offers the observation that the dual volume of 1671, containing both *Paradise Regained* and *Samson Agonistes*, provides a “double-edged response to the crisis of the Restoration” (247). *Paradise Regained* represents the millenarian perspective, while *Samson Agonistes* is apocalyptic; the two works are complementary rather than contradictory.

Cummins is correct when she argues in her introduction for the current relevance of this volume. She cites the “human concern with endings” as well as the continuing search for “structures of meaning” (7). Unmentioned is the rise of apocalyptic and millenarian political movements around the globe today. The contributors show how understanding visions of the ends of time enhances our appreciation of Milton and his times. The best essays also provide the historical and theological knowledge essential to comprehension of our own. For both purposes, the collection makes a persuasive case for the value of seventeenth-century scholarship.


Laura Lunger Knoppers and Joan B. Landes have assembled a fascinating interdisciplinary anthology of essays about interactions between the concept of monstrosity and ideas of the body politic in early modern Europe. Using eight essays by well-regarded scholars, the book pairs essays according to related themes. Covering texts from Germany, Austria, Holland, France, Spain, and England, the book also contains the editors’ introduction, an afterword by Andrew Curran, nearly fifty pages of endnotes, short bios of contributors, and an index. The collection features a wide range of relevant illustrations, such as woodcuts of grossly deformed “monstrous births,” photographs of early modern preserved anatomical specimens, and politically charged prints from the French Revolution of guillotined heads and of cannibals. Essays vary in approach, with some focused on particular texts and others
offering a broader discussion of one angle on politics and monstrosity. Despite some problems discussed below, overall the collection is thought provoking, well researched, and creative, likely to inspire more fine interdisciplinary work.

After a helpful introduction that summarizes the articles and recent scholarship, the book opens with Part 1, “Monstrous Races, Boundaries, and Nationhood,” the focus of paired essays by Peter Burke and David Cressy. Burke’s essay, “Frontiers of the Monstrous: Perceiving National Characters in Early Modern Europe,” examines the intersection of beliefs about “monstrous races” and stereotypes of national character. Burke gives examples of ways in which one European nation used the idea of the monstrous or the bestial to characterize other European nationalities. Cressy’s compelling piece, “Lamentable, Strange, and Wonderful: Headless Monsters in the English Revolution,” focuses on two English pamphlets from the 1640s, each an account of a woman bearing a headless child. Both pamphlets claim the mother rebelliously caused her child’s deformity. Since one pamphlet blames the mother for resisting the Church of England, and the other condemns the mother for resisting the Puritans, Cressy concludes that both pamphlets fed the appetite for Civil War propaganda. He adds, “Both stories drew attention to the problem of controlling unruly women at a time when patriarchal discipline, like other forms of authority, seemed to be crumbling” (54). This excellent essay contains a clear argument and a powerful conclusion.

The second pair of essays develops the theme, “Apocalypticism, Bestiality, and Monstrous Polemics.” R. Po-Chia Hsia’s article, “A Time for Monsters: Monstrous Births, Propaganda, and the German Reformation,” explores difficulties in interpreting the political and religious significance of monstrous births. He begins with a 1495 German broadsheet about stillborn twins joined at the head, a sign that the German author interpreted as meaning, “God wants to bestow/ Unity to our Empire” (69). Hsia then explores nuances of Lutheran versus Catholic discussion of monstrous births. He finds that “the advent of the monstrous discourse on the eve of the Reformation reflected a profound anxiety about redemption, a fear
fueled by the expectation of the end of time that resulted in the births of multiple bodies of Christendom” (71-2). Furthermore, Hsia argues that as the German Reformation reshaped the political and religious landscape, the monstrous ceased to effect social and religious change and in its place came “a new language of discipline and sin.” Hsia’s balanced essay contains especially interesting comments on Luther, whom Hsia represents as being careful not to assign theological meaning to strange births.

Knoppers’s essay “‘The AntiChrist, the Babilon, the Great Dragon’: Oliver Cromwell, Andrew Marvell, and the Apocalyptic Monstrous” shows how civil war polemic in England used monsters from Revelation alternately to praise or damn Cromwell. The engravings and written texts that Knoppers analyzes richly exemplify changing attitudes toward Cromwell, who appears in some texts as the archangel Michael, and in others as the Whore of Babylon. Knoppers’s analysis of her visual and written texts is compelling and interesting, particularly as she reveals relevant details of the international diplomatic scene.

Part 3, “Medical Knowledge, Grotesque Anatomies, and the Body Politic,” pairs Marie-Hélène Huet’s “Monstrous Medicine” and Joan B. Landes’s “Revolutionary Anatomies.” Both articles discuss early modern French approaches to the monstrous. Huet explores French physicians and the debated roles these men played in interpreting the monstrous. Her essay also includes a helpful summary of the era’s medical beliefs, as well as interesting material on serpents as symbols both of healing and of evil. Landes’s intriguing, well-written essay focuses on French Revolutionary concepts of the anatomical body and the body politic. Analyzing photographs of Honoré Fragonard’s fascinating anatomical specimens, which bridge the boundaries between art and science, she shows how developments in anatomy gave new emotional charge to political prints of severed heads and intensified portrayals of political opponents as monstrous cannibals.

In Part 4, “Displacing Monsters: Sign, Allegory, and Myth,” the paired essays straddle the Channel. Timothy Hampton explores political uses of simile, metaphor, and allegory in sixteenth-
century French works. His article, “Signs of Monstrosity: The Rhetoric of Description and the Limits of Allegory in Rabelais and Montaigne,” contains the clearest explanation of figurative language I have ever read. He illustrates the problem of describing monstrosity as he shows a pattern in sixteenth-century accounts of monstrous births: writers shift without warning from simile to metaphor, so that “the child ‘becomes’ the figure to which he is initially only compared” (180). Hampton sees this “slippage of language,” first, as indicating monsters’ powerful place in rhetoric, and second, as affecting complex battles over “interpretative and rhetorical authority,” especially in Reformation and Counter-Reformation struggles in France. He proves both patterns with nuanced explications of three texts: Montaigne’s essay “D’un enfant monstrueux,” Calvin’s 1550 Des Scandales, and an episode from Rabelais’ Quart livre of Pantagruel.

The second essay, David Armitage’s “Monstrosity and Myth in Mary Shelley’s Frankenstein,” extends the early modern period into the early nineteenth century, paralleling Landes’s forays into that era. After demonstrating the modernization of classical mythology, he shows how unusual Shelley’s novel was in combining myth, the monstrous, and prose, especially when prose was thought too dull a medium in which to explore the edges of the real. He also explores the influence of her unusual combination on two other writers, John William Polidori and William Hazlitt.

Although extremely interesting and containing some excellent essays, the anthology has some problems. First, a few essays needed better revision, either to clarify focus or to smooth out logical problems. Burke’s article, for example, while clearly structured, covers so much ground and so many countries in a few pages that I longed for a fuller treatment of fewer points. Huet’s essay sometimes lacked important logical transitions. Second, holes and errors in the treatment of early modern religious thought were troubling. Some gaffes merely needle observant readers without impairing an essay’s overall argument. For example, in otherwise excellent articles, Hampton calls Lent a Catholic “sacrament” instead of a liturgical season, and Knoppers, in analyzing an Andrew Marvell quotation,
completely misses Marvell’s direct allusion to John 5:1-9, an important reference that would strengthen her analysis on this point (186, 114). Other holes in understanding religion, however, harm the argument or our confidence in the author’s grasp of the material. For example, Huet makes an unsubstantiated claim about Luther’s attitudes toward monstrous births that evidence in Hsia’s article clearly contradicts (131, 78, 80). Her essay also suffers when she oversimplifies early modern beliefs about knowledge and sex in the Fall narrative, neglecting other early modern Europeans such as Milton who viewed sex and humble learning as created and experienced as good before the Fall.

The collection would improve if all authors had imitated the excellent balance in Hsia’s essay, where he carefully admits the theological complexity of early modern interpretations of causes for the suffering that monstrous births bring. The introduction and several essays tend to stress that early moderns viewed monstrous births as a warning of God’s judgment, often on the parents’ sins, sometimes on society’s sins (44–45, 49–51, 62–63, 131, 143). While this emphasis indeed occurs in the texts discussed, some essays should acknowledge that other early modern texts assert that not all who suffer, suffer because their sins were worse than others’ sins. One thinks, for example, of the 1560 Geneva Bible glosses or introductions to the Book of Job, the story of the Tower of Siloam (Luke 13:1-5), and the account of the man born blind (John 9:3). Finally, the collection sometimes muddles early modern theologies by conflating dualism with early modern apocalyptic writing, while downplaying the powerful Protestant and Catholic beliefs in the eventual triumph of good over evil because evil is parasitic (derivative, not equal to the Creator) and because Christ’s resurrection ensures victory over evil. Acknowledging and clearly articulating early modern theological complexity would allow the entire collection to live up to its editors’ high goals of showing the tensions and ambiguities inherent in representing monstrous bodies in early modern Europe.

Despite these shortcomings, however, the collection is well worth having on college and university library shelves. It brings readers
a rich, elaborate tapestry of ideas, gathering together many fascinating strands of solid research on early modern political uses of monsters, the grotesque, and monstrous births.


"Why is the cunt masculine and the prick feminine?" roughly translates a Johannes Secundus epigram on the gendering of genitalia and language that serves as the primary epigraph to this, the third volume in James Grantham Turner's decades-long effort to write the literary and intellectual history of carnal knowledge. The first volume was *One Flesh: Paradisal Marriage and Sexual Relations in the Age of Milton* (Oxford, 1987, 1993) and the second *Libertines and Radicals in Early Modern London: Sexuality, Politics and Literary Culture, 1630-1685* (Cambridge, 2001). This epigram, or translations and interpretations of it, gets repeated at frequent intervals throughout this long and learned book (6-7, 55, 116-17, 153, 172, 175 fig. 9, 186, 190, 257, 272-73, 291, 296, 307, 311-12 fig.15, 323-25). From epigraph to conclusion, this wee paradox serves as a major motive in a dazzlingly elaborate survey of the early modern "hard-core" canon, ranging from Pietro Aretino and the Florentine courtesan Tullia d'Aragona to the English libertine poet John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester and genteel porn consumer, Samuel Pepys. Erotic philosophers and libertine pornographers persistently cast sexuality, seriously and sarcastically, as an academic discipline, a schooling of the body and the mind, or, defying simplistic versions of Platonic dualism, a schooling of the mind through the body, a sensually-grounded education not entirely unrelated to Comenian theories of education.