



EVENTEENTH-



ENTURY



NEWS

SPRING - SUMMER 2002

Vol. 60

Nos. 1&2



Including

THE NEO-LATIN NEWS Vol. 50, Nos. 1&2

---

# *SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY NEWS*

VOLUME 60, Nos. 1&2

SPRING-SUMMER, 2002

**SCN**, an official organ of the Milton Society of America and of the Milton Section of the Modern Language Association, is published as a double issue two times each year with the support of the English Departments of:

University of Akron  
Concordia University, Wisconsin  
Oklahoma State University  
Texas A&M University

**SUBMISSIONS:** Though primarily a review journal, **SCN** also publishes shorter articles and scholarly notes. Manuscripts should be submitted in duplicate (with the author's name and institutional affiliation on the cover page only) accompanied by a stamped, self-addressed envelope. As a service to the scholarly community, **SCN** publishes news items as well.

**SUBSCRIPTIONS,** Domestic and International. \$15.00 (\$20.00) for one year; \$28.00 (\$37.00) for two years; \$40.00 (\$52.00) for three years. Checks or money orders are payable to *Seventeenth-Century News*. A current style sheet, announcements, previous volumes' Tables of Contents, advertising rates, and other information all may be obtained via our home page on the World Wide Web. Books for review and queries should be sent to:

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

E-Mail: [scn@tamu.edu](mailto:scn@tamu.edu)  
WWW: <http://www-english.tamu.edu/pubs/scn/>

ISSN 0037-3028

# *SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY NEWS*

## **EDITOR**

DONALD R. DICKSON  
Texas A&M University

## **EDITOR EMERITUS**

Harrison T. Meserole  
Texas A&M University

## **ASSOCIATE EDITORS**

James Egan, University of Akron  
Gene Edward Veith, Concordia University, Wisconsin  
Jeffrey Walker, Oklahoma State University  
Thomas L. Wilmeth, Concordia University, Wisconsin  
Michele Marrapodi, University of Palermo  
Patricia Garcia Ocañas, Our Lady of the Lake University

## **EDITORIAL ASSISTANTS**

Joshua D. Hill, Texas A&M University  
Christopher L. Morrow, Texas A&M University  
Larry A. Van Meter, Texas A&M University

## CONTENTS

VOLUME 60, Nos. 1&2

SPRING-SUMMER, 2002

### REVIEWS

- “Vocation Homily, George Herbert, and the Cultural Criticism: A Review Essay” by JONATHAN NAUMAN. . . . . 1
- Robert Wilcher, *The Writing of Royalism, 1628-1660*. Review by ALAN RUDRUM. . . . . 21
- John T. Shawcross, *The Uncertain World of Samson Agonistes*. Review by WILLIAM B. HUNTER. . . . . 25
- Jameela Lares, *Milton and the Preaching Arts*. Review by JAMES EGAN. . . . . 28
- Stanley Fish, *How Milton Works*. Review by JOHN MULRYAN. . . . . 32
- Victoria Silver, *Imperfect Sense: The Predicament of Milton’s Irony*. Review by DAVID V. URBAN. . . . . 34
- Kristen Poole, *Radical Religion from Shakespeare to Milton: Figures of Nonconformity in Early Modern England*. Review by ELIZABETH SAUER. . . . . 39
- Mary Ellen Henley and W. Speed Hill, eds., *Wrestling with God: Literature & Theology in the English Renaissance. Essays to Honour Paul Grant Starwood*. Review by DONALD R. DICKSON. . . . . 41
- Andrew Gordon and Bernhard Klein, eds., *Literature, Mapping and the Politics of Space in Early Modern Britain*. Review by IRA CLARK. . . . . 43
- Germaine Warkentin and Carolyn Podruchny, eds., *Decentering the Renaissance: Canada and Europe in Multidisciplinary Perspective, 1500-1700*. Review by TY M. REESE. . . . . 48
- Harriette Andreadis, *Sappho in Early Modern England: Female Same-Sex Literary Erotics*. Review by MADHAVI MENON. . . . . 52

- Deborah Aldrich-Watson, ed., *The Verse Miscellany of Constance Aston Fowler*.  
Review by ADAM SMYTH. . . . . 55
- Jane Spencer, *Aphra Behn's Afterlife*, and Derek Hughes, *The Theatre of Aphra Behn*. Reviews by ROBERT MARKLEY. . . . . 58
- Karen Raber, *Dramatic Difference: Gender, Class, and Genre in the Early Modern Closet Drama*. Review by JULIE D. CAMPBELL. . . . . 61
- Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth, eds., *Literary Circles and Cultural Communities in England*. Review by MARLIN E. BLAINE. . . . . 65
- Larry F. Norman, *The Public Mirror: Molière and the Social Commerce of Depiction*. Review by KIKI GOUNARIDOU. . . . . 69
- Nicholas D. Paige, *Being Interior: Autobiography and the Contradictions of Modernity in Seventeenth-Century France*. Review by ZAHİ ZALLOUA. . . . . 72
- Andrew Calder, *The Fables of La Fontaine: Wisdom Brought Down to Earth*.  
Review by JOE JOHNSON. . . . . 75
- Yvonne Bleyerveld, *Hoe bedriechlijk dat die vrouwen zijn: Vrouwenlisten in de beeldende kunst in de Nederlanden*; Eddy de Jongh, *Dankzij de tiende muze*; and Eric Jan Sluijter, *De 'heydensche fabulen' in schilderkunst van de Gouden Eeuw*.  
Reviews by CHRISTOPHER P. HEUER. . . . . 78
- Rudolf M. Dekker, *Humour in Dutch Culture of the Golden Age*. Review by  
LARRY SILVER. . . . . 86
- Randolph Vigne and Charles Littleton, eds., *From Strangers to Citizens: The Integration of Immigrant Communities in Britain, Ireland and Colonial America, 1550-1750*. Review by ELLEN J. JENKINS. . . . . 89
- Adrian Davies, *The Quakers in English Society 1655-1725*. Review by KATE  
PETERS. . . . . 92
- Trevor Cooper, ed., *The Journal of William Dowding: Iconoclasm in East Anglia During the English Civil War*. Review by CHARLES W. A. PRIOR. . . . . 95

Michael Mendle, ed., <i>The Putney Debates of 1647: The Army, the Levellers, and the English State</i> . Review by MARK CHARLES FISSEL. . . . .	98
Philippe Contamine, ed., <i>War and Competition Between States</i> . Review by MICHAEL R. LYNN. . . . .	101
Steve Hindle, <i>The State and Social Change in Early Modern England, c. 1550-1640</i> . Review by NICOLE GREENSPAN. . . . .	104
J.C. Davis, <i>Oliver Cromwell</i> . Review by BRETT PARKER. . . . .	108
Lindsey Hughes, ed., <i>Peter the Great and the West: New Perspectives</i> . Review by CATHY J. POTTER. . . . .	111
Leeds Barroll, <i>Anna of Denmark, Queen of England: A Cultural Biography</i> . Review by JANE LYTTON GOOCH. . . . .	115
Stephen Coote, <i>Royal Survivor: A Life of Charles II</i> . Review by BRYAN N.S. GOOCH. . . . .	120
Brendan Dooley, <i>The Social History of Skepticism: Experience and Doubt in Early Modern Culture</i> . Review by LAURA CRUZ. . . . .	128
Alain Cabantous, <i>Blasphemy: Impious Speech in the West from the Seventeenth to the Nineteenth Century</i> . Review by MELISSA MOHR . . . . .	133
John T. Young, <i>Faith, Medical Alchemy and Natural Philosophy: Johann Moriaen, Reformed Intelligencer, and the Hartlib Circle</i> . Review by IRVING A. KELTER. . . . .	136
John Hajdu Heyer, ed., <i>Lully Studies</i> . Review by BRYAN N.S. GOOCH. . . . .	140
NEO-LATIN NEWS. . . . .	149
NEWS. . . . .	185

## REVIEWS

### Vocation Homily, George Herbert, and the Cultural Criticism: A Review Essay

JONATHAN NAUMAN  
USK VALLEY VAUGHAN ASSOCIATION

The new historical movement has now been with us more than two decades, and has generally displaced the ideological anthropology and linguistics of structuralism and deconstruction to become (under the banner of cultural studies) the ruling force in contemporary literary criticism. We are now sufficiently distant from the movement's beginning to have texts on hand that pursue cultural studies as later contributions to an established school, re-applying the founders' methods and interacting with other similarly-motivated critical works. Cristina Malcolmson's recent study of George Herbert<sup>1</sup> is such a text; and it shows not only the continuing interest in new-historical method, but also the dangers that the method encounters amidst the complex interaction between its ideological critique, its employed historical texts, and the artistic figure concerned. I hope to show, in the context of examining Malcolmson's analysis of Herbert's work, the dangers of reduction implicit in cultural studies' deterministic subordination of history. Although presumptions of structure can be shown to direct and motivate all historical analyses, in cultural studies the avowed historical *modus operandi* passes from open-ended tact to explicit interpretive pressure, from a commitment to articulating what happened as sympathetically and accurately as possible to a straightforward subduing of a complex of events to a determinate historical process. Under such interpretive pressure, the tonal distinctions and details of the sources often blur, becoming a sort of scrim to be torn aside in order to reveal the expected psychological or sociopolitical machinery. This sort of interpretive pressure is what makes recent literary studies seem "a mission in cultural eugenics,"<sup>2</sup> out of touch with the real aesthetic experiences that made such studies possible.

Malcolmson's study evades "the devotionism that, until recently, has been the focus of Herbert criticism" (1) by advocating a cultural materialist interpretation of the poet's career. Herbert is cast as a failed "client in the Protestant faction headed by William Herbert, Earl of Pembroke" (6), a client whose options were dictated by his position as a younger son in the English aristocracy. In early and mid-career, Herbert is portrayed by Malcolmson as endorsing his faction's pious legitimations of innovative business and colonialism—sanctified aristocratic—capitalist ambition that she finds self-deceptive and opportunistic, but nevertheless more attractively progressive than Herbert's late-career stance. This she characterizes as a reactionary revulsion toward his earlier willingness to compromise with impure capital.

The study begins with a review of the political misfortunes of the Protestant-leaning Pembroke faction during the ascendancy of Buckingham. Here Malcolmson repeatedly suggests that, under such constraining circumstances, pragmatic pursuit of wealth and prestige would sufficiently explain George Herbert's movements toward the country parsonage in Bemerton, and render unnecessary any recourse to religious motivations (22-24, 33). Malcolmson does allow to "Herbert's sincere devotional commitment" a subjective reality, but only in the context of maintaining that it did not really modify or ameliorate the socioeconomic pressures that determined the shape of his life (6). She interprets *The Country Parson*, his "Character and Rule of Holy Life," as a fictitious and self-compensatory autobiography (28, 33) that unintentionally forwarded the development of capitalist professionalism (45), and argues that Herbert's sacred verse was intended to be public—in some cases written for entertainments at Wilton House, and in all cases written in implicit dialogue with the Pembroke coterie.<sup>3</sup> For theological background, Malcolmson fields quotations from contemporary Protestant preachers who differentiated between a "general vocation" (the call for all to follow Christ) and a "particular vocation" (the work God calls a Christian to perform for humanity in workaday life). Malcolmson believes that these ministers insisted on uniting the two vocations, workaday life with



following Christ, out of reactionary anxiety over social mobility (4). Certainly there are explicit warnings about the unpleasant consequences of envy, covetousness, and ambition in such sermons and treatises<sup>4</sup>; but, as I will later show, Malcolmson's deployment of seventeenth-century Protestant thinkers within Max Weber's early twentieth-century sociological construct clouds some important differences between the preachers and neglects some noteworthy complexities in the social prescriptions they deduce from their callings.

Malcolmson's analysis of *The Temple* considers the Williams manuscript ("W") an early poetic effort "to hold together the genteel lifestyle and religious holiness through the doctrine of vocation" (72), and she claims that the printed collections (1633 and later, presumably derived from the posthumous Ms. Tanner 307, or "B") show Herbert revising his poems to remove implicit allusions to his earlier secular ambitions and suppressing autobiographical references to specifically personal religious concerns. The poems' final version is therefore seen as an abandonment of any attempt to balance Christian piety with personal secular success, a retreat from unifying the "two vocations" in favor of attempting a sincere response to the general calling, a response that Malcolmson psychologizes as "transparently" pious behavior.<sup>5</sup> I don't think Malcolmson is right to claim that such "transparency" marks a rigorist revulsion against efforts to unify particular and general callings, because the homilists she cites seem to me to have required piety at least as straightforward as that required by Herbert. But it does seem probable that Herbert's later poems show an intensifying rejection of worldly ambition, traces of which Malcolmson and others have convincingly detected in "The Churchporch" and in early letters.

Malcolmson's readings from the final recension of *The Church* are generally Marxian and hostile, portraying Herbert as a regressive cryptofeudal aesthete. She considers the religious consciousness Herbert wishes to endorse a cultural fiction that props non-egalitarian politics by providing a specious alternative to them (169), and she generally attempts to dissolve the artistic moments

of the poems back into the unpleasant sociopolitical forces that she argues to have produced them. "Love unknown," for instance, is a prolongation of unjust leases (163) and despotic oppression (167-68) into the afterlife; "The Elixir" is an attempt to foreclose on subversive discontent with menial work, and its argument provides a rationale for "the drudgery needed for the maintenance of the traditional order" (170); "Love [III]" is a seductive depiction of feudal submission to a benevolent lord, fraudulently softened by language implying low-church liturgical practices that Herbert did not actually espouse (175-77). A final chapter reviewing landscape and statuary in gardens constructed by members of Herbert's family characterizes those gardens, and Herbert's poems "Paradise" and "The Church Militant," as descriptions of "a religious and social order that sanctifies the use of force for the purpose of reproducing this order, psychically in the individual, and physically in the New World" (204); and a conclusion positions Malcolmson's sociopolitical materialist reading of Herbert against recent attempts to appreciate the poet's experiential or transgressive subjectivity.

Malcolmson's study does show sensitivity to the multivalent and fertile role played by the Hebrew and Christian scriptures in Herbert's work. Cunning construction of religious artifacts, for instance, could in the Old Testament be seen either as an admirable service or as an empty imposture, depending on whether the artifact was offered as a depiction of a god or as a prescribed aid for worshipping God as nondepictable. This dual possibility Malcolmson links persuasively with Herbert's ambivalence toward his own art, his determination to locate the importance of his poetry in its gestures toward spiritual inwardness (76). Her characterization of Herbert's religious humility and her enumeration of the psychological postures made available to him by that humility show genuine interest in the human qualities that enabled the writing of *The Temple*—interest of the sort we see in earlier studies by Izaak Walton and George Herbert Palmer (66-67). And her aware-

ness of the Pembroke circle's involvement with the ethos of Philip Sidney prompts her to suggest convincingly that Sidneian technique can be seen at work in Herbert's poems (104-7).

The weaknesses of Malcolmson's readings, on the other hand, reflect the problems of the sociopolitical trend in criticism that her study explicitly seeks to forward. The citations from Protestant divines, so important to the book's historical basis, have a ring of proof-texting: the sermons do not seem really to engage Malcolmson's interest apart from their availability as Herbert-contemporary evidence of emergent Protestant progressivism along the lines of Weberian theory. Take for example Malcolmson's exposition of Herbert's claim in *The Country Parson* that parishioners "labour profanely, when they set themselves to work like brute beasts, never raising their thoughts to God, nor sanctifying their labour with daily prayer."<sup>6</sup> This stricture "echoes the warnings of Perkins and other writers on vocation," she says, "but the image of the 'brute beasts' reveals [Herbert's] class origins: it surprisingly links energetic effort with a lack of civility and follows tradition by suggesting that manual labor and commerce are forms of defilement" (123; see also 170). But is Herbert really betraying himself and going beyond the opinions of the vocation preachers when he compares profane laborers to beasts? Indeed he is, but not in Malcolmson's sense, for Perkins himself held, in his *Treatise of the Vocations*, that diligent, peaceable laborers who failed to offer their labor to God were not merely like beasts, but worse than beasts:

In the same field, at the same time, in the same businesse, there is the work of the oxe, and the worke of a man; now I demand which of these twaine is the better worke? I know the answer wil be, the work of the man; but the truth is, unlesse he be renewed by the grace of God, his labour is worse then the labour of the beast; for the beast in his kinde obeyes God, so doth not the unrepentant sinner.<sup>7</sup>

Herbert was not betraying aristocratic reflexes in his beast trope, but theological reflexes: failure to turn toward God caused one to slip down the chain of being, but did not (as was maintained by Perkins's hardline Calvinist stance) completely erase creaturely goodness.

That Malcolmson's hermeneutic of suspicion, her determination to detect in Herbert a sense of injured aristocratic merit, should lead to slips of this sort is not surprising, since she openly claims the right to depart from textual evidence when her own sociopolitical expectations lead in a different direction: "Herbert openly attacks this sense [of a taint in manual labor] in 'The Church-porch,' but I believe that he felt it himself nevertheless, especially when the lack of preferment opened him up so much more fully to the loss of gentry status through downward mobility" (98). A more accurate and genuinely historical response would allow the data to lead us to the most likely conclusions, in spite of the generalizations widely applicable to a person's origin and class. And the evidence seems to me explicit and clear that George Herbert worked hard to rid himself of aristocratic fastidiousness and that he succeeded to an admirable degree in fulfilling his own injunction from "The Church-porch":

Kneeling ne'er spoil'd silk stocking; quit thy state.  
All equall are within the churches gate (ll. 407-8).

Malcolmson might seem from her arguments to lack interest in the real variety that individual human beings display when dealing with socioeconomic constraints—at one point, for instance, she argues that George Herbert's failure to obtain preferment "cannot simply be the result of a personal disenchantment with the court, since his brothers Edward Herbert and Thomas Herbert suffered from the same difficulty" (6). Certainly there is a sense in which politics and economics determined the shape of the Herbert family's life. But when we consider the art of George Herbert, it is just as important to note the Herbert brothers' remarkably various inclinations and temperaments, and their evident choices to respond to the Pembroke faction's difficulties in very different ways.

Malcolmson believes, in short, that sociopolitical forces were the driving impulse and main determinant behind the treatises of the Protestant divines and the poems of George Herbert, and I think that this belief tends to compromise the sensitivity, the probability, and the proportion of her readings from both. The preachers are generally characterized as confused and nervous progressives, endorsing secular work in a new religiously-intense way while attempting to use religion to prevent class mobility and keep progress (defined teleologically by contemporary egalitarian professionalism) under control. But close inspection of the preachers' works will reveal important differences in attitude, both toward social mobility and toward the relationship between vocation and sociopolitical authority. William Perkins's *A Treatise on the Vocations*, which defined "general" and "personal" or "particular" callings for later writers, recommends that adults choose their vocations after careful self-analysis and good advice, and that they give studied attention to their children's aptitudes before deciding to train them for trade or as clerics (758-59). For Perkins, all callings are to service, and so long as service is the motive, no calling lawfully pursued can be either too low or too high. While he denounces avarice and vanity as motives for taking up a calling (756-57, 767), he positively encourages pursuit (through established channels) of callings considered higher, with Christian ministry considered the highest (759, 762). His style and manner resonate with the fresh enthusiasm of early humanist Protestantism, and he has sufficient confidence in individual judgment to openly advocate disobeying authorities who impose requirements that are unacceptable for religious reasons (757-58).<sup>8</sup>

Robert Sanderson, on the other hand, shows all the concern for control of social mobility that Malcolmson attributes to the preachers, and then some. His *Fourth Sermon Ad Populum* opens with a warning against any neglect of social obligation that might use the "general" religious calling as an excuse (237-38)<sup>9</sup>; and he terms workaday vocations "particular" and "outward" rather than "personal." Every possible motivation—respect, courage, self-doubt, pride, modesty—is carefully summoned to persuade children to ac-

cept training chosen for them against their inclinations by their parents (261-263); indeed, Sanderson would advise us always to suspect our inclinations, for God no longer works through direct promptings (254) and the human heart is desperately wicked (263); instead, the objective criterion of ability should guide us—and this is to include not only mental and bodily ability but “Birth, Wealth, Honour, Authority, Reputation, Kinred, Alliance” (264). Lateral movement is permitted because sometimes it can’t be helped; upward mobility is permitted because promotions need to happen so that certain professions can continue (269). Any idealism envisioning service to God and fellow man is buried under concern for optimum social organization, and even Sanderson’s pitch for the Christian ministry has an overripe savor of establishment:

In the judging of our Abilities, we should have a regard to the outward *circumstances* of *times* and *places*, and the rest. Those *gifts*, which would have made a sufficient Priest, in the beginning of *the Reformation*, in that dearth of learning, and penury of the Gospel, now the times are full of knowledge and learning, would be all little enough for a *Parish-Clerk*. (264)

Whereas Perkins leaves the individual Christian alone before God in his peroration (777-79), Sanderson concludes by making religious observance a matter of obligation, self-interest, and duty—a mainstay against typical corruptions in various fields of work (273).

These details seem to me to show that the Protestant preachers’ attempts to structure seventeenth-century life around “general” and “personal” callings did not produce a predictable and identifiable mode of compromise between class solidarity and social mobility. If it is right to say that George Herbert was drawn for a while into a moderately worldly attempt to combine upper-class office seeking with serving God, and that he finally rejected this attempt in favor of constant and explicit Christian piety, it is at least as likely that the vocation preachers forwarded the rejection as it is that they forwarded the moderation. None of Herbert’s unworldlinesses exceeds in severity Perkins’s insistence that “it is not sufficient to do a lawful action, but it must be done in holy

manner: for lawfull actions unlesse they be sanctified, are sins" (766). Indeed, the whole paradigm of unintentionally progressive bourgeois compromise in the preachers and socially regressive aristocratic severity in the later Herbert needs to be questioned. If Perkins and Sanderson truly indicate two social tendencies in vocation homily, greater severity in prioritizing the religious motive actually correlates with a greater rather than a lesser openness to social mobility and individual freedom.

Malcolmson, on the other hand, characterizes George Herbert as a conservative, mistrustful of his own subjectivity (127-30), aristocratic but forced by unfavorable politics to accept preference to a small ecclesiastical living; and she hypothesizes that the poet came to terms with this setback by progressively masking upper-class disdain for manual labor as an emphatic endorsement of God as sole laborer in all professional and spiritual successes. The evident revisions in some of Herbert's poems, from "W" to "B," are then read by Malcolmson as support for this thesis; but these examinations seem to me only to show that the revisions in question need not contradict the thesis; and Malcolmson's study's unremitting socioeconomic focus often elides other plausible motives for the noticed revisions of "W." For example, the "W" poem "Perfection," revised in that manuscript to "The Elixir," is foregrounded by Malcolmson as an example of Herbert retreating in late career from any implied endorsement of social mobility. Here are the two versions of the poem:

*Perfection*

Lord teach me to referr  
 All things I doe to thee  
 That I not only may not err  
 But also pleasing be.  
  
 A man that looks on glasse,  
 On it may stay his eye:  
 Or if he pleaseth, through it passe  
 And then the heav'n espy.  
  
 He that does ought for thee  
 Marketh that deed for thine:

*The Elixir*

Teach me, my God and King,  
 In all things thee to see,  
 And what I do in any thing,  
 To do it as for thee:  
  
 Not rudely, as a beast,  
 To runne into an action;  
 But still to make thee prepossest,  
 And give it his perfection.  
  
 A man that looks on glasse,  
 On it may stay his eye;

And when the Diuel shakes the tree, Thou saist, this fruit is mine.	Or if he pleaseth, through it passe, And then the heav'n espie.
All may of thee partake: Nothing can be so low	All may of thee partake: Nothing can be so mean,
Which with his tincture (for thy sake) Will not to Heaven grow.	Which with his tincture (for thy sake) Will not grow bright and clean.
A servant with this clause Makes drudgerie divine.	A servant with this clause Makes drudgerie divine:
Who sweeps a chamber for thy Laws, Makes that and th' action fine.	Who sweeps a room, as for thy laws, Makes that and the action fine.
But these are high perfections: Happy are they that dare	This is the famous stone That turneth all to gold:
Lett in the light to all their actions And show them as they are.	For that which God doth touch and own Cannot for lesse be told.

Malcolmson analyzes the “Perfection” version of this poem as follows:

The servant in [“Perfection”] is a far more troublesome figure than in the final revision, since his or her “knowledge of religion” results in actions that verge on “high perfections” (21) in the divine scale of value. The stanza on the servant explicitly and consistently upsets the hierarchical social norm, since the word “chamber” (19) emphasizes the difference between the householder and those he or she serves. The word “fine” (20) also intentionally challenges the upper-class notion of elegance and cultivation associated with the word and suggests much more pointedly than in the revision that individuals first measured as “low” can overturn upper-class expectations as they “grow” upwards on earth, as it is in heaven. The “high perfections” (21) that the poem itself makes possible to servants become too threatening, and the last stanza warns its reader and its author to beware of the motives that lie behind their desire for such an ascent. (171)

This interpretation seems to me to have become special pleading, in which the urging of a certain agenda takes precedence over clarifying what the poems say and what Herbert’s revision implies. Is the first version of the fifth stanza really more “explicitly and consistently” subversive than the second? Is there sufficient war-



rant for claiming that the change from “chamber” to “room” was motivated by fear of lower-class ambition? Are “upper-class expectations” truly overturned more by the “fine” sweeping of the “low” than by the “fine” sweeping of the “mean”? Malcolmson seems to me to presume her interpretation so energetically that its momentum prevents her from understanding the point of the first version’s final stanza—not that one ought to allow God to sift one’s motives for aiming high, but that one ought to allow God to grant a consistent consciousness of divine service being behind one’s every action. In fact, if we reverse the order of the poems, assuming for the sake of argument that “The Elixir” had been revised into “Perfection,” we could make at least as convincing a case for Herbert having been motivated by worries about lower-class ambition as Malcolmson has for the extant scenario.<sup>10</sup>

It is also curious that Malcolmson ignores the evident internal and literary motives for these changes. As F.E. Hutchinson noticed, Herbert’s immediate impulse toward revision seems most probably to have been an attempt to make the fourth stanza’s alchemical “tincture” the central metaphor of the poem. In “Perfection,” the dedicated deed appears under three metaphorical descriptions: a translucent window, fruit on a tree, and an alchemically-transformed lower element; and it is the window metaphor that is recovered and elaborated in the concluding stanza. In “The Elixir,” the fruit metaphor, weakest and least similar to the others, is eliminated in favor of focusing on the transformative and enlightening powers attributed to the “philosophers’ stone.” Accordingly, the rhyming pair “low” and “grow,” which continued the fruit metaphor in “Perfection,” is replaced in “The Elixir” by “mean” and “bright and clean,” which evoke translucent glass and transmuted metal. Since the revised poem will conclude alchemically, the enlightened perception of a sweeping task is pressed for a more transformative dynamic: “chamber” already has “fine” connotations, but use of the single-syllable “room” eliminates these and also enables an echo of the new first stanza’s “as for thee.” This literary explanation for Herbert’s changes would seem to me to be more warranted and probable than Malcolmson’s political speculations;

and I think it important that ideological readings be advanced in the context of recognizing such details. Malcolmson instead either fails to see the literary aspect of the revision, or else consciously suppresses it, for her analysis quotes “Perfection” at length without including its third stanza (170-71).

Similar omissions compromise Malcolmson’s claim that Herbert’s “The Flower” communicates feudalistic recoil from “willed self-cultivation that is both distinctly human and inevitably sinful” (147). Here and throughout the study, Malcolmson persistently ascribes to Herbert the belief that energetic personal exertion amounts to sin and needs to be eliminated; but the three stanzas missing from her quotation (second, third, sixth) effectively resist this simplification, as Herbert marvels at his “recover’d greenness,” wonders at God making his “passing-bell” into a “chiming,” exults in his opportunity despite worldly misfortune to write:

And now in age I bud again,  
 After so many deaths I live and write;  
     I once more smell the dew and rain,  
 And relish versing: O my onely light,  
     It cannot be  
     That I am he  
 On whom thy tempests fell all night.

“Thy word is all, if we could spell,” Herbert says: God is the source both of the “spring-showre” misperceived and misused, and of the “tempests” that end such vagaries; and the humility and gratitude of acknowledging this produces—not a blinkered fear of transgressive egoism, but the “dew and rain And relish” of George Herbert’s savored versing experience. I do not feel Malcolmson is correct when she says that this stanza indicates a patriarchal superior’s confining norm enforcement, and that it minimizes any “traces of human creativity” (152-53).<sup>11</sup>

Malcolmson’s treatment of “The Flower” displaces considerably the matter least congenial to her argument: the poem’s sixth stanza appears several pages after the poem’s main exposition. But one of the texts most inconvenient to Malcolmson’s claims about Herbert’s character emerges in her arguments more than

one hundred pages after the end of her chapter on *The Country Parson*, the work in which the passage appears. Here the passage is, with a sentence of contextual lead-in, followed by Malcolmson's exposition.

If the Parson were ashamed of particularizing in these [reproofs and encouragements of his parishioners at home,] hee were not fit to be a Parson: but he holds the Rule, that Nothing is little in Gods service: If it once have the honour of that Name, it grows great instantly. Wherefore neither disdaineth he to enter into the poorest Cottage, though he even creep into it, and though it smell never so lothsomly. For both God is there also, and those for whom God dyed: and so much the rather doth he so, as his accesse to the poor is more comfortable, then to the rich; and in regard of himselfe, it is more humiliation. (248-49)

In this passage the genteel, sophisticated parson actually confronts the laborer whose poverty he likes to affect in his poetry, and his intense reaction against entering the cottage testifies to his acute consciousness of breaking the rules of social decorum by doing so and his deep fear of the polluting effects of this transgression. To "creep" into the cottage is to risk contracting its commonness, which here threatens like a contagious disease. The Parson's anxiety over this encounter is measured by his inability to describe the people themselves in this cottage, whom he can only grasp as "those for whom God dyed." Herbert attempts to counteract this powerful class reaction by invoking Christian inversions of hierarchy; the passage recalls the explosion of social decorum in "Redemption," when the husbandman confronts Christ amidst the thieves and murderers. But the Parson's "humiliation" here is deeply ambiguous, since it both lowers him to the level of the poor laborers he visits and identifies him with the redeeming Christ who brought comfort to the poor rather than to the rich. (173-74)

Here, even more than in the claims about Herbert's "Elixir" revision, I find that the poet's text is being pressured unconsciously in order to support the sentiments Malcolmson would ascribe to him. Candor about the real discomforts in visiting the poor becomes an "acute consciousness of breaking the rules of social deco-

rum” and “deep fear” of being polluted by commonness. It is as if Malcolmsen would bully Herbert into expressing the very aristocratic fastidiousness that his text straightforwardly proscribes. Proud social disapproval is not expressed, but effectively excluded in Herbert’s willingness to mention the need to stoop and “creep” into a cottage with bad odor, and Malcolmsen’s simile likening the unpleasant smell to a “contagious disease” emanates more from her own modern knowledge of the dangers of bad sanitation than from any gesture to be found in Herbert’s text. Furthermore, since the immediate context of the passage at issue champions service to God as a motive unanswerably honorable, why should we read Herbert’s endorsement of the valuable humanity of all “those for whom God dyed” as though it were an anxiety-ridden “inability to describe the people themselves”? Does the passage indeed identify Herbert’s Parson “with the redeeming Christ”? And if so, would such an identification necessarily compromise the social humiliation that Herbert is clearly espousing? I find these attempts to replace the Parson’s explicit social humility with implicit aristocratic pride unconvincing, and Malcolmsen’s ensuing allowance that Herbert may have been doing the best he could I find unjustifiably patronizing.

In this passage and the experience it describes, Herbert may have honestly and decently tried to step outside the definitive power of the status system; certainly, we can see here that his “plain style” was no utopian pastoral aesthetic, but a model of Christian identity used to control his class responses and govern his everyday behavior in his rural community. Nevertheless, the brightness and cleanness that characterizes this plain style, and that he so desperately misses in this cottage, is centuries away from egalitarianism. If sweeping a “room” in “The Elixir” refers to sanctifying and purifying any worldly office or action, then we can see that such holiness was in part a method of protecting Herbert from the “mean” activities he describes in this passage. (174)

Malcolmsen’s persistent detection of desperation in Herbert’s tone remains speculative here even if we grant the sociopolitical subtext on which it depends. The Herbert texts at issue not only sanctify and purify, but also dignify servants sweeping and people in pov-

erty; and the *Country Parson* excerpt does not communicate self-protection, but sternly admonishes readers to avoid self-protective aristocratic fastidiousness.

I have said that the weaknesses of Malcolmson's readings emanate from the new historical criticism she wishes to forward. Her study follows current trends in leftist literary history by refraining from deconstructive denial of the signifiatory powers of language, which undermines both leftist and non-leftist histories when applied consistently; and she is wary of the private-public distinctions that undergird bourgeois psychoanalyses and the post-structuralisms dependent on them (264). But the cultural criticism's insistence on positioning all texts within a deterministic historical and psychological process can compromise one's abilities as a careful, open reader just as effectively as subjective psychoanalysis. The point can be made best, perhaps, by offering two brief examples of this dynamic at work in Stephen Greenblatt's provocative *Renaissance Self-Fashioning*, a text foundational to most cultural critical work of the last two decades, and certainly influential in Malcolmson's.

Greenblatt's study subjects various Renaissance texts to the pressures of post-industrial sexual expressivism.<sup>12</sup> His treatment of Sir Thomas Wyatt<sup>13</sup> focuses on a rendering of select penitential Psalms that the Protestant sonneteer adapted from an Italian prose paraphrase by Pietro Aretino. Wyatt's selection<sup>14</sup> follows Aretino's mode of presentation, which employs dramatic introductions and continuos before and between the Psalm translations, imaginative contexts freely developed from David's adultery with Bathsheba, his murder of her husband Uriah, and the ensuing rebellion of his son Absalom.<sup>15</sup> Greenblatt claims that "by using the Bathsheba story as the context for the entire sequence, the Renaissance in effect sexualizes what in the original is a broader expression of sinfulness and anxiety" (122). But the Bathsheba story is clearly cited in Psalm 51's ancient title, well-known from the Vulgate and elsewhere: none of the other Psalms selected by Aretino and Wyatt is given a historical frame in the original, and 51 is the only scriptural Psalm that is ascribed to a distinct repentance nar-

rative. Furthermore, Aretino and Wyatt actually deemphasize David's adultery with Bathsheba, which event tends to disappear amidst mythologized technical explanations for the process of erotic infatuation: the drawing of David's vision to Bathsheba's beauty and the ensuing error of considering that beauty "thing of things best" (l. 16) leads directly to the murder of Uriah and its fraudulent concealment.<sup>16</sup> Textual warrant is also lacking in Greenblatt's claims about Aretino's and Wyatt's depiction of David

Inflam'd with farr more hote effect

Of god then he was erst of Bersabe (ll. 317-18).

Greenblatt submits that this comparison indicates a blighted and repressive psychological "transference" of sexual passion from Bathsheba to God (122), an analysis that I think unduly dependent on the persistent ideological pressure of his selective and doctrinaire post-industrial reading. If we approach these lines of "hote effect" through the immediately preceding preternatural light on David's harp-strings,

The torne wheroff into his Iyes did sterte,

Surprisd with Joye by penance off the herte (ll. 315-16),

the imposition becomes evident. Even readers disinclined to question the totalizing assumptions about sex that undergird Greenblatt's work might notice that such analysis does not explain or do justice to Aretino's and Wyatt's depiction of David's reenergized vision. Malcolmson's pressing of Herbert's relished versing into a requisite cringing before a patriarchal superior is no more counterintuitive than this.

My second example comes from Greenblatt's expressivist critique of Shakespeare's *Othello* (232 ff.). In this case, interpretive pressure is built up by Greenblatt's recalling, in a tone of stern arraignment, various warnings by ancient, medieval, and Renaissance Christians against sexual excess: attention is given, especially, to those claiming that "active *pursuit* of pleasure in [marital] sexuality is damnable" (249). However, the sentiments Greenblatt disapprovingly discusses are thoroughly humane and comprehensible when they are understood as attempts to combat, from a philosophical and religious angle, the tendency of sex to become narcissistic.<sup>17</sup> Interestingly parallel efforts were being made by

secular psychologists during the time that *Renaissance Self-Fashioning* was being written—Masters and Johnson and Germaine Greer come to mind. Greenblatt would have it that Shakespeare's play presents a subliminal vitiation of Othello the Moor by Christian disapproval of marital enjoyment, and that Desdemona's "frank acceptance of pleasure" with Othello is to be considered a cause of Othello's murderous rage not secondary to Iago's slander (250). I would submit, on the contrary, that this pressured reading lacks warrant, either in the Christian moral and confessional practices Greenblatt cites or in the text of Shakespeare's play. Othello and Desdemona do not have the exploitative or narcissistic attitude toward vengery that the Christian thinkers sought to combat. Their erotic relationship is (unlike that of Cassio and Bianca) both reciprocal and committed, and it is the presumed violation of this treasured commitment and reciprocity that overthrows Othello. The Moor does not call his wife a whore for enjoying the pleasures of marriage, but for promiscuously bestowing those pleasures on Cassio, a fiction Iago imposes on him by exploiting both the brevity of Othello and Desdemona's wholesome relationship and the Moor's status as a cultural and racial outsider. Greenblatt bills his reading an exposure of "the colonial power of Christian doctrine over sexuality" (242), but it could more accurately be said to manifest the colonial power of late twentieth-century sexual expressivism over Shakespeare's art. Malcolmson's preemptive insistence on the Country Parson's aristocratic pride is more than matched by Greenblatt's preemptive assertion of Othello's subliminal nervousness about sex.

At the beginning of her study, Malcolmson quotes Raymond Williams's dictum that, "instead of reducing works to finished products, and activities to fixed positions," good analysis of literary works should be "capable of discerning, in good faith, [their] finite but significant openness."<sup>18</sup> It seems to me that fixity and finitude are propagated, not avoided, when literary artifacts produced under earlier historical models are peremptorily trimmed to fit contemporary economic, political, social, and sexual histories. One recent observer of literary studies has noted that,

While [in leading academic programs in literature] one may still report that at places like Johns Hopkins, in some sense of the term, “historicism is still central,” it is its demystifying rather than its imaginatively sympathetic power that is applied—its power to see through rather than to understand.<sup>19</sup>

Openness with good faith would mandate a tactful, tentative acceptance of human pursuits of love, wisdom, and beauty even when those pursuits are in some ways fundamentally at variance with a reader’s own beliefs and priorities. Demystification of preindustrial art—that is, reduction of it to contemporary scientific and cultural models—may seem invigorating and powerful for a time, but such empowerment leads to distortions and oversimplifications that can hardly be defended as goods. Humanity does not need to be demystified. Rather, its texts need to be read, sympathetically thought along with, courteously argued against. For this interchange to be meaningful, we need as much historical background as we can get, but “an author’s date can never declare what he meant.”<sup>20</sup>

### Notes

<sup>1</sup>*Heart-Work: George Herbert and the Protestant Ethic*. Stanford Stanford University Press, 1999. xi + 297 pp. \$45.00. References to Malcolmson’s work below will appear as parenthetical citations.

<sup>2</sup>See Isobel Armstrong, *The Radical Aesthetic* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000), p. 1: “Marxists, cultural materialists, post-structuralists, and deconstructive psychoanalysts, have converged in what has sometimes looked like a mission in cultural eugenics.” Armstrong is a leftist talking to fellow leftists; but her assessment seems to me equally applicable to cultural criticism on the right.

<sup>3</sup>Malcolmson notes that Sidney claimed “that one’s lyric powers could best be dedicated to God, a credo that Sidney did not follow himself” (47). Fulfilling this Sidneian possibility, she suggests, would have occurred to Herbert as a good way to elicit patronage from Pembroke.



<sup>4</sup> See for example William Perkins, *Works* (London: John Legate, 1606), pp. 767, 773; Robert Sanderson, *14 Sermons* (London: Printed by R.N. for Henry Seile, 1657), p. 270.

<sup>5</sup> Malcolmson's ideological geometry gets somewhat confusing here. "The character of holiness in the revised *Temple*," she says, "creates a model of selfhood in which the social role becomes a clear expression of the devotion within. This transparency lights up the darkness made possible by the original contrast between inside spirituality and outside gentility and dispels the possibility of private, hidden motives" (126). The psychology here, in which a factitious privacy enables a self-consoling publicity, I find somewhat difficult to imagine; and I don't see how straightforward expression of inner devotion makes the expressed devotion less privately motivated. Also, transparency isn't illuminative! But it is clear to me that Malcolmson means to describe the final intensification of Herbert's Christian commitment in non-appreciative materialist terms.

<sup>6</sup> F. E. Hutchinson, ed., *The Works of George Herbert* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1941), pp. 247-48. Citations below from Herbert are from this edition.

<sup>7</sup> Perkins, p. 766.

<sup>8</sup> Naturally, Perkins uses a worker being required to attend a Roman Catholic mass as his exemplary scenario for disobedience; but one remembers that the Puritan revolution depended heavily on this religious loophole.

<sup>9</sup> Citations are from the above-noted 1657 edition of *14 Sermons*.

<sup>10</sup> The first stanza of "The Elixir" valorizes the speaker's own motives, while the first stanza of "Perfection" vests success in "pleasing" the "Lord." The last stanza of "The Elixir" frankly contradicts aristocratic disdain for menial labor and implies that labor conventionally considered superior might actually not be; the last stanza of "Perfection," on the other hand, valorizes the act of changing one's perception without explicitly challenging the status quo.

<sup>11</sup> One notes that this stanza gives another recent new-historical reading of Herbert more pause. Michael Schoenfeldt avers that Herbert's words communicate "affirmation of the joy of creation," but claims that this joy contra-

dicts “the theological order the poem asserts” ; see *Prayer and Power: George Herbert and Renaissance Courtiership* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991), pp. 150-51.

<sup>12</sup> By post-industrial expressivism, I mean the popular belief that sexual norms and taboos distort healthy behavior, and the opinion that, when one exerts one’s will to oppose sexual impulses, the efforts psychologically resemble and predictably produce violence and hatred.

<sup>13</sup> *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980), pp. 115 ff. References to Greenblatt below are by page from this edition.

<sup>14</sup> Psalms 6, 32, 38, 51, 102, 130, 143.

<sup>15</sup> II Samuel 11-12, 15-17.

<sup>16</sup> Kenneth Muir and Patricia Thomson, eds., *Collected Poems of Sir Thomas Wyatt* (Liverpool: University of Liverpool Press, 1969), pp. 98-101, 358-59. Quotations from Wyatt are cited by line from this edition.

<sup>17</sup> Greenblatt concedes that Christian thinkers acknowledged “the legitimate role of sexual pleasure” in marriage (248), but his insistence on the expressivist correlation of repression with violence seems to overwhelm any sympathetic understanding of the Christian thinkers’ concerns that marital pleasure be an expression of love rather than a mere use of another body for self-pleasure.

<sup>18</sup> Raymond William, *Marxism and Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977), p. 114.

<sup>19</sup> Avrom Fleishman, *The Condition of English: Literary Studies in a Changing Culture* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1998), p. 115.

<sup>20</sup> Rosemond Tuve, “Sacred ‘Parody’ of Love Poetry, and Herbert,” in Thomas Roche, ed., *Essays by Rosemond Tuve: Spenser, Herbert, Milton* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1970), p. 247.

Robert Wilcher. *The Writing of Royalism, 1628-1660*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001. xii + 403 pp. \$70. Review by ALAN RUDDUM, SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY.

Robert Wilcher's intention "is to offer a more comprehensive survey than has yet been attempted of the range and diversity of the partisan writing that was devised to meet challenges to the authority of Charles I and the institutional integrity of the Church of England, and later to cope with the social, political and psychological consequences of the defeat of the royalist armies, the execution of the King and the abolition of the monarchy." He has adopted a chronological, narrative approach "in an effort to locate each text as precisely as possible within the contexts of its original composition, transmission, and reception" (2). The aim is to determine "what any given text was likely to mean to its audience at the time of its appearance" and to take account of authorial intention, so far as it can be reconstructed (2-3).

These aims might (in my view should) seem so sensible as to be uncontentious, to represent the way any one of us should proceed in seeking to understand a period which those who lived in it experienced as one of "rapid and disorientating change" (3). Yet experience suggests otherwise. A few years ago, at the International Conference at the Centre for Seventeenth-Century Studies, a leading British critic told me firmly that "meanings *are* undecidable." More recently, in a long-running thread on the electronic discussion list, Milton-L, focusing on *Samson Agonistes*, it was necessary to invoke E.D. Hirsch's *The Validity of Interpretation*, and to insist that the thoughts to which a work might give rise may be significant for the reader, but are not *ipso facto* a guide to authorial intention. As to the importance of chronology, one recalls how heavily John Wall, in his reading of Henry Vaughan's *Silex Scintillans*, relied upon *The Mount of Olives* as a basis for interpreting the poems. The latter work, published in 1652, is clearly a response to the Act for the Propagation of the Gospel in Wales, whose writ ran from 1650 to 1653. That is, it began too late to have influenced the 1650 *Silex* and ended long enough before the

1655 *Silex* to make its influence on that volume something to be argued rather than assumed. Mention of Vaughan is apposite here. In spite of a steady stream of essays on the nature of his engagement with the political sphere, most book-length studies of literary reactions to the Civil War have largely ignored his work. Wilcher's is the first overall study of royalist writing in which Vaughan is given due recognition; he provides the epigraph to the volume, and in the Acknowledgements Wilcher writes that the book "stems from a fascination with the work of Henry Vaughan." As this aspect of his work is of special interest to me, I shall, at the risk of imbalance, abandon a "chronological" account and consider it immediately.

In the Introduction Wilcher writes of the emergence of the public sphere created by rising literacy and the availability of cheap print as being among the new developments that writers in the royal cause had to confront. He cites Arthur Marotti's argument that the manuscript system of literary transmission survived because it stood opposed to the more democratizing force of print culture and allowed its participants to feel that they were part of a social as well as an intellectual elite (3). He does not mention possible prudential considerations. Am I wrong in supposing that what distinguishes Vaughan from Rowland Watkyns is not merely the relative quality of their work, but the fact that Vaughan published into the teeth of the storm? Watkyns, whose verse presumably circulated in manuscript during the Interregnum, did not publish until 1662, that is when it was not merely safe but possibly advantageous to do so. There are grounds for supposing that the publication of Vaughan's *Olor Iscanus* (1651) was delayed because the original version contained material which Vaughan's friends or his publisher thought too obviously provocative. Much of what he did publish was provocative enough; a poet such as he would have courted a short lifespan in the more totalitarian twentieth century.

It is not clear, therefore, why the "Jonsonian epistles and translations of Henry Vaughan" are mentioned in the context of "poetic manifestations of royalism [which] had circulated in manu-

script" (254). They may, as Wilcher suggests, have had a "very private readership" in the sense of a small one, but they surely belong to print rather than to manuscript culture. I have remarked elsewhere on the interesting disparity of views of the similarities and differences between the poems of the 1650 *Silex Scintillans* and those added in 1655. Wilcher sees the first volume as dominated by "personal grief and political despair" and the second as contemplating the future "with a renewed sense of political purpose" (336). There may well be a truth expressed here; but the argument for it is not helped by the surely incorrect suggestion that the Master of "The Proffer," a poem packed with imagery referring to the Day of Judgement, is Charles II rather than Christ (337). Wilcher's opposition seems to me too stark. Even if we forget the poem "Cheerfulness," there is enough vitality and exuberance in the 1650 *Silex*, even in its expressions of personal grief, to rule out "despair." Think of "Rules and Lessons," for example. Further, Vaughan's intellectual engagement with Calvinism, evidence that he was thinking hard as well as feeling, is as clear in the 1650 *Silex* as in 1655. His opposition to predestinarian doctrine is expressed in "The Retreat" as it is in "Child-hood." His inclusion of "the creature" in the scheme of salvation is expressed in "And do they so?" as it is in "The Book."

Local disagreements aside, it must be said that *The Writing of Royalism* is a welcome, impressive and important book. Each phase of the history, from "the halcyon days" to "coping with defeat and waiting for the King," is deftly sketched in and the royalist response recorded. Wilcher makes it clear that the idea of halcyon days, nostalgia for which was exploited by writers of the 1640s, was a conscious construction of court propagandists before during the period of personal rule. His account of the Bishops' Wars is a stark reminder that Charles I, in his determination to impose uniformity in religion, reverted in effect to the kind of folly from which the death of Buckingham should have released him for good and all. The literary responses recorded range from that of George Daniel of Beswick, a masque-like performance that does not end on a masque-like note of triumph and harmony, through Edmund Waller's ostrich performance in his poetic welcome to the inopport-

tune arrival of Marie de Medici, to Henry Valentine's sermon *God Save the King*. Waller and Cowley are shown as more concerned for the fate of Falkland than they were for the religious or political issues at stake, Waller absorbing Falkland "into the realms of masque and myth," Cowley conveying "the texture of the existential moment." Cowley is among those sensitively and intelligently treated in Wilcher's tracing of "the journeys of individual writers." Anonymous comment on the penultimate list of contents of the *Broadview Anthology* taught me that some specialists in this period still regard Cowley with disdain, so I was grateful for the exposition of the real interest of the *Poems* of 1656, prepared during Cowley's imprisonment. Inevitably, in dealing with such a range of writers, Wilcher draws heavily upon recent specialist criticism, but he knows how to winnow out the chaff, as for example in the carefully considered section on *Cooper's Hill*. Readers who have been engaged on related projects might wish for more extended discussion in some cases, Herrick and Lovelace perhaps. One of the book's intelligent features is its manageable length, so it is perhaps perverse to wish for more detail. The account of "the finest of all literary treatments of Strafford's death" is generally excellent, but for the bare notation that it was "probably [by] John Cleveland." The evidence, published in Peter Davison's *Poetry and Revolution* (1998), that "Here lies Wise and Valiant Dust" was written by Strafford's chaplain, Clement Paman, should be acknowledged. I found myself wishing too for an account of the symbolism of Charles I's coronation, and, in the discussion of Waller's panegyric, "Upon His Majesty's Repairing of Paul's," and for some mention of the negative aspects of a work no doubt undertaken in support of the beauty of holiness, the way in which, as Whinney and Millar pointed out in 1975, it "contributed materially to public discontent, and so ultimately to rebellion."

Whatever reservations one might have on a few points of detail, it has to be said that few literary scholars, even among those who profess historical criticism, have so close a command of the historical record, or could, in discussion of the literature, tie it at so many points to relevant manuscript and printed sources. I found

myself wishing disconcertingly often that it had been to hand while the *Broadview Anthology* was in preparation. Mastery of material, remarkable narrative skill, and an eye for the telling detail, makes for enjoyable as well as essential reading, the frequent pleasure of “something understood,” which Herbert so rightly saw as the culmination of the passionate engagement that is prayer. Wilcher is passionately engaged in his project as scholar, not as polemicist. Some historical criticism of this period reminds one of those anniversary advertisements which used to appear, perhaps still do, in *The Times*, commemorating Charles I as Martyr, or honoring—or execrating—Cromwell. Wilcher’s concern is not to fight, on either side, the war of words and ideas over again, but to understand it. The clarity of his exposition makes it accessible to ambitious undergraduates, and the details he has uncovered, or set in a fresh light, will engage historians and literary scholars alike. This is an important book, and its author deserves our congratulations and gratitude.

John T. Shawcross. *The Uncertain World of Samson Agonistes*. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2001. ix + 158 pp. Review by WILLIAM B. HUNTER, MILTON SOCIETY.

Students of Milton begin the new millennium with this major study of *Samson Agonistes*. In no sense thesis driven, it unifies and evaluates the criticism of the past half century and more to open the poem to its readers as the great achievement that it is, not subject, as some would limit it, to feminist, political, or ethnic interpretation. As the author observes of his work, he did “not have an agenda overriding what I read as the substance of the poem, or even a thesis that I seek to ‘prove’ through that reading” (ix).

Especially welcome is its author’s grounding as one of our best bibliographers in the fundamental question of the reliability of the text which only the original edition offered in 1671. An early work? Or, more likely, an early work with some later revi-

sions? Equally welcome, unlike some other critics, he emphasizes the significance of the biblical context in Judges upon which Milton drew. Finally, he relates throughout the ideas in the play to those in Milton's other works, both prose and poetry. In detail, the ten chapters explore "the world" of the play (the ethnic principles within which Samson should have acted), the difficulties of the text, the drama as fundamentally a poem, Samson as type or individual, Dalila's role (at the middle both of the poem and of this book), political issues (Samson failed to free his people from Philistine rule), the question of how much Milton's own blindness and marital troubles permit the play to be read as biographical, its use of irony, a chapter that brings all these issues together into a unified interpretation, and finally the question of how consistent Milton's beliefs remained over the course of his life.

I do not know of any other work, including the fine bibliographies of Huckabay and Klemp, that gives better citations and evaluations of every salient publication about this subject. Without an ax to grind, Shawcross has provided us with an authoritative and dispassionate approach that recognizes the strengths and weaknesses of the great variety of readings that have been argued. For example, can one accept, as some have, Dalila as the repentant, now faithful wife that she claims to be? One of the prime attributes of great literature, of course, is that it can be interpreted in a variety of ways—often ways that reflect more the culture of the interpreter than of the literary work at issue. One must add, however, that without the direction of an all-encompassing thesis *The Uncertain World* quite properly leaves the reader at its completion to develop his own final understanding of the play: such a reader must employ the rich evidence that the book provides to make this uncertain world as certain as he can.

To reflect on a single important insight, one must agree, as Shawcross emphasizes several times, that *Samson* has major affiliations with the companion work with which it first appeared, *Paradise Regained*. But some questions must be raised. Thus he argues that each work has three temptations—in the case of the play those of Manoa, Dalila, and Harapha—just as Jesus has three in the wil-



derness. Both Samson and Jesus refuse them, and so the central episodes of each work parallel one another. But are they so closely analogous as Shawcross implies? For example, Manoa's proposed attempt to buy Samson's freedom is problematical to interpret as a temptation and in any case is not clearly rejected. Or can one equate the third, that of Harapha, with Satan's placing Jesus perilously on the pinnacle of the temple? One must also remember that those of Jesus are responsive in some sense to the triple formula of the baptism which initiates the narrative, an unlikely implication in Samson's case. Furthermore, Samson experiences a fourth, that he give in to the demand of the Officer to come to Dagon's temple as an entertainer. Samson resists it until he experiences inwardly God's direction that he go. On the other hand, all the refusals of Jesus and Samson are consistently based on the requisite that one must act only to execute divine direction, just as Milton without any known external motivation had unexpectedly acted several times—to write and publish the divorce tracts or *Tenure*, for example. One may wonder whether he had impulsively married Mary Powell without having received prior divine approval as Samson had for marrying the woman of Timna but not Dalila.

One of the strongest points about Shawcross's work is his insistence on seeing Milton's character against the biblical source in Judges from which he derives. Accordingly, one discovers with some surprise that he never cites what for Milton must have been a very important single verse from the New Testament. According to Hebrews 11:32, Samson was one of the early leaders of Israel who were "saved by faith." The Chorus calls him God's "faithful champion" (1751). Shawcross mentions Samson's faith several times (e.g., he "does appear to reaffirm faith" [61] and the play "delineates how humankind should turn their depravity . . . into good, to act in obedience because of faith" [88-89]), but not so as to emphasize this Christian interpretation of Samson's life. Coincidentally, as Vickie Hodges pointed out in an essay read at York in July 1999, the *Christian Doctrine*, often assigned to Milton, never mentions Samson as one so saved, even in its chapter 1.20 on sav-

ing faith, a surprising omission had Milton been responsible for the work in that the story of Samson obviously occupied much of his thought early and late.

One closes the book with a troubling question posed by the events of September 11, 2001, and the destruction of our own temple of Dagon with the deaths of thousands of innocent people: Will we now read *Samson Agonistes* in yet a new light? Was Samson indeed a suicidal fanatic? (John Donne raised the issue of his suicide, and the possibility is mentioned in the play.) Or as Shawcross shows, a major issue that it poses is, "Whose god is God?"

Jameela Lares. *Milton and the Preaching Arts*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 2001. 352 pp. \$58.00. Review by JAMES EGAN, THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON.

Though Milton claims in *The Reason of Church-Government* that poetry and the pulpit are integrated for him, critics have traditionally preferred to separate the two. Lares sets out to demonstrate Milton's substantial, lifelong connection to what she designates as the "preaching arts," the formal manuals of sermon construction and the pervasive technical or "applied" manuals that embodied them. Preaching manuals typically adopted classical rhetorical theory, invoking Aristotle in matters of argumentation and the deployment of *logos*, *ethos*, and *pathos*. Lares begins by tracing Milton's indebtedness to specific traditions of English Reformation homiletics and then locates applications of these homiletic designs in the anti-prelatical tracts of 1641-42, *Paradise Lost*, and *Paradise Regained*. She attempts the combination of intellectual history and rhetorical analysis undertaken by the editors of the Yale Prose and such distinguished practitioners as Kranidas, Wittreich, and Lieb.

Lares evaluates biographical evidence to show that Milton was not as reluctant about the ministry as scholars, particularly postmodern ones, normally assume. Obviously, there was ample precedent in the seventeenth century for poet-priests: Donne,

Herbert, and Traherne are prominent cases. Milton believed that an unordained person of his intellectual and spiritual qualities could perform the function of a minister, and he considered writing to be a type of “extraordinary” ministry (35). Lares explains the aesthetic digression in *The Reason of Church-Government* as a “turning” of poetry to account for the ministry (47). Her discussion of Reformation *artes praedicandi* examines the work of Andreas Gerardus Hyperius, a Flemish Lutheran scholar who wrote *De formandis concionibus sacris* in 1553, a work translated into English in 1577 by John Ludham, under the title *Of Framing of Divine Sermons, or Popular Interpretation of the Scriptures* (56). Hyperius synthesized several prominent Reformation notions of homiletics and proposed the five sermon types so influential in seventeenth-century English treatises on preaching. English translations of his works were readily available. Though Hyperius respected classical rhetoric and recommended the form of the classical oration for the sermon, his emphasis was on the *confirmatio*; he proposed five categories of *confirmatio*, all of them to be drawn directly from the Bible: doctrine, reproof, instruction, correction, and consolation. The popularity of the Hyperian classification was profound—“virtually all of the English sermon manuals after 1590 refer to Hyperius’s five sermon types” (78). Lares presents and collates an important constellation of sources here, without question-begging or special pleading. She concludes the presentation by suggesting that Christ’s College was a center for homiletic theory and that Hyperius influenced at least two sermon manuals written by William Chappell, Milton’s first tutor at Cambridge: *The Preacher* (1656) and *The Use of Holy Scripture* (1653). Whether generally, as a student at an institution whose graduates produced “the lion’s share of English Reformation preaching manuals” (95), or specifically, as a tutee of William Chappell, Milton would have been exposed to Hyperius.

Chapter Three, “The Poet as Polemicist,” applies the homiletic traditions Lares has documented to the antiprelatical controversy of the early 1640s, including the work of Joseph Hall, Milton’s five pamphlets, and those of his allies, the Smectymnuans. “The most important sermon type for the controversialist,” Lares ar-

gues, was the “redargutive sermon,” the one that “reproved false doctrine” (98). Hyperius advised that the redargutive sermon be based on Scripture and directed at contemporary heresies. In Lares’s reading, Joseph Hall’s tracts qualify as the canny, rhetorically adept productions of a doctrinal dissembler. Hall’s first opponents, the Smectymnuans, not only attack his false doctrines, but provide a metadiscursive commentary on his rhetoric, revealing how Hall was “hiding his art” (119). For his part, Milton, in the *Animadversions* and *An Apology*, adopts the ideology of the sermon manuals of Hyperius and his followers, notably the rationale for the redargutive sermon. Milton, of course, was considerably more creative than the Smectymnuans and not afraid of appearing so. In short, though Milton transcends the argumentative strategies outlined in the sermon manuals, he insists, as the manuals had insisted, that Scripture itself was the model for discourse. Lares’s interpretation of the rhetoric of the episcopal controversy is a mixture of strength and weakness. The contextualization she provides for Joseph Hall’s polemic and that of the Smectymnuans is plausible; she develops important supporting evidence for Kranidas’s characterization of Hall as a shrewd controversialist, anything but an underdog. Lares does manage to fit Milton’s *Animadversions* and *An Apology* into the Hyperian model, but oversimplifies them as she does so. In contrast to her position, much of the scholarship on these tracts over the past decade has argued for their creative sophistication. Lares’s claim of sermon manuals as templates might have been more persuasively demonstrated in Milton’s pamphlets of 1659–60, the divorce treatises, or even the antimonarchical tracts. The fact remains that native polemic conventions in the seventeenth century, classical rhetorical theory, and the sermon manuals Lares studies are woven together so closely that, in a pamphleteer of Milton’s training and sophistication, a distinct, single line of influence is difficult to establish conclusively.

Chapter Four, “*Paradise Lost* and the Sermon Types,” treats Books 11 and 12 of the epic on the assumption that the dominant model for them is neither pedagogy nor typology, but rather the sermon. Book 11 draws from the correction model of the sermon

and Book 12 from the consolation model. These sermon modes of correction and consolation also structure the angelic discourses of Raphael and Michael at the middle and end of the poem. Lares's reading of the angelic discourses as manifestations of traditional preacherly aims of encouraging obedience, warning against sin, and rousing the passions is persuasive and energetic, and her treatment of Books 11 and 12 as a whole is a plausible alternative to the overextended pedagogical and typological readings of the past thirty years.

The final chapter, "Using the Word and Defending the Word in *Paradise Regained*," returns to the history-of-ideas format of the second, with a fresh contextualization of Christ's defense of Scriptural style in the poem's Athens temptation. Christ's argument parallels those voiced by Milton's contemporaries from 1650-1690. Defenses of Scriptural style by Norwood, Assheton, Boyle and many others, in turn, derive from the paradigm of *artes praedicandi* Lares has explicated. In this context, Christ's denunciation of heathen rhetoric takes on new meaning as an analog to mid-seventeenth-century theoretical discussions of the validity of verbal ornaments in discourse. Christ's remarks about the "majestic unaffected style" of the Scriptures become a signature identifying Milton, not with a retreat from humanism, but with the "progressive" side in post-1650's debates over Scriptural style. The chapter concludes by measuring the "contemporary phenomena" provoking defenses of Scriptural style, namely Neoclassicism, Restoration "wit," and skeptical readings of the Bible. As she did in the chapter on *Paradise Lost*, Lares again registers as generally persuasive, in local instances dramatically so, and consistently fresh in her conclusions. Despite some unevenness early on, *Milton and the Preaching Arts* breaks enough new ground to merit serious attention.

Stanley Fish. *How Milton Works*. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2001. 616 pp. \$35.00. Review by JOHN MULRYAN, ST. BONAVENTURE UNIVERSITY.

Several years ago, when I was preparing a revised draft of an article on Mikhail Bakhtin and Milton for *Milton Studies*, one of the readers suggested that I omit a section in which I critiqued F. R. Leavis's claim that Milton's English was out of the colloquial mainstream and markedly inferior to the language of Donne and Shakespeare. The reader argued that the issue had been resolved in Milton's favor, and Leavis was no longer taken seriously by Miltonists. I demurred, responding that many people still held this view of Milton (including some of my students) and that the argument was quiescent, but not dead. Well here it is again, in Stanley Fish's second major book on Milton, along with Leavis's second charge that Milton was obsessively single-minded: "More than sixty-five years ago, F. R. Leavis charged Milton with two crimes of which he has never been, and should not be, acquitted. The first charge is that his style does not sufficiently register the diversity and complexity of human life, especially in comparison with the styles of Donne and Shakespeare. The second charge is that he has an excess of character, by which Leavis means that he is 'disastrously single-minded and simple minded, . . . reveal[ing] everywhere a dominating sense of righteousness and a complete incapacity to question or explore its significance and conditions'" (478). The language suggests that Milton is on trial here, but Fish lets him off with a suspended sentence because his idiosyncratic irascibility and verbal quirkiness enable Milton to speak with the psychological certainty of one who argues from an assured faith, present at the inner core of his being and impervious to external arguments. For as Fish states earlier, for Milton "the true meaning can be discerned only by the heart and mind already informed by it" (85). Or as T. S. Eliot would (more sardonically) put it: "One . . . on whom assurance sits / As a silk hat on a Bradford millionaire" (*The Waste Land* 233-34). Both Leavis and Fish are engaged in a circular argument here: if Milton has a unique, unmistakable po-

etic voice, “a voice so distinctive that no one could mistake it” (7), then it must be recognizable as Milton and only Milton—hence an ‘excess of character’ and a ‘single-minded’ approach to his task.

Fish is an engagingly scrappy stylist, and this book is an unmitigated pleasure to read. However, I do not find its thesis convincing—namely that Milton is caught in a dilemma: his writing asserts that obedience to God, from whom all things flow, is the highest virtue, while at the same time this certainty makes all action pointless, even the act of writing divine poetry. Thus “Milton wants at once to celebrate humility and to be celebrated as the celebrator of humility. He is the poet of submission and corporate identity (“Mee hung’ring . . . to do my Father’s will” [PR II.259]) and he is also the poet who would write something the world will not willingly let die” (7). Again, when the Son in *Paradise Regained* speculates that John the Baptist’s baptism “was from above” [I.274], “His belief is not supported by evidence, but constitutes evidence; he does not come and then believe; he believes and then he comes” (64). Since belief is by definition not supported by evidence, and all we have is our belief, we can never be sure we are acting properly or in accordance with God’s will. Thus there is no point in doing anything (chapter 9), saying anything, (chapter ten), plotting out one’s life or story (chapter 11), attempting to understand anything (chapter 12), or attempting to be understood (chapter 13). This is, to say the least, a reductive way of reading Milton’s work.

This, in my view, is “how Fish works.” Milton’s poems and prose compositions were, for the most part, fortunate enough to have escaped the scrutiny of the New Critics, who searched for more ambiguous, ironic fare in Donne and the other metaphysicals, without regard to the historical meanings contained therein. But Fish, now armed with both the New Criticism and Jacques Derrida, searches for ambiguity and confusion in Milton. Take, for example, his gloss on the line “And Devils to adore for Deities” (*Paradise Lost* I.373): “The supposed great opposites [devils and deities] are linked together by alliteration, assonance, and final consonant; and these two verbal mirror images themselves frame an internal du-

plication in the nearly identical sounds of 'adore' and 'for.' The entire line breathes sameness at the same time that it insists on the perspicuousness of a distinction" (485).

This is a simple case of Milton's using balance and antithesis to set forth his meaning. The fact that it took such a torturous analysis of Milton's poetics to find such "sameness" shakes one's confidence in the reading. However, if, following Derrida, we forsake the obvious and deconstruct the author's intentions, we can then introduce difficulties in "perspicuous" texts and mystify ourselves to the point where we ask pointless questions like "What then is the line saying?" (485).

In the process of documenting this inactivity and unverifiability in Milton, Fish takes us through Milton's *Apology against a Pamphlet, Areopagitica, Artis Logica, Christian Doctrine, Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce, Eikonoklastes, Of Education, Of Prelaticall Episcopacy, Tetrachordon, The Likeliest Meanes, The Readie and Easie Way, The Reason of Church Government, "At A Solemn Music," Comus, Nativity Ode, Paradise Lost, Paradise Regained, and Samson Agonistes*—a thorough, unified presentation of a Milton many will find unpalatable. Ironically, Fish's description of *Paradise Lost* applies equally to his own work: "As many have observed, this is a poem [book] one cannot read without being provoked to argue back. . . . the more it attempts to fill every nook and cranny—the more energetically will those at whom it is directed struggle to escape it" (508).

Victoria Silver. *Imperfect Sense: The Predicament of Milton's Irony*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001. xiv + 409 pp. \$49.50. Review by DAVID V. URBAN, OKLAHOMA BAPTIST UNIVERSITY.

In this ambitious work, Victoria Silver seeks to demonstrate "the calculated presence of irony" in Milton's *Paradise Lost* (ix), paying particular attention to its manifestation in Milton's God. In addressing this subject, Silver draws heavily upon Old Testament theologian Gerhard van Rad, the philosophers



Wittgenstein and Stanley Cavell, and the writings of Luther and Calvin, who, in Silver's words, emphasize that "the hidden God's difference from us is consummate and ineffable" (x). Connecting these Reformation theologians' emphasis on the hidden God to Milton's writings, she "argue[s] that it is this abiding, sometimes anguishing, distinction between creator and creature which fosters the apparent eccentricities of *Paradise Lost*." In doing so, Silver hopes that this distinction will explain "those qualities"—both in Milton's writing and in Milton himself—"which continue to perplex and divide the poem's readers." The result is a brilliant yet often obscure study that sheds considerable fresh insight on the subject of Milton's God.

Silver's introductory chapter addresses the uneasy responses readers have had to Milton's attempt to "justify the ways of God to men." Here, she discusses William Empson, whose *Milton's God* she acknowledges as a seminal influence, as well as Samuel Johnson, the first critic "to try to reconcile readerly disdain with consummate artistry" (8). Noting that Milton's readers tend to relate Milton himself to Milton's God, Silver suggests that Milton's deliberate use of irony brings about not only two Miltons, but also two Gods in Milton's epic. Asserting that "irony and allegory can express the human difficulties of meaning without purporting to resolve them by contradiction or hermetica" (14), Silver observes that both Wittgenstein and Luther hold that the incoherence found in language is the fault of language's "interpreters, who are inclined to refuse any order of meaning that conflicts with their own conceptual customs, no matter the human suffering that ensues" (23). Luther's own conversion is credited to his new understanding of grammar, an understanding that freed him from previous angst-ridden notions of a righteous God who judged without mercy. In his new understanding of the phrase "righteousness of God," Luther departs neither from the text of Romans nor its God, but rather his "interpretive egoism" (24). For Luther, God's "hiddenness" signals "the limits of human understanding" (26), and God can only be understood within the confines of these limits. The remainder of the chapter is devoted to a discussion of Job, who, like

the Satan of *Paradise Lost*, was (before his final submission) guilty “of mistaking the incommensurable in God for the unjust, and his inscrutable will for an eternal tyranny” (43).

In her second chapter, “Milton’s God,” Silver outlines the “peculiar hiddenness of the reformers’ God” as a vehicle both to explain her notion of Milton’s two Gods and to propose “a solution” to the “strangely kindred conflicts” for readers of *Paradise Lost* (44). While Silver spends the vast majority of the chapter discussing Calvin and Luther’s writings concerning the hidden God, she does, early on, connect their ideas to Milton’s own presentation of the hidden God in his epic. Silver contends that Milton must argue a “veil of ignorance” that has to do simply and absolutely with the hidden God whose ways he sets out to make right with humanity. He must talk about God as though he knew deity in some sufficient shape or form . . . as though there were some clear and determinate correlation between God’s intent and Milton’s account of it, when theologically there can be neither in his view . . . as Judeo-Christian scripture had done long before, Milton must propose a purely functional parity in his representation between things human and divine that would allow for our experience and understanding of deity, even as this representation must somehow acknowledge the incalculable differences between what it says about God and what deity says about itself. (48)

Silver develops this idea in chapter three, “Milton’s Text,” which illustrates the above “ironical mode of revelation” (xii) by means of Milton’s polemical and doctrinal writings. His prose writings show his insistence that disputed theological matters need to be decided by the biblical text itself, claiming that attempts to reconcile biblical incongruities apart from the text amount to artificial impositions that “seek to bring the hidden God into conformity with extra-scriptural ideas of truth and conformity” (108).

Chapter four, “Milton’s Speaker,” discusses the irony involved in Milton’s autobiographical proems. These proems, which introduce Milton’s grand scheme of the justification of God, exchange the typical poetical invocation for the intense drama of Lutheran spiritual angst, because “the speaker’s desire for intimacy

with the divine arises precisely from his sense of God's remoteness" amidst his various physical and spiritual afflictions (199). It is profoundly ironic that the very speaker who attempts to "justify the ways of God to men" is himself a figure longing for justice. As Silver notes, "it is one thing to justify God's ways from a (false) position of God's certainty, as those readers who subscribe to the notion of Milton's rationalism suppose for him. But it is something else altogether to attempt this from the position of felt injustice and suffering in which Milton's proems place his speaker" (206). The inexplicable disparity inherent in a representative of human suffering seeking to justify God again challenges us to incorporate the hiddenness of God into our understanding of deity.

"Milton's Devil," Silver's strongest chapter, observes that the initially sympathetic character of Satan is exposed as suspect when we recognize, by the appearance of Sin and Death, the thoroughly allegorical nature of his character. It turns out that all along he has been deluded by "the presumption of correspondence . . . first into comparing and likening himself to God, and then into defying and competing with this figure" (221). As Silver demonstrates by means of Luther and Milton's respective discussions of the fourth chapter of Galatians, the allegory which corresponds to a given appearance is for Milton an expression of the law, not the gospel. The supreme irony of all this, however, is that it would be an equal mistake to associate the figure of the Father with the truth of deity. We succumb to such a belief because the poem's argument is conducted by means of these apparent vagaries of figuration:

Satan's graphic splendor and graphic degeneracy, the Father's alternately prosaic and despicable figure, the erratic and grotesque intrusion of allegory on the profundities of the Genesis myth . . . [Milton] no more wants us to believe in the mimetic integrity of his figures than he wants us to suppose that heaven and hell are as he describes them. Yet this is just what we do when . . . we propose to see deity or "the numinous" imaged in the Father, as against one aspect of our delimited, mediated, ironical knowledge of the divine, which the figuration of *Paradise Lost* expresses. (223-24)

"Milton's Eden," Silver's concluding chapter, examines how Adam and Eve bear the image of God, noting that this image signifies both God's special covenant with his creations as well as "the infinite dimension of difference between divine and human being, the creator and creature, which obliges us to speak figuratively in the first place" (289).

Silver's study is especially valuable for the innovative yet carefully argued manner in which it encourages us to read Milton's text from a genuinely new perspective, one that affects not only how we will perceive Milton's God but every aspect of creation that relates to him. Her extensive use of Luther and Calvin enables her to place her argument within the rubric of an established theological tradition leading up to Milton, something that safeguards her from charges of reckless innovation; although it could be argued that she overstates her case at points, I found her connections between Luther and Milton to be genuinely insightful, shedding new light on Milton's thought and character. Silver's book demonstrates real brilliance, and she works intelligently with writings that cut across several academic disciplines. The substance of her argument, however, is often obfuscated amidst the layered complexity of her material. Silver would have done her readers a favor had she introduced more clearly her essential argument for each particular section. Nonetheless, this book is deserving of the concentrated effort it requires. We also may note that Silver almost gives the impression that readers of *Paradise Lost* have been uniformly negative towards Milton's depiction of deity; some mitigating reference to Dennis Danielson's *Milton's Good God* would have been appropriate. That aside, Silver's reading of Milton's God is an important one indeed, and I expect *Imperfect Sense* to have considerable influence on Milton studies in the years ahead.

Kristen Poole. *Radical Religion from Shakespeare to Milton: Figures of Nonconformity in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000. xiii + 272 pp. \$59.95. Review by ELIZABETH SAUER, BROCK UNIVERSITY.

While early modern radical religion has preoccupied historians like B. Reay, Phyllis Mack, Brian Manning, Christopher Hill, and Patrick Collinson for decades, literary scholars, with the exception of critics like Nigel Smith and David Loewenstein, are only now beginning to devote sustained attention to the writings of dissenters. A unique study of some of the intersections between literature and religious and cultural representations, *Radical Religion from Shakespeare to Milton* is notable for the sophistication with which it brings the satirical figure of the nonconformist into the landscape of early modern scholarship. In this wide-ranging and ambitious book, Shakespeare, Jonson, Middleton, Thomas Edwards, and Milton unexpectedly share the stage not only with one other but also with nonconformists and their critics.

The historical moment into which *Radical Religion from Shakespeare to Milton* is written is the point when the radical puritanism of the sixteenth century, which helped foster national unity, is discredited as perverting the Reformation movement. The result is the fragmentation of the Protestant community in a society increasingly haunted by religious difference. The elusive term "Puritan," which was used as a polemical signifier rather than a strict party label, gained currency in the last decades of the 1500s and provided a convenient cipher for the confusion which erupted through the multiplication of religious identities and sectarian divisions. Poole effectively challenges contemporary stereotypical conceptions of Puritanism that was aligned, she demonstrates, not with sobriety and asceticism but with gluttony, lasciviousness, and transgression. Her aims are to study images of the grotesque puritan and to explore how fictional puritans function as a means of representing the social and discursive repercussions of noncon-

formity. Since the identity of sectarians was largely manufactured by writers who opposed them, Poole concentrates on pejorative representations of Puritans.

The six chapters of *Radical Religion from Shakespeare to Milton* balance analyses of popular and canonical texts in which images of Puritans recur. This history of representation is not intended as a social history, though Poole often teases us into thinking about the connection between the two by suggesting that the represented Puritan may have generated the historical Puritan. The nonconformist makes his *début* on the stage as Shakespeare's Falstaff, a hybrid figure who is modeled on a grotesquely depicted Martin Marprelate and on the reformist leader, Sir John Oldcastle, whom Falstaff both mimics and mocks. One of Falstaff's seventeenth-century incarnations is Zeal-of-the-Land Busy in Jonson's *Bartholomew Fair*, a Puritan bellygod featured in chapter 2, who lends his shape to the dualistic Puritan identity and anticipates the carnivalesque Bakhtinian body. Chapter 3 examines the wildest of radical sects in the seventeenth century through the lens of their critics. Middleton's *The Family of Love* picks up from where the satirists left off, translating Familist doctrines into allegations of verbal and sexual license, embodied in the character Mistress Purge. Purge is an ancestor of Mistress Rump, a mid-century feminized figure of political chaos, not mentioned by Poole.

In chapters 4 and 5, Poole turns to texts of the civil war period—Thomas Edwards's *Gangraena*, which classifies the noise of sectarianism, and Milton's antiprelatical tracts in which the images of monstrosity are deployed to vilify episcopacy. Until chapter 5, Poole features satirical representations of radicalism. If the Puritans write back, it is Milton who champions their cause, despite the "polemical and authorial independence" he at times maintained from them (Loewenstein, *Representing Revolution in Milton and his Contemporaries* [2001], 11). Poole's final chapter reinterprets the portraits of Adam and Eve in *Paradise Lost* in terms of debates about nakedness, fueled by accounts of fictional Adamites and actual Quakers who literally embodied the word. "Nakedness in Milton's prelapsarian Eden is 'troubling' because it refuses to

yield to a postlapsarian binary system of signification in which nakedness and clothing are allied with conditions or qualities of human language" (178), Poole concludes, registering the current distrust of binary oppositions which she consistently dismantles throughout her book.

Religious sectarianism was a considerable cultural force in early modern England, but for (past and present) readers of seventeenth-century texts, Puritanism is also allied with political revolution/rebellion. John Spurr in *English Puritanism, 1603-1689* (1998) reminds us that the elusive Puritan movement has been charged (and credited) with everything from igniting the English civil wars to introducing capitalism. Poole comments on the surge in printed materials and the discursive chaos of the 1640s, but says little about the politicizing of radical religion between the time of Shakespeare and Milton. Yet as a Round-head, the nonconformist metamorphosed into yet another series of satirical tropes, which became part of the royalist arsenal, beginning in the 1640s. In their popular writings, royalists, for example, used imagery of grotesque physicality to portray (female) characters who recited false confessions and published their crimes by vomiting or bearing appropriately monstrous offspring. These wide-reaching applications of Poole's rewarding study of the evolution of the grotesque Puritan form will only add to its value for literary critics and historians.

Mary Ellen Henley and W. Speed Hill, eds. *Wrestling with God: Literature & Theology in the English Renaissance. Essays to Honour Paul Grant Stanwood*. Printed privately in Canada, 2001. vi + 336 pp. *Early Modern Literary Studies* Special Issue 7 (May, 2001) <http://www.shu.ac.uk/emls/si-07/si-07toc.htm>. Review by DONALD R. DICKSON, TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY.

*Wrestling with God* is a collection of essays honoring a distinguished scholar of seventeenth-century devotional literature and religious history. Anyone working in this area has learned to rely

on Paul Stanwood's impeccable scholarship, beginning with his edition of John Cosin's *A Collection of Private Devotions* (1967), and then continuing with editions of Henry More's *Democritus Platonissans* (1968), William Law's *A Serious Call to a Devout Life* and *The Spirit of Love*, Richard Hooker's *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* (1981), Jeremy Taylor's *Holy Living* and *Holy Dying* (Books VI, VII, and VIII, 1989). His many essays on Donne, Milton, Herbert, as well as his monograph on Izaak Walton are also well known. What has united the life's work of Paul Stanwood has been a concern for matters theological in the seventeenth century, a concern that also unites the fifteen original essays in *Wrestling with God*, which are presented in "admiration and respect" by his friends and students.

The collection opens with a dedicatory sonnet by the poet X. J. Kennedy, a friend of Stanwood's since graduate school at Michigan, whose theme is "the quest for excellence / And nourishment for spirit, mind, and body." The first essay is by one of the great authorities of seventeenth-century literary studies, the late Louis Martz, whose "Donne, Herbert, and the Worm of Controversy" discusses the political and theological situations of two of the chief poets of the period. The next piece by John Shawcross, "'The Virtue and Discipline' of Wrestling with God" engages directly the idea of spiritual "wrestling"—i.e., "when godward thought and action (morality) would seem to oppose one's desire for and understanding of oneself" (27). A number of the essays that follow are thought-provoking as they deal with some aspect of spiritual "wrestling" or religion in a more general way.

Most of the other essays deal with figures from the seventeenth century, such as Shakespeare, Donne, and Milton, though several move out of the English Renaissance altogether. John Booty, the official historiographer of the Episcopal Church, offers a brief look backward to the Elizabethan Book of Common Prayer, which he calls "The Core of Elizabethan Religion." Eight of the essays concern Donne in some way. Especially noteworthy are Ted-Larry Pebworth's "John Donne's 'Lamentations' and Christopher Fetherstone's *Lamentations ... in prose and meeter* (1587); Claude



Summers' "W[illiam] S[hakespeare]'s *A Funeral Elegy* and the Donnean Moment"; and William Blissett's "The strangest pageant, fashion'd like a court': John Donne and Ben Jonson to 1600—Parallel Lives." The essays on lesser studied works of Donne by Wyman Herendeen (*The Progresse of the Soule*) and R. G. Siemens (*Biathanatos*) are also strong. Another strength of the collection is that lesser known figures are considered. Shawcross compares Lord Herbert of Cherbury to Henry Vaughan; Pebworth introduces us to an Elizabethan translator, Christopher Fetherstone; in a very fine essay, "The Devotional Flames of William Austin," Graham Parry draws our attention to a sacred writer well known to Donne and others in his time. Equally of note is Bryan Gooch's discussion of the manner in which Benjamin Britten composed settings for Donne's poetry, which directly engages the idea of spiritual struggle in both poet and composer: "his wrestle, like Donne's, is with the problem of faith in a tortured world with its death and misery, and in *The Holy Sonnets* both musician and poet find their resolution" (204).

Students of seventeenth-century literature will find much to interest them in the essays in this volume. Available on-line as a special issue of *Early Modern Literary Studies* (vol. 7), *Wrestling with God* serves as a fitting tribute to a scholar who has devoted himself to excellence and spiritual nourishment.

Andrew Gordon and Bernhard Klein, eds. *Literature, Mapping and the Politics of Space in Early Modern Britain*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. xiii + 276 pp. + 30 illus. \$59.95. Review by IRA CLARK, UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA.

This collection includes an introduction by the editors and an epilogue by Richard Helgerson, whose *Forms of Nationhood* first made chorography and geography professionally exciting for most of the contributors and other students of early modern English culture. The eleven essays in between represent a conference that the editors organized at the University of London in 1997, *Paper*

*Landscapes: Maps, Texts, and the Construction of Space, 1500-1700.* The editors lay out the conference in two sections. "Contested Spaces" addresses more general considerations of spatial representation in politics, geography, historiography, civic ceremony, and anatomy; then "Literature and Landscape" presents three essays applied to drama (*Lear*, *Tamburlaine*, and *Pericles*) and three to poetry (Jonson's "On the Famous Voyage," *The Faerie Queene* and *Poly-Olbion*, and *The Faerie Queene*).

In their introduction Gordon and Klein sketch some assumptions underlying this expansionist domain of cultural and literary studies and promote their goal of demonstrating its usefulness for studying early modern England. Exemplifying the commonplace that maps digest and reduce, they pursue a complementary profundity: maps reflect our ability to encompass and manipulate large amounts of data about terrains, peoples, histories, cultures; therefore, maps, by virtue of the choices made about what data get represented and how those data get presented, shape our perceptions. They then consider the impact that maps and mapping, less familiar materials conceived from a recent perspective, had on early modern imaginations, for both vision and consternation, when maps were accelerating into prominence. And they suggest how maps and related representations defining spaces and places can expand our understanding of the era. Helgerson opens his epilogue, "The Folly of maps and modernity," with a review of the progressive impact made by the proliferation of atlases—expanding knowledge, consolidating identity, and reconstituting lives and practices in early modern England. But then, examining de Gourmont's Fool's Cap Map, other similar maps, and their enclosure in literature and *vanitas* still life paintings, he inverts the story to trace the reactionary appropriation of maps that turned their alluring materiality and modernity against themselves as signs of our fools' paradise, and that thereby promoted *contemptus mundi* and rejected imperial nationhood and material riches—or that instigated ambivalent responses to modernity, or that offered another modernity.

Opening "Contested Spaces," Oliver Arnold's "Absorption and representation: mapping England in the early modern House of Commons" investigates the intriguing politics of representation. The Commons, depicted in engravings as a group surrounded by maps of regions its members represented, increasingly claimed to represent all of the realm in the specific space of St. Stephen's Chapel in Westminster and to be the authority speaking for the public; but at that same time the members were often absent and they constricted their logical representativeness by restricting access to their deliberations. Ultimately the sign absorbed the signified, the Commons absorbed both realm and people. In "A map of Greater Cambria" Philip Schwyzer describes the expansionist politics of Welsh polymath Humphrey Llwyd's map of Cambria in the supplement to Ortelius' *Theatrum Orbis Terrarum* (1573). This map includes the three traditional regions claimed by Geoffrey of Monmouth but which for centuries had lacked any political standing, and it extends beyond the Wye River much further eastward to the Severn. Not only was this map repeatedly reproduced for more than a century and a half until 1741 (despite the demurs of other antiquaries), but for almost half of that time it also promoted the jurisdiction of the Council in the Marches over border county English gentry along with the Welsh, until the "gentlemen opposers" persuaded the Long Parliament to dissolve that Council. Based on essentialist "origins," this imagined realm of Wales continued to hold sway. Lesley B. Cormack examines the illustrated frontispieces of popular geography books by John Dee, Christopher Saxton, Sir Walter Raleigh, and others to answer the question of whether "Britannia rules the waves?: images of empire in Elizabethan England." She shows how with variations these geographies promoted an English vision of world empire based on "a belief that the world could be measured, named and therefore controlled; a sense of the superiority of the English over peoples and nations and thus [of] the right of the English nation to exploit other areas of the globe; and a self-definition that gave these English students a sense of themselves and their nation" (45). The climactic essay in this section, for its extension of theoretical and

exemplary complexities and cogency, is Andrew Gordon's "Performing London: the map and the city in ceremony." Gordon considers the moment after the Great Fire in 1666 when maps became aerial, perceived to be pictured more than traveled and geometric rather than iconic. His examination shows how London had been configured spatially through the performance of City Pageants, whose props along their routes and visual records of their landmarks prepared for geometric maps. He shows further how these representations mapped the contest of the circulation of the mayor and guilds' pageants versus the stasis of the monarch's pageant until the latter achieved the representational victory of the static map. Caterina Albano turns the venerable micro-macrocosm trope yet again in "Visible bodies: cartography and anatomy" when she shows how dissected bodies merged into their backgrounds and maps were bordered with personifications dressed as natives, sometimes gendered and eroticized as women corresponding to anatomical illustrations of wombs. Regions became imagined as virgins to be penetrated and colonized.

"Literature and Landscape" begins with John Gillies' theoretically and interpretively impressive "The scene of cartography in *King Lear*," a complex interrogation of the significance of the initial map prop and subsequent spatializations, foregrounded against theatrical map scenes in *IHIV*, *RII*, and *Woodstock*. In inadequate summation, he discovers that as *Lear's* map reduces the kingdom to national political and economic units it simultaneously stimulates erotic voyeurism over territory; that in the travels the play gradually dissolves outside landscapes into interior humanity stripped bare; and that on Dover cliff chorography reappears to further diminish humanity. In "Unlawful presences: the politics of military space and the problem of women in *Tamburlaine*" Nina Taunton uses diagrams and descriptions of martial camps to investigate this masculine domain that excludes and occludes women so she can investigate the status of Zenocrate, Zabina, and Olympia. In a fascinating argument Bradin Cormack explores a complex interplay among treatises advocating naval imperialism, international legal briefs on monarchical jurisdiction at sea and on

trade contracts, symbolic representations in maps culminating in the fusion of the compass rose and James's royal sun, and a Shakespeare tragicomedy. "Marginal waters: *Pericles* and the idea of jurisdiction" demonstrates the subtle modulations required to stake a monarch's, and a nation's, claims for dominion over and across open waters. Out of a tradition of commemorative walks surveying the landmarks of London, Andrew McRae sets up a satiric, carnivalesque expedition through the city's digestive tract, its sewers, that exhibits urban consumption and excretions in "On the Famous Voyage': Ben Jonson and civic space." In "Imaginary journeys: Spenser, Drayton, and the poetics of national space," Bernhard Klein contrasts Camden's chorography in *Britannia* and Drayton's in *Poly-Olbion* with that of Harrison's *Historicall Description* and Spenser's *The Faerie Queene*, the former offer static, geometric plans whereas the latter narrate travels that dynamically reconstitute society and morality as the two modes compete over representing England. To answer her question, "Do real knights need maps? Charting moral, geographical and representational uncertainty in Edmund Spenser's *The Faerie Queene*," Joanne Woolway Grenfell considers the interpretive implications of maps by Reformers that charted a known morality associated with biblical and English places and events in confrontation with maps of new explorations that continually shifted geographic contours and represented unknown cultures. She concludes that Spenser and his knights, exploring a fluid and unknown moral and national potential, found contemporary cartography inadequate.

In the preview that concludes their introduction Gordon and Klein offer a different order of the essays to suggest other links and features. This mapping begins from inside out, from the human body in the fifth essay, extending through the domicile and theater in the sixth, military camp, city of London, nation, and empire, and it heeds the imaginative, epistemological, and ideological spaces under construction in the excitement that early modern maps displayed and generated over the micro and macro discoveries of the age of exploration. The editors thereby claim a number of employments for this approach. The essayists further

promote its imperialism. While the essays focus on framing theories of mappings, on literary, social, and cultural theses, and on supporting interpretations, the notes engage with theories of the construction and effects of spaces and with connections to and extensions of other critical approaches. These generate still more potential. A reviewer might suggest that we could attend as well to routes mapped by pioneers unmentioned, such as Raymond Williams' examination of social confrontations between landscapes or Fredric Jameson's speculative mappings of cognitive spaces with literary genres.

This review provides a reductive map of the imaginative spaces of this stimulating collection of essays. To survey the scope and detail of the insights, materials, analytic methods, and persuasive modes of individual essayists and their mappings of early modern English literature and culture scholars must enter into the representations of the essayists' performances. Those who do will be rewarded.

Germaine Warkentin and Carolyn Podruchny, eds. *Decentring the Renaissance: Canada and Europe in Multidisciplinary Perspective, 1500-1700*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001. xii + 387 pp. + 10 illus. \$60.00. Review by TY M. REESE, UNIVERSITY OF NORTH DAKOTA.

This edited collection of post-colonial "decentring" essays re-examines early cultural interaction in Canada. The contributors hope to better understand the Renaissance, and how it influenced initial contact along with long-term cultural interaction, by extending the boundaries of the Renaissance into the Americas. In their introduction, the editors state that they "look not solely into the impact on Canada of people shaped by the European Renaissance and Early Modern periods, but to the impact of Canada on them" (7). The decentring that the contributors hope to accomplish involves placing "the categories themselves under scrutiny, to make them available for critical thought, and, in stressing the 'opposition between the sensible and intelligible,' to make us aware of

the ways in which thought constructs what we describe as experience" (8). In the end, the editors see the essays as an attempt "to study the results of the shaping of early Canada by men and women who were living in and affected by a period of aggressive intellectual, economic and territorial transformation" (9).

The editors arranged the essays into four sections, with an Afterword, that examine these issues from a variety of perspectives. Part I, "Methods," begins with Natalie Zemon Davis' examination of four decentring strategies. Davis explores the understanding of the Other as a European construction, the attempt to make both Europeans and Native Americans actors within a struggle, the idea of a middle ground, and lastly a "strategy of symmetrical comparative analysis" (30). The major concern raised by Davis, apparent throughout the essays, involves studying cultural interaction without the scholar's culture dominating. The next essay, one of the work's most intriguing, is Deborah Doxtator's comparative examination of European and Native conceptions of time and history. Doxtator begins by stating how Canadian history does not begin until the arrival of the Europeans and that "tens of thousands of years of history in North America are deemed to be largely unknowable" (34). Doxtator clearly illustrates how scholars dismiss Native oral histories as myth while forgetting that much of their own history arises out of myths. Toby Morantz challenges some of Doxtator's arguments by doubting if a single narrative that reflects both sides can be created. While Morantz does not outright dismiss oral traditions, he cautions historians to "think carefully of what distortions they might be creating in absorbing oral text into a new written historical narrative" (50). Of all the essays, Morantz shows that cultural relativism is not equal to cultural understanding. Part I ends with Gilles Thérien's examination of the role of Jesuit *memoria* in the New World. This essay demonstrates the diverse ways in which Europeans viewed and conceptualized early Canada.

Part II, "Mentalités," consists of five essays that examine the European side of early contact. Olive Patricia Dickason examines the French conception of empire. Her essay explores the vari-

ous French attempts to establish themselves in the Americas while reinforcing the long-held view that the French were the most successful in dealing with the Natives. The essay does clearly delineate that trade and colonization were not synonymous and success in one did not guarantee success in the other. Next, Selma Barkham examines how a merchant mentality governed the Basque fishermen's, who annually came to the Canadian fisheries, activities, and relations with the Natives. This is followed by a re-examination of William Vaughn's conception of Newfoundland. Here, Anne Lake Prescott shows that while many conceptualized the New World as feminine, and many times virginal, William Vaughn utilized classical works to create a mythical concept of Newfoundland. The essay of Mary C. Fuller follows this by examining English images of Newfoundland and Roanoke. Fuller shows how the imagined Roanoke was more attractive than the reality of known Newfoundland. The section ends with an essay that examines the changing European views of Native Americans and how these conceptions continue to influence our views of the past.

Part III, "Translatio fide," examines the role of Christianity in early Canada. Luca Codignola begins by exploring the activity of Catholic Clergy in French and British North America. Codignola argues that while Catholic missionary activity has received intensive scrutiny, the "creation of the North American Catholic network . . . is still little known" (173). Codignola contends that when one looks at the number of Catholic clergy who traveled to North America from 1610-58, fewer than four per year, the "massive influence claimed for them" is wrong (184). There was less interest in proselytization than assumed. Next, Peter Goddard shows how French missionary activity lagged behind that of Iberia, yet those who journeyed to the New World made Canada part of their "contemporary religious consciousness and controversy" (197). The final essay, by André Sanfaçon, explores the construction of a Holy House of Loreto in Canada along with the creation, and alteration, of devotional activity.



Part IV, "Decentring at Work," provides five essays that re-examine Canada's early history. The first essay, by Lynn Berry, examines Pierre Boucher's natural history and the influences of the Canadian environment upon him. Next, Conrad Heidenreich explores early French excursions into the St. Lawrence Valley and how the "Europeans had to learn that physical barriers could only be overcome through the removal of cultural barriers" (238). Wallace Chafe examines early Iroquoian language, and from here a group of scholars involved in the *Meta Incognita* project re-examine the Frobisher voyages through archaeological evidence. The section ends with Emerson Baker and John Reid's re-examination of Sir William Phips.

Like many edited collections of essays, the reviewer is left wondering about the cohesion of the selected essays and their attempt to decentre the Renaissance. The essays clearly show the limitations of traditional views of contact, yet their decentring of this, by expanding the Renaissance across the Atlantic and into Canada, remains problematic because of the continued reliance upon European sources, especially the *Jesuit Relations*. The issue that is not raised concerns even if we discover and explore the biases inherent in these sources, do they allow us to better understand the Other? While we do truly want to include the Other into the story of European expansion into the Americas, and insure that their agency becomes part of the larger narrative, we must remember that as long as we continue to rely upon traditional sources of evidence, our narrative will remain lopsided. The essays do clearly illustrate the complexity involved in understanding European expansion while challenging the narrowness of the traditional narrative.

Harriette Andreadis. *Sappho in Early Modern England: Female Same-Sex Literary Erotics, 1550-1714*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001. xiii + 254 pp. + 9 illus. \$17.00 Paper. Review by MADHAVI MENON, ITHACA COLLEGE.

In a book that claims to be about erotic ellipses, *Sappho in Early Modern England* is also dependent on one: its evident debt to Foucauldian theory goes both unnamed and unpaid. In general, scholars of Renaissance sexuality draw on Foucault's theories for two major ideas: first, an emphasis on extraliterary discourse, and second, the historical division of sexual acts and identities between the pre-modern and the modern eras. Even as *Sappho in Early Modern England* is in alignment with both these ideas (Andreadis repeatedly stresses, for instance, that she seeks to problematize the kind of theory that "attributes to an earlier era the relatively recent notion of 'lesbian' identity and assumes its transhistorical presence" [20]), its bibliographic ellipsis sets up a paradigm in which literary predecessors, though invoked, remain unnamed. This "unnaming" provides the methodology for *Sappho in Early Modern England*. And, as Andreadis argues, it also provided early modern women writers with a discursive mode in which to write Sapphic poetry without invoking the taint of Sapphic sexuality.

Such production is necessarily caught in a double bind. Andreadis begins by outlining this dilemma in relation to Sappho. Considered both sexually transgressive and poetically talented, Sappho emblemizes both a highly praised female writer and a woman with shameful sexual secrets. *Sappho in Early Modern England* traces the way in which early modern women writers negotiated a relation to Sappho that was, given the nature of Sappho's cultural position, necessarily doubled, or twinned. To claim the mantle of Sappho's literary genius brought with it the whiff of Sappho's sexual proclivities, and this dilemma informs all the theoretical and historical pressure that *Sappho in Early Modern England* brings to bear on its subjects. Regardless of whether or not the women examined in this book "really" had sexual dealings with other women, Andreadis argues doggedly for their *literary* erotics,

and represents a wide range of writers from Sappho to Katherine Philips to Aphra Behn to Delarivier Manley to Anne Killigrew and Queen Anne. As this selection makes clear, Andreadis deals with both well-known and lesser-known figures, and her project aims to tie them together in what her first chapter tantalizingly calls an “erotics of unnam[ing].” This erotics provides the book’s goal of “locat[ing] and . . . describ[ing] the historical movement toward the silencing that took place as knowledge of transgressive sexuality between women became widespread throughout an increasingly literate and urbanized English society in which print culture was ever more rapidly being disseminated” (24). This is the working paradigm of Andreadis’s book, and it is a brilliant one. *Sappho in Early Modern England* is an analysis, not of speech, but of silence, not of the printed word, but of the ellipses in which erotic *frisson* takes place. The lack of historical “evidence” that has resulted in the erasure of early modern female sexuality in the past is here exhumed, both from the archive and from the text, with astonishing critical perspicuity. It’s not as if there is no “evidence,” Andreadis seems to be saying, it’s just that you didn’t know where to look.

And there’s certainly plenty to see in this book. After outlining the considerable consequences of the Sapphic double-bind to the early modern woman writer, Andreadis moves on in her next chapter to examine the way in which Katherine Philips treads this thorny path. Philips’s “way out,” in stark opposition to a writer like Aphra Behn, is to sublimate eroticism into the acceptable discourse of intense friendship, thus providing what Andreadis calls “a respectable alternative to the specter of unnatural vice” (98). But this specter continues to haunt even its evasions, as the next chapter on “Doubling Discourses in an Erotics of Female Friendship” makes abundantly clear. In other words (and this is Foucault’s point too) the production of writing points not to a freedom from repression, but rather to the *creation* of repression: “to name may be to inhibit and to constrain” (15). The writers examined in this chapter—Anne Killigrew and Jane Barker, among others—“were loath to see themselves . . . in ways considered trans-

gressive [and so] developed more acceptable discursive strategies to contain or to deflect desires that might otherwise have threatened to overwhelm them" (101). This chapter deals with the necessity of the "erotic ellipsis" and begins with a brilliant analysis of the word "ellipsis," which is sometimes defined as "[a]n omission of words needful fully to express the sense" (101). An ellipsis is by definition both linguistically present and absent: it necessarily engenders a double discourse. This doubling carries over into the book's conclusion on the "Configurations of Desire," in which Andreadis examines the Ovidian myth of Calisto and Jupiter, famous for featuring both heterosexual rape and female same-sex desire. Tracing its representational history in art and in court masques, Andreadis comments on Queen Anne (who played Calisto as a young princess of eleven) and on her court, with its (in)famous emphasis on strong literary and political women. John Crowne's court masque of *Calisto*, Andreadis argues, is eerily representative of Anne's court itself, which "might be said to mediate obliquely between contemporary discourses of overt and covert transgressiveness" (176).

The mediation of discursive desire is, finally, what *Sappho in Early Modern England* is "about." Andreadis argues for an inverse relationship between the knowledge of sexual transgression and their literary expression; the more widely circulated discourse of tribadism and sapphism, she suggests, only ensured an elliptical inhibition of literary statement. But despite this immense, and immensely timely, project, the book seems strangely content to cast its ideas in the shadow of similar conclusions about gay "male" sexuality in the Renaissance. In other words, *Sappho in Early Modern England* goes well beyond Foucault, but insists on (silently) echoing his voice. This erotic ellipsis, while providing a brilliant and scholarly paradigm within which to read early modern sexuality, also provides us with a shadow opening onto an entirely *new* mode of inquiry. Like the texts that Andreadis examines, this area of inquiry participates in a doubled discourse: while delineating between early modern and modern sexualities, it also suggests a historical continuity rather than a rupture between the two. Even

as “Sappho was . . . being used in early modern England as an Ovidian example of tribadism in literary discourse” (39), Andreadis notes also that “Sappho’s iconic status in modern discourse . . . can be a witty way of saying ‘lesbian’: for example, during the summer of 2000, a three-week retrospective of lesbian cult films being shown in New York City was entitled ‘Sapp-o-Rama’” (185 n.2). In this account of female same-sex erotics, Sappho in early modern England bears a constitutive, if not seamless, relationship to Sappho in the here and now. Even as her *literary* persona is all but extinguished in its modern invocation, Sappho becomes one of those ellipses that form the content of this book: like Foucault, she functions as a code word that largely fulfills its function by suggesting an intertextual community. This suggestion of historical continuity, though not the goal of *Sappho in Early Modern England*, is nonetheless made possible by its brilliant analyses, which are not only historically grounded and astute, but also intellectually rigorous and timely. As a sign of our times, *Sappho* is also a sign *for* our times, and achieves this dual distinction by continually doubling in on itself.

Deborah Aldrich-Watson, ed. *The Verse Miscellany of Constance Aston Fowler: A Diplomatic Edition*. Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies and Renaissance English Text Society, 2000. Ixii + 206pp. + 2 illus. \$40.00. Review by ADAM SMYTH, UNIVERSITY OF READING.

Deborah Aldrich-Watson’s rendering of the verse miscellany of Constance Aston Fowler (Huntington Manuscript 904) provides the first printed edition of this significant manuscript—a manuscript containing many poems which have not appeared before, in any other context. Aldrich-Watson’s book is thus an important contribution to the process of bringing previously cloistered texts, particularly those by women, to a broader readership. That process of making texts public owes much to the work of the Renaissance English Text Society.

The manuscript contains 65 poems transcribed by Fowler between about 1630 and 1660. Aldrich-Watson's detailed, scholarly introduction suggests the significance of this manuscript is three-fold: in terms of gender, Fowler's Staffordshire family, and Catholicism. Since accounts of early modern manuscripts often construct the verse miscellany as a form inevitably associated with a male, Oxford, anti-Catholic, misogynous context, Fowler's text is valuable in providing an alternative model: the work of a woman, in Staffordshire, in a recusant environment. First, the text tells us much about female agency in the world of manuscript transmission and compilation. This has been discussed by Arthur Marotti in *Manuscript, Print, and The English Renaissance Lyric* (1995), among others, but Fowler's text provides valuable, sustained evidence. Second, Aldrich-Watson carefully positions the manuscript as a product of Fowler's family at Tixall, Staffordshire. Thirty-six of the 65 poems relate to Fowler's family members and friends, and Aldrich-Watson details these connections: there are verses by family members including Fowler's father, Walter Aston, and her brother, Herbert (although I am not convinced by claims that Fowler's own unattributed verse appears, based on assessments of "her style and what is known of her personality" [xx]); there are transcriptions in several family hands; and there are poems marking particular family occasions, including Walter Aston's return from Spain. Third, Aldrich-Watson presents the manuscript as a Catholic text: sixteen of the poems are overtly Catholic, including four by the Jesuit priest Robert Southwell.

While Aldrich-Watson is certainly right to draw attention to this miscellany as a family document, and while her research in this area is exemplary, her tendency to read the manuscript biographically is sometimes restricting. A greater sense of Fowler's manuscript as a collection operating within the genre of the verse miscellany would be helpful. Thus, for instance, when Fowler's manuscript includes a poem perhaps by Robert Herrick, Aldrich-Watson notes that "perhaps she included the poems [...] because Herrick was chaplain to Buckingham on his expedition to the Isle of Ré in 1627" where Fowler's father, Walter, might have met him

(xlii). This might be right: but such a reading overlooks the fact that Herrick was a verse miscellany favourite, appearing in numerous volumes. Fowler's manuscript includes work by poets such as Henry King, Ben Jonson, and Thomas Randolph: poets that align the text with other verse miscellany collections. Aldrich-Watson certainly does introduce discussions of other manuscripts as useful points of comparison: most notably, Bod. MS Eng. poet. b.5, a recusant manuscript of Thomas Fairfax, a Warwickshire yeoman, which exhibits compelling overlaps with Fowler's texts; and BL Add. MS. 15225, a manuscript of Catholic ballads. But the emphasis on Fowler's manuscript as a family document obscures consideration of the text as it relates to miscellany norms. Similarly, Fowler's poems on Buckingham may well have been, as Aldrich-Watson suggests, the result of direct family connections: Fowler's father developed a friendly relationship with Villiers through his appointment as joint ambassador to Spain and his consequent involvement with the marriage negotiations of Prince Charles to the Infanta. But poems about Buckingham (both for and against) were generally popular in manuscript miscellanies, and Fowler's inclusion may owe more to characteristics of verse transmission than to particular family links.

Given this reading of Fowler's manuscript as a text operating within a particular genre, it is useful to compare Fowler's transcriptions with other miscellanies—in part to understand something of the methods and ambitions of Fowler's compilation. Fowler's manuscript is particularly important in this respect since it is in many ways a significantly atypical collection. Aldrich-Watson provides useful starting points, as an appendix notes some textual variants, but more detail would be valuable. For instance, poem 57 in Fowler's manuscript is a verse beginning "O loue whoes powre and might could neuer be w<sup>th</sup>stood." This poem also appeared in a number of popular printed collections of verse (including *Wit and Drollery*, which Aldrich-Watson notes, and others such as *The Marrow of Complements* and *The New Academy of Complements*), and in several manuscripts (Crum's *First-Line Index of English Poetry 1500-1800 in MSS. of the Bodleian Library* lists 13

appearances). A comparison between Fowler's text and these printed versions yields important points of difference: most noticeably, Fowler's text cuts many of the bawdier lines (including "A Turd in Cupid's teeth," and "I'll rend her smock asunder") and, as a consequence, offers a relatively decorous verse (although the poem is still discordant among the manuscript's other inclusions). Fowler's text also omits several lines that construct a female object of love: in her text, only one reference to "Her" remains. Such considerations raise important questions about the degree to which Fowler's transcriptions were in fact active, even creative acts, rather than simple mechanisms of duplication; they invite reflection on the significance attached to early modern ideas of authorship and the original; and they raise notions of how "public" verse was appropriated and rendered "private."

These are just the kinds of important questions that Aldrich-Watson's careful editing and meticulous scholarship has enabled. It is in some ways regrettable that her edition did not fully embrace such issues, but the vital point is that her work has brought out into the public an otherwise secluded text. The use of editions like *The Verse Miscellany of Constance Aston Fowler* in research and, crucially, in teaching, will certainly help reorientate the early modern canon and bring previously neglected texts, compilers, and readers to scholarly attention.

Jane Spencer. *Aphra Behn's Afterlife*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. ix + 307 pp. \$72.00.

Derek Hughes. *The Theatre of Aphra Behn*. New York: Palgrave, 2001. xiii + 230 pp. \$65.00.

Reviews by ROBERT MARKLEY, WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY.

Almost a decade ago in her Introduction to *Rereading Aphra Behn*, Heidi Hutner suggested that critics could not understand Restoration literature without taking into account the significance



of Aphra Behn as a dramatist, poet, translator, and novelist. Two recent studies by Jane Spencer and Derek Hughes build on Hutner's insight to consider, in very different ways, what the canonization of Behn tells about the course of eighteenth-century literary history and the give-and-take of theatrical controversy during the 1670s and 1680s. Both scholars succeed in redefining the literary and historical contexts in which we read Behn's works, and both consequently offer challenges to the ways in which Behn is taught and discussed.

Spencer's *Afterlife* concentrates on the ways in which Behn was read, adapted, rewritten, praised, and dismissed in the eighteenth century. Drawing on the work of Pierre Bourdieu and Barbara Herrnstein Smith, among others, Spencer argues that literary history encodes masculine models of inheritance, lineage, and influence, and therefore is ill-equipped to acknowledge the sophisticated—and often antagonistic—interplay between popular success and aesthetic value. In place of traditional source studies or Bloomian invocations of Oedipal warfare, she explores “the complex effects of gendered beliefs on the creation of literary and cultural histories” (15). Spencer then diligently traces Behn's contemporary reputation as a dramatist, poet, and novelist to produce a detailed account of the vagaries of her reputation between her death in 1689 and the beginning of the nineteenth century. Behn was both celebrated for her “wit” and disparaged for her violations of proper feminine morality. Women writers looked to her both as an “enabling model” (164) and as a negative example of the kind of writing they should avoid. Spencer devotes significant attention to the effects of this complex legacy on writers such as Mary Pix, Catherine Trotter, Delariviere Manley, Anne Finch, Susanna Centlivre, and Eliza Haywood. In different ways, these women appropriate, transform, or try to distance themselves from the mythology of Behn as both foremother and inappropriate role model. There are noteworthy analyses of these writers throughout Spencer's study as well as a first-rate discussion of Samuel Richardson's vilification of Behn and what she had come to represent. *Aphra Behn's Afterlife* concludes with valuable case studies of

the receptions of *The Rover* and *Oroonoko* in the eighteenth century. Rather than sinking quietly into oblivion, Behn's most popular comedy held the stage into the 1750s; its popularity belied the moralistic denunciations of critics and the best efforts of would-be reformers. The afterlife of *Oroonoko* as an abolitionist text, by comparison, is well known, but Spencer's chapter on Southerne's tragicomedy and the republication of Behn's novel contributes significantly to our understanding of the politics of race and reception in the eighteenth century.

Hughes's study of Behn's drama is the most comprehensive to date. *The Theatre of Aphra Behn* pays close attention to stage craft, casting, discovery scenes, and the theatrical repertory of the 1670s and 1680s. Hughes offers analyses of all of the extant plays, and he is particularly good on those works such as *Abdelazer*, Behn's only tragedy, that are seldom read and almost never performed. The portrait of Behn that emerges is a dark one. Rather than the female wit or the feminist champion of women's desire, Behn is portrayed as the skilled anatomist of a masculine-dominated society. Her heroes invariably succumb to their lusts for power and possession; her heroines recognize their limited options in a social worlds in which "all women are classed as whores" (87). For Hughes, Behn's plays derive their edginess and satiric bite by refusing to give in to comic cliches and conventionally happy endings. In her early plays such as *The Forc'd Marriage* (1670) and *The Dutch Lover* (1673), masculine violence is never far from the surface of political, social, and economic interactions, and although Behn is deeply critical of the values and assumptions that underlie masculine prerogatives, she offers no agenda for social change. In her mature comedies, such as both parts of *The Rover* (1677, 1681), the threat of violence hovers over the female characters, and the witty banter and playacting of carnival always verges on degenerating into gang rape. Blustering male characters such as Blunt may be the butt of the joke in *The Rover*, but their response to being duped is to assume that all women are fair game for sexual revenge. Hughes's argument is a necessary—if contro-

versial—corrective to critics such as Catherine Gallagher who have emphasized Behn's witty identifications between female playwright and prostitute.

*The Theatre of Aphra Behn* thus makes a different kind of contribution to Behn studies from *Behn's Afterlife*. If Spencer's study contributes to our historical understanding of the reception of women's writing in the eighteenth century, Hughes's work challenges our conceptions of the ideological underpinnings and overtones of Behn's comedy. For the record, I should note that I disagree with more than a few of the readings that Hughes offers. Willmore may have the attention span of a three-year old and the introspection of a *GQ* model, but Behn dedicated the second part of *The Rover* to the future James II and explicitly identified her exiled Cavalier with the exiled heir apparent. Behn's prefaces and dedications suggest a shrewd and widely read intellectual who was skilled in negotiating the complexities of Restoration politics. One wonders, then, what Hughes would make of her elegy on John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester or her preface to her translation of Bernard le Bovier de Fontenelle's *Cheats of the Pagan Priests*. The great virtue of Hughes's study is that it leads us to ask such questions about the shape of Behn's career, her theatrical and political alliances, and her significance for our understanding of the literature of the late seventeenth century. Like Spencer's *Afterlife*, it is a provocative study.

Karen Raber. *Dramatic Difference: Gender, Class, and Genre in the Early Modern Closet Drama*. Newark: University of Delaware Press; London: Associated University Presses, 2001. 338 pp. \$49.50 cloth. Review by JULIE D. CAMPBELL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY.

For anyone teaching or simply interested in closet dramas, Raber's book is an excellent resource. The study covers plays from the sixteenth-century through the Restoration, from those of Mary Sidney and her circle to those by John Milton and Katherine Philips. Raber especially provides good discussions of the contexts for these

plays, focusing on the relations of the playwrights to their political, cultural, and familial environments. For those familiar with the closet drama of the sixteenth- and early seventeenth-centuries, she covers much ground that has already been quite thoroughly examined in other scholarship; nonetheless, her strategy of putting male and female playwrights' voices in dialogue with each other is one that works well, allowing her to tease out a variety of salient observations about the texts and their contexts. Raber argues that "closet drama offered early modern writers of both sexes the opportunity to interrogate their culture's investment in drama and performance," but for women writers, she continues, it offered "a form of dramatic writing that allowed their participation in the discourses of dramatic representation" as well as provided a means through which women could explore their own "tenuous and marginal relationship to theatrical domains" (13-14). These are the main ideas upon which she elaborates in detail in *Dramatic Difference*.

In her introduction, Raber provides an overview of the history of closet drama. She suggests that although the genre's formation is often attributed to Philip Sidney's comment in the *Apology for Poetry* that English poets might profit from following Seneca's example, "the genre's formation owes more to a less specific, and more socially and literarily complex set of conditions"(25). Citing the suppression of "everyday spectacles of common life," such as the morality and mystery plays, stagings of liturgical drama, and folk plays, in favor of "more centralized, Protestant forms of entertainment," Raber asserts that "the English government under Elizabeth consolidated its hold on forms of representation just at the moment that performances at centralized theaters or inns became the preferred mode of cultural recreation"(25). She also notes that it was at this cultural moment that "a kind of *theorizing* of spectacle, staged speeches, and performance took the place of formerly abundant and varied theatrical pastimes"(25). Thus, she argues that Sidney's approval of *Gorboduc* should be read within the context of "his contemporaries' view of literary production to explain late-sixteenth-century interest in the Senecan closet

drama”(25-26). In addition to hypothesizing about the impetus behind the popularity of closet drama, Raber traces its development, pointing out references to it in Shakespeare’s plays, discussing the impact of the restriction of the licensing of actors upon household entertainments, and emphasizing the centrality of the aristocratic family to the genre.

In Chapter Two, Raber investigates the interaction of gender and class interests in Mary Sidney’s *Antonie*, Thomas Kyd’s *Cornelia*, Samuel Daniel’s *Cleopatra*, and Samuel Brandon’s *The virtuous Octavia*. This chapter contains four sections on the “domestic” and two sections on the “political” regarding Mary Sidney, her place in her family, her society, and her relation to her brother, as well as the influences of her translation upon the work of others. The two sections on the “political” are in many ways the most interesting. In them, Raber delves more deeply into *Antonie* than in the previous sections, considering representations of monarchy, especially relating to Elizabeth, and exploring the question, how does one successfully advise a monarch? She also considers the political impact of Sidney’s play in connection with its impressive publication and reprint record.

Raber continues to examine the issue of advising a monarch via plays in Chapter Three as she explores Greville’s penchant for “applying historical examples to the comprehension of contemporary political and social conditions” (117). In this chapter, Raber seeks to “reinsert Greville’s plays into their immediate historical situation and recover some of their interactions with their political environment” (116). Regarding *Mustapha*, she examines how late sixteenth-century “concerns about familial authority and affection, state-formation, and succession” inform the play, arguing that “the implications of Greville’s exploration of the family/state analogy prove devastating to any positive advisory role for his plays” (125).

Chapter Four is focused on the political tensions in *The Tragedy of Mariam*. Here, Raber examines the issue of “how genre is implicated in women’s unstable construction as domestic rather than political subjects” (150-51). She especially discusses the is-

sues surrounding women's speech and the idea that the only "safe" channel of communication is between a woman and her husband. Raber concludes that Cary's play "attacks patriarchy, including its more concentrated expression in patriarchal absolutism, as a flawed system" (164). While other critics have made similar observations about the play, Raber enhances her discussion of this idea by examining how the play provides a commentary on "perform[ing] subjection as it is described in the Elizabethan Homily on Matrimony" (153). Raber asserts that by the end of the play, Herod has trouble deciding if Mariam is guilty of "treason, of adultery, or simply of talking too much—because, of course, according to the doctrine that makes domestic and political patriarchy mirror images of one another, these crimes are indistinguishable" (170-71).

In Chapter Five, Raber discusses the plays of Margaret Cavendish, which she situates in dialogue with the work of Thomas Killigrew and that of her husband, William Cavendish. She compares Margaret Cavendish's and Killigrew's use of the woman warrior figure in relation to the historical backdrop of civil war. Raber ultimately suggests that in "her imagination of war Cavendish offers a radical revision of women's roles" but that in "her imagination of a peacetime world, she remains as conservative as Killigrew" (217). She also examines the ways in which William Cavendish's contributions of poems, songs, scenes, and dialogue informed Margaret's plays and comments extensively on their literary collaboration. She suggests that in her plays, "Cavendish recreates her husband's reputation. As the subject of her text, he is restored to power and made the authority he believed himself before the war" (235).

In her conclusion, Raber assesses the ways in which the women writers in her survey negotiate the cultural and political circumscriptions of their times, noting that the "implications of domesticity Sidney resists in the 1590s are solidified throughout the 1600s" (237). Raber ends her study with a discussion of the plays of Katherine Philips and John Milton, noting that the differences between how each conceives genre and gender "clarify closet drama's fate during and after the Restoration" (239).

In *Dramatic Difference*, Raber ultimately provides readers with a broad overview of the history of the closet drama in England, as well as a series of in-depth looks at authors and specific plays. Her interrogation of the domestic and political circumstances surrounding authorship, performance, and circulation of manuscripts or editions often rewards the reader with new insights into the issues of gender, class, and genre that she sets out to explore.

Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth, eds. *Literary Circles and Cultural Communities in Renaissance England*. Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 2000. ix + 243 pp. + 5 illus. \$39.95. Review by MARLIN E. BLAINE, CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FULLERTON.

*Literary Circles and Cultural Communities in Renaissance England* presents twelve essays selected from the thirteenth biennial Renaissance conference at the University of Michigan-Dearborn, 15-17 October, 1998. Collections from past Dearborn conferences have been staples of seventeenth-century criticism since the late 1970s and have focused on individual authors such as Robert Herrick, John Donne, George Herbert, and Andrew Marvell, as well as on more general topics such as desire, wit, representations of women, and the English Civil Wars. Like previous collections from Dearborn, this one focuses mostly seventeenth-century writers, despite the use of the word "Renaissance" in its title. The book does have an article on Donne's poetry of the 1590s and brief treatments of sixteenth-century groups such as the Sidney circle and the Areopagus, but its predominant interest lies in the later Renaissance. It will be valuable reading for anyone interested in the question of how social relations—coteries, patronage networks, religious communities, and various other alliances and groupings of authors and readers—shaped literary production and consumption in the seventeenth-century.

It is hard to resist applying the model of the literary circle to this book; many names have appeared in earlier Summers-Pebworth collections. We might speak of a Dearborn Circle. But the existence of such a circle need not be taken as circumscribing the critical imaginations of its members. As the editors observe in their introduction, "The aim of this volume is not to propagate a single view of the function of literary circles in Renaissance culture, but to explore the various ways in which Renaissance literature may be fruitfully approached via literary circles and cultural communities" (2). While most of the articles assess the historical legacy of a specific individual or group, the collection as a whole embodies the spirit of diverse inquiry noted by the editors, as some contributors explore problems of definition, others address issues of groups' self-identification, some show how authors vainly attempted to create certain kinds of literary communities, and one or two question the historical existence of certain circles that scholars have taken for granted.

The collection offers fresh insight into the history of some communities that readers will be quite familiar with, such as the Great Tew group (the subject of two articles) and the Tribe of Ben, as well as less well-known groups such as the one centered on the young Thomas Stanley. Stella P. Revard subtly explores the political and aesthetic valences of the poetry of this last-named group, which included mostly Royalist poets such as Lovelace, Herrick, Sherburne, and Shirley, but also counted among its number the Parliamentarian John Hall. Just as Stanley's group could encompass diverse opinions, so could the Tribe of Ben, according to Robert C. Evans, though he distinguishes the aesthetic issues that were debated in this coterie from the "macropolitical" focus that he finds in recent criticism; Evans polemically calls for the development of a "historical formalist" approach to texts that would offer a corrective to what he considers overly ideological readings. In his article on Great Tew, M. L. Donnelly masterfully explains how a Hobbesian concept of history influenced the aesthetics of this circle, which in turn helped shape the development of the neoclassical aesthetics of late-seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century English litera-



ture. Paul G. Stanwood's contribution on the same group examines the ways in which various Tevians carried on the tenets and spirit of Richard Hooker's rationalist theology—another important legacy of Great Tew. Since this piece is devoted to exploring Hooker's influence, more discussion of Hooker's ideas than is given here would be welcome; spatial constraints were undoubtedly to blame.

Among the articles that critique the theoretical construct of the circle, Judith Scherer Herz's is the most wide-ranging. Arguing that the circle often must be understood not as a stable reality but as "a cataloging mechanism and as a heuristic" (15), Herz surveys a number of "circles," such as those associated with the Sidney family, Grey's Inn, the Caroline court, and Great Tew, as well as the enigmatic Society of Friendship centered on Katherine Philips. Herz usefully observes that some of these "circles" might be better identified as patronage groups, while others, notably the Society of Friendship, might exist more as a textual fiction than as anything else. Timothy Raylor's article reinforces one of Herz's points: the need to redefine certain "circles." Raylor convincingly argues that the so-called Cavendish Circle would more accurately be labeled a patronage network. Paul A. Parrish revises the circle metaphor to provide a more accurate geometrical model of the degrees of proximity of several figures (Nicholas Ferrar, Joseph Beaumont, and Abraham Cowley) to the two foci of a Cambridge literary "ellipse": George Herbert and Richard Crashaw. This article is especially valuable in demonstrating Crashaw's influence on his associates and in sorting out a range of conceptions about devotional writing and devotional practices amongst the non-Puritan crowd at Cambridge. John Considine does not so much critique the critical notion of the circle but debunk the idea that the Thomas Overbury circle even existed. Analyzing the printing history and manuscript evidence pertaining to Overbury's *A Wife*, Considine demonstrates the falsehood of publisher Lawrence Lisle's claims that the verses and the prose "characters" with which he repeatedly augmented editions of the book were composed by Overbury's friends. Considine compellingly argues that Lisle com-

missioned many of these additions from writers with whom he, not Overbury, had relationships, and passed them off as the work of Overbury's friends to dupe middle-class readers into thinking they were gaining access to the writings of a courtly coterie, while the sales thus generated swelled Lisle's purse.

Several articles explore attempts more legitimate attempts to fashion circles or communities, although these, like Philips' Society of Friendship, tend to remain more fictive than real. Sharon Cadmon Seelig suggests that the socially isolated and marginalized Aemilia Lanyer created, through the dedicatory verses of her book *Salve Deus Rex Judaeorum* and "The Description of Cooke-ham," "a fictive community that functions as an alternative to the patriarchal structure" (50). Anna K. Nardo examines the implications of Milton's unrealized suggestion in *The Reason of Church Government* that England should establish literary academies on the Italian model and traces out Milton's ambivalence toward this kind of institution. And Achsah Guibbory analyzes Margaret Fell's series of pamphlets attempting to engage Menasseh ben Israel in a textual dialogue (which he declined to enter) as she attempted to convert the Jews to Christianity. Guibbory's is a fascinating article, and, even if her claim that Fell implicitly presents herself as the Messiah seems somewhat overstated, the article nevertheless takes a welcome look at an under-examined body of pamphlets in which issues of English religious identity, Jewish-Christian relations, and the rhetorical authority of women converge in complex ways.

The only contribution that I found fully unconvincing was M. Thomas Hester's "Like a spied Spie': Donne's Baiting of Marlowe," which provides an illuminating discussion of the piscatory tropes used in the discourse of Elizabethan religious surveillance, but does not ultimately succeed in its attempt to read Donne's "The Bait" as a critique of this surveillance. According to Hester, Marlowe's "The Passionate Shepherd to His Love" stands as the figure for this surveillance because Marlowe served in the Walsingham spy network. Hester, however, can only suggest the possible existence of a literary circle in which the fish of "The Bait"

would resonate as images of Catholics entrapped by the Elizabethan intelligence apparatus. To be fair, Hester himself admits to an ultimate uncertainty about his proposition (42).

Only a few minor errors mark this generally well-edited volume. The most noteworthy are probably the misspellings of two foreign language book titles, one of which is wrong in two articles and the index. On the whole, however, the volume presents an intriguing array of studies on an important topic that has not often enough been addressed directly, despite the number of books and articles in recent years that have taken for granted the importance of coteries and other literary communities in Early Modern England.

Larry F. Norman. *The Public Mirror: Molière and the Social Commerce of Depiction*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1999. vii + 226 pp. \$40. Review by KIKI GOUNARIDOU, SMITH COLLEGE.

In *The Public Mirror*, Larry Norman's intention is to uncover the aesthetic and social conditions that made Molière's satires possible. The idea of the "public mirror" was used by Molière in describing his own plays as a means for audience self-recognition through satire. Norman argues that, with satire, there is a fine line that the playwright walks in order to satisfy his audience. Molière must keep his characters and their flaws specific enough to delight audiences with satires of their peers, yet his audiences must not realize that they themselves are also being targeted. In the first two parts of the book, Norman examines Molière's engagement of the audience, "both in the creation and in the reception of his works" (9), before turning to the actual dramatic structure of the plays in the third part.

In Part One, "Creation," Norman explains that, because *L'École des Femmes* was "dangerously triumphant" (13), Molière uses *La Critique de L'École des Femmes* as an apology for the first: the public is depicted on stage criticizing its own stage depiction in Molière's previous play. Of these plays, Norman says, "If we wish

to understand the aesthetics of Molière's comic mirror, we must look at the social configuration of its performance" (15). He believes that, for Molière, representation is "indissociable" from reception (16), and points out that, in *La Critique*, reception becomes in turn the subject of representation. The audience's reaction is placed on stage and turned into the comedy. Through the character of Uranie, Norman illustrates the tensions between general and specific depiction, and compares the comedy's representational dynamics to that of social commerce. Comedy is a genre that requires the presentation of an image of daily life, or "a mirror to manners" (36).

According to Norman, representation of social commerce was an art in Molière's theatre; it was orderly, witty, and lively enough to create comedy. His representation, though, may not have been his own at all, but instead the public's own portrait of their social commerce as a site of depiction. Norman contends that, among the upper, theatre-going classes during the reign of Louis XIV, "*honnêteté* is an emblem for a perfect aestheticization of social commerce, one in which the highest sign of distinction becomes an art that hides itself" (50). Therefore, as a playwright, Molière was more an observer of social commerce than a creator of original material and ideas.

Part Two, "Recognition," begins the discussion of the spectacle of self-recognition in Molière's plays: seeing oneself portrayed can give rise both to moral improvement and to cruel pleasure in the humiliation of the one targeted for ridicule. By provoking a sense of self-recognition, the "comic mirror" proves its efficacy and directness. Moreover, the specific reactions of the characters to the comic mirror indicate not only the power of its image, but also the forcefulness of the spectators' resistance to it. Norman discusses two levels that are present in theatrical performance: the level of "representation" or "spectacle," which includes everything linked to the physical elements of the production such as actors, props, audience members, etc., and the "real" story, which includes the subject matter and the author's treatment of it, the characters, and the dramatic action. Norman then proceeds to answer the question, "How does the spectator confront the comic mirror?" Drawing on

Riccoboni's analysis of seeing one's vices on stage, Norman describes three ways in which spectators can see themselves portrayed without gaining moral profit. The first is vanity at the moment of self-recognition, a narcissistic pleasure in seeing one's own faults. The second is misrecognition, that is, seeing another in the portrait of oneself. The last is painful recognition, which includes shunning of the public mirror and the inability to see oneself represented on stage.

In Part Three, "Dramaturgy," Norman focuses on *L'École des Femmes* and *Le Misanthrope* and suggests that they act as "a critique of both the social commerce of representation and the satirical comedy of manners that rehearses its dynamics" (151). *Le Misanthrope* examines comic creation, "by presenting characters who are defined as observers, portrayers, and judges of their peers" (153) and comic reception, by depicting the response of these characters to the portraits and judgments that result from these identifications. Norman then proceeds to a discussion of the characters of Célimène and Alceste by comparing them to Molière himself. This comparison is further illuminated when the differences between Alceste and Célimène are outlined; they both speak against current manners, but the circumstances surrounding their satires are very different. Alceste is motivated by hatred but Célimène is motivated by pleasure. Both characters, however, are interpreted as representing Molière: on the one hand, Molière wanted to befriend and seduce the upper class while, on the other, his satires of these very people could be biting and unpleasant. Lastly, Norman discusses the differences between the staging of tragedy and that of comedy. Molière's theatre acts as a parody of tragedy but, whereas in tragedy one views personal grandeur, "comedy explores the eyes' fascination with superficial merits and ridiculous faults" (196).

Norman concludes that, in Molière's plays, satire drives dramatic conflict, and the true lesson of Molière's drama is "not to abandon satire but, quite the contrary, to extend its insight into its own limitations of vision and to the limitations of self-recognition on the part of its subjects" (209). In Larry Norman's complex,

intelligent, and innovative analysis, Molière's comedy acts as a baroque self-reflexive mirror in which the spectator becomes aware of the nature of self-discovery and the fashioning of his or her identity.

Nicholas D. Paige. *Being Interior: Autobiography and the Contradictions of Modernity in Seventeenth-Century France*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001. ix + 299 pp. + 4 illus. \$55.00. Review by ZAHİ ZALLOUA, PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

Nicholas D. Paige's *Being Interior* makes a compelling case for the irreducibility of modernity to skepticism and secularism. Turning to the religious literature of seventeenth-century authors, mostly of women writing in the first person, Paige examines the historical process by which the works of those authors, displaying an interiorized subjectivity, came to be read as "autobiographical," and its importance for a more nuanced understanding of the origins of modern subjectivity—one which does not equate the beginnings of modernity solely with the advent of the Cartesian *cogito*.

Central to Paige's project is the metaphor of interiority, which permeates the religious or mystical writings of lesser-known seventeenth-century authors. Attention to the personal space of interiority in its religious context has indeed been a lacuna in contemporary criticism of the early modern period. Yet it would be an error, as Paige warns, to see *Being Interior* as a naïve valorization of religious inner space. Quite the contrary, what Paige seeks to illustrate is that from its very inception the autobiographical subject is mired with contradictions and paradoxes, and it is precisely these contradictions and paradoxes which Paige claims to be constitutive of modern subjectivity.

In his introduction, Paige quotes approvingly Judith Butler's formulation of the modern process of subjection: "[T]aken to be the condition for and instrument of agency,' Judith Butler has recently argued, '[the subject] is at the same time the effect of subordination, understood as the deprivation of agency'" (4). This essentially Foucauldian insight is confirmed in the early writings

of religious autobiography. Motivated by two contradictory impulses, the turn to interiority is seen at once as a *voluntary act* performed in the pursuit of self-cultivation (the fashioning of an inner self), and as a *forced response* to infringing forces from the external (social) world (the desire to turn inward did not originate from within). A case in point is Marie Baron. In a letter describing Baron's fascination with interiority, the Jesuit Jean-Joseph Surin reveals how Baron experiences her vast inner depth simultaneously as an idealized place where love abounds ("where loved kept her occupied"), and as a place of exile ("banished and confined"), where she takes refuge from the scrutinizing male gaze ("the eyes of men"). The space of interiority is, as a result, a "Janus in that it is both desired and imposed" (3).

But what provokes the injunction "be interior"? This question is, again, interlaced with the question of modernity. While modernity has been defined in terms of the absence of God (the expression of a skeptical, secular, or atheistic ideology), Paige contends that this picture is both incomplete and misleading, for it fails to attend to the complexity and specificity of the relationship to God found in some of the early autobiographical writings. Facing a social and semiotic crisis in the spiritual domain (the disturbing *prise de conscience* of a discredited natural theology; the questioning of bookish and scholastic accounts of God's existence), religious autobiographers turned inward for a (deceptive) sense of stability and for a more authentic knowledge of God. The modernity of early autobiographers lies, then, in their refusal of a hierarchical and institutionalized rapport with God, in favor of one grounded in both experience and experimentation.

Paige's book is divided into two well-balanced parts, "Reading In" and "Frictions," each comprised of two chapters. In the first chapter, Paige turns to the material forms of early autobiography, examining how autobiographical texts—namely Augustine's *Confessions* and Montaigne's *Essais*—were strategically packaged and sold. And while today's readers, who are more sensitive to the historicity of those quintessential texts, may object to the characterization of the *Confessions* and the *Essais* as "autobiography," Paige

convincingly shows that the making or history of this “anachronism” is nevertheless quite telling. Drawing from Foucault’s late works on the “technologies of the self,” Paige argues that Montaigne’s writing, for instance, displays two competing models of selfhood: the “care of the self” and the “hermeneutics of self.” On the one hand, Montaigne is a clear inheritor of the Greco-Roman culture of self-care, which sees “the self as a practice” (29), that is, the self as something to fashion rather than discover. On the other hand, through his use of metaphoric interiority, Montaigne seems to present the “self as the locus of pre-existing truths” (29), although, as Paige remarks, even the deepest inward turns are perpetually disrupted by the very mutability of the Montaignian self. But in a move to make the *Essais* the book of a “universal inspector of the inner man” (from Marie de Gournay’s 1635 “Preface” to the *Essais*, quoted in Paige 46), seventeenth-century editors readily privilege the author’s intimate “hermeneutics of self” over his Stoic or aristocratic “care of the self.”

In the second chapter, Paige investigates the formative process by which seventeenth-century writers became autobiographers. What started as a typically private exchange of letters between a nun and her director acquired around 1650 the status of publishable material. The unparalleled demand for autobiography is especially visible in the proliferation of religious biographies, which, it must be stressed, amounted to verbatim representations of autobiographical documents, or a compilation of autobiographical fragments. Yet what remains most striking about autobiography is its female origins. Paige turns again and again in his learned study to the “gendering of autobiography,” and interestingly suggests a collaboration between mystic writers (predominantly women) and their progressive biographers “who were trying to enlarge women’s influence in the Counter-Reformation Church” (115).

Moving from “Reading In” to “Frictions,” Paige explores the more problematic side of autobiography and modern subjectivity. In chapter 3, he addresses the problem of interpretation surrounding the works of three key autobiographers: Jean de



Labadie (1610-1674), Antoinette Bourignon (1610-1680), and Jeanne Guyon (1648-1717). The utopian wish to effectuate a pure correspondence between interiority and exteriority through the autobiographical text is shown to have been repeatedly frustrated from its outset. With print technology, which many mystics did their best to resist, the autobiographical text unavoidably escaped its author's interpretive control, becoming something dangerously "exterior"—subject to misreading and misappropriation, and, in some cases, leading to judicial persecution. Increasingly conscious of the "legal vulnerability of writing" (170), seventeenth-century mystics came to realize that the threat of alienation paradoxically accompanied any proposed "transparent" act of autobiography. In the last chapter, Paige returns to the Jesuit exorcist Jean-Joseph Surin (the spiritual director of Marie Baron), whose autobiography *Science expérimentale des choses de l'autre vie* (1663) recounts the bizarre story of his twenty-year struggle with aphasia and delirium, and, perhaps most importantly, his painful and acute sense of his own otherness. Writing privacy and difference—producing a book "about being different" (180)—raises particularly interesting questions regarding experience, form, and authority.

Eloquently incorporating literature, history and critical theory, Paige's *Being Interior* will have great appeal not only for seventeenth-century scholars, but also for avid readers of the early modern period and critics interested in the genealogy of the modern subject.

Andrew Calder. *The Fables of La Fontaine: Wisdom Brought Down to Earth*. Geneva: Droz, 2001. 224 pp. (cloth). Review by JOE JOHNSON, GEORGIA SOUTHWESTERN STATE UNIVERSITY.

There are more than a few ways to "read" and appreciate La Fontaine's *Fables*. A student might memorize these models of form and content for recitation and classroom study. Other readers might prefer to dissect their discourse, content, and intertextual or formal elements for insight concerning a Sun King's France or the

fabulist's poetics. Still other readers might prefer to savor the *Fables'* skillful distillation of seemingly timeless, practical wisdom with respect to the human condition. Such is the tack largely preferred by Andrew Calder in some sixteen, self-contained chapters of *The Fables of La Fontaine: Wisdom Brought Down to Earth*.

Calder, author of an earlier book and several articles about seventeenth-century writers or culture, sets the tone for his well-documented work in the opening chapter. Purporting to provide a "working definition of what a fable is"(17) and how to go about reading them, he takes up the case of the very first "fable choisie" in La Fontaine's collection, "La Cigale et la Fourmi," a text critics have traditionally considered as setting "the tone for the whole collection of the *Fables*"(23). Calder establishes the difficulty in attempting to assign any final meanings to La Fontaine's fables and persuasively argues the necessity of considering this fable's various lessons in the context of similar insights proffered by earlier Humanists.

Chapters 2 through 8 are primarily concerned with establishing this humanistic context. Calder begins by considering didactic, figurative genres such as fables and proverbs throughout the ages, looking to La Fontaine's models in antiquity, especially Aesop, Homer, and Socrates. Calder also links the comedic vein in La Fontaine to Ancient and Modern satiric writers such as Horace, Lucian, and Erasmus. Among specifically French models discussed in the fourth chapter, Calder includes both Montaigne and Rabelais, figures whose writings were in the Silenic mode, that is, carrying gems of wisdom under a sometimes crude, self-mocking exterior. Calder links this mode to La Fontaine, who worked with what had traditionally been considered a low poetic form, yet refined and polished it into something more. Moving on to consider matters of rhetoric and voice in the fifth chapter and self-knowledge in the sixth and seventh chapters, Calder concludes this section of the book with a consideration of how the comic perspective in La Fontaine's *Fables* exposes human foible.

From this point forward, the remaining chapters are even more self-contained. For example, the ninth chapter is concerned with reader response to the ethos style of oratory that La Fontaine employs to examine the quotidian flaws of human beings. The tenth chapter, meanwhile, considers questions of pathos in various fables, especially “Le Loup et l’Agneau,” one of the few fables Calder subjects to a close reading as he describes how readers may experience the unfolding of drama in the fable. The remaining six chapters are largely concerned with following various “patterns of thought”(16), as a sampling of chapter titles and subtitles will no doubt indicate: “Follow Nature,” “Desires and Fears,” and “Kings and Courts.”

Specialists in La Fontaine may be dissatisfied with such sections, for they do not examine particular fables in great depth. Take, for example, “Les deux Amis,” (book VIII, fable 11 in the *Fables*), a fable Calder discusses in the chapter 14 sub-heading “The Rarity of True Friendship.” He gives this particular fable only the briefest consideration, doing little more than synopsisizing the contents of a fable. Nonetheless, he does provide larger contexts to consider, such as other models of friendship, the dangers of friendship, and literary precedents for depictions of friendship—in short, grounds for further study on the matter if one wishes. With its copious cross-referencing to other fables and writers, Calder’s book is an excellent starting point for re-reading and researching La Fontaine’s *Fables*. As such, it will prove especially useful for undergraduates, for scholars wishing to consider La Fontaine in a larger humanistic context, and for those seeking a quick introduction to particular fables and their thematic connections with other fables and texts in the Lafontainian corpus.

Yvonne Bleyerveld. *Hoe bedriechlijk dat die vrouwen zijn: Vrouwenlisten in de beeldende kunst in de Nederlanden circa 1350-1650*. Leiden: Primavera, 2000. 240 pp. + 143 b&w illus. \$32.00/€36.00.

Eddy de Jongh. *Dankzij de tiende muze*. Leiden: Primavera, 2000. 234 pp. + 160 color + 90 b&w illus. \$27.00/€30.00.

Eric Jan Sluijter. *De 'heydensche fabulen' in schilderkunst van de Gouden Eeuw*. Leiden: Primavera, 2000. 519 pp. + 275 b&w illus. \$37.00/€41.00.

Reviews by CHRISTOPHER P. HEUER, RIJKSUNIVERSITEIT LEIDEN.

Three new art history publications from Primavera address a question that, overtly or not, continues to dominate studies of painting in the early modern Netherlands; namely, “what’s so Dutch about Dutch art?” This query was first posed in a 1996 lecture by the Princeton scholar Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann. It has proven curiously resilient in many studies of Dutch culture in the seventeenth century, resurfacing even in broader cultural works like Simon Schama’s *Embarrassment of Riches* and museum exhibitions devoted to connections between the art of the United Provinces and Italy. Monographs on painters Gerard de Lairese and Samuel van Hoogstraten (to name two)—both of whom worked in the 1670s and 1680s at courts and specialized in grandiose, classicizing pictures—have challenged the traditional conception of Dutch art as a quiet craft of bourgeois realism, associated exclusively with canvases by the likes of Metsu, de Hooch, and Vermeer. Yet as Eddy de Jongh points out in one essay from his new collection here, scholars, particularly those based outside the Netherlands, persist in attempts to isolate a style or a mode of representation recognizable as *typisch Hollands*. Much light remains to be shed on those aspects of Golden Age painting, drawing, and printmaking previous generations of scholars dismissed as insufficiently Dutch—e.g. depictions of the nude or historical subjects. Fortunately two related topics—the little-studied subgenres of mythological and bib-

lical themes in Northern Netherlandish painting, have now been treated by a pair of new surveys by Sluijter and Bleyerveld. Along with these two, a compilation of essays by de Jongh on Dutch art from 1400 to the present has appeared. All three of these works—at least for the moment—seem to have put the (non-) issue of an art work's "Dutchness" refreshingly aside.

Yvonne Bleyerveld's subject is the representation of "power of women" (*vrouwenlisten*) stories in early modernity. This corpus of art works—chiefly prints and paintings—is defined as those biblical and mythological stories wherein "one or more women cunningly discredit or bring down a man" (296). Bleyerveld's most common examples are the tales of Judith and Holofernes, Phyllis and Virgil, or Lot and his daughters. These narratives were not altogether common subjects for Dutch artists. Bleyerveld traces the development of the theme in chapters divided roughly along chronological lines, and her focus lies chiefly on the sixteenth century. In Northern Europe an independent pictorial tradition of the power of women topos first appeared in the thirteenth century in manuscripts, tapestries, and sculptural ornaments in churches and monasteries in the Rhineland. Particularly popular (although Bleyerveld, strangely, never speculates why) in these early works was the story of Samson and Delilah. During the late fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, Dutch and German printmakers took up stories like Aristotle and Phyllis as illustrations for *moralia*; later engravings by Martin Heemskerck and Lucas van Leyden depicted Old Testament *vrouwenlisten* stories in elaborate etched series aimed at connoisseurs. The seventeenth century saw an efflorescence of paintings modeled on such prints in the Spanish Netherlands and the Dutch Republic, particularly among the so-called Utrecht *Caravaggisti* like Honthorst and Stom. Bleyerveld plausibly argues that the male audience for such images would have read them chiefly as negative examples of female behavior; or, more commonly, as warnings against the dangers of love. It was after 1600, she quite interestingly shows, that authors (again, mostly male) writing on the subject of female conduct increasingly turned to such images to support their observations on women in general.

As evidence Bleyerveld cites some particularly obscure seventeenth-century tracts, few of which have ever been examined seriously by modern scholars; we are introduced to farcically pejorative pamphlets such as *The ill-tempered and deceptive housewife* (*De boosaardige en bedriegelike huisvrouw*, 1682) and to eulogies like Johan van Beverwijck's *On the excellence of the female gender* (*Vande wtneementheyt des vrouwelicken geslachts*, 1639.) Bleyerveld concludes that by the mid-seventeenth century Dutch artists were increasingly abandoning biblical and mythological exemplars for their pictorial depictions of "powerful" women, more frequently liberating the figures of ostensibly shrewish or cunning women in their works of iconographical or mythological garb and placing them simply in recognizably Dutch households. Well-known instances of this pictorial culmination, she concludes, were the hectic interiors of Adrien van Ostade or Jan Steen.

The amount of visual material Bleyerveld has amassed is truly impressive, and doubtless even specialists of Dutch genre painting will here discover images they have never seen (e.g., the Hendrick Bloemaert on 232!). Unfortunately such compiling is perhaps the book's greatest strength, since, frustratingly, any real definition of the somewhat ambiguous idea of a *vrouwenlist* is nowhere to be found. Readers may find themselves searching for some indication of whether the category of "power of women" (which delimits Bleyerveld's whole analysis) was recognized in any form by early modern viewers, or whether it remains a category coined solely by the author. Surely a figure such as Eve (cited as a woman of power on page 9) demonstrates that any stable notion of a *vrouwenlist* is not unproblematic? Bleyerveld seems to have isolated a handful of mythological and biblical episodes which appear in Dutch art starting in the fourteenth century and followed them through 1650, disappointingly leaving unconsidered any possibility of divergent responses, or changes in their perception. That, for example, Judith's potential as a woman of power may have differed for a painting's viewer in 1420 as opposed to 1620 is never explored comprehensively. Instead it is purely the (arguably more concrete) details of iconography and

style that are the real subjects of this study. Once this is recognized the book remains a potentially useful source of images and texts. Hopefully Bleyerveld herself or other scholars will avail themselves of this aspect in future publications to look more critically at the very category of *vrouwenlisten*, and perhaps rethink what changes may have taken place in responses and definitions of this fascinating and unjustly-marginalized body of work.

One of Bleyerveld's acknowledged methodological debts is to Eddy de Jongh, professor emeritus at the University of Utrecht, who has dominated the study of seventeenth-century genre paintings in the Netherlands since the 1970s, when he proposed that the apparent "realism" long upheld as the hallmark of Dutch art often veiled a complex set of textually-derived signs: e.g., the caged-bird hanging in the rear of a Gabriel Metsu interior was not just furniture—within the context of the painting it alluded to the virginity of the young woman who sat beneath it. This iconographic approach, derived from Erwin Panofsky's early analyses of Italian and German painting, has proven particularly durable in the past three decades. Despite quite effective challenges to its usefulness, and often vehement charges of ahistoricity, de Jongh's iconographical method continues to attract devotees. Not only de Jongh's students but the professor himself bring forth a steady stream of publications, which to this date have chiefly taken the form of articles or exhibition catalogue entries. Many of these were recently made available in translation as the *Questions of Meaning* (Leiden, 2001), but the vast majority of de Jongh's work remains available only in Dutch, as is the case with *Dankzij de tiende muze*, the book here under review. The work brings together thirty-three previously published essays from the art periodical *Kunstschrift*, which de Jongh himself edits. This journal is something of an oddity in the Netherlands, but a laudatory endeavor; it generally includes articles on very specialized topics (a recent issue discussed the woodcuts with Caesare Ripa's *Iconologia*, for example) but geared towards a general readership. Consequently *Kunstschrift* is known as a reliable source of absolutely stunning reproductions but also of short articles with no footnotes and few references.

De Jongh's essays are mostly on seventeenth-century topics (Italian and North Netherlandish, chiefly), and, averaging about ten pages in length, offer discrete introductions of his iconographic approach. Subjects ranging from peacock symbolism in seventeenth-century painting (99-106) to early modern portraits of dead infants (79-90) to Bernini's caricatures (178-84) are discussed chiefly as reflections of vernacular emblematic texts, although de Jongh frequently moves beyond his earlier concern with merely affixing a definite meaning to a painting or visual theme. In what is perhaps the book's (unacknowledged) centerpiece, "Sick and Healthy things in Dutch seventeenth-century art" de Jongh turns to the historiography of Dutch painting in an attempt to redress the idea of a "national" type of art: "Nationalism too frequently goes hand-in-hand with a certain xenophobia," he warns, and "too often the key terms earlier generations of art historians used to characterize the seventeenth century overlap with the themes used to describe the national character (*volkskarakter*) itself" (73). de Jongh then goes on to discuss several texts from the early 1940s, and effectively proves that their reductive, national-socialist informed collapsing of culture and normative character still lingers in some contemporary scholarship.

It is a pity de Jongh doesn't venture this kind of cultural analysis more frequently in this volume. He is clearly comfortable with the history of ideas, and his writing is forceful and concise without seemingly pettily vindictive. Like Bleyerveld he remains interested chiefly in the formal, visual aspects of a painting or engraving, and more than a few of the essays here spring from a single painting—witness "The Sleeve of the Cavalier" (147-51) in which de Jongh posits that Frans Hals' wry portrait in the Wallace Collection actually cloaks quotations from Alciato's 1530s emblem books, which in turn refer to the sitter's social aspirations. With this kind of treatment de Jongh justly draws attention to the validity of potentially "hidden" sources like emblem books and fashion history for the interpretation of Dutch painting; yet at the same time the essays often overemphasize the extent to which purely artistic and literary sources alone account for everything in a work



of art. The background of Netherlandish politics, economics, and science (which have been so fruitfully been surveyed in other recent writings by Dixon, Swann, or Brusati on medicine and still-life) are almost never invoked in these essays. As his critics have complained, de Jongh sticks instead to a body of purely textual and pictorial contexts, which, although rich, should be recognized as but one source among many to access the ways paintings and early modern viewers interacted. The scholarly debates much of de Jongh's work ultimately stimulated in the 1980s and 1990s are not played out here, but the for the reader of Dutch this collection stages a helpful (and beautifully illustrated) set of glimpses of a method which largely determines the way art history in the Netherlands is done today.

Eric Jan Sluijter's weighty new book, meanwhile, deals with many of the same issues touched on by both deJongh and Bleyerveld, particularly the use of textual sources from Greek and Roman antiquity. But Sluijter's analysis manifests a strikingly more judicious approach to the use of historical narratives by Dutch painters. Originally published privately as a doctoral dissertation at the University of Leiden (1986), the book represents a greatly expanded survey of the theme of "pagan fables" in the Dutch Republic. Since its original appearance Sluijter's work has been recognized as definitive on a theme which is still unfamiliar to many, despite the high quality and professional success of its sixteenth- and seventeenth century specialists: Cornelis Cornelisz. van Haarlem, Joachim Wtewael, Paulus Moreelse, Pieter Lastman, Cornelis van Poelenburgh, Pieter de Grebber, Caesar van Everdingen, Gerard Lairesse, Adriaen van der Werff, and of course Rembrandt van Rijn. Sluijter, a professor at the University of Amsterdam and New York University's Institute of Fine Arts, surveys a sprawling mass of material; from his discussion one recurrent concern surfaces: the degree to which the exposition of narrative is made clear. Scenes from Ovid, we learn, were by far the most popular from 1580 on. As a result Sluijter appends a

marvelously-researched appendix (170-92) on sixteenth- and seventeenth-century editions and vernacular translations of the *Metamorphoses*.

The book's first part provides a useful chronological basis for situating these editions within a history of the mythological themes in painting. Hendrick Goltzius, the Haarlem printmaker who turned exclusively to painting after 1600, serves as the starting point for the tradition, followed by clusters of other artists working in Utrecht and, eventually, Leiden, where Rembrandt and pupils like Gerrit Dou were active. From a startling array of published translations, individual prints, and earlier paintings Dutch artists are shown to have lifted not just compositional ideas, but also clues about costume and staffage. This connection is not just Sluijter's own; the theorist/painter Gerard de Lairese (d. 1711), he notes remarks explicitly on the practice of painters copying from prints of the *Metamorphoses* in his treatise *Groot Schilderboek* of 1707 (45). Yet unlike de Jongh, Sluijter does not confine his analysis to sources directly related to art theory: he cites Erasmus, for example, on the (potentially) idolatrous incitements of antique sculpture (158).

The second part of the book looks at six Ovidian themes in depth with close readings of Latin and Dutch sources available in the seventeenth century. Quite interestingly, Sluijter deliberately avoids using the texts, as de Jongh has been accused of doing, as a sort of iconological key to "solve" the paintings as if they were, as he claims "kinds of learned visual puzzles" (163). Rather Sluijter concludes that thanks to the relatively copious and free circulation of paintings and books in the Dutch Republic, there was not always a definitive link between the way readers and painters construed mythological histories. Instead, Sluijter believes that "the beholder could adopt for himself something from the spectrum of possible connotations which suited his particular background, or knowledge: it was he who gave the painting a function." (169) Not only does this conclusion resonate with recent literature on early modern reception theory (e.g., Stoichita, Belting), but more importantly remains sensitive to the different values, audiences, and con-

texts surrounding books, paintings, and prints in the seventeenth century. In direct response to de Jongh (and by extension, Bleyerveld), Sluijter reminds us that such diverse media cannot be taken as evidence on the same historical terms. An advantage of this approach is that it can accommodate new research quite easily, particularly any concrete evidence about the use and consumption of specific pieces of art work or texts. Clearly not all Dutch depictions of pagan fables meant different things to all Dutch viewers, and in this perhaps Sluijter is just a hair *too* relativistic in his reluctance to suggest what exactly many of these pictures were for. Yet his enormous bibliography of period sources, however, would convince one is clear he had surveyed any source which would suggest the opposite.

This is a very minor quibble, however, and perhaps more than compensated for by the nearly three hundred paintings Sluijter's book discusses explicitly. Clearly the author's work is the result of many, many hours in museums and photographic archives. As attractive as this commercial edition of Sluijter's book is, an English translation with color illustrations would be even better. This meaty work will be of immediate use to Dutch specialists but its methodological approach, one in which scrupulous collection and attention to sources is coupled with imaginative research, deserves to be recognized by a wider scholarly audience. Even more so than the publications by de Jongh and Bleyerveld, Sluijter's will doubtless prove decisive for art historical research on the painting of the United Provinces in the coming years. One result will doubtless be to usher discussions about a painting's "Dutchness" towards a more productive and, ultimately, more interesting level.

Rudolf M. Dekker. *Humour in Dutch Culture of the Golden Age*. New York: Palgrave, 2001. 187 pp. + 23 illus. \$55.00. Review by LARRY SILVER, UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

Back in 1977, Amsterdam art historian Hessel Miedema could assert (presumably with a straight face) in discussing Pieter Bruegel images that “it is out of the question that anyone of erudition . . . could ever have laughed uninhibitedly at peasant scenes in Bruegel’s day.” He goes on to contend that people laughed “above all at the bizarre, the deformed and the weak.” In the quarter-century since those extreme claims to empathetic understanding of past attitudes (and in contradiction to Miedema, who considered readings out of pictures by modern interpreters to be anachronistic), we have broadened our understanding about the breadth of Dutch humor in both art and literature. For art historians one major contribution has been the contextual researches of Dr. Mariët Westermann, particularly into the paintings of Jan Steen (who was also largely ignored until recently) in her 1996 dissertation, *The Amusements of Jan Steen* (published in 1997).

Another rejoinder to the dour, Calvinist stereotype has now been provided by cultural historian Rudolf Dekker of Erasmus University, Rotterdam, co-author most recently of an essay on childhood education during the Dutch Golden Age for a recent exhibition of children’s portraits (*Pride and Joy*, Exhibition Catalog, Haarlem-Antwerp, 2000-01). The core of his new study is a recently discovered manuscript, entitled “Anecdotes,” by Aernout van Overbeke, a lawyer and poet, a Lutheran connected with the Dutch East India Company but also displaying bohemian tendencies. This collection of some two thousand jokes (imagine a Dutch Milton Berle) reveals a ribald sense of humor, perhaps not so far from the accusations by Miedema that associate laughter with vulgarity and joke-makers with the butts of their jokes. This is oral rather than printed material, so without the decorum of literature. Many of the subjects remain marginal or controversial, including topics with sexual or religious content.

Dekker is a native speaker with a strong sense of the linguistic history even of Dutch words for “joke,” and his first chapter historicizes the emerging national association of laughter with dishonorable behavior and the loss of self control that Miedema evokes. He suggests that such reliance on etiquette manuals (including Erasmus’s) or Calvinist criticisms limits the cultural picture to one side of a debatable issue, the more so at a time when humor increasingly began to split into distinctions between high and low, elite and popular, wit and vulgarity. In a well researched second chapter, Dekker traces published works with humorous content as well as foreign influences, chiefly from Germany in the earlier sixteenth century, followed by Italy and Spain (note the allusion to Spain in Bredero’s celebrated *Spanish Brabander*, 1618). Jestbooks formed a publication genre during the seventeenth century, though their rate of survival is low, and they disappeared by the eighteenth century. Young males seem to have been the principal audience, and the texts suggest that jestbooks were meant to be read aloud or performed like theater pieces. Dekker also points to visual humor and the role of jesters in sixteenth-century images as well as the farcical elements in Steen and other seventeenth-century painters. Here the presence of beggars and cripples as ludicrous figures shows how little decorum prevailed in the visual sphere (on deformities as joke material, see 119–20).

Of course, the heart of this study is the analysis of the van Overbeke text. The third chapter builds up the biography of the author as well as of his father, Matthijs, including impressive family intellectual and friendship circles, including Constantijn Huygens. Like commonplace books, the collection includes venerable examples culled from classical and medieval literature as well as Erasmus and Bacon. References to jesters abound in the tradition of *rederijker* verses, and some jests are credited to historic rulers, but there are also more personal citations of Dutch contemporaries. Ultimately the jokes mix traditional forms with personal references, and Dekker points out, they extend the realm of humor out of the defined place (fairs) or time (Shrove Tuesday) or role-players (jesters) into a more inventive, less structured en-

semble. Another fascinating connection is the insertion of the author into his works, much as Jan Steen featured self-portrait cameos in his boisterous paintings.

Chapter four (“Polarity and Inversion”) attends more closely to the thematic content of the humor. Many of the jokes resemble modern teen movies in excretory or sexual focus. They also have a contemporary penchant for lawyer jokes as well as doctor (and enema) jokes. The male audience frequently got entertained at the expense of women, particularly shrewish wives and other rebels against gender decorum in the late medieval tradition of misogyny. Some jokes extend *rederijker* farces about adulterous marriages, hen-pecked husbands, or other social inversion. Ill-matched pairs, or unequal matches in age or social rank, also extend late medieval targets. Dekker’s discussion of sex norms and jokes (104-11) offers a rich store of material. His knowledge of children and families also stands out (111-16). Political correctness is entirely absent, as foreigners (especially Germans) and Catholics become butts of jokes, and there is precious little self-deprecation towards either the Dutch or Protestants.

Perhaps analysis of humor is in the air. Recently a more philosophical approach to the principles of joke-making appeared: *Jokes* by Ted Cohen (Chicago, 1999). But humor is so topical and temporary that even television reruns or old *New Yorker* cartoons require footnotes or subtitles. Humor exists within a fleeting and informal, largely oral discourse, with little written evidence left behind. Hence the need for serious and local historical studies like this one. Dekker offers us a rare glimpse of the Netherlandish world we see more often in paintings from Bruegel to Steen, and in the process he has recovered for the Dutch and for students of Dutch history a vital, missing piece of culture. No longer can Dutch humor be considered an oxymoron.

Randolph Vigne and Charles Littleton, eds. *From Strangers to Citizens: The Integration of Immigrant Communities in Britain, Ireland and Colonial America, 1550-1750*. London and Brighton: The Huguenot Society of Great Britain and Ireland and Sussex Academic Press, 2001. xxiv + 566 pp. + 32 illus. \$75.00. Review by ELLEN J. JENKINS, ARKANSAS TECH UNIVERSITY.

The session papers of an academic conference often do not lend themselves readily to collection and publication. Too often, such compilations contain the driest material possible, appealing only to the presenters and their closest colleagues or, at best, to a small group of specialists. Such is not the case, however, with *From Strangers to Citizens: The Integration of Immigrant Communities in Britain, Ireland and Colonial America, 1550-1750*, a collection of 57 papers presented at the International Historical Conference of the Huguenot Society of Great Britain and Ireland, 5-7 April 2001. The conference, which was held at the Dutch Church, Austin Friars, London, commemorated the 450th anniversary of the charter in which Edward VI granted continental Protestant immigrants the right to conduct their own religious rites in England, apart from the procedures of the English Church. Edward also gave these "Strangers" the thirteenth-century Augustinian priory that stood, at the time, on the site of what became the "Dutch" Church.

Edited by Randolph Vigne, general editor of the Publications of the Huguenot Society, and Charles Littleton, of Birkbeck College, *From Strangers to Citizens* addresses numerous facets of the immigrants' experiences as outsiders, as well as their assimilation into or acculturation with the prevailing populations. As a collection of essays, the book provides depth and color to the stories of the thousands of refugees who left their native lands, largely to escape religious persecution, and settled in Britain, Ireland, or the American colonies. Organized topically, this collection includes sections on the founding of Strangers' churches; on the work of immigrant craftsmen and artists; on intellectuals among the

immigrant communities; and on the conditions in which non-Protestant Europeans and “Others” lived among the English, Irish, or American colonists.

The first superintendent of the “Strangers’ Church” in London was Jan Laski, who was appointed to that position by Edward VI in 1550. In “Discipline and Integration: Jan Laski’s Church Order for the London Strangers’ Church,” Christoph Strohm explains that it was Archbishop Thomas Cranmer who originally invited the Polish nobleman and Protestant cleric to England, eager to make use of Laski’s experience with the Continental Reformation to strengthen English Protestantism and anxious to use the Strangers’ churches as models for English congregations. Though Laski enjoyed a close relationship with Cranmer at first, their friendship was permanently damaged after the Polish cleric refused to submit the Strangers’ congregations to the English Protestant forms of worship. And though he was forced to leave England in 1553 upon the accession of the Catholic Mary Tudor, Laski was able, during his brief tenure, to forge a shared identity and sense of community among the French, Italian, and Dutch-German congregations in London, overcoming the obstacles of language and culture by creating a common order for church services. Strohm, of the Evangelisch-Theologische Fakultät, Ruhr-Universität Bochum, argues that Laski’s successful integration of immigrant groups into the Strangers’ Church served another important purpose by eliminating many avenues for liturgical conflict and preventing “the spread of anti-Trinitarian and other false doctrines” (31).

Similar religious backgrounds did not ensure cooperation. In his essay, “Myth and Realities of the Ashkenazi Influx,” Michael Berkowitz writes that the stereotypical view of English Jewry is that it was established by the Sephardic Jews from Spain and Portugal, who arrived early and were a wealthy and sophisticated elite by the time vast numbers of Ashkenazim arrived, having fled the turbulence of eighteenth-century Central Europe. According to this interpretation, the Sephardim looked with disdain upon the poverty and marginal or criminal occupations of the Ashkenazim



in England, only to be eclipsed gradually by the overwhelming numbers of Central-European Jews. Berkowitz, of University College London, points out that the Jews in England were falsely divided into two categories by suspicious onlookers—wealthy and reputable Sephardim, and poor and degenerate Ashkenazim—while the truth is that both groups contained rich and poor, respectable and disreputable members. In the long run, writes Berkowitz, the entry of the Ashkenazim into England actually strengthened the presence of Jews in the country, since they arrived in large enough numbers to bolster the smaller population of Sephardim, even if the latter avoided assimilation between the two groups.

The question of assimilation is the basis for several essays in this collection. One of the most instructive is “From Ethnicity to Assimilation: The Huguenots and the American Immigration History Paradigm,” by Bertrand van Ruymbeke. Van Ruymbeke, of the University of Toulouse, explains that American colonists were ignorant of France’s regional diversity—a strong identifying factor among French immigrants—and attached their own qualifying descriptions to their new neighbors. For example, Van Ruymbeke explains, Americans coined the oddly redundant term, “French Huguenot” to describe newcomers who were culturally and linguistically different (French) and were practitioners of a specific form of Protestantism (Huguenot). The Huguenots, who were *specifically* the Protestants in France, did not think of themselves as “French” until they were outside the boundaries of their own nation, while the Americans used the double-barreled name to differentiate between immigrants from countries other than France and the distinction between Frenchmen who were Catholic and those who were Protestant. Despite these new descriptors, the Huguenots in America continued to identify themselves by their French regional origins. Van Ruymbeke also argues that in their case, assimilation did not mean the elimination of ethnicity, culture, or traditions. The Huguenots in the American colonies, he writes, retained many of their own customs while incorporating those American traits and practices most useful to them in their new

circumstances. In doing so, they also influenced their new countrymen as the groups gradually commingled through marriage and commerce.

Standard histories too often gloss over the varied and complex processes involved in the passage from immigrant status to citizenship, despite the importance of immigration history in personal and national tradition. In mythologizing the accounts, or in emphasizing immigrants' nations of origin and abbreviating or ignoring differences within nationalities, we lose much valuable history. *From Strangers to Citizens* is a source of fascinating richness, not only in the depth these essays provide to those histories and in the riveting interpretations of the writers, but in the wealth of source materials they have consulted in European and American archives. The essays presuppose an advanced knowledge of history, but they will be enlightening reading for graduate students and academics, and this collection will be a valuable resource for university libraries.

Adrian Davies. *The Quakers in English Society 1655-1725*. Oxford: Clarendon, 2000. xvi + 262 pp. + 6 illus. £40.00. Review by KATE PETERS, UNIVERSITY COLLEGE LONDON.

This book is an impressive expansion of the author's doctoral thesis on early Essex Quakers. Adrian Davies has reworked his Essex material in order to discuss more broadly the impact of early Quakerism on English society: the book's stated aim is "to consider the social consequences of religious belief," and in particular to examine (and ultimately to question) the "extent of the fissures which opened up in society as a result of Quakerism" (4). In so doing, he has much of use to say about the transition from sect to denomination in the first seventy years of Quaker history and about the importance of local, grass-roots experience to our understanding of the development of the Quaker movement.

The book is divided into four parts. The first, "Holy Subversives," provides a useful context on which to build, exploring the hostility which early Quakers aroused in their contemporaries. This, Davies argues, stemmed in large part from the intense Quaker experience of spiritual re-birth, which led to aggressive proselytising, rejection of clerical authority and the flouting of social hierarchies which were so fundamental to harmonious parish life. In passing, Davies makes short shrift of the model of social and economic radicalism offered by Christopher Hill and Barry Reay in their own treatment of the Quakers: it was the notion of religious equality which underpinned Quaker radicalism, and the desire for religious liberty which informed their political activities, including the resistance of tithes.

The second part, "A peculiar people," examines the consequences for individuals of belonging to the Quaker faith. This section is rooted more deeply in the Essex material, and Davies presents us with some of the minutiae of the Quakers' daily lives as they set about sustaining their church and its people, establishing meeting houses, burial grounds, and systems of poor relief and discipline, as well as supporting one another in trade, fostering "informal contacts between members which cut across normal kin and neighbourly relations" (84). The role of the rank and file in the development of the sect, Davies argues persuasively, is insufficiently recognized by scholars who focus on the words and actions of the Quaker leadership. Essex Quakers, we are told, were unusually tolerant of backsliding among their brethren, seeking to bring them back to the fold rather than casting them out. Thus the formidable and rigid system of Quaker discipline, which elsewhere has been pointed to as a factor in the movement's decline, operated more flexibly among Essex members. Variation in local behaviour is important: "previous explanations for sectarian development have been insufficiently sensitive to local factors in different regions" (107). This part of the book also includes a very important and overdue assessment of literacy levels among early Quakers, which in Essex, Davies shows, were astoundingly high, particularly for women. The unusual ability to read and write is attrib-

uted, not wholly convincingly, to “the Quaker desire to escape worldly contagion” by teaching their children to read their own literature (122). Yet the literacy figures themselves are interesting and deserve further attention.

Part three, “Origins and development,” examines Quaker membership. Davies is sensibly reluctant to be drawn out on possible continuities between Quakers and Lollards in Essex parishes but is much more confident in identifying anti-Laudian protesters in the 1630s who turned Quaker in the 1650s and later. His work on the social composition of the movement in Essex reinforces what we already know from other local studies: although drawing members from both the humble and prosperous ends of the social spectrum, the bulk of early Quakers in Essex were “from the ranks of the comfortable or fairly prosperous” (147). Davies distances himself from earlier debates about the social composition of the movement, emphasising once again the importance of local variety: “the sect reflected distinctive and sometimes sharply contrasting characteristics according to the locations in which it took root and flourished” (147).

Part four, “Quakers and the world,” focuses on the transition from sect to denomination, and Davies argues cogently that the 1670s was the key decade. Records of sufferings show a clear change in Quaker political strategy (but not a withdrawal from politics): rather than steadfast refusal to co-operate with the authorities, Quakers began petitioning for the reduction of fines, allowing friends or relatives to pay fines on their behalf, and issuing legal advice to members on how to avoid punishment. Davies also shows how this desire for local accommodation and consensus was reciprocated: parish constables played an important role in protecting Quakers from government-inspired prosecution. Thus, Quakers achieved ever greater integration with the outside world; the sectarian model espoused by Richard Vann, of increasing isolation from society, is firmly rejected by Davies on the basis of his material, and he inclines, by the end of the book, for a model of consensus between Essex Quakers and their neighbours.

Like many local studies, this book is inevitably bounded by its (very rich) source material. Essex Quakers demonstrate interesting variations from the national picture, and Adrian Davies thoughtfully questions models of sectarian development on the basis of his research. Yet, as he himself concedes, his questions require further regional studies—a rather self-defeating conclusion, since Davies' book is more than adequate as it stands. Some of the local intimacy of his doctoral research has inevitably disappeared in the book, but in its place we have an authoritative account of the early Quaker movement and a strong argument for the importance of local efforts in its evolution. Quakers are notoriously well-documented, and there have been a number of impressive local studies in recent decades. It is a pleasure that this one has been published.

Trevor Cooper, ed. *The Journal of William Dowsing: Iconoclasm in East Anglia During the English Civil War*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2001. 551 pp. + 64 plates. \$90.00. Review by CHARLES W. A. PRIOR, QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY AT KINGSTON.

Readers who are familiar with William Dowsing will know that this is less a journal than a catalogue of the activities of an iconoclast in Suffolk and Cambridgeshire during 1643 and 1644. Those *unfamiliar* with the author, and who come to the book expecting to be introduced to a village Pepys, will encounter a sober and purposeful character. Dowsing (1596-1668), acting under the commission of the second Earl of Manchester, and flanked by a half dozen associates, conducted a thoroughly destructive tour of churches in two counties. His mission was to carry out the directive of the Parliamentary Ordinance, passed during August 1643, "that all Monuments of Superstition and Idolatry should be removed and abolished." The journal therefore recounts the dates, locations, and provides details of what was destroyed. While there

is little description of events, places, or people, and not a hangover in sight, the journal proves to be rich fund of detail on a variety of topics of importance to our period.

Yet it would not be so, were it not for the efforts of Dowsing's modern editor. On its own, the journal consists of 273 entries, many of them of sentence length; for example, the entry for January 23 reads: "We brake down 60 superstitious pictures; and broke in pieces the rayles; and gave order to pull down the steps." Occasionally Dowsing inserts more detail. During his late December visit to Pembroke at Cambridge, he met opposition from a group of Fellows who disputed Dowsing's interpretation of the Parliamentary Ordinance, and who argued that "the clargie had only to doe on ecclesiastical matters." Dowsing describes the ensuing debate in which each side reinforced its case by alleging scriptural proofs, and in the process reveals something of the schism that defined relations between English Protestants during the 1640s. Yet entries such as this are the exception, and so the journal is swaddled in pages of annotation, sixty-four photographs, sixteen appendices, twenty-two maps, twenty-seven tables and introduced by eleven essays. Indeed, the text and annotations of the journal itself comprise just one third of the volume.

The current edition is the first to reunite the Suffolk and Cambridgeshire segments of the journal. The reason for the division, as well as the original manuscript, have been lost; the journal survived in a number of eighteenth-century copies, the most reliable of which are used for the present text. Spelling is modernised and, while original italics and underlining are omitted, the original punctuation is retained. Each entry is numbered and meticulously annotated. Churchwarden's accounts, college registers and miscellaneous manuscripts furnish the bulk of the context, while Mr. Cooper and a number of his contributors have fleshed out the rest of the story by retracing Dowsing's steps in order to verify the accuracy of each entry; no small task, this involved visits to all of the 250 churches mentioned by Dowsing. Introductory essays by John Morrill, Robert Walker, John Blatchly, S. D. Sadler, as well as Mr. Cooper himself consider Dowsing's relation to the religious

upheavals of the 1640s, give details of his homes and associates, and assess the nature of iconoclasm elsewhere in the Eastern Association.

At times, the reader feels overwhelmed by minute detail: an appendix devoted to the selective mutilation of brasses, a Norfolk glazier's invoice, a ten word entry followed by eight pages of annotation, or a "frequency distribution" of pictures in Dowsing's churches, for example. At other times, the scholarly apparatus is of great value, as in the (all too brief) chapter in Dowsing's dispute with the Fellows of Peterhouse. In short, this edition has the potential to be many things to many readers, whether their interest lies in ecclesiastical architecture, the impact of Laudianism, the enforcement or parliamentary directives in the localities, or the surprising reading habits of a forty-seven year old yeoman farmer.

It is to these larger themes that John Morrill's excellent essay is devoted. Dowsing, we learn, was an enthusiastic collector of sermons, particularly Fast sermons preached before the Long Parliament. Morrill has hunted down Dowsing's now scattered library, and it is shown that in addition to sermons, he collected scriptural commentaries, controversial works, editions of Plutarch, Livy, Josephus, Polybius, as well as three copies of Foxe's *Actes and Monuments*. All of these he annotated in a manner common for the period: underlining, quarrelling and, most significantly, correcting mis-rendered passages of scripture. Both Morrill's essay and this edition as-a-whole reveal that Dowsing was no "puritan" zealot (although the term "puritan" is retained here), but rather a sober and committed believer in the necessity of reform based on scripture.

Indeed, the journal's central value is the insight it offers into the mind of a mid-century scripturalist, keen to challenge the legitimacy of the "visible" Church that was the legacy of the Laudian circle. For Dowsing—as for all of his comparably-literate contemporaries—the Church was only a "true" Church if it could be shown to have an uninterrupted connection with the ancient or "primitive" church. There were many who felt that aspects of doctrine and discipline that smacked of "humane invention" ought to

be removed as the signs of an institution fallen into corruption and “popery.” Others (like the Fellows of Peterhouse), whose libraries would have boasted the works of church Fathers and reports of the great synods, argued that images were an indifferent “help” to worship, and sought a pedigree for them in the ancient church. Seen in this light, Dowsing’s mission forms part of a long struggle to define and defend the Church of England, a theme that is emerging as the most dominant in the history of the seventeenth century. It is this fact that makes this edition worthwhile.

Michael Mendle, ed. *The Putney Debates of 1647: The Army, the Levellers, and the English State*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001. xii + 297 pp. + 1 illus. \$64.95. Review by MARK CHARLES FISSEL, AUGUSTA STATE UNIVERSITY.

In late October-early November 1647, with King Charles I defeated (for the moment at least) and Londoners clamoring for Parliament to disband its victorious (and expensive) army, officers and soldiers of that New Model Army gathered in St. Mary’s parish church, beside the Thames, at the bridgehead of Putney Bridge, southwest London. Contemporaries wrote little of the discussions that continued for several days in the sanctuary of Putney church.

Roughly 243 years later, the librarian of Worcester College Oxford mentioned to a historian that minutes of those meetings had lain undiscovered in a cupboard until recently. Would the historian like to have a look? That serendipitous find propagated an entire historiography, so much so that 350 years after the event, these once largely ignored proceedings of the Army Council and rank-and-file soldiers were now commemorated by a score of political groups, religious faiths, social activists, and more than a few historians.

One need only contemplate the diversity of the audiences at the various Putney commemoration events on both sides of the Atlantic, honoring what are now dubbed “the Putney Debates.” One finds socialists, Green Party members, Americans, Quakers,



Libertarians, Labour Party representatives, antiquarians, Civil War re-enactors, and a host of others who saw (somehow) their identity as having (somehow) emanated from those “debates.” These apparently contradictory legacies prompted one contributor, Blair Worden, to find it “fitting that the 350th anniversary was celebrated in two places: in Putney Church, with speeches by Christopher Hill and Tony Benn, representatives of the tradition that has looked east to Moscow; and, in the conference from which this book has emerged, in Washington, the capital of the free world” (280).

What were these “debates” ? The volume editor, Michael Mendle, writes, “The debates at Putney are battles of texts—*physical* texts” (14): the New Model Army’s “book of declarations,” *The case of the armie truly stated*, *The Agreement of the People*, *The Heads of Proposals*, and others. In their quest to formulate a settlement for the realm, a direct result of Parliament’s failure to negotiate the demobilization of the Army to the latter’s satisfaction, a wide variety of what Americans would term “constitutional” (for lack of a better word) proposals provided the grounds for the debates.

Mendle’s editing integrates almost seamlessly a stellar group of contributors, who have read each other’s essays and cross-referenced frequently. The result is a conceptually unified book that reads extraordinarily well. Lesley Le Claire’s detective-like tale of the provenance of the papers of secretary William Clarke dovetails with Frances Henderson’s textual commentary. The venerable Austin Woolrych then weaves a narrative of events surrounding the debates (a good place for the uninitiated to start their reading). Barbara Donagan brings to bear her unrivalled knowledge of 1640s civil-military relations to define the legal underpinnings of the Army’s predicament. John Morrill and Phillip Baker team for a revisionist interpretation of the authorship of *The case of the armie truly stated*. Mendle explores the use of the pronoun “we” in the debates, casting considerable light on the army’s collective self-consciousness and the centrality of the issue of indemnity.

The radical or populist civilian Leveller Party attempted to infiltrate and influence the army’s deliberations in Putney church. Ian Gentles traces the evolution of three incarnations of their most

famous tract, *An Agreement of the People*. Barbara Taft follows the “journey” of Cromwell’s son-in-law, Henry Ireton, the Commissary General of the Army and an indefatigable opponent of the political aspirations of the propertyless. For all the vociferousness in Putney church, there was “a total silence about women’s political rights” (197). Patricia Crawford pursues the profound implications of citizenship and enfranchisement. Women exercised traditions of activism, from participation in food riots to Elizabeth Poole’s appearance before the Army Council (in January 1649) to communicate a religious revelation. The “Puritan” framework and consequent limitations on the individual’s “liberty of conscience” are dissected by William Lamont, and a distinguished trio (Tim Harris, Blair Worden, and John Pocock) assess the legacy of the debates.

Generally speaking, most contributors “stress the centrality of the army-as-institution to the proceedings of 1647” (126). In other words, it is the military experience and soldierly identity of the speakers in Putney church (not, say, London radicalism or Puritanism) that makes the debates understandable, a view that would win approval from the original editor of the debates, Sir Charles Firth, who first presented to the public these remarkable documents in 1891-1894. The military context has most recently been restored and embellished by Mark Kishlansky. Indeed, Kishlansky’s scholarship is cited frequently, and occasionally is resonated by contributors. One cannot help but to wonder what Professor Kishlansky would make of the powerful arguments put forward by this book. The thoughtful reader might also wish to connect the overall thrust of *The Putney Debates of 1647* with the Kishlansky-Adamson controversy of the early 1990s. That heated exchange merits not a solitary comment in the book.

In spite of the historiographical controversies, the documents themselves are more compelling than any commentator. As John Pocock concludes, “It continues to be extraordinary that some of the things said (and attempted to be done) at Putney should have been said at all; as it remains extraordinary that we should have this, and only this, record of them” (284). That such sponta-

neous and revealing dialogue never became part of our civilization's print record until comparatively recently makes its immediacy rather stunning to the modern reader. Rarely do we see so clearly, without "mediation," into the heart of seventeenth-century political and social consciousness.

Philippe Contamine, ed. *War and Competition Between States*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. xi + 347 pp. \$74.00. Review by MICHAEL R. LYNN, AGNES SCOTT COLLEGE.

States in early modern Europe lived under the constant shadow of warfare. Even during those rare times when a war was not being fought somewhere during this period, preparations for future wars were underway. The daily reality for state leaders, members of the military, and the general population always included the possibility of war. As such, the very construction of the modern state came to depend heavily on how people went about participating in or preparing for war. Based on this premise, Philippe Contamine has edited a volume that examines the nature of interactions between states in early modern Europe, looking at war as well as peacetime exchanges. Competition between states, Contamine notes, played a crucial role in the development of the modern state. It affected not just the creation of the army and navy but the very financial system used to pay for military matters as well as such disparate things as European laws, recruitment, bureaucratic structures, the welfare state, and the fine arts. In addition, war itself was not static but underwent significant changes between 1300 and 1800. The practice of warfare altered as armies became both larger and more professional. At the same time, the effect of war on the general population changed as states formulated customs and laws to deal with topics such as non-combatants, looting, and violence.

This volume is the first in a planned series on the development of the modern state. Based on a number of conferences sponsored by the European Science Foundation, these books seek

fundamentally to reconceptualize the process of European state formation. Seven themes were identified and over one hundred scholars recruited to come together over a four-year period to discuss these topics. The result will be seven volumes on diverse issues such as economic systems and state finance; legislation and justice; power elites and state building; resistance, representation, and community; the individual in political theory and practice; propaganda, iconography, and legitimation; and, of course, war and competition, the topic of the present volume. Contamine has brought together scholars from all corners of Europe to contribute to our understanding of the development of military matters in early modern Europe. The ten main chapters examine political and military bonds; types of armies; navies; the army, roads, and the organization of space; financing the military; ransom and booty; military society; patriotism; peacemaking; and international law.

The various authors each approach their topics with a specificity grounded in a particular time period or region while at the same time many of them try to speak to the larger issues at hand. Jan Lindegren, for example, analyzes the military resources available in Denmark and Sweden in order to discuss the impact of money on both warfare and the creation of the state throughout Europe. Luis Ribot Garcia's essay on types of armies, on the other hand, examines the emergence of the army in early modern Spain. As with many of the essays in this volume, however, the lessons learned here are applicable to the rest of Europe. Garcia argues that the developing state relied heavily on the army; this importance arose from the usurpation by the monarch of the role as the sole individual responsible for the practice of war. A transition occurred in early modern Europe from private to state warfare that complemented the development of the notion of the state. The monarch came to occupy an absolutist position over the nobility even as the obligation of warfare shifted from nobles to the king. Alongside this transition came changes in the technology and organization of warfare, sometimes referred to as a "military revolution," that ultimately led to the creation of the modern army. This new army was much larger than before, tended to be perma-

ment, and was made up largely of members of the lower classes. Garcia examines multiple aspects of this development including the use of mercenaries and the idea of conscription. The result, argues Garcia, is the creation of a modern nation at arms.

Not all of the articles deal so explicitly with fighting. Françoise Autrand, for example, looks at the efforts of the papacy to foster a peace between England and France in the fourteenth century. Heinz Duchhardt, on the other hand, examines how warfare aided in the formation of international law between the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries. Jean Meyer takes a different approach and analyzes the more ephemeral development of how nations organize, and defend, space. The relationship between the state and the land was complex, dynamic, and crucial to the preservation of the nation. The state had to develop a system for blocking its land from invaders while simultaneously allowing its armies to move about freely and defend the borders where necessary. Thus, the military needed a varied transportation infrastructure; in some cases it required a road system suitable for the rapid passage of couriers while in other instances entire armies had to be able to move from place to place. Not surprisingly, geography became a crucial component in the education of princes as states came to realize that the safety of the nation depended on a series of physical and military buffers. Similarly, knowledge of geometry and the science of fortifications also became crucial for the early modern monarch. Louis XIV, Louis XV, and Louis XVI all patronized savants who taught them mathematics, physics, geography, and other sciences useful for an understanding of space, defense, and the military. Most European monarchs were keen to collect maps and funded numerous cartographic enterprises to aid in their knowledge. The state, then, exerted a fair amount of energy trying to master their internal space, work that required the assistance of the general population who labored to build roads and fortifications.

All of the articles in this collection make a concerted effort to illustrate the ways in which successful state-building relied on warfare. More importantly, many of these essays also reveal the

ways in which everyday people, such as road builders, taxpayers, and conscripts, also participated in the developing state. While much more could have been said about how war and competition affected the common people over time, the authors do at least implicitly acknowledge the importance of people in both war and the creation of the state. The volume includes a useful bibliography for all of the essays that includes much of the most important research on military history from throughout Europe. Ultimately, this volume will have great appeal to historians of the military and of the state.

Steve Hindle. *The State and Social Change in Early Modern England, c. 1550-1640*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000. x + 338 pp. \$60.00. Review by NICOLE GREENSPAN, UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO.

In this provocative and well-argued study Steve Hindle calls for a fundamental change in the way historians conceptualize the formation of the early modern English state. Political historians tend to view the "increase in government" in Tudor and Stuart England primarily as the product of institutional development and the growth of central authority which gradually spread outward to the provinces and "trickled down" through society. On the other hand, social historians commonly view early modern government as an essentially local affair and consequently pay scant attention to developments at the center. Finally, the growth of criminal and civil litigation in the later sixteenth century is still not widely accepted as an integral part of the process of government and is rarely incorporated into studies of state formation. Hindle advances a "comprehensive" model for the study of early modern English politics and society, one which takes account of the "sedimentary" and "discontinuous" (ix) process of state development and stresses the "participatory nature" (114) of government. Hindle concludes that "the early modern state did not become more active at the expense of society; rather, it did so as a consequence of social need" (16).

As Hindle demonstrates, the center and localities, or the “state” and “society,” were interdependent in late Tudor and Stuart England and the processes of negotiation between the two spheres were conducted to a great extent through the arena of the law. Moreover, Hindle is concerned to uncover the “vertical” relationships between power and socio-economic status throughout society; thus, the extension of state authority required negotiation and legitimization not only between the centre and localities but also within individual parishes. The role of the “middling sort” in the formation of the early modern state is at the heart of this analysis. By acting as overseers of welfare policies, as litigants in prerogative courts, as enforcers of the regulation of moral conduct, and as members of parish vestries, the “middling orders” legitimated the extension of state authority while simultaneously adapting national laws and policy directives to suit local circumstances. Chapter 3, for example, details the role of the court Star Chamber in state formation. Until the 1630s the majority of Star Chamber activity was initiated by private litigants rather than by state agents. As such this prerogative court was a resource for the “middling sort” to resolve private conflicts, which in turn contributed to the “gradual embedding of the state deeper into the social order” (89). The use of recognizances or bindings to “keep the peace” is explored in detail in Chapter 4. Recognizances were both an “instrument of authority” enabling magistrates to suppress “anti-social” conduct as well as a means by which private individuals could obtain a measure of protection from violence.

Hindle also devotes a great deal of attention to the difficulties of enforcing national policies at the local level. Chapter 6 outlines the insufficient resources of the state to effectively implement welfare legislation and Chapter 7 details local resistance to the “reformation of manners.” In response to central directives the “parameters of enforcement were set by the community itself,” and as a result communities developed methods of implementation as well as “strategies of resistance” (201). The desires for justice, peace, order, and welfare were shared by the state and localities

alike, but the forms these ideals would assume were open to various interpretations “by those with conflicting sensibilities, opposing visions, and differing interests” (235).

For this deeply researched examination, Hindle draws on a wide range of material. His command of secondary scholarship produced in last half-century in the areas of political, social, economic, and legal history, as well as the history of popular culture, is impressive and thorough, and he also includes the occasional interdisciplinary foray into the fields of sociology and philosophy. Primary material encompasses both central institutions and their directives, in particular prerogative justice and national welfare policies, as well as local implementation; for the latter, Cheshire records constitute the core of his sources. A good deal of Hindle’s evidence is anecdotal, though this may be attributed to the nature of the material consulted; as he concedes, Cheshire records are ill-suited to “systematic quantification” (109). The author eschews the customary chronological method of discussing state formation and the development of the “political nation” and has instead employed a thematic organization. This approach functions to highlight individual trends and factors in the growth of the state and permits a nuanced analysis of regional and local variations and evolution over time. Introductions and conclusions are provided for each chapter and are related to the central arguments of the monograph as a whole, a process which helps to alleviate much of the discontinuity that often results from such thematic approaches.

There are, however, a couple of issues which would have benefited from further discussion. In particular, the role of religion *per se* as a component of social policy and the involvement of the clergy in state-building receive little sustained treatment in the monograph. Notably, there is insufficient engagement with recent scholarly investigations of the influence of the church hierarchy on the formation of social and political policies throughout the period under consideration and especially during the Caroline regime. Hindle consistently conflates religious and secular spheres. He argues, for example, that for the “reformation of the people” and regulation of moral conduct to succeed, there could be no distinc-



tion between religious and secular issues (179), and in his examination of the parish vestries the secular functions of these bodies is foregrounded. Consequently, it is unclear whether in Hindle's view religious concerns or clerical involvement were incidental to the development of the state or were important instruments in the formation of central or local policies and regulations. Similarly, the extent to which female participation in the culture of "popular legalism" impacted upon the formation of the state is uncertain. Hindle repeatedly notes the concern of local and state officials to regulate female conduct. Moreover, women regularly appear—at least anecdotally—throughout the monograph alongside their male counterparts seeking recognizances, initiating lawsuits, acting as defendants, and defying or negotiating laws and regulations on both national and local levels. Nevertheless, there is no direct assessment of women's impact upon the growth of governance and the participatory nature of state formation.

On the whole, however, Hindle's study—which is intended for an expert audience and assumes considerable familiarity with Tudor and Stuart political history—successfully integrates institutional, localist, and legal approaches to state formation. He also presents extensive analysis of both the exercise and the experience of authority in early modern England. Finally, Hindle offers valuable theoretical suggestions for further research. Not only is the conventional opposition between "center" and "locality" problematic, but also the historiographical dichotomy between "conflict" and "consensus" is to a great extent an artificial one, borne of modern concerns and interpretations. Contemporaries, he demonstrates, not only were accustomed to a world in which both coexisted in a dynamic relationship, but it was this very tension which contributed to the growth of the state and the formation of a popular political culture.

J.C. Davis. *Oliver Cromwell*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001. i + 243 pp. \$19.95. Review by BRETT PARKER, UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA.

Oliver Cromwell has never suffered from a lack of historiographical attention, and in most cases explanations of his remarkable career have suffered from a persistent need to portray him and his apparent greatness as an unavoidable paradox. Because of Cromwell's professed godliness, his skillfulness in military leadership, and his efforts in crafting a political settlement, he has, on the one hand, long enjoyed the reputation as a saint and devout republican who delivered England from the clutches of a treacherous king and an outmoded constitution. Concomitantly, he has been considered the greatest apostate, especially in light of his turning out of the Rump and his acceptance of the Protectorate. As a result, Cromwell has been understood as both a saint and hypocrite, victor and villain, and statebuilder and destroyer; all of which, unfortunately, have stemmed from the myopic view that for whatever else he was, his force of personality and protean qualities informed history more than history, in all its complexity, informed his public life. This is a pitfall J.C. Davis successfully avoids in his new work on Cromwell by carefully negotiating his reputation through a thorough contextualization of the events and circumstances that bounded Cromwell and made him less enigmatic than particularly revealing of the dilemmas of his day. As a result, the Cromwell that emerges from Davis's nuanced approach is of an endearing figure whose commitment to civil and religious liberty, coupled with his desire for political consensus, makes him less a mystery and hero than a principled, albeit pragmatic, statesman.

Davis's organization is well suited for his aims. He begins by giving a dense narrative of his life before providing a diachronical assessment of Cromwell's reputation. This allows him to suggest how Cromwell's legacy has been fashioned in concert with changing political circumstances, and the degree to which such renderings have contributed to modern scholarly interpretations. One of the main threads Davis follows is the process by

which alternate histories of Cromwell were constructed, one which sees him as the destroyer of church and state, a view propagated during the Restoration, and one as the restorer of order and temporizer of political retribution, an analysis offered in part, ironically enough, by Clarendon, the ex-Royalist. The balance of these views, however, was that Cromwell was a reproachable character with a few redeeming qualities. If there was historiographical consensus in the next two centuries, it was, simply enough, that Cromwell was an ambiguous leader, a complex figure who even the celebrated Thomas Carlyle could not clarify. For Davis, recent scholarship offers some hope out of the interpretive box, as historians have begun to shear traditional labels of Puritan and Independent and stitch together a more complex and fruitful picture of the circumstances of the Civil War and Interregnum periods. But getting past notions of Cromwell as “a horrible great man” or a “brave bad man” requires not only a sensitivity to evidential limitations but also to this process of reputation building (64).

Davis considers five forms of Cromwell’s reputation, each of which receives a chapter—his rise from “obscurity,” military leadership, godliness, political instincts, and role as a statebuilder. At every turn Davis is iconoclastic, beginning with the received wisdom that Cromwell was a self-made man who climbed to the top of the English political nation through merit and natural talent. Drawing on John Morrill’s rich study of Cromwell’s early history, Davis shows that far from a meteoric rise, Cromwell suffered from a series of setbacks and disappointments in the 1620s before slowly improving his status in the 1630s. Moreover, his move to gentility and increased political prominence cannot be explained by class or Puritan ideology, but instead only by his ability to draw on three networks—cousinage, godly, and political ones—all of which overlapped and not only propelled Cromwell’s national ascent but also allowed him to form valuable alliances crucial to his public aims in 1640s and 1650s.

Having established this general explanation of Cromwell’s rising stardom, Davis explains how the other forms of his reputation resulted, in part, from his movement within these connections.

For instance, Davis emphasizes that much of Cromwell's military success, at least in the early years of the Civil War, was due to his willingness to be a team player, and this in part explains his commitment to the army between 1645-1646, a period when increasingly national settlement required a political rather than a military solution. As for his campaigns in Scotland and Ireland, where historiographical criticism has been acute, Davis disavows suggestions of Cromwell's brutality by pointing to his appeal to a stern and often chastising God, as well as, in Ireland's case, the widespread anti-Catholicism that, if anything, demanded even harsher treatment than Cromwell allowed. A crucial component of this interpretation requires seeing Cromwell's military goals as driven by political aims, both of which remained subservient to God's will for his children. Davis situates Cromwell's thinking in a discourse of millenarianism, one in which a living and active God possessed a dynamic relationship with his people and that sublimated secular institutions as unreliable forms of God's order. Cromwell, like many of his contemporaries, read events through this lens and thus every political proposal or military encounter was considered a test for the nation.

Davis sees Cromwell's Providential discourse as more than political capital and argues for his sincerity by pointing out his consistency in following the logic of this *mentalité* even when things did not go his way (129). But there was a political snare to his religious thought as well, and Cromwell consistently sought to balance liberty of conscience with civil order. This meant finding a workable settlement with a myriad of religious faiths while pushing a reformation of manners aimed at purifying the nation in an effort at comprehensive unity. Cromwell's commitment to religious and civil liberty made him less Machiavellian than has been suggested, and Davis insists that Cromwell's primary goal was to reach a political settlement based on the principles embodied in The Heads of Proposals. All of this—his providential outlook, desire for consensus, and commitment to tender consciences and civil order—made Cromwell a disinterested, if not ineffective, statebuilder. According to Davis, the 1650s required a national order and sta-

bility not clearly projected by Cromwell, and a widespread conservatism among the ruling nation meant old forms would die-hard. Again, Cromwell was only as “great” at circumstances allowed.

Davis’s contextualization of Cromwell’s reputation has produced anything but a paradox, and instead Cromwell the enigma has been reduced to Cromwell the sincere and moderate leader. But while Davis’s approach allows him the latitude to ask significant questions, his answers do not always comport to the context he so vigorously purports to evince. For example, while he recognizes that the language of liberty by the mid 1640s contained multiple meanings, he is unwilling to engage its implications for Cromwell and Independents. A more thorough examination of the ecclesiastical debate among Protestants about the nature of and style of a national church may have further elucidated Cromwell’s political strategy. Finally, it is not churlish to demand a greater understanding of Cromwell’s role at Putney than seeing it as a moment of attempted consensus building and adherence to the principles of The Heads of Proposals. A variety of political understandings were present there, and Davis’s reticence on this significant debate is symptomatic of his own warning that the ultimate meaning of Cromwell’s reputation depends on the narrative form given to the English Civil War.

Lindsey Hughes, ed. *Peter the Great and the West: New Perspectives*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire and New York: Palgrave Publishers Ltd. in association with School of Slavonic and East European Studies, University College, London and National Maritime Museum, Greenwich, 2001. xxiv + 280 pp. + 15 plates + 3 tables. \$45.00. Review by CATHY J. POTTER, CHINESE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG.

The essays comprising this volume first were presented at a conference organized by the National Maritime Museum and the School of Slavonic and East European Studies in 1998 to mark the tercentenary of Peter the Great’s unprecedented expedition to

the West. The conference honored the occasion and also announced a most welcome reinvigoration of scholarly interest in the West in the career of this astonishing figure. That year also saw the publication of Lindsey Hughes's own important book, *Russia in the Age of Peter the Great*, as well as a collection sponsored by the School of Slavonic and East European Studies, *Britain and Russia in the Age of Peter the Great: Historical Documents*. The appearance in 2001 of yet another major study of Peter and his reign, Paul Buskovich's *Peter the Great: The Struggle for Power*, might suggest that Peter as a subject of historical investigation has been exhausted for the next three-hundred years. The essays in this volume belie such a conclusion, proposing numerous avenues for further promising research.

The organization of this volume follows that of the conference, beginning with Anthony Cross's opening address. Professor Cross's essay wends its erudite way from British theatre of the period and an alleged liaison between Peter and the admired English actress Letitia Cross, to portraits of Peter and their painters, gracefully reminding us that scholars and scholarship need not necessarily be dry and humorless.

Section II of the volume presents two essays focusing on the famous Petrine reforms in their context. Alexander Kamenskii's contribution offers a useful précis of his previously published arguments that the Petrine reforms made it possible for Russia to surmount a systemic crisis that had matured by the end of the seventeenth century. Andrei Medushevskii argues for the application of a comparative approach to the Petrine reforms and Russian modernization, again summarizing his previously published work on the topic. These essays are provocative and useful for the non-specialist; specialists would do well to consult the originals.

In Part III, three essays examine the connection between Peter and his reforms and Great Britain. Janet Hartley traces the evolving attitude of successive British government to Peter the Great and Russia, an attitude which progressed from curiosity to concern. At the time of the Great Embassy in 1698, Russia "was perceived as being of only peripheral importance in Europe and

of no threat to England" (53). By the 1720s Russia had become "a power of European significance and a potential disturber of the European peace" (62). British policy towards Russia was sensitive to trade concerns and changes of government personnel, with the former perhaps being dominant. Hartley's discussion is enhanced by extensive quotes from relevant British archives, quotations which suggest that there is more to be discovered here. In fact, W. F. Ryan's essay in Part IV of this volume utilizes many of the same archives and papers to explore the transfer of maritime technology from England to Russia in this period. Judiciously analyzing the evidence, Ryan argues convincingly that British maritime expertise and technology "did give Peter an extraordinary boost to build his navy during the period of his visit to England and immediately thereafter" (150). One of the most interesting essays here is Joan Lane's report of her discovery of the records of a number of young Russian men apprenticed to craftsmen in England in accordance with the wishes of Peter the Great. Lane is an historian of early modern England and her findings vividly illustrate the importance of cultivating an active exchange among specialists in different fields. Perhaps historians of Russia will continue Lane's work and discover the fate of these apprentices upon their return to their homeland. Dmitrii Fedosov's contribution explores the "Scottish Dimension" of the Petrine reforms, discussing the careers of some of the prominent Scotsmen who served Peter. The Scottish influence in Peter's Russia was significant, Fedosov argues. One wonders if there were any discernible Russian influences in Scotland.

In the section entitled "Maritime History," essays by Richard Warner and W. F. Ryan complement each other. As noted above, Ryan argues that the transfer of British technology to Russia contributed to the building of Peter's navy. Warner's contribution reveals the extent to which British merchants in pursuit of profit transferred not just technology, but fully fitted men-of-war to Peter's Baltic fleet in the period 1712-1716. Aleksei Karimov traces the evolution of Russian forest cadastral surveys in the eighteenth century to illustrate the dynamic between state needs and

the introduction of Western science and its methods to Russia. The needs of the fleet prompted a search for the required resources, which in turn stimulated “the first attempt at a systematic, regular survey of Russian forests” (121). Ultimately these surveys “became a means for the geographical exploration of the country, not only for practical needs but also in the interests of knowledge” (127). Karimov makes creative use of new sources to shed fresh light on old questions.

Diplomatic and Military History is the theme that links the four essays included in Part V. Graeme Herd closely examines Peter’s conquest of Azov (1695-96), finding in that campaign themes that would come to fruition in the Great Northern War. David Kirby offers a reassessment of Peter’s activities in the Baltic, arguing that the emphasis must be revised. He concludes that while “(l)ess dramatic than the war against Sweden, and lacking the definitive character of the peace of Nystad, Peter’s Polish policy was arguably of far greater importance for the future” (187). Robert Jones asks why Peter created St. Petersburg. Certainly economic considerations, Peter’s desire to create a port for shipping Russian products to the West, were important. Equally important, Jones asserts, was Peter’s intention “to create an imperial metropolis” that would replace and surpass the fallen Constantinople (201). Thomas Eekman extracts interesting and important nuggets from the generally dry official correspondence of Jacob de Bie, the Netherlands States General resident in St. Petersburg from 1699 to his death in 1710.

This volume concludes with two essays under the rubric of “The Court and the Arts.” John Alexander’s analysis of “Catherine I, her Court and Courtiers” raises interesting questions about the impact of the Petrine reforms on women’s lives. Alexander’s discussion of Catherine I and her court reveals Peter’s consort to be an extraordinary woman. It also suggests the drastic changes Peter introduced and enforced in the lives of female members of the elite. Lindsey Hughes’s essay explores the iconography of Peter the Great and the unresolved contradictions about “the man and his meaning” which find reflection in that iconography.



As the preceding suggests, this collection is a rich *mélange*. The essays included explore diverse issues in regard to Peter the Great and his reign on the basis of multiple sources, offer a multitude of answers, and raise further questions for discussion and research. In a number of cases, the offerings are diamonds in the rough that perhaps might have benefited from further polishing. Nonetheless, the collection as a whole is provocative and stimulating and should inspire continued interest and further research in this area.

Leeds Barroll. *Anna of Denmark, Queen of England: A Cultural Biography*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001. 227 pp. + illus. \$35.00. Review by JANE LYTTON GOOCH, UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Leeds Barroll's account of the cultural and political activities of Anna, Queen of England 1603-1619, reverses the usual scholarly impression of her. Up to now, the daughter of the King of Denmark has been viewed by historians as a frivolous and inconsequential appendage to the culture of a royal court dominated by James and his son Henry. Barroll brings forth startling evidence to the contrary. Far from being insignificant, Anna was a force to be reckoned with; she was not only able to assert her will and thwart the king's wishes in the political arena, but she also created her own courtly culture with the masque at its centre, performed by Anna and her inner circle of carefully chosen noblewomen. Barroll's research into Anna's life in Scotland, before following James to England in 1603, reveals a remarkably determined and capable young woman. Barroll argues that she transferred the political energy exhibited in Scotland to the creation of a court based on alliances with aristocratic patrons of the arts at a time when Donne, Jonson, and Shakespeare were writing.

After an introduction giving an overview of his argument, Barroll begins his cultural biography of Anna by considering in Chapter 2, "Anna in Scotland: Style and Substance," her role as the

Scottish queen. He notes that while many Scottish records about Anna's political activity in her thirteen years as queen exist, very few have survived describing her life in England, probably giving rise to the traditional view that her role was inconsequential. When only eighteen, Anna sought the power of influential lords in Scotland to form a faction against the Lord Chancellor, Sir John Maitland. She showed at an early age not only her political astuteness and self-assertiveness, but also her relentless opposition to someone she did not like. Although Anna aligned herself with different groups of nobles in subsequent political intrigues, the episode that stands out, and has a crucial bearing on Henry, the Prince of Wales in Jacobean culture, is her struggle for Henry's guardianship in 1603. Before leaving on her progress to England to join James, Anna went to the Earl of Mar's castle in Sterling and demanded that he relinquish Henry to her. When her request was denied, she began a twenty-five day stand-off, during which time she suffered a miscarriage, but still adamantly refused to leave Scotland without her son. The king decided that the only way to resolve the problem was to give in to Anna and grant her wish that Henry travel in the company of the Duke of Lennox. As Barroll points out, scholars such as Roy Strong who claim that Anna played an insignificant part in Henry's life, particularly his role in court culture, would do well to remember the struggle Anna had just to bring Henry to England. When she finally arrived to become the new queen of England, she was separated from the Scottish nobles who had supported her and turned, instead, to creating a cultural role through alliances with those interested in the arts and through, especially, the development of the masque with the queen at centre stage.

Barroll describes in Chapter 3, "Queen Anna's English Court," how the queen consort carefully chose the noblewomen of her Bed and Privy Chambers to include those with similar cultural tastes and to provide a nucleus of dancers for the masques. Anna allied herself with the cohesive Essex faction which had fallen into disfavour with Elizabeth after she beheaded the Earl of Essex. Anna was immediately attracted to women who were not close to

Elizabeth, and those in the Essex circle in Elizabeth's time were patrons of the arts. The leader of the gentlewomen who went to meet the new queen as she traveled from Scotland was the twenty-eight year old Lucy Russell, Countess of Bedford, who became an early favourite of the twenty-nine year old Anna. As part of the Essex faction and an art collector and patron to Samuel Daniel and John Donne, the Countess of Bedford moved in the same social circle as the Earl of Southampton, Shakespeare's patron in the 1590s. Barroll suggests that the relationship between Anna's cultural circle and Shakespeare is worth investigating. The Countess of Bedford was appointed to the Bed Chamber, Anna's inner circle, along with the Countess of Hertford, a young intellectual and patron of Samuel Daniel, who was later called home by her husband. Anna's Drawing Chamber included Penelope Rich, ten years older with an intellectual focus and an interest in artists, writers, and musicians, especially Dowland and Byrd. Another member of the Drawing Chamber was Susan de Vere (later the Countess of Montgomery) who supported the arts and became a patron to John Donne. John Dowland dedicated his *Lachrimae* (a famous collection of music) to Anna in 1604, and her interest in painting reveals her cultural activity beyond the court masque. The masques, however, show us the women of the court who were close to her; of the twelve who danced, eight made regular appearances each year between 1603 and 1612. The queen's court was separate from the king's, first at Greenwich palace, and then, after 1613, at Denmark House (Somerset House renamed); hence, there was some duplication of officials, including the Lord Chamberlain, with Anna finally settling on Sir Robert Sidney, the brother of Sir Robert Sidney and a patron of the arts. As Barroll takes care to explain, Anna surrounded herself with influential supporters of culture, and he takes issue with Roy Strong's claim that Prince Henry was at the centre of culture in the English court. Barroll maintains that Anna developed her own court through cultural alliances, and the masque was the emblem of the queen's court.

In Chapter 4 “The Stuart Masque and the Queenly Arts of Ceremony,” we have an intriguing description of Anna’s court masques, performed once a year in order to affirm her identity and to place her in the centre of attention. Barroll does not agree with the traditional view of the masque: a display of the artistic talents of Samuel Daniel, Ben Jonson, and Inigo Jones in order to enhance the image of James I, with the queen and her ladies merely dancing, oblivious to the emblematic significance. Anna’s first Christmas season at Hampton Court, when James was hosting ambassadorial dinners to commemorate the beginning of his reign, allowed her to establish the masque as an integral part of the revelry. She presented the *Vision of the Twelve Goddesses* written by Samuel Daniel and performed by eight core dancers from her inner circle, supplemented by four occasional dancers; all the dancers were married women whose husbands had much prestige or who were countesses with political power. As Barroll notes, the *Twelve Goddesses* was a paradigm for Anna’s later masques; its purpose was to enhance the public image of the queen and her ladies and to compliment important noblemen. This masque did not use allegorical characters but powerful women from mythology. Invitations to Anna’s masques were sought after by foreign dignitaries, and they became an important political tool in giving recognition to different countries. Anna was in complete control, and one year she would not agree to invite the French ambassador despite the king’s urgent request for his inclusion on diplomatic grounds. She later relented and in the 1608-9 Christmas season gave La Boderie, the French emissary, an honoured role in *The Masque of Queens* in which Anna portrayed herself at the top of a pyramid of worthy queens.

After placing Anna in her cultural context and describing her masques, Barroll concludes with Chapter 5 “Masquing and Faction: Prince Henry and After,” in which he draws the connections between Henry and his mother through the masques and political alliances. In 1604, Henry joined Anna’s court and stayed there until he became Prince of Wales at age sixteen and was granted a house of his own. At Henry’s installation in June 1610,

*Tethys' Festival* was presented, an entertainment giving prominence to both the new Prince of Wales and Anna, the mother of the future king. The following Christmas two masques were presented: *Oberon*, featuring the prince, in which Henry paid homage to his mother in the dancing, and *Love Freed from Ignorance and Folly*, featuring the queen. While these lavish entertainments brought Anna and Henry together in a cultural context, they were also allied in a political faction to oppose Rochester, the king's favourite. Anna stopped producing masques performed by her gentlewomen in 1610-11, and Henry's early death in 1612 brought to an end their close political and cultural alliance. Anna, true to form, did not withdraw from factional struggles and continued to exert her influence until her death in 1619. One good example is the support Anna gave to the heiress Lady Anne Clifford; under extreme pressure from the king to allow her husband to sell some of her land, Lady Anne Clifford was able to resist, and, subsequently, outlive all involved, by following Anna's advice.

Barroll in his scholarly text, complete with an appendix ("Anna of Denmark and Catholicism") and extensive notes, offers a fascinating account of Anna's personality and her successful creation of a courtly culture to enhance her own image. While not the most influential figure in James' reign, Anna certainly deserves more attention for her role in Jacobean culture. This well-organized cultural biography, emphasizing Anna's life as the queen of England from 1603-19, is written to correct the dismissive attitude to Anna and the supposition that Henry, a prince of nine years in 1603, was a dominant cultural force. Barroll's careful research into the existing documents, Scottish and English, clearly shows an extraordinarily strong-willed queen, able to surround herself with carefully chosen noblewomen. Throughout her tenure as queen consort, Anna showed her strength in opposing James and his circle of noblemen. With this character and interest in the arts, Anna is shown at the centre of a cultural court in the performance of masques and in the support of Henry's cultural activi-

ties. Feminist writing has ignored Anna up to now, but she definitely established herself as one who promoted the arts at a time when Shakespeare, Donne, and Jonson were writing.

Stephen Coote. *Royal Survivor: A Life of Charles II*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000. xiv + 396 pp. Includes b & w plates. \$27.95. (First published in the UK by Hodder and Stoughton.) Review by BRYAN N.S. GOOCH, UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA.

Stephen Coote's *Royal Survivor* is more than a well-researched, cohesive, and engaging biography of Charles II, for it takes into account the political, social, and cultural issues of Charles II's era, detailing concerns and events within Britain and on the Continent before and after the Restoration. Coote's label "Royal Survivor" is apt, certainly, given the shocking fate of Charles' father (ironically, outside the northwest, main floor window of the Inigo Jones Banqueting Hall with its sublime Rubens ceiling, the centre panel of which depicts the apotheosis of James I) and the brief, ignominious reign of James II, who utterly failed to suppress his autocratic ways so that he might achieve some measure of political stability. That Charles II managed to survive to die a natural death in 1685 while still monarch is, in many ways, remarkable; good luck and wily management were locked in serious struggle with stubbornness, bouts of dangerous ineptitude, and numerous forays in social and diplomatic impropriety. Coote spares few sensibilities in his revelation of a crisis-marked rise to power and the equally skiddy reign which followed in what, without question, is a commanding piece of historical narrative.

Following a Preface in which Coote asserts Charles' belief in royal prerogative and his single-minded maintenance of authority which could lead the king to display a singularly virtuosic deviousness when necessary (charm, candour, and wit being, often, insufficient unto the day), a notion which surfaces constantly throughout the account, Coote proceeds to offer the elements of the monarch's early life and his escape, during the Civil War, to the

Channel Islands and thence to Paris where he was once again in contact with Francis and George Villiers (the latter became Duke of Buckingham in 1628), experiencing some forays in matters academic (Thomas Hobbes made a sometime august tutor in mathematics), meeting the young Louis XIV, tasting the fringes (amatory and otherwise) of the French court under the less than successful hand of his mother, Henrietta Maria, and developing what Coote aptly calls a “survivor’s code” (54). The somewhat confused political/military situation in England (nicely detailed) serves as a counterpoint to Charles’ activities in Europe (including a visit to the Hague and the growing influence of Edward Hyde) and, after the execution of his father, his direct attempts to regain the crown. Chapter Four brings one to the negotiations with the Covenanters, a return to France, the defeat of Ormonde in Ireland, another journey to Jersey, and, in due course, to Breda, with further demands from the Scots, to which he acceded. Abundantly clear is that Charles had no easy time, financially or, really, any other way. He was a royal refugee attempting to find support where he could, and expediency often dictated, even at the expense of religious principles. Chapter Five sees him in Scotland under the rather heavy thumb of the Earl of Argyll, with Cromwell moving (1650) against the Scots (the latter increasing their pressure on Charles), the Battle of Dunbar (vigorously described), the famous Start, more difficulties in dealing with the Covenanters, Charles’ Scottish coronation (Scone, 1651), and further unsuccessful military forays (including Wales) and the gripping Battle of Worcester (1651), with (in Chapter Six) Charles forced to flee, with guile and guise, to France. The extended description of the escape is superbly handled—the famous refuge (with Col. William Carlis) in the Boscobel oak tree (see 107-8) is part of the story—and it has all the marks of deadly suspense, intrigue, and danger, stunningly reminding the reader just how close the Cromwellian side came to eliminating any chance of Charles’ restoration.

Chapter Six sees the Prince back in France, dissembling about his escape, with Hyde working to prevent him from becoming a Roman Catholic, while real poverty—worse than genteel shab-

business—dominates the regal scene. There follows Coote's lucid handling of matters political and military in England, France, and Holland, e.g., the portrayal of Mazarin's power in France, anti-Dutch sentiments in England, the unpopularity of the English Rump Parliament, Cromwell's authoritarian attitude and appointment as Lord Protector for life (see 134), the revelation of the anti-Cromwellian "Sealed Knot" plot, false rumours re Hyde, diversions with Anne Killigrew, and Mazarin's determination (1654) that Charles should leave Paris. Heady stuff this is, and nowhere is there a hint of the sometimes conventional notion that Charles grew up comfortably in French palatial style while waiting for the proverbial English chips to fall into place. Indeed, Chapter Eight sees the Prince very much on the move—to Spain, Namours, Liège, Spa (where he was reunited with his sister, Mary), Aix-la-Chapelle, and then Zeeland (in the event of Royalist success in England). Lucy Walter was again a source of scandal and financial vexation, not that Charles showed any signs of abandoning his own promiscuity. Personal issues and international negotiations (e.g., with Spain regarding Jamaica) are woven together as Coote moves the exile to a gradual close with the death of the Protector (1658), and in Chapter Nine, Richard Cromwell's brief and wholly unsuccessful assumption of power, the unpopularity of the war with the Dutch, the actions of General Monck, the delegation to Charles in Breda, the appearance of Barbara Palmer (née Villiers, later the obtrusive and alarming Countess of Castlemaine and Duchess of Cleveland), the triumphal journey to England, and Charles' return to London as King.

The first half of *Royal Survivor* thus deals with the extraordinary tapestry of the pre-Restoration years. Quite apart from the fact that Coote manages his narrative so adroitly and clearly, the weighing of the material in the book is wholly appropriate in order that the reader understand fully the nature of the experiences that shape the king-to-be. Here is a shrewd, witty, intelligent, enquiring, evidently courageous, and, at times, stubborn man who has known danger and deprivation—a "survivor," to use Coote's term—who will build his reign with panache and



determination to assert his right to royal prerogative. What was denied before 1660 he would have in the years following. If he was to follow French fashion as King (the royal accounts for the period, i.e., the Lord Chancellor's Rolls, are immensely revealing in this regard) he would do so not just because of what he had seen while in exile but because of the need to satisfy long-lingering needs. A show-piece court could both serve the national and the royal desire: if Louis XIV could have a band of 24 violins, so could Charles, and so on it went. Majesty returned to London with a flair, though political and personal dangers and scandals (whose garments, indeed, were drying on the royal clothes-line?) were to abound and genuinely threaten the security of a reign in an era in which many sought stability, order, and balance in political, religious, and scientific realms.

In Chapter Ten come the initial events of the Restoration years—for example, the retribution exacted from surviving regicides, the appointment of Hyde as Lord Chancellor, the rewarding of supporters, an attempt to calm the animosities between Anglicans and Presbyterians, the deaths of Prince Henry and Princess Mary, James' marriage to Anne Hyde, daughter of the Lord Chancellor (who became Earl of Clarendon), the Portuguese offer to Charles of the hand of Catherine of Braganza, the coronation, and the meeting of the Cavalier Parliament, fraught with controversy over the Act of Indemnity and the issue of royal finances—the latter an ominous harbinger of monetary contention as the years of the reign wore on, for Charles would ever be in search of cash, and those who provided it, at home or abroad, expected concessions, sometimes of a kind perilous to national interest. Religious issues loomed large, and a Declaration of Indulgence fostered by Charles foundered in the House of Lords, and the new King continued to cause consternation—even for such an assertive womaniser as Samuel Pepys—with his affairs and the constant attention of Lady Castlemaine, whose husband retreated to France. The Roman Catholic Catherine arrived to become a royal bride; there were indeed to be royal children, though none legitimate, and the new

Queen's religious affiliation only served to worry many citizens and inflame protestant angst while, at the same time, the demanding Lady Castlemaine bid fair to overturn the regal coach.

Foreign issues dominate the first part of Chapter Eleven—Louis XIV's power, and the Duke of York's warlike designs on Dutch prosperity (a conflict ill-prepared and under-financed, with a navy simply not up to the task); even the rout of the Dutch fleet off Lowestoft turned into failure as Henry Brouncker, lacking stomach for continued action, let the Dutch under deWitt slip away to safety, and the English fleet was later in 1665 bombarded from the shore into inglorious retirement from an attempt to strike Dutch shipping at Bergen. Coote also describes in detail the disasters at home—the plague of 1665 (with the King off to Salisbury and Oxford to escape) while the redoubtable Sir Edmund Berry Godfrey remained in London to look after common graves and punish pilferers of burial sites. More Dutch vengeance was to follow, with an abortive attempt to attack the British fleet in the Thames, while the wily Louis XIV moved to support the Dutch, whose fleet inflicted a significant blow to the English in the Channel in 1666. Even the successful English fire-ship raid destroying “some 170 Dutch ships” (218)—“Holmes' Bonfire”—was slim compensation, for favourable flames at sea were followed by the fire-storm, superbly described by Coote, which left the greater part of London a smoking mess in September of the same year. Coote spells out the situation, including Charles' notable role, and moves on, for example, to reconstruction, the successful Dutch raid on British ships in the Thames (1667), the ensuing public outcry, further scandal at court, the Peace of Breda, and the opposition to Clarendon—a convenient scapegoat—and his departure for France.

In Chapter Twelve, Coote deals with the results of Clarendon's expulsion—even the Duke of York pleaded further return of his father-in-law to no avail, while Charles displayed marked displeasure to his former Lord Chancellor's backers, including the Bishops of Winchester and Rochester and the stalwart Gilbert Sheldon, Archbishop of Canterbury, whom Charles declined to hear preach (229). Stirring up bishops was to mix a potentially lethal

cocktail, as the Duke of York was later to discover as James II; Charles' actions here are further testament to his assertiveness and his insistence on royal authority. Religious issues predominate. James converted formally to the Roman church in 1669, and the Queen's miscarriages did nothing to remove the spectre of Catholic succession, while Buckingham increased his political power in the absence of Clarendon. Coote weaves his tapestry with a masterly hand as he goes on to discuss Charles' unsuccessful attempts to have the House accede to toleration, the failure of Scottish union, secret letters to Louis XIV, the French control of the Spanish Netherlands, the Triple Alliance, and the devious currents of foreign policy with the King on the edge of his own conversion. This is the period of the emergence of the Cabal, the death of Henriette Anne, the secret Treaty of Dover, the Stop on the Exchequer, and the second Declaration of Indulgence, supported by Anthony Ashley Cooper, created Earl of Shaftsbury, a promotion the King would deeply regret. Charles ought to have read *Il Principe* more thoroughly.

Almost as a kind of relaxation after this powerful sweep of events, Coote, in his thirteenth chapter, "The King of Play," offers considerable insight into the artistic/recreational side of the court—spaniels, walking, swimming, rowing, shooting, riding, tennis, yachting, and horse-racing (especially at Newmarket). St. James' Park was made public, and Charles had enthusiasms for exotic birds, for park and garden design, and naval architecture. He had an active, enquiring mind, particularly with respect to matters technical. And if his extra-marital affairs were, in any sense, recreational, that with Lady Castlemaine became increasingly problematic. Not by any means a source of public enthusiasm, in debt and disgrace (she was, indeed, an unrepentant gambler), she left for Paris in 1676. Here, too, are details of his friendship with the brilliant John Evelyn, his introduction to Grinling Gibbons, his interest in painting and music, the restoration of Windsor Castle, the royal collections, the theatres, and new affiliations with Nell Gwynn and Louise de K eroualle (who became Duchesse of Ports-

mouth)—both women remarkably expensive additions to the royal *ménage*, the latter a dangerous potential for leakage of information to the French. Pillow-talk can come at high prices.

As Chapter Fourteen indicates, English envy of Dutch prosperity and demands that the latter recognize English supremacy at sea went unabated, and what was planned was, according to Coote, “a war of naked aggression” (271), in the early 1670s difficult to justify. Plans went awry, and the result was unsuccessful, William of Orange refusing to give into English demands. Meanwhile, anti-French/anti-Roman Catholic propaganda was rife, and Shaftsbury, though brilliantly manipulative, could not persuade the House to accept Charles’ policies. The Declaration of Indulgence was doomed and the Test Act was passed. There was contention between the British and French fleets, and Sir William Coventry persuaded the House against the war. Peace was forced on the King, and a bill of supply would only be passed (1674) if Charles would support Anglican primacy. He also blatantly denied the existence of the Treaty of Dover (not revealed until 1830—see 285, note); the Cabal was riddled by acrimony, and Shaftsbury lost his role as Lord Chancellor—only to become an implacable foe in the exclusion crisis.

Appearing on the scene in Chapter Fifteen is the adroit and ambitious Sir Thomas Osborne, soon to be Earl of Danby, whose task it was, as Lord Treasurer, to bring Charles’ finances under such control that he might have some relief from Parliamentary nay-sayers. But even money for the navy was hard to wring from the House, which also turned on Charles over his support for Louis XIV and for the behaviour of intimates like John Maitland, Duke of Lauderdale (see 289). With an inflamed House in uproar, and an addition to the Test Act (designed to stifle further opposition to the King) a failure, Shaftsbury seized the opportunity to mount opposition to royal policy. “What next?” the reader might well ask as Coote skilfully continues his weaving of the positively Byzantine manoeuvring. The Duke of York’s marriage to Mary of Modena, a threat to his daughters Mary and Anne, only inflamed anti-Roman Catholic fervour in the nation.

Enter the popular Duke of Monmouth again, against the background of James' obvious pro-Roman Catholic/anti-Parliament intransigence, as the royal brother pushed for financial arrangements between Charles and Louis XIV. Enter also Hortense Mancini, Duchesse Mazarin (niece of the fearsome Duke), somewhat a foil for Louis de K eroualle—French diplomatic fingers could extend behind the curtains in the Privy apartments while Charles played off Louis and William of Orange, a dangerous game, as Coote rightly acknowledges (297), and the House refused to agree to supply unless an argument was concluded with the Dutch. While Danby sought to set bungled financial negotiations at rest, Charles finally agreed to a marriage between William of Orange and the Duke of York's elder daughter, Mary—the courtship and wedding are nicely drawn (see 299-301)—and Charles continued to chase the ever-successful Louis for money.

The convolutions and horrors of the Popish Plot are neatly and chillingly unveiled in Chapter Sixteen. Informants and insidious rumour-mongers abound—Christopher Kirkby, Israel Tongue, and, of course, the malignant and unhappy Titus Oates. Add the still-unsolved murder of the respected Sir Edmund Berry Godfrey, and anti-Roman Catholic fear runs amok. Even the Duke of York and the Queen were suspected of involvement. Coote offers a clear outline of the outrage—false accusations, improper convictions, and executions of the order that national hysteria can produce; the revelation of Oates' perfidy is spectacular, as is Coote's depiction of Charles' attempt to get rid of Danby through the offices of Ralph Montague, who, with access to Danby's letters to Louis, turned against King and counsellor on losing his positions as ambassador in Paris and in the Privy Council. More turmoil—in the end Danby survived with a pension but broken power. With the old Parliament prorogued and a new one in place came further struggles for the exclusion of James from succession, with Monmouth, illegitimate though he was, as a plausible candidate (to some) in the head-on struggle between Shaftesbury and his rightful king. Coote's expansive treatment of the machinations is gripping—even if one knows the outcome, as Tories and Whigs

slog away at each other. In the end, with the second Exclusion Bill a failure, Charles called Parliament to Oxford, dismissed it (never to recall it), and, as Coote notes in Chapter Seventeen, arrested Shaftesbury for treason. Acquittal by a Whig-packed jury followed, despite Dryden's superb efforts in *Absalom and Achitophel*. This penultimate chapter also outlines the Rye House Plot, Monmouth's exile, Louis XIV's further involvement in Charles' political affairs, and the King's death.

The Afterword offers, at the end of this somewhat symphonic *tour de force*, a necessary *dénouement*. It briefly covers the exasperating if mercifully short reign (as Charles had predicted it would be) of James II (formerly Duke of York), the rebellion and execution of Monmouth (1685), the subsequent Bloody Assizes, and James' undignified departure in 1688, allowing the succession of William and Mary. There follow a list of references, a bibliography, and an index.

Stephen Coote's *Royal Survivor* is a masterly, compelling piece of work. He has assembled his myriad of details with care and discrimination and has managed to bring events and personalities vividly before the mind. More documentation will probably be wanted by some readers, and to many a more generous supply of dates throughout the text would be helpful. Nonetheless, this volume, as it stands, is one for which we can be grateful—utterly useful in terms of an historical study and splendid literary fare as well.

Brendan Dooley. *The Social History of Skepticism: Experience and Doubt in Early Modern Culture*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999. viii + 213 pp. \$42.95. Review by LAURA CRUZ, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT BERKELEY.

Brendan Dooley ends *The Social History of Skepticism* by pointing out that his is a cautionary tale. His message, which he shares with Italian philosopher Giambattista Vico (a central figure in the work), is that scholarship needs to be protected from the

wiles of the market, whether in the seventeenth century or the twenty-first. When information becomes a commodity, then truth, understanding, and order are impeded and progress of all sorts is disrupted. Like modern tabloid journalists, seventeenth-century news writers, whether they were the desperate men copying newsletters in the back room or respected court historians, produced a massive amount of disinformation—from dramatic embellishments to outright lies—that made many scholars (and rulers) despair of ever finding an objective and practical account of events in the past. *The Social History of Skepticism* is both an example and a description of the methodological philosophy that developed in order to save the discipline of history from capitalism's evil clutches and the dustbins of Cartesian skepticism.

It is no surprise that the business of news was lively in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Italy, where Dooley focuses his attentions. The political vicissitudes of the various city-states and their involvement in foreign wars meant that accurate information was in high demand. The first vehicle to respond to that demand was the newsletter, essentially a hand-written sheet of insider political gossip. Newsletters were soon joined by printed newspapers, although the latter never completely supplanted the former and, in fact, often copied them verbatim, as Dooley impressively illustrates with several colorful examples. With the advent of newspapers, the buying and selling of information became an orderly business subject to rules and regulation like other municipal trades.

On the surface, the newsletters and newspapers appear to be very unpromising sources from which to work. Like other kinds of ephemera, they are imperfectly preserved. They were produced sporadically, almost always by anonymous copyists hoping to avoid nearly constant censorship. Most of the information contained in them is completely unverifiable and, as is true for most early texts, we have no idea who read them or what effect they may have had on the population at large. A lesser historian might have been daunted, but Dooley is able to turn these vices into virtues. By focusing on the context from which they sprang—the poor job pros-

pects for many copyists, the availability of insider information, the interest of important clients—he is able to piece together the world of the newsletter. His sketch of the contours of that market and the motivations and strategies of the actors involved make a welcome contribution to the history of early modern journalism before the French Revolution, which hitherto had consisted of only a handful of specialized texts.

The persistence of newsletters, Dooley argues, is proof of a developing market for information that had previously been reserved for a select few. The theory that the advent of print turned the once private affairs of state into fodder for public consumption is certainly not new, but Dooley does give the public sphere argument an original twist. While journalism may have created informed citizens and more accountable governments, it also had deleterious consequences. The information revolution produced as much disinformation as information and it was difficult to tell which was which. Even “respectable” sources like newspapers and published histories became suspect in the eyes of the discerning viewer. Newspapers were subject to censorship and could lose their privileges or be forced to print expensive retractions should their work run afoul of local authorities. Writers often colored their accounts in order to gain the patronage or protection of the characters involved and many admitted that they simply fabricated those parts for which no hard information was available. According to Dooley, with more and more of such suspicious texts around, many readers did not know what or whom to believe.

For many scholars, the answer was nothing and no one. Dooley suggests that the spread of yellow journalism contributed directly to the growth of the philosophy of skepticism. Because he concentrates on its contributions to philosophical thought, he neatly avoids the pitfalls of establishing the causal connections between texts and their readers. Unlike the average reader, the scholars of the seventeenth century conveniently wrote many of their thoughts down and many of them mentioned the pernicious affects of journalism specifically. The bewildering and seemingly insolvable problem of finding objective accounts of events in the recent past



dovetailed nicely with the suppositions of the empiricists that history is unverifiable and Descartes' belief that is was "oriented towards pursuing information about affairs of no moral significance" (137).

Dooley is hard pressed to show that this was much more than a coincidence. Although these scholars may have read and often disapproved of the popular newspapers, there is no way to tell whether or not that disapproval affected their ideas about the importance of received wisdom in general. This link between journalism and skepticism is the most ambitious section of the book and the most questionable. If taken to their logical conclusion, his findings suggest that the roots of the Enlightenment can be traced back to sixteenth-century Italy, a hypothesis sure to cause controversy. To his credit, Dooley does not claim that political journalism was the only factor that influenced the growth of skepticism nor does he claim that the Italian experience is necessarily representative of Europe as a whole. This modesty makes his claims more obtainable, but they also reduce the dramatic impact of his work. What is left is the tantalizing hypothesis that political journalism may have contributed some small part to the growth of the philosophies that caused Europe to completely re-examine her intellectual foundations. How significant or necessary that link was, we may never know.

It is ironic that history was saved by a number of Italian philosophers (among others). The very people who had the most potential exposure to the vagaries of the Italian equivalent of Grub Street are the same ones who worked to find it a place in the new intellectual environment. In Dooley's model, the connection between journalism and historiography is predicated on the first connection between journalism and skepticism, and so the direct causal links between the reformers of history and the authors of scintillating newsletter gossip are practically non-existent. He does succeed, however, in drawing attention to a number of lesser-known Italian philosophers whose contributions to the post-Cartesian universe may have been under-appreciated.

According to seventeenth-century writers such as Ludovico Antonio Muratori and Benedetto Bacchini, history is not a science and cannot, therefore, satisfy scientific ideas about truth, but that does not mean that it is meaningless or futile. Rather, “a distinction could be drawn between reasonable and unreasonable doubt” based on informed, critical readings of documents, manuscripts, and even visual evidence (142). The gaps between those sources could reasonably be filled by the historical imagination, but this was not the free-flowing imagination of a poet or painters or storytellers. Good historical writing needed to be consciously tempered by a responsibility to the actual events of the past. These criteria separated good history from bad history and scholarship from journalism.

That separation remained theoretical, however, until scholarship was truly able to free itself from the same constraints that the journalists had to operate under, namely, capitalism and censorship (if it ever really has). Even if they were not able to reap what they had sown, the historians of the seventeenth century began a movement to put academic history on a foundation sufficiently solid to support it to this day. Dooley’s book is evidence of that. It is based on a solid familiarity over a wide range of disparate primary material, which he pieces together with a keen sense of the weaknesses inherent in his main sources. He exercises his imagination not only to wrest significance from inauspicious sources but also to make a possible connection between a limited, isolated phenomenon (the Italian newsletters) to a European-wide movement of revolutionary proportions and to modern historical methodology. Did he definitively prove each of these “leaps of imagination”? Probably not, but arguably all he needed to do was to overcome reasonable doubt.

Alain Cabantous. *Blasphemy: Impious Speech in the West from the Seventeenth to the Nineteenth Century*. Trans. Eric Rauth. New York: Columbia University Press, 2002. xiv + 288 pp. \$29.50. Review by MELISSA MOHR, STANFORD UNIVERSITY.

With verve and a dry sense of humor (helped not a little by a skillful translation), Alain Cabantous provides a thorough and a careful history of the crime of blasphemy and of the “mentalities” behind it. He focuses on France, but touches on blasphemy in Spain, Italy, the German-speaking states, and England as well. (The West of the title is western Europe—America is not part of his purview). Though concerned mainly with the seventeenth through the nineteenth centuries, Cabantous does look back briefly to the Biblical origins of the sin (Leviticus 24:16: “He who blasphemes the name of the Lord shall be put to death”) and forward to incarnations of blasphemy in contemporary western culture—in today’s secularized society, he suggests, it is possible to blaspheme against such hallowed ideals as “human rights” (205). He also includes much useful information on blasphemy during the religious upheavals of the Reformation, drawn largely from the work of Olivier Christin and David Lawton. Previous studies of blasphemy have, for the most part, been of two kinds. They were either magisterial, like those of Lawton and Leonard Levy, traversing the history of the subject from the Bible up to now, in Jewish, Christian, and Islamic traditions, or very localized, examining, for example, prosecutions for impious language in Paris from 1610 to 1671. Cabantous (along with Joss Marsh in *Word Crimes*, her excellent account of blasphemy trials in Victorian England) strikes a balance between these two approaches—his study is both wide-ranging enough to draw interesting conclusions about how and why the meanings and practitioners of blasphemy changed over his chosen time period, and focused enough to give him room to support these conclusions with ample and convincing evidence.

Blasphemy is “the act of ‘refusing that which belonged or amounted to God Himself or attributing to God that which was not of Him’” (11). Cabantous works most frequently with this definition, crystallized by Scholastic theologians in the twelfth century. The category is broad, encompassing anything from oaths sworn unthinkingly in anger (“By God’s blood!”) to the most intentional acts of sacrilege, such as Sir Charles Sedley’s 1663 “miming [of] sodomitical postures” (88) while abusing Scripture, naked. The specifics of the charge “vary according to the actors who passed judgment” (6)—blasphemy, as Cabantous sees it, is a crime defined by its jurisdiction. In spite, or perhaps because, of its variability, it is an allegation with great power. Cabantous spends the first half of the book describing the institutions that competed for the authority to define and punish it, including the Church, both Protestant and Catholic, the King, municipal governments, down to *fadernes*, societies of pious people that banded together to stamp out blasphemous speech in their parishes. Blasphemy had to be punished not just to maintain doctrinal purity but also to preserve social stability. It was “as much a civic as a religious concern” (65), partly because it could call down the wrath of God on communities that did not root it out, and partly because blasphemers were often also thieves, drunkards, gamers, or otherwise socially-disruptive figures. One of Cabantous’s most interesting arguments links increasing monarchical control of blasphemy trials to the consolidation of royal power across Europe in the late sixteenth century—what was once a transgression against God becomes primarily a transgression against the King, God’s representative on earth.

Befitting a crime so difficult to pin down, blasphemers come from a wide variety of social levels and occupations. Theological tracts and legal statutes identify sailors, soldiers, aristocrats, and gamblers as the archetypal users of impious language, and Cabantous provides convincing explanations for why each of these groups was singled out as a target. Blasphemy on ship, for example, was particularly dangerous because it might prompt

God to sink the vessel; its role as disorderly speech often accompanied by insults and physical violence meant that it had to be strictly controlled on ships in which men lived at close quarters for long periods of time. When (French) records of trials for blasphemy are consulted, however, a different picture of the typical blasphemer emerges. Although people from all walks of life were denounced, those actually charged with the crime most frequently came from the bourgeoisie. Cabantous attributes this to tensions within the bourgeois sphere of life, the result of “a profoundly and visibly unequal society, [in which] the risks of contention were quite real and strong—between neighbor and neighbor, owners and renters, masters and journeymen” (108). Blasphemy was a handy accusation with which to damage an enemy’s reputation, a tool useful in the process of resolving property or other disputes. On opposite extremes of the social scale, aristocrats and vagabonds would have had little reason or opportunity to involve themselves in such quarrels and thus, for the most part, were not prosecuted. What all blasphemers, emblematic and actual, have in common is a propensity for risk-taking and a striking ability to “avoid . . . the control of religious authorities and, in consequence, *social* control (so interconnected were the two)” (94). For Cabantous, the blasphemer is a heroic figure.

The second half of the book follows a more chronological organization and focuses more directly on France. After 1750, cases of blasphemy declined greatly, though there were still occasional trials, like that of the chevalier de La Barre, that resulted in the execution of the accused. The French Revolution radically redefined blasphemy, while giving renewed vigor to the charge. According to Cabantous, the Revolution rejected Christianity and institutionalized new sites of the sacred: “the State, the Republic, the Revolution” (158). Anything that denigrated or endangered these ideals, then, was stigmatized as blasphemy. In Restoration France, the Church reasserted control over the sin, designating the failed Revolution and its formerly sacred ideals as the primary loci of the blasphemous. At this

point, however, the Church's jurisdiction was moral and spiritual only; blasphemy was dropped permanently from the statute books in 1791 as an "imaginary" crime.

Cabantous's take on blasphemy as a crime defined by the institutions that condemn or prosecute it is, for the most part, a productive one, but it tends to make the charge itself seem endlessly elastic. He ends up glossing over some real differences in the kinds of offenses committed by his 'blasphemers,' particularly between oath-swearing and other, more intentionally impious, language and actions. Swearing "by God's death" in anger during a quarrel and stripping naked to urinate on a crucifix are very different activities, and would spring, one imagines, from very different mentalities. He sometimes gestures towards a distinction between oath-swearing and other kinds of profane practices, but more often considers them equivalent, quoting, for example, theological tracts that reprove the sin of swearing as if they address 'blasphemy' more broadly. Such impreciseness, though, may simply be a function of the book's scope. It marshals a large number of sources from diverse countries and time periods into a generally cogent history of a slippery concept.

John T. Young. *Faith, Medical Alchemy and Natural Philosophy: Johann Moriaen, Reformed Intelligencer, and the Hartlib Circle*. Aldershot, Great Britain & Brookfield, Vermont, U.S.A.: Ashgate, 1998. xv + 278 pp. \$86.95. Review by IRVING A. KELTER, UNIVERSITY OF ST. THOMAS, HOUSTON.

John T. Young has written a book with an admittedly narrow focus. It deals with the life and work of an obscure German born alchemist and religious thinker Johann Moriaen (c.1591-c.1658) who "initiated no new ideas, but played an essential role in broadcasting new ideas and stimulating discussion and reassessment of them." He was "not a producer of 'ingenuity and knowledge' but he was a major trader in it" (247). Moriaen was decidedly a minor figure in the intellectual world

of the first half of the seventeenth century but he was associated with major figures, such as Samuel Hartlib, John Dury, and Jan Comenius. That is where his importance lay and he can be used as a doorway into a larger world.

Young divides his book into two parts. The first part is a biographical sketch of Johann Moriaen, which may be of less interest to students of the history of seventeenth-century culture and science than the second. Moriaen was born in Nuremberg to a Dutch reformed family and educated at Heidelberg. He served as a minister of his church in various cities, such as Frankfort and Cologne during the troubled early years of the Thirty Years' War, the period in which Young thinks Moriaen became acquainted with Theodore Haak, a close associate of Hartlib. Unfortunately, Young is only able to assert this as a probability for the documents available to him do not allow him to make that many historically certain statements concerning this period of Moriaen's life.

The later 1620s and '30s are the "wandering" years of Moriaen's life. In the 1630s Moriaen began to show signs of a marked interest in medicinal or "iatrochemistry," an abiding passion for the rest of his life. Finally, in 1638 he settled in the United Provinces of the Netherlands where he remained and where he became a sort of non-denominational religious thinker. In the Netherlands, Moriaen also became involved in the Hartlib circle and as a disseminator of their ideas. He became a part of the network of figures trying to further the cause of what Young calls the "Second Reformation," which involved millenarianism, encyclopedism, a reform of educational theory, and the quest for useful knowledge. Yet, Young insists at the beginning of his volume, the underlying idea behind all of this was "the affirmation of God's providential design in the world, the assertion of man's potential to gain access, through grace, to a more than human understanding of the nature of things, and a palpably horrified rejection of the idea that either mind or matter is on its own sufficient to explain the universe" (xii).

In the second part of his work, Young deals in great detail with the major themes of the Hartlib circle and Moriaen's involvement with them. Here he casts his net wider and brings in fascinating information on many well know and lesser known figures of the intellectual world of the early seventeenth century. In "Panaceas of the Soul," Young examines the drive on the part of many, most notably the Moravian Jan Comenius, to establish a new *pansophia* or universal knowledge and wisdom for the betterment of all mankind. In England, Hartlib was a great supporter of Comenius and tried, without much success, to get the governments of Oliver and Richard Cromwell to fund this endeavor. Moriaen was attracted to Comenius' ideas for a time and tried to disseminate them throughout northwestern Europe; he also helped Comenius when he visited the Netherlands. This chapter contains a stimulating account of this quest for a universal wisdom, including how early seventeenth-century figures such as Moriaen and Dury saw in mathematics and mathematicians—e.g., John Pell, who also offered a model for the new *pansophia*. Eventually, Moriaen fell out of love with Comenius's particular approach, seeing in him a writer of too many schoolbooks. However, Moriaen would always remain enamored of the idea of *pansophia*.

The remaining three chapters take up the world of seventeenth-century alchemy, the time of "alchemy's Indian summer" (165). Young not only demonstrates Moriaen's personal involvement with alchemical/chemical experiments and work but also attempts to uncover the underlying assumptions, goals and philosophy of alchemy. Young analyzes the history of the term alchemist to show that at this time (first half of the seventeenth century) there was no true distinction between alchemist and chemist, although there were most certainly attacks on alchemists as frauds and cheats by literary figures such as Chaucer, Sebastian Franck, and Ben Johnson. Alchemists such as George Starkey and Johann Rudolph Glauber defended themselves against such charges by distinguishing between the alchemical charlatans and the followers of true alchemy. Moriaen had an



easy rule of thumb to judge who was an alchemical fraud. If you charged money for your “secrets” you were a fraud, for if you were a true alchemist who had discovered the secret of transmuting base metals into gold you would have no need of money. Just such a charge was leveled against Glauber, with whose misleading, if not fraudulent claims, concerning his chemical discoveries Moriaen finally became disenchanted.

In this section of the book, Young continues to argue for the connection between the quest for *pansophia* and alchemy by asserting that both were related to the Judaic creation “myth.” The alchemists wished to return “Creation itself to its original status as blank page, when the earth was without form, and void.” Just as the Comenian reformers would mold the minds of the uncorrupted young, the “alchemists would rewrite creation in better accord with the original divine intention” (174). While the religious, at times mystical, foundation of much of early modern alchemy is a constant refrain in Young’s book, others have begun to question this assertion: e.g., Lawrence Principe at the Renaissance Society of America annual meeting in Chicago in 2001.

In conclusion, we can say that Young’s book as all the advantages and some of the disadvantages of being based on his dissertation. It is very well researched in terms of the pertinent primary sources, manuscripts (especially the Hartlib papers), and printed works. It is also well grounded in all of the pertinent secondary literature; Young quotes and discusses both types of literature throughout the work. Unfortunately, Young seems to have felt constrained not to directly tackle some of the leading authorities in this area. Only in his very brief conclusion does he even attempt this. There he disagrees with Charles Webster’s assertion of an essentially Puritan connection between Hartlib’s endeavors and the rise of modern science, seeing the figures in the Hartlib circle as involved in an anti-denominational endeavor (at least within the Protestant world). He also briefly surveys Hugh Trevor-Roper’s assertion that there was no “philosophy” associated with the Puritan revolutionaries in

England and, considering their lackluster support for Hartlib and his associates, he finds merit in this. Finally, he disputes Richard Popkin's association of the Hartlib circle with a "third force" in seventeenth-century thought, neither rational nor empiricist, but combining elements of both, along with theosophy and biblical interpretation. Young argues that such a classification would have made no sense to Hartlib, Comenius and the others.

This work is a learned, valuable study of the world of early modern philosophy, education and, alchemy and I do recommend it.

John Hajdu Heyer, ed. *Lully Studies*. Foreword by James R. Anthony. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000. xx + 311 pp. Includes b & w illustrations, tables, and musical examples. \$64.95. Review by BRYAN N.S. GOOCH, UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA.

*Lully Studies*, a collection of eleven essays, edited by John Hajdu Heyer, is a welcome contribution to the growing body of research concerning Jean-Baptiste Lully (1632-1687), son of a Florentine miller, who after moving from Italy to France rose to become the dominator of French opera in Paris during the reign of Louis XIV, the premier exponent of baroque style in France, a major figure in the musical politics of his day, and a profound influence on his contemporaries and successors. It is a mark of Lully's centrality that his works were performed not only within but beyond France, often with lasting results on the composition of foreign composers—Henry Purcell, for example, is no exception. One simply cannot study late seventeenth-century music without bumping into Lully. Yet, as James R. Anthony notes in his Foreword, the Italian-born French master is now more honoured in study than in performance. What is particularly surprising about Lully's situation is that it carries on despite the wave of interest, particularly in the last few decades, in ba-

roque music in performance. Anthony's comments about the lack of performing editions—a new *Oeuvres complètes* is finally under way—offer a practical explanation, though one may still find some curiosity in the fact that more has not been done before now: as he notes, Henry Prunières' *Oeuvres complètes*, after nearly seven decades, despite its title, is incomplete. Anthony also offers a brief review of Lully scholarship, provides remarks on the essays in the current volume, and proffers a prescription for further research.

The essays, which follow a short Preface by Heyer containing observations complementing those of Anthony as well as a list of acknowledgements, deal with a wide variety of subjects, from matters biographical and stylistic to reaction and theatre design. The first, by Jérôme de la Grace, throws some remarkable new light on Lully's family and his early life, and is supplemented by a family tree and, as appendices, two Tuscan documents (a notarised deed of 1640 and the first will of the composer's father, Lorenzo [1655]). Lully's attempt to gild his somewhat humble origins is one issue here; others involve Lorenzo's increasing prominence and his son's prolonged time away from home and neglect of his Italian family, which could well explain his absence as a beneficiary in Lorenzo's second will of 1666. This essay, readable and thoroughly documented, reflects first-rate research and nicely declares the standard of the other pieces in the volume. It is followed by Patricia Ranum's elegant and detailed review of the issues leading up to and surrounding Lully's appointment as the court's *surintendant* of music in 1661, his attainment of the opera privilege in 1672 and his struggles with Charpentier and the Orléans faction, and his handling of—and challenges and limitations to—his artistic authority. The rise to power was one effort; maintenance of it was another, as Ranum clearly outlines.

Stylistic concerns are at the centre of the next three essays. Barbara Harris-Warwick's contribution, on phrase structure in the dance music, is generously illustrated with musical illustrations and provides clear evidence that in the thirteen

*tragédies en musique* written between 1673 and 1683, each containing, on average, fifteen dances (excluding *preludes* and *ritournelles*), only about twenty-five percent of the dances are marked by regular (or balanced) phrases (e.g., four measures followed by four more). Indeed, she argues, irregularity is the norm in the musical structure though not, as she describes in detail, the choreography and visual effect, the dance-designs clearly accommodating the apparent imbalance in the music. The potential effect of text and dramatic issues are also considered, and dances labeled *Air* and *Entrée* receive particular attention in the final part of the essay. Buford Norman's article on Philippe Quinault's libretto for *Isis* (1677) follows, pointing out the uniqueness of the work in view of current norms (the unity residing in the idea of freedom rather than in, say, a story of love or central action [see 62]) and the importance and nature of dances and *divertissements*. Norman offers a clear analysis of the plot and outlines some antecedents. *Isis*, musically and, obviously, visually stunning, just did not fit into the regular *tragédie lyrique* pattern and failed, as an entire work, to win the same measure of revivals as other works, though, as Norman points out, its music—some parts in particular—continued to be much admired. Lois Roscow in "The articulation of Lully's dramatic dialogue" concentrates on the overall structure of Lully's musical dialogue scenes, noting the ways in which he enhances points in the text and the degree of fluidity between declamation and aria, between through-composed and contained ("closed" [73]) sections. The discussion centres first on a detailed discussion of *Armide* (1686), Vi, providing considerable insight into the text (by Quinault), marked by *vers libres*, and the supporting melodic and harmonic structure of the music: Lully clearly aligns words and music as he works with an eye to overall dramatic effect. *Alceste* (1674), II. ii, also provokes enlightening comments, as does *Atys* (1676), II. ii, and Rosow also remarks on eighteenth-century score markings which reveal performance practice. The provision of musical examples and of the text of Vi of *Armide* is of particular assistance.

Carl B. Schmidt's "The Amsterdam editions of Lully's music: a bibliographical scrutiny with commentary" provides a well-placed change of emphasis. With so much detail about Lully's genius and his reputation in France before the mind, given the preceding papers, the reader is well-positioned to consider his stature, reflected here in publication beyond France. Noting the emergence of Amsterdam as a centre for music publication and artistic activity, particularly in the latter part of the seventeenth-century, Schmidt reviews existing scholarship concerning Lully's work and influence (including performance in cities outside France—London could have been mentioned as well) and then goes on to offer comments on the nature of Dutch interest in Lully's music which gave rise to the publication of *livrets* and of many of the compositions, before turning to a review of the relevant work of individual publishers, including Jean Philip Heus (excerpts from *Cadmus et Hermine* [1673], Lully's first real opera in 1682), Antoine Pointel (with substantial list of Lully's works), Pieter and Joan Blaeu (brothers), Amédée Le Chevalier, Estienne Roger, Pierre Mortier, and Michel Charles Le Cène. By 1720 there were some sixty Dutch editions. Along the way Schmidt discusses, for instance, printing processes (moveable type/engraving), details of editions, and the Mortier-Roger conflict. This careful work, as Schmidt suggests, makes possible further research, modern facsimiles, and so on. Appended to the text of the article is a splendidly detailed bibliography of editions, set out by printer, in chronological order, with locations of copies specified. This essay is—on its own—a major piece of fine, thorough scholarship.

The seventh piece, John S. Powell's "Pourquoi toujours des bergers?" Molière, Lully, and the pastoral *divertissement*" describes the role of the pastoral, including its conventions, as a source of comedy, and discusses, for instance *Le Sicilien, ou l'Amour peintre* (1667), a *comédie-ballet* containing a pastoral, *La Princesse d'Elide* (1664), with comic pastoral inserted (in *intermèdes*) in heroic drama, and *Les Amants magnifiques* (1670), with musical/dance *divertissements* (again in *intermèdes*). George

*Dindin* (1668) and *Psyche* (1671) also receive extensive comment, as does Lully's work with Quinault after the parting with Molière in 1672 (see 194 ff.). Indeed, as Powell so clearly outlines, the *divertissements* are not simply separable sections tipped into larger works for contrast or relief of tension but are integral to their enveloping musical and/or textual drama.

The next essay, by Catherine Cessac, concerns Sébastien de Brossard's presentation of *Alceste* at the Strasbourg Académie de Musique—probably in the mid-1690s (not later than 1698). She outlines Brossard's career: bibliophile, composer, and theorist, he was evidently a strong admirer of Lully—by virtue of his own admission and his copies and arrangements. She then goes on to provide, briefly, details of the emergence of *Alceste* in 1674 and Brossard's association with the Strasbourg Académie before turning to his arrangement of *Alceste*, a comparison between the Lully and Brossard scores (a full outline of Brossard's version is provided in Table 8.1), including comments on form, orchestration, allocation of solos, and the chorus. Once more, musical examples are ample and helpful. As Cessac notes in her conclusion, such treatment of Lully's work made it available for another audience, outside Paris, at least two decades after its première and, as an effort in itself, constitutes evidence of the continuing regard Lully's compositions would continue to sustain in many quarters.

What about the original venue (in Paris) for works like *Alceste*? That is precisely what Barbara Coeyman in the ninth paper, "Walking through Lully's opera theatre in the Palais Royal," seeks to explain. Granted his opera privilege in 1672, Lully in 1673 set about changing, with Carlo Vigarani (designer), the sometime court theatre into an opera house, for public diversion, offering *Alceste* as the opening work on 19 January 1674. The house survived until it burned down in 1763 (a bad year for the French, given the outcome of the Seven Years War). Coeyman gives the reader neatly arranged details of the location from its opening in 1641 as a theatre built for Cardinal Richelieu's Palais Cardinal through its modifications (installa-

tion of stage machinery) by Cardinal Mazarin in 1645 and further redevelopment by Molière in 1660 to Vigarani and Lully's rebuilding of 1673-74 (paid for by the King—see 221). Table 9.1 sets out Lully's premières and revivals in the house from 1674-1687. Architectural drawings by Vigarani (floor plan and site elevation, Plates 9.2 and 9.3) and other sources (including commentaries) offer a substantial basis for Coeyman's reconstruction which deals first with the exterior (see Plate 9.1—Israel Silvestre's front view, from an elevation, of the Palais Royal) and then with the interior, quite literally taking the reader on a guided tour of the building and providing details and relevant figures (measurements, etc.) along the way. The stage, with its flats, drops, machinery, etc., is given special attention, and further plates support the discussion. The result is that the reader gains a remarkable impression of the ambience of the place, the positioning of audience, orchestra, and cast (including singers and dancers), and the process and appearance of a production. A notable contribution to theatre history and to performance practice, Coeyman's essay is a happy blend of meticulous work and felicitous explanation.

The final two contributions take the reader—and Lully—into later centuries. Herbert Schneider's "Gluck and Lully" explores the relationship between the French baroque master and Gluck, the great operatic reformer of the eighteenth century, particularly in terms of the latter's Paris operas. There is, of course, a range of views on this subject, but Schneider is clear in his assertion that in Gluck is to be found, in the Paris period (1774-1779), the blending of Italian opera (*not* the reformation of it) with the traditions of the French *tragédie lyrique*, despite the gnashing of Piccinian teeth. Clearly, Gluck wanted a clear shift which would be sustainable (see 246-47), and the ground was apparently suitable for movement away from the *tragédie lyrique* after the *Querelle des Bouffons*, especially in the light of comments by the Abbé François Arnaud and Baron Grimm (see 247-48). Schneider records other views of the time and clearly establishes Gluck's position, especially regarding the

avoidance of dance parody and the integration of the chorus into the drama (253). Further, he stresses the blending of text, music, painting, architecture, and dance—it was the whole, as Alexander Pope would remark in another context (*Essay on Criticism*) that must impress. Schneider also gives particular attention to declamation and recitative, again citing critical views of, for instance, Claude-Joseph Dorat and François Arnaud, and arguing, with Patricia Howard, for Gluck's fluidity in moving from air to recitative to dance or chorus and in his balancing of drama and music (see 264). He then turns to Gluck's *Arnide* (1777) as a "paradigm" (264 ff.). With libretto by Quinault and Lullian echoes (especially in *da capo* structures—see 265-66), this work is the subject of some detailed comments which are followed by, for instance, a review of assessments of Gluck by Jacques Martine, Franz Liszt, and Hector Berlioz and of the Lully-Gluck relationship by Reynaldo Hahn. Had the chronological positions and careers of the two men—given their operatic sensitivities—been reversed, might one not have witnessed a similar result?

The final piece, by Manuel Couvreur—"Jean Ecorcheville's genealogical study of the Lully family and its influence on Marcel Proust"—explores not only the issue highlighted in its title but takes the reader into the rapidly shifting world of early twentieth-century French musicology where the reforming (and young radical) interest, stimulated by, for instance Romain Rolland and developments in German musical study, lay in the direction of old as well as new French music and also the international scene. In particular, Rolland wrote a dissertation on early opera (pre-Lully and Scarlatti), and among his protégées were two men, Ecorcheville and Henry Prunières, both concerned with seventeenth-century studies, the former writing on musical aesthetics from Lully to Rameau (1690-1730) (see 274). *Mercurie musicale* (founded 1905) offered a forum for fresh commentary about both early and new music, while in 1903 Proust contributed to *La Figaro* "Musique d'aujourd'hui, échos d'autrefois" (274-75). The new group gained ground, and by 1912 Ecorcheville was Presi-



dent of the Société internationale de musique, and the *Bulletin François de la S.I.M.* would last until 1914 (275). Couvreur notes the interest in Lully (for example, research by Prunières and Lionel de la Laurencie), including the hilarious spoof in April, 1912—the stunning news (with documentation to support the joke) in *Revue musicale* ... that Lully was really French; even Prunières joined the fun with the release of “original” Florentine evidence (see 278-79). The first decade had seen performances of some of Lully’s works, and Hahn echoed Lullian style, Couvreur notes, in the choruses for his *Esther* (1905) (279), a work which Proust liked and mentioned in both *Contre Sainte-Beuve* and *A la recherche du temps perdu*, though he used Lully’s name only once in *Un amour de Swann* (280). Jean de La Fontaine’s satiric attack on Lully in *Le Florentin* raised the spectre of Lully as a sodomite, while Rolland (noting Lully’s stinginess and pleasures in shows of wealth), Prunières, and La Laurencie focused on more serious characterisations, not neglecting Lully’s blemishes (281). That Proust would be interested in the social rise of this Florentine miller’s son is, Couvreur suggests, hardly surprising, and Proust’s curiosity many have been further piqued by Ecorcheville’s article on Lully’s descendants and his provision of a family tree. Couvreur goes on to discuss those descendants and the possible ways in which Proust may have been become acquainted with Lully-linked names, also suggesting explanations for Proust’s use of certain names prior to Ecorcheville’s release of his genealogy, noting the author’s dismissal of both Rolland and Prunières (283). What develops is essentially an exploration of Proust’s use of names of people and places; the discussion does not bear, really, on Lully and his work but on the surviving family lines—demonstrating, in a way, a particular kind of interest in Lully, of course, and, in Proust’s case in particular, in social mobility and the consequences of marriages affluent and above rank and otherwise. Couvreur does not assert a clear influence of the Ecorcheville genealogy on Proust but suggests that it is difficult to refute a connection with the issues raised in *A la recherche du temps perdu* (288). This

remarkably thoughtful essay—soundly researched—opens further doors for the inquisitive Lullian scholar and will be of central interest to Proust specialists as well. It is followed by a list of works cited in the volume and by an index.

Offering, then, major essays—all top-flight, superbly documented, and well-written—Heyer's *Lully Studies* stands not only as a superlative addition to existing work on the brilliant if sometimes despotic and always intriguing Caesar of the Palais Royal, but as an invitation to further research and to the encouragement, indeed, of performance of much more of Lully's enormously significant repertoire. It is admirable, certainly, to know about a great composer and to analyse the works, to study technique, style, and influence; ultimately, though, the music must be brought to life in church, opera house, or concert hall. If the genius is there, silence is unjustified.

## NEO-LATIN NEWS

**Vol. 50, Nos. 1 & 2. Jointly with SCN. Subscriptions: \$15.00 (\$20.00 international) for one year; \$28.00 (\$37.00) for two years; \$40.00 (\$52.00) for three years. Checks or money orders are payable to *Seventeenth-Century News*, 4227 TAMU, College Station, Texas 77843-4227. NLN is the official publication of the American Association for Neo-Latin Studies.**

Edited by Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University; Western European Editor: Gilbert Tournoy, Leuven; Eastern European Editors: Jerzy Axer, Barbara Milewska-Ważbińska, and Katarzyna Tomaszuk, Centre for Studies in the Classical Tradition in Poland and East-Central Europe, University of Warsaw. Founding Editors: James R. Naiden, Southern Oregon University, and J. Max Patrick, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee and Graduate School, New York University.

*The Latin Odes of Jean Dorat.* Trans. by David Slavitt. Washington: Orchises, 2000. 94 pp. \$20. David Slavitt is well known as a translator of the classics, especially of classical drama by Seneca, Aristophanes, Aeschylus, and Euripides, and as a poet and novelist. Given that classicists tend to ignore Latinity as late as that of the Renaissance, it is a pleasant surprise to discover that Slavitt has turned his attention to *The Latin Odes of Jean Dorat*, the verse of a French humanist, scholar, and poet. Dorat's relative obscurity outside of Neo-Latin studies (itself considered a very arcane field in the United States) is aggravated by the fact that little of his work has survived. While we have doubtless lost much of the poetry that he wrote, a great deal of his production probably consisted of lessons delivered orally as a teacher: after all, Dorat was the French royal reader in Greek and the preceptor of several of the French Pléiade poets. What does remain of Dorat's work lives

on mainly through these poets who mention him in their poetry and in the sparse liminary or circumstantial verse that Dorat wrote for his former pupil and important patrons.

Slavitt's translation of Dorat's Latin odes coincides with a renaissance of interest in this sixteenth-century humanist: the first international conference on Jean Dorat was recently held in Limoges, Dorat's birthplace, and Philip Ford has just published the precious notes taken by one of Dorat's students during his commentary on book ten of the *Odyssey* (reviewed by Jeff Persels in *NLN* 49.3-4 (2001), pp. 373-75). One would expect the purpose of a translation such as Slavitt's to be the widening of the audience for Neo-Latin poetry, and therein lies a problem: for whom is this book of translations intended? Although Slavitt notes that Dorat's poems are very contemporary and political, he provides only the barest of introductions, no more than an enumeration of the different members of the Valois monarchy; even worse, the poems themselves are not accompanied by any sort of explanatory notes. It is strange to see Slavitt acknowledge the important historical basis for Dorat's poetry, yet to declare (on what basis, one might ask?) that he represents an ideal alternative of politeness, elegance, charm, and learning in a barbaric age "much like our own," ignoring, apparently, that Dorat was steadfastly and cruelly on the side of the Catholics during the Religious Wars. Indeed, Dorat is notorious for having rejoiced after the death of the rhetorician Petrus Ramus during the Saint Bartholomew's Day massacre. The basic problem is that those who could derive benefit from reading a translation of poems by a Renaissance humanist without any scholarly apparatus are precisely those who would not need to pick up this book. Indeed, it seems unlikely that a general reader could identify Henri de Mesmes, to whom Dorat addresses a horoscope in the first Ode (he was a statesman and humanist whose godfather was the future Henry II), or Phillippe Hurault de Cheverny in Ode 35 (Duke of Orleans, chancellor of the future Henry III, who became *conseiller d'Etat*). Even worse, except for the fact that there are gaps in the numbering, the reader is not even made aware that Slavitt is presenting a selection of odes (the title

certainly makes no reference to this). One wonders why Slavitt has omitted odes that otherwise present considerable generic and thematic interest, such as Ode 7, on the death of Gelonis, the wife of the Neo-Latin poet Macrinus, himself famous for writing conjugal erotic poetry, or Ode 24, to Camille de Morel, the extraordinary gifted humanist daughter of Jean de Morel, a patron of the Pléiade poets.

Lastly, and most disappointing, the readers to whom this volume is presumably destined cannot rely on its translation for accuracy. Even a cursory comparison of Slavitt's English translation with Demerson's and the original Latin text reveals that Slavitt often takes severe, unjustified liberties with the original. A few lines from Henri de Mesmes's horoscope (Ode 1), for which Slavitt gives the original Latin, should suffice to demonstrate Slavitt's translating style. For example, one only has to read a few strophes before one encounters gratuitous embellishments, such as where the cries of the newborn child, evoked as *salutat / Aethereas lachrimosus angor* ("a teary cry greets the air"), are rendered as "those tears the child sheds in advance of the blows / it must receive from a life on earth." This theme is apparently dear to Slavitt, because immediately afterward, as the *vates* wonders whether he has erred in making this augury a mere reflection of his wishes, Slavitt interjects "Do I dare dream for my daughter a better fate than most of us face?" which is nowhere in the original text. Perhaps even more importantly, the whole entrance of the poet as the father and husband is delayed because of Slavitt's choices. The child's cry which reaches the poet's own ears and announces him a father (*vagitus aureis cum pepulit meas / Iam patris*) becomes clumsily a "cry announcing itself to a world that knows as any father does," while the triple appearance of that I along its self-affirmation as fatherly witness and as paterfamilias whose household is being increased (*aucta*) is simply not rendered with the necessary force (vv. 21-24). Slavitt's rendition is a start, but we need modern translations of Renaissance texts that offer better and more carefully conceived access than this. (Marc Bizer, University of Texas)

*Bibliografía sobre Luis Vives.* By Francisco Calero and Daniel Sala. Colección Serrano Morales. Valencia: Ajuntament de Valencia, 1999. 348 pp. This indispensable tool for scholars of Juan Luis Vives (1492-1540), the ethnically Jewish, Roman Catholic expatriate Spaniard, brings unannotated bibliography on this humanist to a new level. No predecessor, including Bonilla, Empaytaz, or Noreña, has remotely approximated so exhaustive a project as this feast of citations undertakes. The 2196 main entries, ranging back into the sixteenth century, are divided among thirty-four thematic sections, followed by a twenty-three-part breakdown of Vives's works. (Inexplicably, as far as I can tell, the standard eight-volume Valencia *Opera omnia* of 1782-90 is not listed, despite repeated citations of Gregorio Mayans y Siscar's *Vita Vivis* from that compilation.) An appendix of references to Vives in the Valencian press and an essential index of authors complete the book.

Many items make repeat appearances, as demanded by the thematic categories. Topics include Vives's psychology, anthropology, educational theory and practice, dialectic, ethics, juridical thought, ideas on war and peace, rhetoric, etc., and his relationship with four major contemporaries (Erasmus, Luther, More, and Ignatius of Loyola). The multi-part arrangement exposes at a glance instances of the sparse scholarly attention given to some of Vives's works. The *Commentary on Augustine's City of God* (Section XLI) draws only eleven entries apart from the work of Estellés González and Pérez i Durà, whose labor-intensive new edition is now in progress. The *De conscribendis epistolis*, finally given a critical edition in 1989, shows seven entries. The lengthy and important *De anima et vita* shows only thirteen. These numbers are striking even in view of Calero and Sala's decision not to count cases where a work of Vives's is treated as part of a larger scholarly study.

The impression of comprehensiveness strikes the reader immediately. I venture to assert that any scholar of Vives will discover useful things that he or she did not know exist. You find everything from unpublished works (## 110, 112, etc.) to large bibliographies or reference works in which Vives merely occurs

(e.g., Nicolás Antonio's eighteenth-century *Bibliotheca Hispana*, Palau y Dulcet's twenty-eight-volume *Manual del librero hispano-americano*, and the Toronto *Contemporaries of Erasmus*). The editors justifiably note that the line has to be drawn somewhere; thus they do not attempt to cover the political, pedagogical, and biographical background for Vives's time. Nor do they pretend to rival compilations of source editions like González, Albiñana, and Gutiérrez's magnificent *Vives: edicions princeps* of 1992, or even Adolfo Bonilla y San Martín's sketchier century-old chronological bibliography, which unlike the present work embraces translations categorically.

On the other hand, some caution is required in using the volume. Things are not always easy to find. Confusion will visit the reader who overlooks the editors' unobtrusive note (p. 21, n. 3) that when collections are cited by abbreviation, the complete bibliographical addresses for these abbreviations are to be found in thematic section II, 'Obras colectivas.' Charles Fantazzi's 1979 critical, annotated edition of the *In pseudodialecticos* is missing from Section XXXVIII (*Adversus pseudodialecticos*), where one would go first to look for it, but may be found in Section IV ('Edad media. Universidades. Filosofía medieval'). Inconsistently, Rita Guerlac's edition of the same work appears in both places. This is one of a number of instances where the book will be friendlier to the user familiar with Vives than to the scholar making acquaintance with this formidable humanist for the first time. Similarly there is not always a logical or necessary home for important translations. Thus Riber's commonly used Spanish-version *Obras completas* appears as entries #79 and #599, but can most reliably be found (as is the case with other items) by tracing backward from the entry 'Riber' in the Index. This means that someone would need to know of that edition in advance in order to be sure of finding it. The important 1610 English translation of the *City of God* commentary, still the only English version of that major work, is not cited.

The editors' ironclad and understandable determination to avoid comment sometimes works against the book's usefulness even on its own terms. The scope of many items far outstrips the study of Vives. While one appreciates being apprised that these

works deal with the humanist, they are cited without any indication at all of where or to what extent Vives is treated. Thus, for example, the value of entry #157 (complete citation: “Gassendi, Petrus: *Opera omnia in sex tomos divisa*. Florentiae: 1727”), or #175 (“*Historiae de rebus Hispaniae. Libri XXX* by Juan de Mariana, 1605”) is not readily apparent. Such instances are frequent. The style of citation sometimes masks the accurate title of a work (cf. ## 113, 132). Misprints occur, but none that I have found fatal to understanding. “Briesemeister” is misspelled; entry #70 is published by Edwin Mellen Press.

In sum, this bibliography is a groundbreaking new vehicle for which scholars will be grateful, and one which will benefit from further refinement when the time for an update arrives. Physically the book is elegant and soundly bound. Layout is lavish to a fault; a later edition could diminish the page space reserved for each entry with no loss in quality. The editors generously invite readers to communicate regarding errors and deficiencies. (Edward V. George, Texas Tech University)

*The Adages of Erasmus*. Selected by William Barker. Toronto, Buffalo, and London: University of Toronto Press, 2001. li + 405 pp. \$80 cloth, \$29.95 paper. *Friends Hold All Things in Common: Tradition, Intellectual Property, and the Adages of Erasmus*. By Kathy Eden. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2001. ix + 194 pp. \$35. Five hundred years after it was first published, Erasmus's *Adages* remains a remarkable book. In spite of an occasional slip, it reveals an astounding grasp of all extant classical literature on the part of one gifted, voracious reader. The *Adages* is a reference work, to be sure—one which has still not really been superseded—but it also preserves the distinctive voice of its author, becoming a work of literature as well. It remained a best seller for generations, partly because it was a good read in its own right, but partly because it proved an invaluable resource in an age when mastering Latin style was the ticket to professional success. First published in 1500, it was followed by major revisions in 1508 (the Aldine edition), 1515 (the Froben edition), and 1533, then by epito-



mes and expansions that adapted it to the needs of new readers through the eighteenth century, when European education began to turn away from the rhetorical approach to the classics that had dominated the schools since the Renaissance.

The proverb, defined by Erasmus as “a saying in popular use, remarkable for some shrewd and novel turn” (Barker, p. 5), was opened up in the *Adages* by being resituated within its ancient literary culture, thereby becoming a thought-provoking linguistic phenomenon that looked simultaneously back toward the past culture whose wisdom it encapsulated and forward into the new culture that was emerging in imitation of Greece and Rome. The unusual metaphorical force of the proverb offered both delight and instruction: *festivitas* to adorn the *genus familiare* favored by Erasmus and *auctoritas* to make an argument persuasive. Proverbs could also be transferred directly into commonplace books, where they were organized under headings like *temeritas* and *pietas*, at which point they stood ready to flesh out new writings in new contexts. Erasmus’s *Adages*, in other words, stood as a filter between antiquity and those who gazed back on it from an ever-increasing distance.

Barker’s anthology presents English translations of 119 of Erasmus’s 4151 proverbs, taken from the relevant volumes of the Collected Works of Erasmus. The selection focuses on widely circulated proverbs, especially those that are also found in English. All the famous adages are here—*amicorum communia omnia*, *festina lente*, *Herculei labores*, *dulce bellum inexpertis*, etc.—along with a generous selection of less famous, but no less interesting, ones, making this a good introduction to the *Adages* for those who wish to sample the riches of Erasmian *copia*. It is worth remembering, however, that when volumes 30, 35, and 36, with the last of the *Adages*, an index, and introductory matter, join volumes 31 to 34, which have already been published, the Collected Works of Erasmus will offer these same selections situated within the collection as a whole, making this volume a questionable purchase for major research libraries and for specialists whose needs go beyond introductory anthologies.

Eden's study of the *Adages* develops an elegant argument about the work and its significance that is so deceptively simple that its originality threatens to become obscured by the modesty with which it is presented. The *Adages* serve as a way to preserve and make accessible the classical tradition, but *tradio*, as Eden points out, is a term derived from Roman law, where it refers to the most regular means for transferring the ownership of property. The early Christians used the figures of the *spoliatio Aegyptorum* and the *mulier captiva* to appropriate the classical tradition as a hostile property transfer between enemies, but Erasmus reconfigures this relationship, substituting for the appropriated property of enemies the shared property of friends. In his opening adage, *amicorum communia omnia*, Erasmus bases this approach in Pythagoras, the originator of pagan communalism as well as of the saying itself, and Plato, Pythagoras's most persuasive disciple, both of whose teachings are in obvious agreement with those of Christ. Eden develops her argument through close readings of Erasmus's sources, showing how the famous proverbs initiating each group of a thousand (*chilias*) reinforce the relationships among friendship, property, and the literary tradition and structure the collection as a whole. Eden also suggests that the new technology of printing, which disseminates Erasmus's work as the common intellectual property of all who care about the classical past, also poses a threat to the free transferral of that property, for it was in Venice at the turn of the sixteenth century—where Aldus Manutius published the second major edition of the *Adages* in 1508—that laws regarding intellectual property began evolving toward the copyright system of today, which offers certain advantages to the author but impedes the free flow of ideas at the same time.

This last point begins to emerge at the end of Eden's book, but it is not developed as thoroughly as it should have been. Erasmus certainly held to the ideals expressed in *amicorum communia omnia*, but he also had a keen awareness of scholarly publishing as a source of income that he fully intended to exploit. In *festina lente*, he notes that his publisher and collaborator Aldus "has acquired as much gold as he has reputation, and richly deserves both" (Barker,

p. 149). And he expected no less for himself. The *editio princeps* begins with a dedication to Lord Mountjoy and ends with a poem on the virtue of the English king Henry VII and a letter to the young prince Henry, thus placing it emphatically within the network of English patronage. And as Jean Hoyoux showed more than fifty years ago (“Les moyens d’existence d’Erasmus,” *Bibliothèque d’Humanisme et Renaissance* 5 (1944): 42-43), both of these strategies were designed to maximize the profits that were potentially available through the new technology. In other words, as Lisa Jardine has explained at length (*Erasmus, Man of Letters* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993)), Erasmus quickly mastered the ways in which he could use the new army of printers, editors, and proof readers to promote himself and advance his career. This Erasmus exists in uneasy tension alongside the Erasmus of older scholarship, the great master of the disinterested pursuit of knowledge. Eden’s balance tilts rather more toward the latter than I would have liked, but *Friends Hold All Things in Common* remains an important book that will help us appreciate the complexities of the adages collected and translated in Barker’s anthology. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

*Controversies: Hyperaspistes 2*. Ed. by Charles Trinkaus, trans. by Clarence H. Miller, and annotated by Clarence H. Miller and Charles Trinkaus. *The Collected Works of Erasmus*, 77. Toronto, Buffalo, and London: The University of Toronto Press, 2000. xiv + pp. 333-812. \$125. Book 2 of *Hyperaspistes* (1527) is the fullest expression of Erasmus’s disagreement with Luther and is closely linked to the works translated in CWE 76: Article 36 of Luther’s *Assertio omnium articulorum per bullam Leonis X novissimam damnatorum / An Assertion of All the Articles of Martin Luther Which Were Quite Recently Condemned by a Bull of Leo X, Article 36*, which stimulated *De libero arbitrio diatribe sive collatio / A Discussion of Free Will* (1524), which in turn stimulated Luther’s *The Enslaved Will* (not in CWE), to which *Hyperaspistes liber unus / A Warrior Shielding a Discussion of Free Will against The Enslaved Will by Martin Luther, Book One* (1526), then *Hyperaspistes liber secundus*, respond.

The section of *Hyperaspistes* in this volume is twice the length of Book 1, but is nevertheless difficult if not impossible to understand without the material in the preceding volume.

Book 2 of *Hyperaspistes* sets out Erasmus's earlier argument, Luther's response in *The Enslaved Will*, and Erasmus's further response, developed at great length here. The mass of detail, coupled with the complexity of multiple, intertwined arguments, can make for difficult reading, but for those with the patience to unravel it all, the depth and range of Erasmus's theological vision come into focus. Erasmus attributes almost everything in justification to grace, with a minimum concession to free will, and models his position on Augustine in a deliberate effort to appropriate to his own position the churchman whom Luther most admired. He therefore attempted to draw together the grace that acts on a person and the person willing through assent, delineating a place for both divine and human participation in the conversion of a soul and drawing together Augustine's insistence on the omnipotence of God with the late scholastic argument that God grants a person a role in his or her own salvation. Erasmus's position rests on his own particular way of reading Scripture, which "should be interpreted according to the character of those who are being addressed," since "Scripture sometimes addresses one group, sometimes the other" (1536E), and which allowed for reconciliation by opening a way to see the other side of an argument. Within ten years, however, Erasmus was dead, followed ten years later by Luther; by then the religious wars were beginning, and Erasmus, the great advocate of concord and civil discourse, was condemned by both sides and is remembered for his failure to achieve the reconciliation he sought.

Though published separately, volumes 76 and 77 comprise an integral unit, as evidenced by the continuous pagination that links them together. The reader who wants to straighten out the nuances of grace and free will in the works of the two greatest theologians of the Renaissance thus has gracious plenty to work with here. Regular readers of this journal will be aware that CWE has become the standard English translation of Erasmus's works,

and given the importance of the material contained here, anyone with any real interest in the subject will have to turn to this translation. As always, the quality of the scholarship is high, as is the price, but in the end the former justifies the latter. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

*Giovanni della Casa's Poem Book, Joannis Casae carminum liber, Florence 1564.* Ed., trans., and commentary by John Van Sickle. Tempe, Arizona: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1999. xi + 156 pp. \$20. Like his fourteenth-century countryman Petrarch, Giovanni della Casa (1503-1556) is better known for his Italian sonnets than for his Latin verse. A Florentine by birth, della Casa was an important member of the humanist circle in Rome in the first half of the sixteenth century, and his Latin verse, published, like his Italian verse, posthumously, charts his involvement with that circle. John Van Sickle has edited, translated, and commented on the poems that make up the posthumous volume—the *Carminum liber*—published in Florence in 1564. Van Sickle's introduction considers not only the literary aspects of della Casa's Latin poetry but also traces how the poetry reflects his association with important figures of the Cinquecento world (Pope Paul II and his grandsons Alessandro and Ottavio Farnese, the Venetian Bishop Gian Matteo Giberti, Cardinal Reginald Pole) as well as his fellow humanist poets (Marc Antonio Flaminio, Pietro Bembo, Francesco Maria Molza, Lodovico Becadelli, Francesco Berni), along with friends and relatives in Florence like Pier Vettori and Carlo Gualteruzzi, who eventually saw his poetry into print. Van Sickle has made use of the contemporary letters of della Casa to friends and associates along with their letters to him, as well as letters which concern della Casa's activities, a selection of which he prints in Appendix II in Italian (without translations). Most of these letters concern, he indicates, literary activity involving the *Carminum liber*.

Van Sickle reprints and translates only the poetry of the *editio princeps* of 1564. Other Latin poetry attributed to della Casa, such as that reprinted in Toscano's *Carmina illustrium poetarum Italorum* (Paris, 1576), in Gherus's *Delitiae CC. Italorum poetarum*

(Frankfurt, 1612), and in the two eighteenth-century collections of Latin verse by Italian poets, printed in Florence and Bergamo, in 1719 and 1753 respectively—*Carmina illustrium Itatorum* and *Carmina quinque illustrium poetarum*—he neither directly mentions nor discusses. Yet surely he must know of the existence of these reprints, since they include all the poetry of the 1564 volume as well as additional poems.

Hence there are only sixteen poems in this collection; the final three short poems, moreover, are often printed as one. Horace is the primary literary influence, though echoes of Catullus, Propertius, Callimachus, and Euripides can be found. Poem nr. 4 in fact is adapted from Hippolytus' denunciation of women, Latinized virtually word for word. However, della Casa can most often be found, like Horace, giving advice to his friends, deploring the vulgarity of the mob, inveighing against Fortuna, castigating ambition, advising retreat from the city, and praising those who also serve the Muses. The collection is essentially a set of familiar poems to friends and patrons, written in meters that range from elegiacs (which, as Van Sickle notes, Horace never used) to the favorite Horatian meters—hexameters, As-clepiads, Alcaics—and even an excursion into Catullan hendecasyllables. The book served della Casa as much for experiments in Latin meters as for addresses to associates. In true Neo-Latin style, it is marked as much for improvisation on classical themes as for imitation of Latin and Greek poets. Van Sickle's translations are serviceable and as rewarding to readers who can enjoy the facing Latin as to those who must come to della Casa only in translation. His commentary and notes, together with his introduction, are helpful in placing that poetry in the context of the poetics and politics of the Renaissance in Italy. (Stella P. Revard, Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville)

*Een netwerk aan de basis van de Leidse universiteit: Het album amicorum van Janus Douza.* Ed., trans., and commentary by Chris L. Heesakkers. 2 vols. Leiden: Universiteitsbibliotheek Leiden / Uitgeverij Jongbloed, 2000. 143 ff, [xiv] + 558 pp. Distributed through the Leiden University Library. The volumes under re-

view here present a remarkable manuscript, Leiden Universiteitsbibliotheek BPL 1406, the 'friendship album' of Janus Dousa (1545-1604). Trustee, then librarian of the newly founded University of Leiden, diplomat and man of letters, Dousa stood at the center of literary and political life in late sixteenth-century Holland. Beginning in his student days and continuing through his active involvement with the university, Dousa kept an *album amicorum*, in which he invited his friends to write something of interest to him. Given Dousa's prominence as a writer, educator, and statesman, this album clearly merits the time and attention that have been lavished on it here.

Preparing such an album appears to have become fashionable just a short time before in Germany, so that Dousa's in fact is one of the earliest of the versions prepared by Dutch students. He did not abandon the project until the press of serious, non-university business at the end of his life forced him to, so that from 1563 to 1597, 135 of his contemporaries from all over Europe commemorated their friendship with him in texts of various length, usually in Latin and sometimes illustrated with their family coats of arms. The album looks today very much as it did in the sixteenth century, making the decision to publish a facsimile a sensible one.

Even a cursory examination of the album reveals its fundamentally literary character. The inscriptions return over and over again to Dousa's *candor* and *eruditio*, and to his abilities as a poet. He published several books of Latin verse, a historical study of the Netherlands, and commentaries on Sallust, Horace, Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius, Petronius, and Plautus, so it would stand to reason that he would seek out contact with those of like interests. Thus poets and scholars appear again and again in the pages of the album, and since Dousa moved in high circles, the key figures—Lucas Fruterius, Gulielmus Altarius, Daniel Rogers, Hadrianus Junius, Victor Giselinus, Justus Lipsius, Jan van Hout, Bonaventura Vulcanius, Paulus Melissus, Janus Gruterus, and Joseph Justus Scaliger—were well known in his day and, in many cases, still are now.

What is worth dwelling on here, I believe, is the potential that works like this offer for the study of Neo-Latin literature. Dousa's literary abilities seem to have inspired his friends, who honored him in the most appropriate way they could: with poems. This makes the album, as Heesakkers notes, "a paradigm of Latin—and in small measure also of Dutch—literary activity at the young Dutch university" (p. 43). Thus we find in this album, as in others, original poetry that is well worth studying in and of itself, along with the concrete evidence about who knew whom that literary history should rest on. To be sure, this evidence is not easy to use, for when an album remains unpublished, one has to struggle through not just one sixteenth century hand, but dozens. In this case Heesakkers has presented the manuscript for us to appreciate in facsimile, but also done an enormous amount of work in transcribing this material, providing a translation into Dutch, and clarifying the relationship between each writer and Dousa. This album, and others like it, clearly merit further study, and the editor and his university are to be commended for making this material accessible to today's community of Neo-Latin scholars. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

*Giordano Bruno 1548-1600: mostra storico documentaria*, Roma, Biblioteca Casanatense, 7 giugno-30 settembre 2000. Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 2000. cxliv + 234 pp., 12 color plates. Lit. 75,000. To honor the four-hundredth anniversary of the death of Giordano Bruno, the Comitato Scientifico e Organizzativo arranged for an exhibition of materials relating to his life and times at the Biblioteca Casanatense in Rome. Given that Bruno was not just a philosopher in the strictest sense, but a thinker whose ideas and actions have maintained a certain notoriety among the educated public, the goal of the exhibition was to use primary sources—archival documents, first editions of Bruno's works, contemporary illustrations of the places in which he lived, and so forth—to produce a full, scientifically accurate picture of the man and the ideas from which he constructed his world. Judging from the catalogue that accompanied the exhibition, the organizers succeeded splendidly.



The catalogue begins with an introduction that contains a basic narrative of Bruno's life and works, an iconographical survey that includes twenty-three pictures of Bruno, a selection of documents recording the major events of his life, a section on the surviving manuscripts of his works, a bibliography of secondary works cited in the catalogue, and a chronology of key dates. The catalogue proper is organized chronologically, in nineteen sections whose titles give an idea of their respective emphases: 'Da Nola a Napoli,' 'La prima formazione filosofica di Bruno: aristotelismo e platonismo,' 'I "maestri",' 'La scintilla dell'*Ars memoriae* e dell'*Ars lulliana*,' 'Bruno nel convento di San Domenico Maggiore,' 'Per una riforma morale e religiosa: scelta di testi in volgare,' 'I trattati d'amore e alcuni autori prediletti di Bruno,' 'Il "cavaliere errante" dalla fuga da Roma all'espatrio,' 'Nella cittadella di Calvino,' 'L'insegnamento a Tolosa e il giudizio su Francisco Sanchez,' 'Nella Parigi di Enrico III,' 'L'esperienza inglese,' 'Il secondo soggiorno parigino,' 'L'arrivo in Germania,' 'Da Praga a Francoforte,' 'Il rientro in Italia,' 'La fase veneta del processo,' 'La fase romana del processo,' and 'Inquisizione e indice: la proibizione delle opere di Bruno.' The book concludes with a general bibliography.

This exhibition and the catalogue that accompanies it exemplify the best work of this kind in the Italian scholarly community of today. Months of labor have clearly gone into researching and selecting the items to be displayed, arranging for their collection in Rome, and preparing a permanent record of what is known about this material at the time of the exhibition. The result is a research tool that will serve as a point of reference for the next generation of Bruno scholarship, presented in a form that is both easy to use and elegant—the twelve color plates are accompanied by a generous selection of black-and-white illustrations, and as is always the case with Olschki books, type face and page layout combine in a presentation that meets the highest publishing standards. If you have any serious interest in Bruno at all, you will want to have this catalogue readily to hand. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

*Die lateinische Poetik des Marco Girolamo Vida und ihre Rezeption bei Julius Caesar Scaliger.* By Susanne Rolfes. Beiträge zur Altertumskunde, 149. Munich and Leipzig: K. G. Saur, 2001. 304 pp. 88 EUR. This study begins from the observation that in spite of its initial success, Marco Girolamo Vida's *De arte poetica* (1527) was overshadowed by the *Poetices libri septem* of Julius Caesar Scaliger (1561), which is widely viewed as the first complete and systematic Renaissance poetics, a precursor of modern literary history and the most important foundation of classical aesthetics. Rolfes' project is to revisit this apparently simple relationship and to restore to Vida's treatise the praise she feels it deserves.

A cursory reading of Vida's poetics shows that it was designed to help a practicing poet make a perfect epic, using Virgil's *Aeneid* as a model. Rolfes argues, however, that we should not overemphasize the pedagogical intent of the work. Instead, favorite themes like the Prometheus myth, the music of the spheres, and the Muses guide the reader toward "eine 'epische Kulturgeschichte'" which helps explain the rise and fall of great cultures. Divine inspiration and literary imitation are certainly treated, but again, the discussion goes from literature per se to its social and political ramifications—that is, Vida believed in the power of language, but he also believed in the reciprocal relationship between epic poetry and cultural and political power. Italy was being threatened from within by squabbling city states and from without by the Turks; Vida's solution was to promote the writing of a good epic poem, which would unite his countrymen politically at the same time as it raised the literary culture upon which Italy's strength depended.

Scaliger positioned himself in Vida's footsteps, intending not only to go beyond what he had done, but to move in a different direction: he retained Vida's interest in literary development, but not in its social or political corollaries. Thus themes like inspiration and imitation, along with the theory of epic and the traditional comparison between Homer and Virgil, are treated in Scaliger's poetics, but as elements of an objective, properly literary history. Thus Scaliger indeed expanded and in some ways excelled Vida, but in other ways they remained different enough to defy

comparison. Consequently Vida's poetics should be appreciated on its own terms, as a document that is worth reading for its critical, aesthetic, and intellectual dimensions and for what it can tell us about the values of the age in which it was written. Like many lightly revised German dissertations, Rolfes' study retains a good deal of historical and biographical background which does not really advance the argument, and it occasionally suffers from a somewhat pedantic, overly thorough presentation, such that in the end one wonders (at least in passing) if the whole business would not have been better as an article than a book. But unlike some dissertations, this one rests on a good idea and comes to an interesting, clearly stated conclusion which strikes me as right on the money. The direction Scaliger took, of course, is the direction that literary studies, particularly among classicists, continued to follow until very recently, and it is perhaps ironic that a dissertation which remains virtually untouched by the literary theory of our day pleads for the appreciation of a poetics that recognizes the very interconnection between literature and politics that drives so much contemporary theory. In other words, the book is certainly worth reading, both on its own terms and for what it might suggest in other areas as well. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

*Mars et les Muses dans L'Apologie pour Hérodote d'Henri Estienne.* By Bénédicte Boudou. Geneva: Droz, 2000. 684 pp. CHF 145.40, EUR 97.41. The *Apologie pour Hérodote* is one of the most fascinating works of the French Renaissance. Published in 1566, it follows the shorter, Latin *Apologia pro Herodoto*, which Henri II Estienne wrote as an introductory essay to his 1566 edition of Lorenzo Valla's Latin translation of Herodotus's *History*. The chief interest of the *Apologie* lies in its outstanding literary value in many areas. It is a great collection of stories, close in ribaldry and satirical spirit to Rabelais or Boccaccio; it is also a critique of the Roman Catholic Church and so belongs to the history of ideas and religious apologetics. And it is a masterpiece of French prose. As its

title proclaims, it is a defense of Herodotus and of the Greek historian's claims to veracity, and so a fitting witness to the revival of Greek letters in Europe.

Had Henri Estienne simply produced a translation of his Latin text, the interpretation of the *Apologia* would be far more straightforward. Instead, the French *Apologie* has a polemical and critical thrust that goes well beyond the purpose of defending Herodotus. Is, then, the *Apologie* a satire? No, says the author of this lengthy study: that is a reductionist reading, although the work is certainly satirical. Is the *Apologie* a work of religious apologetics? Again, no: "La richesse, la profondeur et la diversité des réflexions d'Henri Estienne dans *L'Apologie pour Hérodote* attestent que son livre est bien autre chose qu'un brûlot protestant" (p. 503). But just what is this "autre chose"?

Boudou seeks to provide answers to this question in her lengthy study. Her documentation is extensive, her scholarship wide ranging. At the same time, her book reveals a lack of focus even as it creates, through its close, attentive readings, an interest in Henri Estienne, that most prolific and individual of authors. A bonus of this study is that it provides, as an appendix, the complete text of the Latin *Apologia pro Herodoto*, with a French translation *en regard*. Boudou is concerned, however, with the French *Apologie* almost exclusively.

The title of her book calls attention to two characteristics of Henri Estienne's work: a polemical, or martial, one and a more literary one delighting in words and poetry. Boudou's main thesis is that the *Apologie pour Hérodote* is best analyzed as two forms of discourse—the polemical and the literary—of which "Mars" and the "Muses" are metonymies. She takes this dichotomy from Henri Estienne's own works, in which he seeks to demonstrate that literature ought not be foreign to those whose duty is the protection of France: Henri Estienne "aspire à voir Mars, dégoûté de combattre, se réconcilier avec les Muses" (p. 17). Chagrined that the polemical aspects of the *Apologie* have overshadowed the more literary aspect, Boudou seeks to restore the balance and analyze the poetical, playful, literary aspects of the work.

The critical essay is divided into three parts: ‘Histoire de l’Apologie pour Hérodote,’ ‘Mars dans l’Apologie pour Hérodote,’ and ‘L’Apologie pour Hérodote sous le signe des Muses.’ The first part, in two chapters, studies Henri Estienne’s background and the “genesis” of the *Apologie*; the second part, also in two chapters, focuses on “Mars”, i.e., on a discussion of “argumentation” and “satire”; under the third part, “Muses”, we find three chapters on, respectively, the role and meaning of the numerous “histoires,” on the importance of “critique”—giving to this word the meaning that it has in Jean Jehasse’s *La Renaissance de la critique*—, then on the *Apologie* as a “method” for the reading of history.

My chief concern lies in the usefulness of this Mars-Muse antithesis. One often finds discussions of polemical technique not under “Mars,” but under “Muses,” and vice versa. Take comedy, for example: is comedy polemical? Yes: in chapter 4 we find a section and sub-section on “le rire satirique.” But comedy is also playful and literary, as we find in reading the analysis of the “contes pour rire” in chapter 5, which is placed “sous le signe des Muses.” And can comedy somehow be both? The answer is yes, as we find in reading part 4.3 of this same chapter 5. Likewise: why separate the presumably “martial” rhetoric of exempla studied in III.3.3 from the “musing” exemplum studied in V.4.2? That Henri Estienne’s writing can be defined as having essentially a “martial” and a “musing” spirit is certainly true. But the reader of this study may begin to wonder: just how useful is this dichotomy Mars / Muses as an analytical distinction? Does this division do justice to the nature of the *Apologie*?

Similar questions can be raised in regard to the author’s introduction of other themes into her analysis. Eager, and justifiably so, to claim for the *Apologie* a more ambitious character than that of mere satire or polemic, she claims that the *Apologie* is a “recherche de la vérité,” an “enquête,” a “critique,” “une véritable réflexion sur la manière de lire et d’écrire l’histoire,” etc. These terms show that the author is seeking to underscore the intellectual depth and originality of the *Apologie*. Yet how and why are “recherche,” “enquête,” etc. related to Mars or the Muses? The

author does succeed in demonstrating this depth and originality, but it is through a method that the author herself qualifies as “pédestre.” The book is in fact a series of close readings of various argumentative and literary techniques in the *Apologie*, along with useful discussions of important influences, such as Sextus Empiricus, and various intellectual relationships, such as Estienne’s with Calvin. In these aspects of her work, the author succeeds quite well. She alerts the reader on the first page that her study is going to follow the text closely. With such an approach, most readers, I believe, will have no quarrel: a pedestrian, modest approach is one that can do much to bring an author home to the reader. And it is within these close readings of the text that the book ultimately succeeds in its basic aim. Again and again, in close, careful readings, the author analyzes the essential aspects of style and argument in the *Apologie*. We arrive at a great appreciation for Henri Estienne’s literary abilities, his individuality as a writer even as he embraces religious apologetic. Yet the overall thesis seems to dissolve and disappear when we get to this level of close reading. The why and how of moving from topic to topic was not always apparent to this reader as he read the three parts, seven chapters, twenty-six sub-parts, and sixty-four sub-sub-parts.

More discussion of some basic points might have given this study more focus. What, for example, is the “real” title of Henri Estienne’s work? The original title is *Introduction au Traité de la conformité des merveilles anciennes avec les modernes ou Traité préparatif à l’Apologie pour Hérodote*. In her introduction, Boudou shows great interest in this original title and criticizes those editions which fail to respect it: she chides the 1735 editor of the *Apologie* for “relegating the original title to a sub-title” (p. 11). She criticizes Paul Ristelhuber, the editor who gave the first complete text of the French *Apologie*, for calling Henri Estienne’s work *Apologie pour Hérodote* and for committing the further sin of putting in the sub-title *Satire du XVI siècle*. But if this original title is so important, then why was it discussed so briefly in *Mars et les Muses*? And why does the author almost always use the word *Apologie* to refer to the French text? To focus on the original title, to discuss its

complexities and implications—it is a real conundrum—would allow for more analysis of an essential feature of the *Apologie*, namely Henri Estienne’s concern with belief and truth, and this in turn might have allowed for clearer connections between the various analyses of Estienne’s rhetoric, or for more complete justification of her often repeated statements that the *Apologie* is a “recherche de la vérité,” “enquête,” “méthode,” “une réflexion épistémologique,” etc.

Still regarding the title: Boudou states that it is with the 1735 edition that “Pour la première fois, le livre prend le titre d’Apologie pour Hérodote” (p. 11, n. 26). How then does this square with Ristelhuber’s claim that Estienne adopted the ordinary title *Apologie pour Hérodote* “dans le cours de l’impression,” in other words, in 1566 (*Apologie pour Hérodote* (Geneva: Slatkine, 1970), 1: xlv)? Moreover, I feel that our author is a bit unfair to Ristelhuber. Yes, it is true that he does not mention the original title of Henri Estienne’s work “dès la première page” (p. 12), but he does provide the complete original title twice: once, after his *Note de l’éditeur*; the second time, before Henri Estienne’s *Préface de la première partie*.

More discussion of some of her major claims would also have given this study more focus. For example, the author makes at the end of her study the very interesting remark that Henri Estienne adopts a “démarche mimétique” (p. 504) in his *Apologie*, that he is imitating Herodotus’s own example. Why not have made more of this relationship? The Greek word *historia* means, literally, “enquête,” and throughout her study, Boudou uses a French translation of Herodotus’s *History* that translates the title of his work literally: *Enquête*. Since she wishes to demonstrate that the *Apologie* is a “recherche de la vérité,” “enquête,” etc., why wait until the end to point out this “démarche mimétique” (on p. 351, she raises in a single sentence the possibility of “mimétisme”)? Likewise, if the “apport majeur d’Estienne à la réflexion sur l’histoire” is to emphasize the “distance qui sépare les historiens anciens du XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle,” then how does that square with Henri Estienne’s desire to demonstrate “conformité” between “merveilles”?

In a study of this length, errors will of course slip through. On p. 364, the Latin quotation reads *Si non caste, tam caute*, it should read *tamen caute*. The following sentence, as it appears in the text, is misleading: “Dès 1561, il écrit ainsi, à l'exemple de Xénophon, un *Discours sur le Devoir de joindre Mars aux Muses*” (p. 17): Xenophon never wrote such a treatise. In fact, although there is a footnote to Jean Jehasse, *op. cit.*, p. 134, the author seems to be quoting Jean Jehasse, *op. cit.*, p. 97, who is referring to Estienne's edition of Xenophon. On p. 53, in discussing some references that Henri Estienne makes to Petrarch, she refers to the poet's Italian sonnets; one should include too Petrarch's Latin polemic *Sine nomine*, which Henri Estienne appears to be quoting directly.

Given the length of this work, the reader might have welcomed an index that listed those pages where the author analyzes so well Estienne's rhetorical and argumentative techniques—*hyperbole, métaphore, enthymème, synecdoque*, etc. (although I remain a bit puzzled by the definition given to the enthymeme). Likewise, a complete and precise bibliographical listing of the French editions of the *Apologie*—none are listed in the bibliography—would have been of no small help to the reader in tracing more easily the evolution of the title from its original form to the current *Apologie pour Hérodote*.

This study appends the Latin text of the *Apologia pro Herodoto* and a French translation. Boudou also includes the prefatory letter to Camerarius and a letter to the reader, and so provides a more complete text than does the previous edition of the *Apologia*, by Johannes Kramer (Meisenheim am Glan: Verlag Anton Hain, 1980, with a German translation). However, she omits two Latin epigrams by Henri Estienne that appear after the title page and before the letter to Camerarius. (I am grateful to the Division of Rare and Special Collections of Cornell University for sending me photocopies of portions of the Latin text.) There are errors in the Latin and Greek which need to be corrected. On p. 514, we read *Mars et les Muses tuum apaibaion munusculum*, but Henri Estienne printed *tuum amoibaion munusculum*. On p. 516, we read *ego tamen numquam ad subeundum castigationis onus magis imperatus fuissem*, but



the original text as printed reads *magis imparatus fuissem*. On p. 520, we read *quaedam tua poëmatia*, translated as “ces poèmes de toi.” I believe however that Estienne printed *quaedam tua ponêmátia*, the diminutive of “works.” *Sed quid plura?* The responsibility for providing a complete list of *errata* and *corrigenda* lies with those who chose to edit and publish this valuable text.

Discrete mention is made that “une réédition de *l'Apologie pour Hérodote* [est] en préparation” (p. 21, n. 1). We are not told by whom, but I assume that it will be done by the author. It would be most useful for scholars if this new edition of the French *Apologie* included the Latin *Apologia*, with the translation of the latter. Readers would then be able to read for themselves these two fascinating texts and compare them more easily. (Why the Latin *Apologia* should be appended to *Mars et les Muses* is left unclear.)

The author has a real sympathy for Henri Estienne and illuminates the individuality of his style and thought. She has demonstrated that this masterpiece of French prose repays close study. Her command of scholarship is impressive: she is well poised to produce further studies on Renaissance literature, and in this study she has established a good basis for her future work. Many pages of Boudou's study will be referred to by specialists of the Renaissance, and her work will certainly create further interest in this writer. Saint-Exupéry wrote that to encourage men to build ships, you need to give them the love of the sea: Boudou has certainly succeeded in creating an affection for Henri II Estienne, and her work will encourage further studies of his vast output. (John A. Gallucci, Colgate University)

*Disputatio nova contra mulieres / A New Argument against Women*. Ed., trans., and commentary by Clive Hart. Mellen Critical Editions and Translations, 1. Lewiston, Queenston, Lampeter: Edwin Mellen Press, 1998. \$89.95. It is always encouraging to see a press launch a series of critical editions and translations with the avowed intent of making significant but neglected texts available. The Edwin Mellen Press is therefore to be congratulated on its decision to start such a series and, given present scholarly interest

in Renaissance texts about women, is to be praised for starting with the *Disputatio nova contra mulieres*, of 1595, edited and translated for the first time into English by Clive Hart. However, that said, the press might give some thought to the format they have presumably chosen for the series. In this first volume, it leaves much to be desired.

The work is divided into six chapters. The first presents a rather spotty survey of the 'querelle des femmes' from the Middle Ages to the nineteenth century, the second a history of the publication and reception of the *Disputatio nova*. Hart takes as his starting point the full paradoxical title of the work, *Disputatio nova contra mulieres, qua probatur eas homines non esse*, translated as "A new argument against women, in which it is demonstrated that they are not human beings," and in this first chapter addresses the long-debated question of whether women have souls. Starting with Aristotle, he skips rather erratically over a series of little-known texts by some unfamiliar authors, mentioning in passing "the development of neoplatonism in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries" and Lodovico Domenichi's 1549 *La nobiltà delle donne* (without an accent). He stops to discuss a 1566 play by Lewis Wager, whom he familiarly calls "Lewis," and goes on to mention a Nashe pamphlet, a Donne "Problem," Marston's *The Dutch Courtesan*, Shakespeare's *Macbeth*, one of Samuel Butler's "Miscellaneous Thoughts," and a series of rather obscure writings ending with a French work of 1834 today largely forgotten. The choice is nothing if not eclectic. The section ends by mentioning "the energetic refutations of Gedik, Sister Arcangela, and others." Although this is his first reference to these people, we are told nothing about them, even in a footnote, until pages 28 and 32, respectively. Chapter 2 opens with a discussion of the disputed authorship of the *Disputatio nova* and a description of the work. It is an anonymous small tract of fifty-one paragraphs whose tone swings from solemn to facetious but whose thesis is resolutely anti-feminist: women are not human. The work, Hart says, is most notably characterized by "intentional and skilful misuse of sources." The chapter ends with a discussion of works connected in various ways to the

*Disputatio nova*, from Simon Gedik's refutation, published several months after the *Disputatio nova* in 1595, to adaptations and translations, and even works that Hart claims *seem* to refer to it (the italics are mine), like Ben Jonson's *Masque of beautie* and, more surprisingly, Dostoyevsky's *Crime and Punishment*.

There now follow the English translation of the Latin text (Chapter 3), what is called a "commentary, with identification of allusions and sources" (Chapter 4), a translation of a French anonymous essay of 1744 entitled *Essai sur l'ame des femmes* (Chapter 5), and then, finally, the Latin text with bibliographical introduction and textual notes (Chapter 6). The inappropriateness and sheer clumsiness of this format beggar belief. Firstly, in an edition of this nature, especially a "critical edition" as this claims to be, the original is the 'authoritative' text and should be placed first, or in a format with facing-page translations, on the left. Here it is placed last. Secondly, the annotations (what Hart calls "commentary") often pertain to expressions and allusions occurring in the Latin text. The reader is therefore obliged to keep the book open at three separate places: the translation, the annotations, and the original. Thirdly, and worst of all to my mind, the translation and its original are separated by a nine-and-a-half-page English translation of an anonymous essay entitled *Essai sur l'ame des femmes*, which Anne Gabriel Meusnier de Querlan appended to his 1744 French translation of the *Disputatio nova*. Although the essay begins by mentioning the *Disputatio nova* and quotes once briefly from it, its author says it is not a response to the earlier treatise. One might add that it has no particular merit of its own. Its relevance in this volume therefore has to be questioned. Rather than giving us the *Essai*, Hart should have provided a Latin text and an English translation (or even just a translation) of Simon Gedik's response, *Defensio sexus mulieribus*, a far more interesting and influential text, reprinted very many times both with the *Disputatio nova* and as an independent tract. It was still being quoted in the eighteenth century, as witness the *Essai*, and is the subject of many of Hart's annotations.

More can be said about the unfortunate format of Hart's book. No line numbers are given for either translations or the Latin text. Words or expressions commented on are in italics and within a single bracket in the annotations but are sometimes difficult to find in the text and translation given the absence of line numbers. No numbers or asterisks are used in the Latin text or translation to refer to the textual notes and annotations. The reader is therefore unaware—unless keeping a thumb in the annotations chapter—of which words or passages have elicited Hart's comments. Finally, as a result of the format, facts are often repeated. For example, comments on textual points in Chapter 4 reappear in the textual notes in Chapter 6.

There remains the question of Hart's editorial and translation skills, about which one can fortunately be more positive. His text of the Latin original is based on both manuscripts and printed editions, and he gives most substantive variants in his notes, although he considers the variants in the 1595 "reset" text, not entirely correctly, I think, not substantive enough to warrant inclusion. The text is carefully and cautiously edited, and the textual notes are accurate. The annotations, or "commentary," are pertinent and useful. The translation of both the Latin text and the French *Essai* is, Hart says, "literal." This makes for overall semantic accuracy, although neither rendering is completely free of minor mistranslations. It also makes for occasional awkward phrases. On the whole, however, Hart's translation renders the style of the *Disputatio* faithfully, changing neither tone nor register.

In conclusion, Edwin Mellen Press and Clive Hart have done scholars interested in the history of the 'querelle des femmes' a service by providing the text and translation of a treatise that has been rather neglected up to now. It is a pity that they decided to give us the *Essai sur l'ame des femmes* instead of the more important *Defensio sexus mulieribus*, still awaiting a modern edition and a translation. It is an even greater pity that they chose such an awkward format. It is to be hoped that they will improve on this in their future volumes. (Brenda Hosington, Université de Montréal)

*The Oxford Francis Bacon XIII: The Instauration magna: Last Writings.* Ed. and trans. by Graham Rees. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000. xcvi + 363 pp. \$135. The traditional story of Francis Bacon's death is that he wanted to find out whether stuffing a dead chicken with snow would preserve it, and that the chill he caught when gathering snow for this experiment killed him. This sounds apocryphal, but it is certainly *ben trovato*. Since around 1607, Bacon had been working intermittently on the enormous, unfinishable *Instauration magna*, a project which called not only for grand philosophical engagement with questions about life, the universe, and everything, but also for the accumulation of a very great many experimental data. Seven of the last writings which he meant for the *Instauration* are gathered here in a new edition and translation by Graham Rees: two versions of the *Historia densi et rari*, which is in effect a discussion of the way in which matter is distributed in the universe; the *Abecearium nouum naturae*, which outlines eighty areas of inquiry into the physical world; the *Historia et inquisitio de animato et inanimato*, the *Inquisitio de magnete*, and the *Topica inquisitionis de luce et lumine*, all of which appear to be sketches for a part of the *Instauration* in which Bacon would show how specific inquiries might be conducted; and the *Prodromi siue anticipationes philosophiae secundae*, which was written as an introduction to the penultimate part of the great work. These texts show a recurring interest in the processes at either end of human and animal life, vivification and putrefaction: their author would have been just the man to jump out of his coach on one of the last snowy days of winter and try an experiment in keeping flesh from decay.

The volume in which these texts are collected is part of the Oxford Francis Bacon, *OFB*, a brainchild of Graham Rees and Lisa Jardine. This project will publish all of Bacon's original writings in fifteen volumes, of which this is the fourth to appear: the Latin *Philosophical Studies ca. 1611-ca. 1619* came out in 1996 (reviewed by Lee Piepho in *Neo-Latin News* 45.1-2 (1997), pp. 32-33), and was followed in 2000 by two volumes in English, the *Advancement of Learning* and the *Essayes*, the latter being a reissue of an edition first published in 1985. Four volumes of Bacon's

correspondence are also to be published, under the general editorship of Alan Stewart. Since the edition of Spedding, Ellis, and Heath (1857-61), *SEH*, has served readers of Bacon so well, it is reasonable to ask whether a new edition is worth undertaking—and, indeed, whether it is worth paying for at an average price of \$135 per volume. Answering this pair of questions makes it possible to see some of the distinctive virtues of *OFB* as a whole, and of this volume in particular.

First, the Bacon canon has changed. Of the seven texts presented in this volume, three are new: an early version of the *Historia densi et rari*, the *Abececlarium* (which had previously been known from a fragment of an earlier version than the one presented here), and the *Historia et inquisitio de animato et inanimato*. These are all printed from a manuscript compiled by Pierre Dupuy, for whom they were copied from originals given to or stolen by a member of the Dupuy circle, Philippe Fortin de la Hoguette. These new texts are matched by a number of others elsewhere in *OFB*, and the edition of the correspondence will add more than 200 letters to the 700 printed by Spedding in the *Letters and Life* (1861-1874) which complemented *SEH*. These discoveries thus make new material available; for instance, seeing how Bacon reworked the Dupuy manuscript text of the *Historia densi et rari* is very instructive. Second, the texts presented in *SEH* were not edited to acceptable modern standards. Rees remarks with restraint that the textual notes to the earlier edition of the *Topica inquisitionis de luce et lumine* “show Victorian editorial practices in an interesting if melancholy light” (p. lxxxiii), and even when the *SEH* text is not seriously defective, its treatment of important matters such as capitalization contrasts sharply with the meticulous fidelity of *OFB*. Third, *SEH*'s translations from Latin are not only written in rather laborious prose, but treat technical terms anachronistically (cf., e.g., Rees's “Loadstone is not dissolved in aqua regia” and *SEH*'s “A magnet is not dissolved in nitro-muriatic acid” for *Magnes non solvitur in Aqua Regis*), and are sometimes very misleading (cf. Rees's “put into a crucible, yet not heated to the point where it gives off flame” and *SEH*'s “put into a crucible, yet without any flame” for *in*

*Crucibulo positus, citra tamen quam ut flammam immittat*). Text and translation are on facing pages in *OFB* and, inconveniently, in different volumes in *SEH*. Fourth, *OFB* is furnished with excellent introductions, which are equally attentive to intellectual content and context and to textual history, and with endnotes which are richly learned and often most attractively written: see, for instance, the discussion of *motus pilorum ex cauda equina* at pages 328-29. *SEH*'s editorial matter is, of course, obsolete. Neo-Latinists will be undismayed to find that some material, for instance the important distinction between *lux* and *lumen* (pp. 333-34), is explained in the *OFB* endnotes solely by quoting Latin discussions of the subject which are not translated. Fifth, *SEH* broke the works of Bacon up thematically and relegated the occasional works to the *Letters and Life*, whereas *OFB* treats the whole corpus together and (except that works from the *Instauratio* are presented in a single sequence) chronologically. Taken together, these five areas of improvement transform the experience of reading Bacon.

In conclusion, this volume is not only a superb piece of work in itself, but also part of a project of the highest importance for all Neo-Latinists and for all historians of early modern thought or of early modern England, one which is being carried out to the highest imaginable standards. (John Considine, University of Alberta)

*La France des humanistes: Hellénistes I.* By Jean-François Maillard, Judith Kecskeméti, Catherine Magnien, and Monique Portalier. Europa Humanistica. Turnhout: Brepols, 1999. LII + 598 pp. 450 FF, 65 EUR. This book, in the form of a dictionary, inventory of editions, and transcription of prefatory material, focuses on a group of French humanists whose books contain the prefaces which illuminate the two great preoccupations of Renaissance scholarship: the return to sources and the transmission of texts. Printing turned out to be the most effective means of preserving and transmitting the texts of antiquity, and the material reprinted here presents a step-by-step record of that work, from the discovery of manuscripts to the printing practices that favored the birth of

modern principles of philology and textual criticism. At the heart of this story is Guillaume Budé, whose work with the Collège des lecteurs royaux inspired the other humanists treated here: Germain de Brie, Pierre Danès, Jacques Louis de'Estrebay, Agostino Giustiniani, Gentien Herve, Jean Mercier, Jacques Merlin, Philippe Montanus, Joachim Périon, Guillaume Petit, and Godefroy Tilmann. For them, classical Greek was the key that unlocked the parallels between secular and patristic, then between Greek and Latin culture, which provided in turn models for the renewal of the vernacular. After the invention of printing, the enthusiasm for pursuing manuscripts was matched by the determination to get the text into print, to recreate the original and to make it available as widely as possible. The focus here on the role of printing, in turn, nuances the traditional version of this story. The roles of those who underwrote the costs of publication, who merited the label *humanissimi* often applied to them, and of the young students for whom the books were written, the *iuvenes* and *studiosi* who appear on the title pages of the day, come to center stage, as do those of the correctors, who found themselves curiously situated between the worlds of the artisan and the scholar. The relationship between printer and scholar in turn emerges in all its many complexities: each needed the other; but the latter often found himself simultaneously praising the former for the work of cultural dissemination and excoriating him for inadvertently corrupting the text in an effort to cut costs and accelerate production.

Each of the dozen entries stands in effect as a monograph, consisting of a brief biography and a bibliography of basic reference works, followed by a list of the authors which each humanist worked on, a chronological inventory of editions with extracts from prefatory materials, and an indication of further works that remain unpublished. In addition to an index of classical authors and a general index, there are two other indices that are especially useful: one of the authors and recipients of the dedications and prefaces whose works are reprinted here, and the other of the printers and booksellers who disseminated this material. This allows the reader to use the book in two ways, either by tracing the ap-



pearance and disappearance of various individuals through the work of one scholar, or by tracing the impact of a patron across the work of many scholars and editors.

Since Latin was the international language of scholarship in the Renaissance, the documents reprinted here function as the primary sources in a key period of the history of classical scholarship. They further our understanding of the classical authors whose works they accompany, but as letters they also stand on their own as literary texts. The editors of this volume have invested a good deal of time in collecting this material, but the result is well worth the effort: not only have they made easily accessible a corpus whose *membra disiecta* are scattered throughout the libraries of Europe, but they have also provided the primary sources with which the old story of textual recovery and transmission can be retold in terms of the emerging discipline of book history. This collection, in short, belongs on the shelf of every serious student of Neo-Latin literature and the history of classical scholarship. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

Florence Vuilleumier Laurens. *La Raison des figures symboliques à la Renaissance et à l'Âge Classique: études sur les fondements philosophiques, théologiques et rhétoriques de l'image*. Travaux d'Humanisme et Renaissance, 340. Geneva: Droz, 2000. 538 pp. 145.40 CHF, 97.41 EUR. This weighty volume represents the slightly modified Sorbonne doctoral thesis defended by VL in 1996, in which the author studies the theoretical bases of the association of word and image from the fifteenth through the seventeenth centuries, with particular focus on the hermeneutic procedure called into play by the "mysteriously meant." It is a dense and intensely learned work which general readers might find somewhat daunting, but which specialists will find well worth their time. It more than justifies its author's claim to chart "les phases du long débat entre iconophilie et iconoclastic," with particular focus on the shift from medieval allegory to humanistic symbolism. VL tracks the all-important emergence of metaphorical discourse as a rhetoric granting ever more legitimacy to readerly interpretation as a counterweight to

authorial intention. If Horace was right to assert *ut pictura poesis*, then VL shows that, in the material she is concerned with, there might well be a case to argue that *ut pictura omnia scripta*. She succeeds fully in her intention to present the portrait of “un XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle se découvrant . . . comme un grand ‘Âge symbolique,’ le dernier peut-être, puisque condamné bientôt à se dissoudre sous le soleil des Lumières” (p. 14).

The book consists of some 300 plus pages of critical analysis, divided into four sections; some forty pages of bibliography; and over 150 pages of transcribed Latin treatises on the properties and functions of symbolic images and the hermeneutic they engage. This organization, reinforced as it is by the extensive bibliography and a ten-page Index Nominum, makes of the volume an important “instrument de travail,” although one that lends itself more to consultation by readers with specific inquiries in mind than by neophytes in the field. As a whole, it tends to wear its doctoral robes a trifle ostentatiously—between one-third and one-half of many of its pages are made up of dense footnote text, for example—but there can be no doubt that VL has established a thorough and ground-breaking catalogue of the important treatises in the field, and her constant recourse to primary sources, always discussed both analytically and in their historical context, makes of her book an invaluable reference tool.

Part One, ‘Le retour de Pythagore,’ charts the humanist rehabilitation of Pythagorean notions of form and harmony through the writings of Alberti and Ficino. Fruitful attention is then paid to the way in which such texts as the *Pythagorae fragmenta* of 1603 (indeed, the whole tradition of *praecepta mystica* and symbolic discourse) were scrutinized in the seventeenth century under the mutual tensions of philology and philosophy. Part Two, ‘Le nouveau monde symbolique,’ relates such inquiries to the Erasmian and post-Erasmian world, in which Christian wisdom becomes anchored in ‘classical’ adages, and the linkages of Stoic precepts and Senecan style engage a thinker like Vives in sustained reflection on the nature of figurative thinking and writing. Part Three, ‘Les enfants de Denys,’ then traces the influence of Denis the

Areopagite throughout the field of “symbolic theology.” VL’s inquiries into the notion that Christian truth possibly lends itself more readily to figurative representation than to explicit verbal declaration prove to be especially engaging here: see for example her study of the Dutch Jesuit Maximilian van der Sandt, who undertook to explicate both the profane and the sacred *arcana* of antiquity as a “delectable form of learning” (*amoena erudita*) for the benefit not only of the literary writers, but also of the “Christian philologists” of his day (p. 189). Part Four, ‘La rhétorique des formes symboliques,’ then develops the “veil or mirror?” formulation of the hermeneutic challenge posed by enigmatic writing, with detailed explication of works by Jacob Masen, Emanuele Tesauro, and Claude-François Ménéstrier. Consideration of the latter’s desire “de pénétrer dans la philosophie des et d’en rechercher les principes” (p. 297) leads to a far-reaching conclusion: in post-Cartesian France, where the canons of style assert “that which is not clear is not French” (a dictum school children are taught to this day!), enigmatic and symbolic writings fall from favor. On the brink of the Enlightenment, “la clareté française” arrests the hegemony of the symbolic until such time as it is reinstated in philosophy by eighteenth-century German reflection on the sublime, and thereby in literature by Romanticism.

VL invokes more than once the work of one of her mentors, Marc Fumaroli, and in particular his 1994 study, *L’École du silence: le sentiment des images au XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle*. Her volume, in its synthesis of the theoretical relationships between verbal and visual rhetoric (between *logos* and *symbolon*), constitutes an impressive development of Fumaroli’s essential studies of the late Renaissance’s understanding of the artistic process (*poiesis*). Her explorations in the fields of emblematica, the mystical, and the cabbalistic further the work of scholars such as Frances Yates and D. P. Walker. Erudite and replete with documentation, this volume is a major contribution to our notions of taste and sensibility, as well as of the nature of hermeneutic, during one of the most formative periods of our intellectual and artistic history. (Kenneth Lloyd-Jones, Trinity College, Hartford)

Giovanni Boccaccio. *Famous Women*. Ed. and trans. by Virginia Brown. I Tatti Renaissance Library, 1. xxvi + 530 pp. Marsilio Ficino. *Platonic Theology*, vol. 1: Books 1-4. Trans. by Michael J. B. Allen, with John Warden; Latin text ed. by James Hankins, with William Bowen. I Tatti Renaissance Library, 2. xxviii + 342 pp. Leonardo Bruni. *History of the Florentine People*, vol. 1: Books 1-4. Ed. and trans. by James Hankins. I Tatti Renaissance Library, 3. xxiv + 520 pp. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2001. \$29.95 per volume, cloth. The three volumes under review here launch a new series, the I Tatti Renaissance Library, which is designed to make available to a broad readership the major Latin texts of the Italian Renaissance along with an English translation. Given the nature of the series, some words about the project in general are in order before we turn to the three books that are currently available in it.

The I Tatti Renaissance Library was conceived as a sort of extension of the Loeb Classical Library, acknowledging that Latin remained a vibrant literary and intellectual force after antiquity and providing an outlet for the publication of key texts from a time when the language and values of the classical world got a new lease on life. That is, the series presents itself at the level of *haute vulgarisation*, not rarified scholarship, and it deserves to be evaluated in these terms. Each volume contains a "reliable Latin text," as the series publicity puts it, and that is indeed a fair assessment. There are no claims that these are critical editions based on extensive philological work with a full *apparatus criticus*, but each volume contains 'Notes to the Text' that often reflect considerable effort: in the Ficino volume, for example, Hankins began with the only modern edition, that of Marcel, but recollated the major independent witnesses, and in his Bruni volume the working text he presents takes an important initial step toward eventually producing a critical edition that recognizes the various stages through which the work went as Bruni revised it. An English translation, reasonably close to the Latin but clearly pitched toward readability, appears on facing pages. Each volume also contains a short

introduction by the editor, brief notes to the translation (often dominated by, but certainly not restricted to, identification of sources), a brief bibliography, and an index of names and places. The first three volumes suggest that the series can indeed be used as its originators intended, as reliable texts for the educated general reader, for advanced undergraduate and graduate courses, and for the growing number of scholars who need access to this material but who are not professional Latinists by training.

The general editor, James Hankins, has introduced the project with three volumes that show clearly the potential scope and appeal of the series. Virginia Brown's edition of *De mulieribus claris* is the first English translation based on the autograph text, and brings to a much wider audience than Zaccaria's 1967 Latin text the first biographical collection devoted exclusively to women. The 106 figures described here, almost exclusively from the classical world, were renowned for the great deeds they performed, whether good or bad, and reflect the conviction of humanists like Boccaccio that women as well as men required models of virtue and eloquence to move effectively through the world. Ficino's *Theologia Platonica* is the most important product of the Renaissance revival of Plato, part of an effort to synthesize Platonism with Christianity that would exercise wide influence on the art, thought, and culture of the period. It is translated into English for the first time in this series, as is Bruni's *Historiarum Florentini populi libri*. This latter book is generally considered the first modern work of history, an account of Florence's attempts to maintain her liberty against foreign powers and to expand her rule over the surrounding areas of Tuscany. These three works influenced later authors ranging from Chaucer to Spenser, and suggest that major works of biography, history, and philosophy of broad general interest can indeed be extracted from the thousands of Neo-Latin works written in the Renaissance.

Each of these volumes is done to consistently high standards, clearly and accurately printed in a readable format at an attractive price. The intention is to issue two or three volumes a year, and this is a goal that any Neo-Latinist cannot help but ap-

plaud. One wonders whether all the ‘hype’ that has accompanied the launch of the series is really necessary—publicity claims that this is “the only series that makes available to a broad readership the major literary, historical, philosophical, and scientific works of the Italian Renaissance written in Latin” are hardly accurate, as any regular reader of this journal knows—but if that’s what got the entire first printing (of several thousand copies) of the first two volumes sold out in a matter of months, perhaps in an increasingly Latinless age, the end justifies the means. In any event, I congratulate the authors, the series editor, and the press for their success, and I look forward to seeing the next installment in the project. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

• **The Milton Society of America**

Approximately seventy-one members and guests attended the annual dinner and meeting of the Milton Society of America on December 28, 2001, at the Royal Sonesta Hotel, 300 Bourbon St., New Orleans. Achsah Guibbory of the University of Illinois, Urbana, presided. The following members were elected to offices: Annabel Patterson as President (2002), John Leonard as Vice President (2002), and Elizabeth Skerpan-Wheeler and Paul Stevens for three-year membership (2002-2004) on the Executive Committee.

The principal address, "Milton's Nationalism and the Rights of Memory" was given by Paul Stevens, Professor and Head of the Department of English, Queen's University, Canada. The James Holly Hanford Awards recognized the excellence of the following book and essay:

Barbara K. Lewalski, *The Life of John Milton* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell Publishers, 2000)

John Leonard, "Milton, Lucretius, and the 'void profound of unessential Night,'" *Living Texts: Interpreting Milton*, eds. Kristin A. Pruitt and Charles W. Durham (Selinsgrove, PA: Susquehanna University Press, 2000), pp. 198-217.

The Irene Samuel Memorial Award recognized the excellence of the following multiauthor collection of essays:

*Milton Studies* 39, ed. Albert C. Labriola (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2000).

Roy C. Flannagan, Emeritus Professor of English at Ohio University and Scholar-in-Residence at the University of South Carolina, Beaufort, was cited as Honored Scholar of the society by Edward Jones of Oklahoma State University.

Labriola announced the two open meetings of the society at MLA '02 in New York City. The first, with Annabel Patterson presiding, is "Milton for the New Millennium"; the second, with Diana Treviño Benet presiding, is "Why Milton Matters."

At the executive session after the dinner and general business meeting, Labriola and Benet were reappointed Secretary and Treasurer, respectively. Benet will select a suitable site for the dinner and meeting on December 28, 2002, in New York City. Annabel Patterson was nominated for induction as Honored Scholar of the society in 2002.

Albert C. Labriola, Secretary  
The Milton Society of America

#### • **The 2003 Gerald Kahan Scholar's Prize in Theatre Research**

The American Society for Theatre Research offers an annual prize of \$500.00 for the best essay written in English on any subject in theatre research, broadly construed. The author must be untenured and within seven years of the awarding of the doctoral degree—or be a student—at the time the essay is published. The Kahan Prize is presented at the ASTR annual meeting, at which time the editor's contribution to scholarship is also acknowledged.

To be eligible, an essay must have been published in a refereed journal or anthology dated 2002. Previous winners are ineligible. Essays may be nominated by members of ASTR, by editors (one essay per issue), by the authors themselves (one entry only), or by other persons on their behalf. In the case of editorial submissions, the Committee will verify the author's eligibility, requiring only that editors include the author's current address in the submission. In the case of other submissions, please include a



brief statement of the author's credentials in conformance with the award's eligibility requirements, as well as the author's current address.

Those wishing to nominate essays should send four copies of each entry, together with particulars of publications and information concerning the author's eligibility, by 15 March 2003 to:

Professor Carol Fisher Sorgenfrei  
Department of Theatre  
102 E. Melnitz Hall  
UCLA Box 951622  
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1622

