see the seventeenth and early eighteenth cen-

turies as “a time of expanding possibilities for English women poets” (242). To prove her point, she provides an insightful survey of ways to consider progress in English women’s writing, from that of Aemilia Lanyer to Aphra Behn.

In the end, Wright’s study underscores the value of the ground-laying work of scholars of the 1990s and early 2000s, which has clearly paved the way for her own scholarship. With this book, Wright provides readers of early modern English women’s poetry a valuable resource for textual and paratextual histories regarding these women’s *oeuvres* and models for further close readings of their poetry.

Judith H. Anderson and Jennifer C. Vaught, eds. *Shakespeare and Donne: Generic Hybrids and the Cultural Imaginary*. New York, New York: Fordham University Press, 2013. viii + 291 pp. \$55.00. Review by GRAHAM ROEBUCK, MCMASTER UNIVERSITY.

The editors have assembled nine challenging essays, varied in approach and focus, that consider possible literary relationships, including dialogue, between the poet-priest and the poet-playwright. If this is how we initially categorize Donne and Shakespeare, the editors prepare us to think about them differently. In the context of literary genres and the imagination of the age, as transgressors of generic boundaries they are “themselves generic hybrids” (Introduction, 2). There is little speculation about the possibility of direct interaction between the two contemporary denizens of London’s theatrical and literary worlds. Donne as “a great frequenter of Playes” is mentioned in passing. The implications of Sir Richard Baker’s brief notice of his “old acquaintance” and his progress from youthful pursuits to his becoming “so rare a preacher” are not pursued in this volume. Likewise, the debate raised by earlier scholars about Donne’s attitude to the theater exemplified by Patrick Crutwell’s confidence in Donne’s “deep and lively experience of the theatre” (*The Shakespearean Moment*, 1960) and Victor Harris’s claim that “Donne rejects the theatre” noting his “antipathy toward the theatre nearly every time he mentions it” (“John Donne and the Theatre,” *PQ*, 1962) is also not pursued. These are not the questions asked. Direct influence and borrowings are incidental

to the focus of the collection, which is on the “immediacy of cultural cross-fertilization” carried on “the cultural winds” (Introduction, 3). The biological metaphor—the editors are not engaged in a “literalized search for hybrids in full bloom” (3)—enables studies that are “broadly cultural, theoretical, and imaginative” (3).

There are four parts, thematically labeled. In Part I: “Time, Love, Sex, and Death,” the first essay, by Matthias Bauer and Angelika Zirker, proposes the centrality to Donne’s writing of the “manifold deaths of this *world*” (17), quoting *Death’s Duell*, that is “inspired, as well as elucidated, by a dialogue with Shakespeare” (18). Interaction between “The Extasie,” “Epitaph on Himself,” and the tomb scene in *Romeo and Juliet* is explored in this well-informed study. Other pertinent sites of life and death discussed include Puck’s epilogue to *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* and Prospero’s island. A good deal of fascinating work is found in the copious notes—as is the case with some other essays. A second collection might almost be compiled from them.

Catherine Gimelli Martin’s essay probes the ways Shakespeare’s plays—*Othello* and *Much Ado* are explicated in detail—and Donne’s love lyrics express the desire to transcend change and mutability. She challenges the view that the Western love lyric “exalts mutability” (38). Why did Donne move from amorous changeability to constancy? Like Benedick he “unwittingly wanted constancy all along” (45). Donne was no libertine, but rather like the “semi-insecure cynic who speaks his harshest” lyrics, is nearly identical with Benedick (48).

The final essay in Part I by Jennifer Pacenza deals with puns on the word “die” used by the two writers. Described as “the most speculative in the volume” (Introduction, 6) it examines a longing for the perpetual sexual moment found in Shakespeare’s “masturbatory” sonnets (65) and compares this with Donne’s striving to escape linear time in his poetry. To this end the author wrestles with “ontological classification attempts to fix the body in a grid of predefined binaries of signification” (63).

Part II, entitled “Moral, Public, and Spatial Imaginaries,” contains two essays that make us think again about the spaces of early modern imaginative engagement—the first in the confines of Court and theater, and the second unconfined celestial space.

Jeanne Shami and Mary Blackstone collaborate in an important addition to study of pulpit and theater, asking how playwright and preacher, major competitors (86), engage their audiences. Their texts are *Henry V* and two sermons, both preached at Whitehall, one in 1617/18, without King James present, and the other in 1627 in the presence of Charles I. Much of the effectiveness of stage performance and sermon depended upon the “relative nearness or distance” of the audiences (95). Negotiating these distances with all the art and rhetorical variety at their disposal, Shakespeare and Donne, as the essayists show, “engaged their audiences more immediately in the performative event” than some scholars, talking of metatheatrical moments as distancing, think (103). Donne and Shakespeare are here convincingly located at the “forefront of the cultural and political changes that marked their age” (109).

Douglas Trevor’s “Mapping the Celestial in Shakespeare’s *Tempest* and the Writings of John Donne” sets out to correct misunderstanding of the reception of theories about the multiplicity of worlds, of which the most significant was Giordano Bruno’s, raising profound theological problems. Arguably, he paid for this speculation with his life: burned at the stake in Rome in 1600, although he had racked up an impressive array of other offences against Roman orthodoxy. Trevor sees the implications of Bruno’s thought, amplified by others and founded on the discoveries of astronomers, as less transgressive than was once thought. Empson, notably, assumed that the skepticism of the age, especially Montaigne’s, would have rejected life on other worlds, but, “the opposite is true”—Montaignian skepticism powerfully emboldened the expanded universe’s possibilities (114). *Ignatius His Conclave* is, of course, the Donne text relevant to this theme. For Shakespeare it is *The Tempest*. Trevor deftly argues the case for the significance of the moon in that play.

Part III: “Names, Puns, and More” has a short, unfinished, essay by the late Marshall Grossman, to whose memory the volume is dedicated, with a response by David Lee Miller. This poignant dialogue is powered by their lifelong commitment to the supremely important power of language. Hamlet’s linguistic sparring with Claudius in Grossman’s essay and Luther’s “theological grammar” in Miller’s are prime themes. The final essay in this part is Julian Lamb’s study of

the pun—impossible to define—with discussions of Sonnet 135 and “A Valediction of Weeping” and the “tennis balls” scene in *Henry V*. Wittgenstein’s ideas on the physiognomy of words are brought into play before turning to puns on Will, More, and Donne. The argument surprises wittily at every turn as we see criticism’s best moves checked by the lowly (often despised) pun.

The fourth Part, “Realms of Privacy and Imagination” presents Anita Gilman Sherman’s essay on fantasies of a private language. Wittgenstein is also a major interpretive presence in this study (along with Stanley Cavell), which engages early modern notions of private language(s), naming, and the further fantasy of perfect knowledge. The problem of privacy and solitude is the skepticism those desires engender—the “impossibility of knowing the marriage of true minds from the inside” exemplified in the “deliberate poetic obscurity” of “The Phoenix and the Turtle” (173). The notion of Donne’s “The Ecstasy” as a response to Shakespeare’s puzzling poem is revisited, with a helpful review of the generic tradition to which both belong. The sharply contrasting visions of perfect knowledge may be attributable to personality (184).

The final and longest essay in the collection is by Judith H. Anderson. It covers a great deal of ground, summarizing many of the themes and concerns of the volume as a whole, although also taking directions not previously examined, or not previously made central, such as Aristotelian psychology (sometimes hybridized with versions of Platonism) and its bearing on cognition in Shakespeare and Donne. Its large purpose is to elucidate the workings of the early modern imagination. The urgent attention to the mind’s operation, the essay makes clear in its treatment of Hamlet, Macbeth, and Leontes, is Shakespeare’s overriding concern (201). As the Introduction puts it, the “cognitive, formal, and cultural concerns” examined in this essay “inform the whole volume” (13). Scholars will welcome the wide range of topics and the stimulating arguments of this volume.

Daniel W. Doerksen. *Picturing Religious Experience: George Herbert, Calvin, and the Scriptures*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2011. xiii + 241 pp. \$75.00. Review by ANNA LEWTON-BRAIN, MCGILL UNIVERSITY.

George Herbert's own comment to Nicholas Ferrar—that Ferrar would find in *The Temple*, "a picture of the many spiritual Conflicts that have past betwixt God and my Soul" (6)—holds the key, for Daniel Doerksen, to interpreting Herbert's poetry in the light of Calvin's biblical commentary. Indeed, *Picturing Religious Experience: George Herbert, Calvin, and the Scriptures*, might just as appropriately have been titled, *Picturing Spiritual Conflicts*, for the depiction of the experience of "spiritual conflicts" is the central theme that binds together Doerksen's three subjects: Herbert, Calvin, and Holy Scripture.

A "schema" (61) or pattern "of recurrent [spiritual] conflict and resolution" (7) in the Psalms provided a model, for Herbert and Calvin, of a literary depiction of the lived experience of an individual's relationship with God (65) through life's "vicissitudes" (200-9). Afflictions, Doerksen argues, are never accidental, but are "from God" (153-54) and are at the heart of the Reformation Christian's experience of struggling and abiding in faith. Building on Barbara Lewalski's discussion in *Protestant Poetics and the Seventeenth-Century Religious Lyric* (1979) of "the long slow process of sanctification" (Lewalski 287, Doerksen 61), Doerksen traces a path of "continual" (142) repentance in *The Temple*. For Doerksen, "introspection" is the first movement towards repentance and "leads to a sense of personal need and a desire to call upon God" (68). That process of turning inwards and upwards, although interrupted by afflictions (152-69), eventually leads to mortification: "the actual, though mystical participation in the death of Christ" (137). Afflictions interrupt the relationship between God and man and yet, dynamically, are the means by which God "tempers" and "tunes" the individual soul (201-5). Doerksen finds "resolutions of...conflicts" (198) in *The Temple* that inspire praise and thanksgiving (198-200), but these are always only glimpses of the (as yet unattainable) perfect and final subsuming of the self into the godhead.

Juxtaposing *The Temple* and *Country Parson* with the *Institutes* and *Commentary on the Psalms*, Doerksen draws compelling parallels

between Herbert's and Calvin's use of imagery and vocabulary. The strength of Doerksen's contribution to the argument for a "Calvinist consensus" is evident not only in his skillful selection of quotations from the *Institutes* and *Commentary* to elucidate the correlation between Herbert's and Calvin's writing, but also in the way that he attunes his readers to draw further parallels between the two authors. In Doerksen's discussion of the appropriate response to the weight of sin, for example, the recurrent use of the term "groan" (70, 114, 131), recalls "*Ephes. 4. 30*": "I sinne not to my grief alone, / But to my Gods too; he doth grone" (lines 17-18). The speaker's desire to "grone" with Christ in His passion is further evidence of the inner conflict of "grief" in Herbert's verse (133) and of the desire to imitate the "inimitable Christ" (133-34).

Laying the groundwork for his reading of Herbert's verse within the biblical "*schema*" as described by Calvin (and Athanasius before him) (62-75), Doerksen provides an informative overview of Calvin's influence in the English church of Herbert's day and investigates the reception of Herbert's poetry in the seventeenth century (Chapters 1 and 2). Doerksen focuses his discussion on Calvin's less polemical work and views Herbert as theologically conservative; for Doerksen, Calvin and Herbert are essentially moderates. He notes, for example, that Calvin, "following St. Paul and Augustine among others," taught foreordination "without regarding it as central to the Christian faith" (5), and that, although "Calvin and Herbert both have a high view of doctrine, what matters in their common texts is not formal theology but a focus on personal spiritual experience" (1).

Doerksen's reading of Calvin and Herbert is nuanced and always careful. He critiques the generalizations and reductions that have led some scholars to use Calvin as a totem for the doctrine of predestination (5), or to read Herbert's poetry solely in the light of Walton's Laudian and hagiographical *Life* (37, similarly 10, 38, and 43). Indeed, Doerksen ends his book with a rousing call to church historians to "get away from preoccupations with predestination or church polity or extremism to attend to what the moderates of the time were saying and writing," and thus, to give "more attention to the 'Calvinist consensus'" (213). Likewise, literary scholars will find in *Picturing Religious Experience* a strong argument to read not only

Herbert within the framework of that “consensus,” but also, to study Donne, Bacon, and other seventeenth-century conformists in this illuminating middle way.

Wendy Beth Hyman, ed. *The Automaton in English Renaissance Literature: Literary and Scientific Cultures of Early Modernity*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2011. x + 210 pp. \$99.95. Review by JESSICA WOLFE, UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA, CHAPEL HILL.

This collection of nine essays, published by Ashgate’s Literary and Scientific Cultures of Early Modernity series, examines automata, automaticity, and “literary fantasies of animation” in early modern English literature. The essays helpfully contextualize the study of automata in a range of early modern philosophical, aesthetic, and religious discourses and practices: Cartesian metaphysics and Lucretian atomism, botany and hylozoism, the Protestant distrust of liturgical set forms, royal pageantry, and anti-theatrical sentiment. They also speak, in varied and (for the most part) admirably subtle ways, to recent critical trends such as animal studies, “thing theory,” speculative materialism, and posthumanism. Hyman’s marvelous introduction ensures a strong cohesiveness throughout the volume and also provides a useful introduction to automata both real and fictional in early modern English culture, objects she astutely describes as provoking ambivalent, perplexed, and conflicting reactions of “exhilaration and terror.” As Hyman observes, “the animation of material is the *Ur*-narrative of the western imagination.” The volume does an especially nice job of illustrating the bifurcation of that narrative into fantasies of “poetic triumph over the limits of material” and corresponding nightmares of “devolution and disassembly of personhood” (3-4).

The volume is divided into three parts. Part 1, “Creations, Creatures, and Origins” is the least unified of the three, principally because Scott Maisano’s lead essay, “Descartes avec Milton: the Automata in the Garden,” has so little to do with the kinds of automata (speaking statues, mechanical birds, iron grooms) that populate the rest of the book’s chapters. Instead, Maisano makes an ambitious yet deeply flawed argument that Milton’s theodicy in *Paradise Lost* is rooted in

the “psycho-physical dualism” of Descartes, an argument that fails to address compelling, pervasive evidence of Milton’s monism and also misreads Adam as a kind of automaton lacking free will simply because he has sprung to life fully formed (this *might* make Milton a preformationist, but it certainly doesn’t make him a Cartesian dualist). The other two essays in this opening section, Justin Kolb’s “‘To me comes a creature’: Recognition, Agency, and the Properties of Character in Shakespeare’s *The Winter’s Tale*” and Lynsey McCulloch’s “Antique Myth, Early Modern Mechanism: The Secret History of Spenser’s Iron Man,” are more persuasive as well as more on target with the volume’s principal subject. Kolb’s essay reads Hermione and her statue in terms of the interactions between “human and non-human actors” on the early modern English stage; it makes an especially convincing case that children in that play are semi-rational automata who occupy an indeterminate midpoint between living creatures and non-living objects (51). McCulloch’s attempt to recuperate the “much maligned” Talus in book 5 of Spenser’s *Faerie Queene* is refreshing even in its occasionally excessive enthusiasm to read the legend of Justice and its odd metal man through lenses other than Spenser’s involvement in the English colonization of Ireland (61).

The essays by Leah Knight, Brooke Conti, and Michael Witmore in Part 2, “Motions,” conform more to each other and to the volume as a whole, and all three are a pleasure to read: original, learned, and persuasive. Knight’s “Orpheus and the Poetic Animation of the Natural World,” perhaps the strongest essay in the collection, brings together an impressive array of Elizabethan poems, rhetorical handbooks, and scientific (especially botanical) texts as it explores early modern representations of the Orphic animation of the landscape in light of contemporary beliefs about the vivency and mobility of plants. Conti’s “The Mechanical Saint: Early Modern Devotion and the Language of Automation” is admirable for its attention to the ambivalent religious implications of early modern culture’s preoccupation with automata: despite the Protestant condemnation of “mechanical saints” as Catholic trickery and associated condemnations of “mechanical” or rote forms of Catholic prayer and worship, Conti’s reading of a 1616 sermon by Lancelot Andrewes offers surprising evidence of the positive religious connotations that at least one (admittedly high church) English Prot-

estant could attach to automata or pneumatic machinery. Witmore's study of mechanical and acrobatic motions in Tudor civic pageantry (especially the 1547 coronation pageant for Edward VI) draws upon humanist ideas of movement and dance to explain the aesthetic logic of the pageant's "moving parts" as well as the "kinesthetic sympathy" of its audience (125; 111).

The third and final part, "Performance and Deception," covers more well-trodden ground in three essays examining representations of automata in English Renaissance literary texts by Robert Greene (Todd Borlik on Friar Bacon and his speaking head), Thomas Nashe (Wendy Hyman on mechanical birds in *The Unfortunate Traveller* and other Elizabethan texts), and Edmund Spenser (Nick Davis on the mechanized pseudo-Edenic landscape of the Bower of Bliss). All three essays provide new insight about the ethical and aesthetic implications of machines in texts that are, in various ways, preoccupied with the legitimacy or illegitimacy of artifice. Borlik cleverly reads Greene's speaking head as a mechanical clock, Hyman plots the range of attitudes towards the mechanical birds that populate Renaissance gardens and literary representations of them, and Davis' essay offers a compelling account of what artificial gardens have to do with unbridled hedonism for Spenser, while also reminding us about an often-overlooked model for Spenser's bower in the medieval French garden of Hesdin.

On the whole, the essays offer skillful, often original interpretations of English Renaissance literary works in which some of the most delightful, disturbing, and downright bizarre automata (and related fantasies of animation) can be found. I did find the collection too Anglo-centric, particularly since the vast majority of automata and other mechanical devices that gripped the English Renaissance imagination were European or Arabic in origin: the Strasbourg clock; the hydraulic garden machinery of Pratolino; the metal men of the Alexander romances; even Hermione's statue is purportedly sculpted by an Italian, Giulio Romano. It might also have been nice to include more scholarship by scholars working in other disciplines, particularly the history of art, a field likewise currently preoccupied with questions of lifelikeness, vivency, artifice, and verisimilitude. But the narrower focus does allow the authors of this volume to carry on a sustained

set of conversations with each other, and the editor has done a very good job of nurturing those conversations and cross-currents both in her introduction and throughout the volume as a whole.

Lara Dodds. *The Literary Invention of Margaret Cavendish*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 2013. viii + 317 pp. \$58.00. Review by LISA HOPKINS, SHEFFIELD HALLAM UNIVERSITY.

Margaret Cavendish asserted that she read no English books, but Lara Dodds' exploration of Cavendish's engagement with her English literary predecessors comprehensively disproves that and shows that Cavendish read, in Dodds' words, "widely, if not deeply" (2). The book has six chapters, focusing on Cavendish's reading of Plutarch's Lives; of Donne; of Milton's "L'Allegro" and "Il Penseroso"; the tradition of Utopian literature exemplified by Lucian, Cyrano, and Bacon; of Shakespeare and Jonson (whom Dodds sees her as reading in a way informed by the influential tradition of syncrisis); and of natural philosophy, principally in the shape of Hobbes, though the chapter in question also contains an extremely interesting tracing of Cavendish's place in the history of engagement with Marlowe's *Passionate Shepherd to his Love*. Dodds considers the way in which Cavendish's self-proclaimed envy and emulation of successful male authors such as these (a coda explains that Dodds, to her regret, can detect no similarly sustained engagement with female ones) acted as stimuli to her own literary creativity.

Dodds identifies her own project as being to "[correlate] empirical questions about what Cavendish read with theoretical and historical questions about how early modern women and men used their reading in the service of personal and literary invention" (4), and she consequently pays sensible attention to questions of bibliography and the practicalities of publishing as well as to those pertaining to more strictly literary approaches. Implicitly and more generally, she also aims to rehabilitate the investigation of what authors read as a legitimate form of critical enquiry, one which is neither theoretically naïve about the status of the author nor plays down the achievement of women writers by tracing them reductively and simplistically to a male source.

(She is also sensitive to the disconnect between the metaphors of filiation through which influence has traditionally been examined and the more isolated nature of female authorship.) Instead source study is a manoeuvre which can, Dodds very credibly argues, help scholars to stop seeing “women’s writing” as a separate sphere and allow them to integrate the voices of women who write into the wider conversation. It can also allow us to recognise the extent to which writing women are able to deploy wider, shared mechanisms rather than simply articulate local, personal concerns. As a subsidiary enterprise, Dodds also attempts to rehabilitate Cavendish’s literary criticism of Shakespeare, which is too often treated as a curiosity rather than as serious critical analysis. Dodds finds it especially fruitful to look not just at what Margaret Cavendish read but at what she *mis*read, most rewardingly when she discusses how registering the effects of a misattribution of a poem to Donne can enable us to detect a more fundamental challenge on Cavendish’s part to Donne’s use of the symbolic feminine, as well as enabling us to see differences between the ways Cavendish uses Donne and the ways her husband does.

I was a little disappointed not to find more than a glance at Cavendish’s reading of John Ford, whose *’Tis Pity She’s a Whore* provided her with the plot of *The Unnatural Tragedy*, and I think too that Dodds misses a trick in not fully pursuing how Cavendish’s refusal to accept Plutarch’s valuation of Cato’s suicide surely bears on her own political beliefs as well as her reading practices: it cannot have been comfortable for her to condemn Cato for an inappropriate attachment to traditional forms of government when that was precisely the logic of Cavalier support for the king. Dodds hints at this but does not develop it, and one can understand why given her desire not to read in terms of the purely personal. However, one might well feel that in reading Cato’s story Cavendish is implicitly writing her own, as she speaks of “Dispers[ing] the Ashes of . . . Dead Ancestors” (44). After all, the whole structure of *Parallel Lives* could be seen as implicitly inviting the adducing of further parallels, and Cavendish could well be seen as implicitly doing just that; to recognise this is not, I think, to tie Cavendish reductively and limitingly to her own personal circumstances but to recognise the extent to which they energised and informed her writing. Nevertheless, this is a sophisticated, nuanced,

and finely written book, and Dodds reads her chosen texts attentively and illuminatingly.

Kate Narveson. *Bible Readers and Lay Writers in Early Modern England: Gender and Self-Definition in an Emergent Writing Culture*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2012. x + 235 pp. + 12 illus. \$99.95. Review by LISSA BEAUCHAMP DESROCHES, ST. THOMAS UNIVERSITY.

Kate Narveson's examination of lay writing in divinity is a thorough and wide-ranging recovery of texts about the emergence of identity through authorship in the period. She further examines gendered authorship in a balanced context, placing texts by male and female authors side by side to offer insights on key similarities as well as differences. Indeed, as she traces the fascinating subtleties that connect reading and writing practices, she shows how the concerns with identity in this period are important to both men and women for similar reasons. In drawing attention to these significant points of similarity, Narveson firmly places the emphasis on identity as people construct it through reading and writing. This larger context is then applicable beyond the period she sets for her examination and in fact constitutes a theoretical hermeneutic.

In the first part of the book, consisting of four chapters, Narveson focuses on the ephemeral connection between the internalizing process of reading practices, in both active and passive senses, and the expression of writing, both as a "passive" reproduction of received generic convention and in the active sense of selecting what conventions to use for the purpose at hand. Narveson resists the easy conclusiveness of essentialist arguments and treads the paradoxical lines of her evidence, showing how passive and active modes co-operate in both reading and writing practices. And despite prevailing notions of either subversiveness or subordinated models, Narveson demonstrates how the paradox of "guided reading" invites readers to engage directly with the text in order to find a sense of connection with it, without the guidance necessarily controlling the response. Using a variety of examples from men and women of different classes and levels of education, she reveals the web of common elements that form a common

sense of belonging among readers of prayer books, spiritual memoirs, and the bible itself, both in printed texts and “private” manuscripts intended for family or personal use. Thus she demonstrates that the notion of applying reading to everyday experience, so important to Reformation exegesis, implicates each reader as an emerging identity, in the deliberate and conscious process of self-construction as a writer. And, through selective imitation, each writer reflects that process for readers in turn, encoding (sometimes deliberately, sometimes without design) the paratextual details and exegetical methods in their own hands—literally, in manuscripts in their own writing as well as print.

Part 2, divided into three chapters, focuses the discussion on the question of gender, but not by exclusive examination of one or the other; like a few other critical voices, Narveson espouses the importance of placing female authors in context beside male authors, with some interesting results. The first is that in devotional prayers, gender does not seem to signify; as in medieval exegesis, when monks gendered themselves female to describe an intensified, intimate awareness of Christ, so in Reformation prayers, the soul has no specific gender. This may seem an equivocation, but it is not; think of Donne’s Holy Sonnet 14 or 18: appropriating a differently gendered voice is the same as relinquishing bodily gender as a marker of identity, or at least it has the same effect for readers and writers: “Voice, [Danielle] Clarke reminds us, is a rhetorical construct. And the rhetoric of the devotional voice tends to suppress gender” (Narveson, 132). Secondly, Narveson’s conception of “discursive horizons” is useful beyond the categories of gender that she uses it to explore, and, I think, beyond the period too:

these examples indicate the role of genre or mode in shaping voice. Genres carry conventions: the voice of the historian is far less gendered than that of the flirtatious correspondent. . . . By ‘horizon’ I mean the vista of texts and discourses that appear in a compilation or composition. . . . [this] included the full range of texts the person read in print or manuscript and the oral discourses he or she participated in. Scripture and godly books might be the immediate context for devotion, but Latin adages and observations by Montaigne might for one author be situated in the same general vicinity while for another, the *Book of Common Prayer* might dominate the

landscape, and for another, broadsheets giving news of God's providential acts might stand next to the earnest conversation with neighbors that followed a sermon. A discursive horizon may be broad, including classical literature, political events, Church Fathers, and continental theologians, or it may be narrow, including only the Bible and godly books. Further, a horizon has a foreground, a background, and peripheries, and can therefore be a useful way to think not simply about what texts and discourses register in a person's writing, but what prominence they have and how other texts are qualified by their position in relation to the dominant discursive features. (Narveson, 133-134)

In this sense, a rhetoric of reading—print, manuscript, Bibles, social conversation—becomes a “schoolroom of print,” teaching people through both reading and then writing how to remake themselves as reading material for others.

Such practices are indeed problematic for the emerging professional class of clergy: if laypeople can claim authority as authors simply by reading readily available texts, then what is the distinction of professional office and formal education worth? The final chapter and conclusion return to this question, first addressed in the opening chapters regarding how to read independently and with guidance at the same time. Just as in earlier chapters, Narveson charts tension between passive and active habits as advocated by clergy and practiced by laypeople, so too in her conclusions she returns to the theme, amplified by the intervening discussion. She points to how authorship can itself negotiate a position within a hierarchical order and still be functional, claiming the authority of experience (like Chaucer's *Wife of Bath*) but still respectful of patristic sources and/or educated clergy, for instance. Thus the emerging genres of lay divinity, while threatening to clergy's authority as professional interpreters of scripture, yet motivate clergy to continually justify its status as educated guides.

The only weaknesses I noticed here are slight and relevant only in certain contexts. Given the wide-ranging application of the theoretical model Narveson develops, she gives very slight treatment to the monastic traditions of exegesis that in many ways inform the Reformation reading practices she examines so thoroughly. Such background is an

enormous and complex study in itself, and so admittedly difficult to treat fairly as background; but some basic review and reference could have been included here, with direction to further more specific research, and might have enlarged the discussion more explicitly. As well, I would like to have seen a more explicit engagement with theoretical models of reading, given the kind of ideas Narveson herself develops. At one point she makes a brief reference to Wolfgang Iser's concept of reading as performance, but beyond this she limits herself to period-relevant criticism only. The absence of reference to Stanley Fish and Roland Barthes stands out; Barthes in particular seems a blind spot, given his theorizing of authorship and writerly/readerly writing and reading. That being said, however, some may consider this a strength because the omission permits Narveson to concentrate on excavating and recovering manuscript sources, so again, the weakness I note here is relevant only for some. Overall, this is a sophisticated and engagingly lively discussion that ranges impressively through the primary and critical sources involved—perhaps more so than Narveson recognizes herself.

Derek Hirst and Steven N. Zwicker. *Andrew Marvell, Orphan of the Hurricane*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012. xvi + 197 pp. \$99.00. Review by GEORGE KLAWITTER, HOLY CROSS COLLEGE.

For *Andrew Marvell, Orphan of the Hurricane*, Derek Hirst and Steven Zwicker have undertaken a difficult and, as they admit twice in their introduction, suspect construction or re-construction of Andrew Marvell's "imagined life." Since the poet left us few autobiographical comments, they contend readers are free to create for themselves the man-behind-the-poems as much as they can discern or think they can discern behind the lyrics and the prose (both letters and tracts).

For chapter one, they focus on "Upon Appleton House," and after Vitally Eyber's rather exhaustive 2010 analysis of the poem (*Upon Appleton House: An Analytic Commentary*) it is a wonder that Hirst and Zwicker could find anything fresh to say about that long poem, and they admit that the poem cannot be successfully explicated with any kind of finality. This opening chapter of *Orphan*, however, adds some

significant appreciations of the poem to an already mountainous pile of critical insights. Among the most daring ideas are the Hirst-Zwicker remarks on the curious absence of Lady Fairfax from the poem, she surfacing a scant four times (II. 299, 492, 724, 7424). The authors suggest that Lady Fairfax's reputation as a political embarrassment at the trial of Charles I, as well as her probable dalliance with Presbyterian causes, may have caused Marvell to minimize her presence in the poem, unless, and here the authors are most brave, Lady Fairfax appears in the poem as the lamentable and comic prioress who supervises the captivity of Isabel Thwaites. This is new ground to till and will delight graduate seminars for years to come. Having done their historical homework and backed up by solid documentation, the authors seem on safe ground. It is the highlight of a chapter marred only by some discursive pages on "The Garden" and "Bermudas."

But if chapter one shows only a few distracting sidelines to its major premise, chapter two is an absolute riot of insight, reference, and quotation. Paragraphs jump from poem to poem, buoyed by extensive footnoting, often with quick jabs at several poems within a single paragraph. This Hirst-Zwicker type of explication can exhaust a reader and distract from the chapter's main point: that Marvell was uncomfortable with heterosexuality and patriarchy. Some suggestions fly up with an air of brilliance only to dash themselves on unanswered questions. For example, the authors try to show that lines 241-6 in "Upon Appleton House," lines long assumed as referring to Fairfax, actually more appropriately refer to Cromwell so that the poet is actually undercutting the élan and respectability (patriarchy) of his host while supposedly praising him. The authors marshal little proof for this strange assertion other than to list three Cromwellian forays between 1648 and 1650 at a time when Fairfax was still nominally in charge of the rebel forces but was contemplating retirement. The density of interpretations and the sheer volume of repeated references to works are so thick, for example, during a consideration of Marvell's prose letter to Sir John Trott, "Little T.C.," and *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*, as to leave a reader gasping for air.

Chapter three, however, does manage a rather fine cohesiveness by sticking to a close, extended reading of "The Unfortunate Lover," the poem which afforded the title for the Hirst-Zwicker book. The

authors examine the piece segment by segment, their explication for the most part satisfying and honest enough to admit that for most readers the poem is beyond comprehension. The second half of the chapter, however, is subject to the same blitzkrieg organization that confounded chapter two. An attempt to use “The Unfortunate Lover” as a base text to understand the entire Marvell corpus is an exercise in futility. The poem is too obscure to hope it useful for anything beyond itself.

One thing is certain about *Orphan*: it is not a book for new Marvelians. Appreciating the Hirst-Zwicker book requires a solid familiarity with the Marvell corpus, especially the poetry. The authors expect of their readers not just a knowledge of major poems (“Nymph,” “Horatian Ode”) but also of the minor poems and some of the prose. Theirs is a book of scholarly expectations, and their method may distance a significant portion of Renaissance readers. Stopping to re-familiarize oneself with, for example, “Daphnis and Chloe” can be an education surely, but stopping to reread minor poems does interrupt the flux of enjoyment one would get from sustained analysis of a single major text. One of the dangers of blitzkrieg referencing is that some insights passed off as gospel do not get the benefit of proof, either by extended explication or by documentation, for example, a sentence like “Coy engagement, as we have seen, may well be detected too in ‘The Garden,’ Marvell’s most famous rendering of ecstatic absorption within a green world” (154). What, we may ask, makes this poem the “most famous”? And what about “ecstatic absorption” in the Mower poems?

There is troubling repetition of material in the book: the exhumation of Tom May’s body surfaces twice (the second time apparently innocent of the first appearance), and twice we get a pairing of Valentine Greatrakes with Prince Rupert. The authors twice reference Marvell’s refusal to apologize on the floor of the House for his aggressive behavior. On page 26 they raise the influence of Nathaniel Whiting’s *The Pleasant History of Albino and Bellama* on the Appleton House poem and resurrect the same influence twenty pages later (46) as if we are getting it for the first time. Such repetitions may be a casualty of joint authorship, but one would think that double proof-reading would double the chance to eliminate tautology. At the 2011 South-Central Renaissance Conference in St. Louis, Hirst and Zwicker explained their

method of composition as a true partnership: each paragraph is read and endorsed by the other team member before an article or chapter proceeds. A method that may seem a tedious process requires great faith in each other's insights and has worked well for them in their joint careers over the years. The present volume, however, demonstrates this method's strengths and weaknesses.

Hirst and Zwicker often set out to interpret Marvell's texts based on what they have imagined his life to have been. They admit as much, and given this investigation of Marvell's "imagined life," it is curious but wonderful to find at the end of their book that Hirst and Zwicker have little patience with the critics who have "imagined" a Restoration dating for "The Garden." Finally, Allan Pritchard's presumptive 1983 article claiming that for this poem Marvell was influenced by Katherine Philips and Abraham Cowley circa 1667 (for images and rhymes) has been anatomized at some length and happily demolished. In a refreshing appendix, Hirst-Zwicker attack the Pritchard conjectures that have received too much credence by Marvell scholars over the past three decades:

That there is verbal consonance among the texts of Marvell, Cowley, and Philips is beyond question; but that there was traffic among these three and that it flowed in a certain direction has to remain, for an era with abundant common sources and a flourishing manuscript culture, unproven. What is striking about the present academic conjuncture is the way a number of distinguished scholars have recognized the weakness of Pritchard's argument, at times offered evidence countering the argument, and yet accepted his re-dating. (175)

I hope the good sense of Hirst and Zwicker will forever lay to rest attempts to wrest early Marvell lyrics out of their suitable and time-honored place in the canon.

Since much of Marvell's life was not the focus of significant contemporary comment, Hirst and Zwicker are free to imagine all they wish, as long as they can convince a readership that their suppositions make sense. Sometimes they do (e.g., Marvell's concerns for children in distress), and sometimes they do not (e.g., Marvell's hidden jabs at Fairfax in "Upon Appleton House"). One thing is certain: they have

chosen an enviable human being for much of their mature scholarship. In *Orphan* they have brought to their study of Marvell's texts a great respect for the man not only as a writer but as a servant of the realm, and if they at times bludgeon their readers with over-zealous rapidity of referencing, their good intentions are always evident. For seasoned Marvellians *Orphan* will be a welcomed exercise in textual engagement.

Reid Barbour and David Norbrook, eds. *The Works of Lucy Hutchinson*. Volume I: Translation of Lucretius. 2 parts. Latin text ed. by Maria Cristina Zerbino. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012. cxlvi + 797 pp. + 11 illus. \$375.00. Review by TANYA CALDWELL, GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY.

This first volume of *The Works of Lucy Hutchinson* establishes the project that raises to a status among the key authors of the seventeenth century a writer too long considered anomalous and relatively insignificant. Reid Barbour and David Norbrook acknowledge at the start that the unexpected size of this two-part edition of her translation of Lucretius may seem disproportionate to its history, but they argue that the text requires renewed attention for the various spheres of seventeenth-century philology and life into which it feeds. In particular, they endeavor to place the translation within the context of Hutchinson's "wider canon in new ways" in light of recent scholarly work revealing that "her literary ambitions extended to a long biblical poem" (xv). This scholarship is the culmination of many years of work and a body of publications by a coterie of scholars on both sides of the Atlantic headed by Barbour and Norbrook. The pioneering work on Hutchinson's surprising Lucretius began with Hugh de Quehen's edition in 1996.

Barbour and Norbrook's introduction (with a contribution from Jonathan Gibson) approaches monograph length as the scholars provide the most comprehensive discussion to date of the contexts of Hutchinson's translation. Dividing their introduction into seven major sections, each with several subsections, the editors range over a wealth of subjects. These include the controversial likely composition period of the translation; the English and European traditions of

Epicurean thought and Lucretius's cosmology within these traditions; what Hutchinson's 1675 completed translation can tell us about radical changes since the 1650s in theological, political, and literary history; and the editing decisions and procedures of the present volume.

By placing Lucy Hutchinson's translation dynamically within the major cultural debates and traditions of its time, the introduction provides a vital resource for early modern women's studies, scholarship on seventeenth-century atomism and Epicureanism, translation studies, and the complex political and religious intersections of the Interregnum and Restoration. Most important, this work of criticism grounds the task of the Oxford *Works of Hutchinson* by elevating Hutchinson fully into the world she inhabited as well as this translation into her corpus as a whole. Until de Quehen's edition, Hutchinson's translation was not really taken seriously, her own dedication offering a red herring: "I turn'd it into English in a roome where my children practiz'd the severall qualities they were taught, with the Tutors, & I numbred the sillables of my translation by the threds of the canvas I wrought in, & sett them downe with a pen and inke that stood by me" (7). Just as problematic has been the issue of the inconsistencies of a Puritan woman, who wrote the life of her husband, a man arrested for the regicide of Charles I, yet who translated a notoriously atheistic text, which is dedicated to the "Lord Keeper of His Majesty's Privy Seal & One of His Majesty's Most Honorable Privy Council." However, the contradictions surrounding Arthur Annesley, Earl of Anglesey (1614-1686), who may well have "come to her husband's aid in 1660," simultaneously highlight and reflect the complexities involved in the text as a whole, and the editors here do the first extended work at unfolding them (cxiii).

The key development in scholarship on Hutchinson, Barbour and Norbrook argue from the beginning, has been the discovery of her Christian poem *Order and Disorder* (xv). In their discussion of her Lucretius, they consequently reinforce their major arguments through comparisons between her approach in the translation and the philosophy underscoring the poem, which they see as epitomizing her poetic stance. In addressing how Hutchinson can possibly have been inspired by Lucretius's atheism, for example, the editors demonstrate the probable influence of her contemporaries Pierre Gassendi

and Robert Boyle as she worked through the translation to reconcile Lucretian atomism and a Christian god. They then point out that she “does something similar in *Order and Disorder*, where she feels able to transfer the language she had used in describing Lucretius’ gods to the Christian Trinity” (lxvii). Her reconciliation of her Calvinism with historical shifts and her attraction to Lucretius is also effected through her manipulation of language. In the life of her husband (“The Life of John Hutchinson”) she consistently uses the word “priest” pejoratively to express “anticlericalism” (lxviii). She similarly makes Lucretius denounce idolatry, and, as the editors also point out, uses the same recurrent language in *Order and Disorder* (lxviii).

As well as the introduction, part one includes Hutchinson’s dedication to the Earl of Anglesey as well as all six of the books of her translation. These are each prefaced by an argument and juxtaposed with the Latin text that she used, prepared by Maria Cristina Zerbino. The translation appears on the right hand page and the Latin on the left. The texts are presented, as the editor’s note, as close to the original form as possible. There is no modernization of spelling or letters, and the font indicates where the manuscript (British Library Additional MS 19333) is either in Hutchinson’s hand or that of a professional scribe. The demarcation, Barbour and Norbrook argue, is a crucial one, for it indicates Hutchinson’s own editing of her complete manuscript and so her “complex relations of involvement with and distancing from this ‘atheistical’ text” (cxxxvii). Part two contains the extensive commentary, bibliography, and index. That the commentary warrants a whole volume, the editors suggest, simultaneously indicates the importance of the groundwork laid with de Quehen’s edition and the limitations of the concision that he strove for. This present edition is a response to the need for a “lengthy commentary” that de Quehen noted (cxxxvi).

The elevation of another complex and multi-faceted early modern women writer is always a major accomplishment and provides new foundations for scholarship. This work will remain a wonderful resource for generations to come.

Joyce Ransome. *The Web of Friendship: Nicholas Ferrar and Little Gidding*. Cambridge, UK: James Clarke, 2011. 291 pp. + 12 illus. Paper \$35.00 (ebook £26.25; PDF £31.50). Review by P. G. STANWOOD, UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Little Gidding is a very small settlement, nestled in the gentle rolling countryside of Huntingdonshire, along with its neighbors Steeple Gidding and Great Gidding, with nearby Leighton Bromswold, where George Herbert was once curate. In the mid-1620s, Little Gidding and its old manor house and church became the place of a religious community that Nicholas Ferrar (1593–1637) established.

Ferrar was remarkably clever, proceeding to Clare College, Cambridge at the early age of thirteen, and four years later, in 1610, he graduated with a BA. His college elected him to a fellowship the same year, and he remained in Cambridge until about 1613, when he left for extensive travel on the Continent, with visits to numerous monastic and religious communities, returning in 1617, no doubt considering the formation of a holy fraternity in England. But at first Ferrar joined his brother John in managing the affairs of the Virginia Company, becoming its director in 1622. The failure of the company and the subsequent financial crises seem to have hastened Ferrar's decision to acquire the property at Little Gidding, to begin the restoration of its dilapidated buildings, and so to create a new community devoted to prayer, good works, and orderly living.

These details and many more are recalled and reassessed by Joyce Ransome in her fascinating and scholarly study of Nicholas Ferrar and Little Gidding. She has made excellent use of the familiar studies by Peckard, *Memoirs* (1790), Blackstone, *The Ferrar Papers* (1938), Maycock, *Nicholas Ferrar of Little Gidding* (1938), Muir and White, *Materials for the Life of Nicholas Ferrar* (1996), and others. But Ransome's work benefits from her extensive use of materials not so easily available to her predecessors. While the archive of Ferrar papers in Magdalene College, Cambridge remains a vital source for all of Ferrar's investigators, Ransome has also made use of the discovery of additional letters in this collection. She notes that the collection is now fully catalogued, available on microfilm, and now online. She observes that "the detail that the letters furnish makes possible a much

more revealing picture of relationships and family dynamics than was earlier possible. The sustained sequences of letters between Nicholas and Arthur Woodnoth and between Nicholas and Joshua Mapletoft give an unusual depth of insight into these three men and particularly into Nicholas as counsellor and friend. The letters also reveal him as a different style of counsellor with his older Collet nieces" (15). The thoughtful consideration of these additional documents brings special significance to her book—meaningfully titled *The Web of Friendship*.

While Nicholas Ferrar never married, his extended family included several siblings, notably Susanna whose marriage to John Collet produced fifteen children, and from that generation there were connections with the Mapletofts and the Woodnoths. Ferrar's brother John also enlarged the family with his wife Bathsheba. The community gathered not only family but also local neighbors, especially young persons in need of fundamental education. The initial chapters of Ransome's book, which are laid out chronologically, from the formative years of the Little Gidding community to its decline and posthumous life, describe the complicated relationships and strands of "the web of friendship"—a bewildering tangle of genealogies, friends, and acquaintances, largely presided over and managed by Nicholas Ferrar himself. The genealogical charts or pedigrees at the end of the book are both welcome and indispensable.

Most of the figures mentioned in this book appear briefly; but Ferrar is of course the principal actor, difficult and complex. He grew up in a pious family where Foxe's *Book of Martyrs* was regularly read, he was a precocious student of languages and culture, and he knew the world of business and politics. Ferrar emerges as a man of deep devotion, yet highly practical, industrious, and firmly in control of his little community. His concern for the English Church and "the good old way" led to his formation of "a little academy" and the various pedagogical efforts and artistic efforts of the Gidding community, notably "the story books" and especially the beautifully crafted Gospel Harmonies.

Ransome's book about Nicholas Ferrar and Little Gidding, like most of its antecedents, is above all a historical, even archival study, yet with greater attention to the personalities involved. She writes efficiently, with great sympathy for her subject, and with much knowledge

gained from prodigious research. Yet in spite of Ferrar's exemplary efforts to illuminate English devotional and ecclesiastical life, he remains somewhat distant and elusive. His translation of Valdeso's *Divine Considerations*, with his friend George Herbert's preface and notes (1638), was a late and posthumously published effort to offer light to a dark world. Through this and similar projects, "Ferrar hoped that Little Gidding, like the Boston of his contemporary John Winthrop, would be for his contemporaries a 'City Set Upon a Hill'" (133).

After Ferrar's death in 1637, the community continued for a number of years, but gradually declined, and had largely dispersed after 1657. Little Gidding would become a metaphor for a lost but glorious cause, memorably evoked in the hugely popular novel by J. H. Shorthouse, *John Inglesant* (1881). Here was a highly romanticized view of an age gone but in need of recovery, which fortuitously appeared during the apogee of the later Oxford Movement, and helped to support certain of its values. Perhaps Shorthouse has few readers today, but Little Gidding is well known through T. S. Eliot's *Four Quartets*, where Little Gidding becomes the symbol of a place of achieved spirituality. Ransome properly eschews these later manifestations, for they do not fit into her plan or purpose. Yet one would welcome a book one day that explores the *literary* significance—real or imagined—of Little Gidding and its spiritual progeny.

Meanwhile, we are grateful for this new study of a fascinating family and place, all carefully situated in their seventeenth-century context. But a reservation and modest animadversion: the index is brief and inadequate. Yet the bibliography is too long, with many works of general or only marginal background interest about Ferrar or Little Gidding. And surely it is unnecessary to give the *Short Title Catalogue*, or other standard reference works. A general listing of early modern works has no end, but certain immediately relevant titles might have been included: Where is Richard Crashaw, Joseph Beaumont, J. H. Shorthouse, or T. S. Eliot? Herbert is obviously relevant, for his connection with Ferrar is of supreme importance, and indeed his works are duly cited, yet not in a standard edition—Hutchinson (1941, 1959) or Wilcox (2007)—but in an Everyman edition. But these points are mere quibbles about an immensely rewarding book.

Jennifer L. Airey. *The Politics of Rape: Sexual Atrocity, Propaganda Wars, and the Restoration Stage*. Lanham, Maryland: University of Delaware Press, 2012. viii + 251 pp. \$80.00. Review by JOSEPH PAPPA, INDEPENDENT SCHOLAR.

In a 2002 review essay, James Grantham Turner observed how “emergent scholars feel the pressure to theorize, to philosophize, to psychoanalyze, to politicize, which often leads to feverishly exaggerated theses” (*SEL* 42 (2002), 173). In her *Politics of Rape*, Jennifer Airey has succumbed to this pressure. Airey has read widely in the political propaganda from the Interregnum and Restoration, focusing on depictions of rape and other forms of sexualized violence. From this cache of documents, she distills six character types that she believes appear frequently in Restoration tragedies: the demonic Irishman, the debauched Cavalier, the poisonous Catholic bride, the demonic Dutchman, the ravished monarch, and the cannibal father. She proposes to demonstrate her claims by examining plays by Orrey, Howard, Shadwell, Rochester, Dryden, Lee, Settle, Crowne, and Ravenscroft, among others, as well as poems by Marvell and Milton. Her claim is that both sides of the political divide—Whig and Tory—availed themselves of images of atrocity to score political capital. For Airey, “[a]n examination of the period’s rape plays exposes the extent to which playwrights drew upon, responded to, and interacted with the offstage culture of political propaganda pamphlets” (217).

Unfortunately, Airey’s study is flawed in both conception and execution. Her organization of material is inefficient: she details incidences of sexual violence in her first chapter and then proceeds to draw on them throughout the book, demanding that her readers have particularly good memories for unpleasanties. In chapter three we are told unhelpfully that “Brutus’s use of Helen and Lucrece mirrors the use of rape in propaganda as described throughout this study” (129). Conceptually, after reading the Yale edition of *Poems on Affairs of State* and John Harold Wilson’s edition of *Court Satires* is anyone really unaware that early modern polemicists slung the same mud at one another over the fence? For that matter, it seems almost like a truism by now that political attacks were carried out indirectly by calumniating a person’s sexuality: essays from the 1970s by John

H. O'Neill and Reba Wilcoxon made this point very clear. As far as Restoration drama goes, more than a few readers will be put off by her easy slippage between stage and pamphlet: plays become "political acts[s]," and "acts of rape provided a consistent, emotionally charged set of tropes to guarantee some form of political response" (46, 217).

One may well wonder how many early moderns were familiar with Airey's tropes? It is a well-known and lamented fact that we possess little contemporary information about the reception of Restoration drama. This dearth of evidence, however, does not deter Airey: we are informed that "Shadwell's play might have resonated in the minds of *The Rover's* audience" (102)—then again it might not have: Airey provides no evidence to support her qualified speculation. And what of the authors? We also learn that "Rochester and Lee are both interested in the process of propaganda making on a metatheatrical level and ... in the broader realm of political rhetoric" (115). No supporting documentation describing such interests is offered for either man, other than Airey's readings of their plays.

I was dumbfounded by the number of times scholarly hocus pocus transformed one subject into something else: Elkanah Settle "Reconfigures the trope of the poisonous Catholic bride into an attack on Charles's poisonous Catholic mistresses" (22); "Orrey transforms the trope of the debauched Cavalier into the trope of the debauched usurper" (43); "Atreus has ... become the dramatic embodiment of Locke's cannibal father (albeit one who forces other fathers to eat their young, rather than indulging in cannibal acts himself)" (173); in Ravenscroft's adaptation of *Titus Andronicus*, Airey over-ingeniously "blend[s] the rape of Lavinia with Eucharistic ritual ... transform[ing] her, perversely, into the Host" (176). Hey Presto! Airey never met an example that her argument could not "reconfigure."

Airey's method is unsophisticated. A lot of furniture gets shuffled around, but Airey never provides any new insight into the drama. Indeed, if you know which political pamphlet she is discussing, then you know what her reading of the play will be—it is a foregone conclusion, as all formulas are. Her plug-n'-chug thesis is carried out with dogmatic insistence, usually to the detriment of her evidence, when evidence is provided, that is. The analysis she provides is usually nothing more than limp paraphrase. When she discusses a play, she starts at the

prologue and works her way through to the end, without ever really trimming the unnecessary bits. Slow wind-ups abound throughout.

Her approach lacks focus: for example, “this chapter explores the prevalence of rape *and* cannibal imagery as metaphors for political *and* religious disruptions in the drama *and* propaganda of the late 1670s *and* 1680s” (150; my italics). A professor of mine used to write “Andy-Pandy” next to sentences loaded with “ands” in which I could not make up my mind about what my main idea was; the above quotation is for an entire chapter! Is it any wonder that some of Airey’s paragraphs have weak organization? That they swell with unrelated pieces of information? (See the paragraph on 161-62 for an example.)

Her lack of precision in scholarly practices extends to word choices, in particular “vampire.” The word appears throughout the book; indeed, it is such an important theme for Airey that she includes it in her index. Never mind that the word was not used in our sense until 1734. A search of EEBO for “vampire” and variant spellings yielded zero hits. I don’t mind using a modern word to describe an early modern idea or practice, but when Airey claims that the Catholic Church “is ... explicitly a vampire,” I threw up my hands (149). The word she wants is “parasitic,” “barbarous,” or “savage.” Just because someone drinks blood does not make him a vampire, especially when such behavior is described otherwise: in discussing Nathaniel Lee’s *Mithridates*, Airey explains that “Ziphares becomes his father’s ‘Bosom-wolf’ who vampiristically ‘laps my dearest blood’” (163). Why “vampiristically”? Why not “wolf-like,” or, if you must have a supernatural creature, why not “like a werewolf”? Lycanthropy was a well-known condition; at least such a stretch would have been historically appropriate.

This semantic peccadillo takes on greater seriousness when Airey uses vampirism to explain the following passage from Lee’s *Lucius Junius Brutus*:

Behold, you dazled Romans, from the wound
Of this dead Beauty, thus I draw the Dagger,
All stain’d and reeking with her Sacred blood,
Thus to my lips I put the Hallow’d blade,
To yours Lucretius, Collatinus yours, ...
kiss the Ponnyard round. (1.1.434-39),

which Airey explains thusly: “Brutus’s use of Lucrece’s knife is a less obvious but no less definite act of blood drinking than that of the royalists . . . That Brutus, like his hated son, participates in an act of vampirism suggests that the republicans may be no better than the royalists they replace” (128-29). Airey is not the first scholar to see in this passage a parallel to the blood-drinking ritual that occurs in the play, but she certainly stresses its “vampiric” associations. Unfortunately this conclusion is no more than a fevered expression of an overheated imagination. The keyword in this passage is not “blood” but “Hallow’d.” The phrase “kiss the Ponnyard” is a variation on the phrase “kiss the book,” which was used in the period to confirm an oath, which makes sense in its context. For example, in Behn’s *The Rover*, we find the following humorous use of the phrase:

Helena. Nor then neither, unless you’ll swear never to see
that lady more.

Willmore. See her!—Why, never to think of womankind
again.

Helena. Kneel—and swear—

Kneels, she gives him her hand.

Willmore. I do, never to think—to see—to love—nor lie—
with any but thy self.

Helena. Kiss the book.

Willmore. Oh, most religiously.

Kisses her hand. (3.1.249-55)

I can discern no signs of vampirism in Lee’s passage other than the blood; kissing a bloody dagger is not the same as drinking blood, and it is not the main point of the action anyway: swearing an oath is. This unfamiliarity with the language of the period casts considerable doubt on Airey’s “suggestion” about republicans and royalists.

To return to Turner, he asks, “why do we need to make grandiose claims for the materials we have unearthed, to adopt the guise of psychohistorians or social anthropologists or grand theorists of identity?” (178). Airey had a compelling topic: her work on pamphlet propaganda would have stood on its own, and I regret that no one advised her to work solely on this topic. In *Politics of Rape*, she lacks the capacity to extend her research into the realm of drama and still make a plausible case that contributes to our understanding of Restoration drama. And by force-fitting her tropes to the plays, she

minimizes what truly would have been a legitimately interesting study on material that is unfamiliar yet important.

Philip Major, ed. *Literatures of Exile in the English Revolution and its Aftermath, 1640-1690*. Farnham, England, and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2010. xvii + 215 pp. \$99.95. Review by KATHRYN VOMERO SANTOS, NEW YORK UNIVERSITY.

Scholars have long acknowledged that the events of the English Revolution forced many men and women into exile, but it is only in recent years that historians and literary critics have begun to devote significant attention to the effects of such displacement on the literature and culture of the second half of the seventeenth century. Philip Major has assembled an interdisciplinary collection of essays that examine the full range of these effects by presenting new approaches to the historiography of exile during and after the English Civil Wars. Published as part of Ashgate's Transculturalisms 1400-1700 series, *Literatures of Exile in the English Revolution and its Aftermath, 1640-1690* has two main goals: to contribute to the ongoing project of recuperating a history of the royalist exiles and to expand the traditionally Anglo-centric focus of existing scholarship on the Revolution to include English engagements with the continent as well as with the New World. As Lisa Jardine notes in her foreword to the collection, scholars must account for these transcultural exchanges if we are to fully understand "the intellectual and cultural history of the British Isles in the second half of the seventeenth century" (xviii).

The historiography of exile during this period has presented a number of methodological challenges, many of which are outlined by Timothy Raylor in the first essay in the collection. As Major fully acknowledges in his introduction, it is somewhat jarring to read an opening essay that seems to critique the larger project of the collection in which it appears, but it is nevertheless an important perspective that sets the tone for a volume that demonstrates a deep commitment to discussing methodology and identifying new areas of research. For Raylor, the difficulties stem first from what he calls "problems of definition" (20). The category of "exile," narrowly defined in political terms,

limits the scope to a specific group of people (the royalists) during a short period of time. Raylor advocates instead for examining “English Civil War Travelers,” which would allow scholars to take a broader view of Anglo-European interaction. Furthermore, Raylor contests the notion that England was intellectually isolated before the English Revolution and argues for an approach that recognizes continuity in English engagement with the continent. The second problem Raylor identifies is one of evidence. We should always be aware, he cautions, that the particular circumstances of exile and related movements across borders had serious effects on the completeness and quality of the records on which scholars typically rely.

Despite Raylor’s misgivings about the archival limitations in the study of exile during and after the revolutionary period, many of the collection’s contributors conducted impressive research in English, continental, and early American archives. Most notably, Marika Keblusek brings together a wide range of sources, such as letters, scrapbooks, manuscripts, acquisition records, and accounts of personal book collections in order to map out what she terms “exile book culture” in her essay on the role of printed and manuscript texts in the royalist and Anglican experience in exile during the 1650s. In her consideration of individuals who “felt forced to escape into a self-constructed universe of paper and words,” Keblusek also explores the centrality of reading and studying to the “inner exile” that many people experienced as the Church of England went underground during the Commonwealth (83).

Although all of the essays contribute to a broader understanding of the impact that exile had on the writing and reading practices of the mid-to-late seventeenth century, two pieces deal explicitly with the ways in which exile shaped the literature of the period. Christopher D’Addario, who has written at length on the topic of exile and seventeenth-century literature, demonstrates that the experience of being in exile and away from the English language deeply affected Abraham Cowley’s relationship to the poetic endeavor and forced him to embrace the polyvalence of language. Nigel Smith, on the other hand, notes that historians of literature, politics, and religion have not fully explored the ways in which the presence of English exiles on the continent also had effects on European literature. Smith deftly illumi-

nates this phenomenon by analyzing plays, poems, and other forms of writing in Italian, Dutch, German, and French that represent and engage with English politics of the period. Smith even goes so far as to suggest that the royalist exiles living in Europe “transformed their destinations, and helped start the great obsession with English culture and letters that is such a mark of eighteenth-century Europe” (106).

While the first eight essays certainly deliver on the promise to expand the typically Anglo-centric focus of revolutionary historiography, the final two essays by Philip Major and Jason Peacy broaden the geographical and temporal scope even further by examining the regicide exiles living in New England. Drawing on the limited archival resources that survive in the form of letters, journals, legal papers, and eyewitness accounts, Major and Peacy both attempt to reconstruct a sense of how regicide fugitives lived in the colonies and what kinds of relationships they maintained with their homeland. In many ways, these self-reflexive final essays reveal the fact that, as Major notes, this is a “new frontier in the study of exile born of the English Republic” (166). Indeed, both essays preview an exciting area of future research for scholars of English, American, and transatlantic cultural history.

The essays in *Literatures of Exile* are thoughtfully organized in such a way that encourages the reader to make clear links between neighboring essays and to follow various threads that run throughout the collection. Individually, the essays make substantial contributions to our understanding of the English Revolution and its complexities, but the true innovation of the collection is its sustained attention to methodology. *Literatures of Exile* does not claim to be able to fill any of the gaps it identifies comprehensively. Rather, each contributor uses new research ultimately to gesture toward more work to be done on this rich topic. As it both showcases and inspires new work, *Literatures of Exile* is a successful model for any collection of essays.

David Randall. *English Military News Pamphlets, 1513-1637*. Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2011. xxviii + 187 pp. \$60.00. Review by NICOLE GREENSPAN, HAMPDEN-SYDNEY COLLEGE.

From medieval and Renaissance epistolary ideals, conventions, and practices through to the development of printed news pamphlets and corantos in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, in this collection of military news pamphlets the editor David Randall explores the evolution of the form and content of military news in England. Randall outlines three main characteristics of English military news pamphlets. The first is the plain or unadorned style, which evoked immediacy, urgency, and firsthand experience, privileged by military news writers. The second is partiality: English military news promoted Protestantism, nationalism, and support for allies. The third is rhetorical, the aim to persuade audiences of the justness of the cause, the heroism of particular individuals, and the importance of pursuing the conflict. In turn, each of these characteristics was tied to contemporary conceptions of truth and credibility.

The collection comprises a total of fifteen texts spanning the years 1513 to 1637. It begins with two pamphlets on Anglo-Scottish military conflicts during the reign of Henry VIII. The first, *Hereafter ensue the trewe encountre*, is the earliest extant printed military news pamphlet and treats the battle of Flodden Field in 1513. The second pamphlet, published in 1544, offers a good example of Anglo-Scottish border warfare. Two texts focus on conflicts between Christians and Muslims: the siege of Malta (1565) and the Ottoman invasion of Hungary (1566). Another pair of texts examine different facets of Anglo-Irish warfare. Three pamphlets cover various stages of the French wars of religion, while four texts examine wars between the Spanish and Dutch in the later sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. The final two pamphlets move a bit further afield: one 1610 text examines the Swedish-Polish war fought in Russia, and the last, from 1637, treats the war between colonists in New England and the Pequod nation.

The texts highlight a variety of perspectives, experiences, geographical regions, religious affiliations, and types of warfare. Among the themes are the experiences of officers and common soldiers, differing

conditions in battleground and siege warfare, intra-Christian conflict, war between English colonists and Native Americans, and between Christian and Muslim nations. Attention to differing perspectives is evident in other ways as well. Alongside English translations of French and Dutch accounts of continental battles, for example, Randall includes pamphlets composed by Englishmen who witnessed or participated in continental warfare. Some of the selected pamphlets, such as English translations of French and Dutch military news, are relatively unknown to early modern English historians and literary scholars. The authors of other texts, including Hugh Peters, George Gascoigne, and Thomas Churchyard, are more familiar to those who work in the period. Taken together this is a series of well-chosen pamphlets that offer important insights into international and transatlantic warfare.

David Randall situates military news in the larger context of pamphleteering and popular literature. To frame the collection, the introduction provides a concise overview of recent scholarship in the fields of print and news cultures. The chronological and geographical breadth of the texts allow readers to follow the evolution and development of the genre of military news, and the juxtaposition of pamphlets can raise connections that are not always apparent in or made possible by keyword and title searches in Early English Books Online and other digital repositories. For historians and literary scholars who specialize in particular regions and periods, this collection can offer rich opportunities for international and chronological comparisons. For those unfamiliar with a particular period or conflict, each pamphlet is preceded by a separate introduction that contextualizes the account, identifies principal events and figures (including the author, if known), and highlights principal themes in the genre of military news. This makes it a particularly useful resource for students and instructors (though the steep price of the book may place it out of the range of individual, rather than library, purchasers).

Readers may find a number of the inclusions and omissions surprising. Some may be disappointed that the collection maintains the customary distinction between land and naval warfare and eschews the inclusion of naval pamphlets. Others may wonder at the absence of texts devoted to warfare in Germany during the Thirty Years War. No selection, however, will please everyone. Moreover, the decision

about which texts to include seems to have been made with more than geographical breadth in mind. As is evident in the series of pamphlets treating the French wars of religion and the wars between the Spanish and Dutch, for example, multiple accounts composed over the course of a long-running conflict demonstrate different stages of war and its evolution. Including a pamphlet on the less well-known war between Sweden and Poland shows the wide circulation of, and interest in, international military news. On the whole the pamphlets are good representations of the genre and illustrate the content, range, and breadth of news pamphlets. The anthology also builds upon increasing scholarly interest in international news and print cultures. Individually and collectively these lively and engaging texts are great examples of the dynamic, informative, and entertaining nature of military news pamphlets in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

Stephen Pender and Nancy S. Struever, eds. *Rhetoric and Medicine in Early Modern Europe*. Farnham, UK and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2012. Literary and Scientific Cultures of Early Modernity Series. ix + 299 pp. \$119.95. Review by KARIN SUSAN FESTER, INDEPENDENT SCHOLAR.

The book, the first of its kind, is a collection of essays that concentrates on the intimate relationship between medicine and rhetoric in early modern Europe. Each of the essays—ten in total—in this volume make a valuable contribution to the field of seventeenth-century studies, medical rhetoric, and scientific cultures, as well as philosophy.

Stephen Pender presents an eloquent and in-depth introduction to the history of rhetoric in medicine. In the first chapter of the book, Pender argues for the intersection of medicine and rhetoric, and he invokes the thinking of Pierre-Jean-Georges Cabanis, Plato, Aristotle, and the English physician John Cotta. He argues that “rhetoric and medicine share forms of inference and reasoning as well as areas of inquiry”; moreover, that “rhetoricised logic” influenced and was clearly linked to medical practice and theory during the early modern period (41).

Jean Dietz Moss' essay is concerned with six physicians who published works and promoted hydrotherapy at the curative thermal baths in Bath, England from the mid-sixteenth through the seventeenth centuries. The focus is on defining aspects of medical theory and practice as part of the rhetoric of curative hydrotherapy. Moss discusses the rhetoric of cures of William Turner, John Jones, Tobias Venner, Edward Jordan, Thomas Guidott, and Robert Peirce. Particularly noteworthy is Moss' attention to Robert Peirce who apparently wrote detailed case histories about his patients and the treatments they received. The author also highlights Peirce's case studies of women's ailments and diseases, as well as his practical approach to healing rather than relying on medical theory.

Richard Sugg concentrates on early modern anatomical rhetoric. The author discusses the work of Baldasar Castiglione, John Lyly, Thomas Nashe, William Harvey, Helkiah Crooke, and Robert Burton who all made use of anatomical terms and metaphors in their works. Sugg starts off by presenting a detailed chronology of the historical development of anatomy as a rhetorical source illuminating how it developed concurrently with developments in medicine and studies of human anatomy in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Sugg demonstrates how single works of literary anatomy were apparently linked to all subsequent literary anatomies. And finally, he focuses on the rhetorical uses of the word "section" and "dissection."

Andrea Carlino's essay is devoted to analyzing Andreas Vesalius' *De humani corporis fabrica libri septem* of 1543. He illuminates the relationship between medicine and speech, which is often overlooked. Carlino's objective is to reinforce Edelstein's arguments: Vesalius was indeed a humanist who embraced the humanist quest for knowledge, not to mention that he was greatly influenced by Cicero. The author examines the cultural environment in which Vesalius worked, highlights commentaries and interpretations from various sixteenth-century writers, and points out the humanists of the period who came to appreciate Vesalius' anatomical method and its heuristic value for the humanist project overall, which was "reforming knowledge" (128). Carlino argues that there was an essential relationship between medicine and speech and he details the relationships that emerged between anatomical method and rhetoric during the sixteenth century. This

essay is useful for seventeenth-century scholars because Vesalius' *Fabrica* is to be viewed as making a significant contribution to humanism overall in its goal of reforming knowledge.

Daniel Gross investigates Philipp Melanchthon's physics of persuasion and how to rule the passions; the essay is concentrated on the late sixteenth century and through the German baroque. Gross takes a new view as to how the modern human sciences were shaped and argues that it was Philipp Melanchthon, the German Reformation theologian, who set the ground for the modern human sciences: "human nature can be studied in terms of natural philosophy and not just scripture" and the human being is "subject to the practical arts of rhetoric and medicine" (129). Despite Melanchthon being a theologian, he instilled a humanist mission in his work and rhetoric. Gross also argues against Foucault's view that human nature didn't exist prior to the eighteenth century. Instead, Gross claims that a concept of human nature already was developing at the end of the 1500s (145). Gross also reconsiders the origins of modern political thought.

Amy Schmitter expounds on the human passions in the framework of Descartes' and Spinoza's conceptions of finitude and the Infinite and the relations to somatic (bodily) and psychic vulnerability. She considers the claim, "that humans are vulnerable *because we are finite*" (147). Descartes' and Spinoza's notable distinctions between finite and infinite are detailed, as well as their respective formulations of the connections between finitude and vulnerability, and hence their responses to vulnerability. In the final part of the essay, Schmitter addresses psychic vulnerability and the remedies for the passions: Descartes' adherence to virtue and the "developing the passion of generosity," and Spinoza's "psychic and individual strategy" analogous to his political strategy (170, 166).

Guido Giglioni presents an examination of the nature of rhetorical persuasion focusing on the analyses and critiques of the sixteenth-century physician Girolamo Cardano. Gross makes extensive use of Cardano's numerous and diverse writings. Referring to Cardano's *De utilitate*, Giglioni writes, "One of the most insidious dangers lies in the rhetorician's ability to instill belief in the lack of differences between 'knowing how to speak about things and knowing and taking control about the things themselves,' between 'talking nonsense and arguing'"

(178). Cardano's ambivalent attitude toward rhetoric is most remarkably expressed in the *Antigorgias* (186 -90). The dialogue, as Giglioli points out, is preoccupied with virtue and values thus exemplifying Cardano's "flexible view of truth" (187).

Julie Solomon, in her essay, takes a distinctly different approach to the passions and does not rely primarily on Galenic writings. Instead, Solomon's rhetorical analysis draws on ideas from diverse sixteenth- and seventeenth-century writers who embraced various syntheses of Aristotelian-Thomist and Galenic theories about the relations between the passions and humors. She discusses the various theories of such sixteenth- and seventeenth-century thinkers as Bright, Melanchthon, Burton, and others. Solomon argues that "the passions were representations imbued with rhetorical significance" (216). She also provides a survey of the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century writings of Vives, Primaudaye, Bacon, Burton, Charron, Coeffeteau, and Senault. Finally, Solomon invokes Shakespeare's *Macbeth* because it is remarkable for demonstrating how theater during the early modern period "was the most potent instrument for rectifying these troubling forces of the sensitive soul" (224).

Grant Williams concentrates on Robert Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy*, which was originally published in 1621. Epistemological impossibility and chaos characterized Burton's attempt to collect data and classify symptoms about melancholy within Galenic medical categories and methodology. Burton used the Babel trope to convey the infinite semiosis of melancholy (236-37). Williams writes, "Burton's invocation of Babel raises the possibility that the infinite variety of melancholic symptoms rivals—if not exceeds—the infinite and unmanageable potential of linguistic semiosis" (233). Eventually, Williams proceeds to show that even in Burton's own writings—chaotic organization—a "symptomatic nature" is evident, particularly in "his meandering composition" (239). Williams' essay is an extraordinary account of Robert Burton's labyrinthine experience of trying to make sense of melancholy's infinite symptoms within the Galenic disease categories and tropes of linguistic disorientation.

Nancy Struever's essay is concentrated on Anton Francesco Bertini's *La medicina difesa*. Bertini's work is essentially a political exposition—a political rhetoric of medicine—detailing the "archetypal political

construct of authority” that apparently governed medical practice and cure, and medical theory, physicians’ identity, and their socio-economic interests during the seventeenth century (251-2). Bertini’s *difesa* is preoccupied with “the rhetorical coinage of beliefs, not knowledge,” emphasizing how the “task is not so much the explication of medical *episteme*, but the reorientation of the audience towards the mass of medical topoi” (253). Struever emphasizes how Bertini’s *difesa* is central to understanding medicine as a cultural practice in the seventeenth century. Moreover, that the doctor/patient rhetoric of the period ought to be viewed intrinsically as “an autocratic regime” rather than merely as a political one (261).

The book is an excellent source—rich in its inclusion of references—and would be quite useful to those scholars who require a specialist treatment of medicine and rhetoric and philosophy of medicine during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in Europe. A bibliography and index are also included. Philosophers might also find this book useful especially if they want to investigate the philosophical developments as they pertain to medical discourses during the early modern period.

Susan Hardman Moore. *Abandoning America: Life-Stories from Early New England*. Woodbridge, UK: The Boydell Press, 2013. xxviii + 412 pp. + 2 illus. \$95.00. Review by WILLIAM J. SCHEICK, UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN.

In *Abandoning America* Susan Hardman Moore begins with a salient point: “The [overlooked] stories of those who went over to New England but did not stay are at odds with the onward march of American history” (1). These people might be ignored in the American national narrative (as are, incidentally, those who fled abroad or to Canada during the Revolutionary years), but their numbers and viewpoints are nonetheless historically significant.

“It is ironic,” Moore observes, “that the settlers who provided New England’s leadership were also the most liable to pluck up stakes and go home” (18). Nearly half of the graduates of Harvard College headed to England before the Restoration of Charles II, and a third of the

ministers who migrated to the colonies returned to their homeland during the two English civil wars. Other ministers, including John Davenport, intended to return to England, as well, but were thwarted by the Restoration. Of course, many ordinary people re-migrated, too, for various economic, social, and spiritual reasons. Some were disenchanted with colonial experience, while others simply expected to find a better livelihood.

Recalling the loss of colonial population during that time, Increase Mather succinctly summed up the situation: "Since the year 1640, more persons have removed out of New England, than have gone thither." Increase was, in fact, one of those Harvard graduates who hoped for an illustrious career in England during the 1650s, the decade when the reverse migration from the colonies surged. Once the Restoration loomed, however, Mather fled back to New England, where he produced a series of writings designed to negotiate his secular disappointment into a divinely authorized mission.

Although young Mather found it easy to leave, many others struggled with finding a just cause for leaving their New England churches and communities. Moore has examined this and related issues connected with the pre-Restoration remigration in her *Pilgrims: New World Settlers and the Call to Home* (2007). Moore's summary of her findings in this valuable book provides a good hefty introduction to *Abandoning America*.

Moore's new book is primarily comprised of detailed profiles of hundreds of individuals whose lives informed the conclusions Moore presented in the earlier book. What Moore hopes to provide in *Abandoning America* is a collection of life-stories that, in the aggregate, amount to "a new resource, based on a deep trawl of seventeenth-century sources in America and England" (16). She achieves that goal handily.

Eric Klingelhofer, ed. *A Glorious Empire: Archaeology and the Tudor-Stuart Atlantic World*. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2013. xxii + 194 pp. \$80.00. Review by WILLIAM J. SCHEICK, UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN.

Handsomely produced, *A Glorious Empire* is a Festschrift honoring the career of Ivor Noël Hume, an award-winning historical archaeologist devoted for over fifty years to the study of the Tudor-Stuart period. The collection includes fifteen essays detailing new material-culture findings pertaining to both shores of the Atlantic Ocean during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

When thinking about the origins of his professional specialty, Hume has claimed that historical archaeology emerged from studies of the Jamestown settlements in Virginia. Such studies, Hume has suggested, were aimed less at physical reconstruction than at cultural understanding. This different emphasis made a disciplinary difference, too, in his opinion.

Even so, financing Jamestown research has always been problematic, “more often dependent on public relations factors than on a desire for knowledge”—dependent on “creative writing, media arts, and exhibit design.” No doubt he and other archaeologists invested in Jamestown research smiled knowingly at recent attention-grabbing newspaper accounts of cannibalism in this colonial settlement during the winter of 1609-10, although cannibalism there was hardly news to experts in Hume’s field.

Never mind bones of the horses and dogs also eaten. Safe food and water were always issues for early American settlements. Gardens there, as in the homeland, were rarely ornamental. Instead, they were downright utilitarian, involving necessary tools such as the sprinkler-type ceramic watering pots described in Jacqueline Pearce’s contribution to the Festschrift. Imported homeland wine helped ease daily colonial hardships, and Martin Biddle offers a catalog of seventeenth-century wine-bottle designs with assigned dates. He notes, as well, that in Oxford (at least) customers apparently expected tavern keepers to be well informed about vintage.

Jamestown and other early settlements were mostly about resource exploitation. In a thoughtful contribution, Nicholas Lucchetti surmises the resourcefulness of Thomas Harriot, the scientist with Walter Raleigh’s expedition to Roanoke Island. Harriot likely suggested that the Jamestown sponsors should fashion homeland copper into native ornaments for the Indian trade market. And this decision, in turn, likely helped protect Jamestown from attack.

Virginian immigrant Samuel Mathews, according to Edward Chappell's essay, fought "at least four Native American groups in the 1620s and turned his experience into lucrative grain and fur trading." He married well, too, and built a substantial residence known (by 1626) as Mathews Manor. It did not last, of course; nor did his second attempt at a home.

George Calvert's 1628 home in Newfoundland, James Tuck and Barry Gaulton report, was not as small as first surmised by archaeologists. It was the same house described as a mansion during the 1650s—an amalgamation of early and new construction that included a stone residence, a courtyard, and various semi-attached buildings.

William Kelso's questions about an inscribed slate—"a miniature archaeological site in itself" found in a 1607 deposit at James Fort in Jamestown—are especially intriguing. At least three artists contributed to the imagery on this reused slate. Perhaps William Strachey was one of the authors of the "meaning hidden among the 'scratches' on this remarkable object."

But for now, maybe forever, we only have uncertainty and conjecture about this slate. And such is the equivocal state of so much else in historical archaeology. Over time, the residues of past lives become hard-to-decipher faint texts intimating the highly combustible constructions that human dreams lead to, whether in material fact or merely in fanciful scheme.

Enriqueta Zafra, ed. and Anne J. Cruz, trans. *The Life and Times of Mother Andrea/La vida y costumbres de la Madre Andrea*. Woodbridge/Rochester: Tamesis, 2011. 163 pp. \$90.00. Review by JULIO GONZÁLEZ-RUIZ, SPELMAN COLLEGE.

An anonymous manuscript from *circa* 1650 that narrates the story of a brothel—presumably located in Madrid—its sexual workers, and wide social spectrum of clients, according to the testimony of its own procuress (a rarity indeed, since brothels administration was reserved for men), sounds appealing at first glance. *The Life and Times of Mother Andrea/La vida y costumbres de la Madre Andrea* was very likely penned by a converted Jew from the Iberian Peninsula

and found in an Utrecht antique bookstore three centuries later by Hispanist Jonas A. Van Praag, which only adds depth and interest to this riveting picaresque narration.

It is known that prostitution was socially permissible and even became tacitly supported in sixteenth and seventeenth centuries by the Catholic Church, whose theologians considered necessary the very existence of public brothels in order to avoid greater evils such as incest, sodomy, rape, etc. But as Enriqueta Zafra explains in her introduction, when in 1623—and within the context of Counter-Reformation—King Phillip IV eventually prohibited prostitution, “[it] did not disappear nor did the concern about unenclosed women, who before, during, and after the ending of legalized prostitution kept slipping through the system and became associated with picaresque behavior” (7). E. Zafra and A. Cruz—respectively, editor and translator for this edition—have in common their expertise in the picaresque genre and a scholarly interest in the misogynist perception that *pícaras* and prostitutes share in Early-Modern Spain where female figures who are considered to be out of control are primarily sexualized and stigmatized. This anonymous novella, with Mother Andrea as the brothel administrator and main voice—narrating in first person the account of her own life—follows on the Celestinesque tradition of the female picaresque in Spain with texts such as *La pícaro Justina* (1605), *La hija de Celestina* (1612), and *La garduña de Sevilla* (1642) as its precursors. All female protagonists in these picaresque tales share an elevated dose of physical beauty and artfulness that allow them to take advantage of their male counterparts, while pleasantly engaging the reader. The common goal of such a portrayal of crime and deceitfulness though is to allegedly warn the reader with its moralizing message.

Since its original publication in 1958 in *Revista de Literatura* by Van Praag, *The Life and Times of Mother Andrea* has been forgotten until now. In her introduction to the volume, Zafra explains that the present edition follows the eighteenth-century copy of the text found by Van Praag, with the intention of complementing the late Hispanist’s work and having in mind the modern reader. With this aim, “annotating the text differently in the original and the translation, although there are bound to be crossovers, we [Zafra and Cruz] allow readers to reach their own conclusions, to wander through the

pages of the parallel texts and, in doing so, to achieve a fuller and more enlightening reading experience" (23). In fact, the reader here gets "two for the price of one" since we find both Zafra's and Cruz's expertise reunited in this edition.

Firstly, the introductory study by Zafra offers a compelling and thorough overview of the female picaresque and the discourse on prostitution in early modern society, including topics as relevant as: the general discourse on women; the debates among moralists on the legalization of prostitution; the picaresque text as a space "where men could be entertained and amused, while remaining free of disease and guilt" (4); the rules and dynamics in brothels; and the legal ordinances on health and their lack of compliance or enforcement; among others. No less interesting is the portion of the study devoted by Zafra to analyzing certain characteristics of the text—related to the lexicon, graphemes, sociolinguistics, etc.—in order to throw light on the anonymous authorship of the manuscript and to link it to a converted Jew or "*converso* from the Iberian Peninsula most probably living in Amsterdam, but who could also have resided at some point of his life in other *converso* communities, such as the ones in Venice or Livorno, and even perhaps southern France" (17-18).

Secondly, the contemporary reader will find in Cruz's translation the perfect balance between a more modern conversational English that makes less challenging the understanding of this seventeenth-century manuscript, while still preserving the identity of the original text and portraying the Baroque culture in full color. I particularly admire Cruz's ability to convey in such a skillful and accomplished way the complexity of the *double entendres*, satires, puns, proverbs, and the rhetorical richness intrinsic to Mother Andrea's marginal world. The annotations to her very own English translation of the text for this edition deserves, in my opinion, a very special mention since they concisely unveil the rather complex semiotic universe portrayed in the novella, and what we could call a catalog of cultural curiosities. Just a random example, opening the book in page fifty-three: when describing the garments of a poet and client of Mother Andrea's brothel, Cruz offers a note describing Walloon collars as "unstarched," completed with information that is key to fully understand the cultural referent as well as the richness of the Baroque text. In this case,

Cruz observes that these kinds of collars “were unpopular in Spain [and] identified with the Dutch heretics and the Flemish” (note 75), which obviously encompasses a negative moral connotation within the context of the Spanish Catholic Reformation that we could not even find if we used the main resource for scholars of Spain’s Golden Age, *Diccionario de Autoridades* (published between 1726 and 1739). The following annotation also discloses the cultural value associated with “Chinese dogs” for a sentence that compares this bald canine kind with the description of the poor and threadbare garments of the above mentioned poet: “Hairless dogs were bred by the Chinese for use as ratters on ships. In the seventeenth century, they were a common sight at ports” (53, note 76). Thus, as readers we do not only get to understand the author’s election of a specific referent within a particular context, but we are also exposed to the vast universe of cultural curiosities informing the Baroque aesthetics, which are seldom fully comprehended by an unaware reader.

In summary, we owe to E. Zafra and A. Cruz the precious recovery and careful edition as well as the exquisite translation of this must-read, seventeenth-century picaresque narrative, that can finally now be added to the scholarly debates on Spain’s Early-Modern period, in general; and in particular, to the studies on the picaresque novel, gender studies, and cultural studies for which it will be, no doubt, a highly valuable contribution.

Pierre-Esprit Radisson. *The Collected Writings Volume 1: The Voyages*. Ed. Germaine Warkentin. Montreal-Kingston: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2012. xvii + 357 pp. + 12 illus. \$65.00. Review by M. G. AUNE, CALIFORNIA UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

Until recently, the writings of Frenchman Pierre-Esprit Radisson (1636/40-1710) would have been regarded somewhat reductively as the memoirs of an explorer / fur trader or *coureur des bois* in seventeenth-century North America. The interdisciplinary developments of recent decades, however, have broadened the scholarly interest writings of figures such as Radisson. Not only did his travels include commercial exploration of what is now upstate New York, Ontario,

and the Midwest, he was a captive of the Iroquois, a founder of the Hudson's Bay Company, and an aspiring courtier in Paris and London who wrote extensively if unevenly of his adventures. As a result, Radisson's writings have found audiences interested in the colonial history of Canada, captivity narratives, Native American ethnology, and post-colonial studies.

As a teenager, Radisson travelled to New France and was soon captured by Mohawks. After living with them long enough to learn the language and earn their trust, Radisson managed to escape. With his newfound knowledge of the geography, language, and cultures of New France, he found work as a guide, trapper, and interpreter. Partnered with his brother-in-law, Médard Chouart des Groseilliers, he helped develop the fur trade around Lake Superior. They used Radisson's familiarity with Native American languages and customs to make contact with and enlist as trading partners a great range of peoples, including the Sioux, Cree, Huron, Sauteaux (Anishinaabe), and members of the Iroquois nations. Radisson's success also brought him into contact with French Jesuit missionaries and embroiled him in conflicts between French, Dutch, and English fur traders. For several years he left the French and was employed by the English, helping to found the Hudson's Bay Company in 1670. When his relationship with the HBC became strained, he joined its competitor, the *Compagnie du Nord*. This placed him in the middle of several clashes between the French and the English over colonial claims around Hudson's Bay. In 1683 Radisson returned to France to resolve legal claims on his profits with the *Compagnie*, fell into a complex religious / political plot, and again returned to service with the HBC. Radisson remained with the Company until about 1687, retiring to England after running afoul of internal company politics. He lived in England for the rest of his life, somewhat embittered by his treatment at the hands of the Company and its irregular payment of his pension.

Radisson's extant writings consist of his *Voyages*, which he composed in English in 1668 while idled in England, waiting to make his first expedition with the HBC. He seems to have written it in part to manage his restlessness and in part at the behest of Charles II. The original of the manuscript is lost, but a contemporary transcription was made and is among Samuel Pepys' papers at the Bodleian Library.

Four separate narratives make up the *Voyages*. The first is an account of his teenage captivity by the Iroquois in 1652. The narrative is far less providential than other contemporary captivity accounts; nevertheless, it provides a wealth of detail about the culture and language of the Iroquois at a time of dramatic change. The other three narratives describe Radisson's various travels throughout North America. They are rich with description of the Native Americans, Jesuits, other fur traders, and the flora and fauna of the region. They are also distinctly self-promotional, highlighting Radisson's linguistic abilities, resourcefulness, and sense of personal honor. The focus on him, coupled with numerous internal inconsistencies has raised the specter of reliability. Radisson, for example, claims to have traveled greater distances and to more destinations than is physically possible. While these elements may irritate readers in search of verisimilitude, they are very much characteristic of the voyage genre of the time and would have enhanced Radisson's reputation as a trader and guide.

Radisson also composed, in French, two *Relations* of his experiences of the Anglo-French conflict over Hudson's Bay in 1682. Both manuscripts were owned by the HBC. A superior manuscript of these texts was found in 1996 and serves as Warkentin's copy text. A collection of several letters, a log, and personal writings, some of which came to light only in 2007, constitute the rest of his works. These materials have also been collected, edited, and translated by Warkentin and will appear in a companion volume in 2014.

Two prior editions of Radisson's *Voyages* appeared in 1885 and 1961. Warkentin rightly finds faults with each based largely on antiquated editorial practices and a lack of primary materials. Her aim is to provide a fully annotated scholarly resource, as well as a text that is accessible to readers at the undergraduate level. Some silent emendations have been made, replacing the seventeenth-century "c" with the modern "ç" as well as the "i" for "j" and "u" for "v." The paragraphing, punctuation, and capitalization have also been modernized. Marginal notes are included inside angles and brackets are used to denote the rare editorial intrusion. The result is a very readable text. The early modern orthography and sentence structure reminds readers of the age of the text, but the emendations make it comprehensible to a non-

specialist reader. The typical page has between two and ten footnotes that identify names, locations, cross-references, and terminology.

Germaine Warkentin is the ideal choice for Radisson's modern editor. Emeritus professor of English at the University of Toronto and author of numerous books and articles on the history of the book, early modern culture, and early Canadian writing, she deploys this combination of skills and interests to create an accessible and reliable volume. In addition to her editing and annotating of the text, Warkentin also provides a lengthy (111 page) introduction that serves as a biography of Radisson as well as a contextualization of his writings. If there is one critique to make about this volume, it is that the introduction tends to read Radisson's *Voyages* as literary texts, identifying themes and treating Radisson as a character more than a historical figure. This, however, is a quibble as the volume is an excellent scholarly resource.

Five very well executed maps trace Radisson's travels and helpfully include bilingual and modern place names. The appendices provide a lengthy bibliography, list of emendations, glossary of archaic language, and an essay, "Radisson in an Aboriginal World." Written by University of Toronto history professor Heidi Bohaker, the piece provides a deeper contextualization of the events Radisson witnessed in his encounters with the Native Americans and could stand on its own as an article or chapter in a monograph.

For too long Radisson's writings have been available only in unreliable editions without the benefit of contextualizing material. Warkentin has provided an excellent, accessible resource that will appeal to undergraduates as well as advanced scholars across a range of disciplines.

Susan Hardman Moore, ed. *The Diary of Thomas Larkham, 1647-1669*. Woodbridge and Rochester: The Boydell Press/Church of England Record Society, 2011. xiii + 410 pp. \$115.00. Review by CHRIS R. LANGLEY, UNIVERSITY OF YORK, UK.

Following its publications by Tom Webster/Kenneth Shipps and Anthony Milton in 2004 and 2005 respectively, the Church of England Record Society returns to publish another critical volume on the

Church of the seventeenth century. The volume transcribes, in full, the diary of Thomas Larkham (1602-69), a non-conformist minister in the Devon parish of Tavistock. Larkham's rise to the pulpit was not atypical of the period, a former Parliamentary chaplain who had stints in New England and Ireland, who then settled in Devon to begin God's work. Larkham painstakingly recorded his economic fortunes in the notebook, punctuating his accounts with brief reflections on his spiritual and temporal fortunes in the parish.

The document is prefaced by a thoroughly researched introduction. The editor debates the provenance of the manuscript with admirable clarity and explains Larkham's position in Tavistock society. In these discussions, Hardman Moore uses some excellent archival and pamphlet material to give the reader an insight into the local dimension of Larkham's diary. Although Hardman Moore explains Larkham's ministry with similar clarity, non-specialists may require more information on the English Church Larkham inhabited, its lack of episcopal control, and the national polemical struggle between different strands of Protestant thought. Connecting the excellent analysis of Larkham's local position with this national context would have strengthened what is an already highly commendable introduction. With its excellent archival material, this remains a useful addition to the historiography of the period in its own right.

The editor must be commended for deciphering what has become an infamously complex manuscript. The diary itself is a palimpsest, with Larkham's entries imposed around, or on top of, previous records. Larkham's accounts and thoughts are dotted around the notes of the Elizabethan scrivener, turned cleric, George Lane. Hardman Moore describes the editorial process as "like exploring a vast dark attic with a torch: seeing only small patches at a time, disturbing forgotten heaps" (3). The photographs of the manuscript included at the close of the introduction show this complexity, with Larkham's accounts interpolated amongst older, faded notes. Living up to its notoriety, the diary contains another important idiosyncrasy. Larkham marked time in what Hardman Moore calls "Larkham years," starting the year at his birthday on 18 August (xi). Fortunately, while the editor has eschewed much of this complexity and presented the diary in a straightforward manner, the resulting transcription remains unique.

Although the practice of leaving pages intentionally blank to correspond with the original manuscript is not the most aesthetically pleasing way of presenting the diary, the editorial conventions allow what is undoubtedly a hugely complex manuscript to be presented in a readable fashion. Hardman Moore is particularly effective at guiding the reader through entries that seem innocuous at first glance. Such guidance means that the diary needs Hardman Moore's introductory section and accompanying footnotes to be fully understood. While this shows the depth of the editor's knowledge, the sheer dependence of the diary on such annotation may affect how scholars choose to use it in future research.

The diary is replete with fascinating insights into community life in the mid-seventeenth century. The array of entries relating to business matters contributes to our understanding of trade and economic activity in a post-war period. Tavistock society was not only recovering from the damage of conflict, but the older forms of communal obligation and reciprocity were still apparent. The diary shows how Larkham perceived these economic activities to be part of a larger divine plan, "with every entry a potential opportunity for slipping into prayer" (9). The start of each new "Larkham year" is heralded by a verse, usually asking for patience in the face of adversity:

A Day of rest begins this following yeare
On it my Lord lay sleeping in the Grave:
That I may serve his now without all feare
In trueth of heart is the choise thing I crave (116).

Each verse illuminates the conflation of personal, national, social, and economic concerns in Larkham's brand of providentialism. This combination provides the reader with an insight into local understandings of England's recovery following the Civil Wars.

The diary is particularly useful in our efforts to understand *Interregnum* religious disputes at a local level. Larkham's position as preacher in Tavistock, his attempts to reform the parish along godly lines and his "zeal for purity" all created tensions with other members of the community (15). The entries in the diary are complemented by the two pamphlets that are transcribed in full in the appendices, neither of which are easily available elsewhere. In all of this, Hardman Moore refuses to forcibly apply a religious label to Larkham, or

his opponents, allowing for the flexibility and polemical potential of terms such as “nonconformist,” “rigid,” or “godly” in contemporary discourse. The reference to the pejorative term “Larkhamites,” coined by Larkham’s opponents for his adherents in Tavistock, shows just how flexible these labels could become (21). The resultant corpus of information sits favourably alongside the diaries of Henry Newcome and Ralph Josselin in providing valuable insights into the complexity of religious identities in this period.

Hardman Moore’s edition of Larkham’s diary is a significant contribution to the field. Appreciating the importance of the parish in understanding the aftermath of the English Civil War and Interregnum is usually stymied by a lack of local records. Material like Larkham’s diary provides an insight into the parish in a time when ecclesiastical records are thin on the ground. The volume’s main contribution is showing how parochial ministry worked in practice. The editor leads the reader through Larkham’s disputes, showing how national concerns were played out on the local level. Larkham’s combination of mundane entries, providential verse, and comments on his spiritual fortunes are reflective of the seventeenth-century ministry generally and the local experience of national divisions.

Francis J. Bremer. *Building a New Jerusalem: John Davenport, a Puritan in Three Worlds*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012. ix + 424 pp. \$80.00. Review by MARC L. SCHWARZ, UNIVERSITY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Professor Francis Bremer has made a significant contribution to early Stuart studies and American colonial history in his biography of John Davenport. Not only has he focused attention on a relatively neglected figure, but he has also placed Davenport at the center of the puritan movement during this critical period.

A major point for Bremer is to describe Davenport at the outset as a “moderate puritan,” meaning that he accepted the validity of the Church of England but dissented from some of its practices and found fault in some of the aspects of the prayer book. In providing this description Bremer illustrates the fact that many puritans remained within the Church, which they considered the true Church. This at-

titude was possible given the moderate policy that James I carried out for most of his reign and also the conciliatory stance of Archbishop George Abbot.

Now, what is important about this is the way in which the author clearly demonstrates how Archbishop Laud's harsh and destructive policies drove a moderate like Davenport out of the Church. As minister of St. Stephens Church in London and a member of the Feoffees of Improvements, Davenport found himself doggedly pursued by Laud, brought before the High Commission, and threatened with arrest. Davenport's flight to Holland and transition into true nonconformity was the direct result. Thus, in Bremer's hands, Davenport's journey becomes emblematic of the development of puritanism in the early seventeenth century.

In dealing with Davenport's decision to emigrate to New England, the author starts by asking the interesting question of whether clergymen might have considered it ethical for them to leave England, or was it desertion at a time of crisis, as may have been the case with some Marian exiles. This is an issue that calls for discussion in more detail for it had important implications for England in the late 1620s and 1630s.

Davenport was a firm Calvinist who accepted predestination with all of its implications as spelled out in the Synod of Dort. Thus it was the elect, those that had received God's grace, who comprised a church identified by baptism and a testimony of conversion. Yet despite this strict attitude, Davenport was a strong supporter of protestant unity and conciliation working with individuals like Dury, Comenius, and others. This goal remained a focal point throughout his ministry. As Bremer notes, these seemingly divergent views could exist in the same person. Thus it isn't surprising that even with such feared and condemned groups as the Quakers he could show moderation. Moreover, he sought to find common ground within New England puritanism—the so-called “New England Way.” In the diverse climate of New England religion, theology, and practice Davenport found it difficult to find solutions. In Boston and New Haven, he faced the challenge of the halfway covenant, which threatened his ideas of baptism and church membership. Changing conceptions between the generation of English emigrants and those who had been born

in America caused concerns over the nature of the church and the survival of congregationalism.

Davenport was opposed to the dissolution of the New Haven colony, which he had founded with the help of his friend, Theophilis Eaton, and became increasingly concerned over attempts to diminish congregational independence, such as the synod of 1662, which endorsed the halfway covenant. He and others were suspicious of this action as a move toward the more clerical Presbyterianism. Davenport was a supporter of lay involvement in the life of the church and while in England had cooperated with many lay figures including the Puritan peer, Viscount Saye and Sele.

When Davenport was called to Boston as a minister, Bremer deftly describes the clash between him and a significant minority in the church who opposed his views on baptism and opposition to the synod. The battle that ensued cast a shadow over his last years.

At the same time, Bremer also points out Davenport's growing concern about the second coming and refers to him as believing in the middle advent, the period of preparation for that event. For example, in the building of the New Haven settlement he used biblical and Hebraic sources to pattern the town after scriptural Jerusalem. New England proved a particularly appropriate place with its relatively untouched landscapes. These comments by Bremer are further evidence that such thinking as this did not exist among fringe groups only but within mainstream puritanism as well.

On the whole, Bremer's study is a monograph to which scholars would want to pay close attention. In the first place, it provides an in depth portrait of an important, but neglected, Puritan leader whose career encompassed three countries, and influence was felt in a variety of contexts. Yet, he shows that Davenport retained throughout a devotion to the congregational model and an antipathy toward clerical Presbyterianism. For this reason we can see that his roots remained English and that he found the theocratic aspects of New England inhospitable. Beginning with his work with the Feofees of Improvements he maintained a strong desire to cooperate with his lay counterparts.

Professor Bremer has mastered the material connected with Davenport and can handle theological developments and controversies with

great skill. His bibliography and footnotes are learned and helpful. The monograph is full of useful detail and information leading to other areas of investigation as well. Every student of early modern British history will be indebted to this significant work.

Eamon Darcy. *The Irish Rebellion of 1641 and the Wars of the Three Kingdoms*. Woodbridge, Boydell and Brewer, 2013. xiv + 211 pp. + 1 illus. \$90.00. Review by MARTYN BENNETT, NOTTINGHAM TRENT UNIVERSITY.

The Irish Rebellion began on the night of 22-23 October 1641 when a plot to seize a series of military strong points in Ulster and the castle at Dublin was put into action. Castles and forts fell to armed rebels throughout central and southern Ulster, but Dublin Castle remained unscathed. This was the third rebellion of the age and sits firmly in the context of the political and religious revolution in Scotland, which began four years earlier, and the English and Welsh political revolution, which was nearly a year in the making by the time the fighting began in Ulster. Moreover this rebellion was not the first resort to arms during this revolutionary period: there had already been two wars in Britain by this point and there had moreover been something of a political rebellion in the Dublin Parliament a year earlier. What marked the Irish situation out was religion. The rebellions and revolutions in Britain had been protestant—sometimes extremist protestant—inspired attacks on what some saw as the manifestation of a counter-reformation, whereas the rebellion in Ireland and indeed the political impetus behind it was Roman Catholic. It was this phenomenon, which was to give this rebellion its “edge,” and made it the most feared and despised of the whole series of rebellions and revolutions across Britain and Ireland in the mid-century. It also ensured that it and moreover the oral, written, and illustrated representations of it would resonate throughout the next three and a half centuries. Each “Marching Season” in the six counties of Northern Ireland, despite starting on the date of a later battle (of the Boyne) images on banners and even march-routes, owe their origins to this rebellion.

Eamon Darcy's book concentrates not on a narrative of the rebellion, but on the portrayal of that rebellion in newsbooks and in other documentary evidence, most notably the depositions created in its wake. The depositions are a collection of eye-witness testimonies aimed at getting to the bottom of the rebellion and who was responsible for it, but also as a means to begin thinking about recompense and confiscations. They are notoriously problematic. They have been declared "propaganda" by one side and evidence of cruelty and deprivation by another since the dates they were compiled. They have been used selectively and source-mined for as long as they have existed. Their complexity had never been fully realised until quite late in the last century when they were seen by Nicholas Canny and others as evidence of social and cultural changes enacted over the previous century, telling us almost as much about the successes and failings of colonisation and previous fifty years of causation for the rebellion as they do of the early stages of rebellion itself. The testimony itself needs careful navigation, for as the note takers and inquisitors must have realised, the depositions contain the origins of myth as much as they do the origins of rebellion. Witnesses gave their information in a series of concentric circles: a kernel consisting of what happened to them lies at the centre, swathed in stories of what their friends and acquaintances witnessed wrapped around that kernel, and finally, on the outside at a distance, are the rumours that their friends heard. Duffy's task has been at least two fold, to explore these circles of evidence and look at the way they related to the information leaking to the outside world. Almost at the start these documents were used to construct newsbooks and pamphlet accounts for circulation across the Irish Sea, and in turn these images—visual and written—became part of a frightening tale of an attack on Protestantism.

Darcy's book too consisted of a series of circles: starting with a look at how the evidence of the rebellion fit into a tradition of representing violence within the recent past; violence against Indians by Catholics in southern and central America and the violence of American Indians as visited upon the colonists of Jamestown all gave a literary and representational framework for the material that emanated in Ireland from 1641 onwards. Perhaps this could have been rounded out by an exploration of the use of imagery to accompany text as with the

literary tropes there are perhaps clearly “stock images” of such violence to be found from all these outer contextual circles, including the St Bartholomew’s Day Massacre in sixteenth-century France. Darcy follows this contextual locator with an exploration of what the rebellion actually was, and how it was seen by contemporaries and later by historians. The contemporary view that it was a premeditated plot to extirpate all the protestant colonists was very much based on two premises: firstly the notion that this was the intention of the continental European Catholics involved in the on-going Thirty-Years’ War, and, secondly, the warnings that there was a plot in existence in Ireland used by John Pym to enhance and continue the motivation for continued political change in England and Wales during the summer of 1641. In reality whilst religion cannot be divorced from the equation, there was a hugely important political and economic motivation driving the Gaelic Catholic nobility and gentry and their Old English social equals into rebellion. Duffy then turns to a useful and comprehensive examination of how the depositions were mined for good stories to back up the theory of extirpation and turned into books and pamphlets for sale in England, Wales, and Scotland. The follow-up chapter then takes this forward into the ensuing years when having sought out the perpetrators for the purpose of confiscating their lands, discussions of Ireland in print turn to finding potential purchasers of the confiscated lands, partly to raise funds to support reconquest. The arguments over the exact nature of events—from protestant assertions of a catholic plot to kill over 600,000 protestants to the catholic claims of protestants obtaining political equity by force—shape the central government policy throughout the remainder of the century and form an important fourth chapter in the book. Perhaps the most interesting aspect of the book is the successful attempt to link all of this coverage with the wider colonial world, following therefore the strand of British and Irish history that sees the Atlantic and colonial contexts as crucial. This is a valuable book with important insights into the rebellion and broadening our view of the material—literary and oral—which it produced and was used in a variety of ways to justify actions both during and after the wars. Perhaps the way in which the social disorder aspects of the rebellion were represented in the texts could have been drawn out more in the work. They were emblematic

of the way in which the unnatural nature of the rebellion was presented to the readers and listeners. Duffy's assertion that the concentration on the murder of women and children seems to suggest to him that it was a modern concern perhaps needs revisiting: concerns for the death of those considered innocents or "weaker vessels" are very much grounded in seventeenth-century world views, rather than in ours.

Sanjay Subrahmanyam. *Courtly Encounters: Translating Courtliness and Violence in Early Modern Eurasia*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2012. xvi + 312 pp. \$29.95. Review by TILLMAN W. NECHTMAN, SKIDMORE COLLEGE.

Sanjay Subrahmanyam is well known and widely regarded for his connected histories and for the global breath of his scholarly investigations. In *Courtly Encounters: Translating Courtliness and Violence in Early Modern Eurasia*, Subrahmanyam offers a valuable addition to his own oeuvre as well as to the field of early modern global history more broadly.

As much a series of micro historical investigations into cross-cultural courtly encounters as it is a theoretical guidebook for those interested in making sense of such interactions, *Courtly Encounters* began its life as a series of lectures Subrahmanyam delivered at Bryn Mawr College in the autumn of 2009. Those lectures now constitute the three main chapters of the volume, bookended by an introduction and conclusion.

Each of the book's three chapters confronts a distinct mode of intercultural encounter. Chapter one looks closely at the world of courtly diplomacy and of a language of insults that could run through a diplomatic conversation. Chapter two centers on cultures of violence and war, looking particularly at the intercultural meaning of martyrdom. And, chapter three devotes itself to questions of visual culture and courtly imagery as a means of intercultural understanding.

In each chapter, Subrahmanyam weaves a micro historical narrative with all of the grace, style, and literary talent that we have come to expect of his work. Taken individually, the case studies are rich both for their detail and their contextual specificity. Subrahmanyam's close

reading of Manoel Godinho de Erédia's *História de serviços com martírio de Luís Monteiro Coutinho* (1615) in chapter two, for instance, takes the reader deep into the world of a Christian in the courtly world of early modern Aceh, in contemporary Indonesia. How, Subrahmanyam asks, are we to understand Coutinho's refusal to convert and his willing submission to a brutal martyrdom by cannon?

In answering this question (and the many others that he asks of his case studies), Subrahmanyam deftly draws in examples and connections from around the early modern world, weaving lines of connection as well as boundaries of discontinuity. Coutinho's fate, for instance, was a necessary indicator that martyrdom was as much a reality for the seventeenth-century Portuguese as it was for early Christians. As Subrahmanyam notes, Erédia was a *mestiço*, and his determined telling of Coutinho's death marked out clear lines of cultural distinctiveness—perhaps even of cultural incommensurability—at a time when the boundaries between the Christian and Muslim worlds in Southeast Asia were more indistinct than might have felt comfortable.

As is the case with his analysis of Coutinho's martyrdom, most of Subrahmanyam's studies in *Courtly Encounters* are small. Many focus on individuals who have never before made an appearance in histories of the early modern world, and, if they have, most of the characters here have played only minor parts. But, in Subrahmanyam's world, there are no small roles. Here, each of these actors is busy in the project of creating a culture of commensurability across boundaries, or at least of engaging that process, even if only to resist it.

And, it is here that this book is bigger than the sum of its parts, for Subrahmanyam is not content to offer us a collection of closely read and well-argued case studies. Rather, he leaves us here with a bold new way of thinking about early modern cultural exchange. So often bounded by arguments of commensurability or incommensurability, the history of early modern cultural exchange has tended towards a bipolar model in which historical encounters highlight either understanding or a failure to understand.

Subrahmanyam offers a new path. What if, he asks, the ability to understand (or not to understand, for that matter) was a process? What if commensurability had to be constructed?

Investigated with these questions in mind, early modern cultural encounters cannot be reduced to meetings in a state of nature. Rather, they become moments fabricated by the human agency of the singular individuals involved. These moments are not, Subrahmanyam notes, the work of entire cultures but of the few whose specific and contextual encounters brought the relationship into being. To speak merely of commensurability or incommensurability is, then, to reduce the diversity and richness of early modern cultural exchange and to obscure a day-to-day human process with what Subrahmanyam sets aside as “sociological abstractions and idealizations” (219).

In the early modern world that Subrahmanyam paints for us here, insults, humor, art, and religion all function as communicative tools that helped individual people articulate their state or empire to others. These tools were hardly perfect cultural arbiters, to be sure. But, neither did they fail completely in their attempts to communicate across cultural boundaries, for, as Subrahmanyam notes, “what usually happened was approximation, improvisation, and eventually a shift in the relative position of all concerned” (29).

The court is the center of Subrahmanyam’s study here because, as he indicates in several places, courts have left historians with some of the best records. And, in Subrahmanyam’s adept hands, we have ample proof that court records can still produce exciting, fresh, and stimulating new scholarship. But, at a less contextual level, Subrahmanyam’s analysis here allows us to imagine new readings of all sorts of archival materials. Though he eschews the shorelined frontiers of the eighteenth-century Pacific, for instance, one wonders what Subrahmanyam (or those who follow in the wake of this book) might now make of other moments of historical contact.

Courtly Encounters, therefore, offers a great deal, not merely to students of the early modern world or of Eurasian history in particular, though scholars in those fields will learn a great deal and find much to like in these case studies. Rather, *Courtly Encounters* is a book for any scholar interested in what have elsewhere been called contact zones, beach crossings, or frontiers, for it is a book that forces us to ask questions about intercultural exchange that reimagine that exchange as a real human process, a history that always involved “learning by doing, even if not a perfect ‘reciprocity of understanding’ in the manner of Diderot” (30).

NEO-LATIN NEWS

Vol. 61, Nos. 3 & 4. 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.

◆ *Odyssea Homeri a Francisco Griffolino Aretino in Latinum translata: Die lateinische Odyssee-Übersetzung des Francesco Griffolini*. Ed., with an introduction, by Bernd Schneider and Christina Meckelnborg. *Mittelateinische Studien und Texte*, 43. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2011. 330 pages. 132 €. Some research has already been dedicated to the tradition of Latin translations of Greek texts during the Renaissance period, especially to the translation of Aristotle's works. However, there is still a lack of knowledge about the reception and distribution of Homer, as most humanist Latin translations of his epic poems are yet waiting to be resurrected. In this sense, the edition under review makes a substantial contribution to research, providing the first critical edition of Francesco Griffolini's (1420–?) *Odyssea Homeri in Latinum translata*, supposedly one of the most influential Latin translations of the *Odyssey* in prose. Indeed—and this is one of the big achievements of the book—Griffolini is identified for the first time here as the actual translator of this piece of work.

The edition consists of an introduction, Griffolini's Latin translation of the *Odyssey*, and two appendices. The introduction offers a dispassionate overview of Griffolini's work and times in four chapters. The first concerns itself with the socio-historical background in Italy

that gave rise to the Latin translations of Homer. In the fourteenth century, most intellectuals were ignorant of Greek and therefore could not read Homer. This finally annoyed Petrarca so much that in 1360 he, in agreement with Boccaccio, decided to have Homer's epics translated into Latin by the Calabrian Leontius Pilatus (d. 1365). At that time a success, the reputation of this *ad verbum*-translation in the medieval tradition declined steadily with the rise of humanism and its ideals of classical Latinity. Consequently, a large number of new Homer translations were produced. By particularly highlighting among them Lorenzo Valla's translation of the *Iliad*, the connection is eventually made to Francesco Griffolini, who, as a former student of Valla's, accomplished his translation by adding the missing books 17 through 24. Only after that would he start translating the *Odyssey*. In the following section, a short biographical summary of the life of Griffolini that also mentions his Latin translations of other Greek texts is given. This section is one of the rare places in the edition that could have benefited from a bit more effort to situate Griffolini in a broader humanistic context and make him appear less of a random producer of erudite literature. The second chapter of the introduction takes a look at Griffolini's style. For this purpose, the Greek original is compared with the Latin versions of Pilatus and Griffolini, who, in his dedicatory epistle, criticises Pilatus for his technique. The analysis shows that Griffolini did not use Pilatus as a model on the one hand, and that his Latin reproduction does not aim at an accurate translation of the Homeric text on the other. Rather, Griffolini tends to skip single details from the original as well as the typical elements of Homeric language (*epitheta ornantia*, formulas). Some events of the epic even become interpretive paraphrases of the plot, and the broad and colourful storytelling of Homer is reduced to a prosaic narration in order to correspond to the Latin adaptation; as a result, the whole translation appears more evocative of the Ciceronian school than of the actual Homeric epics. The third chapter of the introduction lists the nine extant manuscripts of Griffolini's translation. Each one of them is briefly described in turn before their overall interdependency is worked out flawlessly in more than twenty-five pages. The introduction finally closes with the guidelines used in making the edition. In sum, the introduction presents itself as a useful addition to the text,

although a short discussion of the translation concepts prevailing at the transition from the Middle Ages to the early modern period would not have been totally out of place for a better contextualisation of Griffolini's adaptation.

The Latin text is supported by a well prepared and substantiated, but not needlessly expanded, critical apparatus. It provides all the differences in the manuscripts apart from orthographical variations. A continuous comparison between the Greek original and the Latin translation in a separate apparatus has not been considered by the editors, as Griffolini distances himself so often from Homer that conclusions can hardly be drawn. In those cases, however, in which Griffolini used something other than the received Homeric text, appropriate reference is given right above the critical apparatus. Griffolini's dedicatory epistle to Pope Pius II, which also gives important insights into Griffolini's intentions and translation methods, is found at the beginning of the text.

The two appendices closing the edition present passages from book twenty-four that survive in two of the nine manuscripts in a completely different handwriting and style compared to the rest of the manuscripts. It is most likely, the editors argue, that those passages were replaced only later after the respective folios had been lost. All in all, with its solid introduction and elaborately constituted text, this edition of Griffolini's *Odyssea Homeri* forms the necessary foundation for further research on Griffolini himself, as well as for the study of other Latin translations of the Homeric epics. Only from this broader perspective can the true importance of Griffolini's translation can be grasped and its existence—albeit satisfying in itself—fully understood. (Isabella Walser, Albert-Ludwigs-Universität, Freiburg)

◆ *The Poetics of Patronage: Poetry as Self-Advancement in Giannantonio Campano*. By Susanna de Beer. Proteus: Studies in Early Modern Identity Formation, 6. Turnhout: Brepols, 2013. xxxii + 431 pages. 120 €. On one level, this book is a study of the poetry of Giannantonio Campano (1429-1477), a protégé of Cardinal Bessarion who was well known in his own day as a Latin poet. Campano made his way through life with his pen, which allows de Beer to make of him an object lesson in the practice of patronage during the Renaissance.

Campano's literary themes therefore emerge within the nexus of the social relationships in which he participated. He was educated in the kingdom of Naples, with the support of the Pandoni family. He next turns up in Perugia, where the Baglioni, the ruling family of the city, obtained for him a professorship at the university there. After entering clerical service, he was supported by Pope Pius II (the humanist Enea Silvio Piccolomini) and Cardinal Giacomo degli Ammannati, then by the papal condottiere Federico da Montefeltro. Not all his efforts to find a patron were successful—his offer of service to Ferrante I, king of Naples, was not accepted—but in general the patronage system allowed him to make of his life a work of art that was inextricably intertwined with his poetry.

As de Beer shows, patronage as a literary system during the Renaissance is little understood today. Drawing on the works of Bourdieu, de Beer notes that a person's power or status was defined by the sum of his or her economic, social, and cultural capital. Patronage was a way in which capital could be exchanged to the mutual benefit of both parties, with the patron offering primarily social and economic capital and the writer offering cultural capital. This provides a satisfying framework for the analysis of poetry like Campano's, which has been too easily dismissed as flattery whose value does not survive the occasion for which it was written. Each poem was at the same time a gift to a patron, an element with which to communicate and negotiate with the patron, and a means to establish a patronage relationship with a wider audience. Campano's literary strategies emerge from his efforts to function on these three levels, reinforced with an eye on the classical patronage discourse that helped legitimate Campano as a poet because it gave him a role in the revival of antiquity that was so highly valued in his day. Understood in this way, Campano's poetry is seen as a literary construct rather than a biographical source. Due importance is also given to the material aspect of this poetry. Since Campano was interested in getting his verse into the right hands rather than into everyone's hands, he was more interested in manuscript than print publication, and de Beer does a good job of using the surviving manuscripts to see where and how Campano's poetry circulated, and at whose instigation.

Chapter 1 is devoted to Campano's relationship with Enea Silvio Piccolomini, a patron whose status was considerably above his own. Chapter 2 is dedicated to the less hierarchical and more intimate relationship with Giacomo degli Ammannati, where we can see more clearly the overlap between literary and social patronage. Chapter 3 discusses the short-lived patronage relationship with Cardinal Pietro Riario, who lacked Ammannati's humanist taste and learning. Campano's unsuccessful attempt to gain access to the Aragonese court in Naples is the subject of Chapter 4, and the final chapter is dedicated to his relationship with Federico da Montefeltro, whom he served in several ways beyond simply writing poetry. Appendix I is a richly detailed description of all the known manuscripts and printed collections of Campano's poetry which also allows de Beer to document how one published in manuscript form within the Renaissance patronage system. Appendix II provides detailed information about Campano's poetic oeuvre, while Appendix III offers a critical edition of all the poems discussed in the book.

Beautifully produced, with a series of high-quality illustrations in both color and black and white, this is an important book both for what it reveals about Campano and for its discussion of patronage within Renaissance literary culture. Indeed, in its combination of philological rigor and methodological sophistication, this book stands as a model for what a monograph in Neo-Latin studies should look like in 2013. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Oration on the Dignity of Man: A New Translation and Commentary*. By Pico della Mirandola. Ed. by Francesco Borghesi, Michael Papio, and Massimo Riva. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012. viii + 308 pages. Pico della Mirandola's so-called *Oration on the Dignity of Man* is one of the best-known works of Italian Neo-Latin Literature. It was prepared in 1486 to accompany Pico's *Conclusiones*, the 900 philosophical theses he intended to debate in Rome with learned men from all over the world. The publication of these theses caused Pope Innocent VIII to call off the debate and convene a theological commission that would end up condemning some of the theses. Scholars are divided about whether Pico's work is important for its contribution to magic, astrology, the esoteric, the Cabala, and

syncretism, for its continuation of the theological tradition that runs from the Bible through the Church Fathers to scholasticism, or for its early place in modern philosophy, but in the end the *Oration* came to represent Pico's attempt to defend himself against the accusations of heterodoxy. His theses attempted to show that the major beliefs of antiquity and the Middle Ages were essentially in harmony and that reconciliation was desirable where opinions appeared to differ. This attempt came dangerously close to making Christianity only one of several possible paths to a superior unity, and this is what got Pico into trouble: indeed he did not intend a frontal challenge to Christianity, but his transformative aims were every bit as radical as those of the reformers in the following generation.

The value of this edition does not lie in the text, which Bausi had taken care of previously, nor in the translation, since the one published in 1948 by Cassirer, Kristeller, and Randall in *The Renaissance Philosophy of Man* remains serviceable. What is distinctive here is the richness of the notes and the method by which they were produced. The 268 sentences of text are accompanied by 386 notes, some of which are simple identifications of sources but many of which become mini-essays in their own right: as examples, one might consider note 338, on writing systems in Egypt; note 326, which begins by explaining the name Jesu Nave but turns into a small summary of divine names in the Judeo-Christian tradition; and note 306, on Eudoxus and Hermippus. These notes, along with the edition itself, began as a collaborative effort in 1997 by the Brown University—University of Bologna Pico Project. This project was born digital and came to include a text with annotations, translations into English, Italian, and Spanish, and auxiliary documents that explain both the project itself and the material being studied. The results were first presented online, then printed here, but work continues through the web site of the Virtual Humanities Lab at Brown, which contains images from manuscripts and early printed editions along with extensive quotations in their original languages that surpass what could reasonably be offered in print (see http://www.brown.edu/Departments/Italian_Studies/vhl_new/). Pico's theses and their accompanying oration were a collaborative enterprise, gathered from the largest possible number of sources and presented (at least in part) through the new

medium of print; now they are being studied collaboratively again and disseminated through a new technology that is peculiarly suited both to group work in general and to a new dynamic ideal in which the interactive interface of the Virtual Humanities Lab will allow the continuous updating and integration of material. In this way the lowly footnote, born in print culture, can undergo a digital renaissance in which it assumes a life of its own and pulls away from the text it originally served. The hybrid model presented here is an interesting one and may well become the new normal, as Neo-Latin struggles to adapt itself to the emerging world of the digital humanities. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *De incantationibus*. By Pietro Pomponazzi. Ed. by Vittoria Perrone Compagni. Florence: Leo S. Olschki Editore, 2011. cli + 229 pages. The edition provided and introduced by Vittoria Perrone Compagni, in collaboration with Laura Regnicoli, is a complete study of the *De incantationibus* of Pietro Pomponazzi (1462-1525) as well as a tool for further investigation. Perrone Compagni's introduction (xi-lxxi) presents the main strains of Pomponazzi's work and highlights their connections with other works, such as the *Libri V de fato*, *De libero arbitrio et de praedestinatione* and *Tractatus de immortalitate animae*. One of the most striking features of Pomponazzi's philosophy is its probabilistic method of investigation, which always grounds itself in experience, proceeds through trials, and remains open to new results. Moreover the structure of *De incantationibus* reminds one of a dialogical process: the author highlights the contradictions of his adversaries, tries to solve them, poses questions, and proposes answers. Furthermore this recalls the medieval scholastic method of investigation. Even though Pomponazzi adopts Aristotle's outlook in natural philosophy, other philosophical traditions, like Stoicism, affect his thought. Pomponazzi, though, reinterprets his sources in a revolutionary way, which results in an approach that conflicts with the Thomistic philosophy predominant at this time.

In the first six chapters of *De incantationibus*, Pomponazzi analyzes the chain of causes that makes every phenomenon possible, paying particular attention to natural magic. While the first section of his work may agree with Thomism, the second section—beginning at chapter

seven—turns away from both Thomism and Neo-Platonism. In fact, Pomponazzi denies the existence of demons, basing his argument only on Aristotle's natural philosophy. Therefore the actions of God and angelic intelligences, the influence of the planets on the sublunary world, and physical dynamics are sufficient to explain prophecies, prodigies, and dreams. With regard to those topics, Perrone Compagni several times insists on the distance between Pomponazzi and Marsilio Ficino as well as Giovanni Pico della Mirandola. Pomponazzi pays particular attention to the power of human imagination because of its role in making wonders and dreams, although not in the way that Avicenna, who was commonly considered the main source on this matter, conceives. Pomponazzi's anti-Thomistic approach led to the insertion of *De incantationibus* into the list of prohibited books created by the Catholic Inquisition.

De incantationibus was published in 1556 and then in 1567 in Basel. Both editions are introduced by a dedicatory letter to a prince-elector; the first is addressed to Henry Ottone, the second to Frederick III (185-89). Regnicoli's essay (lxxiii-cviii) on the manuscripts that transmit the text investigates aspects of their history. She compares the surviving witnesses of the text on the basis of their characteristics: size, dating, collocation, type of paper used, diffusion, writing style, and owners. Next Regnicoli gives a detailed list of the manuscripts as well as the two fifteenth-century editions (cix-cxv). Currently one may consult the majority of manuscripts in Italian libraries. Perrone Compagni completes the philological study of *De incantationibus* with an essay on the tradition of the text, ending with the criteria chosen to establish the edition included in the book and a *stemma codicum* (cxvii-cli). She points out that there is enough evidence to claim that Pomponazzi never considered the preparation of his *De incantationibus* to be concluded, a possibility that seems the most natural result of his more general intellectual approach. The variety of natural events challenges the human capacity to understand the world as an ordered structure, and this pushes the ideal investigator towards never-ending research.

After such an accurate introduction and edition of *De incantationibus*, it would be extremely useful to complete a translation of Pomponazzi's Latin text into a modern language, hopefully English,

for a broader diffusion among international readers. This kind of author deserves to be read not only by specialists but also by anyone interested in deepening the history of ideas in Western culture. Students in particular might be fascinated by Pomponazzi's vivacious and dynamic method of argumentation, just as students were five centuries ago. Finally, this book encourages scholars to keep revising Renaissance Aristotelianism as a rigid tradition blindly subjected to Aristotle's *ipse dixit*. The more scholars study Aristotelian authors closely, the more they perceive how those authors may be acute and innovative. This book on Pomponazzi is a valid example of fruitful research in this direction. (Teodoro Katinis, The Johns Hopkins University)

◆ Theodore Bibliander. *De ratione communi omnium linguarum et literarum commentarius*. Ed. by Hagit Amirav and Hans-Martin Kirn. Foreword by Irena Backus. Travaux d'Humanisme et Renaissance, 475. Geneva: Librairie Droz S.A., 2011. liv + 684 pages. This well-presented volume offers the first edition of a key work by the Zurich scholar Theodore Bibliander (1505-1564). Bibliander's name has remained current thanks to his early translation of the Qur'an (1543), which revised Robertus Ketensis's effort of 1143, but the majority of his work has, until the last decade, rarely been studied. Amirav and Kirn's edition of *De ratione communi* contributes, then, to a rekindling of scholarly interest in Bibliander exemplified by Christian Moser's *Theodor Bibliander (1505-1564): Annotierte Bibliographie der gedruckten Werke* (2009). The current volume makes accessible a work in which the Swiss reformer put forward his ideas about language, theology, and the fundamental connections between them in a comprehensive approach. It therefore seems a sensible choice for the first edition of one of Bibliander's works.

After the foreword by Irena Backus, the introduction (XV-XLIII) outlines the life of Theodor Buchmann (Bibliander). Born in the canton of Thurgau, he studied in Zurich and Basel before taking over from the key Reformation figure Huldrych Zwingli (1484-1531) as lecturer on the Septuagint at the *Schola Tigurina* in 1532. He taught there until 1560, when he was forced to leave his job on dogmatic grounds. He would die four years later of an infection during the plague. Conrad Gesner (1516-1565), Bibliander's best-known student,

thought highly of his teacher and used the *De ratione communi* for his own linguistic work *Mithridates* (1555).

The rest of the introduction contextualizes the work in five sections treating ‘Structure,’ ‘Bibliander’s Linguistic Theology,’ ‘Bibliander’s Linguistic World,’ ‘Bibliander’s Scholarly Method and Classical Scholarship,’ and ‘Bibliander and Pre-Modern Comparative Religious Studies.’ A note on the fourteen polyglot Paternoster texts collected at the end of the *De ratione* and a page on the impact of the work conclude the introduction.

In the longest of the introduction’s seven sections, ‘Bibliander’s Linguistic Theology,’ the editors whittle the work down to its core elements: *De ratione* uses a “system of genealogic branching with Hebrew as its starting point” (XXII), and this “quest for a common ‘principle’—in the sense of shared rules or a common structure for all languages—led consequently to the question of the hidden unity of all religions in shared basic convictions” (XXIV). The three key language-related Bible passages (Gen 11.1-9 on the tower of Babel, Acts 2 on the beginning of the Eschaton, and 1Cor 14.6-12, where Paul writes on the gift of tongues) provide the biblical framework for Bibliander’s views on language and theology (XXV).

The work itself, never fully completed by Bibliander, is comprised of three *tractatus*. The first (30-239) prepares the ground for the coming chapters by providing an overview of all known languages. It also contains interesting sections on the origins of language and of writing systems, their development as well as their influence on printing. The second tract (242-503), which comprises the main part of the treatise, begins with a (re-)statement of the overall aim of the work as well as notes on methodology before proposing Bibliander’s system of comparing languages. Tract three brings *De ratione communi* on to religious and philosophical concerns (507-81), where the structural arguments that the author makes for a universal system of language in tract two are shown to be relevant for the transmission and spread of Christianity. The incomplete nature of the work means that, particularly in the second tract, some chapters (8-12 and 15-20) amount to little more than a list of topics to be discussed under a given heading. By way of appendix, the work closes with a collection of catechetical texts in different languages.

The edition, comprising over 700 pages including the introduction, is a hefty volume. This means that the typing errors and questionable English in the introduction and translation make the work occasionally hard going. Mistakes such as “writnigs” (X) or a missing full stop (XI) are easy to read over, but sentences like “Regarding the Roman or Latin language, why should one spend many words to the question whether that language which has been treated by so many grammarians and dialecticians, both in the past and in our present time, can be understood by method?” (77) may unfortunately hinder or confuse the reader. These mistakes are at their worst and most damaging when they cast doubt over the accuracy of the translation. This is the case at page 81, for example, where *Quando religio Israelis adeo invalescet in Aegypto ut . . .* is translated as “The religion of Israel will once upon a time flourish in Egypt to such an extent that. . . .”

It is a source of relief, then, that the Latin text has been meticulously prepared. In the absence of a commentary, the notes at the foot of the text are full and very informative. The pie charts in the third appendix to the edition are a novel way of bringing the editors’ statistics on Bibliander’s source material in *De ratione communi* into clearer perspective. They, like the edition itself in general, provide a stimulus and a strong basis for further study of this interesting and important Reformation figure. (Tom Deneire, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven)

◆ *Iusti Lipsi epistolae, pars IV: 1591*. Ed. by Sylvette Sué and Jeanine De Landtsheer. Brussels: Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie van België voor Wetenschappen en Kunsten, 2012. The edition of Justus Lipsius’s correspondence from 1591 has been long in the making. Its origin lies in the 1975 Ph.D. edition by Sylvette Sué, who was unable to finish her project and publish it in the *Iusti Lipsi Epistolae* (ILE) series. Accordingly the supervisors of the series turned to their regular and most experienced editor, Jeanine De Landtsheer, who had already co-edited ILE V (1592) and edited ILE VI (1593), VII (1594), VIII (1595), and XIV (1601). Besides, De Landtsheer’s life-long work on Lipsius’s correspondence had already naturally brought her to ILE IV (see “Towards the Edition of ILE IV (1591): A Revision of Its 1974 Version Extended with Five Overlooked Letters,” in J. Papy—D. Sacré (eds.), *Syntagmatia: Essays on Neo-Latin Literature in Honour of Mo-*

nique Mund-Dopchie and Gilbert Tournoy, *Supplementa Humanistica Lovaniensia* (Leuven, 2009), 507-20). As a result of these particular circumstances, Sué and De Landtsheer are credited as *quam curavit edendam Sylvette Sué, recognovit Jeanine De Landtsheer*. As this phrasing suggests that De Landtsheer accepts the final responsibility of the work, this review will treat her as the primary editor.

The year 1591 is arguably the most interesting year in Lipsius's biography. It tells us the story of his tumultuous move (or rather flight) from Leiden, where he had been living and working since 1578, to settle again in his native country, first in Spa and Liège (May and June 1591) and later in Leuven (1592). Lipsius's decision to leave the Calvinist North came as a shock to the Northern authorities and his Leiden friends, and was obviously fraught with danger and practical problems. He needed to reconcile with the Catholic church, transfer his personal belongings and his wife to the South, and completely rebuild his network of scholarly and political connections. In this way, ILE IV is a priceless document for anyone studying early modern history in the Low Countries.

As usual the volume starts off by prefacing each letter (ILE includes letters both from and to Lipsius) with a summary of its contents and with some introductory remarks on the correspondent, the letter's context, issues of dating, and an overview of the collated witnesses. Below the edited text, one finds the *apparatus criticus* and a number of historical, literary, linguistic, or other annotations. At the end of this part, relevant documents included in or referred to by the letter have been published in an *Appendix*.

All in all, ILE IV is a fine piece of editorial work, conforming to the high standard we have come to expect from De Landtsheer. Granted that Lipsius's correspondence has usually not been transmitted through a complex manuscript tradition (although ILE IV has some interesting exceptions like 91 05 02) and has often been printed already in early modern editions, there are still some major challenges involved in the edition. To start, Lipsius's handwriting is notoriously hard to read—a fact even he himself was well aware of. Besides Latin, there are letters in early modern Dutch, French, Italian or—ILE IV has one of the very rare examples (91 04 13 T)—German to be dealt with. The topics of the letters are myriad and require an extremely

versatile background knowledge. Indeed, ILE IV offers several truly nightmarish letters for an editor/commentator, like the complex 91 01 11 on chronology, or 91 09 01 on emendations. Moreover, ILE IV is by far the largest volume in the series to date (752 pages, 285 published letters). Accordingly, I have no qualms about the edition as a whole and would surely recommend it to anyone in the field: not only Neo-Latinists, but a broad public working in early modern history, art, theology, and so on. Still, it is impossible to make an edition of this size without leaving at least something to be desired. The reader will find a list of (relevant) *errata* at the end of this review. Meanwhile I will touch on some more general issues.

The annotations, for instance, are highly instructive, extremely abundant, and clearly also take into account a readership that is not primarily Neo-Latin. However, even then I would sometimes have liked some additional information. For example, if 91 05 09 R¹ comments on the meaning of *exspatiari* (which is rather clear from the context), it should definitely also explain the rare expression *propria quadra vivere* a few lines earlier (“to live from one’s own table,” cf. Iuv. 5, 2). A similar case is found a few pages later, where a note in [91] 05 17 explains the (common) verb *exanclare*, but none is found on the meaning or origin of the puzzling *cum phreneticis septentrionum filiis* (an echo of Varro, *Sat. Men.*, fr. 271).

In most cases, De Landtsheer deals well with the ever-knotty issue of early modern orthography and punctuation. There is the occasional case where consistency seems to be lacking (91 09 03 H, 10: *otio* vs *ibid.*, 13: *ocio*), and here and there I do not agree with the editor’s adaptation of the original punctuation. In 91 09 14 BA, for instance, the accusative case *Europam nostram* seems unintelligible in the sentence *Germaniam vestram intuemini: apertis aut occultis dissidiis laborat; Europam nostram ardet civilibus fere externisque bellis*, until one goes back to Lipsius’s original spelling, which makes clear that we have an ellipsis of *intuemini* at hand: *Germaniam vestram intuemini, apertis aut occultis dissidiis laborat: Europam nostram, ardet civilibus fere externisque bellis*. Similarly, in the next letter, 91 09 14 BR, I find the eighteenth-century editor Burman’s punctuation much more readable than De Landtsheer’s: *Tu vero non molestus interpellator et saepe eveniant mihi tales, ut per viam defessis, iucundus comes taedium levat*

et laborem. Sic mihi tua interpellatio, erudita et pro nostro gustu (Burman: *Tu vero non molestus interpellator, et saepe eveniant mihi tales. ut per viam defessis iucundus comes taedium levat et laborem, sic mihi tua interpellatio, erudita et pro nostro gustu*).

Finally, the edition provides a very detailed and meticulously constructed *apparatus criticus*. The only possible point of criticism here is that I sometimes disagree when De Landtsheer intervenes in the text. For instance, in 91 08 27 (Janus Dousa, Jr. to Lipsius) I see little reason to correct the reading of **o** and **d**₂ *quamvis (...) sint de quibus in utramque partem arbitrari possit* (“although these are things about which one can differ in opinion”) into (...) *possis*. Besides, *possis* should not be called a correction, as De Landtsheer does, since it is already attested in **d**₁. This kind of impersonal *potest*, although unusual, is not impossible, as explained by E. Löfstedt, *Philologischer Kommentar zur Peregrinatio Aetherae: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der lateinischen Sprache* (Darmstadt, 1970), 44 (referring to, e.g., Apic., 8, 266 or Var., *L.L.*, 6, 77). Granted, one might argue that it is more likely that Dousa made a grammatical error and took *arbitrari* for a passive verb. In that case, I would still prefer the text to read “*possit* (sic).” The same goes for other instances where De Landtsheer corrects the transmitted reading when it does not conform to strictly Ciceronian grammar, like 91 02 22: (...) *non diu Lipsius apud vos erit et amittetis eum, dum tenetis* (from *amittitis*) or 91 10 02 R: *Quod memoriam nostri tenes, Iuste, et eam litteris quoque attestaris gratum est* (from *attesteris*). To my feeling such instances are acceptable Neo-Latin rather than textual mistakes that need to be emended.

That being said, none of this should detract from the overall value of ILE IV. It is a work of great merit and even just reviewing it, one can begin to understand why an edition like this can eventually take over 35 years to be published. I only wished the ILE series would have considered waiting just a little longer so that the book could be published in English, so that even more people could make use of it. Its interesting contents, shrewd annotation, and accurate editing certainly deserve as much. (Tom Deneire, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven)

Errata

- p. 25: Nécrologe *pro* Nécrologie
 p. 70: Verg. *Aen.* 1, 475 *pro* Hor. *carm.* 4, 6, 4-5
 p. 73 (note): depopulai *pro* depopulati
 p. 186 (note): includebant; *pro* includebant; verbis autem supra ceteros in majus efferebant.
 p. 199: Nonnius *pro* Nonnus
 p. 200: nomini tui *pro* nominis tui
 p. 246: Lucr. 5, 95-96 *pro* Ausonius, *Versus ad Theodosium Augustum* (= *Praefationes, IV*), ed. S. Prete (Teubner, 1978), v. 7, 4
 p. 262: nota habeo *pro* notam habeo
 p. 325 (note): valetudine *pro* valetudini
 p. 326 (note): διδάσκολον *pro* διδάσκαλον
 p. 351 (note): nostratum esset partium *pro* nostrarum esset partium
 p. 398: ὁ μάλα *pro* ὃς μάλα
 p. 430: κεισόμεσθα *pro* κεισόμεσθα
 p. 430: ὀστέων *pro* ὀστεῶν
 p. 546 (note): uncae *pro* unciae
 p. 546 (note): lucti *pro* lucri
 p. 605: multum salutem *pro* multam salutem
 p. 632 (app. crit.): omisisse videatur *immo* omisisse videtur?
 p. 690 (note): resistant *pro* restituant
 p. 690 (note): Beldur *pro* Bebdur
 p. 719: Snisanum *pro* Strisanum (reading of **o**, **d**₁ does have the non-sensical “Snisanum”)

◆ *Memoriae matris sacrum: To the Memory of My Mother: A Consecrated Gift. A Critical Text, Translation, and Commentary.* By George Herbert. *George Herbert Journal Special Studies & Monographs*, 33, Numbers 1 & 2 (Fall 2009/Spring 2010). Ed., trans., and commentary by Catherine Freis, Richard Freis, and Greg Miller. Fairfield, CT: George Herbert Journal, 2012. xxi + 199 pages. Within four to five weeks of the death of his mother in early June 1627, the Welsh-born poet George Herbert (1593-1633) wrote nineteen short poems in Latin and Greek (319 verses in total) as a dedicatory offering to her memory. The poems were printed in July of 1627 together with the

sermon that John Donne preached in memory of Herbert's mother (Donne's patroness for some twenty years) after her funeral in the parish church of Chelsea.

This volume, a new edition of Herbert's poems in honor of his mother, is the result of a close, and seamless, collaboration by three authors (two professors of classics and a professor of English). The prefatory material focuses on textual issues, such as revisions, punctuation, and diacritical marks used in the texts of the poems, and includes three figures that reproduce pages from the original printing. A critical text of the fourteen Latin poems (1-13 and 19) and five Greek poems (14-18), with an *apparatus criticus* for each poem, appears next. Facing the Latin and Greek poems are English translations in "free but patterned" verse (vii) that accomplish well the authors' stated aims of reflecting the sense, tone, diction and euphony of the originals. Following are the commentaries for the poems, each of which includes a construe (an English prose translation that replicates closely the word order and literal meaning of the poem) and an extended analysis. The volume includes three appendices: a glossary of technical rhetorical terms; an analysis of Herbert's metrics, which includes a table detailing the metrical design of the poems as a group and a discussion of the meters used (the authors use "elegaic" for "elegiac" in the table); and a list of parallel passages in Herbert's *The Temple*, a collection of devotional poems in English published in 1633. The volume closes with a bibliography of scholarly works in English.

The corrected text of these poems (last edited by F. E. Hutchinson in 1941) presented here will certainly prove a welcome update for specialists. The commentaries and ancillary material will be of interest not only to Herbert and other Neo-Latin scholars but also to classical scholars and senior students because of the detailed guidance they provide in how to approach, read, and evaluate original post-classical Latin and Greek poetry. The commentaries, which comprise about 60% of the volume, offer some help with syntax and morphology (referring to Allen and Greenough's Latin grammar and Smyth's Greek grammar) and the construes present a literal path through the Latin and Greek texts, but the focus of the commentaries is explication and the greatest attention is paid to the craft of the poems. To this end, the commentaries lead the reader carefully through the interplay of

meter, lexicon, sound, mood, tone, content, texture, syntax, verse structure, word order, cadence and meaning in the poems. The commentaries point out where Herbert's verses echo ancient authors such as Catullus, Horace, Vergil, Ovid, St. Paul, and *The Greek Anthology*. They also provide guidance in the appreciation of Herbert's poems as examples of highly original seventeenth-century verse that was influenced not only by classical precedents but also by other English verse and contemporary interests such as Reformation demonology (93) and cosmology (103, 149).

The authors' goal is "to recover the significance of the work intended by the author" (94), and as a result, they only briefly discuss, and dismiss (61, 81), Freudian interpretations of the poems as a reflection of the close relationship between Herbert and his mother. Biographical information about Herbert's mother, who remains nameless in the poems, is limited in the commentaries (see, for example, 82, 115, 125), as it is in Herbert's poems themselves. In Poem 2, for example, Herbert celebrates the estimable qualities of his mother: she was prudent, pious, charitable, and modest; she could manage her household well and serve as a gracious hostess; she was well spoken and known for her beautiful penmanship; she enjoyed gardening and music; and she was beautiful. This poem presents a rather formal portrait. But it gains more resonance when it is set against the facts of the real life of Herbert's mother, Magdalen Herbert Danvers (née Newport). From other sources, we know that Herbert's mother had ten children by her first husband, who died when Herbert was only about four years old. After the death of her husband, she deftly supervised her household and the education of her children. When Herbert was fifteen years old, she married again. Her second husband was half her age, and the marriage, according to Donne, was a happy one. Extant also is her kitchen book and a portrait of her by Federico Zuccaro, which conveys her beauty and vitality. Biographical information is not necessary, of course, for the appreciation of the striking imagery and technical craft evident in the poetry and deeply explored in this volume, but it brings another layer of interest to the intense and poignant meditation on grief and loss that infuses these poems.

This volume, which is a monograph published as part of the *George Herbert Journal*, may be accessed through subscription-only

online scholarly portals such as Literature Online, Project Muse, and Academic OneFile. Copies of the volume can also be ordered directly from the *George Herbert Journal*. Orders can be placed by regular mail with Sidney Gottlieb, Editor, *George Herbert Journal*, Sacred Heart University, Dept. of Media Studies, 5151 Park Avenue, Fairfield, CT 06825 U.S.A. or by e-mail to spgottlieb@aol.com. (Anne-Marie Lewis, York University)

◆ *Flora Neolatina: Die Hortorum libri IV von René Rapin S.J. und die Plantarum libri VI von Abraham Cowley, Zwei lateinische Dichtungen des 17. Jahrhunderts*. By Ruth Monreal. Beiträge zur Altertumskunde, 278. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2010. x + 333 pages. It was M.'s purpose in this book (a revised version of her Ph.D. thesis in Tübingen) to present two Neo-Latin didactic poems, René Rapin's *Hortorum libri IV* (Paris, 1665) and Abraham Cowley's *Plantarum libri VI* (London, 1668).

Like Virgil's *Georgics*, one of the most important models for these texts, and Rapin's *Horti* themselves, M.'s book also consists of four parts. In the middle there are two large-scale chapters on Rapin resp. Cowley. They are framed by a general introduction (chap. 1) and a comparative summary of the two poems (chap. 4).

In the introduction M. classifies the poems in the context of didactic poetry (1-9) and describes the state of research on that literary genre (10-16), leveling a lot of criticism at Bernd Effe (*Dichtung und Lehre* (Munich, 1977)) and Yasmin Haskell (*Loyola's Bees* (Oxford, 2003)), although in the discussion that follows she is often in line with Haskell.

The second chapter deals with Rapin's *Horti*. After a biobibliographical introduction (23-26) and an annotated list of editions and translations, M. discusses the topic of the poem in general and provides a summary of the four books (34-58). In several lists, she records historical characters and (real and fictitious) gardens in the poem (58-61). The given factual information is also examined in its relationship to Rapin's prose treatise *De universa culturae hortensis disciplina*, which was printed together with the poem (61-65). The literary form of the *Horti*, which imitates Virgil's *Georgics* in general, is analyzed as far as metrics, division into several books, extent, com-

municative situation, paratexts, *prooemium*, *praeteritio* of medicinal plants, aitiological epyllion, and *sphragis* are concerned (66-99). Rapin's poetological self-conception is studied in the *praefatio* of the poem and in his *Réflexions sur la poétique* (1674), an important text for the famous *querelle des anciens et des modernes* (99-109). Concerning the question of whether Rapin supported the *anciens* or the *modernes* (both answers were given in former studies), M. takes a middle position. Comparing the *Horti* with Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, the differences in *eroticis* are very striking (109-23). Perhaps a nod towards the *Ovide moralisé* would have been helpful here. Furthermore, M. discusses Rapin's imitations of so-called "*schöne Stellen*" (beautiful passages) of the *Aeneid* (1.423sq. and 6.847sq.), Fracastoro's *Syphilis* (2.223 sq.), and Vida's *Scacchia ludus* (123-31). Very few Christian elements can be found in the *Horti* (132-34). M. tries to explain, as part of an interesting theory, why the splendid garden of Nicolas Fouquet, who fell from Louis XIV's grace, in Vaux le Vicomte is not mentioned in the poem (134-42). The chapter ends with a detailed tabular summary of the poem (142-88).

The third chapter deals with Abraham Cowley's *Plantarum libri VI*. After biobibliographical information and a survey of editions and translations, M. presents an overview of the content of each book (189-99). Cowley's medical and botanical knowledge is analyzed together with the sources he had available for his poem; here, especially Pliny the elder and Jean Fernel stand out (200-12). Some examples illustrate these results: amenorrhea and blood circulation (plant. 2.177-246), the doctrine of signatures, i.e., the correspondence between micro- and macrocosmos, and humoral pathology (pp. 212-17). Concerning the literary form of the poem, M. scrutinizes content, personifications of the plants, extent, division into several books, metrics, notes, poetological passages, the beginning and ending of the books, and catalogues (217-78). As in the previous chapter, this one also ends with a detailed summary of the poem (278-313).

The last chapter is quite short (314-21) and compares the two poems, summarizing the results of the previous chapters. The figure of Flora, the national focus, scientific information, literary form, integration into the generic tradition, and the reception of the poems all

come into view. The whole book ends with a bibliography (322-28) and indices (329-33).

M. tries to do justice to the two poems on several levels and analyzes them on different levels. For her, the didactic poetry of the Augustan age is as important for the understanding of Rapin and Cowley as their knowledge of contemporary scientific research. All her observations are well-founded, and sometimes she makes astounding discoveries, e.g., she has discovered an acrostic in hort. 4.813-17 (139-40) and translates a line from Nahuatl (plant. 5.1010 *oi camacalli camatli natastlits intelolocti*) which so far was considered as mere crying (274-78). M. shows convincingly that in Virgil's *Georgics* the levels of teaching and of dedication are clearly separated, while they blur in Cowley. But one could certainly ask which political implications Virgil's choice of subject contained and whether these implications also exist for the topic of gardens in Louis' France of the seventeenth century. Analyzing the last book of Cowley's *Plantae*, which deals (differently from books 1-5) with English history, the question might arise whether this could be an influence from Propertius's last book, which deals (differently from books 1-3) with Roman history. This would also fit together with the intermediate position of the poet between epic poetry, didactic poetry, and a collection of poems.

Considering that the book is a Ph.D. thesis, which must be ready by a certain deadline, one must be deeply impressed by the finesse of the language and the high quality of the work in general. If M. had written the book with less career pressure, she would have taken some additional weeks in order to correct some trifles, like missing (e.g., 122, 260, 320) or clumsy translations. But this is the book of a young Neo-Latinist of high quality, and it is most warmly recommended to anyone interested in Neo-Latin didactic poetry. (Florian Schaffenrath, Universität Innsbruck)

◆ *The Music Theory of Harald Vallerius: Three Dissertations from Seventeenth-Century Sweden*. By Peter Sjökvist. Uppsala: Uppsala Universitet, 2012. 426 pages. Peter Sjökvist's *The Music Theory of Harald Vallerius* is far more than a mere translation of three music theoretical dissertations connected with Vallerius, a professor in physics and mathematics at Uppsala University from 1684 to 1712. The three

dissertations—*De sono* (On Sound), *De modis* (On the Modes), and *De tactu* (On the Tactus)—are beautifully translated and presented with the original Neo-Latin on facing pages with the translation. In addition to this, however, Sjökvist accomplishes three astounding achievements: 1) he provides a richly textured discussion of academia in seventeenth-century Sweden and the position and value of the dissertation as a project; 2) he discusses in great detail the language and style of this particular brand of Neo-Latin, offering the reader a keen insight into the relationships among classical Latin, medieval Latin, and Neo-Latin as well as the impact genre has on the language; and 3) he thoughtfully comments on the texts themselves with respect to authorship, some elements of interpretive detail, and the many subtleties of the language itself. In this review, I touch briefly on these three aspects of Sjökvist's work and then close by examining some aspects of the dissertations themselves.

Roughly the first third of the Introduction is given over to an investigation into the status of music theory at Uppsala University in general, Vallerius's career in particular, and the role the dissertation played in the education and qualifications of the students. Sjökvist shows that music theory had fallen into a great decline at Uppsala in the decades preceding Vallerius's *De sono* (1674). Although music theory was part of the curriculum (within the quadrivial studies that stem back to Boethius) at the time of the university's founding in 1477, it had fallen by the wayside in 1645, when the revised statutes removed music as a responsibility of the faculty. Thus when Vallerius's dissertation appeared, it marked the return of music as an object of academic study to the university after an extended absence. Sjökvist provides letters of recommendation in support of Vallerius from his professors that confirm the sense that Vallerius had picked a subject that had not been studied at Uppsala for some time and was considered something of a novelty. Moreover, as Sjökvist shows, Vallerius brought the most up-to-date scientific and philosophical models to bear upon his work, building on the writings of such figures as René Descartes and Marin Mersenne. Certainly, with Vallerius's *De sono*, Uppsala University took a great stride forward in the study of music theory.

The most fascinating part of the Introduction is undoubtedly Sjökvist's handling of the value and role of the dissertation in uni-

versity culture of the time. One must not read these works with the anachronistic expectation that they will conform to current standards of dissertation writing. Written dissertations in Vallerius's day were a mere platform on which the respondent (the person defending the dissertation) could build the oral disputation. The main purpose of the printed dissertation was to announce the theses that would be defended orally. Indeed, perhaps to add to the rhetorical flair of the event, some dissertations (including *De sono*) ended with a "Corollary" that introduced theses (entirely unrelated to the main topic) that were patently absurd and indefensible so that the respondent could entertainingly demonstrate rhetorical skill by "proving" that which is false! *De sono's* "Corollary" culminates in the assertion that "In every rectilinear triangle all angles considered together are not equivalent to two right ones" (177).

Since the primary concern was the demonstration of oral argumentative skill, the matter of who actually wrote the printed dissertation was of less concern. Sometimes the respondent did, but often it was the *praeses* (the professor supervising the dissertation and the defense). Thus the question of who actually "held the pen" is at issue in these works. Sjökvist convincingly argues, largely on the basis of style, that Vallerius himself wrote *De sono* (for which he was the respondent) and *De modis* (for which he was the *praeses* while Nathanael Rydelius was the respondent) but did not likely write *De tactu* (for which he was the *praeses* and Olaus Retzelius was the respondent). The latter treatise is included, however, because it so clearly builds on Vallerius's earlier work, seems to have been written under his close direction, and indeed completes the project as Vallerius had outlined it in *De sono*. Thus Sjökvist contends that the three dissertations provide a corpus containing the thought of Vallerius on music theory.

The remaining two-thirds of the Introduction and the majority of the comments to the translations concern the language and style of Neo-Latin and the specific problems it presents to a translator. Sjökvist refutes the notion that the Latin of the Renaissance and later periods was petrified and stultifying. He clearly demonstrates that it remained, especially in academic circles, a flexible and mutable language capable of great subtlety and insight. Sjökvist presents what amounts to a primer in the relationships among Neo-Latin and classical

and medieval Latin by meticulously exploring issues in orthography, morphology, syntax, and vocabulary. He then goes on to investigate the style of the dissertations with a keen eye toward how the language presents issues of causation and handles the characteristic jargon of music theory. Considering the concision of the discussion, Sjökvist manages to cover a lot of ground, and the reader of Latin will find here an ideal investigation into the vicissitudes and richness of academic Neo-Latin.

The commentary largely serves to clarify the particular shadings of meaning for certain words or phrases. Occasionally Sjökvist delves into more interpretive exploration but he mostly avoids it, as he declared he would in the Introduction (11). The brief forays into interpretation are mostly quite solid. Sjökvist tries to hunt down precedents for many of Vallerius's claims, often stemming from the work of Descartes or Mersenne, although Sjökvist does not always note just how deep Vallerius's indebtedness to Descartes runs. He sometimes misses obvious references to other important figures in the history of music theory (some of Vallerius's claims come from the work of Gioseffo Zarlino, albeit perhaps filtered through Descartes). At one point (209) he seems to misconstrue the meaning of "overtone." One perhaps longs for more interpretive commentary, but it seems unnecessarily peevish to insist upon that which the author himself proclaimed he would not do.

Of the three treatises, *De sono* has the most to offer the modern historian of music theory. *De modis* and *De tactu* provide few original insights, and even their manner of presentation pales in comparison to the sources. *De sono*, however, is quite striking, in part because it is so far removed from what many would now consider to be the province of music theory. Indeed Vallerius here is concerned more with the propagation of sound itself and the physics of sounding bodies than with recognizable music-theoretical concerns. Vallerius here presents and then builds upon the Cartesian criticism of Aristotelian physics. In so doing, Vallerius establishes a boldly modern foundation for the reintegration of music theory into the curriculum of Uppsala.

As a group, the dissertations inform us of the largely mechanistic seventeenth-century concerns with music theory and what that subject can tell us about the properties of sound. In their careful compilation of contemporaneous work on the subject, the dissertations also provide

a key insight into the production and reproduction of knowledge in the university of that era. Peter Sjökvist's lucid translation and his admirable ability to clarify the complexities of the language make *The Music Theory of Harald Vallerius* an admirable window into an academic world that informs our own but in many ways strikes us as bizarrely and compellingly foreign. (Chadwick Jenkins, City College of New York)

◆ *Nuovi maestri e antichi testi: Umanesimo e Rinascimento alle origini del pensiero moderno*. Atti del Convegno internazionale di studi in onore di Cesare Vasoli, Mantova, 1-3 dicembre 2010. Ed. by Stefano Caroti and Vittoria Perrone Compagni. Centro Studi L. B. Alberti, Ingenium, 17. Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 2012. VIII + 456 pages. 45 €. The essays in this volume derive from a conference held in honor of Cesare Vasoli (1924-2013), emeritus professor of the history of Renaissance philosophy at the University of Florence. Vasoli's appointment was in philosophy, but he was more properly a historian of culture in general, a prolific scholar of wide-ranging interests whose published work ranged from Dante to the encyclopedism of the seventeenth century, including along the way major books on Bruno, Renaissance Platonism, the diffusion of new religious ideas in the Reformation, and the role of rhetoric and dialectic in the development of Quattrocento and Cinquecento culture. As a student of Eugenio Garin, Vasoli was one of the last links to the generation of Kristeller and his contemporaries, the generation that connects us back as far as Burckhardt in the historiography of the Renaissance.

The volume contains the following essays: Michele Ciliberto, "Cesare Vasoli interprete del Rinascimento"; Michael J. B. Allen, "Eurydice in Hades: Florentine Platonism and an Orphic Mystery"; Marco Bertozzi, "Giovanni Pico, Gemisto Pletone e l'imperatore Giuliano: una strana alleanza"; Sebastiano Gentile, "Considerazioni attorno al Ficino e alla *prisca theologia*"; Giuseppe Gardoni, "Libri e uomini di corte a Mantova fra Tre e Quattrocento"; James Hankins, "Modern Republicanism and the History of Republics"; Stefano Caroti, "La filosofia nelle università italiane: spinte dinamiche e resistenze nel dibattito sulla *intensio* e *remissio* (secoli XV-XVI)"; Stéphane Toussaint, "Kristeller, Garin e l'Umanesimo: appunti ritrovati"; Franco Bacchelli,

“Appunti sulla prima fortuna basileese e francese dello *Zodiacus vitae* del Palingenio”; Simone Fellina, “Cristoforo Landino e le ragioni della poesia: il dissenso con Marsilio Ficino sull’origine della *pia philosophia*”; Vittoria Perrone Compagni, “Machiavelli metafisico”; Elisabetta Scapparone, “Jean Bodin e la ‘felicità futura’: salvezza e immortalità nel *Colloquium Heptaplomeres*”; Anna Laura Puliafito Bleuel, “Strategie retoriche? Metafora ed esempio nella filosofia naturale di Francesco Patrizi”; Germana Ernst, “La splendente immagine di Dio: *Spiritus e Mens* nell’*Ethica* di Campanella”; Maurizio Torrini, “Il Rinascimento nell’orizzonte della nuova scienza”; Marie-Dominique Couzinet, “Aspetti dell’eredità di Pietro Mamo nell’opera di Jean Bodin”; Maria Muccillo, “Platonismo e anti platonismo nel tardo Rinascimento: echi di dottrine patriziane negli scritti di Paolo Beni e Giovanni Battista Crispo di Gallipoli”; Enrico Peruzzi, “Keplero e la natura degli enti matematici”; and Marco Sgarbi, “La presenza dell’aristotelismo padovano in Inghilterra (1589-1689).” The book concludes with two indices, of names and of manuscripts.

Fortunately this collection of essays by Vasoli’s colleagues, students, and younger collaborators appeared shortly before his death. It is a fitting tribute to a master scholar, one whose work will continue to set the direction of research in Neo-Latin studies for the next generation. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

♦ *Corolla Gemina: estudios de filología latina dedicados a los profesores José Castro y Pilar Muro*. Ed. by Miguel Rodríguez-Pantoja. Ciclos de filología clásica, 6. Córdoba: Servicio de publicaciones, Universidad de Córdoba, 2012. 121 pages. This collection of essays, in honor of two colleagues at the University of Córdoba, includes three pieces on Neo-Latin themes. Julián Solana Pujalte’s “Un himno a San Rafael de finales del siglo XVI” edits and sets into its historical context an unknown hymn to St. Raphael that was published in a small school book (Cordova, 1598) and aimed at the teaching of grammar in Jesuit colleges. “Contribución al estudio de la *Didascalía multiplex* de Francisco Fernández de Córdoba: los capítulos XV, XXII y XLIII” offers an edition, analysis, and translation into Spanish of three chapters of *Didascalía multiplex*, written by Francisco Fernández de Córdoba (1565-1626): XV (*Quid sit servitus; & unde dicta; ipsius origo; &*

quare a iure gentium introducta, & iuri naturali dicatur contraria, cum ab ipsomet emanarit); XXII (*Morem appendendi ad parietes aedium sacrarum tabellas pictas, cereos, hominum simulachra, arma, vestes, caesariem, donariaque alia ab antiquis desumptum, & cur voti causa capilli tondeantur*); and XLIII (*Quid sit nobilitas, & unde dicta; nobilem pro noto, ignobilem pro ignoto antiquos usurpasse*). And finally, Joaquín Mellado Rodríguez's "Inscripción latina en el altar de nuestro Padre Jesús Nazareno de Fernán Núñez (Córdoba)" offers a philological study of an eighteenth-century Latin epigraph engraved on a sarcophagus that was later used as an altar in the Chapel of Our Father Jesus in the parish church of St. Marina of Fernán Núñez (Córdoba). It also provides information about the people who appear in the inscription and identifies those who installed the sarcophagus inside the church, as well as other details that are important for the history of the area. The books in this series appear only intermittently, but they are a good example of a type of publication that is common in Spain and well worth reading, but difficult to obtain elsewhere. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Notable Men and Women of Our Time*. By Paolo Giovio. Ed. by Kenneth Gouwens. The I Tatti Renaissance Library, 56. xxii + 760 pages. *Latin Poetry*. By Girolamo Fracastoro. Ed. by James Gardner. The I Tatti Renaissance Library, 57. xx + 537 pages. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 2013. \$29.95. The last two volumes to be published in the I Tatti Renaissance Library are unusually hefty tomes, containing important works in the Neo-Latin canon accompanied by an English translation and extensive annotation, more than enough for an intelligent first reading of the text.

Paolo Giovio (1486-1552) wrote *Notable Men and Women* after the sack of Rome in May, 1527 by Emperor Charles V. As Clement VII's personal physician, Giovio was a firsthand witness to this event, initially following the pope into imprisonment but eventually gaining a safe-conduct which led him to Ischia, an island off the coast of Naples. There he stayed with Vittoria Colonna and composed the dialogue, as consolation for the disastrous events in Rome. The major interlocutors are Alfonso d'Avalos, a renowned imperial military officer; Giovanni Antonio Muscettola, a Neapolitan jurist who was

well known in his own day; and Giovio himself, all of whom were on Ischia in late 1527. The first day's discussion ostensibly focuses on military matters, but it also extends to philosophical debates about fate, the value of astrology, and the place of morality in keeping order. On the second day the dialogue turns to men of letters, surveying over a hundred and considering why opportunities for composition in Latin have declined. The third day's discussion centers on illustrious women and asks whether the outstanding figures of the present can rival those of the past. The last discussion is probably the most interesting for a reader at the beginning of the twenty-first century, given that it takes a topic of great interest today and develops it into a series of portraits that are considerably more detailed and realistic than much of what was written in this area in the Renaissance. The work raises more questions than it resolves, but this is typical of the Renaissance dialogue as a genre and of humanism in general.

Coincidentally Girolamo Fracastoro (1476/8-1553) was also a physician-poet like Giovio, but unlike *Notable Men and Women*, which has attracted little scholarly and editorial attention until lately, Fracastoro's corpus includes one work that has been printed and discussed continuously since its composition, *Syphilis*. This poem reflects the fact that its author is considered one of the founders of modern epidemiology, but it is also excellent poetry, combining scientific and medical lore in the tradition of Virgil's *Georgics* with poetic interludes derived from Greco-Roman mythology. The first book examines the causes of the disease, the second its remedies, and the third a guaiacum cure that leads to what appears to be the earliest poetic account of Columbus's voyages (syphilis was often thought to have been brought to Europe from the Americas in the Renaissance). But Fracastoro wrote many other works as well: *Joseph*, an epyllion about the Biblical patriarch; a varied collection of lyric poetry that ranges from the rustic pleasures of his country home to panegyrics of important political figures of the day; *Homocentrica*, a defence of the earth-centered model of the universe; *De contagione et contagiosis morbis*, the first medical work to argue that the seeds of a disease could be carried through the air; *Naugerius*, a dialogue named after Andrea Navagero that explores poetry as a Platonic journey toward the idea of beauty; *Turrius*, a dialogue on how the mind learns and functions;

and *Fracastorius*, a discussion of the soul's immortality that remained incomplete at the author's death. The major works are presented in complete form and the minor ones in extracts, giving us for the first time a modern edition that represents the full range of Fracastoro's literary achievements.