



EVENTEENTH-



ENTURY



NEWS

SPRING - SUMMER 2007

Vol. 65

Nos. 1&2

Including

THE NEO-LATIN NEWS Vol. 55, Nos. 1&2

SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY NEWS

VOLUME 65, Nos. 1&2

SPRING-SUMMER, 2007

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

University of Akron
Oklahoma State University
Texas A&M University

SUBMISSIONS: As a scholarly review journal, *SCN* publishes only commissioned reviews. As a service to the scholarly community, *SCN* also publishes news items. A current style sheet, previous volumes' Tables of Contents, and other information all may be obtained via our home page on the World Wide Web. Books for review and queries should be sent to:

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

E-Mail: scn@tamu.edu
WWW: <http://www-english.tamu.edu/pubs/scn/>

ISSN 0037-3028

SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY NEWS

EDITOR

DONALD R. DICKSON

Texas A&M University

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

James Egan, University of Akron
Jeffrey Walker, Oklahoma State University
Michele Marrapodi, University of Palermo
Patricia Garcia, Our Lady of the Lake University
E. Joe Johnson, Clayton State University

EDITORIAL ASSISTANTS

Christopher E. Garrett, Texas A&M University
Jacob A. Tootalian, Texas A&M University

CONTENTS

VOLUME 65, NOS. 1&2

SPRING-SUMMER, 2007

REVIEWS

- Harrison T. Meserole: In Memoriam by JAMES L. HARNER, TEXAS
A&M UNIVERSITY 1
- Graham Parry, *The Arts of the Anglican Counter-Reformation: Glory, Laud
and Honour*. Review by P. G. STANWOOD, UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH
COLUMBIA 5
- John K. Hale, *Milton's Cambridge Latin: Performing in the Genres 1625-1632*.
Review by EUGENE D. HILL, MOUNT HOLYOKE COLLEGE ... 8
- David Farr, *Henry Ireton and the English Revolution*. Reviewed by ROBERT
MCJIMSEY, COLORADO COLLEGE 10
- J. B. Owens, "By My Absolute Royal Authority": *Justice and the Castilian Com-
monwealth at the Beginning of the First Global Age*. Review by MICHAEL
J. LEVIN, THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON 13
- Alexander Samson, ed., *The Spanish Match: Prince Charles' Journey to Madrid,
1623*. Review by BRENNAN C. PURSELL, DESALES UNIVERSITY
..... 16
- Faith E. Beasley, *Mastering Memory: Salons, History, and the Creation of Seven-
teenth-Century France*. Review by STEPHANIE O'HARA, UNIVERSITY
OF NORTH CAROLINA AT GREENSBORO 19

David Colclough, <i>Freedom of Speech in Early Stuart England</i> . Review by JONATHAN WRIGHT, HARTLEPOOL, UNITED KINGDOM	22
Diana Newton, <i>North-East England 1569-1625: Governance, Culture and Identity</i> . Review by MARTYN BENNETT, NOTTINGHAM TRENT UNIVERSITY	25
Jonathan Scott, <i>Commonwealth Principles: Republican Writing of the English Revolution</i> . Review by CHARLES W. A. PRIOR, UNIVERSITY OF HULL	28
Whitney R.D. Jones, <i>Thomas Rainborone (c. 1610-1648): Civil War Seaman, Siegemaster and Radical</i> . Review by ELLEN J. JENKINS, ARKANSAS TECH UNIVERSITY	31
Marcus Nevitt, <i>Women and the Pamphlet Culture of Revolutionary England, 1640-1660</i> . Review by ELIZABETH SKERPAN-WHEELER, TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY-SAN MARCOS	33
Rebecca Totaro, <i>Suffering in Paradise: The Bubonic Plague in English Literature from More to Milton</i> . Review by JOHN GIBBS, TEXAS A&M UNIVER- SITY	36
David Read, <i>New World, Known World: Shaping Knowledge in Early Anglo- American Writing</i> . Review by WILLIAM J. SCHEICK, UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN	40
William M. Kelso, <i>Jamestown: The Buried Truth</i> . Review by WILLIAM J. SCHEICK, UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN	42

Bonnie Gordon, <i>Monteverdi's Unruly Women: The Power of Song in Early Modern Italy</i> . Review by ANDREW H. WEAVER, THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA	44
Jean-Noël Laurenti, <i>Valeurs morales et religieuses sur la scène de l'Académie royale de musique (1663-1737)</i> . Review by DOWNING A. THOMAS, UNIVERSITY OF IOWA	47
Bret L. Rothstein, <i>Sight and Spirituality in Early Netherlandish Painting</i> . Review by MIYA TOKUMITSU, UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA	50
Thomas V. Cohen, <i>Love and Death in Renaissance Italy</i> . Review by MICHELE MARRAPODI, UNIVERSITY OF PALERMO	52
Peter Rietbergen, <i>Power and Religion in Baroque Rome: Barberini Cultural Policies</i> . Review by MICHAEL J. REDMOND, UNIVERSITY OF PALERMO	54
John Marshall. <i>John Locke, Toleration and Early Enlightenment Culture</i> . Review by CHRISTOPHER N. FRITSCH, INDEPENDENT SCHOLAR	58
William R. Shea, Mariano Artigas. <i>Galileo Observed. Science and the Politics of Belief</i> . Review by ALESSANDRO GIOSTRA, ACCADEMIA GEORGICA, TREIA	62
Jesse M. Lander., <i>Inventing Polemic: Religion, Print, and Literary Culture in Early Modern England</i> . Review by IRA CLARK, UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA	65
NEO-LATIN NEWS	68
NEWS	101

HARRISON T. MESEROLE

25 July 1921 – 20 December 2006

In Memoriam

by
James L. Harner
Texas A&M University

We are here today to celebrate the life of Harry Meserole, Distinguished Professor of English and Abell Professor of Liberal Arts emeritus. We knew Harry as a loved one, friend, colleague, teacher, mentor, orchid breeder, dog lover, Dairy Queen habitue, and/or Texas lottery devotee. I shall speak of the Harry I knew—a role model, colleague, collaborator, and—above all—friend. Harry was what we once called a gentleman-scholar and a scholar-teacher; indeed, I like to think of him as a scholar's scholar and a bibliographer's bibliographer. His passion for accuracy in the smallest detail and his unselfish delight in sharing his immense learning set a standard that his colleagues and students aspired to but never attained.

Let me explain why I called Harry a scholar's scholar. As editor and bibliographer, the majority of Harry's publications were designed to serve the profession of English at large rather than merely advance his career. His *American Poetry of the Seventeenth Century* (which went through 4 editions between 1968 and 1985 and is still in-print) remains the standard edition. Leo Lemay (the reigning Colonial American literature scholar), in assessing the importance of the edition, asserted that only two other scholars "have done as much original work in seventeenth-century American poetry as Harry Meserole."

Outside of the field of early American literature, Harry was best known in the profession as a bibliographer. Indeed, as I noted earlier he was a bibliographer's bibliographer; that is, he articulated bibliographical principles and practices that were widely emulated, and he set standards that many tried vainly to meet. Anyone who ever visited his office would immediately realize that Harry was a bibliographer: his desk was piled high with stacks of notecards,

letters, publishers' catalogs, page proofs, and sheets filled with copious notes. To the uninitiated, these teetering stacks seemed a meaningless jumble of miscellaneous pieces of paper, but Harry knew precisely where every note, letter, or citation resided in each stack.

From 1957 to 1975, Harry edited the *MLA International Bibliography*, the indispensable annual bibliography of scholarship published worldwide (in more than 100 languages) on all modern languages and literatures, linguistics, and folklore. As you might imagine, editing this protean work required someone who commanded a broad and deep knowledge of languages and literatures, possessed a prodigious memory, and required little sleep. Characteristically, Harry reorganized the rather haphazard classification system he inherited, dramatically expanded the coverage, and late in his tenure initiated the computerization of the *Bibliography*. (I shall have more to say about Harry and computers in a moment.) The result was a vastly improved essential and enduring resource for researchers worldwide. The importance of Harry's herculean contribution to this indispensable work becomes clearer when we recall that during his editorship the *Bibliography* was based on contributions by a worldwide network of scholars, many of whom volunteered out of respect for Harry. There was only one paid contributor—Priscilla Letterman, his assistant.

Harry's editorship of the *Bibliography* led to his participation in one of his least-known but nonetheless important publications: the second edition of *The MLA Style Sheet*, a predecessor of the *MLA Handbook*, the style bible for those who publish on literary topics and for two generations of freshmen composition students.

After relinquishing the editorship of the *MLA International Bibliography*, Harry was recruited as editor of the annual *World Shakespeare Bibliography*, which he edited from 1976 to 1992. Once again, he immediately set about reorganizing the bibliography and expanding its scope. And, once again he brought a bibliography into the computer age by working with programmers to design a program and record structure that has migrated through several platforms and still serves as the cyberinfrastructure of the award-winning *World Shakespeare Bibliography Online*. Harry's farsightedness in creating one of the first humanities databases is all the more remarkable since he himself never used a computer. In all the years we shared the same office suite, I recall seeing him touch only *one* computer key *one* time!

Despite the demands of his editorial positions, Harry found time to write the American literature portions of *A Guide to English and American Literature*, co-authored with F. W. Bateson. An evaluative, frequently trenchant, survey of the best editions and criticism of important authors as well as reference works, literary histories, anthologies, and special studies, the *Guide* is now outdated but it has never been superseded, and will not be until another Harry Meserole steps forward. Appropriately, Harry's accomplishments as bibliographer and editor were recognized by his receipt of the Cecil Oldman Medal in Bibliography in 1978.

How did Harry accomplish so much that is of such lasting importance to the profession? His memory was prodigious, his learning was deep and broad, his capacity for strong coffee was seemingly bottomless, he was able to write or dictate with minimal revision, and for 28 years he had Priscilla, the best collaborator one could hope for.

The depth and breadth of Harry's learning was legendary among both students and colleagues. Let me illustrate this with two anecdotes. In my first semester at A&M, I met a graduate student, who, learning that I shared an office suite with Harry, breathlessly exclaimed, "You're so lucky. He's the smartest man alive!" The second anecdote I hope to see immortalized one day in a John Updike novel or short story. In the early 1990s I was invited to participate in a symposium at which John Updike was the featured speaker. Soon after deplaning at the Columbia, South Carolina, airport, I met Harry's friend Matt Bruccolli who was there to transport participants to our hotel. When I told Matt that I brought greetings from Harry, Matt—in his characteristically booming voice—exclaimed, "Harry Meserole—the only [expletive deleted] man smarter than I am." Needless to say, this startled a number of nearby people, including Mr. Updike who was just emerging from the jetway. Let me supplement these anecdotes with a telling fact: in 1960 Harry was appointed an assistant professor at Penn State; in 1965, he was promoted to full professor. In academe, we sometimes speak of a very bright assistant professor as being on the fast track toward tenure and promotion; moving from assistant to full professor in five years is the equivalent of an academic sub-four-minute mile.

Harry was unselfishly generous in sharing his knowledge, expertise, and editorial pencil with students and colleagues. Harry's door was always open for his students. Since our office suite on the sixth floor of Blocker was rather

compact, I could not help but overhear Harry talking with students. I marveled at his patience with several whom I would have ushered out as quickly as possible. I am aware of only one time that Harry became impatient with a student (and this I know only by report since it happened at Penn State). As I already mentioned, Harry was one of the editors of the second edition of the *MLA Style Sheet*, which prescribed that writers should “*Never* fasten the pages [of a manuscript] with more than a paper clip.” A student in his bibliography and research methods course, knowing his penchant for accuracy in the smallest detail, repeatedly came to his office to inquire about the size of the paper clip, its shape and material of composition, and its precise placement in inches from the margin of the sheets. Rumor has it that Harry finally became exasperated at the student’s third visit!

For many of us gathered here, Harry’s perceptive reading of a manuscript saved us from embarrassing lapses in logic, factual errors, and ill-phrased circumlocutions.

Great scholars are not always great teachers, but Harry was, and like the best of the great teachers, he was both respected and revered by his students. And, like all great scholar-teachers Harry knew that his legacy would be the students he taught rather than his publications. And what a legacy it is: in the course of his career Harry directed the dissertations of thirty-nine students, many of whom contributed essays to *Early American Literature and Culture: Essays Honoring Harrison T. Meserole*. In the United States only the legendary scholar-teachers are now honored with such a Festschrift. The lasting impact that Harry had on his students is best summarized by Stephen Yarbrough (who was also Harry’s colleague at A&M): “To send Harry a poorly written essay is . . . unthinkable. . . . To be churlish with one’s colleagues once one has had Harry for a colleague, to be stingy with one’s students when one has had Harry for a teacher, is unthinkable. He is, simply, a living standard that one does not forget.”

* * * * *

Graham Parry. *The Arts of the Anglican Counter-Reformation: Glory, Laud and Honour*. Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 2006. xii + 208 pp. + 26 illus. \$80.00. Review by P. G. STANWOOD, UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA.

This is an elegant book in many ways: beautifully printed on high quality paper, with many informative and excellently reproduced illustrations, it is a fine example of modern bookmaking; and Graham Parry's narrative is learned, cogent, and, as we have come to expect of him, characteristically eloquent. The essential idea of the book is to survey the arts in England during the 1620s and '30s, in the reign of Charles I and of his principal ecclesiastical advisor, William Laud, archbishop of Canterbury from 1633 until his death in 1640. Parry's witty subtitle anticipates what is to come, for in recalling the great Palm Sunday processional hymn (by the ninth-century St. Theodulph of Orléans), we think of the celebration that led to catastrophe. Archbishop Laud is the hero of Parry's story, but obviously he is no saviour. Yet Laud's ambitious program for renewing the church of Richard Hooker and Lancelot Andrewes, and for exalting "the beauty of holiness" resulted in a remarkable though short-lived burst of artistic expression in Caroline England.

Although Parry is decidedly sympathetic with the aesthetic achievements of the "Laudian period," he himself does not take up sides in the sharply ideological campaigning of that time. His is not a political or theological apologetic, but an attempt to disclose the spirit of the baroque in pre-Civil War England—a movement already prevalent throughout Catholic Europe. This extraordinary mood was manifested in a brief but golden period that he styles the "Anglican Counter-Reformation." Parry takes up his theme in a series of interrelated and occasionally overlapping chapters: Church architecture; the renovation of cathedrals—especially Durham, St. Paul's, and Canterbury (but with special attention also to Laud's own chapel at Lambeth Palace); college chapels of Oxford and Cambridge; church furnishings; devotional prose and poetry; church music. In a final chapter on the response of contemporary historians and chroniclers to these ambitious activities, Parry draws from his deep knowledge of the period, well displayed in his earlier *Trophies of Time: Antiquarians of the Seventeenth Century* (1995), but now he emphasizes a different cast of worthies—amongst them John Stow, William Dugdale, Henry Spelman.

There is no doubt that “the arts of religion” in early Stuart England reflected an increased emphasis on ceremonial worship, sacerdotalism, formal liturgy, and ornamentation. There is no entirely satisfactory term for describing this movement, although it derives from a fundamental theological disposition based on an intense sacramentalism. “Arminianism” is too narrow, misleading and often had an opprobrious sense; “High Church,” in its common Victorian use, is an anachronism. Parry prefers “Laudianism”; yet the main title of his book, perhaps overly tendentious, is appropriate; for we are taken into the midst of a Counter-Reformation in England, whose progenitor—he might have been surprised to discover—is Hooker. Andrewes, his younger friend (and one of his executors), connects him with others, mostly of the next generation: John Donne, John Cosin, Nicholas Ferrar, George Herbert, Richard Crashaw, of course William Laud—and many more.

Parry is especially informative in his description of the renovation, construction, and decoration of college chapels, and particularly of glass-making in this period. Clear glass was painted with various devotional scenes and saintly figures, then “annealed,” or oven-fired. Notable artisans employing this method were Bernard van Linge and his brother Abraham, from The Netherlands, who created windows in the chapels of Wadham and of Lincoln College, with further examples of their work throughout Oxford, the finest of all in University College. Architectural embellishments and structures also contributed to this artistic revival: in Oxford, the most striking is the new porch added to the University Church of St. Mary’s, in 1637, an extravagantly baroque design with twisted columns, and a pediment surmounted with a statue of the Virgin and Child, the whole composition designed by Nicholas Stone—the designer also of the remarkable sculpture of Donne standing in his shroud on an urn, in St. Paul’s Cathedral, London.

Because of its long and traditional association with Reformation thought, Cambridge University (“a seminary of Puritanism”) was not as sympathetic to Laudianism as Oxford. Nevertheless, Peterhouse had well realized the aesthetic innovations that Archbishop Laud advanced. Under the successive masterships of Matthew Wren (1625–34) and John Cosin (1635–45), Peterhouse observed an advanced ceremonial in its worship that fully reflected Laud’s desire for seemliness and beauty. Wren, whom Laud promoted to the bishopric of Ely, built the splendid chapel. With its curious blank baroque façade (Inigo Jones’s designs of 1637 for the west front of St.

Paul's are noticeably similar) and its mixture of late gothic and Jacobean features, Peterhouse Chapel stands as the most engaging example in all Cambridge of the Laudian era. When Wren left Peterhouse to become bishop of Ely, Cosin continued the work of his predecessor by enriching the interior of the chapel with glorious features—angels' and cherubs' heads carved into the stonework and woodwork, paintings and hangings, and a marvelous east window of the Crucifixion.

John Cosin was enormously energetic and variously talented. His genius is appropriately described at a number of places in *The Arts of the Counter-Reformation*, for hardly anyone else seems to have achieved so much in this period of Laudian ascendancy, as designer, architect, author, administrator, liturgist. Cosin (1595–1672) first became known for his *Collection of Private Devotions* (1627), which passed through five further editions to 1655. Evidently encouraged by the court, Cosin's work is based on pre-Reformation primers and the canonical hours, with prayers and readings appropriate for the seven traditional times of the day, and with additional intercessions, the whole offering a supreme example of Laudian churchmanship and devotion. As a prebendary of Durham Cathedral, Cosin encouraged ceremonial worship, rich music, and the renewal and construction of the cathedral furnishings, and as archdeacon of the East Riding, he undertook the renovation of many parish churches in the diocese, notably of Brancepeth. He brought to Peterhouse this wealth of experience, which he put to use in the embellishment of the new chapel, and in the administration of college affairs. Cosin's efforts brought the scorn of his puritan enemies, who feared Cosin, precisely because of his wish—so they alleged—to create a "Counter-Reformation" in England; the Long Parliament called for him to appear as a "Delinquent" and subsequently impeached him, declaring him unfit to hold any office, in March 1641. These events go beyond Parry's discussion, but they are pertinent to it; for Cosin's life after Laud exemplifies the continuing influence of the old regime. Cosin spent the Interregnum in Paris, chaplain to the Royal exiles, returned briefly to Peterhouse in the Restoration, then with full sway and authority became bishop of Durham as one of the most notable survivors of the Laudian era. Well known as a ceremonialist and as a liturgical scholar, Cosin took part in the revision of the Book of Common Prayer—no one since Cranmer had done so much in shaping its familiar cadences. Even Cosin's final resting place testifies to his single-mindedness in these arts of

reformation; for he embellished the chapel of the residence of the bishops of Durham at Auckland Castle in the baroque fashion familiar at Peterhouse, and there he rests.

Parry is certainly aware of all these details—though perhaps surprisingly he makes no mention of Auckland Castle—and one might occasionally wish for an ampler portrayal of some of these most exuberant characters who figure prominently in his book. But he is carefully selective and sensibly unwilling to allow his story to become digressive. Parry is, after all, writing in a thoughtfully focused way of only the few years that mainly enclose the reign of Charles I; he is attempting, as he says, “to retrieve the cultural achievements of the Laudian movement, and identify what remains of a brief yet productive phase of English art.” He is justified in declaring that “since the Reformation, artists and craftsmen had never worked so hard for the Church as they did in the twenty years before the Civil War” (190).

Graham Parry’s unique achievement lies in his discovery of a theme that brings together diverse materials that illuminate one another—into a whole that is much grander than any one of its parts. His book assumes the interrelationship of the arts, which possess in common a didactic purpose and derive fundamentally from a distinct theological and political outlook. Parry is principally interested in the aesthetic expression of an underlying cultural and intellectual movement, and indeed he writes of it splendidly, with sure confidence and affection.

John K. Hale. *Milton’s Cambridge Latin: Performing in the Genres 1625-1632*. Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2005. xii + 305 pp. \$32.00. Review by EUGENE D. HILL, MOUNT HOLYOKE COLLEGE.

John Hale offers an expertly guided tour of Milton’s Cambridge Latin writings—obligatory, voluntary, and satirical—composed during the young man’s late teens and early twenties. An Oxford-trained Latinist himself, Hale plays the role of one of those dons hired to shepherd upscale academic tourists on a cruise through classical sites of the Mediterranean. Always informed, charmingly avuncular, he politely shows us things we might have (should have) known but didn’t know. At moments he rides a hobbyhorse or two, makes

a questionable assessment, but these moments prove infrequent—and are more than atoned for by the splendid treatment of the commentator's own special subject.

Hale reminds us that act verses and declamations were required of all undergraduates. Exercises delivered in the chapel of one's own college would be more intimate in tone than those performed "in the larger, less familiar" auditorium of the Schools (6). These were agonistic encounters, but "disputing could be fun" (16); Hale variously and correctly uses comparisons to "pillowfighting" (17) as well as to bullfighting (18) and gladiatorial combat (56). The key point was "the stylistic glee" (31) of the combatant. Throughout the undergraduate exercises the student was referred to as the "son" of his college tutor (the "father"). Capitalize Father and Son and you have an article on Milton's big epic—Hale himself is chary of such extrapolations.

Hale takes issue with received views of "De Idea Platonica," asking "Does Milton Really Ridicule Plato's Theory of Ideal Forms?" (51) and answering in the affirmative (51-65). He contends that "[s]atire is not usually subtle when practiced by undergraduates in high spirits" (64). But many readers will be inclined to attribute the grotesqueries of this poem to some collegiate in-joke, perhaps now unrecoverable—the same way some of us do with *Allegro* and *Penseroso*. While Hale may underread "De Idea," he perhaps overreads *In Quintum Novembris*, which he wants to see as a turning point in Milton's thought: "Milton's political awakening is found in this very poem" (168).

One last bit of carping: Hale chooses to downplay the significance prior scholars have attributed to Neo-Latin verse in Milton's early Latinity, arguing that as a teenager Milton probably wouldn't have been intimately acquainted with the moderns (47-48); hence Professor Hale's preference "with a Neo-Latin poem . . . to go not very far into labyrinthine epigoni, and to stay close to its Roman starting-points" (48). Not all readers of this journal will share Hale's inclination in this matter.

These quibbles aside, the real treat of *Milton's Cambridge Latin* comes in the two final chapters, well over a hundred pages. Many of the Latin exercises at Cambridge made place for a "varier" or "Praevicator"—as Hale explains, "Latin for 'shyster,' shifty lawyer" (192)—to parody the serious topics of debate. This figure came into his own in the collegiate "salting"—a new Renaissance genre to which (as Roslyn Richek showed in a nifty article [ELR 1982]) Milton's Sixth Prolusion, together with its original companion piece, the En-

glish poem “At A Vacation Exercise,” belongs. The Renaissance version of freshman hazing (a term that is American and late nineteenth-century), a salting is never an assaulting, as hazing was—sometimes a fatal one—in the nineteenth century, and on occasion even today. No, the underclassmen at Cambridge were required to do no more than display the salt of wit in their Latin performances before the upperclassmen. Wit being absent, salt would be supplied by way of noxious additive to the beer already being consumed in no small dosage.

These are difficult texts and one can only applaud the annotating vigor with which Professor Hale carries water for the team. One example: Milton “calls the freshmen ‘Saltaturientes,’ ‘those who desire to leap up [to higher status].’ He lets fly with this imposing new Latin word to glance simultaneously at increase of status, at possible hubris (‘jumped-up’), at the ‘dancing’ or antics by which they acquire tribal seniority; and then, down at the bottom of the pile of puns, ‘sal-’ (and ‘salt-’ for the monolinguals present) give to the central salting idea a sudden and surprising new embodiment” (219).

Hale’s expertly established, indispensably annotated, accessibly Englished text of Milton’s collegiate salting marks the highlight of the tour and will be an essential guide for scholars. Masson long ago found the Sixth Prolusion “nauseous and obscene”; today bits of it actually sound like excerpts from Joyce’s *Ulysses*. A judicious guide, Hale knows when not to bother explaining the jokes, as when Milton urges, “fellow-students of mine” (“Academici”), “Let the soft breeze of your goodwill erect me [*erigat me*], faint as I am, for I know it can; let it warm me back to life” (250-51). Neo-Latin can be fun too.

David Farr. *Henry Ireton and the English Revolution*. Rochester, New York: Boydell Press, 2006. ix+277 pp. \$90.00. Reviewed by ROBERT MCJIMSEY, COLORADO COLLEGE.

This work is not a biography of Henry Ireton. Rather, its author’s aim is to relate Ireton to the various events of the English Civil Wars that shaped both his own position and that of the New Model Army concerning the goals of the rebellion. To accomplish this task the author gives the reader a background on Ireton’s family, their puritan views and Ireton’s education at Oxford and the Middle Temple. These three elements, he claims, provided

the formative influences upon Ireton, in particular his strong and enduring religious convictions. Thereafter the author provides successive chapters, detailing Ireton's and the army's movement toward the necessity of a settlement based upon regicide. The author's general argument is that Ireton's position moved in step with this movement and that his writings gave the army's case an influential voice. His final year as Lord Deputy of Ireland (1651), ending in his death, left open any assessment of his leadership of the revolutionary movement.

Although he favored a moderate settlement between Charles I and Parliament, Ireton was able to maintain reasonably good working relations with some of the more radical members of the army. These included Thomas Harrison, John Lambert, John Wildman and, if briefly, Thomas Rainsborough and John Lilburne. Here his success owed something to the influence of his father-in-law, Oliver Cromwell, and to the fact that one of his brothers embraced millenarian views. In 1647 he emerged as a spokesman for the army's grievances against Parliament, his efforts culminating in *The Heads of the Proposals*, itself a moderate attempt by the army's leadership to reform both the monarchy and Parliament. This document led to open opposition within the army against Ireton and Cromwell. Wildman, Rainsborough and Lilburne charged Ireton with Machiavellianism and demanded a more radical settlement based on ideas of popular sovereignty. From this point onwards Ireton and Cromwell were enmeshed in efforts to reconcile differences within the army—the Putney Debates—and confront the dawning realization that Charles I could no longer be trusted. This conclusion led Ireton to accept that the road to regicide entailed the purging of Parliament of its moderate members.

Throughout this confrontation with events, religious convictions guided Ireton's thinking. On this subject, however, the author's footing is less assured. He establishes, at the outset, Ireton's "puritan" background, without giving much indication as to the content of his beliefs. In subsequent chapters he brings up Ireton's religious views in particular circumstances, such as his appeal that the army pray to discern God's purpose in support of its cause (Putney), and his reliance on God's Providence as a support to his *Remonstrance*, demanding the abolition of the monarchy. The term Providence, however, is a slippery one. At times it means finding God's blessing in victory in battle. At other times it means using the Bible to find an appropriate sanction for actions

against the king. And it also means simply appealing to God for guidance. It is possible to bring these elements together with an overview of certain puritan beliefs. For example puritan Biblicism stressed use of the Old Testament as a guide to temporal affairs. Hence Ireton's use of the Book of Numbers to attack Charles I as a man of blood. In the same way Puritanism placed heavy emphasis on moral conduct, a way of making Providence depend upon deeds done with a righteous understanding. And the concept of natural law, found according to reason, was part of the puritan canon. This observation should encourage the author to rethink his identification of "the generall law of reason or Nations" with an appeal to Providence (149). In the end the reader is unsure whether Ireton's religious views, however sincerely held, were more than a justification for conclusions he had reached by other means.

This lack of a general perspective on particular topics and problems places unfortunate demands upon the reader. The author more or less stipulates the general narrative of Ireton's career and then concerns himself with a close reading of documents illustrating Ireton's involvement in particular activities. This approach makes the balance among evidence, analysis and argument highly uneven. Often evidence means the presentation of long indented textual quotes, giving the reader a chance to sort out analysis and argument for himself. In the same way analysis often means lining up the opinions of a select group of historians and either taking their views at face value, or offering some form of modification or dissent. While the comparison of authorities can provide a useful introduction to particular topics, substituting their opinions for those of the author causes the reader to wonder to what extent the author has taken possession of his subject. This concern receives reinforcement from the author's use of qualifiers. Words such as "probable," "possible," "may be," "suggests," and "could simply be seen" (52) flow throughout the text and remind the reader that without a clear interpretative structure, the facts themselves yield stunted fruit. The limitations of this approach become even more apparent in the book's Conclusion. Rather than relating the three influences the author established at the outset to Ireton's career, the author speculates on the role of the individual in history and cites the opinions of Ireton's contemporaries about his significance.

This is a work of serious scholarship but needs to move further beyond the orbit of the graduate seminar to become both absorbing and convincing.

J. B. Owens. *“By My Absolute Royal Authority”: Justice and the Castilian Commonwealth at the Beginning of the First Global Age*. Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 2005. xvii + 371 pp. + 2 illus. \$75.00. Review by MICHAEL J. LEVIN, THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON.

How much power did kings actually have, and how did government really function, in early modern Spain? Many historians have written on this topic, but J. B. Owens declares that they have gotten it mostly wrong. Instead of an increasingly strong, centralized, and bureaucratic state, Owens perceives a Spanish Crown dependent on cooperation from competing social groups; when monarchs tried to exercise “absolute” dominion, they only angered one or another of these factions and thus ended up undermining their own authority. Similarly, Owens insists that the Spanish monarchs were unable to impose a rigid idea of loyalty to the state on their subjects. Different segments of society understood the relationship between themselves and the monarch in different ways, and if the king violated a particular group’s criteria for good government, resistance or even rebellion could result. In the end, Owens depicts the early modern Spanish monarchy as surprisingly weak and inept, and Spanish “absolutism” as a distortion projected backwards by later generations.

This is a dense book, which tries to accomplish several things at once. On the broadest level, it is the first part of a projected trilogy, an extended meditation on the “nature of Castilian monarchical government between 1400 and 1700” (vii). Books two and three will discuss the roles played by municipal oligarchies and the territorial aristocracy, respectively; this volume focuses on royal judicial institutions, and the king’s role as the ultimate arbiter and enforcer of justice. More specifically the book analyzes a particular lawsuit that remained unresolved for generations, precisely because it hinged on the question of royal authority. The book is thus “a type of microhistory,” as Owens suggests, in that it examines an extraordinary court case in order to illuminate larger sociopolitical issues (9). Owens follows the vicissitudes of this case (known at the time as the “Belalcázar lawsuit,” after the count of that name, a central player) from its inception in the mid-fifteenth century to its sudden denouement in the late sixteenth century. Along the way, we learn a great deal about Castilian politics, on both the national and local levels.

It all begins during the reign of King John II (1406-1454), a time of chaos

and civil war in Castile. In 1445, John made a fateful decision to award a large swath of land in south central Castile to a noble named Gutierre de Sotomayor, in return for military service. The problem was that the land belonged to the city of Toledo, not the king; John evaded this technicality by invoking his “absolute royal authority” to do as he pleased with other people’s property. Toledan authorities protested loudly, of course, and would continue to protest for decades. Sotomayor’s descendants meanwhile enjoyed the rights to the land and rose in prominence, eventually becoming the Dukes of Bejar. Unable to sue the king, the city of Toledo tried to take the noble family to court, claiming that they had seized the land illegally. The lawsuit thus became a literal test case for what “absolute royal authority” (a commonly used phrase throughout the period) actually meant. Owens also uses this case to illustrate how different “interpretive schemes” concerning royal power existed simultaneously in early modern Spain. Was the king’s authority based on his ability to reward personal service, as the high nobility believed, or was it rooted in his role as the enforcer of justice and the law of the land, as municipal authorities preferred to see it?

Partly because of the on-again, off-again history of the lawsuit, it often seems peripheral rather than central to the work. Of the book’s eight chapters, only two are devoted to the actual trial. Chapter one sets up the book’s theoretical framework; chapter two describes the historical context for John II’s problematic gift; chapter three explains why Ferdinand and Isabella refused to allow the lawsuit to be given a hearing. The Catholic monarchs, who first had to consolidate their own power in Castile and then had to complete the conquest of Granada, could not afford to alienate a powerful noble family. Although Toledan authorities petitioned royal justice several times, and both sides gathered evidence, the monarchs suspended proceedings indefinitely. Then dynastic politics intervened: a foreign prince became King Charles of Spain, as well as Holy Roman Emperor. The perceived indifference of Charles and his Burgundian councilors to Castilian affairs led to the famous Comunero Revolt of 1520-1521. Toledo was one of the centers of the revolt, and as Owens suggests in chapter four, resentment over the Belalcázar lawsuit was a major factor. In Owens’ interpretation, the Comunero Revolt was not a radical attempt to overthrow the system, but rather an “essentially conservative” and traditional reaction to the king’s failure to uphold the laws (112). In any case, the revolt forced Charles to pay attention to Castilian needs,

including reform of the judicial system, which had become increasingly corrupt. It is in this context that, starting in 1523, Toledo finally got its trial.

In chapters five and six we finally get to the heart of the book, a detailed analysis of the Belalcázar lawsuit, and of the judicial proceedings that surrounded it. Based on exhaustive research in municipal and state archives, these chapters provide an intimate glimpse of how the theory and practice of law really worked (or not) in early modern Spain. Given the complexities of the case, and the number of people involved, I would have liked a more straightforward narrative, and perhaps a timeline or chronology, but the basic story is clear: the original grant of land was illegal. The Duke's lawyers tried to obfuscate matters and delay the hearing (for example, by deposing witnesses who happen to be in America at the time), but they could never deny this basic fact. Nonetheless the tribunal did not find for Toledo until 1536, and the Duke's appeal was not denied until 1555. The length of the trial is an indication of its importance: the tribunal knew it was being watched, and that its verdict would be taken as a judgment on the power of the king. According to Owens, the tribunal's decision was a victory for the municipal patricians' view of royal authority.

Or it would have been, if Philip II had not ruined it. Charles V had been careful to stay neutral and prevent the nobility from influencing the royal tribunals; his son rejected that trend in favor of "authoritarian" rule. He transferred jurisdiction over the Belalcázar case to the Council of Castile, a body dominated by grandees; in 1568 the Council reversed the tribunal's verdict. Owens speculates that the king himself may have had a hand in this decision, although he admits he has no hard evidence. The author clearly dislikes Philip and feels that justice was not done. In his final chapter, Owens also suggests that Philip (and his seventeenth-century descendants) made a serious mistake by ruling in such an arbitrary manner. The paradox of "absolute royal authority" is that the exercise of such power causes resentment and resistance, but the Spanish monarchs did not recognize this fact. As Owens concludes, "No ruler among the last Habsburgs understood how to be a truly respected and widely supported monarch," which explains the crisis of the Spanish Monarchy in the seventeenth century (233). I believe Owens overstates his case here. Nonetheless he has provided a valuable counterargument against the idea of the uninterrupted rise of absolutism in Spain, and this book is sure to spark much further discussion.

Alexander Samson, ed. *The Spanish Match: Prince Charles' Journey to Madrid, 1623*. Aldershot, Hampshire: Ashgate, 2006. x + 243 pp. + 20 illus. \$99.95. Review by BRENNAN C. PURSELL, DESALES UNIVERSITY.

The sudden appearance of the Prince of Wales in Madrid was sensational in its own day and makes for one of the best stories of the early seventeenth century. Alexander Samson's delightful volume is the result of an interdisciplinary gathering of experts in the fields of early modern European art, clothing, public ceremonies, and literary studies, held in Stratford-on-Avon in April 2003.

In the first chapter, Jerry Brotton argues that Charles and Buckingham's art acquisition reflected the fluctuating fortunes of the match negotiations. The Prince's collecting actually began in the years before the journey and show preparation for it. Purchased tapestries and paintings from Italy and Spain, devoted to Catholic themes, attest to the Stuarts' public commitment to a limited ecumenism. The collection building process is described in detail, but Brotton's comments about motives concerning individual artworks are highly speculative. Nonetheless, looking at Charles' selections on the whole, one must conclude that he had a "preference for highly erotic classical scenes by sixteenth-century Italian masters" (24). Turning to dress, Lesley Miller argues that it was a "significant tool" in the negotiation process (48). Charles did his best to attire himself in accordance with Spanish style, British expectations, and Philip IV's intermittent sumptuary legislation. The impact of the Prince's clothing, Miller admits, remains anyone's guess. David Sánchez Cano provides a richly detailed description of the many festivals and processions held during the visit, which were meant to impress the Prince with "messages" about "political power and religious propaganda" (73). Henry Ettinghausen surveys Andrés de Almansa y Mendoza's vividly composed letters, adding that their ability to influence what Spaniards thought of it all "cannot have been negligible" (88).

Chapters five to eleven are devoted to contemporary literary developments in England, France, and Spain, all in response to Charles' romantic journey. Alexander Samson addresses Spanish texts that were translated into English in 1623. These were mainly grammar books and dictionaries but also some literary works and religious tracts meant for England's small Catholic minority, not to mention an array of pamphlets for London's literate, inter-

ested population. Jeremy Robbins examines the Spanish literary response to the Prince's visit. Amid reams of bad poetry, certain common characteristics emerge: general approbation of the Prince's chivalric, knightly daring in having come so far despite the vagaries of winter; light mockery of his periodic bouts of love-struck behavior, compounded by a general ignorance about Spanish courtly behavior; the usual comparisons and references to figures of classical mythology; emphasis on the friendship between Charles and Philip; the innate superiority of Roman Catholicism and the possibility of the Prince's conversion. Unlike in England, Robbins notes, there is no discernible sign of critique of the Spanish monarchy or revulsion for the other side after the match fell apart. The lasting impression is that the marriage simply could not have worked without bastardizing the Catholic faith. The next chapter, by Karen Britland, concerns the next romance in the story, that between Charles and Henrietta Maria of France, and how its literary supporters interpreted the debacle of 1623 in retrospect. These writers did their best to downplay the shows of affection that Charles had directed toward the Infanta. They also asserted that he was struck by her beauty when he passed through Paris in disguise, attended a rehearsal for a ballet at court, and laid eyes on the Princess herself. Other poems are flagrantly anti-Spanish and anti-Habsburg, their main characters becoming stock in the politicized tale of romance. Claire Jowitt continues in a similar vein, looking at the allegorical political content in two plays written and performed in the first few years after Charles' return, Philip Massinger's *The Renegado* and *The Unnatural Combat*. In these works, one can detect the great crises of the day, the fate of the Palatinate and the business of the Spanish Match, but the English and their values prevail in the end.

In chapter ten, Trudi Darby turns to the most famous English play concerning the match, Thomas Middleton's *A Game of Chess*, and tries to relieve the "critical unease" associated with the text (173). This anti-Spanish work was the theatrical hit of the year and in the last century has variously been regarded as a "simple moral allegory, political satire, ideological propaganda and history" (179). The best way to understand it, Darby argues, is as part of the spontaneous, authentic rejoicing at the Prince's failure, a kind of "prolonged English anti-festival, the negative aspect of the Spanish festival in Madrid which had welcomed Charles the year before" (184). While the White House (the Stuarts) triumphs at the end of the play, the best characters and finest part of the drama remain with the defeated Black House (the Spanish Habsburgs)

and the Black Knight (Count Gondomar) especially. The final chapter, by Clare Wikeley, concerns John Taylor the Water Poet, in particular his mocking praise of the court fool, Archy Armstrong, who attended Charles in Spain. Wikeley argues that in the publication of this work in a larger volume, in its literal positioning in relation to others, we can see that this writer made the obvious connection between the events of 1623 and the crisis in Bohemia and the Palatinate. Taylor's anti-Catholic, anti-Habsburg views almost demand an interpretation with regard to the Prince's visit in the wider context of European politics. Finally, at the end of the book is an appended set of information about Spanish and Imperial ambassadors in England, 1603-25. It must be said that the twenty colored and black and white plates make for a helpful and beautiful addition.

If there is a single, blanket criticism to be lobbed at this publication, it is that the articles seldom venture to transcend merely antiquarian interest. What was the significance of the journey? Why did Charles and Buckingham go in the first place? Why did they fail? Samson's introduction mentions my article in the *The Historical Journal* 45 (2002) on these matters, the argument of which he describes as "consecrated," yet at the same time "supplemented if not supplanted" by Glyn Redworth's book, *The Prince and the Infanta* (1). Because neither treatment is entirely satisfying, the significance of the escapade remains open to further research and debate. While it is certainly true that the chapters of Samson's book have much to tell readers about various aspects of what occurred and how it all was presented and represented in various cultural media, at least this perpetual student of history is left hungering for something more. But all this is to criticize the book that wasn't written. Therefore, for anyone drawn to these matters, this text remains a real contribution to the field, an essential work to read, ponder, and consult repeatedly as needed.

Faith E. Beasley. *Mastering Memory: Salons, History, and the Creation of Seventeenth-Century France*. Aldershot, Hampshire and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2006. xii + 345 pp. \$94.95. Review by STEPHANIE O'HARA, UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT GREENSBORO.

In this thought-provoking study, noted feminist critic Faith Beasley argues that literary history has misread and suppressed the major role women writers and thinkers played in seventeenth-century French salon culture. Indeed, this willful misreading and suppression became the foundation upon which to build the officially accepted view of French literary history—and consequently, French cultural identity. France's understanding of its literary history, and of what it means to be French, is contingent on the erasure of women writers from that history. Women's exclusion has remained so pervasive and enduring that, as Beasley reminds us in her Introduction, the Académie Française, that most august of French cultural institutions, did not elect a woman member until 1981, when Marguerite Yourcenar took her place among the forty immortals. Why were women excluded for so long, and were they ever really absent in the first place?

In order to answer these questions, seventeenth-century salon culture must be closely reexamined, and on its own terms. To begin with, the word "salon," as applied to literary gatherings in the early modern era, is of nineteenth-century vintage. Although anachronistic, the word has become so commonly used as to be unavoidable. Beasley follows this usage, but she counterbalances it by also using the seventeenth-century term *ruelle*. In addition, she reminds the reader that seventeenth-century salon culture must not be confused with that of eighteenth-century salons. "Instead of primarily occupying the role of hostess, which became the dominant female role in the eighteenth-century salons, the seventeenth-century *salonnière* set the agenda for *ruelle* gatherings and played a much more active role than that ascribed to her eighteenth-century counterpart" (5).

The first two chapters of *Mastering Memory* are devoted to examining just what that active role was, and how seventeenth-century contemporaries reacted to it. "The first half of this study culminates in the following intriguing question: Why was this memory of salon culture ostensibly written out of French literary history?" (14). The next two chapters then draw out the implications of the first two by analyzing the historiography of the seven-

teenth-century salon, and how that historiography contributed to France's sense of its literary past. The book then concludes with a reflective Afterword. *Mastering Memory* therefore reads as a coherent narrative, with each chapter serving as the building block for the next one. It is also a book that builds on an important body of scholarship in early modern French studies, feminist and gender studies, and cultural studies. Throughout the book, Beasley succinctly summarizes and acknowledges what other scholars (both French and North American) have contributed to the field in general and to her project in particular.

The first chapter, "The Voices of Shadows: The Salons and Literary Taste," focuses on elucidating how salon women were just as effective and important literary critics as academic or scholarly literary critics. As Beasley is well aware, the primarily oral and collaborative nature of salon interaction means that the historical record is perhaps not as complete as the modern scholar would like. However, "[w]hile it is difficult to determine precisely how the participants in the worldly milieu functioned as literary critics, it is possible to determine how they were *viewed* as functioning, and the nature of their influence" (30). The issue of perception is important here, for as Beasley demonstrates through a variety of citations, salon women were viewed by their contemporaries as key players on the literary scene. The nature of their influence lay primarily in their taste, and so, this chapter traces how the concept of taste evolved, and what it meant to both *salonnières* and their critics (of whom Molière is perhaps the most famous). Ultimately, by the end of the seventeenth century, in the minds of the Académie Française and influential writers such as Bouhours, "terms associated with the worldly milieu, taste and *bon sens*, for example, must be appropriated and redefined in order to weaken or even sever their connection with a worldly public dominated by women" (75).

The second chapter, "Defining Literary Culture: The *Ruelles* and Literary Innovation," shifts to less abstract ground and examines the role salon women played in famous debates over individual works of literature. *Salonnières* participated in these debates not only as arbiters of taste, such as the women Corneille unashamedly sought to please in *Le Cid*, but also as writers, as Madame de Lafayette famously did with *La Princesse de Clèves*. Beasley also offers intriguing readings of Lafayette's *Zaïde* and Villedieu's *Désordres de l'amour*, arguing that both novels valorize salon practices (such as collaboration) in a

fictional setting. Of the former, she writes, “[w]hen viewed in light of the context of the debate over criticism, this provocative novel offers an epistemological critique: it advocates reaching knowledge, evaluating the world and by extension a literary work, by other than the traditional means of institutionalized written precepts and stringent rules” (146).

In chapter three, “From Critics to Hostesses: Creating Classical France,” Beasley convincingly demonstrates how literary history has simplified and marginalized seventeenth-century women writers. Especially interesting to note is the existence of early anthologies of French literature, such as Evrard Titon du Tillet’s 1732 *Parnasse française*, which grant women an equal place with men. “Male and female figures whom today are considered relatively minor merit a place alongside those now recognized as the canonical masters of France’s illustrious ‘Grand Siècle’” (185). By the end of the nineteenth century, however, things had changed. Writers such as Ferdinand Brunetière, Victor Cousin, and Sainte-Beuve would set the tone for official literary history, in which Molière was right to roundly mock the salons, and in which only two exceptional women writers (Lafayette and Sévigné) can be found to have existed in seventeenth-century France.

The fourth chapter, “Disseminating a National Past: Teaching *Le Grand Siècle*,” illustrates the depressing extent to which these nineteenth-century views have been unquestioningly accepted at face value and repeated by modern literary scholars, particularly in France. When teaching seventeenth-century French literature and history, if salon culture is remembered at all, it is usually only in Molière’s satirical portrayals, and the critical apparatus in student editions of Molière’s plays is no better. Leaving the genre of theater aside, in anthologies and manuals, “the novel is consistently eliminated as a serious genre in the seventeenth century” (291). Books aimed at the general French reading public, such as Jean d’Ormesson’s *Une autre histoire de la littérature française*, and academic projects such as *Les Lieux de mémoire*, continue this same tradition of eliding and excluding women’s role in French literary history. “The ultimate erasure of the links between salons, literary criticism, women’s literary production, and the classical cultural field reveals the power of critical myth-making. If Corneille’s sister’s literary influence, representative of general salon taste, and Scudéry’s novels provoked such critical fire and historiographical backlash, it is because of the power they exerted during a premier moment in the formation of France’s national culture and identity” (323).

Mastering Memory is dense and complex, and it is difficult to do full justice to its richness here. This book raises provocative questions by illuminating the hidden gaps and tensions underlying French literary history and cultural identity.

David Colclough. *Freedom of Speech in Early Stuart England*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005. xiii + 293pp + 3 illus. \$75.00. Review by JONATHAN WRIGHT, HARTLEPOOL, UNITED KINGDOM.

The offering of counsel to monarchs was at the heart of the early modern political system. Of course, the era had no shortage of haughty, headstrong princes who would have preferred to disregard dissenting opinions, but this only made the notion of freedom of speech all the more important. Provided they remained within the borders of decorous behaviour, political counsellors (at least in theory) had the opportunity to speak frankly and boldly to their rulers without running the risk of falling from favour. This was perceived as a keystone of civic life, and as a crucial antidote to the flattery and evil counsel which plagued so many early modern courts. This is, almost always, what contemporaries understood by “freedom of speech”: crucially, it was perceived as a duty—an obligation to courageously serve the commonwealth—rather than as a right. It was, in other words, a very long way from how we would understand the phrase today.

There has been much recent work on what might be termed the negative aspects of free/frank speech in Tudor and Stuart England: censorship being at the top of the current scholarly agenda. In his rewarding new study, David Colclough turns to its more positive role as “a significant civic virtue in the early years of the seventeenth century” (1). His route into the subject is via an analysis of the rhetorical figure of free speech, *parrhesia* (*licentia* in Latin). Colclough traces how the figure emerged in Greek and Roman culture, and then analyses how early modern scholars—Thomas Wilson, Abraham Fraunce and Henry Peacham among them—adopted and adapted it. Colclough makes it very clear that the term *parrhesia* had manifold meanings, ranging from bold speech itself to the rhetorical device of apologising for the unvarnished advice that invariably followed.

Colclough’s next task is to investigate how frank speech operated in prac-

tice. Firstly, he explores what might be termed religious *parrhesia*: the venerable tradition of preachers and divines proffering unpalatable counsel to their political masters. This phenomenon is traced from its biblical roots, via the encounter (famously analysed by Patrick Collinson) between Ambrose and the emperor Theodosius, into the early modern age. Figures such as Hugh Latimer and Edmund Grindal (as well as voluble, risk-taking martyrs) are seen as exemplars and inheritors of this tradition. Finally, we are shown how a sermoniser such as John Donne walked a tightrope between offering constructive criticism and showing the fawning deference that James I always expected. We also see how the strident pamphleteer Thomas Scott abandoned all pretence of decorum in his series of attacks on Stuart foreign and domestic policy. The treatment of Scott is very well rendered, although it is difficult to see how someone of such radical proclivities can be held up as representative of the wider culture that Colclough is seeking to anatomise.

Colclough next turns to the more predictable venue of Parliament: the only place in the Stuart world where a right to freedom of speech was explicitly demanded. He offers a blow-by-blow account of the various issues—ranging from foreign and fiscal policy to the royal prerogative—that provoked debates about frank speech. The famous moments when Parliament asserted its role with particular vim or offered trenchant criticism of the Stuart regime—the Form of Apology and Satisfaction of 1604, the Commons' Protestation of 1621, and the Petition of Right of 1628—naturally take centre stage.

In a final section Colclough strives to demonstrate how such tendencies seeped out of Parliament into the provinces. By analysing the widespread circulation of verse libels and the many efforts to assemble manuscript miscellanies of parliamentary debates and other political texts, Colclough paints a picture of a politically-curious Stuart populace, many of whom, even when they fell short of voicing their own criticism, were still groping towards the exercise of engaged citizenship. His account of the manuscript miscellany of the Shropshire minister Robert Horn is especially valuable, and this section as a whole adds to the recent work of scholars such as H. R. Woudhuysen and Harold Love by stressing the continued importance of manuscript culture in an age of print.

It is always perilous for historians of early modern England to write about so loaded a concept as freedom of speech. By searching for the roots

of modern-day notions they open themselves up to charges of Whiggish teleology or of investing the construct of freedom of speech with an ahistorical, immutable nature that it has never possessed. Colclough is aware of all this and, for the most part, he proceeds with due caution. He is careful not to assume (as Conrad Russell long ago taught us) that the parliamentary debates of the 1620s were nothing more than precursors of the Civil War's ideological battles. He is also (a few overly-zealous moments aside) suitably circumspect when attempting to recruit such debates as predecessors of modern articulations of the right to freedom of speech. That said, he also refuses to allow revisionism or relativism to hem in his analysis to a point where it ceases to have a resonance beyond the political circumstances of Jacobean England. "What they were referring to was very different from anything we might recognise as freedom of speech today," Colclough concedes, but we are still entitled to "see how our own notions of freedom of speech are formed by the debates in which these people were involved, the choices they made, and the linguistic changes that they provoked" (124). This is a very level-headed proposition. If we try too hard to treat every era as a discrete historical phenomenon then the possibilities of a larger narrative about freedom of speech all but vanish.

Perhaps, though, Colclough goes a little too far in his search for the watershed moment when freedom of speech moved beyond a pragmatic mechanism for sustaining political life to become a fiercely-defended right. His final pages, in which he announces striking coincidences between Stuart political discourse and the wording of the European Convention on Human Rights, will jar with many readers. It is the oldest mistake in the historiographical book to confuse similarities of language with similarities of meaning and intention, and Colclough should know better: indeed, throughout these pages, he proves that he *does* know better. His enthusiasm presumably got the better of him because he wants to pin down the moment when modern ideas about free expression had their genesis. This (the bold stuff of which historical monographs are, perhaps regrettably, obliged to be made, these days) inevitably invites scepticism or, at least, a host of alternative theories about when, where, and why this happened.

Not that any of this should detract from the fact that Colclough has written a nuanced, well-researched book that will be of great interest to all scholars of Stuart political, philosophical and literary history. He takes several

risks, applying a veneer of interpretation that doesn't always work to the book's advantage, but at least, in the very tradition that he is discussing, he opts to be bold. He also makes you wonder if, against your better judgement, he might be correct, and this can only serve to revitalise the creaky old debate about where our notion of freedom of speech came from. It should also be mentioned that the book is very well written.

Diana Newton. *North-East England 1569-1625: Governance, Culture and Identity*. Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 2006. x + 214 pp. £50.00 / \$85.00. Review by MARTYN BENNETT, NOTTINGHAM TRENT UNIVERSITY.

Dr. Newton's book deals with a significant region of the kingdom of England. She rightly places this geographic part as centrally important to the union of crowns in 1603. To people both sides of the border in the later years of Elizabeth I's reign, the question of succession was important. No one was allowed to speculate publicly on what would happen: Elizabeth disliked mention of the issue, not for fear of death, but for fear of drifting from the centre of political attention once her successor was named and confirmed. James VI was frustrated by the constant avoidance of the question and sought confirmation and solace in international expressions of support (as well as the more dubious support offered by the failure of a diabolic attempt on his life at the beginning of the 1590s).

In the borderlands, the issue of succession had a double edge. The borders were culturally diverse, and they were unruly. There were special jurisdictions in place, and the rule of law could be flouted by gangs, or more precisely clans of criminals known as the "surnames." These lawless families raided rival groups and their tenants periodically and violently, precisely because they were on a border where cultures, legal principles and jurisdiction met untidily. If the crowns were united then these border shires would stop being the rough edges of two kingdoms jostling against each other and become the centre of a new, rebalanced nation. Thus the questions of culture, order and lawlessness could be thrown into very different lights whenever succession was mentioned. Borders and fringes were important to Tudor and Stuart monarchs in their respective kingdoms; governance in these areas threw into relief the ability of a monarch to rule their entire kingdom. James

VI was battling with various fringes around his kingdom, and Elizabeth was preoccupied for much of the 1590s with colonial Ireland, but both were drawn back to this particular border.

Newton deals with the eastern part, the counties of Northumberland and Durham, the northernmost of which contained two of the subdivisions of the border, the east march and the middle march. Cumberland constituted the west march. These marches had their own devolved government to some extent but were swept up under the control of the Council of the North. Nevertheless each warden had some autonomy, and their personality and socio-political connections were crucial to good government in the region. Newton examines the importance of studying this region by justifying (perhaps unnecessarily) the nature and importance of regional studies, the definitions of region, etc. The most important part of this argument is that which points to the importance this area has for the development of British history, precisely because the area was the raw edge of two conjoined nations, and therefore its government was important for the English nation's credence as a state.

The real meat of the work comes with the analysis of the region through various focal points—culture, law, social order elites and government and of course religion—which would be important given work on the composition of royalist armies some seventeen years later. The book first looks at the elite families in the region: their structure, marriage patterns, social origins, particularly in relation to their location in the rural and urban gentry, using and, at the same time, critiquing the various forms of analysis developed during the past fifty years since gentry studies became common. Dr. Newton portrays the elites of the north east as less than parochial and suggests that as a group they were beginning to see themselves as a socio-economic class, at least in an embryonic sense. The focus shifts from a general overview of the elites to look at those involved in government, in which arena there was a division between the rural gentry which seemed to be quite county-bound and the urban gentry who were more peripatetic in their administrative responsibilities. From this point it is a natural movement to look at the “crisis of border government.” Here there seems a shift. As a border group, the Tudor regime saw the locals as ineffective and not to be trusted. Central government interference through Council of the North or via more direct means was the norm. However, with the group now part of the centre of the

kingdom, James placed far greater trust in the region's elite, further developing their class identity.

Whilst the religious element of the region was, according to Dr. Newton, generally a picture of peaceful coexistence as elsewhere in the country, there were periods of crisis such as the Northern Rising of 1569 and smaller crises caused by international politics throughout the period, which impacted on the relationship between Protestant and Catholic. Generally however the Catholic population was not a distinct community; families intermarried and did not necessarily develop fully as either Catholic or Protestant by tradition. In a cultural sense the region was not insular either.

The book demonstrates particularly well the differing views of the region. Lawlessness, seen from the south, was related to the borderers' predilection to not see the clarity of the drawn border in the same way as the southern-based government observers. That the ordinary people of the north east intermingled with the Scots was a problem to the Tudors and their national security. That the northern governors were a party to the cross-border cohabitation (and its illegal side) was a problem until 1603. For James, the lack of borderline clarity was exactly the opposite; intermingling could symbolise harmony in the middle of the kingdom. Far from hectoring the locals, James encouraged them. This book demonstrates why both policies existed and why they were both derived from the character of the region and its elites, cultures and communities. Neither view was right or wrong; it was the circumstances (as well as the ruler) which had changed.

This book is an important addition to our understanding of localities and geographic divisions as well as national governance and unification. It deserves a wide audience and is a laudable multifaceted work that creates a rounded picture of government, the regions and union.

Jonathan Scott. *Commonwealth Principles: Republican Writing of the English Revolution*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004. xii + 402 pp. \$75.00. Review by CHARLES W. A. PRIOR, UNIVERSITY OF HULL.

In his seminal study of the Atlantic republican tradition, *The Machiavellian Moment* (1975), John Pocock observed that republican ideas “had to become domiciled in an environment dominated by monarchical, legal, and theological concepts apparently in no way disposed to require the definition of England as a polis or the Englishman as a citizen” (334). To a very large extent, Jonathan Scott’s mission is to show how this process of domestication took place, and the result is a thought-provoking discussion of republicanism in a variety of discursive and political contexts. Where others have associated republican thought with one key figure (normally Machiavelli or Harrington), Scott here seeks to expand the discussion from single writers and concepts to an examination of “commonwealth principles.”

The book is divided into three parts, totalling sixteen chapters: “Contexts” examines the religious and social content of republican ideas; “Analysis” engages with broad and thematic concepts such as “liberty” and “virtue”; and “Chronology” places all of this complex exegesis within the context of political disruption in England between 1603 and 1725. It is a book dominated by many long passages and quotations from the works under discussion. On the one hand, this is an effective demonstration of how the republican idiom sounded, and in many cases the works are permitted to speak for themselves; but on the other the reader occasionally loses sight of how this complex parade of ideas can be seen to bear on events, especially given the comparative brevity of the contextual chapters. Nevertheless, the work is a seminal one in the sense that never before have we been presented with such a substantial discussion of republican thought, one which should force a revision of the tradition as a whole.

Scott argues that republican thought came to England in aid of a radical “reformation of manners.” Here, he revisits arguments from his influential *England’s Troubles* (2000), a work of synthesis that can be seen as the foundation for the present study. That Scott sees religion as important to telling the story of republicanism is a welcome development, since proponents of republicanism have tended to see the period in overwhelmingly secular terms. However, the pattern is shifting, albeit unevenly: Pocock himself has lately

found religion in his continuing series of volumes on Gibbon's *Decline and Fall*, where he has observed that the Church of England is the "key" to early modern English history, while Quentin Skinner remains deaf to the roar of religion and its links to government, preferring instead the whisper of neo-Roman ideas. Scott applies a powerful correction, arguing that English republicans were "overtly engaged" with matters of religion (42). For example, they evoked providential and apocalyptic language to forecast the destruction of the earthly monarchy; they called for toleration, liberty, and freedom of conscience; and they aimed for a reformation of manners, defined by the attainment of a Godly form of civic virtue. Yet it is also the case that Scott has tended to focus on one set of voices in the debate over religion: in addition to a core group of republicans, we have the Levellers and men on the edges of the Westminster Assembly, a body desperately trying to pick up the pieces of the shattered confessional state. He observes that republicans emphasised the sufficiency of scripture, were virulently anti-clerical and anti-Catholic, yet they were silent on matters of doctrine. Here, Milton is an archetype: he entered political debate in a series of pamphlets attacking episcopacy and calling for a return to the example of Constantine and the "monuments" of British antiquity. By 1650 he was a convert to republicanism. However, providing an explanation for Milton's apotheosis is not part of Scott's remit, and this leaves us wondering why figures like Milton embraced a body of ideas that seemed so alien to their former preoccupations.

Before 1649, republicanism was essentially "stateless" (its major spokesman being Thomas Scott), and in this book it emerges as a stream of classically informed discussion of a kind of civil theology. Moreover, as Mark Knights has observed in connection with this study, it relies on a "canon" of luminaries. Rather than commonwealth "principles" we have commonwealth "principals": Sidney (on whom Scott has written two books), Milton, Harrington, Molesworth, Nedham, Neville, as well as John Streater, the regicide Henry Vane, and John Toland, who published many of the major texts at the end of the seventeenth century. The picture that emerges is a complex one: Scott's republicans were not crude anti-monarchists (although they could be), but sophisticated commentators on a range of political topics, from the nature of just war and the problem of "empire," to the discussion of liberty and virtue, commonwealths, and rebellion; a major theme, developed by Scott in a series of articles, is the Anglo-Dutch connection, which allowed

three kingdoms to be transformed into a “supranational state” (357). There are many Scottish and Irish historians who will disagree with this analysis, and so here and throughout we find that Scott has retained his ability to provoke. He also displays characteristic flair and originality. Two excellent chapters “Old Worlds and New” and “The Politics of Time” take up the problem of republicanism and history. This is a crucial contribution to our understanding of the early modern reverence for the past, evident among the common lawyers and advocates of the ancient constitution, and churchmen and others interested in the ancient roots of British Christianity. Given that the precise patterns of these historical narratives came to be contested, there emerged a variety of historically-rooted political theories. In this way, Scott’s study offers a bridge between republicanism, law, and ecclesiology—if not in content, then surely in terms of the preoccupation with the past as a repository of authoritative examples.

England experienced eleven years of kingless government, as against eleven centuries of monarchy. Hence republicanism had to compete with an immense weight of tradition; after the Reformation and the Union of the Crowns, kingship became sacerdotal and imperial, and hence what Scott calls the “English revolution” was not strictly English, nor was it a revolution. The question of whether there was a “British” republicanism is one that awaits its historian. Seen in this way, republicanism was a body of ideas that were employed to fill a void caused by the wholesale collapse of the ecclesiastical polity. In place of the antiquity of the ancient constitution, it urged forward Plato, Aristotle, and Machiavelli, and in place of the established Church, it retained religion, yet its discourse was shaped by the millenarian fringes. And then, in 1660, the conditions that fostered it vanished. Its importance would seem to lie in its legacy, as Pocock suggested in 1975: republicanism became a principled language of civic virtue useful as a response to the corruption and luxury of the Walpole regime, and as the great lever that pried America loose of the tyranny of George III. Moreover, it was always a political language employed by those who inhabited the neo-classical groves of the political wilderness. How times, and the very idea of republicanism, have changed.

Whitney R.D. Jones. *Thomas Rainborowe (c. 1610-1648): Civil War Seaman, Siegemaster and Radical*. Rochester, NY: Boydell Press, 2005. x + 154 pp. \$75.00. Review by ELLEN J. JENKINS, ARKANSAS TECH UNIVERSITY.

When Thomas Rainborowe argued at the Putney Debates in late 1647 ‘I do think that the poorest man in England is not at all bound in a strict sense to that government that he hath not had a voice to put himself under,’ he affiliated himself with the Levellers in the English Civil Wars and earned a position for himself in the history of political theory. His role in the wars and the role of his affiliation to the Levellers are the subjects of Whitney R.D. Jones’s work, *Thomas Rainborowe (c. 1610-1648): Civil War Seaman, Siegemaster and Radical*. Rainborowe (or ‘Rainsborough’) served the Parliamentary side as a naval officer, a colonel in the New Model Army, a recruiter Member of Parliament for Droitwich, and vice-admiral of the navy. He had ties to the New England colonies—one of his sisters was married to Governor John Winthrop of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, while another married Winthrop’s son, Stephen—and his infantry command included a sizable number of colonists who had returned from New England in order to fight for the Parliamentarians.

As a military leader, Rainborowe became an expert at siege warfare. He participated at the battles of Naseby and Langport, fought at the sieges of Bridgwater, Sherborne, Bristol, Colchester, and Worcester, and blockaded Oxford, gaining a level of outspoken prominence that finally put him at odds with Thomas Fairfax, Oliver Cromwell, and Henry Ireton. Jones, a retired lecturer, academic administrator, and author of *The Tree of Commonwealth* (2000), points out that Rainborowe, a prickly and ambitious character in his own right, was part of the delegation that presented Henry Ireton’s *Heads of the Proposals Offered by the Army* to Charles I as the basis for a proposed constitutional monarchy. Along with other radicals, Rainborowe was disgusted by the king’s scornful response and lost patience with Cromwell and Ireton, who continued their unsuccessful negotiations with Charles I for a settlement. Rainborowe sided with the Agitator ‘Freebom John’ Lilburne, one of Cromwell’s enemies, who wrote *Agreement of the People*, which called for Parliament to hold the authority to make laws, conduct domestic and foreign policy, and make appointments.

Rainborowe left no writings, so the accounts of his short career have been, by necessity, cobbled together from the records and testimonies of others. Still, he made a distinctive mark at the Putney Debates in late 1647, when representatives of the New Model Army and the Parliamentary radicals (the latter called “Agitators”) met to discuss proposals for a constitution for England. Rainborowe argued for manhood suffrage, claiming, “For really I think that the poorest he that is in England hath a life to live, as the greatest he.” The “Grandees,” Cromwell and Ireton, fearing anarchy, took the more conservative point of view that suffrage must be limited to owners of property. The compromise that was reached did not allow for manhood suffrage, but the Levellers had acquired a hero in Rainborowe. Rainborowe’s efforts to push the Levellers’ agenda at the Corkbush Field rendezvous later in November 1647 were a failure, however, and he was shunted aside when he attempted to present a copy of Lilburne’s *Agreement of the People* to the New Model Army’s commander-in-chief, Thomas Fairfax. Rainborowe eventually submitted a formal apology before an army council in order to retain both his seat in Parliament and his naval command, leading some contemporaries, including Cromwell, and recent scholars to doubt the validity of his commitment to radical politics. As vice-admiral, Rainborowe was unpopular with the largely Presbyterian naval officers because of his perceived radical attitudes, however, and so he was removed from his command. He was returned to the army.

Shortly afterward, Rainborowe was sent out of the way by Fairfax to take charge of the siege of Pontefract Castle. He was assassinated by Royalists at his Doncaster headquarters on October 30, 1648, after which event the Levellers turned out in the thousands to mourn and demonstrate, ostensibly wearing sea-green ribbons to honor Rainborowe. Jones points out that contemporaries and historians have continued to debate the accounts of the assassination, some arguing that the murder was engineered by Rainborowe’s opposition from within the army. The Levellers were never able to advance their objectives after Rainborowe’s death, and whether that event made any difference is a matter for debate. At any rate, the movement scarcely outlasted the king, finally losing support and falling apart before the end of 1649.

Jones’s account of the brief and turbulent career of Thomas Rainborowe is well-written and readable, though not for the fainthearted; nor is it suitable for undergraduates. Rainborowe remains a rather flattened persona, since he

did not leave letters and papers that might have given his character greater depth. Still, the reader with some background in the Civil War era will find that Jones's book provides valuable perspective on the factionalism within the ranks of the Parliamentarians.

Marcus Nevitt. *Women and the Pamphlet Culture of Revolutionary England, 1640-1660*. Aldershot, Hampshire: Ashgate, 2006. xii + 218 pp. + 15 illus. \$89.95. Review by ELIZABETH SKERPAN-WHEELER, TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY-SAN MARCOS.

For those scholars who fear that historical readings of literature have been drifting away from attention to language, this book should be a welcome discovery. Marcus Nevitt's study of agency in the writings and actions of non-aristocratic Englishwomen truly breaks new ground in the study of political discourse in the revolutionary period. First, Nevitt examines the rhetoric employed in women's pamphleteering, rather than the more feminine-gendered prophecy, as a site of negotiating female agency. Second, and perhaps more important, he challenges the disciplinary limitations of previous scholarship to argue for the importance of material culture as a significant source of evidence of women's participation in the public sphere of political action. Through five focused case studies, or "close-analyses" (19), Nevitt discusses a range of genres and loci of female presence: animadversion, regicide pamphleteering, newsbooks, public demonstration, and petitioning. Arranging his chapters chronologically, he devotes the first, second, and fourth chapters primarily to the study of female rhetorics, the third and fifth to material culture. Such an organization clearly demonstrates the intersection of the two approaches and the importance of setting aside as artifacts of previous methods any assumptions about political or sectarian affiliations of women writers.

Before commencing his case studies, Nevitt devotes part of his introduction to presenting a model of his method in an analysis of the "performances and prophecies" (6) of the Fifth Monarchist Anna Trapnel in 1654. Following the collapse of Barebone's Parliament in January, Trapnel took to bed for twelve days in a trance while uttering "prayers, songs and prophecies" (7). However, this episode was far from the end of the event. As Nevitt shows,

it gained significance from both Trapnel's subsequent writings, notably *The Cry of a Stone* (1654) as well as other publications, and male mediation in an anonymous "Relator's" effort to describe and perhaps contain Trapnel's actions and speech-acts. The event thus demonstrates that "transformative action does not arise from a single source but is always mediated and preceded by other actions" (18). The approach thus defined and illustrated makes Nevitt's point that the distinctive qualities of mid-seventeenth-century women's agency demands of scholars new categories of interpretation and new sensibilities towards women's handling of traditional polemical genres.

The first chapter discusses Katherine Chidley's transformation of the male genre of animadversion in her pamphlet war against the militant Presbyterian Thomas Edwards (Milton's "shallow Edwards"), author of *Gangraena*, in 1645 and 1646. As Nevitt shows, animadversion has its origins in Humanist debate, wherein writers characterized themselves as aggressive combatants doing battle with their intellectual and confessional enemies. Chidley challenges Edwards on his own grounds while subverting the conventions of the genre through an open-ended rhetoric of subtle self-effacement. In the following chapter, Nevitt alters the scholarly discussion of responses to the regicide by demonstrating how rhetorics of silence and self-effacement became gendered through the "masculinization of the political subject" (54) in republican discourse and the adoption of female figures as symbols of royalist grief.

In the fourth chapter—the last of the three chapters devoted to a rhetorical focus—Nevitt presents a distinctive modification of New Historical practice by analyzing the written male responses to the appearance of a naked, or at least partially disrobed, woman in the midst of a congregation gathered to hear a sermon by Peter Sterry, chaplain to Oliver Cromwell, in the summer of 1652. As Nevitt explains, these pamphlets illustrate "the lengths to which some male contemporaries would go to deny the very possibility of women's goal-oriented action" (121). Male pamphleteers labeled the woman mad while criticizing Sterry's failure to rebuke her, depicting his inaction as a dereliction of male authority. In contrast, Nevitt describes the immediate context of nude protesting as practiced by several radical groups, most notably the Quakers. Especially in light of Sterry's connections to Cromwell, Nevitt argues, the naked woman could well have been engaged in a political act. Certainly, the rhetoric of the male pamphleteers asserted the "false universal"—the gendering

of political subjects as male.

These three chapters are balanced in length by the two that focus on material culture. It is here that Nevitt proves the significance of that approach to our understanding of revolutionary political discourse. Chapter three presents a fascinating picture of the underappreciated Elizabeth Alkin, known to her detractors as “Parliament Joan.” The widow of a Parliamentary spy hanged by royalists, Alkin was active in her own right as a petitioner and spy. Most noteworthy, however, were Alkin’s activities in 1650 as a writer and publisher of newsbooks. Most newsbooks were distinguished by the distinctive, male voices of their authors, argues Nevitt. Further, many used salacious verbal images of women to enliven their copy. However, the few newsbooks published by Alkin employed a more neutral, collective voice that emphasized the reporting of events rather than the representation of opinion, and reflected the truly collaborative nature of the newly developing profession of journalism.

The final, fifth chapter examines the participation of Quaker women in petitioning against tithes in 1659. In a perceptive survey of the history of opposition to tithes, Nevitt demonstrates how anti-tithe petitioning was recognized, like the genre of animadversion, as a male activity. Employing great learning and the rhetoric of combat, tithe petitions typically enforced the false universal of the male political subject. And Quaker women usually avoided the issue. The petitions of 1659 were a notable exception. While Leveller women had petitioned in the 1640s and early 50s, the form rapidly became a vehicle for antifeminist satire in such pamphlets as *The Maids Petition* (1647). The Quaker women reclaimed the petition with a significant innovation: the publishing of the names of all the signatories. As Nevitt explains, “The Quaker women’s insistence on the material importance of the printed ciphers representing every one of their names ... gives the work an innovative substantiality ... and impels it as far away from individualistic, competitive models of authorship as is conceivably possible” (172). Simultaneously self-effacing, collaborative, and assertive, Quaker women’s anti-tithe petitions reclaimed, if only briefly, women’s claims on the public sphere.

This is a handsomely produced volume. Many readers will appreciate the fact that the notes appear at the bottom of the page for easy reference. Moreover, and importantly for a book that argues the significance of material culture, the text is accompanied by illustrations: reproductions of

newsbooks, title pages, and portraits of Anna Trapnel and Elizabeth Alkin. There is also a detailed index, helpful for both students and active scholars. The only curiosity in this otherwise extremely well researched book is the omission of some scholarship on collaboration in the mid-seventeenth-century book trade, notably the work of Stephen Dobranski. This minor caveat aside, Nevitt's study makes a valuable contribution to our understanding of the revolutionary public sphere and those who shaped it.

Rebecca Totaro. *Suffering in Paradise: The Bubonic Plague in English Literature from More to Milton*. Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press, 2005. xiv + 242 pp. \$58.00. Review by JOHN GIBBS, TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY.

The actual scope of Rebecca Totaro's study is significantly less ambitious than the title implies; her more modest major premise is intriguing, however, as she reads early modern English utopian literature exclusively as a cultural response to bubonic plague. The period from 1348 to approximately 1720 Totaro calls "plague time" (4). Totaro finds in "plague-literature" literary "works produced either in direct response to a plague visitation or those in which bubonic plague functions as an essential event or primary metaphor" (13), including utopian fiction. Such plague literature, she contends, demonstrates that, in a state of perpetual anxiety over the possibility or reality of epidemic, "they [men and women] practiced utopianism, imagining that in the future their children would live longer and in less fear. Those with the most powerful imaginations began the work of building toward that place of improved health" (36). In these plague-inspired utopias, their authors fashion boundless literary domains "in which to illustrate and then animate abstract ideas, seeing whether and to what degree they work, before perhaps employing them in the real world" (19). And from this genre's characteristic interrogation of the universal, familiar experience of bubonic plague, early modern culture realizes "there is practical hope, a realistic guide to a more prosperous future that begins now" (19).

Totaro's claims interestingly suggest she will employ a form of cultural poetics to read her chosen plague texts as dynamic agents of cultural production. But her various explications of plague-time utopias end in contradictions and closed readings. The reader is warned: "some of these plague-

infected works display overt symptoms, and others ooze the odor of plague-time. Another set defiantly masks the buboes in their narrative in order to avoid detection” as plague-inspired utopian fiction (8). Recognizing (or not) then, the argument’s broadly and somewhat ambiguously defined parameters, the reader is somewhat prepared for some of the plausible but often exquisitely forced analyses of so-called “plague-literature” that follow. For if, as the author contends “all lives—including those of the most imaginative of English writers—had a conceptual place for plague” (8), meaning an (apparently) intimate knowledge of such an (apparently) ubiquitous horror, then any and all texts might be made (apparently) to speak plague.

The reader’s perception of bubonic plague as an insidious, ubiquitous presence in early modern England for nearly four hundred years is essential to Totaro’s argument where frequently overstatement and implication substitute for rigor and coherence. She (repeatedly) proclaims “ever in mind if not literally in body,” bubonic plague “ruled the minds of the nation [early modern England]” (6). Typically, one finds that plague discourse quickened in proximity to major epidemics, but the silence of years intervening (of which there were many) between major national epidemics seems to contradict the author by suggesting that the individual and communal fear and anxiety that defines Totaro’s “plague-time” largely receded from consciousness. It’s a terribly dramatic but unsupported claim, as we finally have no way of knowing if in fact, as Totaro asserts, plague exerted such a singular and sustained psychological hold on early modern English culture. But it is precisely this claim that in part permits the author to locate significant textual representations of utopian hope-in-plague-time.

The book’s first two chapters capably map the cultural terrain of plague-time (epidemic). Along with examples of plague discourse produced by the state, the church and the early modern medical establishment, Totaro reads the works of such poets John Davies and John Taylor and the dramatist and plague pamphleteer Thomas Dekker to reconstitute for the reader a sense of the pervasive cultural anxiety due to bubonic plague from 1348-1722. Of principle interest to the author is the ascendancy of Galenic theory as the “natural philosophy” that “supplied the platform from which early modern men and women understood their relationship to the natural world” (49). According to Galenic plague ideology the disease had a divine origin but a mundane form: the environmental focus was miasma—stinking and, there-

fore, harmful air and the conditions that produced it. Galenic theory in medical and scientific communities in early modern England influenced both practical and imaginative methods of containing plague. For example, in their prescriptions of popular quarantine and sanitation practices the Plague Orders designed to manage sixteenth-century urban (London's) epidemics responded to Galenic theory. Similarly, utopian fiction essentially signifies an individual and collective hope in the form of imaginative (medically progressive) narrative responses to plague: "while many were wishing and living, others determined to put their plans for ideal health into writing" (13).

Totaro's first example of a plague-time utopia is Thomas More's *Utopia*. One learns *Utopia's* Galenic representation of plague and the fantastically effective civic prophylactics deployed against it reflect More's experience as an under sheriff of London and later as the city's Commissioner of the Sewers (72). More's credentials are further underscored as we learn of his association with the physician Thomas Linacre and his advocacy for Linacre's vision (inspired by contemporary Italian practice) for public health in England. The miasmatic (and so potentially contagious) air of London's streets, alleyways and yards was an obvious nuisance, but seemingly neither city nor state government was as enthusiastic about public sanitation or a comprehensive program for public health, including the administration of epidemic, as was Thomas More: Thus "England would not surpass other nations in healthcare. But Thomas More's land of Utopia would. It rivaled all nations by its best practices of medicine. Its citizens would be healthier than England's or any other known population" (75). In *Utopia* Galenic plague ideology is refined and ideal, and more fantastically, accurate and effective. This interesting and capably-argued reading well supports Totaro's assertion that her "plague-texts" result in "a formation of hope" (23). But then the argument takes a disorienting and damaging turn. *Utopia* is a private reserve, as Totaro confides in the chapter's closing moment:

even if Thomas More ultimately wrote *Utopia* as a bit of self-entertainment and not as a prescription for the nation, he did imagine a world grown out of his present conditions of plague-time and into a healthier future. By this one measure of better health and hope fulfilled, Thomas More offers us *eutopia*—a better alternative to plague-time England and perhaps a guide out of it. (86)

She seems unaware of or unconcerned by this radical contradiction of her thesis. By some now relaxed criteria, *Utopia* offers an irrelevant hope—but to us. Significantly and despite the author's repeated claims, it is revealed that *Utopia* only ever minimally engaged in the culture's production of plague's meaning. The identity and cultural function of a plague-time Utopia is incredible. Following this perplexing and illogical turn, the argument immediately takes another.

Chronological structure trumps generic and/or thematic similarity, as Totaro explores what she identifies as popular dramatic "plague texts": Shakespeare's *Timon of Athens*, and Jonson's *The Alchemist*, "the most overtly pestilence-ridden" of early modern drama; "only Tony Kushner's Tony Award winning *Angels in America* (1991) comes close to matching Jonson's play in the staging of infectious disease" (110). Arguably utopian in form in that both plays offer depictions of "two worlds in contrast" (107), neither one offers a fantasy of hope-in-plague-time: Instead we discover that both reveal the fraudulence of medicine and its inspiration of false hope. One's frustration confirms that, now, having once abandoned and now modified her thesis, for Totaro, indeed virtually any text is a plague-text. Yet we are encouraged by biographical sketches hypothesizing for each author some form of an intimate personal experience of plague (Shakespeare's birth in the midst of a visitation in Stratford, the periodic prohibition of dramatic performance in London due to plague epidemic, the death of Jonson's son and best friend and maybe even his parents of plague) that gives the authors a particular sensitivity to and interest in bubonic plague: "always in mind," a sort of psychological and intellectual authenticity.

Totaro eventually returns us to more certain and familiar utopian ground with chapters on Francis Bacon's *New Atlantis* and Margaret Cavendish's *The Blazing World*. The former best and most closely supports the argument's thesis. *The New Atlantis* is a text preoccupied with and motivated by the meaning of plague-time and its author an active and vocal proponent of scientific and medical progress. In contrast to England's occasional and ineffective policy, Bacon's Bensalemites practice a rigorous and comprehensive and humane policy of personal quarantine. Bensalem defers to the wisdom and learning of a professional organization of wise and learned and progressive scientists. Bacon's utopian land possesses more efficacious medicines and sanitation policies. Its people are god-fearing people who may honestly assert

“You shall understand that there is not under the heavens so chaste a nation as this of Bensalem; nor so free from all pollution and foulness” (137). Thus as representation of a society that has mastered plague through science, Bacon’s *The New Atlantis* provides its reader with imaginative possibility of practical deliverance from bubonic plague.

Subsequent chapters examine the selected works of Margaret Cavendish, particularly *Observations Upon Experimental Philosophy* and *The Blazing World*, and provide a brief comparison and contrast of Bacon’s and Cavendish’s literary style in order “to gain insight into each author’s conception of the human condition” (159); finally and similarly, by reading *The Blazing World* together with John Milton’s *Paradise Lost*, “we gain an understanding of how Cavendish and Milton conceive of the human condition” (172). Ultimately, however remarkable the trajectory of Margaret Cavendish’s musings on the nature of plague, Totaro argues that Cavendish’s utopia also fails to provide a culturally relevant fiction of hope.

When writing a book review, one always wants to be diplomatic and encouraging of one’s colleagues and fellow scholars. We inhabit an insular environment, after all, and there are relatively few of us working in this particular period and fewer still exploring a subject as complex and significant and frankly relevant as the textual production of plague in early modern England. One longs to write “this provocative and brilliantly executed study makes a significant contribution to the field of X,” or words to that effect. Of course, frankly unfavorable reviews such as this are more difficult to write: obligatory, concluding thoughts seem either redundant or patronizing. Thus I will end as I began: The major premise of Rebecca Totaro’s *Suffering in Paradise: The Bubonic Plague in English Literature from More to Milton* is intriguing.

David Read. *New World, Known World: Shaping Knowledge in Early Anglo-American Writing*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2005. ix + 177 pp. \$37.50. Review by WILLIAM J. SCHEICK, UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN.

In *New World, Known World* David Read emphasizes the strangeness of colonial America as first encountered by newly arrived Europeans. Read knows that this is not news to the academic community, but he hopes to revitalize interest in certain colonial American texts written between 1624 and

1649 as neglected but rich repositories of this perceived strangeness. Texts are not only the product of distinctive individuals, Read contends; texts are themselves distinctive literary embodiments. The books under review in Read's study range from John Smith's *General History of Virginia* to William Bradford's *Of Plymouth Plantation*.

One way these texts register their distinctiveness includes peculiar gaps between what their authors seem to have intended and what actually gets recorded. Often, Read finds, some Old World literary convention breaks down when applied to New World experience. As a result the earliest colonial American texts fail to achieve a discursive stability.

This instructive failure in the function of familiar literary devices to contain, explain or simply describe utterly unfamiliar New World exigencies reveals telling and narratively opportunistic instances when authors do not know exactly what they are doing or trying to do. Each such textual breakdown, to apply Emily Dickinson's memorable image, becomes that "certain slant of light" which makes an "internal difference / Where the meanings are."

Read detects considerable incoherence in Smith's *General History*, which abounds in contradictions, asymmetrical juxtapositions and tonal confusion. Beyond his own understanding, Smith sometimes records a Native American's viewpoint in a manner which undercuts the certainty of English perspective.

Bradford's *Of Plymouth Plantation* also reflects complicated and inconclusive experiences which, Read contends, lead the Pilgrim governor to consciously reject his initial providential-history project celebrating the divinely-guided deeds of prominent men. Instead, in the second book of his account and particularly in his observations about Thomas Morton and Isaac Allerton, Bradford embraces the experiential realities of a community dependent upon and defined by economic success through trade.

Morton's *New English Canaan* applies a mercantile and metropolitan framework to familiarize New World experience for homeland readers. Morton indicts his Pilgrim enemies for their failure to import London's urban/urbane culture, which Morton assures his audience can indeed be exported to a New World already replete with the multifarious contradictions characteristic of city life.

In *A Key into the Language of America* and *The Bloody Tenent of Persecution* Roger Williams presents a curious paradox, Read argues. Williams affirms Christian certainties drawn from the Bible while at the same time he credits an

ideological pluralism based on New World “wilderness” experience. Firm belief and contingent knowledge intersect in Williams’ works, which sometimes simply leave this awkward juxtaposition unresolved, neither elucidated nor moralized.

If I mention missing in Read’s discussion any awareness of my own closely related interest in logocentric cruxes in *Design in Puritan American Literature* (1992) and logonomic conflict in *Authority and Female Authorship in Colonial America* (1998), excuse a murmured quibble from an old man who still likes to be invited to a good party now and then—because I do believe that *New World, Known World* is worth celebrating. Here is an author-centered, text-centered study that eschews fashionable and predictable political hegemonies. Here is a book that emphasizes the conflicted humanity of authors, to whom we are more than casually introduced and then to whom we are urged to listen very, very closely. How uncommonly humane.

William M. Kelso. *Jamestown: The Buried Truth*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2006. xii + 238 pp. \$29.95. Review by WILLIAM J. SCHEICK, UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN.

The earliest advertisements for New World settlement promised or intimated a plentitude of land, meat and women. Keenly aware of the importance of real estate to one’s social standing and economic survival, landless men became the most likely prospects to undertake the dangerous transatlantic journey. These potential colonists were also largely grain-eaters who valued animals as a culinary luxury as well as a profitable resource. And these men preferred to imagine the ready hospitality of friendly local women.

Of course advertisements, then and now, are notoriously unreliable. The first settlers at James Fort, later expanded into Jamestown, soon discovered the dark side of such fantasies. Water either too salty or contaminated, food spoiled by heat and humidity, crops destroyed by drought, disease spread by insects, Indians fiercely hostile to outsiders, life-threatening accidents, volatile arguments among the colonists themselves and the machinations of Spanish spies, among other hardships, all conspired against the earliest colonial Virginians’ dreams of a better life. It is said that dreams die hard, but at James Fort the dreamer’s end came all too easily.

The winter of 1609 and the spring of 1610 were particularly terrible. It is a historical irony that this period of misery, the “starving time,” provides a highpoint in William M. Kelso’s fascinating *Jamestown: The Buried Truth*. Kelso, who serves as head archaeologist of the Jamestown Recovery Project, discloses the grim *in situ* and documentary evidence of those seasons of famine: desperately eaten dogs, cats, horses, musk turtles, rats and poisonous snakes. By the end of the “starving time” only about ninety settlers survived out of several hundred.

Kelso also considers chemical analyses revealing what these recent immigrants primarily ate while living in their homeland. Chemical studies of isotopic signatures relating to diet enable archaeological speculation about the identity of some of the dead buried at Jamestown. Particularly indicative are two isotopes found within interred human bones. Each of these isotopes suggests whether wheat or corn was the deceased’s primary dietary grain, and this information in turn provides a clue to how long a particular settler resided in the New World before he or she died.

Such findings necessarily remain inconclusive, even as they usefully narrow the boundaries of certain archaeological questions. So Kelso’s book poses more questions than it provides answers. Much of the “buried truth” referred to in this book’s title unfortunately remains still buried. But if Kelso’s book is more about archaeological methods than about firm answers, it nonetheless offers an appealing crazy quilt of informative bits and pieces.

For instance, *in situ* evidence suggests that John Smith, whose veracity about so many matters remains suspect, was probably telling the truth about the quality of the water in the James Fort well. Other evidence implies that the gunshot wound which caused the first death of a James Fort settler appears to have been accidental. Kelso also observes that the James Fort dead were buried with their heads westward, a traditional Christian custom based on the expectation of the Second Coming of Jesus. However, Christian rites and superstitious rituals easily coexisted during the seventeenth century, a fact possibly explaining the artifact caches found in shallow fissures of the earthen floor of the excavated Fort. These curious objects were likely intended to ward off evil spirits.

“The American dream was born on the banks of the James River,” Kelso aptly states at the outset of his report (1). His book provides intriguing traces of just how troubled was the history of the colonists’ pursuit of a

better life in early Virginia. They had imagined a New World land that would fulfill Old World dreams, but instead James Fort settlers quickly discovered nature's stark indifference to human desires, needs, life.

Bonnie Gordon. *Monteverdi's Unruly Women: The Power of Song in Early Modern Italy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. x + 234 pp. + 9 illus. \$80.00. Review by ANDREW H. WEAVER, THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA.

True to the series in which it is published, *New Perspectives in Music History and Criticism*, Bonnie Gordon's monograph suggests a new way of hearing and interpreting seventeenth-century music. Not a book about Monteverdi *per se*, Gordon instead uses selected works by the composer—including such well-known masterpieces as the *Lamento d'Arianna*, *Il Combattimento di Tancredi e Clorinda*, and frequently performed works from the seventh and eighth madrigal books, as well as lesser-known compositions such as Book Eight's *Ballo delle ingrato* and pieces from the third and fourth madrigal books—as a frame of reference for making larger observations about seventeenth-century musical culture. In a series of five independent but interconnected essays (plus an introduction and brief “Coda?”), Gordon pursues two primary goals: to “re-hear” Monteverdi's music as it would have been heard in the seicento, informed by seventeenth-century ideologies of anatomy and gender difference, and also to demonstrate how these ideologies were used to “contain” women's voices while at the same time offering a means for female singers to empower themselves through song. To do so, she draws upon an impressive wealth of source material, including anatomical and other scientific treatises, singing manuals, Monteverdi's own writings, music theoretical works, conduct books and other prescriptive writings, as well as contemporaneous poetry, literature, and painting (plus a sprinkling of recent pop culture references). Along the way she also touches upon a number of other issues, such as the well-worn subject of love and sex in the madrigal and an ambitious discussion of the change in aesthetics and musical style from Monteverdi's early to late works.

If this sounds like a lot for a book of just over two hundred pages, it is, and the various strands that Gordon pursues do not always connect as well as

one might hope. For example, in the impressive third chapter, the longest one and (rightfully so) the centerpiece of the book, Gordon offers new insights into the confluence of love and sex in the polyphonic madrigal, convincingly demonstrating that regardless of the high-minded Neoplatonic spiritualism in the poetry, sung performance renders the music explicitly sexual. While this foregrounds Gordon's assertion that listening to music in the early sixteenth century was an embodied, physical experience, it does not add anything to her argument about the containing or empowering of women's voices; gender, in fact, is only discussed in a three-page "Excursus" that is extraneous to the chapter and does little more than recall ideas from earlier in the book. In chapter four, Gordon draws upon literary, social, and artistic sources to offer a context for understanding Monteverdi's Book Eight madrigal "Mentre vaga Angioletta" as a disjointed, fragmentary, eroticized representation of the ideal female voice, but her attempt to connect the processes of the text and music to the processes of anatomical dissection is rather forced, as is her larger conclusion that through analysis and dissection the madrigal serves to contain and control the unruly and dangerous female voice. Even the masterful first chapter runs into similar difficulties: After using singing manuals to gain insight into seventeenth-century notions of anatomy and then using that insight to offer an erotic interpretation of Monteverdi's Book Seven madrigal "O come sei gentile," Gordon goes on to discuss the strict discipline under which singers were trained and then pushes the envelope a bit too far with the admittedly "very speculative conclusion" (44) that written-out ornaments, especially those circumscribed by other musical elements, served as a means for male composers to physically control their female singers.

The chapter that most successfully unites Gordon's two primary goals is the second one, which originally appeared as an independent article in the 1999 issue of the *Cambridge Opera Journal*. This chapter focuses on the *Ballo delle ingrate* within its original context of the famous 1608 marriage festivities at the Mantuan court. Gordon contextualizes the ballet by comparing it to contemporary conduct books and tracing its Ovidian, Boccaccian, and Petrarchan themes, and she compellingly discusses how the physicality of live performance and even the scenic effects both emphasized the disciplinary message and also subversively undermined it. By allowing one of the doomed unruly women to sing a lament at the end of the work, Monteverdi presents the female voice as a powerful force in need of male control, but he simulta-

neously presents a woman who resists the confinement imposed upon her: "By bringing to life these punished but not passive female figures, the singers asserted the very agency that the productions attempted thematically to suppress" (81). Gordon then concludes the chapter with a brilliant reading of a well-known contemporaneous description of festivities, stripping our modern sensibilities from the (male) author's exaggerated prose and demonstrating that his words once again put the women "in their place."

It is in the fifth chapter that Gordon tackles the ambitious project of accounting for the shift in musical style and aesthetics from Monteverdi's early to late works, using her embodied understanding of music as a key to better understanding what scholars have discerned as a shift from resemblance to representation in Monteverdi's music. Focusing on four works sung by angry women, she argues that while the power of the earlier works comes from music that viscerally creates the movement of the passions, the later works merely represent anger by using purely musical materials to create abstract sounds that we passively associate with anger. Through a bravura series of comparisons and associations, she then equates Monteverdi's musical experiments (especially as described in his own words in the preface to the Eighth Book of Madrigals) with seventeenth-century scientific experiments, ultimately drawing parallels between the way one experiences Monteverdi's later music and Descartes's natural philosophy. By mid-century, she argues, new ways of construing the body and new "soundscapes" in music had put a "space" between the singer's voice and the audience's ears, thereby "taming the power of song" (200) while also creating more opportunities for the public display of the no longer dangerous female voice. This final chapter sheds light on the previous four, illuminating the large-scale organization of the book and also betraying Gordon's unspoken premise: that the earlier music, in its embodied physicality, is in many ways more powerful (and therefore better) than the merely representational music of Monteverdi's later years. In this way, she follows a long line of scholars, most notably her dissertation adviser Gary Tomlinson, who have bemoaned the loss of the "Renaissance" aesthetic of Monteverdi's early music.

This book is of greatest value to musicologists, though the general reader who knows Monteverdi's oeuvre well could also find much to appreciate. Gordon devotes little space to detailed musical analysis and offers few musical examples, which would seem to make the book more accessible to a

wider audience; however, the emphasis in her musical discussions on local surface detail, often at the expense of the whole, makes it necessary to read the book with recordings and/or scores at hand (unless one is already intimately familiar with the works). Her broad range of source material and larger cultural discussions would seem to make the book attractive to social and cultural historians of the seventeenth century, but because Gordon's readings of her sources are drawn almost entirely from secondary sources, the book will most likely not provide any new information for scholars already familiar with the works in her extensive bibliography. For readers familiar only with the standard musicological literature, however, Gordon's book will definitely shed new light on the music of the seicento. Even if it does not cause a seismic shift in the way one hears and interprets Monteverdi's music, it nonetheless gives the reader much to ponder and will make anybody think twice before interpreting a piece of early seventeenth-century vocal music according to our modern understandings of the body, the voice, and musical meaning.

Jean-Noël Laurenti. *Valeurs morales et religieuses sur la scène de l'Académie royale de musique (1663-1737)*. Geneva: Droz, 2002. 440 pp. CHF 148. Review by DOWNING A. THOMAS, UNIVERSITY OF IOWA.

Opera is a serious matter, Jean-Noël Laurenti tells us in his introduction, which is why he has decided to focus not on the aesthetic qualities of the *tragédie en musique* or its political or social functions during the Ancien Regime, but rather on the moral, philosophical, even theological meanings explored on the lyric stage. Moving against the grain of accepted notions of opera as mere fluff, Laurenti bases his arguments on tendencies in the repertory over the first seventy-four years of its history, primarily through comparisons of individual works and references to contemporary writings on the theater, philosophy, and moral or religious matters. Taking into account the shifting philosophical orientations over the years, he reminds his readers that spoken theater was also a form of "spectacle" in order to bring home the point that opera was not *only* spectacle, even though it was manifestly spectacular. Recognizing the limitations of an approach to opera that leaves out any consideration of the music and dance that were essential to it, Laurenti nonetheless

defends his decision to restrict his study to the libretti by noting that the texts allow us to get a snapshot of opera's thematic concerns, albeit without full resolution on the genre. His corpus has also been limited to the selection of libretti published as the *Recueil général des opéras*. This selection allows him to focus on works seen by a relatively large public in Paris, but necessarily excludes court productions or works seen only in smaller venues (such as the parodies of *tragédies en musique* given at the fair theaters). The endpoint of his study—1737—is, he suggests, the point at which music begins to dominate the libretto, previously considered the central element of the *tragédie en musique*. Finally, Laurenti chooses not to take into account variations or changes to works made during or after the publication of the libretto. His approach to this repertory as a body of works fixed on paper has, of course, the advantage of providing the critic with a clearly defined object of study; but, as he recognizes, it also disregards in many cases what audiences actually witnessed, particularly during revivals of the operas.

Laurenti's study is divided into two large sections: the first delves into the Epicurean foundations of French opera, while the second examines the relationship posed in these works between the human and the divine. An introduction situates opera in the context of seventeenth-century Epicureanism, showing how it drew from this intellectual current its celebration of love and pleasure. The first chapter continues this reflection through analysis of operas such as Quinault's *Alceste* and *Roland*, in particular the accommodation of love and glory one finds in these works. The next chapter focuses on the pleasures and virtues of tranquility (*le repos*) and peace, examining the operatic device of the *sommeil* (taking among others Quinault's *Armide* as example) and the prologue that characterized early French operas where the monarch is represented as above (and as resolving) all conflict. The pastoral ideal, in which love is represented as carefree, figures prominently here. Chapter three delves into the worldly qualities of operatic Epicureanism, examining opera's allegories of the arts (and of Louis XIV's promotion of the arts) in the prologue. Laurenti argues that the traditional Epicurean discourse glorifying the simple pleasures of pastoral tranquility is supplanted, beginning already in Quinault, by "un discours à la gloire de la civilisation citadine," offering praise of commerce, luxury, and the arts and sciences (174). Chapter four is devoted to the moral cautions of these early French operas, so many of which urge us to love, "mais sans alarmes" (180). Overall, he sees in these operas an affirma-

tion of “la confiance dans la possibilité d’un bonheur terrestre” (211).

Laurenti explains that opera allowed for a *mondaine* version of moral truths. Through the vehicle of the *merveilleux*, opera also affirmed “l’intelligibilité du monde,” in part because the spectator knew that the actions of the gods on the stage were in reality made possible by that of theatrical machines in the flies (221). The first chapter of the second section reviews the representation of each of the primary divinities from antiquity. Examining the critical representation of the gods (who are enslaved, like humans, by their passions), Laurenti debunks the received opinion that operas must always end happily. Though Quinault often avoids resolutely tragic endings, his successors take a different tack: “de 1687 à 1699, période où produisent notamment Campistron, Jean-Baptiste Rousseau et du Boulay, le nombre des dénouements malheureux est de huit contre sept” (269). The second chapter shifts to the representation of humanity (the fatal nature of love, the ravages of jealousy, ambition, and human weakness) and opera’s “casuistique” with respect to human frailty (273). After 1712, however, Laurenti sees a shift away from Quinault’s ambiguous treatment of the hero, citing works such as Danchet’s *Téléphe* (1714) and his *Achille et Déidamie* (1735): “Les héros [des opéras] du XVIIIe siècle, eux, sont des militants de la vertu, courent à l’action, voire au sacrifice; ils sont peu portés à l’hésitation et à la nostalgie, lesquelles sont réservées comme ornements passagers pour les monologues; les criminels, eux, persécuteurs opiniâtres de l’innocence, peu partagés, ne suscitent guère la terreur admirative ou la compassion que méritaient leurs prédécesseurs” (383). Laurenti sees the 1670s as a period of gallant Epicureanism, the 1680s as a period of growing pessimism and at the same time of heedless Bacchic pleasures, and finally a reorientation of opera in the new century toward responsibility, action, and free will. Laurenti’s periodization goes against the traditional view of the Regency as a time for “[la] course effrénée aux plaisirs,” since that notion characterizes more accurately the operatic repertory from end of the reign of Louis XIV (397). In the end, Laurenti argues, “l’image d’une divinité providentielle, intervenant activement dans le cours des choses, resurgit et vient coexister avec la thématique des Lumières” (399). Despite its limitations noted above, Laurenti’s study has the advantage of exploring some of the complexities and contradictions of a corpus of dramatic literature that does not fit tidily into the accepted frameworks of social or literary history. The

volume includes appendices listing the works included in the *Recueil général des opéras*, a bibliography, and an index nominum.

Bret L. Rothstein. *Sight and Spirituality in Early Netherlandish Painting*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005. xii + 262 pp. \$90.00. Review by MIYA TOKUMITSU, UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

Much like the artists he discusses, Bret L. Rothstein has created a dense work, requiring of its audience close reading and careful interpretation. His book, *Sight and Spirituality in Early Netherlandish Painting*, examines four seminal paintings of the fifteenth-century Low Countries and discusses the consequences of representing aspects of Christian spirituality for both artist and viewer. Painterly reflexivity, or the artist's signaling of his own means of representation, is the overarching theme of the book, and this theme provides the terms on which the other issues, including naturalism and patronage, are discussed. The topic requires some patience on the reader's part, but allowing Rothstein the time to elucidate his observations is worth the effort.

Each chapter of the book is dedicated to a single work: Rogier van der Weyden's Bladelin Triptych (c. 1445), Jan van Eyck's *Virgin and Child with Canon Joris van der Paele* (c. 1434-36), and *Virgin and Child with Chancellor Nicolas Rolin* (c. 1435) and Petrus Christus's *Goldsmith in His Shop* (c. 1449). In the first chapter on the Bladelin triptych, Rothstein argues that Van der Weyden's reflexive painting undermines or at least disturbs the "nature and function of optical experience" (184). While the viewer looks at a visually stunning painting, the subjects of that painting, Octavius Augustus, Bladelin, the shepherds behind the Nativity, and the Virgin Annunciate, are all having their own, purely spiritual visions. Clearly the "spiritual seeing" of these subjects is more exalted than the viewer's physical seeing of the painting. Yet the painting serves a specific devotional purpose. Exactly what this purpose is and how one should employ the painting are at issue. That such paintings simultaneously enhance and complicate the spiritual aims of their viewers is one of the key paradoxes of fifteenth-century devotional art. Rothstein's discussion of it is illuminating in that he shows the artist beginning to position himself within these paradoxes to determine how these paintings should be used and interpreted.

The second chapter, on Van Eyck's Van der Paele *Virgin and Child*, claims

that painterly reflexivity allows Van Eyck to push the limits of visual and spiritual representation. Again, this painting seems to be a paradox unto itself. Clearly, Van der Paele's vision is motivated by spiritually pure meditation and is unaided by visual stimuli, as evidenced by the canon's removal of his spectacles. Yet this ideal form of imageless devotion is represented by a lavish picture. The painting undermines its very function for both painter and viewer. By showing the canon present with yet physically disconnected from his visionary figures, Van Eyck demonstrates that religious experience is separate from, but more exalted than physical, everyday existence. Ironically, Van Eyck must make pictures to deliver this very message. Naturalism and illusionism receive careful treatment in this chapter, and Rothstein argues that Van Eyck deliberately undermines his own naturalistic style in order to reinforce to the viewer that the painting is a physical object and not, in fact, a journalistic account of a naturally occurring scene.

Chapter three discusses the value of style and images as social currency. By showing Nicolas Rolin, the Burgundian courtier, having a lucid vision of the Virgin and Child, Van Eyck presents Rolin to the world as a devout man, thus elevating his social standing at court. He represents the ideal courtly figure: a man who balances adequately the *vita activa*, represented in the painting by the worldly landscape that was his domain, and the *vita contemplativa*, evidenced by his bookmarked prayer book and extraordinary vision of the Virgin and Child. Despite the elevation of Rolin in the picture, Van Eyck's unrestrained virtuosity reverts the viewer's attention to the presence of the artist, and thus the artist can moderate the picture's interpretation.

This final observation of the third chapter sets the stage for chapter four, which, using Petrus Christus's *Goldsmith in His Shop* as its example, shows sophisticated fifteenth-century painters as asserting their talents to their viewers in their works via reflexivity. These painters "not only tried to answer the paradoxical nature of religious picture-making, but also tried to position themselves socially and intellectually with respect to these challenges" (138). Rothstein also discusses at length a small patch of light that is reflected on Christ's orb in Van der Weyden's *Last Judgment* altarpiece. The reflection appears to be created by the loggias that appear in the Rolin picture and in Van der Weyden's own *St. Luke Drawing the Virgin and Child*. As the *Last Judgment* was created for Rolin as well, Rothstein suggests that this reflection respects Rolin's patronage of the other artist, and also links the altarpiece to his

own *St. Luke*. It is a strategic and clever positioning of the artist in that it both praises his patron's taste and in doing so fully incorporates himself to his patron's aesthetic.

Sight and visuality in Netherlandish painting is not a new topic, but it is observations such as the loggia reflection that make this book both refreshing and useful. Rothstein puts the pictorial density in the context of contemporary thought, drawing heavily on writers such as Ruusbroec, Grote, and Gerson. (It is Gerson whose idea of the *vitae* described above provides the framework for chapter three).

Although there are common threads among the chapters, one still wonders what, aside from their renown, links these paintings in such a way that they would comprise a single book. The answer, and it is an enlightening one, is not simply that the term "reflexivity" appears in every chapter. It is that the reflexive elements of the paintings or "play signals" (184) have become an intellectual point which draws artist and patron closer from their opposite sides of the transaction. Or, in Rothstein's own words: "In each case, painters promote themselves by advancing shared rather than competing expectations [of their patrons], and by underscoring the efficacy of their responses to the challenges posed by those expectations" (187).

Thomas V. Cohen. *Love and Death in Renaissance Italy*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2004. x + 306 pp. \$27.50. Review by MICHELE MARRAPODI, UNIVERSITY OF PALERMO.

Thomas V. Cohen's *Love and Death in Renaissance Italy* is a compelling and stimulating book which aims to blend historical accuracy with a critical investigation into the social life of Renaissance Italy. Departing from a careful examination of the court papers of the Roman governor of justice during the second half of the sixteenth century, the author singles out six piquant cases of awful crimes and illicit passions taken from the state archives of Rome. The book's strength is to illustrate every single trial in an individual chapter, introduced by a narrative reconstruction of the historical facts which are then followed by brief excerpts from the actual written proceedings. As the author rightly points out, "these court papers are marvellous cultural documents; they open windows onto modes of thought and speech and tell

precious stories about how sixteenth-century Italy worked" (4). The task, however, is replete with obstacles and Cohen is perfectly aware of the difficulties that arise in deciphering most of the trials: "they have meandering lines of twisting plot and unexpected knots where several fates entwined and snarled. At the center, often, is some mishap or catastrophe, the *corpus delicti* that spurred the trial. And all around the crisis lie the fragments of many lives, some tightly bound and others linked only by the caprice of connection to the crime" (5). These important issues may explain why each chapter begins with the case's historical reconstruction reported in narrative style. In the manner of an omniscient narrator, Cohen introduces the protagonists' different roles, describes their social ambience, customs, and behaviours, and exposes their vices by recounting their intimate desires and anxieties. In doing so, the writer succeeds in drawing the reader's attention as a proven story-teller by translating the forensic if cold description of a criminal trial into novella-like terms.

After this fictional introduction, the book's style often turns to the first person and allows the protagonists to speak in their own words. This shift in the narration proves to be particularly effective in that it draws directly from the voices of the real characters, reciting their speeches almost verbatim. Thus brief abstracts from the court papers are skilfully exploited as direct testimonial evidence and put into the mouths of the very same protagonists. This historical documentation helps Cohen to delve into some of the most intricate cases of sexual crimes in the domestic life of Renaissance Italy, evaluating at the end of each trial the actual roles and responsibilities of both the victims and the guilty and even making a moral lesson out of them for the reader's benefit.

Among the most notorious criminal cases taken into account from the state archives in Rome after 1550, we are told of betrayed husbands prosecuted for murdering their adulterous wives, of bloody revenges for sexual abuse, of rapes with illicit appropriation and robbery, all facts that shook the very heart of the city's social and domestic life and seem to recall that kind of Italian novelistic literature that inspired the plot structure of much Elizabethan and Jacobean drama. In writing all this, as the author concedes, "readers will sometimes feel as if they have strayed into a story by Boccaccio, Sercambi, Bandello, or some other Italian short-story writer. The old *novelle* imitated life. Meanwhile, life itself, at some remove, aped *novelle*?" (13).

Among the author's strategies as both historian and narrator, there are in

the book's structure several intervals used for instructive comments, almost a devised space for a moral reassessment, placed either at the beginning or at the end of each chapter in order to offer a moral lesson. The close reading of the legal documents of the Roman court proceedings thus becomes an important occasion for reconsidering the social life of the most famous city-state of Renaissance Italy in light of some uncovered cases of forbidden desires and unrestrained vices which characterized part of the city's social history. Cohen's own comments implicitly emphasize this role of the historian as a moralist and teacher, a notion that is also graphically expressed in italics as an introductory note or coda to each chapter. These remarks also serve as the necessary link with the subsequent parts of the book, binding them all into a unifying didactic pattern. This methodological feature in the book's strategy may also arouse some queries in the reader's mind. Can the often fragmented pieces built up to construct each story always be sufficiently complete and instructive to become a suitable subject for didactic purposes? And what is the author's own assurance for a faithful historical reconstruction? The truth is that throughout the book Cohen turns out to be both an objective historian and too sympathetic a writer. And this may be interpreted as both a flaw and a demonstration of his achievement. He provides his narratives with painstaking details and appears genuinely struck by the human suffering which covers at times the sordid crimes he discloses from the secrets of the court archives. Cohen's effort is surely praiseworthy, and the final description of the "textuality of text," albeit widely defined and unisolated from its historical contexts, is a model for young scholars. Elegantly written as a collection of thrilling short stories and erotic *novelle*, this book is at times much more appealing owing to the alluring efficacy of its narrative style and didactic strategy than to the real success of its historical documentation. But this is perhaps the book's real achievement as well as the author's most natural aspiration.

Peter Rietbergen. *Power and Religion in Baroque Rome: Barberini Cultural Policies*. Leiden: Brill, 2006. xviii + 437 pp. \$50.00. Review by MICHAEL J. REDMOND, UNIVERSITY OF PALERMO.

The omnipresent Barberini bees depicted on the surfaces of major Ba-

roque landmarks in Rome attest to the contribution that Pope Urban VIII made to the development of architecture and decoration during his lengthy pontificate. What comes to the fore in Peter Rietbergen's *Power and Religion in Baroque Rome* is the extent to which literature, scholarship, and the visual arts formed an essential part of the relentless strategy of family aggrandizement practiced by Urban and his favorite nephew Francesco, the Cardinal-*padrone* appointed to manage the religious and state apparatus of the papacy. In dealing with culture as an instrument of power, an argument that is anything but new in early modern studies, Rietbergen applies rigorous historical methodology to a process that tends to be studied only in terms of its artistic legacy. The diverse case-studies provided in the eight chapters, Prologue, and Epilogue focus on the ideological objectives of patronage, production, and dissemination, rather than the rhetorical schemes of individual works. The book's approach uses detailed research from the Barberini manuscript and document archives to trace the bureaucratic administration of the commissioning process by family members appointed to positions of papal authority, emphasizing the importance that representation acquired in the struggles for spiritual and temporal power in the Vatican. For although the cultural policies of the Barberini have long been of incidental interest to art historians, concerned primarily with the background to the conception of masterpieces like Bernini's *baldachino* and *Cathedra Petri* in St. Peter's, the intense effort to foreground the family's heraldic emblem in churches and public spaces suggests a social and political agenda that went well beyond personal spirituality or the disinterested advancement of creative endeavor.

While the future pontiff frequently praised the value of withdrawal from the corruption of society in his own poetry, Maffeo Barberini would not have become Urban VIII if he had not been a good politician. Indeed, in casting his brother Angelo as the embodiment of piety and integrity within his verses, he employed the cloistered monk as a symbol for the family as a whole and compensated for his perceived lack of these qualities. The account of Maffeo's rise to the papacy in the first three chapters shows the care which he lavished upon the public image of the Barberini. The discussion in the first chapter of his micromanagement of the decoration of the Barberini chapel in the church of Sant'Andrea della Valle on the Via Papalis is especially enlightening. Aware that he was becoming regarded as *papabile*, Maffeo took great care to create a chapel that would underscore the prestige of himself and his

family, hiring the most fashionable artists to impress the *cognoscenti* and arranging for the acquisition of relics to attract pilgrims. The detailed contracts for the production of individual paintings and sculptures offered no scope for artistic freedom, defining the iconography and materials of each work as part of a coherent overall project. Although Rietbergen is convinced of the serious literary ambitions of Maffeo's poetry, contending that "it would be wrong to interpret these texts purely as career-serving political poems," it is telling that his supporters released the 1621 collected edition featuring verses praising the virtues of influential figures in the *Curia* and the devoutness of his family at a time when he was a serious candidate to succeed Paul V (112). After he was selected by the conclave, as the publication history in the second chapter shows, his nephew Francesco co-opted the cultural influence of the Church to ensure that the poet-pope's works were imposed as a set text in religious schools. With the role of *Cardinal-padrone*, the subject of the third chapter, Francesco became head of the Barberini and took on the responsibility for such efforts to maintain the reputation of his illustrious uncle and legitimate the increasing control of the Vatican bureaucracy by members of the family.

There are some acid comments in the Introduction about recent scholarship that implicitly condemns the society of the past for "seeing a religious procession as the festive celebration of the presence of Christ or the saints instead of seeing it as the complex iconography of power it 'really' was" (14). While Rietbergen would like to believe that Urban VIII and Cardinal Francesco used their powers "to effectuate the ultimate goal, man's union with God," he is also keen to deny that seventeenth century Romans were naïve (14). Although the scale on which the Barberini exploited the propaganda potential of high culture may have been unique, his Prologue shows that contemporary observers were already well aware of the systematic use of public imagery to sustain papal nepotism. It is noteworthy that well-connected figures in Roman society like the diarist and civic administrator Giacinto Gigli interpreted religious ceremonies and the fine arts as "visual expressions of power" (59). For observers with a stake in Vatican power struggles, a particular interest of such cultural manifestations was the message which their patrons wanted to convey. Gigli's journal entries express great curiosity about what Barberini sponsored processions, sculptures, and executions reveal about the ambitions of the family itself, treating their political significance as a social

function distinct from ideals of aesthetic value or religious faith.

The final five chapters of the book, surveying a series of cultural questions in Baroque Rome, betray its origins as a collection of separate articles. Chapters six and seven assess the contribution of foreign scholars to Roman academic circles in the seventeenth century, detailing how the German Lucas Holste and the Lebanese Maronite Christian Ibrahim-al-Hakilani were drawn to the city by the opportunities offered by the papal libraries and colleges. With his ability to locate important manuscripts by personal research in monasteries and the use of a network of book buyers, Holste became an essential figure in the management of the great libraries linked to the papacy. While he was first brought to Rome to oversee the formation of the library of Francesco Barberini, the highpoint of Holste's career came after the pontificate of Urban VIII, with his appointment as first custodian of the Vatican Library in 1653 by Innocent X and continued preferment under Alexander VII. The life of Ibrahim-al-Hakilani, who used the name Abraham Ecchellense in Europe, is the subject of chapter seven. In the midst of an extensive career promoting cross-cultural contacts in the Mediterranean—as merchant, diplomat, translator and teacher—he held the chair of oriental linguistics at the papal university at the behest of Urban VIII for two relatively uneventful terms but is most noted for his service in Paris as Cardinal Mazarin's personal scholar of Arabic and Syriac manuscripts.

The most compelling chapters in the final part of the book deal with political disputes involving Urban VIII himself. The discussion in chapter four of the ceremonial crisis surrounding Prince Eckembergh's 1638 mission to the Vatican, an attempt to get papal recognition for the election of Ferdinand of Habsburg as King of the Romans, shows how formal diplomatic events staged great European conflicts in miniature. For although the prince took care to impress the Romans with the wealth and power of the Habsburgs, arranging two elaborate entrances into the city, Urban's initial lukewarm reception of the envoy created a political crisis that could only be resolved by holding a rare papal banquet. The fifth chapter details the conflicts about the representation of St. Augustine during the seventeenth century, an issue that the Barberini pontiff seems to have been eager to ignore. The effort to prevent the saint from being depicted wearing sandals, a symbol of poverty, was of essential importance to the conventional order of Augustine monks, eager to curb the growth of the reformist faction of *svakzi* that had adopted

the basic footwear as a challenge to the perceived worldliness of their colleagues. Urban's main contribution to resolving the problem was to impose an ineffective *silentium* on the two groups, leaving his successors to deal with the hostilities. He was more active, as chapter eight shows, in responding to those that tried to use black magic against him. Rietbergen provides a fascinating review of the case of Count Giacinto Centini, executed for conspiring to murder the pope through necromancy. As sole heir of one of the *papabili*, Centini hoped to become Cardinal-*padrone* himself after his uncle filled the ensuing vacancy. While the relevance of all this to Barberini cultural policy seems a bit stretched, the plot emphasizes the manner in which Urban's lengthy pontificate frustrated the ambitions of families that were waiting for their turn to take over the papacy.

There is a good book here trying to get out. Although the lengthy Epilogue attempts to demonstrate the implications that such diverse material has for our understanding of Barberini cultural policy, repeating much of the contents of the individual chapters in the process, some ruthless editing would have greatly improved the continuity of the overall text. A particular distraction for the reader looking at the study as a whole, apart from a surprising number of typographical errors, is the extent to which relevant historical figures like Galileo Galilei and the Calabrian heretic-monk Tommaso Campanella are introduced and reintroduced over a series of chapters. However, given the breadth of Rietbergen's primary research and the new perspectives opened up by his approach to cultural history, there is no question that *Power and Religion in Baroque Rome* will be of interest to a wide variety of scholars working in seventeenth-century studies.

John Marshall. *John Locke, Toleration and Early Enlightenment Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006. viii + 767 pp. + 6 illus. \$110.00. Review by CHRISTOPHER N. FRITSCH, INDEPENDENT SCHOLAR.

With professional roots in the examination of early Pennsylvania, John Locke and toleration has often been a strong interest. William Penn's connection to both Locke and the topic of toleration are intriguing to say the least. For the author, John Marshall, both of these men and numerous others debated and wrote about the application, limits, and merits of toleration in a

period designated as the early Enlightenment. In the years between the Restoration and the Wars of Succession, the authors on all sides of the question of toleration found themselves influenced, in part, by the religious, intellectual, and political ideas and events of the ancient, medieval, and Reformation worlds. They were not, as Marshall shows, men with only a contemporary mindset, but rather men who engaged in the critical examination of the past and an ever-developing interest in the variety of academic study and discourse within the present.

For example, Locke and his tolerationist associates were as adept at formulating anti-intolerance arguments based upon the writings of Augustine, the actions of the Roman Catholic Church in the Middle Ages, and the most recent activities of the French monarchy in the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. For these men, toleration—the question of it—or the lack of it, involved an understanding of the foundations of Christianity, the early debates by Church synods on creeds, and the actions of contemporary governments, both Roman Catholic and “magisterial” Protestant in their efforts to undo or limit Reformation thought. Their diverse backgrounds of experiences and perceptions of the past and present, combined with an intellectual breadth of curiosity and thought that went beyond politics and religion to the developing sciences of physics and chemistry, forged the early Enlightenment which was international in its development, perception, and influence. They came from England, Scotland, France, Switzerland, and for a number of years lived together in, what was for many, the most tolerant environment in Europe, the United Provinces.

In order to provide a cohesive and thoughtful examination of this broad range of early Enlightenment authors and their ideas, Marshall has taken the challenge to explore all facets of toleration and its antithesis. The book, therefore, is broken into three parts. Part one focuses upon the contemporary issue of intolerance as practiced by both Roman Catholics and Protestants in late seventeenth-century Europe. Part two is a thorough examination of the intellectual foundations of intolerance from both the Roman Catholic and Protestant perspectives. The final section of the book, perhaps the most interesting, concentrates upon the early Enlightenment defense of toleration and the creation of an intellectual world collectively perceived by its participants as the “Republic of Letters.”

Part one specifically examines intolerance by both Catholics and Protes-

tants. Marshall explores these attitudes and actions in England, Ireland, and the Netherlands, and within this geographical structure, he shows the types and levels of intolerance by Catholics against Protestants, such as the increasing intolerance from French Catholics toward their Protestant countrymen. However, he also provides insight into the intolerance of Protestant communities in England, the Netherlands and the exiled French Huguenot toward, not only Roman Catholics, but also toward perceived Socinian and Arminian Protestant believers. What is perhaps most interesting about his examination of Catholic/Protestant intolerance is the trans-Channel impact which certain events had. The forced re-Catholicization and expulsion of French Huguenots from their homes presented a seemingly clear picture of a Catholic monarch's perspective on upholding former laws which protected Protestant worship. For English Protestants, the Revocation and the subsequent treatment of the Huguenots showed all too clearly what might happen in the near future under an openly Catholic Stuart monarchy. With an understanding of the events in France, one can begin to see the impact that the Revocation had on events, such as, the Popish Plot and the Exclusion Crisis and how they, in turn, impacted events across the Channel and the broad political and intellectual world in which Locke's essays on toleration were developed.

With a broad understanding of the political, religious, and social events and how they impacted each other across a broad stretch of geography, part two of the book takes us on a journey backwards in order to understand how intolerance was justified by Catholics and "magisterial" Protestants. As we might come to expect, Catholics and Protestants saw each other as heretics and schismatics. For political and religious leaders of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, though, the designation of people as heretics and schismatics encompassed much more than theological perspective. Heretics and schismatics were also associated with sedition and treason within a political framework and pestilence, poison, sodomy, and libertinism within a cultural one. Ultimately, there were those groups, such as Anabaptists and Quakers, who incurred the wrath of both sides—Roman Catholic and "magisterial" Protestant. By the Restoration, Catholics and Protestant hoped to gain or maintain political power in order to curb what they considered to be Christian heresy and societal malevolence, as they called for the destruction of residents outside the religious norm. There were those, such as Pieter de la Court, who questioned the use of political power in this way, if only for the

sack of the national economy and decreasing the threat from nations interested in protecting coreligionists.

Part three returns us to John Locke and his circle of friends and associates. In many ways they were fellow critics of intolerance but they seemingly became friends and colleagues, who debated with each other, critiqued each other's writings, reviewed each other's works and helped each other to find employment by recommending them to other friends and associates. They became a group of scholars beyond the issue of toleration as they began publishing their own journals, which became forums for the critique of Catholic and Protestant thought and the presentation of recent scholarly inquiry of the latest writings on history, philosophy, and science in the hopes of finding "truth" and presenting truthfulness. Locke and his associates looked to move the rhetoric beyond its contemporary level of heresy and schism to focus the debate upon a new set of criteria that looked to end superstition, ignorance, and barbarism. In this shift from the question of toleration for Christian heretics and schismatics, Jews, and Moslems to an intolerance of superstition, ignorance, and barbarism, one finds Marshall's *Enlightenment* has all of the trademarks of the traditional view of the Enlightenment. Marshall's story, however, shows that not all of Locke's friends and associates were always tolerant and enlightened. Criticisms, arguments and fears about the tendencies of certain members within the group ended some relationships, while others experienced some of the strongest friendship ties these men would encounter.

Here lies one of the strengths of Marshall's work. His early Enlightenment is much more than scientific discovery and philosophic inquiry. Marshall brings Locke and his colleagues to us in recognizable form—the lunchtime colloquium or the office discussion over books and interpretation—a collegial environment. This does not question the value of the main thrust of this work—his discussion of tolerance and intolerance. Marshall brings to us an in-depth reading and comprehension of the issues as they date back to Augustine and he masterfully provides us with the contemporary use of this knowledge by Locke and his co-tolerationists. If there is anything that might be thought of as a criticism, it would perhaps be the call for a bit of editing to reduce certain phrases and explanations, but even here, within a work this large and vast, they are more often a helpful aid in keeping the reader on course throughout his exploration of the political and religious debates of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, than they are an encumbrance.

William R. Shea, Mariano Artigas. *Galileo Observed. Science and the Politics of Belief*. Sagamore Beach: Science History Publications, 2006. 224 pp. \$30.00. Review by ALESSANDRO GIOSTRA, ACCADEMIA GEORGICA, TREIA.

“In this book we try to set the record straight in the belief that truth is more satisfying, and more challenging, than propaganda or media hype” (ix). These words, forming part of the Preface (ix-xi), sum up the aim of the publication by William R. Shea, Galileo Professor of History of Science at the University of Padua, and Mariano Artigas, teacher of philosophy and theology at the University of Navarra who unfortunately died at the end of the last year. The authors lay stress on some commonplaces belonging to the Galileo case in order to show the historical authenticity about that important moment in modern history.

A clear instance of a prejudicial reconstruction is outlined in chapter one (1-26), in which the authors discuss the idea that Galileo’s trial is part of the historical conflict between science and religion. That idea was supported by John William Draper (1811-1882) and Andrew Jackson White (1832-1918), though an objective look at their conclusions clearly shows that they have been led astray by their ideological belief in the conflict thesis instead of investigating the historical truth. On the other side, Arthur Koestler’s opinion, which considers the clash between Galileo’s and Urban VIII’s tempers as the main reason for Galileo’s condemnation, can be deemed another kind of historical mistake (27-52). Koestler is right in affirming the condemnation could be avoided but his denying the relevance of a contrast between biblical exegesis and science in the modern age is also not correct. Bertold Brecht’s *Life of Galileo* (53-84) is another clear instance among the ideological and instrumental accounts of that affair. The German author abused Galileo’s memory in order to explain history on the stage and spread his own vision against western society. Unfortunately, most of the Brecht’s audience does not know much about the Galileo’s case and seventeenth-century cultural milieu; therefore, Brecht’s play does not dispel any of the common myths about the case. In the following chapter (85-106) the authors examine five common charges which have been held by historians supporting that Galileo was not treated fairly. Among those accusations, the one upholding Galileo’s being tortured is surely the most absurd. The opening of the Vatican archives in 1998 allowed researchers to examine all the documents concerning Galileo’s trials in great

detail and none of them contains information about any kind of torture.

Some historians, such as Walter Brandmuller, have interpreted Galileo's conflict with the Church as a case of mutual mistake. The question forms part of the arguments expressed in chapter five (107-125) which deals with the complex aspect of inquiring into the right statements and errors made by both Galileo and the Church in science and theology. The analysis carried on by Shea and Artigas stresses the insufficiency of prejudicial arrangements as many details must be considered in order to express a true judgement upon that question. The idea that Giordano Bruno's trial is "the occult but real cause of the condemnation of both Copernicus and Galileo" is affirmed by the famous historian of science Alexandre Koyrè and the comparison of those two characters is made in chapter six (127-144). Their trials ended with different verdicts but the most important difference between Bruno and Galileo consists in the core of their thought. Their belief in the Copernican system was the only common ground between them; Bruno, moreover, was not a scientist in the modern sense of the word as his natural philosophy was not founded upon experiments and mathematics. The authors rightly establish that Bruno "was not a scientist, and he was not interested in astronomy as such but in Copernicanism as a launching pad for his cosmological ideas" (129).

The condemnation of Galileo as an actual "heretic" has been declared by the Italian historian Pietro Redondi and his position is discussed in details in chapter eight (165-180), which may be the most specialized essay in the volume. Redondi's theory is based upon the contents of an anonymous manuscript, preserved in the Vatican archives, which denounces Galileo for denying the doctrine of the Eucharist. Redondi claimed that the author of that manuscript was Orazio Grassi, a Jesuit astronomer who affirmed in a book on comets that Galileo imperilled the dogma of transubstantiation by rendering the sensible qualities of matter subjective. According to Redondi, that was the real reason why Galileo was condemned in 1633. It is well known that Galileo replied to Grassi's work by publishing *The Assayer*, in which he established the distinction between primary and secondary qualities which led to the suspicion of heresy described in the anonymous manuscript. *The Assayer*, however, had been examined by the theologian Giovanni Guevara who found nothing to proceed against Galileo on that occasion. In a paragraph of that chapter, the theological grounds why the Holy Office let the matter

drop are briefly exhibited. Moreover, a detailed research in the Vatican archives was made by Mariano Artigas when they became wholly accessible to students. Artigas found another anonymous manuscript that was closely linked with the previous one. According to Shea and Artigas, the author of that other document was probably Melchior Inchofer, a Jesuit member of the Preliminary Commission established in 1632 by Urban VIII to analyse the *Dialogue on the Two Chief Systems*. Therefore, the manuscript examined by Redondy is probably a copy and Inchofer may be the author of the original version. "For the record, let us mention that no one who has studied the trial thinks that Redondi has got it right" (168).

The work made by the Pontifical Commission established in 1992 by Pope John Paul II, as a part of a broader research design concerning the science-theology interaction, is the content of chapter nine (181-194). Not all historians, who in recent years have dealt with Galilean studies, agree with the work of the Commission even if it gave rise to some very meaningful publications. That disagreement can be judged to be a clear demonstration of the difficulties inherent in the reconstruction of the Galileo case and the negative approach of prejudicial and superficial accounts. As the authors declare:

A movie with no clearly recognizable good guys and bad guys might be more true to life but it would stand no chance of establishing a record at the box office. Commercial films sacrifice historical authenticity for broad audience appeal, simplifying the complex patterns of the past, and telling the public what it wants to hear. (195)

This declaration is the main historical consideration that led the authors to write this book. Their conclusions can be found in this highly readable publication. Although it deals with a very specialized subject, it will appeal to general readers interested in modern history. Shea and Artigas present the Galileo case in an objective manner and succeed in showing how it is possible to write an entire book containing the main historical errors about it.

Jesse M. Lander. *Inventing Polemic: Religion, Print, and Literary Culture in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006. x + 324 pp. + 20 illus. \$85.00. Review by IRA CLARK, UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA.

Jesse M. Lander begins *Inventing Polemic* by recounting Swift's satiric literary allegory *The Battle of the Books*, in which "ancients" and "modems" wage war by way of personified volumes attacking and counterattacking each other on the field of King's Library, offering the early eighteenth century a retrospective on the futility of controversy fueled by "enthusiasm," excessive inspiration. He ends it with the history of the rise and fall of Chelsea College: it was founded in the context of the Gunpowder Plot and the Oath of Allegiance controversy so as to champion James I's religious position through contentions over doctrine and discipline; by the Revolution it had fallen into disuse and abuse; finally its assets and properties were granted to the Royal Society by Charles II; polemic had been displaced to the margins of literature. In between "The disorder of books" and "Institutionalizing polemic," Lander pursues the active cycle of a once potent genre. "The volatile mixture of religious controversy and print technology introduced a new polemical element into the literary culture of early modern England, and the invention of polemic in turn produced a reaction in the form of polite learning" (230-31), he summarizes. In outline, polemic was born with "Foxe's Books of Martyrs: printing and popularizing the *Actes and Monuments*," grew turbulent in its early years of "Martin Marprelate and the fugitive text," gained definition in contrast to literature in "Printing Donne: poetry [*An Anatomy of the World*] and polemic [*Pseudo-Martyr*] in the early seventeenth century," and achieved a maturity that simultaneously marked a decline in Milton's defense of the form itself in "*Areopagitica* and 'The True Warfaring Christian.'"

Omitted in my reiteration of the contents of this book subtitled *Religion, Print, and Literary Culture in Early Modern England* is "Whole Hamlets: Q1, Q2, and the work of distinction," because in my judgement this middle chapter does not advance Lander's argument. Instead it exemplifies and confirms Lander's major premise that religious controversy provided both an encompassing context as well as an overlooked and once important genre among all kinds of writing from the Elizabethan period until the Restoration. Polemic then was not subliterary or peripheral but rather central, ultimately contributing to the definition of what was to become considered literary. "Whole

Hamlets” also exhibits Lander’s primary mode of working and his characteristic employment of evidence. In this chapter he focuses on the differences between a script of a revenge tragedy in the earlier quarto and a reading text interrogating religious questions in the later quarto as the two texts suggest different publication goals and audience responses.

For Lander “literary culture” is no mere generalized rubric; it is an essential term. It signals an engagement with the creation of an audience, since polemic ostentatiously splits its audience into for and against, wooing partisans and assailing enemies. Consequently he examines a work’s publication history and its rhetoric of presentation, elements central to engaging a public audience as well as an opponent. So his evidence consists of more than the accounts of literary and theological controversies that raged throughout the period, or the literary biographies of Donne or Milton, or even the cultural and social history of the process of defining literature, though he uses these. It includes as well the production and publication history of six English editions of Foxe’s *Actes and Monuments* and its primary printer Richard Day and dwells on the public sensation and intrigue of the appearance of Martin Marprelate. Lander takes into account in his analyses not merely the arguments of various tracts with their diction and tone and dialogical restatements and rebuttals, but he includes as well evidence of the material presentation, the black letter versus roman type faces of the Marprelate pamphlets and the differences in title pages between Donne’s polemic and his poem, and the polemic’s table of contents versus the commendatory poems ushering us into and out of the elegy. Moreover, he includes speculation about audience response based on commendatory comments and opponents’ counterarguments, written reactions plus data such as the abridgments, imitations, and appropriations of an *Actes and Monuments* or an *Areopagitica*. Lander’s very notes provide a useful bibliographical commentary about histories of religious controversies, histories of book making, histories of individual writers, and theoretical backgrounds for all these concerns, especially the idea of public discourse, in England from about 1550 until the late 1600s.

In “Epilogue: Polite learning,” Lander reiterates his opening from a new point of view. He recounts the story of the rise of Jacob Tonson, the first publisher to found a firm on the elaborate production of literary works that have come to be regarded as canonical, of Spenser and Donne and Waller and Shakespeare, far removed from the strikingly opposed anonymous, fu-

gitive production of the Marprelate polemics. The most interesting exhibit is the pomp and luxury of Tonson's publication of *Paradise Lost*, a volume that effaces Milton's authorship as a Puritan polemicist and exalts a new commitment to a universalized and aestheticized "polite learning" as the sphere all came to regard as literature.

Jesse M. Lander makes a learned and significant contribution to an emerging history of literary culture that helps us understand some of the determinants that characteristically emerge from print and manuscript cultures and some of the social determinations of what and how literature is constituted. It is a literary history that characterizes a genre in the context of religious and hence political controversy wherein authors, printers, and publishers sought to define and win over one audience and anathematize another. It is a literary history that interprets evidence from printing history, material conditions of presentation as part of its rhetoric, audience response, theological and social and cultural history. It is a history of literary culture that calls other scholars to help give us more insight into literature from a fuller, more complex perspective.

NEO-LATIN NEWS

Vol. 55, Nos. 1 & 2. Published jointly with SCN. Send inquiries to the editor, Craig Kallendorf, 4227 TAMU, College Station, Texas 77843-4227. NLN is the official publication of the American Association for Neo-Latin Studies and is edited by Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University; Western European Editor: Gilbert Tournoy, Leuven; Eastern European Editors: Jerzy Axer, Barbara Milewska-Wazbinska, and Katarzyna Tomaszuk, Centre for Studies in the Classical Tradition in Poland and East-Central Europe, University of Warsaw. Founding Editors: James R. Naiden, Southern Oregon University, and J. Max Patrick, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee and Graduate School, New York University.

◆ *Opera poetica*. By Bohuslaus Hassensteinus a Lobkowicz. Ed. by Marta Vaculínová. Munich and Leipzig: Saur, 2006. xl + 328 pp. The *Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana* has traditionally refreshed its focus on the Greek and Latin classics with the critical editions of late antique (e.g., Donatus – Wessner 1902–1908, Macrobius – Willis 1970, Martianus Capella – Willis 1983), patristic (e.g., Lactantius – Heck & Wlosok 2005), medieval (e.g., Remigius of Auxerre – Fox 1902), and humanistic authors (e.g., Lorenzo Valla – Schwahn, 1928). These traditional refreshments also include the *Epistulae* by Bohuslaus Hassensteinus a Lobkowicz (Martínek and Martínková 1969–1980). Marta Vaculínová of the Library of the National Museum in Prague has now provided the critical edition of the *Opera poetica* of Hassensteinus (1462–1510), a humanist author from Bohemia who studied in Italy (Bologna and Ferrara), developed a reputed library, traveled to Greece and the Holy Land, and also worked in Vienna and Hungary (hence his poems *Boemia ad Hungariam sororem*, *Comparatio Bohemiae et Pannoniae*, *Ecloga sive Idyllion Budae*, and so on).

Vaculínová's work is all in Latin and features a straightforward structure. The *Praefatio* offers a short biography of Hassensteinus, as well as discussions of the chronology, the titles (usually later inventions), and the humanist net-

work of the addressees of his poems. The description of the manuscripts (eight codices from the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries) and the editions is followed by the *stemmata codicum*, a statement on the editor's orthographic principles (*aspirationem omitimus... discrimina litterarum e/ae/oe, i/y non respiciamus...*, xxviii), a bibliography with a separate section on the library of Hassensteinus, and finally the *sigla* of the codices and the editions. The main text of *Hassensteinii opera poetica* numbers 1 to 504 poems of varying sizes, and the critical apparatus records the variant readings along with the textual references. The editor's *Commentarii* outline matters of textual and literary criticism as well as historical context (254–91). The *Initia carminum* and the *Index nominum* conclude the volume.

The meter of Hassensteinus' poetry is overwhelmingly distichs, with some Sapphic strophes. The occasional acrostics and telestics are highlighted by typesetting in the present edition. The textual references reveal the author's two types of approach: his classical erudition (Horace, Juvenal, Lucan, Lucretius, Martial, Ovid, Propertius, Seneca, Statius, Tibullus, Vergil) and his leanings towards later authors especially popular in the Middle Ages (Ausonius, Boethius, Claudian, *Disticha Catonis*). The first example of the combination of classical and Biblical influence is number 102 (*In fratrem religiosum*):

*Carmina Nasonis laudas cultumque Tibullum
 Lucanusque tibi Vergiliusque placent.
 Sed mallem Davidis cantus psalmique placerent
 et Salomonicae Musa pudica lyrae.
 Non bene nempe tuo concordat Naso cucullo
 detonsumque odit pulchra Corinna caput.*

The critical apparatus employs here MS Budapest, Hungarian National Library, Clmae. 367, fol. 216r (copied after 1522 and containing only two poems, numbers 72 and 102): while it has a variant reading *placet* for *placent* against the majority of the witnesses, it also has *Sed mallem* against the variant reading *mallem* of the edition of Thomas Mitis (*Farrago prima* 1562) which would transform the line into a spondaic hexameter. The apparatus records the classical antecedent of the epithet *cultumque Tibullum*—Ovid, *Amores* 1.15.28: *culte Tibulle*. The complete Ovidian distich (*Amores* 1.15.27–8: *Donec erunt ignes arcusque Cupidinis arma, / discentur numeri, culte Tibulle, tu*) suggests that Hassensteinus

evokes this Ovidian context by imitating the epithet. The editor's reference to Ovid, *Amores* 3.1.66 is not directly relevant; it should be corrected to 3.9.66 (*Aucāsiti numeros, culte Tibulle, pios*). To elucidate poem 102, the *Commentarii* at the end of the volume quote a letter of Hassensteinus from 1502: *ecclesiastici crebrius de nummis quam de caelo loquuntur saepiusque Nemesim et Laidem quam Christum in ore habent* (272). The combination of classical and Biblical influence is also apparent in poems 202–13 (*Disticha de duodecim apostolis*).

The second example reveals medieval influence on the humanistic author: as the following set of textual parallels indicates, poem 218 (*Salutatio Mariae Virginis*) is an inspired paraphrase of the antiphon *Salve regina*.

Salve regina

*Salve regina, mater misericordiae,
vita, dulcedo et spes nostra, salve.
Ad te clamamus exsules filii Hebrae,
ad te suspiramus gementes et flentes
in hac lacrimarum valle.
Eia ergo, advocata nostra, illos tuos
misericordes oculos ad nos converte
et Iesum, benedictum fructum ventris
tui,
nobis post hoc exsilium ostende.
O clemens, o pia, o dulcis virgo Maria.*

Salutatio Mariae Virginis

*O regina poli, cuius clementia summa est,
vitae dulcedo spesque salutis ave.
Ad te clamamus miserandis vocibus, Evae
eripe nos natos exsulis exilio!
Ad te cum gemitu, lacrimarum valle iacentes
suspiramus, ades, Virgo beata, tuus.
Ergo age, mortalis, genitrix, patrona catervae
luminaque ad populum verte benigna
tuum
et post exilium hoc faciem da cernere Christi,
o clemens, dulcis et pia Virgo, precor.*

The third example, finally, shall stand for what is the most significant aspect of the poetry of Hassensteinus: the classical tradition. A Sapphic strophe of poem 502 (*Ad Mercurium pro salvo conductu Ioannis ad Elysios campos*) runs like this:

*Haec tulit caelo via Scipiones,
hac laborabant rigidi Catones
hacque vivendo sapiens beate
Laelius ibat.*

The critical apparatus records the classical hendecasyllabic antecedent of the epithet *rigidi Catones* – Martial, *Epigrammata* 10.20.21: *Tunc me vel rigidi legant*

Catones. Overall, the above samples from the *Opera poetica* of Hassensteinus and their apparatus clearly demonstrate that Vaculínová's new critical edition is a welcome addition to textual scholarship on Humanistic Latin and the classical tradition in the Renaissance in Bohemia, Hungary, Central Europe, and beyond. Therefore, the present refreshment served by the *Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana* will hopefully delight more than just one type of Latinist scholars: the *rigidi Catones* of classical philology and the *Scipiones* of the classical tradition alike. (Elod Nemerkenyi, Central European University, Budapest)

◆ *Columbus' First Voyage: Latin Selections from Peter Martyr's De orbe novo*. Ed. by Constance P. Iacona and Edward V. George. Wauconda, IL: Bolchazy-Carducci Publishers, 2005. xv + 39 pp. \$20. This is an intermediate Latin text that offers unusual promise for the classroom. While the central place in any beginning Latin program must be occupied by the standard Roman authors, most readers of this journal will be open to the argument that judiciously used, Neo-Latin material can offer a useful supplement. Since good Latin in the Renaissance was understood to be classical Latin, the best writers expressed themselves in ways that are very hard to distinguish from Cicero and Virgil. Thus nothing, or next to nothing, is sacrificed in terms of grammar and style if a good Neo-Latin text is read, and something considerable can be gained if the subject matter is of interest to the students. That is what we have here.

Peter Martyr of Angleria (1457-1526) was an Italian in the service of the Spanish crown. He had a patron back in Italy, though, whom he had promised to keep abreast of his activities, and when Columbus returned with stories of what he had found on his voyages, Martyr began almost immediately to interview the travellers and prepare reports on what they said. Samuel Eliot Morison, the distinguished historian, describes *De orbe novo* as the earliest history of the 'new' world, although the full scope of what Columbus had found was not immediately understood.

Columbus has become a controversial figure, being both praised for his daring and courage and condemned for his role in starting the encounter between the Europeans and the indigenous peoples that had such disastrous consequence for the latter group. Martyr's text can be read against both interpretations. The background notes included by the editors refer the reader

to the other main sources for Columbus' first voyage: Columbus' own journal, abstracted by Fray Bartolomé de Las Casas; Columbus' 1493 letter announcing his discoveries; the biography of Columbus by his son Ferdinand; and Gonzalo Fernández de Oviedo's *Natural History of the West Indies*. Martyr's account does not always agree with what is found in these other sources, allowing for discussions of motive and historical method that can be fleshed out through reference to the bibliography at the end of the book.

Martyr's Latin style is much like that of Caesar's *Gallic Wars*, favoring spare simplicity over ornate embellishment, making it as easy to use in the intermediate-level classroom as Caesar. Each Latin extract is accompanied by vocabulary and notes, along with contextual explanations in English and engaging pictures. There are also a group of "auxiliary sentences" which convey Martyr's thought in somewhat easier form, allowing different teaching strategies depending on the level at which particular students are working.

For American students in particular, this book offers a chance to see how Latin maintained its relevance beyond the limits they typically imagine. It is one thing to say in general terms that people like Copernicus and Newton wrote in Latin; it's quite another to show them how Latin was the language that carried news of an event whose importance will be immediately obvious to them. I'm going to give this book a try in my intermediate Latin class. (Craig Kallendorf)

◆ *Pichiana: bibliografia delle edizioni e degli studi*. By Leonardo Quaquarelli and Zita Zanardi. Centro internazionale di cultura "Giovanni Pico della Mirandola," Studi pichiani, 10. Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 2005. 434 pp., 4 color plates, black and white figures. 45 euros. For the last seventy years Giovanni Pico della Mirandola (1463-94) has been the object of significant scholarly attention, especially from such major Florentine scholars as Alessandro Perosa, Cesare Vasoli, and Eugenio Garin and their students. Back in 1963, at a conference commemorating the five hundredth anniversary of Pico's birth, Paul Oskar Kristeller provided a "tentative list" of manuscripts and an inventory of printed editions divided into texts and studies. Kristeller's *Iter Italicum* moved the manuscript material to a definitive state, but as far as the printed books go, "tentative" still meant tentative, even when the compiler was Kristeller. Accordingly in 1994, the five hundredth anniversary of Pico's death, the Centro internazionale di cultura "Giovanni Pico della Mirandola" commissioned a

series of studies from younger scholars to provide a proper bibliography of the printed material. This book is that study.

The book is divided into four parts. The first two, “Le edizioni antiche di Giovanni e Giovan Francesco Pico” and “La bibliografia moderna di Giovanni Pico,” contain five essays that provide an overview and analysis of the material: L. Quaquarelli, “Gli incunaboli”; R. Campioni, “Le edizioni del XVI secolo in Emilia-Romagna”; Z. Zanardi, “Le edizioni del XVI secolo fuori dall’Emilia-Romagna”; Z. Zanardi, “Le edizioni del XVII e del XVIII secolo: la loro diffusione in Italia e nel mondo”; and L. Quaquarelli, “Le edizioni dell’Ottocento e del Novecento e gli studi.” The third section, “Catalogo,” contains an inventory of editions. The first 116, published between the fifteenth and the eighteenth centuries, are given a detailed treatment according to the principles of descriptive bibliography that govern older books, with a great deal of information about individual copies as well as exacting descriptions of ideal texts. Numbers 117 to 235 bis were printed in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and are treated in short-title format. The final section, “Bibliografia XIX e XX secolo,” presents books and articles about Pico, numbered continuously with the preceding section, from 236 to 999. The book concludes with four indices: “Indice cronologico,” “Indice dei tipografi,” “Indice dei possessori e delle provenienze,” and “Indice dei nomi.”

The decision to move from detailed to short title-format in describing the editions, with the nineteenth century as the dividing point, is certainly reasonable, but using continuous numbering across both the catalogue of editions and the bibliography of secondary materials is a bit curious, although in the end not confusing. It is particularly pleasing to note the presence of the essays in the first two sections. Bibliographies like this are invaluable sources for tracing the diffusion of important works in intellectual history, but the general practice is to do the bibliography and let someone else then use it to ‘tell the story’ of a particular author. Having both between the same covers is most valuable indeed and suggests a model that could be followed usefully by anyone thinking of doing a similar project for another author.

With the aid of the introductory essays, one can pick up several conclusions quickly. First, the *editio princeps*, although posthumous, exerted a great deal of influence on the later dissemination of the text. The *cinquecentine* in turn show that Giovanni and Giovan Francesco Pico exercised a significant im-

pact throughout sixteenth-century Europe, but disproportionately so in Emilia-Romagna. This effect continued, although in gradually diminishing power, through the next two centuries; striking is the existence of only one eighteenth-century edition. Pico's presence in anthologies, often with analogous passages from Savonarola, is interesting, as is the gradual introduction of critical works about Pico beginning in the nineteenth century.

More, of course, remains to be done in tracing the diffusion and influence of the ideas of Pico across the centuries. But thanks to the efforts of these two scholars, the bibliographical work on which such studies should rest is now available. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Alberto Pio da Carpi contro Erasmo da Rotterdam nell'età della Riforma*. Ed. Maria Antonietta Marogna. Pisa: Edizioni ETS, 2005. 118 pages + xvi plates. 13 euros. This book contains three essays by participants in an international meeting held in Carpi in May of 2002 on the occasion of the publication of Fabio Fomer's two volume work, *Ad Erasmi Roterodami expositulationem responsio accurata et paraenetica* (Firenze, 2002). This extended criticism of Erasmus's views had been prompted by a letter Erasmus wrote to Alberto Pio protesting the calumnies and charges which he had heard Alberto Pio was circulating in Rome about him. My review of this work appeared in the Fall-Winter 2004 issue of this journal (vol. 62). But Erasmus's letter and Alberto Pio's response by no means put an end to their controversy.

The first essay, "Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda: un umanista spagnolo difensore di Alberto Pio contro Erasmo," translated from the Spanish by Maria Marogna, is by Julián Solana Pujalte of the University of Córdoba. The posthumous publication in 1531 of Alberto Pio's second book criticizing Erasmus, written in 1526, *Tres et viginti libri in locos lucubrationum variarum D. Erasmi Roterodami, quos censet ab eo recognoscendos et retractandos*, prompted an extended response by Erasmus in his lengthily titled *Apologia adversus rhapsodias calumniosarum querimoniarum Alberti Pii quondam Carporum principis quem et senem et moribundum et ad quidvis potius axomodum homines quidam male auspizati ad hanc illiberalem fabulam agendam subornarunt*.

The deceased Alberto Pio's defense was taken up by his close friend and admirer, the Spanish humanist Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda, in his *Antapologia pro Alberto Pio in Erasmus Roterodannum*, published in 1532. Prof. Pujalte's paper contains a brief biography of Sepúlveda, a criticism of the strongest charges

of Erasmus against Alberto Pio, and a defense that Sepúlveda made of his patron and protector. The first part of the paper surveys his extensive literary works; of special interest to New World scholars is his dispute with Bartolomé de las Casas, the defender of the Indians against the abuses of the Spanish. Sepúlveda vigorously defended the justness of the Spanish wars against native Americans and authored several treatises on this subject.

Then, Pujalte takes up Erasmus' charge that Alberto Pio was not the author of works signed by him, but that they were produced in a sort of *fabbrica anti-erasmiana* (18) by priests in Paris or by scribes paid to do so. Erasmus leveled this charge in editions of his *Ciceronianus* and in the *Apologia adversus rhapsodies* ..., saying *Ne priorem quidem librum, quem ad me misit, scripserat suo Marte, tantum abest, ut credamus hoc opus ab ipso fuisse perfectum* (19, n. 35). Sepúlveda's defense of his mentor in his *Antapologia* ... emphasizes two facts: first, that anyone acquainted with Alberto Pio's education and career could never believe that he needed anyone to revise his works or to furnish him theological and biblical passages to bolster his writings. Second is the charge that Alberto Pio was not the author of works he published. Perhaps, Sepúlveda writes, this mistaken notion arose from the fact that Alberto Pio was ill and dictated his works to secretaries or from Erasmus's charge in the *Apologia* ... (18, 1-2) that many had helped Alberto Pio, among them and specifically, the good Spanish Latinist "Sepulvela." This, Sepúlveda explains, was impossible because at the time Alberto Pio was in Paris writing his *Tres et viginti libri* ... he, "Sepúlveda," was in Italy, not in Paris.

The second essay, "Dare corpo alla saggezza antica. Elementi figurativi e monumentali della ricezione di Erasmo," is by Silvana Seidel Menchi of the University of Pisa. While Alberto Pio was writing energetically against Erasmus, the latter's *Adagiorum Chiliades* were enjoying immense popularity in Italy and had achieved the status of a best seller. It was only a matter of time before this literary work began to influence not only literature, but the plastic arts as well. She discusses a statuary group by Agostino Busti with the title *Lacto lupum* and the literary background of the saying which goes back to the Palatine Anthology. In Ferrara, two palaces, one the Naselli-Crespi (ca. 1530-37) and the other the Contughi-Gulinelli (1542), are, in her words, "testimonianze monumentali della risonanza che l'enciclopedia paremiografica dell'umanista transalpino ebbe nel Ducato estense (32)." While there are twelve tablets with inscriptions on the Naselli palace, she devotes the most attention to discussing

four proverbs inscribed on plaques affixed on the façade of the Naselli palace traceable to the *Adagia*: *stateram ne transgradiaris, ignem gladio ne fodito, leonem ne tondeto*, and *umbram ne metiare*. On the Contughi-Gulinelli there are eight inscriptions from the *Adagia*, but only six preserve the original inscriptions which, according to Prof. Menchi, “... presentano iscrizioni nelle tre lingue canoniche del programma culturale, di conio umanistico-biblico, con il quale Erasmo si identificava: il latino, il greco, il ebraico.” Thus, from the *Adagia*, there are two Latin inscriptions on the façade of this palace, *serpentis oculus* and *lingua clavus*, two Greek, *domus amica, domus optima* and *aut ter sex aut ter tesserae*,” and two Hebrew, *harundines sub eodem tecto ne habeas*, and *malo acceptus stultus sapit*.

Prof. Menchi traces the influence on painting of two of Erasmus’ best-known proverbs, *occasione arripere* and *nosce tempus*, originating in Posidippus and Ausonius. The pictorialization of these concepts is traceable to antiquity’s visualization of *Kairos*, as a figure with winged feet, the front of his head with long hair, but bald in back, standing on a swiftly whirling orb. A painting by Girolamo da Carpi, now in Dresden, with the title “L’Occasione e il Pentimento” is directly inspired by this idea of *Kairos*. Prof. Menchi shifts the inspiration for this painting from the *De deis gentium libri sive syntagmata XVII* of Erasmus’ contemporary, the humanist Lilio Gregorio Giraldi, a long-held thesis established by Rudolf Wittkower in 1937, to Erasmus’ *Adagia*, saying “... la scoperta dell’attualità che le *Adagiorum Chiliades* avevano avuto per Girolamo da Carpi architetto negli anni immediatamente precedenti l’esecuzione del dipinto di Dresda ... pone la questione della sua fonte letteraria in una nuova luce e accredita la tesi della funzione ispiratrice del testo erasmiano (44).” Her essay closes with the statement that the surface has barely been scratched on this topic, viz., the influence of Erasmus on the visual and plastic art.

The third essay in this volume, “Nuovi documenti della polemica tra Alberto Pio et Erasmo da Rotterdam, e alcune lettere inedite,” is by Prof. Fabio Forner, now at the University of Verona. He states that the basic text for Alberto Pio’s “*Responsio accurata et paraenetica ...*” is the manuscript (fondo Falcò Pio, scatola 282, documento numero 6) in the Veneranda Biblioteca Ambrosiana of Milan. Nevertheless, portions of the manuscript have found their way into other collections, e.g., the Biblioteca Comunale Ariosteo in Ferrara, which has fascicles clearly belonging to the Ambrosian manuscript. Another manuscript, now in the Biblioteca Angelica in Rome

(folio 137, ms. 479), contains an extract from Alberto Pio's *Tres et viginti libri ...* contending that Erasmus had shown himself an ingrate to Aldus Manutius. Prof. Forner then describes the French translation of this work, a sumptuous parchment manuscript (Fr. 462) now in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris. An almost identical copy also exists in the Musée Condé at Chantilly. Prof. Forner also supports the thesis of Prof. Pujalte, discussed at the beginning of this review, that while the relationship between Alberto Pio and Sepúlveda was of the closest kind, and that while Sepúlveda had collaborated in the writing of Alberto Pio's first work against Erasmus and had expressed a desire to come to his mentor's assistance again (*Si Alpes non intercederent, crede mihi, iam ad te advolassem ...*, p. 56), there exists today no document to support the notion that there was any actual collaboration between the two in writing the *Tres et viginti libri...*

Prof. Forner concludes his essay with a word about the biography of Alberto Pio. He writes, "Come è stato più volte sottolineato, da Carlo Dionisotti *in primis*, una esaustiva opera monografica su Alberto Pio è ancora da scrivere." The *disiecta membra* of his voluminous, unpublished correspondence are scattered throughout libraries in Italy, France, Austria, and the United States. Some of his correspondence, however, has been published, and Prof. Forner lists the works in which these letters have appeared in Appendix 2, publications which include letters both from and to Alberto Pio. It would be difficult to imagine another scholar more qualified to undertake the formidable task of writing "una esaustiva opera monografica" about Alberto Pio or to edit the correspondence of Alberto Pio than Prof. Fabio Forner, and it is to be hoped that the lack of such editions reflects his own inner desire to undertake one or both of these tasks!

The volume also contains a preface by Brunetto Salvarani, an introduction by Anna Prandi, and brief but incisive "linee introduttive" in an essay "L'età della Riforma tra Erasmo e Lutero," by Giuseppe Campana, who has been director of the Centro Studi Religiosi della Fondazione San Carlo in Modena and has taught history and philosophy in the lycei of Carpi and Modena. (Albert R. Baca, California State University, Northridge)

◆ *The Correspondence of Wolfgang Capito, Volume 1: 1507-1523*. Ed. and trans. by Erika Rummel with the assistance of Milton Kooistra. Toronto, Buffalo, and London: University of Toronto Press, 2005. xlii + 285 pp. \$95.

Wolfgang Capito (1478-1541) is not well known today, but he was in fact one of the most important figures in Reformation Europe. First as a professor of theology in Basel, then as advisor to the Archbishop of Mainz, Capito remained Catholic until he received a position as a preacher in Strasbourg, at which point he joined the Protestants and worked for the next two decades with Martin Bucer in directing the reformation of that city. He wrote or contributed to more than forty books and pamphlets, in which his basic approach to theological matters becomes clear. After his conversion his humanism became tempered, with the classics firmly subordinated to confessional goals. By personality and belief, Capito was inclined to compromise. He eventually abandoned Catholicism for the Protestant cause, then left Luther for Zwingli, but he tended to express himself with an apologetic rather than a confrontational style and sought accord whenever possible. In the end he never fulfilled the promise he showed in the early years of the Reformation, in part because his age was more suited to the confrontational style he eschewed, but in part because a series of personal misfortunes and an involvement with marginal figures held him back. Nevertheless he played his part on the same stage as Erasmus, Karlstadt, and Oecolampadius (whose widow he married).

These relationships are illuminated most clearly by the letters he wrote to and received from men like Luther and Bucer, over seven hundred of which survive. There is, however, no complete collection of these letters, and this is the gap into which Rummel steps. About a third of Capito's letters are still in manuscript or printed in publications that were published before 1900 which are hard to find and which in most cases offer a text only without translation or background information. How to handle this situation is debatable. First, Rummel chose not to publish the Latin or German originals, but annotated translations into English. This is, of course, the same decision made by the Collected Works of Erasmus series, which is also published by the University of Toronto Press and with which Rummel has been intimately involved for much of her scholarly career. She has, however, gone back *ad fontes* in the best tradition of humanist scholarship, collecting the source material and transcribing the manuscript letters. I suspect that it would have been difficult to find a publisher willing to print several volumes of Latin and German letters, especially since the ones to and from Capito's most famous correspondents can usually be found in other modern editions. It would have been a shame for

this material to remain inaccessible, and here Rummel made a very good decision, to use the internet to make these documents available to those who need access to the originals <www.wolfgang-capito.com>. Her second choice, however, strikes me as less commendable. Rather than doing translations of all the letters, Rummel has published only the letters that were previously unidentified or unpublished, or that were published before 1900 or in venues of limited circulation. The others are listed and summarized in the appropriate place. This decision can certainly be defended, but what constitutes “limited circulation” is open to discussion; only readers with access to a very good research library will actually be able to find all the summarized material readily to hand, and even then there will be a lot of shuffling back and forth between volumes for anyone who wants to work seriously with Capito’s correspondence.

This is the first of three projected volumes. It breaks off at a logical point, at a time when Capito had clearly turned away from the Catholic church. Rummel is a well established, well respected scholar, and this book meets fully what the reader will expect from her, fluent translations with carefully prepared annotation and careful cross-reference. We should be grateful to her and her collaborator for making the works of this unduly neglected reformer accessible, and hopeful that the other two volumes will appear quickly. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Cœuvres complètes, Tome I: Basiorum liber et Odarum liber.* By Jean Second. Ed. and com. by Roland Guillot. Paris: Honoré Champion, 2005. The *Basiorum liber* of Johannes Secundus is among the most celebrated of all neo-Latin poetry today, not least because of the many imitators it found in vernacular literature. The text of this short collection and related materials focusing on the poems’ French reception take up the lion’s share of this edition, the first of five projected volumes of Secundus’ complete works, of which two have been published to date.

Fully one third of the volume is taken up with a compilation of sixteenth-century French-language imitations of the *Basia* by members of the Pléiade, and by the poets of the later generation which saw the ‘baiser’ genre descend into preciousness and ‘mignardise.’ The bulk of the introduction, too, focuses on the influence of Secundus on contemporary French vernacular love poetry. While this will be of great use to many scholars—indeed, there is material

enough there for a book-length study of its own—his choice seems injudicious for what is meant to be a critical edition of the poetry of Johannes Secundus. Of course, any analysis of the *Basia* cannot bracket off the text from the context of its reception, so influential has it been on love poetry traditions; but a balance must be struck. Another problem with this approach is that the *basium* came to take on the status of a genre of its own; and a direct line of influence from the Secundus text to the French ‘baisers’ cannot always be traced. This is further complicated by the fact that Secundus was certainly not the first neo-Latin author to write kiss poems—a fact acknowledged but downplayed by the editor: on p. 28 we find the telling admission that it is sometimes difficult to identify precisely the extent of Secundus’ influence on later poets, given the great proliferation of other models available to them.

The excessive attention paid to Secundus’ imitators leads generally to a back-to-front approach to the poems themselves. In the introduction there is some very suggestive analysis of Secundus’ poetry, but much of it is done *through* other texts. Too often the poems themselves are reduced to the status of ‘texte matriciel’ or ‘hypotexte.’ A reading of the poems ‘on their own terms’ is lacking. This is exemplified by a particularly unfortunate editorial mistake: a paragraph analysing the death-eroticism nexus in Secundus’ *Basia* on p. 16 is reproduced word for word on p. 33, but there the analysis is predicated of the *Baisers* of Belleau! If a reading is equally applicable to source text and imitation, the difference between the two is elided and the poetry itself is devalued.

The introduction, which numbers one hundred pages, is somewhat messy: the ordering of sections is confusing, with no general introduction, and the biographical note delayed until the end. The emphasis on the posterity of the *Basia* again makes it difficult to find a way into the text itself, and the reader must make an effort to glean nuggets of information on Secundus from various footnotes scattered throughout the text, before he is formally introduced.

The notes to the poems are brief, and the editor has taken the decision to confine his attentions to the sources Secundus imitates and to the later French imitations. Commentary on the poems themselves is lacking. The facing prose translation renders the sense of the Latin fairly well, but the notes might have offered more help with the stylistic intricacies that the translation necessarily misses. The notes to the *Odes* are fuller in places, for example in their

exploration of Secundus' *encomia* to Charles V and their models in Horatian paeans to Augustus; but elsewhere they are infuriatingly slight, for example to Ode XI.

The text of the poems, which is based on the 1541 Utrecht edition, is not without typographical errors, and the punctuation is not always clear. Certain errors are repeated: on p. 428 alone we find *paematum*, *paetae* (for *poematum*, *poetae*), and *ziminis* for *criminis*. The *index nominum*, bizarrely, eschews page numbers, as does the index of first lines.

While this volume will be helpful to those interested in Secundus' influence on French poetry, it is of less use to a broad academic audience, and many readers will prefer the inexpensive *Classiques en poche* edition of the *Basia*, which has just been published. (Paul White, Cambridge University)

◆ *Justus Lipsius. Politica. Six Books of Politics or Political Instruction*. Ed., with trans. and intro. by Jan Waszink. Bibliotheca Latinatis Novae. Assen: Royal van Gorcum, 2004. 94.50 euros. This is an important publication. Not only is this volume a helpful complement to other modern studies and editions of Justus Lipsius' *oeuvre*, such as the ongoing project of his correspondence (the *Iusti Lipsii epistolae*) or Jacqueline Lagrée's anthology of the humanist's Stoic tracts; but, above all, Jan Waszink's bilingual edition now makes more easily accessible a text which historians of early modern political thought have long deemed influential on the concept of practical statesmanship in the late sixteenth century and the seventeenth century.

Ever since Gerhard Oestreich underlined the relevance of the neo-Stoic movement for early modern political thought, Lipsius—the formidable editor of Tacitus and Seneca, and the author of a hugely successful dialogue *On Constancy*—has been gaining ground amongst critics as a political thinker. Indeed, the influence of Lipsius' *Politica* has now been detected in works emerging from such divergent contexts as Elizabethan deliberations on the fate of Ireland (most notably Sir William Herbert's *Croftus sive de Hibernia liber*) or the German juridico-political teachings of Johannes Althusius (Althusius [1557-1638]), whose *Politica methodice digesta* appeared in 1603. Be it through translations into French, Dutch, English, Spanish, Polish, and Italian or through the many Latin reprints, Lipsian ideas also filtered through to political tragedies such P. C. Hooft's *Henrik de Grôte* (a Dutch theatrical portrait of the French King, Henri IV) or German Baroque theatre of the late seventeenth century.

Thus, despite writing in Latin, Lipsius is now readily mentioned in the same breath as vernacular political writers such as Machiavelli or Jean Bodin. To undertake the preparation of a critical edition with English translation was therefore a timely initiative. However, it was also bound to be a thankless task, fraught with pitfalls.

The 839-page book under review opens with a substantial introduction presenting Lipsius and his work, in terms of reception, context, and interpretation. The actual Latin edition of the *Politicorum libri sex*, with facing English translation, then forms the core of the volume (223-709). Four appendices provide further documentation: they include (1) the text of various imprimaturs (“approbations,” Waszink calls them) as well as censorial reports preserved in the Vatican, (2) Lipsius’ *Notae* (722-82), (3) a set of disparate “observations on the structure and composition of the text,” and (4) a section with items of linguistic and typographical interest. A richly furnished bibliography and three indices close this fifth volume of the *Bibliotheca Latinitatis Novae*. The book as a whole thus testifies to an extensive body of knowledge and a great amount of legwork on the part of the editor and translator, who claims ownership of the *Politica* not just by bringing together printed and manuscript sources, but also by moving confidently between the various sections of his publication, thanks to an at-times-bewildering system of cross-references.

The Latin text of the *Politica* is clearly set out, reproducing the original double marginalia, and with italics and roman characters differentiating between Lipsius’ own words and the interlacing borrowed formulae. As for the latter, it is worth noting that Waszink prefers to emphasize their commonplace character, whereby “the longer lines and greater structures of the original disappear from sight altogether” (51-56, pp. 152-55 [here, p. 153]), rather than admit the loaded and often ambivalent intertextuality inherent in the building blocks of the *cento* (the genre is briefly considered on pp. 56, 58 and 59). Nonetheless, the identification, provided on the translation’s side, of Lipsius’ sources according to current reference conventions for classical texts will be a helpful tool for those modern scholars who do wish to pursue the matter of authorial intent and of closed *vs.* open readings of sixteenth-century texts.

It is worth drawing attention also to the fact that the Latin text here presented is based on the 1599 edition of the *Politica*, which Waszink describes as “the most developed authorised edition”; however, it is also an “expur-

gated” version, which was “entirely dominant ... in the seventeenth and eighteenth-century reception of the *Politica*” (193, and again 216) and thus “by far the most widely read” (216). Now, one could follow Waszink’s dismissal of the 1604 edition, the last edition to appear in Lipsius’ lifetime with his permission but apparently with little input on his part (despite the editor’s insistence elsewhere on the importance of variances in punctuation). However, it is also true that the changes in the editions of 1590 and subsequently 1596 (which the 1599 edition largely echoes) with regard to the first editions (Leiden, 1589, in 4° and in 8°) were mostly (though not totally) imposed by external, censorial pressure. So it could be argued that the text of 1589—which sprang from a context of social unrest—was actually more representative of Lipsius’ original thought; since it also seems to have been the basis of at least one French translation, as well as a Dutch and German translation (1590 and 1599, respectively) (198), this version may be considered more relevant to the study of *sixteenth-century* political thought as opposed to that of later eras, which reflect the further *Wirkung* of the text. Certainly, dedicated sixteenth-century specialists will pay special attention to the excisions of 1590 and 1596 (helpfully indicated with square brackets), whilst a summary list of “textual changes,” i.e., instances of significant rewriting, can be found on pp. 187-89.

The *Politica*’s translation into English tends to work adequately overall, and undoubtedly provides a useful crib to Lipsius’ Latin; given the length of the text and the rhetorical polish of Lipsius’ style, that is no mean feat. However, any translation has its flaws, and not everyone will consistently agree with Waszink’s lexical choices. For instance, Lipsius draws the reader’s attention to his preliminary presentation of the plan and objectives of his treatise by urging him *paullum in vestibulo hoc siste* (230). Here I would have preferred “[pause a little while] in this antechamber” to Waszink’s “[stop briefly] in this entrance-court,” since the latter solution conjures up too grand an image of exterior courtyards, whereas the former would have corresponded better to sixteenth-century rituals of politeness and (often delayed) admittance to important personages or spaces. These are minor quibbles, arguably more a matter of taste than of substance.

Nonetheless, and most importantly for a translation that is likely to become a standard work of reference, some baffling inconsistencies remain. It is a great pity, for example, that unlike the main text, Lipsius’ *Notae* to the *Politica*

or indeed the censors' reports have not been provided with a parallel translation. Similarly, as part of his liminary materials, Lipsius lists the sources of his quotations in an "Auctorum Syllabus" (254 ff.); yet apart from the short preamble the actual "List of Authors" (254, 256-58) is not translated. It would have been useful, and certainly coherent, if instead of being referred back to the Latin, the non-Latinist reader had been presented with the common vernacular equivalents for the Latin names of the listed authors, i.e., "Sallust," "Livy," and "Juvenal" instead of "C. Sallustius," "T. Livius," "Iuvenalis," and so on. Translating the entire list might have prevented the editor from claiming, in the first and third footnote to the list of less frequently cited Latin authors (256), that Cornelius Nepos does not feature in it, whereas in fact "Corn. Nepos" is listed in the third column on the same page.

Or take the title of the work itself, in which the expression *civilis doctrina* is rendered as "Political Instruction" on the cover, on the main title-page ([iii]), and at the head of the text itself ([223]). However, the same words in the same context become "political theory" at the head of each of the six books (261, 295, 347, 383, 535, 667). Cicero admittedly opposed the term *doctrina* to the notion of practical experience and concrete applications (*De or.* 1.48.208). Yet the choice of the English term "theory" as a substitute for "instruction" flies in the face of Waszink's introduction, in which he affirms that "in the time Lipsius wrote the *Politica*, Reason of State, concentrating on a ruler's prudence in actual practice, was closer to an antidote to political theory than a theory itself" (3). Moreover, by opting for the term *civilis*, Lipsius himself clearly proffered a Latin-based alternative (*civilis*, based on *cives*, citizen) for the Hellenic term *Politica* (based on *polis*, city, state, or *polites*, citizen)—as indeed the author himself explains in his *Notae* (722). I am not necessarily proposing that a modern translator who wishes to provide a text that is readily accessible to today's readers, transpose the title in some Latinate English or anglicized Latin form, as in William Jones's sixteenth-century translation, *Sixte bookees of politickees or civil doctrine, written in Latine by Iustus Lipsius* (1594) (which was "sometimes consulted to help clarify the Latin or for an English formulation" [218]). Nonetheless, this translation of what I would call Lipsius' *Lessons in statesmanship* will attract more cultural and intellectual historians than politicians amongst its readers, whilst the snares and snags of the early modern Latin political lexis are not served by a translator's undecidedness.

In some instances, interpretation and even accuracy may be at stake. Thus

the expression *de Republica universa* (230) refers not so much to “all forms of government” (the expression implies a collection of individual forms) as to “the entire system of government” or “the entire Common Weal.” The distinction between “all of” and “entire” is a fine one, but inherent in at least the Latin terminology of early modern treatises of political thought, whose legal (not to say, legalistic) underpinnings ought not to be underestimated.¹ Let us consider just one further example. At the beginning of the Second Book, Lipsius outlines, as is his wont, argumentative structures, before focussing on the item that is of immediate interest. Thus he declares, *Vita Civilis in Societate est: Societas in duabus rebus, Commercio et Imperio. Illud alterius* [in margine: *Nempe Moralis aut Oeconomica] argumenti est, hoc mei*. Waszink translates: “Civil life in a community is: to live in community of two things, trade and government. Now the first is of a different subject-matter [*in margine*: namely moral or economical], the last of mine (295).” This rendering does not do justice to the conceptual duality and grammatical parallelism of the original construction. Jones, for all his extrapolations and archaisms, has in this case understood the Latin better: “Ciuill life consisteth in *societie, societie* in two things, *Traffique*, and *Government*. The first, is the argument of an other discourse: the latter, the matter, and subject, I intreat of” (Jones, 16). It is clear that a modern English translation should have read along the following lines: “Civic life lies in (or: relies on) society; society relies on two things: commerce and government. The former belongs to a different sphere of discussion [namely the ethical or economical one], the latter pertains to my present topic.” Jones’s “traffique” is broader and less technical than Waszink’s “trade,” and therefore closer to Lipsius’ *commercium* as a concept of exchange, or interaction, as we find it in a contemporary reader of the *Politica*, Montaigne and his essay *Des Trois commerces*.

¹ See George Garnett’s discussions of the argument of the *Vindiciae, contra tyrannos*, which hinge on the distinction between *universitas* or *universi* (the corporation, or the corporate members of society) *vs.* the individuals (*singuli*). *Stephanus Junius Brutus, the Celt. Vindiciae, contra tyrannos: or, concerning the legitimate power of a prince over the people, and of the people over a prince*, ed. and trans. by George Garnett (Cambridge 1994), pp. xxxiii sqq. The translation was recently attacked, and then robustly defended: see Anne McLaren, ‘Re-thinking Republicanism: *Vindiciae, contra tyrannos* in Context,’ *The Historical Journal* 49,1 (2006): 23-52, and George Garnett, ‘Law in the *Vindiciae, contra tyrannos*: A Vindication,’ *The Historical Journal* 49,3 (2006): 877-91.

That a translator should be diffident of false cognates such as *commercium* / 'commerce' or *societas* / 'society' is in itself both understandable and commendable. However, such diffidence can also be misplaced, especially where the modern vernacular is derived from the Latin and where the *Oxford English Dictionary* (or comparable standard reference work) allows for the required meaning. In fact, Waszink does not hesitate to translate Lipsius' *pietas* now with "faith" (e.g., 263), now with "piety" (which *can* have negative connotations of hypocrisy and sanctimoniousness), because the Fleming himself excludes from his understanding of *pietas* (godliness, devotion) all notions of dutifulness towards the state.

In all, the translation, though useful, comes across as uneven, and at times rugged. Whilst acknowledging the "acute ... difficulties of interpretation" (218) presented by a text that is a patchwork of citations and allusions, one wonders whether the modern adage 'publish or perish' is to blame for the loss of this unique opportunity to provide a truly authoritative English version.

The sheer bulk and ambition of the project also leave it vulnerable, as Waszink attempts to serve too many masters. Why include a "Summary of the *Politica*" (205-13) when Lipsius provides an overview of the *Ordo et index librorum singillatim et capitum* (240-54, with translation)? It might in fact have been wiser to split the work over two volumes: a monograph dealing with the literary and political significance of the work, and a text edition of the *Politica*, alongside the *Notae*, and other *parerga* which are not included here, to wit: the *Adversus dialogistam* and *De una religione*. Such an arrangement would have done greater justice to Waszink's worthwhile re-evaluation of the extent and nature of Lipsius' corrections to his text (187). At the same time, it is no use crying over spilt milk. There is no doubt, after all, that a vigilant and assiduous reader may profitably have recourse to what Dr. Waszink does provide: a significant stepping-stone for further study and research on Lipsius and on early modern political thought. (Ingrid A. R. De Smet, University of Warwick)

◆ *Das Supplementum Lucani von Thomas May: Einleitung, Edition, Übersetzung, Kommentar.* By Birger Backhaus. Bochumer Altertumswissenschaftliches Colloquium, 65. Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag, 2005. 541 pp. 48.50 euros. One of the enduring curiosities of Neo-Latin literary life is the number of supplements to Latin authors that were produced during the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries. Probably the best known are the supplements to the *Aeneid* written by Pier Candido Decembrio (1419), Maffeo Vegio (1428), Jan van Foreest (1650), and C. S. Villanova (*ca.* 1697), all of which may now be read in modern critical editions, but many other Latin works were also ‘completed’: Livy, by Johannes Freinsheim (1649–60); Tacitus, by Sir Henry Savile (1649) and Justus Lipsius; Valerius Flaccus, by Giovanni Battista Pio (beg. 16th cent.); and Plautus, by Hermolaus Barbarus, Antonio Beccadelli, and Antonius Codrus, all in the fifteenth century.

Thomas May (1595–1650) approached Lucan’s *Pharsalia* from within this tradition. He began with a translation (1627), then moved to *A Continuation of Lucan’s Historical Poem till the death of Julius Caesar, by T. M.* (1630), then finished with *Supplementum Lucani, lib. vii* (1640). Until the beginning of the nineteenth century, the *Supplementum Lucani* enjoyed considerable popularity, going through fourteen separate editions, often as part of May’s edition of the *Pharsalia*. Somewhat unexpectedly, perhaps, May’s work on Lucan has been attracting considerable interest again in recent years. May was writing during a time of considerable political upheaval in England, when objections to the monarchy grew, leading to the Commonwealth of Cromwell and ultimately to the Restoration. Lucan’s poem referred to a period of similar change in Rome, with the possible parallels being as obvious to May and his contemporaries as they are to scholars of the twenty-first century who are interested in that period. Thus Lucan, and by extension May, have attracted the interest of such formidable scholars as David Quint (*Epic and Empire: Politics and Generic Form from Virgil to Milton*, New Haven 1993) and David Norbrook (*Writing the English Republic: Poetry, Rhetoric and Politics 1627–1660*, Cambridge 1999). The publication of Backhaus’s book, a revised version of his 2004/5 Bochum dissertation, is most timely indeed.

Backhaus presents a Latin text based on the last edition supervised by May himself (1646), along with a German translation, an extensive commentary (almost 300 pages, more than four times the length of May’s Latin text), and a substantive critical introduction. The commentary is devoted

primarily to historical background and verbal parallels, with the introduction providing a sensitive orientation to the poem as a whole. Backhaus argues against the political interpretation currently popular among Anglophone scholars, noting (correctly) that the *Supplementum*, which was dedicated to King Charles I, was completed twelve years before the outbreak of civil war and that in general May presents the murder of Caesar in negative terms. Backhaus argues that May, whose broad range of sources demonstrates his wide classical learning, was drawn primarily to the *Pharsalia* for philological reasons. There are obvious parallels with the work it was designed to complete, but the *Supplementum* is no slavish imitation: the number of books is oriented toward Silius, not Lucan, and the number of verses per book is halved; what is more, May differentiates himself from the *Pharsalia* in a variety of areas, ranging from vocabulary to the presentation of dreams and of pathos. One is left with the impression that May did not intend this to be the poem that Lucan would have written, but one he feels is a worthy alternative.

Not everyone will agree with all of Backhaus's conclusions—I suspect that the political parallels between ancient Rome and seventeenth-century England will remain tantalizing, even if the *Supplementum* is not read as a call to regicide—but this is the right moment indeed for a carefully prepared, readable edition of this particular Neo-Latin poem. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *De arte graphica* (Paris, 1668). By Charles-Alphonse Dufresnoy. Ed., trans., and com. by Christopher Allen, Yasmin Haskell, and Frances Muecke. *Travaux du Grand Siècle*, 24. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 2005. 560 pp. 158 CHF. I am embarrassed to admit that not only had I not read *De arte graphica* before, but I do not recall even having heard of it, and I suspect I am not alone among readers of this journal. As is so often the case with Neo-Latin literature, this situation would have been unforeseeable two hundred fifty years ago, when *De arte graphica* was “among the most universal of art theoretical texts in the eighteenth century” (7) and its author, Charles-Alphonse Dufresnoy (1611-68), was known to educated people across Europe. Its demise is undoubtedly due in part to the series of challenges to academic classicism which have shaped art history since romanticism, but in part as well to the fact that a major treatise on art was written in Latin at a time when mass facility in that language was beginning its long decline. Recovery has been

impeded by the fact that today, it is almost impossible to find a single scholar with the requisite expertise in art, didactic poetry, and the classics to do Dufresnoy's text justice. The three Australians who have produced this edition have found an imaginative solution to this problem, combining their expertise to rescue from an undeserved oblivion a key text in western intellectual history.

De arte graphica was intended to distill, in 549 Latin hexameters, the essence of the classicist doctrine that had evolved from Alberti's *De pictura* in 1435 to the artistic debates of the 1630s and 1640s. The poem was controversial at its point of origin, in that the author was a close friend of Pierre Mignard, who was a bitter rival of the head of the new Académie Royale de Peinture et de Sculpture, Charles Le Brun, and that Dufresnoy's editor and translator, Roger de Piles, was a critic of Academic teaching. The poem therefore picked up associations with theoretical anti-academicism which stand ironically at odds with its content, which is essentially conservative, resting in the authority of the ancients and upholding the modern tradition as exemplified by the Carracci and their school. Ancient sources include Vitruvius, Pliny, Aristotle's *Poetics*, Horace's *De arte poetica*, Cicero, and Quintilian; among the modern sources we find Alberti's *De pictura*, Vida's *De arte poetica*, Castiglione's *Cortegiano*, Vasari's *Vite*, and Dolce's *Aretino*. Dufresnoy was also familiar with what was going on in the art world of his own day, like the quarrel that had broken out in Rome in 1636 between Andrea Sacchi and Pietro da Cortona.

Its modern editors admit that "Dufresnoy's not-so-magnum opus is unlikely to win modern admirers for its strictly poetic qualities" (63); indeed, like much Neo-Latin poetry, it reads rather like a tissue of *sententiae* and brief observations on its topic, set out to be remembered. Yet it attracts, curiously. For one thing, as the controversy surrounding its birth suggests, *De arte graphica* presents an interesting tension between the traditionalist tendencies of school and academy and a subjectivist view of art that begins to move away from the Renaissance reliance on objectivism as presented through perspective to a sympathy for Venetian colorism that would be picked up again by the Impressionists. What is more, it has tended rather more than many texts to have become what a succession of readers have made of it. The first edition offered minimal help to the reader, and a series of editorial transformations and deformations have accompanied a poem that turns out to have been surprisingly protean. It was translated into French, English (by John Dryden, no less), German, Italian, and Dutch, then retranslated in these same languages

to meet changing taste.

One always hesitates to say that any book, however well prepared, offers the proverbial last word on its topic, but that may well be pretty much the case here. Dufresnoy's text is accompanied by a straightforward English translation; three introductory chapters on the author, the poem and its place in the didactic poetry tradition, and the reception of *De arte graphica*, almost two hundred pages of commentary, focused not on minutiae but on explicating the themes and topics raised in the text; six appendices, which include relevant documents and two French translations; and a bibliography of primary and secondary sources.

Hail, Dufresnoy *redivivus*! And thanks to the scholars who have raised him from the dead. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Johann Sieders Übersetzung des "Goldenen Esels" und die frühe deutschsprachige "Metamorphosen"-Rezeption. Ein Beitrag zur Wirkungsgeschichte von Apuleius' Roman.* By Birgit Plank. Frühe Neuzeit, 92. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2004. vii + 260 pp. 64 euros. The story of the reception of Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* (more commonly called the *Golden Ass*) is as varied and episodic as the plot of the novel itself. Plank's study (based on her dissertation) treats the interesting fortunes of the novel in Germany from the earliest translation (1500) to the end of the seventeenth century. Her work falls into three sections, which discuss the reception of the novel to 1500, the three versions of the German translation by Johann Sieder, and the later use of the *Golden Ass* in the fiction of several German authors, notably Grimmelshausen and Printz.

Plank's summary of the reception of the novel is short and depends mostly on secondary scholarship, some of which is long out of date. It contains some errors: e.g., that Boccaccio's manuscript was the first to combine Apuleius' literary and philosophical works (26 n. 29), and that Bussi dedicated the first edition to Cardinal Bessarion (31). But she does touch on the principal moments in Apuleius' reception from Macrobius to Beroaldo and presents the interesting claim that Fulgentius' allegory of the story of Psyche is based on Neo-Platonic ideas (22-25).

The heart of the study, however, is Plank's extremely valuable discussion of Sieder and his successors. Johann Sieder's translation of the *Golden Ass* is preserved in a manuscript now in Berlin (SB Ms. germ. fol. 1239), which was dedicated to the humanist bishop Johann von Dalberg. In 1538, after Sieder's

death, the translation was printed in a revised form by Alexander Weissenhorn in Augsburg, but this edition was based on a different manuscript from the one dedicated to Dalberg. (Plank deduces the existence of a second manuscript from the fact that the 1538 edition omits a long passage from Book 11 that had been inserted—apparently by the original scribe—as a supplement to Dalberg’s manuscript.) In 1605 the translation was printed again with further revisions, this time in Frankfurt.

Plank notes important differences among the three versions of Sieder’s translation. Sieder completed the work without benefit of Filippo Beroaldo’s commentary (Beroaldo’s work was printed in Bologna on 1 August 1500; Sieder’s dedication to Dalberg is dated 29 September 1500.) But Sieder did have before him Niklas von Wyle’s German translation of Poggio’s Latin translation of the *Onos* (*Ass*) of pseudo-Lucian. (Poggio’s translation was printed in Augsburg ca. 1477, von Wyle’s ca. 1478.) Like von Wyle, Sieder both provided a literal translation and treated the ass story as a satire. Sieder leaves places in his manuscript for illustrations, and this idea too may have come from von Wyle, whose translation included lively woodcuts. His interpretation (unlike Sieder’s) is overtly religious and Christian, but he also emphasizes the entertainment value of the novel. The translation simplifies Sieder’s original and smoothes out some of the complexities in both the content and style of Apuleius. The edition contains interesting woodcuts by two different artists: Hans Schäufelein and the unidentified monogrammist NH, whose illustrations are both superior to Schäufelein’s and somewhat earlier (74). The edition of 1605 emphasizes the sensational and marvellous elements in Apuleius and further simplifies the language.

Plank’s discussion of the three manifestations of Sieder’s translation is required reading for anyone interested in Apuleius in the vernacular. Given the fact that all three versions are extremely rare, however, I would like to have seen more extensive quotations, particularly from the prefaces of each. But a recent article on Sieder by Ralph Häfner does help fill the gap: “*Ein schönes Confitemini*. Johann Sieders Übersetzung von Apuleius’ Goldenen Esel: Die Berliner Handschrift Germ. Fol. 1239 aus dem Jahr 1500 und der erste Druck von 1538,” *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 125 (2003): 94-136. Häfner, whose article is an important complement to Plank’s book, prints the preface from Sieder’s manuscript and juxtaposes several key passages from Apuleius, Sieder, and the 1538 edition to show their differ-

ences.

In the last section of her book Plank argues that the *Golden Ass* is a picaresque novel whose qualities were first appreciated in Germany by Grimmelshausen and Printz. Their predecessors, she suggests, treated only separate aspects of the novel, using it in works that were comic, “historical” (and related to contemporary stories of demonic metamorphosis), or allegorical. This is an interesting discussion, but it does not seem very closely related to the central section on Sieder. The connection is in fact a negative one: Sieder and his redactors did not grasp the complex nuances of the novel, and it was left for Grimmelshausen and Printz to bring together the comic, “historical,” and allegorical elements. (Julia Haig Gaisser, Bryn Mawr College)

◆ *Latin Rhetoric and Education in the Middle Ages and Renaissance*. By James J. Murphy. Variorum Collected Studies Series, 827. Aldershot, Hampshire and Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Co., 2005. x + 334 pages. \$124.95. Rhetoric in Greece and Rome has been studied extensively for a long time, but the centuries after the fall of Rome have received much less attention. Only in the 1860s did the outlines of the medieval art of letter writing begin to take shape, with the arts of poetry coming into focus in the 1920s and the arts of preaching in the 1930s. A good survey of medieval rhetoric was published by Murphy himself in 1974, but much work remains to be done in this field. Murphy has also teamed up with Lawrence D. Green to begin the basic bibliographical work on Renaissance rhetoric, but their identification of some 3,770 titles simply confirms that a true survey is not likely to appear in the near future. Under these conditions, the best that can be hoped for is what this book offers: “a kind of mosaic which will provide the elements necessary to construct a history of a thousand years of language activity” (10), prepared by one of the few people qualified to offer it.

As is the case with all the volumes in Ashgate’s Variorum Collected Studies Series, the essays reprinted here have been previously published in a wide array of venues, which more than justifies gathering them together in one place. They fall into three groups. Under “The Middle Ages” we find “Western Rhetoric in the Middle Ages,” “The Rhetorical Lore of the *Boveris* in Byhrttferth’s *Manual*,” “The Teaching of Latin as a Second Language in the Twelfth Century,” “Two Medieval Textbooks in Debate,” “The Scholastic

Condemnation of Rhetoric in the Commentary of Giles of Rome on the *Rhetoric* of Aristotle,” “Dictamen as a Developed Genre: The Fourteenth-Century «Brevis doctrina dictaminis» of Ventura da Bergamo” (with David Thomson), “Quintilian’s Influence on the Teaching of Speaking and Writing in the Middle Ages and Renaissance,” “Poetry without Genre: The Metapoetics of the Middle Ages,” and “Rhetoric in Fourteenth-Century Oxford.” The next section contains three “Applications of Latin Rhetoric in Medieval English Literature”: “A New Look at Chaucer and the Rhetoricians,” “John Gower’s *Confessio Amantis* and the First Discussion of Rhetoric in the English Language,” and “Rhetoric and Dialectic in *The Owl and the Nightingale*.” The final section is devoted to “The Renaissance”: “One Thousand Neglected Authors: The Scope and Importance of Renaissance Rhetoric,” “Rhetoric in the Earliest Years of Printing, 1465-1500,” “Caxton’s Two Choices: ‘Modern’ and ‘Medieval’ Rhetoric in Traversagni’s *Nova rhetorica* and the Anonymous *Court of Sapience*,” “Ciceronian Influences in Latin Rhetorical Compendia of the Fifteenth Century,” “Raffaele Regio’s 1492 *Quaestio* Doubting Cicero’s Authorship of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. Introduction and Text” (with Michael Winterbottom), “The Double Revolution of the First Rhetorical Textbook Published in England: The *Margarita eloquentiae* of Gulielmus Traversagnus (1479),” “Antonio Nebrija in the European Rhetorical Tradition,” and “The Relation between Omer Talon’s *Institutiones Oratoriae* (1545) and the *Rhetorica* (1548) Attributed to Him.” (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Letters*. Vol. 1, Books 1-4. By Angelo Poliziano. Ed. and trans. by Shane Butler. The I Tatti Renaissance Library, 21. xiv + 362 pp. *Baiae*. By Giovanni Gioviano Pontano. Trans. by Rodney G. Dennis. The I Tatti Renaissance Library, 22. xxiv + 236 pp. *Platonic Theology*. Vol. 6, Books 17-18. By Marsilio Ficino. Trans. by Michael J. B. Allen, ed. by James Hankins, with William Bowen. viii + 415 pp. The I Tatti Renaissance Library, 23. Cambridge, Mass. and London: Harvard University Press, 2006. \$29.95 per volume. This group of texts, the 2006 offerings from the I Tatti Renaissance Library, brings one multi-volume set to a close, initiates another, and offers a freestanding volume of poetry.

The set being initiated presents the first of three planned volumes of the letters of Angelo Poliziano (1454-94), the great humanist scholar who formed one of the embellishments of the Medici court in the Renaissance. As Butler

notes, “even the reader inclined to acknowledge Poliziano’s genius detects something of smoke and mirrors behind the construction of his almost impossibly erudite and authoritative persona” (vii), and the letters offer what is probably the best opportunity to penetrate their author’s self-invention and self-presentation. Some of them were overtly public; others were ostensibly private but in fact crafted in the knowledge that they would be read by others, for it was through his correspondence that a Renaissance humanist defined his place in the *res publica litterarum*. The *editio princeps* appeared from the Aldine press in 1498, but comparison of this edition with manuscript versions of the letters shows how carefully Poliziano revised them, sometimes for content but more often for style, in preparation for publication. This being the case, there are good grounds for the decision Butler made to base his edition on the Aldine, rather than trying to integrate the letters found there with the others not included in this book, for this maintains the integrity of the collection as a collection.

The freestanding volume of poetry in this group is the *Baiae* of Giovanni Gioviano Pontano (1426 or 1429-1503). *Baiae* was the place on the Bay of Naples where “[p]leasure was available and stylish people misbehaved” (viii) in Roman times, so this was also the place that Pontano and his humanist friends went to recreate the ambience of Lesbia and Catullus. The poems treat of friendship, old age, and the variety of human relationships, and it is in this variety that the complexity of Pontano’s poetic persona, and life, appears. He is one of the great poets of married love whose *De amore coniugali* deals in affectionate detail with his wife, Ariane Sassone, to whom he was devoted, yet another collection, *Eridanus*, is devoted to his mistress Stella and another mistress, Focilla, passes through the pages of *Baiae*. The poems sing the pleasures of sex, often evoking Catullus, but they do so through allusions, quotations, references and *loci classica* that only a scholar could manage. These poems had a significant effect on the reception of Catullus in later ages, as Julia Gaisser has shown (*Catullus and His Renaissance Readers*, Oxford 1993, pp. 220-33), and they are well worth our attention now.

Vol. 6 of *Platonic Theology* brings this series to a close. Since the earlier volumes have been reviewed as they have come out in *NLN*, it will suffice here to mention again that this work, the *magnum opus* of Marsilio Ficino (1433-99), played a significant role in the Renaissance reception of Plato. Ficino’s Plato, however, was understood through the Neoplatonism of Plotinus and

Proclus, with an eye to reconciliation with Christianity. It was widely influential in its own day and deserves to be made accessible once again in ours. It is worth noting that this last volume contains comprehensive indexes that facilitate the use of the series.

All three of these volumes present the first-ever translation into English of the works they present. The series aims to extend the Loeb Classical Library into the Renaissance. As such it does not offer critical editions, but reliable texts accompanied by an English translation and supported with a minimal textual apparatus and enough notes to facilitate a first reading by an educated general audience. Thanks to the efforts of the indefatigable series editor, James Hankins, three or four volumes are appearing each year, so that at this point my collection is about to extend onto a second bookshelf. This is a significant accomplishment, and the editor and press are to be congratulated for their success. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Scientia in margine: études sur les marginalia dans les manuscrits scientifiques du Moyen Âge à la Renaissance*. Ed. by Danielle Jacquart and Charles Burnett. École pratique des hautes études, Sciences historiques et philologiques, 5, Hautes études médiévales et modernes, 88. Geneva: Libraire Droz, 2005. xii + 400 pp. 72 CHF. The essays in this volume were originally presented at a colloquium at the Warburg Institute entitled “Writing in the Margin: A Context for the Development of Scientific Ideas, from Late Antiquity to the Renaissance,” held on 20-21 April 2001. Marginalia in general have attracted a good deal of interest recently, from art historians to book historians, and the writing of glosses has been discussed in relation to literary, biblical, philosophical, and legal texts. The colloquium took place as part of this trend, but with an eye on filling a gap: discussion is limited to scientific and philosophical texts, and more particularly to annotators in the process of reacting to the contents of these texts, either as commentators, critics, or readers using the text as starting points for their own ideas. Marginalia tend to be the reader’s first reactions, unedited, often not repeated elsewhere, more personal than what finally makes its way into print and tied in turn to a broader field of experience.

The volume contains the following essays: Danielle Jacquart and Charles Burnett, “Avant-propos”; Brigitte Mondrain, “Traces et mémoire de la lecture des textes: les *marginalia* dans les manuscrits scientifiques byzantins”; Henri Hugonnard-Roche, “Scolies syriaques au *Peri Hermeneias* d’Aristote”; Marwan

Rashed, “Les *marginalia* d’Aréthas, Ibn-al-Tayyib et les dernières gloses alexandrines à l’*Organon*”; Emilie Savage-Smith, “Between Reader and Text: Some Medieval Arabic *Marginalia*”; Tony Lévy, “Le manuscrit hébreu Munich 36 et ses *marginalia*. un témoin de l’histoire textuelle des *Éléments* d’Euclide au Moyen Âge”; Wesley M. Stevens, “*Marginalia* in the Latin Euclid”; Anna Somfai, “The Brussels Gloss: A Tenth-Century Reading of the Geometrical and Arithmetical Passages of Calcidius’s Commentary (ca. 400 AD) to Plato’s *Timaeus*”; Irene Caiazza, “Mains célèbres dans les marges des *Commentarii in Somnium Scipionis* de Macrobe”; Marilyn Nicoud, “Les *marginalia* dans les manuscrits latins des *Diètes* d’Isaac Israëli conservés à Paris”; Dietrich Lohrmann, “Les marges dans les manuscrits d’ingénieurs”; Robert Goulding, “Polemic in the Margin: Henry Savile against Joseph Scaliger’s Quadrature of the Circle”; and Adolfo Tura, “Essai sur les *marginalia* en tant que pratique et documents.”

Chronologically the essays from the sixth to the sixteenth centuries, including material written in Syriac, Arabic, and Hebrew as well as Greek and Latin. In philological terms, the *marginalia* in the manuscripts considered here do not differentiate themselves very much from other glosses, although the calculations they carry perhaps offer an unusual temptation to the copyist to intervene and correct something that looks wrong and their illustrations invite completion as well. And like other *marginalia*, the ones considered here show a tension between the centripetal, integrating and exegetical, and the centrifugal, a looking to other texts that breaks down the structure of the text being commented on. Such *marginalia* can also carry *realia* that are of value, ranging from the names of copyists to records of past events. What is found in this volume is therefore tantalizing, a suggestion of what other scientific manuscripts can offer to those who wish to approach them in this manner. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *On Renaissance Commentaries*. Ed. by Marianne Pade. *Noctes neolatinae / Neolatin Texts and Studies*, 4. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 2005. 139 pp. 34.80 euros. This volume presents six articles based on papers given at the two-part special session “Renaissance Commentary” at the IANLS Congress held at Bonn in 2003. The aim of this session was to ask whether there is such a thing as a Renaissance commentary as distinct from a medieval commentary (as usual, the Renaissance is here being perceived as having a beginning which is more interesting and distinctive than its end).

The first two articles, by Robert W. Ulery, Jr., and Patricia Osmond, have had several incarnations; earlier versions were given not only at Bonn but at the Renaissance Society of America congress in Chicago in 2001, and both arise out of work undertaken for Ulery and Osmond's jointly-authored *Catalogus translationum et commentariorum* entry on Sallust, published in 2003. Ulery points out that the commentary on Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae* which is ascribed to the fifteenth-century humanist Omnibonus Leonicensus in an edition of 1500 is in fact extant in a thirteenth-century manuscript at Bern, and that the printed version shows no sign of reworking by Omnibonus. Having already made the first and more important of these points in print (*CTC* 8: 225-6), Ulery is here fleshing out his earlier work and providing it with documentary support, demonstrating that a medieval commentary really does not look very much like the work of a good fifteenth-century scholar. Osmond addresses another problematically attributed commentary on Sallust, published as by Lorenzo Valla in an edition of 1491, examining sixteenth-century discussions of its authenticity (cf. her remarks on this subject in *CTC* 8: 237), and asking on what criteria early modern philologists might see a commentary as part of, or to be excluded from, the canon of a great humanist: what, in other words, they saw as characteristic of Renaissance commentaries at their best. The fifth article in the collection, by Julia Haig Gaisser, considers the interface between printed commentary and spoken lecture in the Renaissance, giving a lively account of Filippo Beroaldo's pedagogical strategies in his commentary on the *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius by looking at "some of the ways in which Beroaldo brought Apuleius to life for his students and readers" and promoted himself into the bargain. It was also premiered in Chicago in 2001, and also includes material which has appeared in print elsewhere, being a substantially rewritten version of her contribution to the Festschrift for Michael Putnam *Being There Together* (2003), which itself reworked material from Gaisser's Presidential Address to the American Philological Association of 2001 (*TAPA* 131 (2001): 1-21, esp. 3-12). Some of its contents are therefore appearing in print in a third version here, having also been presented at three conferences.

Marianne Pade's contribution discusses the *Cornu copiae seu linguae latinae commentarii* of Niccolò Perotti, asking to what extent this vast work really is a commentary on Martial, and arguing interestingly for its status as indeed a commentary, but one which takes the ideal of reading a classical text in order "to acquire an active mastery over its linguistic and doctrinal universe" to an

extreme. Here the relationship between commentary, commonplace book, and reference work is being sketched out, and the boundaries of the commentary are being valuably questioned; Pade comments suggestively on the replacement of the *Cornu copiae* by Robert Estienne's *Latinae linguae thesaurus*, suggesting that the commentary and the dictionary may sometimes serve the same function. Johann Ramminger's discussion of Ermolao Barbaro's *Corollarium* to Dioscorides makes an argument which is the converse of Pade's, proposing that the mass of material in Barbaro's work which "contributes only incidentally to an understanding of Dioscorides" defines the *Corollarium* as not so much a commentary as "a work of humanist philology in the field of medicine." An appendix to this article presents a first-rate discussion of the words *commentarius*, *commentatio*, *commentum*, and *commentari* as used in the Latin of the late fifteenth century, a reminder of the fine work which Ramminger generously makes available online through the *Neulateinische Wortliste* at <www.neulatein.de>. The collection concludes with Craig Kallendorf's "Marginalia and the Rise of Early Modern Subjectivity," whose title should not deter readers who view accounts of the rise of subjectivity with suspicion: this is an argument for the *personal* quality of early modern readers' manuscript marginalia in their books, intended as a corrective to those accounts of the history of reading which have emphasized the functional impersonality of such material in the period, and enriched with fascinating examples, not all of them, it should be said, written in Latin or responding to neo-Latin texts.

Pade provides a minimal introduction (a pity, since an overview of the common ground shared by the six articles, and the points of tension or disagreement between them, would have been welcome), and *indices codicum* and *nominum*, the former excludes printed books with early modern annotations, and there is no general bibliography. But despite these editorial omissions, she has done neo-Latin studies a real service in making these excellent papers available as a separate, thematically unified volume rather than allowing them to be submerged in the large and tardily published body of the conference *Acta*. (John Considine, University of Alberta)

◆ *Centuriae Latinae II: Cent une figures humanistes de la Renaissance aux Lumières. A la mémoire de Marie-Madeleine de la Garanderie.* Ed. by Colette Nativel, with Catherine Magnien, Michel Magnien, Pierre Maréchaux, and Isabelle Pantin.

Travaux d'Humanisme et Renaissance, 414. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 2006. 864 pp. 220 CHF. In 1997 *Centuriae Latinae I* appeared, under the editorship of Colette Nativel. Ostensibly a *Festschrift* for Jacques Chomarat, the book consists not of the usual run of miscellaneous essays, but of 100 bio-bibliographical essays on prominent humanists. The venture was quite successful—in each case, the entry in *Centuriae Latinae I* is the most up-to-date starting place for someone who wants an orientation to a new scholar or a handy summary of editions and key secondary works—and the editor is to be commended for retaining the same format in a second volume. Unlike with many movies, in this case the sequel is every bit as good as the original.

The second hundred articles, with their authors, are: Domenico Defilippis, “Belisario Acquaviva”; Jean Irigoien, “Jérôme Aléandre”; Alejandro Coroleu, “Benito Arias Montano”; Pierre Maréchaux, “Claude Baduel”; Antoine Harmsen, “Caspar Barlaeus”; Étienne Wolff, “Caspar von Barth”; Emmanuel Bury, “Jean Baudoin”; Perrine Galand-Hallyn, “Nicolas Bérauld”; Jeanine De Landtsheer, “Johannes Bernartius”; Stéphane Garcia, “Mathias Bernegger”; Domenico Defilippis, “Flavio Biondo”; Sebastiano Valerio, “Giovanni Bernardino Bonifacio”; Michel Magnien, “Nicolas Bourbon”; Michel Magnien, “Jean de Boyssoné”; Jean-Claude Margolin, “Sébastien Brant”; Stephen Murphy, “Guillaume Briçonnet”; Max Engammare, “Martin Bucer”; Jan Papy, “Celio Calcagnini”; Johann Rammingner, “Domizio Calderini”; Jean-Louis Charlet, “Ambrogio Calepino”; André Godin, “Lambert Campester”; Jacob Schmutz, “Juan Caramuel Lobkowitz”; Guy Bedouelle, “Sébastien Castellion”; Hélène Cazes, “Florent Chrestien”; Jean-Pierre Massaut, “Josse Clichtove”; Germain Marchadour, “John Colet”; Jean-Frédéric Chevalier, “Gregorio Correr”; Pierre Laurens, “Richard Crashaw”; Wil G. Heesakkers-Kamerbeek, “Petrus Cunaeus”; Jean-François Maillard, “Pierre Danès”; Jean-Frédéric Chevalier, “Leonardo Dati”; Antonio Iurilli, “Antonio De Ferrariis, dit Galateo”; Jan Pendergrass, “Jean De Pins”; Olivier Millet, “Louis Des Masures”; René Hoven, “Jean Despautère”; Geneviève Demerson, “Joachim Du Bellay”; Hélène Cazes, “Charles Estienne”; Colette Demaizière, “Henri Estienne”; Chris L. Heesakkers, “Jacobus Eyndius”; Étienne Wolff, “Johann Albert Fabricius”; Alexandre Vanautgaerden, “Johann Froben”; Pierre Petitmengin, “Sigismundus Gelenius”; Antonio Iurilli, “Giacinto Gimma”; Jean-Louis Charlet, “Francesco Mario Grapaldo”; Philip Ford, “Gabriel Harvey”; Catherine Magnien, “Gentien Hervet”; Jan W. Bok, “Thomas

Hobbes”; Chris L. Heesakkers, “Lambertus Hortensius”; Dirk Sacré, “Sidronius Hosschius”; Frans R. E. Blom, “Constantin Huygens”; Jacob Schmutz, “Sebastián Izquierdo”; Alain Michel, “Jean de Salisbury”; Michel Simonin, “Michel de L’Hospital”; Colette Nativel, “Domenicus Lampsonius”; Pierre Lardet, “Louis Le Roy”; Marie-Élisabeth Boutroue, “Carl von Linnaeus”; Ann Moss, “Conrad Lycosthène”; Monique Mund-Dopchie, “Olaus Magnus”; Alain Legros, “Jean Maldonat, S.J.”; Marc Laureys, “Bartolomeo Marliano”; Toshinori Uetani, “Jean Martin”; Charles Béné, “Marc Marule de Split”; Isabelle Pantin, “Michael Marullus”; Jean-François Maillard, “Jean Mercier”; Chris L. Heesakkers, “Johannes Meursius”; Catherine Magnien, “Claude Mignault”; Jan W. Bok, “John Milton”; Jean Dupèbe, “Antoine Mizauld”; Philip Ford, “Camille de Morel”; Hugues Daussy, “Philippe Duplessis Mornay”; Juliette A. Groenland, “Johannes Murellius”; Jean-Frédéric Chevalier, “Albertino Mussato”; Jean-Louis Charlet, “Dionigi Nestore”; Alain Michel, “Agostino Nifo”; Cesare Vasoli, “Mario Nizolio”; Gilbert Tournoy, “Fulvio Orsini”; Jean-Claude Margolin, “Gui Patin”; Steve Farmer, “Jean-François Pic de la Mirandole”; Marc Laureys, “Stephanus Vinandus Pighius”; Jeanne Peiffer, “Willibald Pirckheimer”; Lionello Sozzi, “Iacopo Poggio Bracciolini”; Noëlle-Marie Egretier, “Reginald Pole”; Louis Holtz, “Giovanni Gioviano Pontano”; Hilaire Kallendorf, “Francisco de Quevedo y Villegas”; Jean Brunel, “Nicolas Rapin”; Ingrid De Smet, “Nicolas Rigault”; Alain-Philippe Segonds, “Christophe Rothmann”; Pierre Maréchaux, “Marcantonio Sabellico”; Georges Soubeille, “Jean Salmon Macrin”; James Hirstein, “Ioannes Sapidus”; Alejandro Coroleu, “Juan Ginès de Sepúlveda”; James Hirstein, “Jakob Spiegel”; Béatrice Charlet-Mesdjian, “Tito Vespasiano Strozzi”; Kees Meerhoff, “Omer Talon”; Michel-Pierre Lerner, “Bernardino Telesio”; Jeanine De Landsheer, “Laevinus Torrentius”; Jean-Louis Charlet, “Giovanni Tortelli”; Antonius Harmsen, “David Van Hoogstraten”; Craig Kallendorf, “Maffeo Vegio”; André Godin, “Jean Vitrier”; and Jan Papy, “Marcus Wēlser.”

A quick glance at this list suggests that we have a broad range of figures being treated, from first-tier scholars to the more marginal figures about whom it can be very difficult indeed to find information. The contributors come from all over western Europe and the U.S., and the entries are of uniformly high quality. De la Garanderie was an accomplished and much-loved scholar, and this book is a fitting tribute both to her scholarship and to the web of scholarly relationships she fostered. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

Proceedings of the Milton Society of America

Radisson Plaza-Warwick Hotel, Philadelphia
December 28, 2006

Secretary: A. C. Labriola, Dept. of English, Duquesne University,
Pittsburgh, PA 15282 (E mail: Labriola@duq.edu)

The officers and Executive Committee met in a preliminary session at 4:00 PM at the Radisson Plaza-Warwick Hotel. Present were Laura L. Knoppers (President), Paul Stevens (Vice President), Labriola (Secretary), Diana Treviño Benet (Treasurer) and the following members of the Executive Committee: Margaret Arnold, Mary Fenton, and Thomas Luxon. Excused were Gardner Campbell, Angelica Duran, and Gregory Machacek.

1. OFFICERS AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE. The following members of the society were nominated for offices: Paul Stevens for President; Kristin Pruitt for Vice President; and William Shullenberger and Nicholas von Maltzahn for three-year membership (2007-2009) on the Executive Committee, succeeding Gardner Campbell and Angelica Duran.

2. TREASURER'S REPORT. Benet indicated that the assets and net worth of the society as of July 1, 2006, were \$11,900.00. Benet and Labriola stressed the importance of donations and space advertisements as sources of revenue in order to stabilize the cost of the annual dinner at \$55.00. Benet will monitor the added revenues and report whether they are adequate to cover the mounting costs of the dinner and the increased expenses of printing the booklet, postage, and the like.

3. COMMITTEE ON SCHOLARLY AWARDS. All officers and members of the Executive Committee are urged to be in contact with Benet to nominate Miltonists to serve on the committee. The chair of the Committee on Scholarly Awards will be David Loewenstein.

4. SECRETARY'S REPORT. Labriola indicated that his announcements are printed on pages 7-10 of the annual booklet. He announced the names of

the members of the society who are recently deceased: Margaret Byard, Harrison T. Meserole, Kenneth Hovey, William B. Hunter, James D. Simmonds.

Labriola announced a new award that will be presented by the Milton Society of America: The John T. Shawcross Award. This award will recognize a distinguished edition, bibliography, reference work, or a distinguished chapter on Milton in a monograph that covers other authors or engages topics that bear on seventeenth-century England. He also stressed the importance of space advertisements in the annual booklet.

Thomas Luxon reported on Milton's Cottage, his recent visit there, and the importance of Miltonists becoming "Friends of Milton's Cottage." To that end, he distributed brochures that provided more detailed information.

5. OPEN MEETINGS AT MLA 2007 in Chicago. The following open meetings, each 75 minutes long, were approved:

- A. "John Milton: A General Session," with Paul Stevens presiding;
- B. "John Milton: Land, Space, Place," with Mary Fenton presiding;

NOTE THE FOLLOWING RULES FOR THE
ABOVE-MENTIONED MEETINGS:

A. The chairs should have a 1-page detailed proposal sent by e-mail not later than 15 March. Usually three papers are chosen, and the chair may appoint a respondent; or two longer papers may be selected, with or without a respondent; or a panel discussion might be organized. It is essential, however, to provide time for questions and comments by attendees.

B. The chairs must submit the names of participants, academic affiliations, and titles of presentations to Labriola no later than April 1st (Labriola@duq.edu).

C. Labriola will place an announcement concerning the open meetings in the upcoming *MLA Newsletter*; Benet will also include notice in her upcoming letter to all members; and the chairs of the open meetings are urged to publicize in other ways.

D. All presenters must be members of MLA. If not, they must join by April 1st unless their specialty is something other than language and literature, in which cases they must seek, through Labriola, special permission for their participation from the MLA Executive Director.

E. Chairs are encouraged to be in contact with each other to be sure that they are not considering duplicate papers and to call attention to papers that may seem more suitable for the other's open meeting.

6. The officers and Executive Committee deliberated on the possibility of a special program for the dinner and meeting in 2008, which is the 60th anniversary of the Milton Society (1948-2008) and the quartercentenary of Milton's birth (1608-2008). Options considered were the following: inviting a creative writer to be the principal speaker, inviting a panel of Honored Scholars of the society who would address in conversational manner the changing critical perspectives on Milton, inviting a speaker to recount the history of the Milton Society, preferably someone who attended the first meeting in 1948, inviting a speaker from outside the field of literary studies, perhaps someone in government, who would provide an innovative outlook on Milton.

Approximately 80 members and guests attended the dinner and meeting at which Knoppers presided.

1. The nominees for office (see item 1 above) were elected by acclamation.

2. Labriola announced the two open meetings at MLA 2007 (see item 5 above).

3. The James Holly Hanford Award for a distinguished book recognized the excellence of William Poole's *Milton and the Idea of the Fall* (Cambridge UP, 2005). The James Holly Hanford Award for a distinguished essay recognized the excellence of Joanna Picciotto's "Reforming the Garden: The Experimentalist Eden and *Paradise Lost*," *ELH*, 72.1 (Spring 2005), 23-78.

4. The Irene Samuel Memorial Award recognized the excellence of the following multi-author collection, *Milton's Legacy*, ed. Kristin A. Pruitt and Charles W. Durham (Susquehanna UP, 2005).

5. The featured address, "Late Milton: Nationalist or Patriot?" was given by David Loewenstein.

6. Thomas Corns, Professor of English & Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Teaching & Learning), University of Wales, Bangor, cited David Loewenstein, Marjorie and Lorin Tiefenthaler Professor of English, University of Wisconsin-Madison, as Honored Scholar 2006.

~~*~*

At the executive session after the general business meeting, the following were present: Stevens (President), Pruitt (Vice President), Labriola (Secretary), Benet (Treasurer), and the following members of the Executive Committee: Arnold, Fenton, and von Maltzahn.

1. Labriola and Benet were reappointed Secretary and Treasurer, respectively.

2. Benet was empowered to choose a site for the 2007 dinner and meeting in Chicago.

3. Robert T. Fallon was the nominee for Honored Scholar of 2007.