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*English Clandestine Satire* is the last of what Harold Love describes as his “trilogy” of studies investigating the circulation of textual materials in the latter part of the seventeenth century in England. In this last work, he concentrates on “lampoons” which contemporaries called “libels,” that is “satire written for circulation through means other than the licensed press, which is to say by oral recitation, manuscript transcription, or surreptitious printing ... [and arising] from poetic traditions independent of and often actively hostile to those fostered by the metropolitan book trade” (7). In this comprehensive guide to the world of scurrilous writing, produced during a period Love depicts as being characterized by an “enormous information vacuum” (2), lampoons not only helped to shape public knowledge but also to create a highly unreliable “news.”

He organizes his opening discussion of the lampoons by the sites where they were composed and circulated, namely the court, the town, and the state. The second part of the study is devoted to a consideration of the issues raised by the phenomenon, for example, attribution and authorship practices among a select group of identified lampoon writers, the lampoon’s relationship to oral traditions and to gossip, and the “poetics” of lampoon writing. The book concludes with an extremely valuable first-line index covering the main manuscript sources of the lampoons and the four volumes of *Poems on Affairs of State*.

Love grounds his study on the related premises that the “outburst” of clandestine satires produced during the Restoration was “in a real sense an outcome of the Stuart phenomenon and the particular vision of modernity that dynasty tried to impose” (15) and that “like Restoration comedy, the Restoration lampoon took several years to mature into a distinctive genre” (21). While he does cite Raylor’s study of mid-century satire and touches upon earlier satirists, in particular Sir John Suckling as a forerunner of the type, one would have appreciated a little more assistance in seeing what is peculiarly “Restoration” about the genre apart from its “characteristic viciousness” (23). Love theorizes more interestingly that the origin of the Restoration court lampoon, “insiders” writing for insiders, was in part intergenerational; the
new generation of courtiers collided with the older who had followed the fortunes of the court in exile, and in part the “endemic rivalry between the male court and the female ones” (42). From this highly personal if factional start, as the materials became read by those outside the immediate court circles, for example at the Inns of Court and the Universities, their nature changes, taking on a more national dimension. This shift in readership, Love argues, would lead into the “state” lampoons, in which the corruption of the monarchical system is attacked through targeting the court’s most prominent figures, in particular the court mistresses, and dealing with larger issues of nation, politics, and religion.

For Love, the town satire in contrast “speaks to a new social formation which was still in the process of fashioning its identity” (67) and he sees the lampoon writers, along with the dramatists, as “training its members in acceptable modes of deportment, and of articulating shared values” (68). Love’s discussion of the “town lampoon” owes much to his knowledge of Restoration drama. In these satires, the court becomes merely another site for spectacle and entertainment, but not necessarily for emulation in terms of style or fashion. As such, the town lampoon along with the “comedy of manners” are important agents in shaping the “new forms of sociability … that were to govern the lives of the newly reinforced leisure class of the metropolis” (98).

As Love notes, the classification of lampoons into court, town, and state is not clear cut, nor does he wish to claim a rigidly defined set of boundaries. The distinction instead serves to highlight the lampoon authors’ perspective on their targets and their imagined audiences. The most interesting chapters for this reader were those which considered the issues lampoon writing and transmission raises about authorship practices, both handwritten and printed, the genre’s relationship with gossip and its oral presentation, and the transmission and reception of the lampoons. These chapters raise numerous possibilities for future investigations and for rethinking how we understand an early modern period’s ways of shaping expectations about public behavior. Another key area for future development would be the participation of women in this process. Love points out that women were “so directly affected by the lampoon phenomenon, one would imagine they were eager to seize control of it, either directly or through male surrogates” (174), but apart from Aphra Behn, he apparently was unable to find or imagine where one would find
evidence that they did so, which certainly leaves open an inviting door for future studies of seventeenth-century women writers’ relationship to this particular genre and in particular, the literary culture of the women’s courts who supposedly provoked the genre.

*English Clandestine Satire* will be an invaluable tool for all students of the literary culture during the Restoration and late seventeenth century. It offers a remarkable amount of data collected by a master investigator over a lifetime devoted to the literature of the period. In its speculations about the social, sexual, and poetic values of those times as opposed to our own, it offers new perspectives on familiar authors and texts and at the same time highlights new ways of considering the significance of the sites of production and the modes of transmission as part of understanding the poetics of the text and the dynamics of the period.


Revisionist biographers must be master picklocks. Their impulse is discovery; finding new truths; and their tactics of detection must be bold, shrewd, and imaginative. Rectifying historical error and re-representing their subjects, biographers of this persuasion blow off the dust of centuries. They collect new evidence; they draw fresh inferences; and they (inconveniently) upend traditional views. Reliable revisionist biographers, those who delve with care and good judgment, reorder long-held opinions, and we are in their debt for the alterations they make in our perception of an individual life and the forces which shaped the character and the arc of that life.

Cometh the hour, cometh the man. Welcome, Anthony Adolph, who brings to seventeenth-century studies the first-ever biography of a principal, though unstudied and much maligned, Stuart statesman Henry Jermyn (c.1604/1605; d., 1684), first Earl of St Alban (investiture, 1672). Adolph’s biography was a short-list nominee for The Biographer’s Club Prize; and while the book is (oddly) a self-published venture, it valuably received close vetting and guidance by many distinguished specialists and peers named in the volume’s Ac-
Henry Jermyn (Germain), first Earl of St Alban (baptized 1605, died 1684).

Principal Stuart Statesman & Courtier.
Knight of the Garter Portrait (investiture, 1672) by Sir Peter Lely.
Kedleston Hall, Scarsdale Collection.
(Acquired with assistance from the National Heritage Memorial Fund and transferred to The National Trust, 1987.)

Photograph: Photographic Survey, Courtauld Institute.
With gracious permission.
Well up to the task, Adolph is a student of seventeenth-century history (training: Durham University and The Institute of Heraldry and Genealogical Studies, Canterbury) and also a professional writer, genealogist, and TV and radio broadcaster (see Adolph's website, referenced at the close of this review). His broad, interdisciplinary skills supplied several good lenses through which he examined a large, complex body of uncollected material on his subject.

Most students of Stuart court culture and seventeenth-century English political history are but vaguely familiar with Henry Jermyn. While they appreciate that he was a pervasive presence and faithful royalist during the administrations of Charles I and Charles II, the typical view is that of a man who achieved more than his wit and talent allowed. Adolph has done an important service for history by swiveling the focus altogether. He counters the vilified view of Jermyn with a substantial body of new facts and inferences which enable him to convincingly reconfigure (indeed, radically reconfigure) his subject's character and achievements. Adolph presents Jermyn as a capable, energetic personality, especially during Jermyn's glamorous youth at the first Caroline court, where he secured his reputation and status as the acknowledged favorite and confidant of Queen Henrietta Maria. In his black satin suit and white boots, Jermyn cut a stylish figure, and Van Dyck's portrait of a youthful Jermyn (62) captures something of his early vigor. But the man's singular talent, as Adolph shows over some 24 densely supported chapters, many with excellent images, was the courtly arts of intrigue and diplomacy. Adolph's Jermyn is a man of parts, and Jermyn's long résumé lists several critical roles during the turbulent seventeenth century: chief financial administrator and household steward to Queen Henrietta Maria; administrative principal during the long Stuart exile of the Queen's coterie (the Louvre group, mostly English Catholics); and after the Stuart restoration in 1660, Lord Chamberlain to Charles II, who assigned Jermyn (then into his sixth decade, nearly blind and crippled by gout) the sensitive task of opening negotiations with Louis XIV's ambassadors—talks which importantly led to the secret Treaty of Dover (May, 1670).

Yet, for all of Jermyn's contribution to domestic and foreign affairs, not to mention his devoted care of Queen Henrietta Maria, dating from about 1624 to her sad death in 1669, his reputation was nastily smeared by Puritan propagandists, by jealous court satirists, and by Clarendon, a principal antago-
nist. It fell to Andrew Marvell, in his scathing satire on the conduct of the Dutch Wars, *Last Instructions to a Painter* (September, 1667), to famously fix Jermyn in the historical record as a dissipated opportunist, gambler, and *roué* — a man who had outlived his usefulness in the boneyard of obsolete power brokers:

> Paint then *St Albans* full of soup and gold,
> The new court’s pattern, stallion of the old.
> Him neither wit nor courage did exalt,
> But Fortune chose him for her pleasure salt.
> Paint him with drayman’s shoulders, butcher’s mien,
> Member’d like mules, with elephantine chine.
> Well he the title of *St Alban’s* bore,
> For Bacon never studied nature more
> But age, allaying now that youthful heat,
> Fits him in France to play at cards and treat.
> (G. de F. Lord et al., eds., *Poems on Affairs of State*, 1 [1963], 100)

Marvell’s Jermyn is the pompous and unattractive subject in Lely’s garter portrait (1674), the man whom of ‘Harry’ Jermyn invariably became in his declining years. Sadly, this soiled and unjust image is the one that has remained, even amongst the publishers whom Anthony Adolph approached, evidently. And while C H Firth’s perfumery essay on Jermyn in the earlier *DNB* series (1891) is now justly superseded by Adolph’s, there is no denying that Henry Jermyn has taken quite a pasting over the centuries.

While never valorizing his subject, Adolph’s book on the life and times of Jermyn valuably balances the record: Adolph admits to his subject’s vagaries (his seduction and consequent indifference to the pregnant Lady Elizabeth Villiers was but one of many high-profile peccadillos), but Adolph foregrounds Jermyn’s political skills and his subject’s faithful assistance to the Stuart monarchy before and after 1660. Thankfully, this is not a modish psychobiography (Adolph is no ‘pathographer’, nor would his source-materials allow such latitude); this is a responsible repositioning of an important political figure in seventeenth-century English history, drawn mainly from a broad range of interdisciplinary sources. In his role as a responsible revisionist biographer, in this case, Adolph handsomely serves three masters, really: biography, history, and also genealogy; the book’s closing chapter includes three
pedigrees of Adolph’s own personal construction (262-267), representing
Jermyn’s paternal line, his maternal line, and the Bourbon-Stuart line which
played so large a part in Jermyn’s life and long career.

There are two facets of Jermyn’s biography which Adolph manages
with special care. First is Jermyn’s special relationship to Queen Henrietta
Maria, dating from the 1620s. Restoration gossips and memoirists, and espe-
cially Puritan scandalmongers, roundly asserted that Jermyn’s power and rise
to the nobility were not earned, but all the Queen’s doing; rumor also had it
that one of the great open secrets of the century was the quiet ‘marriage’, after
1649, between Henrietta Maria and Jermyn; and according to a tantalizing bit
of spin in Pepys, a child resulted from this union. Adolph confirms that this
long, affectionate union did in fact exist between the Queen and Jermyn
(morganatic marriages were not uncommon at this time, especially on the
Continent), but he deduces that theirs was very probably a “chaste, Platonic”
bond. Adolph does suggest, however, in a masterful essay in the Irish Genealo-
gist, volume 10, 1999, that Pepys’s throwaway comment on illegitimate issue
from this union, alongside other garbled versions of Pepys’s court gossip,
suggests at least Pepys’s suspicion of bastard issue from this union and also
that the child was quietly taken in and bred up by the Queen’s favorite lady-in-
waiting and adoptive daughter, Mary Villiers, later Stuart, Duchess of Rich-
mond (very probably the ‘Ephelia’ poetess); and furthermore that the child, as
Adolph puts it, may have ‘masqueraded’ as Mary Stuart, later Butler, Countess
of Arran (1651-1668), daughter of the Duchess of Richmond and her hus-
band, James (Stuart), Duke of Richmond. This view gains credibility in light
of the strenuous and successful attempts by the Duchess’s only living brother,
George Villiers, second Duke of Buckingham, to disinherit the Duchess’s
‘daughter’, an action entirely sensible had she not been legitimate issue of the
Villiers bloodline.

And then there is Jermyn’s little-known link to the English order of the
Freemasons, an association suggested by the activities and disposition of
Jermyn’s coterie, by Jermyn’s work in urban planning, by James Anderson’s
history of the Craft (Constitutions of the . . .Masons, compiled with the authority
of the Grand Lodge, London, 1723, 1738, 1746), and by Jermyn’s own
choice of title upon his elevation to the peerage in 1659: Earl of St Alban, St
Alban being the legendary founder of English masonry (180-187, with im-
ages; 256-259). It appears that Jermyn maintained a distinguished niche in the
London order of the Freemasons, rising to the elected administrative role of Patron and also Grand Master (1660-1666). The seventeenth-century English brotherhood of Freemasons was the Mensa group of its day: an elite and clandestine society of cultured and forward-looking individuals, whose agenda promoted Classical ideals in the trades (especially architecture), as well as tolerance, benevolence, and human improvement. Its distinguished (elected) membership included Sir Francis Bacon, Elias Ashmole, Sir John Denham, Sir Christopher Wren, Inigo Jones, Sir Robert Moray, George Villiers second Duke of Buckingham, Thomas (Savage) third Earl Rivers, Henry (Bennet) first Earl of Arlington, Charles II, et al. Jermyn’s work in Masonic circles is visible down to the present day in his principal achievement: the design of St James’s Square and surrounding streets, including Jermyn Street in London’s Westminster. As Adolph emphasizes, this was the first truly unified, residential square built on Classical lines in London, and it led to the growth of the West End of London, to the extent that Jermyn has justly been hailed ‘the Founder of the West End’. The extent to which Jermyn (familiarly, Jermyn the Great and “His Greatness,” 256) figures in the “J.G.” sequence in Female Poems …by Ephelia (London: William Downing for James Courtney, 1679; 8vo), we leave to the hungry hounds of literary history (of which this reviewer is one, and in the best of company).

Priced at a manageable £18, Adolph’s biography of Jermyn is an attractive and useful new product; it doubtless shall remain for some time the authoritative source on this consummate Stuart courtier and diplomat. Ol’ Harry Jermyn, dusted off and dignified at last.


(Book Orders: see Adolph’s website, linked at: http://www.genealogypro.com/anthonyadolph.html.)
Elizabeth Sauer, ed. *Milton and the Climates of Reading: Essays by Balachandra Rajan.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006. xii + 192 pp. $45.00. Review by JOHN MULRYAN, ST. BONAVENTURE UNIVERSITY.

This book contains nine essays by the celebrated Miltonist Balachandra Rajan, flanked by an introductory essay by the editor and an afterword by Joseph A. Wittreich, Jr. Through the selection of these essays from sixty years (1945-2005) of Rajan scholarship, “this book undertakes the daunting literary, cultural, and political work of developing a narrative of Milton criticism over the past sixty years” (3). This is the stated goal, but in fact *Milton and the Climates of Reading* focuses on Rajan’s “efforts at connecting Milton to our contemporary preoccupations” (4), most recently globalization and the war on terror.

Reading Rajan’s prose reminds me of a complaint registered by one of my philosophy teachers at college; he said that English majors had an unfair advantage in essay examinations, because they could write better than anyone else and teachers were so relieved to read an aesthetically pleasing essay that they assumed the arguments were sound. Rajan’s elegant style (marked by Ciceronian periods, metaphor, euphony, clarity, allusion, irony, and wit) is a delight to read; however, only those who have had the privilege of hearing him speak in person can fully appreciate what a marvelous instrument it is. At times the “Rajanic” voice almost drowns out the Miltonic, as critic vies with author for stylistic supremacy. While a number of these essays comment on the dialogic nature of Milton’s discourse, Rajan’s “answerable style” is an even more impressive response to Milton’s work than the dialogic structures within the poems themselves.

A case in point is the first essay, “Osiris and Urania.” Rajan plucks the myths of Osiris and Urania from the classical past and reshapes them as metaphors for the difficulty of Milton’s work and the divine inspiration essential to its completion. Just as Isis had to reassemble the dismembered parts of her brother-husband Osiris and make them into a coherent whole, so the poet must search through the fragments of reality to create a coherent synthesis of events and themes. “The spirit which brooded over the creation [Urania] must now be importuned to brood over what might otherwise be the chaos of the poem” (26). Thus “the Osirist principle of the search” is united with “the Urania principle of vision” (28).
The second essay, “The Poetics of Heresy,” focuses on the unique status of Milton’s *Paradise Lost* as both a secular poem and a commentary on the sacred text of the Bible. Thus in his “heretical” way, Milton engages in a dialogue with his readers that reshapes both author and poem. “Indisputably, the poet writes the poem but major poems sometimes rewrite their authors … Milton’s poem is written for a contemporary audience in a language as universal as possible, in the sense that it is accessible to more than one reading of the primary and initiating text” (43).

The third essay, “Surprised by a Strange Language: Defamiliarizing *Paradise Lost*,” alludes to Samuel Johnson’s warning that the reader, on first encountering *Paradise Lost*, will be confronted with a new language. But it also focuses on the dialogic nature of the poem (cf. Mikhail Bakhtin, Julia Kristeva), a structure that opens up the poem to a variety of interpretations, but also threatens its stability: “If the poem’s propositional nucleus is potentially dialogic and if its central engagement of primary genres as well as its only human relationship is also subject to dialogic stresses, we are looking at a work that is much more open, much more the chronicle of its own self-making than previous readings of it tend to suggest. We are also looking at a troubled poem…” (62). The fissure that creates this distress is the one that forms between the competing genres of epic and drama, creating a tension that threatens to split the poem apart.

The fourth essay, “Milton Encompassed,” wittily explores the tension between received wisdom and new ideas in “the Milton community” through the metaphor of the compass: “The fixed foot of the compass stabilises the world of Milton scholarship while the errant foot takes what is possible into that world’s circumference” (65).

Essays five (“Banyan Trees and Fig Leaves: Some Thoughts on Milton’s India”) and six (“The Imperial Temptation”) explore Milton’s uneasy relationship to imperialism. “Banyan Trees” refutes the myth that commerce can be separated from imperialism, while also establishing that not even Milton himself could distinguish “the sanctified from the demonic uses of imperialism” (76). “The Imperial Temptation” points up the irony that anti-imperial Milton is himself the author of the most imperialistic poem in the canon: “Despite his safeguarding manoeuvres, Milton contributes considerably to the mainstream of imperial discourse…. But the epic voice in *Paradise Lost* is also the voice of the imperial imagination, of sumptuous orchestration, of
metaphorical opulence, the encyclopaedic, outreaching, all-encompassing voice, the voice of the unifying imperative. No one articulates this voice more resplendently than Milton; and no one struggles against it more insistently” (102, 108). He experiences similar difficulties in *Paradise Regained*. While he succeeds in “reducing Satan to a salesman of empire,” and “exposes the gaudiness of empire,” “he does not quite succeed in exposing its emptiness” (108).

The seventh essay, “The Two Creations: *Paradise Lost* and the *Treatise on Christian Doctrine*,” is perhaps the weakest in the collection. Rajan makes an excellent point when he observes that critics who focus on the radical differences between *The Christian Doctrine* and *Paradise Lost* are not permitting the author to “differ from himself,” but this is based on the assumption that Milton is the author of both works, even though Rajan acknowledges that this might not be the case: “It is possible that the *Treatise* was not written by Milton or that not all of it was fully rewritten by Milton. . . . Skills worthy of Miltonists are displayed in this exercise but the display helps us to avoid examining the extent of an author’s entitlement to differ from himself” (119).

The eighth essay, “Milton and Camões: Reinventing the Old Man,” is equally speculative. Here Rajan returns to the theme of imperialism and post-colonialism. There is sufficient evidence to suggest that Milton read the Portuguese Camões’ epic *The Lusiads* (at least in English translation); Rajan hopes that this is so because *The Lusiads* is a secular epic that clearly equates commercial and imperial interests. Where other epics catalog heroes, *The Lusiads* catalogs spices! The “Old Man” referred to in the title of the essay functions as a “countervoices” to Camões’ poem, “arguing that the epic should not be written at all” (129). Here Rajan touches on his own roots as a native Indian whose country was occupied and degraded by commercial imperialists from the West. In a sentence that bears repetition, he notes that in our time so-called objectivity must give way to advocacy: “We can no longer leave our ideologies in the cloakroom as we enter the literary seminar” (125).

The final essay, “Warfaring and Wayfaring,” takes up a “textual crux” (138-39); whether (in *Areopagitica*) the person who turns away from vice and toward the good is a “true wayfaring” or a “true warfaring Christian.” The original text has “wayfaring”; many later texts have been corrected (manually) to “warfaring.” Since *Areopagitica* is a combative text, “warfaring” would appear to be the correct reading, but, as Milton observes, good and evil tend
to collapse into each other, leaving a “wayfaring” rather than a “warfaring” Christian to deal with the collapse of such easy binaries: “Good and evil then elide into truth and error, and error can be treated as a wandering from the truth or more philosophically, as truth’s insufficient presence. Warfaring slips into wayfaring” (144).

In sum, Rajan is suspicious of Miltonists who offer simple responses to complex problems. Wittreich says it best when he contrasts the subtle, nuanced approach of Rajan with the more simplistic assertions of earlier critics: “Rajan displaces the certainties of [C. S.] Lewis, [Douglas] Bush, and [A. J. A.] Waldock with a hermeneutic of suspicion, one of whose initial objectives is to contradict Milton and his critics out of their contradictions” (“Afterword: His More Attentive Mind,” (155). Finally, I am pleased to report that this collection does not mark the terminus of Rajan’s career; as recently as March 2007 he has been pleased to enlighten us on how “Samson Hath Quit Himself / Like Samson” in a seminal article that appeared in *Milton Quarterly*.


This book vibrantly sets before us nine engaging and informed articles by leading scholars of John Milton in tribute to Stanley Fish, one of “our most provocative, as well as most eloquent, of critics” (ix), and closes with a tenth by the honoree himself. The title is curious—“The Age of Fish” flashes forth the grand elevation usually reserved for volumes on Milton himself, or for other preeminent figures in literature or history (e.g. “The Age of Shakespeare,” “The Age of Elizabeth”). But though the editors remain silent in the Preface as to their choice of words, there is no mistaking the affection and admiration they mean to convey about this “most eloquent” writer and thinker. The Introduction sets the tone and is by Lana Cable who recalls her former student days under Fish’s “analytic and persuasive genius” as he inflamed her classmates to follow his brilliant lead in “the pursuit-of-truth-enterprise” (4). As one would expect in a tribute volume, the essays are varied: half spotlight Milton’s view of himself as author or are examinations of what influenced
him to the style and manner of presentation in his poetry and prose; the other half feature Milton as seen by Fish. Four highlight *Samson Agonistes* and the charge, brought by John Carey after the attack on the World Trade Towers in September 2001, that both Milton and Fish endorse terrorism.

In the first section of the book, called "Authorship and Authority," there are three essays by Marshall Grossman, Barbara Lewalski, and Annabel Patterson. Grossman’s "The Onomastic Destiny of Stanley Fish," is a largely psychological work that intends to be "funny" yet "nontrivial" as it seeks "to say something celebratory about the remarkable intellectual itinerary of Stanley Fish" (28). It begins with a fishing epigram Grossman has borrowed from Bunyan’s "Apology for a Book"—"You see the ways the Fisher-man doth take / To catch the Fish," a passage Fish quotes in *Surprised by Sin*—and, playing on the homophones Fish and fish, proceeds to suggest that Fish, by his very name, was almost fated to fish out meaning and fish for readers, just as Milton hooked Fish himself (30). The essay is far too complexly organized to summarize fully or fairly and so this one example from Bunyan will have to be suggestive. From outset to finish Grossman deluges the reader in an onomastic blizzard, a snowfall of names and technical terms, some familiar, some obscure, which he lets fall from the various fields of psychology, philosophy, literary theory, novels and movies. Freud and Lacan provide the theoretical basis for his discursive, probing, analysis of the person he calls "the character Fish bespoken in a public discourse" (40). How the author Fish (not the private and actual person of that name) has revealed and identified himself as a "Miltonist" is what occupies Grossman's thinking. And that thinking unfortunately reveals in setting itself forth in cloudy mazes of syntax uncoiling in locutions such as these not atypical examples: "mobility of emotion is facilitated when disparate chains of signifiers are imbricated so that associated feelings may jump from an unconscious chain of signifiers to another, conscious one, the links of which are similarly configured" (41-42); "When through metaphor or metonymy a material sign is made the signifier of an unnamed other, the resulting compound sign is subject to two sets of associations that may be made on the basis of the signified and on the level of the signifier" (43). Humor and clarity suffer when theoretical lingo and an overly complex sentence structure take control, as they do here.
The essays by Levalski and Patterson do not deal directly with Fish, but instead look closely at Milton's manner of thinking about authorship. Levalski's "Milton's Idea of Authorship" commandingly surveys much of his prose and poetry in proof of her assertion that Milton always kept in mind a "rhetorical theory appropriate to worthy authors" (54). He believed an author is a reformer of "society and its culture" (60), and its guide to "moral and political knowledge, virtue, and inner freedom" (62). An author's life was to be independent of patronage, either from the state or the church, and was to be the ground out of which the works sprang: "In Apology for Smectymnuus he insists in all seriousness that the high poet can only make his poem out of his own wide experience and the values and virtues he has cultivated within himself" (64). Even the Bible is not to be a final arbiter of belief or authority greater than the author himself. Milton only allowed its determination of his thoughts and actions in so far as Scripture was to be judged worthy by Milton's own subjective inner authority, his sense of "charity" (70).

Patterson's "Milton's Negativity" emphasizes Milton's stylistic and psychological habit of putting "his most important positives [...] in negative form" (81), a habit accentuated in his later writings and poetry by two things, his steeping in negative Latinate diction and his blindness. As Levalski has done, Patterson impressively surveys much of Milton's prose and poetry to develop her thesis. Milton's meticulous attention to negative form helps him not only to deny certain things but also to emphasize, to bring out, to compel attention to positive ideas. They also work to describe the indescribable, as happens with the Father in Paradise Lost who is immutable, immortal, infinite (94). Patterson herself works confidently in the negatives of Milton's Latin. In one of the many lessons taken from her study, she neatly denies a theory of early composition for Art of Logic (1672) which rests on the notion that it is too complexly organized to have been written when Milton was blind, but must have been the work of a sighted Milton during the 1640s. Milton, she counters, was doing the same complex writing in his Pro Populo Anglicano Defensio Secunda (1651), a work filled with Latin privatives and composed after he was entirely blind (87-88).

There are four papers by Albert Labriola, Stella Revard, Joan Bennett, and Joseph Wittreich in the second division called, "Text and Context." Labriola's is a unique and curious theological paper, "The Son as an Angel in Paradise Lost"—unique because it is almost alone in its view, and curious because
of its twists on conventional theology concerning the Son. As analogue for his discussion of the Son as an angel, Labriola offers the pseudepigraphal work The Martyrdom and Ascension of Isaiah, a work he does not establish Milton as having read but which he offers for its striking parallels to what he believes is happening to the Son in Paradise Lost. The Son is both deity and angel in the epic, a being Labriola calls the “christological angel or theangelos” (112). The Martyrdom exhibits the Son descending through various orders of angels on his way to the incarnation, and as he goes taking on each station’s less glorious essence until he becomes a man on earth. With this notion as his guide, Labriola sees something of the same kind going on in the epic: the Son begins as deity concealed within the brightness of the Father and thus beyond the angels’ knowledge. His deity, however, is not co-extensive with that of the Father: “the Father endowed the Son with divine nature akin to, but not the same as, his own” (106). This, Labriola says, is the first of three literal begettings and takes place sometime before the action of the poem. But once the Son is presented openly to the angels, he is himself angelic: “The Son appears in the epic only and always in the form and nature and with the features of an angel” and is “the means by which his ontological relationship with the Father is clarified” (106). This is the second begetting. The third is his appearance to Adam and Eve in the Garden, but Labriola does not cover this. One would expect Labriola to conclude from his angelic assertions that the Son in Milton’s theology is unorthodox and that his Trinity is defective. But he does not. “My argument concerning the Son’s status as a divine person is not situated in the context of ongoing commentary on Milton’s orthodox trinitarianism, Arianism, or subordinationism” (274, n.2). His concern, he asserts, is to explain how the Son is an angel and how this state is parallel to that in the Martyrdom and Ascension of Isaiah. Labriola’s accounting for the mystery of the Son is insightful insofar as it offers the possibility of the Son’s having been hidden but existent prior to his day of presentation, but it needs further development along the lines he presently avoids entering, and one hopes that he will undertake that task.

Revard’s fascinating thesis in “Milton and Henry More: The Chariot of Paternal Deity in Paradise Lost, Book 6” is that “Milton’s Son goes forth to claim his kingdom, and the manner in which the chariot is described makes it clear that it is his millennial kingdom he is establishing” (135). The impetus for Milton’s treatment derives from both Ezekiel and Revelation ultimately but
was mediated by his study of the Kabbalah, an interest he had in common with Henry More (in his *Divine Dialogues*, 1668). Though the two men likely were acquainted, they “pursued their kabbalistic studies independent of one another” (124).

“Mary Astell, Lucy Hutchinson, John Milton, and Feminist Liberation Theology” is Bennett’s renewed defense of Milton against the old simplistic charge of secular feminists that he was a misogynist, a charge addressed and overturned in the 1980s by Diane McColley. Bennett’s new path to a feminist reading of Milton is theological rather than merely secular. “Feminist liberation theology exercises a hermeneutics that can open texts like Milton’s, as it opens the Bible, to the needs of a feminism that wants women to exercise agency [...] as builders of a society that frees the full potential contribution of each member—female and male—to the whole” (152). The women she highlights are different in religious views and politics, yet both exhibit a feminism working within the establishment orthodoxy centered on male superiority. Astell is Episcopalian and a deplorer of Dissent, whereas Hutchinson is a Dissenter. Using insights on the freedom both women represent, and the insights gained from a modern feminist theologian, Elisabeth Schussler Fiorenza, Bennett discusses *Paradise Lost* 10.145-56, the Son’s charge to Adam concerning his role as governor of Eve. She says that Milton, a dissenter, found abhorrent “Charles I’s submission to his queen [and] Charles II’s to his mistress.” Such is the context for properly taking what the Son says to Adam in judging “Adam’s fall as the failure of a governor” when he submitted to Eve. For if we mistakenly take the Son’s words “with a strictness of literal interpreting, God’s words to Adam would place a great and sad oppression on many women” (160). Perhaps they would, but to see things this way, Bennett surely exaggerates the sense of oppression by men that most women of the seventeenth-century would likely have felt. And to arrive at her defense of Milton against the charge of being a misogynist, Bennett must minimize the literal reading of both Genesis and Milton, and must ignore or minimize the strictures of his own time (and likely his own mind) regarding the subordinate position of women in the home and society.

Stanley Fish “is arguably the most influential of Milton’s living critics” (168), states Joseph Wittreich in “‘The Ramifications of those Ramifications’: Compounding Contexts for *Samson Agonistes*.” Beginning with the charge made by John Leonard that Fish’s *How Milton Works* ignores contexts, par-
Particularly religious and literary, Wittreich’s essay is a declaration to the contrary, that Fish works in these areas “cunningly,” and never loses either the aesthetics or the theology of Milton’s craft. “Milton’s rebellious writings find their counterpart in Fish’s provocative readings” (168). Wittreich, working in the vein of modern revisionist criticism, seeks to expand the appreciation and understanding of Samson by taking into account the reception of the work and its multiple contexts, both modern and of Milton’s day, that complicate any straight line interpretation that travels from the Bible to Milton. Thus Wittreich upholds the ambiguity Leonard (and others) seemingly deplore. He stresses this ambiguity at the very outset when he declares of Milton criticism that it “is progressively taking direction from contexts compounding, steadily shifting, multiplying in number, and often eliding with one another” (167).

Instead of the old way of asking what influence the Bible had on Milton, Wittreich asks us to reverse this to “consider, alternatively, Milton’s influence on the Bible,” that is his influence on Biblical criticism written subsequent to Samson and the epics. He surveys many literary and religious commentators, mostly of the nineteenth century to show forth a “new hermeneutic” (182), one which goes beyond the Bible to reveal a “Samson ambiguous, even defective, in his heroism” (185). The weakness in Wittreich’s preference for the new hermeneutic is that it is a way both he (and Fish) have of minimizing the historical seventeenth-century understanding Milton and England would have taken in the Bible’s account of the historical Samson. Wittreich is guilty of the very charge Alan Rudrum makes and which Wittreich airily quotes and dismisses in a note: “the fundamental problem of most revisionist criticism,” says Rudrum, is that “it outlines what significance the poem might have for modern readers and then imputes it back to Milton as his meaning” (287, n. 30).

The final section of the volume, titled “The Terrorist Plot,” has three articles by David Lowenstein, Michael Lieb, and Stanley Fish. All center on the sensational and moralistic charge made by John Carey, as set forth in the Times Literary Supplement (September 6, 2002). Samson’s violence makes him a “terrorist” and Milton an endorser of terrorism. By implication Fish is as well, to judge from an assertion he makes in his How Milton Works (426), wherein he claimed that Samson’s act in killing so many was actually “a virtuous action” since he believed it to be God’s will. “‘There is Nothing He Cannot Ask’: Milton, Liberalism, and Terrorism” is Fish’s refutation of Carey’s
kind of liberalism that abhors any kind of violence for any purpose whatever.

"Milton would have us proceed by looking to the spirit within which an act is performed—to its intentional structure—rather than to what may or may not occur in its wake" (250). Fish surveys several of Milton's prose works to mine evidence for the interior guide to behavior. He recognizes the danger that those acting in the name of God may in fact be deluding themselves and acting from the source of their own will. But even so, Samson's actions, from his own view, are faithful to what he perceives is God's will. Thus the interior, and not the exterior, of any event is always the judge of that which is worthy of praise. "This is all I mean by the judgment that so incenses Carey: the judgment that, insofar as Samson's act is the outward gesture of his interior desire to do God's will, 'it is a virtuous action' and 'no other standard for evaluating it exists'" (256). Besides, Carey should know better than to engage in "morality" when he is doing "literary criticism" (257). Fish's name for Samson (and Milton himself) is "antinomian," meaning one who disregards exterior law for an "internal justification of the Spirit of God working within him" (258). But to be an antinomian is not the same as being a terrorist, and Fish is explicit in his rejection. "Stanley Fish is a literary critic" and "no reading he gives commits him to terrorism or to becoming an apologist for terrorists" (262). Nor can the label fairly apply to Milton or Samson. Both "may be many things—regicide, misogynist, elitist, bully, boor—but they are not terrorists" (264).

The essays by Lowenstein and Lieb uphold Fish's take on Samson Agonistes in refutation of Carey's charges. In "Samson Agonistes and the Culture of Religious Terrorism," Lowenstein points out how easily "terrorist" now lends itself to abuse when used "to demonize opponents"; the act of doing so blocks "discriminating analysis" and "rational argument" regarding violence in religion (207). Milton is disconcerting in light of our current concerns with terrorism as can be seen in his favorable writing about Cromwell's Irish campaign while at the same time upholding freedom in religion and politics (210). But against Carey, Lowenstein asserts that he has too easily equated the terror in Samson Agonistes with today's suicide bombers. Though Samson is a "unique dramatization of religious terror" (212), and though "Milton's God is "a God of terror" (222), we must not connect these particulars with the acts of terror we associate now with suicide bombers. Lowenstein's final comment is useful as a gauge to true terrorism. "The destruction and ven-
geance depicted in *Samson Agonistes*, then, dramatizes a kind of awesome religious terror,” but “as unsettling as the horrific events dramatized at the end [...] may be, they do not concern terrorist activity—or ‘an incitement to terrorism’—in the way that we usually understand it” (227). In this elegant statement he does away with the easy equations Carey and others try to assign when they mistakenly align the language of terror they see in literature such as *Samson* to events now. There is no real correspondence to the wantonness involved in the latter.

Lieb, in a similar vein, attacks Carey’s misreading of Fish in his “Returning the Gorgon Medusa’s Gaze: Terror and Annihilation in Milton” and in doing so sets before us a far more radical Fish than Carey knows or than Lieb may consciously mean to champion. Lieb points to Carey’s mishandling of *How Milton Works*: “Carey’s error is in associating Fish with the regenerationist point of view and then castigating Fish as one who, in the fashion of the regenerationists, looks approvingly upon Samson’s massacre of the Philistines” (233). Regenerationists see Samson at the play’s end moving toward inner light from darkness and the final act of vengeance as an expression of God’s will. Fish is no regenerationist and no endorser of terrorism as that term is now understood. Instead, Lieb sees Fish as “downright subversive” (231) because he believes that the final scene of *Samson* “is one of complete occlusion, rather than of reassuring revelation” (232) and that what we have before us is a poem without interpretive possibilities, one “with no meaning to be grasped” (234). But is this not an implicit endorsement of blank nihilism, both in Milton and Fish as well? Lieb seems to make way for this conclusion when he says: “Fish’s outlook may be nihilistic or perhaps antinomian, but it is not one that claims annihilation as the inevitable outcome of regaining one’s station with God” (234). This is a curious defense and one that is hardly flattering since it makes of Fish, by implication at least, if not by declaration, one who has no moral compass, who does not see a moral purpose in literature at all. Whatever else one may say of Carey’s passion, it cannot be said that he lacks a moral compass. But in taking away any morality from Fish, as Lieb seems to imply, he has left his champion in a dark place by implication at least. Lieb does clear Fish of Carey’s charge in his conclusion: It is not “meaningful,” given the premises of *How Milton Works* to argue that Fish “would endorse the idea of Samson as a terrorist” for “to speak of terrorism or the committing of terrorist acts is to speak of motive” (241). The poem has no
motives in view; thus Samson is not one, nor is Fish an endorser of the idea. In an earlier note, however, Lieb makes a regrettable equation in his application of “terrorist” to the present situation in Iraq. He speaks of “the horrific events of 9/11” but then says: “In a kind of quid pro quo, however, one might also suggest that the U.S. attacks on Baghdad in March 2003 represent their own form of terrorism” (236).

Only if we wish to empty the word “terrorist” of its present meaning in association with the deliberate jihadist murders of 9/11 or the strapping on of suicide belts can this equation be made. Clearly Lieb does not wish to do this, but he should better have used the word “terrify” or “terror” of the U.S. raids to avoid the confusion of terms.


Aimed at college and university survey courses and the “general reader” and designed to complement Blackwell’s *A Companion to Milton* (2001), edited by Thomas Corns, the *Concise Companion* features twelve newly-published chapters and two reference sections. Part I: Surveys, addressing the central role of Miltonic texts in the English and international literary canon, contains the following essays:

- Robert Thomas Fallon, “A Reading of His ‘left hand’: Milton’s Prose”
- Roy Flanagan, “The world all before [us]: More than Three Hundred Years of Criticism”

Shawcross makes the case for the vast influence of Milton while conceding the difficulty of systematizing an influence which transcends historical, genre, and other conventional categories. In keeping with the introductory nature of the volume, he includes a clear, comprehensible definition of “influence in literary materials” and identifies the forms influence might typically take. Examples of Miltonic influence range from Spanish baroque illustrations of *Paradise Lost* to contemporary drama, poetry, and the novel, including Aldous Huxley’s *Eyeless in Gaza* (1936) and Walker Percy’s *Lust in the Ruins*.
(1971) as well as several poems by the American modernist poet Louis
Zukofsky.
Shawcross even manages to link the postmodern Argentinian
fantasy writer Jorge Luis Borges to Milton because of each author's self-
reflective blindness. This essay offers not only an eclectic, graceful overview
of the daunting subject of Miltonic influence, replete with an encyclopedic
range of illustrations, but it provides an example of a fundamental form of
literary criticism at work when Shawcross measures the boundaries of influ-
ence study. As anyone who has heard John Shawcross synthesize the discrete
essays presented at an academic conference will testify, subject matter and
authorial ethos are well matched here.

Part II: Textual Sites, targeting the relevance of specific Miltonic texts to
such topics as cultural encounters, gender, religion, and the nature of scholar-
ship, contains nine essays:

Angelica Duran, “First and Last Fruits of Education: The Companion
Poems, Epistola, and Educational Prose Works”
Annabel Patterson, “Milton's Heroic Sonnets”
Paul Alpers, “The Lives of “Lycidas”
Katsuhiro Engetsu, “A Mask: Tradition and Innovation”
Achsah Guibbory, “The Bible, Religion, and Spirituality in Paradise Lost”
Karen L. Edwards, “Gender, Sex, and Marriage in Paradise”
Juliet Lucy Cummins, “The Ecology of Paradise Lost”
Louis Schwartz, “The Nightmare of History: Samson Agonistes”

The arrangement of these essays is meant to follow the chronology of
Milton's poetry, the traditional organization of academic syllabi, and the pre-
sumed “reading practices of general readers” (2). Though speculating about
the “reading practices of general readers” in the “information age” seems
problematic, the Concise Companion generally presents its material accessibly.
Duran concludes the introduction with an eminently postmodern invitation
to readers of the volume to contact her with descriptions of their successes
and failures in using it.

In “Milton’s Heroic Sonnets” Annabel Patterson reviews the structural
formats of the sonnet Milton had to choose from when he began writing,
stressing the unconventional deployments he eventually made of the genre
and cautioning against imposing conventional stricures of sonnet arrange-
ment on his poems. Topicality, she insists, was the signature of Milton's
sonnets, here challenging Mary Anne Radzinowicz’s claim for a “shape in Milton’s 23 sonnets as a group” and Anna K. Nardo’s idea of the sonnets as an “ideal community.” What Patterson does particularly well is to demonstrate how critical analysis moves from hypothesis, to colloquy with competing theses, and finally to the positing of the most plausible explanation of the evidence under discussion. Her reading preserves both the uniqueness of Milton’s sonnets as a whole and the particular importance of historical occasions in his final ten poems. In effect, Patterson illustrates how one may practice literary criticism without over reliance on the habits of response shaped by critical templates rather than by the artifacts themselves.

In “The Ecology of Paradise Lost,” Juliet Lucy Cummins develops a postmodern history of the ideas of vitalism and the seventeenth-century ecological sensibility, setting Paradise Lost in opposition to the “prevailing mechanistic and instrumental forms of natural philosophy” (163) and to the Cartesian theory of mind (171). Milton’s vitalism in the epic, she points out, implicitly critiques the “objectification and exploitation of nature often connected with the new science” (163). If Adam and Eve repeatedly demonstrate their harmony and continuity with other natural things, Satan and the fallen angels violate, exploit, and deny the spirituality of the material world. Milton shows the ecological dimensions of his epic by assigning to humankind “responsibility for nature and the present value of created things” (175).

Part III: Reference Points contains these essays:
Edward Jones, “Select Chronology: ‘Speak of things at hand/Useful’”
J. Martin Evans, “Select Bibliography: ‘Much arguing, much writing, many opinions’”

Chronologies and bibliographies seldom stir passion in the hearts of readers, but these pieces by Jones and Evans contain some of the best scholarship in the entire volume. Though the novice reader may not be the ideal audience for them, the bibliographical cullings of Evans will be appreciated by Miltonists for their astuteness and wide value.

One could argue that Angelica Duran has written a book about the advancement of learning in seventeenth-century England, and that hers in effect advances a similar goal today. To put it in that abstract way is of course to occlude the two massive abstractions of her title, *The Age of Milton and the Scientific Revolution*, which on the face of it seems to propose division, while Prof. Duran’s effort is to show verbal overlaps among the terms, to focus on particularities, and to synthesize. Prof. Duran advances our learning, among other ways, by reading Milton’s writing and those contemporaries who commonly feature in histories of science, through a lens which assumes, for starters, that the education of all these writers was in many ways the same. Like the exponents of the advancement of learning in Milton’s time, many of her readings cast new light, while a few seem a bit fanciful. Just as she entertains the unevenness of some arguments in natural philosophy, we acknowledge some unevenness in hers.

Prof. Duran casts valuable light on developing and changing thinking and writing, both in the scientific community and in Milton’s texts. For example, the phrase “natural philosopher,” which for this reviewer still suggests a person, like Newton, concerned to observe and speculate upon natural events, which for her in contrast often (but not always) signals elements of early naturalistic writing that suffers a “death” in her chapter 2 because it is basically passive, retiring, and behind the times. Thus she shows how writing about natural philosophy came increasingly to emphasize activism and a kind of militancy.

The book unfolds in three movements, headed “teachers, academic subjects, and students,” each composed of four chapters (22). At the outset, “Milton among Early Modern Scientists” lays the ground work, pointing to many similarities in education and interest, while demonstrating the verbal difficulties occasioned by words like *scientia*. Examining first “Il Penseroso” and *A Mask*, and then “Elegy IV” and particularly “Lycidas” and *Of Education*, she shows how Milton’s writing about teaching progressed toward what she calls “new model” teaching (49).
The teachers she selects, the four archangels in *Paradise Lost*, are dressed in highly militaristic language, a “Vanguard,” although Raphael only sports “feathered mail.” This stress on military gear seems to conflict with Michael’s warning

Dream not of this fight,
As of a Duel, or the local wounds
Of head or heel: not therefore joynes the Son
Manhood with God-head, with more *strength* to foil
Thy enemie, nor so to overcome
Satan... (12: 386-391, emphasis mine)

Other evidence suggests that armed blows are repeatedly deferred and martial gear and “force” are ridiculed both in book 6, in *Samson Agonistes*, and in *A Treatise of Civil Power*. That seems part of Milton’s effort to distance his Christian epic from the non-Christian epics. But this militaristic language as employed by advancers of learning, which puzzles this reviewer in *Paradise Lost*, suggests more generally that natural philosophers, focused in many directions, perceived themselves to operate in a culture needing severe blows. Duran traces developing activism even in the sequencing of archangels, as for example her comment that “Raphael’s attire expresses his defensive role as sentry and Michael’s his offensive role as crusader.

The curriculum—the “subjects—retained vestiges of the trivium and quadrivium, yet exploded de facto, with increased emphasis on the quadrivium. “Subjects of Change in ‘L’Allegro,’ ‘Il Penseroso’ and *A Mask*” (ch. 6) show Miltonic changes in writing about education. For example, the brothers in *A Mask* satirize a taste for older, passive, backward-looking activities also visible early in the Prollusions, while the Lady engages in a disputation with Comus in which the effort is not rhetorical display but winning. She verbally attacks Comus’ “gay rhetoric” violently. Similarly, Duran argues that ‘L’Allegro’ hearkens back to pastoral poetry while ‘Il Penseroso’ implicitly “extols natural studies” (137).

The second section concludes, in chapter 8 (“The Sexual Mathematics of *Paradise Lost*”); it is centered on two related passages, Eve’s elaborate “Sweet is” song in book 4 and Adam’s conversation with Raphael in book 8. In discussing Eve’s song, Duran makes much of the primarily English invention of calculus, which uniquely accounts for complex relationships, the matter of her song as well as the conclusion of Adam’s astronomical conversation in
book 8. That conversation shows Raphael’s tentativeness—developed by serious mathematicians—as well as a kind of cosmic sexuality. Prof. Duran remarks that “Adam’s account to Raphael of his marriage at last implies the answer to Eve’s question, ‘wherefore all night long shine these? to light the bridal Lamp’” (204).

The third section, on “Students,” is to this reviewer the least compelling of the three. Initially, in chapter 9, “Brave, New Students,” Prof. Duran attempts to say something about early modern students, a difficult task given the archive. She perceives “a crisis of [self]-definition . . . especially conspicuous at the transitional moments of education . . . from young students to older students, and from students to professionals” (214). This crisis sounds something like a “Miltonic Moment,” and J. Martin Evans’ argument, while not cited here, underlies much of Prof. Duran’s reading. The crisis involves an “increased sense of isolation” (126). All of this is tenable, if somewhat speculative in places.

The title of Chapter 10, “From Philomela to luscinia magarynchos in A Mask” indicates one of the main points concerning the Lady. Philomela’s grueling story of rape, was, late in the scientific revolution, subsumed by botanical classification as part of a genus, wholly abstracted from gender or sexuality. The abstract business of the bird is to sing, as the Lady does early; later, no longer threatened by rape and so moving away from the song-bird tale, she does not speak or sing, but rather dances, showing, as Duran reads it, her “decorative accomplishments” as well as her and her family’s social status. “Lady Alice transforms from the character of the Lady into the family member of the powerful host family . . . ” (246).

The final discussion of Samson Agonistes seems to ignore the extreme contingency generated by the text, in which character after character searches the “unsearchable dispose/ Of highest wisdom” without success, since it is “unsearchable.” By omitting a conversing deity, the play avoids presenting a *deus ex machina* and a mindless Baconianism—which is precisely the marked, formal difference between Samson and Milton’s epic poetry. Duran opens by reading Samson as a type of Christ, following Bucer and Calvin. She proposes that Samson’s rousing motions are “God’s” (280), and reads those “arm’d with deadly stings” as his duplicitous “enemies” (286); that is not to deny the possibility of those readings, but to notice that there is some fairly restrictive interpretive work and some leaps of faith here. For example, when
the Chorus meditates on consolation and patience, they focus on “book-learning” (287), which fits with the Baconian concerns among natural philosophers, though it leaves the issue of consolation behind.

Overall, this reviewer prefers Peter Herman’s handling both of verbal contingency and gender relations in Destabilizing Milton. to Prof. Duran’s third section. Finally, Ann Astell was not indexed nor her first name supplied in text, opening for a moment the expectation that Mary Astell’s critique of Milton and Locke would appear in this tale. But it is a guy tale, as Prof. Duran notes candidly when referring to Bathsua Makin and Margaret Cavendish.


This book represents three important modes of criticism: the relational paradigm of psychoanalytic theory, theories of the body, and disability studies. In bringing these theories to bear on Milton’s poetry, Susannah Mintz offers significant new readings of Paradise Lost and Samson Agonistes.

The relational paradigm that now dominates psychoanalytic theory in the United States has not been widely acknowledged or used by literary critics. The first phase of psychoanalytic criticism derived from Freud’s own interpretation of literary texts, and emphasizes the Oedipus complex, instinct, and drive theory. This mode fell out of favor, in part because it often seemed reductive, but survives in Lacanian emphases on the symbolic. Feminist literary critics reinvigorated psychoanalytic criticism by drawing on the object relations theories of Donald W. Winnicott. These critics emphasized the pre-oedipal bond between mother and child as ‘mirroring,’ unlike the subsequent oedipal bond between father and child as ‘contest.’ Susannah Mintz’s book is grounded in object relations theory, but like many contemporary psychoanalytic theorists she focuses on the newer paradigm of “intersubjectivity.” For Mintz, and for such noted psychoanalytic theorists as Jessica Benjamin, relationships are not the product of interior drives but are the primary source of those drives. Self is constructed and reconstructed in relationship. These relationships occur in a “threshold space between, but also of, self and other,” where a person discovers and shapes identity through encountering the other
In “intimate transitional space,” characters can perceive objects as subjects and form a relationship of mutuality, “hand in hand” (211-12). Mintz’s primary concern is the relationship between Adam and Eve, and between Samson and Dalilah. By using the paradigm of intersubjectivity, she can enrich our understanding of the complex human relationships Milton portrays in his poetry. Through close readings of specific scenes and conversations, Susannah Mintz makes it possible for us to see the dynamic evolution of the relationship between Adam and Eve, and the complex mutual failure of the relationship between Samson and Dalilah. In Mintz’s close readings, all four characters are subjects who both deserve our sympathy and demand our judgment.

The second mode of literary theory adopted in this book is the “body theory” that has become so prominent in recent years. Susannah Mintz is among the first Miltonists to combine relational psychoanalytic criticism and the mode of criticism familiar today as “body theory.” Rather than focusing on the sexual body, rather than defining the body in terms of the mind’s desire, she draws on the corporeal feminist theory of Elizabeth Grosz and considers all the actions of the body—looking, walking, eating, sleeping—that can foster or impede both identity and relationships. These actions, as threshold moments of encounter, are the focal point of Mintz’s discussion of *Paradise Lost*. Her book emphasizes the “birth” scenes in *Paradise Lost* (chapter 1), the creation and life in unfallen Paradise (chapter 2), transgressive and redemptive eating (chapter 3), and the threshold spaces of talk and touch as Adam and Eve lose and recover their double desire for relationship and self-identity (chapter 4).

Susannah Mintz’s theoretical stance enables her to offer persuasive readings of important topics in *Paradise Lost*. She re-reads the scene of Eve at the pool in ways that counter both the positive moral reading provided by Diane McColley and the negative submission to patriarchy claimed by Christine Froula. She reads the portrayal of abundance in prelapsarian Paradise and the ethic of work before the Fall to suggest that the abundance in Milton’s nature suggests an independence from control, whether divine or human. She offers an especially intricate reading of Adam’s contradictory attitudes about work (98-102). Her reading of what work means for Adam and Eve goes beyond a simple gender dichotomy and suggests that Milton uses each of them to figure a different, valid relationship between human beings and the
natural world. Using the theories of Christopher Bollas, Susannah Mintz can read Paradise as a kind of aesthetic transitional object, a threshold space where Adam and Eve at once encounter themselves and the otherness of nature. Her careful reading of the creation narrative in Book 7 sets up her claim for Milton’s ideological revisionism. This reading, while it is often appealing, may not entirely be persuasive to those who see the apparent ease of the narrative as Milton’s rigorous effort to reinscribe the traditional biblical narrative in the new language of natural philosophy, even as he challenges that language as a “human measure” of God’s creation. In reply, she might suggest that Milton portrays Eve’s mode of being attuned to nature rather than controlling it is more morally appropriate to life in Paradise.

Perhaps the most original and important contribution of this book is the final chapter, “Dalila’s Touch: Disability and Recognition in *Samson Agonistes*,” in which Mintz reads *Samson Agonistes* from the perspective of disability studies. This reading shows how concepts of the disabled body enable us to understand Samson in his blindness and in his physical weakness. Although she is concerned to contrast the relationship between Adam and Eve to that of Samson and Dalila in order to keep the arc of the book clear, in fact the reading of *Samson Agonistes* can stand alone. Using theorists of disability (Nicholas Mirzoeff, Leonard Davis, Rosemarie Garland Thomson) who argue that disability is a social construct, historically specific in its relation to what is considered “normal,” Susannah Mintz reads Samson’s body—its blindness and its physical weakness—as a threat to his world. The disabled body “resides in threshold space” (185), defying the hierarchical social structures that exclude it. She reads Dalila’s attempt to reconcile with Samson as “authentic—an act of genuine desire for contact, motivated by true affection” (200). Although Mintz focuses entirely on that one relationship, she could have read Manoa’s offer to take Samson home in the same way. Both Manoa and Dalila are rejected: Samson chooses his relationship to his own ideal self, however compromised, over a relationship that would diminish him even further and confirm him in an identity of disability.

*Threshold Poetics* is an important example of the way Milton studies can benefit from engagement with contemporary literary theory. The book is not “theory-driven,” but shows how the insights that theories provide can enable us to read Milton’s poems with renewed close attention to his complex portrayal of human relationships. Work like this can help keep Milton’s

Scholars of early modern women and gender have long been aware of the importance of parent-child relationships in determining family and household politics. Pioneering historians of the 1970s and 1980s such as Lawrence Stone, Alan MacFarlane and Ralph Houlbrooke found prescriptive advice literature to be a useful source for helping to formulate questions about the nature of domestic life. Many of these sources were problematic as they were male-authored, and as such revealed more about early modern patriarchal ideology than the practices and experiences of daily life. One exception to the rule was a sub-genre of female-authored mother’s legacies, published mostly in the first half of the seventeenth century. Authored by women from the gentry and upper middling sorts, these texts were written by expectant mothers for their husbands and their unborn offspring. Fearing they might die in childbirth, some women chose to clarify how they wished their children to be raised in the event of their demise. Varying in tone between passive and pious, forceful and angry, such writings can provide some degree of information as to what women themselves considered the duties of a good parent to be. The responsibilities of motherhood provided women with a rare occasion to publish their own thoughts without occasioning an immediately hostile reaction, and in general contemporaries accepted that women could not be forced to remain silent if by writing or speaking out their desire was to help their children. As Patricia Crawford, Laura Gowing, and Linda Pollock have shown, the exclusively female functions of childbirth and breastfeeding united women as mothers, and gave women a unique natural authority that men could not enjoy. By entering the public discourse through their role as mothers, women sidestepped male disapproval and avoided potential attacks on their authority as women.
Urban’s book begins with a useful and up-to-date summary of much important literature on the family, demography, and fertility in early modern society, before moving on to highlight some of the major themes and issues discussed in such texts. Expectant mothers emphasised the need to inculcate ideals of modesty, chastity and piety into their children, as well as some semblance of equality and agency for women. The deportment of the child was of utmost importance, and Elizabeth Grymeston believed modesty in dress, speech, and action to be attributes of both sexes. Dorothy Leigh stressed the importance for both young women and young men of maintaining chastity prior to marriage, and by using the term ‘children’ she appears not to have differentiated greatly between her male and female offspring (although she placed the responsibility for a loving marriage squarely on the man’s shoulders). Urban also discusses how piety and elite social rank enabled female authors to project positive self-images. Elizabeth Joscelin wished to be perceived as a God-fearing, learned woman from a God-fearing family, whilst the social position of Elizabeth, Countess of Lincoln, imbued her text with an assumed public agency.

After this introductory chapter Urban discusses a specific text in greater detail. *Age Rectified* was published in 1707, over fifty years later than the other legacies, and differs significantly from the earlier, but better known texts. Urban demonstrates that it was written by one Anne Brockman, a member of the Kentish gentry who only began to have children at the age of thirty-five. Brockman identified herself with a “neighbourhood” of mothers, showing how motherhood could bring women into various social networks and potentially earn them respect and credit in their local communities.

Brockman’s purpose in writing was markedly different than the other women discussed by Urban. Rather than instilling a love for God in their children, Brockman argued that mothers ought to rear their offspring so that they retained a love for their mother throughout their lives so that elderly gentlewomen could cohabit with their adult children in peace and quiet. Whilst earlier advice books focused on piety, self-sacrifice, and chastity, *Age Rectified* re-envisioned the duties of a mother. She discussed the time parents allotted for their children, arguing that by building a foundation of parent-child interaction early in life, parents were building an annuity of sorts. By banking upon the emotional connection from childhood, parents, especially mothers, created an emotional annuity that they could draw upon in old age when they
needed support from their adult children. Brockman changed the role of mother from one of enforcer of Christian values to one of guide to ethical choices, emphasising that mothers should let their children go as they mature and reduce interference in the lives of their offspring to a minimum in order to hold on their affections in adulthood. Her strategy was to produce an independent adult with natural parental ties. Like her predecessors, Brockman was concerned with providing her children with lessons for a good life, but these lessons are also providing her with a retirement plan—a place in her adult child's household.

Brockman also moved away from the focus on motherhood to seek to improve the lives of aged mothers, advising women to take any available opportunity to obtain knowledge of physic and surgery as this would enable them to be useful and charitable individuals, earning them esteem from their neighbours by helping out in times of illness. Brockman's aim was to make old age a time filled with activity and people for women. She pointed out that advice was seldom given to the aged, who were either venerated or thought ridiculous, expressing her fear that the aged did not want to admit their faults, a lapse that might create difficulties with the younger generation.

Marsha Urban has done a great service to literary scholars and historians by bringing to light and discussing in such detail a much neglected text. As well as getting a real sense of the author and her motives, Urban links Age Rectified to important recent scholarship on motherhood and old age in early modern England. Scholars interested in either of these topics must read this book.


As anyone who works on Restoration texts knows, scholars of the earlier seventeenth century and the later eighteenth century often either ignore Restoration drama or treat it like some bizarre anomaly that occurred ex nihilo. Sophie Tomlinson's new book Women on Stage in Stuart Drama, however, offers an important intervention by demonstrating “the literary and theatrical continuities” between early seventeenth-century court productions and later
seventeenth-century public ones (1). By focusing on the continuities between female power, female performances, and female authorship, Tomlinson deconstructs the popular assumption that “the appearance of the professional actress [was] a decisive change from the past” (1). Ultimately, Tomlinson argues, “As the introduction of actresses opened up a new range of conventions and attitudes, so the metamorphosis of the female wit into the woman playwright brought an enlarging of dramatic perspectives” (17). This is a large claim, and Women on Stage in Stuart Drama provides a thought-provoking, but not fully convincing, narrative about the shifting cultural norms that led to the opening of the stage to both female actresses and playwrights.

Although it appears as if the chapters are organized thematically, they are also arranged temporally, moving the reader from the Jacobean court of the early seventeenth century to the Restoration plays by Katherine Philips. Chapter One focuses on several court masques by Ben Jonson and Samuel Daniel. Aligning her argumentation with those by critics like Leeds Barroll and Stephen Orgel, Tomlinson links the power of the Anna of Denmark’s cultural and political influence with her ability to direct the construction of the court masques (costuming, plotting, casting, etc.). Tomlinson, however, is less interested in the cultural work of the masques than in their “representation of women’s persuasive agency, figured through a dynamic language of action and motion” (19). By attending to the persuasive elements of motion, Tomlinson provides a compelling alternative to the assumption that agency comes through the voice. “The poetics of female performance,” Tomlinson argues, reveals that physical embodiment can be transgressive in its own right (3): actions without words are persuasive and powerful. She ends this chapter by arguing that the court masques organized by and for Anna of Denmark and Henrietta Maria “opened up” the idea that a rich power was endowed when there is collaboration between the sexes (that is, between the queen and the king, or the queen and the male masque writer). This chapter represents the best of Tomlinson’s book. Her theorization of the persuasiveness of bodily performance provides an important addition to the study of seventeenth-century masques.

Chapter Two, which focuses on pastoral drama, adds voice back into the analysis by attending to female singing and “burgeoning vocal and articulate power” (78). This chapter provides readings of texts by Aurelian Townshend, Walter Montagu, and John Milton that present ways for women to express their love chastely. Tomlinson closely examines the ways these performance
pieces depict women who are moved and who move others, and I appreciate the way she connects the previous chapter's interest in physical movement with this chapter's attention to emotional movement: there is (and was) a connection between these two states. Tomlinson argues that these texts demonstrate “an encroaching sexual realism” through “forensic attention to female discourse and display” (78). Thus, the plays not only demonstrate their engagement in the debates of the time, but also “represent new forms of feminine self-consciousness” (78).

Chapters Three and Four deal with Caroline comedy and tragedy, respectively. Despite the fact that the plays analyzed in these two chapters are all written by male playwrights for boy actors playing female roles (plays by Ben Jonson, James Shirley, William Cartwright, and John Ford), Tomlinson wants to track how the representation of female characters changes after the reigns of the powerful Stuart queens consorts. Because she is mounting an historical reading of female performance and agency back from 1660 to 1603, Tomlinson must address the public theatre of the Caroline period. Yet, these chapters are the least convincing. In the chapter on comedy, for example, Tomlinson argues that these plays “raise questions about women's legal and political status in early modern England . . . in particular highlighting women's loss of liberty upon marriage” (81). I am sure there are many Shakespeareans out there—to name just one group—who would argue that this occurs well before the plays of the Caroline period. While the chapter on tragedy examines the “interlinked themes” of theatrical expressions of female sexual passion, madness, and ceremonies of death, Tomlinson never spells out if she reads these playwrights as being influenced by the private court performances she describes in the first two chapters, or if these dramatic developments were a phenomena occurring independently (121).

The book picks up again with an “Interchapter” on Davenant's interregnum operas and two final chapters on plays by Margaret Cavendish and Katherine Philips. The “Interchapter” clearly demonstrates that theatre did not stop during the interregnum even if the public playhouses were closed. There was lots of playing and Davenant's operas showcased female performers in new ways. The chapter on Cavendish's plays tracks her exile from England to Europe during the interregnum and her exposure to female performances while abroad. Tomlinson provides a beautiful reading of Cavendish's responses to these performances by arguing that the attraction
was not only that the actresses challenged the assumption of the naturalness of femininity, but also that they exhibited the power of “litheness, aptitude, art and aspiration” (165). Thus, for Cavendish “performance means crossing the boundary between inside and outside, animating the self in front of the gaze of others” (176). Tomlinson’s chapter on Katherine Philips provides a bridge between the elite culture of the Caroline court and the public theatres of the Restoration. She reads Philips’s translations of Pierre Corneille’s plays as offering a careful revision of the image of the public woman as the Amazon: Philips re-creates the femme forte as one who has a “careful self-scrutiny and concern for decorum” (202). This, Tomlinson argues, sets the stage for the female characters we are more familiar with in Restoration comedies.

While I find Tomlinson’s overall thesis compelling—that Restoration actresses, female characters, and female playwrights did not spring out of Jove’s head fully formed—the execution of the book is not. As I have indicated, it is unclear exactly if/how Tomlinson sees a relationship between the performance of male-authored female characters by boy actors, the performance of male-authored female characters by female actresses, and the performance of female-authored female characters by female actresses. Is it a causal relationship (i.e., does one have to occur before the others)? Is it a semi-causal relationship (i.e., one must occur first, but then the others occur simultaneously)? While it is clear that Tomlinson is attempting to create an historical arc, the dots along the arc are not fully connected. Likewise, there are several moments in the book that reveal a reliance on speculation. For example, Tomlinson reveals in a footnote that she “assumes” the witches in The Masque of Queens were performed by professional male actors (218). Why? What is the evidence? Also, when discussing Tempe Restored, Tomlinson speculates not only that Madame Coniack was the singer employed in the court and the masque, but also that “It is conceivable that this line-up represented four distinct vocal registers and tone colors: a boy treble for Cupid, a bass for Jupiter, [etc.] . . .” (57). While it may be “conceivable,” it would only be convincing if there were evidence. I read this reliance on speculation (“It is possible that women performed in the dialogue songs . . .” [154]) as part of the problem with Tomlinson’s attempt to create a neat and clean historicized reading of female performance and agency. The book is most exciting when it theorizes performance (as it does in the first two chapters), but this ultimately does not appear to be Tomlinson’s aim, alas.

It may seem odd to express surprise, in a review written for a publication entitled *The Seventeenth-Century News*, at the appearance of a book that successfully bridges the great divide of 1660, and treats the seventeenth century as a coherent whole. Yet, it is still relatively rare to find an author who can treat Donne and Dryden with equal authority and sensitivity to historical nuance. Anne Cotterill proves herself one such in her study, *Digressive Voices in Early Modern Literature*, a book that succeeds brilliantly at finding connections where others have more frequently seen only discontinuities.

Cotterill’s book deals, in fact, with no less than five seventeenth-century authors, in all of whom she finds an interesting commonality: John Donne, Andrew Marvell, Thomas Browne, John Milton, and John Dryden all at some point “found themselves in weakened and powerless or dangerously ambiguous social and political positions” (5) that necessitated a shift in rhetoric. Their response, in each case, was to turn to digression, a mode that Cotterill identifies with feminine figures “who through associations with death, melancholy, or sacrifice, receive and absorb the poet’s fears of weakness and marginality” (14).

Cotterill’s interest in the connections between rhetoric and psychology are evident in this last suggestion: her authors’ digressions enable “an exploration of hidden and unruly or disturbing parts of the speaker’s self” (2), while suggesting “an ‘inner self’ that inhabits the perspective of the weak and marginal” (27). Closely associated with this insight is her identification of digression with the Ovidian figure of the “labyrinth,” which is here less a place of entrapment and confusion than an opportunity for indirection and subtle subversion, “a winding trail scattered with intellectual riches” (12).

Cotterill begins her close readings with a focus upon patronage, which looms large in her discussions of Donne, Marvell, and Dryden, all of whom found themselves to some degree undermined and feminized by, or resentful of, their patrons. Chapter 1 treats the digressive elements of Donne’s *Anniversaries* (1612) in the light of the poet’s attempts to secure literary patronage. In this context, the deceased Elizabeth Drury becomes “a fit vehicle for absorbing, reversing, and transforming feelings of vulnerability, unfulfilled
promise, and transcendent visionary capacities into a marketable self” (60). In Chapter 2, which may be the most impressive in this book, the literal and figurative mazes of Marvell’s Nun Appleton become a means of obliquely expressing disappointment at his patron Thomas Fairfax’s self-emasculating retreat into the world of his country estate in the face of a nation needing his services becomes personal for Marvell, “the failure of a male guardian” (121). Cotterill very neatly ties together the political and personal through the figure of the “drowned man,” identified here as “an image for chaotic dissolution, whether of the self or the state” (101).

Cotterill concludes her exploration of patronage in Chapters 5 and 6, examining two late texts by Dryden which employ digression to shift “the meaning of being on the ‘inside’—from the world of court and government to the fluid home and interiors of a mind become infinitely expansive” (217). Her discussion of The Hind and the Panther (1687) argues that Dryden employs digression as a means of evading direct polemical statement and responsibility, while the labyrinthine course of the debate that he chronicles circumambulates the disappointing space at the centre of the poem vacated by his patron and king, James II. In her treatment of Dryden’s Discourse Concerning the Original and Progress of Satire (1693) Cotterill sees a neglected and, since the Glorious Revolution, thoroughly disenfranchised Dryden employing a rhetorical maze of indirection to critique his patron and supporter of the new political regime, the Earl of Dorset.

Sandwiched between these discussions of digression and patronage are readings of Thomas Browne’s Hydriotaphia (1658) and Milton’s Paradise Lost (1667;1674). Chapter 3 deals with Browne’s text within the context of Royalist defeat and Interregnum politics: this focus, and Browne’s use of the image of the garden, tie this chapter very nicely to the preceding one on Marvell. In Browne’s “quincunx” the geometric diamond figure with interconnected points, and “lattice,” Cotterill sees another version of the labyrinth, and a means of subtly critiquing the linear and simplistic narratives imposed upon nature and religion by the “Puritans.” Chapter 4, on Eve’s fateful rejection of “Grateful Digressions” in Paradise Lost, seems admittedly somewhat out of place in this volume given the shift in focus away from the author; Cotterill argues, however, that “Eve becomes Milton’s instrument for the transformation, domestication, of sensuous beauty, and not least language, into an interior space of reflection” (199). Eve’s abandonment of digression
in favor of the reductive rhetoric of Satan is redeemed through that fall, when she transforms “guilt” into an “interior space of understanding and will” (211).

Cotterill concludes with an “Epilogue” that argues that, for Jonathan Swift and the eighteenth century, digression becomes unavailable as a generative rhetorical strategy, becoming instead, in works like *A Tale of a Tub*, a figure of madness, “the modern voice of permanent dislocation and dis-possession” (304). While one might cavil that Cotterill’s depiction of eighteenth-century attitudes towards digression is a little overstated (the feminized figure of the obsessively digressive Tristram Shandy surely bear a close resemblance to her own authors), her overall conclusion is well-conceived and convincing.

_Digressive Voices in Early Modern English Literature_ is an accomplished study and a most entertaining read. Cotterill’s identification of digression in these diverse texts as a coherent rhetorical strategy operating at both the conscious and unconscious levels is enormously useful and suggestive. Her discussions of these texts are most worthwhile and explore aspects of works like *Upon Appleton House* from a perspective that is refreshingly new. It is a work that will, it is hoped, encourage and engender future studies seeking to similarly refocus our understanding of seventeenth-century writing.


In this rewarding study, Elizabeth Sauer proposes that the mid-seventeenth century theatrical mode migrated into print, especially with the closing of the theaters in 1642, and that it generated divergent and conflicting “textual communities,” i.e., networks of writers and readers informed by a sense of audience and performance, even to the point that readers were addressed or constructed as de facto jurors. Sauer particularly focuses on trials and spectacles of punishment, which were the primary social dramas of seventeenth-century England, and for which she considers a wide variety of texts, including trial accounts, religious tracts, female-authored defenses, petitions,
newsbooks, closet dramas, political treatises and dialogues, printed speeches, and documented speech acts.

Given that this study grew out of the 1997 Folger Library Institute conference “Habits of Reading in Early Modern England,” directed by Stephen N. Zwicker, it comes as no surprise that Paper-Contestations is deeply historicized. Sauer identifies her methodology as “post-revisionist,” that is, allied neither with the Marxist-oriented school of Christopher Hill, which argues for distinct divisions in Stuart England, nor with such “revisionists” as John Morrill, Kevin Sharpe, Conrad Russell, and Anthony Fletcher, who insist on political continuities, but rather with such “post-revisionists” as David Norbrook, Peter Lake, and David Zaret who “resist the notion of a historical continuum” (4). Sauer’s choice of methodology is a happy one, permitting her to find alternate means of accounting for well-known phenomena.

Paper-Contestations proceeds chronologically from 1637-1662, the period between two decrees against treasonable and seditious publication, with an epilogue concerning the Restoration stage. Sauer’s first chapter considers published attacks in the early 1640s against monopolies on such items as salt, vinegar, pots, starch, soap, cloth, tobacco, and even playing cards. These commercial agreements diverted trade and commerce into the hands of a few, denying a livelihood to the many. Not only did publications attack monopolies, but they staged in print the trials of convicted monopolists, validating verdicts and warning others to avoid their fate. While Sauer is not the first to consider monopolies, she particularly stresses how they were attacked not merely in economic terms but also as an issue of justice and equality under the law. She also demonstrates the extent to which anti-monop- olist sentiments imbue Milton’s Areopagitica, which rejects a ban on honest labor in the field of truth and argues instead that “Truth and understanding are not such wares as to be monopoliz’d and traded . . . like our broad cloth, and our wooll packs” (31, citing Yale Prose 2.535-36).

Chapter 2 examines how the trials of the Earl of Strafford and Archbishop William Laud were staged in various pro-Parliament texts and pamphlets, and also how this trial literature indicates a heightened awareness of the extrajudicial role performed by the reading public to whom in effect the members of the court were also pleading their case. Sauer demonstrates how the commonplace that an execution is a stage play, including the inter-
changeability of the terms *stage* and *scaffold*, meant that many of the texts played out the execution as a tragedy with cathartic effect for the nation.

This language of tragedy would later be used to describe Charles’s execution as well, as Sauer demonstrates in chapter 3, which situates the execution of Charles I in relation to “a transmigrated theatre culture and emergent print culture” (58). Though Parliament had closed the theatres, the Rump staged Charles’s trial before a live audience at Westminter Hall, opening the great gate to whomever wished to come. The text of the trial itself was published in full, including the king’s words, which were then rehearsed and re-rehearsed with added commentary by various factions. The king himself, of course, refused to follow Parliament’s script but staged an effective counter-performance of silence, as if Christ before Pilate.

But not all enemies were publicly tried. Chapter 4 investigates how the realignment of the dramatic and tragic modes along with politically prompted acts of reading could arraign other enemies by means of the closet-drama, or play as book, readily dispersed to wide audiences and encoded for recognition by their various audiences, such as the depiction of haunted perpetrators popularized in anti-Straffordian and anti-Laudian pamphlets. Paradoxically, Charles I’s tragedy set the stage for Restoration tragicomedy, since only divine intervention could restore the king to his throne, as Dryden suggests in his *Essay of Dramatick Poesie*.

Chapter 5 extends the dramatic arraignment of political opponents by considering how religious dissenters entered the dramatic world of print, trying their enemies and being tried. Sauer examines several trial accounts of mid-century radicals John Lilburne, Anna Trapnel, James Nayler, Margaret Fell, and George Fox, all of which indicate renegotiated power relations as the radicals claimed their rights under the nation’s laws and dramatically and effectively arraigned their accusers.

The epilogue nods to Dryden’s conception of the tragicomedy as a reborn and superior dramatic genre, but gives center stage to Milton’s stubbornly non-visual *Samson Agonistes*, which challenged “a nation thrown into confusion and mesmerized by spectacles that bolstered royalist power” (134). The last pages thus supply a fitting conclusion to Sauer’s study of how various factions used the stage to advance their own political agendas.
In the main, ‘Paper-Contestations’ is a careful and convincing argument about the construction of authorship and readership in the messy mid-century. Sauer evidences a wide sampling of primary texts, makes careful and nuanced reference to secondary scholarship, and carefully and patiently builds her case with example after example. She also identifies several issues needing further study, such as how the rise of “extrajudicial popular writings” corresponded with Parliament’s rise to power and its control of the press’s output (15-16). Even her chapter titles argue wittily that mid-century texts were theatrical performances. For instance, rather than an Introduction, Sauer supplies a Prologue—as if to a play—with the further title, “Press Acts.”

A few drawbacks to this study might be noted, one being that Sauer’s study argues for a causality that it can hardly prove, i.e., that the closing of theaters led to the generation of textual communities. Nevertheless, the evidence she marshals certainly makes the causal link sound likely. Sauer also aligns herself with the current—and puzzling—critical orthodoxy that declares the rarefied stage to be the primary discursive organ of the age rather than the ubiquitous pulpit. Sauer’s fine argument, however, is strong enough to succeed in either case, and well worth reading.


Jonathan P. A. Sell, lecturer at the University of Acalá, Spain, who has published on Shakespeare, Chaucer and modern British literature, has revised his doctoral dissertation into a book that seeks to contribute to the rapidly growing scholarship on early modern travel writing. Taking up Stephen Greenblatt and Mary Campbell’s (among others) work on wonder as a travel writing trope, Sell focuses on the other rhetorical devices used by travel writers (and neglected by modern scholars) to broaden our understanding of the production and reception of such texts. In the introductory chapter, Sell argues that early modern travel writers deployed a variety of rhetorical strategies intended to evoke wonder and that their readers recognized these strategies and responded in predictable ways. Modern readers, on the other hand, find the strategies unfamiliar, not recognizing their function or importance.
Sell's study sees early modern readers as an audience with particular “hermeneutic expectations” derived from an educational system that emphasized Latin and Greek, and classical rhetoric.

Sell's second chapter establishes his theoretical framework. He begins with the notion of consensual truth, a shared, mutually associative sense of reality. Statements that appeal to consensual truth attempt not to refer to external reality, but to a collection of ideas and beliefs shared by writer and reader. Together, these ideas and beliefs make up a literary heterocosm that was “a prime store and conduit of consensual knowledge and consensual communicative strategies” (30-31). Thus a travel writer, in order to make his observations meaningful, appealed not to external references, but to ideas he knew that his reader would possess. The reader, in turn, was able to infer the writer's meaning, understanding that an image, such as a blue swan, may not necessarily refer to an actual type of waterfowl, but instead worked to establish a sense of the exotic intended to shape the reception of the text as a whole.

Chapter three begins Sell's most intensive exploration of travel writers' use of rhetoric. He begins with genre and reception, positing that the relevant ethos for the genre of travel writing, in part because of its medieval origins, was wonder. A travel writer had to communicate the appropriate generic cues to activate this ethos of wonder, which helped to achieve the consensual truth necessary for a text that sought to convince its readers of its own veracity. To support his contention, Sell deploys his knowledge of classical rhetorical strategies, captatio benevolentiae (the capture of goodwill) in particular, to examine several travel narratives' prefatory material. Sir Walter Ralegh's attempt to guide the reader of his Discoverie of... Guiana (1596) is examined—arguing that Ralegh attempted to disguise the failure of his enterprise by establishing a general sense of wonder that engaged his reader's goodwill. “Ralegh has put the Ewaipanoma [men whose heads do grow beneath their shoulders] in his text not to attest to his own belief in them or to invite the reader to believe in them, but in order that his tales of gold will sound comparably less improbable in a context of relativized wonder” (78) and in so doing, helped distract readers from his failure to find gold in Guiana.

The fourth chapter moves beyond prefatory material to examine the narratives themselves. The first text is Arthur Barlowe's narrative of his 1584 expedition to Virginia, printed in Haklyut's 1598 Principal Navigations. Sell is
attracted to Barlowe’s description of Virginia because at the time, the space was unknown; it “existed entirely off the consensus and was a conceptual blank which required filling in” (92). Barlowe does so by describing the flora and fauna using familiar topos of place. These topos create meaning more through implication than denotation, Sell argues. The implications direct the reader to turn to the literary heterocosm to understand what Barlowe is attempting to communicate about Virginia. To help illustrate this strategy, Sell refers to similar sylvan descriptions from Spenser, John Speed, and others stretching back through Chaucer to Ovid, and Homer, showing shared strategies which evoked a particular image of place in a reader’s mind. Barlowe’s readers, argues Sell, filled in the blank of Virginia in terms of these earlier texts, rather than with an actual description of the colony. Travel narratives by Anthony Sherley and Edward Hayes received similar attention. The narratives all share, Sell points out, a distinct lack of concrete description. They evoke a sense of wonder, but do not tell their readers much about the places they visited.

The book’s final chapter takes up the travel writer’s veracity as established by the evidence of their own scarred and worn out bodies. By describing their travails, and sometimes their tortures, travelers presented their bodies as irrefutable evidence of their experiences. This was effective because, as Sell writes of Raleigh, “the body is mutually manifest, because we all know what it is to have a body, what it feels like to be cold and wet . . . the representation of the body acts as an experiential interface between the writer’s and the reader’s contexts” (149). The second half of the chapter pursues this strategy employing the world-as-stage metaphor to argue that the traveler became a type of actor who generated authenticity through the power of dramatic performance.

The epilogue posits *The Tempest* as an example of the early seventeenth century tension between a largely metaphorical epistemology, centered on Miranda, and a newer, empirical sense of the world located in the body of Caliban. For Sell, the play is a landmark that delineates the fading of a rhetorical, literary form of travel writing, that he has carefully investigated, and the rise of an empirical, scientific form of travel writing.

In reading *Rhetoric and Wonder*, there is no question of Sell’s strong grasp of early modern rhetorical strategies. His analyses are compelling and clear. The texts he has chosen are largely, though not entirely, of the New World and
the chronological range of his study derives from the publication dates of the rhetoric and travel texts he studies. The result is a somewhat uneven study. One learns much about rhetoric and its use in a handful of travel narratives, but the selection of texts limits the book’s usefulness in understanding the English engagement with the New World or the East. The books’ greatest value lies in what we can learn about the types and use of rhetoric and for an enterprising scholar, it provides a good model for an intensive study of a broader range of travel narratives.


Alison Scott’s informative study of the paradoxical nature of gift exchange and the quest for patronage in early modern England emphasizes the complex economy involving emerging market forces, established conventions of court culture, and a universal understanding of gift giving as an integral component of a civil society. The extended introduction to *Selfish Gifts* points out the frequency with which early modern poets and playwrights commented on the gift in relation to their own literary production. Samuel Daniel, Ben Jonson, and William Shakespeare are among the many Renaissance authors who concerned themselves with the complex logic of gift-giving in exchange for support for their literary endeavors, and Scott is careful to point out in the introduction how several of these authors’ works elucidate a number of “gift issues” (15) in the early modern period.

In addition to establishing gift giving as a preoccupation of various early modern authors, Scott’s introduction clearly lays out the theoretical stakes of *Selfish Gifts*. In *The Gift of Death*, Jacques Derrida examines the paradox of exchanged gifts and discovers a contradiction between the two values—gift and exchange. Derrida’s challenge to Marcel Mauss’s seminal theory of gift exchange makes possible Scott’s examination of the contradictions inherent in the gift in Renaissance England. Arguing that Derrida’s paradox of the gift is anticipated by Renaissance patronage literature, Scott’s book asks how an early modern gift can be both given and exchanged.
The years between 1580 and 1628 prove especially fertile in generating
cultural debate on the subject of gift exchange. Scott observes that those
years witnessed Elizabeth I's "sustained withholding of royal gifts" and James
I's "extravagant giving, particularly to male favorites" (39). The pronounced
shift in royal gift giving was in part responsible for what Scott describes as a
"renegotiation of boundaries" (39) that governed gift giving, as was the "emerg-
ence of a market economy, the decline of stable aristocratic patronage, and
the growth of the literary marketplace" (39). Reflecting the book's claim that
Elizabeth and James participated in a gift economy in very different ways,
*Selfish Gifts* is organized into two sections: the first concentrates on the perfor-
mance of powerlessness of the donor of the gift and the demand for
reciprocity that erotic or love gifts exercise on the recipient during the Elizabe-
than period; the second section shifts its focus from broad questions of
gendered gifts registered in Elizabethan poetry and drama to the specific
political contexts, practices, and problems of gift exchange at court during the
Jacobean period.

The pleasure in reading *Selfish Gifts* emerges precisely from the logic be-
hind this bifurcated structure. Simultaneously, Scott's book is both a lesson in
astute close-reading of sonnets from Shakespeare, Sidney, and Barnabe Barnes
(*Parthenophil and Parthenophe*) and an historical account of the drama of the
quest for patronage during specific historical moments. Chapter 4 on gifts
for the Earl of Somerset's wedding is especially rewarding in the way it
rereads John Donne's *Epithalamion* and amplifies current critical debates about
the poem by reconstructing its historical moment. Scott demonstrates clearly
how Donne was in an untenable position as the poet to praise the scandalous
marriage between James I's favorite courtier Robert Carr, the Earl of Somerset,
and the newly divorced Frances Howard. Using Donne's letters to friends
that describe his discomfort over what he perceived to be his duty to bestow
a gift at the marriage ceremony, Scott captures the poet's anxiety over his
work—a gift that could be rejected by the powerful patrons or, if too success-
ful, could bring mocking derision on the poet himself. For Scott, the eclogue
to the *Epithalamium* "undermines the gift that is offered and detaches Donne
somewhat from the subject he addresses" (161). Donne's ambiguous posi-
tion in relation to the wedding makes him, according to Scott, a "passive
rather than aggressive pursuer of Carr's sponsorship, guarding against antici-
pated criticism by emphasizing subjection to the king" (163).
Scott’s close textual analysis in chapter 4 and the author’s attention to establishing poetic occasion characterize the book’s analysis of other literary gifts from Jonson, Chapman, Campion and Bacon. Earlier chapters, however, are noteworthy for their fresh interpretations of Elizabethan texts. Although chapters 1 and 2 in *Selfish Gifts* might appear to retrace some critical ground that by now may be familiar to students of early modern culture who have read Elizabethan poetry and drama through the lens of gender studies or male friendship, Scott extends the analysis of the desire for patronage and gift giving more generally to include the concept of nonreciprocity—in chapter 1 from a disinterested, powerful female and in chapter 2 from an ungrateful, male lover. Because Scott offers clear and sustained readings of canonical texts such as Shakespeare’s *Sonnets*, *The Merchant of Venice*, and *Astrophil and Stella*, the book provides one opportunity after another for teachers of these texts to reexamine their own pedagogical approaches to major works that they explore annually with their own students.

Scott concludes *Selfish Gifts* with an account of the wedding of James I’s most controversial favorite, George Villiers–Duke of Buckingham. The story that Scott tells about their special relationship underscores the complexity of gift giving in the early modern period. Arguing that Buckingham was a perpetual gift for the king—an indulgence the king consistently granted to himself despite its tendency to bring his judgment into question—Scott points out that Buckingham too was a recipient of gifts as much as a donor: “a powerful patron and an enduring parasite” (42). Yet, Buckingham’s threat to royal prerogative really emerges after Charles I becomes king and the erotic relationship with James is transformed into a friendship with the new king. Scott examines many negative representations of Buckingham as a usurper of the throne, culminating with a discussion of Philip Massinger’s *The Duke of Milan*. For Scott, the play shows how James’s relationship with his minion “made it impossible to exercise his prerogative without, in fact, damaging royal sovereignty” (214). The chapter makes the case that Buckingham’s threat to power, though real during James’s reign, increased after Charles assumed the throne because Buckingham was not part of a gift economy that made him indebted to or owned by his king. He effectively was “the king’s equal” (224). This challenge to sovereign power sustained in part by the gift economy was untenable, according to Scott. Using *King Lear* as one illustrative text, Scott traces other voices during the period—some poetic and
some politica—that acknowledged the breakdown of a social order predicated on gift giving and Buckingham's influence.

To Scott's credit, *Selfish Gifts* speaks to several related audiences. The book is geared toward scholars interested in the ways that early modern social and political structures are sustained by what might seem an ancillary custom or tradition. It also offers teachers of the period's most canonical texts interesting ways to frame many of its most significant poems and plays for their students. In its investigation of the paradoxical gift economy that influenced political and social relationships in early modern England, *Selfish Gifts* effectively weaves functional theoretical methodology with compelling historical context and astute literary analysis.


Julie Campbell's study of how gender operates in the literary circles and salons of early modern Europe relies on a balance between genders as a matter of fact and gender as a matter for discourse. In other words, *querelle* discourse forms the basis for rhetorical and practical involvement in literary groups. Campbell's method treats a complex and interdependent series of influences, from late medieval *Querelle des femmes* to early modern *Querelle des amores*, from Italy through France to England, and between actresses and courtesans and court ladies. Yet her examinations of texts and textual influences, even when focused on relatively obscure material, are always lucid and held together coherently.

Divided into six chapters, the book considers Italian, French, and English literary circles in turn, with two chapters for each regional culture. The first two chapters pair male- and female-authored texts in order to demonstrate the collaborative basis of literary circle authorship: Sperone Speroni and Tullia d’Aragona, and Tasso and Andreini, each represent various angles of *querelle* rhetoric in their discourses. These pairings also demonstrate how literary interaction worked through the contemporary questions of gender roles and representation as employed in the *querelle* rhetoric. In the third and fourth
chapters, which examine French cultural contexts, Italian influences are clear: the salon of the Countess of Retz and the works of Louise Labé indicate how the late medieval *Querelle des femmes* extends into the *Querelle des amours*, drawing the intellectual discourse of the woman question to bear on the behaviour of both men and women in love. As well, the “liminality between [French] court and [Italian] stage” fosters flexibility for female roles in cultured society, providing women with positive and useful *exempla* (86-87). In the fifth and sixth chapters, the Protestant influences on the Sidney circle, presided over by the Countess of Pembroke, concentrate on questions of gendered virtue in *querelle* discourse, as considered by Sidney himself, Lady Mary Wroth, Shakespeare, and others in a variety of pastoral works, closet dramas, and public theatre. Not only does the scope of gender widen to include the behaviour of men as well as women in love, but also the notion of female virtue as chastity shifts to incorporate that of constancy, which had previously been identified as a masculine virtue in *querelle* rhetoric. Again, too, the liminality of stage and court in England (albeit in a somewhat more domestic and private sense of “court” in the noble houses) suggests interesting connections between the concerns of intellectual and public communities. The Sidney circle’s Senecan-style tragedies, for instance, like *Othello*, tend to focus on a woman oppressed by misogyny as a central figure, to “affirm by the very intensity of … grieving the value of what is lost” (Campbell qtg. Linda Woodbridge, 157). As well, Campbell’s discussion of the various Cleopatras of the period, both in public and closet drama, is intriguing in its suggestion that authorship is inscribed in dying well (163), much like Shakespeare’s Lucrece, whose suicide, after publishing the details of her rape, serves to re-assert and mythologize her self-determined value rather than simply to cover her shame.

Throughout her various discussions, Campbell manages to reiterate the importance of female discourse regarding gender, their own as well as men’s, as an important element of ongoing intellectual and cultural debates, without ever sounding repetitive. This persistent reminder implies that it is not only despite misogynistic attitudes, but perhaps also because of them, that such female discourse is even possible, since a *querelle*, or quarrel, by its very nature requires an oppositional or antagonistic dynamic. Especially where Campbell pairs male- and female-authored works, this dynamic is clearly beneficial for the female writers to make use of—and the pairings work as well for Campbell herself, as she draws out the interdependent concerns and nuances of *querelle*.
rhetoric more precisely than if she had focussed on women's works only. For instance, her exploration of the ongoing "body-speech link," in which male authors associate female speech/writing with a particularly sexual availability, is interesting and evocative, in that her discussion goes on to show how women could use this otherwise oppressive problem to their advantage: while this Petrarchan notion does contribute to preventing women like Retz from publishing their works, it also renders the notion of privacy as a quality of femininity. Thus when Labé publishes her work, she is careful to assert her female identity as, ironically, a performance of privacy (101-103). Just as Labé's alternative to the praise/blame rhetoric of the woman question addresses love rather than kinds of lovers (115), her publication addresses authorship rather than kinds of authors.

Generally speaking, Campbell shows that while male writers tend to employ Petrarchan figures and ideals, whether to criticize or elevate women, female writers like Aragona and Wroth consistently tend to avoid ideals of any kind in order to shift the focus of the dialogue away from praise or blame of either gender. Instead, the works of these women, and others including Andreini and Labé, denote a distinction between ideal images and real bodies, exposing the inherent Narcissism of Petrarchan beloveds and but also revealing the legitimate passions of real women through the very exempla they embody as female writers. Again, though Campbell never draws this out explicitly, women turn the otherwise negative querelle "body-speech link" to their advantage. In other words, between the "whorish seductress" and the "mirror of virtue," the "elephant in the salon" is the educated and outspoken woman who discusses gender roles in the plural. The new querelle that arises through women's participation in the antagonistic discourse regarding the female gender expands to include not only actual female voices, but also actual male voices too, rather than idealized virtues of either gender (97). As a result, a model of literary collaboration grows out of quarrelling, as if to shape the emerging discourse of love itself, where constancy must become not a singular ideal but a "joint virtue" if love is to be satisfying (188).

Campbell quotes Margaret Ezell's suggestion to organize the study of female works "around the mode of production and the intended audience" to "invite fresh questions about the past rather than silence its answers" (qtd. in Campbell, 96). Campbell certainly takes this approach and thoroughly illustrates its benefits, and her wide-ranging and suggestive study is a sound co-
trition to early modern scholarship. Like the female-authored arguments that insist on collaboration between men and women in love (whether positive and to good effect, or negative, to ill effect), the literary collaboration of circles and salons celebrates a mutual criticism between speakers/authors. Furthermore, this social institution of early modern Europe emerges as a significant medium for cultural play between men and women, much like love itself.

Subha Mukherji. *Law and Representation in Early Modern Drama*. Cambridge University Press, 2006. xii + 286 pp. + 4 illus. + 3 maps. $95.00. Review by NANCY M. BUNKER, MACON STATE COLLEGE.

*Law and Representation in Early Modern Drama* convincingly argues for the “nature and extent of the engagement” between legal and dramatic “cultural practices” (2), focusing on the “nature of the interaction” more than “either of the two disciplines *per se*” (15). Subha Mukherji concentrates on links between dramatic and legal evidence and highlights the unique devices drama employs to represent the legal experience. Her study, she notes, is the “first book of literary criticism or interdisciplinary enquiry that attempts to reconstruct the physical realities of courtroom interaction and experience” (16). She points out that this method uses “drama itself as historical evidence–implying the larger argument about historical method and the place of literary evidence in it” (12).

Chapter one interrogates early modern marriage law through grounding in legal records, Henry Swinburne’s seminal text, *A Treatise of Spousals* (c1600), and Shakespeare’s *The Merchant of Venice* and *All’s Well That Ends Well*. Exposing legal skepticism, Mukherji addresses this often overlooked uncertainty located within the legal evidentiary patterns. Her examination sheds new light on both *de futuro* and *de praesenti* oral marriage contracts and calls attention to the instability of verbal intent, the ring accepted as a non-verbal token, and the misappropriation of signs as legal proof, all of which further complicate adequate dramatic representation.

In a carefully studied unpacking of Thomas Heywood’s *A Woman Killed With Kindness* (1607) and a 1596 Cambridge University employee’s court case, Mukherji’s second chapter explores the judicial attitudes that accompany adul-
tery and characterize infidelity. Her investigation explains ways that the “ascertainment of adultery as a legal fact provides a historical basis to the metaphor of public spectatorship and helps us to understand key aspects of early modern mental life, such as privacy, intimacy, and experience of domestic space” (11). Mukherji’s analysis reveals investigative practices in dramatic fictional communities and the contemporary legal environment exhibit remarkable consistency; further, she shows that the “dirty business of ferreting out adultery” casts respectable evidence collection into an undignified space (80).

Contemporary materials such as Protestant judgment books, moral tracts, popular news pamphlets, broadsides, and ballads underpin the exploitation of evidence and legitimate representation in chapter three. Mukherji explores *A Warning for Fair Women* (c. 1590s), an anonymous play that both aligns itself with anti-theatrical sentiment and attempts to “forge a generic identity legitimate by the moralists’ own standards” (96). Linking *Warning* with well-known providentialist history in *The Theatre of God’s Judgements* (1597), she argues the play “serves a legal agenda” (112). Her focus on the dumb show as performance within representational strategies demonstrates drama’s attitude toward evidentiary issues. Mukherji’s chapter closes with an analytical look at drama’s ability to “cast doubt on the project of theatrical providentialism itself” (134).

John Webster’s *The White Devil* provides the focal point of Mukherji’s chapter four, as she examines the word “colour” in relationship to image-making, evidence, and judgment. A systematic treatment demonstrates Webster’s understanding of colour as a “hermeneutic tool,” one scrupulously marshaled in order to interrogate evidence (135). She attends to issues of spectatorship and suggests diligent study of “white” and “black” exposes the potential for misreading signs. Her reading offers multiple rhetorical interpretations of “colour” and the legal implication of giving “colour”—“a practice known to be a sham, pure fiction” (149); she contends the play’s judicial self-reflexivity distinguishes it within the context of the early modern legal framework.

Chapter five, “Locations of Law: Spaces, People, Play,” looks at the physical, lived interrelated spheres of legal and theatrical cultures (12). Set in the legally entrenched Whitefriars’s district, with its urban, specifically metropolitan identity, Lording Barry’s *Ram Case* (1608) represents the city, “where law’s centrality was often social rather than technically pertaining to law courts”
Her reading of this play’s legal plots exposes the law’s trickiness as well as its malleability. A 1623 Star Chamber litigation against playwrights Webster, Ford, Dekker, Rowley and company involving a real-life alehouse story (now lost) furnishes the backdrop for the second strand of Mukherji’s analysis. She explores the connections between the era’s present-day scandals and entertainment venues. Of special interest are the discussions of common law courts and their workings within and without London, the trial tracts written by those who witnessed proceedings, and the issues of ‘open court’ that came to signify jurisprudence.

Focusing on law and gender, chapter six examines Webster’s *The Devil’s Law Case*, a play whose female adulterous protagonist “outperforms” her accusers and disrupts court proceedings (206). Female litigants were accommodated by the court, but the court operated from an established “patriarchal position” and was underpinned by “severely limiting” female “legal agency” (214). Utilizing Shakespeare’s *Measure for Measure*, she shows ways the law itself makes space for contradictions that can then be exploited by women; these situations take the form of “double-speak, contradictions, law-trick, stratagems, and sexual intrigue” (208). Historical background, multiple law cases, and an emerging model for women at court support Mukherji’s claims. The “fictional component itself as a historically meaningful phenomenon,” she maintains, and the “living art of dramatists resides in the middle ground between literal reality and pure invention” (232).

Mukherji’s “Epilogue: The Hydra Head, the Labyrinth and the Waxen Nose: Discursive Metaphors for Law” analyzes the multiplicity of dramatic signification and legal application through a rereading of *Ram Alley* and Swinburne’s *Spousals*. “The threat of multiplicity implicit in legal discourse,” she suggests, is “also the threat of uncertainty” that the hydra, labyrinth, and waxen nose make concrete in drama. She integrates Bacon’s remarks on the labyrinth of uncertainties that common law had become. Further, she suggests that the image of “error, confusion, and incertitude that occupied theology, science, and philosophy” indisputably points to legal mazes. Although Swinburne recognized these mazes, they have been largely overlooked in examinations of common and canon law (242).

Subha Mukherji has produced an illuminating examination of the relation between drama and law in Renaissance England. With well-researched and solid investigation, her book makes a valuable contribution to cultural studies,
gender representation, legal history, and seventeenth-century theatre. A focus on evidence foregrounds the resemblances between the formal structures; however, her argument, she says, is for “salutary caution against an overgeneralising model of the drama’s critique of law” (228). Mukherji succeeds by exposing the complex interaction between these two vital cultural forces.


Curtis Perry’s study of court favoritism in the period between the mid 1580’s and the outbreak of the English Civil War is arranged into seven chapters and an “Afterward” that looks briefly (and revealingly) at Milton’s treatment of the subject in *Paradise Lost*. After the first, which introduces generally his aims, methods, and scope (while it would have been possible to write a history of early modern favoritism beginning with Wolsey and Cromwell,” he admits, “[t]his is not the book I have written” [20]), each succeeding chapter considers the subject from a specific angle (e.g., the assumed erotic relationship between monarch and favorite); in terms of recurrent tropes (e.g., the ubiquitous association of poison with the favorite); or in light of a specific work and its subsequent influence (e.g., *Leicester’s Commonwealth*). The two most substantial chapters examine the importance of King Edward II and of Roman history for a critical shift in the age’s “structures of feeling” about the constitutional implications of royal prerogative. He continuously refers to the five best-known favorites of the period, extensively to Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, Robert Carr, Duke of Somerset, and George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham, and more incidentally to Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford and Walter Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex.

Perry is above all committed to a principle of “continuity,” the recognition of which, he believes, is crucial for an adequate understanding of what favoritism may have meant at any given moment. He puts it most succinctly, perhaps, in the following: “…the discourse I am surveying here is a significant native tradition of semi-theoretical radical thought not because it provided anybody with a political program but because writers kept returning to the inherited language of corrupt favoritism to frame responses to new political
His firm adherence to the principle leads to some of his most convincing insights and allows him to articulate with some precision how one writer may be both like and unlike his predecessor, as in the following: “Instead of showing the mechanisms of control [as Jonson does], Massinger dramatizes their effect upon public discourse” (256). I quote this because it illustrates not just Perry’s insistence on continuity but also his commitment to the notion that what is most important is to get beyond a concern with or focus on individual personalities to the level of cultural discourse and its “cultural work.”

Arguably, Perry’s key word in all of this is “tension.” In each chapter, he is concerned to elucidate how a fundamental tension between two competing political theories plays out in the various discourses of the period. On the one hand is the broadly Aristotelian ideal of “balanced constitution,” in which the monarch’s rule is abetted by the counsel of noble peers, under the guidance of common law; and on the other is the practice of personal rule in which the prerogative of the monarch is absolute, his will analogous to God’s. The “profound ambivalence” produced by this incompatibility, as shown in the speeches and writings of a wide array of politicians, pamphleteers, compilers of manuscript anthologies, poets, and (especially) playwrights, some of them well-known, others barely recognizable names, constitutes Perry’s subject. But there is another “tension” at work in his book, that between his aim on the one hand of making each chapter “stand on its own” and, on the other, of producing “a deeply interwoven account of a literature whose various strands are meaningfully intercomplicated” (21). This tension produces not ambivalence but an amount of repetition that anyone reading straight through (say, a reviewer) may find himself so disgruntled as to become inattentive and lose the import of what he is being shown. This is unfortunate, because Perry’s is a significant intervention in the multiple political discourses that dominate the period leading up to the Civil War.

Although there are several kinds of repetition—e.g., a habit of explaining quotations that need no explanation—two in particular tend to weaken the overall effectiveness of Perry’s argument. Typically, a detailed reading of a work expands outward to encompass its deeper implications within its cultural moment. The following examples are typical. Speaking of the anonymous plays *A Knack to Know a Knave* and *Charlemagne* Perry claims that the “characteristic mixture of critique and avoidance gives expression to a real
cultural ambivalence about the politics of personal intimacy” (154). Commenting generally on the Edward II story, he finds that it “invokes a profound ambivalence about the nature of personal monarchy . . .” (186). Or again, generalizing from his reading of Marlowe’s Edward II, “. . . the balance built into the . . . story between blame for the king’s tyrannous passions and blame for the peers’ rebelliousness actually mirrors a deeper cultural ambivalence about the nature of personal monarchy and the nature, respectively, of tyranny and treason” (201). Regarding the two states of Francis Hubert’s verse history of The Life and Death of Edward the Second, his conclusion is that “both texts are profoundly ambivalent about the radical questions about personal rule and prerogative . . .” (211). One effect of such repetition, in almost identical language, is to flatten out real distinctions and make quite different kinds of works seem curiously alike.

Another kind of repetition may make it seem that Perry is indulging in circular reasoning. The following example is not unique. “In other words, the account of James constructed by writers like [Anthony] Weldon and [Arthur] Wilson resemble Jonson’s depiction of Tiberius and Sejanus because they all share the same classical sources. This kind of specific causality is worth revisiting in detail because it can help us understand the way received habits of thought fed into and shaped the ‘epistemic limits’ governing later Jacobean conflicts as well” (249-50). Doesn’t this say, in effect, that because we understand how Roman history is being used we can come to understand how Roman history is used?

Despite these quibbles, there is real significance in Perry’s work. Perhaps most far-reaching is his engagement with current historical debates about the rise of Republican thought in the period before the Civil War. His careful and nuanced analyses of a large number of plays during the 1620’s, -30’s, and -40’s make a convincing case that, “while it is appropriate to see our playwrights’ conversation as part of the gradual development of oppositional republican habits of thought” (275; my italics), in no case does he find any strong evidence of “the more broadly egalitarian ideas that have come to be associated with the word” (279). In every instance, although his analyses make explicit the various ways that the playwright is digging vigorously in the seedbed of republicanism, his basic conclusion is that, to quote his formulation concerning Thomas May’s Julia Agrippina, “the play’s political morality . . . is conventional enough and does not seem to me to be inconsistent with the ideals of
the balanced constitution” (263). An important element in his engagement is
the leverage provided by the New Historicism model of subversion and
containment. Although his quarrel with its basic premise—that radical possi-
bilities may be deployed in literature because that makes them “safe” and thus
easily diffused—is not paraded prominently, it is a current running throughout,
leading to his resounding final rhetorical question: “. . . given the fact of civil
war, how can one say that the subversive perspectives made available within
the discourses of favoritism were—ultimately—contained?” (285).

What underlies the forcefulness—and I think success—of this essentially
historical intervention is Perry’s training as a literary scholar. For that is what
allows him to trace more clearly, perhaps, than most professional historians
the linguistic indirections whereby important directions may be found out. It
helps him, for example, to keep his critical eye trained on the deep structure of
the “cultural paranoia” regarding the royal favorite—i.e., the fact that both the
idea of a monarch who can remain “above” the merely personal and the
idea of an all-powerful favorite are equally “ideological fantasies,” one the
inverse of the other (8-9). Such perceptions guide his readings of individual
works, whether literary or not. And it is this same training, I think, that permits
him to argue, convincingly, that, while the royal favorite may be “an imaginat-
ive construct,” the anxiety that it produces is real indeed, with real conse-
quences.

To make this argument, Perry marshalls an impressive quantity of re-
search—the sheer number of little-known or little-examined primary works is
just shy of intimidating, as is also his familiarity with the secondary scholarship,
both historical and literary. His research is matched, I believe, by the acuteness
of his detailed analyses of individual plays, poems, and such non-fictional
works as Parliamentary speeches, political pamphlets, and histories. As might
be expected, the wide cast of his net brings in a large number of big fish, for
many of whom he provides lengthy and cogent commentary: e.g., Sidney’s
New Arcadia, Marlowe’s Edward II, Jonson’s Siganus, Massinger’s Queen of Corinth,
Elizabeth Cary’s History of the Life, Reign, and Death of Edward II, among other
well-known works. But of more lasting value, I think, will be his having put
into critical play a host of smaller fry: anonymous works like A Knack to Know
a Knave (late-Elizabethan), Charlemagne (1610-22), The Tragedy of Nero (1624),
and The True Chronicle History of . . . Thomas Lord Cromwell (1600); such under-
studied or—appreciated plays as Massinger’s Duke of Milan (1623) and The
Roman Actor (1626); a substantial number of political pamphlets, such as George Eglisham’s The Forerunner of Revenge (1626) or Marchmont Needham’s The Second Part of Crafty Cromwell (1648); and verse histories, such as Francis Hubert’s, cited above.

Perry’s insightful readings are aided not just by his familiarity with a mountain of recent historical and literary scholarship, but also by the degree to which he is conversant with a range of critical methodologies and theories: in addition to the New Historicism, he calls in aid Jurgen Habermas’s notions regarding the “public sphere” and Raymond Williams’ theories of residual, dominant, and emergent social formations and of structures of feeling. However, probably most important for his purposes are recent developments in “sodometries” and in conceptualizations of a “bodily politics.” Both of these inform his rich examination of “erotic favoritism” and of the staying power of the Edward II story. Recent advances in our understanding of sodomy as a complex and contradictory discursive category inform his ability to show how erotic favoritism offers the age an “alternative” to the longstanding habit of “blaming evil counselors for misgovernment while exonerating their royal patrons” simply by reassiging “the favorite’s power to the erotic incontinence of the monarch” (135-36). This reattribution enables the hitherto “impossible” idea that whatever rottenness may be in the state emanates from the monarch himself, thus making it possible to think of a different form of government. As I indicated, no one writing about the evils of favoritism unequivocally took that next step, though, as Perry shows, several came close. One factor contributing to this state of affairs may be laid at Marlowe’s door—although Perry himself does not say so. In a fine reading of Mortimer’s soliloquy at 5.4.46-55, he makes clear that the political drive in Marlowe’s play has been to a complete impasse, in which “both royal will and subject’s opposition tend ultimately toward the chaos of passion” (201). Marlowe, as early as the 1590s saw no way out. As Perry is careful to say repeatedly, he is not claiming that the discourse of favoritism caused the Civil War, but he makes abundantly clear its unquestionable importance in the formation of the set of discursive conditions that made it possible.
In this study on autobiography and gender, Seelig examines the life-writing of six seventeenth-century Englishwomen: Margaret Hoby’s diary (1599-1605), Anne Clifford’s diaries and annual summaries (1603-1676), Lucy Hutchinson’s unpublished fragment of her own “life,” set against that of her husband (c.1674), Ann Fanshawe’s and Anne Halkett’s narrative royalist autobiographies (c. 1676-78), and Margaret Cavendish’s *True Relation of My Birth, Breeding and Life* (1656) and *Blazing World* (1666). Addressing her subjects chronologically, she observes that these women’s texts “trace a progression from fairly factual documentation of events to more consistent and conceptualized narratives, to extravagant and romantic self-depiction and self-construction” (11). Seelig asks perceptive questions regarding the life-writing of women of this period, such as, “Are these texts in which we might look for coherence, linearity, and consistency? Are these expectations of ours something alien to the writer or something shared by her?” (2). She also considers, “How often did the writer record? What kinds of things did she include? What did she omit? . . . for whom was she writing?” (2). Moreover, she asks, “What happens to me when I read? What patterns do I find in this text? Are they of my making or the author’s?” (11). Seelig then provides close readings of the texts based on her responses to such questions. She summarizes her intentions by stating, “My goal is not to arrive at an absolute definition of these forms [of autobiography], but rather to notice how individual texts are related, and how distinguished from each other” (7).

Demonstrating her familiarity with the theoretical territory of autobiographical criticism, Seelig engages with the work of J. Paul Hunter, Georges Gudorf, Paul Delany, Estelle Jelinek, Sidonie Smith, James Olney, Sara Heller Mendelson, and Elspeth Graham. She especially asserts that Mendelson’s and Graham’s observations about the difficulties of categorizing seventeenth-century self-narratives are particularly helpful to consider in light of the variety of styles of women’s life-writing from this period. She emphasizes that her approach is “to encounter each text on its own terms, without being too categorical at the outset about what those terms might be” (11). She also
states that the “pleasures of these texts are in what they reveal—about the lives, the thoughts, the formal possibilities and constraints of seventeenth-century women writers—and in what they conceal” (14). Regarding her own notion of a theoretical approach, Seelig seems to argue that such texts are best served by close readings couched in historicized frameworks.

In each of her six chapters, Seelig discusses the historical context of the life of the woman in question as she addresses key passages from that woman’s writing. Seelig comments on the passages in relation to the questions she has posed regarding her own reading objectives, and she assesses the writing styles and rhetorical strategies at work in each case. In general, she observes that the earliest two works, those of Hoby and Clifford, are in large part about record-keeping of spiritual exercises and daily life, while those of Hutchinson, Halkett, Fanshawe, and Cavendish “raise much more substantial questions about narrative form and principles” (73). Moving from observing the ways that the “taciturnity, and even the heavily repetitious pattern” of Hoby’s recordings of her spiritual exercises may give readers a “sense of [Hoby’s] agency and confidence” (33) to assessing Cavendish’s “bashfulness” in *A True Relation* vs. her taking “center stage” in *The Blazing World* (153), Seelig combs through the “array of strategies for self-understanding and self-presentation” (11) that she perceives in the works of this group of women.

In addition to asserting that she is reading each work on “its own terms,” Seelig also argues that her selection of texts from the seventeenth century, which are drawn from “the considerably larger body of possibilities” (11), offers “a view of the development of seventeenth-century women’s writing” (154). The statement on the book jacket goes further, noting that Seelig “demonstrates how, in the course of the seventeenth century, women writers progressed from quite simple forms based on factual accounts to much more imaginative and persuasive acts of self-presentation.” Observations concerning development and progression suggest that influences of various kinds were at work, that these women were learning from literary developments in other genres, as well as the life-writing of others. Regarding the former, Seelig does note the increasingly sophisticated literary and rhetorical strategies that these individual women use, saying, for example, that the texts of Hoby and Clifford rely on “devices of time,” while Lucy Hutchinson’s prose particularly recalls that of Richard Hooker, and that Anne Halkett’s
work at times resembles “the best tradition of romantic fiction,” but she does not delve deeply into why this progression might be occurring (131, 75, 115).

Such questions come to mind as, was there really such a linear progression? And, if so, could it be demonstrated in more detail by further consideration and discussion of “the larger body of possibilities”? Were such women reading the life-writings of other women and men, and to what effect? Would it be worthwhile to consider further the development of complexity of style among seventeenth-century women writers of belles lettres (she does mention Austen) alongside that of women who wrote these autobiographical works? While it is true these particular texts suggest a progression toward increasingly sophisticated approaches to self-representation in women’s life-writing, Seelig offers little beyond the internal evidence of her selected texts to support this idea; thus, more contextualization of this phenomenon would be useful. She does acknowledge in her conclusion that “one might complicate the picture I’ve sketched” (159).

The picture that Seelig has sketched is indeed a fascinating one of women recording the events of their lives and families, as they see fit, in a variety of autobiographical styles. Her probing questions help to open these texts up for readers in ways that are insightful, and they complicate theories about life-writing as a genre. In her introduction, Seelig points out even those studies that “deal primarily with women’s autobiography struggle to arrive at accurate descriptions or generally valid principles” (5); thus, in her own, she seeks to allow the texts to speak for themselves, discussing on a case-by-case basis what she believes are the shaping forces for each. This study will appeal to scholars of autobiographical and gender studies, as well as to literary scholars and historians, and it will open the way for more questions about the developments in women’s life-writing during this period to be addressed.


Since 1965, the Renaissance English Text Society has been publishing “literary texts, chiefly nondramatic, of the period 1475-1660.” Now, in conjunction with the Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, it has

In this volume, Evans collects several dedicatory poems to Robert Parry, *Sinetes* (facsimiles of 46 “Passions,” 13 “Posies,” 31 “Sonnetos,” and several miscellaneous poems), *The Lamentation of a Male-content* (facsimile), “Epitath of Mistris Katheryn Theloall,” and the 22 songs from *Moderatus, or the Adventures of the Black Knight*. Against Carelton Brown who, in his edition of 1914, attributed the majority of these works to Sir John Salusbury, Parry’s patron, Evans argues that they were all composed by Parry. Evans cites both “external evidence”—the title page of *Sinetes* and the capital “S” in Sonnetos 2-14—as well as “internal evidence”—Parry’s statements of intent and verbal and thematic echoes from work to work—to illustrate his position. Thus, he reclaims for Parry the Patron series and the other seven Posies, Sonnetos 1-31, along with the other poems preceding “Sinetes Dump,” and *The Lamentation of a Male-content*, a poem at least questioned by Brown.

As part of his argument from external evidence for Parry’s authorship of these texts, Evans notes that “Parry makes three statements about the intentions underlying his publication of *Sinetes*. (1) in the top division of the title-page, he tells us that his “Passions yppon his fortunes” are “offered for an Incense at the / shrine of the Ladies which gui- / ded his distempered / thoughtes”; (2) in the opening dedicatory Epistle, he promises that Salusbury will gain lasting honor and immortal fame from what is said about him in *Sinetes*; (3) in the dedicatory Epistle prefacing “The lamentation of a Male-content,” he announces that “the Name-lesse (i.e. Parry) is writing the poem to wish “the Honorable minded vnknowne” (who will shortly be identified as Helena Owen) “perfect health and / perpetuall happines” (13). Such statements are, indeed, convincing.

When he turns to internal evidence, Evans claims that “‘Posie I. The patrones conceyte’ offers clear evidence of Parry’s hand, furnishing thematic and verbal echoes, a number of them what may be called distinctive Parryisms . . .” (13). At this point, Evans provides a table, one of five, of such verbal echoes. For example, he lists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line: 5</th>
<th>Posie III:33: Natures pride</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natures chiefe pride</td>
<td><em>Moderatus</em>, sig. B1: the verie pride of Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Moderatus</em>, sig. R2: the pride of Nature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At first, such words and phrases seem too closely to echo Mathew Arnold’s “Touchstone Theory,” but once one reads the poems, one realizes Evans’ intimate familiarity with these texts, and, along with the external evidence, they provide considerable support for the argument that these works were indeed written by Robert Parry.

As Evans points out, Parry’s life, and his connection to Salusbury, supplies a rich context for Parry’s work. In addition to his poetry, Parry kept a detailed diary, and as Evans states, he is perhaps “the only Elizabethan poet for whom a day-by-day, month-by-month, and year-by-year diary has survived, a personal/impersonal record of his life and times” (3). A landed Welsh gentleman, with “substantial private means” (5), Parry apparently received a liberal education; he was “well-grounded in classical Latin literature, with a command of the language, and easily familiar with Greek and Roman mythology” (4). In addition, as a landed gentleman, Parry knew the law and “may have had some connexion with one the Inns of Court” (5).

Parry’s life and work, of course, is integrally bound to his patron, John of Salusbury. Parry’s association with Salusbury, who was knighted Sir John in 1601, and his circle “must have begun some time before 1591” (6). Indeed, Parry not only dedicated *Sintetes* to him, but in the opening dedicatory Epistle and in the so-called Patron-series, Parry “paints Salisbury in almost heroic terms” (8). In fact, in the latter poems, a part of the “Posies,” Parry practices “a kind of ventriloquism” (25). That is, Parry presents Salusbury “in the role of a would-be lover speaking of his mistress, Dorothy Halsall, a device that enables Parry to lavish ‘glorious’ praise on both” (25).

Chronologically, Parry’s life parallels that of Shakespeare. As Parry himself wrote in his diary: “this yere [1564] the 30 daye of Iulie between 3 & 4 a clocke in the moringe I *Robert Parry* was borne” (1). Although the date of Parry’s death is unknown, the last entry in his diary is “12 February 1613” (2). While the two men lived at approximately the same time, their work differs considerably. As Evans says, “Robert Parry, as a poet, may properly be ranked with a group of Elizabethan-Jacobean poet-versifiers, who, occupying what may be called a third level, wrote more from a sense of satisfying a fashionable mode . . . than from any deeply-felt emotional involvement” (23). One element of this “fashionable mode” was Parry’s repeated use of acrostics, which were often extensive and elaborate, especially in his connections with four women in his life. Although he never tells his wife’s name, he
develops clever acrostics that name Helena Owen, Frances Willoughby, Elizabeth Wolfreston, and Salisbury’s sister-in-law Dorothy Halsall. In a less clever and more conventional poem, Sonneto 18, (Parry is apparently the only sonnet writer to use the Italian form of the word), he indirectly praises Helena Owen by writing:

Namelesse the flower that workes my discontent,
Endlesse the cares for her I doe sustaine,
Waste is the soyle which shadowes my content
Once lende a salue to cure my curelesse paine.
Ah deere, how deere I purchase my delight?
Not longe when first I view’d thy sweetest fayre.
Except thy beauty lend my darknes light,
Long shall that looke my heauie lookes ympayre;
Esteeme of him that liues to honour thee,
Hopes true respose shall then be lodg’d in mee.

Finally, Parry’s first published text (1595), a romance entitled Moderatus, or The Adventures of the Black Knight, may have been his most original work. In it Parry combines elements of traditional romance with those of contemporary pastoralism to produce a work that is closely associated with Sidney’s Arcadia (30).

On one level, then, The Poems of Robert Parry provides documentation about an individual gentleman-poet whose skills and talents varied widely. In addition to writing numerous poems in a variety of modes and styles, he produced a significant prose romance. Also, as his diary suggests, Parry took an avid interest in history and politics, both personal and public, English and continental, and he was possibly, as evidence suggests, a fairly accomplished translator. In this regard, even though it collects the work of a single individual, this volume provides documentation of the tastes, interests, and habits of a social/political circle that lies beyond our usual range of interest. It is a valuable text that broadens our scope and understanding of the life and literature of the period.

Alison Findlay’s *Playing Spaces in Early Modern Women’s Drama* investigates the multivalent concept of space in a wide-ranging survey of plays, masques, and liturgical dramas written and performed by women from 1376 to 1705. Examined are dramatic works of the Abbess of Barking, Elizabeth I, Mary Sidney Herbert, Henrietta Maria, Rachel Fane, Margaret Cavendish, Aphra Behn, and many others. Informing Findlay’s study are the social and spatial theories of Henri Lefebvre and Michel De Certeau. (See, for instance, Lefebvre’s *The Production of Space* and De Certeau’s *The Practice of Everyday Life*.) In *Playing Spaces*, space is figured as “the product or result of a given cultural practice” that contains moments where change may or may not take place, depending upon the forces at work in the moments of production (1). A key component of this analysis is the study of the interplay of boundaries both physical and cultural. Utilizing Mikhail Bakhtin’s work on creative chronotopes, Findlay interrogates the relationships of such boundaries by examining the ways venue and setting respond to and inform one another.

This study of venue and setting as it relates to dramatic writing by women provides an important approach to understanding ways in which early modern women articulated and negotiated social and political positions. Dramatic composition and performance, Findlay argues, afforded women a “vehicle through which their own spatial experiences could be translated into play, and through which they could lament, reject, criticise, celebrate and, most importantly, renegotiate their place in the world” (3). Although little to no material evidence regarding specific performances exists outside of the texts of this study, Findlay shows that textual evidence internal to these pieces addresses questions of performance and illuminates moments of production. The notion that many dramatic pieces were designed to be acted or performed in some way is emphasized at multiple points throughout this work and is drawn from projects including the Women and Dramatic Production 1570-1670 project directed by Findlay, Stephanie Hodgson-Wright, and Gweno Williams.
The chapters of *Playing Spaces* are organized thematically around the five spaces most important to the study of dramatic composition by women: homes, gardens, courts, sororities, and cities. Each chapter is organized chronologically, and the movement from chapter to chapter provides a logical progression that begins with a study of drama composed prior to 1660 and that culminates with professional dramas staged in London.

Chapter 1, “Homes,” provides a discussion of the relationship of noblewomen to the great houses they occupied by asking how “the fictional zone created by the script” rearticulates the domestic household controlled by men. Mary Sidney Herbert’s *The Tragedie of Antonie* is analyzed in the cultural and material context of Herbert’s Wilton estate, concluding with the image of house as tomb and the necessity of “self-annihilation” (30). A similar approach is made to examinations of Elizabeth Cary’s *The Tragedy of Mariam*, Lady Jane Cavendish’s and Elizabeth Brackley’s *The Concealed Fancies*, and Margaret Cavendish’s *Plays*, investigations revealing further how the dramas were used by their authors to imagine the possibility of a home created and managed by women.

“Gardens,” the second chapter, leads readers into the world of the pastoral by examining the spaces and freedoms of gardens, heterotopic places resembling the living art form of the theater that offered women opportunities to participate in green worlds. Female-authored entertainments for Elizabeth I, such as Lady Jane Lumley’s translation of *Iphigenia at Aulis*, are discussed. Also included here are investigations into Lady Mary Wroth’s *Love’s Victory* and the venue of Penshurst, Rachel Fane’s entertainments and the house of Apethorpe, and Lady Jane Cavendish’s and Lady Elizabeth Brackley’s *Pastorall* and the fountain garden at Bolsover Castle.

The third chapter, “Courts,” presents the mercurial world of the court and the elaborate masques designed for Mary Queen of Scots, Elizabeth I, and Anna of Denmark. Especially interesting is Findlay’s discussion of *The Vision of the Twelve Goddesses*, a masque performed at Hampton Court. Anna requested the performers utilize the clothes of Elizabeth I as a means to invest herself with the authority once held by Elizabeth. Also illuminating is the section “Framing Beauty and Planting Voices: Henrietta Maria’s Court Drama,” which incorporates an analysis of English versions of French scripts as well as English texts that “struggle against the confinement of the mirror or picture frame” and embrace “the spectacular possibilities of court theatre” (133).
Chapter 4, “Sororities,” focuses upon sororal chronotopes by discussing the communities of convents and academies that provided women utopian worlds. Examination of liturgical chronotopes produced by nuns and priests at Wilton and Barking Abbeys is followed by a study of Antonia Pulci’s *Play of Saint Domitilla* and *Play of Saint Guglielma*, a move that accounts for the religious displacement taking place in England in the period. The sororal tradition in women’s drama is shown to reemerge in England in secularized form with the performance of *Cupid’s Banishment* and to persist with the production of plays by Margaret Cavendish, including *The Female Academy* and *The Convent of Pleasure*.

In the final chapter of *Playing Spaces*, “Cities,” women’s drama meets city stages. Findlay examines the ways that women playwrights and actors interrogate traditional contrasting attitudes toward the city—the masculine *polis* and the feminine, “mysterious city, full of secret passageways and unexpected openings” (182). Women’s drama, especially post-Restoration theatre, is shown to take new risks as it questions and seeks to reform boundaries between the city and court, the city and town, and the public and private realms. In these spaces women playwrights and actors “change the way female identity is constituted” (183). As with the discussions in earlier chapters, numerous plays are surveyed. Here, analyses of Elizabeth Polwhele’s *The Frolicks*, Susannah Centlivre’s *The Basset-Table*, and Aphra Behn’s *The Rover* and *Sir Patient Fancy* are especially noteworthy.

*Playing Spaces in Early Modern Women’s Drama* is a remarkable study for its depth, density, and range. The treatments of arguments about the spaces of composition and performance that are made by Findlay are sophisticated and complex. This book provides highly stimulating and rewarding reading for students and scholars of women’s drama.


Somewhere between old-style bibliographical studies that focus on the physicality of the printed book and post-modern inquires into material culture lies a new balanced, sophisticated class of research that looks into what
physical books mean to ideologically-rooted cultures and how those cultures influence the production of texts. John N. King searches for such a balance in his *Foxe’s Book of Martyrs and Early Modern Print Culture*. King focuses on the genesis, history, and reception of John Foxe’s *Book of Martyrs*, the influential Protestant text of the sixteenth century, and he provides us with a book that is a real scholarly achievement. Tracing the original conception, compilation, and production of *Book of Martyrs* as well as the subsequent editions of the work (with all their various amendments and alterations), King narrates the complete early modern history of this important text. But the book attempts to be more than just a book about Foxe’s *Book of Martyrs*; King provides what promises to be a case study that provides detailed insight into early modern print culture itself.

King divides his book into four major sections, the first of which deals with Foxe’s collaboration and compilation of the material found in the *Book of Martyrs*. He argues against the negative label of Foxe as a plagiarist, but rather looks at the book for what it is: a true compilation. King highlights the interaction Foxe had with other collaborators, such as John Aylmer, Henry Bull, and others. The fact was that Foxe was part of a large community of writers, printers, and religious thinkers, many of whom had a hand in the “composition” of the *Book of Martyrs*. King also discusses various models for *Book of Martyrs*, and especially addresses the association the book had with John Bale’s *Image of Both Churches*.

Chapter 2, perhaps the most in-depth chapter of the book, addresses *Book of Martyrs* “in the printing house,” that is the actual production of the text itself. King discusses early modern printing houses, in which Foxe himself was always immersed. An entire section is devoted to the *Book of Martyrs*’ printer, John Day, whose work with Reformation printing—Protestant printing—was immensely influential and ultimately affected the overall impact of Foxe’s work. King thoughtfully describes the first nine editions of the work, as well as the abridgements by Dr. Timothy Bright, Clement Cotton, Thomas Mason, and John Taylor. Discussing everything from font type to printing techniques, to religious context, King argues that such an overview reflects “the shifting expectations of editors and readers with different social positions and ideological beliefs” (161).
Chapter 3 looks at the vast iconography of *Book of Martyrs*. King makes a strong case that Foxe did not exert heavy serious control over the printers’ inclusions of images. Both the technical and ideological elements of the images in the various editions are discussed in detail, and many illustrations of the woodcuts are provided. King offers an interesting assertion that the manner in which woodcuts are arranged in the text influences the very activity of “reading,” and in fact looking at the woodcuts becomes a kind of reading in itself.

Finally, in Chapter 4 King discusses the actual reading, readership, and reception of *Book of Martyrs*. Apparently, Foxe specifically intended his book to be read by different classes of “readership,” from the more casual Renaissance reader to the real scholar; Foxe even wrote different prefaces to address these different readerships. King also generally discusses the nature of book ownership and private libraries during the period as well as how the book was, of course, received differently by Protestant and Catholic readers. The book ends with a glossary of printing terms (some terms in that glossary, like “gloss” or “pagination,” I must admit, seem a bit unnecessary), a good bibliography, and a strong index.

Is this book significant scholarship and done well? Absolutely. Do we understand the cultural context, the printing trade, and the genesis of this great early modern work by Foxe? Again, yes. But is this a “must read” for any Renaissance scholar or critic? Maybe not. Despite the fact this truly is a great achievement and very impressive, I do wonder whether or not this would only be of primary importance to other scholars working specifically on the production of Foxe’s book. Again, there are certainly places that argue for bigger ideological relevances (I am particularly drawn to the idea of “looking as reading” with regards to the woodcuts), but the bottom line is this is a book that really is about the making of Foxe’s *Book of Martyrs*. If that’s not your primary interest, then King’s book serves best as a kind of reference work, something to sit on the shelf until you need a name of, let’s say, some prominent Protestant printer whose name you just cannot quite recall. Of course, every Foxe scholar and critic should have the book, consult it often, and know what is in there, but I am not sure we are getting a truly new approach to early modern book making or reading, which is what the author suggests and what would make this a book for all Renaissance scholars.
Still, I must emphasize that for what it is—and it is a lot–this is a superb study of Foxe’s famous and influential work.


In this clearly written, substantive, and well-researched book, Steve Mentz makes a strong case for the importance of prose fiction in the literary and social culture of late Elizabethan and early Jacobean England. He argues, for instance, that “as we come to realize that our sense of Shakespeare’s disinterest in print publication may have been overstated, we should also remember that the common practice of playwrights who were not also shareholders seems to have been to write prose pamphlets along with plays, as did Greene, Lodge, Nashe, Chettle, Munday, and others” (6). Writing for print publication (in other words) may have been a far more important aspect of the literary environment of Shakespeare’s days than we commonly assume, and Mentz persuasively contends that the voluminous prose fiction produced during this time has been neglected for far too long. Fortunately, his own book is one of many signs lately that this neglect is diminishing, and indeed one great value of this volume is the overview it provides of recent developments in the field. Mentz seems to have read everything relevant to his various topics, and his often lengthy footnotes (which are, thankfully, indeed at the foot of each page) are well worth reading in their own rights. He provides brief but judicious assessments of the scholarship he cites, often indicating the main points of critical controversy so that readers will have a clear sense of the many issues under debate. He will, usually, indicate his own position on contested matters, but he can also be trusted to summarize lucidly and fairly any points of contention. His highly detailed notes, almost by themselves, make this book worth owning.

But there is more, of course, to this book than its notes and the guides to scholarship they provide. There is, above all, Mentz’s own effort to describe the nature, origins, and significance of the rapidly increasing number of texts that helped shape the genre of prose fiction (and especially prose romance) in the late 1500s. Mentz contends that
the defining feature of Elizabethan fiction, the feature that distinguishes it from its medieval ancestors and connects it to the modern novel, is simply large-scale narrative coherence. This feature has been overlooked because our habits of reading have taught us to believe that length and coherence are marks of little distinction, but comparing Elizabethan fictions to their immediate predecessors supports my claim. Neither medieval romances of chivalry nor Renaissance novelle were organized this way. For Elizabethan romance writers plot became something to be shaped into a coherent and closed whole, and this innovation was key to the success and influence of their works. (11)

This is a tantalizing claim; if it ultimately proves convincing to other specialists in the field, it would seem to authorize a whole new emphasis on formalist study of a huge body of early modern literature. The coherence of literary works, of course, has been under suspicion and attack for many decades and from many quarters of literary theory, but Mentz's book seems to fly in the face of such deconstructive impulses. Thus he suggestively advises that “[r]eaders of early modern fiction should expect schematic and allegorical structures, be suspicious of apparent irrelevance and inconsistency, and discern behind discontinuity and multiple narratives formal patterns and intellectual consistency” (12). In other words, the old notion that a work of art is a carefully crafted formal object that strives for the achievement of complex unity may not be nearly as outmoded or irrelevant as some recent theorists have claimed. Approaching works with complex unity in mind may, in fact, be a historically appropriate way of thinking about fiction and other kinds of literature produced during the age of Shakespeare. One of the many virtues of Mentz's book, in fact, is that he shows how and why this alleged emphasis on unity and coherence resulted from specific historical conditions of the time. He argues, for instance, that the growing emphasis on publication through “[p]rint made lengthy coherent narratives practical for transmitting in significant numbers to a broad readership” (12). In other words, length and coherence as formal features were made possible, in part, through the rise of a new form of technology.

The most important influence on the rise of Elizabethan prose romance, however, was (or so Mentz persuasively argues) the impact of Heliodorus's *Aethiopian History*. “This late classical prose romance, rediscovered in six-
teenth-century Europe and widely published and translated, was” (Mentz claims) “a—perhaps the—key structural model for Elizabethan prose fiction,” and he stresses that “Heliodorus showed Elizabethan writers how to flesh out the bare dicta of Aristotelian theory with a complex, suspenseful narrative structure combining economy and amplitude. Borrowings from Heliodorus have been documented in Shakespeare, Sidney, and Spenser, among others,” but the larger impact of his text “on literary structures and techniques of plotting has been underestimated” (14). Mentz has no difficulty, in the following chapters, making good on this claim. By studying the fiction of Sidney, Lodge, Nashe, and especially Greene, he not only shows how Heliodorus affected their particular works but also helped contribute to the rise of a new kind of writing in England—a kind of writing which (he contends) contributed in turn to the eventual development of the English novel.

Mentz believes (and it is easy to share his conviction) that the time is over-ripe for a reassessment of Elizabethan prose fiction. As he says, the fiction of this period has long been under-valued when compared with the poetry and the drama. His own book makes a valuable contribution to rectifying this neglect, but it is a book written mainly for other specialists in Renaissance studies. What we need now is volume that can make a case to students and other general readers that this kind of fiction is well-structured, well-written, and pleasurable to read. The present book (like much present criticism) tends to focus primarily on the themes and ideas literature explores rather than on the skill, craft, art, and (dare it be said?) genius of much of the detailed phrasing of these works. Mentz is as qualified as anyone to produce the kind of book that still needs to be written—a book that might help win these writers and their prose the broader, deeper kind of attention, and affection, they deserve.


It is a truisim that the some of most extraordinary discoveries seem obvious after they have been revealed, and the prevalence of the idea of equity in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century English discourse falls into that category.
Once Mark Fortier carefully makes a case for the centrality of this term, and the ideas associated with it, in political and religious debate, in poetics, in law—in practically every domain of intellectual pursuit, the reader might respond: “yes, it’s obvious.” To Fortier’s credit, and as a result of the clarity and range of this study, the importance of a concept the author identifies as a cultural phenomenon has become undeniably apparent.

One reason the concept has resisted this sort of comprehensive critical study might be its very complexity: Fortier quotes John Selden as calling it a “roguish thing,” an idea that is elusive, elastic, manipulable, a Janus-like cipher in the middle of the radical politics, theological disputes, and general turmoil of the period. Equity is a term still current in law: a remedy or process distinct from a strictly legal one. Part of its English origin lies in the creation of Chancery, a court designed to redress failings or inadequacies in the common law. The idea of equity suggests, in some contexts, that there is a form of justice or liberty or conscience that supersedes that offered by the judgment of law, in some ways equivalent to the notion of natural law. When the law is unfair, the idea of equity provides a remedy.

Fortier demonstrates that equity was a remarkably diverse concept. For example, one should read “equitably”; that is, in a measured spirit of fairness. Equity is divine, a gift of mercy meant to transcend the human constraint of the legal system. It is a virtue preached regularly from the pulpit. However, as the author amply demonstrates, it is a notion so malleable that it was used to support radical republican arguments, as well as those for royal prerogative. For Charles I, the divine nature of equity is the *sine qua non* of royal authority, that which permits him to minister to his people impartially and with a divinely inspired sense of justice. On the other hand, many argued that a monarch’s authority emanated from law, and so can never be above the law. The concept of equity, then, should serve as a check on royal tyranny.

Another strength of this study is its ability to extend its scope to the area of literary and rhetorical analysis. Too often in historical studies of this sort, authors choose either to exclude literary texts and literary or rhetorical analysis or, conversely (especially if they are English professors), to focus exclusively on the literary, with short shrift given to legal, political, or religious documents for example. Fortier skillfully reveals the “tropes of equitable reading” created in the seventeenth century to imagine “idealized readers—kind courteous, judicious, understanding, Christian and so forth.” The imagined “equitable
reader” brings a kind of divine justice to the experience of reading, thus rendering criticism, properly conceived, a holy act. The author then demonstrates how the principle of equity plays out in several of the canonical writers of the period: Sidney’s use of Euarchus in *Arcadia* as an exemplar of equity; Spenser’s understanding of justice and equity in *The Faerie Queene*; Shakespeare’s invoking the principle (although not the word itself) in *Merchant of Venice* with Shylock’s complaints about law and justice. The section on poetics adds a valuable dimension to our understanding of how writers of the time employed tropes of justice, law, fairness, and so on.

In a final section on “Radical Equity” Fortier shows, once again, how “roguish” the term could be, in this case in the context of the debates leading up to the Civil War. The rhetoric of equity was used commonly to justify the parliamentary rebellion. Apologists such as Milton argued that the idea of equity, embedded in the individual conscience, is rightfully the prerogative of Parliament, to whom a King should answer. In fact, the idea of equity was used to justify the regicide: there is a transcendent law or justice that supersedes tradition and royal authority and must be invoked to liberate people from tyranny. From the Royalist standpoint, of course, “True Equity” is vested in the monarch and that espoused by Parliament was treasonous casuistry.

He concludes with a discussion of Thomas Hobbes’s discussion of equity in *A Discourse of Laws*. Hobbes espouses the idea of “natural justice” and an equity upon which law must be built. Notions of equity, here conceived of as “natural” as well as providentially bestowed, demand our adherence to something like the “Golden Rule.” It helps to preserve the peace, to resolve disputes fairly. While republicans conceived of equity as the province of the individual—a guarantee of liberty, Hobbes saw equity as a part of “the King’s Reason” and therefore part of the rationale for obedience to royal authority.

Fortier’s book is an entertaining and accessible introduction to a principle that had remarkable versatility and potency for seventeenth-century writers, preachers, and political figures. Complex and elusive as the concept is, this study presents it in terms that students from a wide spectrum of disciplines can appreciate and use.

As the first essay collection devoted to the writings of Elizabeth Cary, *The Literary Career and Legacy of Elizabeth Cary, 1613-1680* sets out to do more than simply celebrate Cary's centrality to the study of early modern women's writing. This twelve-essay volume also seeks to establish Cary's relevance to our understanding of seventeenth-century religious controversy, political thought, and manuscript culture—not only in England, but also in Ireland, where Cary lived for four years, and on the Continent, where her children continued her religious and literary legacies. This ambitious program is accomplished by broadening the focus of the volume from Cary's two best-known works, *The Tragedy of Mariam* and *The History of Edward II*, to include considerations of Cary as a poet, translator, polemicist, patron, and religious and literary role model. The end result is a nuanced treatment of the relationship between gender and authorship in early modern England, one that manages to "avoid generalizations about gender that would smooth over [Cary's] consistently ambiguous portrayal of male and female figures and her complicated appropriations of typically ‘male’ genres" (2), while at the same time suggesting just how integral women and women writers might have been to the "male" discourses in which Cary's writings participate. In these essays, Cary's "marginal" position as a Catholic woman writer emerges as a strategic point of departure for interrogating our own categories of historical and literary analysis. By carefully tracing Cary's movements across religious, national, gender, and generic boundaries, the authors not only contribute to the study of an important early modern woman writer, they also make a convincing case for the contribution of early modern women's writing to the study of "authorship, form, and reception" (2).

The volume is divided into four sections. Parts I and II treat Cary's best-known works, *The Tragedy of Mariam* and *The History of Edward II* respectively. Part III is devoted to Cary's lesser-known writings, while Part IV discusses her legacy as a literary patron and role model. The emphasis of Part I is on context. Pointing out that 19 of *Mariam*’s 22 scenes contain at least one lyric, Illona Bell argues that the play's already ambivalent treatment of early modern gender and marital ideals is further complicated by its "often ironic
links to the Renaissance lyric tradition” (18). Erin Kelly explores how the play’s engagement with early modern discourses of martyrdom complicates interpretation of Mariam’s “public voice,” while simultaneously critiquing the tendency of contemporary Protestant martyrology to silence female martyrs. Allison Shell reads the preface of Thomas Lodge’s translation of Josephus’s Antiquities of the Jews as a key to Cary’s “autodidactie” approach to the Mariam story, and moreover as a clue to how we might more fruitfully integrate Cary’s biography into criticism of her literary work.

The first two essays of Part II continue the emphasis on context. Curtis Perry’s chapter on the folio version of Cary’s History links the text to controversies surrounding Charles I’s favorite, George Villiers, duke of Buckingham, while Mihoko Suzuki roots it in Cary’s innovative readings of both English and Continental political theorists. Jesse Swan and Margaret Reeves direct attention to the History’s own complicated history in both manuscript and print. Swan argues for the importance of the 1680 octavo, which is usually dismissed either as a redaction of the folio or as an unreliable earlier version, tracing the octavo’s postpublication history and making a case for its independence from the folio text. Reeves discusses the relationship of two recently discovered manuscript versions of the History to the folio and octavo, linking all four texts to Cary, while demonstrating that the two printed versions are independent productions with separate aims stemming from two no-longer-extant sources.

The essays in Part III are the most innovative and illuminating of the collection, situating Cary nearer the middle than the margins of important religious and political debates of the 1620s and 30s. Karen Nelson contextualizes Cary’s translation of the first part of Jacques Davy du Perron’s Réplique a la réponse du Sérénissime Roy de la Grand Bretagne (Paris, 1620) within contemporary controversies about the increasing power and prominence of Catholics in England. R. W. Serjeanston attempts to reconstruct Cary’s career as a religious controversialist in her own right. Based on his readings of the print and manuscript sources that influenced both parties, he speculates about the contents of the now-lost treatise Cary directed at her Protestant son, Lucius, second Viscount Falkland. Reading the authors of the Great Tew Circle against the Life’s account of Cary’s dispute with William Chillingworth, Serjeanston makes a convincing case for Cary’s influence on many well-known works of religious controversy, including Chillingworth’s Religion of Protestants.
Nadine Akkerman attempts to recover Cary’s reputation as a manuscript poet. Based on the poem’s frequent association with a popular epitaph attributed to Cary in two manuscript sources, she argues for Cary’s authorship of a 44-line elegy for the Duke of Buckingham, reading Cary’s own complicated political and personal loyalties into the elegy’s ambivalent portrait of the Duke.

Part IV of the collection maps Cary’s literary legacy, crossing the national boundaries that tend to limit our sense of her interests and influence. Deana Rankin discusses the likely impact of Cary’s four years in Ireland on her literary and religious identity. Reading the Irish Catholic Richard Bellings’s *A Sixth Booke to the Countesse of Pembroke’s Arcadia* (dedicated to Cary in 1624) alongside the *Life’s* account of her time in Ireland, Rankin explores how Cary’s public role as wife of the Lord Deputy might have challenged her “earlier perceptions of the borderline between private and public pursuits” by affording her “the possibility of practicing both writing and Catholicism in a newly emerging Irish public sphere” (204-5). Marion Wynne-Davies points out common themes in the writings of four of Cary’s children, Lucy, Anne, Patrick, and Lucius. Lucy and Anne wrote from their cloister in Cambrai. Patrick traveled throughout Europe, eventually making his way back to England, where he converted to Protestantism and secular verse, while Lucius assumed his father’s title and his role as an outspoken defender of Protestantism. Wynne-Davies argues that the literary preoccupations of Cary’s Protestant and Catholic children alike reflect her concerns with the dangers and difficulties of judgment, the dynamics of personal transformation, and the material and social costs of spiritual choice.

The common themes discussed by Wynne-Davies in the last essay suggest one point of criticism for the work as a whole. Readers are likely to find themselves wishing the authors had more time and space to talk to each other about the recurring emphasis on judgment, conversion, and political and domestic tyranny running throughout Cary’s writings and linking her to her sources. However, this weakness is an effect of the collection’s own integrative approach, which carefully lays the groundwork for addressing the questions it makes possible.

This welcome study of the remarkable Jane Lead or Leade (1623–1704) thoughtfully depicts her life and her numerous works (http://www.passtheword.org/Jane-Lead/index.html). The “Philadelphians”—the circle that surrounded Leade and her “spiritual mate” Dr. Pordage—have often been poorly remembered. Evelyn Underhill (in *Mysticism*, 1910), for example, styled this “extraordinary sect” as exhibiting mysticism “in its least balanced aspect mingled with mediumistic phenomena, wild symbolic visions, and apocalyptic prophecies.” But Julie Hirst, while uncritically accepting Leade’s claims to mystical experience, approaches Leade out of an interest “strongly shaped by concerns within feminist theology.” Hirst is not interested in describing Leade as an example within a certain tradition, but “as a figure in her own right,” uniquely gifted as a charismatic prophetess and prolific religious writer. This book thus aims to reflect on Jane Leade’s prophecies and “the gender dynamism of her mysticism and spirituality” (9).

Hirst divides her short book into eight somewhat overlapping chapters. She begins with a brief outline of Leade’s life, tendentiously titled “Norfolk’s Child to ‘Bride of Christ.’” This chapter recalls Leade’s early life as one of nine children born to Hamond Ward and his wife Mary, affluent members of the landed gentry, in north Norfolk. At the age of about fifteen, during Christmas festivities, a voice told her to reject such vanity, after which she withdrew into a religious melancholia that lasted three years. Her unwilling marriage at about the age of twenty to William Leade, a worthy and “godly” merchant of King’s Lynn, with whom she had four children, was unsatisfactory, for she was “largely subsumed under her husband’s jurisdiction” (21). He died intestate in 1670, leaving her penniless but free to follow her heavenly calling. She longed for spiritual intimacy; and soon after her husband’s death, she began to have visions of the holy virgin Wisdom, with whom she would in due course be married. She would write in her diary that her first husband had “long hindered my marriage with the Lamb” (26). Now she might call herself divinely owned: “She had the power of personal, spiritual and political choice through a determined will to break free of patriarchal restrictions . . . her solution to widowhood was thus remarriage to God” (27).
But already one is moving into chapter 2, on Dr. John Pordage, who had been leading a circle of “spiritual thinkers” in Bradfield, Berkshire; but he was forced out of his ministry there, and would resign it altogether when the Act of Uniformity was introduced in 1662. Moving to London, Pordage and Jane Leade met, and she joined his group. Pordage encouraged Leade’s visions and her writing, and he evidently introduced her to Jakob Boehme whose works were to occupy an immensely important place in her thought and composition. The central and most important chapters of the book describe Jane Leade’s peculiar transformation of Boehme by means of her own unique alchemical discourse and her vision of mystical marriage to the universally redemptive figure of Sophia, or Holy Wisdom. She was to search for “gold” in terms that might signify the way into a realization of the divine; moreover, she would confer on Wisdom a relationship within the Trinity. These are the concerns of the chapters on “Searching for GO(L)D,” “Visions of Sophia,” and “Mystical Marriage.”

Sophia appeared in many of Leade’s visions and became for her a representative of the female Christ crucified. Hirst describes Leade’s use of Sophia “as a theological tool which enabled her to express certain concepts such as redemption and spiritual rebirth in which Sophia became the mediator between the human and the divine” (62). Leade’s decidedly feminized Deity generates a principal theme of this book. Hirst asks, “How might we read Jane’s visions of Sophia in the light of current feminist scholarship and feminist theology?” (63) Hirst pursues answers to this question throughout most of the remaining chapters of her book, urging the point that Jane Leade became “a fully formed mystic” principally by becoming a “Bride of Christ” through the power of the Virgin Wisdom. Leade’s role as “prophetess” to the Philadelphians allowed her to teach these views, supported by numerous and increasingly intense visions, and also to advance her millenarian ideas about universal salvation available at the Second Coming.

Hirst provides a sympathetic though mostly uncritical summary of Leade’s beliefs, and she quotes a number of passages from Leade’s extraordinarily active pen. Many of these brief excerpts reveal a writer of highly turgid and inflated prose. The one poem, “likely to be Jane’s own work,” is extracted from The Revelation of Revelations (1683), but apparently it was first published in A Heavenly Cloud now Breaking (1681). Hirst quotes this poem in order to demonstrate Leade’s fascination with Sophia, which it clearly succeeds in do-
Yet this poem of forty lines (in five eight-line stanzas) is an egregious mangle of unscannable lines and empty images. Stanza 3 (lines 17–24) is characteristic:

Oh! Hear Virgın-Wisdom’s call and cry,
Who skil'd would be in her Mystery:
A new Way of Manifactory stands open, I see
Such Treasures as the World's Wonder be:
A Ship laden within, that God himself again
Will enter in to seize upon these heav'nly Gems;
Ah, blessed sale for such rich Goods imbark'd here,
For what less than she acting Stone will appear? (76)

This book seems to have begun as a thesis or dissertation, which the author has left unrevised. Hirst’s prose is cluttered with references to various contemporary critics, especially those who help her to advance her feminist reflections—one wishes for a more secure, independent, and skeptical interpretation of Jane Leade’s significance. Furthermore, there is in Hirst’s book frequent repetition of ideas and statements in a dense and fettered style. The typographical and syntactical errors are numerous, for which the publisher may be to blame. Was there no competent in-house editor? Examples abound: from dangling participles, “Remaining in control, her accounts of these episodes . . .” (28) to other irritating lapses: “much less studied in than in the revolutionary decade” (111); “to emphasis a spiritual transformation” (124); “Jane made use of on standard biblical imagery” (126). Hirst aims to describe Jane Leade’s unusual personality, strange visions, and heterodox theology with little reference to a larger context in her own time, though she is at pains to demonstrate Leade’s importance to current women’s studies, and to “thealogy.” Yet for all these caveats, this modest study is a useful and honest biography of a remarkable and genuinely fascinating woman of the later seventeenth century.

Michael J. Colacurcio’s *Godly Letters* poses a challenge for the reviewer. It is, in the author’s own words, a work of “summary analysis” (323). Proportionately, it is more summary than analysis, a fact delimiting a reviewer’s effort at any précis of nearly 600 closely-printed pages of text.

*Godly Letters* has a subject: the celebration of “the Big Books of the first generation” (xviii). This first generation was comprised of Puritan men with a deep emotional investment in their religious enterprise. They were, Colacurcio writes, “men of rare genius” who possessed “a complexity of imagination, a sudden suppleness of notice and of style, and an instinct for the pleasures and the pitfalls of extended composition” (xix).

But if, as Colacurcio’s statement indicates, *Godly Letters* has a big and broad subject, it is also unfortunately a book without a distinct thesis. It leaves the reader with the impression that its author believed or hoped that his sequential, close tracking of the religious arguments in a handful or so of Puritan works would somehow inherently yield a unifying thesis.

Instead of a thesis, there is a declaration of purpose: to identify “a literary story” about “a remarkable number of excellent books” (xii, 33), to recognize that “the prose of the first American Puritans is by itself an enormous literary fact” (555). It is indeed factually clear that early colonial Puritans wrote histories, autobiographies and sermons. What never comes into sharp focus in the welter of paraphrased theological argument and review of historical events comprising *Godly Letters*, is what exactly is meant by “literary.”

The word itself pops up sporadically, but to little avail in such claims as “happily, for our literary interests, not all Puritans stand together on all issues” (172); or “the highest sort of imaginative stress … bring[s] forth … a product we can appreciate as literary” (534-35). It is of no help at all to encounter vapory claims, such as “there are considerable stretches where [Thomas Hooker’s *Application of Redemption*] reads itself”; its “prose rejoices in its own vernacular conviction” (291).

Interestingly, one of Colacurcio’s observations about Hooker’s *Application* suggests a curious parallel to the reader’s experience of *Godly Letters*. Although Hooker’s sermons in *The Application* are thoroughly Rammist in struc-
ture, something odd happens at the end of this two-volume work. Hooker's book, Colacurcio convincingly observes, "is radically incomplete" (323). This lack of finish is a seemingly peculiar outcome in an otherwise rigidly structured book promoting the methodology of preparationist theology. This incompletion is every bit as disappointing for the reader as (Colacurcio could have added) the ending of John Bunyan's later *Pilgrim's Progress*, which shuts down just as the reader most wants to see what lies behind the pearly gates of heaven.

When it comes to "final manifestation" or "perfect completion," Colacurcio explains, "Hooker has no text to speak for ... transcendent possession. And he appears to know exactly what he has elided" (326, 328). Curiously, a similar incompletion and elision characterize *Godly Letters*, which promisingly guides readers on a pilgrimage through dense exegeses of theological argument and historical review only to abandon them at the end without a clear sense of any specific beyond-the-pearly-gate literary revelation.

However, something akin to a literary thesis seems to peck now and then from within the book's hard shell of synopsized theological discourse. How the early colonial Puritan religious ideals pertaining to church and social order were challenged by the tumult of human experience emerges from time to time as a theme in *Godly Letters*. William Bradford's elegiac narrative wrecks on the shoals of lost purpose, Thomas Shepard's autobiography stages a life-drama of progressive discovery that arrives at no conclusion, Edward Johnson's conservative history occasionally and inadvertently registers sentiments antithetical to its design as a practical support for Shepard's theology and John Winthrop's policies, and Winthrop's journals mutate from records of experiential accidents brought under control to reports of irreparable ruptures ensuing from John Cotton's controversial preaching in Massachusetts Bay. After Cotton's arrival "Winthrop's world has become all at once less simple and less easy to control, both in fact and in prose" (170).

These are, in short, narrative breakdowns resulting from the intersection of ambiguous "emergent occasion" and steadfast "genius and passion" (334). The works of the first generation of colonial Puritans, then, convey a sense of "repeated new departures" (574) from frustrated efforts which fail to arrive at some point of certainty. So, like Hooker's *Application*, all of these books remain incomplete or marred. This, it appears, is the literary thesis which is
embedded in *Godly Letters* and which would have benefited from more direct exposition in a more slender volume.

Not that this is a new thesis, of course. Studies of the many narrative failures of Bradford’s history—“the dramatic posing of his problem is more moving than anything his prose can conclude” (146)—have long ago set a pattern for exploring the fault lines of early Puritan literature. Such narrative instability, we now know, can be inadvertent or deliberate, even both simultaneously. Congregationalists practiced a decorum of imperfection, Charles W. Mignon’s pertinent phrase for the self-conscious management of literary defects akin to the intentional design flaws found in Puritan quilts and woodwork.

But the good news about *Godly Letters* is that some of the books reviewed in it have never before been treated as worthy of special attention. Colacurcio, who is extremely well-informed on recent insights into the triumph of the preparationists over their more mystical peers, produces reliable, rich paraphrases and redactions of these books. In fact, his summaries and sidebar comments, often speculating about what an author is thinking, are far more enjoyable to read than the original works. It would be good indeed if the enthusiasm and energy he has lavished on these books proved to be contagious.

*Godly Letters* is a deeply informed resource for anyone with a keen interest in the theological hairsplitting, the twists and turns of early colonial Calvinist arguments. The center of the book, nearly 200 pages long, is aptly titled “Doctrine.”

Eric Jan Sluijter. *Rembrandt and the Female Nude.* Amsterdam University Press, 2006. 448pp. + 100 color, 250 b/w illus. $74.50/59.50 Euros. Review by LARRY SILVER, UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

Some scholarly projects have a vitality of their own, progressing from particular studies to a richly layered synthesis. This book is one of those projects, a masterwork by a mature and leading scholar fully in control of his materials. Eric Jan Sluijter, professor of Dutch and Renaissance art history at the University of Leiden, wrote his earlier studies exploring the Dutch visualization of Greco-Roman myths as well as interpretive issues concerning the
female nude in Dutch art. Now, in a culmination of his research interests, he turns his attention to Rembrandt, focusing on his mythic, including biblical, stories that expressly focus on the nude. Most of these chapters elaborate upon a shorter published essay on the separate subjects: Andromeda, Susannah and the Elders, Diana and Actaeon, Danaë, and Bathsheba, but they are interspersed with erudite discussions (*intermezzi*) on such topics as Dutch cultural attitudes towards the nude and artistic practices of producing the nude from female models.

What makes this book so valuable—aside from the clarity of exposition and cogency of interpretations by Sluijter—is his wide-ranging comparisons to artists beyond Rembrandt. Visual inspiration from Italy, especially Titian, and from Netherlandish images of myth, particularly by Goltzius and his generation as well as the Rubens circle, provided the solid foundations—often through engravings—on which Rembrandt built. These and other sources enable the author to discern what was unique and distinctive about Rembrandt’s female nudes, which soon elicited quite scathing criticisms. Sluijter also examines that contemporary verbal critical and theoretical prose, both pro and con, to situate both the general controversies concerning depictions of nudes as well as the particular assessments of Rembrandt’s own, seemingly anti-classical nudes.

An example of Sluijter’s procedure is his short opening chapter on Andromeda, which outlines the visual tradition, from Titian through Goltzius and Rubens (including an image on his own house), as well as the poetic and allegorical, usually political, interpretations of the scene that Rembrandt would have known. But the then discusses Rembrandt’s “drastic deviations” (90), excluding allegory entirely by omitting both Perseus and the monster as well as stressing not the beauty but the awkwardness and fright of the solitary heroine. This is an emphatically non-classical, non-conventional, un-stylishly vulnerable naked damsel in true distress. At once more linked to the verisimilitude of early Netherlandish nudes, e.g. van Eyck or van der Goes, than to the more recent, Italianate beauties, this nude is also more life-like in appearance, and it conveys emotions emphatically. Sluijter’s first *intermezzo* explores Rembrandt’s depiction of the passions as a maturing artist in the 1620s and 1630s as a context for the ambition in his own *Andromeda* (ca. 1630-31; The Hague), a textbook nude subject for display of his artistic talents for capturing the natural and the human. In the process he provides one of the best
introductions to a rhetorical art theory, expounded by later Dutch art writers, as well as the first decade of the painter's own experimentation with biblical subjects and emotions, exemplified by another mythology, the Rape of Prosperina (ca. 1631; Berlin).

Because of the author's own prior accomplishments, his every assessment carries true authority. This is a book of crucial importance for Rembrandt scholarship (though in some ways prepared by Sluijter's earlier publications), but also for assessments of the classical heritage in Dutch culture or even European culture more widely. The inclusive roster of images, especially of engravings and of mythologies by other, less familiar Dutch painters makes this study all the more useful and comprehensive.

Even when Rembrandt adopts the model of Rubens and the ultimate source in antique statuary for his imagery, such as the 1636 Susanna (1636; The Hague), he shows the figure isolated and vulnerable as well, subject now to the gaze of the (male) viewer and emphatically unclassical in her anatomy and proportions. Sluijter also advances the novel hypothesis that the 1647 but more conventional Susanna and the Elders (Berlin) was actually begun first and only reworked and completed more than a decade later. For this subject, the current extromission theory about the power of a returned gaze by a female (in contrast to downcast eyes and modesty) leads him to the next intermezzo, a reprise of his essay, Seduction of Sight, on “Moral Disapproval and Erotic Impact,” concerning the arousal of desire by a picture of a nude and the inherent threat such desire poses to morality. In the lifelike painting tradition of the Netherlands, this danger of vision was all the more provocative and acute. Sluijter is one of the few scholars who is willing to examine the erotic power of images in the period both frankly and historically (154-63). He makes clear that Rembrandt's paintings of female nudes all would have had conscious voyeuristic appeal.

His third Intermezzo examines Dutch art theory of the seventeenth century concerning the role of the “natural,” to argue that the supposed posthumous, classicist criticisms of Rembrandt's nudes were actually part of a heated dialogue during his own lifetime, in which the artist advocated both the painterly and the natural over the rule-based selection of the beautiful. Titian, an artist frequently adopted by Rembrandt in this book, especially for his subject of Danaë, formed the prototype for the “lifelike” painting camp already by the 1604 theorizing by Karel van Mander in his Schilderboeck. While appropri-
ately focused in a book on Rembrandt and his nudes, Sluijter's discussion will hold wide interest to all scholars of Dutch painting of the century, particularly for its knowledge and thorough use of all kinds of sources, including pamphlets (Jacques de Ville, 1628), anatomy lessons (Jacob van der Gracht, 1634), and especially the critical, even condescending views of Rembrandt's achievement in the artistic treatise of painter Joachim von Sandrart (1678 but based on Amsterdam years, 1637-45). It richly complements and corrects the classic earlier studies by Slive (1953) and Emmens (1979).

In many respects the Danaë chapter is the centerpiece of the volume, and Sluijter is extremely thorough in his consideration of the models for the picture as well as the ambitions (especially relative to the previous nudes) that Rembrandt exerted in its making over two campaigns (Sluijter does, however, belittle modern scholars, including this reviewer, who could still see lingering medievalist allegory along with the new eroticism in the sixteenth-century rendering of the subject by Jan Gossaert, 1527, fig. 201—must the conversion be all or nothing and overnight?). This nude exerted an immediate influence on Dutch painters, especially Jacob van Loo. But chiefly it marked a turning-point for Rembrandt himself, to which Sluijter does full justice.

His next three discussions, also Intermezzi, address contemporary art production: the first examines artistic competition and emulation (*rapen*, “stealing” or “borrowing”); the second focuses on drawings and prints of the female nude, including images of sleepers and models posing in the studio; the third considers the fraught relationship between artist and model. All three of these are major new contributions by Sluijter and valuable for dispelling clichés and commonplaces about models in the period as well as inherited ascriptions in the Rembrandt oeuvre, particularly to the face of his common-law wife, Hendrickje, as model. Sluijter, like Stephanie Dickey on the “Saskias,” finds a decidedly mixed grouping of types, albeit with some close overlaps of features, so he quite sensibly abandons the standard identification of Hendrickje as the sitter for the great Bathsheba (1654, Louvre).

The life-sized Bathsheba forms the other node of this volume with Danaë. Sluijter also articulates the prehistory of this picture through prior models and earlier versions by Rembrandt himself as well as his contemporaries. Here he underscores (355) what had been an observation for earlier chapters—that the viewer “inescapably” takes the place of King David as a voyeur of this
beautiful nude. This perceptual and psychological engagement is one of the reasons why Rembrandt strove so mightily for palpable flesh and lifelike bodies, as discussed above—in appeal to both empathy and erotic desire, as with the Danaë, his other life-sized nude, but now in a religious scene of moral temptation. Rembrandt thus makes his images immediate in accord with their subjects, but also in emulation of the great artists of tradition, from Titian through Goltzius to Rubens, and in defiance of moralists from Erasmus to Jacob Cats.

A final note is that this large book offers good value. It is handsomely produced and lavishly illustrated (though comparative photos are often minuscule), and it remains a pleasure to read, even spiced with contemporary references. Certainly it is already a primary resource in course readings, including undergraduate classes, where the larger relevance as well as the perennial significance of Rembrandt himself makes this wide-ranging but closely focused study indispensable. This is the kind of book every library should own, the kind of book that every scholar enviously wishes s/he could have written.


Early in the introductory chapter to Aileen Ribeiro’s Fashion and Fiction, an ambitious survey of seventeenth century English dress, the author describes several surviving garments from the period. That this list is so brief indicates the challenges faced by the early modern fashion historian. Ribeiro’s turn, then, to visual representations of the clothing of the period is a necessary one and it is clear why she would look to the wealth of visual depictions of dress, mostly portraiture of royalty and aristocrats, to give a sense of how fashions emerge, develop, and shift throughout this tumultuous period. Ribeiro is a renowned art historian at the Courtland Institute of Art and she carefully analyzes seventeenth century imagery. The book includes scores of sumptuous color reproductions in a gorgeous, oversize format. The form of her book, however, belies what makes it a fresh and important contribution to early modern studies at large: Ribeiro also takes textual representations seri-
ously as sources for understanding a “narrative of dress” (5). By also attending to the wealth of literary material of the period, imaginative and non-fiction texts alike, Ribeiro provides a more complete sense of the extent to which subjectivity in Stuart England was negotiated through attire.

Ribeiro’s book is comprised of five substantial chapters, generally running chronologically from the seventeenth century through the early years of the eighteenth century. While court dress during James’s reign was not significantly different from that of Elizabeth, in Chapter One, Ribeiro sees an increasing sense of clothing as “a form of theatrical diplomacy,” where donning styles of foreign nations signified favor and alliances (27). Portraiture in this period became more prominent as England now had a royal family, something it had been lacking for decades. The “presence and importance of fabrics, clothes, accessories, and jewelry” in the paintings helped to create a sense of the identity and status of, and associations with, the sitters (32). A melancholic posture and somber, often disheveled garments, for example, indicated a contemplative mind and was a popular pose for aristocratic sitters and literary subjects alike. Clothing could also indicate the moral qualities of the wearer, as a garment embroidered with lilies, for example, would symbolize modesty. The interest in allegorical representations in clothing is seen in other visual forms, such as emblem books and costumes for masques. But it also is found in the complex and symbolic “language of contemporary poetry,” such as that of Herbert (76). Ribeiro, then, does not merely use literary texts to find references to dress, but also sees that literature participates in intricate cultural sign systems of which attire was also a part.

Chapter Two takes up the clothing of the Caroline court, which embraced a “kind of casual elegance” (98) and signaled a departure from the stiff and bombastic attire associated with the Jacobean period. Both the clothing and the portraits (or the clothing in the portraits) emphasized softer lines, a trimmer silhouette, and the “understated” simplicity of plain velvets and satins (120). For women, the popularity of *déshabillé* contributed to an idealized beauty, famously seen in Herrick’s poetry about the sensual “disorder” of his beloved’s clothing. Many of the images analyzed in this chapter are paintings by Van Dyke, and one cannot overstate the importance he had in engendering the image of a “Careless Romance” and a dream of Arcadia” (91). Van Dyke, according to Ribeiro, was “the first artist to experiment with notions of ‘timelessness’ in dress” and he often painted his subjects in “studio
draperies,” rather than their actual clothing (138). The popularity of classical and pastoral themes and images in the literature of the period influenced fashion and suited the “relaxed informality” of van Dyke’s style (143). Ribeiro, however, makes the important point that the idealism of a Golden Age found in the representations of clothing and in the literature of the 1630s and 40s, was necessarily “a form of escapism” (142) and perhaps signaled a desire to obfuscate the increasing troubles of the Caroline court.

Chapter Three, “Sermonizing Dress,” is distinct from the rest of the volume in that Ribeiro relies much more on textual output to discuss the “wider attitudes to clothing and appearance” in the period, many of which were governed by increasingly conservative religious voices (159). The moral regulation of attire and comportment is found in writings by Puritan polemists and Anglican sermonists as well as popular satirists and dramatists, all of whom decried the English preoccupation with extravagant dress, foreign fashions, and the “class confusion” that arose from donning luxury apparel (166). Women were accused of counterfeiting by wearing deforming fashions and falsifying cosmetics, which signaled their loose sexual morals. Complaints against men focused on the vain and profligate fashion-crazed gallants or gulls (183). Ribeiro then moves to a discussion of the shift in style that emerges during the civil war and interregnum. While the Puritans espoused a greater modesty in styles and fabrics of clothing, the absence of a court as a central site of fashion ironically led to a greater prominence of modish attire on the common Londoner. The Royal Exchange and other markets sold an unprecedented number of goods to a wide customer base, while the new coffee houses, public promenades, and the Exchange itself provided a venue to flaunt one’s new purchases. One of the primary virtues of this chapter is that Ribeiro gathers a vast array of textual references from the period, and goes well beyond canonical texts to support her claims. And while the analysis of the literature is primarily in service to gleaning a sense of how fashion is revealed, pamphlets and conduct books, frontispieces and engravings are treated with the careful attention that the other chapters give to court portraits.

Chapter Four focuses on the Restoration of the monarchy and an attendant renewal of a court-centered fashion. The moral strain of discourse around clothing so prominent during the earlier part of the period gives way to revival of “elite lifestyles” (215). High fashion for men during Charles II’s reign became increasingly effeminate: the wide “petticoat” breeches deco-
rated with yards of ribbons were as popular as the high-heeled shoes and the long, ubiquitous periwig. Two important trends in clothing emerged in the 1660s and 70s that would shape fashion for decades: for men, a “suit” consisting of a long waistcoat or vest and a matching outer coat; for women, the “mantua” or loose, often elaborately draped outer gown that was worn over the bodice and skirt. With the rebuilding of London after the Great Fire came an increase in markets—including those selling ready-made clothing and second hand goods—throughout the expanding city. French fashion flourished, while anti-French sentiment, “a constant current in English society,” continued unabated (256). Restoration drama both reflected and contributed to the cultural emphasis on fashion. Comedy often pointed out the distinction between the “man of fashion,” who is “at ease with his appearance” and “the foppish gallant obsessed with his costume” (260). The renewed interest in theatricality that emerges with the reopening of the playhouses is reflected in Baroque portraiture, which often depicts sitters in classical “costume” rather than in court clothing. With the arrival of William and Mary, and throughout the reign of Anne, we see a turn toward relative simplicity in attire; fashion took a back seat at court to the various wars and political factionalism that marked the last decades of the century. With a less dominant court culture, we again see a growing increase in fashion among urban commoners. A larger selection of fabrics, including the popular calicoes from India and cheaper domestic silks, were made available and the market in second hand garments was robust. While there is certainly evidence of extravagance in attire—seen noticeably in elaborate headdresses, powdered hair, long wigs, and expensive lace cravats—and shopping for clothes was as popular a pastime as displaying them in St. James’s Park, the Augustan period was marked by decorum. The Tatler and The Spectator both promoted “a new aesthetic of gentility,” seen in clothing that was “modestly in fashion” (323). Avoiding extremes, in clothing and in behavior, was the ideal of the time.

*FASHION AND FICTION* is a significant achievement and an important contribution to the study of fashion in the early modern period. Admittedly, this reviewer was disappointed by the extent to which the discussion was skewed towards elite dress and surprised at how little attention was paid to England’s great wool industry. Further, readers looking for deep literary analysis likely will be unsatisfied. This disappointment, however, will be tempered by the large storehouse of material the author does discuss. And Ribeiro’s attempts
to connect modes of dress to the complex political background of the
seventeenth century, which at times seems a bit too facile, nevertheless
demonstrates the ambition that marks the entire book. By presenting the
discourse of dress through an examination of both art and literature, Ribeiro’s
project is truly interdisciplinary, the sort of work which many of us value, but
do not see enough of.

Gauvin Alexander Bailey, Pamela M. Jones, Franco Mormando, and Thomas
W. Worcester, eds. Hope and Healing: Painting in Italy in a Time of Plague, 1500-
1800. Worcester, Mass.: Clark University, College of the Holy Cross, Worcester
Art Museum, 2005. viii + 264 pp. + 43 color and 68 b/w illus. $39.95.
Review by JEFFREY FONTANA, AUSTIN COLLEGE.

The subject of the present volume, which served as the catalogue to an
exhibition of paintings held at the Worcester Art Museum in the summer of
2005, could not be more aptly or succinctly stated than by one of the curators
of the show, Thomas Worcester: “This exhibition has sought to explore how
early modern people (especially in Italy) thought about life and death, illness
and health, plague and piety. It has sought to show how painting was a
privileged expression of metaphors and symbols, by which painters and their
audiences not only coped with plague and the threat of plague, but also
expressed their fears and—especially—their deepest hopes for health and salva-
tion in this world and in eternity” (170). The curators, who were also four of
the seven authors, have succeeded admirably in their ambition to better define
the place of plague in the early modern worldview and to illuminate how
paintings functioned instrumentally as a response. Using an interdisciplinary
variety of perspectives, the essays focus on the functional aspect of paintings
as “spiritual remedies” to the plague, which is similar in approach to the essays
in Saints and Sinners: Caravaggio and the Baroque Image, the catalogue to a 1999
exhibition in which the four curators of the present exhibition took part. A
chief virtue of both books is the ability to resituate objects in their original
spaces of belief, hope, longing, despair, death and institutional power, far
distant from modern spaces of aesthetic contemplation such as the museum
gallery or catalogue page.
The volume is divided into a section of essays and a catalogue of exhibited works, and is weighted heavily toward the former. To a certain degree, the paintings themselves are given short shrift; the catalogue entries average about three paragraphs, and much of their contents consolidates more ample discussions within the essays. Information about provenance and appearances in previous exhibitions and in the literature is absent. Though this treatment could be mildly frustrating to a reader wishing to know as much as possible about individual works, it emphasizes the seeming importance to the curators of considering the paintings woven back into their cultural contexts, which the essays achieve, rather than as isolated objects of delectation.

Not surprisingly, the essays by the four curators make the best use of the exhibited works. The three contributions commissioned from Sheila C. Barker, James Clifton, and Andrew Hopkins integrate less well with the catalogued paintings and the other essays, although they do expand the reach of the volume as a whole, making it a broader contribution to the literature on art and plague. The commissioned essays are shorter, and deal with plague imagery in Rome, Naples, and Venice, respectively.

Mormando’s introductory essay sets up the other contributions to the volume with an overview of the presence of the bubonic plague in the experience of early modern Italians, and of the role played by art as an “instrument of healing and encouragement” (2). The repeated strikes of the plague in Europe from the mid-fourteenth to the eighteenth century created a sense of helplessness, due to the mysterious natural cause of the disease, and the lack of an effective physical treatment for it. In the light of biblical stories of plague, most accepted the Church’s interpretation of outbreaks as God’s wrathful punishment of humanity’s sins. Since the best “temporal remedy” (one of the “medical-social-political measures”), flight from an infected area, was impractical for the less wealthy, and alternatively the confinement of suspected victims in a plague hospital (lazaretto) meant almost certain death, early modern Italians sought “spiritual remedies” (articulated by the Church), such as prayers, processions, and charitable works, to placate God. Works of art “served to remind the viewer of the necessity, availability, and efficacy of the various ‘celestial cures’ at their disposal, thus offering comfort and hope in times of despair” (2). The afflicted were depicted with plague buboes on their necks, in their armpits or in their groins, but often they were shown more decorously with a bubo on the upper thigh, pointing to an armpit, with gray
skin (alluding to subcutaneous hemorrhaging), or simply in a languishing state. The sacred personages who might respond to the prayers of the faithful and intercede on their behalf were depicted often in order to give hope and comfort, and included the Virgin Mary, St. Sebastian, St. Roch, St. Michael the Archangel, Lazarus, and St. Rosalie of Palermo. Mormando effectively delineates what to look for in plague art, how it functioned, and how it reflected hopes and fears for centuries.

Jones’s essay focuses on plague imagery in paintings in Milan and Rome from the cult of St. Carlo Borromeo, the sixteenth-century archbishop who was beatified in 1602 and canonized in 1610. Borromeo was highly admired for his care for the afflicted during the plague outbreak in Milan from 1576-77, and his insistence on administering the sacraments to those confined to the lazarettos, at great risk to his own health. Consistent with the general thrust of his reform movement, Borromeo’s ministry in time of plague emphasized penitence, intended to improve the state of a victim’s soul and to placate God. Borromeo organized several penitential processions during the plague, and one of these, the procession of the Holy Nail, supplied a major theme for the saint’s iconography. Paintings for his beatification ceremony at the cathedral of Milan and for his canonization at St. Peter’s in Rome began to standardize his plague imagery, which was disseminated through prints. Both narrative and devotional paintings revolved around his administration of the sacraments, his penitential procession, and his charitable donation of clothing and furnishings. In devotional paintings, two of the saint’s attributes—bare feet, one of which was wounded, and a rope around his neck—can be traced to depictions of the procession of the Holy Nail, underscoring his role as a plague saint who could bring some hope to the afflicted. Borromeo’s devotion to the Holy Nail reveals the importance of Christ’s Passion to his personal penitential piety, and this is reflected in paintings representing him in prayer before a crucifix or the holy sepulcher. Jones identifies in paintings key aspects of this popular saint’s iconography from his plague ministry, and shows how they presented him following both the active life, and a contemplative life of prayer.

The subject of Bailey’s essay is St. Rosalie of Palermo, a twelfth-century reclusive nun whose bones were supposedly found in a cave by a hunter in 1624. Following instructions from a vision of the saint, the hunter had the bones carried in procession through Palermo during a plague outbreak, which
subsided shortly thereafter, conferring upon Rosalie the status of plague saint and patron of the city. The great Baroque painter Anthony van Dyck lived in Palermo from 1624-25, and executed a series of canvases of the saint that established her iconography, but which drew upon lesser regional works. Van Dyck depicted her wearing a Franciscan habit and a rope belt, with blonde hair, accompanied by a skull (a reminder of penitence and plague), and living an isolated existence. The contemplative life implied by the latter suggested comparisons to St. Francis of Assisi, but especially to Mary Magdalene, rendering Rosalie a comparably exemplary post-Tridentine saint. Bailey discusses four painting types of Rosalie by van Dyck, making good use of two works in the exhibition (catalogue numbers 30 and 31).

Worcester studies the development of the cult of St. Roch, the saint perhaps most turned to in times of plague, in the concluding essay. The essay is thorough and informative, and covers the literary sources of the saint's life, paintings that highlight his various roles, the spread of devotion to the saint beyond Italy to northern Europe from the 1500s on, and Roch's importance as a figure of reassurance in a time of fear. Though born in France, Roch traveled widely in Italy giving aid to the plague-stricken while on a pilgrimage to Rome, giving rise to his frequent representation as a pilgrim. The bubo on his thigh is generally exposed, but he shows no other symptoms, alluding to his cure. The presence of the dog that fed him during his illness points to the overcoming of famine, which was often suffered in times of plague. These motifs reflect the selection of only certain episodes to highlight from Roch's life, all chosen to strengthen victims' faith in the saint as an intercessor and hope for the alleviation of their suffering. For Worcester, who refers to almost half of the exhibition's paintings in his essay, images of St. Roch are emblematic of early modern Italian paintings that promoted hope for healing.


In From Pilgrimage to History John G. Demaray extends his scholarship on the cosmologies and poetic structures of Dante, Spenser, and Milton into an account of the transformation that occurred between the influence of faith-
based medieval pilgrimage stories and maps on Dante and that of contemporary empirical geographical and cultural explorations on renaissance historians from Ralegh through Milton. The shift he expresses in various ways: from faith-based to empirical, from biblical to experiential, from iconographic to natural, from ancient to modern, from ideological to pragmatic, from spiritual to humanistic. Demaray proposes to revise current historiography’s postulate about the rise of “global historicism” (something like a secular interest in interpreting past and contemporary regions and peoples) by moving its origins from the French enlightenment back to the mainly British seventeenth century. His goal is to show that the conflict between encompassing providential, teleological, goal-driven history and empirical, data-driven histories, both continuing to vie for allegiance (often within the same work), was founded in the renaissance.

Demaray’s argument alternates between exemplifications of the conflict between the two impulses and presentations of the grounds for each. The first chapter concentrates on the complexities of Sir Walter Ralegh trying to accommodate both ancient and modern historical visions. The second chapter establishes the patterns of the pilgrimage with its allegorical stations then goes on to Columbus’s reorientation of the pattern to make claims for his own explorations. The third chapter turns to the vacillations that Richard Hakluyt displays in his compilations’ reliance on multitudes of contrarily inflected accounts from biblical through sixteenth-century travel literature. The fourth chapter offers Francis Bacon’s argument for a new empirical and pragmatic history and Abraham Ortelius’ representations of both modern and pilgrimage cosmographies. The fifth and sixth chapters trace the conflicted development of a skeptical empiricism beyond faith that Samuel Purchas underwent through various editions that revised, extended, and added to Hakluyt’s collections. The seventh and eight chapters account for Milton’s empirical history of Moscovy and then his exploratory and expansive inclusions of new historical discoveries within his all-encompassing providential epic. Demaray concludes with “An Overview” that comments on problems with secular post-enlightenment historians who have sought a variety of goal-driven, (pre)determined ends.

The evidence and mode of argument that Demaray exploits throughout From Pilgrimage to History focus on evolutionary analyses of historical texts. The implicit outcome is that revolutionary ideas too require an extraordinarily
wise father to recognize his own child. Ralegh's *History of the World* reveals an interpretation that is deeply divided between faith in the Christian worship of God's providential design including its pilgrimage to read the Book of the World and parochial patriotism plus shrewd critical analyses of human causation of events. Columbus' *Prophetic Books* portray a prophet and pilgrim who imposes new data atop revered traditions with reinterpretations that skew both. Hakluyt's *Principal Navigations* follows the pilgrimage arrangement of clustering in chronological order accounts of regions, indiscriminately relying on the accounts of his originals, ancient pilgrimage tracts and mythologies, fictitious narratives early and late, and modern official reports and travel propaganda. The maps in Ortelius' *Theatrum Orbis Terrarum* along with their glosses in *Thesaurus Geographicus* provide an empirical modernist perspective of theatrical discovery but still provide as well the old T-in-O pilgrimage and emblematic explanations, albeit sometimes skeptically. The editions of *Purchas his Pilgrimage* from 1613 to 1626, including the 1625 humanist global history, *Haklytus Posthumus or Purchas his Pilgrims*, make up the centerpiece for Demaray's evolutionary history. Through these Demaray traces the theoretical development of a position that does not turn against faith-based pilgrimages but instead extends these into naturalistic, empirical accounts of peoples and lands and their stories; moreover it provides readers an apparatus for judging veracity. *A Brief History of Moscovia* contributes a sole narrated empirical history of Purchas's various accounts, and *Paradise Lost* incorporates in a providential and linear history a theater of current exploratory shapes and cyclical recurrences. Demaray's analyses engage with other critical testimony, particularly in his discussion of Milton. Sometimes he might have profited from 21st-century reassessments, of Bacon's enduring contribution, for example, or of revisionary estimates of the renaissance revolution in understanding space and perspective through cartography.

Demaray's conclusion comments on a sampling of post-enlightenment, secular universal and deterministic histories from Hegel's *Philosophy of History* to Fukuyama's *The End of History and the Last Man*. This provides his demonstration of how later historians continue to encounter problems faced, he would likely claim are ultimately influenced by the problems discovered, by the renaissance historians he has analyzed. But these analyses become less specific and acute and their persuasiveness diminished.
The shift on which Demaray focuses indicates that renaissance vacillations over the competing urges to see history as meaningfully deterministic and also as empirical and irregular represents one era's manifestations of a more general conjunction of contrary appeals or drives in western thought between global goal-directed and predictive histories and specific detailed data-driven histories, often within the same historian. So Demaray often draws from both earlier visions—Plato's utopian versus Herodotus' specifically detailed accounts—and recent historical enterprises. The Renaissance provides a persuasive case for the ambivalent response and, to our ears, incongruous accommodations between the drives of faith and experience in historical explanations. And Demaray's picture reminds us how demanding historical understanding is. Consequently, I would propose that his contribution is the demonstration in one particular western era of problems generally repeated by those seeking "global historical explanations" that make appeals and try to meet demands that may be incompatible. And I would suggest that in order to understand history and historiography more fully we need more such analyses of the irresolutions of historical studies across time and space. For they could help us understand the problems involved with pursuing history and indicate whether or not the contrary impulses of visionary predictive histories and empirical data driven histories can be reconciled.


This is John Coffey's second detailed study of a major figure in the religious culture of seventeenth-century Britain. The first, published in 1997, focussed on Samuel Rutherford, the chief theorist behind the cause of the Scottish Covenanters; that book was widely praised for its grasp of a substantial array of sources and complex currents of thought on the intersection of politics and religion. This was followed by a survey of debates on persecution and toleration from the age of Elizabeth to the revolution of 1688. Coffey has thus established himself as the leading student of the political, doctrinal, and ecclesiological positions of those who quarrelled with the es-
tablished Church and its clerical defenders. The present book will certainly bolster this reputation, as it is the first comprehensive intellectual biography of one of the more complex minds of a complex century. John Goodwin (c. 1595-1665) was preacher, polemicist, and political theorist in a period where a divide between religion and political life was wholly absent.

But was he a ‘puritan’? We have come to expect this group to exhibit a number of characteristics. For them, the scripture contained all that was necessary in religion, and their idea of the church took the form of gathered congregations, meeting in spaces uncluttered by the ceremonial and architectural blandishments of Roman Catholicism. They were staunchly anti-clerical, and strikingly anti-episcopal: they had reason to detest the likes of William Laud and Matthew Wren for their harrying of non-conforming clergy; their promotion of ceremonies and Canons that seemed to smack of ‘popery’; and for their brutal treatment of those, like Burton, Bastwick, and Prynne, who would criticise them. According to some historians, it was ‘Arminianism’—an assault on the binding Calvinist theology of grace—that drove ‘puritan’ resistance to the established Church; hence all ‘puritans’ were Calvinists. Finally, the puritans’ position on Charles I was harder to assess. Some regarded him as having been led astray by evil counsel, while others adopted their politics from the scriptures and argued that God would strike down those who defiled his church. In the hands of scholars such as William Haller and Michael Walzer, the events of the 1640s were a revolution of the ‘saints’, a providential struggle to defeat the forces of anti-Christ in order to establish the Godly kingdom. Cromwell certainly tailored his rhetoric to people of this stripe, but his ‘Godly republic’ was founded on the genocide of Drogheda and the fanatical asceticism of a regime that banned Christmas, music, and dancing.

Coffey retains the idea of Puritanism and even of the Puritan ‘revolution’, but his portrait of Goodwin’s intellectual life offers a number of challenges to the conventional view of ‘puritanism’. This is done at great length and in painstaking detail. The reader laying this book aside will, in addition to having been presented with surgical exegeses of Goodwin’s printed works, know which of his children he baptised and how long they survived; which circles he moved in while at Cambridge, not to mention what he paid for his beer; who lived nearby to him in the ‘militant hotbed’ of London’s Coleman Street, and who attended his sermons there; and much else besides. Yet Goodwin himself shatters the Puritan mould. Rather than a pious voice in
the wilderness, he was at the centre of a succession of politically astute and influential networks; as the edifice of the confessional state toppled, they moved, as it were, from opposition into government. Yet Goodwin can be seen to have been tortured by the events he witnessed at close hand: unlike many of his fellows, he assailed Presbyterianism, and espoused ideas of ‘liberty’ that were rooted in sacred rather than classical sources. Most astonishing is his decision to embrace Arminianism. Coffey argues that Goodwin was ‘keen to make his theology match his politics’, and so he rejected Calvinist predestination on the grounds that it suggested that God had ‘favourites’ and that he did not hold all of his ‘subjects’ in the same esteem (207-11).

Goodwin is therefore depicted as a man of his time, who nevertheless exhibited qualities of mind that would define the ‘most powerful trends’ in seventeenth century intellectual life. What are these? “The rise of Arminianism; the development of toleration; the growing stress on reasonable religion; the defence of individual judgement; and the optimism about new knowledge” (9). There is good reason to question a number of these: toleration proved an illusive ambition, for despite the conciliatory legislation of the Restoration, it is clear that the defenders of the resurgent Church of England were at least as concerned with the political effects of non-conformity as were their predecessors in the earlier part of the century. Goodwin himself was hunted by Roger L'Estrange, the Torquemada of the late Stuart age, and was saved from a pogrom by the plague. A small vignette, perhaps, but one of many which call into question how ‘reasonable’ religion was in decades defined by popish plots, and continuing attacks–in the press and in the alleys of London–on those who deviated from official patterns of worship. In this context, individual judgement was heavily circumscribed.

Coffey concludes by arguing that Goodwin “helps us to see how a new style of English Protestantism emerged from the fusion of radical Reformation and Renaissance humanism” (293). This new style was defined by the virtues of intellectual exploration and ‘liberation from slavery; but the source of these good things was not the light of reason and a concomitant rejection of the faith. Rather, they came through the benevolence of God’s redemption. Here Coffey seeks to revise older ‘Whiggish’ interpretations of Goodwin that depicted him as the harbinger of the Lockean age, and suggests instead that he became the progenitor of eighteenth-century ideas about reason and liberty, ideas grounded firmly in religious soil. This is an intriguing point, but
one that lies outside the remit of this study. Nevertheless, Coffey’s meticu-
ously researched and audaciously argued book should at the very least com-
pel us to re-examine the tumult of the 1640s and to think again about the
complexity of ecclesiastical polity. Those who continue to urge a portrait of
the period as the seedbed of secular liberty will, like his contemporaries, find
Goodwin a formidable obstacle and paradox.

D. F. McKenzie and Maureen Bell, eds. A Chronology and Calendar of Documents
$187.00. Vol. 3. 1686-1700. 468 pp. $187.00. Review by RANDY
ROBERTSON, SUSQUEHANNA UNIVERSITY.

The Chronology and Calendar is a staggering achievement. Some years ago,
D. F. McKenzie began to collect references to the book trade that he discov-
ered in the Calendar of State Papers Domestic (CSPD), the Journals of the House
of Commons and the House of Lords, and the Court Books of the Stationers’
Company during the span 1641-1700. As Maureen Bell notes in her brief
introduction, McKenzie had relied on the indexes of many of these official
documents; as Bell observes, however, the indexes are far from exhaustive,
so she undertook the daunting task of combing through the entirety of the
CSPD, the House Journals, the Stationers’ Company’s Court Books, and the
Historical Manuscript Commission Reports for the years covered in the Chron-
ology. She provides generous excerpts and paraphrases of the relevant entries,
along with full citations and a superb index. The result is a magnificent refer-
ence set that should change the field of seventeenth-century book history.

The Bell-McKenzie volumes afford an unparalleled view into the rela-
tionship between the government and the Stationers’ Company, the guild that
held a virtual monopoly on British publishing from its incorporation in 1557
to the lapse of the Printing Act in 1695. The Chronology sheds light on com-
plicated and sometimes murky topics, such as the mechanics of early modern
censorship, the ways in which the Stationers enforced their intellectual prop-
erty regime, and the habits and predilections of early modern readers. The
citation of works that do not appear in the sources calendared but are never-
theless relevant to book historians is one of the work’s many nice touches.
The *Chronology* offers, as well, clearer portraits of the “players” in the early modern book trade: authors who published their works anonymously frequently come out of hiding in the official records, as do printers and publishers who published the works *sine nomine*. For example, we learn from parliamentary examinations that while Queen Henrietta Maria was the nominal author of *The Queen’s Majesties gracious answer to the Lord Digbies letter, and the Parliaments censure to the 18. Rebels* (1642), John Bond was likely the real author, a fact not recorded in either the Wing Catalogue or the English Short Title Catalogue (*Chronology*, I, 39, 42). Such examples could be multiplied.

One drawback to such a colossal work as the *Chronology* is that readers might mistake it for a comprehensive treatment of censorship 1641-1700. Bell is careful to note that the State Papers contain much that is not calendared in the *CSPD*, but there are other official sources not encompassed in the *Chronology* that detail instances of censorship: the *Thurloe State Papers*, the *Clarendon State Papers*, and archival records of the Stationers’ Company aside from the *Court Books*, just to name a few.

Perhaps the most significant flaw of the *Chronology*, however, is its medium. Given the scope of their project, McKenzie and Bell cannot have caught every reference to the book trade in the *CSPD*, the House *Journals*, etc. Indeed, in my own research on seventeenth-century censorship and copyright I have come across several dozen references to the book trade in the documents they consulted that did not find their way into the *Chronology*, and although the books have been extremely well edited, I noted a handful of errors in the text as it stands. Yet owing to the cost of printing and publishing university press books, mistakes and omissions cannot easily be corrected; new editions would be prohibitively expensive, and supplements would prove ungainly, as the entries would no longer be in strict chronological order.

Internet publishing would offer an obvious solution to these problems if the cachet of publishing with an academic press were no obstacle. Bibliographers in particular need to move beyond the idea that publication in book form is *de rigueur*. Indeed, the terminally incomplete nature of most bibliographical reference works suggests that hypertext is the appropriate medium for them. Such works need to be revised, corrected, and supplemented continually, and they are, in the upshot, a collaborative endeavor. Undoubtedly, seventeenth-century newsletters that report on books seized by government searchers or other book trade matters await discovery in the Bodleian,
the Huntington, the Folger, and elsewhere. In a hypertext publication, such records can be added without ado. (Full disclosure: I am currently nearing completion of an “Index” of works censored 1641-1700 that will be published online.)

Equally important, hypertext publication can have a democratic dimension. It doesn’t always these days: Early English Books Online (EEBO), Eighteenth Century Online (ECCO), and other online subscription services are astronomically expensive and have created a class system within academia. But the British Library has made the English Short Title Catalogue (ESTC) publicly accessible (estc.bl.uk/), and British History Online has made a trove of primary and secondary documents available gratis (www.british-history.ac.uk/). Indeed, ESTC is rendering the Wing volumes and even the Wing CD-Rom obsolete, for, as we have noted, with an online publication new entries can be added, and a revised “edition” produced, with just a few keystrokes. And the more widely available a resource is, the more readily it can be corrected.

Nonetheless, Bell deserves the gratitude of all book historians and scholars of the early modern period. The three-volume set that she has brought to fruition is a marvelous resource, and, despite the high cost of the collection, no library that is serious about the study of book history can afford to be without it.


If Conal Condren’s claim in Argument and Authority in Early Modern England is right, then almost everything political theorists think they know about early modern England is wrong. “[W]e might dispense with the organising notion of early modern political theory” (10), he writes, either because the early modern framework is misleading or because politics and theory were not really what was at stake in those contentious times. “[O]ffice is what matters,” and any evaluation of political thought should properly be subordinated to the central idea of office (7, 197, 343). (Condren thus rejects Aristotle’s claim, that politics is the authoritative good and that offices are subordinate to
the regime.) Office matters because the disputes we observe in sixteenth and seventeenth-century England concern claims about the duties, rights, and privileges of office-holders; such claims are driven by events rather than by theories (160). Sometimes Condren’s claims are quite startling, but this is a valuable work for reminding readers that the concepts we think of as modern (the self, the individual, the private) are really quite different from the concepts that marked the pre-modern world (concepts like honor and duty), and he urges us not to collapse the modern into an earlier world that is foreign to it.

Condren’s work is organized in three sections. The first establishes the pervasiveness of the language of office and the fluidity of the meanings and conceptions attached to it. The second examines particularly the casuistry concerning thinking about authority and (for lack of a better term) political office. The third describes the debate and development surrounding the use of oaths of office in the seventeenth century. His reevaluations and analyses of contending claims about office, personae, and oath-taking are provocative and insightful. Many readers will be especially intrigued by his helpful readings of Shakespeare’s histories, and his accounts of the “offices” of poet and actor unveil something important about the development of early modernity that other scholars have simply missed.

Condren is especially concerned to refute claims of some theorists to find the manifest footsteps of republicanism and liberalism in (very) early modern political thought. Condren is correct in critiquing our propensity to impose general “isms” or invented categories on the ideas of the past (republicanism, liberalism, capitalism, and so on) instead of reading the texts with particular care for what is in them (2-3, 37, 213); too often such efforts contribute little to real understanding, or result in a new “scholasticism” that seems quite removed from the world we live in, or–more to the point–the world of the men and women we study. As Condren observes, “we can get a long way in early modern political theory without automatic recourse to ideological modelling” (351). Condren is careful not to impose his own ideological model—a model of office—on the history he relates. Yet his fine work is not always entirely successful on these terms. First, his care in this regard prevents him from pursuing an analysis of meaning very far. As Condren admits, much of this book is a “descriptive synopsis” (351). Second, Condren is not immune to venturing to read history through a 20th century lens: the late seventeenth-century Bishop John Sharp asks a
“Wittgensteinian question” about the use of the word conscience (133); the work of John Donne leads ultimately to Foucault (173); “Derridean theory” is applied to works of the fifteenth century (286-7). Condren’s readings here are, I think, perfectly reasonable (one reason—not the only one—to read these works is to understand the development of our own conceptions), though such comments are sometimes difficult to explain methodologically given his critique of current trends of analysis.

At times readers may wonder whether the language of office describes so much (almost everything) that it explains very little. The idea encompasses the work of actors, poets, philosophers, parents, children, scavengers (57) and farmers (21). When Condren suggests that the tension over conflicting obligations is better understood as a tension between conflicting offices (31, 41-2), it is not entirely clear what he has clarified for us. It is not always clear what he means by politics when he rejects certain political readings of texts (214-16, 222-3). He treats the idea of the political as a foreign concept to the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, in spite of the work of Aristotle. He argues that the distinction of public and private is a modern imposition in pre-modern understanding, in spite of Socrates’ concern to draw and maintain such a distinction. On occasion his own readings seem to idealize, and thus obscure, the political in the writings of Machiavelli and (to a lesser degree) Francis Bacon. Twice he tells us that Machiavelli disapproves of Agathocles (86, 222). In fact, immediately after Machiavelli tells us that we “cannot call” what Agathocles did “virtue,” Machiavelli himself does call it virtue (Princ. 8). Condren holds that Machiavelli’s concern is for the office of the soldier (which for Condren is not a political office); he apparently misses (or dismisses) that Machiavelli uses the language of arms and militia to speak metaphorically about other things, including natural philosophy (220-222). Bacon’s discussion of counsel receives a similar treatment.

What emerges, almost in spite of Condren’s zeal, is an affirmation of the theorists’ view of Hobbes and Locke (and Algernon Sidney) as articulating a new idea of individual, state, and society. (Condren explains the rise of contract theory as an effect of the discovery of America, and the growing emphasis on consent and toleration as effects of the dispute over coronation oaths at the ascension of William and Mary (264, 259-60, 268). Condren tells us that the modern distinction of public and private emerges at the end of the seventeenth century (94, 205); in the late seventeenth century Sidney and others
first “sustain” a negative concept of liberty (90); following Hobbes, Locke develops a modern theory of the self and conscience (122, 134-5, 141-3); though they do not justify rebellion, Hobbes and Locke do articulate a right of self-defense and resistance (205-6). To be sure, for Condren Hobbes and Locke are not representative of the period (265). But this only emphasizes the innovation in their thinking. Condren’s own history suggests that Hobbes and Locke mark a significant departure from what came before them; we disagree only about the cause of their departure.

Through this approach Condren too easily collapses political philosophy into ideology. The modern state was not shaped by theory, he argues, but through practical contests over the meaning of office. Philosophers like Hobbes and Locke do not so much produce new political ideas as their ideas are products of dynamic social milieux; theories of rights and interests, and modern ideas of politics and liberty, do not drive political action as much as they are driven by it (23, 71, 344-6). This is plausible, and any political theorist worth his salt should be aware—as Aristotle was—that political philosophy lives on the border of practice and theory. But, unlike Aristotle, this approach means that Condren does not really take the claims of political philosophy seriously; one might go so far as to say that for the historian there is no such thing. (That fits very nicely, actually, with our contemporary suppositions.) For Condren, political theory is merely ideology, a “juvenile discipline” that in the last hundred or hundred and fifty years has “fabricate[d] . . . a near two-millenia achievement of (western) civilisation.” It is a convenient “teaching device” that sells books to students, but it is not true (347, 351). This is all the more puzzling because Condren co-edited a very good volume (The Philosopher in Early Modern Europe: The Nature of a Contested Identity) on changing self-conceptions of the philosopher in the seventeenth century. It is true that in the early modern era philosophers increasingly thought of themselves as engaged in practice, and aimed at useful work; Condren takes that to mean that they were not motivated most by the love of wisdom, but by the love of country or by an ambition to serve. But this misses the joy of Baconian science, and Locke’s claim that he is a “lover of Truth for Truths sake” (Essay Concerning Human Understanding 4.19.1). It misses Machiavelli’s declaration that “it is good to reason about everything” (Discourses 1.18). Condren’s descriptions of claims surrounding offices cannot tell us much about the truth of those claims, because he has begun by denying that they are true. If Condren is right, then
it is apparently impossible for us to think philosophically about politics; if Condren is right, we cannot know what is true.


In Revolutionary England and the National Covenant, Edward Vallance announces his intention in the Introduction: the work is a “study of the significance of the idea of an English national covenant” (1, italics added). It reveals, among other things, a longstanding English covenanting tradition, one that existed alongside and in conjunction with the Scottish tradition of personal bonds that culminates in the National Covenant of 1638.

According to most traditional narratives, the Scots take credit for the covenanting movement of the mid-seventeenth century. This tale would have the Covenant emerge, fully-formed, from the tortured head of Archibald Johnston of Wariston, sweep Scotland in a wave of millenarian enthusiasm, and be foisted on England through the device of the Solemn League and Covenant of 1643. That treaty, the price of Scottish participation in the English civil war, bound both nations in a civil union and obliged Parliament to reform the Church of England according to “the word of God and the example of the best reformed churches.” By this telling, the English emerge as rational actors, pragmatic politicians caught up in a nasty war with their own king. The Scots, by contrast, are beholden to an apocalyptic Calvinist fanaticism, drafting national oaths, press-ganging the unwilling, and calling God to witness and enforce it all.

This is a convenient anglophile narrative, useful to insulate the English from the obsessions of foreign zealots. It is, however, a telling that has been buried by a generation of scholarship. In his important new study, Vallance adds another nail to the coffin of the traditional Whig narrative. Vallance demonstrates that the several Covenants of the seventeenth century had a long genesis in England, and that millenarianism was present on both sides of the Tweed. Identifying the origin-state of the Covenants, he says “is pointless given the degree to which it was a part of a shared Anglo-Scottish Protestant
culture”(6). He uses three of these, the Protestation of 1641, the Vow and Covenant of 1642, and the Solemn League and Covenant of 1643, to illuminate that composite culture and to shed light on several important historiographical issues. The pamphlets and sermons debating the covenants show the development of resistance and contract theories, while the subscription returns yield evidence of early-modern nationalism as well as the expansion of the political nation in the civil war period.

The search for “the origins of the idea of a national covenant”(6) begins in the sixteenth century with the sermons of Hugh Latimer at the court of Edward VI, continues with the resistance literature of the Marian exiles and crescendos in the personal and political oaths under Elizabeth. Vallance assigns theological significance to all of the above, including traditional English oaths of association and Tudor oaths of allegiance. Indeed, he asserts that “the term ‘oath of association’ effectively became a synonym for ‘national covenant’”(17) under Elizabeth. Though he cites and discusses opposed views, this hasty sacralization constitutes a weakness in an otherwise solid argument; the equation of a secular oath of mutual protection, even when sworn in the imagined presence of God, is a far cry from an obligatory national subscription to a political program that identified God as a participant in a convenanted relationship.

Covenants or not, the discussion of Tudor and Jacobean oaths of association gives way to the three examples that form the backbone of the book. In these, Vallance has plumbed a rich vein of literature. The Protestation, the Vow and Covenant, and especially the Solemn League and Covenant provoked hard-fought pamphlet wars, and left a record of subscription returns that to this point have been the near-exclusive domain of the cliometricians. Royalist sermons and pamphlets consistently assailed the various Covenants as illegal and disobedient, Parliamentary partisans insisted that the coronation oath was a contractual agreement, as binding on the crown as was obedience on the subject. The violation of the coronation oath justified resistance, resistance that was itself justified in the contractual nature of the Covenants. Regicide and army coups meant that the Solemn League and Covenant, born of the civil war, became by 1650 “a bulwark against the forces of revolution” (178).
If the pamphlet wars illuminate the changing nature of the Covenant, the subscription returns illustrate the way that English parishioners took the oaths that different regimes foisted on them. Vallance finds evidence of equivocation and reservations, but ultimately (and wisely) refuses to draw strong conclusions from uneven records. What can be said, though, is that the inclusion of unpropertied men and women into these explicitly political tests of loyalty and association constitute “an implicit expansion of the political nation” (129). This was not lost on civil war-era radicals, who interpreted the Covenants through their own circumstances. Diggers and Levellers “saw these documents as not only involving spiritual obligations, but also bestowing extensive political and economic rights upon subscribers” (156). Revolutionary England and the National Covenant is based on prodigious archival research, and the arguments derived from the subscription returns may be the most original section of the book.

Be it Scots or English, the millenarian enthusiasm of the mid-seventeenth century did not endure. In his study of oaths from the latter seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, Vallance finds that the nature of the covenants changed. Oaths of association to the Hanoverians were rooted in the “constitutional and commercial considerations” (214) and consciously avoided discussion of the Covenants of the past. Gone was the nationalism, gone was the impending apocalypse. “England’s Covenant with God” he concludes “had been forgotten” (216).


This fine contribution to Four Courts Press’s series of monographs on Ireland’s place in the history of the three Stuart kingdoms originated in the author’s PhD dissertation under Michael Perceval-Maxwell’s supervision. The book proceeds chronologically and provides abundant political and military context for O’Hara’s analysis of interest in Irish affairs, the newsbooks, their editors, and the content of their articles. This strong contextualization of English reporting and publishing during the confedrate period yields two main theses. First, the birth of the English newsbook owed a great debt to
the tremendous demand for information once word of the Irish rebellion reached England on 1 November 1641. Second, in the process of providing that news, English editors reinforced pre-existing notions of Irish “barbarism” that then became vital ideological weapons in the domestic conflict between parliament and the crown.

Taking cues from Joad Raymond’s *Invention of the Newspaper*, O’Hara begins with events surrounding the appearance of the first newsbook, *Heads of Several Proceedings* (29 November 1641), and the ways it piqued the nation’s interest in the rebellion. In the explosion of serials that followed (4,600 between 1641 and 1649), ninety-two percent contained articles on Ireland. However, unlike the pamphlet literature that appeared from November, 1641 to August, 1642 the early serials reported the Irish massacres of Protestants much less luridly and propagandistically; moreover, the newsbooks maintained a careful neutrality in reporting growing hostilities between Charles and the parliamentary opposition. Yet, even though English editors began to take opposing positions on the war from the fall of 1642 to the fall of 1643, both royalist and parliamentarian newsbooks were of one voice in underscoring the limitless savagery of the Irish rebels. Parliamentarian editors, fearful that crown discussion of a cessation of hostilities with the Catholic Confederation of Kilkenny would result in an Irish-Royalist alliance and invasion of England, began printing detailed and gruesome accounts of 1641. Royalist papers also “played the Irish card” with assertions that Parliamentarian atrocities at home were even worse than the 1641 massacres. Regardless of political allegiance, Irish savagery and barbarism had become an English moral yardstick.

Needless to say, inaccuracies, exaggeration, and a kind of hysteria saturated Irish news in the two years following the cessation of hostilities between the crown and the confederate Irish in September of 1643. Three events precipitated this reporting: the landing of the first Irish royalist–and Protestant–troops in England; the arrival at Oxford of confederate commissioners presenting permanent peace proposals to the king; and the recruiting of native Irish soldiers by Charles’ chief Irish commander, the Earl of Ormond, in order to bolster royalist forces in England. In addition to several false stories that the Irish troops in England were rebel papists (not royalist Protestants), there were reports of an Irish massacre of a parliamentary garrison that had surrendered and asked for quarter, of horrific torture by rope and fire of
civilians in Pembrokeshire, and of public masses in Bristol’s streets, forced upon the populace by 1,500 Irish soldiers accompanying the confederate commissioners to Oxford. Of course, this amounted to more than harmless hyperbole, for MPs used these reports to justify a 1644 ordinance forbidding quarter to Irish soldiers captured in England. In fact, both parliamentary and royalist papers printed accounts of imaginary victories and defeats in Ireland in 1644. Three London serials hailed a great victory by the Ulster Scot commander Robert Monro, who inflicted massive casualties on the Irish rebels, while a royalist newsbook reported Monro’s defeat and many dead Scots; in reality both sides had withdrawn to winter quarters rather than fight.

With the end of the first civil war and a royalist peace with the confederate Irish in 1646, a new and less hysterical English interest in reporting what actually happened in Ireland emerged. Yet, inaccuracies and exaggerations persisted, although now driven less by any perceived threats from Ireland and more by domestic English politics, particularly the Presbyterian-Independent conflict over the New Model Army and relief of Irish Protestants. Parliamentary papers increasingly ran atrocity stories similar to those from 1641 and designed to compel the Army to hurry across the Irish Sea. One such report claimed that rebels threw sixty naked Protestants into a deep cave in Kerry, while another contended that the Irish had slit the throats of 40,000 English residents of Down and Armagh. Nor was the royalist press completely silenced in 1647 and 1648, for the three main serials, known collectively as “The Trinity,” carried much Irish news, although the editors were careful to “spin” the stories by using ridicule and sexual slander to attack their domestic enemies, the Grandees and Parliament. Lacking the specifics commonplace among Parliamentary papers, the royalist press claimed, for example, that their foes sought to extend the war in Ireland in order to enlarge their English power, and that they minimized casualties in Michael Jones’s parliamentary army so as not to frighten potential investors, the “Adventurers,” in Ireland’s re-conquest.

O’Hara’s book ends with a thorough analysis of the period from January to August, 1649, which saw extraordinarily high levels of press coverage of preparations for Cromwell’s Irish expedition and its first few days. The heart of this chapter, and of the whole book really, is the author’s analysis of the Independent paper, Moderate Intelligencer, especially a series of articles refuting point-by-point the anti-invasion arguments of the Leveller tract Certain Queries.
(April, 1649). This anonymous pamphlet had trumpeted natural rights of the Irish to resist tyranny and choose their own government without outside interference. In its counter-attack, *Moderate Intelligencer* avoided employing the 1641 massacres to justify English re-conquest; rather, the editor stressed that the “godlessness” and savagery of the native Irish—worse even that of the American Indians—justified forfeiture of any right to select their own laws and forms of government. In addition, *Moderate Intelligencer* reminded readers of England’s vital interests in Ireland and of the harsh measures that might be required. O’Hara strongly suggests that the Commonwealth’s dubious moral bases for the invasion required just such a rationale and that *Moderate Intelligencer* and other serials were preparing the ground for the kind of massacres that would unfold at Drogheda and Wexford.

Although the sheer volume of Irish news in the spring and summer of 1649 reached record levels, accurate reporting attained no such heights. Parliamentary serials boasted that within forty-eight hours of arriving at Dublin, Cromwell’s army had defeated Ormond, while a royalist paper claimed that Ormond’s forces not only defeated the raw recruits of the New Model, but also managed to kill Cromwell’s son. Misreporting and exaggeration thus constituted a continuous characteristic of English news about Ireland from 1641 to 1649.

O’Hara’s organization and prose is clear and straightforward, he provides an excellent summary chapter, and he includes many colorful quotes that capture the flavor of 1640’s reporting. In addition, the book is a valuable contribution to two areas of scholarship. First, it adds to the wider history of early modern reporting and writing by extending to Ireland some of Joad Raymond’s insights into the process of constructing the news in England. Second, the author includes an extraordinary amount of military, political, and diplomatic background on the “Wars of the Three Kingdoms” to explain the changes and continuities in English reporting on Irish affairs. Ultimately the strength of this book is its integration of major English, Scottish, and Irish events into the early history of the English press. Here O’Hara builds on recent work by Jane Ohlmeyer, Nicholas Canny, Aidan Clarke and many others. Perhaps some readers will feel as if they are “drowning” in the book’s historical context. Yet such contextualization remains crucial to understanding the extraordinarily complex interactions between the three kingdoms during
the 1640s and 1650s. And that complexity is, after all, a major source of our fascination with the period.


In her ambitious study of three female prophets (Eleanor Davies, Anna Trapnel, and Margaret Fell), Teresa Feroli argues that women entered the political sphere during the English Revolution and Restoration by claiming authority to speak based on their identity as women. Her aim, in part, is to locate female political consciousness much earlier than has historiographically been supposed. More importantly, however, Feroli suggests that the prophesying of these three women represented not only a powerful call for political change but anchored an acute awareness that ultimately shaped secular feminism (32). In closely analyzing the religious texts of these prophets, Feroli follows through on her promise to assess not only their feminism but also their political thought (31). She also remains mindful in unpacking of selected texts that prophesy was a puritan discourse rooted in self-identification, a genre that lent itself to political representation and activism in a world turned upside down. Along the way Feroli demonstrates how justification of female authority shifted from a patriarchal model under the righteous rule of James I to a model of sexual difference under the tyrannical Charles I, Cromwell, and Charles II.

To her credit, Feroli gives two chapters to Lady Eleanor Davies, whose prophetic works distinguished between the reign of fellow prophet James I and the wicked and unjust Charles. This is carried out by a close textual analysis of Davies' Warning (1625) and her anti-Charles tract All the Kings (1633), a reading that demonstrates an increasing awareness of Davies' role as the Prophet Daniel under the Babylonian King Belshazzar (51). What Feroli makes of this is illuminating, arguing that Davies came to understand her authority as rightfully inherited from James I, a source of truth and order in a time of an impending apocalypse. Charles' failings are also read in Davies' The Restitution of Prophecy (1651), which provides an "extensive meditation on
the fate of her brother, the earl of Castelehaven, who was convicted of rape and sodomy in 1631 (73). She, like her brother, is alienated by the ruling powers and Castlehaven’s alleged “sexual deviance” is compared to her own “transgressions” as a female prophet. Thus her brother’s execution, a result of Charles’s failure to intervene on his behalf, is representative of the end of times. At such a moment, when men are effeminate rulers, “domineering women have taken center stage (96).”

Feroli’s depiction of the political thought of Trapnel and Fell is less engaging, even if their justifications for female prophesying are more novel and modern. For the Fifth Monarchist Trapnel, the body was a sacred if material possession that represented a political domain. In January 1654, just a month after the termination of the Barebones Parliament, she fell into a fortnight trance at Whitehall where she fasted and “uttered Revelations (97).” As she blended individual and national crises, Trapnel argued she was not a sufferer but rather a harbinger of God’s holy will. Literally and figuratively filled with Christ’s spirit, Trapnel’s body becomes a habitat for godliness and, consequently, divine political authority. In a similar vein, Margaret Fell, the “mother of Quakerism” (149), articulated a vision of prophetic and political power based on the intimate bond between women and Christ. With Fell, Feroli is bolder in her claims, arguing that her Women Speaking Justified (1666) is a tract that “transcends the bounds of much Quaker gender polemic because it not only affirms the theological point that women may speak in the church but also attempts to change general perceptions of women’s abilities (151).” Such an assertion is rooted in Fell’s belief that women’s sexual difference was a positive attribute, explaining that their maternity, weakness, and carnality made their reliance on Christ all the greater. Female sexuality was no longer to be neutralized or excused, but rather embraced as the divine sanction for political engagement.

Feroli is to be commended for writing an account of little known and certainly undervalued women prophets, and her analysis of their writings evinces some clear political thinking about the authority of women to speak on national issues. Nevertheless, her study could have been more convincing had it situated the texts more closely in political problems of the revolution. As with any examination of specific texts and literary genres, she runs the risk of isolating the works and rendering them intellectually sterile. To avoid this danger, Feroli links the prophets as building blocks for one another. As a
result, prophetic discourse and female authority is presented as a tidy narrative of increased feminine consciousness and radicalism, culminating with Mary Astell, who used the politics of sexual difference to write a “recognizably secular female tradition” and a “vision of female equality (214).” Feroli claims much for her book, and when she compares texts, relates them to broader contexts, and details the role of sectarian prophesying, her arguments work. But unfortunately those moments are too few and she resorts to reasserting, with greater insistence, her broad claims.


In this collection of eleven essays, adding an introduction and two “afterwords,” thirteen scholars offer their definitions and applications of radicalism and its proponents. Given the slippery nature of English radicalism, each author’s approach is somewhat idiosyncratic and the best this reviewer can offer is guidance concerning a few interpretative and analytical points. Along this line, reading the introduction and the “afterwords” would be a good preparation for digesting the main corpus.

The approaches of these scholars to their subject reflect the historian’s dilemma of seeking a proper perspective. Akin to choosing a camera lens, the closer one views the subject the more disparate and particular the evidence becomes and the more the writer relies on descriptive language. Essays one through five, eight and eleven fit this approach. Pulling back the lens leads to more interpretative approaches, often focusing on the use of language as radical strategies. Essays six, seven, nine, and ten fit this general approach. Thus the reader emerges from this volume with a sense of the variety of radicalisms. Although most radicals wished to delegitimate established authority, governments and loyalists could resort to radical, or emergency, measures to support political stability. The Bond of Association (1584) to secure Queen Elizabeth’s crown and the Church and King associations of the French Revolutionary period would be examples found here. Otherwise the ranks of the disaffected stretched across Levellers, Millenarians, Restoration republicans, feminists, and institutional reformers of various stripes and causes.
Although none of the principal authors directly investigates the causes of radical behavior, the volume’s timeline points to the two seismic events: the Protestant Reformation and the French Revolution. The Protestant Reformation undermined established authority with a combination of threats from abroad and a variety of local discontents and protests, leading to government policies of clerical controls, and the suppression of dissent. The resulting contest between the central government and the local communities persisted throughout the seventeenth century, spawning the efforts of radicals studied here. In the same way, the French Revolution reopened possibilities to assert popular rights and advance proposals for institutional reform, in this case often focused upon Parliament. Each of these seismic events had its own chronological dynamic, and radicals appeared in different guises and with programs often driven by the necessities of the moment. Hence an emphasis on both variety and fluidity mark the contents of this volume.

While radicals were critical of established institutions, their own efforts either made use of or appealed to certain institutional forms. All groups and individuals made use of print media. Other major components included associations directed toward a particular end, clubs to debate and formulate programs and strategies, and “engagements” that pledged members to the pursuit of particular goals. Religious societies of a more millennial disposition could harbor radicals. During the French Revolutionary period, appeals to a “convention” as a means of redressing a variety of social and institutional ills sprouted up. These groupings shared the English scene with more benign venues, such as coffee houses, Spectator Clubs, taverns, village fêtes, and Benjamin Franklin’s JUNTO.

These institutions implied the preexistence of local networks where formal and informal forms of authority established traditions of self-governance. Offices comprising “constables, churchwardens, jurymen and overseers of many kinds,” (350) worked to create what Professor J. C. Davis calls the “unacknowledged republic.” These networks, in turn, lent credibility to the variety of sources upon which exponents of radical ideas drew. These sources included: the ancient constitution, the Revolution of 1688, millennial hopes, appeals to natural rights, and to its more ethno-centric version of an English birthright of liberty, a civic culture dedicated to the public good and arrayed against corruption, and the experience of American democracy. Seventeenth-century radicals such as the Levellers and Diggers appealed to the
restoration of this “unacknowledged republic” to legitimate their movements. In the eighteenth century the distinction between social manners and personal virtue—a hallmark of the literature of the period—became the departure point for Mary Wollstonecraft’s arguments. Particular writers could exert powerful influences. John Foxe’s Acts and Monuments of English Martyrs supplied grist of many radical mills. Jeremy Bentham followed cues from Hume and Helvetius. And Bentham turned his own conversion to atheism into a wellspring for his utilitarian and reformist program.

This final observation provides the basis for Professor J. C. D. Clark’s argument that English Radicalism came into being with Bentham’s utilitarian program, reinforced by Ricardian economics. Bentham’s thoroughgoing rejection of religion, Clark claims, was the defining characteristic of his, and future, radical appeals, distinguishing radicalism from both socialism and liberalism. While Clark’s point illuminates the modern aspects of English radicalism, it tends to privilege the particular over the general. His claim that English Radicalism must be shorn of its religious concerns leaves the reader wondering what interpretative constructs he would develop for the impact of the Protestant Reformation. As this volume argues, radicalism remains a sufficiently plastic term to distinguish the various levels of protest and rebellion associated with the crises the Reformation spawned. This plasticity turns out to be both the blessing and the curse of the word.

This volume also offers a view of a newer historiography of radicalism. On the one hand this newer historiography is non-Marxist. Class interpretations are out. Christopher Hill and E. P. Thompson receive respectful, but definite, critical appraisals. The newer historiography builds on the assessments of social and linguistic historians, some of them reaching back into the 1980s. Each essay is thoroughly endnoted, giving the reader access to the avenues leading to this newer historiography. Thus, while potential readers should be warned that these essays are not meant for the generalist, the rewards of this volume are as many and varied as the subject it addresses.
This is a significant volume for anyone interested in original, recent work not only on the industrial history of Venice and its mainland territory in the fifteenth through eighteenth centuries, but also on the economic history of early-modern cities more generally. The nine essays (plus an introduction by Paola Lanaro and a conclusion by Maurice Aymard) are all by Italian academic scholars and result from a series of workshops at the University of Venice at Ca’ Foscari. They are sophisticated, well edited, and excellently translated into English. The general themes explored are well stated in the introduction. All of the essays argue against traditional assumptions about the economic decline of Venice following its loss of dominance of Mediterranean trade in the late sixteenth century through the opening of new sea routes to the Orient and the entry of English and Dutch shipping. Instead this marked the beginning of a significant phase of proto-industrial activity. Other factors often associated with economic decline are addressed: the relationship of guilds to new products, techniques, and entrepreneurial activity, the degree of openness of the work force, and the relationship between the capital city and its mainland territory. What emerges is a new and stimulating assessment of Venice’s adaptation to the realities and trends of the fifteenth-to-eighteenth-century European economy.

Four of the essays are devoted to Venice itself, although others partly concern the capital. Andrea Mozzato addresses the sixteenth century rise, and then late-seventeenth century decline, of the Venetian wool cloth industry that reached its height around 1600, employing nearly 20 per cent of the urban population. Capital was provided by noble merchants, raw materials were plentifully available by sea, foreign workers not associated with the guilds were accommodated, and the type of cloth produced adjusted to the market, particularly with lighter Dutch-style fabrics for the Levant trade. Marcello Della Valentina discusses the Venetian silk industry. The weaving of luxury silk cloth, including patterned weaving sometimes laced with gold thread, and velvet, persisted more successfully than wool, although here again products
came to imitate the style of French silk production at Lyons. Profits were supported by the large-scale employment of women in the silk industry, an unsuspected development that affected several industries. Francesca Trivellato traces the history of Murano (and Venetian) glass. Here guilds were pliable to technical innovations borrowed from English, French and Bohemian glass making. Venice never equaled the French expertise in making mirrors, but an important Venetian specialty was glass bead production in demand for European colonial expansion, and this sector also employed many women.

Walter Panciera addresses issues of relative industrial decline in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Wool output declined to shift partly to towns on the mainland, which produced cheaper cloth, but silk continued along with other industries: ship building, soap making, book printing; even a cotton cloth firm appeared in 1748.

Five essays are devoted mainly to the Venetian mainland—the territories of Bergamo, Brescia, Padua, Treviso, Verona, and Vicenza among others that have been largely ignored by economic history. The Venetian Republic did not closely control its subject cities, whose economies were quite varied and developed independently with some local integration. Edoardo Demo surveys the textile industry on the mainland, which was densely populated and where manufacturers employed a putting-out system. Wool involved both imported and local wool and was important around Bergamo and Verona. Export was toward Germany, the south of Italy, and the Levant. There was considerable development of silk. In the mid-sixteenth century Vicenza produced 100,000-200,000 pounds of raw reeled silk annually. Silk throwing, sometimes using water-powered machines was more restricted, and silk weaving was only significant at Vicenza in the eighteenth century. After textile production, the most widespread industry in Venice and its mainland cities was probably the clothing trades, represented here in the essay of Carlo Marco Belfanti by hosiery manufacture. Women hand needle-knit wool stockings, a specialty of Padua, where some 2,500 women were said to have been employed in this way in the eighteenth century. However, the Venetian Republic welcomed the English stocking frame of William Lee (1589) that was well adapted to the mechanical spinning of silk stockings. In 1683 the Republic established a guild in Venice for silk frame-knitters, and in the early eighteenth century the capital was producing some 46,000 pairs of silk stock-
ings yearly, although stocking frames for silk were also discovered, and tolerated, at Vicenza, Brescia, Udine, Gradisca and Trieste.

Ceramics were another important industry discussed by Giovanni Favero. Apparently Venetian pottery of the early Renaissance was of poor quality and the guild was weak; better pottery was imported from Spain (Majolica, initially from the island of Majorca, was imitated and long remained a locally produced staple for a growing middle class consumer market). The Republic followed a vacillating trade policy, often industry-specific, of free trade, protection, and the granting of monopolies to favored entrepreneurs. Aristocratic taste wanted Delft blue-and-white pottery, which was imitated and locally produced, and eventually Chinese-style porcelain and even English-style earthenware. Some of the manufacturers of these specialties, often on the mainland, were granted privileges. To conclude the discussion of industry on the mainland, Luca Mocarelli surveys the western zone of Venetian Lombardy with its wool and silk production, paper mills around Salò on Lake Garda, iron founding at Bergamo and Brescia, and the increasing economic integration of this region. Francesco Vianello surveys a similar process of economic integration in the eastern zone of Vicenza, Padua and Treviso.

In short, these essays contain much that is new and interesting about the economy of Venice and its mainland territory during the late Renaissance and Early Modern periods. As Maurice Aymard concludes: “[Venice] suddenly draws nearer to us, more alive, less exceptional, but also more European, without, however, ceasing to surprise us.”


To those unfamiliar with the Lutheran funeral work, a book devoted to the biographies that were an important part of these publications might seem rather morbid. That is certainly not the case with Cornelia Moore’s study. Instead, her book is a lively overview of a major genre of early modern German literature. It is all the more welcome because it is the first major study of German funeral biographies in English.
The significance of the funeral work is revealed by the numbers: there are over 220,000 surviving funeral publications dating from the mid-sixteenth into the eighteenth century. These publications generally contained one or more funeral sermons as well as biographical information about the deceased's life and death. They might also include commemorative poems or songs, illustrations, and acknowledgement speeches given by a family member or friend of the deceased. Professor Moore concentrates on the biography, whether incorporated in a sermon or included as a separate section of the larger funeral work. Her goal is not to mine the biographies for information about early modern Germany, but rather to discuss the genre as a whole, describing its origin, development and demise over the course of two centuries.

The book is clearly structured around this goal. After an opening chapter that introduces the Lutheran funeral biography, Moore devotes two chapters to placing the genre within its religious and rhetorical setting and describing its emergence in the mid-sixteenth century. Although funeral sermons and orations were delivered within other confessions and in other countries, the funeral biography as it developed in Lutheran Germany differed from these other types of addresses in several ways. Its original purpose was to testify to the deceased's faith that brought eternal salvation; it was thus meant both to console mourners and to encourage them to exercise such faith in life and on their own deathbeds. The topics covered in the biography were shaped by the demonstrative genus of classical rhetoric, but they were also chosen to reflect or illustrate the lessons taught in the Scripture text on which the sermon was based. Individuals were portrayed as representatives of their social class, profession or gender, but the preacher also personalized his presentation with anecdotes from the deceased's life and deathbed.

Funeral biographies were thus a blend of the secular and the religious, the stereotyped and the individual. They differed according to the status of the deceased and they changed over time. To illustrate these differences, Moore devotes the next three chapters to case studies of the funeral biographies of three groups: the noble canons of Magdeburg cathedral, the burghers of the city of Brunswick (Braunschweig), and the Saxon electors and their wives in Dresden. One problem faced by all preachers who included biographical information in their sermons was how to avoid hypocrisy or hyperbole in describing the deceased's life. To some extent they were spared this tempta-
tion because the genre itself did not demand a complete presentation of the deceased's life, “warts and all,” but only those portions that would edify the audience. Sometimes pastors had to resolve such difficulties more creatively, as Moore shows through the case of Elector Christian II, who drank himself to death at an early age. Preachers spoke of the health that the Elector had been blessed with at birth and then extolled the virtues of a healthy lifestyle, without connecting those virtues to the late Elector or, if they were far enough away from the court, they claimed that they did not know enough details to give a lengthy biography.

Although the funeral biographies developed along a common trajectory, those from each city also had their own distinctive characteristics. The earliest published funeral works were for members of the nobility; only after the establishment of a printing press in Brunswick in the early seventeenth century did funeral works for the urban patriciate and professional classes become more common. Over time the emphasis of the biography shifted from concern with the deceased's salvation to the exemplary nature of his or her life and the grief felt by mourners at their loss. By the later seventeenth century the representational aspect of the funeral work became more prominent. Accordingly, publication format changed from quarto to folio, the biography was clearly separated from the sermon, and the contents were expanded to include portraits, epitaphs, and other material.

In her final chapter Moore describes the reasons for the gradual decline of the funeral work over the first half of the eighteenth century. Most important was the growing popularity of the silent funeral, in which the deceased was laid to rest without a sermon; this in turn led to a growing secularization of burial practices. She closes with a discussion of the impact of funeral biographies on other types of literature in the eighteenth century, especially the lives of “spiritual heroes” presented in religious-moralistic literature.

Because its subjects spans two centuries, *Patterned Lives* gives a fascinating insight into the cultural changes of the early modern period. Funeral biographies illustrate in a particularly revealing way the shift from the initial post-Reformation concern with salvation by faith to the Enlightenment emphasis on morally exemplary lives, the growing preoccupation of the aristocracy with representation, and the increased attention paid to description of character and explanation of internal motivation. For this reason Moore’s study will
be appreciated by literary scholars and historians alike. It will be required reading for anyone wanting to study this extraordinary source of information about the lives and deaths of men and women in early modern Germany.


A colleague remarked to me recently that modern historical inquiry demands that once a particular argument has become established, eventually another scholar writes to argue exactly the opposite. This is how scholars make names for themselves; one could even argue that such professional dialectic pulls the field forward. How one feels about it as a reader is another matter; the person arguing the contrarian case is often liable to charges of grandstanding, revisionism, or casuistry. Not so Kenneth Appold’s Habilitationsschrift: it argues the opposite case with modest bravura, plenty of data, and convincing results. Appold also revises our perspective on how dialectical processes worked in the early modern confessional university.

Appold aims to examine the applicability of the confessionalization thesis; to study late-sixteenth- and early-seventeenth-century orthodox Lutheran ecclesiology; and to rehabilitate study of university elites against a research agenda currently much more occupied with popular piety and territorial politics. Most importantly, however, as signalled by the order of his arguments, he seeks to argue against a still-common stereotype of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Lutheran theological culture: that Lutheran orthodoxy (the period between the Book of Concord and the beginning of pietism) was characterized by contentious theologians who engaged in meaningless polemic over obscure issues at the drop of a hat. Interpretively, the period suffers from the double whammy of the pietists, who found it emotionally sterile, and the Luther Renaissance, which termed its leading lights unoriginal epigones. This picture has been changing over the last few years, as theologians interested in confessionalization have increasingly called into question stereotypes about this period. Appold significantly expands this new work, however, by arguing
that one of the central means by which confessional orthodoxy developed a theological position was via the disputation, a process that, although it typically produced a published result, otherwise took place outside of wider public view. Moreover, he argues, while the point of disputation was the establishment of an orthodox teaching, this process was not characterized by belligerent, aggressive boundary-marking but rather by the gradual formation, through these highly disciplined disagreements, of an “open consensus.”

After a short terminological, source-critical and methodological introduction, Appold turns in part 1 of his book to the background, context and structure of the art of disputation as practiced at the University of Wittenberg, the leading Lutheran university of the sixteenth century. The narrative begins with Jakob Andreae’s inaugural lecture in 1577, just after the purge of crypto-Calvinist scholars from Wittenberg theological faculty. Appold traces Andreae’s efforts, with Saxon Elector August I, to establish a new method of theological education and its outcomes for the practice of disputations. Interest in disputations waxed and waned, but eventually was sustained, not because it served as a means of indoctrination, but rather because the theological faculty saw disputation as a way to control theological discourse itself while protecting it from the influences of outsiders. This standpoint also suggests, as Appold notes, that the Book of Concord was not seen as a final statement, but as a point of departure—another argument that challenges scholarship that has long argued that the statement’s definitive nature undermined the legitimacy of the many subsequent theological controversies, even at the time. A great deal of the argumentation here is based on insights from speech-act theory, and conservative theological readers may take issue with its application here. Probably sensing that readers will either accept or reject this strategy, Appold does not bother to justify it except by stating that a communicative theory of language is an appropriate tool for the examination of disputation as a communicative process. While such an insight turns some traditional assumptions about the nature of theological disagreement on their heads, it also makes disputations into an object more easily susceptible to comparison with other confessional age communication processes such as preaching, teaching, education, and polemic.

Part 2 discusses disputations at Wittenberg, showing convincingly that the chestnut that Philip Melanchthon was the last faculty member interested in disputation is erroneous. Appold distinguishes five phases of focus in
Wittenberg disputations up till the triumph of pietism and discusses normative boundaries on innovative processes in disputations, such as the scriptures and confessional statements. Appold suggests that disputants revealed a wide-ranging series of interests in their premises that diverged from the merely theological or biblical, an openness that they extended to Lutheran interlocutors but which they restricted in controversialist positions directed at members of other confessions. Part 3 then turns to ecclesiology (the teaching on the nature of the Church), traced both through a series of theological positions and a discussion of (sometimes competing) theoretical models. Appold chose ecclesiology as the test case because he views it as the theological realm with the largest broader social consequences; while we might disagree, this choice thus functions as a proof of his assertion that theology professors participated in disputations not as a means of supporting the territorial state (a central moment of the confessionalization thesis), but rather as a means of engaging with supra-territorial and supra-confessional discussions in western Christianity. Ecclesiology also spawned significant disagreement with both Catholics and Calvinists, and is thus a good barometer for discussing confessionalization as a process that marks boundaries toward the outside. Appold establishes a fairly wide spectrum of theological opinions grouped around Article 7 of the Augsburg Confession; what emerges less clearly from his discussion is exactly where the boundaries of Lutheran teaching lay—perhaps because his sources, the printed theses of disputations, were censured before they were printed, so that interpretations beyond the pale were weeded out in a previous step. Appold also examines archival materials related to censorship of disputations, suggesting that participants considered this a positive rather than an interfering process. But I found myself wondering if the reason that a study of ecclesiological disputations produced a result of relative consensus was because while Lutherans disputed with non-Lutherans about the definition of the true church, the matter was relatively less controversial within the Lutheran camp itself. I wondered whether the same result would have applied to disputations about Christology, the divisive issue among Lutheran theologians in the period just before Appold’s study starts.

Regardless of how we view Appold’s evidence or theoretical choices, however, this book takes several important steps for further studies of theology—considering its communicative aspects, viewing it as an academic system with potential comparisons to other disciplines, and treating the unifying po-
potential of theological arguments. Moreover, somewhat atypically for a Habilitationsschrift, this displays an innate sense for knowing when an argument has been made and further discussion will only deaden our interest. This admirable book is a model of hyperbole-free argumentation that quietly makes a persuasive case not only about the development of dogmatic theology, but also about the ways in which that development was couched in communicative processes. It should be read not only by those with interests in ecclesiology, but by any scholar with interests in Lutheran theology, the confessional age, university culture, early modern theological polemic, and the communicative aspects of confessionalization.


Redefining Female Religious Life is a comparative study of two pioneering post-Reformation female movements: the English Institute of Mary Ward, which established houses in England and continental Europe, and the French Ursulines. Both focussed their energies on teaching girls outside the cloister, activity that the Church did not consider suitable for women religious, which meant that their fate rested primarily on the status that they adopted. Shortly after France received the Decrees of the Council of Trent in 1615, the Ursulines accepted enclosure, after which their houses proliferated throughout the country. Mary Ward and the English Ladies, on the other hand, fought against enclosure, which contributed to the Institute being disbanded and Ward being branded a heretic in 1631 by Pope Urban VIII. In her analysis of the underlying motivations of the two groups and the reasons why they were received so differently by contemporaries, Lux-Sterritt provides an insight into the changing position of women in the early modern Catholic Church.

Early chapters consider how the English Ladies and the French Ursulines worked with traditional gender definitions. Both “perceived their vocations as an integral part of the on-going movement of the Catholic Reformation” (28). Ward maintained that the Institute was a response to the particular circumstances of English Catholicism, arguing that a more active religious life for women would be of greater benefit to the mission. The Ursulines saw
their actions as essential in countering the fact that women had been receptive to the Protestant movement in France. In presenting themselves as active agents of the Catholic mission, the English Ladies and the Ursulines became subjects of suspicion and were forced to defend themselves against attack on a number of fronts. Ward’s imitation of the Society of Jesus proved a significant obstacle and it was widely believed that the English Ladies “were usurping roles which were rightfully male” (47). Despite being advised to embrace an Ursuline way of life, Ward refused to compromise on enclosure. Conversely, the diplomacy of the Ursulines ensured their success. Their adoption of enclosure hid firm resolutions and a number of that Order refused to take the habit until a supplementary papal Brief allowed them to teach boarders and local day pupils. It is hard to avoid Lux-Sterritt’s conclusion that this outcome was “a tactical tour de force” for the Ursulines, who apparently endorsed subjection to male authority to deliver their self-appointed educational brief (71).

Chapters four and five provide an analysis of the syllabi and evangelical activity of both groups. Following their enclosure, the Ursulines limited the topics they taught to those “deemed appropriate for education in the cloister” (89). However, the English Ladies followed the Jesuit syllabus, including, for instance, dramatic performance as part of their curriculum. Nonetheless, though both demonstrated significant innovations in female education, Lux-Sterritt argues that “no evidence has yet been unearthed which would demonstrate a ‘modern’ view on women’s learning, one which would claim complete parity with that of men” (95). Both groups emphasised the virtues of order and harmony and their pedagogical aims were generally limited to providing the foundations to become pious Catholic women. The same pattern can be observed in evangelical activity. Although enclosure precluded free travel, the Ursulines retained an interest in Catholic missionary activity, and were eventually entrusted to establish an Ursuline movement in Quebec. Characteristically, Ward flouted gender boundaries, openly intending for the English Ladies to model the missionary activities of the Society of Jesus, a factor which further contributed to their eventual suppression.

The final three chapters of this book are, for this reader, the most impressive. In an examination of how the English Ladies and the Ursulines balanced active and spiritual, Lux-Sterritt shows that they both “retained a common core based upon their adoption of the mixed life” (151). Alongside
their catechetical brief, both of these ‘innovative’ groups also maintained the virtues of chastity and obedience, and freely observed “a regularity which was very much in keeping with medieval traditions” (154). The rapid enclosure of the Ursulines after France accepted the Decrees of the Council of Trent and the fact that moves had been made by many houses in favour of enclosure long before, is convincingly used to suggest that the enclosure of the Ursulines sprang “from their own yearning for what they still regarded as an ideal” (159). Nonetheless, the teaching of day pupils allowed an exchange with the outside world that signalled a new type of religion for women: “one where teaching modified monastic claustration” (143). A similar attitude to traditional monastic values is also evident amongst the English Ladies, and the houses of the Institute “adopted a semi-monastic lifestyle” (164). Indeed, Lux-Sterritt argues that throughout her life Ward elevated the virtues of contemplation, suggesting that “the image of Mary Ward as a feminist adventurer who purposefully set out to destroy centuries of tradition in the Catholic Church is an anachronistic misinterpretation” (170). In light of this, while the decision to adopt a ‘mixed’ life may have been a means to ensure their own sanctification, it is argued that for both the Ursulines and the English Ladies it was not a means of ‘self-empowerment, but a gesture of self-abnegation and religious altruism.

The focus of Redefining Female Religious Life is not as expansive as its title might suggest. It considers two particular groups of women, concentrating almost entirely on the early seventeenth century, while work on the French Ursulines is overwhelmingly concerned with the Toulousain foundation. However, this is not a criticism. The familiarity and deep engagement with the sources relating to both groups, which this approach allows, is one of the main strengths of the study. This clear grounding in the primary sources has apparently helped avoid an anachronistic dichotomy between a liberating apostolate and an imprisoning contemplative life. The methodology adopted throughout, that of comparison between the two groups, works particularly well and ensures that the study is not restricted solely to geographical particulars. Lux-Sterritt’s nuanced and persuasive argument that the English Ladies and French Ursulines were not deliberately revolting against oppression from the Church, but instead engaged in a form of self-abnegation in its service, is a valuable contribution to our understanding of female spirituality in post-Reformation Europe.

The Performance of Male Nobility can be read, like a Molière performance, on multiple levels. The book casts new light on a performance genre whose structure and dynamics are conveyed only incompletely by extant sources, it highlights Molière's clever manipulation of the social stereotypes, and it analyzes these subjects in light of the critical first decade of Louis XIV's personal rule, when the royal court was being reconfigured as a site of representation and negotiation. Smith succeeds best when she describes the complicated internal mechanics of the *comédies-ballets* and reveals the inventiveness of Molière and his collaborators. Her efforts to relate those performances to the contexts of court life between 1661 and 1670, however, yield uneven results. Critical elements of the context are lacking, and in some ways Smith's representations of contemporary social and political relations serve to reinforce misleading perceptions. Nevertheless, Smith's evidence is sufficient to show that the staging of *Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme* in 1670 marked a conservative turn in Molière's writing that reflected the changing cultural politics of Louis XIV's court.

Smith provides close analyses of eight *comédies-ballets*, beginning with *Les Fâcheux* of 1661. The performance took place at the notorious festival held in Louis XIV's honor at Nicolas Fouquet's lavish chateau, Vaux-le-Vicomte. Fouquet's impolitic display of wealth and cultural capital, reflecting his personal successes as the king's *surintendant des finances*, is widely thought to have excited the king's envy and suspicion, and Fouquet was arrested on charges of corruption only weeks after the August extravaganza. For Smith, though, the principal significance of the festival is that it marked the beginning of an active collaboration between Molière and the Sun King, whose appreciative suggestions to Molière after the initial performance eventually inspired changes to the script and branded the *comédie-ballet* as a genre fixated on the identity of the "male courtier." The action in *Les Fâcheux* was dictated by a straightforward plot device—two noble lovers are prevented from meeting at a secret rendezvous because a series of irritating personalities, the *fâcheux* of the title, take turns disrupting the lovers' plans. By populating the stage with recognizable
courtier “types,” and by punctuating the presentation with meta-theatrical gestures and ballet interludes with noble dancers, Molière implicated his audience in the action and turned the production into a commentary on the role(s) of the courtier.

Smith develops this theme in discussions of subsequent comédies-ballets performed at Versailles and other royal chateaux throughout the 1660s. She shows how Molière, using a variety of fictional settings and combining inter-class and intra-class dynamics, both mirrored the social values of the courtly audience for whom the performances were staged and also subtly challenged the terms in which nobles—especially male nobles—defined themselves. Most of Smith’s observations are unobjectionable, though they will also be generally unsurprising to specialists of the period. Characters’ costumes, speech, and control over codes of etiquette signaled their social status. Interactions between noble but duplicitous characters, on the one hand, and common but virtuous characters, on the other hand, highlighted the “hierarchies and anxieties of masculinity” in an evolving court culture (88). The ideal of honnêteté demarcated the established elites from the laughable pretenders, but it also drew attention to the mutable character of the qualities that increasingly came to represent noblesse.

The analysis of the scripts and staging of the comédies-ballets is consistently astute, but Smith frequently stumbles when she fills in the context that allegedly shaped Molière’s thinking and behavior. For example, she refers repeatedly to royal servants as “bureaucrats,” which few political historians of the period would accept, and she describes the noblesse de robe as being “located socially between the noblesse d’épée and the merchant class,” positioned somewhere beneath self-described honnêtes homes—a characterization that historians of the seventeenth-century nobility would regard as a gross simplification (98–9). Although Smith acknowledges and draws from some of the revisionist literature that has emphasized the reciprocal benefits that Louis XIV’s “absolutist” style bestowed on monarchy and nobility, she remains frustratingly one-sided in her depiction of “Louis’s transformation of the nobility” (213). By granting nobles limited but valued rights to participate in theatrical spectacles, Smith suggests, Louis “directed and seduced his aristocracy onto his stage at Versailles” (69). The king himself, by contrast, always appears unconstrained. His personal influence on Molière, too, is consistently emphasized—even though the clearest evidence for this seems to be Molière’s own published testimony,
the rhetoric and purposes of which are unfortunately never subjected to scrutiny.

Louis XIV is still seen here, in other words, as the prime mover, the agent of change whose views and perspectives are most worthy of attention. Curiously, Smith never attempts to provide a profile of the typical courtly audience that witnessed Molière's performances. The reader is told that the fâcheux of 1661 were “specifically chosen to appeal to and parody [the] audience at Vaux-le-Vicomte” (14), but no systematic effort is made to assess the social composition of that audience, which apparently numbered in the thousands. Smith assures us that the noble audience “was familiar with the conventions of both the farce and the pastoral” (95), that the rural setting of Geog Dandin “would certainly resonate with courtiers” (126), and that the signifiers of fashion and conversation “were certainly recognizable to Louis's courtier audiences” (130), but the voices of actual courtiers are never heard, and Smith uses little contemporary evidence outside the world of the theater to cast light on the nobility's concerns and priorities. This is a serious problem for a book that purports to show the dynamic interplay between the “real” and “staged” representations of the male courtier.

Despite these deficiencies of context, Smith's final chapter presents a compelling account of the transformation, and decline, of the comédie-ballet in the early 1670s. The turning point came in February, 1670. Molière's playful challenging of social types in Les Amants Magnifiques—where gods and kings were revealed to be actors and creators of illusion—ultimately exposed the dangers inherent in comedic explorations of social representation. Louis XIV, in the role of Neptune, evidently refused to perform in the intermède after the initial performance, and Smith argues plausibly that Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme—with its affirmation of traditional social roles and its elimination of open-ended meta-theatricality—represented Molière's effort to make amends. The performance went over well with audiences in the fall of 1670, but the king's tastes had moved decisively toward the more conservative genre of tragédie-lyrique in the months that followed the debut of Les Amants Magnifiques. Already in the two years before his death in 1673, Molière recognized that he had been displaced by his one-time collaborator Lully as Louis XIV's favored court entertainer. Thanks to Smith, readers will now have a fuller sense of the richness and complexity of Molière's collaborative productions in the decade before Lully's ascendancy.

1659 was the banner year for verbal portraiture in France, marking the apogee of a mondain vogue that impelled seemingly all members of polite society to “paint” each other and/or themselves. Illustrated first and foremost in the novels of Mademoiselle de Scudéry, the craze culminated in the publication of several collections of stand-alone portraits, in prose and in verse, placed under the auspices of Mademoiselle de Montpensier, cousin of Louis XIV. A shrewd observer of social and literary trends, Charles Sorel (best known, then as now, as the author of the immensely successful Histoire comique de Francion, 1623-33) wasted no time in (de)riding the wave of portraiture and presenting his personal take on this “bizarre and agreeable constellation” (73). Despite its highly topical and precisely dated character, however, Sorel’s Description de l’île de Portraiture et de la ville des Portraits is more than a mere œuvre de circonstance: as Martine Debaisieux’ superb edition makes abundantly clear, this novella-length capriccio encapsulates the prolific writer’s entire career and reflects his lifelong preoccupation with art, truth, and society.

The Description is in fact a “little story” (67), that of an imaginary voyage to an island “in the middle of the world” (69) whose inhabitants all share the same single obsession and occupation, that of producing, commissioning, and distributing portrait paintings. The narrator-traveler Périandre is accompanied by two of his “old friends” (69), named Erotime and Gélaste, and guided by the wise and expert Egemon. They explore the island’s capital, where each street is dedicated to a specific type of portraiture: heroic, amorous, satirical, self-portraits, etc. Egemon gives a lecture on the history and general utility of portraits and leads Périandre to the old painter Mégaloteknès, who laments the public’s frivolous lust for novelty and its disregard for serious and instructive works, such as his own latest productions. They return to the center of the city to attend a judicial ceremony during which “bad” portraits (i.e. offensive, scandalous, or simply “useless” ones; 108) are publicly burned and their authors reprimanded, whereas the “good” painters in each genre are crowned and rewarded. Finally, Périandre learns about the political organization of the island-state (a senatorial, meritocratic
republic) and sees how chariot-loads of portraits are shipped off to France, where he himself returns shortly afterwards.

While the first half of the Description is predominantly satirical, exposing life on the island as a universal masquerade and mocking the vain foibles of models and portraitists alike (with the exception of the virtuous and veracious “peintres censeurs”; 86), the second is more serious and didactic, albeit in a still playful manner. The distinction between “good” and “bad” portraiture becomes increasingly paramount, and the judicial and political passages take on a utopian dimension, which is of course a classic feature of the genre of the imaginary voyage. In this geographical allegory (a mini-genre which had itself become fashionable in the 1650s: see for example Scudéry’s famous Carte de Tendre), the Isle of Portraiture is a transparent stand-in for the world of Letters; but the text actually operates on both levels and, although ultimately about writers and writing, also discusses painters and painting in their own right. Rather than sacrificing the literal to the figural plane, Sorel’s allegorical fiction constantly intertwines the visual and the verbal, thus reflecting the concept of *Ut pictura poesis* and the closeness between the two sister arts in seventeenth century France.

Debaisieux’ edition of the work ensures perfect readability by modernizing the spelling and punctuation, adding paragraph breaks, and inserting section titles based on the marginalia of the original. She provides the reader with a comprehensive array of relevant background information and concise analysis: the text is framed by a 35-page introduction, 136 footnotes, eight illustrations, as well as a 50-page annex of annotated excerpts from the 1659 portrait collections and, especially, from six of Sorel’s novels. The latter document the writer’s longstanding interest in painted portraits (such as those of Nays in *Francion* and Charite in *Le Berger extravagant*), which often play a pivotal role in the narration’s overall economy and serve to problematize the relation between art and reality. Throughout his diverse œuvre, Sorel pursues a reflection on the charms and perils of figurative representation, denouncing “the impostures of mimesis” (61) and advocating truthfulness and *naturel*. Debaisieux demonstrates in detail how the “critical fiction” (55) of the Description de l’Île de Portraiture not only echoes Sorel’s earlier novels but also announces his subsequent works of literary criticism, *La Bibliothèque française* and *De la connaissance des bons livres*. What’s more, the story’s protagonists seem to represent the many faces of Charles Sorel himself: the corncrak Gélaste, the senti-
mental Erotime, the “curieux” Périandre, the “savant” Egemon, and, last but not least, the venerable and embittered Mégaloteknès. As it turns out, Sorel’s caustic depiction of the Isle of Portraiture is also, tacitly, an intriguing and poignant self-portrait.

A final bibliographic note: the Description de l’île de Portraiture had not been reedited since 1788, when Charles Garnier included it in his 36-volume collection of Voyages imaginaires, songes, visions, et romans cabalistiques. By a curious coincidence, this little gem has suddenly sprung to life again in not one but two modern editions, which appeared almost simultaneously last fall: perhaps attracted by the “insular” element of the title, the Parisian publisher L’Insulaire printed its own modernized transcription of Sorel’s text, with extremely sparse annotation and an introductory essay by Pierre-Henry Frangne, a specialist of symbolist esthetics. While this inexpensive brochure (105 pp., 13 euros) may help introduce Sorel and his work to a wider circle of curieux, it is Martine Debaisieux’s authoritative and well-furnished edition that should find its way into all good libraries.


Catherine Marchal-Weyl is right to say that studies of seventeenth-century French theater have underestimated the significance of the Spanish comedia for early modern aesthetics. Le Tailleure and le fripier accomplishes the significant scholarly task of correcting this tendency while providing a wealth of information, both about the comedias themselves—authors include Pedro Calderón de la Barca, Carpio (Félix) Lope de Vega, Francisco de Rojas Zorrilla, and Gabriel Téllez a.k.a. Tirso de Molina—and about their adaptations by French playwrights. The latter include principally François Le Métel de Boisrobert, Jean Rotrou, and Paul Scarron, and more incidentally Pierre and Thomas Corneille, Antoine Le Métel, sieur d’Ouville, and Philippe Quinault. Marchal-Weyl argues convincingly that Gallic interest in the plots and characters of three subgenres of the comedia—then comedia palatina (“palace comedy”), the comedia de capa y espada (adventure stories about the nobility) and the comedia de figurón (comedies centered on a single ridiculous character, the better to highlight
aristocratic values by contrast)—was much more than just a passing fancy. Adaptations of Spanish comedies around the middle of the seventeenth century contributed to laying the groundwork for what we have come to call classical aesthetics.

This book’s greatest strength lies in the rigor and extensiveness with which the author examines individual plays, in comparative fashion, from both sides of the Pyrenees. In addition to the detailed textual analyses covered in five chapters, Marchal-Weyl also provides appendices that contain useful plot summaries for readers, enthusiasts, and teachers of seventeenth-century European theater.

The methodological sophistication, attention to detail, and sensitivity to exceptions to perceived trends in the analyses of plays do not always find an adequate counterpart, however, in the study’s treatment of history. The author’s overviews of seventeenth-century French society in particular follow an implicit teleology and posit direct, causal connections between politics and art that remain open to question. Particularly at the beginning of the book’s first chapter, on the origins of French interest in Spanish theater, the author frequently uses terms like “évolution” to describe France as moving collectively and inexorably toward administrative centralization, political absolutism, and rationalist epistemology. Recent works of historical and literary scholarship—Daniel Gordon’s *Citizens Without Sovereignty* and John D. Lyons’s *Kingdom of Disorder*, to name just two—might be brought to bear on the discussion to temper the claims of linear historical process and direct influence of perceived social conditions on dramatic art.

Nonetheless, the main concepts examined in *Le tailleur et le fripier* are presented compellingly and intelligently in a number of painstaking comparisons and close readings. The book’s central paradox regarding the *comedia* and its avatars is an important one, and Marchal-Weyl explains it cogently: “C’est néanmoins sur le terreau fourni par ce théâtre délibérément non aristotélicien que va se constituer, en quelques décennies, l’esthétique classique, laquelle deviendra référence culturelle pour le reste de l’Europe dans les années qui suivront. Ce n’est pas le moindre des paradoxes, mais c’est plus qu’un simple hasard” (9). Showing that arch-Aristotelian classical doctrine came from an anti-Aristotelian creative form provides a fascinating new perspective on the *Grand Siècle*. What took place was no simple evolution from baroque to classical aesthetics.
French playwrights and theatergoers approached the Spanish *comedia* with an ambivalence that Marchal-Weyl considers “une certaine hypocrisie” (41). Whereas the French acknowledged that both Spanish and Italian playwrights were more diegetically inventive than their own, they denounced the formal openness and sociodramatic hybridity of Spanish theater as imperfect and inferior to Gallic, rules-driven dramaturgy. In other words, Marchal-Weyl argues that the French admired their Spanish models more than they were willing to admit and misunderstood much about the specificity of the *comedia* along the way.

One aspect of the *comedia* that Marchal-Weyl evokes most effectively is the genre’s musical shape and sonority. Like a fugue, the *comedia* plays out through counterpoint, leitmotifs, reprises, and energetic rhythms. It is this musicality that French playwrights, with the exception of Scarron, largely missed in their adaptations. Yet these misconstruals also led to new theatrical forms and practices that contributed significantly to the development of early modern French theater and classical aesthetics more generally. As the title of the book indicates, Marchal-Weyl uses the notion of character to draw important distinctions between Golden Age and French classical comedy. Characters in the *comedia* function above all as parts of a dynamic whole. Like pieces on a chessboard, Spanish Golden Age personae lack depth and are defined above all by their actions. Dramatists including Rotrou, on the French side, begin to develop an understanding of characters as subjectivities, interesting and revealing in their own right.

In the *comedia*, the situation provided by the plot often exemplifies a moral principle, as evidenced in the sententious titles of many of the plays. French adaptations eliminate mottos like the one in Rojas Zorrilla’s *Entre bobos anda el juego, don Lucas del Cigarral* (“May the Hands of the Innocent Be Full; Don Lucas del Cigarral”) to focus more on the identity of the main character: Thomas Corneille’s adaptation bears the shortened and altered title *Dom Bertran de Cigarral*. While both traditions provide a vision of the aristocratic world that aims to reinforce values definitive of that world, Marchal-Weyl shows that the *comedia* undertakes freer experimentation with conventional views of social roles, even if the end result is to reinforce notions of rank, hierarchy, and social order.
With the assassination of Henri IV still fresh in the national memory, the French proved to be squeamish about disorderly, frontal conflicts onstage. Stock elements of the *comedia* like generational struggles and tensions between sovereigns and their subjects disappear by and large in the adaptations. Political theories of divine right monarchy (e.g. Cardin Le Bret) drive reflections on French politics as the Iberian dynamism of opposition gives way onstage to the stability of royal predestination and legitimacy. Similarly, master-servant relations, which can be ambiguous and unpredictable in the *comedia*, become static visions of the superiority of a master over his laughable valet in French comedy. Scarron’s raucous and nervy Jodelet (and eventually Molière’s *Sganarelle*, whom Marchal-Weyl never mentions) provides a notable exception.

Also gone from most adaptations are the contrasting scenes of court versus country life. Whereas these oppositions ultimately serve to reassert aristocratic values and the stability of social hierarchy in the *comedia*, the French *bienséances* tended not even to allow rustic life to be represented onstage. Along with an increased “purification” of language, French dramatists overall aimed for sociopolitical homogeneity in the distribution of roles—the focus remained on nobles, with the requisite valets and ladies in waiting included for their functionality. Ultimately, French comedy would move toward an ethics of *honnêteté* that would come to supplant the dramatic articulation of the values of the landed aristocracy.

The most clearly exemplary, and thus least interesting characters, according to Marchal-Weyl, were those of Boisrobert. A founding member of the French Academy, Boisrobert practiced a predictable, didactic brand of heroic characterization. Rotrou, whose production was much more varied and nuanced, undertook among other things a true theatrical reflection on the workings of political power. But Scarron emerges from this study (along with Molière, who merely but interestingly remains on its horizon) as the most provocative, albeit socially conservative, playwright. Marchal-Weyl argues that Scarron is both an exception and a sign of his times. He was also the only French adaptor of the *comedia* at mid-century to understand and deploy its most definitive techniques. Burlesque inversions of social roles, multiple registers of language, musicality, and metadramatic winks at the audience were all comic tools that Scarron deployed fearlessly. Scarron’s comedies and tragicomedies moved the French tradition from adaptations of the *comedia palatina*...
and the comedia de capa y espada toward a new avatar of the comedia de figurón. Ridiculous characters, monomaniacs, and burlesque situations increasingly occupied the stage to expose a society rendered vulnerable by the regencies and the Fronde. We can already see Molière coming, and before him Corneille’s cynical early comedies. In Scarron, biting satire that questions the underpinnings of French social mores ultimately raises doubts about the capacity of language to represent reality.

In his own way, Scarron participated in a meta-theatrical trend whereby French dramatists shifted the focus of comedies from the quest for perfection in the social world portrayed onstage to a quest for perfection in the very processes of dramatic representation that construed that world. Tailoring the comedia to the unities, the bienséances, and the overarching criterion of verisimilitude left out much of what gave the Spanish art form its particular flavor. While Marchal-Weyl chides French dramatists for misunderstanding so much, her erudite approach consistently succeeds in bringing out the complexities of the similarities, differences, trends, and exceptions observable in this bilingual corpus of plays. Largely thanks to this important book, the significance of the dramaturgical dialectics between the comedia and early French comedy can no longer be underestimated.


The very title of this work captures the substance of a problematic perspective that never ceases to challenge literary critics of late sixteenth and early seventeenth-century French literature. In a period that witnesses simultaneously the cultivation of poetry as a vocation and the reaffirmation of faith, how does a poetic voice translate or give witness to religious experience? How can one conceptualize the relationship, if there is one, between the poet and the theologian as interpreter of the scriptures? In anthropomorphic terms, how does one conceptualize the Greek goddess of music and poetry as the Muse converted to Christianity? Are such phenomena identifiable characteristic of a period of time that one can call baroque, a term that straddles art and literature as sister arts and one that French literary historians do not find particularly
friendly? Bourgeois has addressed each of these questions with careful and meticulously researched analyses of the poetry of the better known Jean de la Ceppède, Jean de Sponde, and Agrippa d'Aubigné as well as that of some lesser known poets such as Pierre de Croix and Claude Hopil.

Taking his lead from the seminal work of Jean Rousset on the baroque, Bourgeois isolates the traditional characteristics of the baroque aesthetic, understanding them as the “visage particulier qu’a pris la rencontre entre le littéraire et le religieux” (13), and proposes to examine how these characteristics correspond to the literary production of certain poets, who personify the Christian Muse, between the years 1570 and 1630. Key to his examination is to “considérer chacun des poèmes étudiés comme la reformulation d’une parole donnée par la tradition chrétienne. Le langage poétique reformule le langage théologique” (25). In examining this reformulation he toggles binary topoi such as interior and exterior, sacred and profane, introspection and ostentation, and the subjectivity of personal religious experience as related to the objectivity of proclaimed dogma. Tensions such as these reveal the instability, movement and ornamentation characteristic of the baroque “visage particulier,” and the reader quickly becomes aware that Bourgeois’s own discursive style imitates the very rhetoric he is examining, as if by what Faguet termed “innutrition.”

Bourgeois dedicates Part I of his study to reconciling the sacred and the profane in the person of the poet. A sound and comprehensive explanation of the origins and development of secular humanism is balanced against the poet’s call to “escrire Chrestiennement,” as he cites Henri Estienne (81). Here Bourgeois balances myth and fable by assiduously backtracking to the classical tradition of Greece and Rome before approaching the Italian humanists and then treating one important poet of his study, Jean de la Ceppède, whose Théorèmes Bourgeois considers a clear and constant example of the inclusion of mythological figures in the Christian poem. Bourgeois continues to put a face on the new Muse converted to Christianity by citing La Ceppède’s self-reflective preface in which the poet admits to having been seduced by the pagan Muse in his youth only to mature by unmasking and rejecting her. As is his wont throughout the book, Bourgeois establishes a relationship to an intertext, here to the conversion of Saint Augustine as it is modeled in his Confessions. The role of Saint Augustine as intertext is continually plumbed as Bourgeois proceeds to analyze Pierre de Croix’s Miroir de l’amour divin, seeing in it an example of the baroque tension between sacred and profane. Bour-
geois notes here that the *Miroir*’s “deux diverses citez” as earthly and celestial cities is a direct borrowing from Saint Augustine’s *City of God*. A final adieu to the profane Muse closes Part I with an affirmation of divine love’s rapture replacing the experience of human love.

Part II is by far the most significant section of the work. Entitled “Figures de la Bible,” it examines how the rhetoric of biblical expression informs biblical exegesis as it is practiced by the poet. Questions of paraphrase, interpretation, imitation and rewriting place the scriptures as the primary intertext of the Christian Muse. Bourgeois has done enormous research here not only into La Ceppède, Pierre de Croix and Aubigné but also into several translations of the Bible, including the Bible Benoist and the Latin Vulgate. Several side-by-side comparisons make clear cases of borrowing and interpolation. Notable here is the manner in which Aubigné and Sponde are shown to have modeled their style on biblical psalms. In addition to exegesis, biblical commentary was also practiced by the Christian Muse. Bourgeois has dutifully included discussion on how the Christian Muse has offered commentary on the scriptures. Immediately coming to mind is the case of La Ceppède’s *Théorèmes*, in which some 520 sonnets that chronicle the passion, death, resurrection and ascension of Christ are accompanied by their discursive and perhaps even more copious commentaries. Bourgeois has certainly given these commentaries their due but they are far less treated than the sonnets themselves although they give ample evidence of scriptural exegesis.

Part III, entitled “Rhétorique de l’âme,” narrows the baroque question down to style. The key question here is how a poetic style specifically identified as baroque translates the lived experience of Christian life. Having taken his cue from Saint François de Sales’s letter to La Ceppède at the very beginning of his first chapter, Bourgeois again takes up the seventeenth-century saint’s injunction to apply one’s love of God to a practical life of moral Christian living. The saint’s *Introduction à la vie dévote* (1641) is the stepping stone in this part to a discussion of the current of devotion in the early seventeenth century. The questions of meditation and spiritual exercises as well as giving voice to the voice of God in the eloquence of preaching are seen as emanating from a certain devout alchemy by which the experience of God’s love is transformed into poetic expression. Thus, the mystical expression of Pierre de Croix’s *Miroir* and the oxymoronic “chant silencieux” of Claude Hopil’s
Divin Élancements are seen as poetic expressions of an inner reality of religious experience.

Part IV situates all that preceded in a historical perspective. Twentieth-century and earlier criticism, notably that of Jean-Pierre Camus (1584-1652), is brought to bear on Bourgeois’s argument.

In sum, Bourgeois has set an enormous agenda in a volume that is more important as a resource for French devotional poetry of the period than as a work that answers convincingly the question of how the baroque aesthetic is expressed in that literature, if indeed it is. On the other hand, the reader is treated to a wide reaching array of intertexts, background material and textual explanations that pepper the volume. It is easy to forget the author’s original goal to show the integration of theology and rhetoric in the conversion of the Muse as he leads the reader along numerous paths. This book will be valuable to any researcher already familiar with the terminology of classical rhetoric, Tridentine theology, mystical literature, the sister arts, and the devotional poetry of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries.


Michael Moriarty’s new book picks up where his last, *Early Modern French Thought: The Age of Suspicion*, left off, and we are treated to the same erudition, well-crafted arguments, thought-provoking explorations, and lucid prose. This time Moriarty aims to demonstrate that in the early modern period, French thinkers, including philosophers, theologians, poets, and playwrights, were developing what might be called a kind of proto-psychology—a study of human behavioral motivation with a pronounced focus on subjective interiority. He traces his theme from its roots in neo-Augustinian conceptions of original sin to the problematic nature of self-knowledge as explicated in the works of thinkers from Pascal to La Rochefoucauld. The book is wide-ranging in scope and firmly anchored in textual analysis from a variety of primary sources, drawing on philosophical, theological, and literary work from the early modern period. Like Moriarty’s earlier book, *Fallen Nature, Fallen Selves* is a finely crafted, nuanced, and well-paced work of remarkable
scholarship which should be of great interest to scholars and advanced stu-
dents interested in the period and figures it covers.

Since much early modern thinking about the self, its nature and motiva-
tions, is grounded in, or is in some way a reaction to, an Augustinian concep-
tion of original sin, Moriarty launches his discussion with an analysis of the
changes that conception underwent at the hands of thinkers like Jansenius,
Malebranche, and Pascal. These thinkers were responding, directly or indi-
rectly, to a Thomistic reading of the doctrine of original sin in which human
nature was not entirely corrupted by the fall and where human nature and
moral obligations could be understood outside the supernatural realm of
revelation or grace. Though the will can only be entirely satisfied by the
beatific vision, we may yet, Aquinas argued, pursue our natural human end of
happiness by living a life of virtue along Aristotelian lines.

What see in Jansenius, Pascal, and Malebranche, by way of contrast, and
despite their differences, is a rejection of the idea that we can somehow
pursue wholly natural human ends by the light of reason alone, or that an
account of human motivation can be given that does not start with an
acknowledgement of the wretchedness of human nature as a result of the
fall. According to Malebranche, for example, human nature as a whole was
utterly perverted by the self-induced fall that separated us from God, and
ultimately led to the perversion of our natural desires. Most importantly, the
fall and the wedge it drove between human beings and God caused human
beings to forsake what was their natural end—the love of God—for the pursuit
of changeable, impermanent, worldly goods (109). As fallen human beings,
originally created to love God, we now can linger over particular goods, as if
they were good for us in themselves. There is thus a permanent possibility
of voluntary estrangement from God” (139). That we are in this predicam-
ent, willing ourselves away from God, shows that our original nature has
indeed been corrupted; that reason is powerless to set things right shows that
“we are no longer as we were created: we must be unworthy now to
approach him…. We were in a certain state, we are now in another that is
displeasing to God: we must therefore be guilty, as a species, of sin” (140).

As a result of our voluntary separation from God and our attachments
to and desires for worldly goods (concupiscence) we are tempted to think of
ourselves as the beginning and end of all our endeavors. This focus on
ourselves takes the form of an unnatural self-love, as a result of which our
natural drive to self-preservation, which was intended to be a reflection of our love of God, “has become the host inhabited by a new parasitic growth, a morbid attachment to self as the object of one’s desire” (178). Here is where the interiorization we tend to identify with psychology, and the modern period, gets a foothold: when self-love supplants charity (love of God) as the primary motivation for our actions, the only standard we can apply for judging the moral quality of those actions is a subjective one. “The viciousness of a sinful act or desire resides in its relation to the subject. To assess the quality of one’s own actions, one no longer compares their objects with the ideal object, God; one is forced to introspect, to query and to sift one’s own motives” (189-90). But since our nature has been so corrupted by the fall, we can never find anything inside ourselves but unnatural motives, clouded by the kinds of passions and bodily distortions of reason that Descartes so famously uncovered. Even when we appear to be acting for the sake of others, the appearance is only an illusion—a cleverly disguised effort to make others love us, and to persuade ourselves that our motives are justified. For Malebranche, though we may seek to mask our pursuit of worldly goods in our efforts to win the affections and approbation of others, the result is self-delusion (395). The recognition that self-love is a prison from which we cannot free ourselves leads Pascal to offer this shocking claim about virtue:

The true and only virtue is thus to hate oneself, for one is hateful on account of one’s concupiscence, and to seek a truly lovable being to love. But as we cannot love what is outside us, we must love a being that is inside us, yet not ourselves…Now only universal being meets this requirement. The kingdom of God is within us. (201)

The turn to interiority has been further entrenched, and brings with it a host of new worries for writers of the early modern period—principal among those worries was our human tendency to self deception. As Moriarty notes, in referring to Malebranche, since self-love as we now experience it is not part of our original nature, there is “something perverse and inauthentic in self-love, and this appears particularly clearly in its liability to illusion” (271). When we recognize our fallen nature, we try to turn from it by covering our motives with what we take to be good intentions, but we thereby succeed only in making our true nature more opaque to ourselves, for “to misrecognize the
source of one’s own (interested) actions empowers one to perform them with all the more vigor and conviction” (395).

In the final section of the book Moriarty pursues this theme of self-deception in the works of La Fontaine, Pierre Charron, Jacques-Bénigne Bossuet, Pierre Nicole, François Lamy, Antoine Arnauld, Pierre Corneille, Moliere, Jean Racine, Madame de Lafayette, and La Rochefoucauld. There are forays along the way into philosophy, theology, literature, poetry, and theatre. In each case, Moriarty points up the fact that the legacy of self-deception that issues from a recognition of our fallen nature presents formidable obstacles to our attempts to come to clear self-knowledge. Sometimes there is an attempt by these thinkers to overcome those obstacles, which takes a clear theological form. Witness Malebranche, who argues that we can only trust the outcome of our introspective self-searching where that searching is subordinated to our love of God, which can only be guaranteed by grace. Other strands of thinking about self-deception in the early modern period, which do not appeal to divine grace to extricate us from our predicament, are equally critical and suspicious of our motivations, grounded as they are in self-love. Without trying to suggest that there is universal agreement among the authors whose work he examines in this final section of the book, Moriarty successfully manages to bring into high relief a set of family resemblances that bind them all together: a self-conscious recognition of the way that self-love and concupiscence tend to obscure our true motivations and put genuinely virtuous actions out of reach, coupled with a commitment to the idea that our opacity to ourselves is the result of the fall which permanently separated us from God and perverted our true nature. Moriarty notes:

What is lastingly fascinating about so many thinkers of this period is the combination of an acute awareness of the omnipresence of the ego, in our relations both with ourselves and with other, with a steadfast refusal to treat this as a natural and justified state of affairs. Ego, suffused with illusion, appropriative and assertive, yet fragile, and elusive, can never ground any but illusory and exploitative relationships. At a fairly early state in the development toward and egoistic individualist society, it was above all the theology of the fall and of grace that prompted and enabled the writers studied here to develop this crucial vision. (404)
Fallen Nature, Fallen Selves is welcome and eminently successful companion piece to Moriarty’s Early Modern French Thought. Readers who were engaged by that earlier book will find much to like here as well—wide-ranging erudition, subtle textual analysis, and lucid, well-paced prose. The book offers a persuasive case for the claim that there was a form of psychological study emerging in the early modern period, grounded in a neo-Augustinian conception of original sin, which left a profound mark on subsequent developments leading to the kind of individualism that we recognize as one of the hallmarks of the modern period.


In this very extensive analysis of the interplay of medical and religious discourse in England, Claire Crignon-de Oliveira focuses on the complex relationship between the concepts of melancholy and enthusiasm. As the book’s title suggests, its main focus is on the works of Burton and Shaftesbury in the early seventeenth and eighteenth centuries respectively, but it also contains material on authors writing in the years between: Méric Casaubon, Henry More, Joseph Glanvill, Thomas Hobbes, Thomas Willis, John Locke, Thomas Sydenham, Nicholas Robinson, George Cheyne, and John Trenchard amongst others. Its central task is to show how Burton’s innovative classification and description of enthusiasm as a product of “religious melancholy” inaugurated a form of polemical discourse in which medical and psychological concepts supported and gave shape to religious-political concerns, and which in the hands of various authors, culminating with Shaftesbury, subsequently underwent a series of transformations with significant implications for contemporary theories of human nature and society.

The book opens (part I) with a general account of the medical, spiritual and demonological aspects of the concept of melancholy in The Anatomy of Melancholy, and proceeds by showing some of the political implications of this work by turning to Burton’s portrayal of collective melancholic pathology. Burton’s rather perplexing assertion that bodies politic may suffer from mel-
ancholy—which I shall revisit below—is explained in terms of sympathy and contagion, and this approach is then shown to undergird Burton’s diagnosis of collective religious melancholy afflicting Christendom in the final part of the *Anatomy*. The most influential aspect of Burton’s analysis of the spiritual dimension of melancholy is to be found in his somewhat fragmentary account of enthusiasm as a form of excessive religious zeal, and in part II we are given a careful and lucid treatment of its systematic development, elaboration in the works of the Cambridge Platonists, where it is instrumental in their critique of puritan spirituality. As Crignon-de Oliveira recognises, however, seventeenth-century theories of religious melancholy and enthusiasm also raised prickly ethical and juridical issues concerning physiological determinism and moral responsibility: were such religious melancholics and enthusiasts to be pitied and treated with physic, or blamed and imprisoned or persecuted? We are shown how contemporary discussions of such questions employed the idea of “partial delirium” and drew upon medical and psychological accounts of mental aberration in which the imagination rather than reason were damaged.

Part III of the book is concerned with the ways in which medical doctrines of melancholy and enthusiasm were drawn into Restoration debates about religious toleration and freedom of conscience. On the one hand, we are presented with pamphleteers urging the persecution of dissident groups, who argued that the health of the body politic required the quasi-surgical removal of such pathological entities; on the other, we meet (amongst others) Shaftesbury, arguing for toleration by referring to contemporary medical doctrines of the healthy organism in which heterogeneous elements must be granted the liberty to circulate freely, as long as they keep within certain limits and so do not damage the wellbeing of the whole. Throughout the book, parallels are drawn between Burton and Shaftesbury, and its conclusion is explicitly concerned with the ways in which both authors’ engagement with the subject of melancholy constitute reworkings of the classical enterprise of moral philosophy as a “spiritual exercise.” However, Shaftesbury is also shown to have formulated a conception of melancholy and enthusiasm in relation to human nature and society that differs radically from that of his seventeenth-century predecessors, in that he recognises the place of moderated and civilized versions of both conditions within the happy, flourishing human life and community.
There is much to be admired here. It is an ambitious author who attempts to traverse, as announced at the outset (7-8), the two very different political, religious, and intellectual worlds of Burton and Shaftesbury, and the close focus upon the points of harmony, conflict and tension between the medical and religious concerns within the material under discussion yields many interesting results. Although there is much repetition, the exposition is generally precise, the analysis is consistently thoughtful and probing, and in contrast to some existing accounts of this territory, great care is taken to articulate the complicated relationship between melancholy and enthusiasm clearly throughout. In particular, the discussion of the tension between humoral determinism and individual liberty within theories of mental derangement illuminates the moral and social complexities posed for contemporaries by melancholy and enthusiasm very effectively.

However, there are also shortcomings. Crignon-de Oliveira is more comfortable discussing the milieu of Shaftesbury than that of Burton, and there are several peculiarities and problems with her account of the latter. Some of these do not do too much damage to the overall thesis. For example, the assertion that Burton theorizes the collective melancholy of bodies politic by drawing upon the occult concept of sympathy (as formulated by Fracastoro) is purely speculative and unsupported by the text of the *Anatomy*, which offers no such explanation but simply refers to Botero and states that the melancholy of such states can be “easily perceave[d] by their particular Symptomes.” However, the general emphasis on the collective, epidemical status of melancholy for Burton is undoubtedly correct. Similarly, the claim that there is no definition of melancholy in the *Anatomy* (54) is flatly contradicted by the text, which clearly settles on a conventional medical definition of the disease as a species of delirium in which imagination or reason are corrupted, and which is usually accompanied by fear and sorrow (1.1.3.1). Still, Burton does voice serious doubts elsewhere about the applicability and usefulness of such a definition. Unfortunately, there are also more serious omissions from this account. Most obviously, Burton’s well-known status as a humanist, and that of the *Anatomy* as one of the last great monuments of Renaissance humanism in England, receives no discussion whatsoever. The very substantial differences between the different editions of the *Anatomy* published in 1621, 1624, 1628, 1632, 1638 and 1651 are also completely overlooked. (Here the author has not been assisted by the editors of the
otherwise excellent Clarendon edition, who chose to catalogue the multitude of textual variations in appendices rather than signal the most substantial changes in the margins of the main text in the manner of modern editions of Montaigne—but it does not take much effort to discover that Burton's argument about religious melancholy alters significantly in the different versions, and one cannot simply ignore this.)

Other omissions will frustrate some readers more than others. Although it is a lengthy book, there is relatively little detailed exploration of the political and religious contexts of the works under discussion, and large portions of the historiography of the period are neglected. What we have instead is a largely detached investigation of the workings of discourse, occasionally seasoned with contextual interludes and allusions. There is undoubtedly a rich and sophisticated body of Francophone scholarship on the subject of melancholy (most notably in the output of Jackie Pigeaud and Jean Starobinski) with which Crignon-de-Oliveira fruitfully engages, but whilst this quasi-Foucauldian approach does yield insight, for some historians and literary critics it will seem problematic. On the purely theoretical level, it is not clear whether the changes in conceptions of melancholy, enthusiasm, and human nature generally, are to be attributed to external contextual pressures in the domain of religion and politics, or whether—as is sometimes implied by this type of analysis—the discourse itself has an inherent logic that tends towards particular ends. It is on the empirical level, however, that the defects of the book are most obvious: its account of areas of religious and political conflict, especially where the recent historiography has been contentious, is very problematically restricted. There are references to the work of Roy Porter, Michael MacDonald, Michael Heyd, and Lawrence Klein, but effective contextualisation of this material now surely requires coverage of the scope of recent arguments amongst historians about republicanism, civil society, and politeness, and about the theological nuances of English Protestantism throughout the century. Because Renaissance humanism is never mentioned, we are left to wonder about the transformation of moral-philosophical discourse in the century; and the very minor role given to Stoicism in this account, given its importance in the *Anatomy* and absolute centrality to Shaftesbury's enterprise, is perplexing. Crignon-de-Oliveira has almost nothing to say about Shaftesbury's political career.
Despite these objections, this remains an intelligent and thought-provoking book. It may be profitably read alongside other accounts of seventeenth-century science, religion, and politics.


In the canon of French verse, the didactic and scientific poetry of the seventeenth century has not met with great favor on the part of the general public; nor has it elicited vast attention within the scholarly community. Philippe Chométy's impressive examination of this body of poetry does much to fill this lacuna, and his study represents an important contribution to the field. Examining the works of poets ranging from the great to the forgotten, from La Fontaine to Magnon, Chevalier, and Vion Dalibray, Chométy displays both vast erudition and scrupulous methodological rigor in calling attention to a rich and fascinating literary corpus, the understanding of which is revealed in the multiple tensions and paradoxes embodied therein. Faced with the pronounced task of disentangling and elucidating the various problematic issues inherent in these works on both a theoretical and textual level, the author succeeds admirably in bringing to light the essence of these poems within their literary, social and philosophical contexts.

The difficulty of this undertaking is evident in the very nomenclature required to characterize the poems studied, for the province of their scope is varied and wide, embracing the philosophical, scientific, moral, and didactic. The author notes that the seventeenth century could classify them all under the rubric of “philosophie,” in as much as the word itself, as evoked by Chevalier in his Nouveau Cours de philosophie en vers français, referred to the “connaissance/Des choses que l'esprit humain peut penetrer” (273). For the basis of his study Chométy has chosen the designation la poésie d'idées.

But problems presented themselves beyond the question of terminology. For in an era of Cartesian rationalism, the very attempt to discuss in poetic tropes and cadences such matters as philosophical systems, the history of ideas, the nature of the cosmos, mathematics, natural sciences, or the latest scientific discoveries occasioned skepticism as to whether the genre of poetry
could accommodate such considerations. To explain theoretical principles or natural phenomena in an objective and scientific way seemed intuitively to require a discourse of scientific clarity and precision and a mode of expression seemingly incompatible with the strictures and structures of poetry. La Grange’s statement in his *Principes de la Philosophie*, “toutes ces métaphores sont un peu grotesques, quand il s’agit de décider un point de Philosophie” (29), reflects a train of thought that would immediately cause the learned to look askance at poetic efforts to engage in scientific discussion. The mere act of expressing oneself in a figurative or fanciful way seemed automatically to exile a poet from the dispassionate purlieus of savants. Thus, when La Fontaine, in his *Poème du Quinquana*, affirmed as his intent, “Philosopher en langage des dieux,” we are struck by the irony that a language that was fit for the gods (and La Fontaine), was deemed to be not good enough for philosopher/scientists.

Yet, as revealed in La Fontaine’s proclamation, the poets of the seventeenth century themselves were not deterred by such thinking. Seeing their art entirely capable of satisfying the dual goal of instructing and pleasing while disseminating and celebrating knowledge, they set themselves wholly to the task, and as difficult as it was, they prided themselves on having succeeded in “la difficulté vaincue.” Indeed, as Chométy argues, the language of poetry had powers of didacticism that could surpass those of prose. The elevation and inspiration of the poetic muse could infuse the subject of the poet’s lyre, which, in turn, could inspire its reader. Verse could also facilitate instruction and retention by means of striking imagery or rhetorical phrasing that colorless explanation in prose could not match. Finally, a poetic masterpiece could provide its subject with the sort of immortality conferred upon the works of a Hesiod or Virgil.

While detailing the tensions between the domains of poetry and philosophy during the seventeenth century, the author equally points out their affinities and affiliations within their social milieu. Poets admired philosophers and vice versa, and whilst poets engaged in philosophy, so too did philosophers set their pen to verse. They frequented the same social circles, and breathed in the same intellectual climate. By studying the complex interrelationship between the two realms and their practitioners, the author captures and conveys both the strains and bonds between two disciplines existing within a shared and strangely symbiotic space.
After careful examination of this dynamic, the author turns his attention to analyses of the poems themselves from a number of perspectives. His observations are cogent, insightful, and persuasive. One of his most interesting revelations is how diverse were the structures and tonalities that could be assumed by the poetry of ideas. It could present itself in modes ranging from the philosophical to the lyrical, from the elegiac to the satirical, from the lighthearted to the heroic, and in formats extending from expansive scientific tracts to the evanescent bagatelles of fugitive verse. In assessing the value as these poems as works of art, though wholly cognizant of their deficiencies, the author does not fail to underscore their merits. Making the case for their rehabilitation, Chométy shows that this poetry may be appreciated on both a didactic and an aesthetic level. It remains to be seen whether his work will occasion a reassessment of these poems on the part of either scholars or the public at large. At the very least, the author demonstrates that reconsideration is in order.

In addition to the acuity of his arguments and assessments, the author impresses by the breadth and scope of his knowledge and research. His footnotes provide a wealth of valuable information and references, complemented by an extensive bibliography. Particularly helpful is a glossary with biographical information on the lesser-known poets of his focus. Chométy’s writing is both exacting and commanding, and the reader is advised to have a thorough knowledge of rhetorical terminology. As a scholar of ideas, Chométy provides a study of ideas that is at once rich and richly rewarding.


In this edition, La Rochefoucauld’s text is prefaced by a short Forward which gives the date of original publication, and situates the Maxims within the salon culture of seventeenth-century Paris; brief mention is also made of stylistic aspects of the maxim as a literary form, and of their ability to provoke controversial reactions, both among their original readers and now. In addition, a short Biographical Note about La Rochefoucauld is appended to the text, but, with these two exceptions, the translator offers us a completely
plain text, uncluttered with notes or critical apparatus. This is no bad thing, since the text is therefore left to speak for itself. But, in consequence, two questions arise: which text is being offered? and, how well is it translated?

The first of these questions is not, at first glance, easy to answer. The Forward and the Biographical Note both state, without qualification, that the text was published in 1665. However, as is well known, La Rochefoucauld's text was progressively modified and enlarged between the first edition (1665) and the fifth edition, now regarded as definitive (1678), which was published two years before La Rochefoucauld's death. Edward Stack's translation contains four parts: Maxims (numbered 1-504), Posthumous Maxims (505-562), Suppressed Maxims (563-641), and Additional Maxims (642-650). That is to say, Stack's text reproduces the 504 maxims of the 1678 edition, supplemented by additional items now traditionally printed as an appendix to La Rochefoucauld's text. Even so, Stack's numbering of that additional material is not transparent: he does not follow the numbering of either Jacques Truchet or Jean Lafond, who have produced the most authoritative recent editions of the *Maximes* (Paris: Garnier, 1967; and Paris: Gallimard, 1976). Instead he reverts substantially to Gilbert's edition, published in the series Grands Ecrivains de la France between 1868 and 1883. However, the nine maxims (642-650) which Stack includes under the heading Additional Maxims are not found in the Grands Ecrivains series: they come from different sources and are included by Truchet as numbers 19, 32, 33 and 34 of his Posthumous Maxims. Of these, Stack splits number 33 into three separate parts (maxims 664-666) and number 34 into four parts (667-50). There is, therefore, a degree of invisible editorial intervention in the text of which the reader will be unaware.

The accuracy of the translation is also open to question in a number of respects. The first of these concerns the themes with which La Rochefoucauld is dealing. According to the Forward, "La Rochefoucauld's analysis of human actions makes the premise that all actions are the result of a single motivation. In this case, the motivating factor is self-interest, or egocentrism. Life is a complex of business-like ruses, all based on self-preservation, self-pity, self-esteem, personal pleasure and all other forms of selfishness." This is true, but, for La Rochefoucauld, terminology is important, and the dominant motivation which he identifies is *amour-propre*, self-love. This term is used 16 times in the 504 maxims of the fifth edition, and a further 8 times in the Posthumous and Suppressed maxims. Stack, however, does not use it once
in the major part of his text, the only part published by La Rochefoucauld. Instead he replaces it 14 times by “self-esteem,” once by “self-interest” and on one occasion suppresses the term completely. This cannot be because the term “self-love” is judged inappropriate, since it does appear among the supplementary material in maxims 510, 531, 563, and 582. In these later sections _amour-propre_ is also replaced three times by “vanity” and on one further occasion by “self-esteem.” However, the consequence of these substitutions is that La Rochefoucauld’s text loses the cynicism or ferocity that it has in French: in English, self-esteem generally carries a far less pejorative connotation than self-love. Similar remarks could be made about La Rochefoucauld’s use of the term _passions_, often rendered (as in Maxim 12) as “emotions,” or the term _humeur_, rendered as “mood” (Maxim 45). This last point undermines somewhat the assertion made in the Forward that the maxims “transcend temporal boundaries”: the seventeenth-century view of “humour” and “humours” does not.

Accuracy, however, is also relevant to the issue of style, and the specificity of the _Maxims_ lies, as Stack recognizes, in the brevity and precision of their formulation. La Rochefoucauld’s brevity is a challenge to any translator, but it is singularly not captured on a number of occasions in this version: for example maxim 423 (“Peu de gens savent être vieux”) is rendered as “Few people know how to act old when they reach the right age for it,” in which the last eight words are redundant. Similarly, the emphasis which La Rochefoucauld gives to his maxims is clear from his choice of vocabulary and the placing of his words, whereas this edition makes use of other devices such as italics (maxim 56), the use of bold type (maxim 49), or the inexplicable use of centring for one maxim (84) followed by left-justification for the next (85). On some occasions a generalized human characteristic is printed in uppercase characters (such as “SINCERITY” in maxim 62), while on other occasions it is not (for example “Gracefulness” in maxim 67). The reader notices these differences but is given no clue to their significance, and will be completely unaware that they do not correspond to anything similar in the French version of the text.

Finally, accuracy has to do with the straightforward rendering of the French which in this translation has, on a number of occasions, been misunderstood. In maxim 73 (“On peut trouver des femmes qui n’ont jamais eu de galanterie; mais il est rare d’en trouver qui n’aient jamais eu qu’une”) the
term *galerie* is rendered as “compliment” when it surely means what the first edition of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie Française* (1694) calls a “commerce amoureux” (“an affair”). Similarly, in maxim 401 (“L’élévation est au mérite ce que la parure est aux belles persones”) *élévation* is translated as ‘promotion’, a term which is not only anachronistic when applied to seventeenth-century society, but which also fails to capture the sense of *dignité* (“dignity”) to which the Academy Dictionary so clearly points. On other occasions too, the sense of the original has not been grasped, or has not been conveyed in English. For example, maxim 404 reads in French as follows: “Il semble que la nature ait caché dans le fond de notre esprit des talents et une habileté que nous ne connaissons pas; les passions seules ont le droit de les mettre au jour, et de nous donner quelquefois des vues plus certaines et plus achevées que l’art ne saurait faire.” In the phrase “les passions seules ont le droit de les mettre au jour,” *les* refers to *talents* (“talents”) and *habileté* (“skill,” “craft” or “cunning”)—so, passion will reveal our talents and our cunning; but the translation mistakenly reads “only passions have the right to show themselves.”

La Rochefoucauld will inevitably pose enormous difficulties for any translator, and one is grateful to those who seek to keep his work alive in the English-speaking world. But other translations, such as Leonard Tancock’s largely unannotated text, first published by Penguin Books in 1959, will better serve the needs of readers seeking to grasp the meaning or flavor of the original French *Maximes*. 
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♦ Marginalia figurati nei codici di Petrarca. By Maurizio Fiorilla. Biblioteca di ‘Lettere italiane’, Studi e testi, 65. Florence: Olschki, 2005. 96 pp., 67 plates. 19 euros. The seventh centenary of the birth of Francesco Petrarca (2004), as often happens on the occasion of similar events, has brought the name of the honoree to the attention of both scholars and the wider public. Unlike a hundred years ago, there was fortunately no thought of making a new monument in his honor or a pilgrimage to the house and tomb of the poet, but as has already happened more than one time in the past, the celebrations were appropriate to the times. We have the inevitable but fruitless polemics against the slowness of the Edizione Nazionale delle Opere di Francesco Petrarca, born on the occasion of the preceding centenary of the poet's birth (1904). And yet with the festivities now concluded, if we sort through the initiatives and writings that have appeared or been announced on Petrarca and his circle, the balance on the whole is positive. Beyond numerous conferences and the ambitious project launched by the Comitato Nazionale per le Celebrazioni del VII Centenario to publish the opera omnia of the poet in a partially critical edition that after almost five centuries could finally substitute for the Basel folio of 1554, the study of the marginalia in Petrarchan manuscripts has been revived, in the glorious footsteps of Nolhac and Billanovich. Editions of marginalia of some of Petrarca’s classical and Christian texts are now in print, and others are in preparation. In order of their publication, we have M.
Petoletti, “Petrarca, Isidoro e il Virgiliano Ambrosiano. Note sul Par. lat. 7595,” Studi petrarcheschi, n.s. 16 (2003), 1-48; F. Santirosi, Le postille del Petrarca ad Ambrogio (Codice Parigno Lat. 1757) (Florence, 2004); L. Refe, Le postille del Petrarca a Giuseppe Flavio (Codice Parigno Lat. 5054) (Florence, 2004); and F. Petrarca, Le postille del Virgilio Ambrosiano, ed. M. Baglio, A. Nebuloni Testa, and M. Petoletti (Rome and Padua, 2006)). The contribution of Maurizio Fiorilla is inserted into this profitable line of research and, in a certain sense, reinvigorates it in an original way, furnishing a useful and capable reference instrument for anyone who in the future would like to follow the difficult task of reconstructing and analyzing the library of the humanist. Instead of examining Petrarca’s annotations on a single author, Fiorilla systematically collects all the *marginalia* that contain figures in the manuscripts that come from the poet’s desk, not overlooking the presence of other hands, more or less definable, earlier or later than the illustrious reader, which are to be put in relation with Petrarca’s notes and make precious the examples that hand them down. Fiorilla’s work has been conducted on the foundation of all the manuscripts of Petrarca’s library registered in M. Feo’s “Francesco Petrarca,” in Storia della letteratura italiana, gen. ed. E. Malato (Rome, 2002), 10:321-29 and “La biblioteca,” in Petrarca nel tempo. Tradizionale lettori e immagini delle opere. Catalogo della mostra, Arezzo, Sottochiesa de S. Francesco, 22 novembre 2003 – 27 gennaio 2004, ed. M. Feo (Pontedera, 2003), pp. 461-96. Fiorilla has for the most part examined the manuscripts himself, using in other cases microfilms, facsimiles, and photographs of the originals or copies that often reproduce the manuscripts faithfully. The volume is divided into two chapters and three brief appendices; fundamental is the rich array of tables (sixty-seven in all).

The first chapter concerns the reader’s marks and the frames. Petrarca’s most frequently used mark is the floweret, formed by two, three, or four little points from which a stroke descends, of varying length, straight or wavy, followed by a small hand with the index finger pointing toward a place in the text that is worthy of interest and, to a lesser extent, by small figures that frame some notes with an exquisitely decorative or, in certain cases, practical aim (as, for example, the frames of Pliny, Par. lat. 6802, in the form of a mountain serving to distinguish among the rich mass of *notabilia* the name of a mountain or of a promontory from that of a river). The complete catalogue of such reader’s marks allows Fiorilla to mark out a system of unmistakable glossing, as well as the subtle graphic evolution to which the system was
subject in the course of time, from Petrarch's early forties to old age. This in turn allows Fiorilla to discuss once again the attribution to Petrarch's library of the Cicero in London, British Library, Harl. 4927, a manuscript of the twelfth century of French origin, whose annotator is the same as the one in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Canon. Patr. lat. 210 and 229, which were originally united with the letters of Ambrose. The entire marginal apparatus of the three exemplars cannot be taken back to Petrarch, whose possession of the Harleian Cicero and the Oxford Ambrose has not yet been demonstrated. Fiorilla cautiously leaves the problem open. Different is the case of another manuscript of Cicero's orations, Vat. lat. 9305, from the end of the fourteenth century, taken from a lost Petrarchan source, from which it reproduces glosses and pictorial annotations; for the latter, however, we cannot be certain that they descend from the original manuscript, considering the absence of designs in other copies with marginalia of the lost Petrarchan manuscript.

The last part of the first chapter examines the hands of other annotators that can be taken back in different times and ways to Petrarch's circle. Landolfo Colonna, canon of Chartres, author and possessor of an extraordinary library, friend of Petrarch and older by a generation, glossed at least three codices (two miscellanea of sacred texts, Par. lat. 1617 and 2540, and the important historical encyclopedia of Dictys, Florus, and the first three decades of Livy, Par. lat. 5690) which ended up in the hands of Petrarch (the first two in Rome in 1337, the third in Avignon in 1351). In all three manuscripts the marginalia of Landolfo (braces, for the most part formed by a vertical stroke in which shell-shaped elements and chains of rings, little hands, and faces are interpositioned, traced in profile along the margins of the column of writing) have a very characteristic style which is differentiated clearly from that of Petrarch. In two other manuscripts from Petrarch's library Fiorilla distinguishes the hand of a second annotator, Giovanni Boccaccio: a miscellanea with the Liber de Regno Sicilie of Ugo Falcando, Par. lat. 5150, probably a gift of Boccaccio to Petrarch in 1361, and the Claudian, Par. lat. 8082, which has a crowned head once attributed to Boccaccio by other scholars, and a little hand designed in correspondence with a passage of the De raptu Proserpinae, whose erroneous interpretation by Petrarch and Boccaccio is perhaps the origin of the false belief in the Florentine birth of Claudian (see Appendix I, 67-73). The fact that cannot be neglected is that Par. lat. 8082, not forming part of the group of manuscripts given by Boccaccio to Petrarch, gives
witness to a reading community between two friends and above all a broad range for the intervention of Boccaccio in the books of Petrarca. The chapter concludes with the attribution to the bishop Ildebrandino Conti, Petrarca’s friend, of some new little hands and braces on two manuscripts, the Isidore, Par. lat. 7595, and the Augustine of the Biblioteca Universitaria of Padua, ms. 1490, in which the hand of Ildebrandino had already been identified by Maria Chiara Billanovich (“Il vescovo Ildebrandino Conti e il De civitate Dei della Biblioteca Universitaria di Padova. Nuova attribuzione,” Studi petrarceschi, n.s. 11 (1994 [2000]), 99-127), and with the individuation of marginalia with figures by anonymous annotators in other manuscripts of Petrarca, among them Par. lat. 1989, the gift of Boccaccio to his friend.

The second chapter is dedicated to the pictures present in Petrarca’s library: four in total, distributed in two manuscripts, the previously cited Par. lat. 6802 and 8082, with three pictures and one, respectively. The Pliny has the well-known sketch of Vaucluse, the logo of the recent national celebrations, a picture of Rome, and a head with a bearded man, while the Claudian preserves a crowned head flanked by a little hand. From the end of the nineteenth century until today it has been widely discussed whether Petrarca or Boccaccio is the one who executed these pictures. With several arguments Fiorilla pronounces himself “a favore di Boccaccio sia nel caso della testina coronata tracciata nel Par. lat. 8082, che forse rappresenta proprio il dedicatorio del De raptu, sia in quello della testina barbuta vergata nel Par. lat. 6802” (63), who for the first time is identified with Abraham. The identification of the hand of the two pictures in Par. lat. 6802 is more complicated. The depiction of the Vaucluse, of which Fiorilla quotes the suggestive description of Contini (“La posizione verticale, a destra, riproduce una rupe sormontata da un sacello e adorna di ciuffi vegetali; ai piedi, nel suo centro, è l’antro sorgivo, dal quale i flutti procedono orizzontalmente verso sinistra, incontrando a cielo ormai scoperto, una fila di erbette e di fiori palustri; all’estremo è un airone con un pesce in bocca,” G. Contini, “Petrarca e le arti figurative,” in Francesco Petrarca Citizen of the World, Proceedings of the World Petrarch Congress, Washington, D.C., April 6-13, 1974 (Padua and Albany, 1980), 115-31), has been the object of debate since the time of Nolhac, along with the note that accompanies it, Transalpina solitudo mea innocuissima, certainly in Petrarca’s hand. Fiorillo puts into the field in Boccaccio’s defense a new element in respect to the criticism that has preceded it: he returns to a passage of the De montibus in which the writer
recalls the spring Sorgue, certainly having present the passage in Pliny, but probably also the note and the sketch of Par. lat. 6802. Such an argument on Boccaccio’s behalf is, in my opinion, more than any paleographical verification, not at all irrelevant, as this is the challenge, that of the more than seventy manuscripts from Petrarca’s library, only the Pliny and the Claudian from Paris have pictures. As soon as it became clear, however, that precisely these two manuscripts bear signs of Boccaccio's hand, Fiorilla limits himself to the hypothesis that the two friends could have conceived the figure together in one of their meetings, presumably the one in Milan in 1359. In the last picture examined, depicting Rome, Fiorilla registers the presence of two different hands, one of Petrarca, who could have executed the first part of the picture, and the other, later, of an anonymous reader. Fiorilla arrives at this conclusion exclusively on the basis of stylistic comparisons, retracing in particular a resemblance with the picture that frames the note Roma affixed in the margin of Vat. lat. 9305, a copy of an exemplar with autograph notes of Petrarca.

At the end of the volume is the second appendix (75-81), which considers the marginal apparatus of Laur. Pluteo 66,1, a manuscript of the eleventh century from Monte Cassino, with the Antiquitates and the De bello Iudaico of Flavius Josephus in Latin translation. Fiorilla assigns the phytomorphic designs, the little hands, and the glosses to Boccaccio, as had earlier scholars who had studied the manuscript (with the notable exception of Giuseppe Billanovich, who attributed the marginalia to Zanobi da Strada). Fiorilla’s thesis appears convincing because it rests on stylistic proof as well as textual comparisons with the Genealogie deorum gentilium. (Monica Berté, University ‘G. D’Annunzio,’ Chieti; trans. by Craig Kallendorf)
appeared, but the series was never completed, the early volumes have become virtually impossible to find, and modern scholarship has called into question some of the editorial decisions in the editions that were published decades ago. So it is very good to see a new edition of Petrarch's collected works underway, and to see the first volumes in print immediately after the anniversary date that stimulated its creation.

In theory at least the editorial principles for this series are somewhat more modest than those for the older series. When possible the editors will use the texts already prepared for the Commissione per l'Edizione Nazionale delle Opere di Francesco Petrarca. If the commission doesn't have a text to hand, the editors will make one, but the editorial work will rely on a limited number of textual witnesses and the apparatus will be restricted to authorial variants and to sources that have been explicitly cited. The introduction to each volume will discuss the textual tradition of the work it presents, and some basic information will be provided for smaller units in the text like individual epistles. Latin texts will be accompanied by Italian translations.

The principles here are similar to those of the I Tatti Renaissance Library, but as with that series, an ambitious editor is given the scope to do more. The editors of both these volumes have done so, making their volumes into solid scholarly works. It so happens that Monica Berté was the person responsible for producing the text of *Contra eum qui maledixit Italie* for the Edizione Nazionale, and she has surveyed all thirty manuscripts and four sixteenth-century printed editions. Her critical text is reproduced here for the first time. The textual tradition, now clarified definitively, divides into two streams, one derived from the intellectual environment of the dedicatee, the other from the exemplar kept by Petrarch himself. Much work has gone into the notes, which often go beyond tracking down a half dozen citations a page to include (for example) references to scholarly articles that illuminate the point at issue.

The first volume of Silvia Rizzo's *Seniles*, prepared with the help of Monica Berté, is similarly ambitious. This collection, begun at age fifty-seven and including 127 letters distributed over seventeen books, is one of our most important sources for Petrarch's life and thought, although like everything else he wrote, it was revised throughout his life to present the perspective he wanted at the point of revision. The letters, which are in general shorter than those in the *Familiares*, are arranged in basic chronological order, although some modifications are made (for example) to provide greater thematic
unity. In preparing this edition, the editors have used the *editio princeps* as a base text but incorporated readings from twenty different manuscripts, resorting to conjecture in those cases where no earlier reading is satisfactory. In accordance with the norms of the series, authorial variants are grouped into three categories in the apparatus, which also contains a good number of explanatory notes that go beyond the simple identification of explicit references.

For any series, the inaugural volumes are important in establishing the standards for what follows. As two of the first books to appear in this series, these volumes suggest that neo-Latinists with an interest in Petrarch will soon be able to get good scholarly texts at very reasonable prices. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

Lodovico Lazzarelli (1447-1500): The Hermetic Writings and Related Documents. Ed. by Wouter J. Hanegraaff and Ruud M. Bouthoorn. Tempe, AZ: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2005. $45. Hanegraaff and Bouthoorn's volume examines the little-known Italian poet and hermetist Lodovico Lazzarelli, as well as his eccentric mentor, the prophet and provocateur Giovanni “Mercurio” da Correggio. Together with Marsilio Ficino, Lazzarelli translated the *Corpus Hermeticum*, a group of Greek texts attributed to the mythical adept Hermes Trismegistus. As a result, the set of philosophical and magical beliefs known as hermetism enjoyed great popularity in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, particularly among humanists such as Ficino, Giordano Bruno, and Giovanni Pico della Mirandola. The most important study of the subject, Frances Yates's 1964 *Giordano Bruno and the Hermetic Tradition*, emphasized the influence of Renaissance hermetism and portrayed the movement as a precursor to scientific advancement, and even modernity. Despite Lazzarelli's contributions to hermetism, he was for the most part ignored by Yates's analysis, as well as by subsequent histories of the period. Hanegraaff and Bouthoorn argue that Lazzarelli was unfairly marginalized by Yates because of his piety and prophetic enthusiasm, which failed to support her analysis of hermetism as a harbinger of scientific and social progress. In contrast, the authors present Lazzarelli as central to Renaissance hermetism.

A number of scholars have rediscovered Lazzarelli in recent years, and this edition of his hermetic writings (with facing pages in English and Latin) aims to establish further his significance. The volume begins with a lengthy biographical sketch of Lazzarelli and a critical analysis of his best-known
work, the *Crater Hermetis*. Lazzarelli’s early life was marked by great honors: he was crowned poet laureate at the age of twenty-one by the Emperor Frederick III, and he became involved with the humanists of the Roman Academy soon after. Lazzarelli encountered both the *Corpus Hermeticum* and the apocalyptic prophet Correggio around 1481, and he consequently abandoned his secular interests in favor of Christian hermetism and spiritual regeneration. Correggio, who became Lazzarelli’s religious teacher, traveled throughout Italy presenting himself as an apocalyptic reformer and even a second Christ, pretensions that led to a brief imprisonment in Florence by Lorenzo de’ Medici. Nevertheless, Correggio and Lazzarelli both were able to secure aristocratic patronage for their pursuits. Lazzarelli’s ambitions culminated in his *Crater Hermetis*, a bold synthesis of Christianity and hermetic philosophy in which he claimed the role of a semi-divine hermetic master. Hanegraaff and Bouthoorn’s edition surveys the biblical, alchemical, and kabbalist sources that shaped Lazzarelli’s *Crater Hermetis*, as well as his other hermetic writings. Their footnotes to the edition also offer a useful running commentary on the texts.

Hanegraaff and Bouthoorn’s main arguments—first, that Lazzarelli is central to hermetism and, second, that he undermines Yates’s paradigm—seem justified. Unfortunately, the authors briskly dispatch with Yates’s progressive “grand narrative” of hermetism, rather than laying out their objections to her analysis in detail (the thrust of their counterargument is summarized in a footnote on page 103). Likewise, they state that hermetism played a larger role in Lazzarelli’s writings than in those of Ficino, Bruno, and other humanists favored by Yates (they note that such figures should not even be classified as hermetists), but the authors do not provide any evidence to persuade the reader. Hanegraaff and Bouthoorn also assume a high level of knowledge of kabbalist and hermetic ideas, which decreases the accessibility of the volume.

Beyond their specific response to Yates, the authors criticize historians who lionize historical figures and texts that fit into modern interpretive frameworks while ignoring those that do not. This salient point brings to mind a number of recent challenges to the scientific revolution paradigm, including those collected in Margaret J. Osler’s *Rethinking the Scientific Revolution*. It seems unfortunate that Hanegraaff and Bouthoorn accuse Yates of reading history “backwards” for its premonitions of what was to come, since she is usually viewed as a champion of forgotten thinkers and non-canonical sciences over-
looked in the search for what the past got right. Nevertheless, her focus on Bruno, Ficino, and Pico della Mirandola has enhanced their reputations while Lazzarelli languishes in obscurity (at least for now). Perhaps this book, along with other new scholarship on the hermetic poet, will one day elevate him to the Renaissance pantheon. (Leah DeVun, Texas A&M University, University of Wisconsin-Madison)

* Das Argonautika-Supplement des Giovanni Battista Pio. Intro., ed., trans., and com. by Beate Kobusch. Bochumer Altertumswissenschaftliches Colloquium, 60. Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag, 2004. 58.50 euros. In her dissertation, Beate Kobusch deals with one example of the supplementa-literature whose popularity in early modern times is only slowly finding resonance in recent scholarship. Her rich book offers one fine example, the supplement to Valerius Flaccus’ unfinished *Argonautica* written by the Bolognese humanist Giovanni Battista Pio. The edition is mostly based on the *editio princeps*, Bologna, 1519 (b), which was supervised by the author himself. Several later editions from the sixteenth through the early nineteenth centuries do not offer many textual variants, a fact that makes the editor’s work easy. Kobusch has chosen not to print the text of b in a diplomatic edition but to unify the orthography according to the rules for classical Latin texts. *Hoc loco*, the pros and cons of this decision cannot be discussed in general, although I think that in the case of a textual witness which is so closely tied to the author, it would have been better to stick to the Latin of the *editio princeps* (Kobusch briefly discusses this possibility on 194 f.). For the rest, the edition is in general carefully prepared, and the few conjectures (9,171; 9,348; 9,351; 10,148; 10,579) seem to be justified. The edition is flanked by a German prose translation and an *apparatus fontium* which lists all parallels in ancient Latin literature (some of them must surely be judged as coincidental); on the other hand we do not find any references to earlier humanistic poets. In her commentary, Kobusch mostly deals with the reception of the Greek epos by Apollonios Rhodios and the Valerius Flaccus-text, but also offers links to other ancient texts dealing with the topic. Personally, I think the commentary, which retells great parts of the text in order to explain the parallels and differences, could be shortened and thus concentrated on the important aspects of Pio’s literary technique; the existing general introduction about Pio as *imitator Apollonii et Valerii* would have allowed Kobusch to skip some less significant passages. Nevertheless, she offers her own inter-
pretation based on her close reading of the text, which adds much useful information to the reader's analysis.

Before her edition, Kobusch gives an introduction (13-196), but this section is surely not adequate for this part and suits the second half (118-196) only, in which she informs the reader about the literary tradition of the *Argonautica*-topic and about Pio's own work on Valerius (besides his creative reception, he also published a commentary on the ancient text). On pp. 13-117, however, she presents a biographical sketch of Pio's life and his dependence on the humanistic culture of his time which should better be called a second short monograph, as it is not always in logical coherence with the edition. But these one hundred pages are by far the best you can read today about Pio in general. Having said this, let me admit that not all chapters convince the reader equally. For reasons of space I must limit myself to selected critical remarks: The overview of the humanist quarrel about imitation or style and Pio's own position towards this question is divided into two chapters (1.3. and 1.10), which forces Kobusch to become repetitive; at the end of her book (5.2), where she takes up again the language and style of the *supplementum*, she comes back to the same point, showing that Pio has opted for a traditional *aemulatio Vergilii*—but why does she insist, then, on “apuleianism” as Pio's stylistic ideal (1.3)? Her attempt to combine the two observations by proving Pio's “Interesse für außerkanonische Autoren” (620) with his reception of Lucan, Statius, and Silius is not convincing—all three (with only a slight exception in the case of the last) are frequently used by humanistic poets and should not be excluded from the canon (actually, they were not until the late nineteenth century). Here, it would have been much more interesting to read Kobusch's opinion on a problem not yet solved concerning humanist poetics, namely that poetical theory and practice do not always coincide (a fact which she herself hints at; cfr. 64-67). Chapter 1.4 (Pio as humanist, 31-34) does not really bring the discussion forward, either. Kobusch's effort to define the term *humanista* follows the old idealistic view of the Renaissance (the humanists wanted “durch die Begegnung mit der Antike dem Menschen zum wahren Menschen verhelfen”; cfr. 32 f.), definitely marking too drastic a break with the Middle Ages (education for the “Mensch ohne eigenen Spielraum” in a transcendental world, 32). Later on, Kobusch convincingly shows with the example of Pio himself how dependent the career of a humanist was on the political and cultural discourse of his time, and surely
these circumstances should not be forgotten when we deal with the reception of antiquity in early modern times, which was much less idealistic and (at least for the great majority of intellectuals) a strategy to manage their own lives.

Much could still be said about Kobusch’s book, which has a great many unquestionable merits. If I have concentrated on just a few concerns, it is because of the purpose and the restrictions of a review; which is in a way also a supplementum: without the book to review, it would not exist, either. (Christoph Pieper, Leiden University)

Nicolaus Scutellius, O.S.A., as Pseudo-Plato: The Sixteenth-Century Treatise Pletho in Aristotelem and the Scribe Michael Martinus Stella. By John Monfasani. Istituto Nazionale di Studi sul Rinascimento, Quaderni di “Rinascimento,” 41. Florence: Olschki, 2005. x + 182 pp., 7 b/w plates. 19 euros. This book is actually two works, having their connection by way of a manuscript. Two-thirds of the book concerns Nicolaus Scutellius’ writing entitled Pletho in Aristotelem. The last third of the book considers the late Renaissance scribe Michael Martinus Stella, whose copy of Scutellius’ work is one of two extant manuscripts of it. Prof. Monfasani, a renowned authority on Renaissance thought and the Greek influence upon it, is a careful editor, the apparatus is thorough, and the nine appendices provide detailed descriptions of the manuscripts and further information on Scutellius and Stella.

Nicolaus Scutellius (1490-1542) was a member of the Order of St. Augustine and spent much of his career with Giles of Viterbo. His work here is one of several on Pletho and Neoplatonists, most being translations of their writings. The first part of the book contains a survey of Scutellius’ writings and an edition of his Pletho in Aristotelem. Prof. Monfasani reasonably argues (10) that Scutellius wrote this in the 1520s as part of the Renaissance Plato-Aristotle controversy, and in order to expand and improve upon Pletho’s De differentiis Platonis et Aristotelis (1439). Scutellius argues that Plato is superior to Aristotle in regard to both philosophy and theology, including compatibility with Christianity, the Ideas, the immortality of the soul and its nature, virtue, physics, and other subjects. He is not original and clearly draws upon Pletho in support of the claim that there is no common ground between Plato and Aristotle.
The section on Michael Martinus Stella contains biographical information and a survey of his work. Stella was a Renaissance scribe and printer, based primarily in Basel. From 1549-52 he was in Rome copying manuscripts (including Stella's). These were sold to the Fugger family and eventually ended up in Munich. As a printer, Stella printed a variety of works, such as an editio princeps of Leon Battista Alberti. At some point Stella converted to Protestantism and was listed on the 1560 Index. Prof. Monfasani carefully presents information about manuscripts and editions involving Stella, most of which have no connection to Scutellius, making this an excellent source for someone interested in Stella and the career of a late Renaissance scribe.

In reviewing this book, two issues arise. The first has to do with Scutellius as “Pseudo-Pletho.” On the one hand, Scutellius does draw upon arguments made by Pletho, and Plate II shows the Munich manuscript by Stella clearly having the title *Pletho in Aristotelem* written across the top. On the other hand, Plate III shows that on f. 175v of the Vienna manuscript there is no title, but only a short prefatory statement by the anonymous scribe and then the work by Scutellius. Prof. Monfasani says that on f. 175r of the Vienna manuscript there is a table of contents which was probably not by either the scribe or Scutellius, and it is clear that the chapter headings in the table vary considerably from those actually given by the scribe in the manuscript. Also, both the Munich and the Vienna manuscripts contain two other works by Scutellius, one being a summary paraphrase of Pletho’s *De differentiis*. Since this is in an appendix, we see that Scutellius refers to Pletho as George Gemistus, not Pletho. Since Prof. Monfasani says (17) that the scribe of the Vienna manuscript is more reliable than Stella, this raises the question of whether the title *Pletho in Aristotelem* was actually given by Scutellius or was added later either by Stella or someone else. Stella, or any scribe, would certainly get more for a work with Pletho’s name in the title than Scutellius’s.

If the work is read without the title, rather than being a “Pseudo-Pletho,” it appears that Scutellius is setting forth in a general work all the arguments he can in support of Plato over Aristotle, some of which come from Pletho. If Scutellius was “the most competent Hellenist and Neoplatonic scholar in the circle of Giles of Viterbo” (16), it is surprising he is not influenced by Bessarion or Neoplatonic approaches. He does not attempt to reconcile Plato and Aristotle, and passes over much since Bessarion’s *In calumniatorem Platonis* of 1469, including his own translation of Proclus in 1520. By the 1520s Platonism
was not going to displace Aristotelianism or Nominalism in Catholic theology and philosophy, and by following Pletho's eighty-year-old model, Scutellius is writing in a way which the controversy itself had left behind.

A second issue has to do with the Order of St. Augustine during a crucial era. The most famous member of the Order at the time is, of course, Martin Luther. Scutellius should have had a decent understanding of the challenge Luther posed and how the leaders were responding since, as part of the group around Giles of Viterbo, he moved in the highest circles of the Order. Giles of Viterbo had been General of the Augustinians from 1506-18, and even after 1518 was a leading figure in the Order, being the Bishop of Viterbo, a cardinal, and the papal legate to Spain. With such a patron, one wonders what Scutellius is doing writing on the Plato-Aristotle controversy at all. In the 1520s the Augustinians are in the process of losing all of their German provinces to Protestantism, so one would expect their leaders to have other concerns than the relative merits of Plato over Aristotle. Prof. Monfasani points out that Scutellius was concerned about Luther, and perhaps in his forthcoming study of Scutellius (indicated on 105) he will discuss this. Here, Pletho in Aristotelem leaves us with an image akin to Pliny the Younger studying Livy while Mt. Vesuvius erupts in the background. (Bruce McNair, Campbell University)

♦ Filippo Beroaldo l'Ancien—Filippo Beroaldo il Vecchio. Un passeur d'humanités—Un umanista ad limina. By Silvia Fabrizio-Costa and Frank La Brasca. Leia, Liminalaires-Passages interculturels italo-ibériques, Université de Caen, 5. Bern: Peter Lang, 2005. 192 pp. $43.95. In 2005 an entire issue of the University of Caen's journal Leia was devoted to Filippo Beroaldo the Elder. It contains a series of eight articles, written between 1989 and 2004 by Silvia Fabrizio-Costa and Frank La Brasca. As a common theme, the book sets out to demonstrate how this little-studied provincial humanist, who belongs more to an illustrious jurists’ circle than to a recognized humanistic or literary one, played an important role in the intellectual development of his day as what might be called a 'facilitator of the humanities.'

Examining the contents of his letters, the breadth of his correspondence, his translators, and his pupils, the authors succeed in painting a much richer portrait than that sketched by E. Garin and E. Raimondi in 1974. The articles are richly documented, with an appended index of letters, carefully studied
manuscripts, and letters edited with original text (17-21; 49) supported by facsimile manuscripts or printed Renaissance texts (22-28). On pp. 107-9, for example, the authors propose two catalogues, one bibliographical of the De fidelitate, collating manuscripts from the Library of Congress, the British Library, and the Bibliothèque nationale de France, and the other a French translation catalogue of Beroaldo's works. All the classical literature quoted by Beroaldo (e.g., Apuleius's The Golden Ass) is quoted in the original (126-32), together with the respective prefaces (147-50).

In short, this collection of articles delineates a very modern thinker and a pivotal intellectual figure in the scientific heyday of the Renaissance era.

Although the book is both helpful and well documented, extracts are simply quoted and the authors address themselves to the 'informed reader,' giving neither translations of the Latin or Italian texts nor indications of where these may be found (if indeed they exist). In the absence of any such aids to better understanding, while we must concur with their expressed hope that the volume will be helpful to an erudite readership (XII), we also understand the authors' somewhat diffident dedication of their work to their children, "who will probably never read one of these lines." In our field, if we are to attract readers, perhaps heavier emphasis should be placed on modern, readable translations. (Florence Bistagne, Marseille, France)

**Das Carmen Bucolicum des Antonio Geraldini. Intro., ed., trans., and com. by Sigrun Leistritz. Bochumer Altertumswissenschaftliches Colloquium, 61. Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier, 2004. 276 pp. 28 euros. The Carmen bucolicum is the most successful work of the Italo-Hispanic humanist and poeta laureatus Antonio Geraldini. Published in 1485 and printed several times until 1597 in the German-speaking part of Europe, the poem was written originally as an educational work for Alfonso d'Aragon, illegitimate son of the Aragonese King Ferdinand, who was ordained Archbishop of Saragossa at the age of thirteen. Within the Carmen bucolicum, the author presents the New Testament story of the life and sufferings of Christ in a sequel of twelve Virgilian eclogues evoking the most important stations in the life of Jesus through dialogues partly between biblical protagonists, partly between protagonists of the pastoral world. Apart from the edition of Wilfred P. Mustard (Baltimore, 1924), this volume of Sigrun Leistritz presents the first modern edition of this interesting text.**
The book consists of three parts. In an introductory section (11-49), Leistritz offers a short but instructive survey of Geraldini's life between Italian humanistic circles, the Catholic church, and the Spanish court as well as his widespread contact with Italian humanists (11-25) and his published and unpublished works (25-31). (The humanist network of Antonio Geraldini and his relationship to high-ranking personalities of his age have been comprehensively addressed in the dissertation of M. Früh, *Antonio Geraldini († 1488). Leben, Dichtung und soziales Beziehungsnetz eines italienischen Humanisten am aragonesischen Königshof. Mit einer Edition seiner “Carmina ad Iohannem Aragonum,”* Diss. Marburg 2003 (Münster, 2005)). Turning to the *Carmen bucolicum*, Leistritz then provides an accurate description of the extant printings of the text (she does not mention the Spanish edition (Salamanca, 1505), which is listed in Früh’s study, p. 53). Furthermore, she points out the interdependence between the editions, in which she takes into account, apart from their chronological order, the recurrence or non-recurrence of certain paratexts such as the author’s personal epigram, which precedes the text of the *Carmen bucolicum* in the *editio princeps* (Rome, 1485), or a letter of recommendation of a later editor as well as the congruence and disparity of orthographical variants (32-49). The results of the comparisons are documented in a *stemma editionum*, which allows a concise survey of the relationships between the printed editions. It clearly shows that the Leipzig editions of Jacob Thanner (1510) and Martin Landsberg (1511) are derived from the first German edition of Thomas Anselmus (Pforzheim, 1507) and that the later sixteenth-century printings are either derived from the Thanner or the Landsberg edition; thus, the textual history of the *Carmen bucolicum* establishes that the German editors had absolutely no interest in producing a text in accordance with the author’s aims, but preferred to reprint (perhaps for financial reasons) any edition they had at hand.

The introductory part of the book is followed by an edition of the twelve eclogues of the *Carmen bucolicum* and a precise and fluent translation of the difficult Latin text and useful explanatory notes on geographical, historical, and mythological details (51-163). In her edition of the text, Leistritz radically adopts modern punctuation as well as the classical Latin orthography. This is a difficult decision every editor of neo-Latin texts is concerned with: On the one hand, the classical orthography makes access to the text easier for a modern reader trained in the reading of classical texts. On the other hand, the
historical orthography can also be regarded as a part of the neo-Latin text (rooted in the conventions of medieval manuscripts, a neo-Latin author did not spell *mihi* but *michi* and not *ratio* but *racio*) which is lost when the classical orthography is used. In the constitution of the text, Leistritz principally follows the *editio princeps* (Rome, 1485), replacing evident misprints as well as grammatical and semantic errors. The edition of the text is furnished by two apparatuses containing (a) the divergences of the printed editions (including orthographical variants) and (b) *similia* from ancient and neo-Latin literature and from the Bible. The critical apparatus in particular is a considerable improvement on the edition of Mustard, who completely omitted any documentation for the constitution of his text. Nevertheless, it should be kept in mind that the *editio princeps* of Eucharius Silber (Rome, 1485) was authorized by Geraldini himself (45). For this reason, the textual situation of the *Carmen bucolicum* is quite different from the textual situation of any ancient work insofar as the variants in later printings are not at the same level as the text of Eucharius Silber's edition. This causes the problem that any change of Eucharius Silber's text is somehow a correction of the author's own version. If, for example, a later printer or a modern editor corrects grammatical errors in an authorized text (replacing, e.g., Ecl. 2.39, *sine mater* by *sine matre*), this is, in a way, a distortion of the original (even if the author, which is likely in the *editio princeps* of the *Carmen bucolicum*, never saw the print settings). One should also take into account that the early fifteenth-century German editions were primarily produced for scholarly use. Therefore, the German printers sometimes tend to simplify Geraldini's text (e.g., Martin Landsberg prints 1.30 *ansas* instead of *ansa*; 7.19 *in orto* for *in herae*; 7.42 *ab atro* for *opaco*). Thus, the later printings of the *Carmen bucolicum* are documents for the reception of the text rather than instruments for its constitution.

The third part of Leistritz's study is about the literary context, the interpretation, and the reception of the *Carmen bucolicum* (164-249). Leistritz gives a survey of the history of the pastoral in ancient, early medieval, and Renaissance literature (164-84) that is concise, even if it is also quite close to the monographs of B. Effe and G. Binder, *Antike Hirtendichtung. Eine Einführung*, 2nd edn. (Düsseldorf – Zürich, 2001), and W. L. Grant, *Neo-Latin Literature and the Pastoral* (Chapel Hill, 1965). She then places Geraldini's *Carmen bucolicum* within the traditions of ancient and early Christian literature, adds some general remarks on the poem such as the presumed addressees, the language of
the poem, and recurrent motifs within the eclogues (e.g., the metaphors of light and darkness, exhortations for the praise of God, the protreptic character of the eclogues, panegyrical passages), and provides an instructive summary of the contents of the single poems (185-214). These general remarks are followed by a closer examination of three eclogues (Ecls. 1, 3, and 12: pp. 215-38). Especially her analysis of the third eclogue, a dialogue between Joseph and Mary about the loss of their son who is later recovered in the temple of Jerusalem, shows convincingly that the purpose of the poem is highly didactic insofar as the dramatic and playful character of the dialogue makes access to the biblical topics easier for the juvenile addressee of the poem, and that, for this reason, the eclogue (as well as the other eclogues of the collection) has very little to do with its Vergilian models. In a final chapter, Leistritz deals with the author’s motifs for the composition of the eclogues and the reception of Geraldini’s work in the German-speaking part of Europe (239-49). She points out that Geraldini’s purpose is mainly a didactic one and that the Carmen bucolicum was originally meant to strengthen the Catholic faith in the era of reconquista, granting it its success in Germany’s Catholic section of the population in the era of Reformation. To sum up, Leistritz’s new edition not only allows a convenient access to an interesting example for the adoption and transformation of ancient bucolic poetry, but also to a first-class document for the Christian employment of ancient models in fifteenth-century Europe. (Claudia Schindler, Eberhard-Karls-Universität, Tübingen, Germany)
struction of idolatry” (3). Unlike earlier expositors like Augustine, Erasmus emphasizes the mystical, moral, and tropological senses of the psalm, interpreting human suffering as referring to Christ and his followers and wickedness as relevant to the Jews, to non-Christians, and to those who are Christian in name only. The exposition of Psalm 22/3 is in some ways disappointing, for the psalm is one of the key texts in Christianity and Erasmus’s exposition of it was written for Thomas Boleyn, the father of Anne, at a time when her marriage to Henry VIII of England was under threat. The enarratio triplex developed here, in which the ‘I’ of the psalm is referred at first to Christ, then the church, and finally the individual, is the most interesting part of the work. The exposition to Psalm 33 also develops Erasmus’s ideas about the relationship between literal and allegorical truth.

The Utilissima consultatio de bello Turcis inferendo, published shortly after Sultan Suleiman abandoned his siege of Vienna in October 1529, begins with an exposition of Psalm 28/9, but Scriptural exegesis plays a relatively minor role in what is essentially a political tract. Erasmus reads the psalm as a hymn to God’s omnipotence in which the Turks simply serve as the latest in a series of divine warnings that go all the way back to the plagues of Exodus. The idea that military action without reconciliation to God is unlikely to succeed is one that Erasmus had put forth before, but here it unfolds in response to Luther’s writings on the Turkish threat, which began by arguing against resistance to the scourges of God, then ended in a justification for a defensive war. In the end Erasmus’s position is similar to Luther’s, in that both counter the revival of the old crusading spirit with a call to spiritual and moral reformation which looks tepid indeed in comparison to many of the other proposals of the day.

A number of key ideas emerge in these works. One of the most interesting is a sort of double justification formula that recognizes both the received righteousness of faith and the synergistic operation of that faith through love. The formula appears in the exposition to Psalm 22 and is developed further in the treatment of Psalm 33, where Erasmus develops “a striking corporal image in which the bones are faith, the sinews are love, and the flesh is good works, which are inseparable from faith and love” (xiii). Erasmus’s position toward violence in pursuit of orthodoxy is also striking in the context of the Turkish threat, where the emphasis is placed on the need to face first the enemy within. Luther’s passivity against the Turks as the scourge of God is rejected, but so is the idea that death in a war against the infidel offers instant
absolution. In both cases, Erasmus's constant preoccupation is with rediscovering the spiritual dimension of Christianity that carries the believer through outward signs and ceremonies to the personal encounter with God through prayer. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

♦ Les lettres authentiques à Nicolas Heinsius (1649-1672). Une amitié érudite entre France et Hollande. By Jean Chapelain. Ed., introd., and annotated by Bernard Bray. Bibliothèque des correspondences, mémoires et journaux, 22. Paris: Honoré Champion Éditeur. 588 pp. 63 euros. In the third quarter of the seventeenth century, Jean Chapelain, a Frenchman prominent in the political and cultural life of his day, engaged in a lengthy correspondence with Nicolas Heinsius, who held a series of political appointments but is better known today for his scholarly activities. Heinsius wrote in Latin, in a style that was much praised in his day, discussing his scholarly and diplomatic work, his bibliographical activities, his health, his pleasures, and his disappointments. Chapelain responded in French, as a participant in the same community, discussing the newest publications, disputes among the learned, their travels and their interests, and what was happening in military and political affairs. Heinsius's letters do not survive, but Chapelain's do, and it is this latter group that is published here. For readers of this journal, the result is a bit curious at first glance—the letters in Latin on which we would normally concentrate are conspicuous by their absence—but the republic of letters crossed linguistic as well as political boundaries, and there is much of interest here.

Chapelain's letters abound with references to the scholarly world of his day, and they are valuable as well for the light they shed on the life and works of Heinsius. But as Bray notes, they also paint a portrait in words: “la personnalité de leur auteur apparaît ici dans une plus vive lumière que dans les textes publiés jusqu’à présent. Ces lettres ont donc l’intérêt, non seulement d’éclairer de l’intérieur la société des ‘doctes’, hommes et travaux, où les deux correspondants trouvaient l’occasion de leur dialogue et de fondement de leur amitié, mais plus encore de révéler, mis au jour par le pouvoir génétique de l’écriture épistolaire, le tempérament sensible d’un écrivain que seul l’amour des lettres a pu conduire à dessiner, sans y prendre garde, son autoportrait’ (28).

These letters are also of special interest to historians of the French language, for they offer a strikingly rich vocabulary, filled with archaisms and rare words imported from the Greek and Latin environment of the discourse
they carry. Chapelain wrote in French, but he often chose to create French words out of Heinsius’s Latin rather than spend time searching for the right equivalents in more common use. Latin also creeps into these letters through proverbs as well as a common cultural ground, both linguistic and cultural in a more general sense. Bray has modernized Chapelain’s usage to conform with the norms of the series in which the book appears, but the changes are focused on capitalization, abbreviations, and punctuation. The text is annotated, not in the sense of a full commentary, but as a way to clarify what Chapelain is writing about, so that the brief notes explain historical events, now-forgotten individuals, and bibliographical references. Each letter also contains a cross-reference to the partial earlier edition of Philippe Tamizey de Larroque from the end of the nineteenth century.

In the end it would have been nice to have Heinsius’s half of the correspondence, but what we have make a good read nevertheless. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

♦  

_The Epic of America: An Introduction to Rafael Landívar and the Rusticatio Mexicana._ By Andrew Laird. London: Duckworth, 2006. viii + 312 pp. $70. Latinists, Laird observes at the outset, are liable to take “Latin literature” to refer exclusively to Roman literature, thereby ruling out a vast treasury of Renaissance, Baroque, and Enlightenment writings. A star example of unjustifiably neglected work is the _Rusticatio Mexicana_ of Rafael Landívar, S.J. (1731-1793), a collection in dactylic hexameters of fifteen portrayals from Mexican and Guatemalan colonial life that is rich in poetic appeal and cultural significance. Laird reprints whole the hard-to-secure Latin text and English translation of Graydon W. Regenos (1948) and supplements Landívar’s own notes with additional commentary. _The Epic of America_ adds three other compositions, all translated: a funeral for a benefactor of the Jesuits, surprisingly embellished with classical rather than scriptural allusions; and a pair of poems, in Latin and Castilian respectively, honoring a biography of the Virgin Mary. Laird includes Landívar’s key baptismal and funerary documents, again bilingually (282-83).

Part I of the book presents a prologue (“Landívar, Latin and Colonialism”) and three “essay studies” on classical culture in colonial Mexico, Landívar’s life and early writings, and literary examinations of the _Rusticatio_. The first study (9-30) “gives an account of the classical tradition in New Spain from the
defeat of the Aztecs in 1521 to the time of the Bourbon reforms in the mid-eighteenth century” (4). Laird recounts the institution of Latin teaching in Mexico City along with the birth of the Colegio de Santa Cruz de Tlatelolco soon after Cortez’s conquest, leading to indigenous Latinists such as Juan Badiano. Vasco de Quiroga, Fray Alonso de la Vera Cruz, Carlos de Sigüenza y Góngora, and others appear en route to the “Golden Age of Mexican Latin in the 1700s” (19), the time of Landívar and other Jesuit savants such as Francisco Xavier Clavigero and Diego José Abad. The expulsion of the Jesuits from Spanish realms in 1767 sent Landívar and many of his confreres to exile in Bologna, where he completed the *Rusticiatio*.

The second essay (31-42) sketches Landívar’s sparsely documented life. Son of a young Spanish nobleman and a criolla (daughter of Spaniards but born in the New World), he entered the novitiate at nineteen, receiving ordination five years later. He taught grammar and rhetoric, and had risen to Prefect of the Congregation at San Borja in Guatemala when the 1767 expulsion occurred. He lived out his years in Italy.

The third essay (43-75) studies the “conception and design” of the *Rusticiatio*. Vergil’s *Georgics* is the model that springs ordinarily to mind. Laird observes traces of “an astonishingly wide range of Greek and Roman authors including Homer, Hesiod, Lucretius, Horace, Ovid, Lucan, Pliny, and Apuleius” as well as later writers including Petrarch, Fracastoro, and Thomas More (45). The presence of a *propositio* (what material the poet will discuss), alongside an *invocatio* to a Christian or pagan personage (Apollo, Mary, etc.) at book-openings, establishes “a dialectic between ... the intellectual discourse of science and natural history, and the artistic and more subjective discourse of poetry” (57). Numerous other valuable observations follow.

Regenos’s Latin text is a corrected version of the faulty second Bologna edition of 1782, “although one or two new errors [which Laird emends] have crept in” (96). The translation “taken as a whole” is “highly readable” (96). Laird’s praise for Regenos’s work is richly merited (“the first attempt to present a major work of American Hispano-Latin literature to an English readership,” 96).

Laird has created a timely starting point for use by others who wish to understand the role of Landívar and his writings in New World Spanish colonialism, a field whose analysis Laird mainly leaves to others. (“[T]he sustained application of political or ethnohistorical criticism to particular works is
not so easy to accomplish,” 7; cf. 74). Antony Higgins’ *Constructing the Criollo Archive* (Lafayette, IN, 2002), cited by Laird, is a nice companion to *The Epic of America*, explicating the Rusticatio as a criollo voice; as Laird notes and Higgins would agree, “Oppositions and differences between Europe and America may have led to the conception and creation of Landívar’s work, but the resulting text does not belong to either continent” (74).


*The Epic of America* belongs at the top of any list of neo-Latin texts from or about the New World. (Eward V. George, Texas Tech University (Emeritus))

♦ *Renaissance Rhetoric Short-Title Catalogue 1460-1700.* By Lawrence D. Green and James J. Murphy. 2nd edn. Aldershot, Hants and Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing, 2006. xxxvi + 467 pp. $99.95. This is an enlarged, much improved version of James J. Murphy’s *Renaissance Rhetoric: A Short-Title Catalogue of Works on Rhetorical Theory from the Beginning of Printing to A.D. 1700, with Special Attention to the Holdings of the Bodleian Library, Oxford (New York and London, 1981), drawing as well on Professor Green’s *Rhetoric 1500-1700* in the *Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature, 3rd edn.* (Cambridge, forthcoming). RRSTC “provides a comprehensive list of primary printed sources for the study of Renaissance rhetorical theory in Europe and America from the onset of printing to the year 1700. The RRSTC now presents 1,717 authors and 3,842 rhetorical titles in 12,325 printings, published in 310 towns and cities by 3,340 printers and publishers from Finland to Mexico” (xi). As such, it is a monumental achievement.

For someone who has not worked in Renaissance rhetoric or tried to do an enumerative bibliography of early printed books, it is easy to underestimate what has been accomplished here. The project is complicated enor-
mously by the very success of the humanist movement, which managed to saturate early modern culture so thoroughly with rhetorical principles and teachings that it is surprisingly difficult even to draw the boundaries for a retrospective bibliography. The editors state that the “basic criterion for inclusion in RRSTC is that a given work purports to offer preceptive advice for the preparation and delivery of future discourse, or to offer analytical study intended or used for the same purposes” (xvi). So, preaching and letter writing are in, as are works of rhetorical criticism (e.g., Ramus’s prælectiones to Cicero’s speeches). Cicero’s speeches are out, but commentaries that delineate rhetorical principles are in. Treatises on the composition of poetry are out, except when they shade into rhetorical elocutio; similarly treatises that address systematic or analytical logic are out, but those that shade into rhetorical invention are in. One suspects that in a good number of cases, such distinctions become hard to make, but this is only one problem that Green and Murphy had to overcome. Just as challenging is the fact that to a large extent, this bibliography, like any other, reflects the strengths and weaknesses of its sources. The National Union Catalogue, for example, remains a fundamental source, but it was compiled by reproducing cards from American libraries and is therefore only as accurate as the cataloguing practices at those libraries allow. There are no common conventions even among Anglophone bibliographers, let alone their counterparts in other countries, for names and titles. If the field were smaller, this would not be such a big problem, but with almost two thousand authors and almost four thousand titles, bibliographical minefields abound.

In the face of obstacles like these, there are a few places where a reviewer can quibble. Green and Murphy admit that their bibliography is strong regarding editions from England, France, Germany, Italy, and the Low Countries, but less so regarding books from Spain, Latin America, eastern and northern Europe, and Russia. It is true that online resources for these latter areas lag behind the U.S. and western Europe, but old-fashioned methods like corresponding with librarians still produce good results. Not accenting Greek is barbaric, and while Renaissance practice in this area may indeed have been erratic (xxii), this is a modern work that should rest in modern scholarship. Finally, Green and Murphy have taken considerable care in slaying bibliographical ghosts, not, for example, being content to list books from questionable secondary sources if they couldn’t actually find a copy themselves. They
have visited in person a small group of libraries, mostly the obvious suspects like the British Library and the Bibliothèque nationale de France, but also including a couple of well-chosen, less obvious ones like the Biblioteka Jagiellońska in Kraków, Poland and the Zentralbibliothek in Zürich, Switzerland. But this has the effect, unfortunately, of privileging the very libraries whose holdings are in most cases the most accessible, which can produce a somewhat misleading picture. If a particular book survives in only one or two copies, and those copies are in the British Library and Oxford, the book can look important, but if the same book survives in two minor provincial libraries, it can disappear completely off the edge of the bibliographical radar screen.

One could quibble about such things, but one shouldn't. This is an excellent work which already suggests how our working assumptions about Renaissance rhetoric change when we begin asking seriously who had access to what and when they had it, information that can only be gotten by tracking the early editions that early modern readers used. Green and Murphy suggest, for example, that the influence of Susenbrotus's summary of the schemes and tropes must be overrated because there simply aren't enough copies in all of Europe, much less in England only, to produce the effects attributed to it. They have similarly solved the problem of the National Union Catalogue's "Lugduni, 1643" imprint of Farnaby's *Index rhetoricus*, which is otherwise restricted to a London-Amsterdam printing axis that makes sense given its English school market: this edition turns out to be a false imprint that was actually printed in Cambridge, which makes much more sense. Knowledgeable users of the RRSTC will clarify many similar things. I should also note that this project can serve as a model for how to prepare an enumerative bibliography at the beginning of the twenty-first century. On-line data bases and library catalogues with remote computer access have increased immeasurably the information that can be uncovered, and the introduction to this book provides an excellent list of what is available now. I am preparing a similar work myself on a Latin poet and did not find a single key source in my repertoire that had not been used here.

In short, this is a first-rate scholarly resource, one that should be in the library of every neo-Latinist with a serious interest in rhetoric. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)
Alaudae: ephemeridis nova series, fasciculus primus. Ed. by Anna Elissa Radke. Noctes Neolatinae / Neo-Latin Texts and Studies, 5. Hildesheim, Zürich, New York: Georg Olms Verlag, 2005. x + 199 pp. 39.80 euros. It must be said at the outset that this is a strange little book. It takes its title from a periodical published by Carolus Henricus Ulrichs between 1889 and 1895 and devoted to the revival of the Latin language. Radke’s goal is more modest—to ensure for Latin one voice among many—but she has gone back to Ulrichs’ title for her own collection of ephemera. This collection had its birth in a conference organized by the editor some time ago in Poland, with the idea of bringing together poets who write in Latin and philologists who could comment on their work. In the end, however, only one of the critical works is focused on a living neo-Latin poet. The result is a book that is indeed devoted completely to neo-Latin culture, but in which the first half consists of essays on neo-Latin poets from as far back as the fifteenth century and the second half contains Latin poetry composed by living Latin writers.

Part I, entitled “Vorträge über neulateinische Autoren / Acroases de poetis recentioribus Latinis,” begins with Alfons Weische’s “Angelus Camillus Decembrio quomodo inter varias observationes demonstrat substantia officio poetico epithetorum fungi posse,” a study of Decembrio’s poetics that focuses on details of usage, closing with a useful bibliography of recent work on Decembrio. Wolfgang Hübner, “De Pontani Uraniae prooemio,” offers a study of fifteenth-century astronomy that centers on the most talented of the learned poets in this area, Ioannes Iovianus Pontanus. In “L’Esprit et l’Art – Matthieu Casimire Sarbiewski et ses Epigrammes,” Elwira Buszewicz analyzes the theory and practice of the Polish Horace, Sarbiewski, in the epigram, a part of his work that has not received the attention it deserves. In deference to Silesia, the location of the conference from which much of the material in this volume derives, Joanna Rostropowicz turns to “Die lateinischen Gedichte Georgs III., Graf von Oppersdorff aus Oberglogau,” showing that these little-read neo-Latin poems by a refined local ruler reflect well the culture of the time and place in which they were produced. Next we get the opening address to this conference, “Vortrag, gehalten auf der Tagung ‘Antike Traditionen in der Kultur Schlesiens’ (21.-24.11.99) in Kamień Wrocławski (bei Opole, Polen) vor polnischen Philologen, Historikern und Archäologen,” in which Anna Elissa Radke traces connections between Latin and the vernacular, secular and sacred, in the literary culture of the region. In “De novis Angliae
sactoribus neolatinis," David Money confirms that good neo-Latin poetry (as well as good criticism about it) continues to be written in the United Kingdom, while Walter Wimmel presents a short analysis of one of Radke’s poems in “Pädagogische Lenkung als Sonderfall dichterischer Wortmacht. Interpretation eines Gedichtes von Anna Elissa Radke.”

Part II, entitled “Neuere neulateinische Dichter / Poetae Neolatini recentiores,” offers a hundred pages of shorter Latin poems by Karl Heinrich Ulrichs, Manfred Hoffmann, Thomas Lindner, Gerd Allesch, Karin Zeleny, David Money, Alain Van Dievoet, Martin Rohacek, Dirk Sacré, Tuomo Pekkanen, Winfried Czapiowski, and Anna Elissa Radke. The authors come from several countries—Germany, Austria, the United Kingdom, Belgium, and Finland—and demonstrate control of an impressive variety of poetic forms, ranging from alcaics and elegiac couplets to hymns and odes. Among many that could be singled out, there is this haiku of Dirk Sacré’s (145):

Advesperascit.
Ingruunt (viden?) umbrae.
Nox est ... et ... est ... me.

And this rendering of a well-known Shakespearean quatrain by David Money (128):

That time of life thou mayst in me behold,
When yellow leaves, or none, or few, do hang
Upon those boughs which shake against the cold,
Bare ruined choirs where late the sweet birds sang….  (Sonnet 73)

Hoc tandem vides vitae venisse cadentis
Tempus, ubi auctumno pendent vel nulla colore
Iam folia arboribus vel pauca, tremescit et algens
Ramus eae veritate nudatum frigore sectae
Fanum qua nuper dulces cecinere volucres.

The glory of this book lies here, in the work of a group of living poets that will head out like the crested lark to which the title refers, heralding another new day, but one in which Latin verse composition still maintains a place. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)
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C. Murphy, “Thomas Stapleton’s Latin Biography of Thomas More”; S.
Murphy, “Maro mutatus in melius? Lelio Capilupi’s Cento in feminas; C. Neagu,
“The Hungaria-Athila: Nicolaus Olahus’s Formula of the Orbis loca and Orbis
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Latin Bible”; G. Rossi, “Le oraciones de Marc Antoine Muré: humanae litterae et
iurisprudentia a confronto nella Roma del Cinquecento”; J. Sánchez Gázquez,
“Aristoteles in el Da fato et libero arbitrio de Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda”; T.
Santamaría Hernández, “La diffusión del humanismo médico: el boticario
Lorenzo Pérez contra los depravata monina o las demonum appellaciones”; C. Santini,
“Citazioni da autori classici, icone e paradigm ideologici, echi del momento
presente nella prefazione all’Almagestum novum di Giovanbattista Riccioli”; P.
Sartori, “Frans Titelmans e la difesa della vetus editio del Nuovo Testamento
dalle opere di Erismo, Faber e Valla”; Schreiner, “Die komische Seite der
Wissenschaftlichkeit: Aenarius’ Aenaria, die neulateinische Übersetzung von
Zachariä’s Murner in der Höll’”; A. Steenbeck, “Lipsius’ Motive für die Saturnales
sermones, die über die Gladiatoren”; F. Stok, “Paolo Zacchia e il lessico della
psicopatologia” ; S. Surlël and H. Nellen, “Classical Philology and Early Hu-
nanism in the Low Countries: Research for Europa Humanistica”; H. Szabelska,
“Ontologische Grundlagen der humanistischen Konzeption der Sprache als
Medium der gesellschaftlichen Kommunikation”; L. Szörenyi, “Die

The length of this volume alone, which is 50% greater than its predecessor from the Cambridge congress, attests to the vitality of neo-Latin studies today. The proceedings of the 2006 meeting in Budapest should be in print at about the time of the IANLS’s next meeting in Uppsala in the summer of 2009. The readers of this journal would be most welcome there. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

* Silva: estudios de humanismo y tradición clásica. Ed. by Jesús M. Nieto Ibáñez and Juan Francisco Domínguez Domínguez. Vol. 5, 2006. Universidad de Léon, Secretariado de Publicaciones. 463 pp. This volume of *Silva*, the Spanish journal most heavily invested in neo-Latin studies, contains a substantial group of articles that will be of interest to readers of *NLN*. In “Pedro Nuñez Vela, helenista y heterodoxo: documentos nuevos,” Vicente Bécares Botas uses two autograph testaments and a codicil to shed light on a mysterious, religiously heterodox humanist whose previously unknown family history and training made it difficult to determine why he was forced into exile. Avelina Carrera de la Red’s “La rebelión de Martín Cortés según Juan Suárez de Peralta (México, 1589), una ‘catilinaria’ al estilo criollo” identifies the points of contact between the insurrection of the Spanish nobility in sixteenth-century Mexico and the Catilinarian conspiracy of 63 BC. Matilde Conde Salazar and María Victoria Fernández-Savater Martín’s “Comentaristas de la obra de César en el siglo XVII: diferentes estilos, diferentes tendencias genéricas” discusses three seventeenth-century works dedicated to Caesar with different goals: Henri de Rohan focuses on Caesar’s military virtues; Carlos de Bonyères...
on rhetorical, political, and moral comments; and Enrique de Villegas on a synthesis of what is found in the other two writers. In “La fórmula epistolográfica del saludo en las Heroides de Ovidio y su recepción en las epístolas responsoriorum humanísticas,” Manule Antonio Díaz Gito traces the reception of the salutation pattern from Ovid’s Heroides in the works of such humanist poets as Joannes Pierius Valerianus, Iohannes Scheprevus, Ianus Doua ‘Filius’, Marcus Alexander Bodius, and Jacobus Eyndius. Arturo Echavarren’s “Espejo de falsarios: menciones de Sinón en el teatro español del Siglo de Oro” is a fascinating study of the unexpectedly large number of references to Sinon in Spanish Golden Age theater, where he oscillates between being a positive symbol of wit and a negative symbol of treachery. In “La tradición clásica en La pícara Justina,” Francisco Javier Fuente Fernández analyzes the references to the ancient world that permeate this early seventeenth-century picaresque work, showing that like everything else in the plot, antiquity moves within a world of trickery and half-truths, now being employed in a positive sense, then being parodied. “Referencias bíblicas y literatura espiritual en la obra poética de María Joaquina de Viera y Clavijo (1737-1819)” is a source study in which Victoria Galván González demonstrates that the author uses the full arsenal of resources for the Christian humanist. María de la Luz García Fleitas goes in a different direction in “Acerca de las columnas egipcias descritas por Calixeno de Rodas; carta del humanista Pedro de Valencia al pintor Pablo de Céspedes,” using the correspondence between a painter and a contemporary humanist to demonstrate their common interest in ancient Egypt. Much more general is “Comentario renacentista, cambio lingüístico y norma de estilo,” in which Felipe González Vega shows how the eclecticism and pragmatic nature of the Latin used in Renaissance commentaries encouraged the precision of meaning that eventually came to replace the abstruse, highly technical language of scholasticism. In “Un Aquiles barroco: la materia mitológica en El monstruo de los jardines de Calderón de la Barca,” Mónica María Martínez Sariego focuses on the episode of Achilles’ cross-dressing on Scyros, tracing various versions of the myth from antiquity to the Renaissance, then showing how the dramatist drew from his sources to integrate mythological material into the play. Jesús Paniagua Pérez extends the reach of his discussion in “Arias Montano y los ilustrados: dos ejemplares en México de sus supuestos escritos contra los jesuitas,” focusing on two copies of Arias Montano’s writings now in the Archivo General de la Nación de
México to show how the Spanish Enlightenment revisited the ideas of a writer whose work was used as justification for the expulsion of the Jesuits from Spanish territory. Finally, Antonio Serrano Cueto offers a critical edition, Spanish translation, and analysis of Martín Ivarra’s *Epithalamium* (Barcelona, 1514) in “La boda de Íñigo López de Mendoza (IV dunque del Infantado) e Isabel de Aragón cantada en verso latino por Martín Ivarra.” Eleven books are also reviewed here.

The articles in this issue are noteworthy for showing the current reach of humanist studies in Spain. We certainly find the traditional sort of thing here, in an edition and discussion of a short poem suitable for treatment as an article rather than a book (e.g., Serrano Cueto) and in studies like that of Bécares Botas, which use archival sources to fill out what we know about a humanist of interest. But these articles are done to a consistently high standard, and several others go in more unexpected directions: Paniagua Pérez and Carrera de la Red show how the Spanish tradition offers unusually interesting possibilities for trans-Atlantic, cross-cultural study; García Fleitas suggests some of the possible connections between humanism and art; and Fuente Fernández, Echavarren, and Martínez Sariego show that the classical tradition entered Spanish vernacular literature in some very interesting ways. Now with five annual volumes in print, *Silva* joins *Humanistica Lovaniensia* and *Neulateinisches Jahrbuch* as one of the journals which every neo-Latinist needs to look at each year. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)