



**EVENTEENTH-**



**ENTURY**



**NEWS**

**FALL - WINTER 2021**

**Vol. 79**

**Nos. 3&4**

Including

**THE NEO-LATIN NEWS Vol. 69, Nos. 3&4**

---

# SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY NEWS

VOLUME 79, Nos. 3&4

FALL-WINTER, 2021

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 twice a year with the support of the English Department at Texas A&M University.

**SUBMISSIONS:** As a scholarly review journal, **SCN** publishes only commissioned reviews. A current style sheet, previous volumes' Tables of Contents, and other information all may be obtained via at [www.english.tamu.edu/scn/](http://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: [d-dickson@tamu.edu](mailto:d-dickson@tamu.edu)  
[scn.sites.tamu.edu](http://scn.sites.tamu.edu)  
and  
[oaktrust.library.tamu.edu/handle/1969.1/94990](http://oaktrust.library.tamu.edu/handle/1969.1/94990)

ISSN 0037-3028

# SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY NEWS

## EDITOR

DONALD R. DICKSON  
Texas A&M University

## ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Livia Stoenescu, Texas A&M University  
Michele Marrapodi, University of Palermo  
Patricia Garcia, University of Texas  
E. Joe Johnson, Clayton State University

## NEO-LATIN NEWS

PATRICK M. OWENS, EDITOR  
Hillsdale College

## WEBMASTER

Megan N. Pearson, University of Illinois

## CONTENTS

VOLUME 79, NOS. 3&4..... FALL-WINTER, 2021

### REVIEWS

- Erin A. McCarthy, *Doubtful Readers: Print, Poetry, and the Reading Public in Early Modern England*. Review by JOSHUA ECKHARDT ..... 93
- Patricia Fumerton, *The Broadside Ballad in Early Modern England: Moving Media, Tactical Publics*. Review by LAURA WILLIAMSON AMBROSE ..... 97
- Linda Phyllis Austern, *Both From the Ears & Mind: Thinking about Music in Early Modern England*. Review by ANNA LEWTON-BRAIN..... 103
- Robert Wilcher, *Keeping the Ancient Way: Aspects of the Life and Work of Henry Vaughan (1621–1695)*. Review by DONALD R. DICKSON ..... 108
- Feisal Mohamed, *Sovereignty: Seventeenth-Century England and the Making of the Modern Political Imaginary*. Review by ALEX GARGANIGO ..... 111
- George Oppitz-Trotman, *Stages of Loss: The English Comedians and their Reception*. Review by J. P. CONLAN ..... 116
- Ross Dealy, *Before Utopia: The Making of Thomas More's Mind*. Review by M. G. AUNE..... 123
- Erin Webster, *The Curious Eye: Optics and Imaginative Literature in Seventeenth-Century England*. Review by EILEEN REEVES ..... 127
- John C. Appleby, *Fur, Fashion and Transatlantic Trade during the Seventeenth Century: Chesapeake Bay Native Hunters, Colonial Rivalries, and London Merchants*. Review by JOSEPH P. WARD ..... 130
- Patrick J. McGrath, *Early Modern Asceticism: Literature, Religion, and Austerity in the English Renaissance*. Review by P.G. STANWOOD ..... 133
- Paula Hohfi Erichsen, *Artisans, Objects, and Everyday Life in Renaissance Italy. The Material Culture of the Middle Class*. Review by R. BURR LITCHFIELD ..... 137
- Alisha Rankin, *The Poison Trials: Wonder Drugs, Experiment, and the Battle for Authority in Renaissance Science*. Review by CELESTE CHAMBERLAND..... 139

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Esther Sahle, <i>Quakers in the British Atlantic World, c.1660-1800.</i><br>Review by JAMES WALTERS .....   | 144 |
| Roberto Romagnino, <i>Théorie(s) de l'ecphrasis:<br/>entre Antiquité et première modernité.</i><br>Review by KATHRINA A. LAPORTA .....                                | 147 |
| Kathrina Ann LaPorta, <i>Performative Polemic: Anti-Absolutist<br/>Pamphlets and their Readers in Late Seventeenth-Century France.</i><br>Review by IVY DYCKMAN ..... | 150 |
| NEO-LATIN NEWS.....   | 154 |

Erin A. McCarthy. *Doubtful Readers: Print, Poetry, and the Reading Public in Early Modern England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020. xviii + 277 pp. + 13 illus. \$85.00. Review by JOSHUA ECKHARDT, VIRGINIA COMMONWEALTH UNIVERSITY.

This is an important book. It surveys printed books of English poems from 1590 to 1660, arguing for the importance and influence of the stationers who compiled, published, and sold them. It nevertheless poses a challenge to “print studies” and to most any scholarship based solely on printed books. It poses this challenge, in very small part, by referring to its printed evidence with greater specificity than usual, citing not only editions and issues by STC or Wing number but also individual copies by library and shelf mark (except when using an EEBO copy). Likewise, and less distinctively, McCarthy provides library shelf marks for manuscripts. More to the point, she has found manuscripts to cite more or less throughout the volume, even though she has focused this study on print. In my view, this is what makes McCarthy’s book so challenging to print studies: it can help demonstrate how much we have yet to learn, even about stationers and printers, from surviving manuscripts.

Although she cites more than thirty manuscripts, McCarthy gives to one manuscript in particular the introduction to a broad audience that it has long deserved. McCarthy has begun assembling this audience not only by writing a monograph for a top university press, but also by devoting entire chapters to Shakespeare and Lanyer and engaging a wide range of other literary figures as well: Michael Drayton, Samuel Daniel, Thomas Coryate, Mary Fage, Anne Bradstreet, George Herbert, William Crashaw, John Milton, and others. Students of Shakespeare’s poems and women’s writing cannot afford to overlook this study. Some of the former will find challenging McCarthy’s reassessment of William Jaggard’s *The Passionate Pilgrim* as a success in the context of sonnet sequences. The latter will appreciate McCarthy’s consideration of Richard Bonian’s decision to publish so many dedicatory poems at the start of *Salve Deus Rex Judaeorum*.

The manuscript at the heart of McCarthy’s book is the O’Flahertie manuscript (Harvard MS Eng. 966.5). The O’Flahertie manuscript

needs no introduction to Donne scholars, especially those who have made good use of *The Variorum Edition of the Poetry of John Donne* and its website, *Digital Donne*, with its full-color facsimile edition of this important source. Donne experts have long known that this overly inclusive collection of “The Poems of D. I. Donne / not yet imprinted” was apparently compiled by or for an anonymous stationer by the date on the title page, “12 October 1632.” McCarthy points out that this date falls “exactly one month after Marriot entered his copy in the Stationers’ Register” (158). Over several years, *Variorum* textual editors have assembled the evidence to show that John Marriot must have acquired the O’Flahertie manuscript after his printers had started, but before they had finished, printing the first edition of *Poems, by J.D.* in 1633. In McCarthy’s words, “the manuscript was completed too late to be of much use in the production of the 1633 edition” (158). *Variorum* editors have also confirmed that the O’Flahertie manuscript gave Marriot the texts and the generic categories that he needed to produce an entirely new second edition of *Poems, by J.D.* (1635). The O’Flahertie manuscript deserves to be better known beyond the community of Donne experts, particularly for what it can reveal and suggest about the activity of stationers and compositors in general. McCarthy has designed her book perfectly to make the manuscript better known. She has used her opening chapters to call on Shakespeareans and scholars of women’s writing; and she has ranged widely, drawing on non-canonical authors and miscellanies in both print and manuscript. By doing so, she has claimed a relatively broad readership for a work of early modern scholarship. I encourage any readers attracted to the opening chapters to keep reading, even and especially if they think that a Donne manuscript does not really pertain to their interests. It does. And McCarthy explains why.

McCarthy represents the first edition of Donne’s poems, printed in 1633, as “a loosely organized collection resembling a manuscript miscellany.” She recognizes that the roughly contemporaneous O’Flahertie manuscript, on the other hand, “divided the poems by genre in order to highlight Donne’s religious poems” (148–49). Paradoxically, it is the printed book that mixes its content like a manuscript miscellany, and the manuscript that organizes genres as readers might later expect of a printed book. McCarthy shows that

the mixture of contents in the 1633 printed edition concerned a number of the poets who wrote elegies on Donne—particularly the mixture of religious and other verse. She demonstrates that most of the “elegists had some familiarity with Marriot’s planned edition, and they propose reading Donne’s [secular or non-religious] poems in three ways, as sins to be repented (what I will call the repentance model), as necessary if less worthy preparatory exercises for Donne’s later achievements (the preparation model), and as evidence of the underlying unity of Donne’s habits of mind (the continuity model)” (153). McCarthy returns to these interpretive or biographical models throughout the rest of the study, as she explores the profound influence that Marriot’s editions of Donne had on subsequent printed books of English poems.

Having acquired the O’Flahertie manuscript, Marriot adopted its generic categories for the second edition of *Poems, by J.D.* (1635). Crucially, however, “he rearranged them.” As a result, “the O’Flahertie manuscript and the 1635 printed edition suggest different frameworks for interpreting Donne and his work.” The manuscript foregrounds the “Diuine Poems” that, in that location, emphasize “the most recent and, arguably, publicly recognizable stage of Donne’s career” (161). The 1635 edition, by contrast, is “organized roughly along a trajectory from profane to sacred,” even though “no extant manuscript organizes the poems in quite this way” (167). “The 1635 edition of *Poems* thus anticipated Walton’s *Life* and inaugurated a new, if not entirely straightforward, biographical account of Donne’s transformation from young rake to sober Dean.” The now-familiar contours of Donne’s life find their origin, then, not so much in Walton’s *Life* (nor even in Donne’s life) as in Marriot’s efforts to take advantage of the O’Flahertie manuscript for an entirely novel second edition. With its generic sections progressing from profane to sacred, “the second edition also established authorial biography as a means of understanding Donne’s poems” and provided “a deeply influential model for future poetic publications” (179).

McCarthy shows the influence of this edition on readings of Donne’s verse and on understandings of his biography, as well as in a wide range of seventeenth-century printed poetry books. In order to consider its influence on readings of Donne’s poems, consider



the contrast between the start of his “Songs and Sonnets” in the O’Flahertie manuscript and the 1635 edition. In the manuscript, this generic section begins with four of Donne’s valedictions, numbered one through four, as if they constitute “a sequence” (175). Marriot, though, decided to start his 1635 grouping of *Songs and Sonets* with “The Flea.” “The modern status of ‘The Flea’ as a quintessential Donne poem—if not *the* quintessential Donne poem—can thus be traced back to the second edition” and, in particular, to Marriot’s interest in “both the underlying unity of Donne’s life and career and the very kinds of poems he arguably needed to repent” (173). Consistent with McCarthy’s argument about stationers and print publishers, Marriot is the agent here, changing course and going his own way, with the benefit of a fellow stationer’s work. What makes the argument especially impressive is that McCarthy is sufficiently well-informed about manuscripts to draw that anonymous stationer’s labor into a study that champions print publication, even though the stationer’s work on Donne remains in manuscript.

At least as wide ranging as the first, the final chapter traces the profound and lasting, yet limited, influence that the second edition of Donne’s poems had on subsequent printed books of English verse. The chapter ranges through printed books of poetry by Beedome, Suckling, Cartwright, Waller, Lord North, Bradstreet, Henry King, Herrick, Jonson, Vaughan, and others. McCarthy’s point in this chapter is generally to demonstrate the remarkable extent of the influence that the second edition of Donne’s poems soon had. Nevertheless, she also delimits its influence. For instance, she admits that the editor of Corbett’s *Poëtica Stromata* “felt no need to emulate the structure of Donne’s *Poems*” (198). Furthermore, George Herbert’s *The temple* offers an exclusively religious model for poetry that is quite distinct from that of *Poems, by J.D.* Nevertheless, McCarthy shows that, even as he marketed Abraham Cowley as “Herbert’s *second, but equall*,” Humphrey Moseley ended up separating Cowley’s secular and religious poems in terms that are reminiscent of Donne in the 1635 edition. In the final example before the conclusion, Moseley’s 1645 edition of the *Poems of Mr. John Milton* serves as another delimiting example, resembling certain predecessors “only superficially” and resisting “biographical organization” (214). Ideally, McCarthy’s book will demonstrate

to students and scholars of print that manuscripts relevant to their interests survive and continue to be made accessible to them by the labor of librarians and other scholars.

Patricia Fumerton. *The Broadside Ballad in Early Modern England: Moving Media, Tactical Publics*. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2020. x + 469 512 pp. + 83 illus. \$89.95. Review by LAURA WILLIAMSON AMBROSE, SAINT MARY'S COLLEGE (NOTRE DAME, IN).

With *The Broadside Ballad in Early Modern England*, Patricia Fumerton has produced the singular volume on the broadside ballad in the early modern period. Part ballad primer, part exhaustively-researched history of ballad media, collectors, and culture, part theoretically-informed analysis of individual ballads and their publics, *The Broadside Ballad in Early Modern England* stands as a cornerstone for scholars interested in print history and ephemera, music history, performance studies, popular culture, and more. In focusing on the heyday of broadside ballads (1600–1650 and 1670–90), Fumerton's book spans the seventeenth century. But it also gestures both backward and forward, treating earlier sixteenth-century examples alongside eighteenth- and nineteenth-century collecting practices as a way to contextualize the seventeenth-century cultural milieu, refining our own contemporary understandings of the broadside ballad as a genre, a material object, and, indeed, a maker of early modern “publics.”

The ballad, Fumerton reminds us, was far more than mere cheap print: it was at once a multisensory performance, a printed record, and an art form. In this study, Fumerton sets out to “approximate something of the lived aesthetics and mobile makings of early modern English broadside ballad culture” and does so through an attention to what she calls the “many moving parts” of the ballad sheet: text and tune, woodcut illustration and typographical form, seventeenth-century paper and twenty-first-century digital scan (19). Ballad producers and consumers engaged with these “mobile component blocks, both intentionally and fortuitously” much like “hits” in an online web search (15). The interactions among language, music, and illustration

within and between ballads provided a nearly limitless range of possibilities for meaning-making for early moderns—and a monumental task for a scholar dedicated to their study.

Standing at more than 400 pages, the sheer heft of *The Broadside Ballad in Early Modern England* speaks to its ambition and its innovation. Like the ballads themselves, the book works as a multimedia (and even multisensory) technology, with eighty-three figures and illustrations as well as references to forty-eight audio tracks accessible via an Audio Companion website, which is itself indebted to the online English Broadside Ballad Archive (EBBA) founded by Fumerton in 2003. These audio tracks offer more than a taste of the soundscape of seventeenth-century England. In her first focused examination of a single ballad, for example, Fumerton uses variations on tunes for two editions of “Mock-Beggar Hall” (1633–35, 1639–40) to animate an analysis of the ways in which poetic and musical metrical stresses might work differently (upbeat or downbeat? major or minor scale? sympathy with beggars or landowners?) and, therefore, afford ballad consumers multiple opportunities for meaning-making and interpretation. In combination with the visual dimensions of the ballad—woodcuts as well as the layout of text on the page—these interpretative questions are amplified rather than stabilized. Might the use of distinct woodcuts (from previous publications) be a tactical move for a printer to sell more broadsheets? Or, as Fumerton also asks, might they actually work in tandem with the printed text, providing surprising or even subversive readings of the lines to a would-be consumer or singer? Possibilities for affect and interpretation abound.

Possibilities for reading *The Broadside Ballad in Early Modern England* are similarly multitudinous. One might progress through the volume “in order,” mapping each theoretical turn Fumerton provides (from tactical hits, to making publics—differently sized, diachronic and synchronic), or one might simply hone in on an individual chapter, section, or case study with relative ease and comprehensibility. Extensive transitions, while not always fresh in their articulation or advancement of the overall argument, offer helpful summaries and linkages for the reader who puts the volume down for a period of time or elects to narrow in on an area of focus. Save the Introduction and the first chapter, which lays the theoretical groundwork for the

study, the volume is divided into four parts, each with two chapters. Part 1, “Assembling by Disassembling: Archives, Databases, and Ballad Bits,” offers an extensive analysis of the broadside ballad’s multimedia components as well as how they might be read, experienced, or accessed, both from an early modern standpoint and a contemporary one. The second part, “Remembering by Disremembering: Black Letter, Calligraphy, and Print History,” invites readers to consider ballad collecting practices, networks and individuals. One of the most famous of these collectors, Samuel Pepys, forms the focus of the third part, “From Networks to Publics: Samuel Pepys,” where Pepys’s own meaning-making tactics in the form of particular publics (gendered and political, interpersonal and public) are explored. Following that, Fumerton moves to the final section, “Diachronic and Synchronic Ballad Publics: Crossing Society, History, and Space,” which considers how ballads might work across time and space, including the space of the Shakespearean stage. Such a four-part structure might allow scholars of music history or popular print, for example, to drill down to Part 1, while those interested in Pepys might focus on Parts 2–3, leaving Shakespeareans and performance studies scholars to hone in on Part 4 and Fumerton’s original take on *A Winter’s Tale*.

What of the individual arguments posited by each chapter, though? Fumerton’s introduction contextualizes her study in light of useful work in textual materialism, historical phenomenology, and cognitive science. It also introduces one of the key theories of the book: Manuel DeLanda’s concept of “assemblage” wherein things—i.e., ballad parts—are “not innately related in a fixed or determined way” but instead relationally determined (12). Fumerton likens these movable pieces and their respective acts of meaning-making to “Lego-block play . . . [with] encountering and making sense of the bits and pieces of ballad media” (14), textual, visual, and oral.

Chapter 1 offers a more extensive critical history and overview of the various theories that animate this study. This theoretical matrix is mirrored by the book’s longer title: “Moving Media, Tactical Publics”. As Fumerton explains, the broadside ballad is “more than any cultural artifact of the early modern period . . . *moving*, in parts and in wholes”: from rearrangeable parts that can separate and be recombined, to the changing aesthetic of the form over time, to a good circulated and

sold across England, to fragments of an individual sheet reframed and positioned at the hands of collectors, and more (33). These moving media are then used—consumed, made, repurposed, or collected—in spontaneous and everyday ways as *tactics* to produce various publics “of varying size and character, who performatively redeploy such making processes to realize their own collective ambitions or desires” (50–51). The challenge that such theoretical signposts (and pathways) present is one Fumerton faces throughout the study: how to access a shared broadside ballad experience which is itself impossibly multiple, indeterminate, always moving, and contradictory.

In Chapter 2, Fumerton presents the challenge of this fragmentation as a kind of opportunity. Current digital humanities resources and computational methodologies, she suggests, approximate something of seventeenth-century broadside ballad experience. Our own scholarly engagements with large databases such as EEBO (Early English Books Online), ECCO (Eighteenth Century Collections Online), and even EBBA, involve partial access through limited facsimile versions and digital scans, discontinuous reading practices, and online searches with incomplete and fragmentary “hits,” much like early moderns and their experiences of assembling and disassembling, partial views and piecemeal repurposing of tune, woodcut, or textual snippet. The “ballad in parts” approach forms the remainder of the chapter, where two versions of a single late 1630s ballad, the aforementioned “Mock-Beggar Hall,” forms the first extensive and multimodal analysis of a broadside ballad and the nearly endless array of “meaning-making relational bits and pieces, like individual notes” (96) that it provides.

Chapter 3 steps back to consider the broader cultural context for the early modern ballad and does so through opening up of possible associations with individual ballads. “Mock-Beggar Hall” becomes less of a singular example of a ballad and, instead, isolated to one of its parts: the woodcut image. Tracing the “hits” of this woodcut in previous ballads or in the hands of different printers leads to an undulating analysis of possible additional tunes and associative ballad text, which themselves lead to a set of anti-feminist (or feminist) debate tracts. Readers searching for a singular argument here will be left unsatisfied. Indeed, Fumerton is clear about her ambition in offering an analytic array rather than a vector: she seeks to “open up

the possibility of making a more whole (if never singular) vision of the past that actually captures something of the early modern experience of broadside ballads” (139). Possibilities unfold in a kind of dizzying spiral.

The “rhizomatic” pathways of individual ballads also give shape to the networked dynamic of ballad collectors themselves, which form the subject of Chapters 4 and 5. Seventeenth-century collectors such as John Selden, George Thomason, Elias Ashmole, Anthony Wood, and Samuel Pepys, were not simply antiquarians: they were part of a network of production and dissemination. These relationships help to foreground a shared commitment to the visual dimension of broadside ballads and to blackletter typography and woodcuts in particular. Where later eighteenth-century collecting practices, priorities, and even mythologies prioritized the notion of a unified “whole”—even cutting pieces from other ballads to produce a kind of Frankenstein-esque unit—these seventeenth-century collections and collectors highlight the tactical, on-the-fly approaches that characterized much of early modern broadside ballad culture where ballads might be gathered, valued, and preserved for any number of different purposes. Chapter 5 offers a fascinating deep-dive into one visually-driven assemblage, none other than Samuel Pepys’s, “My Calligraphical Collection.” Fumerton’s rich treatment of this chronicle of handwriting contributes in important ways to work on typography and print history, suggesting that black letter signified more than “common” folk or nostalgia but rather an awareness of what she calls the “passing present” where print began to replace handwriting (185). Notably, Pepys used a ballad, awash with visual appeal in its woodcut image and black letter print, as the frontispiece to his conclusion of the calligraphical collection, highlighting the connection between handwriting and typeface as visual art forms and vestiges of a lived history. Pepys’s diary forms the focus of the following two chapters in the book, which serve as a kind of case study for how ballads were used in everyday ways to formulate opinions and tactical positions with regard to gender and politics.

Chapter 8 pivots in a new direction: rather than tracing a single broadside ballad or ballad “Lego block” in a particular moment (i.e., “Mock-Beggar Hall”) or a particular ballad collector (i.e., Pepys),

this chapter tracks a single ballad, “The Lady and the Blackamoor” across multiple editions and time periods (269). The chapter’s crucial recontextualization of a late-eighteenth-century “news” story on “African Humanity” as a retelling of the mid-sixteenth century ballad, “The Lady and the Blackamoor,” reminds us of both the long lifeline of broadside ballads and the importance of pan-historical research. Much like Fumerton’s analysis of “Mock-Beggar Hall,” this detailed treatment of the textual, musical, and visual dimensions of the “The Lady and the Blackamoor” highlights the ways in which both individual words (i.e., “blackamoor”) and notions of violence carry different meanings and resonances depending on emphasis (282). Where the analysis stands less convincing, though, is in the suggestion that representations of or engagements with racialized blackness were largely the stuff of later historical periods. Such omissions also afford opportunities, as the solid methodological and historical foundation that Fumerton provides here might open up additional future work and arguments for scholars invested in historical race studies, transatlantic studies and more.

It is in the concluding chapter where *The Broadside Ballad in Early Modern England* makes one of its most compelling claims: that broadside ballads “create a multimedia cross class and fully experiential moment more extensively and intensively than . . . drama” (320). As evidence for this claim, Fumerton turns to William Shakespeare’s *A Winter’s Tale* and to the many ways the play invokes ballads, either directly or indirectly through references to black letter and woodcuts, tunes and jigs, or through the character of Autolycus, who disguises himself as a balladmonger. The broadside ballad, she suggests, with its performative, multimedia nature is a natural fit for one of Shakespeare’s most experimental works (326). While the generic experiment itself might have been a failure, as many scholars have noted, Fumerton’s fresh take on the embeddedness of broadside ballads is not. Broadside ballads—their music, words, woodcuts, economics, collectors, and performance—resonated or, rather, registered “hits” across all facets, strata, and art forms of early modern English culture.

This keenly interdisciplinary study offers immense value, not simply for its expansive investigation into a key understudied genre, art form, and experience of the early modern period but also for its

ability to balance tightly woven theoretical frameworks with a refreshing spirit of curiosity akin to the very “felt liveliness” the book seeks to explore (11). Invitations to “join [her] in not in wrapping up an argument but in opening one up” ensure the lasting impact of *The Broadside Ballad in Early Modern England* (98).

Linda Phyllis Austern. *Both From the Ears & Mind: Thinking about Music in Early Modern England*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2020. vi + 380 pp. + 5 color plates, 25 halftones, 19 line drawings. \$55.00. Review by ANNA LEWTON-BRAIN, MCGILL UNIVERSITY AND DAWSON COLLEGE.

Linda Phyllis Austern’s latest contribution to early modern studies is wide-ranging, extremely learned, and illuminating to those interested in the history of ideas in general and the history of ideas about music in particular. Austern shows how music permeated nearly every aspect of early modern English culture and intellectual life: from academic debates in the elite colleges, to medical treatises touching on the mechanics of the ear and sensory perception, to magic, alchemy, astrology, architecture, arithmetic, emblematics, moral philosophy, theology, poetics, travel, and even zoology. Music and musical ideas provided a framework by which to understand the world. Music’s liminal characteristics, of inhabiting “spaces between literal and metaphorical, mental and physical, and manifest and mysterious categories” (2), made it particularly useful for thinking through various salient questions from the period such as the relationship between visible and invisible truths. Thus, Austern argues that music “stood at the centre, not the periphery of the early modern English intellectual enterprise” (2).

In “Chapter One: Praise, Blame, and Persuasion” Austern lays out the relationship between speculative and practical music in the period, showing how the “ancient liberal-arts tradition of [speculative] music [was] an intellectual preparative to performance and aural judgement” (10). Thus, as a preparative to her discussion, Austern begins where Renaissance thinkers began, not by examining any particular musical works, but by thinking philosophically about music in general.



Her sources in this chapter include treatises such as the anonymous 1586 treatise *The Praise of Musicke*, “the lengthiest and perhaps most ardent defense of music of the Tudor dynasty” (17), as well as common places about poetry and music. Austern surveys the “ancient encomiastic tradition in which speakers (or writers) first emphasized the importance of music as a subject for the listener’s (or reader’s) attention and then praised its essence, significance, and effects” (10), showing how numerous early modern thinkers turned to classical authorities to argue for the value of music. She provides a corrective to the “the long-standing assumption” of a “coordinated ‘anti-music movement’” in the period (15). In the tradition of intellectual debate surrounding music, as Austern puts it, “it was always somebody else who had no use for music” and, “since the Judeo-Christian tradition emphasized the divine origins of the art, proper practice brought one closer to all things heavenly, which none dared deny” (15).

Although the right sort of music was undeniably of value, the specifics of what that actually sounded like varied depending on religious denomination or the particular moment in history. “Chapter 2: Debating Godly Music” covers the theological debates surrounding the uses and powers of music that shaped and reflected the variations in liturgical musical styles in the Renaissance from polyphony to monody. The primacy of text over music was particularly important for musical reformers such as John Marbeck (c. 1510–c. 1585), whose plainsong setting of the Anglican liturgy is still in use today, but Austern points out that commercial compendia of general knowledge such as Robert Allott’s *Wits Theatre of the Little World* (1559) also included such aphorisms as, “measure & singing were brought in for words sake, and not words for musick” (Allott, fol. 96v; Austern 45). Whether simple monodic psalmody or ornate polyphony was in mode, thinkers looked to common biblical and classical sources to justify their uses of liturgical music and to explain its powers. The most famous Christian examples of the powers of music come from the Old Testament story (2 Sam. 23:1) of David’s musical talents as “the sweet singer of Israel” and from St Augustine’s discussion of music’s affective powers in his *Confessions*, book 9, chapter 6 (42). Austern reminds us that these Christian authorities were supported by “Ancient philosophers such as Aristotle and the early Neoplatonists

[who] had emphasized music's power over the soul and the art's importance to the moral life" (43). Music was thought to penetrate the ears and proceed directly to the heart and soul of auditors and thereby affect their very being. Music in liturgy was often described as evoking an ecstatic experience in an auditor, "dividing as it were his soule from his body, and lifting up his cogitations above himself" (*The Praise of Musicke* 152; Austern 42). Thus music was both physical and metaphysical; through the delights of the ear the soul itself was moved. As Austern expresses it, "within early modern English culture, music had the distinction of providing a pathway to ecstasy through a paradoxically wordly pleasure" (75). The chapter ends with a wonderful reading of Thomas Thomkins's madrigal, "Musicke Devine" from *Songs of 3.4.5 and 6. Parts* (1622), which Austern shows is itself a contribution to the *laudes musicae* tradition, and is a sort of encomium that allows for "the auditory equivalent of Platonic ascent through earthly beauty" through its carefully married words and notes (85).

"Chapter 3: Harmony, Number and Proportion" discusses the theories that explained to early moderns the causes of music's affective powers, especially Pythagorean-Platonic ideas of harmony and proportion that were thought to govern the cosmos. Music was understood to have soul-ordering properties because the soul was governed by the same principles of harmony that music was based upon; indeed, "the most widely circulating discourses on [music] recognized its unparalleled capacities for affect as an extension of numerical proportion and hidden correspondence" (164). Austern reviews Pythagoreanism, and theories such as the "harmony of the spheres," as it appeared in various early modern English texts by authors ranging from William Shakespeare to Robert Fludd. The Boethian doctrine that *musica humana* (the music of the soul and body), *musica mundana* (the music of the spheres), and *musica instrumentalis* (practical sounded music) were all interpenetrating and resonant forms of order continued to inform early modern thinking well into the seventeenth century. Austern points out, the "harmony of the spheres remained viable as a metaphor within philosophical, literary and theological discourse even when its literal meaning became irrelevant or it had been adapted to modeling other, sometimes newer, physical systems" (114). Austern shows the importance of metaphor

and analogy as fundamental ways of thinking about the cosmos for Early Moderns (99). Moreover, Austern digs into the influences of Pythagoreanism and musical-harmonical thinking in early modern magic (142), stoichiology (142), Neoplatonism (132), Emblems (123), architecture (115), and poetry (122).

Both chapters three and four open with readings of the iconic scene in *Merchant of Venice* in which Lorenzo and Jessica, while sitting under a canopy of stars and listening to music, discuss its affective powers (5.1.54-88). But while it begins with further discussion of the music of the spheres, “Chapter Four: To Please the Ear and Satisfy the Mind,” moves on to discuss the role of the senses and cognition in musical affect. Austern shows how sound itself, the building block of music, “was ascribed physical and spiritual aspects” and that it “had direct influences on bodily structures and hidden dimensions” (172). Here she turns to sources such as Francis Bacon and Robert Burton to explain Renaissance theories of affect, showing how the heart and brain were directly affected by musical sounds.

In the final chapter, “Chapter Five: ‘Comfortable ... in Sickness and in Health’: Music to Temper Self and Surroundings,” Austern expands her discussion of music’s effects on the minds of auditors to the effects of music on the whole body and even to collective bodies of people. Music had “capacity to bridge the substantial and insubstantial” as it had both physical and psychological influence. Indeed, music’s therapeutic characteristics were much discussed in the period. Austern reviews the Galenic humoral theory that dominated medical understanding and shows how the sanguine personality was most often associated with music and musicians, but also how the cult of melancholia that blossomed at the end of the sixteenth century had strong associations with particular forms of music such as the lament genre. Austern’s sources in this chapter are extensive, including musical and medical treatises ranging from an instructional manual for the lute compiled by Mary Burwell (b. 1654) to Robert Burton’s seminal *Anatomy of Melancholy* (1621). The chapter concludes with a discussion of the agency of musicians and composers and argues that for those skilled in music it must have “enabled continuous self-fashioning” (265–66).

Austern's book is filled with knowledge distilled and clarified. She has digested and made comprehensible many of the most important ideas from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, from humoral theory to cosmology, and shown how music is at the heart of them. As Henry Cornelius Agrippa von Nettesheim explains in James Sanford's English translation of his *De incertitudine & vanitate scientiarum et artium*, "Because *Musicke* dothe comprehend al disciplines . . . *Musicke* cannot be entreated without all disciplines" (fol. 27v; Austern 13). Austern has indeed "entreated . . . all disciplines" and shown the breadth and depth of her knowledge of early modern English culture and its music.

The book, she tells us in the "Acknowledgements," was first conceived as a "collection of edited texts" appertaining to music (269). What she has produced instead is so much more than that, and yet, the book can also function as a rich compilation of primary sources. Austern has generously quoted at length from many of the important historical texts relating to music, and when she does musical analysis of pieces, she helpfully includes transcriptions of the complete scores. Likewise she includes images of the emblems she discusses, and the passages of poetry she quotes are comprehensive, allowing the reader to follow her argument fully and engage independently with the primary sources she presents. The "Selected Bibliography" (331–72) is organized into "Before 1700" (further categorized by "Manuscripts" and "Printed Materials") and "After 1700" and is itself a valuable resource for scholars interested in music in early modern England. The book is also fully indexed and available in e-book format, published to Chicago Scholarship Online in January 2021. The e-version includes chapter abstracts and key words and is fully searchable, adding to the value and utility of this book as an important new resource in early modern studies.

Robert Wilcher. *Keeping the Ancient Way: Aspects of the Life and Work of Henry Vaughan (1621–1695)*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2021. xiv+366 pp. £90.00. Review by DONALD R. DICKSON, TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY.

*Keeping the Ancient Way* is the first book-length study of Henry Vaughan in nearly two decades and will take its place among the finest studies of the poet, such as Jonathan Post's *Henry Vaughan: The Unfolding Vision* (1982) and Philp West's *Henry Vaughan's Silex Scintillans: Scripture Uses* (2001). Robert Wilcher is well-known among Vaughan scholars internationally for his many contributions to Vaughan studies, especially on Henry and occasionally on Thomas, beginning with his doctoral dissertation and continuing into his retirement from the University of Birmingham. He has now synthesized these individual studies into a comprehensive account of Henry's life and works. As he explains, "I was struck by the preponderance of items intent upon placing his work in various historical contexts that had prompted or could be illuminated by it: biographical, literary, religious, political. It soon became apparent that the book I now had in mind would need to balance this approach with a more adequate treatment of the aesthetic dimension of Vaughan's poetry" (327). The result of Wilcher's stock-taking is the most comprehensive account yet of Henry life and work, *Keeping the Ancient Way*.

The first half of *Keeping the Ancient Way* places both Vaughan twins within their biographical and historical contexts. Wilcher summarizes what is known about their family, their education, and their corner of Wales before and during the Civil War, but what makes this familiar story quite rich is the interweaving of personal moments from their poetry and prose—especially that of Thomas who is comparatively unknown to most students of Henry's verse. Thus all the information on the Vaughans gleaned by Gwenllian Morgan and Louise Imogen Guiney that was passed on to F. E. Hutchinson is here but supplemented with the work of Roland Mathias, Donald Dickson, and others and then illuminated by the words of the twins. Within this larger frame Wilcher places both of Henry's early collections: *Poems, with the tenth Satyre of Iuvenal Englished* (1646) with its London poem "A Rhapsodie" celebrating literary gatherings in the Globe tavern that

contains hints of his association with the William Cartwright circle in London; and *Olor Iscanus* (1647, published 1651) which celebrates his native Wales, while also offering translations of Ovid's poems lamenting his exile from Rome as well as translations from Boethius's *Consolation of Philosophy* that witness his psychological adjustment to the Royalist defeat. Wilcher also has a full discussion of Vaughan's royalist allegiance in the Civil War and his war-time poems.

Perhaps the most interesting chapter in the first half of *Keeping the Ancient Way* is the second one devoted to what Stevie Davies aptly called "the crucible of twinship." Again, Wilcher summarizes the known biographical data of their education together under the tuition of Mathew Herbert at Llangattock and then at Jesus College, their service together in Sir Herbert Price's regiment, and their domestic lives (though the evidence of their marriages is unfortunately scanty). Less well known is the evidence that the brothers remained involved in each other's literary lives despite the physical distance between Breconshire and London where Thomas lived. Henry had copies of Thomas's books in 1673 when he wrote to his kinsman John Aubrey, who was collecting biographical data for Anthony Wood's *Athenæ Oxonienses*, and he published some of Thomas's poetry in *Thalia Rediviva* (1678). More importantly, the record shows that Thomas served as his brother's agent in London during the 1650s. Wilcher's knowledge of their work is exhaustive, and he examines "twinship" in a profound way, showing how central ideas in Thomas's philosophy of Nature—the vitalist conception of the world, the belief in the restoration or resurrection of the creatures, and the possibility of ascent from the physical to the spiritual world—are also common in Henry's thought though with significant differences (63). The animating breath of Nature for the Hermetical philosopher may be God's, but the "devotional poet experiences himself as an integral part of a greater harmony to which all of Nature contributes—his soul 'breakes, and buds' into 'flowres, / And shoots of glory' like plants rooted in the earth and the blood courses through his body with the same life-sustaining energy as the 'Hymning Circulations' of the quick and waking world of birds and beasts" (64). Wilcher's account of their work in the context of the times contains a wealth of such analysis. Chapters on Vaughan and the Interregnum and Vaughan and the Church place certain of his

poems in their proper perspective and remind us how his loyalty to the outlawed Church of England during the Interregnum affected his life and work. He offers a political reading of part of *Silex Scintillans* that illuminate many of the poems; he also places the prose works in this same context. Again, the comprehensive view of how the parts fit into a seamless whole is perhaps of even greater value than the discussions of individual poems.

In the second half of *Keeping the Ancient Way*, Wilcher explores the literary practices of Henry Vaughan as a poet and his relationship with other poets of his age—some of whom he may have known at Oxford or in London of the early 1640s—and especially with George Herbert. The sixth chapter is an interesting defense of Vaughan's "maggie" habit of borrowing from others. He had been accused of outright plagiarism in the case of his use of Owen Felltham's *Resolves*, but Wilcher shows how the borrowings of this bookish poet from Thomas Randolph, William Habington, John Donne, and even John Milton are characteristic of seventeenth-century modes of "imitation" and homage. His chapter on Vaughan's indebtedness to Herbert is one of Wilcher's special interests for it is the indebtedness that Vaughan himself acknowledged and has drawn the most frequent scholarly attention. After surveying the scholarship on this topic, he studies Vaughan's "Misery" with its clear indebtedness to Herbert's "Miserie" to show that "a great part of its subtlety lies in the complex tissue of allusions by means of which it draws both inspiration and authority from the work of a great poet whose name, by the end of the 1640s, had become associated among members of one substantial community of Herbert's readers with the cause of an outlawed church and the king who had died for it" (120). In short, Vaughan creatively imitates Herbert's poem rather than simply copies it. His chapter on Vaughan and the Scriptures is equally authoritative, mixing the wisdom of the critical tradition with his own insights.

While each of the chapters is self-contained and situates the subject within both past and current critical debates, the book's strength is its focus on biography and intellectual and political history in the first part and poetic craftsmanship in the second. This context provides the framework for critical readings that will be of interest to specialists in the literature and history of the Civil War and Interregnum and

will be invaluable to students of Henry and Thomas Vaughan alike. *Keeping the Ancient Way* is a great achievement.

Feisal Mohamed. *Sovereignty: Seventeenth-Century England and the Making of the Modern Political Imaginary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020. x + 220 pp. \$77.00. Review by ALEX GARGANIGO, AUSTIN COLLEGE.

Feisal Mohamed's *Sovereignty: Seventeenth-Century England and the Making of the Modern Political Imaginary* makes an ambitious intervention into studies of both literature and political thought, bringing into productive conversation literature and theory; literature and law; the early modern and the modern; and Hobbes, Milton, and Marvell on the one hand and Tacitus and Carl Schmitt on the other. While it builds upon and transcends studies of early modern British republicanism and political theology, his study is best seen as an expansion of the latter and thus as an extended argument *with* Schmitt and *for* his continuing usefulness to us—purged, of course, of his Nazi associations and other mistakes. As Mohamed shows, Schmitt has become known principally for three adages: “sovereign is he who decides on the state of exception”; “all significant concepts of the modern theory of the state are secularized theological concepts”; “the specific political distinction to which political actions and motives can be reduced is that between friend and enemy.” Unfortunately, these “potent ideas” have sometimes “deteriorated into slogans” (192), some literary theorists using Schmitt and political theology to discuss *any* connection between the political and the religious, however slight, and to read *any* moment of exception or ambiguity in a literary text as an opportunity for someone, sovereign or not, to construct reality performatively by deciding the exception arbitrarily in the absence of norms.

Mohamed makes the case that Schmitt remains useful because his thinking was more subtle than some vulgar political theologians have made out in recent years and that the even greater subtlety of Tacitism and reason-of-state discourse played a much larger role in early modern political thought than we have supposed, anticipating and correcting Schmitt (14). Among the book's many insights, for



example, is that both Schmitt and his Tacitist forebears thought about pluralism (political and religious) and decided that the state should at times act anti-democratically, even dictatorially to protect it (177). In the case of what Yascha Mounk has recently called “democracy without rights,” a situation in which the majority of citizens in a democracy enacts laws to persecute a minority, depriving it of rights (Mounk, *The People Vs. Democracy* [Cambridge, Massachusetts, and London: Harvard University Press, 2018], 6, 29–52), Schmitt would presumably authorize the state to ignore the will of the unenlightened majority and exercise extra-constitutional force to protect minority rights, not because of some vague set of legal norms but for pragmatic reasons: society as a whole will simply be better off after this exceptional, temporary suspension of democracy and the rule of law.

The Introduction to *Sovereignty* notes Schmitt’s similarities to Renaissance Tacitists and *ragion di stato* theorists like Giovanni Botero and introduces Mohamed’s sixfold taxonomy of sovereignties: 1) unitary sovereignty, 2) divided sovereignty, and 3) limited sovereignty—each of which comes in two varieties (red and black). Following a line of political thinkers who have repurposed Giuseppe Toffanin’s distinction in *Machiavelli e il Tacitismo* (1921) between Tacitus’s monarchist followers over the centuries (black Tacitists) and his republican followers (red Tacitists), Mohamed essentially defines *red* as liberal and reformist and *black* as conservative and reactionary (4–5). Hobbes, Schmitt, and Marvell are black unitary sovereigntists; Milton a red unitary sovereigntist; Lord Saye and Sele a black divided sovereigntist; and James Harrington a red divided sovereigntist (5, 7, 11, 38). Although Mohamed doesn’t quite say this, many royalist romance writers in the 1650s may have been black divided sovereigntists or black limited sovereigntists, but they were mostly confused on the issue, even though their work clearly engages in political intellection and champions the cause of a virtuous aristocracy. I was eager to hear more about foundational terms like *power*, *sovereignty*, *potestas*, and *auctoritas* and about the precise differences among the three kinds of sovereignty.

Each of the subsequent chapters ends with an excursus on Schmitt but focuses on seventeenth-century British texts (our quarry here). Chapter 1, “The Crown as Machine: Hobbes and Saye,” argues that

Hobbes did not set out to create political science as a *discipline*, but rather to tout his ideas by using the *rhetoric* of politics as science. Both Hobbes and William Fiennes, Lord Saye and Sele, sharpened their ideas in opposition to what Mohamed calls the mechanization of the state, in which “sovereignty is depersonalized,” made mechanical, and “experienced through mediating bureaucracies” (11), especially law courts such as the Court of Wards and Liveries; corporations such as the Providence Island Company; and the legal doctrine of the Crown as *corporation sole*. Relying on a “language of contract,” Hobbes “seeks most of all . . . to translate into a modern political language the kind of direct personal authority of the monarch that he associates with feudalism,” “finding a way to adapt the feudal rights so visible in wardship to an economy where property and debt were increasingly attached to movable capital” (24, 28). Hobbes “also summons the language of ‘interest’ that had become broadly current in *raison d’etat* literature and defines it in ways that run counter to a Polybian argument for divided sovereignty” (25). His “political writings” are “deeply informed by *raison d’etat* in content and spirit,” and his signal achievement is “to take a potentially subversive category, interest, and to make the pursuit of gain inherent to motives of the individual, who then transfers this quality to the sovereign” (32–3). The irony is that “Hobbes mechanizes political obligation in a way that against its own will displaces the sovereign’s personalist authority,” “prefigur[ing] the liberal democratic state” (39).

Chapter 2, “Provincializing Romance,” argues that in the 1650s the genre of romance became “provincial” in England in the sense of focusing not on larger religious, national, or civilizational issues but on the smaller, provincial one of “an elite whose power is in crisis” (61). Romances such as Sir Percy Herbert’s *Cloria and Narcissus* (1653) and the anonymous *Theophania* (1655) sought to “consolidate group identity” by depicting “a powerful nobility as a stabilizing bulwark against an autocratic monarch and unruly commoners” (62). The context was subjects “seeking to assert political personhood in the face of a hostile sovereign power”—whether Charles I for the Five Knights in 1628 or the Commonwealth government for royalist aristocrats in the 1650s. Beginning his exploration of this context by looking at remarks by the jurists John Selden and Sir Edward Coke in the House

of Lords' 1628 Conference on the Liberties of the Subject (prompted by the Five Knights' Case), Mohamed shows that royalist romance not only protested the absence of king and kingship in the 1650s but also used Tacitist reason-of-state thinking learned from John Barclay and others to acknowledge some of the faults of the dead king and dead monarchy and to think about the aristocracy as the center of the nation, an "independent aristocracy" providing "a counterweight to tyrannous or inept monarchs" (12). Although this might sound like Mohamed's category of divided sovereignty (black or red), the thinking these romances display is never rigorous or coherent enough to warrant the label. Aristocrats simply needed to preserve themselves in the dark present; and writing and disseminating romances to the likeminded was one way of doing so.

Chapters 3 and 4 push back against republican-centered interpretations of Milton and Marvell. Chapter 3, "Milton's Unitary Sovereignty," shows the limits of Milton's godly republicanism: not democracy by any stretch of the imagination but a godly republicanism of the fit and few. Mohamed leans heavily on *The Readie and Easie Way to Establish a Free Commonwealth* (1660), seeing it *not* as a temporary, rhetorical gesture designed to convince Britons to prevent the imminent return of monarchy by any means at their disposal, leaving the exact details of a republican constitution for later discussion, *but* as a considered expression of Milton's long-held core political principles. In making the case for Milton as red unitary sovereigntist, Mohamed enlists *A Maske at Ludlow Castle* (1634) as an early example of Milton's defending unitary sovereignty, here Charles I's royal prerogative as represented by the court that was the Council of Wales and the Marches under John Egerton, first Earl of Bridgewater. Mohamed thus joins Gordon Campbell, Thomas Corns, Nicholas McDowell, and others in reconsidering Barbara Lewalski's and others' previous portrait of the young Milton as political and religious radical. To argue that the Milton of the 1630s defended the royal prerogative (unlike the Milton of the 1640s and subsequent decades) is to deradicalize him. Milton's use of Tacitist reason of state in post-Regicide tracts like *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates*, *Eikonoklastes*, *The History of Britain*, and the two *Defences* helps Mohamed make the claim that in *The Readie and Easie Way* Milton not only defends a temporary curtailment of

parliamentary republicanism, with its relatively frequent elections and rotation of offices, but articulates an ideal constitutional arrangement: an aristocratic, theocratic republicanism consisting of rule by the godly few—certainly not the misguided multitude, with its capacity to be misled by kings and other demagogues.

Chapter 4, “Marvell’s Dread of the Sword,” dismisses any argument for Marvell as a lifelong republican. Instead of seeing the idea of “making destiny his choice” as the key to Marvell’s thinking throughout his various writings, as John Wallace once did, Mohamed posits a different key: *raison d’etat*. Marvell, he maintains, was a consistently reason-of-state thinker, unblinkingly aware that the sword is the foundation of all power and that in England the King had the sword. Focusing on Marvell’s late *Account of the Growth of Popery* (1677) rather than *The Rehearsal Transpros’d* (1672–73), Mohamed argues that the MP from Hull was no Polybian advocate of mixed sovereignty but rather a black unitary sovereigntist recommending that Parliament use its humble power to limit the King’s power when necessary. He convincingly argues that while Marvell was a client of Anthony Ashley Cooper, first Earl of Shaftesbury, he did not share the latter’s enthusiasm for an independent House of Lords as counterweight against the King. Instead, Marvell saw the Commons in that role. And underpinning much of Marvell’s earlier poetry in the 1640s and 1650s—such as the Villiers elegy, “The Picture of Little T.C. in a Prospect of Flowers,” and the Cromwell poems—is an essentially reason-of-state, Hobbesian view of politics as “a bully’s game” dominated by force rather than morality (13, 144–53).

The Epilogue, entitled “Uzzah and the Protection-Obedience Axiom,” neatly shows that even the most hardnosed Tacitist, reason-of-state, Hobbesian, or Schmittian *Realpolitik* acknowledges the costs of a sovereign power bringing order to chaos. Although the sovereign power offers its subjects an implicit contract—the exchange of protection for obedience—the sovereign sometimes doesn’t keep its end of the deal, not only failing to protect subjects, but even harming them itself. In Hobbes’s *Behemoth* (pub. 1681) the biblical story of Uzzah (2 Samuel 6), who prevented the Ark of the Covenant from falling to the ground but was struck dead by God for daring to touch it in the first place, becomes the metaphor for this problem, with Uzzah standing in for

the subject and God for the sovereign state. Mohamed concludes his wide-ranging book with the remark that both Hobbes and Schmitt “alert us to the core bargain of a politics attaching itself to the state, and to the nihilism lurking under modern political settlements. The ultimate message of these apostles of modern political thought is that we should, Uzzah-like, live enslaved or die trying” (193).

Finally, I would be remiss to neglect the humor sprinkled throughout the argument. For example, apropos the committee rooms in which Marvell spent so much time, Mohamed quips, “These are places where political life resembles a meeting of the associate vice provost’s subcommittee on revisions to section four of the campus strategic plan” (142). Enough said.

George Oppitz-Trotman. *Stages of Loss: The English Comedians and their Reception*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2020. 310 pp. 19 illustrations. \$62.00. Review by J. P. CONLAN, UNIVERSITY OF PUERTO RICO, RIO PIEDRAS CAMPUS.

*Stages of Loss* is a valuable, archivally based inquiry into the material conditions inflecting performance and the reception of the traveling English playing troupes in the German-speaking Holy Roman Empire in the late-sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The reader is struck from the “Note on Textual Conventions” describing the nature of the transcriptions as semi-diplomatic, the use of punctuation, the disclosures on how the author approached the variations between the Gregorian and Julian Calendars and the currency conversion table that, regardless of whether or not the findings are comprehensive or complete, *Stages of Loss* strives to be not just a contribution to the field but a book that a professor can teach from. This emphasis on methodological soundness especially manifests itself in a discussion of whether or not a citation to a now not-extant unique manuscript source ought be trusted. In this section, Oppitz-Trotman says probably, and unpacks his reasoning at considerable length, speaking to the conditions of receipt of the book and light-fingered acquisition by scholars that might precede cataloguing, before supporting the reception evidence in the lost manuscript witness with other, extant

documentable fact. This discussion illustrates that archival research is a process that, in the absence of existing sources, often must combine citation, presumption, and reasonable inference to arrive at enthymeme that may be advanced in scholarship even as it admits to and allows for the existence of reasonable doubt.

*Stages of Loss* must address such matters. The project strives towards documenting material conditions of the English comedians' performance and their contemporaneous reception in the Holy Roman Empire, now Germany, where centuries of warfare and the passage of time have destroyed much of whatever ephemeral documentation might have once existed. As Oppitz-Trotman points out in the prologue and the epilogue, relying on past scholarship offers false leads: past literary studies of the English comedians in the German-speaking have typically framed the reception of the English comedians as part of an nation-building origin-story that presupposes that later German playwrights, influenced by or pushing back against the example of the English comedians, wrote native drama that contributed to Germany's cultural self-consciousness; or, relying on the example of the English comedians, they established the first permanent professional theater in the region, receiving Shakespeare's works within the specific lens of the English comedians who toured the Holy Roman Empire in Shakespeare's time.

According to Oppitz-Trotman, the contemporaneous reception of the English comedians in the Holy Roman Empire was ambivalent: on the one hand, native German-speaking commentators respected the professionalism of their clowning; on the other, native German-speaking elites bemoaned the alleged debasement of German culture that arose from commoners' contact with their antics. The watershed moment in which reaction to and differentiation from the English comedians' example served the German nation-building project is, in Oppitz-Trotman's eyes, the banning of the professional clown from the stage in the eighteenth century.

A prologue and an epilogue frame the volume, in between which are five chapters entitled "Into the Air," "Out of Time," "Moving Cloth," "Moving Coin," and "Out of Laughter." The chapters are so well-researched, well-documented, and well-cited that it is easy on the first or second reading to miss that Oppitz-Trotman's argument

is best supported when it focuses on the material conditions of playing, and is theoretically less analytical, and, indeed, presumptively celebratory of English playing when discussing the initial reception of the English troupes in the 1590s, their influence on freeing up the rhythms of civic festivity in the cities in which they played, and the antagonism of native German theater critics toward the project of the English comedians during the conduct and in the aftermath of the Thirty Years' War.

Of the chapters with a materialist focus, "Moving cloth" is the most enlightening. It explores the much overlooked fact that the clothing purchased by the travelling troupes and worn by the actors in their performances constituted both in terms of price and cost of transport their greatest expense. Oppitz-Trotman documents that the cost of this clothing was cited in petitions for licenses to perform; moreover, when licenses were denied, the companies were often provided compensation for this loss. The material conditions of making such clothes—in particular, the multiple baths necessary to produce solemn blacks—give rise to questions as to whether the troupe's "moving cloth" to perform the roles of elite personages in them was thought of at the time as an effective means whereby quality clothes might be marketed abroad. Oppitz-Trotman documents anecdotally that this commercial purpose informed some English comedians' practice, and that several traveling English comedians served as agents of import of goods from England (183), including stockings and gloves and other goods. The illustrations supporting this chapter (152-53) are particularly useful in clarifying that the costumes worn by the English clowns looked like much like the "barbarous breeches" worn as Netherlandish slops. We can thus infer from such examples that the wearing of such clothes by the English clowns served the commercial purpose of putting traditional garb out of fashion and opening up a market for the newer style of silk hosiery.

The next of the chapters with a materialist focus, Chapter 4, "Moving coin," follows up on "Moving cloth," to the extent that it demonstrates that the travelling troupes were commercially successful abroad, in part, perhaps, because travelling away from accustomed sources of credit required them to exercise restraint in their expenses. A more nefarious source of income, however, is indicated by German

broadsides of 1620 and 1621 that indicted the English clowns for profiting at the expense of native German infighting: one source of their wealth, these broadsides implied, arose when the English clown Pickelhering left his clowning for the more lucrative profession of war profiteer. This profiteering, Oppitz-Trotman theorizes, was less likely the trafficking in barrels of spears and axes than the broadsides indict Pickelherring of carrying from place to place than the lending of money out at interest to factions of the religious wars with whom they came across. Oppitz-Trotman speculates from plaintive letters sent home to England that the sources of their capital were likely less coin that they carried with them than letters of credit from patrons that the traveling companies redeemed with moneylenders at fairs.

More celebratory than analytical is Chapter 2, "Out of Time," which argues that the English comedians played the part of "harbingers and catalysts" (114) to release German festive expression from the rigorously enforced rhythms of the Church calendar. Prior to 1593, Nuremberg city fathers had cited the Church calendar universally to deny licenses to performers who appeared there out of the festive season on the grounds of untimeliness. The argument and schedule of licenses provided on pages 86 to 89 is unquestionably useful and persuades this reader that English players played "out of time." However, Oppitz-Trotman gives in to celebratory enthusiasm when he credits the extraordinary granting of a week's license in 1593 to English comedians to perform in Nuremberg to the "unusual virtuosity" of the English company (102).

Oppitz-Trotman's implicit disavowal of political motives for these exceptional licenses does not seem warranted even by the evidence *Stages of Loss* provides. Among the German playwrights whose historical drama this second chapter demonstrates was influenced by the performance of the English comedians was Jakob Ayryer the Elder (d. 1605). Trotman-Oppitz documents that the introduction of the messenger JAHN who "enters dressed like the English fool" (94) in the *Siege of Alba*, the second part of Jakob Ayryer's cycle of Roman history plays, postdates his seeing Thomas Sackville's clowning performance. It is well known (but undocumented by Oppitz-Trotman) that, in the 1580s, Will Kemp carried letters to England for Sir Philip Sidney, under the command of the Earl of Leicester as Governor of the



United Provinces when Dudley had no access to official State department channels owing to Elizabeth's reluctance to wage outright war against Spain; it is equally well known that Will Kemp travelled to perform in Denmark during that same period. Ayer's characterization of the English fool as messenger may thereby reveal an open secret that the 1620 and 1621 broadsides reveal allegorically. The English comedians served the agenda of their masters in delivering messages, whether orally or as letters, and perhaps carrying letters of credit, that furthered England's diplomatic ends through informal, unofficial and plausibly deniable channels; in recompense, the City Fathers extended the English comedians a license to perform whenever they arrived.

Nor does it seem warranted to disavow that the performance of the English comedians released festive celebration from the watchful eye of the City Fathers. On the contrary, as Ayer represents it, the antics of the messenger when dressed like an English clown (as opposed to the English players who dressed in finery when they arrived) were to be rejected, not admired nor empathized with. What Oppitz-Trotman describes as "Nuremberg's [preexisting sixteenth-century] culture of pervasive surveillance and regulation" would be reinforced by a bifurcated reaction in the theater space to these antics, on the one hand, by groups of naïve knowers who empathetically laughed, and, on the other, by the censorious responses of the Nuremberg elite.

A cleaner interpretation of *The Tragedy of Doctor Faustus* in Chapter One, "Into the Air," might have helped Oppitz-Trotman reach this conclusion on his own. The chapter opens with a discussion of textual variation in lines 7-8 of the A-Text of the Prologue, that reads "Wertenburg" or "Witertenburg," identifiable in other English texts, according to Leah Marcus, as referencing the Duchy of Württemberg, a territory in the south of Germany where the University of Tübingen was situated. As thorough as Oppitz-Trotman is in documenting where the English comedians might have played this version, he neglects to note that, in the text of the pact, FAUSTUS identifies himself as "John Faustus of Wittenburg, Doctor." Like the mention of "Rhodes" as a city in Germany (rather than an island in the Levant lost to the Turks in 1521) the textual variation in the cities between the prologue and the pact would have clarified to the attentive German subject, familiar with the geography of the Holy Roman Empire, that the Prologue,

later identified as WAGNER, who was to receive FAUSTUS's goods (including his books), was a benchmark of imperfect understanding neither to be listened to nor trusted.

Similar audience differentiation would have occurred when witnessing FAUSTUS read out the “deed of gift” that Oppitz-Trotman erroneously claims is a “common law instrument which *immediately* (emphasis in the original) transfers title” (73). Individuals familiar with the *ius commune*, the *Lex Romana* redacted and Christianized under the supervision of Justinian that prevailed throughout the Holy Roman Empire, would have recognized the legal instrument that FAUSTUS writes in his own blood to be a last will and testament, which FAUSTUS fails to recognize as such because he stopped reading the *Institutes* at his first appearance. Such persons—had they spoken English—would also have noted that that FAUSTUS's bequest of the soul is not and cannot be final until his death, at which time would be subject to the five conditions precedent (called suspensive conditions in the civil law tradition), the fourth and fifth of which are contradictory; the second and third of which are not performed; and the first of which, impossible to perform, is evidence of Faustus's heresy. Further, those trained both in the *ius commune* and the English language would have known that the object to be received after twenty-four years of successful performance is phrased in the disjunctive as “full power to fetch or carry the said John Faustus, body and soul, flesh, blood **or** goods, into their habitation wheresoever.” Those who wrote such last wills and testaments in England certainly knew that the first clause of such instruments typically bequeathed the soul either to Jesus alone, in the case of Protestant adherents, or to Jesus, Mary and the communion of Saints, in the case of Roman Catholic adherents. Indeed, Reformation historians rely on this evidence to determine the extent to which Roman Catholicism survived after the Act of Supremacy.

The dynamic where the English comedians performed such plays whose full comprehension depended on specialized knowledge and yet whose sinful clowning antics moved laughter in the commoners seems consistent with rather than contradictory of the stodgy gravity and censorious agenda that Oppitz-Trotman deems informed the attitude of the Nuremberg city fathers toward civic festivity decades before and up until the English comedians received license to per-

form. And so, there is no reason to believe that mere virtuosity—to the exclusion of the opportunity the English comedians offered upon arrival for message delivery, extensions of credit and supervision and censorious correction of audience response—moved the City Fathers to grant them license to play out-of-season in the town.

Understanding the political purpose of English clowning to the City Fathers' role of correction perhaps also sheds more light on the antipathy of native German theater critics to the English-style clown in the aftermath of the Thirty Years' War. Chapter 5, "Out of Laughter," points out that, just at the time that the English comedians had persuaded the City Fathers to allow them to establish a permanent theater in the 1620s with the argument that their performances served as antidotes to the melancholy of the religious wars, native German playwrights rejected this offering as lacking the high seriousness expected of high art and advanced tragedy as a means of coming to terms with the residual national trauma of the Thirty Years War. Characterizing the contributions of the English comedians as both inappropriate and foreign in relation to the shared experiences that German subjects had passed through, the many prefaces that Oppitz-Trotman quotes from are exhaustive. Their proliferation of the same line of reasoning, however, raises the same sort of questions raised by Petrarch's many sonnets addressed to Laura, or the plethora of the anti-dramatic diatribes written in Shakespeare's time: to what extent did the project that these authors advanced in writing persuade the readers to whom they were addressed to embrace the authors' vision of a common future. Oppitz-Trotman does not address this question.

Insofar as the plays performed by the English, like *Doctor Faustus* or with irreverent clowns who misbehaved, included matter that divided rather than unified the aesthetic response to the play in the theater, it may be that it was not the clown as a comic figure so much as the clown as a means of creating class differentiation in the audience that caused these authors to privilege as a means of unifying a deeply divided Germany the common experience in sadness that a more simply written type of tragedy allows.

In sum, *Stages of Loss* is an admirable contribution to an understudied but important aspect of English theatrical performance in the Late Tudor and Stuart periods—the performance of English plays on

foreign soil—that, interdisciplinary, recognizes the limitations of past scholarship in its prologue and epilogues and advances the conversation on this subject, by way of the rehearsal of archival evidence, in very interesting ways. Oppitz-Trotman does not resolve every issue that he addresses to this reviewer's satisfaction. However, Oppitz-Trotman's recovery of evidence is so thorough and his discussion of the issues is so wide-ranging that *Stages of Loss* establishes itself as both a place of origin for the study of English troupes on the Continent and a guideline in methodology for a wide array of research questions that the next generation of archival scholars can address.

Ross Dealy. *Before Utopia: The Making of Thomas More's Mind*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2020, xii + 400 pp. \$120.00. Review by M. G. AUNE, CALIFORNIA UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

The conventional understanding of Thomas More's intellectual development holds that in the early years of the sixteenth century, prior to his meeting Erasmus, he was unsure of his vocation and his own sense of his faith. This unease was, in part, the result of feeling caught in a binary sense of faith: either/or; contemplative/active. But through his exposure to Erasmus' adaptation of Stoic thought, More became more unitary in his approach to Christianity. According to Ross Dealy, this shift can be traced through More's *Lucian* (1506), Erasmus' *Praise of Folly* (1511) and finally *Utopia* (1516). It is at this point in More's intellectual development that Dealy has located his most recent work of intellectual and philosophical history.

Ross Dealy, retired associate professor at St. John's University, has written several works on Christian thought of the early Renaissance. In his previous book, *The Stoic Origins of Erasmus' Philosophy of Christ* (2017), Dealy argued for a reassessment of Erasmus' theological writings, suggesting that he drew on a sophisticated knowledge of Stoic philosophy, in particular that of Cicero, in his interpretation of the life of Christ. For Dealy, Erasmus posited a novel understanding of intention—virtuous acts require a virtuous intention. And further, that Erasmus' sense of Stoicism is two-dimensional rather than a binary, either/or. His current book picks up where this study left off, continu-

ing to use Erasmus' writings as a way to understand the intersections of philosophy and theology at the turn of the fifteenth century. The life of Thomas More provides the focus and Dealy's book devotes substantial energy to biography as well as philosophy.

Dealy begins by setting out the problem and then moving into a review of current scholarship and its shortcomings. He carefully introduces, summarizes, critiques, and dismisses a range of scholarship on More, stoicism, and *Utopia*. He begins with rhetorical interpretations and how they conflict with Stoic understandings of the key terms *honestas/honestum* and *utilitas/utile*. The introduction then moves on to a kind of genealogy of the scholarship on *Utopia*, stoicism, and rhetoric since the 1970s. Dealy clarifies what he sees as the methodological and interpretive flaws in these studies, all while preparing the ground for his own interpretation.

Dealy's argument focuses on the relationship between Hythloday and "More" and its antecedents in More's sources, in particular Seneca's *De otio* and *De tranquillitate animi*. Dealy finds that Seneca's wiseman "cannot tolerate the state" and "there is absolutely no human state which could tolerate a wiseman" (33). At the same time, those who disavow the state are attacked and, finally, neither "More's" nor Hythloday's positions "represents virtue" (33). In a series of sections built on questions and answers, Dealy briefly explores the Stoic's writings upon which More drew in characterizing Hythloday and his narrative self. He then returns to More's biography and the relationship that developed in More's mind between Stoicism and Christianity. He reiterates that "More's mind was always polarized" and he saw Christianity in binary terms until his encounter with Erasmus' work on Christianity in 1504 (40). In fact, "after late 1504 Thomas More was never 'of two minds'" (42).

*Before Utopia* is then divided into eight sections and a conclusion, which present Dealy's evidence supporting his contention about More's two-dimensional thinking, how it shaped *Utopia*, and how scholars have neglected the importance of this relationship.

Part 1 begins with More's intellectual biography, arguing that More was always of two minds about his engagement with the world, the contemplative life of devotion versus the humanistic interaction with politics, education, and his own physical nature. More's writings of

this time (pre-1504) are examined carefully, in particular his letters to John Colet and his translations of Pico, as is the scholarship devoted to them. The section ends with a summary of the scholarly consensus that More “both chose the world and did not choose the world” (81).

Part 2 takes up “the possibility that [More’s] decision was not either/or but both/and . . .” (82). Dealy builds his argument starting with Erasmus’ *De taedio Iesu* and *Enchiridion*, holding that the works resist a binary understanding and in fact advocate just the sort of convergent point of view that More embodied.

A close reading of More’s Latin translations of Lucian (1506) is the focus of the third part. Dealy traces More’s understanding of the Stoic *honestum/utile* in these texts, along with his borrowings from Cicero. The part ends with a chapter that raises the question of the influence of the work on all aspects of *Utopia*.

Parts 4 and 5 turn to Erasmus and his depictions of More in *The Praise of Folly* (1511). Dealy argues that while Erasmus sees More’s mind as “a unitary whole” (149) he depicts More as “a man for all seasons” but also as a man able sharply to criticize people and their lives. This apparent contradiction prepares the ground for the argument for More’s inclusive character. This argument is bolstered by a reading of *Folly* that argues for a strongly biographic understanding of the work as based in More’s both/and outlook rather than a rhetorical one that focuses too heavily on its contradictions.

The next part engages fully with *Utopia*, and argues that the Utopian conception of pleasure has its beginnings in *Lucian* and again presents what appears to be a binary, this time the Stoic *honestum* and the Epicurian *voluptas*. For Dealy, More presents these ideas in a kind of symbiosis rather than opposition. To prove his point, Dealy works meticulously through the section of *Utopia* devoted to their philosophy. In so doing, he echoes More’s own careful interrogation of Stoic and Epicurian philosophies, which conclude with a nuanced understanding of pleasure. Where health is necessary for pleasure, it is also a kind of pleasure itself.

Warfare and the Utopians’ integrative approach to it are the subject of part 7. Dealy again starts his argument in opposition to conventional interpretations of the matter. While the majority of scholarship sees Utopians’ dislike of war but imperial intentions and preparation for

war as contradictory, Dealy finds their knowledge of war as intrinsic to their basic philosophy of governance. The section concludes with a brief and insightful contrast between Utopians' beliefs on war and those of Machiavelli, concluding that Utopians seek "not to profit from evil but to rectify it" (307).

The final part returns to the debate between "More" and Hythloday and find that while Hythloday is an effective interlocuter and foil, he never fully grasps the complexities of truth as presented in the text. Dealy again argues that More adapts a technique from *Praise of Folly*, having Hythloday present a reductive understanding of truth. Through his critique of this understanding, "More" then presents his own both/and conception of truth, which is ultimately closer to that of the Utopians. Dealy concludes with a summary anchored in More's biography. He clarifies his argument that Hythloday represents More's early, binary philosophical outlook while "More" represents his later, unitary understanding of philosophy and Christianity. The final paragraph provides a thoughtful coda and possibly a preview of Dealy's next project: More's intentions in joining Henry VIII's court and how he hoped to shape it.

*Before Utopia* complements Dealy's prior book very well. Not only does it extend his argument about the importance of a unitary Stoicism in early sixteenth thought (and the development of humanism), it also provides a persuasive rethinking of More's intellectual development and intentions in writing *Utopia*. It presents what seems in many ways a simple argument and in supporting it, takes the reader through equally careful readings of Erasmus, Seneca, and Cicero and assesses (often vigorously) a wealth of prior work. Though some will certainly challenge some of Dealy's interpretations, his argument is clear and will likely become required reading for intellectual historians of the early sixteenth century and the origins of humanism.

Erin Webster. *The Curious Eye: Optics and Imaginative Literature in Seventeenth-Century England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020. xii + 212 pp. + 9 figures. \$ 85.00. Review by EILEEN REEVES, PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

“Curiouser and curiouser,” cried Alice as she bade her feet farewell, “now I’m opening out like the largest telescope that ever was.” We might repurpose that memorable phrase, and even the strange simile that accompanies it, to describe Erin Webster’s study of the mutual engagement of natural philosophy and literature in early modern England. It is not just that the argument gains cumulative force as it moves from an opening emphasis on late sixteenth-century English poetry as a particular type of optical technology and on the Royal Society’s claim to have extracted from its members “a close, naked, natural way of speaking,” to a persuasive examination of embodied vision as it emerges in the anxious formulations of Robert Boyle and Abraham Cowley, and onstage in Aphra Behn’s *Emperor of the Moon*. Webster’s work also maintains in its six brisk chapters careful attention to the critical tradition associated with the texts under scrutiny and its own original and nuanced reconstruction of this odd cultural moment.

The central claim of *The Curious Eye* involves the deployment of metaphor and simile as means of variously isolating, magnifying, enhancing, stabilizing, or naturalizing particular and shared features in what might be otherwise unrelated entities. These rhetorical structures, whether masked by the indulgent or semi-apologetic “as it were” or “so to speak” in natural philosophy or boldly introduced with the accoutrements of alliteration and assonance and the familiar resources of the epic simile, act as lenses: they present to the reader likenesses normally too fleeting, too minute, too far, or too far-fetched to be grasped. As Webster shows, it is no accident that this selective rather than simply mimetic function of poetry, and its correlative agenda of idealization and distortion, emerged alongside crucial developments in optical instruments and in explanations of the eye itself. The instruments here, unsurprisingly, are the *camera obscura*, increasingly often equipped with a lens and deployed to observe eclipses and sunspots as well as to project nearby landscapes, the magnifying glass, valuable to curious naturalists and aging readers alike, and the telescope, its



deficiencies and relative rarity remedied, to a degree, by an avalanche of mediating texts, images, and performances. Such tools clearly called for active interpreters of the confusing data they provided, and just as these figures in their turn translated optical information into a persuasive idiom of similitudes, so anatomists and natural philosophers, following the lead of Johannes Kepler, increasingly favored the intromissionist theory of vision. In that model, a schematic image of the world without entered the eye, imprinting itself momentarily on the *tabula rasa* of the retina. Whether the aperture involved a living, sentient being, or a dead one, or the oval opening of a *camera obscura*, the resultant image, as Kepler realized, required the still shadowy intervention of “the tribunal of the soul.”

Thomas Hobbes, among others, suggested that these intromitted images had a shelf-life of sorts, that they were subject over time to decay, to compression, and to fantastical combinations. Rather than a forthright celebration of the revelatory function of imagination and imaginative literature, thinkers associated with the Royal Society emphasized their distance from conventional efforts to delight and to persuade readers; Robert Boyle’s comparison of the pernicious effect of such rhetorical displays to the distorting effect of the colored lenses adopted by those who trained telescopes on the sun makes the alarming absence of such filters the mark of the heroic observer. Webster notes that the experimentalists, their predecessor Francis Bacon, and their spokesman Thomas Sprat indulged frequently in figurative language themselves but claimed to favor the explicit and workmanlike similitude to the smooth or showy contours of the metaphor, as the latter appeared to acknowledge neither the mediated nature of vision itself, nor the subsequent distortion of linguistic description. Given the novel emphasis on the optical technology of language, the celebrant of the sober scientific style emerged from an authorized elite, one as well equipped with discernment as with proper instruments; within this context, as Webster shows, Robert Hooke presented the micrographic image of the louse in a manner at once literal and metaphorical, depicting the alien, slightly repugnant creature as that familiar target, the courtier. Such strategies are only multiplied and magnified, to use the obvious terms, in Margaret Cavendish’s *Blazing World*: this narrative functions as an engaged critique of the postures

of the experimentalists, foregrounding their narrative strategies and systematically exposing the useful fictions of a uniform scale and a stable perspective.

Webster attends carefully to the sociopolitical dimensions of the emergent “empire of knowledge,” showing their entanglement in the epistemological claims of discovery and invention. Here as before she presents Cavendish’s work as a critique of the experimentalists’ unwillingness to recognize the situated, mediated, and contingent aspects of their findings. On this reading, the arena most free from sociopolitical and epistemological pressure is not the domain of the established and well-equipped empiricist, but rather the author’s interior cognitive space, perhaps best captured by the noun “fancy,” with its gendered connotations of ornamentation, extravagance, and capriciousness. Webster also privileges Cavendish’s steady resistance to the notion that increased visual access to places, persons, and objects would somehow reveal their inner workings: there was neither a continuum between surface and soul, nor any particular guarantee of the legibility or communicability of mental activities of the sovereign self. Those several chasms between sensory experience, private sentiment, and public expression become all the more relevant when Webster moves from René Descartes’ conclusions concerning the eye’s dependence on the divine supplement of the “natural light of reason” to the spectacle of blindness and poetic insight on display in John Milton’s *Paradise Lost*. The epic’s narrator, like Galileo Galilei, the “Tuscan artist” whose accounts of telescopic phenomena appear suspended somewhere between sensory certitude and fantastic conjecture, emerges as a seer whose similitudes offer readers momentary flares of otherwise invisible truths.

A correlate of the providential view of Creation—the notion that natural phenomena made visible the work of the Creator and were therefore scaled to and destined for eventual human perception—eroded over the course of the seventeenth century. But in a compelling chapter devoted to perspective as a conceptual tool, Webster explains the close structural echoes of theological similitudes in presuppositions and operations of infinitesimal calculus as developed by Isaac Newton and Gottfried Leibniz. She goes on to connect the contentious emergence of the latter discipline with the painterly treatment

of celestial space in the cupolas of early modern churches, as well as with Milton's own dizzying shifts of perspective and conjuring of innumerability and limitlessness in Pandemonium. Less austere matters, but no less energy, attention, and originality characterize the final chapter of *The Curious Eye*: her persuasive reading of Behn's *Emperor of the Moon* presents the play not just as a critique of the soft target of the Virtuoso, but also as a careful reflection on the convenient fictions of the experimenter's innocent eye, his austere objectives, his neutral instrument, his disembodied self, and on the patriarchal system required to sustain such poses.

This study manages both crucial attention to detail and a carefully articulated historical arc, and Webster offers throughout generous and informative syntheses of others' critical arguments before going on to delineate her own and often more nuanced position. While the oversized contributions of the usual suspects from the Continent—Kepler, Galileo, Descartes, Pascal—punctuate the narrative, the focus is for the most part on the English ambit. The relevance of England's nascent empire to these natural philosophers is persuasively presented in the third chapter. But the curious reader wonders, especially as the notion of similitude as optical technology is elaborated, if aspects of Webster's argument apply more broadly to other European vernaculars, or if by contrast, something particular to that isolated Anglophone enclave encouraged such developments.

John C. Appleby. *Fur, Fashion and Transatlantic Trade during the Seventeenth Century: Chesapeake Bay Native Hunters, Colonial Rivalries, and London Merchants*. Woodbridge, Suffolk, 2021. x + 294 pp. + 2 illus. \$115. Review by JOSEPH P. WARD, UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY.

Fashion reflected status in early modern England. With the court at its heart, English culture during the sixteenth century fostered a competition for status that fueled conspicuous display among courtiers, with the ambitious deploying expensive, sometimes exotic, clothing as a badge of distinction. Although sumptuary laws half-heartedly restricted the use of certain materials into the early seventeenth century, such restrictions increased the appeal among the elite of rare fabrics

while they failed to prevent social climbers from emulating the styles of the elite. Fur was considered among the most desirable materials, and fur-trimmed attire appealed to men and women in the fashionable arena. For men, fur hats became a primary marker of status, and the resulting demand for pelts placed growing pressure on animal populations in Britain and the Continent, which in turn became one of the leading drivers of European exploration and colonization in North America during the seventeenth century.

John Appleby focuses his new book on the first century of English colonization in the Chesapeake Bay. Tobacco cultivation would eventually become the economic and social foundation for much of the mid-Atlantic, but Appleby reminds us that the development and control of new supplies of fur was, for several decades, an essential feature of colonial enterprise in the western Atlantic. The early years of English colonization in the Chesapeake were managed by the Virginia Company, which struggled both in its relations with indigenous peoples and in its efforts to secure a stable economic foundation for colonization. Upon the dissolution of the Company in 1624, individual traders began pushing the range of their activities further inland, which brought some into an alliance with the Susquehannock, whose trading networks extended from the northern reaches of the Bay to areas of the interior that had been inaccessible to the English.

A key development occurred during the 1630s, when a group of younger Virginia colonists with close ties to London merchants established a new joint stock company based on Kent Island, located near the eastern shore of the Bay. Building upon the extensive research of other scholars as well as his own archival work in English and colonial archives, Appleby reconstructs for his readers the emergence among these traders of an approach to the Chesapeake that tossed humanity aside for the sake of profit: "Confident of exploiting native divisions, such men were beginning to formulate a colonial strategy based on conflict with hostile neighbors and peaceful relations with less threatening distant groups" (92). Maryland was established through a colonial charter in 1632, and it soon asserted a claim over Kent Island, setting the stage for a prolonged period in which the English colonial efforts in the Chesapeake became noteworthy for their intense rivalries, dividing along religious as well as commercial lines.

Profound divisions in England during the 1640s and 1650s left colonial leaders largely on their own. Among the challenges they faced were increasing competition from Dutch and Swedish traders as well as the decline of the Susquehannock as reliable middlemen for English fur traders in the face of Iroquois aggression. These developments led English traders to seek new sources of pelts in the interior, which led to a new era of inter-ethnic commercial relations. While some English merchants successfully established trading partnerships with indigenous communities, Appleby notes that contemporaries were aware of the gradual decline of Indian communities in the face of colonial growth, which increasingly was based on the cultivation of tobacco: "An expanding plantation culture, boosted by the influx of a new wave of migrants, threatened the survival of native groups with a re-shaping of the land and its ecology" (147).

During the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, the fur trade came under the control of the Hudson Bay Company. The new company's royal charter in 1670 gave it authority over an extensive territory from which both Indian and English hunters harvested pelts. Its success in commanding the supply of pelts created challenges for the company because it led to the saturation of the domestic English market, which forced it to seek the re-exportation of both raw and finished furs and opened it up to fierce criticism. Ultimately the pursuit of short-term advantages in the market led the company to exploit the animal population in ways that undermined its long-term health.

Although most of Appleby's book focuses on the English efforts to organize the supply of pelts in North America, he reminds his reader that London manufacturers were crucial players in the marketplace for finished hats. At the outset of the book, he describes in considerable detail the many steps that were required to turn a raw pelt into the fur trimming of a hat. Each step in the process required great skill in order to preserve the expensive and delicate materials. As London became the hub of domestic manufacturing for the luxury trades as a result of its proximity to both the court and the merchants who traded in pelts, it attracted immigrants from the Continent who brought their expertise with them, sometimes to the aggravation of domestic craftsmen. As the seventeenth century progressed, members of the London Feltmakers' Company came to dominate the manufacturing

process, but differentiation within the company gave a small number of merchants disproportionate influence in the trade, which sparked significant resentment among the less well-capitalized producers and disrupted production during the 1690s.

Appleby has written a thoughtful, well-organized study of a complex trade network, shining probing light onto an important aspect of North Atlantic social and economic history. In his concluding chapter he invites his reader to reflect on how Thomas Tryon's *The Planter's Speech* (1684) "provided a voice for the complaints of mute animals against the oppression and violence they suffered at the hands of English colonists in North America" (241). Such an observation could seem a bit anachronistic, reflecting as it may our twenty-first-century concerns about the environment, but it is quite appropriate for the story that Appleby has told. From its outset in the early decades of the seventeenth century, the colonial English concern to send animal pelts to the metropolis reflected nothing more substantial than the whims of elite tastes in fashion, and yet it played a major role in the manipulation of the native societies and natural environments of Chesapeake Bay as the English had found them. From that point onwards, traders showed no regard for being stewards of the long-term health of the people and animals they fell upon, which had devastating consequences for both. Appleby is fully justified to conclude that "the self-destructive character of an enterprise exemplified by deep-seated tension between consumption and conservation lay unresolved" (252).

Patrick J. McGrath. *Early Modern Asceticism: Literature, Religion, and Austerity in the English Renaissance*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2020. 236 pp. + 1 illus. \$52.50. Review by P.G. STANWOOD, UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA.

This ambitious study opens with a statement of thesis, "that the tension between spiritual and physical asceticism became a major theme in the literature and religion of the [early modern] period" (8), thus causing authors the need to balance one side against the other. Patrick McGrath argues that asceticism does not disappear with the Reformation, "giving way to a modern world of increased

bodily liberation, or that the internalization of asceticism (à la Max Weber) removes its pre-Reformation monastic ethos and/or severity” (17). And further, “this book argues for a robust asceticism endemic to early modern culture, not one persisting in isolated parts or for ephemeral durations during it” (21). Each of the five succeeding chapters independently argues for this theme, and focuses selectively on Donne, Milton, Marvell, and Bunyan, each chapter standing alone. The concluding chapter very briefly recalls and names these chapters, but principally addresses one work by the hitherto unmentioned Anthony Horneck (1641–1697), who “stands at the end of the cultural moment of asceticism this book has examined” (153). A curious book, *The happy ascetick* (1681) stands as a kind of emblematic fulfillment of McGrath’s *Early Modern Asceticism*.

The first chapter reveals marks of “ascetic proclivity” in Donne’s three marriage sermons, his decision to remain unmarried after his wife Ann’s death in 1617, and his commendation of Tilman’s ordination which makes him “a blest Hermaphrodite.” The sermon preached at the marriage of Sir Francis Nethersole on Genesis 2:18 seems especially relevant in supporting McGrath’s argument. Donne comments on St. Paul’s “better to marry than to burn,” and says “To be overcome by our concupiscences, that is to burn, but to quench that fire by religious ways, that is a noble, that is a perfect work” (32–33, quoting Donne). Further evidence of ascetic proclivity may be seen in the sonnet “Since she whom I loved hath paid her last debt,” which Donne wrote in response to his wife’s death. The poem may be read as an exhortation to prayer—the better life—against the miseries of worldly life. McGrath reserves his most important “proof” of Donne’s asceticism for last, in an unusual reading of the verse epistle, “To Mr. Tilman after hee had taken Orders” (1619). He sees an important link between this poem and the earlier “The Canonization.” Mr. Tilman will become “a blest Hermaphrodite,” able to bring heaven and earth in a meeting together, even as the two lovers, by uniting the eagle and the dove, become phoenix like. And so “a connection between ‘bless’d hermaphodite’ and the phoenix proceeds from androgyny, gravidity, and the merging of dissimilarity over and above gender difference. Donne coordinates this connection precisely, so that Tilman’s hermaphroditism answers—in every way—the phoenix-like lover” (47–48). This imaginative

construction is fascinating, tendentious, and unconvincing.

The next two chapters turn to Milton, first his mask *Comus*, and then *Lycidas*. An extended discussion invokes or refers to numerous commentators, ancient and contemporary, in an effort to identify “the kind of asceticism *A Mask* advocates” (68). The connection with the Caroline court is then addressed, with a study of the little known Robert Crofts, whose court masque *The Lover* “combines Caroline Neoplatonism and asceticism while evincing several descriptive and mythographic parallels with *A Mask*” (69). McGrath reads closely, perhaps too literally, by finding connections between the actions of *A Mask* and Milton’s own beliefs or inclinations. This kind of analysis is more successful in the treatment of *Lycidas* (and more briefly of “Epitaphium Damonis”), such obviously “personal” poems.

*Lycidas*, the argument urges, is based on Rogation, that is, a religious ceremony that traces parish boundaries on foot, and according to McGrath, “hallows nature in a way similar to how virginity purifies Edward King” (74). This extraordinary idea seems untenable, but McGrath elaborates and supports it with considerable subtlety—much more than a review can demonstrate. But several animadversions can be offered. The author correctly notes that the Rogation days are the Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday that precede Ascension, or Holy Thursday (the liturgical color is white). He says that these days “took place during Lent” (76, and cf. also 82), which of course is certainly not so. Ascension occurs 40 days after Easter, and is thus part of the Easter cycle. The preceding three days are traditionally ones of special prayers of “asking” (=rogare), and of penitence (the liturgical color is violet or purple). The extent to which Rogation “feasts” or “ceremonies” were observed or diminished in Archbishop Laud’s time is not clear; but they served only as one feature among many others that worried non-conformists. William Prynne, who would become one of the principal pamphleteers in the puritan cause, is cited in this case; but he is also an unreliable and eccentric witness. He wrote *A Briefe Survey and Censure of Mr Cozens His Couzening Devotions* (1628), a fierce, grotesque and absurd attack on John Cosin’s *A Collection of Private Devotions* (1627). He is hugely and violently exercised by the very existence of the *Devotions*; his response to commemorative days is only one arrow of a much broader challenge. In this instance,



Cosin has simply recorded a table that gives “The Fasting Daies of the Church ... The three *Rogation daies*, which be the *Munday, Tuesday,* and *Wednesday* before *Holy Thursday*, or the *Ascension* of our Lord” (Cosin, *Devotions*, ed. Stanwood, Oxford, 1967, xxxvi, 36, 305). While McGrath seeks to contrast differing times of cultural and religious performance and custom, the quoted passage from Prynne, with its glance at Cosin, and also at the obscure “Laudian” Henry Mason, all need context. Similarly, the extended and complex discussion of Milton’s “unexpressive nuptial song” gives pause: an allusion to Revelation 14:4 or 19, or both? McGrath appeals to the Greek text, which allows one to “hear” the song of Revelation 14, but not be confined to “its literal interpretation [which] would seem to support the exclusivity of bodily virginity” (89). Jeremy Taylor is one of the literal interpreters, who is quoted slightly out of context, and ungenerously; for he is considering chastity as only one part of a long chapter “Of Christian Sobriety” (see *Holy Living*, Oxford, 1989, p. 74). With some further consideration of “Epitaphium Damonis,” this long chapter ends with a reminder of what lengths have been traversed.

The final two chapters, occupying together only one-third of the book, turn to Marvell’s *Upon Appleton House* (1651) and Bunyan’s *Pilgrim’s Progress* (1678). McGrath sees Marvell’s long and (for this reader) rambling epic poem as a “hostile response to asceticism” (98). His close reading of the poem aims to “show how the serious and the satirical combine ... to offer admonitions about, and celebrate the godly triumph over, the Laudian Church and the various corruptions (ceremonial, ascetic, theological) it represents” (99). While *Upon Appleton House* shows that “physical asceticism” is impossible, *Pilgrim’s Progress* celebrates a kind of spiritual asceticism that embraces also corporal austerity. The argument is awkwardly defined, but Bunyan evidently reveals further development away from the old asceticism (such as monasticism) but its various reflections in “Laudianism.” McGrath, who refers consistently to his own narrative in the third person, writes: “This chapter contests the claim that self-denial in *The Pilgrim’s Progress* presages modern subjectivity. It shifts the critical discussion away from the mere fact of subjectivity remaining to what kind remains after the process of self-denial concludes” (123). Later, McGrath explicates at some length Bunyan’s prefatory lines, forcing

their meaning into an erotic sense. He studies the implications of this poem and of the allegorical narrative that follows. But he ignores the most familiar and popular sense of the allegory: “Life, Life, Eternal Life” is an exclamatory statement that signals conversion, for some the climax of the Christian life; and whatever follows are challenges to that life. In referring to his own study of *Early Modern Asceticism*, McGrath asserts that “self-denial in *The Pilgrim’s Progress* affirms this book’s argument about the nature of early modern asceticism” (143). This theme is indeed supported by the preceding chapters, but each one is fully independent of the others and unique, thus making the book into a kind of anthology.

The book is well presented, and almost free of typological error: but see page 144, line 3, where *mean* should read *means*. The huge number of notes occupies over forty pages, representing the heavy reliance on many sources. The bibliography is correspondingly full, combining both primary and secondary sources. Finally, this book, with some reservations, is a useful contribution to the theme of asceticism, and it features a number of original readings of important works.

Paula Hohfi Erichsen. *Artisans, Objects, and Everyday Life in Renaissance Italy. The Material Culture of the Middle Class*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2020. 364 pp. + 114 Illus. \$153.86. Review by R. BURR LITCHFIELD, BROWN UNIVERSITY.

This is a well written, detailed, and profusely illustrated, discussion of middle class Italian Renaissance household possessions mainly at Siena, although there are examples from other parts of Italy, in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the period largely before the Siena was conquered by Florence in 1555–57. The illustrations are striking. The author is a professor of the History of Art and Culture at Aalto University in Helsinki Finland. By middle class she means the class below patricians who had established surnames and coats of arms, and were habilitated for office in the *Monti* of the city government, but were above the large class of poor “*miserabili*” in the suburbs or countryside who had little or no wealth and do not appear in the tax books. Examples of middle class occupations include goldsmiths,

tailors, weavers, carpenters, second-hand clothes dealers, shoemakers, barbers, and musicians. The most numerous were in textiles or clothing trades. The middle class is not much studied by historians. Most families owned a house, part of a house, or a shop that was located toward the city center, and perhaps a garden outside of the city. The middle class is not much studied by historians. The sources used to assess fortunes are the city's tax and its post-mortem probate records. Household objects were a means for storing wealth and also served as symbols of family status. They were acquired through the city markets, as second hand goods from Jewish traders or other hawkers, and often by barter in exchange for debts. Dowries (there was a Sieneese dowry bank) and marriage ceremonies involved a conspicuous display and exchanges of goods, as were other significant moments of family history and could involve the entertainment of numerous guests. Houses had only a few rooms. Household furniture was important and set the tone of interiors. The bedroom had a big bed fitted with mattresses, pillows, sheets, quilts, coverlets, and linen chests (often elaborately painted). The kitchen with a large fireplace and sink, and the dining room with a folding table, were usually in the same place. There would be a sideboard (*credenza*) to display dishes, glass, plates, Venetian crystal, and cutlery—forks first appeared in this period. Painted birth trays were used to serve snacks. There might be a separate “*studiolo*” for business and accounting with small sculptures, paintings (mostly of the Virgin Mary) and prints bought from street peddlers. Some families concocted coats of arms. About one fourth of households had mirrors and one third of the inventories include at least one book—a book of hours usually, but occasionally Renaissance classics such as Ariosto or Castiglione. Books were likely read aloud. Only a third of men, and 12–15 percent of women could read. An appendix to this study lists in detail the items found in typical inventories.

But some objects are missing, or are not mentioned by the author. No timepieces are listed in the inventories: clocks, sundials, or hourglasses. This seems strange since such must have existed in sixteenth century Siena. For instance, an hourglass (“*clessidra*” in modern Italian) appears prominently in Ambrogio Lorenzetti's Allegory of Good Government fresco, from the 1330s, in the Siena Palazzo Pubblico. Perhaps the author did not recognize this timepiece from whatever it

was called back at that time. In sum, this is a useful book for anyone needing to identify objects in Renaissance literature or works of art. The author shows that conspicuous consumption was not limited to the upper classes at Siena. Instead members of the “middle class” with their precarious place below the patriciate and above the working poor used possessions to distinguish their dwelling places and thus advertise their social place and aspirations.

Alisha Rankin. *The Poison Trials: Wonder Drugs, Experiment, and the Battle for Authority in Renaissance Science*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2021. vi + 329 pp. \$35.00. Review by CELESTE CHAMBERLAND, ROOSEVELT UNIVERSITY.

In an era during which novel experimental methods intersected with fears of political assassination, experiments known as poison trials, which centered on demonstrating the efficacy of acclaimed antidotes, gained widespread support from natural philosophers and their patrons throughout Europe. Emblematic of a growing frenzy for wonder drugs in the Renaissance, poison cures generated widespread interest not only for their purported ability to neutralize toxic substances, but also because they held the promise of curing a variety of fearsome illnesses and ailments. As *materia medica* from new lands increasingly made its way into Europe in the sixteenth century, interest in the untapped curative potential of such remedies grew and inspired great optimism in the promise of mysterious preparations like Caravita's Oil and Silesian *terra sigillata*. Closely tied to the expanding drug trade and the increasing influence of print culture, poison trials flourished in response to the growing demand for pharmaceutical panaceas that captivated the courts and markets of Europe.

In this sharp and engaging analysis of these fascinating yet widely overlooked experiments, Alisha Rankin persuasively demonstrates that the poison trials shed much light on the shifting definitions of medical ethics and the relationship between the marketplace and scientific authority in the Renaissance. By couching the trials in terms of public utility and intellectual enrichment rather than profit, physicians effectively reinforced their occupational prestige and gained the patronage

of influential popes and princes. Within the larger experimental culture of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries delineated by scholars such as Gianna Pomata and Nancy Siraisi, Rankin's study calls attention to another vital but overlooked component of the construction of early modern medical knowledge. By linking the clinical encounter with emergent experimental methods, poison trials provided a unique opportunity to expand the scope of learned medicine and concepts of proof and evidence. In the Covid-19 era, during which fears of disease agents and the enthusiasm for vaccine trials parallel Renaissance efforts to secure potent remedies for occult toxins, Rankin's timely analysis aligns with a much longer historical timeline that demonstrates the striking similarities between the early modern search for pharmaceutical panaceas and contemporary quests for effective anti-viral drugs and preventive measures.

Based on a broad spectrum of archival and print sources, ranging from Galenic treatises to gruesome eyewitness trial accounts, *The Poison Trials* explores an expansive range of medical knowledge and testimony that effectively contextualizes the emergent epistemology of drug trials and human experimentation. Rather than primarily pursuing commercial success, the physicians who oversaw the trials sought to couch them in terms of learned medical research. For that reason, they avidly recorded and published the details of both successful and unsuccessful trials as a means of setting themselves apart from itinerant healers selling their wares in public marketplace spectacles throughout Europe. Whereas so-called empirics hawked wonder drugs like *theriac* for profit, physicians sought and received endorsements from powerful popes and princes, such as Charles X of France, Duke Cosimo de Medici of Tuscany, and Pope Clement VII. These powerful leaders also helped legitimize the practice of experimenting on human subjects at a time when the prevailing influence of Christian theology generated anxiety about interfering with the test subjects' path to salvation.

Although the experimental culture of sixteenth-century Europe had developed independently of the poison trials as a means of reflecting the growing shift toward direct observation and the acquisition of proof among the intellectual elite, the trials offered an important means of challenging the boundaries of conventional text-based medi-

cal theories and research protocols. As natural philosophers began to question ancient textual systems of knowledge, the early contours of what would become known as the scientific method enabled practitioners to find answers through processes of direct observation rather than textual exegesis. Such experiments, moreover, provided an effective method of replicating results to persuade reluctant audiences. Unlike other forms of scientific experimentation of the era, however, the administrators of poison trials faced the additional challenge of distinguishing themselves from marketplace quacks and empirics whose motivation was principally monetary rather than academic. By meticulously recording details, securing the support of influential patrons, and publishing the outcome of both successful and unsuccessful antidotes, physicians overseeing the poison trials succeeded in reinforcing the prestige of their intellectual integrity, but also, in the process, created a new scholarly genre: the poison trial account.

Based on the premise that animal experimentation could not fully yield sufficient information about the effects of wonder drugs on human subjects, Renaissance poison trials centered on testing antidotes on condemned criminals in Italy, France, and the Holy Roman Empire in the mid to late sixteenth century. While one test subject would typically serve as the control and consume deadly poison, a second test subject would receive the antidote along with the poison as a means of authentically demonstrating the efficacy of both substances. Although some of the prisoners were not informed they would be serving as human test subjects and were surreptitiously fed poison-laced marzipan or eggs, there is some evidence that others willingly submitted. Agreeing to serve as a poison trial subject not only enabled condemned criminals to avoid the shame and humiliation of a public execution, but potentially offered the chance to escape death in the event that the prisoner survived the poison.

Whereas dissecting dead bodies had formed the focus of much medical investigation in late medieval and early modern Europe, the use of living subjects in the poison trials became increasingly accepted after the presumed poisoning death of Pope Leo X in 1522 called attention to the need for effective antidotes. After Rome suffered a devastating plague outbreak in 1524, moreover, Pope Clement VII became particularly interested in the potential curative powers of

celebrated elixirs like Caravita's Oil to serve as both poison antidote and plague cure. Within the world of Renaissance medicine, poison antidotes not only held the promise of potentially reversing the effects of toxic chemical agents, but could also theoretically serve as universal remedies for a wide variety of other lethal conditions of the time, ranging from plague to smallpox. Supporting poison trials thus emphasized Clement's commitment to the public good in tandem with reinforcing the legitimacy of experimenting on human subjects. Papal approval ultimately secured full legal and religious support for the trials, which contemporaries construed to be far more valuable than the lives of condemned criminals. Nevertheless, the desire to prevent any type of unrest or anxiety in response to the poison trials' potentially unsavory connotations led to the development of protocols that emphasized the common good and reinforced the assertion that criminals still needed to be punished for their crimes. Those who led the trials assured observers that the subjects would not be prevented from dying a 'good death' with the possibility of redemption.

In addition to the poison trials' influence on the nascent protocol of human experimentation, Rankin also calls attention to the ways in which the trials bolstered Paracelsian theory and cast doubt on the foundations of Galenic medical epistemology. Paracelsus' emphasis on the symbiotic relationship between poison and cure in the natural world posed a significant challenge to prevailing Galenic emphasis on universals. By emphasizing the need to distinguish poisonous and healing elements along with his reliance on alchemical principles, Paracelsus served as a vital source of inspiration for the poison trials. As Rankin explains, this shift in knowledge led to the rise of entrepreneurs who specialized in medical alchemy and recast clay-based antidotes like *terra sigilata* as distilled elixirs and metallic substances, thus providing an additional level of support for Paracelsus' emphasis on the alchemical *tria prima*.

Although experimentation on condemned criminals largely fell out of favor by the end of the sixteenth century, interest in poison trials and experimentation persisted well into the seventeenth century in the works of natural philosophers and physicians, such as William Harvey, who turned his attention to animal experimentation rather than human subjects. Human poison trials as a consequence, largely

disappeared from the historical record, but fascination with poison antidotes persisted within scientific circles and generated interest in developing new ways of testing medicines. The experimental procedures established by the poison trials of the Renaissance laid the groundwork for the eventual formalization of pharmaceutical research. Rather than blindly promoting magic bullets, physicians' participation in the poison trials not only made important contributions to the development of experimental pharmacology, but also established nascent ethical parameters pertaining to research conducted on human subjects.

Although the lurid details of the poison trial accounts read like a chilling Netflix true-crime documentary that likely captivated all those who encountered them, Alisha Rankin deftly demonstrates that, despite their sensationalist appeal, these records performed an important role in the emergence of medical experimentation practices. This stirring topic will undoubtedly be of great intrinsic interest to a broad audience of early modern scholars and non-specialists alike, but Rankin's analysis is no mere sensationalist frippery. *The Poison Trials* is a painstakingly researched and shrewd analysis that links a burgeoning experimental tradition to larger shifts in the scientific and political culture of early modern Europe. As Rankin ably demonstrates, the poison trials shed much light on the shifting connections between medical practice, nascent research trials, and ideas about proof and evidence in the Renaissance. In addition to its contributions to the history of early modern European science, *The Poison Trials*, moreover, also provides much insight into the political climate of the sixteenth century, since many princes became ardent supporters of the poison trials in the hopes that they might encounter a new means of protecting themselves from widely feared assassination attempts.



Esther Sahle. *Quakers in the British Atlantic World, c.1660-1800*. Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell & Brewer, 2021. viii + 206 pp. with 22 illustrations. \$25.95 (paper). Review by JAMES WALTERS.

*Quakers in the British Atlantic World, c.1660-1800* by Esther Sahle represents a valuable contribution to the literature on Quakers. This is a book that is very clearly framed with respect to the existing historiography and largely delivers on its aim of addressing the gaps in this historiography that Sahle identifies.

In previous historiography and popular consciousness, the idea of Quaker success in business and trade as being rooted in a unique set of business ethics and marriage practices has been largely accepted. However, Sahle argues that this idea has its origins in early twentieth-century studies that were methodologically flawed and mostly accepted without scrutiny by later historians of the Quakers and early modern commerce. The main flaws that Sahle identifies in previous studies are a lack of comparative work to establish whether supposedly unique Quaker ethics shared commonalities with those outside the Quaker community, and an assumption that Quaker beliefs, practices and discipline remained largely unchanged throughout the early modern period. In order to redress this, Sahle's book seeks to examine comparatively how Quaker discipline, marriage practices, and rhetoric around business ethics changed across the early modern period and differed in Pennsylvania and London. The book also compares Quaker rhetoric to that of other Protestant groups in an attempt to gauge the extent to which their approach to business ethics was truly unique.

This book is in effect divided into two halves, the first establishing the state of Quakerism and its place in early modern commerce by the first half of the eighteenth century, and the second examining how the attitudes and institutions of Quakerism changed in the later eighteenth century. Its first three chapters function as an introduction to the world of early modern trade and how the Quakers fit into this wider picture, with a focus on London and Philadelphia. Chapters 4 and 5 then examine the nature of Quaker business ethics and discipline, and compare this to how other prominent religious groups approached these issues. Chapter 6 introduces the concept of the mid-eighteenth century "Quaker Reformation," and functions in effect as

an introduction to the second half of the book. Chapter 7 addresses how Quaker discipline in London evolved with regards to debts and “honesty in business,” and chapter 8 addresses similar questions with a focus on Philadelphia. Chapter 9 contains a particularly interesting study of Quaker marriage practices, which ties unique Quaker trends to the wider historiography of marriage and the role of women in early modern society. In chapter 10, Sahle addresses possible causes of the shift in the way Quaker discipline was applied and relates this shift to a series of scandals that undermined Quakerism in Pennsylvania.

Through analysis of Quaker epistles and meeting records, Sahle charts how public perception of Quakers was shaped by crises and the conscious efforts by the Society of Friends to improve their public image in response to these crises. Firstly, Sahle notes how the persecution of Quakers after 1660 as part of a broader concern of the Restoration regime with potentially dangerous religious dissent led to an increased emphasis from Quakers on their peaceful nature and to the establishment of a complex network of Quaker meetings to support their persecuted members.

In the mid-eighteenth century, however, Sahle argues that Quaker pacifism became a weapon with which Quakers were attacked by their opponents, particularly in Pennsylvania. Disputes with the proprietor of the colony, and military threats to Pennsylvania in the 1750s led to pamphlet campaigns to discredit the Quaker elite in Philadelphia. The Quakers’ opponents used this to claim that the supposed pacifism of the Friends was a cover to leave other denominations undefended from the French and Native Americans, and to maintain their monopoly on the fur trade. This situation, argues Sahle, lent greatly increased urgency to a Quaker reform movement which had already begun to emerge prior to the outbreak of war in the 1750s.

Through analysis of the sanctions imposed by Quaker meetings, Sahle demonstrates that from the mid-eighteenth century onwards, the Society of Friends was increasingly concerned with policing the morals, business practices, and finances of its members. However, Sahle argues that in comparing the rhetoric surrounding financial matters in Quaker epistles and sermons to those from other denominations, Quakers and non-Quakers alike shared similar concerns around “covetousness”. Therefore, it was in the enforcement of Quaker discipline,

which Sahle argues was in part motivated by a keen awareness of the importance of reputation, rather than any set of ethics unique to the Friends, that the roots of “Quaker trustworthiness” lie. This concern for reputation also structured other important shifts in the focus of Quaker rhetoric and discipline, such as an increased emphasis on opposing slavery.

It might have been interesting for this book to take these conclusions further, to analyse how the post-1750s Quaker focus on maintaining reputation through discipline actually impacted their role in commerce. That the Quakers enjoyed a trustworthy reputation and that this assisted in their success in business is accepted throughout this work, but as I approached the end of the book I had expected a more comprehensive conclusion regarding how the Friends reached this position from the nadir of Quaker reputation in the mid-eighteenth century. Sahle simply notes “The existence of a Quaker reputation for honesty setting in a few decades after meetings began to publicly condemn malpractice in business,” without going into much detail on this point. However, I understand that this is beyond the scope of this particular work, and it is to Sahle’s credit that she does not overreach with her conclusions and allows the excellent analysis of sources that this book contains to speak for itself.

It is in this analysis that some of the most significant contributions of this book lie, and I have no doubt that it will prove a valuable resource regarding the granular detail of matters such as Quaker occupations, debts, marriages, and how Quaker discipline and disownment functioned. In particular the chapter concerning Quaker marriages, while somewhat detached from the broader narrative of the book, is a fascinating insight into the social aspects of Quakerism and the role of women.

The central contentions of the work, that “Quaker institutions changed dramatically between the mid-seventeenth and the end of the eighteenth century,” and that these changes were more tangible and influential than any unique set of business values inherent to Quakerism, are well evidenced and clearly argued. It also provides a valuable historiographical framework for future studies on Quakerism, as the influences that these changes had on perceptions of Quakerism beyond the scope of this work (i.e., into the nineteenth century) have

yet to be explored. Overall, this work would be of great use to anyone specifically studying Quakers, but also for those with a broader interest in early modern economic and social history.

Roberto Romagnino. *Théorie(s) de l'ecphrasis: entre Antiquité et première modernité*. Paris: Classiques Garnier, 2019. x + 299 pp. €32.00 Review by KATHRINA A. LAPORTA, NEW YORK UNIVERSITY.

This book presents a history of theories on descriptive writing from Antiquity through the seventeenth century with a particular focus on France. Citing the preoccupation among early modern French authors to paint with words, Roberto Romagnino centers his study on one of the primary rhetorical tools that can give an audience the impression that they are *seeing* what they read or hear: *ecphrasis*. Indeed, one of the strengths of the book is its focus, which allows the author to differentiate with painstaking care the meaning of the term *ekphrasis*, as well as related words such as *enargeia*, *hypotyposis*, *diatyposis*, *description*, and *evidence*. It is exceedingly difficult to discern a stable meaning for any of these terms owing to the evolution in their meaning over time and to mistranslations that have yielded competing definitions in different languages. The clearest example is the term “*ekphrasis*” itself. Whereas for centuries the word referred to vivid descriptive speech that conjures an image before the mind’s eye of the listener, it has been used since the twentieth century to describe a genre in which a writer describes a specific artistic work, such as a painting, in great detail.

Romagnino’s book contributes to a body of scholarship on *ekphrasis*, *hypotyposis*, and other forms of word-images in classical rhetorical treatises and on the reception of these treatises in early modern Europe. Adopting what he calls a “historico-philological approach” (17), Romagnino expertly navigates the vast continent of terms and techniques associated with descriptive speech. He nods to the complexity of such an undertaking in setting forth the goals of his study:

Rouvrir le dossier sur l’*ecphrasis* signifie se confronter à une notion complexe et fuyante, dont la conception s’est reconfigurée à plusieurs reprises au fil des siècles. Voici donc le défi de cet ouvrage: parcourir l’histoire du discours descriptif en tant que

catégorie rhétorique, en mobilisant les grilles conceptuelles et les instruments critiques élaborés par les rhéteurs antiques et reçus dans la réflexion de l'âge prémoderne. (13)

Romagnino thus disentangles what is a true terminological morass for the contemporary scholar interested in how early modern authors were trained to transform their words into powerful textual images.

Originally a doctoral dissertation, the book is divided into three sections, each comprising three chapters. The first section, "Archéologie de l'*Ekphrasis*," sketches a "cartography" of descriptive writing through a presentation of treatises from Antiquity and a selection from the seventeenth century. Reminding the reader of the etymology of the word "ekphrasis," which comes from the Greek *ek-phrazô* meaning "complete, exhaustive exposition" (21), Chapter One centers on the rhetorical exercises in the *Progymnasmata*, in which ekphrasis is theorized as a type of speech that exhaustively describes, as distinct from the quality of the speech responsible for allowing ekphrasis to achieve this goal (enargeia). Chapter Two focuses on formal aspects of ekphrasis, including some of its associated techniques, with further analysis of the often-tenuous distinction between ekphrasis and enargeia in treatises from Antiquity. Chapter Three seeks to unpack the "constellation" of lexical terms on descriptive writing: *graphein*, *descriptio*, *demonstratio*, *hypotypôsis*, *diatypôsis*, *repraesentatio*. Throughout this first section, ekphrasis is thus presented as a sort of floating signifier, defined in relief against the contours of an "abundance" of terms denoting descriptive writing: "l'*ekphrasis* semble encore s'identifier tantôt à une figure macrostructurale, tantôt à un insaisissable *je ne sais quoi* du discours qui le rend particulièrement saillant" (42).

Scholars of seventeenth-century France will likely take a particular interest in Part Two of Romagnino's study, which traces the evolution of ekphrasis in the early modern period, when description became central to the imperative to "delight" (*delectare*) and "move" (*movere*) readers. The first chapter in this section studies the reception of treatises on ekphrasis produced in Italy and in France in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, while the second examines late seventeenth-century French dictionaries (by Richelet, Furetière, Thomas Corneille, and others) to examine the reformulation of the term. Romagnino argues that the seventeenth century marks a moment of rupture in the his-

tory of ekphrasis; while classical rhetoricians primarily focus on the coupling of enargeia and ekphrasis, late seventeenth-century French lexicographers express a more sustained interest in hypotyposis and expand the lexical field of vivid, visual speech to include terms such as *peinture*, *description*, and *représentation*. The third chapter in this section, which is also the longest in the study, shifts from dictionaries to theoretical texts produced in Jesuit circles in Spain and France, treatises that influenced several generations of European authors. In addition to drawing on prior research by Marc Fumaroli on the place of the image in Jesuit writings, Romagnino notes an important connection between the capacity of hypotyposis to transport readers and listeners “outside of themselves” and the “ravishing” effect of the sublime in Pseudo-Longinus (124).

The third and final section presents a typography of ekphrasis to emphasize its persuasive power. Following the *Progymnasmata* and other treatises examined in preceding chapters, this section examines in detail each of the categories of description. The first chapter studies the description of people and moral character while the second centers on the description of actions and events as distinct from pure narration. The final chapter presents an overview of techniques to describe places and moments. In the Conclusion, Romagnino points to the shared etymology of the words *montrer* (to show, to bring to light) and *monstre* (monster) as indicative of the terminological murkiness surrounding ekphrasis—an imprecision that can paradoxically obscure the “clarity” central for descriptive speech to achieve its desired effects.

As is perhaps evident, Romagnino’s study matches the exhaustive nature of his subject matter. He draws on contemporary research in French, Italian, and English, and synthesizes an impressive number of treatises from the classical and early modern periods. Although the book slightly suffers from a focus on summary, it is important to mention that the author specifically sets out to “describe” the history of ekphrasis rather than to analyze its stakes (18). Specialists of literature might find certain sections to be too detailed or repetitive, while scholars of rhetoric will appreciate Romagnino’s precision. The author’s focus on minutiae also occasionally obscures his central contentions; this is the case for his discussion of the relative affective freight of ekphrasis and hypotyposis, for example. Indeed, the shift

from description to analysis in the concluding chapter will be most welcome for scholars interested in affect studies and in exploring the affective stakes of various types of word-images that can strike and even subjugate the reader. By analyzing a wide range of theoretical texts and rhetorical exercises devoted to description, Romagnino achieves his goal of “placing before the eye” the rich domain occupied by ekphrasis within the larger territory of descriptive writing.

Kathrina Ann LaPorta. *Performative Polemic: Anti-Absolutist Pamphlets and their Readers in Late Seventeenth-Century France*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2021. xiii + 322 pp. + 1 illus. \$39.95. Review by IVY DYCKMAN, INDEPENDENT SCHOLAR.

Focusing only on the two-word title of Kathrina Ann LaPorta's recently published book, the reader might gather that it concerns the current vitriolic attacks from partisan ideologists, who urge their audiences to adhere to and act on their spoken and written assertions of purported truths about a targeted governmental system that goes against their grain. Modern technology, especially social media, has opened up ideas and opinions to vast numbers of people all over the world, who, not that long ago, were restricted to receiving this sort of information by word of mouth or in print. Continuing on to the subtitle, the reader discovers that in her work, LaPorta is referring to the political assertions of the anti-Louis Quatorzean pamphlets distributed inside and outside of France in the latter part of the seventeenth century. To allege governmental injustices at any point in time requires not just objections but also calls for performing the necessary actions to realize justifiable change. Not surprisingly, her arguments and examples presented from selected texts have relevance to our present-day sociopolitical realities.

By way of introducing the illicit trade of anti-absolutist propaganda during this period, LaPorta opens her study with a compelling story. She describes how, in 1701, the defrocked priest Antoine Sorel smuggled several texts, known as *libelles* or *pamphlets*, into France. Pamphlet writing that either justified or condemned actions perpetrated by the French State had begun well before the advent of Louis

XIV and continued long after his demise. During his personal reign, however, there was much to denounce, such as the interminable military conflicts; the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes; the great costs in monies and lives wasted on wars; and the lavish lifestyles of the upper classes, all of which illustrate egregious offenses at the expense of the people. Pamphleteering communicated these injustices and many others with the purpose of arousing the masses to vociferously object. As an individual of conscience, Sorel paid for his audacity with a lengthy prison sentence in the Bastille.

In *Performative Polemic*, LaPorta dissects carefully chosen French anti-absolutist pamphlets, circulated during the years 1667–96, from a literary and linguistic perspective. Although significant historical events served as catalysts for their publication and considerable distribution, she attributes their wide appeal throughout France—indeed, throughout Western Europe—to the styles, tropes, and phraseology, for example, culled from various genres. For her, language does matter. It represents a significant weapon of dissent. LaPorta divides her investigation into two parts, both of which contain examples of pamphlets that leveled criticism at Louis XIV's political performance. In Chapters 1, 2, and 3, the author highlights language as the means by which the pamphleteer aimed to prod the reading audience to react for the purpose of challenging the French Crown's actions. Chapters 4 and 5 demonstrate how the pamphlet attracted the attention of the masses by burlesquing authority. This was achieved as a result of incorporating literary elements from the theater, historical novels, and periodicals, all of which were popular with the public. Generally speaking, the content of these later texts became less refined.

The first three chapters metaphorically put the Sun King on trial. Each of the pamphleteers showcased in this first section attempted to fire up readers through distinctive writing styles and language manipulation. In Chapter 1, LaPorta shows how the Habsburg diplomat François-Paul de Lisola advocated justice in his pamphlet *Le Bouclier d'état et de justice* (1667). Although it was published anonymously, as was the practice of the times for obvious retaliatory reasons, Lisola's authorship was confirmed. His background in law and diplomacy served him well in presenting his case against the king prior to the War of Devolution, Louis XIV's first military conflict during his personal



reign. Lisola's eloquent, rational language assured the public that he sincerely cared for their welfare, and in so doing, called upon them to judge for themselves their sovereign's bellicose intentions against the Spanish Netherlands. In the subsequent two chapters, the charges directed against the French monarch only intensified. Whereas Lisola used reason to galvanize the reader into judgment of the king's actions, in Chapter 2 the anonymous author of *Le Miroir des princes* (1684) relied on memory to evoke emotions triggered by the French monarch's injustices perpetrated during the Dutch War (1672–78). The pamphleteer fashioned the text as a figurative mirror that reflected the horror inflicted by Louis XIV and his military machine. Vivid images of atrocities challenged the authoritarian reality. The pamphlet examined in Chapter 3 deviates from attacking the French monarch as a warmonger and threat to Western European peace. The nameless author of *Les Soupirs de la France esclave* (1689–90)—whose publication history extended into the eighteenth century—takes aim at the internal policies of the French government. Surprisingly, the writer was not in favor of the overthrow of the monarchy but rather of political reform. He may have had an enlightened view of government, but he was deaf to the revolutionary rumblings of the future.

The final two chapters of LaPorta's investigation are darkly serious yet entertaining. She examines pamphlets published during the mid-1690s and observes how they evolved from formalized argumentation to grossly satirical criticisms. Taking their cue from contemporary literary forms and theatrical works, the pamphleteers of this period utilized humor to lampoon Louis XIV's absolutist performance. The texts are characteristically blasphemous and vulgar. The subject of Chapter 4 is the anonymously written *L'Alcoran de Louis XIV* (1695). The author of this pamphlet used a trendy literary device, the dialogue of the dead, to present improbable exchanges. An example of one such conversation occurred between Pope Innocent XI and Cardinal Jules Mazarin, major Roman Catholic power players who interacted with Louis XIV at various times during his long reign. Their encounter took place in Hades, of course. Integrating fiction with reality allowed the pamphleteer the freedom to incorporate monarchical attacks within a framework of biting humor, a successful ploy to at once draw readers and expose a decaying regime. The subject of Chapter 5 is even more

outrageous. In her analysis of the three-hundred page pamphlet the *Conseil privé de Louis le Grand* (1696), LaPorta takes the reader from the underworld to the most private, exclusive spaces of Louis XIV. She opens with a description of the frontispiece, the only illustration to appear in her entire study. The empty title cartouche under the stagnant image of the French monarch's Privy Council reinforces the notion of political impotence. The reader witnesses his waning performances in the bedchamber and confessional as well. Ridicule is merciless retribution for a despotic, tyrannical leader. Satire and parody were the *coups de grâce* to the Sun King's public and private persona. The anonymous pamphleteer dealt one more death blow to absolutism.

## NEO-LATIN NEWS

Vol. 69, Nos. 3 & 4. Jointly with SCN. NLN is the official publication of the American Association for Neo-Latin Studies. Edited by Patrick M. Owens, Hillsdale College; Former Editor: Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University; Founding Editors: James R. Naiden, Southern Oregon University, and J. Max Patrick, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee and Graduate School, New York University.

◆ *Americana Latine: Latin Moments in the History of the United States*. By Andrew C. Dinan. New York: Paideia Institute Press, 2020. XVIII +477 pp. \$25. Twenty years ago, James Hankins laid the foundation for the *I Tatti Renaissance Library* with an essay describing Neo-Latin literature as inhabiting a “lost continent.” The series that his essay inaugurated has become an indispensable tool for every scholar and student of the Renaissance. The intervening two decades have seen an explosion of editions, translations, anthologies, reference works, and studies of Neo-Latin texts and their place in early modern European culture. The Lost Continent has been thoroughly explored, the maps have been drawn, and Neo-Latin now holds an indisputable place in the history of Latin letters and European culture.

At the same time, there has been no lack of enthusiasm for bringing Neo-Latin to students and general readers. The last three years alone have seen the publication of Milena Minkova’s important and comprehensive anthology of modern Latin texts as well as two anthologies from Bloomsbury’s recently launched *Neo-Latin Series* focusing on the early modern Latin literatures of Continental Europe and the British Isles. These efforts followed those of Mark Riley and Rose Williams, whose anthologies sought to bring attention to the variety and importance of Neo-Latin literature generally and to the Latin heritage of the viceroyalty of New Spain in particular. At the beginning of this third decade of the twenty-first century, Andrew Dinan’s *Americana Latine* joins this flurry of anthologizing activity by bringing out a

new collection of carefully annotated and endlessly fascinating Latin texts, comprehending multiple genres, including pieces considered non-literary (and therefore all the more fascinating as evidence of the practical application of Latin), from across every region of the lands that would become the United States. The volume ranges from the first contacts between Native Americans and European colonizers to an address delivered by an American prelate at the Second Vatican Council and charts a new course for Neo-Latin studies that one hopes will inspire the mapping of a second Lost Continent and the recovery of its literature.

Perhaps the most impressive aspect of Andrew Dinan's labor is his indefatigable diligence. As he tells us in his acknowledgments, Dinan expertly leveraged internet resources and connections to state and local historical societies to uncover Latin writings which have never before been edited. As a one-time resident of the Cherokee Nation, I was surprised and gladdened to see that he has made use of materials in the tribal archives in Tahlequah, Oklahoma and correlated them with newspaper articles written in the traditional Cherokee homeland in Tennessee. In the opening section of the book, we also find the Latin works of explorers, conquistadors, their enemies among the mendicant friars, French and Spanish Jesuits, English pirates and soldiers, and original texts taken from important documents such as the Treaty of Tordesillas and Martin Walzmüller's map that christened the "new" lands after their purported discoverer, the Florentine navigator Amerigo Vespucci.

The inclusion of native, Hispanic, and Francophone voices stands in contrast to Leo M. Kaiser's *Early American Latin Verse: 1625-1825*, till now the only comparable anthology of the Latin literature of North America. That anthology was produced in a time when the major historiographical contest was between those who thought the United States was founded in Plymouth and those who thought it was founded in Jamestown. Dinan gives as much space to chronicling the fortunes and fates of Latin writers in New Spain and New France as he does to those in New England and Virginia, and he points the way forward for what can be hoped will be the recovery of many native products of Latin literature.

The contentions of European colonial powers, the fight against slavery, and efforts to evangelize native populations and organize and minister to the faithful are the major themes of the first half of *Americana Latine*. Given the great breadth of Dinan's collection, the struggle to end human bondage emerges as a much longer and drawn out conflict than I believe most Americans realize. Sixteenth-century Spanish Dominican friars stand alongside nineteenth-century German farmers in the American Midwest, writing in the same Latin tongue and revealing Latin as an important vehicle in the centuries long and cross-cultural efforts to abolish slavery. In the letters sent between missionaries and the Roman offices of the *Propaganda Fide*, one can trace the slow but steady growth of the Catholic Church from Maine to Hawaii. Some of the most interesting pieces are the *descriptions* and *relationes* of the classically-trained Jesuits who dominate Dinan's pages just as surely as they did Latin letters between the seventeenth and twentieth centuries.

The balance of *Americana Latine* is filled out by some old favorites (e.g., Glass' *Vita Washingtonii*) and a wide variety of *deliciae* (the off-hours amusements of nineteenth-century undergrads in particular) that will surely be unfamiliar to all but the most erudite students of American Neo-Latin. While the majority of the selections across all periods come from clergy and academics, Dinan has taken pains to include writers outside of these groups. The role of Latin in the American Civil War is of particular interest to Dinan, and he has made sure to include several pieces bearing on that conflict in his anthology. We are reminded that (the now quite controversial) Basil Gildersleeve was by no means the only classicist to participate in the war and to see in it a reflection of the glory, horror, and tragedy of the armed struggles of antiquity. The last quarter of the selections trace the decline of Latin as an auxiliary language and of classical education in American life. Most of these later pieces are ceremonial in nature or intended for private amusement, but a letter on the need for ecclesiastical participation in the Civil Rights movement along with Archbishop Hannon's discussion of nuclear weapons at the Second Vatican Council show us the continuing utility of Latin eloquence through the 1960s.

While I have not tabulated the entries precisely, Dinan's anthology seems to be split reasonably evenly between prose and verse. He fur-

nishes his 116 selections with an excellent introduction, indications of his source texts, and 1264 endnotes, primarily of an historical nature, although he does occasionally trace classical allusions. The absence of translations and grammatical aids shows that this book is intended for teachers, scholars, and enthusiasts, but it also means that that much more space may be devoted to Latin texts. In keeping with current standards in academic publishing, the book appears to be printed on demand, and the typesetting is functional rather than beautiful (pg. 98 is mostly whitespace, with the exception of a short explanatory note that ought to have been shifted to the endnotes). My copy suffered from an unfortunate manufacturing defect which meant that every twelfth page or so were stuck together. Typographical errors are few and trivial; the dittography of “Monsieur Monsieur” on pg. 98 and the improper hyphenation of “alii-sque” on pg. 208 are typical. The price is more than reasonable, but at the time of writing, the book seems to be available only from the publisher’s website, which will surely limit its wide distribution and make international shipping prohibitively expensive. It is also to be lamented that there appears to be no electronic version. What small problems exist should in no way detract from Dinan’s achievement. *Americana Latine* is a model anthology that I will use in my teaching and research as well as, I hope, to stimulate my colleagues in South America to recover the Latin literature produced in their own lands. (Erik Ellis, Universidad de los Andes, Chile)

◆ *Juan Luis Vives: Scritti politico-filosofici*. Introduction, Italian translation, and notes by Valerio del Nero. Roma: Aracne Editrice, 2020. Series ‘Renascentia. Studi e opere di storia della filosofia del Rinascimento—4’. 384 pp. €22,00. These Latin socio-political writings of Juan Luis Vives from the tumultuous years 1522-1529 deserve wider attention. Anxiety over vicious power struggles among European princes; arguments for pacifist diplomacy and its limitations; reflections on how to come to terms with the expanding Ottoman Empire; urgent pleas to the Pope for leadership in healing the political and religious fractures of Europe; and crystallization of the idea of Europe, a distinctively Christian Europe—these are the concerns of the works presented here in Italian translation by del Nero, a noted scholar of

the Spanish humanist. To this English-speaking reviewer, del Nero's translation is fluid, accurate, and accessible.

Three letters open the ensemble. The first, to Pope Adrian VI, *De Europae statu ac tumultibus*, hopes the new pontiff is the right one to conciliate warring European powers and bring Christianity together. Next come two epistles to Henry VIII, on generous treatment of the defeated French king and on the qualities of a just princely rule. Fourth is Vives's Lucianesque underworld satire, *De Europae dissidiis et bello Turcico*, in the form of a dialogue featuring Minos, the judge of the dead, Tiresias, the ancient prophet, and Scipio Africanus, conqueror of Hannibal. A glut of army casualties piling up at the Styx, mostly from dynastic battles in Italy, leads to Scipio's ringing call for an end to intra-European squabbles and an aggressive all-out war against the Turks. Del Nero sees Vives's attitude to the Turkish question as complex, even contradictory; in his view Vives rejects any justification for a just war, even vis-à-vis the Turks, and expresses the pacifist line while still recognizing the Turkish threat to Europe and Christianity. Del Nero reads in Vives a strategy of containment without rejection of military options and a hope for rapprochement between the two worlds, idealistically inspired by the conviction that we must love the Turks because they share our humanity.

Then there are three treatises: *De concordia et discordia in humano genere*, based on philosophical and religious considerations, tracing discord back to original sin and privileging revealed over natural religion; *De pacificatione*, classifying people, not just princes, responsible for pursuing peace, including the rich, nobles, counselors, educators, soldiers, priests, and bishops; and *De conditione vitae Christianorum sub Turca*, correcting Europeans who think Turkish rule would be preferable to life under Christian princes.

Del Nero is generous to the reader with a long introductory essay, individual introductions to the pieces, and voluminous notes to the text. A rich bibliography and an Index of Names conclude the volume.

The Introduction follows Vives's departure from his native Valencia to the Low Countries owing to the Inquisition, which dealt harshly with his *converso* Jewish family and made his own career one of "fundamental serenity, resigned and perplexed in the face of violent events without explanation or justification, but tolerable only in an attitude

of total confidence in God” (del Nero, 13). The tension lies close to the surface in the dedication of the *De pacificatione* to none other than Alfonso Manrique, the Grand Inquisitor, whom Vives pointedly reminds that he holds lives and fortunes in his hands.

Del Nero underlines Vives’s reputation as a “European thinker,” concerned for the historical, geographical, and spiritual coherence of the continent. In the letter urging clemency for the French, he shows Vives pleading for careful treatment of the losers via a heartrending portrayal of the ravages, obviously drawn from other events, from which the people must be spared. Del Nero notes that the arguments for clemency are not rational - inductive but communicative and rhetorical, especially religiously rhetorical, with copious biblical citations.

In this current era of boiling socio-political hostilities, when the simple proposition that peace is better than war risks disapproval, Del Nero performs an important service by translating these words of a principled thinker who pleads for reason and reconciliation when these impulses are now so easily dismissed. (Edward V. George, *emeritus* Texas Tech University)

◆ Mathieu Ferrand and Sylvie Laigneau-Fontaine, edd., *Le théâtre néo-latin en France au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle: études et anthologie*. Geneva: Droz, 2020. 583 pp. €46,45. This volume is a survey of Latin plays written and performed in France between 1514 and 1600. There are 16 essays, divided into five groups, followed by a selection of passages from the plays discussed therein, each with a headnote, a brief bibliography, the Latin text, and a French translation. The book is therefore useful as an introduction to the breadth and variety of this theatrical tradition. As most of the plays under discussion were written for students, who performed in them or attended the performances as well as reading the plays in class, the volume also gives a glimpse of academic life in Renaissance France.

The first part, *Un théâtre vernaculaire en latin?*, discusses some relatively early plays and the relationship between Latin theater and contemporary French performance. Jelle Koopmans, “La scène latine comme lieu de débat et comme lieu de combat” (31-48), argues that Latin plays with explicitly political content were performed publicly in the early sixteenth century. John Nassichuk, “La ‘tragédie’ de la



crucifixion chez Quinziano Stoa et Nicolas Barthélemy de Loches” (49-76), treats two dramatizations of the crucifixion, both taking “time is growing short” as a theme. Estelle Doudet, “Moralités et théâtre vernaculaire en latin: autour de J. Ravisius Textor” (77-94), introduces Textor’s *Dialogi*, which she says are not “neo-antique” in the way that most Latin plays are, as they are set in the contemporary world rather than mythical or Biblical times. Nathaël Istasse, “De la réception européenne des *Dialogi* (1530) de J. Ravisius Textor” (95-115), discusses the adaptations and translations of those dialogues over the next hundred years, into French and English.

In the second part, *Renaissances de la comédie*, we have plays in the tradition of Plautus and Terence. Mathieu Ferrand’s first essay, “La comédie dans les collèges parisiens: questions de vocabulaire, définition d’un corpus” (119-140), defines comedy as “théâtre orienté vers le rire” (128), though even fairly early in the 16th century the colleges in Paris were “lieux d’expérimentations formelles” (119) in which professors and students alike were studying ancient drama and also inventing their own, not quite the same as the Roman plays. Ferrand’s next essay, “La *Comoedia* de Jean Calmus et ses modèles (Paris, 1544, 1552)” (141-158), looks at a play written explicitly as a model for students writing their own, and discusses how Calmus adapts Terence’s *Andria* for a modern audience. This is one of the strongest papers in the collection, though the play itself doesn’t sound like a masterpiece. Jan Bloemendal, “Un comédie biblique des Pays-Bas publiée en France: l’édition commentée de l’*Acolastus* (Guilielmus Gnaphaeus, 1529) par Gabriel Dupreau (Paris, 1554)” (159-171), considers how the French editor, a Catholic, treats the play by the Dutch Lutheran as a classic, ignoring theology altogether.

The third part is called *Les “Maîtres”: Marc-Antoine Muret et George Buchanan* and focuses on Muret’s *Julius Caesar* and Buchanan’s *Medea*, *Iephtes*, and *Baptistes*, probably the best-known of all the plays treated in the volume. Virginie Leroux, “Tragique, admiration et eschatologie: le modèle du *Julius Caesar* de Marc-Antoine Muret” (175-202), discusses not so much the models for Muret’s Caesar as Caesar himself as a model of specifically Catholic virtue. Nathalie Catellani and Carine Ferradou, “George Buchanan, modèle du théâtre humaniste français” (203-224), discuss Buchanan’s influence on the first generation of

tragedians writing in French. Emmanuel Buron, “Schèmes tragiques chez Muret, Buchanan et Jodelle” (225-242), looks at how Étienne Jodelle, writing in French, emulates and critiques the Latin authors: “il ne faut pas négliger ... que c’est dans un dialogue critique avec les tragédies néo-latines que Jodelle a conçu les siennes” (242).

In the fourth part, *Tragédies de collège*, we look at plays by and for students. John Nassichuk, “Un tragique exemplaire, ou la moralité du pouvoir dans l’*Aman* de Claude Roillet” (245-266), considers how the play, drawn from the book of Esther, shows Haman’s abuses of power and Esther’s eventual triumph, through a close study of *posse* and related words. Nina Hugot, “*Quis credat? L’incroyable amour de Philanira* (Claude Roillet, 1556)” (267-290), looks at a play set in a bourgeois household in contemporary France, most unusual for a 16th-century play. The play had some success, as it was translated into French in 1563, possibly by Roillet himself, and the translation was re-issued in 1577. Éric Syssau, “La tragédie au collège de Navarre (1557-1558)” (291-308), studies three tragedies on historical subjects, one by a teacher, one by a student, and one by a group of students. The first, by Abel Souris of Rouen, the teacher, is *De sinistro fato Gallorum apud Veromanduos et ocasu luctuoso fortissimi ducis Totovillei et comito Anguiani, tragoedia*, and it dramatizes a battle fought in August 1577, about a month before the festival at which the play was performed; the college of Navarre did a play each year and plays on contemporary themes were not uncommon. The other plays come from a notebook by Jean Rose, brother of Guillaume Rose who became bishop of Senlis. Rose’s own play is *Chilpericus*, about the reign and assassination of Chilperic I, grandson of Clovis I. The notebook also contains the second and third acts from another play, untitled, about Cleopatra, Octavian, and Marc Antony, and Rose’s notes say he wrote these two acts and his classmates completed the play.

The fifth part, *Aux confins des genres et/ou du siècle*, looks at some dramas that are not exactly tragedies, and one that appeared in 1600, the very last year of the century. Sylvie Laigneau-Fontaine and Catherine Langlois-Pézeret, “La *Susanna* (1571) du dijonnais Charles Godran” (311-338), consider this Biblical drama, which might never have been staged, as a tragicomedy, with a serious plot but a happy ending. Monique Mund-Dopchie, “Le *Parabata Vincitus* de Jacques-Auguste

de Thou: tragédie antique et biblique” (339-356), considers how this play engages with *Prometheus Bound*, with Lucifer (the Transgressor) in the role of Prometheus; the play thus straddles the genre of “Biblical plays” and that of “antiquity plays.” Finally, Margaux Dusausoit, “Tragédie prétexte et actualité politique: *Alexander Severus* (1600) de Frédéric Morel” (357-376), discusses the career of Morel, mainly a printer/publisher but also an author and a prolific editor of classical texts. This play draws on the *Historia Augusta*, but makes Severus a Christian; Dusausoit argues that the play is fundamentally political, rejecting Machiavelli and possibly alluding to events at the end of the reign of Henry III.

After the essays comes a generous selection (about 135 pages) of passages from the plays. Each passage is about a page long, with a brief note and a translation into straightforward French prose. The head notes give enough context that the selections can be read independently of the essays, and footnotes explain some of the allusions and point out some classical sources. The passages chosen are often those discussed in the essays; there is at least one passage from each text and often more than one. The volume ends with a 40-page bibliography and indexes of names, characters in plays, and plays referred to (ancient or modern).

One theme that emerges from the essays is the place of religion in French Latin drama. Almost all of the plays under discussion come from the second half of the century, after the Council of Trent and during the French Wars of Religion. Although many of these plays were written as rhetorical studies for students, they do not avoid engaging with the essential issue of their time. Another theme is the influence of Latin drama on French drama, as authors like Jodelle are reading (and probably attending) the Latin plays. It is also clear that much more work can be done on Neo-Latin drama: some of these plays are only just appearing in modern editions and others remain to be reprinted and commented.

The volume would be a useful basis for a class on Renaissance drama (at least, or especially, in France) and is also an introduction to student life in sixteenth-century France. (Anne Mahoney, Tufts University)

◆ *How to drink: a classical guide to the art of imbibing.* By Vincent Obsopoeus. Edited, translated, and introduced by Michael Fontaine. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2020. 315 pp. \$16.95. This is a fun little book; it is also a scholarly edition of a little-known sixteenth-century didactic poem, accompanied by an eminently readable translation—an unusual and commendable combination.

It was not initially clear whether the work under review was going to be an elaborate spoof: who is this Obsopoeus anyway? The bibliography seems designed to deter further investigation, unless one has German journals of 1940 at hand which one doesn't, one's ancestors being otherwise engaged at the time. Could it be a brilliant pastiche? One has to ask, though, whether the editor would be capable of composing three thousand lines of very competent elegiacs. And, even if capable, would anyone really bother to go to so much trouble just to create an elegant spoof? In any case, somewhat to my disappointment, a brief search in the library catalogue indicates that Obsopoeus does really exist—in as many as fifty-seven varieties (not inappropriately for a Germanic cook), as far as the British Library collection goes. He seems to be almost always known by the Latin form (Obs- or Ops-), taken from the Greek *opson* (cooked food): “maker of food” suggesting a family trade. The title of one 1940 article calls him Vinzenz Heidecker, presumably from the village of Heideck in southern Germany. Born in about 1498, Obsopoeus published his *De Arte Bibendi* in 1536, with a revised edition in 1537, and died in 1539.

Fontaine presents the work with a facing-page translation, helpfully providing frequent sub-headings. The three books are titled (by Fontaine) “The Art of Drinking, sustainably and with discrimination,” “Excessive Drinking, what it looks like,” and “How to win at Drinking Games”. Whether Obsopoeus's wisdom is, or ever was genuinely useful advice may be doubted. Like quite a lot of didactic literature, it is an exercise in stretching an obvious statement (don't drink too much) to a suitable length (no, really, *don't* drink too much), but it is done well enough, by both the original author and the translator, to be entertaining and occasionally stimulating.

Why are we seeing this work now? It forms a part of a Princeton series entitled “Ancient Wisdom for Modern Readers.” It is a stretch

to call Obsopoeus “ancient”, and one may question the “wisdom” (though he does state what is obvious to the wise: no, *please*, don’t drink too much; and who is to say that Cicero was any wiser than that?). Obsopoeus finds himself in exalted company in the series: Cicero is featured six times, Seneca twice, Suetonius, Plutarch, Thucydides, and Epictetus as well. Though it is certainly nice to see Neo-Latin alongside major classical authors, there is clearly a difference in status. Anyone who wishes to read Cicero is not confined to a “fun” little series, numerous editions for all types of readership are available. For Obsopoeus in English it is effectively this or nothing. It is perhaps unlikely that many people will consult a previous translation by Helen F. Simpson (about which Fontaine is rude, without explaining exactly why) embedded in the *Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol* for 1945. Even if according to Fontaine that translation is flawed, this reviewer would have liked to have heard more about it.

Although the following comments are primarily from a Neo-Latinist’s perspective (this is not, after all, *Frat-Boy News*), it is worth remembering that scholars of Neo-Latin are not the main audience for this book. Like the rest of the series, it clearly aims to engage the general reader. The commentary is brief, a total of eight pages covering all three books, and briskly explains some things which might otherwise be puzzling. There is a token two-page appendix “for scholars,” wholly devoted to a list of textual changes. Fontaine does not discuss the reasons for such choices. Some of them are obvious to scholars (for sense, or meter), but may not be to the students who might like to know. In one or two cases a discussion might have been intriguing, at Book 1, line 321, *cuius nulla sonant vitae praeconia laudis* (“No proclamations of praise ring out for their lives”), *vitae* is Fontaine’s conjecture (“hesitantly”) for the original *vivae*—which might have been retained as “living, or lively, praise.”

More serious, for the Neo-Latin scholar, are Fontaine’s omissions. A couple of these are substantial, leaving out hundreds of lines. No doubt the readability of the text as “ancient wisdom” is thus improved. But a reader seeking a balanced view of Obsopoeus, including the more boring bits, will wonder what has been left out. A smaller omission also made me curious. Book 1, lines 203–208 are missing, with this note: “In the second edition Obsopoeus inserts six lines of needless

misogyny. I omit them here.” When, one wonders, do we ever *need* misogyny? The fact remains that many authors include it, and, from a sixteenth-century German man, it is hardly a big surprise. What is so shocking about those lines, as opposed to casual remarks elsewhere that could also be construed as misogynist, by modern standards? The suspicion must be that a less sanitized Obsopoeus would be a less “fun” read.

This reviewer made a feeble effort to find the six shocking lines. A poor-quality facsimile text available online, taken from a 1648 edition purporting to be printed at Leiden *ex typographia rediviva*. This starts with Obsopoeus—in four books, not three—and goes on to include humorous didactic works by other authors. The six scandalous lines are not there; presumably it follows the first edition, as Fontaine warns us later printings do. There ended my search for needless misogyny (see, one *can* survive without it), but the search made me wonder how a four-book version arose, but Fontaine’s introduction is rather too sketchy about the publication history of the work. Very probably he has discovered all these things, but he does not share them with readers. Nor does he give any real sense of the poem as poetry. Though much is made of Ovid as a model, the reviewer cannot recall seeing the word “elegiacs” anywhere in the book. A student wanting to know how Obsopoeus’s poetry works will have to look elsewhere. Indeed, that discussion might over-complicate an introduction. This is a case where one might well have hoped for a guide to further reading—especially to help general readers find out more about Neo-Latin in general or didactic verse. The bibliography we do have may be necessary as an indication of sources consulted but is completely useless as a guide for the inexperienced.

What is most remarkable, and remarkably successful, is the style of the translation. It is colloquial, vigorous, and lively, without any loss of accuracy where it really matters. It is also a very clever device to use layout on the page, often in bullet points, to clarify the structure and make it more attractive to read, where otherwise it might descend into a duller, pedestrian list. Fontaine’s method has much to recommend itself to anyone contemplating a translation from a Neo-Latin text. It will not work for everyone; other kinds of text will demand a different tone. But see what can be done to enhance the effect of the

original while retaining its spirit!

The occasional phrase may grate on some readers. The main audience (then and now) is made up of “college kids” (in Britain we tend to call them “students”, and sometimes even treat them as adults), who are tempted to “chug” and then, all too often, to “barf.” These are not words this reviewer would use, but they are readily understood in part due to a mis-spent youth and periodic contact with Americans. It is doubtful, however, that they would be so clear to the non-native speakers of English who form a large part of the international Neo-Latin community. Another consideration might be how common today’s slang will be in forty- or fifty-years’ time, when hopefully this edition will still be read.

Overall, though, we should be thankful to Michael Fontaine for undertaking this edition and translation, and to Princeton University Press for publishing it. If other Neo-Latin works can find a place among “ancient wisdom,” then a similar approach—with perhaps just a little more attention to helping the scholar or college kid who would like further information—should lead to further successes. Obsopoeus might well be proud of how his poem has been presented to twenty-first-century readers. He might even agree that the extra misogyny was not as necessary as all that. (David Money, University of Cambridge)

◆ Cristiano Casalini, Claude Pavur, *Joseph de Jouvancy, S.J. The way to learn and the way to teach*. Boston: Institute for Advanced Jesuit Studies, 2020. IV +270 pp. \$39.95. This volume makes available for the first time an edited Latin text and an English translation of the *Ratio discendi et docendi*, which Joseph de Jouvancy S.J. (1643–1719) composed as a guidebook to support the Jesuit educational institutions throughout the world. At a time when zeal for the humanities curriculum was in decline among certain Jesuit schools, the Superior General tasked Father Jouvancy, “a renowned Jesuit classical ‘man of Letters’” (1) with articulating the ideal Jesuit approach to the humanities. The Latin text is the 1703 edition that received the normative approbation. The book also includes an introduction which provides a useful outline of the intellectual and historical background of the work.

The translation is excellent; it is clear and faithful, managing to walk the line between stiff literal and loose readable prose. The Latin and English texts are free from typographical errors. The notes to the translation are one of the unexpected joys of the edition: the source material and references are explained in full, which opens avenues of new interest and will likely be a catalyst to future research. Jouvancy's opinions on Classical authors (he renders his judgement about most authors of the literary canon vis-à-vis their suitability for the student and teacher) show him to be a critical reader, and his suggestions for feeding the flame of the intellectual life and for keeping students interested and engaged certainly endure.

Jesuit education became distinctive by combining the *modus Parisiensis* with the basic features of Italian humanistic training. The curriculum for the early classes rested heavily in the Classics, with the goal of becoming a Christian *vir bonus dicendi peritus*. In order to assist with the rapid expansion of Jesuit education, the order issued the central document around which Jesuit education developed, its famous *Ratio Studiorum* (1599), which provided guidance regarding the schools' administration, curriculum, and discipline. The *Ratio Studiorum* was not composed as a tract of educational philosophy, but rather as a manual of the Jesuit institutional system by laying out the structure, contents, and governance within a Jesuit school. Jesuit educators would have to wait more than a hundred years for the fuller exposition of Jesuit pedagogy.

The Order asked Joseph de Jouvancy to adapt a handbook that he had published for teachers of the Humanities so that it could be adopted in Jesuit schools around the world as a careful articulation of the Jesuit course of studies in the humanities with principled attention paid to the means and manner of instruction, and encouragements for the instructors. The result was a widely popular and often reprinted booklet known variously as *Magistris scholarum inferiorum Societatis Iesu de ratione discendi et docendi, ratio discendi et docendi* or simply *Ratio Juveneci*. In it Jouvancy expanded on previous guides and extended well beyond them, describing how Jesuit instructors should pursue their own studies even while they are engaged in teaching. It is both a guide to proper teaching and an exhortation to the teacher.



Due to the significant role of Jesuit education in European intellectual history and the perennial need for pedagogical renewal, this edition by Casalini and Pavur is a welcome supplement to the historical of Jesuit education. The translation is readable enough and the material so relevant that scholars of the history of education or those interested in the history of Catholic pedagogy can now approach a text which would otherwise be inaccessible. This is also a worthwhile contribution to recent literature in Neo-Latin studies. This volume will support research into the sources of and influences on Jesuit authors. It is probably the case that the *Ratio studiorum* has had a greater effect on more people than most other things written in Latin after 1500, and the *Ratio discendi et docendi* provides an essential key to understanding Jesuit education in the eighteenth century. Casalini and Pavur contribute to a growing interest in and appreciation of the vast expanse of Jesuit literature. One can only hope that this trend will continue. (Patrick M. Owens, Hillsdale College)

◆ *Empire of Eloquence: The Classical Rhetorical Tradition in Colonial Latin America and the Iberian World*. By Stuart M. McManus. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021. XIII +300 pp. \$99.99. Stuart McManus, an Assistant Professor of World History at the Chinese University of Hong Kong, has written a wide-ranging study that considers an important aspect of the classical rhetorical tradition. Included in Cambridge's interdisciplinary series, "Ideas in Context," the volume under review spans the continents of Asia, Africa, Europe, and the Americas and reaches from the sixteenth through the early nineteenth centuries. McManus's focus is restricted to the role that the Greco-Roman art of persuasion played in the establishment and expansion of the Spanish and Portuguese empires. Even with this delimitation, however, the subject's compass is vast. No reader who has finished the book will be surprised to learn that the author's research took him to over twenty archives in thirteen countries and required him to become familiar with multiple languages (not only Latin, Spanish, and Portuguese but also Konkani and Chinese). The book took a decade to complete.

Following an introduction, McManus takes up in his second chapter a specific example of the influence of classicizing rhetoric in

the early modern period: forty-two funeral orations and sermons that were delivered in various parts of the vast empire of Philip IV of Spain following his death in 1665. Rather than restricting the scope of the study to one nation or continent, as is so often done, the author takes a meta-geographical approach, allowing the reader to see clearly how the practice of public speaking inherited from the ancient world helped shape an impressive “unity of art and erudition” stretching across a global empire (57). McManus suggests that these funeral speeches, whether delivered in Europe or elsewhere, were much more than empty showpieces for virtuosic orators. Nor were they only Machiavellian “technologies of empire,” designed to discourage disobedience to colonial overlords. They also served as effective vehicles for the establishment of “virtue politics,” helping rulers and ruled alike to imagine and expect a monarchy that was “justified and legitimated by virtue” (58), instead of pure self-interest or the exploitation of others.

The third chapter shifts its focus to the role that rhetoric played in the missionary activities of the Jesuits in Japan, concentrating on the figure of Hara Martinho (c. 1568–1629), the accomplished orator who could justifiably “lay claim to the title of Japan’s first *Cicero redivivus*” (112). As McManus shows, Hara Martinho and others in Japan used humanist learning to advance their religious views and practices in a part of the world that was “partially Christianized and Iberianized in this period, but never conquered per se” (19). Chapter 4 continues the analysis of the Jesuits’ use of the classical rhetorical tradition, but the focus is now shifted to Paraguay and Portuguese India. The next chapter addresses the question of Novohispanic identity in Mexico within the larger context of the “Republic of Letters” in the eighteenth century (20). Finally, the sixth chapter considers the relationship between the classical rhetorical tradition and the new Enlightenment ideas that would dramatically reshape the politics of the Iberian world between 1750 and 1850.

This book is not intended to be “a panegyric of globalization, past or present,” but rather a serious scholarly endeavor “to uncover the vestiges of a lost world order that lies buried beneath our modern conceptions of nations, continents and civilizations” (21). There can be little question that the author has succeeded in illustrating the many ways in which a meta-geographical study such as this one can add to

our understanding of how a cultural phenomenon such as classical rhetoric was once able to span the globe. What is less convincing are some of the transtemporal distinctions made here as the author attempts the formidable task of “bridging the gap between Columbus and Napoleon” (13). For instance, his use of the term “post-humanism” to describe “the cultural practices of the early to mid-eighteenth century,” a period of time that the author believes reflects exclusively “neither the humanist world of the early seventeenth century nor the neoclassical rhetorical culture of the early nineteenth” (231), is not unproblematic. This is a period, it is true, that may be said to have witnessed the gradual demise of “the culture of late humanism” and the concomitant rise of neo-classicism, and perhaps it does deserve a designation more meaningful than “very late humanism” or “early neo-classicism,” but “post-humanism” fails to fill the gap in nomenclature satisfactorily. The term itself is not, as the author claims, “a coinage of this book” (231) but has been in use for decades by philosophers and cultural historians to describe a wide range of intellectual movements, including attempts to imagine a world shaped primarily by artificial intelligence. “Post-humanism” is better suited for utopian (or dystopian) discussions of the future than diachronic analyses of nineteenth-century cultural movements.

Several helpful maps assist the reader in following the book’s arguments. The volume concludes with a list of archives visited, as well as an extensive bibliography of primary and secondary sources that will certainly be of great value to anyone who wishes to pursue this subject further. (Carl P.E. Springer, University of Tennessee Chattanooga)

◆ *Printing Virgil: the transformation of the classics in the Renaissance.* By Craig Kallendorf, Medieval and Renaissance authors and texts, volume 23. Leiden; Brill: Brill, 2020. VIII +193 pp. €120,00. Craig Kallendorf (K) is a veteran in Vergilian reception studies with a widely acknowledged publication history going back to the 1980s. The current volume comes on the heel of his numerous literary and bibliographical studies on the Renaissance and Early Modern reception of this foundational poet of the West. It certainly will not disappoint anyone looking for a nuanced, philologically precise, and theoretically aware peek into the “primordial jungle” (17; quoting Ziolkowski, J.M.

and M.C.J. Putnam, eds., *The Virgilian Tradition*, New Haven, Yale University Press, 2008, xxii) of printed Virgilian corpora coming from the mid-fifteenth to early seventeenth century. Kallendorf does not claim to give the final definitive word; as he himself points out, the jungle (or the current scholarly knowledge thereof) keeps expanding at the astonishing rate of about fifty new editions of Virgil published between 1469 and 1850 discovered *every year* (2, 116). Still, this study, which comes out of Kallendorf's decades-long research career, personal visits to numerous public and private collections, extensive use of digital resources including google books, and access to as yet unpublished material in the *Catalogus Translationum*, promises to be an indispensable foundation for any research on Early Modern Virgilian reception.

A brief Introduction outlining the field and research methodology (especially the 14 'transformation types', which are illustrated with examples several times over in the book (6–13, 47–52, 163–6)) is followed by chapters on Commentary, Translation, Canonization, Censorship, and a Conclusion. The main body concentrates on printed volumes whose first editions appeared before 1600 although there are occasional discussions of works that appeared thereafter (e.g. 118). There are also helpful tables listing the commentaries (31–3), translations (60–61, 83, 94–5) and the surprisingly numerous Renaissance and Early Modern Virgilian opuscula (133–5; limited to those printed in Venice).

The chapter on Commentary covers such humanistic heavyweights as Melanchthon (by far the most popular, even in Catholic areas, cf. 34), Vives, Erasmus and Ramus as well as lesser-known figures including Jesse Badius and Sebastiano Regoli. Kallendorf also investigates the role of Renaissance and Early Modern commentaries as acts of meaning-creation or of framing the interpretation of the reference sphere—the commented, ancient original—and sketches how the *Aeneid* and other works of Virgil were presented not only as models of Latinity, at that time seen as no different from what we today call 'Neo-Latin' but also as musters of human virtue, Neo-Platonism, or Aristotelian poetics.

In analyzing Renaissance printed translations, Kallendorf similarly emphasizes their creative aspects. His discussion of the web of profes-

sional/patron-client network behind Italian translations (58–79) is the most extensive. His treatment of French (79–93), English (95–102), German (102–5), and Spanish translations (106–11), while shorter, are also highly instructive, multi-faceted and thought-provoking. Of all parts of the book, this chapter has perhaps the greatest potential as a launching-pad for future research that would arouse a wide interest in literary scholarship.

The chapters entitled Canonization and Censorship, which are both reworkings of earlier journal contributions (cf. vii), address the basic yet often neglected question as to which texts of Virgil, especially other than the usual triad, were presented as those of the revered poet to Renaissance and Early Modern readers after passing through the multiple filters of the editor, commentator, publisher, censor, librarian, curator, etc. Kallendorf's experience in handling numerous rare volumes in public and private collections really shines here, as he can point out many instances of the physical removal of pages which may be difficult or impossible to spot if one were relying simply on library catalogs or even digital images (see esp. 139–141). Understanding the literary, cultural and religious politics behind the filtering process also requires a great deal of background knowledge in Renaissance Early Modern intellectual history, an asset which Kallendorf possesses to an unrivalled degree.

The Conclusion, in addition to containing the usual recap of the main body, has a short but seminal section entitled Final Thoughts from which not only Neo-Latinists but classicists and many humanities scholars should be able to draw applicable lessons. Here, Kallendorf says first that the material matters, i.e. that philologists are well advised not only to collect textual data that can ultimately be reduced to Word or Excel files but also lay their hands on the material bases, the media in or on which the texts are found. Secondly, Kallendorf makes a general plea to get out of our comfort zones by engaging not only with colleagues in other fields but groups outside academia (e.g. book collectors), who may have both knowledge and material that are vital to our endeavor.

To sum up, in this volume Kallendorf examines a vast amount of relevant data using up-to-date theoretical frameworks including reception and transformation and provides many fresh insights into one of

the chief pillars of classical studies, as it were, which one often takes for granted, and yet about which one is too often ignorant as to its base. As Kallendorf himself would probably be the first to admit, renaissance/early modern Virgilian reception is by no means a closed book; among the many details yet to be discovered, the reviewer personally hopes, to give you one tiny example that the 1600 Nagasaki edition of Virgil printed for Japanese students (in all probability one of the mass of under-cataloged printed school texts, cf. 116 and [https://digital-archives.sophia.ac.jp/laures-kirishitan-bunko/view/kirishitan\\_bunko/JL-37-36-31-14](https://digital-archives.sophia.ac.jp/laures-kirishitan-bunko/view/kirishitan_bunko/JL-37-36-31-14) (accessed 8/16/2021)) will be discovered one day. For any future research on Renaissance and Early Modern reception of Virgil, this volume will be an indispensable starting point and one hopes that similar projects will be undertaken for other classical authors as well. (Akihiko Watanabe, Otsuma Women's University).