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John Considine’s fine book tells an upbeat story of some learned but melancholy men: the lexicographers of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Europe. These erudite pioneers saw themselves as performing labors akin to those of Hercules, whom they repeatedly invoke in their prefaces and correspondence. But their typical frame of mind was well evoked in a Latin verse by Joseph Scaliger (aptly and elegantly rendered, as are numerous passages of Renaissance Latin, by Considine):

If a harsh sentence from the judges awaits someone, once
He has been condemned to afflictions and penalties,
Let workhouses not fatigue him with raw material to be wrought
Nor let mines of metal pain his stiffened hands:
Let him make DICTIONARIES. Need I say more? This
One labour has aspects of every punishment. (72)

Himself a former editor specializing in etymology for the OED, Considine writes with informed sympathy of his protagonists (the Estiennes father and son, the Casaubons, and many other figures through Du Cange), his particular heroes being the elder Estienne and Du Cange. Of the former he reports: “It was Robert Estienne who first made a dictionary in which vast cultural heritage was analysed into the stories told by individual words, made readily retrievable by being sorted into an alphabetical macrostructure, and both introduced and coloured throughout by the story of the lexicographer’s personal heritage” (315).

This book abounds in material one ought to have known. Here— with one example where many more could readily be provided. In a discussion of the obscure folk called the Batavi—lauded by Tacitus for their outstanding courage—Considine explains:

A history was manufactured for them, supported by a forged inscription, . . . on a stone supposedly unearthed near Leiden—an appropriate location, since in 1575 Leiden was given the Latin name Lugdunum Batavorum (many neo-Latin place-names were, like this one, creations of the Renaissance rather than revivals of ancient nomenclature). This name appeared as the imprint of a great number
of scholarly books, and told every consumer of Dutch scholarship about a Dutch heritage of independence. (151)

Readers who find this passage, as this reviewer does, both instructive and entertaining will be abundantly rewarded by this study. Younger scholars seeking theorized intellectual history will have to look elsewhere—names absent from the Index include Agamben, Derrida, Foucault, Nietzsche, Hegel and . . . Vico.

What Considine has on offer is a rich report on neglected masters of lexicography, based on close acquaintance with abundant primary sources (mainly Latin but also vernacular). The story he tells is (as this review began by noting) a consistently upbeat one, and Considine may be found at times to inflect his sources in twentieth-century scholarship in ways that match his temperament rather than their intentions. This author’s key notion of heritage—familial, ethnic, national—he takes from David Lowenthal’s The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History (1998), as is acknowledged in the Introduction (8). But that instructively entertaining volume paints a panoramic canvas of the historical enterprises discussed as bunkum (variously deception or self-deception, but bunkum throughout). Lowenthal’s is the opposite of a Whig history—it exhibits stasis not progress—and could not be more different in purport than Considine’s series of lexicographic triumphs.

A further instance of such inflection may be found on the concluding page of the last full chapter, where Considine cites Hans Aarsleff’s classic essay “The Early History of the Oxford English Dictionary” (313). Considine rightly notes Aarsleff’s demonstration that the Oxford project derives its lexicographic method from a book on Greek dictionary-making by the German classicist Franz Passow (1812). Considine takes Passow’s method to be a revival of seventeenth-century lexicographical practice and theory to be found in such scholars as Stiernhielm and Andreas Jäger. But the thrust of Aarsleff’s essay cuts a different way; to quote: “the concepts of ‘etymology’ and ‘philology’ are seriously misunderstood because it is not realized that the meanings of both words changed fundamentally in the course of the nineteenth century so that the meanings now normally assigned to them—i.e. their late nineteenth-century meanings . . .—will not at all do before around 1820 at the earliest” (BNYPL,
There are moments when Considine may be deemed to overstress the continuities between seventeenth-century comments about language and present-day historical linguistics. Thus he writes: “The ‘Scythian’ from which extant languages were supposed [by a number of seventeenth-century scholars, as Considine carefully documents] to descend was not so much the name of a known language variety as a shorthand for ‘a lost language formerly spoken in south-western Asia and distinct from Hebrew.’ So, the Scythian hypothesis adumbrated the modern understanding that a number of European and Asian languages are indeed descended from a lost language which very probably was spoken in south-western Asia and was unrelated to Hebrew—the language now called Proto-Indo-European” (306-07). The jump here is a long one; in making it Considine will seem in the eyes of not a few readers to be taking shadowy types a bit more favorably and scientifically than necessary, even readers disposed to grant Considine the teacher’s privilege of using analogical shorthand. To be sure, these considerations add up to a caveat or two, no more. This book richly rewards the scholar’s attention.


The twelve essays by the same number of authors form the chapters of this book, which is a kind of Festschrift for the late Gale Carrithers, though little biographical account is given of him. His important and influential work Donne at Sermons: A Christian Existential World (1972), however, is a presence that hovers over the whole volume. But his last work, a collaboration with James D. Hardy, Jr., Age of Iron: English Renaissance Tropologies of Love and Power (1998), provides the organizing principle not only of that book, but also of this present collection.

Carrithers and Hardy identified four tropes: journey, theater, moment, and ambassadorship; they believed these terms usefully (if not necessarily fully) provided categories in which might be gathered the congeries
of early modern cultural imagination and understanding. Thus Jeanne Shami demonstrates in her excellent introduction to the present volume of *Renaissance Tropologies* how the different essays define each of the four tropes. She lets Carrithers and Hardy lead the collection with their own essay, offered under the trope of *Theater.* “Rex Absconditus: Justice, Presence, and Legitimacy in *Measure for Measure.*” Isabella’s cry for justice in Shakespeare’s play gives substance, the authors assert, within the earthly *civitas,* divinely bestowed on the sovereign in the ceremonies of coronation. “Uniting the tropes of moment and theater in their performance, coronation proclaimed legitimacy and royal presence, the former a necessary precondition for a valid royal consecration, the latter a necessary sequel to it....These four tropes—moment, theater, journey, and calling or ambassadorship—were the way in which the Renaissance citizenry imagined action, order, and being and in which they longed for all things human finally to be put right” (23). The essay develops these themes through thoughtful close reading meant to sustain and elaborate the overarching ideas (or tropes), and so to provide for us cultural understanding.

Three essays follow this introductory study, grouped under *Moment.* Eric C. Brown writes on “Salvific Moments in John Donne’s *Devotions upon Emergent Occasions*” with sure and effective sympathy, and with effort he connects his discussion with the Carrithers and Hardy trope. Yet the concern with time and eternity, the past and the future, and salvation and redemption remains somewhat predictable, though very sensible. Greg Kneidel writes on “Donne and the State of Exception,” rather surprisingly bringing together T. S. Eliot and Carl Schmitt, “the archconservative German jurist and staunch enemy of liberalism” (65). The essay is fresh and unusual, ending with a brilliant application of political belief and critical theory in an explication of Donne’s “Ecstasy.” Perhaps no less surprising is Jeanne Shami’s unusual but characteristically able piece on “Troping Religious Identity: Circumcision and Transubstantiation in Donne’s Sermons.”

The next section, on *Journey,* begins, with Susannah Monta on “ Vaughan’s *Life of Paulinus* Recharting the Royalist Journey.” Vaughan the Royalist found particular comfort in a kind of holy retreat during the dark years following Charles’s execution, in an implied relationship with the fourth-century religious, who was famous for his renuncia-
tion of all the world’s goods. The “journey trope” receives further, less metaphorical treatment, in A. E. B. Coldiron’s study of the many texts connected with the marriage of Mary Tudor and Louis XII in 1514. Louis’s untimely death within the year led to a second (English) marriage with Charles Brandon, Duke of Suffolk. Yet Mary always remained an “ambassador,” and she might have felt that in going to France in the first instance, “in whatever complex mixtures of dutiful obligation, savvy scheming, and sincere affection,” resulted in a literature with “calls for peace,” wherein she is presented as “ambassadorial” (165).

Donne returns as the pre-eminent subject in the next essay-chapters: Alexandra Mills Block writes tendentiously on “Eucharistic Semiotics and the Representational Formulas of Donne’s Ambassadors,” addressing in particular two of the verse epistles, “To Mr Tilman after he had taken orders” and “To Sir Henry Wotton, at his going Ambassador to Venice”—an essay that cleverly reflects the Carrithers and Hardy trope of Ambassadorship. Similarly, but much more elaborately, Hugh Adlington discusses Donne’s involvement in his various foreign affairs and journeys. He notes significantly that “the evangelical, sacramental, pastoral, and political duties of the Christian minister are . . . illuminated by Donne’s analogical exploitation of the rich permutations of the trope of ambassadorship” (216).

The final chapters, gathered under the rubric “Tropology and Habits of Thought” (obviously recalling Debora Shuger’s seminal work, frequently invoked in these last pages), are among the best in the book. The late Albert C. Labriola leads with “Dangerous Liaisons: ‘Spider Love’ in John Donne’s ‘Twicknam Garden’”—a witty and eloquent reading of this poem (though seemingly independent of the general theme of the book). With similar grace and intelligence, Ilona Bell writes of “Mirror Tropes and Renaissance Poetry,” from Hamlet to Gertrude (Hamlet, 3.4.18-20), with stops in Spenser and Donne (hovered over by the spirit of Petrarch’s Laura). One might suggest, indeed, that the mirror as trope has a very long and familiar life in musical literature, too—from Mozart’s Figaro to Strauss’s Rosenkavalier and Capriccio, among many instances. The tropes offered by Carrithers and Hardy are surely elastic, generous and really overwhelming.
This point is well established in Kate Narveson’s “The *Ars Longa* Trope in a Sublunary World.” With Stephen Pender’s concluding “Habits of Thought, Structures of Feeling,” the tropological world of the Renaissance is extended into a much wider project. “Habits of thought is an ancient endeavor,” indeed, as Pender reminds us; but it is a continuous enterprise (306). The fundamental problem with this book lies in the factitious world of tropology. Why these tropes? The essays gathered here in homage to Gale Carrithers are all, in different ways, excellent and frequently remarkably illuminating. Most of the essayists attempt to write to the general theme of the whole book, and the general editor has been largely successful in sustaining considerable unity among the various contributors so that the volume is coherent. But “cultural imagination” is obviously not well or fully contained in such loose baggage as these tropologies might wish to hold or embrace.


*Women and Islam in Early Modern Literature* makes an important contribution to a growing body of scholarship on Europe’s encounter with Muslim cultures in the early modern period. Andrea’s exploration of the “significance of women’s agency in the inaugural Anglo-Ottoman encounter” from the sixteenth century to the eighteenth century is bold and innovative (1). English engagements with the Islamic world in the period extended into regions of the Mediterranean, Persia, and India, but Andrea’s scope includes the first two regions, to the exclusion of the latter. Andrea joins other scholars like Nabil Matar in overturning the Orientalist paradigm of a dichotomy between a powerful West and subordinate East in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and acknowledges that in this period, “Britain did not enjoy military or industrial power over Islamic countries” (4). But she is also attuned to the historical shift in the late sixteenth century by which time the “anglocentric project of global imperialism imagined at the close of the sixteenth century frequently represented the Ottomans
as positive foils” (4).

Clearly at stake in these early Anglo-Ottoman or Anglo-Muslim encounters is the struggle for the power of self-representation; in this climate, English cultural and literary productions, as Andrea points out, not surprisingly, rehearse the pervasive English anxieties about masculinity as evident in the motif of forced religious conversion of Christian men, or “turning Turk” in many cultural formations of the period. In order to understand the complex dynamic of these discursive and material power struggles of the period, Andrea interrogates the “effacement of women’s agency in recent studies on Anglo-Ottoman relations, most of which focus on gendered representations in male-authored travel narratives and dramas to the exclusion of sustained attention to women’s cultural productions” (2). Offering a different perspective, Andrea brings into the scholarship a new archive of writings by women sovereigns, writers, and travelers, analyzing the “discourses of this era’s Anglo-Ottoman—and more broadly Anglo-Islamic relations” (2). Thus, she focuses on individual, interactive, and collaborative textual productions such as diplomatic letters, travelogues, and religious tracts, as well as… prose fiction, poetry, and drama” (2), while mapping a “series of distinct but interlinked cultural moments from the late sixteenth century through the turn of the eighteenth century” (8).

For her critical theoretical frame, however, Andrea adapts a somewhat essentialist approach of “gynocriticism” focusing on “woman as writer” (and not only as reader) while incorporating techniques of feminist critique which interrogates, among other things, the fissures of male-constructed narratives and histories, attending to images and stereotypes of women in literature, and the omissions of women in literary and critical histories (2). Before examining the promise and limitations of Andrea’s feminist methodology, let me first outline the strengths of its scope and methodology. Eschewing any simple teleology, Andrea illuminates a dialogic interrelationship and comparison between early modern women’s cultural productions in relation to “emergent discourses such as imperialism and orientalism” (8); different women’s voices emerge in a rich dialogic perspective on their engagements—literary, religious, personal, cultural—within Europe’s encounters with Islam, more specifically with the Ottomans. The story
she tells draws in disparate and wide-ranging narratives, revealing early modern English women’s engagement with Muslim cultures and empires in ways that enable us to re-think the categories of gender and femininity when viewed cross-culturally. In this complex mapping lies the strength and originality of this book.

In an organization of four chapters and a coda, Andrea takes us on a far-ranging journey: Chapter One focuses on Anglo-Ottoman relations in the Elizabethan period via the letters and gifts exchanged between Queen Elizabeth and Safiye, the Turkish Queen mother (1595-1603) or walide sultan. Here the author shows us how the exchanges between these women re-figure both the Ottoman discourses which viewed the sultanate of women, of the power of the queen mothers, as a period of decline, and Elizabethan masculinist paradigms of the queen as a “virgin queen” or a “female prince”; in this context, the gifts exchanged between the women “may be seen to short-circuit the patriarchal symbolic system that casts women as objects and men as agents of exchange” (28). Chapter Two re-assesses Mary Wroth’s prose romance Urania and its second part, The Countess of Montgomery’s Urania (in manuscript) via links drawn between the imaginary geography of the “the sub-text of Ottoman imperialism… and the western European imperialists’ counter-response as expressed through the wish-fulfillment of romance” (34). Furthermore, in the manuscript, Wroth introduces the influence of “Sherlian discourse,” implying her own identification with Sir Robert Shirley’s “Persian wife.” Chapter Three offers a compelling account of three Quaker women missionaries, Mary Fisher, who had an audience with the Ottoman Sultan, Katherine Evans and Sarah Cheevers, who were imprisoned on the Isle of Malta. Quakerism’s relationship with Islam is revealed as having particular import in showing Quaker women as publishers of truth among radical sectarians, who in England were condemned by conservatives as “Protestant Mahometans” (57).

Eighteenth-century “feminist orientalism” and strains of “counter-orientalism” figure in Chapters Four and Five. Here Andrea demonstrates how instantiated by the masculinist travel literature of the seventeenth century, the “image of the ‘oppressed’ Muslim woman became the basis for the uneasy marriage between English women’s protests against gender oppression at the turn of the eighteenth cen-
tury and their complicity with the orientalist and racist ideologies that supported England’s emerging global empire” (80). If the feminist orientalist dichotomy between Turkish women’s “natural” slavery and the English woman’s struggles with patriarchy despite her “free born” status emerged frequently in women’s writings of the period, Andrea unveils an interesting interrogation of orientalism in the writings of Delarivier Manley, especially in her autobiographical fictions, *The New Atalantis* and *The Adventures of Rivella*. In the concluding Coda, Andrea continues her explorations of challenges to feminist orientalism. Here the author does something novel in moving away from the persistent focus on the famous hammam scene from Montagu’s writings, with its recuperations of a patriarchal gaze; instead, argues for re-reading *Montagu’s Turkish Embassy Letters* “in dialogue with her precursors and with contemporary Muslim Arab women,” for instance in Assia Djebar’s *Women of Algiers* (121).

To sum University Press, *Women in Islam* productively contributes to the conversations about the Anglo-Muslim encounters in the early modern period, adding an important perspective of women travelers and writers. However, the feminist methodology informing her text is somewhat under theorized, lacking in nuance at times. For instance, throughout the study, “patriarchy” and “patriarchal culture” are often invoked as givens, stable categories in a gynocriticism that seems somewhat dated in an era when gender studies have moved beyond binaries. At times, she gestures to the theoretical perspectives of Luce Irigaray and Eve Sedgewick (13), but does not follow that path of inquiry about the constructions of gender in language and ideology. Finally, however, despite this lacuna, Andrea’s book does provide a rich historical perspective on the lives and writings of early modern women in terms of their insights into and interactions with Anglo-Muslim encounters.


This immensely complicated, jargon-filled book argues that “Milton views reason as the poetic gift of peaceful difference and that he
does not share in the modern assumption that reason is intrinsically coercive” (vii), or that one must choose between determinacy and indeterminacy. Moreover, in contrast to so-called modern views of reason, “the biblicist unfolding of reason in *Paradise Lost* is an attempt to reveal that the origin, or *archē*, of created being is a peaceful gift for the good of others—what I call ‘ontic charity’” (viii). The thesis is ultimately applied to Milton’s resistance to coercion among Protestant sects. Since none of these terms appears together in Milton’s poetic corpus, and the term “charity” appears only twice, textual evidence for the thesis would appear to be sparse. Moreover, the attempt to set up a false dichotomy between “modern” reason (which is used indiscriminately to refer to early modern views of reason as well) and Milton’s view of reason dooms the argument from the start. Donnelly’s only proof texts for this view of “modern” reason are Machiavelli, Descartes, Hobbes, and Foucault. Since Hobbes was an empiricist who attacked rationalist philosophy it hardly seems appropriate to cite him as a defender of modern views of reason. And certainly Foucault was anti-rationalist to a fault. There is no mention of Kant, Hegel, Schopenhauer, Spinoza, or any of the other great thinkers who shaped the modern view of reason.

In this book no evidence is also construed as evidence, as in the following statement: “If we consider some of the key points in *Paradise Regained* at which Milton dilates the biblical narrative, we can understand why the poem does not explicitly invoke ‘charity,’ but instead implies that the Son embodies the unity between ontic charity (love that he shares with the Father) and ethical charity” (193).

Donnelly traces his theme through selections from Milton’s prose, *Paradise Lost*, *Paradise Regained*, and *Samson Agonistes*. According to Donnelly, “Milton offers *Paradise Regained* as a correcting interpretive guide to those who had mistaken *Paradise Lost* as a valorization of epic violence” (24). But what of the violence in *Samson Agonistes*? Simplistically, Donnelly simply asserts that “the play abjures any simplistic suggestion that readers should literally imitate Samson’s actions” (24). Milton also seems to approve of the Son’s violence in *Paradise Lost* as he takes the reins of the Chariot of Paternal Deity and grinds the heads of the rebel angels into the ground (6.824-41). Donnelly defends the Son’s violence by arguing that “Milton’s insistence upon
the ontic priority of peaceful difference does not entail pacifism” (132). To my mind, it does not “entail” anything, since Donnelly has not offered convincing proof of his thesis anywhere in the text. Donnelly also argues that “battle is a fitting response to the demand that omnipotence prove itself by force” (136). In other words, God’s actions are determined by the collective will of the rebel angels.

Complicating the argument still further is Donnelly’s fondness for stipulative definitions of complex philosophical terms. What, for example, is “scriptural reasoning?” If the Bible is a source for one’s thinking, it is outside the realm of reason. And what is “poetic biblicism?” (3). If a biblicist is someone who knows the Bible well or one who strictly interprets its contents, then poetic biblicism can only muddy the waters of hermeneutics. Donnelley also engages in equivocation when he uses “coercion” in two senses, one mental and one physical: “By ‘coercive’ I do not mean that modernity views reason as destructive, but that its presumed function is predictive calculation for the purpose of controlling objects in the world” (3). Later on, in referring to coercion in religious matters, he uses it in the physical sense: “the only alternative to violent randomness appeared to be coercive control” (18). As the OED makes clear, coercion always involves restraining or constraining someone or some thing by force.

Donnelly also extends his “peaceful” metaphor to include rhetoric: “Milton views not only reason but also rhetoric as inherently peaceful, despite the ways in which rhetoric in a fallen world can become a means of deception or coercion” (47). Milton’s own bellicose, acerbic rhetoric certainly belies this assertion, especially his use of murderous rhetoric (Eikonoklastes) to justify the killing of King Charles I. Donnelly also claims that “the typological use of Scripture [interpreting texts in the Hebrew Bible as foreshadowing texts in the New Testament] enables Milton to preserve the interpretive openness of the biblical narrative…” (81). However, as Frank Kermode pointed out some time ago, Typology is a falsification, indeed a desecration of the Hebrew scriptures, not an example of “interpretive openness.” With typology, as Kermode observes, “the entire Jewish Bible was to be sacrificed to the validation of the historicity of the gospels; yet its whole authority was needed to establish that historicity” (The Genesis of Secrecy, 107).
It is often difficult to follow the thread of Donnelly’s argument. Consider the following amazing sentence: “Readers who fail to distinguish between Milton’s ontic and epistemic claims will consistently miss his point: every indication of epistemic limitation will be interpreted as an ontic claim regarding the divine need for evil in reality, rather than as a function of either the finitude or the fallen will of the human knower” (75).

Donnelly asserts that Milton assumes that *Paradise Lost* will require a second reading to be understood: “Only in the second reading does genuine understanding begin, once there is some concrete knowledge of all the parts. The poem’s structure, in effect, presumes a second reading which keeps in mind the previous reading and thus implies the central importance of memory in the readers’ response to its central preoccupations” (185). Moreover, Scripture itself is reduced to a gloss on Milton’s poetry: “Milton’s mode of engagement with Scripture in his major poems also seems to parallel one of the hermeneutic ambitions of the Miltonic *De Doctrina Christiana*: that his own words would be glossed by the biblical text, rather than vice versa” (1). Such extravagant claims can only discourage readers from taking on the now-monumental task of making sense of *Paradise Lost*.

In sum, only the most dedicated of Milton scholars will attempt to read *Milton’s Scriptural Reasoning* and to master its contents. As Milton scholarship becomes more and more particularized, it becomes less and less accessible to the educated reader, even to the specialist in early modern literature. This book is a case in point.


Abraham Stoll’s *Milton and Monotheism* is both history and literary criticism of the kind so well exemplified by the likes of Maurice Kel- ley’s *This Great Argument* and Barbara Lewalski’s *Milton’s Brief Epic*, in that it elegantly and forcefully commands its subject with lucid clarity while avoiding the tenuous and oftentimes opaque postmodern critical lexicon so popular now. Its plentiful and helpful notes add many more
contemporary sources to those he uses in his text, and I can only wish that the publishers had included them all in a full bibliography for convenience of consultation. The book opens a window of light on Milton’s unmistakable monotheistic conception of deity in *Paradise Lost*, *Paradise Regained*, and *Samson Agonistes*, showing how he incorporated polytheistic classical and biblical gods while not endangering his Christian standing with his readership. This standing was the basic general problem to be solved by poets of the seventeenth century wishing at once to honor both the epic traditions they had inherited and the biblical language of monotheism they dared not violate or seem to violate. To cross the biblical divide, named usefully “the Mosaic distinction” (after Egyptologist Jan Assman), was to incorporate gods in the storyworld of the poem and thereby risk a possible misunderstanding by seeming to assert an ontological real existence to those gods which the poet did not intend (34-35). Of less value has been his decision to use Freud’s Aton/Jahve (spiritual/materialistic) divide from his *Moses and Monotheism* as an analytic device for showing “the problems that confront Milton as he attempts to narrate God and his ways” (11). This rather mechanical insertion of a device from a twentieth-century atheistic viewpoint to help organize his remarks for a seventeenth-century set of Christian poems seems unnecessary, especially as Stoll has so many other excellent contemporary illustrations of what Freud gives him anyway. Though Stoll joins Maurice Kelley in enlisting Milton in the Arian camp with some affinity with Socinianism as well (189), he prefers the term “monotheism” over “Socinianism or Arianism,” for explicating “Milton’s Antitrinitarian positions,” because the term is less contentious and “more structural and descriptive” (8).

Chapter One, “Polytheism and ‘truest Poesie,’” considers John Selden, historian and mythographer of the gods, whose *De diis Syris syntagmata* (1617) was a major source of descriptive information that poets used in trying to stay true to monotheism. "Each time Milton returns to the polytheistic gods, they are drawn with anthropological detail that is identifiably from De diis” (32), but he does so in such a way as to avoid the necessity other poets felt to insert actual footnotes from Selden defending their appearance (such as Drayton), or to simply excluded the gods altogether (Davenant’s solution).
Chapter Two, “Occult Monotheism and the Abstract Godhead,” features the premise, offered by Lord Herbert of Cherbury in his *De religion gentilium* that God is abstract, not Trinitarian or personal as he is presented in the Bible, and that he is behind all pagan religions as the common and hidden monotheism. “[T]he true religion is available without the stories of the Bible and without the doctrines of Christianity” (74). To Henry More this amounted to an apology for paganism (88).

Chapter Three, “God and Genesis 18 in *Paradise Lost,*” turns to the Bible directly to show how Genesis 18 in its ambiguous presentation of three men (angels? or God?) shapes the ambiguous presentation in books 3-8 of the epic: “Father and the Son in book 3, Adam and Raphael in books 5 through 8, and God and Adam in book 8” (107). Having the presence of God in the narrative, or his representative in Raphael, makes the whole narrative exist in “ontological ambiguity” (122) which is only relieved in the strongest assertion of monotheism in the epic in book 8,399-407 when God declares his sole existence “from all eternity.”

Chapter Four, “The War in Heaven and Deism,” “examines how the absoluteness of the monotheistic God—his omniscience and omnipotence—affects the possibility and quality of action in the war in heaven” (143-44). The poetic dilemma is this: if God is omniscient, why is it necessary that Milton present Abdiel hurrying to notify the angels of Satan’s rebellion? And if he is omnipotent, why have a battle in heaven at all since God could without effort destroy Satan’s forces? Stoll solves the dilemma, by asserting that there has to be “consequential action” in a narrative, otherwise there would be no plot to follow; and there must also be a special kind of “local forgetting” in which readers set aside “omniscience and omnipotence [which] disrupt narrative” (152). This forgetting includes overlooking the absurdity of Satan’s “discontinuous wound” (PL 6.328) that heals almost instantaneously and other absurdities that make for laughter. Milton is unmistakably monotheist, as he declares in *De doctrina,* but “his commitments to the rigors of monotheism were read by Leslie, Toland, Collins, Hume, and Defoe, as well as Pope and Bolingbroke, as deist” (168).
Chapter Five, “Socinianism and Deism,” locates Milton’s Antitrinitarianism as being more correctly aligned with Arianism than Socinianism, but expresses some surprise that Miltonists like Maurice Kelley, Michael Bauman, and the authors of Bright Essence “give very little consideration to the more radical Antitrinitarian school of Socinianism” (189). Stoll does not say Milton is a Socinian, but wishes to use his “proximity to Socinian thought [which] is palpable” to show how they “share the label of monotheist” (190). The Socinians’ insistence that the Son is not God resulted in him looking “suspiciously like a polytheistic extra” (199). Deism was the cure for this fault of Socinianism in being even more insistent on the supremacy of natural religion over the hated mystery of the Trinity. Its “rejection of religious revelation not only reduces the authority of the Son, it actually makes him inessential” (204). The trouble ultimately with deism is its total abstraction. “God is stripped of theophany and revelation” with the resulting “nothingness and silence” that cannot move “plot, character, and storyworld” necessary to “religious imagination” (213-14).

Chapter Six, “The Son after the Trinity,” depicts Paradise Regained as Milton’s “imaginative response to the often persuasive claims of Socinianism” (233). He is not himself Socinian nor is his epic, but Stoll shows that just as Socinians were prime advocates of the toleration of religions, so the epic pictures a tolerationist Christ that in this aspect is a mirror of the heresy. The Son is presented solely in his human, not pre-incarnate, history so that we only find out his pre-existence at the very end of book 4 when “a fiery globe of angels” transports him through the “blithe air.” Milton presents the Son’s “ontology” as “a thing indifferent.” He is the “God-man” and this in the end does separate him from the Socinians with their charge that he is mere man, but in that indifferent presentation Milton moves him closer to their strong advocacy of toleration (256). “In its own indifference” the epic “is at once a radical statement of Antitrinitarianism, and an irenic intervention in the debates over the Trinity” (263).

Chapter Seven, “Revelation and Samson’s Sense of Heaven’s Desertion,” is Milton’s “experiment in theodicy without angels” (308). In Judges 13 an angel appears to Samson’s parents, but in the poem his brief appearance is quickly withdrawn and no angels or divine revelation occurs for the remainder. Milton substitutes for the
“external revelation” he had used in his other poems an “internal inspiration” where Samson has to look to his “intimate impulse,” his “divine impulsion,” and “rousing motions.” Stoll, who until this chapter, has taken a quite strong biblical stance, seems to abandon it for his conclusion that in Samson, Milton is “bullying” his reader into accepting Manoa’s positive observation that his son did not die apart from God. “Samson’s physical bullying comes to stand for an intellectual bullying, a kind of theological imposition, which is at the heart of the poem’s problematic assertion of faith” (305). This is one of very few places where I do not go along with Stoll. Physical bullying, ok. But not the other. Milton may well just be asserting the verdict of Hebrews 11:32 which praises Samson as a man of faith.

In place of a conclusion, Stoll offers a short “Afterword: Monotheism, the Sublime, and Allegory,” a sweeping look ahead to the eighteenth century and also a look before Milton to Spenser. He had made a case earlier in Chapter Four that in Paradise Lost “Milton’s monotheistic narrative carries the potential to be read as deist” (309) and here in his afterword he returns to that idea. John Dennis and Edmund Burke both find a sublime, not a deist, Milton in the epic. Spenser crosses the “Mosaic distinction” in his introduction of polytheistic gods yet because he is writing allegory, he gets away with the ploy, whereas “in contrast, Milton struggles mightly with the Mosaic distinction” in that he moves away from allegory that Spenser uses as his defense and is thus left exposed (316).


The tension between postmodern philosophy and historical analysis energizes Law, Crime and English Society, 1660-1830, edited by Norma Landau, and Crime, Gender and Social Order in Early Modern England by Garthine Walker. While only the latter acknowledges its
debt to modern critical theory, both books attempt to unsettle the rigid hierarchies of historical classification that have inaccurately generalized their respective periods. As a result, their methodologies, explicitly or not, rehearse a signal move of postmodern thought: the rendering of all cultural production as “texts” and “discourses” that make equal claims to interpretive authority. In distinction to most postmodern work undertaken in literary studies, however, the two books anchor themselves in thorough empiricism and historical analysis. As such, they represent important achievements that encourage scholarly dialogue between two frequently isolated and intransigent disciplinary camps: readers of high theory and archival historians.

Significantly, Walker and Landau’s collaborators center their inquiries on the law and its transgressions—a dynamic that has long attracted postmodern dissection and early modern historical research alike. In literary theory, this exact combination is integral to the field of new historicism, which seizes on Michel Foucault’s famous notion of invisible disciplinary powers to propose an omnipresent saturation of authority made legible even, if not especially, in supposedly illicit conduct. New historicism typically reads outward from a fictional work—by Shakespeare, say—into the broader landscape to suggest discursive exchanges occurring on all levels of society. As a result, it practices a kind of hyper-democratizing: anecdote, poem, broadside ballad and statute exist side-by-side as equally legitimate sites in which patterns of power are enmeshed. Given the waning, though still powerful, hold that this approach has in the academy, it is refreshing and illuminating to see Walker’s book and Landau’s collection overlap with these concerns while incorporating new methodologies and conclusions. The two works accomplish this balancing act by implementing subtle and often surprising interpretations of extensive research. Rather than suggest the potential reductiveness of new historicism, the books maintain sincere belief in the possibility of attaining a more accurate understanding of the past.

_Law, Crime and English Society_ is dedicated to John Beattie, the distinguished English historian of crime, and aligns itself with his critical contributions to the field. For Landau, the primary value of Beattie’s work lies in avoiding the measurement of law and crime “against modern expectations,” but rather presenting it “as contemporaries
thought it worked;” thus, “features of the law which to modern eyes, as to reformers, seem inefficacious, illogical and arbitrary appear in Beattie’s analysis as integral to its system” (4). The key word here is arbitrary: by historicizing the context of legal and criminal activity, Beattie disabuses impressions of irregularity by placing such phenomena in conversation with the intricacies of surrounding discourse. Beattie’s critical analyses combat the persistent Whiggish trends in historical scholarship to concretize past behavior into teleological patterns; at the time, Beattie reminds us, such action followed its own internal logic.

The mission of this collection is to take up Beattie’s call for more situated understandings of the seemingly inexplicable; each chapter does so within different facets of late seventeenth-century, eighteenth-century, and early nineteenth-century law and crime. The book divides into three sections that duly follow the organization of the title: law, crime, and society. The first chapter of the “Law” section, by Douglas Hay, establishes the collection’s methodology in its study of the relationship between lay magistrates and the King’s Bench. Faced with the paucity of cases against justices of the peace in the late eighteenth century, Hay posits that “judicial control over the justices was little but pious hope and convenient fiction, because few victims of magisterial injustice were able to go to King’s Bench” (24). Hay uses the term “fiction” not as disparagement but to denote palpable aspects of day-to-day reality, made through the possibility of potential threats to the justices’ practice. Such threats fall between the cracks of the official historical record, yet operated as legitimate texts in their own right during the period. Randall McGowan echoes Hay’s language in his chapter on forgery legislation, in the “Crime” section: efforts to control forgery “do seem to express a particular logic, to possess a certain coherence; they do not seem to be random or haphazard creations,” she notes (121). McGowan concludes, with a lack of condescension, that “the century’s criminal legislation contains many different tales” (137). Such “tales,” again, function not as ideas to be dismissed, but rather as legitimate modes of codification, capable of affecting the world as much as perceived fact. The instability of the term “fact” is actually the focus of Barbara Shapiro’s chapter, in the “Society” section, which characterizes the legal system of the late seventeenth century as “pervaded by the belief that ephemeral
‘facts’ of human action could be established with the high degree of certitude and that ordinary persons had sufficient ability to arrive at impartial, truthful verdicts” (195). No doubt the authors of this collection feel kinship to this sentiment: following Beattie’s lead, they take up the seemingly irrelevant ephemeral components of early modern life—threats, lies, tales—and find in their pervasive influence the weight of historical fact and opportunity for new appraisals of the past. In this manner, the book silently exercises Foucauldian theory without losing itself in a world of representation; it remains focused on history’s status as lived reality.

Walker takes up a similar project in her book, with a particular focus on renewing understandings of masculinity and femininity in relation to the law. Her work responds to the dominant trends in scholarship that “accept criminality in gender to be a masculine category without conceptualizing or contextualizing it in terms of gender,” which leads to femininity appearing aberrant (4). Her innovation is not to seek any sort of normalcy in the construction of femininity, but to make both genders a function of layered discourses—in effect, to make both “aberrant.” While the shape of this inquiry borrows from postmodernism, what is at stake is not mere deconstructive language games or truth-effects; rather, Walker’s book draws on research of Cheshire legal records to complement her theoretical sophistication with rigorous historical research—or, in her elegant phrase, to stage “a dialogue between qualitative and quantitative analyses” (5). The arc of her book weaves this dialogue through lethal and non-lethal crimes, viewing different data samples according to gender construction and situation.

The result is a valuable study that, like Law, Crime and English Society, recovers a genuinely richer texture in early modern history. In discussing the possibilities available to women in prosecuting would-be rapists, she notes that while “exhibiting sufficient strength to escape the rapist was problematic,” an effective strategy was to describe being rescued by another man, since it “was part of an established genre of the romance narrative and was coded as a positive means by which women might escape rape” (57). The power of seemingly trivial literary “genres” could affect the actual historical record: women and men were both subject to discursive networks that constantly contextual-
ized their sexual and legal identities. Thus spousal murder by wives represented a virtual checklist of negative associations; it “fulfilled almost all the theoretical requirements of ‘wrongful violence’” (140). Walker is attentive to the cultural forces that shaped masculinity as well, noting the chivalric codes that could recast potential criminality as heroism. The most crucial, and theoretically inventive, discourse that Walker introduces in relation to gender deals with internal domestic space. By establishing “the household” as a complicating historical *topos*, Walker shakes loose from restrictive binaries and approaches a more systematized concept of role-playing within a specific site of identity construction.

As with Landau’s collection, it is above all the power of fiction—or, more accurately, the porosity of the border between fiction and fact—that propels Walker’s revitalization of the past. Early modernity is, for Walker and the authors of *Law, Crime and English Society*, a constellation of competing discourses that, regardless of how untrue they may seem in hindsight, provided very real narratives that individuals could connect or combine to forge a sense of self. Both books are essential to early modern scholars wishing to gain a more granulated understanding of these specific intricacies, or to general scholars interested in the ever-vexing problem of marrying theoretical and historical techniques. Given their attentiveness, however, one surprising omission in either text is perhaps the most obvious: a thoughtful consideration of traditionally defined fiction itself. For all the talk of “genre” and the “literary,” one wishes that these authors would give more than a passing look at the thriving world of popular art that pervaded the consciousness of the people as powerfully as the legal and societal “fictions” they explore with such nuance. Despite this slight criticism, these appealing works enhance the potential for the qualitative to further speak with the quantitative, as they trace a richly complicated early modern terrain no less contradictory and multifaceted than our present day.

The merits of John Bowes’s biography of Richard Brathwait (1588-1673) are threefold: one, it reintroduces an author only vaguely known today even by specialists within the field of seventeenth-century literary studies; two, it includes a substantial amount of quotation from a large range of Brathwait’s works, which gives us a strong sense of the author’s style and thought; and three, although Bowes’s work “makes no pretensions to being serious literary biography” (iv), he draws an interesting portrait of Brathwait through contextualizing his writings within the times and place in which he lived, hence the subtitle: *The First Lakeland Poet*.

Although one occasionally comes across allusions to Brathwait’s popular conduct books, *The English Gentleman* (1630, 1641, 1652) and *The English Gentlewoman* (1631, 1641), or perhaps his lively Barnaby’s Journal (1638), this prolific seventeenth-century author is little read or known, nor are there many editions of his writings available in print today. Brathwait’s works, although of unequal merit, include some interesting titles and subject matter and span over three decades of the most turbulent English history. It is worth listing his works here as this information is not readily available elsewhere. This substantial list, which is sourced primarily from *Early English Books Online*, Bowe’s references, and Edmund Gosse’s account of Brathwait and his writings in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, is most likely not complete. Many of Brathwait’s writings were published anonymously or under pseudonyms and some of them have probably been lost. As Gosse points out, in a marginal note to *The English Gentleman* (1630) Brathwait refers to an earlier work of his, *Huntsman’s Raunge*, of which no copy survives.

Brathwait’s works include the following: *The Golden Fleece* (1611) verse, much of which is biographical; *The Poet’s Willow* (1614), a collection of pastorals; *The Yong Mans Gleanings* (1614), a prose work, drawing on the writings of St. Bernard, of Clairvaux; *The Prodigals Tears* (1614), afterwards reprinted along with *The Schollers Medley* as *Nursery for Gentry* (1638); *A Strappado for the Devil* (1615), satires in verse
founded on George Wither’s *The Abuses Whipt and Stript; The Smoaking Age* (1617; 1703), a prose treatise; *A New Spring* (1619), verse; *A Happy Husband* (1619), prose and verse; *Essaies upon the Five Senses* (1620, 1635, 1815); *The Prodigals Teares with A Heavenly New Yeeres Gift Sent to the Soule* (1620); *Times Curtaine Drawne* (1621) verse; *The Shepherds Tales* (1621), a collection of pastorals; *Natures Embassie: or the Wilde-mans Measvres: Danced naked by twelve Satyres* (1621), a collection of odes and pastorals; *The Whimzies* (1631; 1859), a prose work of curious characters; *Anniversaries upon his Panarete* (1634, 1635), a poem commemorating his first wife; *The Arcadian Princess* (1635), prose and verse; *The Fatal Nuptial* (1636), elegy; *The Lives of all the Roman Emperors* (1636); *A Nursery for Gentry* (1638, 1651); *A Spiritual Spicerie* (1638), prose and verse; *An Epitome of All the Lives of the Kings of France* (1639); *Art Asleepe, Husband* (1640), prose; *The Two Lancashire Lovers* (1640), a novel in prose; *The Penitent Pilgrim* (1641); *Astrea’s Teares* (1641), an elegy on Brathwait’s godfather, Sir Richard Hutton; *Mercurius Britannicus* (1641), satirizes the puritan, William Prynne; *Panareetes Triumph* (1641); *Times Treasury* (1652); *A Muster Roll of the Evill Angels* (1655; 1659), a prose account of noted heretics; *The Honest Ghost* (1658), a satire in verse; *Panthalia* (1659); *To his Majesty Upon His Happy Arrival In Our Late Discomposed Albion* (1660); *The Chimney Scuffle* (1662); *Regicidium* (1665), a satire; *The Captive Captain, or the Restrained Cavalier* (1665), prose and verse.

Over the course of thirteen chapters organized chronologically, Bowes offers us a detailed family history and biographical account of Richard Brathwait, or “Dapper Dick” as he was apparently known. The earlier chapters range from the time Brathwait spent studying law at the Inns of Court as a young man to his early retirement to the family estate of Burneside in the parish of Kendal. Later chapters focus on his final years of personal and political disappointment with the Puritan revolution and the restoration establishment, which Brathwait expressed through a series of biting satires. Bowes’s writing is clear and accessible; his book is engaging, even if its subject’s character is often, un-wittingly perhaps, less so.

Brathwait’s life-long passion for literature intersected with his “obsession with the flesh” and his essentially righteous Christian disposition (19). As Bowes writes, “[a]lmost all of Richard’s works, directly or indirectly, castigate lust, ambition, extravagant dress, greed, and bad
behaviour” (87), traits which he himself exhibits at various stages of his life. His love of extravagant dress is presumably what gave rise to his nickname “Dapper Dick,” which appears as “Dagger Dick” in page seven of Bowes’s book (one of a number of typographical errors, or a Freudian slip of the pen, perhaps). Bowes traces Brathwait’s “self-confessed descent into unbridled licentiousness” during his time in London, and his occasional bawdy encounters thereafter (19). Abandoning the “years of drink, ribaldry and fornication,” Brathwait married Frances Lawson of Nesham near Darlington in May 1617, and retired to Westmoreland to assume “the role of a quiet, able, respectable and public-spirited gentlemen” (53). Over the course of time he became deputy-lieutenant of the county of Westmoreland. Richard and Frances had nine children, and shared 16 years together before her death in 1633. Bowes depicts Brathwait’s marriage as one of sincere and loving attachment. Brathwait’s “self-evident contentment,” he writes, is “preserved for posterity in A Happy Husband” (48). Also, Brathwait’s Anniversaries upon his Panarete commemorates his dead wife in loving terms.

Bowes gives the following description of Frances Brathwait, which he gleans from Richard’s writings: “Kind, modest, obedient, virtuous, fertile and warm-natured she made an excellent wife and mother” (55). This may all be so. Nevertheless, Bowes argument that Brathwait modeled his ideal female, as represented in The English Gentewoman, on the virtues of his wife is not entirely convincing. Bowes states that “Frances mirrors The English Gentewoman so closely that Richard even recommends her skin complexion—‘a native red’ (from Anniversaries upon his Panarete...)—as a sign of moral steadfastness” (105). However, the ideal female characteristics recommended by Brathwait in The English Gentewoman, down to the importance assigned to the woman’s ability to “displays her guiltless shame in a crimson blush” (EG p.46), are commonplace in this period and derive often from the writings of the Church Fathers. The work is also contemporary in its allusions. For instance, Brathwait suggests in his conduct book that female readers of Shakespeare’s Venus and Adonis deserve to be denounced along with the most infamous seductresses. Reassuringly, Bowes tells us that Frances’s “reading was limited to books which supported her faith and which were useful in the direction of her domestic household
affairs” (107). The link Brathwait makes between a devouring female sexuality and the reading of *Venus and Adonis* appears also in one of his satires that predates his marriage to Frances:

Ile be thy *Venus*, pretty Ducke I will,
And though lesse faire, yet I have farre more still,
In loves affaires: for if I *Adon* had,
As *Venus* had: I could have taught the lad
To have beene farre more forward then he was,
And not have dallied with [s]o apt a lasse.

Bowes is at his most interesting and persuasive in his discussion of Brathwait's often ambiguous religious and political affiliations over the course of and in the immediate aftermath of the civil war. Brathwait's valuable estates were sequestered for a time once Royalist forces were driven from Westmoreland, but by 1650 he was discharged from sequestration and appointed justice of the peace by the new authorities. Although Brathwait adapted to the republic, his commitment to the institute of monarchy was never in doubt. Even so, following the Restoration he is critical of governmental abuses and aspects of Charles personal rule, which impacted on local land issues and taxation. The Brathwait that comes to life in Bowe's biography is a more complicated man than traditionally portrayed by earlier authorities on his life, such as Anthony A. Wood and Joseph Haslewood. This book successfully challenges the image of Brathwait as simply a devout Christian and well-contented country gentleman by positioning him as a man of his times, devout, yet given to worldly concerns regarding wealth, property, power and sex.

On a final note, while Bowes treats the reader to plenty of quotations from Brathwait's writings, the referencing system Bowes employs is inadequate; he references the works he quotes from in endnotes, but neglects to include page numbers. However, the biggest criticism I have of this book is the very poor quality of its production; when you open the book wide enough to prevent its tendency to close back on itself (which makes it difficult to read with any comfort), the book snaps and many of the pages either come loose or half-way detach from their minimally glued bindings. What you are left with, on reading the entire book, resembles a folder containing a large quantity of loose and untidy pages. This is unfortunate considering the obvious
labor Bowes invested in writing this much-needed and interesting biography of Richard Brathwait.


In this study, Ellinghausen examines the careers of the non-aristocratic authors, Isabella Whitney, Thomas Nashe, Ben Jonson, John Taylor, and George Wither. For each of these figures, Ellinghausen discusses his/her identification with labor and what that means for the rhetorical poses that each assumes. Noting that Whitney identifies as a poor maidservant, Nashe as a day laborer, Jonson as a blacksmith, Taylor as a waterman, and that Wither generally celebrates the virtue of his labor, she argues that these positions allow them “to negotiate restrictions” and re-frame them “as a platform for authority” (5). Making frequent reference to Marxist views, Ellinghausen contends that all of these authors are “situated within a broad and complicated transition from pseudo-feudal custom to systems of social organization that support and are supported by capitalism” and that their careers are “important indices of cultural transition in process” (15).

The key notions that Ellinghausen seeks to illustrate are that privileging the virtues of labor creates a new paradigm in the writing of early modern England and that through observing this development one may have a better understanding of the social shift taking place. To develop these ideas, she builds on the work of scholars such as Richard Helgerson and Raymond Williams by examining each writer’s self-presentation and “alignment” regarding social relations. In the process, she explores the historical context for each figure and provides close readings of his/her work.

Beginning with Whitney, Ellinghausen notes that although in *The Copy of a Letter . . . by a Yonge Gentilwoman: to her Unconstant Lover* (1567) Whitney engages in “the rhetoric of novelty” as she inserts a female voice into the debate about lovers and “caters to readers’ tastes by experimenting with popular mid-Tudor genres,” she also “presents readers with the less familiar viewpoint of a woman for-
saken economically” (19). Regarding A Sweet Nosegay (1573), Ellinghausen asserts that the “marginal, vagrant status” that Whitney adopts in it is “a major departure from the more conventional voice she uses in The Copy” (20). She notes that “when Whitney fashions herself as an unemployed maidservant, she specifically aligns herself with a group that was prone to prostitution in cultural imagination as well as in fact” (20). Examining elements of the historical context, including the 1563 Statute of Artificers, which led to the arrest of masterless men and women, and the unemployment issues facing maidservants, due to the increasing population of London, Ellinghausen suggests that Whitney “harnesses the questions of sexuality and property that maidservants raised to compose her own narrative of intellectual labor” (23). Through a close reading of the Nosegay, Ellinghausen traces the “commodity logic” present in Whitney’s work and Whitney’s self-presentation as an outsider.

With Nashe, Ellinghausen demonstrates how a “nominally elite” university man comes “to voice a poor, embittered learned man who makes a bargain with the devil” (37) in Pierce Pennilesse (1592). She points out that Nashe’s life illustrates the story “of a frustrated scholar cum writer for pay—one who is compelled to adjust to a new socioeconomic reality” (38). Focusing on the anonymously authored plays in the Parnassus, comedies performed as Christmas plays between 1597 and 1601 at Cambridge, she examines the plays’ central theme, “the economic tribulations of scholars after graduation,” and discusses how the plays “use Nashe’s example to stage a collective consideration of the place of scholarly labor in the late Tudor commonwealth” (39). Moreover, she looks at the historical context in which Nashe and his fellow scholars were seeking occupations, examining issues of primogeniture as well as the prospects and salaries for schoolmasters and church officials. She illustrates how both the Parnassus plays and Nashe’s own writings “allow reflection” on the institution of the university and “its unfulfilled promises” (62).

To gain a better understanding of what scholars have called Jonson’s “anti-materialism,” Ellinghausen places “discourses of writing and theater and of labor into dialogue with one another” (64). She notes that Jonson may have embraced metaphors of labor in his writing, but he also “spent his career disassociating himself from the very
degree of people in which he once worked” (65). She points out that although his attitudes may “appear at odds with each other,” they do indeed “intersect with changing early modern discourses concerning social mobility, vocation, and authorship” (65). Surveying Jonson’s work and historical context, Ellinghausen explores the status and practices of brick-layers in early modern London, Jonson’s treatment of Vulcan as a character (in “An Exeçration upon Vulcan”), and his derision of Inigo Jones’ labor. She ultimately suggests that, “Given his proximity to labor in all its forms, the language of labor becomes the best way of capturing process and developing an incipient sense of authorship as a vocation” for Jonson (92).

Noting that Taylor’s practices in his career reflect his admiration and imitation of Jonson, Ellinghausen suggests that Taylor’s approach is, however, “more political” (94). She argues that an understanding of the revolutionary context is key for Taylor and offers detailed readings of his work that show how it partakes of the “explosion of print that attended the intense political debates surrounding monarchy, religion, and governance in the mid-seventeenth century” (94). In Taylor’s case, Ellinghausen posits that “authorial self-presentation becomes bound up in pressing questions concerning the fate of the commonwealth itself” (94).

Finally, regarding her choice of Wither to conclude her study, Ellinghausen remarks that Milton would have in some ways been a more likely subject, but that she chooses Wither, “due to his alleged role in the history of intellectual property” (121). She examines the situation in which Wither contended with the Stationer’s Company concerning the royal patent granted to his *Hymnes and Songs of the Church* (1622-1623), noting that during this process he had “numerous opportunities to assert his writing as not only property, but as labor” (121). In particular, she points out that in *The Schollers Purgatory* (c. 1625), dedicated to “honest stationers,” Wither mounts an elaborate defense that might be summarized, “I am an author, and that is to say I am a worker” (122). Ellinghausen notes that this legal skirmish showcases an historical moment in that it “brings to fruition a sense of author-as-laborer that is informed by religious and cultural discourses that encouraged such thinking” (122), and she then compares various aspects of Wither’s experience with those of the previously addressed
writers. She concludes this chapter and her study with a discussion of the permutations of the notions of “public” and “private” during this period in England, suggesting that “the careers of laboring writers show that the public is not simply an antithesis of or a reaction against the private—it is a positive, deliberate stance that early modern changes in economic organization, social organization, and religion helped make possible” (139).

In _Labor and Writing in Early Modern England, 1567-1667_, Ellinghausen presents insightful commentary on the evolution of writing as a profession. She does an admirable job of considering this group of writers’ relationships with labor and what those conditions meant regarding their rhetorical positioning and careers. The examples that she presents will no doubt spark scholars’ interest in examining the cases of other writers from the period in a similar fashion. Her book will especially be of interest to literary historians, as well as to those who would like to know more about the careers of these specific authors.


When the concept of modesty, i.e., virtue, is applied to seventeenth-century women, specifically women who engage in public discourse and who reject forms of modesty that are essentially about shame and veiling female bodies, the expectation to “keep due measure” regarding one’s conduct takes new forms (1). Tamara Harvey’s _Figuring Modesty in Feminist Discourse Across the Americas, 1633-1700_ explores the writings of Euro-American authors Anne Bradstreet, Anne Hutchinson, Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz, and Marie de l’Incarnation, women whose functionalist treatments of the body provide a fresh and reframed modesty. Each in her own distinct way speaks to the paradoxes and limits placed on public women. Exploring their “discipline, practice and embodied efforts” (2), Harvey shows that these women “fundamentally engage the debates of the time while shifting characteristics of the body in ways that challenge symbolic readings of the body” (13). Importantly, the works serve as correctives for
society’s members who believe women’s words and deeds meant they were unchaste, unreasonable, and unfeminine. Each is read as re-configuring modesty and representing women as capable of self-governing and reason.

Harvey’s “Introduction” establishes the tone and method for her study. She argues that the authors engaged religious, political, scientific, and social discourses while challenging contemporary functionalism. A highlight of her initial discussion examines Helkiah Crooke’s *Mikrokosmographia: A Description of the Body of Man* (1616), a text that challenges assumptions of women as inferior but maintains notions of female embodiment and modesty that subordinate women. Utilizing Crooke’s title page as an example of entrenched misogynistic logic, Harvey distinguishes the male figure’s objective, detailed circulatory system and muscular presentation from the female’s subjective pose with strategically placed hands and veiled modesty.

Chapter One explicates Anne Bradstreet’s feminism in her poem *The Tenth Muse Lately Sprung up in America* (1650), exposing the double bind for vocal women who engage literary activity. Harvey also examines the *querelle des femmes* (debates about women) in Bradstreet’s quaternion on the four humors. The most feminine humor, Flegme, confronts the most masculine humor, Choler, and critiques Aristotelian belief that women are cooler and therefore inferior to men. Bradstreet’s treatment of this verbal contest validates the articulate, well-reasoned female while exposing the polemic of “power hierarchies between the sexes” (24).

In Chapter Two Harvey draws upon literary conversations, scientific theories, and theological debates that have implications for understanding gendered hierarchies in the works of Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz. The medical knowledge present in Sor Juana’s *Primero Sueño* (First Dream) allows the poem to recount both body and soul during a night’s sleep, emphasizing the functions of the body integral to corporeal and spiritual life but not the body’s symbolic value. Modesty in Sor Juana’s poetry joins the body and soul and rejects assumptions that intellect and the spirit transcend the body (79).

Harvey’s Chapter Three brings Anne Hutchinson’s actions into the “free grace controversy in early New England”; both Hutchinson trials insist that the body is not a base for “spiritual and civil values”
Her feminist functionalism is verbalized at her first trial in an argument with John Winthrop regarding women’s public speech. Mortalism, the subject of her second trial, perpetuates Hutchinson’s support for the belief that the body is not resurrected with the spirit. Harvey links this often-overlooked challenge to the Antinomian conflict with Hutchinson’s view of modesty in the public sphere.

The apostolate of Marie de l’Incarnation and the Ursulines of Québec constitute Chapter Four as Harvey probes spiritual autobiographies and collections of letters that expose a feminism which did not simply challenge social and ontological categories as applied to individual women but also explained Marie’s commitment to community life (115). Her life and work provide examples of the contradiction perceived in society between strength and woman. Marie’s speech and dedicated practice within community acknowledge a “sense of the body as useful but without symbolic value” (116). Most illuminating in this chapter are Harvey’s readings of Marie and her fellow Ursulines situating a functionalist understanding of the body as it intersects with religious and communal life. These readings emphasize Marie’s modesty, a topic that is often minimized.

The “Conclusion” offers an impressive synthesis, cataloguing the role each woman played in the evolving concept of feminist functionalism and the practice of modesty. Harvey notes, “Bradstreet and Sor Juana wrote privately to satisfy their own artistic and intellectual impulses” while anchoring their work in a “functioning body” (141-142). Similarly, “Hutchinson and Marie emphasize moderation and bodily practices in this world; they argue the functioning body is an integral part of their understandings of the soul’s relationship to divinity” (143). Each practiced modesty that required action even if the human mind and body lacked complete knowledge. They refused the symbolic and ontological dynamics of embodied chastity and silence —displacing those demands with reason, dignity, and keeping due measure. *Figuring Modesty in Feminine Discourse Across the Americas, 1633-1700* will captivate scholars of women’s studies and literary history. Harvey convincingly argues that these pioneering feminists prove that women can and do become change agents.

Paul Hammond’s new book gathers related essays (two new, others reprinted and revised) which, together, constitute an absorbing reference work that should be on the shelf of serious students of the period, not least since it elucidates areas in which we are probably unaware that our knowledge is deficient. Hammond shows us that the making of a Restoration poem involves complex social, cultural and political machinery, ignorance of which makes us liable to significant interpretive mistakes. The title’s *making* is expansive, including not only what poets did, but also the many ways in which their poetry was constituted and reconstituted by publishers, copyists, editors, and readers. It raises important questions both critical and editorial, sometimes answering them confidently, other times showing that confidence is not warranted.

The book is divided into two parts. In the first part Hammond charts the cultural conditions which went into the making of a Restoration poem. The first three chapters address aspects of publication. Chapter One discusses the central role of print publishers, especially Herringman and his heir Tonson (Dryden’s publishers), in the formation of poetic canons. In Chapter Two, Hammond explores the effects of censorship on poetic production, which naturally encouraged anonymity and indirection, even obscurity, but which also meant that texts, especially those circulating in manuscript, were open to alteration and editing during transmission. Censorship, ironically, enabled writers and texts to speak more powerfully, partly because of the way it precipitated complex modes of writing and reading. Chapter Three zeroes in on anonymity’s uses and virtues. It is not merely an editorial or attribution problem, since it vitally participated in a culture of the communal voice, or of the voice of the “network,” which could presumably serve social purposes of solidarity and identification. An anonymous pamphlet could seem to channel the voice of society at large, more like the public voice of consensus than that of one disgruntled individual. Taken together, these chapters warn us to be wary of our tendency to focus on or value only the version of the
poem that (we think) left an author’s hands, as against the ones which have been edited and rewritten by readers and copyists; authorial and non-authorial versions are differently authentic.

Chapter Four discusses allusiveness in the period. Hammond points out some of the different kinds of allusion (to classical sources, contemporary sources, especially *Paradise Lost*, contemporary events and political rhetoric), giving a few examples of each. He discusses the way an allusion can turn out to oppose its source. He is most interesting when discussing the way an allusion can call into play not only a particular prior textual moment, but a whole ethos. So, he writes about Dryden calling up Horace: “‘How blessed is he’ is more than just a translation of *Beatus ille*, for it sets in motion in the mind of the reader a string of assumptions derived from Horace’s poem…” (86). Such oppositional allusion also happens in topical rhetoric, as in Dryden’s use of Whig keywords like *patriot* and *liberty* in *Absalom and Achitophel*, implicitly redefining the terms in opposition to the Whig political agenda. In Hammond’s account, the purposes of allusion are mainly political or tactical. What is missing here is some accounting for the pleasures of allusion: allusion as company or as community (in the vein of Christopher Ricks, whose *Allusion to the Poets* (2002) Hammond cites). Otherwise, Hammond compellingly makes clear how complex “intertextuality” can be.

Chapter Five pursues intertextuality into the field of classical translation. Among other examples, Hammond studies how Royalist writers, at home or in exile, used the translation of Latin poetry to make coded statements of their loyalty to the defeated cause. Marvell’s “Horatian Ode,” considered under the aspect of translation, generates uncomfortable questions through troubling inconsistencies: Charles is Caesar beheaded; but then, later in the poem, Cromwell too is Caesar, this time conquering foreigners; Marvell wants us to feel how precarious these acts of analogy are—and for that matter how precarious is any act of historical interpretation of the present. At the center of this chapter is a fascinating discussion of the most celebrated translation of the period, Dryden’s *Aeneid*, and of what the practice of translation meant to its great practitioner. Why did Dryden turn so frequently to translation? Was it because he wanted to give to the English language the poems that meant the most to
him and spoke most for him? No. Or at least, not so simply that. Perhaps the primary motive was economic (especially after losing the Laureateship)? Hammond speculates fruitfully about this and many other motivations.

In the final chapter of Part One, “The King’s Two Bodies,” Hammond shows how all of the contextual elements he has been exploring can converge in a single poetic problem: how to represent the king at a time when the normal ways of doing so are no longer viable. Charles’s vaunted promiscuity, and the earlier execution of his father, constituted almost insurmountable challenges to the traditional view of the royal body. Printers, editors, scribes, censors, complex allusive strategies all play their manifold parts in the ways the poetry of the period attempted to solve (or exploit) this problem.

In Part Two, Hammond gives us four fascinating case studies: the circulation of Dryden’s poetry (essential reading for any serious student of Dryden), Dryden’s choice of Flecknoe as poetical father of Shadwell in *Mac Flecknoe*, a famous textual crux in the manuscripts of Marvell’s “To His Coy Mistress,” and a history of modern critical editions of Rochester (to remind us how elusive the editorial questions are, Hammond points out that the table of contents in Harold Love’s great edition can do no better than cite “Poems *Probably* by Rochester”). Each of these in their individual ways illustrates the complex machinery of the world of Restoration poetry.

One disappointment of the book is in the invisibility of Milton. Hammond says that he was “not a significant part of ‘Restoration poetry’ as it was perceived by writers, readers, and booksellers” until the “end of this period” (xxiii). But Dryden is alluding to him as early as 1676, and Hammond does not explain why it became possible for Herringman to publish *Paradise Lost* in 1688 whereas “political caution” (6) had prevented this from happening earlier. There is also, I think, an important missing context: seventeenth-century debates about style and the English language itself. Which English words are suitable and which not? Kenneth Haynes, in *English Literature and Ancient Languages* (2003), reminds us, for example, of how Dryden “complained that Holyday’s translation of Juvenal was crowded with ‘ill sounding Monosyllables, of which our Barbarous Language affords him a wild plenty’” (68). Different relations to English could be “low”
or “high,” could evoke the character of the classic or of the modern, and this seems especially relevant to the period that produced both Milton and Rochester. Still, even with these omissions, Hammond’s book is a fine work of scholarship on Dryden, Marvell, Rochester and their contexts.


William Camden (1551-1623) will always be best remembered as the author of two extraordinarily important works: the *Britannia*, his genre-straddling study of the history, geography and cultural roots of Britain; and the *Annals of Elizabeth*, his painstaking, year-by-year account of the Virgin Queen’s reign. Wyman Herendeen certainly doesn’t want us to forget these achievements (indeed, an analysis of *Britannia* represents one of the most valuable parts of Herendeen’s book) but he would like us to remember that Camden’s life was about much more than the creation of a brace of scholarly masterpieces.

Camden, Herendeen laments, is often pushed to the margins. He usually serves as little more than “a gloss to narratives other than his own” (59). Camden was not a flamboyant person and he lived in an “understated and self-effacing” (14) fashion but, as a schoolmaster, a member of the College of Arms, and as a much-respected figure in the European republic of letters, his contribution was much greater than that of a dusty antiquarian. His role as under master (from 1575) and headmaster (from 1593) at Westminster School is perhaps the most neglected of all his non-literary accomplishments. It is easy to think of Camden reluctantly carrying out his daily pedagogical tasks while itching to get back to his study or to embark upon one of his historical fact-gathering tours around the country. This, Herendeen insists, is likely to be an inaccurate portrayal. Camden was a committed teacher who played a part in the education of many future luminaries, Robert Cotton and Ben Jonson included. Herendeen does a superb job of exploring the world of Elizabethan education which not only serves to put Camden in context but also reminds us that,
as a master at Westminster (located so close to the nation’s leading political institutions), he was never far away from the crossroads of power, patronage and influence.

Ultimately, of course, any study of Camden is destined to return to the Britannia. Here, Herendeen is obliged to enter some choppy historiographical waters. Recent years have seen much scholarly debate about the evolution of historical writing in late-Tudor and early-Stuart England. There has been much talk of revolution, of a new commitment to the rigorous examination of source materials, and of breakthroughs in authorial self-fashioning. Herendeen does not wish to derail such discussions—indeed, he positions Camden as one of the most significant harbingers of change—but the best parts of his book (though there are moments when he fails to dodge glaring hermeneutic pitfalls) serve as a welcome rejoinder to some of the more exaggerated claims that are currently floating around the academy. Any overarching analysis is immediately damaged when we acknowledge that a) early modern history-writing was extremely chaotic, that b) neatly defined genres simply did not exist, and that c) historical practitioners were far more concerned with going about their scholarly business in idiosyncratic ways than in abiding by the parameters of present-day interpretative models. There is, of course, room for the big argument (else what is the point), but before we mount it there is perhaps more sense in pursuing detailed, nuts and bolts research into individual Tudor and Stuart scholars.

This is precisely what Herendeen does and his conclusions about Camden’s motives and methodology ought to be read by any serious student of early modern historiography. Herendeen argues, against prevailing wisdom, that Camden should be seen as a profoundly theoretical historian. From its preface onwards, Britannia demonstrates “a carefully developed epistemology” (200). The book is no random assemblage of facts and speculations. Rather, it is a model of almost Baconian scepticism. Camden sought empirical evidence wherever he could find it and put it to good use, but he was always careful to insist that Britannia (a book that went through various editions during the 1580s, 1590s and beyond) was always a work in progress and that its conclusions were tentative. Furthermore, Herendeen argues that Camden developed a very specific authorial persona—one of
“rhetorical self-effacement” (200)—and that, through his embrace of the traces of material culture (whether coins or monumental inscriptions), he helped to break new ground. Even the structure of his book (one that routinely abandoned the traditional chronological framework of earlier chronicles) had hints of innovation embedded within its many pages.

Some of this is hard to gainsay. Camden’s scholarly radar, always tuned to demythologising, was impressive: he adopted an enviably interrogatory attitude when it came to sources. He also (like many of his contemporaries) played fast and loose, in a rather wonderful way, with historical forms. He did not desire the stable voice of a Rankean wie is eigentlich gewesen historian (which, after all, would have been hard, several centuries avant la lettre) and was much happier moving between antiquarianism, topography and poetic utterance. For all this, there is still a risk of crediting Camden with too much authorial intention. Those who have read Camden will know that chaos is sometimes just chaos, rather than artful playfulness. It is always good fun, but it does not always inspire thoughts of sophisticated theoretical intent (and why, after all, should it?). As for the notion of wily “rhetorical self-effacement”: well, maybe. Or perhaps Camden was just following a modish convention (oh humble me, and all that).

None of this is intended to dent Herendeen’s achievement. He proves beyond doubt that Camden’s Britannia was a profoundly influential text. He claims, convincingly, that it should be read alongside Sidney’s Apologie for Poetrie and Spenser’s The Faerie Queene whenever we try to anatomise the era’s attempt to strike “the proper chemical balance of mythopoeic and historical truth” (210). Camden and his peers were deeply puzzled by profoundly difficult issues: how to write history, how to encapsulate the fledgling notion of national identity, and how to do justice by all the competing Muses, of which Clio was only ever one. Camden, as Herendeen’s book amply demonstrates, was often in the thick of things.

Whether Camden conjured up lasting solutions and whether he was consistently obsessed with the challenge remain as open questions. Just occasionally, Herendeen forces Camden to play by modern interpretative rules—rules (since they are the brain-children of later scholars) which Camden would neither have countenanced nor un-
derstood—but, for the most part, Herendeen offers a sympathetic, well-researched account of this famous, but strangely understudied man. This, flaws and all, is one of the most important books ever written about William Camden. There will be worthwhile debate about how Herendeen positions Camden in the early modern English historiographical landscape and we should all be grateful that he has taken the trouble to reveal Camden the man: a far more interesting figure than most of us (or I, at least) ever imagined.


In his diary entry for 3 May 1664, Increase Mather did not mince words when recording the disconcerting verdict of First Church of Boston against John Cotton, Jr. He straightforwardly recorded that the Church had voted to excommunicate Cotton, Jr., for lascivious behavior involving three women and also for lying about his involvement. Nearly two weeks before this diary entry, Cotton, Jr. had visited Mather’s home to privately discuss his situation. How much Cotton, Jr., admitted to his stepbrother is unknown, but Mather’s agitated reaction to what he was told might be gauged from the illegibleness of his scrawled two-line journal comment concerning that meeting.

Mather was on the spot. During his lifetime, family honor, blood allegiance and lineage politics ran deep. However, when he met with Cotton, Jr., in 1664, Mather was scheduled to be ordained in a matter of weeks. At that point, as throughout his later life, Mather was particularly keen on safeguarding the status of his personal legacy from the first generation of New England divines.

It is not surprising, then, that the twenty-four year old Mather, with ambitions of his own at stake, was thoroughly stymied by young Cotton’s behavior. “Troubled about J. C.,” he confessed in his diary, “being very desirous to testify more fully for him, & yet afraid to doe it, because I could not say (*sana conscientia*) that his carriage & demeanore had bin all along suitable to his condition” (Michael G. Hall, *The Last American Puritan* [1988], 64).
Demeanor unbecoming to a minister was certainly an issue, as editors Sheila McIntyre and Len Travers document in The Correspondence of John Cotton Junior. An investigative General Court committee for the Connecticut Colony had concluded as early as 20 March 1662 that the young minister had exhibited a propensity for using “sinnfull Rach unpeacabell” language “of a veary high defaming natuer” (sic, 44). This General Court finding would not cost Cotton, Jr., the pulpit in Wethersfield, but that outcome was waiting for him just around the next corner.

And so was his excommunication from Boston’s First Church in 1664. Just prior to and after this particular unexpected turn of events, Cotton, Jr., made at least four appeals to John Winthrop, Jr., the governor of the Connecticut plantations. Cotton, Jr., was looking for solidarity based on noblesse oblige, but Winthrop, Jr., was no fool.

Improper comportment was the least of young Cotton’s problems. Far more egregious—though his male peers were slow to admit it—was the young minister’s inability to control his sexual urges. Even as late as 1697, when Cotton, Jr., was 57, the brethren of the Plymouth church met to consider “scandalous reports” of “some miscarriages in the Pastor towards Rebekah Morton” (541). Eventually, Cotton, Jr., would lose his long-held pulpit there. And soon, too, there were more unpleasant rumors, stirred by the fact that his wife now lived apart from him.

All of this was just too much for Increase Mather, who had heard these rumors and likely many others over the years. Doubtless he also recalled how 33 years ago his stepbrother had put him on the spot when Mather’s own incipient career was especially vulnerable to a setback. In 1697, according to Samuel Sewall’s journal, Mather admitted that he and other ministers had been too lax for too long in responding to Cotton’s bad character and subsequent misadventures.

Late in 1698, Cotton decided to move to recently founded Charleston, South Carolina. He would arrive there alone, and in less than a year he would die from yellow fever.

Cotton’s correspondence was extensive, and Sheila McIntyre and Len Travers have worked wonders with these letters. Never mind that some of the quotations in their “Introduction” are not faithful to the texts that follow it. That is a small defect compared to each
meticulously introduced, edited and footnoted letter. This book does more than merely illuminate a previously obscure life; this work also provides an useful primary resource for early American studies. The uncommonly lavish layout of this handsome volume aptly suits the editors’ exemplary dedication to and execution of their editorial undertaking—a model of its kind.


Michael Armstrong-Roche quite correctly points out that most critics view *The Labors of Persiles and Sigismunda* as a “turning away from modernity” (3), an example of Cervantes’ late-life embrace of the Counter-Reformation. Some even consider the byzantine novel a misstep by the author of *Don Quixote* while, ironically, Cervantes himself saw his last book as his crowning achievement. In this perceptive monograph, Armstrong-Roche makes the case that *Persiles* can best be appreciated if, instead of looking forward toward the novel, we look back to the epic. Seen from this viewpoint, Cervantes’ last work summarizes and reinvigorates the epic trajectory by inverting its premise. The author argues that the strong focus on love in Cervantes’ last work does not distract from the protagonists’ epic duty, but rather constitutes the main plot of the heroic adventure of *Persiles and Sigismunda*.

The carefully crafted monograph centers on four themes—empire, religion, love and politics—each of which is studied in its own chapter following a structure that is clearly laid out in the book’s introduction. First we are presented with a characterization of verse and/or prose epic handling one of the four themes; then the author engages *Persiles* in the discussion. The argument, therefore, takes the epic frame as a point of departure to study each particular theme, but does not limit its claims to the genre. Each chapter also explores analytical paradigms that have emerged from a perception of historically significant and recurring features of Cervantes’ text around keywords
such as “barbarism” in Chapter One, “charity” in Chapter Two, and “sensuality” in Chapter Three. In this analysis Armstrong-Roche demonstrates that the novel becomes a kind of parable for debates touching on themes including the legitimacy of conquest, religious reform, the honor code, the concept of matrimony and prerogatives and duties of rulers.

Chapter One, “Europe as Barbaric New World,” studies the relation between the Barbaric Isle—where the action of the novel begins—and the Catholic South, as one to be understood in terms of the difference between law and custom. Armstrong-Roche points out the importance of Cervantes’ departure from the traditional practice of epic writers who worked to “align the hero’s ethnic, political and religious affiliations with those of its first audiences and readers” (36). By doing so, and having northern European Gothic protagonists make their way across Latin Europe, Cervantes is able to showcase the known from an outsider point of view and, consequently, unsettle his first readers’ cultural assumptions. This works particularly well when we see that, while it is true that the Barbaric Law of the Island features consumption of hearts, sacrifices, trafficking of women, and other seemingly barbaric practices, the Catholic and civilized world has its own forms of barbarism present in numerous customs ranging from the idolatry of female beauty to the violent consequences of the honor code. The final destiny of the pilgrimage of our protagonists is then no longer the geographical city of Rome, but a conjugal and charitable love discovered precisely through the encounter of “humanity on the margins and barbarism in the heartlands of Christianity” (119).

The second chapter, “Christian Spirituality: The Law of Love,” relates Cervantes’ work to Greek adventure novels which enjoyed great literary and religious prestige in early modern Europe, and had been previously Christianized and naturalized in Spain by Lope de Vega in *El peregrino en su patria* (*The Pilgrim in His Homeland*, 1604). In Lope de Vega’s work, as in Vergil’s *Aeneid* and Tasso’s *Gerusalemme liberata*, religion is not a problem to be explored, but a fact of life, or a duty. Armstrong-Roche argues that “religion in Persiles is seen as more of a problem and a question” (115) and that the protagonists’ story can be read as a “journey of discovery about what it means to be Catholic” (120). And that meaning is not to be found in an orthodox Southern
Catholicism that is continuously questioned throughout the novel or in Protestantism, as some recent critics have argued. In fact, the book makes the case that being a Catholic is most fully understood when considered in light of a Pauline sensibility that can be traced thematically and structurally in certain parallels between Saint Paul’s voyage from Cesarea to Rome and aspects of the ancient Greek novel such as storms, shipwrecks, mutiny and eastern Mediterranean geography (124) and, most notably, in the importance of caritas over the institutional forms of religion, and the spirit over the law.

Chapter Three, “Epic Recast: The Dream Life of the New Hero,” analyzes Cervantes’ reconciliation of the epic antagonism between war, as the natural occupation of the epic hero, and love, usually subordinated to conquest and considered a distraction from the hero’s duty. The chapter studies passages from *The Aeneid* and *The Odyssey*, as well as Periandro’s dream episode in which he is tempted by Sensualidad. The protagonist recounts this dream and his choosing of Castidad over Sensualidad as one of his heroic deeds, although Chastity is not presented as “an absolute or permanent value” (191). In fact, explains Armstrong-Roche, “Periandro’s quest is erotic, and Rome for him is not a martial or even primarily Christian destiny, but a marital one. The opposition is not only between war and love, but also between immediate and deferred sexual gratifications” (198). This reading seems to be attuned with contemporary reaffirmations of matrimony across confessional lines and effectively redefines the role of the epic hero.

The fourth and last chapter, “Christian Politics: Church and State,” examines a number of episodes of the novel that Armstrong-Roche argues can be considered “a picture of the ritual initiation and education of princes, the experiences they should undergo, the knowledge (both natural and revealed) they should master, and the values they must come to uphold” (205). The first of these lessons can be found in the adventure on Policarpo’s Isle, used as a model of the tensions between Christian ideals and political debates of the time. Policarpo has been elected king of his island because he is considered the most virtuous of all the island’s men and should rule until his passing or his character fails. In this episode, however, Policarpo and his daughter fall in love with the protagonists of this story, Auristela and Periandro, and
scheme together with a sorceress to hold them captive. The episode’s outcome shows us that what seems to be a kingdom of virtue with respect for the law has, in fact, much in common with the Barbaric Isle. The chapter also dedicates attention to the tensions between Church and nobility regarding their different models of matrimony after the Council of Trent. In the realm of the real-world Christian politics, this chapter offers a very perceptive analysis of the morisco Jarife’s speeches in conjunction with the expulsion of the moriscos that is presented prophetically when our pilgrims pass through a village in Valencia, a topic that was very much in the mind of the contemporary readers of Cervantes’ work.

The book continues with an epilogue entitled “Cervantes’ Human and Divine Comedy” that should not be overlooked as it sketches out broader implications of Armstrong-Roche’s analysis dealing with Cervantes as an author, and the historical and cultural reality in which he lived. The book closes with a documented appendix on the composition dates of Persiles.

Michael Armstrong-Roche’s book is an example of an expertly written, well-documented, and theoretically informed study that is attentive to the cultural context in which the object of his analysis was produced. His monograph is not necessary reading for all cervantistas, but it is easy to predict that it will become as essential as the important studies written by Alban Forcione, Diana de Armas Wilson, and Isabel Lozano Renieblas when seeking to understand The Labors of Persiles and Sigismunda.


This volume offers detailed analysis and rigorous contextualization of the diverse writings of Juan Luis Vives (Valencia, Spain 1492/93—Bruges, Belgium, 1540). In the course of some sixty different publications, this Valencian humanist considered the education of women, family relations, poor relief, religious conflict, formal rhetoric and royal power. During his five sojourns at the court of Henry VIII
between 1521 and 1528, he befriended and collaborated with key figures, including Thomas More, Richard Pace, and Bishop Tunstall. His extraordinary productivity is attested in the 1555 edition of his *Opera*, which comprises over 1700 pages distributed in two volumes. This tally does not include the vast *Commentary on the City of God* by St. Augustine, which Vives initiated at the behest of Erasmus. Inventories document that his books circulated widely in Europe, the Americas, as well as Jesuit missions in Asia. But from the last third of the sixteenth century, Vives’s readership waned to the point that the Enlightenment *Encyclopédistes* had almost no direct knowledge of his works. Today, his reputation rests primarily on his writings about education. Hence the volume’s stated goal of drawing new attention to him among a wider English-speaking public. In this respect, the *Companion* complements another project for which Fantazzi is the editor, the *Selected Works of J. L. Vives* (Brill), a series of critical editions of the humanist’s most significant works. Eight volumes have appeared to date.

Two essays by Enrique González y González (hereafter González) frame the *Companion* with reference to this goal. The first, “Juan Luis Vives: Works and Days,” provides a biographical and bibliographical orientation. The discussion here of Vives’s early years in Valencia offers valuable insights about the impact of the Inquisition on Spanish society. Archival records that came to light in the 1960s revealed that both his mother and father were from prominent Jewish merchant families who had converted to Christianity after the devastating pogroms of 1391. Though evidence suggests the family assimilated relatively quickly to Christianity, members retained some Jewish cultural and devotional practices. Even before Vives was born, his mother had been questioned by Inquisitors. He himself left Valencia in 1509 for university studies in Paris, after which he never returned. Back home, Inquisitorial pressure continued, culminating in the 1524 trial and execution of his father, plus the disinterment and burning of his mother’s bones. How, González asks, does this tragic family history inform Vives’s writing? A paradigm dominant in Hispanic studies during the later twentieth century posited that the Valencian, like other *converso* intellectuals, responded to this scrutiny and persecution with a deeply ingrained pessimism. Though González is sensitive to these tribulations, his analysis of Vives’s later works also draws attention to
the humanist’s sense of humor and manifestations of the deep pleasure he drew from his work. The nuance González provides to longstanding conceptions of a *converso* sensibility deserves consideration by any scholar who writes on this issue. The second essay González contributes, “Fame and Oblivion,” closes the volume. Readers may, however, find it useful as an introduction, given its programmatic presentation of his publication trajectory and detailed discussion of the state-of-the-field.

Charles Fantazzi, in “Vives and the *Emarginati*,” pairs treatises on the education of women with those on poor relief, using the Italian term for “marginal groups” as his rubric. The linchpin of his analysis of the first category is the *De institutione feminae Christianae*, prepared at the behest of Queen Catherine of England with an eye toward organizing the education of her daughter Mary. In terms of poor relief, Fantazzi considers the *De subventione pauperum* against the backdrop of the social problems the era’s urban expansion had wrought. He finds Vives’s contribution rests on his conception of a lay, centralized administration of poor relief at a time where private charity and the mendicant orders were dominant. Some closing synthesis might have helped cement the connection Fantazzi proposes in brief at the outset, between women’s education and poor relief.

The section most directly concentrated on humanist circles in the English court is the chapter by Catherine Curtis, “The Social and Political Thought of Juan Luis Vives: Concord and Counsel in the Christian Commonwealth.” In particular, she considers how Vives’s relationships to English and Erasmian humanists shaped his critique of the notion of just war, as manifested in the *De Europae dissidiis et bello Turcico* (Bruges, 1526) and the ensemble of letters in the *De Europae dissidiis et re publica*. A brief closing section proposes Vives’s direct or indirect influence on later writings by Thomas Elyot, James I, Richard Burton, and Thomas Hobbes.

Valerio del Nero contributes a pair of essays, the first of which, “The *De Disciplinis* as a Model of a Humanist Text,” discusses how this encyclopedic educational treatise sets an agenda for all aspects of instruction, from educational facilities, to curricula and textbooks. This chapter is most suitable for seasoned Renaissance scholars, given the dense web of intertextual references, as we can see when he summa-
rizes the treatise’s impact: “If one compares Vives with the preceding pedagogic tradition from Vittorino da Feltre and Guarino Veronese, through Battista Guarino, Maffeo Vegio, Leon Battista Alberti, Enea Silvio Piccolomini to the great productions of Erasmus, Budé, and Rabelais, while not forgetting how much the Reformation (Luther, Melanchthon, Sturm) owes to this debate, the Spanish humanist is seen to play the role of the protagonist” (201). This sentence also attests to the fact that the translation of the chapter from Italian to English could have used more editing. The second essay from del Nero, “A Philosophical Treatise on the Soul: *De Anima et vita* in the context of Vives’s Opus,” is more accessible to non-specialists. Seventeenth-century scholars will find this section particularly helpful for considering how Vives’s writing about the soul contributes to emerging notions of subjectivity and anticipates concepts of *ingenium* that would later be associated with the Baroque.

Peter Mack, in “Vives’s Contributions to Rhetoric and Dialectic,” offers a panoramic view of how Vives engaged this fundamental realm of humanistic inquiry. He notes at the outset that this facet of the Valencian’s oeuvre has been particularly neglected, despite the fact that he wrote extensively on both rhetoric and dialectic. Particularly interesting comments follow from his analysis of *De consultatione* (1523), which Vives prepared while lecturing on Rhetoric at Oxford’s Corpus Christi College. The lengthy citations with which Mack anchors his analysis also provide the reader a chance to get a sense of Vives’s prose style.

Differing attitudes toward non-Christians shape Edward V. George’s essay, “Author, Adversary, and Reader: A View of the De veritate fidei christianae.” This treatise, published posthumously (1543), takes the form of a disputation with a series of non-Christians. Books One and Two dispute “pagan” classical authorities, a tactic that situates the writer in relatively safe terrain. But the following two books dispute Judaism and Islam in turn, entering a territory especially thorny for an intellectual of Jewish descent who came of age in a region known for its sizeable population of Moriscos—the descendants of Spain’s Muslims forced to convert to Christianity in the late fifteenth century. George notes the different rhetorical tactics deployed against these two religions. In Book Three, Vives conceives of a hypothetical
Jew who might listen to reason. No such heuristic device grounds the refutation of Islam. From a different angle, George contrasts the textual representation of a Jewish interlocutor as *Judaeus*, an ethnic category, with the presentation of the Muslim through a sociological one, as an *Alfaquinus*. The latter implies a jurist or community leader. A more coeval treatment of Muslims and Jews would have involved another term, such as *Mahometan*. Convincingly, George attributes this differing treatment to the fact that conciliation toward Muslims was less risky for the *converso* intellectual.

Overall, the essays in the *Companion* will be particularly valuable for advanced graduate students or seasoned scholars in Renaissance studies. Non-specialists will find many useful insights, but will encounter barriers to entry. For instance, the numerous citations of the *Opera omnia* (Valencia, 1782-90) are referenced in footnotes by the editor’s Latinized surname, Majansius. Yet to locate the corresponding bibliographic entry, he or she would need to know this correlates to the surname Mayans. There is no cross reference. Similarly, there is no appendix that lists and dates the many publications discussed. González rigorously documents the complex editorial history of Vives’s works in his two essays, but that information is spread throughout his exposition. At times, therefore, a reader needs to search back to find publication dates or other key information about the many texts the contributors discuss. These minor caveats aside, the editor and his colleagues have presented highly compelling essays, which engage one another yet also stand alone.


The death of James I’s older son, Henry, at the young age of nineteen, changed the path of English history irrevocably. Henry had been the first heir to the English throne for over 70 years and much had been expected of him. Instead, his more reserved, less militaristic younger brother Charles became king. It is not surprising, then,
that Henry’s unfinished life has raised much interest and speculation since his death in 1612. Perhaps best known was Roy Strong’s 1986 biography, *Henry, Prince of Wales, and England’s Lost Renaissance*. This present volume does not attempt to offer a new or complete biography, however. Rather, it seeks to understand Henry’s life and death, not as objective ‘fact,’ but as a series of images and examples for those around him and those who came later. In many ways, Henry’s brief life was ideal for the creation of these images and exempla—we know him more from images and epigrams than from concrete actions or historical events. Timothy Wilks has therefore called on the expertise of art historians, literary scholars and cultural historians to examine the fleeting glances we see of Henry’s life and interpret their uses both for contemporaries and in the decades after Henry’s death. The result is a series of interesting and thoughtful examinations of particular moments and images of Henry’s life, rather than a new understanding of Henry himself.

Henry provides an exemplar of the heroic prince, both by explicitly following historic examples himself, and through the images made of him illustrative of his status. *Prince Henry Revived* follows Henry chronologically, starting with his time as a student. Aysha Pollintz demonstrates that Henry was held up as an ideal student prince, particularly after his death, and that this view has been followed unproblematically by later historians. The reality, however, was quite different. Henry was, in fact, an indifferent student; he was unmotivated, learned no Greek, and was a poor writer. Both James and Elizabeth, by comparison, had been paragons of scholarship. Indeed, we can see part of the early split with his father in this disagreement about the importance of study. Michael Ullyot continues this theme by examining James’ instructions to his son, in his *Basilicon Doron*. Ullyot argues that this text was aimed less at instructing Henry, but more used the existence of Henry to further James’ claims for his own reign. Later readers in turn used James’ suggestions about Henry’s education to further their own political ambitions, especially through encouraging Henry to take a more militant stance.

Contributors to this volume then turn to the community of scholars, politicians, spies, and gentlemen with connections to Prince Henry. Michael O’Callaghan looks at Thomas Coryat’s descriptions
of Venice and France, written for a prince interested in the Continent but who could not himself travel. John Buchtel introduces us to the wide range of books and authors dedicated to Henry. Gilles Bertheau examines one such dedication—that of George Chapman's translation of Homer—and argues that Chapman was using this dedication to show that Henry himself was a Homeric hero, an Absolute Man. Alex Marr looks at the print history and physical construction of *La Perspective avec la raison des ombres et miroirs* (1611), arguing that a close-knit group of artisans, scholars, and printers were within Henry's circle.

We then turn to images of Henry. Given that he was only in the public eye for eight years, the volume of paintings and engravings depicting the Prince of Wales is impressive. Several of these images have been well studied in the past, both with regards to their production history and their provenance. Gail Capitol Weigl here examines a famous equestrian portrait of Henry, demonstrating that the painter, Robert Peake, was portraying steadfastness and a Christian leader, a dawning sun of a new age. She also shows that this portrait owes much to earlier equestrian portraits, particularly one depicting Henri IV. Indeed, it is clear from a number of the chapters in this book that Henry, as image and exempla, fits into a line of Protestant rulers, following Henri IV and Prince Maurice. Timothy Wilks looks at the famous pike portrait of Henry, often copied in engravings, producing a new chronology of its creation (arguing, for example, that the *Poly-Olbion* version predates the more elaborate Simon de Passe version) and showing that the prevalence of this picture of Henry, performing the military exercise of a common foot-soldier, argues that the English nobility were more interested in military activities in the early seventeenth century than has been previously thought. Wilks also suggests that the use of this image after Henry's death, through the period 1616-1620, reminded people of the royal connections to such activities.

The last two chapters look at Henry's funeral and effigy as a further instance of the power and importance of Henry's image. Gregory McNamara shows that the funeral clothes, of the effigy, of the rooms in the palace, and of the mourners, marked the importance of the occasion and separated it from the sumptuous clothing and display of Henry's living court. Elizabeth Golding argues that Henry's funeral,
and especially his effigy, established Henry as a Protestant and military leader. His funeral was, in fact, larger and more expensive than Elizabeth’s had been; his effigy stood in Westminster Abbey until 1641. Much of the imagery harkened back to Henri IV’s funeral, not coincidentally. In the years that followed his death and funeral, the engravings of Henry’s effigy, and the actual thing itself, became part of a political argument about the Protestant nature of Henry’s unconsummated reign, and by inference, what might have been.

The images of Henry examined in this volume told a consistent story. Henry was the hope for international Calvinism (although as D.J.B. Trim argues, James was not as opposed to Calvinism as is sometimes claimed and continued tacitly to support the Dutch even after signing a peace treaty with Spain). Image makers argued that he would be a great military ruler; he would follow in the path of a great Protestant hero like Henri IV. This is probably not surprising. Through this volume we understand a little more of the image-making and using surrounding this tragic prince, although we do not gain from it any final conclusions. It would be instructive to compare Henry’s image with that of his brother Charles, in order to understand to what extent Henry’s England was lost or found.


Rudolf Agricola Junior, Valentin Eck, and Leonard Cox, three young men from German territories and England, who were cast by fortune to Central Eastern Europe, to the courts of the Jagiellons and their subjects in Kraków and Buda are the heroes of Jacqueline Glomski’s recent book. All three of them were young, well educated scholars and poets at the same time. They were humanists, able to teach, write verse, translate and generally serve their benefactors with words.
Dr. Jacqueline Glomski sets out on an adventurous, albeit difficult and full of traps, trip following the footsteps of the three renaissance artists. In an amazing manner she takes us with her to a successful ending of literary, but also social and cultural voyage. I have no doubt, that all readers of the discussed book will be amazed by the quality of scholarship, the erudition of the author and the elegance of the narrative itself.

This book is not about, or rather not just about the renaissance literature produced in Central Europe by three incomers from other parts of Europe. The author seeks to answer much deeper and more complex questions referring to the problem of patronage and careers at the royal courts of the Jagiellons (courts, as at least Kraków and Buda, but also Vilnius and Vienna are in the scope here), but also among the local dignitaries, who willingly copied their monarchs, becoming patrons of arts and learning themselves.

Glomski begins her narrative with examination of ‘humanist’ situation at Kraków, the capital of Poland. Her presentation is not only clear and competent, but also covering large areas and elegant. I do not recall having read recently anything comparable to the background information provided for readers in this work. It is excellent. Against this background, the author sets out to analyze the works of the three authors concerned.

This research, and this book, would have been impossible to carry out without an excellent knowledge of Latin, but also of the literary forms and genres of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Thanks to the very good preparation, the author is able to analyze various works of Agricola Junior, Eck and Cox against the cannons of the epoch and prove to the reader whether a certain piece of their writings was an aimed dedication, self-promotion or something else. This, in turn, allows Glomski to follow the careers of her heroes as their fortunes rose and descended, also depending on the overall situation of their environment, the position of their patrons and events of the state (such as Turkish war and Louis Jagiellon’s death at Mohaes). The three young men’s poetry is questioned about its sense and aim. Were the poems included in books and pamphlets demands for support, or were they a repayment for the received benefices; did the author try to sell himself to a new patron, or was this piece of poetry a special
advertisement? At the same time their work was a literary expression of their times, of the Renaissance and it should not be viewed just as a tool to get privileges and money, but it was literature. In Poland and Hungary such artistic production at that time was not unknown, but it was not incredibly popular and common. One of the problems the author is trying to answer, refers to how we should categorize this literature—as an import from other countries, or maybe we should view it as a local, Polish production—even if written with a foreign hand.

This book cannot be summarized—it has to be read. It is an extremely important work for our knowledge about the artistic and literary dimension of Jagiellon’s courts. It is also an important contribution to our knowledge of simple narrative and social history. The three writers were known and mentioned in various monographs and dissertations. Jacqueline Glomski managed to find most of the scattered production of the three authors, and comments on works, which were either very hard to find, or even were believed to have been lost over the years.

The author’s comments are precise and meaningful, in detail showing all the nuances of her research. We learn not only about the various forms and formats applied by contemporary authors, but also about the background education they all acquired and why twenty-first century intellectuals have problems understanding their ancestors and their writings. Hardly anyone today is able to utilize the texts of ancient Roman authors and explain their meaning, but also explain why they were used in a specific situation. Fortunately Jacqueline Glomski is, and has shared her knowledge with us.

Patronage and Humanist Literature... is not a simple, easy book for everyone. This does not mean it is not written well or hard to comprehend. On the contrary—it reads well and with great satisfaction. Indeed a formidable contribution to our vision of the Jagiellon courts in the early modern period, but to the situation in Poland and Hungary as well.
On one level, this audacious, frustrating, and deeply entertaining work by the distinguished historian Annabel Patterson focuses on the Byzantine political maneuverings of the “Long Parliament” that served at the pleasure—and perhaps more often at the displeasure—of Charles II from 1661 to 1679. She follows her slyly titled Nobody’s Perfect: A New Whig Interpretation of History (2002) with another book that is unabashedly hostile towards monarchy (Charles is a “deceitful crook” [52]) and delightfully dismissive of the rules and conventions of historiography. Placing herself in the company of Steven Pincus and Tim Harris, she frames her work in an ideological “extreme” bold enough to ask, “Do ‘we’ believe that the Restoration was desirable, or simply the only possible outcome after the collapse of the Protectorate, and hence a necessary evil?” (6-7)

She acknowledges but resists the attraction of chronological narrative: for those needing chronology, she begins her second chapter by laying out the highlights of the struggle between Charles and his Parliament in a timeline extending a dozen pages or so. After that, the reader is asked to follow her analytical gaze as it shuttles frenetically back and forth across two decades. For those familiar with the major events and controversies of the period, such an approach is highly refreshing. This strategy comes at a price, though. Readers puzzled by her early references to the assault on Sir John Coventry’s nose are forced to be patient. Those unfamiliar with the Shirley/Fagg affair will have to turn outside the text for assistance, and those not well read in the literature of the Popish Plot will likely be turned away.

Early in her discussion of sources, she mentions Grey’s Debates, an account of the publication of which she delays until the end of the book, where she misdates a proposal to publish the debates in the Gentleman’s Magazine as 1645, rather than 1745 (245). It is a minor error in an exciting and valuable book, but it highlights the risks involved in resisting chronological narrative.

She chides those of her colleagues who present copious concatenations of sources without engaging those sources with the sort of
rhetorical skill and sensitivity she can bring to her more selective list of historical witnesses. With the skill of a literary critic—and with a pardonable hubris—she “hears” her sources, including the speeches of Charles to the extent they have been accurately reconstructed, with a subtlety and care missing in those historians more concerned with the number of their historical witnesses than with their lucidity. She complains that the standard histories create “a large cocktail party. No sooner have these witnesses been introduced than we forget their names” (8).

What she prefers is a careful analysis of a handful of often contradictory sources, towards a kind of “group psychology.” In spite of the impressive assembly and variety of sources, prominent among them the accounts of Andrew Marvell, it is the King’s speeches to Parliament that wind up most compelling the reader’s attention. Patterson identifies in him a “psychostrategical attitude towards parliament” that runs counter to the received opinion of Charles as a hedonist lacking in political savvy. (68 and passim) The rhetorical machinations involved in his constant requests for Parliamentary “supply”—and the “jealousies” or hostile rumors to which the King responded and used for psychological leverage—suggest one answer to the question of this Parliament’s longevity (68). For the better part of two decades, the King believed himself largely in control of this group, or at least more likely to have his way with this group than some newly elected one.

Patterson’s metacritical focus on sources reminds readers not only that the “witnesses” vary widely in their accounts but also that virtually all of them are elicit or illegal. At a time when newspapers were in their infancy, scribal publications, personal correspondence, diarists and memoirists, and the editors of “scofflaw pamphlets” provide such “facts” as are extant concerning Parliamentary business. Assuming the often scurrilous and contradictory nature of these sources, the historian relies on a careful analysis of voice, the subtleties of rhetoric on which revisionist conclusions might be drawn. A prime example is the aforementioned nose of Sir John Coventry. In a debate over taxing the playhouses to raise revenue, Sir John, according to several sources, made an inappropriate crack about the King’s enjoyment of the theatre. All of the subsequent accounts of the “Nose Bill,” and the responses to the ensuing physical attack on the Coventry proboscis,
are subject to multiple interpretation, depending on the historian’s sensitivity to the multiple “voices” doing the witnessing.

This technique is best displayed in analyses of the King’s speeches. She fixes on his repetition of the word *jealousies*, which Patterson defines as “hostile rumors.” Because the King’s speeches were much more likely to be disseminated than other Parliamentary records, the effect of his broadcasting annoying rumors—about his financial malfeasance, for example—had the effect of substantiating and prolonging them. She notes throughout what she identifies as a defensive tone in the royal addresses. She also claims, “Charles was not only disingenuous in his speeches. He was capable of telling outright lies” (82). Apparently, discerning listeners or readers might identify those points at which the King seemed most vehement in his denials as a kind of lie detection system.

A final example of Patterson’s narrative disruption will serve to illustrate both the uniqueness of its structure and the challenge it presents to readers. After repeated cursory allusions to Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon throughout the early part of the narrative, this figure who loomed so prominently in the early years of the Restoration is re-introduced in Chapter Four, an account of the various memoirists on whom the author relies. Again, the chapters weave back and forth from direct analysis of the events impinging on the business of the Long Parliament to metacritical consideration of historiography. Indeed, the book concludes with a chapter set a century later: an account of the historicizing of this period that occurred in the later eighteenth century. It is a pleasant surprise, in this context, to be introduced to James Ralph, a remarkable figure prominent in a wide variety of mid-eighteenth-century histories, as himself one of the early creators of Parliamentary history.

For those not using this book as a historical reference—its organization deliberately resists access as an introduction to Restoration politics—the book serves as a quirky and stylish account of the Carolean period—a designation Patterson would surely reject—whether one views these decades as a period of heroic resistance to royal tyranny or as a endlessly complex multi-plot drama featuring schemers trying to achieve political advantage on their own terms.

This wide-ranging study explores the meanings of psychosomatic illness in works drawn from four classical genres: self-writing, the novel, comedy and tragedy. The author makes three main claims: that Cartesian dualism dominated concepts of mind and body in the French seventeenth century; that dualistic views reinforced the oppressive practices of the absolute monarchy; and that, in contrast, representations of psychosomatic disorders posed a “clandestine, indeed repressed challenge to the hierarchical split of body and mind” (2), revealing a close interrelation between the two. These claims are reinforced by references to a wide array of philosophical, medical, and literary authorities. Höfer’s view of repressive social practices draws on Louis Marin, Jean-Marie Apostolidès, Michel de Certeau, and John Lyons, among others. In linking Cartesian rationality with absolutist policy, she follows critics including James Gaines, Michael Koppich, and Larry Riggs. Beyond her critique of dualism, Höfer seeks to initiate a “dialogue” between classical holistic thinking and contemporary psychological theory, drawing on the ideas of neurobiologist Antonio Damasio, whose books, _Descartes’ Error_ (1994) and _Looking for Spinosa_ (2003,) are frequently quoted. In the introduction, Höfer refers to the fourth edition of the _Diagnostic and Statistical Manual (DSM-IV) _to define psychosomatic or “somatoform” illness as “the presence of physical symptoms that are not fully explained by a general medical condition” (5). She also borrows the psychoanalytic term “conversion”—the means by which a repressed emotional trauma takes somatic form. In analogous fashions, the bodies of literary figures can “speak” their repressions; hence, “reading” the body and reading a text become linked endeavors. This multi-disciplinary approach makes the book an excellent fit for Ashgate’s “Literary and Scientific Cultures of Early Modernity” series.

The first chapter examines the “principal philosophical, medical and moral discourse of the seventeenth century regarding the relation between mind and body and includes matters of contemporary
seventeenth-century news concern” (6) to psychologists and neurobiologists. Höfer begins with Descartes’s assertion in the *Discours de la méthode* that “human existence depends primarily on the principle of thought” (15); the body, in contrast, has no direct capacity to affirm its existence. However, for Descartes “the separation between body and mind operates only theoretically” (16). In *Les passions de l’âme* and in his correspondence with Princess Elizabeth of Bohemia, Descartes sought to clarify the relation between the two. While admitting somatic influences, the philosopher repeatedly asserted that the will, reason and *générosité* have great powers to cure the body’s ills—a premise that Höfer will question. The second part of Chapter One introduces Spinozan philosophy, which will play a key role in Höfer’s argument. Unlike Descartes, Spinoza posits “a material and psychic substance inseparably joined” (24.) A third part of the chapter examines medical thought of the seventeenth century, concentrating on De Laurens’s *Discours des maladies mélancoliques* (1598) and Robert Burton’s better-known *Anatomy of Melancholy* (1621). These medical theses reinforce the traditional theory of the humors, which also informed literature of the time. In conclusion, Höfer returns to the relationship between seventeenth-century holistic thought and current psychological research, asserting that “Spinoza’s idea of *modes* seems more modern than ever” (55).

The body of the book analyzes literary representations of four psychosomatic disorders: melancholy, hypochondria, raging fever, and—underscoring the persistent otherness of the seventeenth century—demonic possession. Chapter Two focuses on Jean-Joseph Surin’s autobiographical work, *Science expérimentale de l’autre vie*. Surin, a Jesuit priest who was sent to “cure” the possessed nuns at the Convent of Loudun, fell into a profound pathological state which he called “obsession”; “the takeover of his body and his soul by demons” (60). This illness, during which he was unable to move or speak, lasted for seventeen years, until it was cured by divine intervention. Surin’s Jesuit superiors, however, refused to consider him as possessed, instead treating him as insane. In his account, Surin rails against the practices of suppression ordered by the Jesuit community, practices that only made his condition worse. Thus, Höfer sees him as “an early rebel against dualistic models of mind and body” (70).
Chapter Three, “Melancholic Subversions in Molière’s *Le misanthrope* (1666) and *Le malade imaginaire* (1673),” posits psychosomatic disorders as both a symptom of, and a revolt against, social alienation under Louis XIV. Following Freudian psychology, Höfer views characters’ somatoform manifestations as responses to their perceived helplessness and frustration. Alceste cannot function at court because of his melancholic humor; yet he also fosters his melancholy as a sign of his difference and superiority. Argan employs a rigid ritual of medical treatment in a (fruitless) attempt to control the environment around him and to gain attention. From a social perspective, Höfer asserts that Acaste’s impotence represents the “emascula- tion” and loss of function experienced by bourgeois as well as nobles under Louis XIV’s rule. For Höfer, the ills of Molière’s characters are “a sign of social rupture” (97); his comedy adopts a “symptomatic language” (125) to express what society attempts to suppress. While Höfer affirms that these plays are indeed comedies, her reading of them is extremely dark: the body becomes the bearer of “psychological conflicts . . . and relentless pain” (99). Finally, she asserts that Molière, like Surin, rejects the “more culturally dominant Western and Cartesian premises prioritizing mind over body,” turning instead towards Spinozan monism (111).

In Chapter Four, Höfer connects Lafayette’s “psychosomatic fiction” to a disparate series of thinkers including Descartes, Pascal, Freud and Spinoza. On the one hand, *La Princesse de Clèves* reveals a dualistic view of the self; yet like the Jansenists, Lafayette appears skeptical of reason’s capacity to control the passions and their physical manifestations: traces of emotions leave involuntary “marks” on the body, which are visible to both characters and readers. Höfer again draws a connection between repression and illness: in Freudian terms, the princess suffers from “neurasthenia” and a strong sense of abandonment, leading her to fear taking emotional risks. She also bears the marks of her mother’s “psychotic” fear of sexuality (158). From a social perspective, however, the princess’s final departure represents a “radical refusal” of the “law of the father.” Höfer portrays the location of her final retreat, near the Pyrenees, as a “borderline” mental and political space symbolizing the novel’s ambivalence.
Seventeenth-century medicine recognized erotic disturbances as causing mental and physical disorders; Chapter Five examines this “love melancholy” in Racine’s Phèdre. The heroine’s distress, however, is not solely the result of frustrated love, but of a “cleavage” between love and duty. While the repression of forbidden passion provokes in her a physical illness approaching death, Phèdre is also driven by desire (libido), which is her only remaining connection to life. This Freudian territory has been explored by Jules Brody and others; but in analyzing Phèdre’s imaginative attempts to reconstruct traumatic events from the past, Höfer expands our understanding of the character. Again, she represents psychic disorders as performed through the body, leaving marks perceptible to other characters (and audience). Finally, as in earlier chapters, Höfer portrays the characters’ melancholy as a revolt against social prohibitions. Phèdre’s forbidden passion is a transgression against the patriarchal law that renders her “abject,” in Kristeva’s terms; and classic Freudian castration theory is literally enacted through the mutilation of Hippolytus’s body.

At times, Höfer’s ideological stance can lead to overstatement: “As decisive apparatuses for controlling the masses, bodily repression and manipulation of the self reduced an entire society to conformity and deprivation” (135, italics added). The same tendency leads to the repetition of the same points in every chapter. Instead of a “dualistic” opposition between Cartesian and “subversive” thought, one could envision placing more emphasis on the interpenetration of discourses: spiritual, medical, and rational thought of the period all underscore the power of the passions, and their ability to harm both mind and body; hence the imperative to find a “therapy” capable of harnessing them. Nevertheless, Höfer’s book is a serious complement to recent work by critics like Erec Koch and Rebecca Wilkins, who are reexamining the role of the non-rational and of the body in seventeenth-century thought. It also opens a promising dialogue with current psychological trends, which could be pursued further. Höfer alludes to the “positive thinking” movement; one could also mention the widespread use of cognitive therapies, which assert with near-Cartesian optimism that we can change our feelings by changing our ideas. In contrast, the notion of “writing out” the repressed links her work to current practices of “narrative therapy.” At a time when many feel angst concerning the
future of the humanities in general and seventeenth-century studies in particular, Höfer’s study reaffirms the centrality of the grand siècle through a timely return to a larger concept of the humanities, before that other dualistic split: between science and art. This book highlights the important role of early modern thought in how we understand and express our psychic selves today. In a nearly transparent translation by Jane Marie Todd...


In this wide-ranging and engaging book, Keith Thomas brings to bear his deep knowledge of early modern English society and culture to reflect upon the fundamental ends of life for the people he has studied during his long career. A revised version of Thomas’s Ford Lectures at Oxford in 2000, The Ends of Life asks how early modern people found meaning in their existence and explores the ways that those meanings found expression through prescriptive literature and lived experience. The result is a rich tapestry that illuminates the changing and sometimes contradictory mental world of early modern English people.

Thomas identifies six major “roads to fulfillment”: military prowess; work and vocation; wealth and possessions; honor and reputation; friendship and sociability; and fame and the afterlife. These serve as focal points for the thematic chapters of the book. While fully acknowledging that these were not the only means through which people might find fulfillment, Thomas convincingly suggests that these categories incorporate important themes running through early modern life. Interestingly, he chooses not to define religion per se, or spiritual fulfillment, as one of his main categories. This is somewhat counter-intuitive, given the significance of religion to every aspect of early modern society. Religious ideals, however, permeate the book and inform Thomas’s treatment of nearly every topic.
Before moving into his main themes, Thomas examines the idea of fulfillment itself. What did it mean to be “fulfilled” in a world where only the very wealthy had much latitude to shape their own futures, and even they were enmeshed in a society which abhorred “singularity” and often stressed communal rather than individual good? Looking at classical, Christian, and medieval influences, Thomas shows the many ways in which things that we in the modern world value as elements of fulfillment or personhood were constrained. Early modern youth could not expect to choose their own spouses, their own occupations, or to a significant extent their own beliefs. For many, the daily grind of subsistence occupied the majority of time and energy. Yet for all the prescriptions promoting rigidity and subordination of self, Thomas also points out growing trends toward the expression of individuality and personal choice. Even the poor had their own sense of reputation and personal worth. As Thomas notes, despite an “unequal and tradition-bound world, there were innumerable individuals who carved out their own destinies, unimpeded by the social and economic barriers in their way” (43).

Thomas uses a similar juxtaposition of prescription and experience to flesh out his main pathways toward fulfillment. Early modern attitudes toward such things as military attainment, work, and wealth were often deeply contradictory. To be a soldier was a manifestation of masculinity and honor, but at the same time society increasingly valued service to the state and crown that did not involve the sword. By the late seventeenth century, soldiering had come to be seen as a special occupation for a few professionals, rather than the responsibility of all gentlemen. At the same time, neo-classical and Christian views of the evils of warfare and aggression made fulfillment through military prowess a complicated proposition. Similarly, attitudes to work and labor varied widely. One discourse emphasized labor as the legacy of the punishment of Adam, a curse humankind must simply endure until death. Another stressed real enjoyment of one’s work and the notion that workers could be fulfilled by their callings. Status mattered—wage-earning manual laborers may have felt less fulfilled in their work than professionals. Yet they, too, might take pride in a job well done. Regarding honor and reputation, Thomas shows convincingly that while honor was meant to be the private commodity of
the elite, in fact people across the social spectrum valued and sought reputation and personal honor. Credit, as understood both personally and commercially, formed a crucial element of early modern identity. In the end, people wanted to be known and remembered for their attainments on earth, whether reputational, familial, military, or otherwise. Thomas highlights the tension between the church’s teaching that the only true fulfillment must be found beyond the earthly sphere and the practical fact that people hoped for fulfillment here in this world. Certainly people wished to be memorialized, through elaborate funeral monuments or works of literature or simply the memories of children and friends. And not everyone was convinced about the glories of paradise, either, as in the old lady from Lewes who, on her sick bed, declared that she had no acquaintance with Jesus or the angels, so she would rather live here on earth with friends than to live in heaven with strangers (230). Even if Christian prescription told them to look to the next life for fulfillment, most people took a more worldly perspective and “cherished life for its own sake, not merely as a preliminary to some future state” (267).

The recurrent theme of *The Ends of Life* is that early modern people carved out spaces for expression of personal identity and individual choice, even within structures that militated against it. The trend toward greater emphasis on individual expression and modern ideas of identity and self-realization comes through clearly. Exactly why that change happened is not systematically explored, and one might have wished for greater analysis of the causes of that change. But the greatest value of this book lies in the rich material that it synthesizes and brings to life. Thomas’s command of a vast array of source material is on display throughout the work. Thomas acknowledges from the start that there is some danger in pulling together a series of anecdotes from disparate sources across a broad stretch of time. An extended case study of an individual to two would have been welcome. Yet he weaves his material together with such authority that the reader trusts Thomas’s judgment on maintaining the context of his evidence. *The Ends of Life* paints a nuanced, complex, and at times poignant portrait of the mental world of early modern Englishmen and Englishwomen and the ways they found value in their daily lives. It is a pleasure to walk the “roads to fulfillment” along with them.
What is perfection? Is it attainable? Is it even desirable? How does perfection, both flawlessness and completeness, play out in early modern French literature and thought? How did writers (and their readers) come to terms with its elusiveness? Anne L. Birberick’s admirably edited collection on *Perfection*, the twelfth volume in the *Studies in Early Modern France* series, is comprised of a patchwork of ten interesting and diverse studies that grapple with this complex notion in sixteenth- and (mostly) seventeenth-century France.

In her brief introduction (five pages including the Work Cited), Birberick announces the four-part structure of the interdisciplinary volume. In the first section, which deals with perfection in socio-political contexts, Cloé Hogg’s opening essay “Useful Wounds” offers a rich panorama of the fascination, use, and implications of the wound in sources ranging from Sévigné’s letters, the *Mercure galant*, and the medical manual *L'Ecole du chirurgien* (1687). Louise Frappier carefully analyzes the discursive strategies the Jesuits employed to depict Marie de Medici’s and Louis XIII’s royal entrances into Avignon in 1600 and 1622, respectively. In “Productive Perfection: The Trope of the River in Early Modern Political Writing,” Katherine Ibbett suggests that the river stands as an ambivalent trope for the poetic figure of perfection on the one hand, and the flexible politics of reason of state on the other. Rivers can be torrential or peaceful, spectacular or prosaic, and Ibbett argues that understanding (the manipulation of) this flux elucidates the underpinnings of absolutist politics.

In the second section, focusing on problems of identity and self-(im)perfection, Daniel Maher’s “Corrompre la perfection—de la Carte de Tendre aux Royaumes d’Amour,” examines the variations and distortions of Madeleine de Scudéry’s sentimental map in works by the abbé d’Aubignac (*Royaume de Coquetterie*, 1654), Tristan l’Hermite (“Le Royaume d’Amour,” 1654), and Paul Tallement (*Voyages à l’Ile d’Amour*, 1663 and 1664). Birberick places Maher’s essay in the second section, as she claims that it deals with the “parfait amant” (xiii); however, its emphasis is rather on the utopia-dystopia *topoi*
as they relate to cartography, narrative, and parody. Twyla Meding painstakingly analyzes Charles Perrault’s rewriting (1694) of Boccaccio’s Griseldis story in the light of the pastoral genre to argue that Perrault re-dresses the heroine à la française, not to imitate d’Urfé’s habit de berger, but to create a “glaring anachronism in the topsy-turvy world of Parisian society,” as he manipulates and modifies his Italian model and French pastoral to toy “with notions of gender and submission,” “revers[ing] the imbalances inherent in pastoral, only to make his rectification always already obsolete” (82). In “(Im) Perfecting the Self: Montaigne’s Pedagogical Ideal,” Zahi Zalloua argues that Montaigne goes against the grain of ancient and humanist thinkers, including Aristotle, Seneca, Erasmus, Guillaume Budé and Etienne de La Boétie, on intellectual, moral, and aesthetic grounds, to promote a cultivation of imperfection of the self and philosophy, mirrored in the very structure of the essay form. Montaigne, writes Zalloua, “seems to announce a new way of doing philosophy, a new ideal of imperfectio hominis” (122-23). This is a clear and concise essay as well as a riveting piece of scholarship that astutely pinpoints an essential element (and problem) of both the Essais and Renaissance Humanism as a whole. Returning to the seventeenth century, Karolyn Waterson’s tripartite study of La Bruyère’s Caractères highlights “les traits d’exemplarité dispersés à l’intérieur” of the work to argue that most of the “modèles exemplaires,” paradoxically defined in fact as “contre-modèles de figures marquantes du Grand Siècle, convergent vers un modèle intemporel et universel qui pourrait, dans l’idéal, les subsumer tous,” (129). Waterson’s meticulous study contributes to the existing abundance of critical work on exemplarity in the seventeenth century.

The third part of the volume addresses aesthetic perfection in two of Corneille’s relatively lesser-studied tragedies, Sophonisbe (1663) and CEdipe (1659). Judd D. Hubert points out the former tragedy’s unique theatrical system, for, unlike the protagonists of Othon, Pulchérie, and Suréna, Sophonisbe attempts but fails to find perfection (i.e. plenitude) with a partner; as a result, the eponymous heroine “must seek fulfillment on her own while preserving and even flaunting her integrity and her superiority” (157). With a series of perspicacious close readings and references to Corneille’s œuvre, Hubert effortlessly demonstrates
how Sophonisbe attains (amoral) perfection: by committing suicide, “she becomes completely self-possessed,” rendering even her rival, Eryxe, “her greatest admirer” (167). In “Corneille and Tragic Perfection,” Helen L. Harrison chooses to analyze the playwright’s rewriting of Sophocles’ Oedipus, which Aristotle held as the perfect tragic subject. Corneille’s challenge was precisely to please a seventeenth-century French audience with a subject that, in most contemporaneous accounts, was unpleasant. And the stakes were high. Indeed, Harrison argues, in erudite fashion, that after Corneille’s humiliating flop Pertharite (1652), retirement from the theater and subsequent attempt at a comeback in 1659, “Œdipe represents [Corneille’s] effort to reinscribe himself in the struggle for tragic perfection and to position himself in respect to his ancient and modern rivals” (168). While both essays on Corneille are excellent, more variety in the realm of theater would have benefited this section; the editor may have included other essays on Corneille’s earlier plays and/or his contemporaries (e.g. Georges de Scudéry, Jean Rotrou, Jean Racine), comedy (e.g. Molière), or opera (e.g. Philippe Quinault).

Erec Koch’s essay “Perfect Pitch” stands alone in the fourth and final section on “art and science” (xiv); specifically, Koch examines scientific and rhetorical discourses on sound, proposing that the two disciplines were intricately linked in seventeenth-century France. By magisterially analyzing Marin Mersenne’s Harmonie universelle (1636-37), Géraud de Cordemoy’s Discours physique de la parole (1668), Charles Perrault’s Essais de Physique (1680), and Bernard de Lamy’s La Rhétorique, ou l’art de parler (1675; 1712), Koch argues that Mersenne prepared the groundwork on the mechanical science of sound that rhetorical treatises eventually adopted to “develop a consequent shift from the consideration of representational modalities of vocal expression, or orality, to the determination of the material effects of sound in audition, or aurality” (185). As a result, “voice no longer imitates passion as its expressive and projected representation,” posits Koch, “but instead functions as sound, a material phenomenon that produces affective responses by the physics of cause and effects” (185). Koch’s essay is very enlightening and fills a critical gap on the relations between passions and rhetoric, for scholars tend to privilege figures to the detriment of voice.
The volume is rather well put together, with a useful index that helps navigate such heterogeneous material. Birberick does admit that “each section, in many ways, may be viewed a discrete unit,” yet still hopes that “the essays of one section enter into dialogue with those of the others, creating thematic leitmotifs that give shape and focus to the volume as a whole” (xii). Its diversity within loosely defined categories is one of its main assets.

The articles are all quite good; nonetheless, this reviewer found the volume a bit lopsided. It is unfortunate that Zalloua’s essay should be the only one that deals with the sixteenth century in a series devoted to early modern France—and not one article is devoted to the eighteenth century. That Koch’s essay is not accompanied by an article on optics and the burgeoning revolutions in the science of vision, for example, is also regrettable, for it would have resulted in a more balanced final section. Finally, the volume is also heavily literary; yet with such a rich and complex theme, it may have been advantageous had the editor included some more disciplines, notably art history or musicology. Overall, though, Perfection is an accessible volume that speaks well of the health of seventeenth-century French studies, in which there is something for any seventeenth-century French student and specialist.


Hannah Dawson’s book is an impressive work about John Locke’s philosophy of language, in particular his critique of words, making it a valuable contribution to the field of seventeenth century studies and philosophy. The book is eloquent in style and rigorous and enduring in its presentation. Dawson makes extensive use of Locke’s original manuscripts, as well as engaging with works from various English, French and other European philosophers. The book is an excellent reference text for those requiring a specialist treatment of seventeenth century philosophy of language, especially where it concerns the development of moral language in political philosophical thought during Locke’s time.
Dawson begins her book by stating: “Language was a problem for early-modern philosophers” (1). For Locke, as well as most philosophers, language obstructed philosophy—they worried about the misuse of words, their ambiguity, and their “corruptible nature” (5). Locke especially was disenchanted with the way words were used in discourses about nature, morality and politics of his time, therefore he turned his attention to not only words but in how they generated moral language as a whole. Locke challenged the commonly held assumption that a universal language existed for communication among philosophers (see Chapters Eight and Nine), arguing that semantic diversity—through private language and cultural attachments—was ultimately manifested in moral language and ideas.

The book is composed of three parts. Part One, “Language in the Trivium,” consists of three chapters concerned with the Aristotelian trivium of logic, grammar and rhetoric, which formed the basis of early-modern philosophy of language. Dawson discusses the theories of language, elucidating how logic was used to facilitate the relationship between words, things and concepts, detailing the disputation among the grammarians of whether or not languages could be reduced to fixed rules or whether they were irregular and mutable. Finally, she points to how words could be used to disguise, manipulate and contradict, especially in how “rhetoric further diffracts language—particularly moral language—which is to be the major location of philosophical anxiety about semantic instability” (130).

Part Two, “Philosophical Developments of the Problem of Language,” is presented in Chapters Four, Five, and Six. In Chapter Four Dawson expounds on the incompatibility between language and science, and philosophers were constantly “engaged in bringing language into congruence with things” (107). Dawson proceeds to invoke the thinking of Francis Bacon who held a culturally specific view of grammar/culturally relative view of semantics. Here she also considers the works of Descartes, Wilkins, Lodwick, Montaigne, Gassendi, Malebranche, and Hobbes to indicate that there was not such a clear cut distinction between the empiricists and the rationalists. Dawson considers these philosophers “to demonstrate the pervasive inclusion of thoughts and things in early-modern theories of language, whilst exploring the differences, developments and doubts therein” (92). In
Chapter Five the focus is on how semantic instability disrupted the general assumption that language is universal. Early-modern philosophers relied on semantic universalism as a foundation for communication (130). Dawson points to the different currents that swept into philosophical dialogues, such as the historicist grammarians who claimed that languages were “diverse and mutating” rather than adhering to fixed rules and how “rhetoric further diffracts language—particularly moral language—which is to be the major location of philosophical anxiety about semantic instability” (130). Skepticism about semantic universality and recognition of instability, Dawson points out, was addressed by only a few philosophers: Montaigne, Hobbes, Pascal, Spinoza, and Pufendorf. In Chapter Six Dawson focuses on the semantic opacity of words (155), drawing attention to how words engender ambiguity, persuasiveness and emotion—ultimately affecting development of moral language, which Dawson detailed in the final part of the book.

Part Three, “Locke on Language,” is composed of Chapters Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten. It is in the final part of the book where Dawson expounds on Locke’s individualism and private language theory and where she makes an excellent connection to her discussions on semantic instability, especially where it concerns moral language in earlier chapters. Dawson draws attention to one essential point pertinent to Locke’s private language theory—where critics often attempt to undermine his inherent individualism—that Locke was not a theorist who denied the possibility “of a common mental discourse and communication,” rather he used “the axiomatic premise of semantic individualism to prove that words are connected to their meanings arbitrarily” (219). Dawson expounds on how Locke viewed moral language as being connected to the culture of the individual person. Thus, for Locke, the individual was an important contributor to semantic instability and “Locke’s radical contribution was to systematise this deep form of semantic instability” (227). In Chapter Nine, Dawson expounds on Locke’s view that words essentially produce morality, that is language seems to have power in the moral sphere.

The final chapter of the book is where Dawson elucidates the contradictions she noted in the coherence of Locke’s thought (277). Dawson points to these inconsistencies in the context of the three
social aspects of Locke’s semantic theory. The first social aspect concerns the individual: “only when individuals have the same ideas in their heads do they properly communicate” (295). Second, “it is the community, not individuals, that dictates which words and meanings are in common use” (297). The second social aspect contradicts the first; it was expounded upon in earlier chapters regarding moral language. Finally, the third social aspect is the “pull of society on individuals,” that is in how individuals strive to be virtuous and always “want to be liked by other men […] They are fixated on others as a result of being centered on themselves” (297). Dawson’s discussion of the inconsistencies inherent to the three social aspects in Locke’s semantic theory are especially thought provoking for anyone interested in analyzing Locke’s political theory.

John Locke is eminent for his epistemology and ethico-political theory, however this book demonstrates that he has also made a great contribution to the philosophy of language. Dawson has presented a thorough account of Locke’s philosophy of language. The only weakness to be found is in the latter portion of the book where the author could have delved deeper into Locke’s individualistic private language argument and its generation of moral language—especially important for Locke’s political philosophical thought; Locke’s critique of words is most essential in this regard. The book’s bibliography includes an extensive manuscript list, as well as a comprehensive subject index. Dawson’s book is not only a specialist text for seventeenth century scholars, but is also a valuable source for philosophers specializing in Locke’s political theory and philosophy of language. Dawson’s book is a definite must read, as it is an ambitious journey detailing Locke’s philosophy of language within the wider framework of seventeenth century philosophy.

Portraits could be found everywhere in seventeenth-century Holland. While today we assume that representation of one’s likeness remains a privilege restricted to the rich or famous, or to those of higher social status from an earlier period, the sheer quantity of painters and pictures in Holland’s Golden Age assured that portraits, too, could be commissioned and obtained. Using documents as well as recent studies by economic historians, especially the late John Michael Montias, this book assesses the new demand and market for portraits, a steady source of reliable income for Rembrandt and a specialty for some painters, notably Frans Hals.

Ann Jensen Adams, a specialist in this country and period, has made this portrait phenomenon her special field of expertise across her entire career, starting with her dissertation on Thomas de Keyser, the leading Amsterdam portraitist before Rembrandt. So this long-awaited, wider cultural study comes out to much anticipation, and it does not disappoint (except in its paucity of chosen images and their lack of sharpness, especially in such an expensive publication—qualities which must be debited against a once-great university press for art books). Also, many pictures that are discussed are not illustrated.

Adams begins by distinguishing between portraits of individuals and another category of pictures, head studies (called *tronies* by the Dutch), often with exotic or colorful costume. Because this book was years in the making, it appeared too soon to take advantage of a pair of recent German dissertations on *tronies*, one by Dagmar Hirschfelder (Munich/Berlin, 2008), the other (in press) by Franziska Gottwald. One of the most difficult determinations to make concerning a face—going back to the origins of portraiture in the later fourteenth century—is to discriminate between a particular, personal portrait and a more generalized type, even at the very outset of the tradition in painting (Stephen Perkinson, *The Likeness of the King: A Prehistory of Portraiture in Late Medieval France*, Chicago, 2009). Of course, questions of personal identity in relation to role arise around any portrait and
pose the larger question—ultimately tied to Burckhardt’s arguments about the Renaissance individual—of just what comprises the modern “self.” Adams addresses this conundrum in her “Introduction,” considering identity within a new social mobility of the seventeenth century, especially in Holland. Certainly the self-portraits of Rembrandt, well studied by Perry Chapman (Princeton, 1990) and Harry Berger (Stanford, 2000), embody this heightened self-consciousness.

Some of Adams’s conceptual locutions, e.g. discourse and mentalité, seem artificially applied to her analysis of the portrait viewing experience, especially with viewer interaction, which she terms “translation.” Adams quite properly calls to task either the simple assumption that portraits transcribe reality and the communicative body of their sitters, or, alternatively, that analysis of their iconographic motifs and settings can be any more empirical. Sometimes her “Introduction” sags under the gravity of its adopted theories and histories of ideas as well as analogies to other images, especially religious works. But the great value of this book remains firmly lodged in consideration of the qualities of portraiture in general as well as the particular kinds of portraits: individuals, family, history portraits (usually called historiated portraits), and civic guard groups, which comprise the remaining chapters, each of them focused on a select few portraits in depth. Adams’s larger purpose is explicit: “I have taken as my subject how the portrait functioned to structure concepts of identity and social relations in seventeenth-century Holland.” (55-56) It entails triangulation—between biography, contemporary culture, and pictorial tradition with assumptions about viewing.

Discussion of individual portraits focuses on considerations of communicating character: the importance of likeness and the imputed transparency of character through either the whole body or the particular forms of physiognomy. Of course, wealth and status played roles in the more idealized presentation of individuals. Artists, too, were constrained by basic appearances and decorum in their task. Physical and mental actions enjoyed particular favor, especially from Rembrandt, but many Dutch individuals convey restraint and sobriety through dress and pose. Adams locates this cultural value in Stoic tranquility and self-discipline (80-93). Similar control also appears in international court portraits. Facial expressions and gestures
also receive attention, conveying emotion through physical motion (Rembrandt’s *beweeghgelicksbeijt*, or Leonardo’s “motions of the mind,” pp. 100-01), often interrupted, suggesting mental activity. These portraits create “a self that is subjectively constituted; they provide models for demeanor; and they offer the viewer an experience of himself in the experience of viewing” (111.)

Family portraits, the topic of the third chapter, address social questions of class more directly, assigning status through lineage as either patrician or petty bourgeois. In a place of considerable social mobility the family provided both stability and a model of the larger state. Related to contemporary family portraits is the use of historical narratives with inserted portraits for ancillary characters: “history portraits,” the subject of Chapter Four, the finest discussion in English of this peculiarly Dutch phenomenon. For the history portraits—encompassing both religious and ancient history narratives—the human animation or relevance of the event is enhanced, often to associate a family with particular virtues but also sometimes by implication to situate them within contemporary political and/or religious controversies. For example, Werner van den Valckert’s large *Christ Blessing the Children* with the (possibly Catholic) family of Michiel Poppen and even the artist himself (fig. 43) anticipates Rembrandt’s *Hundred Guilder Print* etching of a generation later, by using Christ’s mission as a neutral model for contemporary piety and family values, stretching back in Dutch art and religion to the late fifteenth century. In similar fashion the use of a Roman model, the Continence of Scipio, exemplified both magnanimity as well as good leadership and might have signaled political allegiance with the ruling house of Orange. Obviously, to discuss more examples would have further swelled and longer delayed the production of this book, and works presented here will still provide foundations for future understanding of Dutch portraits in their society. But because both family portrait chapters restrict themselves to a principal pair of case studies, they raise doubts about the wider validity of Adams’s broad claims, such as typologies, for these portraits as symbolic forms: “the history portrait potentially provided a canvas upon which the viewer might actively survey himself, his life, its meaning, his relationship to God, and his role in society.” (209)
The final chapter on group portraits of civic guards offers fewer surprises perhaps, but it deftly posits the significance in Dutch cities of these free associations of power, where wealthy citizens enacted the role of corporate commitment to the commonwealth. Adams does raise provocative questions (254-58) about those groups, such as the Dutch East India Company (VOC), which did not commission similar group portraits about public service.

Adams’s book bears the marks of its considered deliberation and is punctuated by numerous useful references to learned writings and leading ideas of seventeenth-century Dutch culture. While she may strive too hard to make connections to Calvinist thought per se, as well as to ends with a theoretical proclamation about the effect of portraits as sites for psychological identity formation (259-71), in the process of her analyses she skillfully and cumulatively builds upon well-founded interpretations of a neglected genre and its associated Dutch values.


This well researched and well written study is a biography of Atto Melani (1626-1714) as a specimen of a seventeenth-century singer. It is based primarily on Atto’s correspondence for the periods it exists, and a catalogue of letters is in Appendices A and B. But the author has supplemented these well with contemporary works and recent scholarship. His discussion of Atto’s career is illuminating.

Atto rose from middle class origins (his father was in the service entourage of the Bishop of Pistoia in Tuscany), to prominence, wealth, social standing, and nobility, through singing. He made a sacrifice to do this. He and four of his brothers were castrated when they reached their early teens. The Roman Catholic Church in this period did not allow women to sing in church (a prohibition from the letters of St. Paul), so for the high notes it used boy sopranos, and if their voices were good it tolerated the castration of some of them to keep their
The use of castrati was most prominent in Italy, but the practice declined with changes in musical taste in the eighteenth century, castration was prohibited in the Italian legal code of 1870, the Popes also forbade it, and the remaining castrati in the Sistine Chapel in Rome died out in the following generation.

Atto Melani learned to sing in the cathedral school of Pistoia, but he later did not sing in church much. Instead, he specialized in the new genre of operas. These became standard features in the festivities of princely courts, which vied for singers. He met his principal patron, Mattias de’ Medici (younger brother of Grand Duke Ferdinando II of Tuscany) when he was singing in Francesco Sacratì’s La finta pazza in Venice in 1641. Thereafter he was traded around to different courts, spending significant periods in Paris, Germany, and Rome, and he soon aspired to be fully integrated into these aristocratic milieus.

A chapter is devoted to his sexuality. In the seventeenth century, sexuality was thought a continuum from women (thought very sexual, emotional, and uncontrolled) to mature men (thought restrained, rational, and more aloof). But the author notes that there was more “sodomy,” casual man-to-man activity of mature aristocratic men, than is sometimes thought; they preferred “boys.” Atto was caught in the boyish middle of this continuum (and there is a satirical poem about his ass—p. 103). He appears to have had some kind of homosexual contact when he was 26 with the young Duke of Mantua, Carlo II, while performing in an opera there. But later in Paris he was idolized by two nieces of Cardinal Mazarin. It is uncertain whether castrati could not get erections. In fact, he was banished from Paris in 1661 because of the jealous enmity of the husband of one of the nieces, although his contact with them in Rome and Paris continued in later life. Little emerges from the correspondence about his sex life in his later years.

That he was viewed partly as a sex object may have influenced Atto’s career and even the portrayal of men in early operas. Aristocratic men who liked music and opera also liked to be intimate with the singers in operas. Atto demanded the leading roles, and the use of castrati tended to feminize male characters onstage. The author notes that in Claudio Montiverdi’s L’incoronozaione di Poppea (1643) “the two leading castrato roles, Nero and Otho, represent the two men
who have lost their rational, masculine self-control and are under the powerfully feminizing influence—that is, are in love with—Poppea, who in this context represents all that is most dangerous in women” (142-143). Atto also wrote music: secular cantatas appropriate for presentation in the refined aristocratic gatherings he sought to attend. Some of his cantatas have survived from the period ca. 1655-1665, and texts are printed in Appendix F. The themes were conventional: the laments of male lovers scorned by their beloved, or of female lovers abandoned. Atto’s musical settings, discussed at length, were conventional too: like the cantatas of Giacomo Carissimi or Antonio Cesti.

In later life Atto abandoned singing and became a kind of court-hanger-on, spy, gossip-monger, and diplomat based on his courtly contacts, a path on which he had earlier embarked. His last musical performance was in 1668. The author explains that he did this to achieve social advancement: “he sought to behave and be treated like a gentleman, a musical amateur rather than a professional. For a castrato, such a pose was challenging.” (149) To ingratiate himself he provided Cardinal Mazarin with inside information about the Imperial election of 1657, which earned him a pension from Louis XIV. He gave Mattias de’ Medici gossip about the preliminaries of the Peace of the Pyrenees in 1659; he was already receiving a pension from Mattias. He lobbied for the election of papal candidates, and for the creation of French cardinals in Rome. Pope Clement X awarded him a post as pronotario apostolito and made him a noble of the city of Bologna. His chief early patrons died: Cardinal Mazarin in 1661 and Mattias de’ Medici in 1667. But by this time Atto had begun to accumulate a landed estate in Tuscany, and in 1675 he transferred permanently to Paris to live as a gentleman. He had already helped his younger brothers establish themselves in musical careers; now he introduced nephews to the court of Versailles. His family was ennobled in Tuscany the year of his death. The author concludes that he had used singing as a means, not so much of artistic achievement, as to gain social advancement. “It is this very human perspective on seventeenth-century music-making . . . that [Atto’s] story so engagingly illustrates” (327).

Upmarket commodities from the East which Dutch merchants, like Van Varick, would have brought back to the West as sale items or souvenirs. We know from her estate inventory (NY, 1696), that Van Varick’s stock in Brooklyn, NY, included exotic goods from artisanal manufacturers and suppliers in the East Indies, the Netherlands, Persia, and England. In this wing of the installation, visitors viewed a Chinese gold silk dressing-gown; two contemporary Dutch portraits of men depicted in these popular wraps; and, in the large display case, a porcelain sweetmeat set (China); a lacquer plate (Japan); a silver bowl with cover and underplate (Indonesia); and an ivory box (Ceylon) (exhibits 30, 26, 23, 25). This gallery view also illustrates the variety of the show’s spatial planning and installation art. See Gallery of Images, below, pp 82-89. Exhibition design and photography: Ian Sullivan.

*Installation View: Luxury Products from the Overseas Network*

Larger View

Another View
After years of dedicated work and research, a collaborative team of New York City curators, academics, Dutch global trade specialists, and graduate students has restored to the historical record a remarkable global traveler and businesswoman of the seventeenth-century: Margrieta van Varick née Visboom (Nieuwe Kerk, Amsterdam, 1649—Flatbush, Breuckelen [Brooklyn], 1695).

Van Varick was an established merchant of luxury commodities, mostly textile products, imported from the East Indies, Persia, and Asia. The priciest of her stock included sumptuous carpets, wall hangings, tapestries, bed covers, fine dressing-gowns and wraps, and other costly items. Some of these were imported to her shop in Brooklyn; others were brought by her to New York from her earlier (adopted) home in Malacca (Malaysia). As many ambitious Dutch of her century, Van Varick and her kin were of the mercantile class; her uncle was a high-level merchant with the Dutch East India Company. Objects very similar to Van Varick’s stock have survived. We value them for their beauty and craft, and as objects of seventeenth-century material culture. The popularity and value of these objects are also a reliable gauge of consumer tastes, economic health, and market demand for particular kinds of high-end products.

With the discovery in 2004 of Van Varick’s 1696 estate inventory—and the dazzling potential that document held for historians and curators—an ambitious project began to build. By 2009, with the Van Varick inventory serving as project compass, a feat of remarkable assemblage and imagination had evolved: a public exhibition on Van Varick at The Bard Graduate Center Gallery, New York City, a show which invoked both the world and the trade of a prosperous Amsterdam businesswoman relocated to the Dutch enclave of seventeenth-century Flatbush, Brooklyn, New York. Working with genuine period artifacts, each similar in kind to those listed in the Van Varick inventory, the curatorial team drew its 171 exhibits from some thirty-five major public and private collections. One third of the objects came from the New-York Historical Society’s own collections; lenders included the Peabody Essex Museum, Yale University Art Gallery, The Brooklyn

The exhibition was organized and co-curated by Marybeth De Filippis, Assistant Curator of American Art, New-York Historical Society, who valuably discovered an early photostat of the Van Varick inventory in 2004 in the library of the New-York Historical Society (talk about a scholar hitting the jackpot!); and Deborah L. Krohn, Associate Professor, Coordinator for History and Theory of Museums, Bard Graduate Center, New York. The show’s impressive catalogue (399 pages), an essential reference source for a broad range of researchers, was co-edited by Deborah L. Krohn and Peter N. Miller (Project Historian and Dean & Chair, Academic Programs, Bard Graduate Center), with Marybeth De Filippis. In addition to its many excellent images (most, provided by the show’s lenders), the catalogue includes closely-documented essays on various aspects of Van Varick’s world by Joyce D. Goodfriend, Jaap Jacobs, Els Kloek, Ruth Piwonka, David William Voorhees, Kees Zandvliet, and De Filippis. Of special importance in the catalogue is a detailed, first-ever chronology of the life and times of Margieta Van Varick assembled by Marybeth De Filippis and Margriet De Roever (xviii-xxi). The overall production and printing of the catalogue, on high-quality glossy stock, by Conti Tipocolor SpA (Calenzano, Italy), is impressive. To Ian Sullivan, working with co-curator Deborah Krohn, we give the laurels for exhibition design and installation photography, about which more below. The show’s many funders included the Consulate General of the Netherlands in New York; Peter Krueger Foundation; Collegiate Church Corp.; New York Council for the Humanities, Netherlands-America Foundation; Robert G. Goelet; The Saint Nicholas Society of the City of New York; Furthermore: a program of the J. M. Kaplan Fund; and the New York State Council on the Arts, a state agency. The Van Varick show was a considerable investment of talent, money, and physical labor. The show’s original run was nearly four months (18\textsuperscript{th} September 2009 to 3\textsuperscript{rd} January 2010), but owing to its popularity, especially among students and teachers, the run was extended to
The curatorial team did not merely hang a show of period objects: they crafted a small parallel world of Van Varick’s own experience. The exhibits they displayed — textiles, fine clothing, furniture, silverware, books, maps, paintings, silver miniatures, household affects, even a miniature candle snuffer — document the travels and business of Van Varick as she acquired and built her stock of luxury commodities from suppliers in the East, Middle-East, and in the West. But the show achieved something more: Using surviving artifacts from the material culture of Van Varick’s own time, the exhibition physically documented a diaspora of v vogues and tastes amongst the principal owners of these goods, such as upwardly-mobile consumers in Colonial America.

Margrieta Van Varick was determinedly Dutch by birth and breeding, and as the daughter of a merchant (Dirck Jansz Visboom), she spent many years traveling; we imagine she breathed the air of shops from childhood. Researchers into her life can say that her formative years and early adulthood were spent in the extremes of the Dutch world, especially Malacca, Malaysia; the final chapter of her life (1686-1695) was spent in that New Amsterdam across the sea: colonial New York. Margrieta Van Varick’s first husband was a merchant in Bengal, India, participating in the trade between India and Malacca. Her second husband was a man of the cloth: Rudolphus van Varick, a Dutch Reformed minister. In 1686, in her late 30s, Van Varick and her husband and children relocated to the Dutch enclave of Breuckelen (Brooklyn) where he advanced his ambitions in the Dutch Reformed ministry; she set up a business in textiles. Her textile shop in the area of Flatbush, Brooklyn (the Van Varicks’ new residence) introduced locals to a remarkable collection of goods from the Far East and Europe, glorious objects New Yorkers had seldom seen. Her shop goods, along with her household furnishings, were meticulously recorded in an estate inventory made after her death in 1695. This fascinating document, which records a lifetime of business activity, as well as Van Varick’s personal possessions, is valuably published in the show’s catalogue (folios 1-19; pp 343-361), along with helpful
endnotes and scholarly commentary by Ruth Piwonka. (So central was the inventory to the conceptualization of this show that selected folios were chosen for the catalogue’s endpapers; the original manuscript folios were displayed at the exhibition; see Gallery of Images, below.)

“Important for material culture scholars,” said Marybeth De Filippis of the show’s curatorial team, “our contextual exploration of Margreita van Varick’s inventory illuminated a possible relationship between the first-hand travel experiences of some of New York’s earliest residents, and also the thread of Islamic art and architectural motifs woven throughout the decorative arts of colonial New York.” Alice Browne, a cataloguer in the New-York Historical Society’s library, offered some good background on inventories of Van Varick’s time: “If the Van Varick inventory provides a window into seventeenth-century material culture, the story of the collection in which the copy resides is equally important as a vivid reminder of the materiality and contingency of archival documents. Historically, these have been vulnerable records, at best. Some New York estate inventories, for example, were discarded by the New York City record office — consigned to the ragman, as it were. But after being rescued by dealers, these old inventories became part of a collection of New York estate inventories donated to the New-York Historical Society by James Wilbur. Documents are also historical objects for study: if museums make objects available for thought, libraries preserve the material housing of information. This is a long chain of integrated responsibility and preservation; in this case, the chain led to a remarkable exhibition.”

The installation of the show was a principal challenge. Ian Sullivan, working within the spatial constraints for such an event at the Bard Graduate Center Gallery, did an excellent and imaginative job of spatial planning. This show of 171 objects was not a large exhibition, by any means, but its demands were large since many of the exhibits were of considerable size and weight, such as ceiling-to-floor wall hangings, seven-feet Dutch kasten (large cupboards), and elaborate ebony furniture. The show was not set up horizontally in one large gallery or in two adjoining galleries (the ideal arrangement), but rather
vertically over three floors: Floor 1 situated the show’s subject in time and space with objects (maps, books) related to the pre-eminence of the Dutch global trade of Van Varick’s century, as well as all eighteen folios of the inventory. Floor 2 (landing) displayed objects associated with Van Varick’s connections in the East (Malacca and Batavia). Floor 2 (north gallery) displayed objects associated with the Dutch overseas network (trade locations). Floor 2 (south gallery) displayed objects associated with Dutch New York and the Van Varicks’ Brooklyn circle (her business associates and customers; her husband’s church and ministry). Floor 3 (landing) displayed representative objects suggesting those listed in the Van Varick inventory, a permanent and reliable record of her ‘world of goods’. Floor 3 (north gallery) displayed selected textiles, silverware, and finely-crafted silver miniatures (from spinning wheels to oil lamps and bedwarmers). Floor 3 (south gallery) displayed items associated with Van Varick’s legacy (e.g., a portrait of a prominent descendant, Mayor Richard Varick of New York City). For some exhibit selections, see the Gallery of Images, below.

Integral to the entire Van Varick project was the organizers’ uses of the electronic medium to promote and explain the show. A handsome Web site was constructed with as many as 6 dedicated links (Exhibition, Highlights, Interpretation, Education, Catalogue, Online Features). The site also includes a kinetic sequence of selected images from the show (a moving narrative of images). Of particular interest on the site is the show’s 20-minute online film, being an interview with distinguished cultural historian Natalie Zemon Davis, conducted by Peter Miller, project historian of the show’s team. Zemon Davis considers the various challenges confronting historians who use inventories for research purposes, as well as the role of women in the seventeenth century, one of her special interests. She speaks of historical methodologies in reconstructing a ‘lost’ life, and she reminds her host that even if historians have yet to recover an image of Van Varick’s face, or her personal papers (letters, a diary, notes & jottings), researchers actually have a promising foundation for continuing research into this elusive figure based on the surviving inventory of her shop goods and personal effects. While we cannot capture her “affect” (her sensibility) from the inventory, said Zemon Davis, we are given a
glimpse of her tastes and her choices. “[Cultural historians] build on what they have,” Zemon Davis emphasized. A material object invites a process of “empathy” and connection; a unique personal story exists behind all material evidence. In the case of Van Varick, her inventory and some of the large textile objects in the show do suggest a picture; we imagine Van Varick at work in her Brooklyn shop, directing customers to her stock and ‘pitching the product’, hoping for a sale; or she is chatting up some pricey item to a foreign merchant, with an eye to placing a big order with an overseas supplier.

The Bard Graduate Center and the New York Historical Society also integrated into the show a set of public programs for the community, such as scheduled talks by curators to visiting groups, walking tours to ‘Nieuw Amsterdam,’ music of Van Varick’s world, and a special talk on the role of silver goods in the trade of Van Varick’s century. An educational interface of this nature between academics and the public is commendable.

The Van Varick show at the Bard Graduate Center Gallery in New York City, 2009-2010, in collaboration with the New-York Historical Society, was an immersive and absorbing experience, and its subject is certain to draw serious interest from cultural historians, feminist scholars, and researchers in diaspora studies. It was an unusual and memorable show; and for those who did not view it, the catalogue is an available resource of long-term value. (A Gallery of Images follows.)
A Gallery of Selected Images
Van Varick Exhibition, New York City (2009-2010)

The document which inspired the Van Varick exhibition: “Inventory of the Estate of Margrita Van Varick Deceased, late widow relict & administratrix of Do. Rudolphus Varick taken by Nicholas Bayard, Charlis Lodwick and John Harperdingh Executors of the last will and Testament of the said Margrita Van Varick.” Appraisers appointed January 7, 1696; inventory registered January 19, 1697. Pen and ink on laid paper. Single leaf, 13" x 8 ¼" (33 x 21 cm); five double leaves, each 13 1/8" x 16 ½" (33.3 x 41.9 cm). New York State Archives, a program of the State Education Department, Series J0301-82 NYS Probate Court Records, Inventories and Accounts, 1666-1822. This inventory is published with bibliographical notes, commentary, and images in the exhibition catalogue, pp 342-362.
Van Varick’s inventory lists her stock of “turky work carpets,” three of which she bequeathed to her children, thus signaling their high market (and sentimental) value to the owner. Judged too rare and precious to be walked upon, these knotted-piled carpets covered tables rather than floors.
This item shows “the craze for calico” (or chintz) during Van Varick’s time. These elaborately-patterned Indian cottons were hand-painted textiles, such as this specimen, and highly prized by merchants and upmarket consumers.
Lo! A popular style of fantastical and colorful man’s gown, often worn as an outer garment wrap, reflecting multi-cultural / diasporic influences: Original design, in external layer of gold silk damask, likely Chinese. Lining, red brocaded silk, likely Persian. Collar and cuffs, red silk damask, English; wool padding L. (center back). 58” (147.3 cm).
Exhibit 112. Armchair (ebony furniture). (Southeast India)  
Probably Coromandel Coast, India, ca. 1680-1720  
Ebony, ebonized hardwood, ivory, ebonized walnut inner-seat frame with cane  
42"x 24"x 19 ½" (106.7 x 61 x 49.4 cm).  

The heavy traffic in ebony furniture, popular with various East India Company merchants, dates to the Coromandel Coast, southeast India, mid-seventeenth century. Ebony chairs and tables were durable and resilient, and also admired for their botanical motifs carved in relief.
Exhibit 105. Silver Water Bowl, with Eight-lobes and Cover. (Batavia [Indonesia])
Batavia (present-day Jakarta, Indonesia), first quarter of the 18th century.
Silver, 4 ¾" x 8 ¼" including handles. Marks: none.
Larger View

The inventory of Van Varick’s personal effects and shop goods includes “three silver wrought East India cupps” which very likely may have resembled Exhibit 105, above.
Kasten were a formidable style of high-end cupboard and storage furnishing, common in the well-stocked homes of the Dutch burgher class; they also signaled social class, thus a popular import item amongst wealthy New York Dutch. Van Varick’s household in Brooklyn (as documented in her estate inventory) included a kast.
A descendant of Margrieta Van Varick, Richard Varick was a notable military and political figure in New York during the Revolutionary War. In addition to serving as the first transcriber of Washington’s papers, he was Mayor of New York City, 1789-1801. Varick Street in Manhattan commemorates the contribution of the extended Van Varick family to New York’s early history and political landscape.
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Karl A. E. Enenkel. *Die Erfindung des Menschen: Die Autobiographik des frühneuzeitlichen Humanismus von Petrarca bis Lipsius.* Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008. Karl A. E. Enenkel’s *Erfindung des Menschen* is an Olympian survey of humanist autobiographical literature. The fruit of ten years of labor and of a keen sensibility for its almost exclusively Latin sources, it belongs, with the work of Curtius and Auerbach, to the grand German tradition of philology and literary interpretation. If scholars can manage its girth (841 pages plus thematic bibliography and index) and language (German), it will doubtlessly become a classic work on humanism, as well as on Latin literature and early modern European culture more generally.

*Erfindung* takes a broad view of its subject in chronological, cultural, and literary terms. It offers a two-hundred-fifty-year span of autobiographical texts and their interpretation, from Francesco Petrarca (chs. 2, 4-5) in the mid-fourteenth century to Justus Lipsius (ch. 26) at the beginning of the seventeenth. This spectrum includes other familiar names, as well as some that are less well known, with chapters on Boccaccio (ch. 3), Giovanni Conversino da Ravenna (ch. 6) Leon Battista Alberti (ch. 7), Campano and Platina (chs. 8-9, 12-13), Pius II (chs. 10-11), Michael Marullus (ch. 14), Eoban Hess (chs. 15-16), Erasmus (ch. 17), Jacopo Sannazaro (ch. 18), Sigmund von Herberstein
(ch. 19), Joannes Fabricius (ch. 20), Jacque de Slupere (Sluperius, ch. 21), Girolamo Cardano (ch. 22), François du Jons (Junius, ch. 23), and Joseph Scaliger and Kaspar Schoppes (chs. 24-25). By treating all of these individuals under a single rubric, Erfindung achieves a rare feat in Renaissance and early modern studies (Enenkel uses the latter term exclusively): setting Italian and northern humanists into a unified framework, here the international, classicizing, Latinate respublica litteraria. When reading Enenkel’s work, one is reminded why it can still be meaningful to speak of humanism as a coherent phenomenon over two and a half centuries and throughout Europe.

The overarching goal of Erfindung is to show how humanists used autobiographical (and in a few cases biographical) writing to showcase what humanism was and to declare their participation in the movement; in these texts they indicate and stylize their departure from medieval culture, their orientation towards antiquity, and their hegemony in the period that they dubbed modernity.

Enenkel does not offer a straight history of humanist autobiography, but rather an inquiry into the process, the discourse, of autobiographical writing in early modern humanism. Indeed, he denies the very possibility of giving an account of autobiography as a genre, as one might attempt by dividing it into sub-genres, periods, groups, and themes. The reason, as he argues, is that there is no such thing: there was no established genre of autobiography from antiquity or the Middle Ages for humanists to use as a model; humanists shared no common understanding of what an autobiography might be, and therefore there is no homogeneous corpus of texts from which salient characteristics might be distilled and categorized. Furthermore, the texts under consideration do not conform to modern conceptions of autobiography, which expect sober prose and demand truth and believability on the part of authors. Nor do they have a constant form, ranging instead from metrical and prose letters to dialogues, poetry, and narrative accounts. Nevertheless, all the writings examined in this book do share certain traits that endow the study with coherence: they tell the putative story of their author (Egodokumenten); they are self-consciously modeled on ancient autobiographical and biographical texts, such as Augustine’s Confessions, Caesar’s Commentaries, Suetonius’s Lives, and specimens of Horace’s and Ovid’s poetry;
they offer details about private life (although many of these are fictive); and most importantly they portray, or rather fashion, an interior self. Thus Enenkel concludes that there is thus no such thing as a genre of autobiography (Autobiographie) in the early modern period; there is only autobiographical writing (Autobiographik).

As opposed to autobiography as it has been written since the nineteenth century, Enenkel argues that early modern autobiographical writing is characterized primarily by “invention” (Erfindung), not authentic recollection. The purpose of such writings is not to record or capture an individual as he was, but rather to fashion him, to create him, to give him life by setting him into literature. Whereas modern autobiography relies on the recognition of shared, authentic human experiences between author/narrator and reader in order to produce meaning (Hermeneutik), early modern biographical writing relies on a shared knowledge of ancient literature. Meaning is created not by claims to authenticity or truth, but by (fictionally) inscribing oneself into the classical texts that constituted the world of common experience for learned men. To set oneself into this context was to make one’s essence, or rather the essence one sought to communicate, intelligible to others.

To see how this works it would be helpful to consider an example in depth, and there is no better place to start than at the beginning: Francesco Petrarca’s invention of autobiography as a literary form. In both antiquity and the Middle Ages, such writing was generally considered taboo, both because the details of private life were not to be made public and because it seemed a breach of decorum to write about oneself. Thus with no models on which to rely and an audience likely to be hostile to his undertaking, Petrarca set out nevertheless to describe his inner self, his status animi, as he called it. He begins with a seemingly unlikely discursive form, the metrical letter (Epistole metrice), which he adapted from Horace. After finding Cicero’s Letters to Atticus, he adopts the prose letter for his Familiares, the first collection of personal letters ever intentionally written for publication. And finally, in his Letter to Posterity, which is the last of his Seniles, he imitates Suetonius’ Life of Augustus. Many of the details Petrarca includes in his letters are false, but this is not an issue for him; facts, even fictive ones, are only important insofar as they com-
municate the image of himself that he is set on fashioning. In his *Epistulae metrice* his primary goal is to style himself simultaneously a Latin poet and a Stoic philosopher, in essence a new Horace but with a humanist twist: he abandons the ancient poet’s opaque self-irony and puts himself—his *status animi*—at the center of his writing. In his *Familiares* he gives further insight into the persona he gradually continues to create: the Petrarca—or the idealized humanist—of the *Familiares* is a traveler, a friend of Rome, a lover of antiquity, a hater of scholasticism and Avignon; he is in essence a writer, a poet, and he is magnificently sustained in this otiose occupation by a devoted patron; although often on the move and somewhat beholden to worldly affairs, he prefers to lead a solitary and contemplative life. By portraying himself in this way, Petrarca provides an authoritative model of humanist self-understanding for his intellectual descendents. Finally, in his *Letter to Posterity*, he once again hammers out his image as a Latin poet, but by imitating Suetonius’ *Life of Augustus* he situates himself within a context of authority and power: he is the *imperator laureatus* of the *respublic litteraria*.

To say that humanist autobiographical writing imitates ancient texts and discourses is not to say that it is slavish or reductive. Enenkel is careful to show the ways that his authors both follow and depart from their ancient models, and indeed it is in the latter way that they succeed in creating the most meaning. Thus, Petrarca appropriates Suetonius’ imperial discourse to style himself a *princeps* of the literary world. Giovanni da Ravenna imitates Augustine’s confessional discourse, but instead of admitting his faults and asking forgiveness he uses the saint’s authority to offer an apology of his misdeeds. Eoban Hess adopts Ovid’s discourse of exile not so much to affiliate himself with the ancient poet as to challenge him. Pius II adapts Caesar’s military discourse to the medieval one of papal authority to express his intentions for a crusade. And Erasmus and Lipsius eclectically juxtapose discourse upon discourse to effect a chameleon-like identity, suited to all seasons and ready to change at a moment’s notice.

The technique of creatively and willfully inscribing oneself into one or more ancient autobiographical discourses lent itself first and foremost to claiming membership in the humanist community, but it had other uses as well. As noted, it was also the mechanism for
creating meaning for an audience of fellow humanists, who were familiar with the discourses adopted and tended to know the source texts by heart; to inscribe oneself into an ancient discourse was to situate oneself in the memory of one’s reader. Furthermore, the auctoritas of the ancients served to enhance one’s own authority and to increase the authenticity of the persona one sought to fashion. Autobiography, finally, was a powerful literary weapon. On the one hand it could function defensively as an apology of one’s personal history, social status, national affiliation, or genealogy. On the other it was deftly wielded in the confessional struggles of the sixteenth century and beyond.

Once the discursive element of autobiographical writings has been identified, Enenkel emphasizes, they can no longer be used as sources for the lives or actual personalities of their authors. Assuming the opposite can and has led to disastrous misinterpretation, such as in Burckhardt’s misreading of the Anonymous Life of Alberti (whose true author, by the way, Enenkel identifies as Lapo da Castiglionchio the Younger). The biography is not a manifesto for a distinctly Renaissance ideal of the uomo universale, but rather a conscious attempt to portray Alberti as a classical philosopher by inscribing him into the discourse of Diogenes Laertius’ Lives. Enenkel’s title is thus polemical: humanist autobiographical writing is not indicative of the “discovery of man” and individualism, as Burckhardt famously thought, but of the “invention of man” (Erfindung des Menschen), or rather the invention of the various humanist personae the authors sought to convey. Autobiography is an exercise in self-fashioning, not self-discovery or self-depiction.

To recognize all this, though, one must be on intimate terms with classical literature. And such is perhaps Erfindung’s most important general conclusion. The upshot is that if modern readers cannot hope to carry the classical tradition in their breast like the humanists of yore, they must at the very least recognize what they do not know when approaching humanist literature, and thus treat it with the proper care and respect. This caveat may be depressing, dampening as it does interpretive approaches not grounded in the classics. Yet it should also be exciting, for it vindicates humanist literature against long-standing charges of derivativeness, opacity, and just plain boringness. Erfindung
gives a tantalizing taste of what we might find if we explore the lost continent of early modern Latin with the proper tools.

Any book of this magnitude will have some defects in the eyes of readers, and *Erfindung* is no exception. Two criticisms appear especially worthy of mention. The first regards Enenkel’s insistence on the lack of autobiographical writing before humanism. From his presentation it appears as if there was a void between ancient authors and Petrarch. But what of Guibert of Nogent’s *Memoirs*, or Peter Abelard’s *Historia calamitatum*? Neither of these works is so much as mentioned. There is no reason, of course, for medieval writings to have a central place in a study devoted to humanist literature, but it would at the very least be interesting to see how the monuments of medieval autobiography compare to humanist counterparts. This point is raised perhaps less out of rebuke than curiosity. For, after seeing Enenkel dismantle the commonplace that Petrarca’s *Secretum* is modeled on Augustine’s *Confessions*, one wonders what he would do with Abelard and Guibert. The second criticism of *Erfindung*, more serious from the historian’s point of view, is that it does not provide a sufficient account of why and by what means autobiographical discourse developed and became standard in humanism. This is the regrettable collateral damage of Enenkel’s method, which otherwise hits its targets with such precision. Echoing Foucault, Enenkel asserts at the outset that “meaningful statements cannot be made about objects, subjects, etc., but only about the discourses … according to which certain objects … are talked about” (36-37). The result is a wonderful array of individual studies, but very little analysis of how they might fit together in any more than a discursive way.

Criticisms like these, however, come close to complaining that one’s favorite dish has not been served. In the final analysis, Enenkel convincingly does what he sets out to do: explain how early modern autobiographical writing works and demonstrate a suitable method for interpreting it. *Multum ei debemus.* (Patrick Baker, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin)

1537) was a scholar and diplomat during the reigns of Louis XII and Francis I. His political career began in the Parliament of Toulouse, but after representing Toulouse at court, he was appointed as Francis I’s resident ambassador in Venice, then served in Rome before returning home to receive the bishopric of Rieux. His diplomatic letters for his countrymen are in French, but official documents meant for the eyes of foreigners are in Latin, giving us insight not only into his own life but also offering commentary on the events and people of his day. Well educated both in France and in Italy—he attended lectures by Marcantonio Sabellico and Battista Guarino, among others—he retained an interest in the humanistic disciplines throughout his life: in Venice, for example, he took time out from his official duties to immerse himself in Greek under the guidance of Marcus Musurus and Girolamo Fondulo, beginning a translation of Cassius Dio’s History of Rome that he would work on for the rest of his life. Indeed his years as bishop of Rieux were largely devoted to study, since he lived not in Rieux but in Toulouse, where his villa served as a gathering place for students and scholars from throughout the region, including Etienne Dolet. Dolet and Jacopo Sadoleto pronounced themselves impressed with his eloquence and turned to him as a proofreader and discerning critic, while the scholars who spoke highly of his intellectual and moral qualities include Germain de Brie, Christophe de Longueil, Johannes Trithemius, Jacobus Omphalius, and Louis Le Roy.

Like most humanists of his day, de Pins carried on an extensive personal correspondence in Latin—indeed the diversity and scope of his writings establish him as one of the central figures of French humanism in early sixteenth-century Languedoc. His letters are eloquent in the style of the times. This style is the one once called familiare et iocosum by Cicero, somewhat informal while showing humor and grace. Within the letters one finds the proverbs, historical exempla, classical quotations, and topoi that illustrate widely approved moral and aesthetic values. For a modern reader, the concatenation of commonplace may suggest a lack of originality, but one must be careful not to inject anachronistic judgments here: Renaissance readers kept commonplace books and turned to them in writing to show that they had mastered the canon and methodology that educated people of the day were expected to control. Thus observations about people
and events are expressed through themes like the obligation to share wisdom with others, the dialectic of concurrent joy and sorrow, regrets for time wasted and opportunities lost, the frustrations of life at court, and so forth. And in the end, the commonplace strokes suffice to paint a picture of an unpretentious, cultured, good-natured man who was well integrated into the life of his day, both as a man of affairs and a man of culture.

The 134 letters in this edition are arranged in chronological order. Each is introduced by a headnote that explains the circumstances of its composition and provides information about the source(s) from which it was taken. The letter itself follows, in whichever language de Prins wrote it. An apparatus criticus comes next, along with notes explaining difficult words, identifying quotations, providing information about the people mentioned, and so forth. Unlike in some recent critical editions, where the notes can exceed the text by two or three times in length, the explanations here retain a due sense of proportion, but where the context demands it, the notes can come close to equaling the length of the letter. The books end with a bibliography of manuscripts and printed material, with the latter being unusually full and helpful, and an index.

In the end, de Pins is no Dolet or Muret, but Pendergrass’s carefully prepared edition allows one to appreciate the contributions of a man who combined otium and negotium in ways that are typical of his age and merit notice by us today as well. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

♦ Girolamo Cardano. De sapientia libri quinque. Ed. by Marco Bracali. Florence: Olschki, 2008. LVIII + 319 pp. 40 euros. This new edition of Girolamo Cardano’s De sapientia, the first modern one since the editio princeps of 1544 (followed by two other editions in 1624 and 1663), has inaugurated, along with Cardano’s Somniorum synesiorum libri quattuor (reviewed below), the new Olschki series Hyperchen. Testi e studi per la storia della cultura del Rinascimento. The ‘rediscovery’ of these two seminal works, now readable in more reliable and annotated texts, may well bear witness to one primary scope of contemporary (not only American) Renaissance scholarship, whose terms have been aptly defined in Christopher Celenza’s ground-breaking book The Lost
In the second half of the Cinquecento Cardano was considered the most famous mathematician, physicist, and physician throughout Europe, while his reputation as a philosopher was mainly due to two writings that enjoyed wide circulation, *De subtillitate* (1550) and *De rerum varietate* (1557). Particularly in the first he rejected Aristotle’s authority both in logic and natural philosophy, maintaining that his abstract theories could not grasp the *subtilitas rerum* or the most hidden connections operating within the natural world. Such an ultimate task requires, on the contrary, a method of knowledge that relies upon experience and reasoning, inasmuch as *experimentum docet et ratio cogit*.

In Cardano’s *De sapientia*, which assumes a twofold perspective, both theological and ethical, experience and reasoning turn out to be the only two guides that can deliver mankind from the captivity of ignorance and the arbitrariness of fortune, and finally lead it to the acquisition of natural wisdom. Interestingly enough, what Cardano here considers natural wisdom is in fact the adaptation to human limits of the unattainable divine wisdom (unless grace intervenes), since both, on two different levels, aim at pursuing the unique truth. As Cardano will write in his *De immortalitate animorum* (1545), a treatise that is strictly connected with the *De sapientia*, *Est autem veritas summa sapientia*. Hence it is only by imitating God’s immanent operations within nature that the authentic *sapiens* can find a way *diu ac bene vivere*. As Bracali notes, in this work too what rouses Cardano’s intellectual curiosity is the necessity of a logic measuring itself with divine omnipresence in nature. From such a perspective, *ratio* is definitely the only instrument at mankind’s disposal to overcome the hostility of the world, and its absence opens the most terrifying *horror vacui* in the human soul. At the end of the work, *stultitia*, defined as a renunciation of *ratio*, more than ignorance itself will be identified as the actual source of all immoderate passions, among which is the unnatural desire to acquire demonic wisdom. Between this inferior wisdom and its divine counterpart lies the vast territory within which any human attempt to acquire knowledge can be made in order to dominate natural processes or natural wisdom. Attracted by these two poles, demonic and divine, man wavers with no certainty, and certainty, in Cardano’s view, can only be found in natural wisdom.
imitating divine wisdom.

But our interest in Cardano’s *De sapientia* lies nonetheless in its being both an erudite excursus and a florilegium of *sententiae* on the topic, from antiquity (Homer, Virgil, Horace, Pliny) up to Erasmus, with whom the author holds privileged (although sometimes polemical) conversation. This trait allows us to read Cardano’s work as one of the last humanistic treatises on wisdom and its author, Bracali rightly points out, as one of the last truly eclectic figures of the whole Renaissance.

The editorial note explains in detail the criteria Bracali followed in order to provide his critical edition and commentary. The absence of extant manuscripts has required the *collatio* of three previous editions of the late Cinquecento and early Seicento (i.e., Petreius, Chovet, Huguetan and Ravaud). The careful apparatus includes a first line for textual variants and a second for sources and commentary. The exhaustive commentary is no doubt the most relevant contribution to the elucidation of the treatise and sheds new light on Cardano’s theological and philosophical library. A translation in Italian would have been welcome, but its absence is certainly a minor flaw if we consider that the volume is aimed at readers who are scholars of Renaissance Neo-Latin literature. (Igor Candido, Johns Hopkins University)

♦  Girolamo Cardano. *Somniorum synesiorum libri quatuor*. 2 vols. Ed., trans., and annotated by Jean-Yves Boriaud. Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 2008. Anyone familiar with Girolamo Cardano’s (1501-1576) autobiography will recall some of the dreams which punctuate or foretell certain moments in his life. A few days before he met his future wife for the first time, a vision of her came to him more lovely, he recalls, than Pulci could ever produce in a poem. His soul once traveled to the heavens where his father announced his role as a guardian spirit. He interpreted a terrible abyss as the ruin of his son. In 1560 while he was so tormented by grief for the death of his son that he believed he would either die, go mad, or at the very least abandon his profession, a voice told him that he would have peace if he placed the gem that usually hung around his neck in his mouth. All of these events happened in dreams. The last piece of medical / psychological advice apparently worked, for he was no
longer troubled by the memory of his son so long as he kept the stone in his mouth. However, as soon as he removed it in order to lecture or eat, he was immediately seized by a fear of death. It will come as no surprise, therefore, that the famous doctor, astrologer, and mathematician devoted a good deal of energy in his scientific writings to the investigation of dreams.

The product of this investigation, the *Somniorum synesiorum libri quatuor*, takes its name from the fifth century bishop of Cyrene, Synesius, whose work on dreams, *Peri enupnion*, was first translated into Latin by Marsilio Ficino and published by Aldus Manutius in 1497. Synesius was still outraged that all forms of pagan divination had been recently prohibited by the Empire when he wrote his treatise on the interpretation of dreams. He encouraged everyone to use dreams as a mode of divination and as a way to bypass the imperial laws as if dreams were, so to speak, a personal *chresterion*. Synesius, however, did not think it possible to arrive at a universal art for the interpretation of dreams applicable to all men at all times. This universal science of dreams is, however, Cardano’s goal in the *Somniorum synesiorum libri quatuor*.

Jean-Yves Boriaud has prepared an excellent Latin edition of the text, based on the 1562 Basle edition, and a clear French opposite-page translation for Olschki’s series Hyperchen. It currently accompanies two other of Cardano’s works published in this series: *De sapientia libri quinque* (see review above) and *De uno, Sobre lo uno*. Boriaud’s edition and translation are also supplemented with well prepared endnotes, indices and a brief introduction, which includes a first section on the chronology of Cardano’s writing of the *Somniorum synesiorum*, a second section that explains the role of dreams in the life and work of Cardano, a third that places Cardano’s work in the history of Renaissance oneirocriticism, another section that presents a concise explanation of the *Somniorum synesiorum*’s arguments and purpose, and a final section on the textual criteria chosen by Boriaud for the present edition. His introduction is brief and not a full study of the work. Nonetheless, it is very informative and useful. He importantly focuses on Cardano’s use of the concept and term *idolum*. The concept, originally atomistic, had by Synesius’s time found its way into other scientific discourses, both Platonic and Aristotelian, and has a
prominent place in Synesius’s *Peri enupnion*. Although Noël Aujoulat translates the Greek word *eidolon* as either “fantôme” or “image” in the 2004 Belles Lettres edition and French translation of Synesius’s work, Boriaud prefers to translate Cardano’s Latin *idolum* as “réplique” since, as he explains in the introduction, Cardano proposed a semantic reversal of *idolum*’s usual Greek etymological association with sight and visible form. Cardano instead associates *idolum* with the faculties of speech and hearing: *Duorum cum sint generum somnia, alia quidem quae rem ipsam declarant, idola vocata, quorum maxima pars oratione et auditu, non visu constat* (Girolamo Cardano, *Somniorum synesiorum libri quatuor*, 2 vols., ed., trans., and annotated by Jean-Yves Boriaud (Florence, 2008), xxv-xxvi and 551-59). Boriaud seems to want his reader to keep this in mind, since throughout his translation he often writes “réplique” entre guillemets as «réplique». The use of the guillemets gives the impression that Boriaud thought that the French translation of *idolum* as “réplique” did not always completely fit within the text. One wonders, then, why not merely keep *idolum* in the translation, since the Latin would have made the word stand out of the French text just like the use of the guillemets. One also assumes that the target audience of Boriaud’s translation would not be startled or frightened by the presence of one Latin term within the translation, especially given the translator’s explanation in the introduction. The present Latin edition and French translation are greatly welcomed, and one should also keep an eye out for another of Boriaud’s recent books published by Belles Lettres, entitled simply *Jérôme Cardan*. (Denis Robichaud, Johns Hopkins University)

livrant deux ans plus tard son livre d’épigraphmes et ses deux livres d’épîtres métriques, aborde ses compositions, certes ‘mineures,’ mais dont la lecture apparaît comme indispensable à la reconstitution de son milieu et de sa trajectoire, tant artistique que biographique. Pour accomplir ce travail considérable—la littérature de la sociabilité à laquelle appartiennent l’épigraphme et la lettre réclame en effet une érudition particulière—Roland Guillot s’est adjoint Daniel Delas et Jean-Claude Ternaux. Ce dernier s’est occupé presque entièrement de l’édition des lettres, Roland Guillot n’intervenant qu’en partie seulement pour les notes. En revanche à celui-ci revient tout le commentaire du livre d’épigraphmes (introduction et notes), traduit par Daniel Delas.

Précèdent l’édition commentée de chacune des deux œuvres (50-324; 390-571) une introduction (11-42; 363-84) et une bibliographie (43-49; 387-89). Un portrait de l’auteur inaugure le volume et douze double pages de dossier iconographique s’intercalent entre l’introduction et la bibliographie des Épistulae. Les éditeurs donnent en annexe de leur édition des épigraphmes (326-36) les trois pièces qui avaient été censurées, pour des raisons morales (XCIII) ou politiques (XCI et XCII), dans l’édition d’Utrecht 1541, mais que Bosscha et Scrivenerius, en 1619, avaient déjà rétablies. Une table des correspondances entre la présente édition et celle de 1619 (339-41), une table des incipit (343-47) et un index alphabétique des noms propres (349-58) viennent faciliter la lecture du livre des épigraphmes. De la même manière, un index des personnes et des personnifications (573-76), un index géographique (577-78) et une table des incipit (581-82) permettent au lecteur des épîtres versifiées de mieux se repérer.

Les commentaires se répartissent entre les introductions et les notes. L’introduction du livre d’Épigraphmes est d’une remarquable exhaustivité. En trente et une pages, toutes les questions (place du livre d’Epigraphmata dans les opera de 1541, rôle d’Alciat et de Steen-Meulen, modèles antiques et contemporains, avec en particulier la part dévolue à l’emblème, statut, longueur, formules métriques, genres des épigraphmes, projet et trajectoire de l’ensemble du recueil) sont traitées de manière à la fois synthétique et circonstanciée. Chaque épigraphme est ainsi répertorié sous ces différents aspects sans que cela fasse jamais double emploi avec le commentaire détaillé, sous forme de notes (de quelques lignes à plusieurs pages), qui suit immédiatement
l’édition et la traduction de chaque pièce. Les esprits chagrins pourraient toutefois émettre certaines réserves: déploiner, par exemple, en ce qui concerne l’analyse détaillée, l’inégalité des commentaires et leur caractère désordonné de notes; ou bien encore reconnaître la notion de *variétas* comme, certes, essentielle pour le recueil des épigrammes de Second (R. Guillot en fait le principe d’organisation de son introduction), mais ajouter qu’elle l’est aussi pour la plupart des recueils de ce type, au moins depuis le Quattrocento, et regretter, à ce propos, que les auteurs n’aient pas souligné de manière plus précise les rapprochements avec les poètes néolatins italiens du XVème siècle. Mais, grâce à cette mise en perspective générale et à la richesse de la documentation historique et biographique ainsi qu’à la recherche méticuleuse des sources, le lecteur est à même de reconstituer le milieu et l’ambiance de ces pièces et de saisir les tenants et les aboutissants de cette littérature de l’intime et de l’éphémère.

L’introduction aux livres d’épîtres métriques, plus brève, vingt et une pages seulement, situe ces écrits dans leur cadre spatio-temporel, ainsi que dans l’itinéraire poétique et artistique, et l’environnement personnel, familial, amical et amoureux, de Jean Second. Après un rapide survol de la tradition épistolaire dans laquelle le poète s’inscrit (Cicéron, Horace et Ovide, Pétrarque et Érasme et, enfin, son contemporain Clément Marot), Jean-Claude Ternaux tente d’appréhender la substance de cette correspondance. Il reconnaît aux cinq lettres “familiales,” au-delà de leur “dimension référentielle et anecdotique,” une fonction matricielle, en ce qu’elles ne se préoccupent pas seulement de la santé des êtres chers, mais aussi de questions d’art et de poésie. Cette réflexion, émanant de surcroît d’un artiste, à la fois poète et ciseleur, ainsi que le côté rétrospectivement dramatique de ces lettres, puisque le poète s’envisage “dans la tiédeur d’un premier printemps” (I,7, v. 10), alors qu’il mourra deux ans plus tard, font tout l’intérêt de ce texte qui n’est certes pas l’œuvre majeure de Second. Enfin l’introduction procure toutes les informations concernant la versification des deux livres d’épîtres (le premier composé en distiques élégiaques sur le modèle ovidien, le second en hexamètres, selon le mètre choisi par Horace pour ses lettres). Elle nous informe aussi sur l’établissement du texte: le texte retenu (l’édition d’Utrecht, 1541) a été confronté aux deux éditions parisiennes de 1561 et 1582,
respectivement chez Andrea Welchelus et Dionysius Duvallius, et à l’édition lyonnaise de Scriverius de 1619. Plus que des notes, le commentaire qui suit immédiatement le texte latin de chaque lettre en vers et sa traduction en propose une lecture à la fois détaillée et composée, alliant finesse d’interprétation littéraire et connaissances érudites. Enfin, pour en finir avec le volet interprétatif et introductif à ces œuvres, soulignons l’importance du dossier documentaire et iconographique qui précède l’édition des épîtres, mais intéresse aussi bien les épigrammes que les lettres. Il rassemble en effet quatre reproductions de médailles représentant le père de Jean Second ou des membres de sa sodalitas, un portrait de Dantiscus, le fac-similé de la lettre de Viglius Zuichem à J. Second, deux photographies de la bague d’Athéna dont il est question dans l’Epistola I, IX, ainsi que tout le dossier du couronnement de Charles Quint.

Reste à examiner les traductions. Les épigrammes comme les épîtres sont traduites avec beaucoup d’élégance et de sens littéraire, mais des fautes sont à déplorer dans la traduction des épigrammes, allant de la simple inexactitude jusqu’au contresens caractérisé. Ainsi, par exemple, dans la première épigramme, traduire insolita religione (v. 2) par “un sentiment religieux” me paraît insuffisant, alato … pede (v. 8) par “d’un pied assuré,” au lieu “d’un pied ailé,” pour le moins inexact et, pour ainsi dire, à la limite du faux sens. De même, toujours dans la même épigramme, rendre Caede coloratas … uias (v. 12) par “les chemins … souillés de meurtres,” plutôt que “rougis de meurtres,” transforme inutilement le texte en lui retirant toute sa couleur, sans parler de l’ablatif absolu duce Mercurio (v. 16) qui ne signifie pas, n’en déplaise au traducteur, “à l’aide de Mercure,” mais “sous sa conduite.” Mais l’erreur la plus grave, dans la traduction de cette épigramme liminaire, puisqu’elle aboutit au contresens, est la traduction stupéfiante de l’attaque du v. 19: Insuetoque modo par “Et, comme elle sait le faire,” alors qu’au contraire le groupe signifie “Et d’une manière inaccoutumée.” Un contresens encore plus étendu touche les v. 12 à 16 de l’épigramme 3. En effet, la traduction proposée: “Que tes flèches toujours chargent le carquois de l’amour, / Et que l’Amour ailé, dont les feux toujours vivaces sont craints de tous, / Accompagne tes joyeux compagnons, / Que tes mignons soient heureux et gentils pour toi, / Que douces soient leurs marques d’amour, que, demain /
comme hier,” est pure invention par rapport au texte latin. En effet, J. Second, après avoir invoqué Vénus, invoque son fils et compagnon, Amour, en ces termes, leur adressant une prière à tous deux pour son ami: *Et, nunquam vacua gravis pharetra, / Et semper uigili timendus igne, / Lasciuae comes Aliiger parenti, / Sint mites tibi, prosperentque molleis / Quas dabunt vel dedere flamma*. Ces vers signifient donc littéralement: “Et que celui qui est alourdi par son carquois qui n’est jamais vide et qui inspire à tous la crainte par son feu toujours vivace, le compagnon Ailé de sa mère lascive < ainsi que sa mère >, qu’ils te soient doux, et qu’ils fassent prospérer les tendres flammes qu’ils te donneront ou t’ont données.”

En conclusion, je soulignerai la richesse de ce travail qui contribue à une meilleure connaissance de Jean Second, en lui-même et dans son milieu, en tant qu’homme, ciseleur et poète. (B. Charlet-Mesdjian, Université de Nice-Sophia Antipolis)


lichkeit der Wörter für die Seinserkenntnis zu untersuchen.


(Heidi Marek, Marburg, Germany)

Daniel Heinsius. Klassischer Philologue und Poet. Ed. by Eckard Lefèvre and Eckart Schäfer. NeoLatina, 13. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 2008. 443 pp. + indices. 98 euros. This compilation on the Ghent-born but Leiden-based humanist Daniel Heinsius (1580-1655) appeared in December 2007 (title page 2008) as the latest publication of the series NeoLatina, which is led by the Freiburg emeriti Eckard Lefèvre and Eckart Schäfer. After similar volumes such as Horaz und Celtis (1) or Johannes Secundus und die römische Liebeslyrik (5) on the German Conrad Celtis (1459-1508) and the Dutchman Janus Secundus (1511-1536), this is the thirteenth issue in this series focusing on the
great Neo-Latin poets, and especially the transalpine ones. And let me be clear: thirteen is not an unlucky number in this case. The scholarship of Daniel Heinsius. Klassischer Philologe und Poet is solid as a rock.

The compilation offers the published papers of a colloquium on Heinsius that was organised in 2006 by the Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg im Breisgau. As a result, most contributions were written by local, German scholars, with the addition of several Dutch researchers and one Belgian scholar. In any case, the scholarly world takes a lively interest in the subject of the book. The name Daniel Heinsius is well known to an international public of scholars of Neo-Latin, Dutch literature, and literary theory, as is that of his son Nicholas. Heinsius won his spurs not only as a classical philologist and an influential literary theoretician, but also as a celebrated poet. His oeuvre primarily consists of Neo-Latin poetry, but we also find Greek epigrams and Dutch verse, and as for poetic genres, we notice the same diversity: Heinsius produced erotic elegies, occasional poetry, didactic poems, emblemata, and drama.

In the past not all that many books on Heinsius have been published, although there have been a great number of scholarly articles. Apart from the historical biography by Dirk ter Horst (Daniel Heinsius, 1580-1655) from the thirties and the more intellectually oriented biography (with a broad bibliography) by Paul Sellin from 1968 (Daniel Heinsius and Stuart England), there is only the important book by Baerbel Becker-Contarino (Daniel Heinsius, 1978), which is the standard introduction to Heinsius’s poetry, and the work by Jan Hendrik Meter (The Literary Theories of Daniel Heinsius, Dutch version: 1978, English reissue: 1984). Besides that, a number of reprints, editions, and translations of Heinsius’s works saw the light, such as a recently published edition with French translation of his influential theory of dramatic art, De constitutione tragoediae (Anne Duprat, 2001).

In view of this status quaestionis the book under review here is a very useful, if not necessary, addition which mainly focuses on Heinsius’s poetic output. Through very reliable and detailed analyses, this book offers a meticulously constructed image of the poet Heinsius and all the different aspects and contexts of his poetry. All the poetic languages and genres mentioned above are treated in it.
The articles are without exception very solid and open up the topics admirably through rigorous edition, translation, and annotation of the material, which the editors explicitly state to be their aim (10): “Die Themen werden zusätzlich durch Textabdruck, Übersetzung und Kommentierung, diesmal noch intensiver als in früheren Bänden, besser zugänglich gemacht.” The reader immediately notices that this is no empty promise, when on page 10 the verse-ending *sternutat Apollo* is interpretatively translated as *Apollo niest (glückverheißend)*. Indeed, not even classical philologists or ancient historians will spontaneously understand that, since Homer (*Od.*, 17.539-51), sneezing was said to be a favourable omen.

This kind of thing is very telling for this book. The majority of the compilations deal with Neo-Latin verse, which they publish, translate, and annotate with great skill and an eye for detail. The Latin is solid and almost always flanked by a German translation. (In the many Latin quotations I found only a handful of typos, which I mention only for reasons of completeness: *excolere* (13) for *excolerem*, *plurimum* (77) for *plurima*, *relictum* (157) for *relictum*, *specie torquet* (323) for *specie dulci torquet*, *perditit* (325) for *perdidit*, *detrahereet* (383) for *detrahseret*, *nonnullae* (428) for *nonnullae*.) Perhaps one small error in judgement is the fact that the authors did not venture to modernise the often-confusing humanist punctuation. The annotations are apt and adequate, although one does find the inevitable *lapsus*. One example is the expression *inter ignitos lapides ambulare* (to walk among burning stones)—a wink to Heinsius’s daring erotic themes—which does not primarily refer to a *locus* in Martianus Capella on the gems in the crown of Juno (pp. 109-10), but is first and foremost an almost-literal quotation from the Old Testament (Vulg., *Ex.*, 28:14).

The stress on the Latin aspect of the book maintained in this review may be interpreted as significant for its chief focus. The book is centred on the primary material without losing itself in ubiquitous and never-ending footnotes, which sometimes happens in Neo-Latin publications. Still, once in a while a bibliographic hiatus is noticeable, as in Lefèvre’s contribution (Lefèvre (2)) on the funerary poetry for Justus Lipsius, where in many cases more recent scholarly literature is available.
For the rest, nothing bad can be said about the rich number of contributions which convincingly illustrate and interpret Heinsius’s poetical genius. The table of contents shows a typological order in the contributions (Elegien, Monobiblos, Epicedia, Satire, Lateinische und Volkssprachliche Dichtung, Spätere Lyrik, Lehrepos, Tragödie), but there are also thematic lines to be discerned. While one or two contributions deal with Heinsius’s part in humanist Streitkultur (Schäfer), his influence on early German literature (Aurnhammer), and his poetry in other languages, i.e., Greek (Golla) or Dutch (van Gemert, de Jonghe), the main group of papers discusses separate Neo-Latin poems in particular (Lefèvre (1), Uhle, Orth, Heerink–Bloemendal, van Dam, Lefèvre (2), Leuker, Seidel, Manuwald, Bloemendal, Stürner) or Heinsius’s poetics in general (Blänsdorf, Gärtner, Czapla, Bureckhard). For this reason the title of the book certainly should have been Daniel Heinsius. Poesie und Poetologie instead of Daniel Heinsius. Klassischer Philologe und Poet. (One wonders whether the already-planned sixteenth volume—Ianus Dousa. Neulateinischer Dichter und Klassischer Philologe (2009)—will show the same discrepancy.) Of course, one can never regard Heinsius’s poetic output as separate from his philological interests and activities. Still in our book one has to wait until p. 155 (n. 38) to read an explicit sentence such as “Philologie und Poesie interferieren hier.” Detailed information or a synthetic appreciation of the philologist Heinsius is not present in this book, even if the link between the two is regularly alluded to (e.g., Gärtner, Orth, Heerink–Bloemendal, Bureckhard, Bloemendal). Above all, the reader of this book will find a sharp analysis of the Neo-Latin poetry of ‘the nightingale from Ghent’, which was admired by the likes of Hugo Grotius and Constantijn Huygens. And, truth be told, that is already more than enough. (Tom Deneire, K. U. Leuven)

Arne Jönsson (ed.), Letters from Sir James Spens and Jan Rutgers, The Works and Correspondence of Axel Oxenstierna, II:13. Stockholm: Royal Academy of Letters, Histories, and Antiquities, 2007. 643 pp. Scholars from the late nineteenth century have been increasingly fascinated by the tens of thousands of unpublished letters written by humanists, but also by other learned persons and men of influence in early modern times. This interest has resulted in a number of proj-
ects leading to the critical editions of the sometimes-very-extensive correspondence of well-known letter-writers, many of which are still going on. One of these continuing projects is devoted to Axel Oxenstierna (1583-1654), who played a pivotal role in European politics and should undoubtedly be counted among the most influential people in Swedish history. He became Lord High Chancellor of Sweden from 1612 until his death and was the confidant of King Gustav II Adolph and later of Queen Christina. The Works and Correspondence of Axel Oxenstierna (in its abbreviated form AOSB) is divided into two series: series I (now 16 vols.) comprises the works and letters written by Oxenstierna, series II (now 13 vols.) the letters written to him by politicians from Sweden and abroad, commanders of the Swedish armies, and key persons from the social and economic scene. An inventory of all the relevant material and the editions with facsimiles of the originals is accessible via the web (http://www.ra.se/RA/Oxenstierna/oxenstierna1engelska.html).

The volume under review, the first to use English as the editorial language instead of Swedish, includes the letters from Sir James Spens (1571-1632), Scottish adventurer, military entrepreneur, and diplomat in British and Swedish service, and from the Dutch humanist and diplomat Jan Rutgers (1589-1625). Its editor, Arne Jönsson, is presently preparing vol. 14, containing the letters from Carl Marinus, Swedish diplomat in Zürich. A brief introduction informs the reader about the Oxenstierna project along with the life and diplomatic activities of the two correspondents and ends with a survey of the editorial principles applied in the edition. This is followed by the chronologically ordered correspondence from Sir James Spens (23-224) and from Jan Rutgers (225-586). The book ends with an alphabetical list of short biographical notes (with further bibliographical references) on the persons mentioned in the letters (with a very few names from ancient times, such as Aeneas and Cicero, dwelling as lost sheep among Oxenstierna’s contemporaries), a survey of the literature consulted, and an index.

In several aspects, editor Arne Jönsson provided careful work, courteously paying attention to the fact that not all of his readers are equally familiar with Latin: he is consistent in his presentation of the letters, his transcriptions are flawless, and the summaries preceding
each letter are to the point and correct. One could, of course, have some doubts about his maintaining the occasional accents on adverbs (deinde, quàm ocyssimè, adeò) or the circumflex on the ablative -â or the preposition â (in a few cases even â), or the fact that, whereas he adapted the occurrence of u and v, or i and j in Latin to modern use, he kept the (in my eyes unnecessary and possibly confusing) distinction between felix and fælix or foelix. I also have some reservation about keeping abbreviations such as ita ex animo do. v. felicem [...] (102, but legio) or Ill. D:ne within his text, instead of simply completing these words between brackets.

No line numbers are given, but small numerals in superscript after a word refer the reader to the critical apparatus, while small letters are used for references to the commentary. This is, in fact, disappointingly brief, consisting mainly of references to earlier or later letters about the same issue (which is very handy) and the explication of an abstract word such as ‘duke’ or ‘daughter’ by the corresponding proper name, which in turn is elucidated in the biographical notes at the end of the book. In the case of historical events (a treaty, an impending war), the commentary is mostly limited to a secondary source. Of course, there is no need to dwell upon each successive stage of a major event, such as forming a Protestant alliance between the British, the Swedes, the Danes, and the Dutch against the Habsburgs and other Catholic rulers in Spens’s correspondence, or similar longer-term affairs in Rutgers’ correspondence. Yet it would have been a boon for the interested reader who lacks an exhaustive knowledge of Swedish history if such episodes in particular had been discussed in a more comprehensive introductory essay, which besides summing up the facts, might also have disclosed the subtle means chosen to achieve the author’s purpose. (Jeanine De Landtsheer, K. U. Leuven)

review here constitute the latest installment of the incomparable I Tatti Renaissance Library, which has already put into print reliable editions of a good number of neglected Neo-Latin works, with the promise of many more to come.

First in this group is Michael Putnam’s Sannazaro. Sannazaro is a well-known poet, but this is because his vernacular Arcadia was a Renaissance best-seller. Much of his output is in Latin, however, and as is often the case, this poetry is known primarily to specialists.

First, there is the De partu Virginis, a carefully structured three-book epic on the virgin birth. Like any good epic in the classical mode, this one comes with examples of divine machinery, simile, ekphrasis, and cataloguing, although the emphasis on speech-making is more Renaissance than classical. The whole is patently Virgilian, although Putnam makes a convincing case that the Georgics is Sannazaro’s principal inspiration, which helps us appreciate the poem’s didactic intentions. Also included in this volume are the Piscatoria, five eclogues transferred to the shore of the Bay of Naples; twenty-four elegies and over a hundred epigrams, impressive for their variety of theme and content as well as their careful craftsmanship; and two shorter works, Salices, an Ovidian transformation poem, and De morte Christi Domini ad mortales lamentatio, a jeremiad exhorting the sinful to repent. In all these poems, the world of Rome interacts with that of Christianity to produce works that partake of both, yet are not fully of either—a tension that is admirably revealed by the hundred fifty pages of notes Putnam has provided for this edition.

The same creative tension drives Vida’s Christiad. This poem has been attracting some attention over the last couple of generations: Gertrude C. Drake and Clarence A. Forbes did an edition-translation a little over thirty years ago (Carbondale and Edwardsville, 1978), while J. Christopher Warner devoted an entire chapter to it in The Augustinian Epic, Petrarch to Milton (Ann Arbor, 2005). This is only reasonable, given that some forty editions appeared in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries and almost thirty translations into the modern vernaculars followed, which helps explain the work’s influence on poems like Jerusalem Delivered and Paradise Lost. Gardner considers Vida’s poem to be the most successful of the Latin efforts to write a Christian epic, but he does a good job of offering a balanced judg-
ment of the poem, noting that successes like the verbal description of the crucifixion, for example, must be weighed against a recurrent difficulty in bringing the characters in the poem to life. To my mind, he underestimates the classical machinery in the poem—I have read it with students at the end of a course on Greek and Latin epic, and they have no trouble seeing the points of connection—but he is certainly right to emphasize that at the level of language at least, the *Christiad* is manifestly Virgilian. I suspect he is also right in suggesting that the efforts to imitate the classical past stifled poetic creativity in the Renaissance, an issue that runs throughout the history of Neo-Latin literature. But thanks to Gardner’s edition, the modern reader can judge for herself. The text presented here, which is based on the definitive 1550 edition but includes the results of collations against the *editio princeps* and a manuscript that might be the dedication copy, is better than Drake and Forbes’s, and the notes are accompanied by a handy list of earlier editions.

Vida’s epic is fairly well known, if not frequently read, but the last book in this group, Brandolini’s *Republics and Kingdoms Compared*, is probably unknown even to active Neo-Latinists. It was never published in the Renaissance and survives in only two manuscripts, yet James Hankins, the editor of this volume as well as the I Tatti series as a whole, makes a convincing case that this is the most interesting work of humanist political theory prior to Machiavelli. The work is a dialogue between King Mattias Corvinus of Hungary and Domenico Giugni, a Florentine merchant visiting his court, about the relative merits of republics and kingdoms. As Hankins point out, this is not a Ciceronian dialogue in which opposing positions are set out fully so that the most probable one can be selected according to the tenets of Academic skepticism, but a Socratic dialogue written by a disenchanted Florentine that is designed to demolish the arguments in favor of a republic that Florentines like Coluccio Salutati and Leonardo Bruni had put forward, arguing instead that the fundamental goals of humanism are more compatible with kingdoms than republics. Here Aristotle’s *Politics* yields to Plato’s *Laws* and *Statesman*, which had become available in Ficino’s Latin translation just six years before Brandolini finished his work. Hankins does a good job of placing this obscure work into the current scholarship on humanist
political theory, pointing out correctly that its hostility to commerce, 
for example, calls into question Pocock’s argument that Renaissance 
republican ideology is fully compatible with Italian commercial soci-
ety, and that since it participates in the ‘Greek tradition’ emphasizing 
the public good and collective happiness over private entitlements, 
this tradition can be argued to precede More’s Utopia, which is where 
the so-called ‘Cambridge school’ puts its beginning. We should not 
forget, however, that many people read More and hardly anyone read 
Brandolini, so that some caution must be exercised in rewriting the 
history of political thought. This does not, however, mitigate in any 
way the debt owed to Professor Hankins for rescuing this unduly ne-
glected little gem from oblivion; every Neo-Latinist active today is in 
debt to him for his herculean labors on this series in general, and now 
we can add our thanks for this specific volume to our more general 
appreciation. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

♦ La obra de Séneca y su pervivencia. Cinco estudios. Ed. by Julian 
Solana Pujalte. Ciclos de Filología Clásica, 5. Córdoba: Servicio de 
Publicaciones, Universidad de Córdoba, 2008. 231 pages. The book 
under review here is at first glance a bit of a curiosity. Its birth goes 
back to 1996, when the editor conceived it as a catalogue of the editions of Seneca found in the libraries of Cordóba, in connection with 
an exhibition that was planned to accompany a congress on Seneca as 
part of the bimillennium of his birth celebrated in 1996-1997. The 
project was not completed then, but the editor picked it up again in 
2005. In this iteration the intention was to focus on the editions of Seneca in the libraries of Cordóba as a way to draw attention to the 
material means by which his works were diffused as part of the clas-
sical tradition. Between 1996 and 2005 the scholarly terrain changed 
appreciably, in ways that benefit this project. The study of the clas-
sical tradition, which had occupied a marginal position in the field of 
classics, moved toward the center, renamed ‘reception’ and given a 
more theoretical underpinning. And bibliography and textual studies, 
increasingly marginalized in turn within the humanities, took on new 
life as book history, where the book as physical object found itself 
analyzed in new ways within cultural studies. It is into this changed 
 scholar environment that La obra de Séneca y su pervivencia finally
entered.

Since the book is aimed at a broad audience, it begins with an introductory essay by Mireille Armisen-Marchetti, “Sénèque écrivain,” which provides basic information about Seneca: what he wrote and the genres in which his works are placed, followed by an analysis of his style and how his stylistic choices become part of his philosophical and aesthetic principles. The second essay, “Séneca y los libros” by Miguel Rodríguez-Pantoja, moves the collection firmly toward the materiality of texts that is its raison d’être. This essay is an imaginative survey of Seneca’s writings to determine what his ideas were about the importance and use of reading, different types of textual consumption, how one reads and studies, how books are written, and what it means to possess them. In “La presenza dell’opera di Seneca nei codici della Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana tra Medioevo e Umanesimo,” Marco Buonocore focuses on the key role that the Vatican Library has played in transmitting both the genuine and apocryphal works of Seneca, discussing key codicological and iconographic features of the manuscripts, the role of the Vatican manuscripts in establishing a stemma codicum of several Senecan texts, and the other kinds of works that have helped fix our understanding of the Senecan corpus, from commentaries and concordances to translations and collections of Senecan commonplaces. Carla Maria Monti, in “La fortuna di Seneca nell’Umanesimo italiano,” studies the reception of Seneca in the first generations of Italian humanism, paying special attention to the new historical and philological instruments by which the authentic and apocryphal works were distinguished, the discussion about whether the works in the Senecan corpus are by one author or more than one, and the often-asserted inconsistencies between what Seneca wrote and how he lived his life. The book concludes with Solana Pujalte’s “La memoria de Séneca en las bibliotecas de Córdoba (siglos XV-XVIII).” This is a catalogue of the works of Seneca, father and son, printed from the fifteenth through the eighteenth centuries and preserved in the libraries of Córdoba and the surrounding province. The catalogue, which is prepared according to exacting bibliographical standards, is accompanied by an introductory essay which provides information on the earliest editions and translations, philological aspects of early scholarship on Seneca, notices about his life and style, such key topics
in Senecan reception as Neostoicism and Tacitism, and Seneca’s place in Spanish religious culture, moral literature, and emblem studies.

Neo-Latinists will find much of interest here, both in terms of content and method. The introduction to the catalogue and the essay on Seneca’s role in early Italian humanism touch on key points in the history of Neo-Latin literature, and the focus on the physical form of the book, whether as Seneca conceived it or as it shaped the reception of his work, can provide a model for similar studies on other authors in the future. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

Dirk Sacré and Jan Papy, eds. *Syntagmatia: Essays on Neo-Latin Literature in Honour of Monique Mund-Dopchie and Gilbert Tournoy*. Supplementa Humanistica Lovaniensia, 26. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2006. XIV + 864 pp. 99 euros. The stimulus for this volume is the simultaneous retirement of two of today’s preeminent Neo-Latinists, Monique Mund-Dopchie, who taught for many years at the Université catholique Louvain-la-Neuve, and Gilbert Tournoy, of the internationally renowned Seminarium Philologiae Humanisticae of Leuven University. Many of the contributors to this Festschrift are fellow members of the International Association for Neo-Latin Studies, where both honorees have long been active and have held leadership positions. Others occupy prominent positions in the libraries and universities of Belgium, as is appropriate for a volume like this.


As this list of contents shows, Syntagmatia offers a cornucopia of riches to the Neo-Latinist, ranging from the fourteenth to the twenty-first centuries and including Latin writings from Italy, Hungary, the Netherlands, Germany, France, Poland, the ‘New’ World, Spain, Scotland, Denmark, and China. The discussions include well-known figures like Francesco Petrarca, Lorenzo Valla, Desiderius Erasmus, Juan Luis Vives, Thomas More, Justus Lipsius and Tycho Brahe, but also writers like Eobanus Hessus and Juan Luis de la Cerda who are likely to be known only to specialists and others like Prospero Intorcetta and Johannes Ludovicus Praschius who are likely to be unknown to most readers, even experienced Neo-Latinists. Contributions cover a variety of topics ranging from Renaissance commentaries and editions of classical authors and the teaching of Latin to Neo-Latin novels, epistolography, and Renaissance rhetoric. All in all, the volume is a worthy tribute to Professors Mund-Dopchie and Tournoy, who, retired or not, show no signs of slowing down in their own contributions to Neo-Latin Studies. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

♦ Walther Ludwig. Supplementa Neolatina. Ausgewählte Aufsätze 2003-2008. Ed. by Astrid Steiner-Weber. Noctes Neolatinae / Neo-Latin Texts and Studies, 10. Hildesheim, Zürich, and New York: Georg Olms Verlag, 2008. X + 876 pp. Five years ago, Miscella Neolatina, a three-volume set of essays by Walther Ludwig on Neo-Latin subjects, appeared in the series Noctes Neolatinae. If these 1,800 pages had represented a lifetime of work, that would be something of which any scholar could be proud, but they in fact are limited to the years 1989 to 2003. One might expect that, since the author was seventy-five at the point when that collection was closed, this would be it, but anyone
laboring under those expectations does not know Walther Ludwig. Collected here some of the essays on Neo-Latin subjects that he has published since then.


Those readers of Neo-Latin News who have been attending the meetings of the International Association for Neo-Latin Studies are aware that Professor Ludwig, now past eighty, continues to put his younger colleagues to shame, working more vigorously and effectively in ‘retirement’ than most of us manage in our so-called prime. I am confident that a few years from now there will be a supplement to this supplement to Professor Ludwig’s collected essays, and, I hope, several more past that. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

✦ El humanismo español entre el viejo mundo y el nuevo. Ed. by Jesús María Nieto Ibáñez and Raúl Manchón Gómez. Jaén: Servicio de Publicaciones, Universidad de Jaén, and León: Servicio de Publicaciones, Universidad de León, 2008. 534 pages. This book contains a collection of essays dedicated to humanism and the classical tradition, with special attention to the Americas and the projection of the culture of the humanists and the Spanish missionaries on the islands and mainland of the ‘new’ world from the sixteenth century onward. As such, it forms a companion volume to one reviewed in the Fall, 2008 issue of Neo-Latin News, El humanismo español, su proyección en América y Canarias en la época del humanismo, ed. by Antonio María Martín Rodríguez and Germán Santana Henríquez (Las Palmas: Universidad de Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, 2006). Given Spain’s special role in the Encounter, it makes sense that volumes like this would continue to appear there after the 1492 fad passed in Anglophone scholarship, but it appears that work on the contact between the two cultures will
continue to be a distinctive feature of Spanish Neo-Latin scholarship over the coming years.


As one would expect in a collection like this, some of the essays are on major figures in the history of humanism, while others introduce works that are more-or-less completely unknown today. This is a good mix, producing a volume that is well worth consulting by anyone with an interest in humanism and the classical tradition in Spain and the ‘new’ world. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)