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**Reviews by MAUREEN E. MULVIHILL**

**PRINCETON RESEARCH FORUM, PRINCETON, NJ.**

In 2007, students of the seventeenth century welcomed two very different titles related to the highly-placed Villiers family: An ambitious two-volume collection of the writings, to date, “associated with,” though not necessarily “by,” George Villiers, second Duke of Buckingham (1628-1687), and a captivating historical novel on the reputed liaison between Buckingham’s intriguing older sister, Mary Villiers, later Stuart, Duchess of Richmond & Lennox (1622-1685), and Prince Rupert of the Rhine, that glamorous hero of the English Civil Wars and son of the unfortunate Elizabeth (Stuart) Electress Palatine, Bohemia’s ‘Winter Queen’. Both of these new offerings—one a sober scholarly venture, the other a creative reconstruction—engage with the literary culture of the Stuart court. We begin with that “blest madman,” as Dryden famously wrote of him in 1681: George Villiers.
In the literary register of the seventeenth century, George Villiers signed his name with a bold flourish. Child of privilege, toy of fate, this second duke of Buckingham was actually doomed to fame; few of his century courted notoriety with equal dash or wore destiny as publicly. As his father and sister, ‘great Villiers’ was a narcissistic personality, keen to cover himself in glory. After the murder in 1628 of his powerful father, Buckingham and his two older siblings, Francis and Mary, were ‘bred up’ by Charles I and introduced to a life of sumptuous empowerment. The Villiers children breathed the air of courts from childhood and their playmates were the future kings and queens of Europe. As a young man in the 1640s and ‘50s, Buckingham’s political loyalties and mettle were tested in the English Civil Wars, where his valor at Surrey proved useful to the future Charles II. With the restora-
tion of the Stuart monarchy in 1660, Buckingham was well rewarded by his king with several titles. The most highly-placed non-royal peer of his age, Buckingham built a distinguished, if short-lived, career in English politics; his natural charm, good looks, and quick wit commanded full attention from friend and foe alike. (This was a dangerous man when in power, more dangerous when out of it.) But the duke was also a gifted writer, by fits and starts. The most broadly talented of the king’s literary circle of ‘Court Wits’, Buckingham’s corpus of work included plays, poetry, caricatures, lampoons, essays, speeches, and letters. Far from an original genius, he was mostly a collaborative writer and, by temperament, his chief métier was ridicule; his amusing talents in mimicry and masquerade are documented in the memoirs of his century. Recent attention to his dazzling older sister, Mary (Stuart) Duchess of Richmond, very probably the ‘Ephelia’ poetess (ESTC, EEBO, BL catalogue), has added a new figure to the literary gallery, a woman rumored to have “fought a duel with a female rival” (Burghclere, Villiers [1903], 140) and possibly coached in fencing by Prince Rupert. Duchess Mary evidently had a close literary sibling bond with her troublesome younger brother. (Maureen Quilligan’s new book [2005] demonstrates seventeenth-century women writers’ use of sibling ties as effective literary agency: consider Mary and Philip Sidney.) After many tensions with the Stuart administration, Buckingham “laughed himself from Court” in 1674, as John Dryden aptly put it, roundly scorned for outrageous scandals and imbroglios. Buckingham died a lonely, embittered former courtier, without heir and intestate; his large potential and wealth were squandered and sabotaged by self-indulgence and political missteps. Yet for all his sins, Buckingham and his writings were never wholly out of fashion.

Sorting through centuries of lore and canonical shambles, Robert D. Hume and Harold Love have constructed a new, if tentative, two-volume edition of Buckingham’s work – texts “associated with” Buckingham, not necessarily “by” him. This is not a photographic facsimile of the writings, but rather a carefully constructed old-spelling transcription from pre-existing copy-texts of printed and manuscript sources (textblock, from running title to last line of footnotes, 6¾" x 4¼," 1356 pp), with full scholarly apparatus, General Introduction, several well-selected illustrations (portraits, manuscripts, title-pages,
musical settings), and an index and bibliography, per volume, of printed sources. The edition’s dedicatee is Donald McKenzie (d. 1999), a distinguished bibliographer and textual scholar.

While the editorial principles of this new edition are likely to be questioned by textual purists and some Restoration specialists, there is no denying that this is an admirably immersive new product which takes readers into the depths of its subject. The editors, of course, had a huge headstart in the project; what they achieved is not a ‘first,’ cut from whole cloth. Prior to 2007, students of Buckingham could avail themselves of a fairly substantial body of critical work on the man’s life, career, and writings. One had, for example, earlier collections and editions (1704, 1705, 1715, 1752, 1754, 1775, 1985); book-length studies (Burghclere, 1903; Chapman, 1949; Wilson, 1954, O’Neill, 1984); extended authoritative articles (O’Neill, DLB, 1989; Yardley, Oxford DNB, 2004); and, valuably, a first canonical study of the writings (Mizener, dissertation, Princeton U., 1934). All of this earlier spadework was useful critical background and a clear advantage to any twenty-first-century editorial team. While these earlier investigations certainly burdened Hume and Love with additional sources to collate and assess, they also would have suggested new editorial directions and some basic contours for the present edition.

Volume I (770 pp), the dominant volume in this two-volume set, with Hume very probably at the editorial helm, presents six plays associated with the duke. Some of these—The Rehearsal, The Chances, The Country Gentleman—will be familiar to students of Restoration drama and the important scholarship of Hume, Judith Milhous, and Arthur H. Scouten. Other plays printed in this volume include The Restauration and, of special interest, Sir Politick Would-be, originally a play in French by Saint-Évremond, Buckingham, and the Sieur d’Aubigny, and presented here in English for the first time (H. Gaston Hall, translator; Wallace Kirsop, editor). Extending the corpus of dramatic writings “associated with” Buckingham, volume one adds a new title in his ‘associative’ corpus: ‘Theodorick’, a fragment of a verse play (two acts, 70 lines) from the commonplace book traditionally associated with Buckingham. The ‘Theodorick’ is a modest curiosity, but an interesting supplement to the dramatic writings, certain to inspire further scrutiny. In addition to textual footnotes to all of the six plays, the volume’s
scholarly apparatus presents a dedicated section of ‘Explanatory Notes’ and, of particular value, a dedicated section of ‘Transmis-
sional Histories’ which supplies bibliographical information on the
background history of each of the plays: composition, performance,
publishation, etc. These two closing sections of the volume, especially
the Transmissionsal Histories, are an inspiring working model for
students of attribution and textual scholarship, for it is here that we
see close and dexterous editorial work.

Volume II (586 pp), very probably assembled by the late Harold
Love (d. 2007), presents the non-dramatic writings “associated with”
Buckingham, being (in this edition) twenty-two poems, nine miscel-
nanous writings (topical pieces: political, religious, satiric), and the
full text of the commonplace book reportedly found in Buckingham’s
pocket on the day of his death (provenance, Earl of Jersey; currently
on deposit, London Metropolitan Archives). For many Restoration
specialists, the presentation of the complete commonplace book,
with editorial commentary, will be the chief attraction in this edition.
However, the argument by the volume editor that the commonplace
book is not written in Buckingham’s hand, but rather in that of his
secretary Martin Clifford, based on differences in a single letter for-
formation (a secretary-style “e,” rather than an italic “e”), may not find
universal acceptance. As specialists on evidentiary documents have
shown, an individual’s handwriting changes over time and it is always
affected by external (physical and material) circumstances. Volume
II also offers seven interesting appendices, such as Poems about
Buckingham, Rejected Attributions, etc. This second volume is less
satisfying editorially than its companion volume, and it is likely to be
irksome and unpersuasive to some specialists, especially those (Phipps,
O’Neill, et al.) whose original researches and earlier commentary are
rather blithely criticized, sometimes dismissed by the volume editor.
The attributional methodology is often so tentative and skeptical as
to be inconclusive—even a bit perverse, making other attributional
approaches all the more attractive; e.g., David Vieth’s “principle of
probability” (Attribution, Yale UP [1963]) and Samuel N. Rosenberg’s
“internal signatures” (“Colin Muset…Attribution,” Textual Cultures, I.1
[2006]). The sensitive section of Rejected Attributions, for example,
presents only the commentary of the volume editor; in all fairness, it
needed to display the texts whose authorship is being rejected. Also
the note (II:435, n.17) to an important couplet (“Poor George, grows
old, his Muse worn out of fashion, / Hoarsly she sung Ephelia’s Lamentation”) in one of the “Julian” poems (pp 30-32), attributed
to Buckingham by Brice Harris (ELH 10 [1943]), refuses to even
“entertain” an “ingenious” counter-reading of the couplet as be-
ing Buckingham’s (encoded) disclosure of his own literary sibling
bond with his clever older sister, Mary Villiers, his old-fashioned
“Muse” and, as the couplet certainly implies, the ‘Ephelia’ poetess.
The note also withholds from readers the source of this sensible, if
not obvious, counter-reading, being Chapter IV at http://marauder.
millersville.edu/~resound/ephelia/. Commentary in this edition on
the Ephelia-MaryVilliers-Etherege connection is never quite complete
and current. Etherege’s poetry, for example, is nothing like Ephelia’s,
of course; the network of references in the Ephelia corpus to Mary
Villiers, her documented coterie associations and court intrigues,
exists as the attributional compass. Incidentally, Duchess Mary may
have died “childless,” but her marriage to James (Stuart), Duke of
Richmond, was not a barren union; it produced two children, Esmé
and Mary, who both predeceased her. John Michael Wright’s painting
of Lady Mary with her children (circa 1661), long misidentified as Lady
Elizabeth Churchill and children, was correctly identified in 2001; see
uk/servlet/ViewWork?cgroupid=999999961&workid=19552&searchid=9878&tabview=text). Finally, it is a shame that the section of
Poems About Buckingham in Volume II fails to include one of the
best (encoded) verses on the duke’s sensational sex scandal with Lady
Shrewsbury, namely, “To a Gentleman that had left a Vertuous Lady
for a Miss” (Female Poems...by Ephelia, 1679, 75-76; 42 lines), wherein
Buckingham (“the fancied Greatness of your boasted Wit”) is given
a proper dressing-down by his angry older sister for his shameful
amour with “the wanton Flora” (she, of “sickly Fame”) and his abusive
treatment of the abandoned Phylena (Buckingham’s long-suffering
wife, Mary Fairfax). Perhaps the volume editor found these obvious
correspondences too “ingenious”?

For all of its manifest achievements, the problem with this edi-
tion is announced on its title-page. This is not an edition, per se, but
rather a heavily-annotated miscellany of writings “associated with” Buckingham, not “by” Buckingham. While it is splendid, on several grounds, to have even an ‘associative’ collection of Buckingham’s writings available in two handsome volumes, the overall editorial principles of this collection may be disturbing to some textual editors and Restoration specialists who expect this new product to be an attributionally and textually assertive edition of the writings, not two volumes of merely ‘associative’ texts. As the editors effectively admit (Preface I:ix-x), theirs is perforce a default editorial position which will not garner full acceptance. Invoking John Harold Wilson’s views on concealed authorship, the editors make special pleadings; they say that definitive attribution for coterie and court literature of Buckingham’s time is a near impossibility since most of these texts were collaborative, anonymous, pseudonymous, and often transmitted in scribal copies and, it must be added, in private code (there is no body of “assured texts,” II:403). Editorial purists, fearing a new precedent in this edition, will argue that if an editor cannot find persuasive evidence to sustain an attribution, the editor must withhold the edition until further delvings prove more productive. In the absence of hard evidence or even highly probative evidence, the new Buckingham boldly shifts the traditional responsibilities of textual editing and attribution to a suppositional and putative plane, wherein ‘an edition’ becomes a gathering of closely researched and annotated ‘associative’ writings. Yes, this is a protective editorial posture; yes, it is cautiously judicious; and yes, there are even a few titles in this collection which can be traced to the duke. But overall, the reader is left with one fundamental question: Which texts are truly Buckingham’s?

For a quite different treatment of the Villiers subject there is the new book by Cheryl Sawyer (now “Hingley”), a successful writer of historical novels (http://www.cherylhingley.com/). Her latest offering is a credible reconstruction of a short-lived affair between Lady Mary Villiers and Prince Rupert, with special focus on the history, literature, and contemporary commentary which framed that clandestine romance. Faithful to historical fact, Sawyer calls this little gem of a
book *The Winter Prince*.

When the historical record is sparse and unreliable, writers of biography sometimes turn to creative, but responsible, historical reconstruction; Janet Todd’s *Secret Life of Aphra Behn* (1996) is a recent example of this popular new form in the biography genre. Cheryl Sawyer is an established novelist (with two graduate degrees), whose special interests have resulted in a flourishing literary career. In addition to her successful narrative on the Mary Villiers-Prince Rupert connection, she has written several historical novels engaging with early-modern figures; her forthcoming book, *The Propagation of Fire*, reconstructs the relationship between Voltaire and his muse: Émilie, the Marquise du Châtelet.

*Image left:* Mary Villiers, later Stuart, Duchess of Richmond and Lennox (1622-1685), with ducal coronet, by the School of Van Dyck. Oil on Canvas, three-quarter length: 47 ¼” x 38” (120cm x 96.5cm). Date undetermined. Huntington Art Collections, San Marino, California. Catalogue No. 25.21. With gracious permission. (Full-length version, 84” x 50” [210cm x 125cm], Petworth House, West Sussex UK; Pet.P.99. Millar, *Van Dyck* [Yale UP, 2004], IV.204, p590. Both portraits are evidently derivatives of a lost original by Van Dyck.) *Image right:* Cover, *The Winter Prince* by Cheryl Sawyer (Signet Eclipse / NAL, Penguin, 2007).
The Winter Prince reconstructs two volatile years, 1642-44, in the intersecting lives of Lady Mary Villiers, later Stuart, Duchess of Richmond, and her ardent suitor Prince Rupert of the Rhine, nephew of Charles I and the king’s principal military commander during the opening years of the English Civil Wars. The very pattern of a warrior prince, Rupert was not without failings and flaws as Sawyer faithfully shows. The setting of his short-lived romance with Mary Villiers is the temporary Stuart court at Christ Church, Oxford; and this setting is true to established fact. At this time, Rupert was still in the marriage market, but the Duchess of Richmond was into her seventh year of marriage to the King’s cousin: James (Stuart) Duke of Richmond (d. 1655). Mary’s union with Richmond was her second, court-arranged marriage, and it evidently had its tensions and disappointments; an heir was not produced until 1649. Complicating matters, Rupert and the Duke of Richmond were the best of friends, dating from childhood. Mary Villiers and Prince Rupert were high-voltage, glamorous personalities; one imagines their attraction for one another was magnetic and palpable. It was not long before their quiet relationship was all the chat in the streets of the capitol. “Lady Mary is brisk and jolly, which makes Prince Rupert melancholy,” wrote Puritan propagandists and anti-royalists; and in A Parliament of Ladies ([Henry Neville], 1647), Mary and Rupert are depicted as frequent visitors to Kate’s in Covent Garden (home of Lady ‘Kate’ Howard) where they were known for “beating up of Quarters and other unlawful sports,” very probably gambling, shooting, and especially fencing, a new vogue amongst noblewomen (Fea, “Duchess Mazarin,” Some Beauties [1906]), 1-26. While there is no historical proof that the Villiers-Rupert affair was consummated (both parties had everything to lose by it), rumor was high. Mary’s (unsigned, watermarked) letter to Rupert (Pythouse Papers, British Library), mentioned by Sawyer and by Rupert biographers, certainly reveals a special attachment.

The achievement of Sawyer’s book, in addition to Sawyer’s writing, imagination, and obvious skill in setting a scene, be it a sensitive political exchange between Mary and Charles I, or Rupert’s awesome presence on the battlefield, is her painstaking research. Not only did she “tramp Civil War battlefields and country towns in England,” as she says, surveying the very places her subjects visited, but she also
scoured the principal printed sources on Rupert, Mary, and the history of the Civil War; moreover, she wisely consulted specialists on Rupert’s military career, such as Charles Earl Spencer and, even more impressively, Sir Frank Kitson, GBE, KCB, former Commander-in-Chief UK Land Forces, whose assessment of her book’s historical content merits full citation: “Your book is an excellent recreation of the period and of the Civil War. Your depiction of Rupert as a commander is both vivid and convincing. I was particularly impressed by your description of the battles of Newark and Marston Moor … you describe them as they might have appeared to Rupert at the time in a vivid and spectacular manner…. You get King Charles’s charm, consideration, indecision and ability to be swayed by the last person speaking to him, to a tee; a mixture between a saint and a disaster” (as posted on Sawyer’s website, referenced above). Sawyer includes a helpful Historical Note in her book and a (1640s) map of England, with locations of Rupert’s battles clearly marked.

Sawyer’s narrative approach and plotting are not formulaic, nor could they be in view of the material selected. The psychological complexity she adds to her characterizations—Mary’s strained relations with her husband, Mary’s emotional confusion over the Rupert affair, Rupert’s similar torment—engage and retain attention. The book’s secondary characters, most especially its three remarkable dwarfs, being the painter Richard Gibson and his wife Anne Shepherd, and the fierce Sir Jeffrey Hudson who was ‘given’ as a gift to Queen Henrietta Maria by George Villiers, first Duke of Buckingham, are depicted with fidelity, humor, and high color. (Every inch a courtier, all of them!) Students of special friendship between women, a popular theme in seventeenth-century literary culture, will admire the novel’s moments of tender (documentable) ties between Mary Villiers and Queen Henrietta Maria, and Mary’s relationship with her dwarf confidante, and possible agent, Anne Shepherd Gibson, the subject of an intriguing double portrait by Van Dyck (Blenheim Palace; Wilton House; Millar, Van Dyck [Yale UP 2004], IV.206, p. 591, with facing photo 9¼” x 5½”). Showing herself to be an alert student of recent research on the Villiers set, Sawyer layers into her representation of Mary Villiers the duchess’s very probable identity as the ‘Ephelia’ poetess, even excerpting lines from the poet’s book of ‘female poems’ (1679)
as chapter epigrams. Of special interest is Sawyer’s use of Ephelia’s exercise in alchemical verse, “To Phylocles, inviting him to Friendship” (Female Poems, 1679, 85–86, 28 lines), which opens with a fine salutation: “Best of thy Sex!” This charming poem on the melding of genders (“We’ll mix our souls”) certainly sounds like chaste, pre-emptive writing from Mary Villiers to her ‘Phylocles’ (lover of fame), Prince Rupert, during the first stirrings of their romance. Finally, being a novel, there are a few predictable fictions in Sawyer’s reconstruction—e.g., Richard Gibson painting Mary Villiers, Anne Shepherd Gibson secreting away Mary’s poems in a glove-case, Mary’s tragic souvenir, being the knife which killed her father—but these inventions ‘work’ so very well we fancy they could be true. Scholars of the seventeenth century will find this book enchanting, and they will see familiar and new personalities through a creative but accurate lens.


Nicholas Tyacke is well known to literary and church historians—and to all students of early modern England—for his highly influential Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism c.1590–1640 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987). His research was among the first to chart a distinctive new course in our understanding of post-Reformation England, but it is only the most familiar of the numerous works by this distinguished historian. In his honor, a number of friends and colleagues have now brought together fourteen essays that variously address many of the issues that have concerned Tyacke over the years.

These essays are of uniformly high quality. Some are very specialized, and examine little known archival and manuscript documents, such as Kenneth Fincham’s study of “The Religious Legacy of the Interregnum at St. George Trombland, Norwich,” which appears last in the collection. Yet this local controversy over the removal of a gallery across the east end of the chancel, built in 1652 to provide more seating for the godly auditory, is shown to have significant
implications for our better understanding of the interaction of opposing groups—dissenters and conformists—during the turbulent years of change from Commonwealth to Restoration. Fincham suggests that we consider the case of the troublesome gallery as symbolic of a more general and widely dispersed cultural movement.

The thirteen essays that precede Fincham’s share with his study a similar design. Each one moves from a particular investigation to a broad and interpretive theme. Apart from this general ambition, there are few obvious links or connections between most of these essays; they do portray, of course, broad concern for early modern England, and they all exemplify thorough and impressive scholarship. Each of the authors offers an essay according to personal inclination, and so the volume is an agreeable miscellany with no obvious overarching theme, plan, or organization—features common to many a Festschrift. The volume begins with an introductory essay by Peter Lake who describes Nicholas Tyacke’s special contribution to controversies about “Puritanism and Arminianism.” Tyacke expounded a thesis as early as 1973 on the rise of Arminianism that “was integrated almost immediately into what emerged over the next ten or fifteen years as the distinctively revisionist account of the period: an account in which the English civil war emerged not as the ‘first modern revolution’ but rather as the ‘last of the wars of religion,’ in causing which the rise of Arminianism, rather than of a revolutionary or proto-revolutionary puritanism, played a crucial role” (3). Lake describes in some detail the historiographical situation in which Tyacke presented, and continues to offer his work.

Each of the essays in this rich volume offers an important insight or observation, yet several of them are especially noteworthy. Keith Thomas, in writing on “Art and Iconoclasm in Early Modern England,” describes and reviews the wholesale destruction by protestant reformers of sacred images depicted in windows, sculptures, and paintings; and he asks whether we may fairly condemn these reformers as haters and trivializers of art and beauty. Perhaps some were, but their main intention was not “the total rejection of art” (38). What they achieved, in fact, was a splitting off of art from faith by setting up “a lasting conflict” between them (39).
Diarmid MacCulloch, in “The Latitude of the Church of England,” cogently sketches the generous theological room extended by the English church from pre-Restoration times up to the late seventeenth century. He very correctly invokes the importance of Strassburg and above all of Bullinger’s Zürich—not Calvin’s Geneva. Heinrich Bullinger’s Decades (translated into English in 1577) was to have a huge influence on “conformist” Elizabethan bishops; on Archbishop Whitgift himself; on Richard Hooker, the greatest philosophic theologian of the age; and on Lancelot Andrewes, whose lectures in the 1590s at St. Giles Cripplegate expounded views in sympathy with these “advanced” reformers. Andrewes preached conformism by criticizing strict predestination, by emphasizing the liturgical year, by regularly celebrating the eucharist, and by indicating that consubstantiation embodies the Real Presence. The St. Giles lectures, published as Apospasmatia Sacra (1657), which MacCulloch cites, are indeed central in showing Andrewes’s beliefs, as a recently discovered manuscript of the lectures confirms (probably appearing too late for mention here, but which I described in English Manuscript Studies 13 2007).

One other essay deserves special mention. Anthony Milton’s perceptive essay about Bishop John Overall sharply expands our knowledge of this little discussed and inadequately understood churchman. “‘Anglicanism’ by Stealth: The Career and Influence of John Overall” nicely corroborates MacCulloch’s essay by extending the ecclesiastical significance of the generation of Hooker and Andrewes to the emergence of mainstream “Anglican” methodology of the 1620s and later. Overall preached vehemently against predestinarianism; but he also keenly defended and emphasized ceremonialism and ritualism—whatever, indeed, he felt would stir up suitable devotion. His influence certainly affected Richard Mountagu’s Appello Caesarem (1625) and John Cosin’s A Collection of Private Devotions (1627), as well as other controversial works, and undoubtedly helped to form the thought of many Laudian divines. Milton argues convincingly for Overall’s significance on many fronts; he was above all “one of the first divines to create for the Church of England a coherent theological identity” (171), for the Church’s “doctrine was to be read not just in its confessional articles, but in its liturgy” (172).
One may take into account only a little of this fascinating collection of historical essays, so filled with ingenious and trenchant arguments: Thomas S. Freeman on Pope Joan and Reformation England; Brett Usher on the many ways in which Elizabethans regarded Puritanism; Patrick Collinson on Puritan nomenclature; Paul Seaver on the variety of patronage of Puritan preachers; Susan Harman Moore on the fate of New England’s “Reformation”; Thomas Cogswell on the family history of the notorious John Felton; Richard Cust’s sympathetic portrait of Charles I and his belief in divine providence; William Sheils on the fortunes in peace and war of two remarkable civic preachers in Yorkshire.

There is a brief preface, a list of commonly appearing abbreviations, and an index of names; but no biographical notices are given for any of the contributors, nor, oddly, for such a volume as this, a biography of the honoree, or a general list of his publications. The editors seem not to have taken sufficient care for stylistic consistency. For example, some essayists modernize quotations, others do not. Notes, fortunately at the bottom of each page where citations appear, are usually careful and informative, but might have been more scrupulously checked. For one example, Diarmaid MacCulloch miscites the Folger Library Edition of Hooker in note 59 of his essay: W. Speed Hill (not ‘W. R. Speed Hill’) is the general editor of the edition, and only 5, not 7 volumes were published at Cambridge (by Harvard UP). Occasionally, some authors fall into rather casual and informal diction, others maintain a more formal and academic mode; and often one feels that an author is still working on an early draft, as in Peter Lake’s “Anti-Puritanism: The Structure of a Prejudice,” which seems repetitive and confusing. But both he and his co-editor Kenneth Fincham, together with their other contributors, have produced a splendid and highly rewarding volume.

Family matters matter, argues John Shawcross, because families matter, even for a figure so redoubtable, so fiercely independent as John Milton. Though Milton may have been “a sect of one” in his religious and political opinions and in his literary originality, he could not claim the radical autonomy boasted of Satan, “self-begot, self-rais’d / By our own quick’ning power.” Rather, Milton lived his life, pursued his poetic ambitions, and forged his political and religious views within a complex network of personal associations that crossed and confounded simple or tidy ideological boundaries and that informed the writer’s self-understanding in rich and various ways. In this study of Milton’s extended family, Shawcross draws on his impressive expertise and his vast knowledge of seventeenth-century history and literary culture to expand our sense of Milton’s life records and to complement, even to correct, the standard biographies by William Riley Parker and Barbara Lewalski, not to mention Shawcross’ own *John Milton: The Self and the World* (1993). Through painstaking and pioneering archival research, Shawcross significantly revises scholarly assessments of Milton’s family relationships, particularly with his nephew John Phillips and his brother-in-law Thomas Agar. Much of the book is dense with closely reasoned inferences from obscure and dusty documents, and hence is likely to appeal mainly to specialists. But Shawcross also offers lucid formulations and edifying insights that will be valued by more general readers and all students and teachers of Milton. He casts new and arresting light on what we might call the “literary Milton,” complicating facile assumptions about his presumed “Puritanism” and “Republicanism,” while also offering an appreciation of familial archetypes in Milton’s dramatic and religious imagination.

*The Arms of the Family* investigates the “significance” of Milton’s relatives and associates by exploring three different but inter-related ways in which familial relationships signify important meanings for and about Milton and his work. First, there is the original biographical
research, going beyond Masson and Parker, to give us a new and corrected appreciation of Milton's brother Christopher, his brother-in-law Thomas Agar, and his nephews Edward and John Phillips. Second, Shawcross seeks then to assess how this evidence might contribute to a more nuanced understanding of the development of Milton's political identity and the evolution of his religious position. Third, in the last chapter and the Afterword, the book limns the patterns of familial relationships in the major poems and in Milton’s “genogram,” a schematic and heuristic mapping of his extended network of kinfolk.

Some of the most intriguing and certainly the most tantalizing material in the study concerns Milton’s relationship with his brother Christopher, the Royalist and Roman Catholic. Admitting that very little has been added to our knowledge of Christopher since Masson’s Life of Milton, Shawcross expertly synthesizes all the available evidence and sorts out the remaining gaps and questions that make it difficult to draw many assured conclusions. We do not know when exactly Christopher reverted to his grandfather’s Catholicism, but his Royalist loyalties were pronounced and consistent from the 1640s on. There seems little doubt that John’s relationship with his brother was severely strained over political and religious differences, but their involvement was nonetheless sustained, up to and including Christopher’s dubious participation in John’s nuncupative will. While Shawcross raises questions about Christopher’s honesty and integrity, he also suggests that the brother may have had a role in John escaping prosecution under the Act of Indemnity of 1660. Christopher was certainly not alone among the committed Royalists who shared a close association with the putatively Republican poet.

Among these figures, Shawcross devotes considerable attention to Thomas Agar, the ardent Royalist who was the second husband of Milton’s sister Anne. Quite aside from the complex and labored exposition of Agar’s own family, Shawcross effectively seizes on this neglected figure to illustrate a chief contention of the study—that well beyond the 1630s John Milton not only kept company with avowed Royalists, but also his own milieu was in important respects defined and characterized by the ethos and values of Royalist and aristocratic culture. Thus Shawcross repeatedly rebukes the tendency to exaggerate the cleavage
between what we have become accustomed to characterize as Milton's middle-class Puritanism and the wealthy, aristocratic society in which he moved and made his way. The book further analyses how Milton's extended family often crossed and ignored the cultural divisions of the times, as families often and perhaps inevitably tend to do. In his discussion of Milton's nephews, Shawcross corrects a number of misleading and biased characterizations of Edward and John Phillips. The spirited defense of John Phillips against his detractors among Milton's biographers, Parker particularly, involves a virtuoso performance of scholarly acumen; Shawcross effortlessly combines a deft sifting of historical evidence, telling archival discoveries, and detailed textual criticism with close stylistic analysis of Phillips' (and Milton's own) propensity for scurrilous satire to refute baseless suppositions of the strained relationship between Milton and his nephew: "the story of John and his uncle has been a flagrant example of the main point of this book: time present has simply taken over the foundationless and prejudiced assertions of time past, superannuating them, and ignoring or misreading whatever evidence there has been that would lead to at least defensible opposed judgments" (133).

Coupling thus revisionist bravado with exacting scholarship, Shawcross proceeds then in Part II of the book to synthesize the biographical evidence of the first part with his own lifetime study of Milton to offer a subtler characterization of Milton's politics and religion than the blunt labels "Republican" and "Puritan" manage to convey. In so doing, however, Shawcross finds himself inevitably stumbling in the overgrown lexical field of reified categories that are never quite adequate either to the paucity of evidence available or to the quicksilver stream of Milton's mind living out his politics and his theology in what Cowley called "a warlike, various and tragicall age." Chapter 5 effectively argues against the facile labeling of Milton as an "anti-monarchist," "anti-royalist," or "Republican"; rather, concludes Shawcross, Milton is better designated as a consistent "Parliamentarian" with strong and abiding "Royalist connections." Chapter 6 is only a little less assured and not quite as convincing in trying, more briefly, to pin down Milton's religious position. Reluctant to engage quarrels about Milton's alleged "heresies," Shawcross argues against calling Milton an "Arian" or even an "antitrinitarian," preferring instead to
paint him as a “subordinationist” with solidly “Protestant” credentials. Milton, we are told—not very helpfully—is somewhat of a “calvinist” (small c) without quite being a “Calvinist” (big C); “he was a Puritan, but perhaps more outwardly than truly” (180). Even though one could complain that there is both too much and too little precision in such efforts to ascertain the poet’s religion and his politics, this section is likely to be found more engaging to the general reader than the densely argued biographical analysis of the first four chapters.

In its closing pages, The Arms of the Family turns from archival research and biography to a more impressionistic discussion of a number of family archetypes in Paradise Lost and the other major poems. Shawcross writes, for instance, “I do not wish to imply any conscious equation between the rebellious Satan and the conflictual Christopher in their relationships with the Father or with the father, but vestiges of such familial disruption do seem to lie psychologically for Milton underneath the change of Lucifer (the light-bearer) to Satan (the adversary)” (184). Developing thus Jung’s idea of Satan as the parallel and rival of the Son and as a concealed quaternity in the orthodox dogma of the Trinity, Shawcross picks up and runs with Northrop Frye’s similar suggestion of a kind of “sibling rivalry” between Satan and the Son of God. One need not see Milton’s relationship to his brother dimly encoded in Paradise Lost nor does one have to follow such old-school psychologizing to share Shawcross’s essential point that patterns of family relationships—fathers and sons, brothers, husbands and wives, parents and children—matter immensely in our interpretation of literature as well as life and that accurate knowledge of Milton’s family enriches our appreciation of the poet and his poetry. John Shawcross has given us yet another important and provocative study and one that richly crowns a most impressive career. Perhaps there is some irony in thus contextualizing Milton, setting him securely “in the arms of the family,” for at the end of the book he stands out more clearly than ever in all his defiant, inexplicable singularity.

*Spiritual Architecture and Paradise Regained: Milton’s Literary Ecclesiology* supplies the revelation and promulgation of church identity as an integral complement to reading Milton’s final poem as the spiritual discovery and proclamation of the Son, best known through Barbara K. Lewalski’s *Milton’s Brief Epic*. Ken Simpson tracks the progress of ecclesiastical realization by considering *Paradise Regained* within two new contexts. First, he focuses on the contribution to reformed theology made by the humanist agenda’s concentration on rhetoric and literature. This textual culture helped found the reformed tenet of the sole authority of the Word of God and its interpretation for the establishment and maintenance of the church. Second, he proposes that the brief epic constitutes the culmination best understood as Milton’s ongoing construal of the true church, a preoccupation from the early antiprelatical tracts through the continuous editing of *De Doctrina Christiana* during the Restoration. These two contexts coalesce in the image of *Paradise Regained* as literary “spiritual architecture.”

Simpson’s first chapter, “Writing the Church,” sets the terms and goals of his study. At the same time it exhibits the materials examined and exemplifies the method of historical and biographical framing, careful argument, and analytical reading of epitomizing language and image he employs throughout. The chapter opens recounting the familiar story of Milton’s calling to priesthood and prophecy from the Nativity Ode through the polemical church pamphlets, the commonwealth prose, the exhortations on the eve of the Restoration, and *Paradise Lost* plus *Samson Agonistes*. Then he focuses closely on the concepts of the all-sufficient salvational authority of the Bible as God’s Word and the invitation to all Christians to interpret and contribute to building a textual communion through their words. For his initial formulation Simpson concentrates on the “word of God,” which *De Doctrina* explicates radically by extending Erasmus’ humanist translation of “*in principio erat* “logos” by “sermo” instead of “verbum.” He draws the conclusion that Milton self-consciously did so since he repeatedly followed this philological point to a radical antitrinitarian
theology: the relationship of the Father to the Son is that of speaker to spoken, the superior author’s intent mediated through the subordinate text’s representation. Rhetoric is transformed into theology through the mediating Son and then spirit: Word becomes flesh and text; ultimately mediation takes the form of the revelatory text written in the hearts of believers. Progressive revelations issue in the text of the invisible spiritual church communicated to and by believers. This argument leads Simpson to the hortatory Areopagitica, humanist oratory as homily. The “sermo” is dominated by metaphors of the church as a building which must be constructed, edified, and as a body which must be gathered like the gathering of Osiris’ body and truth in Milton’s prominent mythical allusion. Thus is laid the foundation for a progressive revelation and edification of the church by the endeavors of Christians freely exercising their calling to textual construction. Such an effort is exemplified in the spiritual architecture of Paradise Regained that is as integral to the poem as the progressive revelation, exemplification, and proclamation of the Son. For Simpson the two motives make up inseparable facets of the poem.

“Silence and the Word” follows out the office of prophecy, the mediating inter-communication of silence and speech. This second chapter brings to bear patristic and Interregnum/Restoration theological arguments, Milton’s own writings, and critical controversies over the passages in Paradise Regained so as to explain the conspicuously silent climactic tower scene when Satan falls and the Son stands. Simpson shows how silence and speech inseparably communicate the all-sufficiency of God’s word for salvation of an invisible church of believers interpreting that word by free exercise of the inner guidance of the spirit as silence and speech simultaneously communicate the mystery of the incarnation.

“The Priesthood of Believers and the Vocation of Writing” follows out the office of priest, Milton’s radical extension of the Reformed conversion of clerical ministration of sacraments to the faithful preaching of the word, eliminating the distinction between clerical and lay and severing the church from the state. Thus priesthood is converted to prophecy and extended to the creation of literature and the exemplification of behavior in imitation of Jesus in an ongoing edification (in at least two senses) of the invisible church.
Again, Simpson works from two heritages of divine inspiration, that of poetry in humanistic rhetoric and that of the spirit in Christian hermeneutics. Then he tracks the development of Milton’s thought from his earliest poetry through the prose tracts into the late poems so as to set up a reading of *Paradise Regained* that pits the true prophetic ministry of the Son against the perverse parody of ministry in Satan’s temptations.

Postponing kingship to the final chapter, “The Renovation of Worship” makes the transition to ecclesiology by way of Milton’s radically Reformed conversion of church rituals in sacraments, set services, and formal prayers into a freer-flowing worship founded on the interpretation of the biblical word by means of the spirit’s text written in the individual heart.

*Paradise Regained* thus performs a literary act of worship and subsumes church rituals within the inspiration of the Word of God in both senses. Simpson shows Milton following out the early Reformation’s reduction of sacraments to two, their shift from presence to representation in their services, and their foundation of services on the biblical text rather than on tradition. The prophetic ministry based on prayer and interpretation of the word was for Milton reinforced by his sense of inspired poetic vocation. *Paradise Regained* embeds a worship service in the Son’s awaiting and announcing the Spirit’s motions. He endures patiently, obediently, and zealously searching himself as well as scripture for *kairos*, that “fullness of time” invoked by ritual’s congruence of fallen time with sacred time. Thus the Son’s baptism, prayers, interpretations of scripture, refusal of satanic food for the word of God and heavenly banquet, celestial hymning, and repetitive recollection of the moments when *kairos* appears in meditations that recurrently recount his life—all constitute a reformed communal church service.

“Astrology, Apocalypse, and the Church Militant” addresses the office of kingship. Against the theological history of arguments over the relationship between the visible and invisible church, and then through Milton’s increasingly thwarted hopes for their coalescence during the swirling politics of his own time, Simpson describes Milton’s ever greater emphasis on the spiritual, inward church and invisible communion as the only church available until the apoca-
lypse. Then comes his reading of the Son’s rejection of the extended temptation of kingdoms for an inner one. Similarly Simpson tracks Milton’s receding horizon of expectations for the apocalypse amidst the many polemics and astrological prognostications of his time in order to display *Paradise Regained*’s imagistic projections of Christ’s ultimate kingdom only at the end of time. Meanwhile *Paradise Regained* presents the literary edification of the invisible church in the testament of the biblical word interpreted by the words written on the hearts of the faithful.

Granting, as I do, the premises that *De Doctrina Christiana* is Milton’s, that his prose and poetry form a coherent pattern of evolution as he examined traditional and current theological controversies and that he extended them to radical ends, Ken Simpson’s *Spiritual Architecture and Paradise Regained: Milton’s Literary Ecclesiology* provides a comprehensive and persuasive complement to the thematic reading of the progressive identification and proclamation of the mystery of the Son of God in that of an ongoing revelatory definition and declaration of the invisible church of believers. The next task for this alignment of readings would be to expand and systematize beyond our current intermittent and allusive political interpretations a comprehensive political definition that evolves through *Paradise Regained*.


This collection of eight essays explores, in both Milton’s poetry and prose, his attitude toward the Jews. I find this approach problematic, because it confounds Milton’s approach to Jews and Judaism in his controversial works with his aesthetic deployment of Jewish traditions in his poetry. In many instances, Milton cited the Hebrew Bible in order to promote his anti-monarchical position, even to justify the killing of a king. In contrast, his treatment of the Book of Genesis in *Paradise Lost* and the Book of Judges in *Samson Agonistes* demonstrates a distinctly more creative and respectful elucidation of Jewish traditions (save for the Pauline transfer of the “elect” designation from Jews to
Christians). That being said, each of these learned essays contributes to our knowledge of Milton and the Jews, and builds on earlier, definitive scholarship on the subject, particularly Jason P. Rosenblatt’s *Torah and Law in Paradise Lost* (1994) and Jeffrey S. Shoulson’s *Milton and the Rabbis: Hebraism, Hellenism, & Christianity* (2001).

In “England, Israel, and the Jews in Milton’s Prose, 1649-1660,” Achsah Guibbory examines why Milton was “curiously silent on the issue of readmission” of the Jews (13) and concludes that “it was unlikely that he would have welcomed the Jews or expected their conversion any time soon” (34). I find this “argument from silence” unconvincing. By 1652 Milton was totally blind. Shortly thereafter his wife Mary died after giving birth to their daughter Deborah. Widowed, blind, and the father of three daughters, perhaps Milton was not disposed to consider the “Jewish question” in any detail in 1655, when the Whitehall Conference on the readmission of the Jews convened. Moreover, since one of the assumptions (later dropped) was that the readmitted Jews would convert to Christianity, and Milton was rightly skeptical of that occurrence, he could not in conscience support the motion for readmission. Hence, in my view, his silence was not “curious” or strange. I therefore object to using Milton’s “failure” to speak out on the Jewish question in 1655 as a litmus test of his commitment to the Jews.

In “Milton’s Peculiar Nation,” Elizabeth M. Sauer explores England’s and Milton’s appropriation of Jewish history as a tool to justify English imperialistic self-definition: “In England, Protestantism and biblical nationalism underwrote history and sanctioned the nation’s expansionary and exclusionary policies, including the historical and rhetorical treatment of the Jews” (56). In “Making Use of the Jews: Milton and Philo-Semitism,” Nicholas von Maltzahn examines the ambivalence of Milton’s words and acts, some of which are distinctly philo-Semitic, while others might be construed as anti-Semitic or at best indifferent. On the oft-debated subject of the conversion of the Jews at the end of the millennium, “Milton in *Paradise Regain’d* describes the calling of Jews at the end of time in terms that nowhere propose conversion” (70).

In “Milton and Solomonic Education,” Douglas Trevor chronicles Milton’s fascination with Solomon as a model of wisdom and learn-
ing, who nevertheless sunk to idolatry and woman worship: “That a teacher as wise as Solomon failed so profoundly in spiritual terms further convinced Milton of how complicated—and precarious—it could be to lead a learned, devout life” (104). In “T. S. Eliot, Anti-Semitism, and the Milton Controversy,” Matthew Biberman claims that “past Milton scholarship has spilled little ink over the Son’s claim that classical knowledge is an inferior derivation of Hebrew knowledge” (106). This is manifestly untrue. Indeed, past Milton scholarship on Paradise Regain’d (E. M. W. Tillyard, John Shawcross, George Sensabaugh, Michael Lieb, Douglas Bush, myself, etc.) spoke of little else. Biberman says as much himself when he questions “Why have so many [emphasis mine] critics of Milton seen the temptation to Athens scene as an either/or scenario?” (110). Biberman then traces what he sees as a shift from an understanding of Milton as philo-Semitic and radically modern (Denis Saurat) to one in which critics (T. S. Eliot) view the poet through their own anti-Semitic lenses in order to dismiss or denigrate his work: “These two critical debates capture quite starkly how a certain kind of high modern cultural poetics uses racial anti-Semitic elements as a central medium through which to articulate a forceful and quite visible conflation of aesthetics and politics” (116). “Through the workings of this critical discourse, the perceived Jewish element in Milton is first contained and then largely erased” (119). Biberman’s real target is T. S. Eliot, claiming that his Milton essays are “clear examples of genteel anti-Semitism within the Anglo-American elite” (123).

In “A Metaphorical Jew: The Carnal, the Literal, and the Miltonic,” Linda Tredennick defends Milton’s allegory of Sin and Death by claiming that the defining characteristic of Protestantism is an overwhelming sense of sin that can only be alleviated by excising the Jewish traits of “legality, literalness, carnality” (132). “The Jew within’ is a metaphor for human sinfulness” (133). Her argument then shifts to a discussion of Miltonic allegory in terms of Jacques Derrida and Paul de Man. In my view the essay is structurally incoherent; I can only agree that “it may seem odd that an argument that began with reformation identity politics concludes with a discussion of the origins of post-structuralist theory” (149).
Trubowitz traces Milton’s view of a rich Asian (particularly Chinese) culture as “a serious threat to the moral and narrative coherence of the Mosaic account of the Fall and the privileged status of Hebrew scriptural history” (154), especially since it was associated with the Stuarts whose renewed ascendancy sealed the doom of Milton’s republican ideals. Milton also associates the Jews with “the Oriental threat of bondage and degeneration,” revealing “the Jew’s native inclination toward slavery” (157). Access to the New World, which has also been corrupted by the slavish east, can only be gained by “a conscious, self-willed act of individual resistance to Oriental degeneracy” (168). The essay traces not only Milton’s ambivalent attitude toward the orientalized Jews, but also reveals an unpleasant strain of global bigotry in Milton’s approach to both the Old and the New World.

In “Returning to Egypt: ‘The Jew,’ ‘the Turk,’ and the English Republic,” Benedict S. Robinson explores “the figure of the Jew and the figure of the Turk in Milton’s thought” (181). Both are guilty of tyranny and idolatry and associated with the hated Stuart royalists. Both have in fact chosen slavery over true freedom: “What blocks our capacity to pursue political freedom, it seems, is an aversion to freedom inherited in our bodies and our world, and associated especially with the Turks and the modern Jews, as the putative examples of those whose own desires have supposedly left them unfit for freedom” (198). The book concludes with an extensive bibliography on Milton and the Jews.

The Milton that emerges from these pages is not a uniformly attractive figure, eager to master the intricacies of the Hebrew Bible but profoundly ambivalent about the Jews themselves. The subject is hardly exhausted by these eight essays, but they offer an excellent introduction to the place of Jews and Jewish culture in Milton’s thought.

The twelve essays in Renaissance Ecology comprise a Festschrift for Diane McColley. Ken Hiltner, who like McColley is a passionate advocate for the contemporary relevance of Milton’s ecological ethos, begins his Introduction with an historical account of the profound ecological problems Milton and his seventeenth-century contemporaries faced. Hiltner then establishes the logical infrastructure of the collection and cogently summarizes respective essays indicating how each relates to McColley’s life oeuvre.

The first seven essays address Milton and imaginings of Eden. Barbara Lewalski’s opening essay, “Milton’s Paradises,” categorizes paradise broadly to include places or states of happiness. Her synopsis of textual examples and well-established critical topics provides a usefully succinct introduction to and classification of the subject. One wishes she would have engaged further in ongoing critical conversations relevant to her topic, such as Milton’s quietism, millenarianism, interiority, and relationships. In “Eve and the Landscape of Love in Paradise Lost,” Stella Revard’s thoughtful and close reading of “sweet” and its classical sources and allusions analyzes how the word changes in its pre- and post-lapsarian meaning. Revard’s essay captures, in its own gracefully poetic language, the “sweet” essence of Eden that has been lost: in Adam and Eve’s love, in their home, and in the quality of their joy together. Ann Torday Gulden’s “A Walk in the Paradise Garden” utilizes the pictorial and textual “triptych” as an apt metaphor and visual model for the conceptual, spiritual, and discursive interrelatedness of Adam and Eve’s speeches in Book 4. 610-88 which lead to and enable their retreat to the “innermost bower.” Gulden, with fresh insights, considers gendered ways of perception (the compartmental male/inclusive female), and her study is augmented by a wide range of critical views that enrich her own ideas. In “Milton’s Primavera,” William Shullenburger offers an inspired exploration of the fullness of the power of art and creation. His analysis of “A Mask” considers the “harmonic reciprocities” of
classical and biblical sources that make “the text a figural counterpart to the perfected ecological dynamism of the garden it evokes” (66). The essay shows not only an exalted appreciation for Milton’s text, but an intensely spiritual, perhaps phenomenological connection with its art. June Sturrock’s “Eve, Eden, and the Flowers of Experience: Milton, Blake, and Botany,” focuses on Milton’s influence on Blake’s botanical representation of fallen and Edenic states, arguing that Blake wants to correct views of Eve prejudiced by the post-Linnaean sexualization of plants in need of tending.

Continuing the center of attention on the visual arts, Wendy Furman-Adams and Virginia James Tufte’s lengthy but multifaceted essay, “‘Earth Felt the Wound’: Gendered Ecological Consciousness in Illustrations of Paradise Lost,” traces the changes in how artists depict Eden and the landscape in illustrations before 1820 (where landscape serves merely as a backdrop) and after 1820, primarily through the work of John Martin and Jane Giraud (the first female illustrator of Milton’s works). Their rich study, supported by numerous images, conveys keen perceptions into Milton’s ecological consciousness from the point of view of gender and visual art. In “Reading Milton Greenly: The Flight Into Egypt in Renaissance Art,” Joan Blythe presents a strikingly original reading of the Nativity Ode, Paradise Lost, and Paradise Regained, by showing how the concepts and images recurring in artistic depictions of “The Flight into Egypt” figure significantly in Milton’s poetry. These include Jesus’ role as new Moses, the ‘world view’ presentation of landscape, and the pivotal importance of Mary. Primary among Blythe’s 18 illustrations are “Flight” paintings by Joachim Patinir, Caravaggio, Claude Lorrain, Poussin, and Rembrandt.

The initial constellation of excellent and thoughtfully interrelated essays gets interrupted by Alan Rudrum’s anomalous essay, “God’s Second Book and the Regenerate Mind: Some Early Modern Conversion Narratives,” which focuses briefly on writers such as Boehme, Fox, and Vaughan with an eye toward their preoccupation with the natural world and the idea of its heavenly regeneration. If Rudrum does not seem to engage as vigorously as other contributors with ecological readings, it is perhaps due to his wariness about over-reading seventeenth-century concerns about the natural world in terms of our
own. Seemingly at odds at first with the overall themes of the volume, but nonetheless with genuine and deliberate meditation on the idea of Eden, is Richard DuRocher’s astute and deeply poignant, “‘Cropt by th’Almighty’s hand’: Allegory as Theodicy in Anne Bradstreet’s Poems on Her Grandchildren.” DuRocher shows beautifully how Bradstreet’s representation of the Edenic, “carrying with it a rich biblical tradition of God’s providential care for his suffering people, holds out some comfort for her family upon their otherwise inexplicable losses” (220). The essay contributes valuable contextualization for the other considerations of Eden throughout the collection.

Returning the attention to Milton, the final two essays both make distinctive contributions to ecological readings of *Paradise Lost*. Jeffrey S. Theis’ “‘The purlieus of heaven’: Milton’s Eden as a Pastoral Forest,” animates seventeenth-century land law and land usage debates, as well as the pastoral tradition, and Theis argues compellingly that Milton engages in the contemporary discourse about woodlands and ecological responsibility through his treatment of Eden in *Paradise Lost* as a forest wilderness. Karen Edwards continues consideration of the literal landscape by aligning Milton’s use of “waste” with the ongoing, political arguments and activities of the Levellers and Diggers. Edwards’ superb essay, “Eden Raised: Waste in Milton’s Garden” signals the peroration for the prescriptive ecological messages of the entire collection.

Diane McColley’s concluding essay, “A Happy Rural Seat of Various View,” with its reflections on Eden and the environment, reminds us that the “variety is the essence of Eden” and “the variety of its beauty is never static or diminished...because it is all connected” (275). Her personal and biographical tribute to the interconnectedness of her colleagues and friends also affirms the useful work of scholarship still relevant and hopefully still influencing our poetic, natural, and collegial worlds.

The essays in Hiltner’s Festschrift collection for Diane McColley not only embody some of the finest critical work currently being done on eco-critical approaches to Milton, but the book also stands as a model of what a true Festschrift ought to be: a generous celebration of an esteemed scholar’s contributions to the field. Almost every essay in the volume substantiates McColley’s important work on gender,
politics, visual art, and the environment, and thus *Renaissance Ecology* stands as a lovely and worthy tribute. In its own right, *Renaissance Ecology* succeeds in offering new, original, and noteworthy contributions to our understanding of Milton and seventeenth-century historical, artistic, and poetic texts and contexts. On the whole, this book holds to the highest standards of scholarship, from the quality of its essays, to the unusually plentiful array of visual images, to the careful management of the Notes, Bibliography, and Index.


This collection includes an introduction, an afterward, and fifteen newly-published essays on the concept of toleration, considered expansively enough to include the history of toleration, its legal and social practices, and the extent of Milton’s participation, both politically and imaginatively, in the discourses of toleration in the early modern world. The introduction by Achinstein and Sauer argues for the relevance of the collection’s contents not only to literary critics, but also to historians, on the assumption that “the images of literature, rhetoric, and poetry present a kind of ‘truth’ of the past” which critics are “uniquely skilled to explore” (5). *Milton and Toleration* balances its agenda by, on the one hand, treating comparatively narrow issues, such as the ways in which liberty of conscience expands historically into a wider “defence of human freedoms” (10); and, on the other, by constructing frameworks of inquiry for new assessment of the intricacies of Milton’s positions on toleration. The editors note that the collection “explores a poetics of tolerance” (19), and thereby qualify the work to join the important post-1990s discussion of the aesthetics of Milton’s prose.

The first part, subtitled Revisiting Whig Accounts, includes the following contributions:

- Nigel Smith, “Milton and the European Contexts of Toleration”
David Loewenstein, “Toleration and the Specter of Heresy in Milton’s England”
Thomas N. Corns, “John Milton, Roger Williams, and the Limits of Toleration”
Nicholas von Maltzahn, “Milton, Marvell, and Toleration”

Loewenstein discusses, in the pamphlets of John Goodwin, William Walwyn, and Milton, instances of the rhetorical or tropal expression of the “visceral and irrational feelings” (46) which inevitably surrounded tolerationary debate in revolutionary England. Conceding that England in the 1640s was as fully involved in religious as in military conflict, Goodman’s writing nevertheless expressed reservations about the role of coercive power in religious debates and the fallible judgment of civic and religious authority in persecuting heresy. Goodwin understood how heresy-hunters might manipulate the fear of heresy into grounds for a more authoritarian state church. Walwyn shared Goodwin’s doubts about the increasing authority over conscience assumed by Presbyterian clergy, advocating a tolerant model of response to those demonized as “heretics” (60). In Areopagitica Milton grew scornful of the danger posed by “those terrible names of Sectaries and Schismaticks” and advanced his own distinctive notion of heresy, namely that one might be a heretic in the truth if his possession of that truth were static (68). Valuably, Loewenstein considers Milton’s position on heresy in the context of two of his most active pamphleteering contemporaries, and by so doing not only measures the evolution of that position, but begins to characterize its rhetorical articulation.

The second part, subtitled Philosophical and Religious Engagements, contains these selections:

Jason P. Rosenblatt, “Milton, Natural, Law and Toleration”
Victoria Silver, “‘A Taken Scandal not a Given’: Milton’s Equitable Grounds of Toleration”
Martin Dzelzainis, “Milton and Antitrinitarianism”
Andrew Hadfield, “Milton and Catholicism”

In “Milton and Antitrinitarianism” Dzelzainis contextualizes Milton’s engagement with antitrinitarianism, beginning with Of True Religion (1673) and working backward. In 1673 Milton’s position that Arians and Socinians should be tolerated can easily be inferred. In his capacity as licenser Milton probably authorized the publication of the Catechesis or Racovian Catechism, and that decision suggests that by 1652 he had “abandoned the orthodox position on the Trinity” (181). Yet some evidence can also be found that he may have begun to doubt the orthodox position as early as the mid-1640s.

The third part, Poetry and Rhetoric, consists of five essays:
Elizabeth Sauer, “Toleration and Nationhood in the 1650s:
‘Sonnet XV’ and the Case of Ireland”
Sharon Achinstein, “Toleration in Milton’s Epics: A Chimera?”
Paul Stevens, “Intolerance and the Virtues of Sacred Vehemence”
Lana Cable, “Secularizing Conscience in Milton’s Republican Community”
Gerald MacLean, “Milton, Islam, and the Ottomans”

MacLean claims that Milton’s rare direct references to Islam, to Muhamed, and to the Ottomans do not constitute ignorance of or indifference to the role played by all three in seventeenth-century toleration debates. In the early seventeenth century, information about the Ottomans and their tolerant policies toward non-Muslims was available in English and other European languages, so that one can reasonably assume Milton’s general familiarity with Ottoman history. The Arab-Islamic critical response to Milton records repeated attempts by academics, writers, and critics to make Milton their own. Moreover, the Qur’an’s Satan-figure, Iblis, available to Milton through a 1649 translation of the Alcoran (294), suggests many parallels in motive
and character to Milton’s Satan. Milton’s idiosyncratic combination of learning and unorthodox interpretations of the Old Testament and various other ancient sources (297) might have made him attractive to Islamic readers and writers. Above and beyond the valuable particulars noted above, MacLean’s piece sets a welcome precedent for further inquiry into the Islamic reaction to the Milton canon.

In her afterward Ann Hughes, as she summarizes the themes and scholarly vantage points of Milton and Toleration, reinforces the important position that these literary-critical essays offer much to historians of toleration in early modern England as well as to scholars seeking to connect the variegated Milton, especially the republican Milton with the Milton who defended religious liberty.


Under the editorship of Jan Ross, Boydell and Brewer has published Volumes 2 and 3 of The Works of Thomas Traherne, an ongoing project that promises to be the complete and authoritative critical text of Thomas Traherne’s work. Following the 2005 publication of Volume 1 (which was comprised of the most recently discovered Traherne texts), Volumes 2 and 3 contain the unfinished Commentaries of Heaven, a kind of spiritual encyclopedia in which Traherne muses over topics ranging from “Anger” to “Babe” to “Babel” to “Bastard” and so on. In all, Traherne includes ninety-five such entries; the content and sentiment of some of these entries are consistent with the more well-known of Traherne’s work (the Poems and Centuries, for example), but there are also some surprises contained herein. The fact is the Commentaries is a huge work that is absolutely essential for students and scholars of Traherne. This is the first time it has been published in its entirety, and its publication will undoubtedly spark new explorations into Traherne’s work.

I have commented earlier on the editorial principles of this multivolume edition (see SCN 1 & 2 [2006], 3-6). Ross does a fine job of recreating the text and providing a readable, accurate rendition of
Traherne’s manuscripts (only two of Traherne’s major works—*Christian Ethicks* and *Roman Forgeries*—were published prior to the twentieth century), and one that also accounts for the physical nature of the manuscripts themselves. Ross gives substantial notes on textual emendations and provides good introductions to the works. In addition, the long term planning of this project is well thought out; Ross is beginning with the least available and least known works and will end with the *Centuries* and *Select Meditations* (Volume 5), Traherne’s verse (Volume 6), and finally *Roman Forgeries* and *Christian Ethicks* (Volume 7), followed by an eighth volume that will contain the commentary and index to all the volumes. I still hope that Ross and the publisher will reconsider not including Traherne’s Commonplace Book and the so-called Ficino Notebook in full (Ross does provide information about and cross references to the Commonplace Book in an appendix to Volume 2); still, despite the fact that those works are largely excerpts from other writers, considering the wealth of information about Traherne’s sources contained in these notebooks, their importance and benefit to Traherne scholars is simply too great to be excluded, and, frankly, this fine complete Traherne edition will ultimately be lacking without them. I would recommend that the notebooks be included in the final volume as an appendix. That issue aside, however, Ross’s work here is sound and seems to fulfill the promise of being the definitive Traherne edition for years to come.

Again, the *Commentaries of Heaven* is particularly important for Traherne studies. This is a huge text that provides a tremendous insight into Traherne’s thought and work. There are passages that will sound very familiar to Traherne enthusiasts, such as this passage from “Babe”: “A Babe is an helpless Infant: a little naked MAN, wrapt up in the Swaddling clothes of his own infirmities; a feeble Spark of immortal fire, that can never be extinguished; a stranger newly come into the World, as Great in his Hopes and Possibilities, as he is Small in the Appearance of his present Attainments” (3.437). There are also passages such as those from “Babel” that introduce elements of seventeenth-century debates on language. Traherne suggests that the Old Testament Babel, and the resulting diversity of language itself, is a kind of *felix culpa* that provides the world endless variety and gives him the ability to praise God and mankind:
I all the World, and Heaven, for ought I know,
My self, yea and my GOD to Babel owe!
Or if that seem too deep: I plainly see,
I owe it Worlds of Sweet Varietie. (3.443.127-30)

Such optimism and positivity have been traditional emphases in Traherne studies; however, there is much here that will facilitate a more complete analysis of Traherne, such as his discussions of “Abuse,” “Adulterie,” “Bastard,” “Atheist,” “Avarice,” and “Antichrist.”

Ross’s project as a whole is an exciting prospect for Traherne scholars, but the publication of the Commentaries alone is a monumental achievement and one that will be of tremendous significance. Arguably, that so much of his work has been inaccessible is a major reason for the relative neglect of Traherne as a seventeenth-century writer and thinker. Certainly, his work aesthetically is uneven—sometimes even bad—but here in the Commentaries, as in Traherne’s corpus as a whole, there are moments of insightful philosophy, sophisticated theology, and spectacular beauty. Now, we are all finally getting a complete access to that corpus, and for that Jan Ross and Boydell & Brewer deserve our appreciation.


In Exile and Journey in Seventeenth-Century Literature, Christopher D’Addario encourages readers to reconsider how “the ruptures of exile” (3) after the regicide and Restoration affected literary production and reception in London. Specifically, he examines how exiled writers refashioned their literary identities after the collapse of the licensing act and the burgeoning of the London print market from which they were putatively excluded. Focusing on early colonial exiles Anne Bradstreet and Nathaniel Ward, continental exile John Hobbes, and interior exiles John Milton and John Dryden, D’Addario meticulously reconstructs the lived experience of their geographical and psychological displacement as they anxiously tried to maintain a literary voice within a London print market increasingly catering to
the “wide-ranging sympathies of a growing London readership” (13). D’Addario’s fresh account of the effect of exile on literary production is both historically trenchant and literarily nuanced. The study revises previous assumptions about literary exile during the last half of the seventeenth century by arguing that these writers consciously addressed a broader, more ideologically varied audience than their homogeneous community of fellow exiles.

In D’Addario’s account, these exiles consciously wrote “with an understanding of the diverse and geographically of ideologically distant print market into which their text would be disseminated” (12). D’Addario adapts Edward Said’s post-colonial concept of exile to assert that the nostalgic turn to the past that characterizes so much of exilic writing was a response to the memory of their lost world, but importantly, it also served a “polemical or public purpose” (11) to reconfigure the exile as central to their homeland’s current condition—“the saving remnant of an English nation hopelessly led astray” (11). As a result, their works simultaneously insisted on their remoteness as exilic texts and on their authority as representations of authentic Englishness. D’Addario’s study contributes most significantly to current scholarship on seventeenth-century English literature with its focus on the influence of exilic writing in the developing public sphere back home in London.

The first chapter on Bradstreet and Ward is noteworthy as an example of how the study of transatlantic texts continues to ask scholars of early modern English literature to reconsider those critical assumptions that tend to limit their scope only to British texts. D’Addario argues that as colonial exiles in the 1640s, both Ward and Bradstreet wrote during a “fruitful time for transatlantic production and consumption of books” (25), insisting that it is impossible to overstate the “connectedness” (27) of colonial readers and writers to the London print market. Ward’s The Simple Cobler of Agawam (1647) and Bradstreet’s collection of poems, The Tenth Muse Lately (1650) share what D’Addario describes as a “bewitching blend” (31) of material connectedness to London and a comprehension of their “new environment and political autonomy” (31) in colonial America. D’Addario carefully explores the debate over the extent to which the early American settlers felt the trauma of dislocation from their
homeland. He concludes that the nostalgia evident in these colonial texts reflects the authors’ attempts to authorize their literary voices in the past ideals of an “idyllic, lost golden age” (42) that embodies the “genealogy of ideal Englishness” (42). For D’Addario, this rhetorical position aligns these writers with Marian exiles such as John Foxe or John Bale, who rewrote church history in order to “resituate their marginal community as the English way” (34).

D’Addario’s account of John Hobbes’s exile is equally as engaging. Using Hobbes’s own description of his writing as “double edge[d]” (57) as a metaphor for the ambivalent affect inherent in exilic writing, D’Addario traces the complete dislocation of royalist material, religious, and social structures that before the regicide had given order to their lives, and he highlights the “extremely polemical and volatile” (58) London print market that usurped meaning and intention from Hobbes’s work, “leaving it vulnerable to, and perhaps encouraging, antagonistic, inquisitive or subversive readings” (58). Dislocated from the royalist community that might provide context for his political theories, Hobbes’s work was left open to interpretations not having to do with exile, defeat, or political defiance. D’Addario argues that the defining characteristic of Hobbes’s *Leviathan* (1650) is its insistence that political authority is exercised through semantic control. The chapter emphasizes the exile’s anxiety about publishing from the margins of the English print market and being removed from the proliferation of reading practices that generate unintended meanings and consequences. According to D’Addario, Hobbes maintains, indeed actively constructs, his reactionary philosophy from, and because of, an exile that produced the desire for a “community of readers who all maintained the same interpretive practices [that] went hand-in-hand with the construction of a well-ordered political state” (86).

The centerpiece of D’Addario’s impressive study is its chapter on John Milton as an interior exile in London during the Restoration. D’Addario points out in the book’s introduction that the term “interior exile” is contested and fraught with ideological implications. In his justification for using the term in his portrayals of Milton and Dryden, the author recognizes the risk of invoking the term to describe poets whose exile might well be described as “voluntary and rather comfortable” (18), turning the historically specific description of a traumatic
condition in response to real power into a romanticized, metaphoric posture of the alienated intellectual. D’Addario’s study of Milton escapes this particularly pointed criticism through its meticulous account of his complete and immediate loss of the world that he had known, and more importantly for Milton’s literary aspirations, “a distancing from the accepted modes of discourse” (20) as he tried to find his way into the London print market after the Restoration.

The effects of Milton’s interior exile produced the desire to “resituate himself within the print world of London while attempting to comprehend the defeat of the revolutionary cause and his sequestration” (88). D’Addario looks at *Paradise Lost* (1667) and *The Readie and Easie Way* (1660) as responses to exile that counteract the “specific exigencies of political and religious displacement and his marginalization as a writer through the formulation of new modes of speaking as well as transformations of old” (88). Far from a retreat from the public sphere caused by the republican defeat, the shattering loss reinvigorated Milton’s critical eye, inspiring him to transform from a proponent of reasoned political discourse into a poet of jeremiad. For D’Addario, *The Readie and Easie Way* nostalgically and idiosyncratically represents reasoned rhetoric, “while the text exhorts and cajoles a wayward nation” (101). *Paradise Lost*, however, articulates a more complex relationship with Milton’s interior exile.

D’Addario focuses on the “linguistic obtuseness” of Milton’s epic and concludes that these moments of opacity—poetics of negation and option as well as complex syntactical and etymological structures—“impress upon the reader that the English language is under constant strain” (123). Like Hobbes’s concern about the instability of language, Milton’s worry over semantic uncertainty, according to the author, should be understood in relation to his experience as an interior exile. Milton, however, negotiated his way beyond this anxiety and produced in his epic a “new relationship with its wide and diverse readership” (123). Having lost his authoritative position after the Restoration as political and social critic, Milton reestablishes this authority with his epic’s representation of Adam and Eve’s exile from Eden and the “shifting and fallen semantics” (123) that accompany it. In D’Addario’s argument, *Paradise Lost* is a sustained, fictive world characterized by self-conscious “aporia” (121). The “fissures and
inconsistencies” (116) in the poem hint “toward epic sublimity and comprehensiveness” (116) that try to counteract the conditional yet indelible loss of exile.

The final chapter on Dryden is the book’s least persuasive account of the influence of internal exile on the late seventeenth-century political and literary critic. D’Addario admits that readers might “balk” (21) at the inclusion of Dryden in a study of English writers in exile, and at times his attempts to justify this inclusion based on Dryden’s self-perception as marginalized and subject to ridicule and derision appear stretched—perhaps a too-generous reading of the term “exile” in contrast to its more powerful applications to Hobbes, Milton, Bradstreet and Ward. This criticism, however, is not to say that D’Addario’s study of Dryden is not rich in historical and cultural context. The chapter examines the role that translations of classic authors such as Virgil played in refining what many in England thought was the new barbaric English language. These translations embodied a renewed nationalism, and for Dryden, his translation of Virgil’s epic, especially the *Dedication* (1697), underscores the realization that a translation entails the loss of the purity and intent of the original. Yet as Virgil’s English translator, Dryden acquires the authority, along with a public forum, to restore the classic poet’s original intent and to refashion himself as the ultimate arbiter of meaning.

D’Addario’s study of literary exile—both interior and external—thoughtfully addresses the way that the traumatic loss associated with geographical and psychological displacement generated inventive and at times powerfully antagonistic literary voices in seventeenth-century British literature. *Exile and Journey in Seventeenth-Century Literature* demonstrates that exile often intensified the voices of political and social resistance and that these exilic voices were often reactionary in their nostalgic reconstructions of an ideal English homeland that had lost its way after the regicide and Restoration. In addition to highlighting this nationalistic impulse, D’Addario’s study convincingly reveals how these exiled writers still actively participated in, indeed even helped shape, a London print market and its increasingly heterogeneous readership from afar.

Postmodern definitions of English Renaissance subjectivity seem to take as their watchword Iago’s infamous remark, “I am not what I am.” Jonathan Dollimore, Stephen Greenblatt and others have urged that literary portrayals of early modern personality renders the self as decentered, fragmented, or otherwise so fluidly conceived as to negate any possibility of ascertaining a fixed or continuing identity. Terry Sherwood takes issue with this view in his new essay, a decidedly historical approach which views the cultural context for Renaissance identity as grounded in the concept of vocation or calling. He traces this basis for identity through Spenser, Shakespeare, Donne, Jonson, and Milton.

Pagan and Christian authorities (Cicero and Erasmus) sanctioned a vision of a volitional self able to choose how to be of best use to God and man, a vision markedly different from presentist images of the self as a fluctuating ground of contending ideological forces. Sherwood notes the assumption of such an intentional identity in the works of Sir Philip Sidney, the political commentaries of Thomas Smith and Robert Crowley, and the Calvinist William Perkins. As early as Tyndale’s *The Obedience of a Christian Man* (1528), obedience to authority, a key element in the crafting of identity, posed thorny questions of allegiance and behavior, questions generating dramatic complexity for figures such as Shakespeare’s King Lear, who becomes tragic “because he no longer accepts his vocational responsibility to his own kingdom although his subjects continue to do so” (40). Lear suffers because of his unwise rejection of a “sense of duty to the common good,” a sense expounded by contemporary authors and contrary to the modern belief that “a centrifugal, radical decentering is a necessary condition of the early modern self” (49).

As an extended discussion of how to “fashion a gentleman or noble person,” Spenser’s *The Faerie Queene* explores the varieties of good and bad service to God and queen, depicting a panoply of selves whose moral distinctions collectively posit an ideal “person.” The epic assumes “that a full person includes a physical presence identified by
expressed intentions, or alternatively, intents or intendments” (62). Sherwood identifies Britomart as the poet’s “most engaging hero” (64), not least because she also confirms that a dedicated self is not an exclusively male prerogative. The epic’s frequent examples of moral and immoral behavior reflect the emphasis upon virtuous discipline found in such contemporary works as Thomas Elyot’s Boke Named the Governor (1531); Spenser clearly expresses “the intermingled assumptions of humanist civic responsibility and Protestant vocation” (94).

Here, as elsewhere, Sherwood is especially effective at reconstructing through primary texts the context of Elizabethan thinking which informed the English “person.” Whereas Spenser explored the varieties of good and bad vocations through a variety of allegorical figures, Shakespeare’s Henriad compresses multiple possible selves into Hal’s process of maturation to kingship. While new historicist critics see him as a self-consciously maneuvering and Machiavellian prince, Sherwood finds Hal navigating the principle of multiple calls to vocation outlined by Luther and William Perkins and thus the interlinked selves of the monarch: prince, son, royal “actor” or personage, moral agent. One wishes Sherwood had dwelled longer on the implications of Hal’s act one “reformation” speech, which displays such a canny sense of purpose that his sense of self seems to need no further elaboration; nevertheless, his various identities, Sherwood tartly notes, render Hal “complex, not incoherent.” (125). The tavern scene coalesces many of these contending roles as the prince confronts Falstaff in a necessary testing which helps him establish his “fitness” for office.

Much more than for Prince Hal, John Donne’s vocational path was a painful and “Jobian” experience of reversal and privation. Sherwood dwells on the emotional strains of Donne’s personal and professional life prior to ordination, and the result is a portrayal of one who struggled to meet his own needs before he could fulfill the model of service outlined in earlier chapters. Donne’s radical neediness makes this chapter more problematic as we confront the poet’s “psychology of loss, separation, and depression” (152). Sherwood plausibly responds to allegations of Donne’s misogyny by stressing the androgynous nature of his poetic speakers and his intimately complex link to the divine/human feminine self which is the subject
of the *Anniversary* poems. Less obvious is how this deep responsiveness to the feminine (contributing to a marriage which sabotaged his political opportunities), coupled with an epistolary self which sought “sociability, friendship, and amorousness” (169), defined, rather than motivated, his final religious calling. Sherwood’s close analysis of Donne’s varied “intersubjectivity” (168) details an emotional fragmentation which ironically suggests the decentered identity he is otherwise arguing against. However, we are on surer ground after Donne’s entrance to holy orders, for which his successful model was a Pauline sense of vocation.

Turning to Ben Jonson, Sherwood traces the poet’s consistent devotion to truth as an apprehendable reality through the *Forest, Epicoene, Sejanus, Poetaster*, and in his friendships with like-minded advocates of humanist learning such as John Selden, William Camden, and Robert Cotton. Borrowing Thomas Greene’s emphasis on the important “centering” images in Jonson’s drama, Sherwood sees Jonson as both centered on a core of truth-values yet always seeking a greater “roundness” in an expanding circle of acquaintances. These friendships with persons of influence were essential to his career growth and have led to accusations of social climbing which are not without some truth of their own. Yet Sherwood emphasizes that Jonson was more selective in his closest relationships to power than has been recognized, favoring those with high ideals and public-mindedness such as William Herbert, Earl of Pembroke and Lucy, Countess of Bedford. His defense of Jonson as a champion of familiar humanist ideals covers predictable ground, but Sherwood carefully rebuts the negative image of the poet as simply a status-seeker by teasing out the core values he praised in others and—in the case of his competitor Shakespeare—envied himself.

Unlike Shakespeare, Milton invested himself in every aspect of his canon, so that we are ever aware of an authorial presence whether direct or implied. His “centered Protestant self engaged in a holy war” (258) is most visible in his combative *A Second Defence* and *A Defence of Himself against Alexander More*. Less overt are his defensive strategies in *Lycidas*, while *Paradise Regained* and *Samson Agonistes* “embody Milton’s maturest interpretation of the defensive pattern that framed his own vocational experience” (294). Samson and Christ become
complex reflections of the poet’s own embattled self during the wars of truth. Sherwood’s postscript argues that Francis Bacon’s public service reflects his family’s sense of vocation, especially the formative influence of his mother Anne. However, Bacon’s infamous trial for graft is noticed only in passing and its implications for the book’s thesis deserve fuller comment.

Sherwood’s argument, both broad and deep, surveys an important theme in the careers of six notable Elizabethans. It deserves a place alongside its new historicist contenders as a rejoinder to be reckoned with.


James Joyce, obviously familiar with the scope and tenor of Phineas Fletcher’s The Purple Island, included but later struck an extended allusion to it in the manuscript version of Ulysses. Overall the poem has not fared well among its modern critics. For example in his anthology of Later Renaissance Nondramatic Verse and Prose, Herschel Baker, perhaps as a benevolent gesture, included twenty-two stanzas of “the notorious Purple Island,” but with the caveat that Fletcher “exhaustively and implausibly expounds human physiology with a blend of Spenserian pastoralism and relentless allegory.” Frank S. Kastor’s conclusion that it is “an unmistakable disaster” gives some indication of why it long has been considered a post-Spenserian curiosity worth knowing about but perhaps not worth reading.

It was just such universal opprobrium that made me eager to read it as a graduate student spurred on, no doubt, by what Poe called “the imp of the perverse.” With only a gut-feeling to go on, I was convinced there had to be more to the poem than I was seeing but simply had not yet acquired the critical acumen to find it. At last though, Fletcher has been vindicated in full by Peter Mitchell, who has published the best critical account of the poem to date. Indeed, he has written what may well be the last book ever needed on The Purple Island.
While this is said with admiration for Mitchell’s laudable achievement, it is equally true this study is a tour de force of scholarly indulgence—a trait shared with Fletcher’s poem. The critical apparatus alone attests to the unbound quest for thoroughness, with its 25-page bibliography, 61-page index, and 146 pages of notes. This book goes well beyond what seventeenth-century scholars have come to expect from a monograph, especially given its fulsome repetition and extensive summing up of each stage of the argument before moving on to the next point: “This chapter began by stating that the question of the purpose and the intentional and reflective directions of The Purple Island, that emerge from an analysis of the work’s design, may be inquired into by situating the work in the contexts of the readers’ expectations and reception” (173). By the same token, when Mitchell takes issue with a critic, typically he states the argument in exacting detail and then outlines his objections before taking each in turn: “The problem with Healy’s argument, however, is fourfold. Firstly…” (264).

In his conscientious attention to the subtleties of scholarly debates Mitchell implicitly self-selected his intended audience, consisting exclusively of advanced graduate students and dedicated seventeenth-century scholars. He has written a book that makes a leisurely, albeit rigorous, case: “The conceptual metaphors of anatomy and the analogies of the microcosm coalesce in the allegorical threshold figure and the figurative design of The Purple Island, providing what is not only a coherent understanding of anatomy, but also a consistent, figuratively complex image, emblem, or speaking picture of anatomy, which explores the shared entailments and significant metaphorical connotations of islands, bodies, and buildings to an extent that is unprecedented in anatomy textbooks in its systematicity, coherence, and persistence” (472).

How, one might well ask, can a book on Fletcher’s Purple Island be sustained for 478 pages of involved argumentation? That Mitchell does so is much to his credit; as is the fact that, notwithstanding the incredible size of this volume, only two minor typographical errors escaped detection—one involving the doubling of a comma (189) and the other the doubling of an apostrophe (441). This study shows Mitchell to be a meticulous and responsible scholar, as well as a subtle
reader not only of seventeenth-century poetry and prose, but also of the main early modern anatomical texts and their illustrations (most notably Vasalius, Estienne, Corti, Harvey, and Paré). He is equally adroit when teasing out cruces debated by historians of science and medicine (Pagel and Nicholson), scholars concerned with the nature of metaphorical language (Lakoff and Johnson), literary critics (Quilligan and Belsey), as well as early modernists focusing on notions of the body (Laqueur and Sawday) and of gender (Traub and Butler).

Without losing sight of the fact that The Purple Island is his ultimate point of focus, Mitchell presents some conclusions that have far reaching ramifications for early modern studies in general and anatomical figuration in particular. For example, early on he observes that the poem “does not merely draw figurative ideas from anatomy and the tradition of microcosmic speculation, but allegorically transforms them into the geographical and social features of the Isle of Man” (87). This allows him later to make claims for the poem regarding “how the body as microchristus and as a microcosm of the terrestrial globe or geocosm contributes to a system of antecedently existing associated commonplaces on the threshold figure” (117). By uncovering the providential plan which Thirsil (the poet-shepherd speaking from within the text) narrates, Mitchell makes a compelling and convincing case that the characteristic feature of the innovation of the Isle of Man figure “is the way in which the ingenuity and effort it expends in trying to shore up and preserve correspondences and analogies, and the entrenchment of its reaction to ‘what e’re is in the continent’ [P.I. 1.53.3], especially Roman Catholicism, help to concretize and give succinct yet infinitely expandable expression to the quasi-Paracelsian and alchemical notion of natural philosophy as individual revelation, and to the emergent ideologies of English (or British) Protestant individualism and nationalism, which ironically introduced a language which would in the history of the discourse of science, religion, and nationhood help to bring about a collapse of what the implied author of The Purple Island endeavored to preserve” (441). In the whole of Fletcher’s poem then, Mitchell argues, “the analogy between Man and an island becomes a metaphor in which the correspondence is extended to provide a justifying context for recent anatomical discoveries” (473).
By way of linking the poem suggestively to the *vanitas* tradition (125-30), showing the extent to which the margin notes are more discursively expansive than the concise clarifying, nomenclatural, or indexical marginalia typical of the day (246), and indicting how *The Purple Island* figurality relates to Harveian anatomy especially as regards the systematic circulation of blood (351), Mitchell clarifies how the poem “develops a highly sophisticated soteriological epistemology and hermeneutics of the ‘scientific’ and poetic concepts of ingenuity and eloquence, which Fletcher’s religious prose shows us is modeled on the operation of the Holy Spirit in *eclesia*, which is in turn modeled on the operation of the soul through the heart and brain in the human body” (478).

As the subtitle indicates, this is a book about anatomy in early modern literature, philosophy, and theology. It succeeds in delivering what is promised by situating *The Purple Island* in its social, political, scientific, and historical contexts. Mitchell is to be commended for showing contemporary readers how the whole of creation, as it was reckoned in seventeenth-century England, came to be subsumed in Fletcher’s Isle of Man.


The key words “Trauma” and “Political” take on special significance in the title of this collection of eight essays, emerging as they did (all but one) from the Bunyan Triennial Conference held hard on the heels of 9/11/01. Vera J. Camden says in her introduction that the “national trauma” and “cultural cataclysm” following that day were “adumbrated” in Bunyan’s England:

Because of this conjunction between his time and ours, our scholarly discourse about religious pluralism and intolerance, rebellion against authority and the temptation to tyranny, the psychological impact of military and domestic service, the gendering of dissent and the dissent from gen-
dered imperatives, and the impact of cultural change on the experience of national subjects—to name just a few of the topics treated in this volume—took on an immediacy that could not have been premeditated but that now appears to have been—to follow Bunyan—“foreordained” (4).

The claim of causal foreordination aside, this is a pretty accurate summary of the book’s main themes.

Several of the essays in this revisionist collection launch highly provocative claims: “T. S. Eliot’s theory of the ‘dissociation of sensibility’... can safely be deemed to have been the single most seminal contribution to English literary history of the twentieth century” (14); “Bunyan experienced the loss of his mother and sister, as well as the rejection of his father, by remarriage, as oedipal longings, as well as oedipal rage at the father during this period of his late adolescence and early manhood” (58); “It seems (all of a sudden) that, from the opening reference to Bunyan taking his pen in hand to the final pulling on the distaff, the ‘Apology’ to The Pilgrim’s Progress might well harbor more puns on sexual generation and male sexual parts than we might either have expected or be able to comfortably accept” (104). The first of these assertions is seriously compromised by David Norbrook’s rebuttal, courageously printed in the volume; the second takes some hard knocks as the methods of Freudian psychology repeatedly jostle against those of the New Historicism; the third achieves a glorious vindication through a skillful reading of Bunyan’s dirty jokes and his theology. But this is just a sampling of the richly debatable material set forth for the reader of Trauma and Transformation.

To my mind, the biggest issue raised but not resolved in these pages is whether and how psychoanalytic criticism can be squared with historicist approaches. The three essays quoted above deal with the question head-on, and several others address it tangentially. In her introduction Camden lays out an almost orthodox New Historicist agenda: “The essays here collected thus make up the question of Bunyan’s ‘political progress’ from the many different perspectives engaged by such public and private interaction; they each recognize that the political culture of seventeenth-century England is reflected in and reflective of the religious, social, cultural, and psychological lives of its subjects” (3-4). Only the term “psychological” feels out of
place in this methodological outline, but it is placed front-and-center in Camden’s “frankly speculative” (43) account of Bunyan’s “devotedly chronicled psychomachia” (6) and Rudnytsky’s argument that “as the moment at which patriarchal culture literally acted out the killing of the primal father in the person of the king, the execution of Charles I is not only a collective trauma, but one to which a traditional Freudian perspective is singularly well suited” (16). However suggestive the psychoanalyst’s paradigms may be for the interpretation of literature, the fully-articulated political debates of the mid-seventeenth century are likely to provide a stronger foundation for placing Bunyan historically than guesswork about the collective mind of the age or the repressed mind of the author (37).

Several essays come at Bunyan’s sexuality and his representations of sexuality from non-Freudian angles. Thomas H. Luxon finds that Bunyan embraces neither the humanist’s Greco-Roman ideals of male-male friendship nor the Christian enthusiasm for sexual expression within marriage. In works such as his handbook for domestic governance, Christian Behaviour (1663), Bunyan rejects both the complete equality implicit in the classical model of loving and the sexual companionship of unequals commonly promulgated by Puritan divines. Eschewing Milton’s accommodation of the softer, humanist tradition, Bunyan lapses into a misogynist view of anyone who requires a female helpmeet as a “meer Natural Man” (95).

Margaret J.M. Ezell shares Luxon’s view but prefers to root her position not in what he calls an “intensely dogmatic allegorical hermeneutics” (Luxon 98), but in Bunyan’s traumatic encounters with two actual women. One was Margaret Pryor, defended by Bunyan in a now-lost pamphlet against accusations by certain Quakers that she was a witch who took on the form of a horse. The other was Agnes Beaumont, who described a horseback ride behind Mr. Bunyan in highly erotic terms. It was these encounters and the “complex social dynamics” he had to negotiate as a spiritual leader, and not some abstract formulation of female sexuality, that, according to Ezell, rendered him incapable ever of “carry[ing] it pleasant towards a Woman” (Grace Abounding). I must admit some disappointment that the elegant chiasmus of Ezell’s title, “Bunyan’s Women, Women’s Bunyan,” didn’t lead to a discussion of the multitudes of women readers who helped
to keep Bunyan’s books at the top of the Protestant best-seller list for centuries. The real appeal to this segment of his audience was probably not the bawdy wordplay that, according to Michael Davies, reveals a powerful “tension between temptation and resistance” in Bunyan’s sexual demeanor (117).

The most explicitly “political” essays in the collection are those by Roger Pooley on Bunyan’s antinominanism and by Sharon Achinstein on the changed political climate under James II that allowed Bunyan to slip from the world without a martyr’s send-off. Vera Camden, however, makes a strong case for considering all aspects of seventeenth-century theological controversy in a political light. Her collection does an admirable job of shining that light on one of the period’s seminal writers and one who is too often underrated in an age that has largely forgotten how to read the complex base-texts of the Christian faith.


In this handsomely produced, nicely illustrated, and well-written volume in the Bucknell Studies in Eighteenth-Century Literature and Culture series, edited by Greg Clingham, Peter Walmsley aims to give us “a book about the writing of science in late seventeenth-century England, a reconstruction of Locke’s rhetorical context so that we may more ably read the Essay as it is embedded in its social and intellectual moment”(17). Important here is Locke’s aim for an “HISTORICAL, PLAIN Method”; his contention, as he put it in his “Epistle to the Reader,” that he will “be employed as an Under-Labourer in clearing Ground a little, and removing some of the Rubbish, that lies in the way to Knowledge”(17). Readers of this journal will know Walmsley for, amongst other things, his ground-breaking study on *The Rhetoric of Berkeley’s Philosophy* (1990). In the book under review here, Walmsley’s six chapters—1. Writing a Natural History of Mind; 2. Embryology and the Progress of the Understanding; 3. Experimental Essays; 4. Wit and Hypothesis; 5. Dispute and Conversation; and 6. Civil and
Philosophic Discourse—flesh out Locke’s relationships with leading seventeenth-century men of science, such as Robert Boyle, Thomas Sydenham, Christiaan Huygens, Isaac Newton, Jan Swammerdam, Antoni van Leeuwenhoek and others, many of whom were members of the Royal Society in London. In his argument Walmsley also makes use of what is known about the contents of Locke’s bookshelves and what Locke is known to have read, thereby effectively tapping into book history to reconstruct Locke’s thought. He also employs the scientific references in Locke’s manuscripts in the Lovelace Collection held in the Bodleian Library, and more occasionally looks to the reception of Locke’s thought as a key to understanding it better, and with illuminating results such as Thomas Burnet’s 1697 criticisms of Locke’s *Essay*. However, Walmsley is concerned to point out that his book “is not meant [...] to serve as a comprehensive scientific biography of Locke, but as a literary analysis of Locke’s *Essay* as a text deeply engaged with the rhetoric and practices of late seventeenth-century science” (23).

For Walmsley, “in turning to epistemology Locke was not abandoning but extending his early scientific work” for “scientific language and scientific method have a central role in Locke’s radical reimagining of human understanding in the *Essay*” (23). With a solid grounding in the relevant historiographies—and defending Locke from those, such as Paul de Man, who accuse him of being “a naive language theorist”—Walmsley builds on the work of John Yolton, M.A. Stewart, Barbara Shapiro, and others, who have attentively sketched the place of natural history in Locke’s life and writings. Walmsley’s emphasis is on rhetoric, however, giving us an account that is at “the intersection of literary analysis, philosophy, and the history of science” (31). Thankfully, that enterprise is pulled off in wonderfully clear prose and without the jargon which so often clutters the dense pages of so much modern literary analysis.

Some of the contents of this book have appeared in print in earlier versions, including the two key chapters (“Dispute and Conversation” and “Civil and Philosophic Discourse”) which are based on essays that were published, respectively, in the *Journal of the History of Ideas* and *Eighteenth-Century Studies*. However, those chapters have been revised for the present book and they have been well integrated with the new
material; rather than having an episodic story, we have a complete one in which previously unpublished material sets the stage for what follows. In “Experimental Essays,” Walmsley argues that “Locke is attracted to experiment as a corrective to theory, as a way of curbing the mind’s impulses toward the abstract and the fantastic with the discipline of the particular experience” (81). The essay form, then, is a meaningful choice. “Locke’s way of ideas is a distinctly modern technology for ordering reflective knowledge and constituting new mental phenomena” (94-95). Chapter 4, “Wit and Hypothesis,” argues “that metaphor and analogy play a crucial, indeed an explicit role in Locke’s probabilistic inquiry; analogy is the best help we have in coming to a comprehension of the elusive objects and processes of mind” (117). And even “more than this, wit’s insistent disruption of established categories is critical to Locke’s project of seeing mental life directly, free of the filters of custom and intellectual tradition” (117). “Locke’s central task,” Walmsley concludes, “is to write the natural history of mind in itself, but he does so with ample reference to a methodologically similar, but more comprehensive study of humanity in all its complex relations” (150).

The book is tastefully illustrated with 15 black and white prints, contains a useful bibliography, and closes with a brief “Chronology: Locke and Science” that puts Locke’s life and writings within a timeline of important scientific events from the publication of Ulisse Aldrovandi’s Ornithologiae in 1600 to 1704, the year of Locke’s death and the publication of Newton’s Opticks. While the index is short (listing only proper names and a few important terms), there are twenty-two pages of endnotes which document Walmsley’s story but are also sprinkled with intriguing bibliographical leads and entertaining comments. Finally, in positioning Locke as a bridge between Restoration science and Enlightenment thought, this book has interesting hints about the nature of the history of ideas in the early modern period. In his commitments to practical learning, the careful weighing of evidence, the drawing of tentative conclusions, and polite conversation, Locke clearly provides a direct link between Francis Bacon and Enlightenment tendencies. In his “Conclusion,” Walmsley captures the essence of Locke as the father of the Enlightenment when he briefly considers Locke’s impact on David Hume’s conception of
things. As Hume put it in *A Treatise of Human Nature* (1739-40), in a passage which substantiates Walmsley’s reading of Locke: “As the science of man is the only solid foundation for the other sciences, so the only solid foundation we can give to this science itself must be laid on experience and observation. ‘Tis no astonishing reflection to consider, that the application of experimental philosophy to moral subjects should come after that to natural at the distance of above a whole century; since we find in fact, that there was about the same interval betwixt the origins of these sciences; and that reckoning from Thales to Socrates, the space of time is nearly equal to that betwixt my Lord Bacon and some late philosophers in *England*, who have begun to put the science of man on a new footing, and have engaged the attention, and excited the curiosity of the public” (147, in the book under review).


As with an earlier volume by the same editorial team (*The Jesuits: Cultures, Sciences and the Arts, 1540-1773*. Toronto: Toronto University Press, 1999), the present work derives from an academic conference (this time held at Boston College in 2002) dedicated to exploring the richness of the Jesuit intellectual and artistic enterprise. That first book probed the notion of a distinctive Jesuit corporate culture: whether it makes sense to talk, as Jesuits often have, of *modus noster procedendi*—‘our way of proceeding.’ This new volume carries that discussion forward and shores up the broad impression given by its predecessor: that Jesuit culture, while efficiently organised and interconnected, was far more diverse than previous generations of historians realised. In fields as disparate as music, science, art and architecture early modern Jesuits made significant contributions to their disciplines. While obscurantist Jesuits undoubtedly existed, they had their forward-thinking confreres, and the notion of an intellectually stagnant or universally reactionary
Jesuit order begins to look increasingly obsolete: a gross and largely inapplicable generalisation.

There are some thirty-eight contributions to this volume, with special emphasis placed on Jesuit involvement with music and theatre, the visual arts, and natural science. Two final sections confront issues raised by the Jesuits’ missionary endeavours across Asia and the Americas and by the events leading up to the worldwide suppression of the Society of Jesus in 1773. The standard of contributions is of a consistently high standard but, given the restraints of space, what follows is merely a digest of some of the volume’s highlights.

Jesuit schools have always commanded a great deal of scholarly attention, but the specifics of how they operated and, crucially, how they were funded have often been overlooked. Olwen Hufton sets future scholars on a rewarding track by providing an overview of such fundamental issues, reaching the conclusion that, once Jesuit schools had been established (which happened thick and fast during the sixteenth century), it proved extremely difficult to sustain an adequate level of financial support. Faced with an “illusory sufficiency” (18) and prey to the vicissitudes of local economies, Jesuits quickly learned the necessity of becoming efficient fundraisers. Alongside Hufton’s essay in this introductory “the Society in Society” section, Peter Burke analyses the contributions made by Jesuit translators to the refining of local vernacular languages, Elizabeth Rhodes explores the intriguing question of why so many women were attracted to Ignatian spirituality, Sabina Pavone provides an insightful discussion of that most influential of anti-Jesuit tracts, the Monita Secreta, and Peter Davidson reveals how Jesuits used their gardens not simply as a living laboratory for newly-discovered plants but also as a site of symbolic expression (a representation of harmony and order that they hoped to achieve within the Society.)

Jesuit artistic expression has also proven to be a rich seam of scholarly investigation in recent years. Here, Jeffrey Muller suggests that we look again, in a more rounded and interdisciplinary way, at the detailed records of Jesuit artistic endeavour in Antwerp—the Jesuits’ so-called ‘second city’—while Anna Knapp reassesses one of that city’s great artistic achievements: the altarpieces and ceiling paintings (many now destroyed) of Peter Paul Rubens. In tune with
much recent work in art history, she asks us to look beyond artistic intention and technique and pay more attention to what impact such images had on their multifarious viewers: what role did they play in devotion, and what image of the Society did they inspire? The central role of art in Jesuit devotional life is also stressed in Nuno Vassallo e Silva’s study of gold and silver artworks in the Society’s Portuguese churches, Alexander Gauvin Bailey’s account of how art was used and transformed by indigenous populations in Patagonian Chile, and Humberto Rodriguez-Camilloni’s chapter on the processions and festivals of coastal Peru. Perhaps most rewarding of all is Hiromitsu Kobayashi’s exploration of the woodcuts of early-eighteenth century Suzhou. Local artists exploited the techniques of earlier Jesuit painters at the Chinese court and fashioned artistic experiments of their own: a striking, hitherto understudied example of how the Jesuit presence in China fanned out into the wider culture.

In the realm of Jesuit science—an area, as the editors put it, once riddled with “the clichés of an older historiography, grounded in the metaphors of conflict between science and religion” (288)—William Wallace has long been offering striking re-evaluations. Here, he fills in some of the links between Jesuit natural science and Galileo’s free-fall experiments. Daniel Stolzenberg explores the Society’s process of reviewing, editing and censoring the works of Jesuit scientists, Antonella Romano takes us inside the mathematics classrooms of the Jesuits’ schools, Henrique Leitao delves into the complex, conflicted Jesuit attitude towards astrology, and Ugo Baldini revisits the career of that most renowned of Jesuit scientists, Roger Boscovich, touching specifically on his theory of an attraction-repulsion force that lay behind all physical phenomena.

Music and theatre come next. There are close examinations of early Jesuit musical manuscripts by David Crook, a study of music in the Jesuits’ German schools by Frank Korndlé, insights into the Jesuit musical culture of colonial Chile by Victor Rondon, and detailed discussions by Bruna Filippi and Giovanna Zanlonghi of the physical apparatus of Jesuit theatrical production. Jesuits, as some of these chapters intimate, often had an ambiguous attitude towards music and theatre: was involvement with such activities suitable for priests, and so forth? This important theme is explored in greater detail by
Michael Zampelli who explores the musings of two Jesuit authors who saw the stage as a source of moral corruption and a stumbling block on the road to salvation. This casts fresh light on a central, abiding tension—almost a fault-line—within the Society.

Finally, the book offers two informative sections on the Jesuits’ missionary enterprise (especially noteworthy here are Sabine MacCormack’s piece on the Society’s codification of the languages of the Andean peoples, and Catherine Pagani’s chapter on the use made by Jesuit missionaries in China of the technology of the clock) and on the events surrounding the Society’s eighteenth-century suppression (the best of an excellent bunch here are Marc Fumaroli on the national suppression in France—a process he suggests made the worldwide suppressions all but inevitable—and Dauril Alden’s careful analysis of the machinations behind the destruction of the Society’s Latin American Reductions).

This is an excellent, well-balanced and handsomely produced volume, of use to any scholar interested in the cultural, artistic and intellectual ferment of the early modern era. It has an audience far beyond aficionados of Jesuitica, but it also reminds us that the study of Jesuit history (by scholars both within and outside the order) is turning out to be one of the most rewarding avenues of cultural and historical scholarship.


This is a very detailed and interesting study of the Venetian theatrical year in its different genres in the sixteenth through eighteenth centuries: improvised comedy (Commedia del Arte), opera, opera buffa, scripted comedy, and musical performances. The main subject is presented in the context of ancillary subjects, where the details sometimes go beyond what is needed to support the main theme, but which are also interesting. About the first third of the book is devoted to the cultural relativity of marking time from place to place in pre-modern
Europe. The ancient world had a tendency to begin the calendar year in the spring, in March; although the ancient Hebrews preferred the fall. The revised calendar of Julius Caesar began the year in January, just after the winter solstice and the re-birth of the sun. However, despite the reform and reinvigoration of the Julian calendar by Pope Gregory XIII in 1582, the March convention continued. Much of Italy began the calendar year on March 25th (the Annunciation) into the eighteenth century. The Venetian calendar year began on March 1st.

The calendar year, however, was supplemented by the civil political year of the Senate and the Consiglio Maggiore, which met in the mornings in summer and in the afternoons in winter; the annual \textit{villeggiatura} of the Consiglio Maggiore began about St. Luke’s day in October and lasted until the beginning of Advent. The Church liturgical year began after St. Andrew’s day (November 30th) with its typical “seasons”: Advent, Christmas, Lent, Easter and Ascension, punctuated by saint’s days, some celebrated only “\textit{in chiesa}” and others publicly “\textit{in piazza}.” The accounting year began at the start of Lent; agricultural wages were paid after plowing in the spring and after harvesting in the fall. Daily hours of the academic school year were longer in summer than in winter. The wages of opera singers were paid at the beginning of Lent; theatrical contracts were negotiated in the spring. During the day, Venice observed the 24 “Italian hours” beginning the new day at sunset, which meant that it had to be advanced or delayed every two weeks to account for the changing setting of the sun—acceptance of Greenwich Mean Time did not begin to spread in England and later in Europe until the 1880s. There were large public clocks, but few private clocks, and hours were divided into fractions, minutes appearing only in the eighteenth century. Thus Venetian time was marked by a cacophony of bells of different institutions. (Did the bell ringers use hour glasses to know when to ring them?)

Although there were other earlier and continuing performance spaces, theatres began in the 1630s with the Teatro di San Cassiano (1637) and the Teatro di SS. Giovanni e Paolo (1639) where Monteverdi’s \textit{L’incoronazione di Poppea} was presented in 1642. Selfridge-Field provides details about more than ten of these, ranging in seating capacity from 197 down to 107 boxes or less. They were mostly under the patronage of noble families; the Teatro La Fenice (1792) was
sponsored by an academy. A mean of six theatres a year were open concurrently in the 1680s, four and a half in the 1740s. When theatres could open was regulated by the Council of Ten: a fall season around St. Luke’s day in October to St. Martin’s day in November, a plethora of openings at St. Stephen’s day (January 26th), many theatrical performances during Carnival, and another short season at Ascension. There could be other brief “carnivals” on special occasions, as for the election of a new Doge. Musical presentations: oratorios and cantatas (sung by nuns in ospedali), motets and serenades, could be presented throughout the year. Carnival-time expanded from just a week before Shrove Tuesday in the sixteenth century to as much as two months beginning in early January, depending on the beginning of Lent, in the eighteenth century. Theatrical genres were somewhat seasonal, comedies being popular in the late fall, operas in the winter, and comedies again in the spring. Genres evolved. Improvised comedies were popular in the seventeenth century, but gave way increasingly to operas, especially with the classicizing influence of the Roman Arcadia in the 1690s. Opera buffa was introduced by a Neapolitan company in the 1730s. The calendar of the Parisian theatrical season was similar to the Venetian one. Under French influence, improvised comedies gave way to scripted comedies in the eighteenth century, particularly through the satirical comedies of Carlo Goldoni, who was very influential from the 1730s until his departure to Paris in 1762, and through the fairy tale comedies of Carlo Gozzi.

The content of productions is viewed through a lengthy separate assessment of gazettes and avvisi (that takes up a tenth of the book), but content does not seem to have varied much predictably by season. There was a liking for subjects that memorialized the successes of the Venetian Republic, but the author confesses “Subjects were chosen at the discretion of the librettist, impresario, or theatre owner” (356). There does not seem to have been much censorship by the Council of Ten, although more attention might be given in this work to attempts at clerical censorship. For instance, Monteverdi’s L’incoronazione di Poppea has a definitely pornographic content, something that might have been more difficult to present under the influence of the Jesuits, who the Republic reluctantly allowed into Venice in the 1660s.
With the end of the Republic in 1797, and the final establishment of Austrian rule in 1814, things changed. Already in the eighteenth century Venetian time was becoming more similar to time elsewhere in Europe. Observation of the transit of Venus in 1761 cast doubt on the validity of “Italian hours.” From the 1760s Venice began to observe the beginning of the year according to the Julian/Gregorian calendar on January 1st. Also, the theatrical season lengthened. Carnival began to extend into Lent (Giuseppe Verdi’s *Ernani* was first presented on 9 March 1844 at La Fenice, and his *Simon Boccanegra* was first presented there on 12 March 1857); Ascension-time lengthened too. The author concludes: “In contrast to the measurement of time, which became progressively more precise, theatrical time remained necessarily vague” (357). This book will be of interest to anyone interested in Venetian theatre. And we still today have an opera season that extends from the mid-fall into the mid-spring.


This book, formed as a collection of essays that seek to clarify the architectural relationship between the Southern and Northern Low Countries, is the fifth volume in the *Architectura Moderna* series. The series was established in 2000 to create a dialogue on the issue of antiquity versus modernism in early Netherlandish architecture, and the theme of this book, coined “unity and discontinuity” by the scholar Charles van den Heuvel, refers to the major goal of the text, which is to convince the reader that while architectural differences can be found between Belgian and Dutch architecture, these differences have been exaggerated over time. Thus, historians have failed to examine such things as the similarities in architectural practices between the north and the south as well as the major patrons and architects who worked in both regions. Krista De Jonge, from the Catholic University of Leuven, and Konrad Ottenheym, from the
University of Utrecht, who wrote a majority of these chapters, include essays by Joris Snaet, Gabri van Tussenbroek, and Thomas DeCosta Kaufmann. All contend that architectural relations between south and north after the political divide of the early 1500s are far more complex than traditionally thought, where a “classical versus Baroque” contrast is usually ascribed to Protestant versus Catholic differences as well as to different government types, foreign versus national influences, and different patrons and architects.

These traditional differences were first laid out by Martin Wackernagel in his 1915 book *Baukunst des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts in den germanischen Ländern*, which follows the lead first established in painting with two texts written by Conrad Busken Huet—*Het land van Rubens* (1879), and *Het land van Rembrandt* (1882). Such studies, written at a time when Belgian and Netherlandish differences were cultivated as part of the widespread nationalist sentiment found across Europe, have now begun to be re-evaluated in the areas of economic and social history as well as in painting. This present text, then, seeks to analyze what exchange of ideas continued between the architects of these two regions, especially after the establishment of the Southern Union of Atrecht and the Northern Union of Utrecht in 1579, when architectural differences seem to appear more pronounced. The authors cite several instances where this “Baroque Catholic” versus “Classical Protestant” division does not work, even outside of the Low Countries, such as in the Escorial in Spain and Perrault’s west façade of the Louvre, where the rejection of Bernini’s proposal in 1665 “shows the strong differences of opinion as to the correct form of architecture, even among Catholics.” (8). It is worth mentioning here, however, that in Chantelou we read that the major criticisms of Bernini’s work were ultimately not based entirely on style or invention, but on its lack of convenience, while the ultimate selection of Perrault can also be seen to resolve the many personal conflicts that afflicted Bernini in his professional relationships in Paris. Nonetheless, these examples suggest that this overly simplistic traditional discussion of stylistic divisions certainly merits re-evaluation, even outside the Low Countries.

Following this introduction, the essays are organized under the general theme of ancient versus modern architecture, and accordingly,
the text begins with an assessment of the early influence of Italy on architecture in the Low Countries. Pieter Coecke van Aelst’s 1539 publication of Serlio’s treatise and a Vitruvian manual of the column orders signaled a new interest in ancient architecture among the noble classes and a more strict interpretation of the ancient architectural vocabulary. The authors argue that the classically-styled Renaissance architecture that predated this 1539 publication was then rejected as incorrect in its interpretation of the antique, and thus came to be called “modern.” Subsequently neglected in scholarship, these early examples of sixteenth-century architecture present an appealing blend of classical and regional architecture that merits further study. In addition, some of the architectural elements native to the Low Countries, such as the stepped gables, were then introduced across Europe. For example, Flemish architectural innovations can be found in the brick and stone masonry, steep slated roofs, and tall windows of Philip II’s Pardo Hunting Lodge outside Madrid and in his commission for the Alcázar in Madrid. The discussion of slate and other new materials being introduced into Spain is a particularly interesting example of cross-cultural influences that merits further study. A later chapter in this text, however, does focus on an interesting comparison of the building industries of the Northern and Southern Low Countries. Integrated into the discussion of classicism is a focus on court architecture and the network of court patronage that facilitated the flow of architectural style across Europe, and special attention is given to the court architect Jacques Du Broeucq and his military architecture.

The second part of the book then presents a discussion of architectural theory during the next generation, from 1560-1640. With the introduction of Serlio and Vitruvius into the Low Countries, it would appear that architecture began to develop along more rigorously classicizing lines, and indeed this is true, but the authors here demonstrate how Coecke’s illustrations tended to favor the more inventive aspects of Vitruvian style, such as the cartouches and more elaborate strapwork that are conducive to the more varied architectural styles of the Low Countries. The new façade of the Antwerp Town Hall, from 1561, heralds these developments, where the Serlian columns are topped by richly carved scrolls in the gable. Hans Vredeman de Vries, Charles De Beste, Simon Stevin, and Hendrick de Keyser are the
focus of this section, and the authors explain how their constructions followed Serlio’s explanation that *invenzione* is not only acceptable, but expected as long as these derivations from the classical rule conform to decorum required of the function and location of the building. This sentiment was not shared by everyone, however, including, most famously, Carel van Mander, who in 1604 blamed Michelangelo for the introduction of this excessive modification of classical rules. This sentiment was also later shared by Inigo Jones in England, who favored the architectural style of Palladio and Scamozzi. Ultimately, the architecture of Jacob van Campen, Salomon de Bray, and Pieter Post can be seen to reflect this return to a more strictly classical model, thus ushering in a new age of classicism in Holland. The Hague, built by van Campen for Constantijn Huygens in the 1630s, is a good example of this form of classicism in the Baroque age.

The strong relationship found between the Northern and Southern Low Countries through the Renaissance gradually began to show a slow separation in the seventeenth century, and these changes form the discussions found in the third part of the text. Here the authors attribute these changes primarily to the different architectural policies that developed in the differing courts of the time, thus referencing early geographical boundaries rather than modern-day national borders. Separate chapters on court architecture, civic architecture, and religious constructions focus on this assertion and provide a thorough analysis of these traditional building types as well as a discussion of newer genres such as the merchant exchange buildings, town halls, trade halls, and guild halls. Thus, despite their architectural differences, it is clear that in comparing Northern and Southern civic architecture of the seventeenth century we can see that these buildings do share a similar theoretical background and are responding to parallel cultural and economic developments.

Ultimately, Renaissance and Baroque architecture of this region of Europe, long categorized under the nationalistic rhetoric of the nineteenth century to emphasize differences formed along a rigid north-south divide, must be viewed under a new architectural context. A close analysis of this early modern culture then provides the reader with a richer understanding of the similarities and differences found in these buildings as well as a more sophisticated understand-
This important book can therefore be used as the basis for forging a new way of understanding the early modern architecture of the Low Countries.


Marieke de Winkel’s well-researched and beautifully illustrated book consists of five essays of varying focus, length, and breadth. She selectively examines the clothing in certain Rembrandt paintings and frequently counters with new conclusions the interpretations by previous scholars of certain articles of fashion and/or accessories. However, de Winkel does not always analyze the paintings as a whole and sometimes overlooks the non-fashion aspects of the images in which the elements of clothing and accessories appear. One wonders whether a holistic examination of such paintings would change the meaning and function of depicted pieces of clothing and accessories examined by de Winkel in isolation.

Chapter one discusses a specific garment worn by several male portrait sitters. In the second chapter, the author considers various fashion accessories worn by some of the women in Rembrandt’s portraits. The third chapter examines the clothing worn by the same sitter in two different portraits of him. In the fourth chapter, de Winkel discusses the clothing worn by Rembrandt in some of his self-portraits. The fifth chapter considers various elements of clothing in several, but not all of Rembrandt’s history paintings.

The first chapter “‘One of the Most Dignified Items of Dress’: The Iconography of the Tabbaard and the Sense of Tradition in Dutch Seventeenth-Century Portraiture” examines the changing perception and depiction of the *tabbaard* or *rock*, a long gown worn at home that had a “broad, turned-down shawl-collar and long, rather wide sleeves with a slit at the elbow for the hand and lower arm, and the rest of the sleeve hanging down” (27). De Winkel observes that Rembrandt’s portraits of older men from the first half of the sev-
enteenth century often depicted the sitter wearing the old-fashioned *tabbaard*. The author argues that due to the depiction of the house garment in such portraits and because of the evolving associations of the *tabbaard* “with learning, tradition and even antiquity” (27), the costume was actually adopted in the second half of the seventeenth century for daily wear by various trades and professions, including painters in their studios.

Chapter two “Frivolous and Vain: Assessing Fashion Accessories in Rembrandt’s Portraits” discusses the potential meaning and function of accessories worn by female sitters in some Rembrandt's portraits. De Winkel takes issue with conclusions by previous art historians that hats, veils, fans, gloves, handkerchiefs, and jewelry functioned as “symbols of marital love, gentility, friendship, or grief” (53). She examines such fashion accessories in the context of seventeenth-century customs of dress, textual accounts by contemporaries, inventories of possessions taken at the time of a death, and contemporary archives. De Winkel concludes that in the seventeenth century, the meaning of such fashion accessories varied depending upon the individual’s social standing, religion, age, city of residence as well as upon cultural conventions, the pictorial context in which a sitter was portrayed, and the circumstances of the portrait’s commission. She also argues that by and large in Rembrandt’s portraits of female sitters, gloves, handkerchiefs, and fans connoted the socioeconomic well-being of the portrayed, but nothing more symbolic.

In addition to the author’s discussion in this chapter of individual fashionable accessories in some of Rembrandt’s female portraits, she makes two strong, overarching points. First, although seventeenth-century Dutch moralists condemned luxurious fashion accessories as signs of vanity, actual practice deviated from such platitudes. Second, although some seventeenth-century Dutch initially found newly introduced, fashionable accessories shocking and immoral, over time the very same accessories were deemed familiar and acceptable, then out-dated and silly, and finally desirable and respectable again.

Chapter three “A Gentleman in a Grey Riding Coat: Dress in Rembrandt’s Portraits of Jan Six” concludes that the 1647 etched portrait of Jan Six, a prominent and well-to-do member of the Amsterdam ruling class as well as a scholar, depicts him in the context of the *Vita*
Contemplativa, whereas the 1654 painted portrait constructs the pictorial context of the Vita Activa. De Winkel demonstrates how both contexts suited the sitter. In the etching, Rembrandt depicts Jan Six casually dressed, reading and surrounded by a game bag, a hunting knife, works of art and other books. In the later painting, Six wears a grey riding coat and red cloak that allude to equestrian pursuits appropriate only for gentlemen. De Winkel further concludes that the clothing worn by Six in the painted portrait references the sitter’s love for the life of his country home, which contemporary literature extolled as a patrician antidote for the pressures of the city. The clothing in the two portraits of Six expresses both casual elegance “and a touch of negligence” (131) characteristic of sprezzatura, in accordance with published advice for gentlemen, such as that by the Italian Renaissance author, Baldassare Castiglione, in his Il Cortegiano.

Chapter four “Rembrandt’s Clothes: Dress and Meaning in His Self-Portraits” concludes that through either the contemporary clothing or the imagined historical costume worn by the artist in his self-portraits, the varying functions of the paintings can be ascertained. As a prolific painter of self-portraits, such paintings had wide ranging meanings and functions, including studies of facial expressions, self-portrayal as a successful professional and businessman, self-portrayal as the artist in his studio, and so on. De Winkel makes the fascinating observation that Rembrandt’s self-portraits almost never present him in a formal portrait pose or in fashionable garb. De Winkel’s conclusions, however, sometimes omit the co-interpretive functions of other elements in the self-portraits, including, for example, facial expression, pose, and/or setting.

When Rembrandt depicted himself in historicizing clothing, de Winkel argues that his pictorial sources prominently included sixteenth-century prints, including engraved portraits of earlier, revered Dutch and German artists. She further posits that Rembrandt was the first seventeenth-century artist to wear a beret, called a bonnet, in some of his self-portraits. The archaizing beret, which had been frequently depicted in sixteenth-century historical pictures, was no longer considered fashionable by the seventeenth century. Subsequently, self-portraits by some pupils of Rembrandt and other painters also include the beret, which has enjoyed a long-lived identity...
as artists’ garb.

Chapter five “Adorned with Manifold Garments: Costume in Rembrandt’s History Paintings” examines whether the artist conceived of the clothing in his history paintings (history, biblical, mythological, and allegorical subjects) chiefly out of his imagination or based on actual pieces of unusual clothing in his studio collection. The author mainly focuses upon Rembrandt’s paintings of female and oriental costumes because she previously examined in chapter four the artist’s self-portraits in which he donned historical costume. In wide-ranging chapter five, de Winkel concludes that costume contemporary to Rembrandt’s time was considered to be inappropriate for history paintings. In contrast to earlier scholarship, she also argues that Rembrandt primarily conceived of his historical costumes from his imagination and rightly states: “however, this leaves us with the difficult problem of how to assess the measure of his imagination” (194).

De Winkel subsequently examines various potential, influential sources upon Rembrandt’s imagination, that is, textual descriptions; theatrical sources; etchings, engravings, and drawings; and books with costume illustrations. From such possibilities, de Winkel concludes that Rembrandt drew the greatest artistic inspiration from the costumes depicted in mostly early sixteenth-century prints and drawings that he owned. Such prints provided him prototypes that conformed to notions of decorum held by his contemporaries. Because Rembrandt made significant changes to his print and drawing sources, later critics often overlooked such artistic borrowings.

In this expansive chapter, the author also considers the degree to which Rembrandt’s teacher and other artists working before him in Amsterdam may have influenced his conception of costume in his history paintings. She also examines how Rembrandt, in turn, may have influenced his own pupils. De Winkel also comes to the fascinating conclusion that the costume in seventeenth-century Dutch history paintings impacted the design of historical costume for the contemporary live theater, rather than the other way around.

Despite the all-encompassing title of her book, de Winkel’s chapters provide revealing depth of scholarship on some costumes and accessories in Rembrandt’s paintings, rather than superficial breadth of examination on all depicted fashion and fancy. Such depth, in fact,
amounts to one of the book’s strengths. We can look forward to any future scholarship by de Winkel on those costumes and accessories in Rembrandt’s paintings that remain yet unpacked.


This fascinating study draws upon a wide variety of source materials—from catechisms and primers, to treatises and *novelas*, to library inventories and paintings—to address an understudied topic: just exactly what was the level of education for women of early modern Spain and New Spain? Obviously, there is no single answer to this question. Elizabeth Howe does a good job of taking a nuanced approach to an ideological mine field where reliable information is often scarce. She differentiates among rich and poor women, lay persons and religious, royalty and the socially marginal. She largely avoids the trap of generalizations by sticking to specific examples. We may not always agree with her interpretations of these examples (a particularly tricky one being the use of handwriting analysis to determine which women had tutors and which did not), but her grounding of the project in *imitatio* of classical role models is hard to argue with. She begins the book with an explanation of the principle of *imitatio* (a pedagogical technique using exemplary women as role models who were supposed to inspire students to lead upright moral lives) and then uses this theme to develop organizational categories reflected in subsequent chapter titles: “Athena and the Amazons,” “The Spanish Zenobia,” “The New Judith,” etc.

Her decision to lump Spain together with its New World colonies is not uncontroversial. Although there is a growing effort (and not just by comparatists) to look at the big picture of the Iberian empire—witness such book, course and even job specialization titles as “The Early Modern Atlantic World”—traditionally survey classes are taught in such a way that Spain and Mexico remain hermetically sealed inside closed little airtight compartments. The cynic might
suspect another motivation for Howe’s decision here, besides ideology: did she choose to end with a chapter on Sor Juana because if she had limited her study to Spain, she would not have had enough material? The Mexican nun takes pride of place not merely because the book’s trajectory moves logically from geographical center to periphery. Unfortunately for the early modern women involved as well as for the scholars who study them, Sor Juana is quite simply the most erudite early modern Hispanic woman to be found. She is rightfully the poster child for any discussion of Renaissance women’s education, its potential and its limits.

Howe’s strategy of starting with continental Europe was also not a given. For reasons ranging from the Inquisition to Franco, Spain is often considered *sui generis*. For example, some European Studies departments find it relatively easy to ignore Spain. It is widely known that the Spanish Golden Age occurred well after the Renaissance first began in Italy. This sense of belatedness erroneously leads many scholars to look elsewhere for explanations of Spanish cultural phenomena: in the Arab world, perhaps, or even in Jewish tradition. While these were important influences in Spain’s unique social melting pot, the rebirth of the classics on the Iberian Peninsula should not be underestimated. As Howe rightly asserts, “The history of women’s education in the Spanish Golden Age begins in ancient Greece” (1). This book thus reinforces a sense of connectedness for Spain with its European neighbors and, indeed, the western classical tradition.

Chapter 1, “Athena and the Amazons: Examples of/for the Education of Women,” begins with Plato and Sappho, continues with Plutarch and Quintilian, stops to consider patristic writers, and eventually focuses on Boccaccio and Christine de Pizan. This whirlwind tour of educational theory finally takes a Hispanic turn with Álvaro de Luna’s *Book of Illustrious and Virtuous Women*. There is room in this chapter for practice as well as theory. Here we meet such figures as Sor Teresa de Cartagena, a fifteenth-century Spanish woman whom Howe hails as Christine’s heir “in spirit if not in fact” (24). Lamentably, Sor Teresa only authored two books, and little is known of her life. It is hard to escape the impression that for this earliest phase of the early modern period, this historian is (as any other inevitably would be) grasping at straws.
The next epoch gives Howe considerably more to work with. Chapter 2, “The Spanish Zenobia: Isabel la Católica and Her Court,” describes the actual academy the queen established within the walls of her palace. She searched high and low for humanists to educate herself and her offspring. She generously made these opportunities available also to daughters of the nobility. The fact that she acknowledged deficiencies in her own early education, and sought to remedy them—even to the point of studying Latin as an adult—makes the earnest humility of her endeavour all the more striking. Isabel really comes to life in this chapter, with even a few glimpses of her personality showing through. Here we learn that the Catholic Queen valued her needle as well as her pen; she even went so far as to mend Ferdinand’s clothing herself! This, perhaps more than any other detail in the book, serves as a reminder of just how far early modern women started behind men. No one could imagine Ferdinand of Aragon tending to his knitting.

The third chapter focuses on Saint Teresa of Ávila, the foremost Spanish mystic and a very prolific author. Her rhetoric of submission/humility, however, would prevent her from being much of a feminist role model. To her credit, Howe does not try to fit the peculiar saint into this or any other Procrustean bed. Accepting Teresa on her own terms, she also takes the opportunity to discuss convent culture and what level of learning might have been expected from the choir nuns versus the abbess. It appears from instructions preserved for these women that they were encouraged to read devotional texts alone in their cells. This not only tells us that they could read but also offers insight into reading practices behind the cloister’s enclosed walls.

The rather complicated title of Chapter 4 contains within it the gist of its argument: “Anne and the Virgin Mary: Home (and) School(ing) for Girls in Spain and New Spain.” In this section of her study, Howe makes the point that many young girls in the early modern period were educated almost exclusively at home. She uses portraits of the Virgin and her mother to illustrate the burden placed on mothers’ shoulders as the first (and often only) teachers of their female children. In this chapter she also explores what other learning opportunities were available to women, such as boarding schools within convents and *colegios* for orphans.
Chapter 5, “Muse(ings) on Women’s Learning,” offers the reader a stark dichotomy between prescriptive treatises circumscribing women’s roles and popular literature subverting these expectations. Here we find Fray Luis de León and Juan Luis Vives juxtaposed to Miguel de Cervantes and María de Zayas. Although she briefly alludes to Cervantes’ enlightened view of women, it is of course to Zayas that she devotes most of her attention. Zayas is joined by Ana Caro in sounding the clarion call for women’s liberation (well, at least as far as possible before the suffrage movement . . . ). One of the most subversive aspects of their early modern feminism may well be their intentional use of metaphors derived from sewing and cooking.

Howe’s last chapter on Sor Juana has already been mentioned. In this chapter as with the book as a whole, some readers might find redundancies or complain of imprecise translations. But this is a well-developed and surprisingly unpolemical study which shall endure. In addition to presenting the full spectrum of women’s varying degrees of educational attainment, Howe manages to situate Spain both diachronically as heir of the European Renaissance and synchronically as a sprawling colonial empire. Sadly, one wonders whether Sor Juana could have written anywhere but in Mexico. Did the colonial environment, oppressive as it was, nonetheless offer her a certain freedom which would have been unthinkable in Spain itself? If she had lived in Spain, would she have been silenced sooner, later, or not at all? Those are questions we can never answer. We can only mourn the loss of so many other words which could have (at least potentially) flowed from her pen. But Howe’s book is, justly, a celebration of women’s educational accomplishments, not merely an ode to women’s writing that might have been. The fact is that a few early modern Hispanic women did manage to cultivate the life of the mind, and it is their legacy we can pass on to our female students. That well-worn principle of *imitatio* is not without current uses.

Suzanne Trill’s selection of self-writings by the seventeenth-century noblewoman, Lady Anne Halkett, forms a welcome addition to the prestigious Early Modern Englishwomen series edited by Betty Travitsky and Anne Lake Prescott, a series that has done so much to rectify the gender balance of the early modern literary canon and to provide insights into how Englishwomen of all social ranks represented themselves and were represented by others. The volume consists of an introduction by Trill, followed by ten chapters, nine of which consist of lengthy excerpts from Halkett’s occasional meditations, written between 1658 and 1699. The exception is chapter five, which consists of an edited reproduction of Anne’s autobiography, written in 1677-78. In addition, the volume contains a detailed bibliography of primary and secondary sources and a list of Bible references made by Anne in her writings. Each chapter begins with a photograph of a page of Anne’s writing from the relevant volume, and a brief discussion by Trill of their size and organization, giving the reader some sense of the materiality of the texts, the originals of which are to be found in the National Library of Scotland, and in the case of the autobiography, the British Library, London.

Anne Halkett was a prolific writer, and Trill estimates that on average she wrote 35,000 words a year. Her writings have been studied previously, and critical accounts have depicted Anne as a spirited Royalist heroine whose primary aim in life was to find romantic fulfilment. Trill’s revisionist account questions this depiction of Halkett as a romantic idealist, both in terms of her politics and her private life, suggesting instead that Anne was well aware of the dangers of ill-advised attachments to duplicitous and inconstant men. The selected writings provide insights into Halkett’s changing life and experiences as a wife, widow and mother, and in keeping with recent trends in early modern studies towards conceptualising the political and religious upheavals of the period in a British context, Trill emphasises the need to study Anne as both an English and Scottish subject. As is evident from her writings, Anne considered herself to possess a
somewhat ambiguous national identity, often describing herself as a ‘stranger’ in Scotland. In many ways she was a ‘cultural amphibian’, having been born to Scottish parents in London on 4 January 1622 whilst her father, Thomas Murray, was in the service of James VI/I. Perhaps her royalism emerged as a result of attempting to reconcile the uncertainties regarding her national identity; after all, in many ways it was only the Stuart monarchs who held the three kingdoms of England, Scotland and Ireland together, albeit precariously, between 1603 and 1707.

Anne’s upbringing was largely typical of that of early seventeenth-century noblewomen: she was taught to read and write; to speak French; to play the lute and the virginals; and to be proficient in various kinds of needlework. Most importantly for her subsequent political development her religious education was based on the precepts of The Book of Common Prayer, and she attended sermons at the Caroline court regularly. ‘I esteeme itt the greatest honour I haue that I haue beeene educated in ye Church of England in the time [in] which itt had greatest incouragements’ she wrote proudly on Thursday 8 January 1691.

However, Anne’s religion and politics consisted of more than mere words. As well as writing the religious ‘Meditations’ Anne instructed her household in prayer and devotion; operated a weekly surgery for the poor; dispatched medical supplies to the needy; acted as a midwife to women from various social backgrounds; and lodged various children, often from families loyal to the Stuarts. In 1650 she made balms and dressings for over sixty Royalist soldiers injured at the Battle of Dunbar, and on one occasion engaged in conversation with Colonel Robert Overton of the New Model Army, during which she prophesised the restoration of the monarchy. In her later life Anne commemorated the anniversaries of the execution of Charles I and the Restoration, and after the Glorious Revolution became a staunch Jacobite, refusing to accept the authority of William and Mary. Halkett thus provides an interesting juxtaposition to female republican writers such as Lucy Hutchinson, Anna Trapnel, and Mary Cary, and might be compared and contrasted with the stridently feminist, but politically conservative Mary Astell.
There is much in these writings to interest social historians too. Anne records details of domestic affairs, including references to beauty, clothes, pregnancy and childbirth, and the management of her servants, but also of her engagements within her local community through, for example, acts of charity, such as going to visit the minister, Mr Cooper, when he fell sick on 11 July 1694, the same day on which she wrote of her intention to establish a public fund for the support of the elderly, and to enable ‘honest parents’ to educate their children. Motherhood, both as a biological and social role, formed a key part of Anne’s identity. She acknowledged the debts she owed her mother, especially in terms of her religious education, and in her later years displayed a great deal of concern about her son, Robin, when he was imprisoned for his political activities in 1690.

Trill notes in her acknowledgments that two of her postgraduate students, Fith Lanum and Sara Murphy, have completed dissertations on Lady Anne Halkett’s life and writings. Thanks to her own scholarship, Trill has enabled a great many other scholars to gain access to Anne’s observations and meditations. Anyone interested in the political, religious or social history of Britain in the second half of the seventeenth century will find something of interest in this collection.


Salzman’s study of the history of reading early modern English women’s writing has two key features: it provides a general overview of the women writers who have been most studied by scholars for the past two decades, and it traces the trajectories of their readerships from their own times to the present. In the process, Salzman deftly weaves commentary from recent scholarship on these writers with his own opinions and research. The result is a book that fulfills his stated goal: it will be of interest to readers from “a wide variety of fields and disciplines who want to know more about what women wrote in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and how that writing was
read, processed, interpreted, rewritten, and often rediscovered, from the time of its writing through to the present day” (10).

Covering the span of years from 1558 to 1700, Salzman begins with the writing of Queen Elizabeth and ends with that of Aphra Behn. In his first chapter, he discusses the scope and nature of early modern English women’s writing, noting that it is “possible to view women’s writing” from this period “as a series of phases, although it is vital to avoid any forced homogenization of what was a very diverse set of practices” (12). He also notes that when “we move away from literary genres, the quantity of material written by women is far more substantial, and grows dramatically throughout the seventeenth century” (17). Genres he covers include poetry, drama, translation, spiritual writings, diaries, letters, recipes, mothers’ advice books, medical writing, and defenses of female education. In this overview, he discusses writers as diverse as the Cooke sisters, the Countess of Pembroke, Anna Trapnel, Margaret Fell, Anne Southwell, Margaret Cavendish, Isabella Whitney, and Bathsua Makin.

In a particularly valuable section of this first chapter, Salzman looks at the preservation of early modern English women’s writing from 1700-1900, examining anthologies and dictionaries of literary biography. He begins with Thomas Heywood’s *Gynaikeion; or Nine Booke of Various History Concerning Women* (1624; reissued in 1657 as *The Generall Historie of Women*), and includes commentary on others such as Nathaniel Crouch’s *The Female Excellency* (1688), Edward Phillips’s *Theatrum Poetarum, or A Compleat Collection of the Poets* (1675), George Ballard’s *Memoirs of Several Ladies of Great Britain* (1752), George Colman and Bonnell Thornton’s *Poems by Eminent Ladies* (1755, exp. ed., 1773 and 1780), Alexander Dyce’s *Specimens of British Poetesses* (1825), George Bethune’s *The British Female Poets* (1848), Matilda Bertham’s *A Biographical Dictionary of the Celebrated Women of Every Age and Country* (1804), and Eric Robertson’s *English Poetesses* (1886). He concludes with Virginia Woolf’s impressions of early modern women’s writing from *The Common Reader* (1925) [27-34]. Salzman’s consideration of these works’ illustration of the historical reception of women’s writing creates a useful resource for readers curious about the “loss” of English women’s writing.
Following his overview are six thematic studies. In the second chapter, Salzman presents “Poets High and Low,” the cases of Queen Elizabeth and Isabella Whitney as opposite ends of the class spectrum of writers. He also discusses the poetry of Aemilia Lanyer, Mary Sidney, and the Anglo-American Anne Bradstreet. Chapter Three is devoted to Lady Mary Wroth as a case illustrating the rise of a woman poet from “Obscurity to Canonization.” He notes that the “story of Mary Wroth’s dramatic increase in visibility over last two decades exemplifies the changes that have taken place in the status of early modern women’s writing” (60). In Chapter Four, Salzman focuses on life-writing in Anne Clifford’s diary, describing her legal predicament regarding her inheritance, her public image, and the history that we have received from Vita Sackville-West’s Knole and the Sackvilles (1922). He also brings in Nicky Hallett’s case “for a connection between Orlando and Anne Clifford” based on Woolf’s early drafts of Orlando (107). Chapter Five is dedicated to the prophets and visionaries, Lady Eleanor Davies/Douglas, Anna Trapnel, Margaret Fell, and Jane Lead. Chapter Six is focused on “Authorship and Ownership” as viewed in the cases of Margaret Cavendish and Lucy Hutchinson, and Chapter Seven addresses notions of reputation in the cases of Katherine Philips and Aphra Behn. His aims in these case studies are to illustrate “how early modern women’s writing was produced, circulated, and responded to at the time it was written” and to show “how it was reproduced, recirculated, and commented on by succeeding generations of readers, editors, and scholars” (219). He fulfills these goals admirably, especially for an audience new to this subject matter. Scholars who work in this field will see many familiar references.

In addition to noting the scholarship of many of those who work on these individual authors, especially those who have been instrumental in the “recovery” of their works, Salzman engages with the theoretical stances of a few scholars who have offered considerations of the development of women’s writing in general. In particular, he considers the work of Margaret Ezell in Writing Women’s Literary History, Denise Riley in Am I That Name?, and Jonathan Goldberg in Desiring Women Writing. He concurs mainly with the work of Ezell and elaborates on her observations about women’s writing during
this period throughout his study.

This book is essentially a compendium of much of the work on early modern English women writers that has been done in the past two decades. It would be an excellent companion to Salzman’s *Early Modern Women’s Writing: An Anthology, 1560-1700* (Oxford 2000). Although the titles of both books are bit misleading, both are specifically about English women’s writing, and would make good texts for courses that address early modern English literature. This book in particular would provide an excellent introduction to the field of early modern English women’s writing for undergraduate and graduate students, and Salzman’s contextualization of historical and current commentary on the vicissitudes of these women’s writing will appeal to specialists in the field.


On the 25th of February 1603, Jacob van Heemskerck’s small Dutch fleet attacked a Portuguese carrack in the waters of the Singapore Straits. After a day’s fighting, the Portuguese captain surrendered his damaged *Santa Catarina*. The ship was carrying cargo intended for Europe, which was worth at least £300,000 according to the contemporary exchange rate. The Dutch, who had left their home country two years earlier, could return with the loot to satisfy the shareholders of the VOC (*Vereenigde Oostindische Compagnie* or *United Dutch East India Company*). (No dividends were paid to the shareholders until 1610, as all profit was reinvested in the company.)

A typical act of piracy, one would observe nowadays. One of the many similar undertaken by the English, Dutch and other privateers against the Spanish and Portuguese ships in the world’s oceans in the early modern period.

Yet the clash between the Portuguese merchant and the Dutch fleet is but an excuse for the author of the discussed work to study the
contemporary political thought of the Dutch, in particular of Hugo Grotius. Martine Julia van Ittersum’s book is not a history of Dutch piracy and trade in the Far East, but rather a study of political thought at the turn of the sixteenth to seventeenth centuries concerned with the right of various nations to undertake colonial trade and rivalry against other colonial powers.

It is Grotius’ defence of the right of the Dutch to engage in privateering actions across the globe, in particular in reference to the above-mentioned incident, which resulted in the writing and publishing of his *De Jure Praedae*, which opens the book. This work was written to defend the captain of the Dutch fleet which attacked the Portuguese, but had much broader aims, argues the author. Grotius and the VOC directors engaged in a campaign to prove the rights of every nation to defend itself against aggressors. In well documented and brilliantly argued chapters two and four of her book, the author discusses Grotius’ use of the so-called Spanish Black Legend to defend Dutch actions in the Far East and to provide arguments for peace negotiations with Philip III, which would open the East Indies for Dutch merchants. In particular, we learn how the killing of seventeen Dutch sailors by the Portuguese in the Far East was linked by the Dutch lawyer with the shadow of the Iberian Black Legend to justify the Dutch ‘just’ warfare against the Portuguese and Spanish ships. VOC, argues Grotius, waged a just war in the light of natural law, which was transgressed against by the two leading colonial empires.

These arguments, which find their way into *De Jure Praedae*, are followed by Grotius’ direct involvement in peace negotiations on behalf of the Dutch—first with the Archduke Albert (and subsequently with Philip III) in the years 1608/09, and next with England in the Anglo-Dutch colonial conferences of 1613 and 1615. It was Grotius’ arguments presented in his *Mare Liberum*, outlining the right of all nations to free trade and navigation, which played an important role in the coming to terms of the Twelve Years’ Truce.

Paradoxically, the same arguments were put forth against the Dutch in their discussions of colonial matters with the English. Yet the arguments of free trade and navigation were countered by the Dutch (Grotius himself) on the basis of an obligation to fulfil already signed contracts. *Pacta sunt servanda*, argues Grotius, even if these *pacta*
were signed with local, native, non-European or non-Christian inhabitants.

In her work Martine Julia van Ittersum presents Grotius as a theorist of rights and contract theories as well as a practitioner of those theories who acted as a negotiator and lawyer of Dutch colonialism and the VOC in particular. In an elegant and very well written book Grotius’ theory is analysed and linked with contemporary politics, in which the political philosopher was involved personally. Grotius’ thought formed the cornerstone of Western imperial theory in the early modern period. At the same time it had very practical aims—to undermine the Spanish and Portuguese domination of the world’s oceans resulting from the Treaties of Tordesillas and Saragossa, but also to justify and legitimize the Dutch entry into the East India exchange market.

Profit and Principle is indeed a very important contribution to our understanding of the colonial expansion in the early modern period. The author has convincingly linked the theoretical considerations of Hugo Grotius with the practical actions of the Dutch (VOC in particular) and the contemporary political scene between Philip III as a ruler of both Spain and Portugal and The Netherlands on the one hand, and England and The Netherlands on the other. Thus we have received a very valuable and important book for historians of political thought, of colonial expansion and empires, but also a history of the Dutch and their struggle for independence.


This book is a history of the intellectual, institutional, and political dimensions of theology in the colleges of Cambridge University from the later years of Elizabeth I’s reign up to the First Civil War and the Parliamentary Visitation of 1644, which so disrupted university life. Hoyle’s study is arranged as a narrative in seven chapters.
It traces a deeply anti-Roman “prevailing consensus” (69) among Reformed Protestant theologians of various stripes from the 1590s through the 1610s, centered around concerns such as predestination, election, assurance, and perseverance. Theologians such as Perkins, Some, Chaderton, Whitaker, Ward, Ames, and Davenant emphasized scripture alone as a source for Christian doctrine, and were hostile to liturgical ceremony and extra-biblical tradition. In the 1620s, especially once Charles became king, this “reformed theological community” (32) began to lose ground to theologians who were less opposed to Roman Catholic doctrines and worship. In the 1630s, under Laud, these more tradition-minded theologians became dominant at Cambridge, their liturgical preferences concretely manifest in the dramatic alterations of numerous college chapels, before a sharp reaction by the House of Commons began in 1641. Hoyle’s guiding argument is that what united all of the theological disagreements and controversies about grace and election, preaching and liturgy, during this half century was an overriding dispute about the nature and identity of the Church of England. Was the church fundamentally part of Reformed Protestantism, or was it continuous with and part of the pre-Reformation Catholic past?

As Hoyle himself suggests (5), much of the material he covers will be familiar to scholars of the period. His treatment of a late Elizabethan church that was fundamentally Reformed Protestant in its theology, with a spectrum stretching from contented conformists to reform-minded precisians, largely echoes the research of Patrick Collinson and Peter Lake; Hoyle draws on yet significantly qualifies some of the findings of Nicholas Tyacke’s influential work on early Stuart anti-Calvinism; and he is indebted to Anthony Milton’s scholarship on changing attitudes towards Catholicism among some influential English Protestant theologians in the 1620s-30s. More noteworthy, however, is his idea that a dispute about the character and identity of the Church of England, rather than dichotomies between “puritans” and “conformists” or “Calvinists” and “Arminians,” unites the subsidiary theological concerns of these decades. He rightly argues that the relationships among university colleagues were often multifaceted and complex, and cannot be simplistically categorized in either-or terms, as for example the relationship between Joseph
Mede and John Cosin shows (189-191). Hoyle suggests that historians have tended uncritically to use the category “Arminian” in ways that reflect its polemical origins; consequently, not only have they seriously overestimated its presence at Cambridge and in England during the 1610s, but they have often mistaken what was more deeply at issue in the 1620s and 30s, namely English Protestant attitudes toward Roman Catholicism. Making use of some hitherto un- or underused university manuscripts, Hoyle is sensitive to the interrelationships among university institutions, politics, and governance, never losing sight of the crown’s significance for and power over the English church and thus over theology in the university, as Elizabeth’s suspension of the Lambeth Articles in 1595, James I’s Canons of 1604, and the repeated involvement of the crown in the election of the heads of Cambridge colleges make clear.

The book also has a number of shortcomings. Beginning with the least substantive, it has more typographical and editorial errors than are acceptable in a scholarly monograph. To give just a few examples: a sentence about early seventeenth-century English religious life is footnoted only with a reference to Calvin’s *Institutes* (26 n. 66); Collinson rather than Lake is identified as the author of *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church* (66 n. 95) even though Lake is given as the author on the same page three notes later; p. 129 incorrectly has “these” rather than “theses”; and just fourteen lines later, “blooded” rather than “bloodied.” More seriously, although Hoyle stresses the extent to which there was a “religious consensus” (74) among Cambridge theologians with “some powerful shared assumptions and a common account of Christian experience” (128), his own exposition contravenes his claim. In the 1590s, Andrewes, Baro, Harsnett, Overall, Barrett, and Digby (the last two of whom eventually became Catholics) all stood outside this alleged consensus on one end of the spectrum of English divines at Cambridge, while ardent Protestants such as Bainbrigg and Johnson stood outside it on the other. The story Hoyle actually tells is not one of a movement from a Reformed Protestant consensus to a divided university (and nation) in the 1630s, but a shift from the predominance of Reformed Protestant theologians and their political influence to a greater contestation of their claims and their temporary political eclipse.
The book’s deepest analytical weakness, however, is related to Hoyle’s essentializing of terms such as “protestant,” “protestants,” “the reformers,” and the “protestant faith”: he fails to see how the “theological sand” (40) on which the Church of England was built was itself rooted in the foundational principle of the Reformation, namely the rejection of the Roman church coupled with the principle of “scripture alone,” the weakness of which was empirically manifest in the indefinitely open-ended number of ways in which the Bible was understood. It is not simply that “the rival claims of scripture and tradition” were unresolved in the 1620s despite having been “familiar to English divines since the 1530s” (160), that “The identity of the Church of England in the early seventeenth century was less certain than anyone cared to admit” (128-9), or that by 1644 “The attempt to define the nature of the Church of England had not issued into any agreement” (230). The deeper point is that from no later than 1520, when Karlstadt disagreed fundamentally with Luther over issues as central as the relationship between the Old and New Testaments, there never was any “fragile doctrinal agreement” (86) among Christians who rejected Rome and proclaimed scripture as their sole authority for Christian faith and life, whether on the Continent or in England. Reformed Protestantism was hardly the whole of Protestantism, as Hoyle seems to recognize by his mention of Lutherans (86), separatists (108-109), and Arminius (a “good enough protestant”; 129). But most radical Protestants in the Reformation era, both in England and on the Continent, derived their doctrinal assertions from the same method as Lutherans and Reformed Protestants: “All theological enquiry had to be scriptural, and they [“theologians”] assumed that there were ‘places’ in scripture that show us the true nature of Christianity” (30). That radical Protestants were politically proscribed and persecuted kept their numbers small and their influence restricted, but it affected neither the theological method that they shared with Lutherans and Reformed Protestants, nor the extent to which their findings issued in a host of mutually incompatible doctrinal claims at odds with Lutherans and Reformed Protestants, who were in turn at odds with one another. What Hoyle correctly sees as an inherent ambiguity, weakness, and source of perpetual contestation about the nature of the Church of England was in fact simply one of many
manifestations of the inherent ambiguity, weakness, and perpetual contestation characteristic of all anti-Roman Christians in the Reforma-
tion era that began even before the formal condemnations of Luther in 1521.


Evidence of the historical relationship between the retailer and the consumer in Great Britain has provided ample material for scholarly investigation. Recent historians have considered retail space, the production and consumption of goods, and the economic and geographical influences of the marketplace on global expansion as aspects worthy of discussion. The authors of early works, such as *Middlemen in English Business Particularly between 1660 and 1760* by Ray Bert Westerfield (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1915) were content to focus on the economic aspects of trade that led to the industrial revolution. It wasn’t until the early 1970s, with titles such as *Oxford Shops and Shopping; a Pictorial Survey from Victorian & Edwardian Times* by Michael Turner and David Vaisey (Oxford Illustrated Press, 1972) and *Urban Markets and Retail Distribution, 1730-1815, with Particular Reference to Macclesfield, Stockport and Chester* by S. Ian Mitchell, that historians took a broader view of the factors that contributed to the expansion of retail trade. More recent works, like *English Shops and Shopping: an Architectural History* by Kathryn A Morrison (Yale Univ. Press, 2003) have taken a more narrow view. Because there is a dearth of substantial data prior to 1830, much of this research has focused on the nineteenth and early twentieth century.

A new study by Nancy Cox and Karin Dannehl, *Perceptions of Retailing in Early Modern England*, takes a more radical approach. Rather than focus on the evidence of sale and trade and the chronological development of early modern retail practices, the authors of this work, faculty at the University of Wolverhampton, structure their research around specific themes of perception, space, and distance.
Their goal is to provide interpretations of the perceptions of retailing disseminated through literature, art, and advertising, and to analyze the lack of pictorial images of shops and advertising in those works. The authors argue for the need to examine retailing as a cultural phenomenon. They define retailing as “the broad spectrum of activities that facilitated the exchange of material goods and supplied end or near-end consumers with them” (5). Through a synthesis of prior research, Cox and Dannehl set the context for their study, which traces the recorded impressions of retailing by contemporary onlookers. Personal accounts of travel writers such as Celia Fiennes in the 1680s and Daniel Defoe during the 1720s, excerpts from literature of the period, images of English townships, and retail handbills serve as the primary material from which they draw their conclusions. Concepts of shopping from eighteenth century dictionaries, advertising, buzzwords, key advertising strategies and promotional concepts are also used to emphasize the social and entertainment aspects of retailing to the consumer.

Using primary material from the digital archive of the Dictionary Project, a collection of digitized historical documents on early modern trade that includes industrial patents, books of rates, probate inventories of tradesmen, advertisements from provincial newspapers, trade cards and bill heads, diaries and personal papers, and other documents that focus on topics like invention and innovation, business methods, and women and household affairs, Cox and Dannehl begin by laying the foundation for their thesis, the definitions and distinctions that set retail apart from wholesale. Early chapters provide a brief discussion of England in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, establishing those events and movements that most affected attitudes toward retailing: changing centers of power, the fear of invasion, expansion of overseas trading, rise in disposable income, political upheaval, and the growth of empire in India, Canada, and elsewhere.

The literary and artistic world of the eighteenth century depicted a world devoid of shops. Engravings of townscapes by Samuel and Nathaniel Buck offered idealized images of towns, artistically omitting any suggestion of commerce in order to focus on the idyllic landscape. The authors provide several theories for this void: premises were more functional, so less effective for advertising than symbols and imagery
from shop signs. Most advertising pieces did not include an image of the shops. Text and pictures provided a wealth of information to an audience versed in understanding symbolism. This promotional literature was directed at an audience of the literate, and generally associated merchandise with status.

Three chapters focus on the roles and effect of promotional materials. Using current analysis of advertising such as Angela Goodard’s 1998 work, *The Language of Advertising: Written Texts*, Cox and Dannehl apply contemporary observations to material from the eighteenth century. Detailed analysis of specific advertisements allow the authors to identify the key buzzwords used to describe the functionality and desirability of objects for sale. Their analysis suggests that manufacturers of the early modern period were anxious to distinguish their products from their competitors. Advertising became “a form of virtual shop floor and a direct extension of the premises of the retailer” (67), needed more by fixed shops than itinerant retailers.

Of particular interest is the discussion of the effect of geography and place names on various aspects of retailing. Retailers often associated place names with commodities to invoke specific characteristics and add cultural meaning to goods. Many products were identified by place of origin. Advertising also addressed the problem of physical distance by providing retailers with a way to increase their presence in the marketplace. Consumers did not need to see the display shelves or see and touch the physical object in order to make a selection. Perception of London as a center of fashion became especially important for the concept of distance selling—prized goods produced far away could be readily available. This eventually resulted in mail order and catalog sales.

The conclusions Cox and Dannehl offer are interpretive in scope. The formation of a social relationship between buyer and seller was necessary to make sure the concept of acquiring goods remained attractive and relevant. Ads reinforced notions about the importance of possessing goods, shaped demand, made information about the goods accessible and named and described the objects and the vocabulary to evaluate them. The authors note that little direct evidence identifying the motives of advertisers is available, and indicate their inability to measure the effectiveness of this advertising.
Nancy Cox is the author of several articles on retail and trade, as well as *The Complete Tradesman: a Study of Retailing, 1550-1820* (Ashgate, 2000). *Perceptions of Retailing in Early Modern England* is part of the Ashgate series, *The History of Retailing and Consumption*, a multidisciplinary series with a focus on the role of the consumer and the rise of consumer society. The authors provide an extensive bibliography that will be useful to scholars of early modern retail practices. Scholars will also be interested in the “Dictionary of Traded Goods and Commodities, 1550-1820,” compiled by the authors. It is an online dictionary of nearly 4,000 terms found used in documents relating to trade and retail in early modern Britain, available at [http://www.british-history.ac.uk/source.asp?pubid=739](http://www.british-history.ac.uk/source.asp?pubid=739).


The essays in this volume comprise the first book-length exploration of its titular subject since William Cunningham’s *Alien Immigrants to England* (1897). Although much work has recently been done addressing specific aspects of the larger topic of immigration, any study of immigrants to early modern England must take Cunningham’s work into account; this the editors do in their respective introduction and conclusion, using Cunningham’s landmark work as a touchstone and positioning their own book as its direct successor. Between Goose’s introduction and Luu’s conclusion are ten essays arranged into three parts: “Immigrant Communities in England,” “Immigrants and Their Impact,” and “Immigrants and the International Community.” Of these ten chapters, Goose and Luu contribute two each, resulting in a collection whose editors contribute half of the content, a fact that raises questions about the absence of contributions by other scholars. However, this fact does not detract from the value of the book, which has much to commend itself.

In his introduction, Goose surveys the estimated number of immigrants to early modern England, acknowledging the difficulties in
arriving at such estimates. He correctly observes that the Huguenots, the “second refuge,” have attracted more attention than the “first refuge” of immigrants and exiles, primarily from the Low Countries, in the sixteenth and early seventeenth century. Goose thoroughly summarizes numerous implications of the “first refuge,” delving into such topics as the legal and social status of immigrants, as well as foreign policy and religion. The introduction provides a useful overview of the topic and effectively contextualizes the following essays.

Chapter Two, by Raymond Fagel, explores the geographical origins of the immigrants, offering a valuable overview of the geo-political context of sixteenth-century immigration; he also addresses the thorny problem of national identity—i.e., the often-blurred distinctions among Netherlandic immigrants. In Chapter Three, Luu considers the legal status of first- and second-generation immigrants, offering a thoughtful consideration of denizenship. Joseph P. Ward’s chapter delves into the relationship of immigrants to trade guilds and the labor force, including the attempts of the guilds to exclude strangers and the well-documented antipathy of apprentices toward the stranger community. Ward also discusses the contributions made by immigrants to such industries as weaving.

Part Two opens with a chapter by Andrew Spicer on immigrant churches. Recognizing these churches as the hubs of the immigrant communities, Spicer discusses numerous aspects of religion and immigrants, including reasons for immigrating, native charges that strangers feigned religious persecution to enter the country for economic gain, and concerns about the influence of foreign sectaries. Spicer also discusses the churches as a locus for violence against the strangers, although he neglects one of this topic’s most interesting episodes, the anti-alien libels placed on the Dutch and French churches in 1593; since Elizabeth’s government launched a thorough investigation into the libels, the omission constitutes a curious flaw in an otherwise noteworthy essay. The next chapter, by Goose, reconsiders the widespread belief that charges of xenophobia toward the strangers have been overstated. He argues that ambivalence rather than animosity characterizes the relationship between native and stranger; here Goose would benefit from an examination of the popular literature of the period, particularly xenophobic interludes such as *Wealth and Health*
and Like Will to Like, as well as the suppression of the Ill May Day scenes in Sir Thomas More. The evidence offered by such xenophobic works challenges Goose’s thesis, as does the number of anti-alien riots that occurred or were suppressed in the early 1590’s.

Goose also contributes Chapter Seven, which offers a consolidation of research into the economic contributions made by immigrants. In some regards this essay is a continuation of the previous one, arguing that the economic and technological contributions of the immigrants fostered the ambivalence he argues overshadowed xenophobic impulses. Goose comes close to embracing a long-standing dichotomy between royal and popular attitudes toward the strangers: i.e., that the Crown recognized and welcomed the contributions of the strangers while members of the guilds, especially apprentices, blamed the newcomers for the plague, shortages of jobs, housing, food, and a debasement of native blood. Collectively, however, Goose’s chapters in Part Two have much to commend themselves, with the aforementioned caveats. Raingard Esser views immigrant culture through the lens of “New Cultural History,” stating that it has “only been addressed indirectly in the case studies written on the various exile communities” (162). In some regards, Esser implicitly challenges the dichotomy underlying Goose’s work. While not comprehensive, this chapter provides a useful overview of the topic and a challenge for more scholarship from this perspective.

Part Three opens with a chapter by Charles G.D. Littleton investigating the relationship of the stranger churches to those on the continent, paying particular attention to the role of the stranger churches as would-be agents of change to English theology. He also explores international trade, providing a useful balance of primary and secondary sources. In Chapter Ten, Luu analyzes the remigration of exiles and immigrants to the Dutch Republic, offering considerable statistics to augment her thesis. The final chapter of Part Three, by David Trim, addresses the international Calvinist movement; his work complements that of Littleton, expanding its scope to consider the role of religion in the war in the Low Countries.

Luu provides the concluding essay, offering an overview of research from Cunningham’s 1897 book to the present day, noting a spike in interest during the 1990s. Luu issues a call to arms, challenging
scholars to look more closely at the “first refuge.” The book’s end apparatus includes a Consolidated Bibliography and an index, which, unfortunately, does not include entries for authors of secondary works. Overall this is a much-needed volume in a field attracting new critical attention and should be of use to historians and scholars working in other fields such as literature and art.


Among the cultural transformations effected by the Reformation, scholars of late medieval and early modern religion, history, and literature have long recognized that the ways in which Protestant ideologies changed Western understandings of textuality must be counted among the most significant. In particular the subject of literacy has attracted a great deal of attention. As the reading and interpretation of Judeo-Christian scripture came to be central to Protestant versions of soteriology, a new emphasis on basic literacy skills and on individualized engagement with scriptural texts emerged. Recently, scholars such as James Simpson have returned to this topic in order to challenge the intellectually democratizing narrative of Reformation-era literacy articulated most famously by Elizabeth Eisenstein in The Printing Press as an Agent of Change (1979). In Religion, Allegory, and Literacy in Early Modern England, John S. Pendergast joins this discussion by beginning with a simple yet crucial question: how can we define literacy in England in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries? Drawing upon the work of E. D. Hirsch and Lawrence Levine (as well as of Walter Ong), Pendergast suggests that literacy must be understood in two different but related ways. Certainly, the term designates the ability to recognize printed characters as units of language, but literacy also describes a much broader cultural function. For Pendergast, literacy is also an institution through which a culture transmits and preserves its own hermeneutic standards. In becoming literate, then, early modern readers learned not only how to read but what to read, and how to interpret what they read. Using
this observation as a point of departure, the book proceeds through an expansive account of early modern reading practices in order to advance two major claims: first, that the process of learning to read entailed important assumptions about how to interpret texts; and second, that this pedagogical connection developed from a fundamental concern among English and Continental Protestants to regulate (or, to use Pendergast’s term, “normalize”) scriptural exegesis. As such, Pendergast seeks to reconsider one quite tenacious element of our understanding of Reformation-era confessionalization—namely, that Catholics and Protestants nurtured absolutely oppositional approaches to textual interpretation and dissemination—and to suggest instead that Catholic and Protestant attempts to stabilize scriptural reading shared some remarkable similarities.

The book is divided into two parts. In chapters one through five, Pendergast advances his chief claims and traces the development of different philosophical and pedagogical models of reading in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. This is done against the background of an examination of Augustine’s understanding of Biblical allegory as both a hermeneutic and a polemical tool. In Augustine’s controversies with the Manichees, allegory serves to locate spiritual meaning in texts that, read literally, seem hopelessly opaque. As a consequence, allegory also helps to separate different categories of interpretation and, by extension, of interpreter. Those able to read allegorically will arrive at a philosophically and theologically orthodox position; those who cannot or do not mark themselves as heterodox. Although Protestant readers and theologians attempted to discredit allegory as a disingenuous device through which the Catholic Church exercised an uncompromising hermeneutic dominance over the canon, it is also the case that Protestant pedagogy retained that principle of sorting good from bad readings. Following Henry VIII’s break from Rome, and particularly under the Elizabethan settlement, the effort to normalize scriptural interpretation acquired a political as well as a spiritual importance, as “English citizen” and “Church of England congregant” became increasingly synonymous terms. During the second half of the sixteenth century, the Church and the Crown addressed the problem of religious education through a series of strategies that reflect the range of forms of literacy in early modern
England. While theological treatises and new vernacular translations of the Bible made the case for Protestant hermeneutics to an educated elite, Protestant pedagogy also targeted illiterate and semiliterate adults as well as children. Because of the importance of textual familiarity with the Bible to emerging understandings of salvation, believers who were unable to read often learned the moral lessons of the Bible in redacted form. Pendergast is particularly helpful here as a guide through these various redactions, as well as other reference tools such as Biblical commentaries and concordances designed to teach Biblical essentials according to stable interpretive standards.

This desire to maintain stability in the practices of scriptural interpretation is a key conceptual continuity that links early modern Protestants and Catholics. However, Pendergast also identifies more literal continuities that are worthy of further attention. For example, in his chapter on primers Pendergast shows that Latin maintained a crucially high profile in English Protestant education and theology. By the late sixteenth century, knowledge of Latin had taken on another fairly surprising pedagogical role, that of a complement to the vernacular as a linguistic source of nationalistic pride. In accounts of Lily’s Latin grammar as well as other pedagogical texts, Pendergast demonstrates that authors of educational treatises sought to locate the Crown at the center of humanistic learning and so to carve out a place for Latin in emerging notions of English national identity.

In the second section of the book, Pendergast reads texts written by more traditionally “literary” figures in order to investigate the ways in which literature explored, defined, and contested post-Reformation approaches to textual interpretation. John Donne in his sermons offers a version of exegesis that, in Pendergast’s view, acknowledges the importance of the literal sense of scripture while at the same time calling attention to the rhetorical capacities of scriptural language. Drawing on his poetic understanding of metaphor, Donne employs strategies of interpretation that attempt to clarify obscure scriptural passages by relating such passages metaphorically to others in which the meaning is more plain. Here, metaphor and typology—both predominantly “figurative” approaches to reading—are thus used to emphasize the significance of reading for the literal sense. Following a chapter on Spenser, Pendergast returns to his observations on the
cultural role of Classical learning in a discussion of Shakespeare’s Love’s Labor’s Lost and Two Gentlemen of Verona. On the stage, the relationship between Latin and English that pedagogues understood to be complementary can seem less obviously so. Shakespeare’s characters in these plays enact a class conflict which also can be oriented around pedagogical poles. Here, Classical learning contains within it the impulse to fix linguistic use and meaning, while the vernacular is used as a tool of social and cultural destabilization, and as a medium in which vernacular models of learning can be used to satirize—and, fascinatingly, to reform—humanist pedagogy.

A good deal of Pendergast’s work on the close relationship between grammar and interpretation in Reformation debates about Biblical hermeneutics covers familiar ground, though it is still useful as a survey. Indeed, the book’s one conspicuous flaw is that it does not engage as fully as it perhaps should with other current work on the subject. Recent research by the historians Andrew Pettegree and Ian Green, and by the literary critics Jennifer Summit and James Simpson, would have complemented Pendergast’s discussion very helpfully, yet their names do not appear on Pendergast’s slightly thin and slightly dated secondary bibliography. Especially surprising is the absence of Brian Cummings’ Literary Culture of the Reformation (2002), with which Pendergast’s work might engage in fascinating critical dialogue. However, the book presents a persuasive reassertion of the claim that Protestant theologians, pedagogues, and secular authorities, like their Catholic counterparts, did seek to stabilize scriptural interpretation, albeit within an emerging cultural framework that identified literacy as a valuable spiritual and patriotic skill. In addition, Pendergast locates these debates over literacy and interpretation within broader literary and intellectual contexts very effectively. Special mention should be made of his excellent chapter on Pierre Du Moulin’s Eucharistic treatise in which Pendergast shows that, contrary to the conventional understanding of Protestant liturgy as grounded fully in a literal interpretation of scripture, Du Moulin critiques the Catholic understanding of the Eucharist by arguing that it is not sufficiently symbolic. Catholics, in other words, read “This is my body” far too literally—for Du Moulin and for other Protestant theologians, the communion ceremony held significance because the interaction of congregation
and clergy stood as a figure of the union of the congregation and clergy with Christ. This riveting analysis underscores one of the book’s most significant contributions to current discussions on the nature of confessionalization. Here and elsewhere, Pendergast complicates still-dominant notions of confessional difference by illustrating key moments at which Protestants and Catholics each borrowed from the other’s interpretive strategies, and even worked from very similar assumptions about the need for hermeneutic stability.


As described by editor Thomas Betteridge, *Borders and Travellers in Early Modern Europe* provides “a trans-European interdisciplinary interrogation of borders and travel in early modern Europe” (12). Of the eleven essays in the collection (nine chapters, plus an introduction and an afterword), eight are written by literary scholars, two by historians, and one by an anthropologist. Several of the literary essays consider genres such as broadsides, traveler’s accounts, and the records of institutions such as Bridewell, and the majority address cultural, political, and social implications of their texts. While some of the essays trace their themes to the end of the seventeenth century, most focus upon the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Ideally, an anthology brings individually strong essays together that create a whole greater than the sum of the parts. Betteridge’s collection is more successful in meeting the first of these criteria than the second.

Betteridge’s Introduction focuses on the figure of the cannibal in Montaigne’s “Of Cannibals” and More’s *Utopia.* He concludes that these “sophisticated humanist texts” are haunted by the “essential sameness” of the European travelers/colonists and the indigenous peoples, whereas postmodern recuperations of the cannibal are part of the “naïve celebration of non-Western societies as non-antagonistic and free from the evils of modernity” (11). The essays that follow, however, are concerned with nuanced modes of othering and with literal and geographical borders, not the abstract distinction between
The “savage” cannibal and the “civilized” European,” and many argue that such absolute distinctions do not dominate the texts and institutions examined.

The collection is divided into three parts. The theme of Part I, “Borders,” relates most clearly to the first and third essays. In the first, Margaret Healy provides a concise and fascinating history of European hospitals and related intuitions, such as leper houses and “lazarretos,” places where sailors were quarantined in an effort to prevent the spread of disease. These institutions, she argues, grew out of pre-Christian sites of healing and Byzantine xenodochium (houses for travelers) and functioned as places of “abjection” and “jettisoning,” as well as places of healing (23). She begins her essay by noting that hospitals were often located by a bridge or other narrow passageway on major routes of pilgrimage. Such sites ensured that travelers were forced to encounter the unfortunates, thus making it difficult—physically and morally—to evade or ignore their pleas for alms. Though such institutions were without doubt “liminal” spaces, in which encounters with marginalized people were controlled, Healy also charts their evolution as political and social resources: monarchs periodically “reformed” them in order to appropriate a share of the alms intended for the inmates. Claire Jowitt’s contribution, “Rogue Traders: National Identity, Empire, and Piracy, 1580-1640,” analyzes three broadsides, a play, and a 1639 pamphlet that celebrate the exploits of two English pirates executed in 1583. She establishes the ambivalence in these popular texts towards figures officially viewed as criminals. The pirates speak in monarchic tones, as “Lords/ Nay Kings at Sea” (qtd. 60) and cite their loyalty to the Queen and their service against “forren foes” (qtd. 57). Jowitt reads these texts as “a celebration of Elizabethan expansionism at the expense of Jacobean pacific policies” (61). Jowitt, like Healy, leaves us with a striking image of the “borderland” or liminal space in which the pirates lived and died. An engraving of their executions shows their half-submerged bodies just off shore, in the water between high and low tide. The second essay in this section seems less clearly tied to the concept of borderlands, except perhaps to establish that the association of sex and the city knows no borders. Duncan Salkeld analyzes documentary evidence of foreigners’ experience with prostitutes to show that
a “sexual economy” involving foreign visitors thrived in London as it allegedly did in European capitals (such as Venice) sensationaly described by English travelers. While official attitudes toward illicit liaisons were stricter in London than on the Continent, malefactors, especially high ranking ones, were not always prosecuted. Salkeld suggests that the stews were not so much a liminal space as an integral part of upper and lower class culture and were therefore readily available to foreign visitors.

Part II, “Europe,” is especially valuable to scholars chiefly familiar with the English scene. Mike Pincombe introduces Balint Balassi, a Hungarian soldier on the Habsburg-Ottoman frontier and argues for the “deeply religious yet non-sectarian nature” of his Christian heroism (75). Working within the tradition of the katonaének, or Soldier-song, Balassi celebrates the frontier as a “school of valour,” but he is also exquisitely sensitive to the natural world. Playing on the dual meaning of the word vég, which means both “frontier” and “end” (81), he portrays death on the battlefield as part of the cycle of life. The absence of hostile references to the (Muslim) Ottoman enemy suggests that demonization of his antagonists was not part of his worldview. In “Unwanted Travellers: The Tightening of City Borders in Early Modern Germany,” historian Maria R. Boes provides a fascinating and meticulously documented account of the paradoxical relations between the desire for international trade (of which Frankfurt was a center) and the suspicion and repression of outsiders in that city. In “an early modern example of present behavior patterns,” “foreign wares and riches were welcome, [but] foreign people were selectively turned away” (111). In addition, some native Frankfurters (the poor, single women) and some semi-assimilated groups (Jews and Gypsies) were re-categorized as “foreigners” and subjected to oppressive badges of identity and residence restrictions. The final essay in this section, Andrew Pettegree’s “The Translation and the Migration of Texts,” studies translations of the Spanish romance Amadis de Gaule and the rise of bilingual editions designed to facilitate language learning. He suggests that texts, popular as well as scholarly, crossed borders more easily than people, partly because translators mitigated or omitted troublesome aspects of their originals. Still, he argues, despite the xenophobic tendencies in many European cultures,
readers maintained a keen appetite for trans-European tales and for mastering foreign languages.

Part III, “Travellers,” discusses three English and one German traveler and their attitudes towards their experiences. David J. Baker’s “‘Idiote’: Politics and Friendship in Thomas Coryate” adds to recent studies of this eccentric English traveler by Andrew Hadfield (Literature, Travel, and Colonial Writing, 1998) and Richmond Barbour (Before Orientalism, 2003). Baker stresses Coryate’s concern with his image in London and Odcombe (his home village) and his apparent imperviousness to the cultures through which he traveled. He argues that Coryate’s relationship with his readers and traveling companions constitutes an example of Laurie Shannon’s “discourse of friendship,” which articulates a fundamentally political “perspective . . . of private sovereignty” (qtd. 132), but this claim is not fully borne out by the evidence adduced. Melanie Ord’s essay demonstrates that Henry Wotton, three times ambassador to Venice, was the opposite of Coryate; he became so immersed in Venetian culture that, on his return, his knowledge and Italianate tastes were viewed with ambivalence, even suspicion. Ord explores how he negotiated the competing claims of his Italian experience and his English identity. In the end, as a purveyor of architectural theory and an educator (Provost of Eaton College), he provided at best “a hesitant validation” of foreign experience (149), even though his own life testified to its benefits for diplomacy and the dissemination of knowledge.

The final essay, “Sacred Cannibals and Golden Kings: Traveling the Borders of the New World with Hans Staden and Walter Ralegh” by anthropologist Neil L. Whitehead, returns to the topic of cannibalism. Whitehead challenges the claim that sixteenth-century German and English accounts of the New World were “interested only in constructing difference as a way of justifying conquest” (170). Ralegh and Staden encountered “borders which needed to be negotiated and not merely overridden” (171). Ralegh depicted Guianan society as “permeable to English diplomacy” and drew analogies between English and Orinoquian political practices (173). Staden sought to recruit and maintain native trading partners and used his ethnological insights to that end. Staden is best known, however, for describing the cannibalistic ritual he witnessed as a captive among the Tupi people.
Whitehead argues that he “nuances our understanding of ‘flesh-eating’ through his detailed account of how and to whom body parts are distributed” (176). The “cannibal moment” in Staden, Whitehead writes, must be understood in the light of the “broader cultural politics of cannibalistic/Eucharistic ritual practice” (177) and attitudes toward anatomical dissection and “medicalized cannibalism,” the latter of which persisted into the early twentieth century (179).

Andrew Hadfield’s Afterword traces themes that link the essays and foregrounds the stereotype of the cannibal, but his appreciation seems most on-target when he observes the ways in which the authors have crossed academic borders and extended the inquiry into new territory. If, as a consequence, this collection is less unified than it might be, it seems an acceptable price to pay. Less acceptable are the number of typographical errors in the book. Some confuse momentarily (“ever aspect of life,” 7) or result in bad grammar (“more then superficial,” 7), but one obscures the name of a major figure: one of Jowitt’s pirates is called both “Atkinson Clinton” and “Clinton Atkinson” (58, 58 n.28, 55 n.9 & n.12, 56, and 56 n.20). A collection as informative and ambitious as this one deserved better copy-editing.


Historians of science have long had a love-hate relationship with the ‘Scientific Revolution’. While early practitioners welcomed the term to denote the modern turn in epistemology and natural knowledge, more recent historians have either rejected the label or qualified it severely. Deborah Harkness, in her most recent book, *The Jewel House*, believes that the concept of the scientific revolution is worth saving, but with a very different focus. Instead of concentrating on the canonical figures, Harkness focused on the social history of London inhabitants, and by doing so she changes the shape of the scientific revolution completely. No longer was this an elite intellectual movement where university-educated philosophers created new
theories and epistemologies. Instead, a much larger community of people were interested in how nature worked, both for practical ends and for the love of such knowledge, and this new socio-economic group produced a new way of creating collaborative knowledge and new topics worthy to be investigated.

Using extensive and breathtaking archival research, Harkness has uncovered a collection of lively communities, whose members invested significant time in developing an understanding of nature in sixteenth-century London. These were apothecaries, instrument-makers, herbalists, midwives, alchemists, and merchants, among others. They formed an ever-changing, dynamic web of men and women, and Harkness argues that it is through their work and interests that we discover the teeming world of Elizabethan ‘science’. (Harkness uses the term ‘science’ quite deliberately, showing that these practitioners used it themselves to talk about natural investigation and knowledge.) While these men and women may not have discovered the ‘big theories’, they developed new experimental methodologies, they painstakingly developed new knowledge of plants and processes, and they created a community of experts in which to test these ideas—all well before the creation of the Royal Society in the next century.

In other words, London during the sixteenth century was full of men and women, both English and strangers, who were interested in understanding nature, often for practical reasons. In a series of focused chapters, Harkness examines city communities interested in botany and natural history, medicine and surgery, and mathematics and instrument making. She shows that there were many more people involved in these investigations than previously thought. She also situates them geographically within London, showing that living and working in proximity to one another really mattered for their intellectual lives as well as their economic ones. For example, Harkness introduces us to a group of men, many of them Dutch émigrés and living in Lime Street, who were interested in the investigation of natural history. These naturalists corresponded with each other and with other interested naturalists on the Continent. They shared specimens, field trips, gardens, ideas, and theories. They identified plant varieties and families, established uses of a number of these plants, observed their growth and development and shared all this information within
their network. Given the volume and importance of their work, it is surprising that without Harkness’s recovery, we would know nothing of these Lime Street naturalists. They have been silenced for posterity, partly because they did not publish (being a close community), and partly because their hard won knowledge was appropriated by a botanist largely unconnected with their group. John Gerard, whose *Herbal, or General historie of plantes* (1597) is now the most common way for modern scholars to approach sixteenth-century botany, was not part of this community. He used their knowledge and got his book in print in order to advance his career and status as part of a court-centered patronage community. His book was such a success that the Lime Street community has now essentially disappeared from the historical record.

Harkness also looks at the development of ‘big’ projects in sixteenth-century London, using an interpretive framework derived from the study of twentieth-century ‘Big Science’. These were projects that involved substantial government and/or private investing, designed to bring riches, fame, and technological advances to the English. She discusses, for example, the curious case of Martin Frobisher’s fool’s gold, a story of investors sponsoring competing alchemists in the hope that private investors and the State could replenish their empty coffers. Using a potentially anachronistic model, Harkness is able to show that science interested a number of influential men and associations, that they were willing to back big projects, and that there was a belief that the knowledge and manipulation of nature had great potential for wealth and the commonweal. By the end of the sixteenth century, these hopes and beliefs had faded, since most projects resulted in serious loss of funds; Elizabeth, her ministers, and London companies became much less likely to invest in such risky ventures and Elizabethan ‘Big Science’ ground to a halt.

One of the areas of burgeoning interest in London during this time was mathematics and instrumentation. Harkness shows that between 1570 and 1600 the number of vernacular mathematics books increased dramatically, and at the same time, many shops appeared selling the latest in mathematical instruments. She does a wonderful job of tracing this explosion, from Dee and Billingsley’s English Euclid of 1572 to the many West-end shops selling instruments by 1600. While
I do have some concern that Harkness sees a larger and more robust market for these books and instruments than we have evidence for, it is definitely the case that this was a new and important industry in London by the end of the century. Harkness also demonstrates that a direct result of this market-driven mathematics was the claim by mathematical practitioners that for most people, instruments could take the place of philosophical mathematical training, or any hard calculations. This was a particular technological thrust to English mathematics, which we might see as continuing in the seventeenth century with Napier’s logarithms.

This is not just a book about specific interest communities or investment in big projects, however. Harkness is particularly interested in how people in sixteenth-century London thought about and studied science, and how those methodologies would affect later scientific development (e.g. the ‘scientific revolution’). In order to do this, she looks at the intellectual journey of one particular Londoner, Clement Draper. Draper was imprisoned in the King’s Bench Prison for debt during the 1580s and 1590s. During that time, he kept a notebook, largely devoted to his investigations of nature. These notebooks are a treasure-trove of information about how a non university-based student of nature set about this study. Draper read and borrowed books; he talked to others and noted their conversations; he conducted his own experiments and asked leading questions. What these notebooks show is that someone like Draper was part of a community of likeminded individuals, constantly circulating a mixture of reading, writing, doing, and thinking, with feedback among all these different vectors. In other words, Harkness argues, a ‘new’ interest in experimentation (sometimes seen as the ‘New Philosophy’) happened in conjunction with older humanistic methods. Practice and theory, seeing by doing and knowing through authorities, were all intertwined. Here is the scientific revolution in practice.

This is an amazing project. Deborah Harkness has taken on the task of finding science in the social, something that many scholars before her would have said was impossible. She has painstakingly gone through archives untouched by historians of science and in doing so she has found a vibrant culture of inquiry into nature. It could of course be argued that the evidence she finds does not finally prove the
importance of these subjects to communities larger than the people she has identified. How typical was Clement Draper? The Lime Street naturalists? Thomas Hood and other mathematical practitioners? Research into the social life of science in this early modern period must always be to a certain extent speculative. But this book and this research open a window to a completely new world, and one that is every bit as important to changing ideas about nature as the Royal Society would be.

But is this book really about the scientific revolution, as the title suggests? Not exactly. The vibrant story of sixteenth-century London tells us that many of the characteristics of the scientific revolution—experimentation, communities of thinkers, practicality, and, above all, the model of Francis Bacon’s Salomon’s House, were present in this teeming and vital city. Harkness shows that Bacon did not create some new organization of knowledge collection, but rather was describing a structure already in place in London—and described in a far more egalitarian guise in the first place by Hugh Platt. Mercantile London did not, of itself, however create the ‘new science’. It added a necessary component to the structure, but not a sufficient one. The more canonical thinkers still have their place in this story, but, as Harkness herself says, our conception of the Scientific Revolution should now include both Newton and London.


This volume is a collection of papers which in earlier versions were presented at a conference held by the Centre for the History of British Political Thought at the Folger Shakespeare Library. As such, the contributions are largely devoted to the so-called “Cambridge school” approach to the study of political thought. The authors are mostly in agreement in their commitment to a contextualist approach to the study of political thought, though there is some debate concerning the object and scope of British political thought in the early
modern period.

The editor’s introduction sets out the purpose of the volume: to inform readers of contemporary developments in the study of political thought from multiple perspectives: historical, literary, and theoretical. The contributors were thus asked to bring their disciplinary perspectives to bear on the study of British political thought, not only to “offer an array of models and methods” for this study (3), but also to show areas of overlap and convergence between the disciplines. Thus historians “have […] become more alert to questions of language and meaning at a time when scholars of literature have been more eager to write historically and when at least some social scientists have returned to history and to hermeneutics” (2).

Despite this interdisciplinary focus, the authors tend to stay within their disciplinary boundaries. This tendency is evident throughout the contents of the volume. The first chapter, by J.G.A. Pocock, Gorden Schochet and Lois G. Schwoerer, addresses the contextualist challenge to traditional “canonical” approaches to the history of political thought. These authors, along with other scholars such as John Dunn, Peter Laslett, Richard Tuck, and especially Quentin Skinner have interpreted the history of political thought not through the lens of “great books” and the men who write them, but rather through the histories of political languages. The thought of a political writer–both philosopher and polemicist–is “presented as a series of speech acts performed in linguistic and circumstantial contexts” (11). Early modern political thought will necessarily consider texts in the “context of more popular and vernacular literature” (13) as studied by historians; it will bring in the efforts of the “new” British history to broaden the geographical scope of British political thought (including both the British isles and Britain’s Atlantic colonies); and it will attend to literary form and technique to elucidate political languages. These areas correspond to the three-fold division of subsequent chapters: “British Political Thought and History,” “British Political Thought and Literature,” and “British Political Thought and Political Theory.”

The chapters in part one consider the relevance of the new British history for the study of political thought. John Morrill surveys the various frames of reference and movements within British historiography from the seventeenth century to the 1970s, culminating in the new
historical approach heralded by John Pocock. Morrill raises complications with Pocock’s approach and calls for a comparative European approach to enrich the new British history. Colin Kidd discusses the “contours of British political thought,” focusing particularly on the Anglo-Scottish relationship in the early modern period. Kidd asserts the need to draw from the “materials of the past” as opposed to “Procrustean approaches to the history of political thought” (66), e.g., concepts of sovereignty as determined by the disciplines of philosophy, political science, and jurisprudence. Nicholas Canny examines the interactions between Irish and British political thought, pointing to the impact of Irish political opinions on British politics instead of the more conventional preoccupation with constitutional relations between Ireland and Britain, and between Ireland and the continent. Finally, Tim Harris uses the Exclusion Crisis to reveal the questionable and problematic nature of the idea of “British” political thought. Tory and Whig thinking across the isles often defied easy categorization as local, national, pan-archipelagic, or continental; Harris suggests we “get beyond such compartmentalizations” (108). Taken together, these four chapters convey a sense of what the new British history is about, thus situating much popular political thinking of the time, but do not explicitly engage the textually-focused interpretations of political literature and philosophy as treated in the following sections.

The authors in part two examine literature as it relates to British political thought. Andrew Hadfield’s essay is devoted to considering sixteenth and seventeenth-century British republicanism as a literary phenomenon, as exemplified by works written by Eulke Greville and Shakespeare. Jean E. Howard considers Shakespeare as a political thinker insofar as he offered “the dramaturgy of politics in action” (132), i.e., the use of dramatic techniques both to depict and criticize multiple strands of political thinking. Steven N. Zwicker champions the role of literature, in its usage of irony, disguise, and deceit, in revealing political languages; historians of political thought should turn to poems, novels, and plays in addition to treatises to uncover the “life of politics endowed with all the subtle inflections of the voice and contradictions of the psyche” (149). This approach is demonstrated in the next chapter by Karen O’ Brien, who interprets
Restoration and eighteenth-century poetry in terms of the language of benevolence in the context of the growing British empire. The authors in part two make a convincing case for expanding the texts studied by political theorists to include works of literature, though as Quentin Skinner rightfully points out in the afterword, a “work of philosophy will inescapably be a literary artifact” (280).

The third part addresses British political thought and political theory, though it is not wholly clear from the findings of the first two parts if such “political theory” is really a separable discipline from history or literary studies. Duncan Ivison’s thoughtful chapter on the language of rights in relation to the history of empire connects the Lockean language of rights with early modern British imperialism. Ivison admirably if naively seeks a conception of rights which take social and cultural difference into account. Joanne H. Wright argues that the language of public and private are appropriate and useful for understanding the works of Margaret Cavendish. Her thesis is unexceptionable, though her apology for Cavendish as not quite a Second Wave feminist because there was “no existing discourse for Cavendish to fall back upon” (227) is questionable. Drawing upon Mikhail Bakhtin’s conception of texts as “utterances,” Kirstie M. McClure traces the print histories of the anonymous *Vindiciae Contra Tyrannos*, Locke’s *Two Treatises of Government*, and Burke’s *Vindication of Natural Society*. McClure’s efforts to counter the privileging of authors over readers lead to tenuous applications: it seems that the future of political theory in this idiom may well take place on the internet, “where the reading of historical texts and the theorizing of future possibilites is likely to take shape” (253). Richard E. Flathman returns to the themes of the first chapter in sketching out the contextualist challenge to canonical approaches to the history of political thought. Flathman utilizes Michael Oakeshott’s distinctions between the present “practical past” and the present “historical past” to clarify the perspectives of canonicists, contextualists, and political theorists, helpfully contrasting the (idealized) contextualist’s lack of interest in the bearing of the past upon the present with philosophers’ attempts to seek a truth which is universal and timeless. Flathman suggests that while the contextualist challenge has been fruitful for thinking about text and context, the contextualist approach should be considered
as complementary to other, more canonical outlooks, especially as contextualists have in some respects been interested in the “practical past” as much as the “historical past.”

Skinner’s afterword reviews all of the chapters in the volume, and welcomes the alternative perspectives offered by the authors in parts one and two as well as Flathman’s gentle critique of the contextualist approach. Skinner concedes that no “single set of hermeneutic principles can ever hope to capture more than a fraction of what we want to know about the texts we study,” and that we “need to remain in constant dialogue with each other about the rival merits of different approaches” (284-5). But apart from the interdisciplinary voices in the volume, and Flathman’s cautionary comments, nothing is heard from such non-contextualist political theorists as Hegelians, Marxists, Arendtians, Foucauldians, and Straussians. The contextualist dialogue is open only to invited guests.


In this deeply-researched and provocative book, Harold J. Cook combines intellectual, cultural, social, religious and political history with the history of science and medicine to investigate the development, in the seventeenth-century Dutch Republic, of strikingly new ways of thinking about the material world. Drawing on numerous carefully contextualized case studies from the United Provinces, Cook argues that expanding interests in global commerce and trade during the seventeenth century supplied the Dutch not only with a plethora of fascinating new objects, such as exotic specimens from far-flung continents, but also with concepts and metaphors (like that of commerce itself) which likewise helped to spur increasingly materialistic modes of thinking. As a result, a newly object-centered, and thus “objective” knowledge arose, increasingly seen as derived not so much from reason as from the “passions” that physicians and folk-healers strove to control, as well as from the body itself.
This phenomenon was, Cook maintains, far from unique to the northern Netherlands. Instead, he argues, commerce can be seen to have played a crucial role more generally in the unfolding of the “new sciences” and related patterns of thought throughout Europe and beyond. *Matters of Exchange* is thus far more than a book about seventeenth-century Dutch science and medicine (though this is noteworthy enough, considering how extremely few studies actually exist on this topic). Rather, it is a highly synthetic and ambitious work that aims to reinterpret the Scientific Revolution itself more broadly—and together with it many aspects of the overall trajectory of seventeenth-century culture from the century’s beginning to its end.

The book unfolds both chronologically and thematically. The first chapter sets forth the themes of the book, placing them in the context of contemporary debates in the history of early modern science and of early modern culture more generally, while the second presents an admirably clear introduction to the history and culture of the late sixteenth-century Netherlands; both chapters should be extremely useful to readers more familiar with other national or disciplinary contexts. As Cook convincingly shows here, concerns with financial exchange and the conversion of currencies went hand in hand with other kinds of exchange, for example that of curiosities acquired on long voyages, which circulated through many a Dutch burgher’s cabinet. Furthermore, in the second chapter, Cook introduces an important case study, namely that of Caspar Barlaeus, a Dutch scholar who in 1632 gave an inaugural address on the founding that year of Amsterdam’s first full-scale Athenaeum. Barlaeus devoted his address to the theme of the union of wisdom and commerce. Rejecting the classical assumption that the pursuit of wealth was incompatible with that both of virtue and of knowledge, the Dutch scholar argued that commerce was in fact highly conducive to knowledge and wisdom—as could be seen in the example of Amsterdam itself, whose affluent citizens had enabled the Athenaeum’s opening. This case study is just the first of many that Cook subsequently deploys to focus readers’ attention on the intellectual implications of commerce, and as such it helps to provide a valuable touchstone for Cook’s own argument, one he frequently refers back to.
Gradually, as the book proceeds, Cook presents many such examples of the intersection of commerce and natural knowledge, in each case delving deeply into the historical context in question in order to explain what was at stake. Thus, he devotes considerable space in Chapter 3 to carefully scrutinizing the religious and political debates that framed the career of the prominent early seventeenth-century botanist Carolus Clusius, who founded the botanical garden at Leiden, and the ways in which Clusius sought to distance himself from these debates by developing an observational style that privileged descriptive detail, that is, that favored knowledge based on particulars, rather than on all-too-controversial general principles. Likewise, Chapter 4 advances Cook’s claims through another case study, this time of the medical doctor Nicolaes Tulp (depicted by Rembrandt in 1632 in his famous painting *The Anatomy Lesson*). Painstakingly uncovering Tulp’s involvement in assorted religious, political, and professional intrigues, Cook shows how Tulp himself, despite disagreeing with Clusius on many matters, similarly ended up “preaching” from the pulpit of the anatomy theater the same kind of emphasis on material detail in the study of the human body that Clusius had advocated in the botanical realm. A case study in Chapter 5 of another physician, Dr. Jacobus Bontius, who travelled with the Dutch East India company to faraway Java and while there conducted critical work on the flora and fauna of the Indies, comes to the same conclusion: Dutch values and the demands of commerce alike furthered the development of new styles of knowledge based on individual “facts,” which could easily be circulated and exchanged in an increasingly globalizing world. Subsequent chapters on the Dutch invention of microscopy and the Dutch transmission to Europe of knowledge about Japanese acupuncture, as well as other examples too numerous to mention here, provide additional evidence to substantiate this crucial claim.

One of Cook’s most striking analyses, though, comes when he turns his attention to philosopher René Descartes, one of the Netherlands’ most famous seventeenth-century immigrants. In a chapter entitled “Medicine and Materialism” (Chapter 6), Cook shows how Descartes’ experiences in Dutch anatomy theaters helped lead him to develop his theories about the relation between body and mind into a full-fledged interest in the “passions.” His resulting treatise on *Les
passions de l’âme, fleshed out in correspondence with the young Princess Palatinate Elizabeth (also taking refuge in the Netherlands at the time), justified the passions as physiologically—and thus materially—caused modes of knowledge that were capable of serving as positive forces in the world. Seen in this light, self-interest caused by the passions, such as an individual’s quest for personal wealth, might very well prove beneficial to the common good. Cook demonstrates how these ideas of Descartes, very much influenced by his stay in the Netherlands, then influenced events in the Netherlands in turn, as they were taken up not only by Dutch proponents of a materialism even more radical than Descartes’ own dualism, but also by some extremely highly-placed republican theorists. In a later chapter, Cook traces the subsequent career of such ideas about the passions, revealing that the London-based author of the highly influential Fable of the Bees: Or, Private Vices, Publick Benefits (frequently used in the eighteenth century to justify commerce), Bernard Mandeville, was himself Dutch in origin and had drawn considerably in this work on the materialist ideas he himself had encountered while studying in Leiden. In short, the intellectual milieu of the Dutch Republic thus proved highly favorable not only to the study of “objective” facts, but also to an accompanying philosophical materialism in which the act of thinking itself came to be viewed in bodily or material terms, with significant cultural and political consequences.

Matters of Exchange thus provides a distinctly new view of early modern science. Paying careful attention to aspects of science and thought often left out of traditional accounts of the Scientific Revolution—from the importance of natural history in the construction of “objective” knowledge, to the key role of medicine in the emergence of materialism—Cook suggests new ways of looking at old narratives. The way in which the book immerses the reader deeply within relatively understudied Dutch contexts has the same effect. The numerous case studies Cook presents of the interconnections between commerce and culture support his argument quite well; the 60 black-and-white illustrations that grace the book also add substantially to its appeal. The book should thus be of considerable interest to a wide range of readers, including literary and cultural historians, as well as anyone interested in seventeenth-century matters.
Sir Isaac Newton was a towering figure in seventeenth-century English science and culture and, indeed, in the development of all of modern Western culture. The book under review by Dr. Mordechai Feingold, the well-known historian of early modern English mathematics and science, was a companion volume to the wonderful exhibition on Isaac Newton and his influence which ran at the New York Public Library from October 8, 2004 until February 5, 2005. This reviewer was lucky enough to view this splendid exhibition at the New York Public Library.

The first chapter, “The Apprenticeship of Genius,” takes the reader through Newton’s early years, his education, his relations with teachers and fellow scientists such as Isaac Barrow and Robert Hooke, and ends with the publication of the *Principia* in 1687. Chapter Two, “The Lion’s Claws,” begins the discussion of the reception of Newton’s work with reactions of supporters such as Halley and Locke and critics such as Huygens and Leibniz. This chapter also details the appearance of Newton’s *Opticks* (1704) and the beginnings of the fierce priority dispute between Newton and Leibniz over the invention of calculus.

Chapters Three and Four, “Trial By Fire” and “The Voltaire Effect,” cover the reception of Newton’s *Principia* and *Opticks* on the continent and the struggle against rival views, especially Cartesianism. Chapter Four analyzes the great role Voltaire, the literary giant, played in the success of Newtonianism and how Voltaire came to view it as, in Feingold’s words, “a secular religion” (104).

Continuing the theme of reception, we come to the most intriguing chapter of the book. Chapter Five, entitled “Newtonian Women,” begins with the assertion that “one of the most interesting manifestations of the struggle for hegemony between the Cartesian, Newtonians, and Leibnizians was the campaign for the allegiance of women, who by the late seventeenth century had become consumers of all things scientific” (119). Feingold cites numerous cases to
confirm his thesis. Among those cited by Feingold are the amazing cases of the child prodigies Laura Bassi—who received a doctorate in philosophy from the University of Bologna in 1732, was appointed to a professorship at that university, and gave private lectures on experimental physics at her home—and Maria Agnesi, who published a list of theses in physics, metaphysics and logic (1738) she had defended over a number of years in her father’s salon. Agnesi applied various Newtonian theses from the *Principia* and the *Opticks* to an overall Cartesian framework. Of course, as Feingold makes clear, there was still male opposition to or suspicion of such scientific women and a number of them, including Bassi and Agnesi, needed help from men such as patrons, fathers and husbands.

The final two chapters, “All Was Light” and “Apotheosis,” deal with the representation of Newton and of Newtonianism in the various areas of modern culture. Feingold narrates the appropriation of Newton and of his ideas and “method” in the fine and literary arts and in social sciences such as economics, as well as in the areas of natural theology and the physical sciences. Some attention is also paid to critics of Newton and Newtonianism.

Of particular interest are the images of Newton that began to appear. One such image was the engraving with the significant title of “The Apotheosis of Sir Isaac Newton” (1732) by George Bickham. Another was the portrait of Benjamin Franklin done in London by David Martin in 1766 where Franklin is depicted at a desk on which stands a large bust of Newton. It would appear that Franklin wished to appropriate the mantle of Newton for himself.

All of the above chapters are lavishly illustrated, with any number of these illustrations in glorious color. The illustrations alone are worth the price of the volume. Although there is no real treatment of Newton’s heretical theology, biblical investigations or alchemy in this volume, perhaps because these were not important in “the making of modern culture,” there is no better introduction to Newton and his influence on modern culture than this book.

In this ambitious volume, editors Kathryn M. Moncrief and Kathryn R. McPherson collected seventeen essays, each contributing to a unity of purpose—maternity as “performed and performative;” its activity laced with complex nuanced qualities in its actions and suggestions of meaning (3). Both public and private aspects of motherhood are analyzed in *Performing Maternity in Early Modern England*. The essays invite exploration of the maternal body’s cultural representations, noting that every body “functions as a potent space for cultural conflict, a site of imagination and contest” (1). Each essay argues for “appropriated, interpreted, and reinvented” representations of maternity (7) along the lines of cultural practices that shape social life (4). Readers will be thoroughly engaged by the wealth of historical documents and artistic representations employed to further the collection’s attention to maternal agency and production of gender identity in the period.

Part I: The Performance of Pregnancy concentrates on the staged pregnant female body; prescriptive literature of the time that included methods to determine fertility and conception as well as conduct expectations speak to and confront the “cultural demands associated with maternity” (8). Sid Ray’s essay on *The Duchess of Malfi* argues for the heroine’s authority because she bore a child; she “rules in her son’s stead” (19). The culturally figurative King’s Two Bodies is linked with the Duchess and suggests Webster’s progressive view of pregnancy as overtly political. Kathryn Moncrief uses gynecological manuals and midwifery guides in her discussion of the staging of Helena at *All’s Well That Ends Well*, the unsettling ending reminds us that paternity is always unknowable to the man. Illusions of twinning and doubling in *The Winter’s Tale* inform Michelle Ephraim’s argument for superfetation, an early modern medical term for women being simultaneously pregnant with children by two different men. Her discussion notes the “competing cultural discourses that simultaneously encourage and assuage contemporary fears about the pregnant woman’s sexual au-
tonomy” (48). Thomas Middleton’s *A Mad World My Masters*, according to Robert Bell, uses “counterfeit” maternity to critique urban culture and the genre of city comedy (69). Inverting the performance issue, a surprising and single reference to children in Thomas Heywood’s *A Woman Killed with Kindness* receives Lisa Hopkins’s attention. She notes the play’s emphasis on male social bonds and that the mother “colludes in her excision from the patriarchal narrative” (83).

Part II: The Performance of Maternal Authority addresses the reclamation of maternal status in a period assuming paternal superiority. Janelle Jenstad argues for childbirth as empowering characters and authors. She interrogates the “lying in” (92) and rituals associated with childbirth, including secrecy, in this “gynocentric space” in *The Duchess of Malfi* and *The Witch* (90). An important aspect of her essay focuses on *The Magnetic Lady*, and her designation of the playwright, Ben Jonson, as theatrical widwife. The male Jonson’s treatment reveals truths about maternity, and he gains “power by gaining control over women’s secrets” (92). Mother’s advice books and the “struggle of the construction of motherhood” contribute to Christina Luckyj’s essay (102). Examining two pamphlets, *The Answere of a Mother Unto hir Seduced Sonnes Letter* and the “expanded version,” *A Mothers Teares over hir Seduced Sonne, or a Dissuasive from Idolatry*, Luckyj studies the divide between acceptable 1620s Puritan and Catholic maternal performance. Male mothering and Prospero’s maternal rhetoric is taken up by Suzanne Penuel, in Part II’s final essay. She argues *The Tempest* “eventually resuscitates the figure of the mother within the figure of the father . . . in part through a redistribution of moral value between the gendered figures of the witch and the magician” (116).

Part III: The Performance of Maternal Suffering shows ways suffering, grief, and death figure into maternal identity. Even the liturgical rite of churching, “the new mother’s appearance at her parish church in the company of her birth attendants,” according to Kathryn McPherson, shows conflicted responses to maternity (131). Notably, the Alice Wadensford and Elizabeth Cavendish Egerton autobiographical writings include but also depart from conventions of public thanksgiving and piety. They complain about suffering and languish over the loss of children in the cause of a religious motherhood, giving authority and influence to women’s suffering. In one
of the volume’s most unique and thought-provoking examinations, Chris Laoutris asserts the funerary monuments of the period—with their feminized tropes of death—move “beyond the limits of heraldic iconography,” and bear witness to the mother’s legacy. He reads *Antony and Cleopatra* as memorializing maternity through Cleopatra’s “dying postures,” which appropriate “dynastic” display and simultaneously challenge constructions of memory (157). Stuart women’s spiritual diaries celebrate the childbirth experience. More prevalent, Avra Kouffman outlines, are fear of loss, bereavement, and acceptance of inevitable child loss. The church “allowed [a mother] only limited latitude in inscribing her experience of maternity,” but the diarists studied suggest a new conception of motherhood for those who shared their written maternal experiences (172).

Part IV: The Performance of Maternal Erasure exposes early modern restrictions imposed upon maternity in essays that attend to the constructed nature of gender.

Maternal power and influence could be subverted, Donna Woodford suggests in her examination of nursing mothers, by fathers who send the newborn to a wet-nurse; thus increasing the possibility the mother would conceive again soon. Using *The Winter’s Tale*, she shows how the play removes the maternal influence of “nursing and nurturing children” and demonstrates the “male attempt to appropriate and take credit for the female power of childbirth and reproduction” (194). In Gloria Olchowy’s essay, murder is refigured as birth in her reading of *Macbeth*. Lady Macbeth, she argues, in helping her husband murder the king “as a means of giving birth to a new version of himself,” acquires a new identity for herself in the process (204). Within the world of the play, however, the absence of women creates havoc with inheritance and increases probability for revolutionary rather than hereditary succession. Olchowy also addresses the ideologies Elizabeth I employed to maintain mother/monarch messages and addresses James I’s “rigorous paternal conception of state power” that eliminates motherhood “altogether” (202). Examining the relationship between domesticity and politics, Mary Stripling unpacks Christopher Marlowe’s potentially threatening version of maternity. Invincible Tamburlaine’s weakness lies in the maternal power of his wife, Zenocrate. Her influence and nurturing of their sons destabilizes
him; his displacement of her role and elimination shows the “tyrant [who feels he] must wrest control of his family away from his children’s mother” (223) In the volume’s closing essay, Douglas Brooks looks closely at the paternity and writing technology issues present in Shakespeare’s *The Merchant of Venice*. He contends the metaphors borrowed from printing to express anxieties of legitimacy, ethnicity, sexuality and Christianity are new in the period, one attempting to understand its gendered roles.

The scope of *Performing Maternity in Early Modern England* is manifested in the remarkable treatment of little-known texts alongside familiar works. Scholars interested in links among literature, drama, performance, gender studies, and cultural influences will find this volume replete with the ways “ideologies of maternity” inform the period (12). Well-argued, these essays of “enacted and embodied” maternity contribute to the existing conversation and advance current scholarship (1). Each author offers fresh insights into cultural construction as well as synthesizes the many competing discourses that make up the performances of maternity.


Patronage has tended to count amongst those cultural institutions of the Old Regime which are primarily characterized by their archaeness and negativity for holding writers back and impeding their “natural” self-expression and development. Peter Shoemaker offers a much needed corrective to this commonplace view in his provocative new study *Powerful Connections*. “Instead of merely assuming that patronage is constraining,” he asserts in the introduction, “I argue that we might also consider the dynamic possibilities that it offered” (23). Given the centrality of the phenomenon to early modern intellectual culture, Shoemaker’s reevaluation of it is extremely compelling, fruitful and important. The backdrop is France of the 1620s and 1630s at a pivotal moment, as the Kingdom reinvented itself under the political
rule of Richelieu and Louis XIII following the devastating Religious Wars of the sixteenth century. Patronage, according to Shoemaker, was a key mechanism of this transformation, which in the cultural arena was manifested by the elevation of the writer in two crucial ways. On one hand, reflecting the rationalization of the absolutist state with its propaganda arm, the writer was called upon to serve as a personal counselor to the prince. On the other, as an effect of the sophistication of comportments associated by Norbert Elias with the rise of court culture, the writer was integrated into the networks of social elites as their intimate.

Both trends, Shoemaker argues, entailed a move away from the grand oratorical models of the very Classically-oriented Renaissance towards a newer “particularistic rhetoric,” a shift that was driven “by the rapid ascension of the early modern state, with its increasingly sharp public/private divide” (22). The central premise of the study is that patronage was not, as it has so often been viewed, a mere fallback for Old Regime writers who lacked alternative means for supporting themselves and who then experienced it as an outmoded obstacle to their evolving intellectual desires and ambitions. On the contrary, Shoemaker highlights the ways in which patronage extended to writers a timely vehicle for their aspirations and was, as a result, integral to the modernization of literary life in the period, serving “as a kind of ‘primordial soup’ out of which new configurations of culture and power emerged” (228). Paradoxically these new configurations, inasmuch as they advanced a belief in the autonomy and authority of the intellectual, also ultimately advanced a view of the patronage relationship itself as restrictive and archaic, and thus as that from which, in the interest of progress, writers needed to escape.

*Powerful Connections* develops the analysis in six richly documented chapters exploring different aspects of the aristocratic and royal protection of letters in the seventeenth century, including a theorization and typology in the first chapter. Shoemaker reconsiders some of the conventional categories that have been used to understand the institution. It is, for instance, habitual to distinguish *mécénat*, involving “free” rewards for artistic activities, from *clientélisme*, which implies the rendering of specific services as, say, a secretary. Shoemaker’s critique of this opposition is particularly insightful for bringing to light the
texturing of “actual” practices and idealizations that is so much at the heart of patronage. Chapter two focuses on Guez de Balzac; the “reinventor of eloquence” figures here as a kind of emblematic case that illustrates both the invariably transitional nature of patronage—Balzac always being something of a forerunner or an “archetype” (57)—and its ambivalence. The thorny question of authorship in a patronage regime occupies chapter three, while chapter four turns to the beginnings of an antipatronage reaction in the writings of libertines such as Saint-Amant, Tristan and Sorel. Again, Shoemaker aims for nuance. His analysis is drawn to the types of paradoxes exemplified by Théophile de Viau, who, calling himself a “serf si libertin,” lay claim to the freedom that would be such a hallmark of his life and poetry not by overtly repudiating noble protection but by cultivating a certain kind of it, and then plumbing its ambiguities (127-8).

While, in principle, the book presents a well-circumscribed chronology, we do get a distinct sense of opening up towards something new in the sequence of chapters. Chapter five, for instance, turns to patronage in the theatre. This of course evokes the role of Richelieu and his cultural politics of centralization. The life of Jean Mairet reveals how writers’ relations with patrons evolved over this period as the social and political authority of the old aristocracy faded before the rise of the state (Mairet’s own position in the literary field, to be sure, profoundly altered when his protector, the duc de Montmorency, was executed in 1632 for plotting against the King). The final chapter addresses this shift more directly, focusing on the birth of the Académie française not in terms of a break with established patronage patterns but of an appropriation and transformation of these patterns in a new political framework. Building on the recent studies of Hélène Merlin and Christian Jouhaud, Shoemaker resists the temptation to see the Académie in overly stark terms, though, either as a propaganda machine co-opting writers or as a new space of intellectual freedom. Instead, he underscores the reciprocal logic of the Académie by which both writer and political patron benefited.

Overall, Powerful Connections delivers an intricate and complete account of the intellectual culture of early seventeenth-century France, refracted through the history of an institution that was absolutely central to this culture yet whose precise contribution to its
development has not always been well defined. As the title suggests, Shoemaker’s study is especially strong when it builds its historical analysis on an incisive examination of the rhetoric that, in a way, is what really constituted patronage. The close readings of the stylized language through which patronage relations were evoked and affirmed in poems, letters, and other forms, and through which the identities of protected writers such as Balzac, Boisrobert, and Du Ryer were, in turn, molded and validated, present some of the most evocative, compelling parts of the book. Above all, they effectively get to the essence of the phenomenon, which lies in the fact that patronage assumes its form right at the point where language and social practice interpenetrate. It is inasmuch as we understand this dynamic that we can appreciate how writers may have become autonomous by embracing rather than rejecting the aristocratic and royal protection of letters, and that we can then see, as Shoemaker forcefully argues, the importance of understanding patronage for understanding the modernization of authorship in the Old Regime.


At the time Louis XIV took power the expansionist wars, the growth of capitalism and the development of commercial ventures were fundamentally transforming France. It therefore became imperative for the sovereign to find new ways of uniting and governing a heterogeneous nation. In this light, Vaux and Versailles can be seen as aesthetic experiments in assembling a mosaic of groups of people into a strong, united nation that could recognize itself not only in a ruler, but also in a system of values and experiences. Claire Goldstein examines the intersection of a particular aesthetic with the awareness of belonging to French culture and ultimately the feeling of being a subject of the king of France through the descriptive literature of Versailles and Vaux in the mid-seventeenth century. However, Professor Goldstein differentiates Vaux, the most accomplished model of a
private residence, from Versailles, a less successful royal palace.

Professor Goldstein elucidates the transformations in the social order through the study of Fouquet’s home and Louis XIV’s palace. Her book explores the state’s attempts to take control over the arts, and more specifically architecture, horticulture, pictorial arts, and literature in order to serve its own ends. She clearly explains how the royal power tried to supervise the rise of the bourgeoisie, in this case Fouquet, in order to take control of increasingly dominant forces. The author challenges the notion of simple evolution from a private residence that was Vaux to the establishment of a royal palace that was Versailles, focusing instead on the “relocation and redeployment aimed at erasure” (21).

Professor Goldstein revisits the theories and visions of Versailles from authors such as Jean-Marie Apostolidès and Louis Marin, to propose a new and refreshing view of royal culture and classicism not embodied in Louis XIV’s legend but materially and literarily constructed in Versailles. Her major point is that Versailles is a masterpiece that tries unsuccessfully to obliterate its model at Vaux. She astutely concentrates on authors who wrote on both châteaux: Molière’s play Les Fâcheux followed by Villedieu’s Le Favory in an intermezzo. She also examines the history of tapestries that were created for Fouquet but were later rewoven in part to celebrate the king of France, in conjunction with a selection of texts from La Fontaine or, in her second intermezzo, two texts of Félibien, Eléments and Saisons. The literary promenade such as La Fontaine Songe de Vaux and Scudéry’s Promenade de Versailles are used to stress the comfort and innovation of Vaux, a place perceived as more humane and sometimes more civilized than the overly structured palace of Versailles with its formal, yet confusing landscape. This chapter concludes with a third intermezzo on later guidebooks that emphasized the cacophonous image of the royal gardens. The most innovative and interesting part of this book appears at the end when the author situates both châteaux within an economic perspective. While Vaux is perceived almost as the international headquarters of a large company—where freedom, economic liberalism, innovation, and trade are celebrated—Versailles, in its “cannibalization” of Vaux, constitutes the incarnation of state capitalism, supreme authority, and total political and economic
control. The last intermezzo focuses on the descriptions of orange trees, ironic metaphors of creation, but also products of an authority striving against the forces of nature.

The book clearly explains how the move from Vaux to Versailles had a profound impact not only on politics, but also on literary style, gardening, tapestry, and architecture. Professor Goldstein views the construction of Vaux, and later Versailles, as symbols of the emergence of a national style and “concomitant invention of new ways of speaking and seeing, even being” (5). One of the more interesting points that Professor Goldstein makes is how Vaux represented and promoted a certain way of life. For her, the entire estate of Fouquet symbolizes a modern and innovative France. Its aesthetics represents tolerance and peace. As it appears in the literature of the time, the residence promises a new, productive and liberal kingdom. On the other hand, Versailles is clearly presented here as the embodiment of the absolute state and the antithesis of the freedom exemplified in Vaux.

One could differ with Professor Goldstein’s view, particularly when she insists upon seeing Versailles as a total failure. More than a royal residence, Versailles was the seat of power and could be seen as a gigantic stage from which the king was able to govern and bring internal peace. Vaux was a private residence with aims that greatly differed from those of Versailles. Fouquet was trying to impress rich clients to compel them to lend money to the crown; Louis XIV wished to dazzle France in order to unite it and to shock Europe with symbols of his political power. Sometimes it seems that Professor Goldstein overstates her argument. A little more temperance in her vision of Versailles might have helped to accommodate some sensitivities and modulate the negative perceptions of a monument that remains the pride of many of the French. The reader understands very well that Versailles has its limitations and its flaws but she may go too far in calling it a failure. Sometimes, her vision opposes too starkly the economic and liberal genius of Nicolas Fouquet with the overbearing political and capitalistic power of Louis XIV. This being said, the clarity of her style and the rigor of her analysis largely compensate for her noticeable distaste for Versailles and her unwavering admiration for Vaux. Let it be noted that at no point does she fall
into the negative legacy of Félix Gaiffe or Michel de Grèce. Professor Goldstein’s book is a must-have for the collections of both scholars and neophytes attracted by Versailles, and an excellent companion to Gérard Sabatier’s monumental Versailles ou la figure du roi (Paris: Albin Michel, 1999).


Positing herself as an “interpreter of [Pierre] Corneille’s ironies” (8), Nina Ekstein offers in her recent monograph an extremely thorough and cogent study of one aspect of the dramatist’s work that had previously received little to no systematic attention by scholars. From her brief overview of irony and its various components to a series of close readings of several plays from Corneille’s repertoire, Ekstein offers a clearly written and in-depth analysis of the pervasive—yet never dominating—place of irony in Corneille’s theater and critical writings. Moreover, the very nature of irony itself, containing as it does a fundamental ambiguity, results in a multifaceted and often open-ended reading that, rather than providing all the answers, provokes Ekstein’s reader to ask still more questions—a very satisfying challenge for any dix-septiémiste.

Ekstein has divided her study into two parts. In Part I, “Evident Irony,” while she acknowledges that “there exist numerous taxonomies of irony” (4), Ekstein nonetheless manages to lay out very clearly several basic elements necessary to any ironic reading of a piece of literature, including doubling, ambiguity, and an “edge,” as well as an intending subject or ironist, an interpreter, and signals of irony. From here, Ekstein goes on to examine irony that has a “manifest and substantial presence” (13) in Corneille’s work, with explicit attention to dramatic irony (both stage-centered and authorial), verbal irony, and situational irony (including reversals of fortune, irony of fate, and oracles). In Part II, “Signals of Possible Irony,” Ekstein explores cases of “reduplication and excess where there should be similarity” (76) as well as “gaps where there should be continuity”
While the cases examined in this half of the book are patently less cut-and-dry, their very undecidability makes for an inherently dynamic re-reading of Corneille as staged in the implicit dialogue between Ekstein and her reader. Thus, any potential for monotony in the cataloguing of ironic “types” is mitigated by the active role of the reader in the critical process.

Significantly, Ekstein is constantly aware of the possible pitfalls and dangers associated with the study of a topic that is itself characterized by dissimulation or ambiguity. She notes one particular danger of seeking the ironic reading: “Certain readers of Corneille, needless to say myself included… have seen irony materialize in the space between two elements, and once it materializes, it never disappears” (76). However, Ekstein is careful always to delineate the limits of her terrain, distinguishing, for example, mere coincidence from coincidence that might be interpreted as ironic, but also expressing doubt that the exaggerated flattery of Louis XIV found in plays such as *Attila* or *Tite et Bérénice* is ironic while simultaneously questioning Corneille’s motives for such excess. Corneille’s tragedies in particular offer an “unstable” (108) terrain for interpretation, and yet the majority of Ekstein’s attention is given to this genre rather than to comedy or tragicomedy. It is refreshing to read a critical work so willing to question its own conclusions, so open to stating that a single, definitive answer remains elusive.

At the level of character analysis, Ekstein repeatedly complicates simplistic readings of dramatic personages by attending to curious or disturbing contradictions or possible “insincerities” that have not previously received satisfactory attention from literary critics. Summarizing past analyses of the characters of Sabine, Attila, Livie, Òdipe and others, Ekstein goes on to propose alternative readings of their seemingly inexplicable actions or problematic situations; while she does not reject out of hand past Cornelian scholarship, Ekstein does offer, in her careful attention to detail, a more nuanced portrait of many intriguing Cornelian heroes and heroines. The attention given to developing more complex readings of Corneille’s female characters is especially appreciated. Ekstein’s Sabine “disrupts the traditional structure of symmetries and the values that undergird it” (97); her study of Livie, while equally intriguing, leaves the reader with more
questions than answers—but in both cases, our understanding of the character is enriched by Ekstein’s approach.

Although the previous two examples might suggest otherwise, Ekstein’s focus in Corneille’s Irony is not the canonical tetralogy of Le Cid, Horace, Cinna and Polyeucte (though each of these plays does receive generous attention). Remarkably, some of Ekstein’s richest interpretations elucidate plays that generally fall under the traditional critical radar. Indeed, it may be at times precisely because of the key role of irony in a given play that the piece has likely been judged less successful. Corneille’s use of a double register in Théodore, vierge et martyr (religious vocabulary in a sexually explicit situation) results in a play that resists synthesis, a gap that, for Ekstein, “invites an ironic reading” (131). Ekstein’s reading of what she calls the “margin” between Le Menteur and La Suite du Menteur is particularly satisfying, as it accounts for many of the unsettling similarities and, more importantly, differences between two plays ostensibly linked by a common character. For Ekstein, the irony of La Suite is inextricably tied to its own subversion of its autonomy as a play. Corneille, in short, was engaging in self-deprecation in this less-loved sequel to his previous blockbuster.

Indeed, Ekstein’s repeated attention to Corneille as author and his own possible ironic intentions is especially interesting, as it points to a more playful side of Corneille that may often be overlooked, both in his plays and in his critical and paratextual writings. Corneille’s very willingness to disconcert seems to signal for Ekstein a greater depth of authorial identity, although she is careful to distinguish between obviously ironic intent and less definitive interpretations of intent. Ekstein clearly demonstrates Corneille’s keen sense of irony in the various ironic clues he embeds in his plays, in his use of surprise to create situational irony, in his penchant for binaries and symmetries to create incongruities, in his occasionally playful dedications, in his ironic challenges of contemporary dramatic authors and critics, and especially in his own self-parody. Ekstein’s reading thus enriches our knowledge of Corneille as author in particularly solid ways.

Throughout this study, Ekstein is acutely aware of the inherently dramatic nature of irony, a condition that fundamentally strengthens the ties she posits between irony’s ambiguities and the nature of the-
Later itself. Her study attends to every one of Corneille’s thirty-three plays (including Psyché), some in greater detail than others, but it is the close analyses of particular plays—Attila, La Suite du Menteur, Cinna, Ôedipe, Horace—that are the most satisfying, and the most fun, sections of this monograph. Some of Ekstein’s conclusions—particularly those dealing with heroism and the sublime, and Corneille’s occasional subversion of both—are perhaps not surprising. And at times she posits a particular case of irony without clearly explicating the precise object of ironic intent. But then again, is it not this very undecidability that makes Corneille’s theater, and Nina Ekstein’s book, so very fascinating in and of themselves?


It has become commonplace in studies of hospitals, charity and poverty to set their particular focus against the backdrop of struggle between local and state, of an aggrandizing crown keen to gain control of the country through charitable institutions and policies. Tim McHugh’s new text proposes to examine thoroughly the truth of this oft-told tale, not only examining the policies of central government but importantly those of the local communities delivering these services across France. McHugh argues that the dominant historiography of early modern charity has seen in royal edicts the trace of an emerging strategy of crown control, often with little attention to the evidence of extant local records. His study will go some way towards showing the interpretive possibilities of remaining local evidence for offering a more complex narrative of early modern hospital politics. Concentrating on the seventeenth century in its own right, rather than as a stepping stone in a broader trend, and studying the archives produced at the local level for poor relief and hospitals, McHugh reveals communities that endeavored to meet their obligations, and enacted care that typically reflected the evolving tenets of Catholic Reformation belief about the salvation of the poor and redemptive
power of charity.

In the first chapter, McHugh examines the social, political, and religious theories from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries concerning poverty and the poor, which were to inform developments in the latter century. His analysis suggests that mercantile, reformed Catholic, and noble ideologies came together in changing views of poverty. In particular, he provides a compelling argument of the intertwined set of beliefs that led to the eventual distinction of the poor as deserving or otherwise, and the proposal of enclosure as a way in which moral as well as physical care could be guaranteed. Social and economic theorists perceived the poor as an underutilized source of labor. Both Jansenists and Jesuits, for different reasons, signaled the importance of donation to organized charity. In concrete terms, the rise of influential confraternities involving a likeminded community of the urban elite (from which administrators would be increasingly drawn) provided a concrete forum in which charitable work could be organized. Finally, through hospital governance, long-held notions concerning noble responsibility for those on their lands were recast by urban elites to allow for their own demonstration of elite status.

In Chapter Two, the focus shifts to the relationship of hospitals to the state, in which McHugh questions whether the crown had the desire or apparatus to control charity at the local level, or to force reforms where the were not supported by local communities. Monarchs, he suggests, gave little more than noble patronage to charity organizations, although the significance of soft power and symbolic indications of central policy are not explored here. Instead, McHugh insists, it was the administrators of Parisian hospitals who sought the support of central government for their specific charitable developments. Where the crown did engage with charity in this century, it was as a mediator reminding urban communities to fulfill their paternal duties towards their poor, rather than being intent on usurping local roles.

The next two chapters explore the developments in Paris, firstly of the Hôtel-Dieu as the long-established and premier institution for care of the destitute in Paris, and then of the newly created 1656 Hôpital Général in the context of the broader reforms to poor relief in that city. In the first of these chapters, McHugh examines the degree of
medicalization of the facility in close detail, as measured through the provision of medical care by nursing orders, physicians and surgeons, and through the expansion and distinction of patient groups into discrete wards. McHugh’s description of these changes as a shift from amateur to professional care may concern some of those scholars who have examined the wide range of healthcare providers within early modern hospitals, but it is clear that broader integration of the elite university and corporate medical communities was perceived as a form of improvement by the equally elite administration. Financially, expansion allowed more opportunities for elite patronage of the institution and new donations provided support to the hospital’s reliance on local taxes and rents for its income. McHugh’s emphasis in tracing these developments is to signal how much of the impetus stemmed from the governors, and to argue for a rehabilitation of the medical assistance provided by the hospital at this period in line with other recent analyses of hospital care.

The broader reforms of poor relief in the city which are the subject of the following chapter chart the ideologies behind the decision to distinguish the deserving poor and providing direct relief to them, as well as eradicating vagrancy, begging, and dealing with an influx of new paupers/migrants to Paris. The 1656 Hôpital was a sign of this development, but also a mechanism by which the aspiring urban elite (many of whom were members of the Compagnie du Saint-Sacrement which helped to spread the idea of enclosure) could demonstrate their attainment of ranks of civic responsibility equivalent to the landed nobility. The central government’s eventual intervention in the governance of the facility was the result of the hospital’s failing financial situation. The crown’s retrospective celebration of its involvement in the Hôpital should not beguile us into believing, McHugh argues, that its actions were in fact the achievement of an intended central policy.

McHugh contrasts the developments of Paris by providing two further chapters that explore Montpellier and Nîmes. In Montpellier, changing demographics of the city saw the rise of an administrative elite distinct from the artisanal groups that had traditionally controlled the charitable organizations of the city. They now demanded representation in these institutions. Developments were also influenced
by the diminution of the rural economy and increased urbanization. The return of the Catholic elite to hospital management after 1622 led to Protestant rights to care being slowly undermined amid complaints about the hospital’s use as a site of conversion. Charity again became a site in which civic leadership by new social groups could be shown. When, towards the end of the century, the maison de charité was enlarged in the model of the Parisian Hôpital Général, McHugh suggests that it was under the influence, not of the crown, but of a reforming bishop working with the local urban elite.

The religious compromise that persisted in Nîmes through the century merits a closer analysis, for both groups used charity as a way of defining their faith. They shared control of the Hotel-Dieu for the first half of the century until the Protestant consuls develop a new facility in the 1650s. When this was shut down at the end of the next decade by the strongly Catholic Parliament of Toulouse, Protestant charity returned to the model of outdoor community relief to avoid conversion attempts by Catholic hospital staff. It was only in 1686 that Nîmes moved to create a hospital enclosure that invested in training and up-skilling of deserving adults and children. McHugh argues that Nîmes may be unusual in its religious divisions but that these help to highlight exactly how much charity developments were governed by local forces, rather than crown policies. Moreover, it seems too that the focus on these particular towns works particularly well to articulate the important role of Catholic ideologies, rather than state policies, in the development of hospital politics. The Catholic Reformation Church’s relatively unified position on charity and poverty was reflected in similar solutions to common problems across the country.

The hospital reforms of the seventeenth century were, in McHugh’s view, a product of an emergent local urban elites using charity as the demonstration of their power. He argues that urban communities treated royal edicts only as reminders of their social responsibility to the poor and as recommendations to action, and that the crown had little interest in intervening in communities which were successfully managing charitable care. The text is patently about charity, and yet the poor themselves remain silent in shaping notions about poverty and charity. Did they have expectations that were ex-
pressed through their recorded statements to clerks, or by their actions in seeking relief to which they felt they were entitled in particular locations and contexts? McHugh’s text is admittedly not intended as a social history of paupers: this is a study of the administrators of hospitals, their intellectual and cultural influences, and their religious and social allegiances. Yet one feels that further study of paupers within the extant bureau and hospital archives may add to a rounded picture of the intellectual and cultural meanings, expectations, and expressions of charity in seventeenth-century communities.

While it is hoped that further studies of the seventeenth century will continue to elucidate the relationships between participants in charity, in addition to expanding the environments analysed, McHugh’s detailed study of sources from the local community level provides a cautionary tale against assuming the authority and efficacy of royal edicts. Hospital reforms, he argues, were largely driven by local initiatives. Transitions towards central control occurred slowly in a more haphazard, less intentional manner than the dominant narrative might suggest. Ultimately, what is distinctive about the seventeenth-century innovations, argues McHugh, is not so much control of charitable care, but rather the forms of moral and physical care provided.


Adapted from the author’s doctoral thesis, this is an exhaustive, seminal work on the once popular, but now little-known genre called the “ana.” Wild clearly sets forth her goals in her introduction: she will first establish a definition based on the original form of the ana and will then trace its subsequent diversification following both a diachronic and synchronic approach. A study of the word “ana” will complete this description of the genre. In her concluding chapter, Wild will raise some questions about the ana’s relationship to society, politics and literature. A primarily chronological study, this book is not thesis-driven. It does, nonetheless, lay the groundwork for further studies of the genre by providing invaluable information as well as
suggesting paths of inquiry to follow.

According to Wild, the genre’s name was derived from the Latin suffix “-anus” which was used in Antiquity to designate geographical, historical or romaneshque works. (17) In the seventeenth century, “ana” instead came to refer to a collection of words spoken by a male member of the intellectual elite and transcribed by a self-effacing compiler. This substantive form first appeared in Jean Bernier’s Reflexions, pensées et bons mots de Pépincourt (1696) which Wild categorizes as an ana despite its title. (344) The first work of the genre was published in 1666 and entitled “Scaligerana.” Three others—the Second Scaligerana, the Perroniana and the Thuana—followed shortly thereafter, and it is these four originators of the genre that form the basis for Wild’s definition. Wild traces the history of each of these works and their reception in chapter one.

The second chapter is devoted to a study of the few ana published between 1668 and 1693 and an explanation for the almost twenty-year gap in the genre’s publication history. Chapter three focuses on the influential Menagiana which uniquely mixes intellectual with worldly content, thereby establishing new parameters for the genre as a whole. The longest ana from an oral source, the Menagiana was also the first to be compiled as homage to a recently deceased person. This ana enjoyed (and continues to enjoy) the widest success. Ménage’s circle of intimates produced the ana that are discussed in chapter four. With some more literary in their origins than others, they illustrate the instability of the genre after the Menagiana’s publication. A study of the ana published between 1694 and 1696 comprises chapter five. These works are light-hearted, and contain no serious sign of an oral source or of erudition.

Wild devotes chapters six through eight to a discussion of two types of ana that developed in the late seventeenth century: the ana savants and the ana galants. By this time, France’s newspapers rivaled the public as judges of good taste and literary merit. While the ana savants were universally well received, the ana galants, although entertaining reading for the worldly, found less success among journalists. Wild attributes this to the sources of each type of ana. The ana savants drew their content primarily from written sources and were therefore less fragmented than the conversational ana galants. The former’s tone
remained more consistent throughout and they therefore seemed more polished and valuable.

Chapter nine focuses on the ana that had circulated for considerable time in manuscript form prior to their publication. Wild suggests that their compilers never intended them to appear in print form either due to their libertine content (the Naudœana and the Patiniana) or due to their very short length (the aptly named Pithœana). The penultimate chapter looks at the Santeuilliana and the Vasoniana, the last two ana published during Louis XIV’s reign. In both, the compiler’s hand is very present. Three appendices follow. The first contains information about ana that had been intended for publication while the last two contain the prefaces to the Scaligerana and the Casauboniana.

Wild addresses inevitable and essential questions raised by the genre’s evolution in chapter eleven. Through an overall assessment of the ana’s reception in newspapers, works of literary criticism and bibliographies, and the ana themselves, the author suggests reasons for an ana’s success or failure. These reasons loosely break down into three categories: authenticity and (mis)attribution, orality and usefulness, and content. While she argues that the inauthenticity of an ana did not entail a negative reception in and of itself, it was the lack of idealization of the author or misattribution of his words that did. The question of orality is related. Wild suggests that transcribing words spoken in a private setting could amount to a breach of intimacy and could result in their misinterpretation. At the same time, readers looked to the ana for their instructional value. Individual works were often criticized as being impoverished partly because they contained traces of orality. Finally, controversial subject matter such as libertinage, Protestantism and Jansenism was a determining factor in a work’s success. While these questions are essential, they do not exhaust the possible paths of inquiry. Wild’s work would benefit in particular from a discussion of women’s particular place in relationship to the ana and how it was affected by the rise in popularity of the ana galants. Similarly, some engagement with twentieth-century scholarship on conversation as well as the fragment or anecdote would strengthen this study.

Throughout this book, Wild’s voice resonates clearly, and she leads her reader through her discussion carefully. Well-written and
clear, this book is a useful resource for those who are familiar with the intellectuals honored by individual ana but who would like to know more about the works that carry their name. It would also appeal to scholars of literary history intrigued by questions of authorship, orality, the anecdote, and biography.
The Rhetoric of Cicero in Its Medieval and Early Renaissance Commentary Tradition. Ed. by Virginia Cox and John O. Ward. Brill’s Companions to the Christian Tradition. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2006. xviii + 545 pp. $163. Among all the classical authors, Cicero and Virgil held pride of place in the curriculum from the early Middle Ages until the classics in general lost their position at the center of classroom activity several hundred years later. For those interested in the reception of classical authors, this has been a mixed blessing; much has been written about the fortuna of both, yet the sheer mass of material makes anything like a complete, definitive treatment impossible. This volume, however, brings us a big step closer toward this goal for Cicero. Given our present state of knowledge, Cox and Ward have decided to limit their inquiry to two works, Cicero’s De inventione and the pseudo-Ciceronian Rhetorica ad Herennium, with an eye on how Ciceronian rhetorical theory was transmitted through texts and paraphrases of, or commentaries on, these two treatises. This is a wise choice, given that these were the two works on which knowledge of Ciceronian rhetoric primarily rested in the Middle Ages.
and at least the early Renaissance.

The book is divided into two parts. The first focuses on the two texts themselves. In “The Medieval and Early Renaissance: Study of Cicero’s *De inventione* and the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*: Commentaries and Contexts,” John Ward divides the period under consideration at ca. 1050 and again at ca. 1215, then tracks important manuscripts and early printed books, especially those with commentaries and glosses, through the resulting periods. Ruth Taylor-Briggs, in “Reading between the Lines: The Textual History and Manuscript Transmission of Cicero’s Rhetorical Works,” offers a spirited challenge to the editorial principles of Friedrich Marx, which have dominated modern textual criticism on the two works in question. Finally, Virginia Cox documents the uneasy coexistence of a medieval civic tradition of Ciceronian rhetoric with a newer humanistic one in “Ciceronian Rhetoric in Late Medieval Italy.”

The second, much larger group of essays demonstrates how Ciceronian material was adapted and transformed in the centuries following Cicero’s death. In “Ciceronian Rhetoric and Ethics: Conduct Literature and ‘Speaking Well,’” Mark D. Johnston notes that advice on speaking well was regularly included in medieval conduct texts. Next Karin Margareta Fredborg considers how Ciceronian material impacted the relationship between “Rhetoric and Dialectic,” in that Cicero remained central to what was taught in the schools, but the great advances in medieval dialectic were not matched by similar advances within Ciceronian school rhetoric. In “Ciceronian Rhetoric and the Law,” Hanns Hohmann notes that medieval jurists raided Ciceronian rhetoric for useful bits and pieces, especially as regards status theory and the theory of rhetorical topics. Mary Carruthers in turn challenges a number of generally accepted ideas in “Rhetorical *Memoria* in Commentary and Practice,” claiming in particular that the influence of the *Ad Herennium* has been overstated and that of the *De inventione*, which she sees as quite important, has been essentially ignored. Rita Copeland uses “The Ciceronian Rhetorical Tradition and Medieval Literary Theory” to conclude that “[i]n its narrowest sense, the Ciceronian rhetorical tradition does not account for all the developments in medieval literary theory; but in its broad conception of textuality and its large structural and discursive perspectives,
it is foundational to hermeneutical theory and practice” (264-65). In “Latin Composition Textbooks and Ad Herennium Glossing: The Missing Link?,” Martin Camargo focuses on the rhetorical figures and the attributes of persons and actions to conclude that the medieval arts of poetry and prose did not simply displace the Rhetorica ad Herennium, but that both held their place in the medieval classroom, so that excerpts from each appear as glosses to the other. Päivi Mehtonen notes the thorough interrelationship of Ciceronian and Horatian principles, with to a lesser extent those of Aristotle, in “Poetics, Narration, and Imitation: Rhetoric as Ars Aplicabilis,” and Margaret Jennings demonstrates in “Medieval Thematic Preaching: A Ciceronian Second Coming” that Ciceronian organizational categories appear in medieval preaching manuals and that medieval sermons show a practical application of these principles. Another revisionist piece is that of Gian Carlo Alessi, who argues in “The Rhetorical Juvenilia of Cicero and the Artes Dictaminis” that the relevance of Ciceronian rhetorical doctrine to medieval letter writing is not marginal, as has often been argued, but grows gradually through the dictaminal period, provided we keep in mind that the medieval manuals always drew selectively from Cicero. Finally, in “Communication, Consensus and Conflict: Rhetorical Precepts, the Ars Concionandi, and Social Ordering in Late Medieval Italy,” Stephen J. Miller examines the place of public speaking in the tradition of medieval and Renaissance Ciceronianism in Italy. The book concludes with an appendix entitled “The Commentaries in Action,” which provides extracts, mostly in Latin, that illustrate unusually interesting points about the Ciceronian heritage, and a collective bibliography for the volume as a whole.

In a collection like this, one can always find something about which to quibble: in a couple of the essays, for example, the relationship to the texts and the accompanying commentary tradition, as opposed to Ciceronian ideas themselves, becomes somewhat tangential. Now and again, the authors of essays in the second part of the volume are forced to admit that even the Ciceronian ideas themselves do not bear very much on their assigned topic (148, 207). But the quality of the essays is consistently high, more so than is usual for a volume by diverse hands, and several of the essays (those of Ward, Cox, Camargo, and Milner) are accompanied by useful appendices
that list primary material in their area. These lists, as their authors acknowledge, will be supplemented as more material comes to light, but like the book as a whole, they provide much useful information that raises research in this area to a new height. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

♦  *Malleus Maleficarum*. Ed. and trans. by Christopher S. Mackay. 2 vols. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2006. Volume I: *The Latin Text*, 720 pp. Volume II: *The English Translation*, 615 pp. $285. This magisterial, two-volume set is destined to become the definitive edition and translation of the notorious fifteenth-century “Hammer of Witches.” The work of two Inquisitors, Henricus Institoris and Jacobus Sprenger, this neo-Latin text is legendary for its misogyny and sexual explicitness. Describing in detail, for example, how witches steal men’s penises and place them in birds’ nests (!), the alleged purpose of this book was to persuade skeptics among the clergy of the clear and present danger of acts of sorcery and their perpetrators. A correlative, though secondary, purpose was to provide antidotes for various types of bewitchment as well as a prosecutorial guide for Inquisitors. As such, it stands not only as a monument to fear-mongering but also as a relic of indescribably bad Latin.

This last point may explain why this project was not undertaken before. Half (or more accurately, slightly less than half) of it was undertaken, just last year, in one of those lamentable cases where two scholars were working on the same thing independently of one another. In 2007, P. G. Maxwell-Stuart published an abridged English translation of the *Malleus* through Manchester University Press, a volume which I reviewed favorably in *The Sixteenth Century Journal*. It is clear from the lack of cross-citation that these scholars were unaware of each other’s work. A comparison of their introductions reveals some important disagreements: Maxwell-Stuart asserts that Institoris was the sole author of the treatise, while Mackay takes the alleged co-authorship at face value, demonstrating in detail the contributions of each collaborator. I am more persuaded by Mackay in this instance. Maxwell-Stuart’s prose makes for livelier reading, but Mackay’s exhaustive treatment reflects all the diligence of a classicist (Mackay’s first book was a military and political history of ancient
While Maxwell-Stuart’s one short volume may prove more accessible to students, Mackay’s complete edition is the only one that will ever be cited by serious scholars. Unlike its competitor, who inexplicably based his translation on the 1588 Frankfurt edition, Mackay’s version is rightfully based on the *princeps*. And the main point in its favor, though rather obvious, should not be overlooked: here we find the complete work in its entirety (Maxwell-Stuart cites page limits and publishing costs as excuses for cutting the _Malleus_ down to a more manageable size). This text has been at the center of so much controversy that it is particularly important in this case to read in their original context the very words that burned witches at the stake.

The introduction is indeed masterful, if perhaps overly long. The editor goes off on seemingly irrelevant tangents such as a brief history of the rosary. On the positive side, he offers miniature intellectual biographies of one paragraph each on all the major ancient and medieval figures cited in this treatise. That list by itself is worth the price of the two-volume set and could be excerpted for students in a course packet on medieval intellectual history. He also explicates convincingly the peculiar structure of this text by placing it within the framework of the scholastic *quaestio disputata*. In fact, he even goes so far as to insert the proper scholastic headings which would have marked off the conventional abbreviations dividing sections of the argument. This will greatly assist the modern reader who attempts to follow the logic of these otherwise-obscure passages.

In the English translation, he successfully navigates the particular land mines lurking in this swamp of bad Latin. His choice of “sorceress” over “witch” to render _malefica_, for example, is well-reasoned: as he points out, in the English language there is no real male equivalent to “witch,” and a word is needed which will express the parallelism of the masculine and feminine forms. His decision not to correct the authors’ bad Latin in his scholarly edition is a good one. This artifact is of potential interest linguistically to academics who study the decline of Latin grammar and the concomitant rise of the vernacular. This text was produced in an era when exorcism manuals, for instance, were still written in Latin, but shortly thereafter, treatises on demonology began to be published at least as often in French, Spanish, Italian, German, etc. The use of Latin in this work was also an implicit assertion
of ecclesiastical authority, as was the accompanying papal bull and approbation (which has since been much contested) of theologians on the faculty at the University of Cologne. But the truth is that only one of these Inquisitors was an academic, and thus a decent writer: Jacobus Sprenger was trained in the scholastic method and thus probably responsible for the theoretical groundwork of the treatise as it is laid out in Part I. Henricus Institoris, by contrast, was the true zealot behind this project, the Inquisitor who included anecdotes of witch trials based on personal experience. The Latin is noticeably worse in the parts of the text which bear his fingerprints.

The only major flaw I can find in this scholarly monument is the lack of an index. This omission is truly unfortunate, considering just how unwieldy this text really is. This could have been the sort of standard reference work which scholars of demonology would store next to their computers. Instead, it will be cited, but only by those who are already familiar enough with this text to know in advance what they are looking for. (Hilaire Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

♦ M. Maruli Delmatae Davidias. By M. Marcovich. Mittel-lateinische Studien und Texte, 33. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2006. xxii + 236 pp. As Jozef IJsewijn noted some years ago (Companion to Neo-Latin Studies, Pt. 1, History and Diffusion of Neo-Latin Literature, 2nd edn. (Leuven, 1990), 92-95), Latin literature flourished on the Adriatic coast from Istria to Albania, in towns like Split (Spalato), Dubrovnik (Ragusa), and Zadar (Zara) that had strong ties with Venice. Croatian scholars like Matthias Garbitius travelled as far as Germany, where he became professor at Tübingen, and foreigners like Laurentius Reginus of Feltre arrived in Dubrovnik to establish there the foundations of Croatian humanism. Croatian humanist poetry began with a flourish with the Elegiarum et carminum libri III of Georgius Sisgoreus from Sibenik, published in Venice in 1477: this collection contains some charming poem on Sibenik and Trieste. Croatian prose, like that of the Lutheran theologian Matthias Flacius Illyricus, was widely diffused in Europe, with the word Encyclopaedia being used in Latin for the first time in an almost-modern sense by a Croatian, Paulus Scalichius, and with Faustus Verancius’s Machinae novae containing the first description with a picture of the parachute (plate 38: homo volans). Latin remained
the official language of the Croatian parliament at Zagreb until 1847, so Latin poetry was written often and well into the nineteenth century: one thinks of Junius Restius from Dubrovnik, who is one of the great satirists of Latin literature.

One of the best neo-Latin writers in this tradition was Marcus Marullus (1450-1524), whose *De institutione bene beateque vivendi* (1506) was printed in Venice, Basel, Cologne, Antwerp, and Paris and translated into German, French, Italian, Portuguese, and Czech. His masterpiece is the historical-heroic epic *Davidiad*, an edition of which is under review here. Divided into 14 books, the poem contains 6765 Latin hexameters that follow closely the Old Testament narrative from 1 Samuel 13 and 15-31 through 2 Samuel to 1 Kings 1-2. Virgil is the chief stylistic and formal source, although the influence of Ovid, Lucan, and Statius can also be detected.

This poem has had a curious history that has impeded in some remarkable ways the production of a critical edition. It was dedicated to Cardinal Domenico Grimani, bishop of Porto and patriarch of Aquileia, but did not meet with the approval of the cardinal, who disagreed with Marullo’s heretical tropology, which offered David as a prefiguration of Christ, notwithstanding the fact that he committed adultery with Uriah’s wife Bathsheba and then killed Uriah. As a result the poem was not published and its text was soon lost. The autograph resurfaced in the Biblioteca Nazionale of Turin, where it is cod. G VI 40, which contains the *Davidiad*, the *Tropologica Davidiadis expositio*, and Marullo’s Latin verse translation of the beginning of Dante’s *Divine Comedy*. Unfortunately the manuscript was badly damaged in the disastrous fire at the National Library in the night between 25 and 26 January 1904. The water used to extinguish the fire has blurred the ink on many of the pages, so that many lines are now very difficult to read.

In the early fifties, Josip Badalić and Miroslav Marcovich began working independently on an edition. Badalić’s edition, which became the *editio princeps*, appeared first in 1954, but it was quickly withdrawn by the publisher, who later added an appendix that printed some of the missing verses, corrected some of the misreadings, and so forth. Marcovich’s edition appeared three years later, but as he himself admits, it, too, was marred by errors and misprints. In 1974 Veljko
Gortan published an edition to replace Badalić’s, with a Croatian translation by Branimir Glavačić and a commentary by Gortan in Croatian. Gortan improved on Marcovich’s edition and proposed a number of plausible restorations of words that are illegible in the manuscript, but he worked from microfilm only and did not present an *apparatus criticus*. Marcovich therefore returned to the *Davidiad* in this volume, collating the original manuscript in Turin, adopting most of Gortan’s suggestions, and making some additional corrections of his own. An appendix contains a brief *Vita Maruli*, written by Marullo’s contemporary Franciscus Natalis (1469-1542).

Finally, then, after more than fifty years of work by three scholars, this fourth effort provides what should be a definitive text of the *Davidiad*. Critical analysis can be found in Winfried Baumann, *Die “Davidias” des Marko Marulić: Das grosse Epos der dalmatinischen Latinität* (Frankfurt am Main and New York, 1984). (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

Die Marias von Cornelius Aurelius: Einleitung, Textausgabe und Anmerkungen. By J. C. Bedaux. *Supplementa Humanistica Lovaniensia*, 20. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2006. iv + 198 pp. In this volume, J. C. Bedaux presents the *editio princeps* of an epic poem on the life of Mary that had interested Jozef IJsewijn, who died before he was able to prepare his own edition. The author of this poem is one Cornelius Aurelius, who was born around 1460 and had died by December, 1531. He received his initial education in or near his birthplace of Gouda, attended a Latin school in Deventer in the 1470s, and studied later in Cologne, Leuven, and Paris. In 1486 he took orders, spending the rest of his life in monasteries in Hemsdonk and Leiden. He wrote a number of other religious poems, including *Alphabetum redemptorum*, *Psalterium Davidicum*, and *Vita Mariae Magdalenae*. His poetic talents were praised by Erasmus, who called him *poeta atque theologus doctissimus* (Ep. 17, 18, 28), and Jacobus Wimfelning called him ‘an evangelical Horace,’ even though Aurelius himself expressed hesitation about his own abilities.

The poem was conceived as covering three decades, and it seems that Aurelius got at least into the second decade, but the manuscript on which the edition rests covers the first decade only. These ten
books work through Mary’s life up to the point when Jesus was teaching in the temple. The poem contains echoes of Baptista Mantuanus, Juvenecus, and Prudentius, along with the elegies of Marcus Antonius Sabellicus and the writings of Rodolphus Agricola. The letter accompanying the poem expresses love for a simple style, but this must be taken *cum grano salis*, given the clear intertextual relationships that exist between Aurelius’s poem and those it echoes.

Bedaux presents a modernized text, one that is easy to read, with a minimal apparatus. There are some thirty pages of notes, which elucidate a few ambiguities in the text but mostly identify intertextual references. The edition also contains a brief bibliography and indices of sources and names. Given that this is the first printed edition of the poem, by definition it never had the critical success of the better-known *Christias* of Marco Girolamo Vida or the *De partu virginis* of Jacopo Sannazaro. Like the *Davidiad* of Marullo, however, which is also reviewed in this issue of *NLN*, Aurelius’s *Marias* is well worth reading, both on its own merits and as an object lesson in the complexities of religious and intellectual life for neo-Latin writers.

(Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

♦ *Rhetoricum libri quinque.* By Georgius Trapezuntius. Ed. and intro. by Luc Deitz. *Europea Memoria: Studien und Texte zur Geschichte der europäischen Ideen*, series 2: Texte, 3. Hildesheim - Zürich - New York: Georg Olms Verlag, 2006. XXXI + sign. a¹⁸ + 645 pp. When I published my book on George of Trebizond in 1976, I quoted his *Rhetoric* from the 1523 Aldine edition, not because it was the best edition, but because it seemed to me that it was the most widely available one, given how highly prized and therefore better preserved Aldine books are. The best edition, however, I had concluded then and have come to believe more strongly since, was the one prepared by the expatriate Italian humanist Valentinus Curio and printed at Basel the year before, in 1522. Indeed, I have wondered privately whether a modern critical edition of the *Rhetoric* would be worth the enormous work required, since spot checking against the oldest dated manuscript (Bologna, Biblioteca Universitaria 2400) has shown the Curio edition to have a more correct text than the Aldine and to be quite sound overall. Moreover, Curio provides the reader
with quite useful and frequent marginal *notabilia*, where, specifically in Book 5, he also supplies the Greek term from Hermogenes not found in George’s Latin text. Finally, the Curio edition begins with a handy sixteen-page alphabetical index giving the page references to a plethora of key words.

Consequently, I can only applaud Luc Deitz’s initiative, which has resulted in the reprint of the Curio edition. Deitz has chosen to reproduce the 1539 Paris reprint by Christian Wechel of the Curio edition. The italic print of this edition is very attractive, clean, and readable, with no abbreviations save for an occasional bar over a vowel for ‘m’ or ‘n.’ The result is that Wechel’s reprint can easily compete with a modern edition in terms of readability.

Deitz has added two new elements that make this new reprint immensely useful. The first is seemingly mundane but actually invaluable, namely, a detailed table of contents, so that the reader can gain control of the *Rhetoric* almost at a glance. The other new element is a product of Deitz’s scholarship. Luc Deitz is the modern editor and translator (in German) of Julius Caesar Scaliger’s *Poetices libri septem* (5 vols., Stuttgart - Bad Cannstatt, 1994-2003). So his introduction to George’s *Rhetoric* is that of a master of the material who knows how to lay out succinctly and clearly the Latin and Greek sources and explain George’s rhetorical doctrine. Deitz also gives in his *Vorwort* an economical but effective narrative of the historical and rhetorical context of George’s *Rhetoric*. In short, Deitz has provided the reader with all the information needed for understanding George’s *Rhetoric* short of an *apparatus historicus* that would report line-by-line the sources and allusions in George’s text.

A modern edition with an *apparatus textualis* would, of course, also supply variant readings and would doubtlessly result in a better text than that of the Curio edition. But, as I suggested earlier, a cost-profit analysis in terms of scholarly gain and effort needs to be taken into account. George of Trebizond was a major Renaissance author, and critical editions of his texts are very much to be desired, – indeed, are really necessary. But of all of George’s core texts, because of the Curio edition, the *Rhetoric* is that least urgently in need of a critical edition.
So Deitz had performed a signal service for scholarship. His learned and elegant introduction to a learned and elegant sixteenth-century edition will serve modern students of Renaissance rhetoric eminently well. (John Monfasani, The University at Albany, State University of New York)


Girolamo Fracastoro was a physician deriving from a family of solicitors and merchants from Verona, with close ties to the Scaligers since the thirteenth century, then landowners during the Venetian Period, although without any medico-scientific background. Fracastoro studied in Padua at a time of major philosophical activity stirring within the Studio (36). The second original feature of this 1500s “elite” Veronese intellectual is underscored by John Henderson (7) and lies in the fact that he makes no connection between disease and moralism and that he is highly distrustful of classic doctors and surgeons who perform major – and often useless – operations. He accordingly placed his trust both in nature and in rational remedies.

In particular, he was the physician for the Council of Trent from February, 1546 to March, 1547, during which period he developed his intellectual doctrine (92). He was a pontifical partisan and adhered to the group wishing to move the Council from Trent not only for political reasons (too near Germany) but also for health reasons.

The remaining articles make an in-depth study of the relationships between medicine and philosophy along with Girolamo Fracastoro’s diagnoses of diseases such as typhus (92), elephantiasis (108), and above all, “the French pox” (73, 311, 317), for which he invented the term “syphilis” in 1530. In an allegorical poem, a shepherd named Syphilus contracted the horrible disease, giving rise to Fracastoro’s work entitled De contagione, in which he establishes the bases of a
theory regarding human contagion.

Lastly, the rarely evoked links between medicine and gymnastics are also addressed in this work. In Verona, fifty years after his death, Fracastoro became the protagonist in a dialogue *Fumanellus seu de arte gymnastica* (163) on the nature of *ars gymnastica* – referred to today as sport – and medicine. The work covers the specific issue of hygiene addressed by Mercurialis (1569) in *De arte gymnastica*. Fracastoro’s idea was to develop gymnastics for military purposes rather than for motiveless athletic body building. In this theory, therefore, there is a link with nature and the aims of medicine, given that ill bodies cannot be trained. Health is accordingly a recommendation for gymnastics and not vice versa.

This deductive method specific to Fracastoro is very well illustrated in the article by Cesare Vasoli on *Turrius*, covering Fracastoro’s philosophical personality. In the article he emphasises logic as an instrument of natural logic by discarding (183) the opinion that there are reminiscences in the human mind (Aristotelian opinion, pursued in particular by his friend Bembo). The method is therefore not inductive but definitely deductive. This innovative position, between Plato and Aristotle, is confirmed in the articles by E. Peruzzi (217) and H. Hirai (245).

The fourth section is devoted to Fracastoro’s posterity in time (in the seventeenth century or again in 1823, 311) and space (in Manchester, 321). While less developed, it does point out the importance of this sixteenth-century physician, particularly from the aspect of the modernity of his diagnoses of “the French pox,” an epidemic spreading at the same time as the wars in Italy and the discovery of America.

The portrait drawn in this work is that of a determinedly modern man, a scientist struggling to construct a method. Naturally there are a few somewhat redundant articles; however for an anniversary and in the context of a symposium of this magnitude – the first in 50 years – the good news lies in the number of researchers interested in this figure, an encouraging point for our studies. Furthermore, it should be pointed out that numerous Latin quotes are provided with footnote translations, making for greater readability considering that few texts are available to facilitate the understanding of this period.
and that even fewer are translated. (Florence Bistagne, Marseilles)

Jean Jacques Boissard’s *Emblematum liber*. *Emblemes Latins, Metz: A. Faber, 1588*. A facsimile edition using Glasgow University Library SM Add 415 with a critical introduction and notes. By Alison Adams. Imago Figurata Editions, 5. Turnhout, Brepols, 2005. xxiv + 96 + 75 pages. 65 euros. One of the more interesting genres of neo-Latin literature is the emblem book. Here we find a series of vignettes, each containing a motto, a picture, and an explanation. The words in this word-image genre need not be in Latin, but during the early modern period they often were, and such usages provide an important part of the intellectual foundations on which neo-Latin literature was built.

Jean Jacques Boissard (1528-1602) was an important writer of sixteenth-century emblem books. His father was a lawyer and his uncle a professor of Greek; he travelled widely and developed a series of connections with prominent families, first as the recipient of patronage, then as tutor and confidant. During the last two decades of his life he published much, in collaboration with the Metz printer Abraham Faber(t) and the Frankfurt de Bry family of printers, including his *Icones* (first published 1584), *Emblematum liber* (1593), *Theatrum vitae humanae* (1596), *Mascarades* (1597), and *Romanae urbis topographia et antiquitates* (1597-1602). Even a work like the *Theatrum*, which is not an emblem book, is associated with an emblematic way of thinking, in that the structure *inscriptio*-engraving-explanation is retained even though the inscription is reduced to a title and the chapters build a longer, logically linked argument. Likewise the *Mascarades* benefits from an emblematic reading, since it offers brief Latin texts containing a moral comment and engravings that develop this comment further.

The *Emblematum liber / Emblemes latins* … (1584, 1588) is of special interest because Boissard was a Protestant. Here, as with his 1593 emblem book, Boissard provides both the visual and textual elements, which also include a sonnet in French by Pierre Joly to accompany Boissard’s Latin quatrains. The 1593 emblem book has a more humanistic, classicizing feel, but in the earlier volume Joly’s French sonnet often makes a specifically Protestant interpretation of the emblems explicit. The *Emblematum liber* is also of special interest because the material it presents is derived from a larger body of
related material in a manuscript in Boissard’s own hand that is found in the Bibliothèque de l’Institut in Paris. The manuscript contains more than 150 emblems, with a motto, a picture, and a Latin quatrain normally on the recto and a French prose commentary on the facing verso. The basis for both the *Emblematum liber* and the 1593 emblem book is here, and it is valuable to be able to watch Boissard select from this data bank in preparing his published works. With some tentativeness Adams groups the emblems in the 1584 collection under the following topics: a Christian framework, death, the miseries of everyday life, humanist emblems, a pragmatic approach, friendship vs. hypocrisy, the ruler, pleasure, and ingratitude.

The centerpiece of this volume is a facsimile reproduction of the 1588 Metz edition made from the copy in the Glasgow University Library. The volume begins with a substantial introduction, which is followed by the facsimile. Then comes a commentary, which offers information on textual variants and dedicatees, a description of the picture, a transcription, translation, and identification of the motto, a literal translation of Boissard’s quatrain, a gloss of Joly’s French sonnet, a transcription of Boissard’s prose commentary, and a transcription, identification, and translation of the Greek *sententiae* added in Boissard’s own hand to the copy of the book in the Royal Library in Brussels. The introduction and commentary together are as long as the facsimile original, making Adams’ work a useful tool indeed for the understanding and appreciation of this most interesting emblem book. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

• *Henri Estienne, érudit, novateur, polémiste. Étude sur Ad Senecae lectionem Proodopoeiae*. By Denise Carabin. Études et essais sur la Renaissance, 66. Paris: H. Champion, 2006. 345 pp. In Geneva in 1586, Henri Estienne published his *Ad Senecae lectionem Proodopoeiae*. The rare word in the title, derived from the Greek verb *proodopoieo*, refers to preparing the way. Estienne offers an introduction to Seneca that will both enable readers to appreciate the ancient author and lay the groundwork for a superior edition of his works. The philological direction of Estienne’s efforts is emphasized by the explicitly textual concerns of his *Epistolae ad Jac. Dalechampium* […] published together with the *Proodopoeia*. However, Estienne never published an edition of
Seneca, and the present volume constitutes a chapter in the Renaissance reception of the man from Córdoba. It is, the author claims, a crucial chapter that contributes significantly to the turn from a largely negative to a largely positive reading of Seneca’s thought and style.

The study first provides context and then examines the *Proodo-poeia* in considerable detail. A preliminary chapter surveys certain literary-critical principles in Estienne’s predecessors (Valla, Erasmus, Budé, etc.) as readers of such ancient prose writers as Cicero and Quintilian. There follows a procession of Seneca’s most important sixteenth-century editors and critics. Erasmus’s editions of Seneca (1515 and 1528) are generally accompanied by negative comments. On the other hand, Calvin’s commentary on *De clementia* (1532) takes important steps towards rehabilitation. The most important edition in the later sixteenth century is the work of Marc-Antoine Muret, published in Rome (1585). Justus Lipsius’s varied works on Seneca, which begin in the 1580s and usher in the well-known golden age of neo-Stoicism, provide the terminus of this survey.

The interpretation of Estienne’s work looks first at his presentation of Seneca’s doctrine, then his comments on Senecan style, and finally Estienne’s own “poetics.” Needless to say, the categories overlap somewhat.

What Estienne emphasizes in his reading of Seneca and what he neglects both deserve mention. On the one hand, the larger questions of moral philosophy, the theory of the passions, *notiones communes*, philosophical vocabulary, and the relation of Stoicism to other ancient philosophies, notably Seneca’s representation of Epicurus, all interest Estienne. On the other hand, he is relatively uninterested in well-worn Senecan themes like contempt for death, providence, friendship, and praise of the virtues, not to mention the philosopher’s apocryphal Christianity.

Two parts of this study are most interesting. First, the treatment of Estienne’s comments on Seneca’s style. In elucidating the philosopher’s sentence structure and syntax (his famous brevity) and his vocabulary (particularly Hellenisms), Estienne gives a positive value to characteristics that had been considered defects. He also emphasizes the pleasure available in such a style. Second, some of the author’s conclusions about Estienne’s style and “poetics.” Estienne justifies his
repeated attacks on Muret’s Roman edition on philological grounds, but they are also plausibly part of an anti-Catholic polemic pursued with some of the verve of the Apologie pour Hérodot. His voice as it emerges from the Proodopoeia is individual, deeply learned but entirely unprofessorial. Moreover, the characterization of Estienne as a Skeptical reader of Stoicism is intriguing. Although one misses a clear, over-arching argument, this study does illuminate both Henri Estienne and the Renaissance reading of Seneca.

In 2007 Champion published an edition and translation of the Proodopoeia by the author of this volume. Henri Estienne, érudit, novateur, polémiste would have been more helpful published after the edition. More fundamentally, it could be argued that the present study would have been preferable in a shortened form as a long introduction published together with the edition. This volume would work best as a guide (a proodopoeia in itself) to the text of the Proodopoeia. (Stephen Murphy, Wake Forest University)

♦ Milton’s Cambridge Latin Performing in the Genres 1625-1632. By John K. Hale. Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 289. Tempe, Ariz.: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2005. xii + 305 pp., 9 illus. $32. John K. Hale’s latest book presents a critical analysis of Milton’s college works in Latin, a language which was “the first language of Cambridge itself” and “second nature to him.” Hale’s goal is the examination of these compositions “from the inside” with an eye to understanding them according to their different genres. Respecting their “original tongue,” Hale wants us “to see them not solely as compositions […] but as performances” and to think about them from “historical, anthropological as well as linguistic and literary” perspectives. Using his earlier studies, Milton’s Languages (1997) and John Milton: Latin Writings (1998), as a jumping-off point, Hale fleshes out in this book ideas he had only touched on before.

The volume is divided into four units. Each unit contains its own subdivisions, which are numbered consecutively from one to ten. Part One: Milton and the University Exercises deals with Milton’s part in the ritualized exercises in Latin, the so-called Cambridge Latin genres, that were required of students. It is split into five sections: 1. Disputations, 2. Milton’s Philosophic Verses and the Cambridge
Act Verses, 3. Declamations, 4. Milton’s Last Declamation, Prolusion VII (*In sacrario habita pro arte. Oratio. Beatiiores reddit homines ars quam ignorantia*), and 5. The Cambridge Exercises and the Defence of the English People. Part Two: Voluntaries is organized in three subsections and deals with work Milton did “first and foremost on paper.” The divisions are: 6. Praising Dead Worthies, 1626, 7. The University Anthologies, The College Community, and 8. *In Quintem Novembris* and the other Gunpowder Poems. The two portions of Part Three: For the College Community, 9. Milton Plays the Fool: Prolusion VI and “At a Vacation Exercise,” and 10. Further Perspectives, present us with Milton “as stand-up comedian and master of ceremonies.” Part Four: Milton’s Salting (*editio princeps*) Text and Translation, offers readers for the first time a full Latin text and facing translation of Milton’s *Oratio* and *Prolusio* from 1628. Working from earlier editions and his own research, Hale describes how he has reconstructed this rarely studied work from disparate parts. Hale has done his readers good service by drawing together and improving upon work done earlier by the Tillyards and the editors of the Columbia and Yale editions.

Hale’s new book should draw attention from several groups of scholars, including those working in rhetoric and communication theory and the history of pedagogy (within and outside the British system) to mainstream neo-Latinists and Milton specialists alike. One cannot hope in fact to understand Milton or offer up any comprehensive interpretation of his work without reading his Latin prose and poetry, and that must be done with eye and ear attuned to both varieties, classical and Renaissance – the kind of work that Hale excels at. If fault must be found, it is that Hale seems at times to be trying to ‘out-Milton’ Milton in terms of witty riposte. The book’s cover – a caricature drawn by Murray Webb of a giant-headed Milton with a shrunken, toga-clad torso atop spidery limbs – is itself suggestive. One thinks at once of the plates John Leech made for Gilbert Abbott à Beckett’s *Comic History of Rome* (1852). But this is no cause for alarm. Milton’s audience was as well acquainted as we should be with the techniques of *spoudaigeloion*. (Michele Valerie Ronnick, Wayne State University)

Like Virgil when asked to make selections for Augustus, Maittaire went to the second, fourth, and sixth books of the Aeneid in search of the most interesting parts of Virgil’s poetry. His goal was to produce dramatic excerpts that would make the Aeneid more accessible to his students at Westminster School, not great original art. The first of the three plays, entitled Excidium Troiae, draws from Book 2 of the Aeneid along with passages from Seneca’s tragedies. This play is short and has a certain tentative, experimental air about it. Dido, which draws from Book 1 as well as Book 4, is more complex structurally and more polished metrically; we can see Maittaire gaining confidence as he continues through his project. The third play in the group, Inferna Navigatio, is the only free-standing dramatization of Book 6 of the Aeneid. This is the most sophisticated of the three plays, an original drama that indeed makes the religious and philosophical complexities of its source more accessible to a school audience.

These three plays survive in an autograph manuscript, MS. Bodl. Rawl. D. 284, which passed directly from Maittaire at his death to the collector Richard Rawlinson (1689/90-1755), then to the Bodleian by bequest at its purchaser’s death. The manuscript has a good many corrections and changes, which provided the main interest in the preparation of this edition. Glei has wisely opted for a readable, accessible text, with orthography and punctuation normalized, ligatures and abbreviations expanded, and so forth. The German translation aims at understandability, not high art, and in this, it succeeds. Two apparatuses record textual variants and ancient sources.

A bonus in this book is the appendix, which lists Neo-Latin dramatizations of the Aeneid. Fifty years ago Leicester Bradner began
the effort to identify these plays as part of his “The Latin Drama of the Renaissance (1340-1460),” *Studies in the Renaissance*, 4 (1957), 47-48, to which Glei has been systematically adding, first with a list in “Die Turnus-Tragödie J. J. Wolfs (1591),” in G. Binder and B. Effe (eds.), *Das Antike Theater* (Trier, 1998), 253-93, then in an expanded version in “Neulateinische Dramatisierungen der Aeneis–ein Überblick,” in G. Binder (ed.), *Dido und Aeneas* (Trier, 2000), 143-74. This latest version, which contains thirty-eight plays to Bradner’s eleven, is striking proof of the way in which work in Neo-Latin continues to turn up new material, particularly as regards a source as ubiquitous as Virgil was in early modern Europe.

Glei’s book offers an appropriate occasion to pause and recognize the author’s efforts in stimulating a resurgence of interest in Neo-Latin in German universities. He himself has appeared frequently in these pages as the author and editor of books on Neo-Latin topics (see, for example, the review immediately following), but recent issues contain reviews of the books of his students as well. Their work begins in seminars like the one Glei offered in the winter semester of 2002/3 at Ruhr-Universität Bochum, in which Alexandra Kopka, Gabriele Buchenthal, Jennifer Denzinger, Uwe Füg, Rainer Hemesoth, and Thomas Zimmer pored over Maittaire’s manuscript, establishing a text and roughing out a translation. These students are listed as collaborators on the title page, and I would not be surprised to see a Neo-Latin dissertation from one or more of them appearing over the next few years. The German system allows an aspiring Latin professor to do either the doctoral dissertation or the *Habilitationsschrift* on a Neo-Latin topic, and thanks to the encouragement of professors like Glei, an increasing number of students are taking this option. This is the kind of leadership we need if the field is to continue to thrive. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

International Association of Neo-Latin Studies (IANLS). It offers scholars a (German-speaking) forum in which to discuss literary phenomena through textual analyses as well as theoretical studies and literary surveys, focussing, however, not just on the German-speaking area. The first workshop concentrated on Latin lyric poetry of the early modern times, whose proceedings were published as *Lateinische Lyrik der Frühen Neuzeit. Poetische Kleinformen und ihre Funktionen zwischen Renaissance und Aufklärung*. 1. Arbeitsgespräch der Deutschen Neulateinischen Gesellschaft in Verbindung mit der Werner Reimers-Stiftung Bad Homburg, ed. by Beate Czapla, Ralf Georg Czapla and Robert Seidel, Frühe Neuzeit, 77 (2003). The second–the proceedings of which are the subject of the present review–was on parody and aspects of intertextuality, the third (2007) on Neo-Latin drama; the planned fourth workshop (2010) will deal with poetics in Neo-Latin literature.

The present volume aims to discuss the changing notion and function of the intertextual phenomenon of parody in early modern times, through case studies as well as systematic analyses of it. It comprises twelve contributions in German, mainly dealing with the German-speaking cultural area, but also referring to works written by Italian and Polish authors between the fifteenth and the eighteenth centuries. Most papers include editions of Latin texts, all with German translations.

Why the word ‘parody’ features twice in the title of the book, is explained by the contemporary understanding of the term *parodia*, the meaning of which has evolved between the early modern period and modern times. This phenomenon is well known when dealing with technical terms in literature (see Jörg Robert, 47 ff.), and it is certainly reasonable to remind the reader of it before presenting examples. Indeed a survey of the seventeenth-century idea of *parodia*, especially the *parodia Horatiana*, is provided in the first contribution by Rüdiger Niehl. Drawing on the theories of Eckart Schäfer, who in the 1970s was the first one to describe the vivid imitation of Horace in seventeenth-century Germany, Niehl undertakes an analysis of a broader corpus of texts: the CAMENA collection, i.e., the Corpus Automatum Multiplex Electorum Neolatinitatis Auctorum, an invaluable database of facsimile editions of Latin texts from the early
modern times written in the German-speaking area. The section “Poemata” already includes over 260 authors, that is, 60,000 printed pages. It is part of the larger online collection MATEO: http://www.uni-mannheim.de/mateo/camenahtdocs/camena.html. He confirms that the German idea of *parodia* originated in Henri Estienne’s (1528-1598) definition (which stands for the imitation of an entire poem, maintaining the metre and the number of lines, but changing the topic), was disseminated in Germany through the works of Paul Schede (1539-1602), and flourished among Protestant scholars of the time. Convincingly Niehl emends Schäfer’s assumption of a Catholic concept of Horatian parody and specifies the purposes and types of the *parodia Horatiana*.

Subsequently Jörg Robert’s contribution on parody and *parodia* in poetics of the early modern times provides the theoretical background to which Niehl occasionally refers, drawing a line from antiquity (Aristotle, Quintilian) to Julius Caesar Scaliger (1484-1558), Henri Estienne, and Paul Schede. Robert discusses the nature of the *parodia Christiana* as a Jesuit genre (or not), interpreting the very same poetologists and poets mentioned by Niehl (Pontanus, Masen, Balde), yet arriving at some different conclusions, e.g., that Jakob Masen (1606-1681) in his *Palaestra eloquentiae ligatae* does in fact discuss parody.

A succinct survey from Aristotle to Scaliger and Estienne is again drawn by Beate Czapla, who in her contribution presents a particular Baroque parody, Paul Fleming’s (1609-1640) nuptial dithyramb, based on a dithyramb by the Polish poet Maciej Kasimierz Sarbiewski (1595-1640). Apart from drawing relations between both texts, Czapla lucidly identifies the references to epithalamia and other genres of classical antiquity and discusses the function of those references.

Intertextual references to antiquity (Ovid) as well as to early Italian humanism (Petrarch) are pinpointed by Christoph Pieper in his study of Basilio of Parma’s (1425-1457) *Liber Isottaeus*. Another Italian author is included through the contribution of Reinhold F. Glei, who examines the *Centones ex Vergilio* by Lelio Capilupi (1497-1560). His paper begins with an innovative treatise on the *cento*. Defining “intra-textual” and “extra-textual” sub-types, which are subdivided into “constructive” and “destructive” types of texts, Glei identifies four types of cento-poems: pastiche, parody, contrafact, and satire.
As an example of a ridiculing parody, Glei then presents a particular cento by Capilupi, entitled Gallus, the text of which he edits, with the respective lines in Virgil also being provided.

Florian Schaffenrath’s essay deals with parodic passages in the epic poem Columbus carmen epicum (Rome, 1715), written by Ubertino Carrara. Two further articles treat Italian authors with a considerable importance for the German-speaking area: Elisabeth Klecker discusses a passage of the Austrias by Riccardo Bartolini (ca. 1475-1529), who managed to include an equivalent to the Virgilian storm at sea in his panegyrical epic poem on the war of succession in landlocked Bavaria. The respective passage in the Aeneid was a standard model for imitation in neo-Latin poetry. Yet the relation to Virgil, the main authority of Latin epic poetry, should also be considered when analysing other ancient models, a task undertaken by Wolfgang Kofler in his discussion of the impact of Catullus’s carmen 64 on sixteenth-century poetry on Lake Garda.

Four further contributions are devoted to significant Germans authors. First Robert Seidel analyses the poem Hipponax ad Asterien, a Latin work written in his youth by Martin Opitz (1597-1639), who established humanistic ideals in German vernacular poetry. Attending to Opitz’s sources and models, Seidel provides an intriguing analysis of the poem’s intertextuality, its hypertextuality, paratextuality, and architextuality. In 1633 Opitz published a didactic poem on the eruption of mount Vesuvius two years previously; this event is also the theme of a poem by the important Jesuit dramatist Jacob Bidermann (1578-1639). The intertextuality of his Campanum, seu Vesuvius flagrans is explored by Wilhelm Kühlmann, who also provides an edition of the text. A nuptial poem by another Jesuit, Jacob Pontanus (1542-1626), is presented by Iris Heckel. For his part, Gernot Michael Müller draws our attention again to Virgil, this time to his eclogues, and discusses extensively the Bucolicon by Helius Eobanus Hessus (1488-1540), who claimed to be the first bucolic poet of German origin and positioned himself as a new Baptista Mantuanus.

Rich in examples, thorough in its theoretical analyses as well as in its bibliographical references, this volume is an indispensable handbook for anyone working on (or referring to) parody and intertextuality in middle-European early modern times. A comprehensive index
of names enhances the usefulness of this book. (Veronika Coroleu
Oberparleiter, Universität Salzburg)

El humanismo español, su proyección en América y Canarias en la época
del humanismo. Ed. by Antonio María Martín Rodríguez and Germán
Santana Henríquez. Las Palmas: Universidad de Las Palmas de Gran
Canaria, 2006. 445 pp. At the end of the eighties, Professor Gaspar
Morocho Gayo of the Universidad de León began a systematic ef-
fort to rescue from oblivion the works of some of the key figures
of Spanish humanism. His effort has led to a monograph series,
Humanistas Españoles. Estudios y Ediciones Críticas, which now includes
more than thirty volumes; a journal, Silva. Estudios de Humanismo y
Tradición Clásica, whose most recent issue is reviewed below; and
a research group, Humanistas Españoles, which includes over thirty
specialists in Greek, Hebrew, Latin, and Spanish literature, American
history, geography, art history, philosophy, law, and biology from the
universities of León, Valladolid, Salamanca, Madrid (Autónoma),
Sevilla, Pablo de Olavide, Huelva, Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, La
Laguna, and California (Merced). To coordinate the work of this
group and to disseminate their findings, a conference is held every
two years. The volume under review here constitutes the eighth of
these conference proceedings.

The essays are divided into three groups, which reflect the
emphases of the research group. The first seven essays are on the
subject of “Humanismo español y europea.” In considering “El cogito
cartesiano y la cuestión de sus precursores españoles,” Benjamín
García-Hernández looks at Gómez Pereira, Sánchez el Escéptico,
and the Quixote for analogies to the Cartesian cogito. Mª Isabel Lafu-
ente Guantes looks at one of these precursors, Francisco Sánchez
el Escéptico, in “El problema de las ciencias en el Quod nihil scitur
de Francisco Sánchez.” In “Humanismo y moral estoica: Epicteto
traducido por Pedro de Valencia,” Jesús Mª Nieto Ibáñez passes from
pure to applied philosophy, focusing on Pedro de Valencia, one of
the figures most studied by this research group. Raúl López López
offers, in “Lorenzo de Zamora: nuevos datos para el primer inventario
completo de sus obras y escritos,” an exhaustive inventory of the
materials available for the study of the work of Lorenzo de Zamora
(ca. 1550-1614), professor of theology and the Bible at the Colegio de San Bernardo de Alcalá. Eduardo Álvarez de Palacio and Beatriz Fernández Díez write first on “La dietética en los regimientos de salud del siglo XVI español: análisis de la obra de Francisco Núñez de Coria,” then turn to “El humanista inglés Richard Mulcaster: ideas pedagógicas y propuesta de educación física,” in which some surprisingly modern ideas about physical exercise are discussed. In “Arte y humanismo de la Biblioteca de San Isidoro de León,” Mª Dolores Campos Sánchez-Bordona moves from the discussion of individual works of humanism to the more general ambience of books and the constitution of libraries.

The second group of essays is devoted to the theme “El humanismo español y su proyección en América.” Jesús Paniagua Pérez studies “La visión del hombre americano en Benito Arias Montano y Pedro de Valencia,” two figures that have been central to the work of this research group, while Jesús Paradinas Fuentes analyzes the educational infrastructure of the so-called ‘new world’ in “La educación en América según las Relaciones de Indias de Pedro de Valencia.” In “La Historia de la Nueva México de Gaspar Pérez de Villagrá: recepción crítica (con nuevos datos biográficos de su autor),” Manuel María Martín Rodríguez studies the reception of Pérez de Villagrá’s epic poem and offers new information about the life of the author. These essays complement one another nicely, in that the first two show the impact of the Americas on European humanism, while the third introduces us to creole culture. Mª Isabel Viforcos Marinas turns to books and reading in the Americas in “Libros y lecturas a la luz de la normativa sinodal y conciliar hispanoamericana (siglos XVI-XVIII),” with a focus on surviving documents from the vice-royalty of Peru. In “Entre la mitra y la pluma: el «sacerdote ilustrado» Castorena y Ursúa (México, 1668-1733),” Isabel Arenas Frutos studies the figure of Juan Ignacio Castorena y Ursúa, priest, professor of Sacred Scripture for twenty years at the Mexican university, journalist, and author of a series of works discussed in this essay. Finally, in “Humanismo y ciencia: José Antonio de Alzate y las Gacetas de Literatura de México (1788-1795),” Mª Justina Sarabia Viejo focuses on the creole priest Juan Antonio de Alzate y Ramírez (1737-1799), a polymath who concerned himself in particular with the classical languages and authors.
The third group of essays are all on the subject of “Canarias en la época del humanismo.” Carmen González Vázquez studies the presence of the Canary Islands in the voyage of Alejandro Geraldini de Amelia to take possession of his bishopric of Santo Domingo in “Las Islas Canarias en el Itinerarium ad Regiones sub Aequinoctali plag a constitutas de Alejandro Geraldini.” In Geraldini’s day, the Canary Islands represented the western limit of the known world, in which the topos of the locus amoenus filled in what was unknown about this distant place. Then in “Fuentes críticas para la edición de los poemas latinos de José de Anchieta,” Francisco González Luis studies the Latin poetry of the man called the “Apóstol del Brasil.” Belén González Morales turns to one of the founders of the literature of the Canary Islands in “«De la esencia y causas de la poética».” La metaforización del espacio poético en la obra de Bartolomé Cairasco de Figueroa,” focusing on metaphor in his work. Eugenio Padorno studies an unedited rhetorical manual conceived on La Palma in “Los eslabones más fuertes de las cadenas de Alcides. Una retórica inédita de raíces humanísticas en las Canarias del siglo XVII,” providing information as well about its author, Pedro Álvarez de Lugo y Usodemar (1628-1726). Finally María Mónica Martínez Sariego studies the survival in the oral tradition of the words of the prophet Jeremiah in Lamentations 1.12 in the oral literature of the Canary Islands in “Si est dolor sicut dolor mens. Sobre la herencia de los comentaristas bíblicos en un romance de pliego dieciochesco y su pervivencia en la tradición oral de Canarias.”

Each of these sections offers its own appeal. The papers in the first group take their place in the rapidly expanding corpus of work on Spanish humanism in general. The ones in the second group are valuable as well for the continued interest in the Encounter, which has remained strong well after the 1992 anniversary. And this is the only place I can think of offhand that will tell the reader anything about neo-Latin literature in the Canary Islands. Unlike some Spanish conference proceedings, the papers here are not lightly annotated, unrevised versions of what was delivered orally, but substantial essays (averaging twenty-five pages) on interesting, timely topics. In short, a good read. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)
Silva. Estudios de humanismo y tradición clásica. Ed. by Jesús-M. Nieto Ibáñez and Juan Francisco Domínguez Domínguez. Nr. 6, 2007. Universidad de León, Spain. 447 pp. The latest issue of this, the newest of the journals devoted to Neo-Latin literature and culture, contains eight articles. In “El poder político o el arte de hacer real lo posible: el Agamemnón de la Hécuba de Eurípides y algunas re-creaciones posteriores (Séneca, Gelli y Pérez de Oliva),” José Vicente Bañuls and Carmen Morenilla offer a very interesting reinterpretation of Euripides Hécuba, in which Agamemnon’s actions are generally seen as cowardly and indecisive. This, the authors argue, is because the reservations of the king are misinterpreted: these reservations should be seen as a sign of prudence in specific political circumstances. What makes this reinterpretation interesting is that it is completed through Seneca, Aulus Gellius, and Pérez de Oliva, confirming the argument of Charles Martindale (Redeeming the Text (Cambridge, 1993), 7) that our current interpretations are inevitably bound to the chain of interpretations that link us to the original work. Next Florence Bistagne, in “Le De sermone de Giovanni Pontano est-il un traité e savoir vivre?,” explores the ideal virtue that makes a person witty in conversation. Wit arises from both ancient rhetoric and from medieval courtesy books, such that De sermone becomes both a work of aesthetics and ethics, of theory and practice. In “Publicações cristãs na China no século XVII. Uma edição da Relatio Sepulturae … S. Francisco Xaverio erectae, Pequim de c. 1700,” Manuel Cadafaz de Matos explores the effect of the missionary press in the Far East on the historiography of St. Francis Xavier. This article focuses on two editions (one from India, the other from the Philippines) that concern Father Mastrilli, subject of a miracle by Xavier; and on another, probably Chinese edition that relates to the saint’s burial on the island of Sanchuan.

In a nice complement to the edition of Reinhold Glei reviewed elsewhere in this issue of NLN, Arturo Echavarren analyzes the frequent references to Virgil’s Aeneas in the non-mythological dramas of the Spanish Golden Age. “La figura de Eneas en el teatro español del Siglo de Oro” shows how the intertextual links between Virgil’s epic and a series of plays draw from a similar symbolic connection, but unfold differently in different dramas. In “La poesía dispersa de Juan de Mal Lara: una formulación estética entre latín y vernáculo (con
nuevas noticias biográfico-literarias),” Francisco Javier Escobar Borrego studies the poetry of the humanist Juan de Mal Lara (1526-1571), which has been scattered into many manuscripts and older editions. Its variety of registers illuminates the poetry of this humanist and that of a number of other writers linked to his Academy. “Algunas ideas de estética neoplatónica a través de un soneto hereriano,” by Francisco Garrote Pérez, analyzes the neoplatonic ideas which Fernando de Herrera used to compose an exemplary sonnet. Next, in “Silva, comentario y memorial: la Silva Palentina de Alonso Fernández de Madrid,” Lilith Lee examines the relationships between ‘commentary,’ ‘memorial,’ and ‘silva,’ showing that the final term can indeed mean ‘miscellany,’ but it also signifies a way of writing—a distinction that proves useful with the Silva Palatina, which accords with the second meaning but not the first. In “Mitos y nombres miticos en las obras literarias de Jovellanos,” Juan Antonio López Férez analyzes the presence of myths and mythical names in Jovellanos’ literary works.

I have divided the articles into two groups because the division suggests to me the strengths that recent work on Neo-Latin offers. The second group might be considered traditional in their focus on philology and its concerns, but they are done to a very high standard and lead to new insights about neo-Latin writings we do not know enough about. The three articles in the first group suggest in turn what happens when these traditional philological concerns are opened up by some of the newer methodologies. The first article ends up being a sophisticated application of reception theory, the second a sort of exercise in cultural studies, and the third an interesting account of what happens when west meets east. That both approaches can meet, and meet profitably, in the pages of the same journal suggests that the next decade or two should be unusually interesting for neo-Latin studies. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)