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In recent years, “companion” and “handbook” volumes, collections of essays introducing or elucidating the dimensions of certain genres, literary movements, or authors, have proliferated in the academic marketplace as part of a competition among prominent publishers to satisfy a presumed need for supplemental aid in reading and/or teaching literary texts. In seventeenth-century studies, while the major literary figures (Shakespeare, Donne, Milton, etc.) elicit the greatest number of these volumes—and the keenest competition for market share—a variety of lesser known and lesser studied writers also receive attention in these volumes, either under the auspices of a specific genre or, in the case of the Cambridge Companion series, of period or thematic groupings (e.g., *The Cambridge Companion to Writing of the English Revolution*, 2001). Perhaps throughout its existence as a discipline from the end of the nineteenth century to the present, literary studies has elicited handbooks as tools for counteracting cultural drift or for excavating what have become obscure ideas and references in complex works of literature. The modern mind needs help in recovering its intellectual, cultural, and aesthetic ancestry.

What marks the current trend as a departure from the mentality underlying, say, James Holly Handford’s *A Milton Handbook* (1929) is a shift from general backgrounding—introducing an audience to an already agreed upon body of essential ideas or received wisdom—as an end unto itself to the advancement of original scholarship as part of the introduction. Thus, the twenty-first-century “handbook” or “companion” essay attempts to offer an original thesis as if the larger collection assumes an audience of both general readers and academic specialists. Indeed, the claim to offer “original scholarship” becomes a selling point, as in the case of *The Oxford Handbook of Milton*, edited by Nicholas McDowell and Nigel Smith.

Before exploring the riches of this book—and riches there are—it is best to place it into its publishing context so that readers can see its contributions more clearly. The drive toward including the work of
established scholars as assigned texts within classes has perhaps never been stronger than now, at least in the U. S. and Canada, where many upper division Milton courses operate as seminars with capstone papers. At the same time, though, because of the increasing dependency on online learning management systems, such as Blackboard, Angel, and Desire2Learn, publishers have intensified the crack-down on perceived copyright infringements, thereby making it more difficult for instructors to include critical readings in their classes. To meet the demand for ready access to scholarship, academic publishers appear to have adopted two general strategies. The first, advanced mainly by the British publishers, Wiley-Blackwell, Cambridge University Press, and Oxford University Press, is the aforementioned companion volume, which presumably is pitched for course adoption as a separate text alongside the chosen literary text.

Within Milton studies, a prime example is the Cambridge University Press volume, *Milton in Context*, published in 2010 and edited by Stephen B. Dobranski. This book can be seen as the nearest competitor of *The Oxford Handbook of Milton* in its substantive scope. Its purpose is to investigate the “various ways in which Milton’s works and experiences emerged from the culture and events of his time.” After two sections of essays on Milton’s life and on the critical heritage, twenty-four chapters focus on subjects of interest to Milton and contexts necessary for situating his literary efforts within a larger milieu. Some of these topics pose no surprise—“Astronomy,” “Classical literature and learning,” “The Civil War,” “Italy,” “Logic,” “Music,” etc.—but a few others promise the sharpened focus on Milton’s relationships with his contemporaries that has come to characterize contemporary Milton studies—“The book trade,” “The Caroline court,” “Manuscript transmission,” “Pamphlet wars,” “Reading practices,” “London,” etc. Curiously, some of the same contributors of *The Oxford Handbook of Milton* are also contributors to *Milton in Context*. Nicholas McDowell, the editor of the former volume and the author of two essays within it, also wrote “The Caroline court” for the latter; Edward Jones wrote the essay on the first half of Milton’s life for the former and the essay on “Early lives” in the latter; Ann Baynes Coiro wrote on Milton’s *Mask* in the former and on “Poetic tradition, dramatic,” for the latter. In a similar fashion, John Leonard, John Creaser, Elizabeth Sauer, N.
H. Keeble, and William Poole all have essays in both volumes. In every case, however, the choice of author for entry makes sense, given each contributor’s scholarly record, and every entry stays within its primarily contextual frame. One can see how the volume functions as a supplemental aid, supplying a series of contextual layers against which *Paradise Lost* or indeed any of Milton’s works might be read.

As may be apparent in the above cursory description, the primary purpose of *Milton in Context* is to create a cumulative thick description of Milton’s milieu and the cultural, political, ideational, and ideological forces acting upon Milton’s imagination. On a smaller scale, *The Cambridge Companion to Milton*, edited by Dennis Danielson (Cambridge UP, 1999), also offers detailed overviews of each of the genres in which Milton wrote, sometimes focused on individual works (e.g., J. Martin Evans on “Lycidas” or Cedric Brown on “Milton’s Ludlow Masque”), sometimes on larger categories (e.g., R. F. Hall on “Milton’s sonnets and his contemporaries” or Thomas N. Corns on “Milton’s Prose”), and sometimes on more general subject areas (e.g., Martin Dzelzainis on “Milton’s Politics” or Georgia Christopher on “Milton and the reforming spirit”). Clearly, though, the overriding impulse is the same as in *Milton in Context*: to present the reader with the equivalent of a brilliant lecturer who discourses at length on material a student’s professor might not have time to “cover” in the same depth during the confines of a class session.

Within this increasingly crowded field of supplemental aids to Milton, a book called *The Oxford Handbook of Milton* might seem like just another installment of the British variety, given the incorporation of “handbook” in titles of both the volume and of the series of which it is a part. Yet what is most intriguing about it is that it not only fulfills the introduction function of the first approach but also seeks to advance the scholarship on each of its subjects. In this way, the volume as a whole accords with a second approach to supplemental aids. This approach, favored by the American presses W. W. Norton & Company, through its Norton Critical Edition series, and Bedford/St. Martin’s, through its Texts and Contexts and Case Studies in Critical Controversy series, presents a state of the art primary text that is then followed—at usually twice or more the page length—by supplemental critical readings. Norton Critical Editions provide generous selections
of mainly already extant critical judgments, spanning the earliest reactions to the work more recent, significant interpreters. Sometimes the editors might commission an essay or two specifically for the volume; but for the most part, the selections are already extant, influential readings. It follows, then, that they are pitched toward specialists in the field, rather than toward a more generalized audience, and thus treat students and other newcomers to the work implicitly as apprentice professionals in the field. Bedford/St. Martins’ Case Studies in Critical Controversy series adopts a similar approach, except that it groups its selections according to studies in controversy rather than by genre or subgenre. The Texts and Contexts series immerses readers in readings from the period in which the literary text was produced and groups these according to topic clusters. Bedford/St. Martins has yet to present a Milton text; but Norton has a Critical Edition of *Paradise Lost*, now in its second edition and edited by Gordon Teskey, as well as *Milton’s Selected Poetry and Prose*, edited by Jason P. Rosenblatt.

At nearly 200 pages longer than *Milton in Context*, *The Oxford Handbook of Milton* does not give a newly edited text of Milton’s work; but each of its essays does provide a new angle of vision in regard to its subject, in keeping with the scholarship routinely published in academic journals. Thanks to the thoughtful selection of topics and the astute pairing of scholar and subject matter, this handbook sets a new standard of thoroughness and scholarly advancement for this emergent academic genre. For, rather than focus simply on providing cultural context or plain overviews of extant critical commentary or basic introductions, most of the essays both fulfill and subordinate these tasks to an implied injunction to offer new insights about their subjects.

The book is organized into seven parts: two essays on the “Lives” (by Edward Jones and Nicholas von Maltzahn); five essays on the “Shorter Poems” (Estelle Haan, Gordon Teskey, Ann Baynes Coiro, Nicholas McDowell, and John Leonard); five on “Civil War Prose, 1641–1645” (Nigel Smith, Sharon Achinstein, Diane Purkiss, Ann Hughes, and Blair Hoxby); seven on “Regicide, Republican, and Restoration Prose, 1649–1673” (Stephen M. Fallon, McDowell, Joad Raymond, Haan, N. H. Keeble, Elizabeth Sauer, and Paul Stevens); four on “Writings on Education, History, Theology” (William
Poole, Timothy Raylor, Martin Dzelzainis, and Gordon Campbell and Thomas N. Corns); eight on *Paradise Lost* (Charles Martindale, John Creaser, Stephen B. Dobranski, Karen L. Edwards, Smith, Stuart Curran, Susan Wiseman, and Dzelzainis); five on “1671 Poems: *Paradise Regained* and *Samson Agonistes*” (Laura Lunger Knoppers, John Rogers, R. W. Serjeantson, Regina M. Schwartz, and Elizabeth D. Harvey); and two on “Aspects of Influence” (Anne-Julia Zwierlein and Joseph Wittreich). Many of the essay titles highlight the effort to contribute new interpretations to the established discourse—not just “Milton’s Latin Poetry,” for example, but Haan’s “The ‘adorning of my native tongue’: Latin Poetry and Linguistic Metamorphosis,” or not just “Milton’s Sonnets” but Leonard’s “The Troubled, Quiet Endings of Milton’s English Sonnets,” or not just “*Lycidas*” but McDowell’s “‘Lycidas’ and the Influence of Anxiety.”

The most obvious way in which the volume embodies the current emphases in Milton scholarship is in the heavy concentration on the prose, sixteen essays in all. Here, again, the titles reveal much—not just single essays on “Milton’s Prose” or “Prose style” in the Danielson and Dobranski volumes respectively, but in the section on the 1649–1673 prose alone, Fallon’s “The strangest piece of reason: Milton’s *Tenure of Kings and Magistrates*”; McDowell’s “Milton’s Regicide Tracts and the Uses of Shakespeare”; Raymond’s “John Milton, European: The Rhetoric of Milton’s Defences”; Haan’s “*Defensio Prima* and the Latin Poets”; Keeble’s “Nothing nobler then a free Commonwealth: Milton’s Later Vernacular Republican Tracts”; Sauer’s “Disestablishment, Toleration, the New Testament Nation: Milton’s Late Religious Tracts”; and Stevens’ “Milton and National Identity.” Each of these essays commits to a reading of the work in question. Cumulatively, the essays in the three prose sections richly contextualize the many concerns that animated Milton’s imagination before, during, and after the period when he lost his eyesight, gave his all for what Andrew Marvell later would call in *The Rehearsal Transpros’d* the “Cause” “too good to have been fought for,” and composed his greatest poem.

For a volume composed of thirty-eight substantive chapters, this review space is too small to afford the luxury of comprehensive summary. But a cursory look at a few chapters illustrates how well the volume succeeds in making good on its initial promise to “incorporate
developments in what can broadly be termed historical criticism of over the last twenty years and to place both the poetry and the prose in a more continuous, unfolding biographical and historical context” (v). For example, the subject of Milton’s famous surviving commonplace book seems like it would invite a mere summary treatment. Yet William Poole, in “The Genres of Milton’s Commonplace Book,” not only provides succinct accounts of its provenance and the cultural habits of commonplacing, but also asks identifies the rationale behind its tripartite division of moral philosophy into ethics, economics, and politics. He then addresses the distinctively Miltonic features of the material within this conventional system of division, what we can deduce about Milton’s reading habits based on the excerpts he copied, and how the manuscript fed into his prose works and later poetry. Along the way, we learn more about Milton the reader. In a brief section on “Fatigue,” Poole glances at how Milton commented on his exhaustion in reading patristics, an experience with which modern scholars wrestling with this same material surely can identify. Rather than simply background one of Milton’s minor works, Poole conjures a lively image of Milton behind the scenes of his composition practice.

The eighteen chapters on poetry also yield many payoffs, even when covering familiar ground. What I am calling the “new-angle-of-vision” approach is prominently on display in Nigel Smith’s essay on “Paradise Lost and Heresy.” From the first two pages, Smith reorients readers regarding his subject by underscoring, in Of Education and Areopagitica, Milton’s “forceful plea for a return to the original meaning of ‘heresy’ in Greek philosophy: choice, from Greek proairesis” (510). By placing this earlier definition in opposition to the Augustinian conception of heresy as “that which is forbidden and to be expunged from believers,” Smith posits an animating tension throughout Paradise Lost between these two definitions. While Milton’s poem articulates the “Augustinian sense of theological doctrine,” the “drama” of the characters’ “dilemmas” is predicated on the notion of heresy as choice. The chapter then reads this tension in the Creation, in the treatment of love in the garden, and in the operations of free will to conclude that Paradise Lost “is a heresy machine: it produces heresies as we readers make sense of the epic” (524). It is difficult to look at heresy in Milton in the same way after reading Smith’s account.
The same can be said of most of the other essays on the poetry, from Stuart Curran’s treatment of God, to Susan Wiseman’s account of Eve within the larger scope of seventeenth-century female interpretation, to Dzelzainis’ explication of the role of lying in politics, as Milton understood it. Each modern interpreter takes us someplace new. It is true that, while John Rogers’ account of Paradise Regained as a sequel to Paradise Lost is equally enlightening, one wishes for more than one full essay on this poem, at least in keeping with the three on Samson Agonistes. Yet what book can offer everything? To read The Oxford Handbook of Milton straight through is to stroll from one richly thoughtful set of deductions about the development and workings of Milton’s imagination to another. It also is to encounter Milton studies as it lives and breathes right now, not as it existed three decades ago, and this is one reason why libraries without this volume on hand might seem quaint in their holdings on Milton.

When it first appeared in 2009, the cloth edition of The Oxford Handbook of Milton cost $150.00, a price viable for libraries and research specialists but outside the Pale of student budgets. In early November, 2011, the paperback version was released at a third the cost. That shift immediately makes it more attractive for inclusion in graduate seminars. Even so, a fifty-dollar supplemental text, even one so astute in its original readings and so accurately representative of developments in Milton studies during the past two decades, is probably not realistic for undergraduate course adoption, when the course context suggests that less than half the essays would find their way onto even the most ambitious syllabus. Would that the cost were a bit lower, so that students would be more able to slide their own copies into their backpacks alongside their trusty, inexpensive editions of the complete poems.

In *The Christian Hebraism of John Donne*, Chanita Goodblatt turns to an often neglected area in Donne studies: Donne’s mastery and understanding of the Hebrew language and the role it played in his sacerdotal years. In her introduction, Goodblatt carefully and clearly articulates the organizational framework of the book, and, by extension, the book’s scholarly reach. She begins by turning to Donne’s 1621 Lenten sermon, where he reads the Book of Daniel “in order to substantiate his argument about the integrity and authority” of the Hebrew text as a means to sufficiently instruct his parishioners on the meaning of the Book of Timothy (1). Needless to say, the very use of a Hebrew (Old Testament) and Jewish text to illuminate the meaning of a Greek (New Testament) and Christian text demonstrates that Donne’s exegesis conceives, as Goodblatt suggests, “of the biblical text as one vast interpretive panorama in which each biblical verse bespeaks the meaning of another” (2). Such a conception, however, presents certain problems for today’s scholars who are highly aware of its latent bias and prejudice: Christianity as the telos of the Jewish religion. How do we come to understand a reading of Hebrew literature that sees it merely as a prefiguration of its Greek descendant?

Goodblatt never asks this question in such an explicit manner. Nevertheless it seems to be the implicit driving force behind much of her thinking. As she points out, from a purely theoretical and methodological position, four distinct habits of thought need to be maintained by any scholar attempting to speak about Donne as a Christian Hebraist. The “discussion of Donne’s study of the Hebrew Bible,” she suggests first, “must include an investigation into the complex Jewish exegetical tradition, as well as into its direct and indirect Christian transmission” (3). Next, Goodblatt asserts that a proper discussion of Donne’s biblical hermeneutics must “also address the textual and religious polemic, both intra-Christian and Jewish-Christian, which is foregrounded in biblical exegesis” (3). Third, she claims that “a flexible understanding of exegetical connections should
be maintained, reflecting the intertwined character of both Jewish and Christian exegetical projects” (3). The fourth point that Goodblatt hopes to maintain throughout the book is that of Mikhail Bakhtin’s “heteroglot conception of the world” (qtd. in Goodblatt 2). She will do this, she claims, by “juxtaposing, confronting and comparing various exegetical and scholarly voices” (3).

If the introduction serves as an explanation of her methodology and theoretical persuasion as well as the scope of the project, then chapter one, “Christian Hebraism: Sources and Strategies,” serves as Goodblatt’s attempt to situate Donne’s Hebraism within its specific historical context. Here, we learn of a Donne who engrosses himself in the Christian Hebraist culture of the early seventeenth century. Much of the tale Goodblatt tells, however, is already known to us by way of scholars such as Judith Herz, Anthony Raspa, and, of course, R. C. Bald, the great Donne biographer (to name just a few). Goodblatt’s more unique contribution, however, is her introduction of scholarship that has remained on the periphery of Donne studies, awakening us to the work of people such as Matt Goldish, Jason Rosenblatt, and Louis Newman, amongst others. Their work helps explain, in part, the contexts of Donne’s own Christian Hebraism. In particular, Goodblatt wants to point out that the work of such scholars, particularly Newman, “undercuts” the foundational work of one of the most recognizable Donne scholars, D. C. Allen. After all, it was Allen who asserted that “the best way to judge the proficiency of a seventeenth-century divine in Hebrew is to see what he does with the rabbinical commentaries” (qtd. in Goodblatt 25). However, Goodblatt demonstrates that the most recent scholarship on Christian Hebraism has demonstrated the “circuitous route” of Hebrew transmission in early modern England (25). Goodblatt concludes, “The most productive strategy … in the study of Donne’s Christian Hebraism is to realign the debate so as to include the two issues of linguistic knowledge and transmitted knowledge” (26).

Indeed, it is this very balance between linguistic knowledge and transmitted knowledge that becomes the hallmark of Goodblatt’s assessment of Donne’s Hebraic knowledge. Opting to bypass breadth of study, however, Goodblatt goes for depth (for very good reasons which are explained in chapter one), restricting her assessment of Donne’s
Hebraism to his sermons on the Penitential Psalms 6 (chapter two) and 32 (chapter three) and the sermons on the Penitential Psalm 38 and the Prebend Psalms (chapters four and five). In these chapters, Goodblatt draws some important, yet not unsurprising, conclusions: Donne’s sermons emphasize “an interplay of voices which creates … a tension between the centrifugal and centripetal forces of reading” (75); assessing Donne along with Archbishop Andrewes “confirms the appropriateness of a move from discussion of linguistic knowledge … to that of ways and means—in other words, issues of transmitted knowledge, discursive systems, sermonic genres, and exegetical agendas” (106-07); “the centrality of grammar … to the Reformation project” explains Donne’s commitment to the literal interpretation of Scripture (137); and Donne uses the “authority” of the exegetical tradition he inherits to speak directly to the political problems of his time (166-67).

For all that the book offers, however, it seems to miss a greater narrative that needs to be made at some point in the history of Donne studies. Exactly where was Donne learning all of his Hebrew (Goodblatt names many texts, but does not go on to examine Donne’s teachers)? How sophisticated were the Christian Hebraists with which he was working? How did his interactions with the translators who had worked on the King James translation influence his theological and political formation? How was Donne similar to and different from these people? Did Donne’s commitment to the Hebrew language shape (or change) how he identified with Jews (here, I am specifically thinking of his Holy Sonnet, “Spit in my face, ye Jews”)? Certainly, we get glimpses of possible answers to such questions in chapter one, but Goodblatt never fully incorporates New Historicist methodologies into her scholarship that would help her better answer these questions. Of course, when reviewing books, it is easy to fall into the trap of thinking of the book that we ourselves would like to write. The desire for such a book, however, stems from Goodblatt’s own provocation; that is to say that The Christian Hebraism of John Donne proves to be a timely and much-needed work in Donne studies. Let us only hope that it inspires future students and scholars to take Goodblatt’s cue. Much more work needs to be done with Donne’s Christian Hebraism and the Christian Hebraism of all sixteenth- and seventeenth-century
England. Goodblatt offers us a very strong beginning to this project, but we have many miles to go before we sleep.


The editors of this volume have brought together in a single volume the full texts of Milton’s five treatises on divorce:

- *The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce* (August 1, 1643)
- Its greatly expanded second edition (February 2, 1644)
- *The Judgement of Martin Bucer* (August 6, 1644)
- *Tetrachordon* (March 4, 1644/45)
- *Colasterion* (March 4, 1644/45)

Milton’s tracts are followed by four documents that responded to his argument, and to which he responded directly in his twin pamphlets, *Tetrachordon* and *Colasterion*:

- William Prynne, excerpt from *Twelve Considerable Serious Questions* (September 16, 1644)
- Herbert Palmer, excerpt from *The Glasse of God’s Providence* (a sermon delivered August 13, 1644, published November 7, 1644)
- [Anonymous], *An Answer to a book, intituled, The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce* (November 14, 1944)
- Daniel Featley, excerpt from *The Dippers Dipt* (February 7, 1945)

The goal of this volume is to present Milton’s arguments on divorce, along with his first critics, in “an accessible, lightly modernized text for interested readers in a variety of fields within and beyond seventeenth-century literary studies” (2). Teachers of courses in literature, women’s studies, history, and law will find this volume useful. It includes a contextual and interpretive introduction, notes aimed at the non-specialist reader, an eleven-page bibliography of primary and secondary sources, and an appendix listing pamphlets in the second wave of responses to Milton’s argument (1644-49), as
well as modern publications (1715-1973) that document Milton’s “Legacy of Reform” (451).

The introduction reads Milton’s arguments for divorce, when “indisposition, unfitness, or contrariety of mind … hinder the main benefits of conjugal society, which are solace and peace” (DDD 44), as central to his concept of liberty. “Inherently divorcive,” Miltonic liberty insists that “the inward and irremediable disposition of man’ must serve as the fulcrum for private acts of interpretation concerning the reformation and regulation of the church, the subject, and the state” (Introduction 10-11). In addition to contextualizing Milton’s argument in relation to his other prose works and the Westminster Assembly’s debates on church discipline, the introduction also analyzes the emotional substrate of Milton’s argument—his affecting images describing marital misery, his joy at finding an ally in such a respected reformer as Bucer, his longing for a worthy opponent, and his disgust at the one full answer to his argument that was published. Finally, van den Berg and Howard investigate Milton’s suspicion that his opponents were in collusion with each other, by detailing the relationships between the authors, printers, and licensers of the first wave of responses.

Whereas the text of The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce in the Yale Prose volume conflates the first and second editions, using a complex system of arrows and brackets to indicate additions and omissions, this volume includes the first two (of four) editions in their entirety because, as the editors rightly claim, “the conflated text … is difficult to decipher, especially for readers not already familiar with the complexities of Milton’s prose tracts” (2). Reading these two versions of his argument serially—followed by his citations of Bucer’s support, the dense exegesis of his attempt to harmonize apparently contradictory Biblical texts, and his angry rebuke of an unworthy opponent—is an edifying experience. In Milton’s paens to “a cheerful conversation, to the solace and love of each other” (77), we see the genesis of his poetic rendering of Adam and Eve’s pre-lapsarian bliss; in his vivid descriptions of marital misery, we hear the “murmuring and despair” of Samson (52).

But contemporary American readers will also be struck, in ways that the editors do not point out, by how relevant Milton’s arguments are to hot-button issues of our past and present.
• In their appendix on the “Legacy of Reform,” van den Berg and Howard aim to document “the ongoing importance of [Milton’s] arguments as the understanding of marriage shifted slowly from a religious and political paradigm designed to regulate procreation to a new model of marriage as a private institution intended to further the personal satisfaction of each party” (25). Is, then, Milton’s view of marriage also in the lineage of revolutionary ideas that have evolved into debates over gay marriage?

• In *The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce*, Milton claims that divorce among the Hebrews “was left to a man’s own arbitration to be determined between God and his own conscience” (72). Is this view of individual conscience in the lineage of revolutionary ideas that have evolved into debates over a woman’s right to choose abortion?

• In *Tetrachordon*, Milton uses, he believes, a *reductio ad absurdum* argument to ridicule those who fear abuses so much that they would forbid all divorce: “If the importation of wine and the use of all strong drink were forbid, it would both clean rid the possibility of committing that odious vice [of drunkenness], and men might afterwards live happily and healthfully, without the use of those intoxicating liquors. Yet who is there … that ever propounded to lose his sack, his ale, toward the certain abolishing of so great a sin?” (288). Of course, Americans tried such “peremptory strictness” (289) with disastrous results during the era of prohibition. Is then Milton’s insistence on liberty, despite inevitable license, in the lineage of revolutionary ideas that have evolved into debates over drug laws?

Reading Milton’s divorce tracts, in conjunction with their first responses, is a no less edifying experience. After his affecting idealism and carefully argued exegesis, the repeated dismissals of the *Answer* and the anonymous author’s low expectations of marital conversation come as a shock. Sometimes, merely repeating Milton’s argument “is enough to confute it and make it lighter then vaintie it self” (434); other times, Milton’s argument seems such “a new principle unheard of till now” that the anonymous opponent concludes only “so I leave
it” (446) without confutation. When he chuckles that any husband may seek a “fit conversing soule” from his neighbor’s wife—“only let him remember to come home to [his own wife] at night” (434-35), we can understand the rage that Milton vents in Colasterion: “I mean not to dispute philosophy with this pork, who never read any…. I spoke [of] how unpleasing and discontenting the society of body must needs be between those whose minds cannot be sociable. But what should a man say more to a snout in this pickle?” (373, 381). By bringing all these tracts together in one volume, van den Berg and Howard make clear why Milton’s arguments were doomed in his day, but remain relevant in our own.

Our reading of the give-and-take of this debate might, however, have been improved if the pamphlets had been arranged in chronological order of publication, and if Milton’s two satirical sonnets on the publication of his divorce tracts had been included. Such an arrangement would illuminate not only Milton’s vituperative ridicule of the “Owls and Cuckoos, Asses, Apes and Dogs” who dismissed his learned argument (“I did but prompt the age to quit their clogs”), but also his invitations in the preface to Tetrachordon to “those his detractors [to] any fair meeting … with a due freedom under equal moderators” (241), and in the coda to Colasterion to “any man equal to the matter … to take in hand this controversy” (389).


No doubt Bunyan is something of an embarrassment to a postmodern world. He was the passionate advocate of a radically imperialistic message, otherwise known as the gospel of Jesus Christ and his kingdom. He allegorized the Christian life as one which assumed the male protection and oversight of women. He believed in another world populated by angels good and bad, by a living Christ, by hosts of redeemed persons (as well as the unredeemed, carefully segregated). He believed that the believer’s life was a pilgrimage, though at least in
his major allegories this life seemed not to acknowledge adequately the role of the sacramental, the necessary role of those not free to be wayfarers, the unimpeachable values of culture, and the ways in which persons actually change and develop over time.

If on the one side in contemporary Bunyan scholarship we find those intent upon defending Bunyan the apologist and allegorist for his earnest presentation of an authentic if difficult spirituality, on the other hand we now have resourceful postmoderns who manage to call into question the reality of that other world to which Bunyan saw the Christian life as a journey. At a campus symposium involving three members of the religious studies faculty, the present reviewer had occasion to ask, with reference to the familiar fable of the six blind men and the elephant, “Is there, in fact, any elephant?” The impaneled respondent chose to fumble the question, though it does seem to be relevant to any discussion of Christian matters.

Bunyan believed implicitly and explicitly that there was an elephant, by which we designate an objective and dynamic transcendence. The way in which such a belief is relevant to the Bunyan scholarship is the awkward, if unavoidable, question: Does belief with its accompanying practices give a respondent any special access to the meanings of the text? The obvious illustration would involve the familiar (Coleridgean) distinction between the Bunyan of Parnassus and the Bunyan of the Conventicle. The common practice is to approach in one of two ways the connection between the Bunyan of imaginative art and Bunyan the churchman and apologist. The one approach is so to divorce them that one never asks “Is the Muse the same inspiration as the Holy Spirit?” The other approach is so to merge them that a literary value is assumed or credited to materials that have none.

In the up-to-date and stimulating collection under review, the piece that comes closest to bringing the premodern into the postmodern is Isabel Hofmeyr’s piece “Bunyan: Colonial, Postcolonial.” She skillfully tracks the course of The Pilgrim’s Progress as it moves around the globe, a work virtually on a par with the Bible as the embodiment of a saving message, or Gospel, moving into many languages with the cultures they serve as vehicles. She acknowledges how Sylvia Brown and Arlette Zinck have added to the common understanding of Bunyan
in translation, and how Michael Davies in another way has managed
to bring together the Bunyan of art and the Bunyan of faith.

This putting front and center the question of belief-ful art is not
in any way to detract from the sound and helpful pieces by N. H.
Keeble on Bunyan’s place in the explosion of print-publication in the
later seventeenth century or of Nigel Smith’s piece on the Restoration
as a literary milieu deserving its own label. Nor does it take anything
from Vera Camden’s deft teasing out of Bunyan’s meanings in treating
the feminine, with an unsuspected application of Luther’s approach
to Scripture as somehow maternal.

In addition, this companion (one of several score listed after the
text) includes a useful seven-page annotated chronology at the open-
ing as well as a six-page list of books for further reading at the book’s
close. But, surprising as it may seem, the likelihood is that many will
find the one most useful piece in the collection to be the editor’s
introduction. Anne Dunan-Page’s nine-page summary of what has
been and is happening in the field is startling in its honesty about the
strengths and weaknesses of the Puritan author who, she reminds us,
was briefly in his youth the keeper of a public house in Bedfordshire.

 xv + 359 pp. $59.00. Review by eugene d. hill, mount holyoke
college.

Plato’s Socrates would permit in his Republic only two kinds of
poets: those who write hymns in praise of the gods and those who
compose verses celebrating great men. Stella Revard’s two-volume
study of Pindar in the Renaissance exhibits the same structure. The
volume here reviewed can be read by itself, but it is best accompanied
by at least the opening chapter of Revard’s Pindar and the Renaissance
Hymn-Ode: 1450-1700 (2001). Students of the period have much for
which to be grateful; Revard has mastered a wide range of primary
materials and presented her findings lucidly.

To “pindarize” in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries connoted
to produce poems of praise in an especially elevated style; French had
the word by the early sixteenth century, England not until well into the
seventeenth. Such a lyric was a luxury item: it bespoke the sublimity of its author and the grandeur of its patron. Every nation needed its Pindar: there was the “French Pindar” (Ronsard); the “Polish Pindar” (Sarbiewski); and the title page of his 1630 collection characterized Gongora as the “Andalusian Pindar.” Given the abundance of material treated, it was perhaps unavoidable that much of the present volume reads like a catalogue of Stoffgeschichte: a poet is named, an historical occasion specified, a figure from ancient history or myth duly and dutifully adduced to celebrate the patron’s assumption of power, victory over foreign foes or triumph in civil war. Revard summarizes the “argument” of the poem, often giving a verse or two, sometimes a full stanza, in the original (French, German, Latin, Italian) followed by a clean English rendering. Hercules’ Labors appear most frequently; this is the default mythic analogue and it was endlessly recycled for changed circumstances. So it would be no surprise in the mid-seventeenth century to find “classical prototypes that earlier poets had employed for Charles I now adorn[ing] Cromwell” (96).

Several of these mythic or historic comparisons strike one as deliciously piquant. One such is Lampridio’s Latin ode (from the 1520s) that celebrates Henry VIII as a champion of the Roman faith: “Henry is portrayed as a contestant pitted against his opponent Luther, and his alleged victory is depicted alternately as an athletic and a military contest—worthy in either case of Pindaric commemoration, although accomplished in the scholastic arena rather than on the battlefield or in the Olympic palaestra” (27). Janus Dousa’s Latin ode of 1586 provides another instance: “Cecil is likened to Nestor in wisdom and counsel and to Ulysses in steadfastness. Just as Ulysses resisted the blandishments of Calypso and Circe to return to his native Ithaca, so may the wise Cecil, Dousa suggests, be likewise steadfast and faithful. By implication Spain’s wasting of the Low Countries is compared to the visitation of the Harpies. Through these allusions, Dousa urges Cecil to lift these devastating plagues from the Low Countries” (76).

The most engaging sections of Revard’s book come when she looks in close detail at major work; particularly welcome for readers of this journal will be the good chapter on Jonson’s Cary-Morison Ode. The full chapter-length treatment of a major work allows the critic to get beyond the catalogue entries and attend to the complexity of Pindaric
Laudation has its finesses and duplicities, as Ronsard explains in a celebrated passage in the preface to his 1550 volume of *Odes*. I paraphrase: the lyric poet’s business being to celebrate to the utmost the figure he has undertaken to praise, that poet must take certain shifts if he finds nothing in the object worthy of such commendation. In that case, let the poet look to the man’s ancestors and their deeds, or honor him by way of his nation, or of some happy fortune that has befallen him or his family, or by way of some *vagabondes digressions*, industriously gathered from here and there, so that the whole resembles one seamless tissue of praise. Ronsard with affected naïveté instructs the would-be Pindarist; but he also indicates what path the close reader needs to pursue in unraveling the laudatory web.

Along these lines the most stimulating chapter is the fourth, on Cowley’s *Pindarique Odes* (1656). Never contentious with other scholars, Revard does make it clear in her notes that she takes issue with the reading of this text offered by Annabel Patterson (*Censorship and Interpretation*, 1984). While duly acknowledging their pervasive ambiguity, Patterson presents a strongly pro-Cromwellian view of the *Odes*. Recognizing that same ambiguity, Revard take the work to be “a coded message to the people of England” (129) in support of the exiled Charles. Indeed, Revard views Cowley’s much cited remarks in his preface on the literary boldness and irregularity as at once a diversion from their political intention and a hint at that intention (they are indeed bold, but primarily as a political intervention). To Pindarize was, perhaps politically as well as lexically, to look toward France. The pages devoted to Cowley by Patterson and Revard would make an excellent session for a graduate seminar on that author.

In short, this volume will serve students of the seventeenth century well. Revard is careful, rightly, to avoid the intrusion of twentieth-century Pindaric scholarship on her treatment of the early materials. There is one moment, though, where she might have allowed herself an exception. In support of John Wallace’s remark that an ode of Marvell exhibits the familiar seven-part rhetorical structure (exordium, narration, divisio … ) cherished by Renaissance pedagogues, Revard provides three facsimile pages from a 1616 annotated edition of Pindar that mark out this very structure (107-11). Wilamowitz called attention to this same schema in the 1616 volume, finding it laughable:
we see Pindar working as if he had read (“als hätte er ... gelesen”) the author of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. The German’s stroke of wit is too good to pass up.


*Passion and Persuasion* claims to examine “the impact of the rhetorical tradition on Dryden’s work” (1). It is comprised of four parts—“Passion and Persuasion,” “Captatio benevolentiae: Appeals to the audience,” “Invention: The temperance topic,” and “Elocution: The body poetic”—spread out over seventeen chapters, with a conclusion, notes given in short title, and a bibliography. Astoundingly, there is no index. In place of the index, there is an ad for VDM press, soliciting “current academic research papers, Bachelor’s Theses, Master’s Theses, Dissertations or Scientific Monographs.” Because I frequently consult a book’s index, I found myself re-reading this ad several times. And, indeed, it explains a lot about what kind of a work *Passion and Persuasion* is.

*Passion and Persuasion* is not a book; it is a dissertation. It is not a dissertation-book. It is an unrevised dissertation. To be sure, there are very few technical errors in the work—some minor typos, the notes to chapter eight are misnumbered, Matthew Lewis is misnamed “Mark” (225 n38)—so I don’t doubt that there was a thorough checking before publication. But that isn’t the problem. The problem, as most of us know, is that a dissertation is not a book. There are plenty of guides that offer advice on how to prepare a dissertation for publication, notably William Germano’s *Getting It Published* (2001), as well as frequent columns in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Indeed, in an essay published just last summer, Leonard Cassuto identified the problem that plagues *Passion and Persuasion*: “A dissertation is a book-length project, but it’s not a book that is just awaiting cover art…. Your dissertation is part of your education. It’s not just a goal of your education. You thesis is almost certainly the first project of
its magnitude that you’ve attempted, and such things take practice. It takes a while to assimilate a large amount of material and the different perspectives it affords” (“It’s a Dissertation, Not a Book,” *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, July 24, 2011.) Simply put, *Passion and Persuasion* is only half-baked.

I can discern no overarching narrative in *Passion and Persuasion*. Its topics are broad and mostly determined by other scholar’s research. This makes sense for a dissertation, and Skouen has certainly done her homework. She has read widely in Dryden, Dryden criticism, early modern linguistics, passion theorists, politics, and history, but herein lies the rub: in a dissertation, a student needs to show familiarity with both primary and secondary materials. The presentation is necessarily cursory and rapid. There is not always room for a focused, original argument. Skouen’s whopping seventeen chapters reflects this practice. She jumps from authorship, to publication, to drama, to religion, to politics, to rhetoric, to audience reception, each receiving its own chapter. But how do they all fit together? Of course, all of these topics are relevant to Dryden, but should they all be treated equally? What is the focus? Dryden and rhetoric and the passions and *The Hind and the Panther*? Not good enough. I shall not attempt to devise a workable thesis for this book, but it needed one.

Instead, Skouen dances to the beat of other critics’ drums. Again, fine for a dissertation, but how can anyone possibly incorporate new ideas while jitterbugging? The lack of focus in the argument affects many paragraphs in the book. We are offered a review of the literature almost every fifth paragraph. The subsections do not have logical conclusions; Skouen simply starts a new one. This created a strange effect where it seemed as though I was reading backwards. All of the information offered is not always necessary. At the very least, Skouen should have re-considered what deserves to be in the text and what should serve as supplemental information in the notes. The information just kept coming. It was pure display, and it made for frustrating reading because whatever useful and informative things she has to say disappears in the slipstream of a casually reprinted dissertation.

The writing itself is as bloated as the paragraphs. Sentence construction desperately cried out for Richard Lanham’s *Revising Prose* and required serious revision for readability. I checked one of Skouen’s
articles that was published from her dissertation. I compared the note to the corresponding sections in the book. Paragraphs and sentences were tighter and howlers were removed. This comparison convinced me that *Passion and Persuasion* received no serious editing from the press before publication.

Despite all the hard work that clearly went into this dissertation, *Passion and Persuasion* does not, alas, contribute to our understanding of Dryden. The readings are either obvious or unoriginal (or, in a few instances, strained). But Skouen’s method does not allow for her to satisfy her dissertation committee and to break new ground. Skouen has re-arranged the furniture by adding the context of the passions and rhetoric to a neglected poem. Not that I think she was wrong to do so. What is most frustrating about *Passion and Persuasion* is that Skouen has a valid idea. The language of the passions pervades early modern writing and for too long it has been ignored by scholars. The subject is certainly multi-disciplinary, since it covers medicine, language, and aesthetics, and Skouen should be credited for not only recognizing it for what it is, but also for making an earnest attempt to articulate a way of using language that has been long forgotten. She clearly is knowledgeable about Dryden, but we still have to wait for a proper study of Dryden and rhetoric. Skouen is qualified to do so, but she needs to think about it a lot more.

At its price, I would not recommend *Passion and Persuasion* for library acquisition, considering how tight budgets are these days. I also found the lack of an index intolerable. A word to the wise: if your press does not allow you the opportunity to provide a map for your readers to help them navigate your work, then you should find a new press.


Katharine Hodgkin’s valuable book offers readers two important contributions to early modern scholarship within a single volume. First and foremost, the book sets out to make available the fascinating au-
tobiographical narrative of Dionys Fitzherbert, a woman born around 1580 into a minor gentry family in Oxfordshire. Fitzherbert’s narrative of her own life focuses on what she considers her “fall” into sin and the spiritual “sickness” that follows. Included in this manuscript are several letters to friends with whom Fitzherbert discusses her illness and recovery. In addition to the transcript, the book also contains a quite extensive introduction that contextualizes Fitzherbert’s narrative by giving a useful account not only of her life circumstances but also of the relationship between her illness and early modern views of madness, melancholy, sin, and redemption. The introduction also includes a detailed description of the original manuscript and the two scribal copies examined by the author, as well as discussion of the editorial practices followed in the book. The book is part of Ashgate’s series *The Early Modern Englishwoman 1500-1750: Contemporary Editions*. It will appeal therefore particularly to those interested in early modern women’s writing as a category, but will also be of interest to anyone concerned with the history of medicine or early modern religious narratives.

Hodgkin bases her own transcription on Bodleian Library MS. E Mus. 169, which contains Fitzherbert’s account of her experience written in her own hand. On facing pages she presents a transcription of the original, complete with highly inconsistent spelling and punctuation, and a modernized, re-punctuated version of this text. She has also consulted the two other existing scribal copies, indicating in notes where these copies differ from the original. Some of these differences seem significant, as Hodgkin points out, including a group of amendments that seem intended to soften her accounts of extreme mental or physical suffering in the original. Hodgkin’s editing practice is meticulous and helpful, providing the reader with explanatory notes where necessary, and directing the reader to edited passages from the scribal copies in the appendix.

The introduction amounts to a short book on its own, and offers a quick but thorough exploration of the many interrelated contextual issues that Fitzherbert’s narrative explicitly or implicitly addresses. Though Fitzherbert’s narrative does not easily fit into any of our modern generic cubbyholes, it does constitute, as Hodgkin points out, an early essay in spiritual autobiography, and as such marks an
adventurous step for Fitzherbert as a writer. Hodgkin’s discussion of the various issues stemming from the nature of this narrative is exemplary; she examines the connections between women, writing and religion in a section devoted to “writing the self and Protestant culture” (34-38), noting how Fitzherbert’s work both follows (in its use of an “exemplary” life, for instance) and departs from, the various models that might have been available to her.

One of the trickiest and most interesting issues to emerge from Fitzherbert’s account of her illness is her apparent insistence that she did not experience melancholy or madness, but rather a spiritual sickness whose onset and cure she attributes directly to God’s workings in her. Hodgkin organizes her material very well here, deftly parsing out the complex relationships between gender, religion, madness, and melancholy in support of her view that “Fitzherbert was joining a continuing debate amongst devotional writers over the relation between melancholy and spiritual affliction” (63). Fitzherbert’s own language about the relation between the affliction of the body and the passions of the mind is highly informative about the psychology of illness in the period: “for in melancholy persons, the body, being overladen with thick and dull humours, by little and little oppresses the heart and spirit; but in these cases [i.e., her own] it first of all falls violently upon the heart and distracts the spirit; then no marvel if all the rest go out of frame” (151). Though she is urging the secondariness of the body in her illness, it is clear that the boundaries between body and mind, emotional and physical illness are highly attenuated. At times I found myself wishing for a little more detail in the discussion of the physiology/psychology of Fitzherbert’s illness. Because she emphasizes that it is entirely possible for the “passions of the mind” to provoke the “distemperature” (153) of the body rather than the other way around, Fitzherbert’s account of her illness complicates recent analysis of the early modern emotions in provocative and interesting ways. Much recent work on the topic focuses exclusively on the physical, humoral bases of emotional disorders rather than their cognitive contents, and a little more discussion of the implications of Fitzherbert’s account in this respect would connect this work usefully to current debates about the early modern emotions. Overall though, given the necessary limitations of the introduction, Hodgkin synthesizes a great deal of
information about madness and melancholy in ways both useful to the specialist and engaging to the more general reader.

Hodgkin also has a shrewd eye for which of the less obvious aspects of Fitzherbert’s sometimes unruly narrative are valuable from a historical and literary perspective. She notes her conscious construction of herself as an author, exploring her place in the emerging canon of women’s life-writing. She also unpacks in interesting ways the somewhat anomalous position of a woman of Fitzherbert’s background who chooses not to marry (indeed sets her face firmly against it) and instead pursues a life of single devotion to God.

Overall, this volume represents an extremely valuable contribution to the study of early modern women’s writing. Hodgkin not only presents a meticulously edited version of this fascinating document, but also highlights skillfully and sympathetically the many ways in which it speaks to contemporary critical interest in gender, mental illness, notions of self, practices of self-writing, and the role of piety in early modern female life. The book is an excellent addition to this admirable Ashgate series.


The family-state analogy in seventeenth-century Britain, specifically in terms of its connection to the issues of lineal succession, is the focus of Erin Murphy’s book. She offers a comprehensive analysis, drawing attention to the use of the metaphor of domesticity for political houses in literary senses as well as to the practical application of genealogies that tied monarchical families to biblical ones. In addition to this, she describes how the term “family” can, for various political purposes, be concerned with either marriage or reproduction. This involves a close consideration of how the female gender operates or is erased, depending on how seventeenth-century writers configured the analogy and how tricky their genealogies proved to be. Murphy does an admirable job of directing her attention in her extended analyses
of works by John Milton, Lucy Hutchinson, John Dryden, and Mary Astell, as well as some initial discussion of works by Robert Filmer, Robert Parsons, James I, and Aemilia Lanyer.

In the first chapter, Murphy examines three kinds of texts by way of establishing common seventeenth-century rhetorical strategies for dealing with the family-state analogy: the father-king analogy (Filmer and James I), the marital model of contractual politics (Parsons and James I), and the model of spiritual/intellectual reproduction offered by a predominantly female kind of community (Lanyer). Sir Robert Filmer’s works “literalize[e] the patriarchalist analogy” in his use of genealogy, arguing “that the relationship between a father and a king is one of identity, rather than similarity” (33). Murphy comments that “Through his mobilization of genealogical narrative, Filmer frees his political doctrine of inheritance from the bondage of actual reproduction” (34). The mother and maternity are thereby also erased, as is any question of bastardy.

John Dryden’s *Absalom and Achitophel* is the subject of chapter 7, and in it Murphy considers how Dryden struggles to reconfigure lineal succession in the literal absence of reproduction, in order to support James II’s nomination as successor to Charles II, who had no legitimate progeny. Like Filmer, Dryden has to erase reproduction and mobilize the patriarchal notion of genealogical inheritance from Adam as first father. Murphy’s analysis considers also how other Genesis stories helped Dryden “figure rebirth without childbirth” (177). Dryden employs typology to figure Charles II as an echo of David, and he “insists on a theory of inheritance that binds the people” to obedience while the king is bound only to God (185). Thus, “under divine right, the king fulfills God on earth … holding a space in which the present can unfold… [T]ypology reoriented to the present allows the king to reclaim the power of fulfillment from dissenting forces” (195). In other words, “by representing the present as a moment of fulfillment, and the king as its guardian” the threat of non-linear succession is overcome (195). Thus, while *Absalom and Achitophel* may embrace paternity, it avoids patriarchalism” (203).

Conversely, in *A Conference About the Next Succession to the Crowne of Ingland* (1595), Robert Parsons “argues for succession based on birth. He admits that reproduction provides continuity and emphasizes the
bonds between a father and a son” (37). But he also promotes the idea that the consent of the people is an important element of monarchical rule. Ultimately, Parsons proposes “a decidedly non-hierarchical image of Adam and Eve as the type of all society” (39) while still insisting on a patriarchalist theory of political governance. Murphy explains that “Parsons uses the connection between husband and wife as a way to reimagine politics” (40).

James I’s uses of his own genealogy worked to authorize his possession of the throne, but interestingly, he refers to both his ancestry and his progeny in terms of how his family is the state. In this way, genealogy can work both ways: “Though he may describe himself as the husband of England, it is as the grandson of Margaret and the father of Charles that he sits as king” (51). Borrowing both from Filmer and Parsons, James I rests his authority in his identity as a father to his children and as a father-king to his people: “James comes from a line of kings” and “he brings with him a line of future kings” (58); thus “the royal heir, like Christ, embodies the power to move the nation beyond mortality” (60).

Chapters 2, 3, and 4 deal with how Milton’s *Paradise Lost* uses “family politics” from Charles I to Charles II. In the first of these three chapters on Milton, Murphy discusses how Milton strategically removes the notion of paternal kingship embodied and promoted by James I and replaces it with a domestic vision of marriage in Eden, like Parsons. Through an examination of the allegory of Satan, Sin, and Death in chapter 3, Murphy considers how Milton constructs patriarchal notions of paternity and kingship as not only incestuous, but monstrous and ultimately self-consuming. Then he envisions how Eve contracts herself willingly to Adam, echoing Parsons’s view of how marriage is a more appropriate model for social relations. Finally, in chapter 4, Murphy offers a fascinating perspective of the less than dramatically compelling final books, when Milton dispels the dramatic mood as he removes Eve from the narrative, putting her to sleep while Michael narrates to Adam the future of his now postlapsarian race. By concentrating on “what remains” as opposed to “what disappears” from the last two books of *Paradise Lost*, Murphy identifies a shift to a more genealogical narration (126). This shift provides a way to translate lineal succession from a domestic and familial setting to one of purified...
political concerns; drama, domesticity, and the female go together in “an earthly sanctuary in which the family exists safe from the realm of government” (118). This re-imagined domesticity is thereby contracted to Adam, and remains a viable model for society, but is distinct from the issues of politics and kingship that concern him alone.

Similarly, Lucy Hutchinson’s *Order and Disorder* employs the marital model for society to overcome the limits and even anguish of reproduction, but from a wifely and maternal point of view: “Hutchinson uses marriage as a figure of consent…. Marriage becomes a source of national stability in the face of the force and deceit of monarchy” for the republican cause (158-159). As for Milton, for Hutchinson “marriage forms the ground of all society” (159), but “the theme of maternity and motherhood as a source of disruption and grief runs throughout the poem, defining some of Hutchinson’s most striking verse … the present-day voice of the narrator rails against the pain of motherhood, while the marginal citations echo her sadness with references to biblical scenes of maternal anguish” (163). The anguish of the maternal body is transfigured into an emotional trauma. The challenge, then, of reproduction omits the notion of hereditary succession of monarchies. Instead, Hutchinson uses typology to cast her husband as a type of Adam and Christ, omitting the monarchical figures of Charles I and II. In doing so, “Hutchinson’s poetic form connects her to a world of women through her use of typology … [she] links the pain of childbirth with the sorrow of the crucifixion, and the joy of motherhood with the promise of Christ’s resurrection” (169). Ultimately, Hutchinson “finds solace by making the past present through the performance of marital conversation” between Adam and Eve, thereby re-imagining the family-state analogy in marital terms that omit monarchical status entirely and which invest meaning in her text to memorialize her husband and their marriage rather than in her children, who challenge her with suffering that she must overcome.

At the end of the first chapter, Murphy discusses how Lanyer places mother and daughter before father and son as reproducers of genealogical connection, “focusing on Christ as king and portraying women as his brides” (63). Lanyer’s configuration of family rests on the “shared lineage” of all her readers, which undermines any sense of paternal or patriarchal claims for monarchical status. Lanyer employs a rhetorical
strategy of typological connections between Old and New Testament figures and Jacobean fulfillment; thus the “spiritual inheritance of divine history” authorizes women in a genealogical way (65). Similar to Hutchinson, instead of valorizing maternity and motherhood as material experiences, Lanyer provides a sense of literature itself as “an alternative form of reproduction” (67).

The reproductive status of the text is a theme that Lanyer and Hutchinson share with Mary Astell, whose *A Serious Proposal to the Ladies* and other works are the subject of the eighth and final chapter. Astell’s works, like Lanyer’s but more so, rely on a model of marriage and family that is dysfunctional for society, and so must be addressed in future changes—thus the form of the proposal: “Though she advocates education to improve the domestic by producing better mothers and more patient wives, her greatest faith lies beyond the family, not just in religion but in the fluid spaces created by circulation” (211). Astell’s vivid and trenchant political criticism here is something Murphy examines with reference not only to her attitudes regarding marriage, which have garnered much critical observation, but also with attention to her notions of reproduction, which, like Lanyer’s, translate the notion into spiritual and emotional terms. Like Dryden too in a way, Astell “resolves the complexity and inadequacy of lineage through an appeal to obedience as its own principle” (218-219). Like Lanyer and Hutchinson, she constructs a notion of female suffering (though in marriage rather than maternity) that has value only in “leading them to the true state of bliss in heaven” (220). But Murphy’s main point regarding Astell’s text is that she addresses it to ladies, and in doing so “she calls into being a community of women readers…. Astell opens up a category defined by the text itself … her reading community remains unbounded … [and] builds on an emerging sense of the public sphere … Her emphasis on the voluntary quality of the retreat marks its distance from the family … [which she imagines] as a realm of dominance and submission analogous to the state” (230-231). Thus, “Astell’s claim for single women articulates a version of the family-state analogy without either the family or the state” (236).

Chapter 5 is an oddly brief chapter that outlines the second half of the book, in which Murphy considers the three chronologically later texts. As already outlined, Lucy Hutchinson’s *Order and Dis-
order (chapter 6), John Dryden’s Absalom and Achitophel (chapter 7), and Mary Astell’s A Serious Proposal to the Ladies (chapter 8) all approach the notions of family-state analogy, genealogy, marriage and reproduction, patriarchal paternity, and lineal succession in a variety of ways that echo ideas already discussed in the first chapter and the chapters on Milton in the first half of the book. Clearly, the predominant structural factor in Murphy’s organization of the book is the historical chronology of texts, and she does insist on reducing the often inspired readings of her chosen texts to historical references by structuring and concluding her arguments this way. As a result, anyone reading the book with a preference for literary interpretation or for particular variations of the family-state analogy may find the second half repetitive, and perhaps this could be frustrating. Certainly, the historical chronology of events could have been honored just as well in more coherent and cohesively arranged discussions of the rhetorical strategies that resembled each other.

And yet, anyone interested in domestic metaphors, the use of Genesis narratives, typology as a rhetorical device, marriage and/or reproduction metaphors, or the family-state analogy as used by seventeenth-century writers in a number of contexts and permutations would find Murphy’s book good reading. Her prose is clear and her insights complex without being overworked and her readings are illuminating indeed, excavating new ways to look at these texts that develop our understanding of the intersections between them. Murphy’s contribution here to our historical understanding of how the family-state analogy operates fluidly will certainly engender further study.


Anyone who has ever read a blog post (meaning most human beings capable of reading who have internet access) will be aware that countless individuals are documenting their lives online, and any literary historian or critic will be aware that such blog posts hardly fit with
traditional notions of autobiography. So the terms “life writing” and “self-writing” have increasingly been used by scholars to describe not just blogs but myriad forms of self-presentation that do not conform with the genre of autobiography. And while blog posts did not exist in early modern England, as far as I know, Michelle M. Dowd and Julie A. Eckerle make an incisive case for a broader understanding of women’s self-writing than would be possible within the narrow confines of autobiography. Building on the work of Shari Benstock, Mary Beth Rose, and Marlene Kadar, they note that the self-presented in traditional biographies tends to be unified and controlling, whereas women’s writings often present selves that are often decentered and provisional. Instead of focusing just on autobiography, which would exclude most significant works of early modern women, Dowd and Eckerle have chosen to use the term “life writing,” defined by Kadar as “a less exclusive genre of personal kind of writing” (3). And on this basis, they have fashioned an essay collection that exemplifies this more inclusive, if sometimes messy, generic category.

Genre and Women’s Life Writing focuses primarily on women writers of seventeenth-century England, but beyond that basic limit, Dowd and Eckerle’s collection reaches out widely to comprehend many forms of life writing. The eleven essays in the collection range over many kinds of women’s writing, including memoirs, diaries, spiritual confessions, poetry, letters, recipe books, prefaces, and defense narratives, just to name a handful. Dowd and Eckerle note well that the essays demonstrate that “experimentation with form was a fundamental characteristic of women’s life writing in early modern England” (4). That was so not only because autobiography was not a formally defined and recognized genre during the period, but also because prolific generic experiments opened up new possibilities for early modern women, both for the social constitution of their selves and for their evolving identities as writers. In describing the generic and stylistic complexity of these writings, the editors hope generally that these essays will “resuscitate early modern women’s life writing in the history of early modern writing generally” (10).

Some of the early modern women whose life writings are featured most prominently in this volume include Margaret Cavendish, Elizabeth Richardson, Lady Anne Clifford, Lady Anne Halkett, Dorothy
Osborne, Martha Moulsworth, Arabella Stuart, Mary Wroth, Aemilia Lanyer, Elizabeth Moore, Agnes Beaumont, Elizabeth Frecke, Dorothy Lewkenore, Lady Grace Mildmay, Lady Brilliana Harvey, and Anna Weamys. As a whole, they are a richly diverse group in both class and generic experimentation. While most seventeenth-century scholars will know the works of Lanyer, Wroth, Osborne, and Cavendish, they will find it rewarding to learn many other names—for example, of Moulsworth (who wrote a remarkable autobiographical poem in 1632 which was not published until 1993), of Richardson (who wrote a mother’s advice manual in 1645 giving advice to her daughters), of Beaumont (who wrote an account in 1674 of her trial on petty treason), of Frecke (who mingled diary entries with recipes, medical notes, and genealogical entries in her manuscript works), of Mildmay (who began a manuscript recipe collection that was continued and annotated by her daughter Lady Mary Fane), of Clifford (whose iterative life writings provide serial justifications of herself, in part for legal reasons), and of Halkett (whose memoirs mingled Christian piety, Royalist politics, and fictive elements of pastoral romance). As impressive as the range of women whose writing is discussed in this volume are the scholars who have contributed. The essay authors that study these life writings comprise a notable catalog of early modern historicist and feminist scholars: Helen Wilcox, Margaret J. M. Ezell, Catherine Field, Megan Matchinske, Mary Ellen Lamb, Eckerle, Dowd, Elspeth Graham, Lara Dodds, and Josephine Donovan. And as should be obvious from the lists above, the archival expertise of scholars like Ezell, Wilcox, and Field in uncovering and studying manuscripts of early modern women is one of the remarkable strengths of this volume.

Another strength of this volume, demonstrated by Elspeth Graham’s essay on Margaret Cavendish, is the critical acumen of the essay writers in treating questions of genre with respect to women writers. Graham asks provocatively how Cavendish could have written so extensively in autobiographical modes when there existed “no established autobiographical tradition for her to work within” (131). And Graham writes with characteristic grace and humor: “I approach the issue of her autobiographical compulsion by investigating her habit of thinking connectively, of cooking diverse ingredients into hot-pots” (132). Cavendish, who famously announced that her “Ambition is such, as
I would either be a World, or nothing,” was, as Elspeth describes, a paradoxical writer who “could not but have written in autobiographical form” (135). The reason for this paradox is that while Margaret Cavendish was profoundly dedicated to her husband William, but as a writer and self-taught philosopher and scientist, she persistently needed to assert her autonomy. So at times, Margaret emphasizes her connection to William as wife, almost entirely eliding herself, as “nothing,” whereas elsewhere she appears entirely separate, “a World” unto herself. Graham thus suggests that Cavendish “wants simultaneously to be her sole author and yet to be written,” seeming to assert a controlling self and to deny it at the same time (142). Even, and perhaps especially in her scientific texts, Graham finds that the writer inserted herself, making autobiography central to all her learning.

In the end, it should be obvious that early modern women’s life writing is not a clearly defined genre practiced by a handful of well-known writers. Rather, Genre and Women’s Life Writing encompasses a vast category of self-presentations—famous and obscure, formal and informal, poetic and prosaic, aristocratic and middle-class, and published in print and preserved in manuscript. Seventeenth-century scholars seeking to expand the scope of their research will find the volume useful in suggesting new published texts, new manuscripts, and new authors for study, as well as new methods of understanding early modern genres. While some scholars may find the messiness of this vast category, the generic experimentation it entails, and the sheer number of unfamiliar authors exasperating, it is a vital form of exasperation. And whatever the exasperation, Genre and Women’s Life Writing in Early Modern England is much better reading than most blogs.


The later seventeenth century witnessed a marked rise in occurrences of life-writing, in which people tried to give shape and order to their personal experiences. Often the results remained in manuscript
until retrieved by more recent scholarship, especially in the case of women. Anthony Wood, or as he later called himself, à Wood, the historian of Oxford University and biographer of its alumni, was more fortunate. Wood wrote two manuscript autobiographies in diary format, both beginning with his birth in Oxford in 1632. The first, entitled The Diarie of the Life of Anthony à Wood, goes only so far as 1659-60; the second, suggestively entitled Secretum Antonii and revising the original into the third person, was still unfinished at his death in 1695. It proceeds as far as July 1672; Wood’s rough copy of the remainder of his life, occasionally referred to in the Secretum, is lost. Thomas Hearne first published the Secretum in 1730 and it has been printed since, but Nicholas Kiessling’s attractively presented edition of the original manuscript (Bodleian MS Tanner 102) is the first with a textual apparatus detailing Wood’s changes to his earlier version.

Like any autobiography Wood’s is a partial, polished and retrospective account of its author’s experiences, written towards the very end of his life and after the works which made his reputation, the Historia et Antiquitates Universitatis Oxoniensis (1674) and Athenae Oxonienses and Fasti (1691-2), were published. Surviving documents, such as Wood’s almanac diaries—frequently referred to in Kiessling’s notes—offer a less varnished, more immediate and indeed more ample record of what Wood actually did and thought. As a guide to what he might have wanted others to believe, or came to believe himself about his life, the Secretum remains illuminating. It vividly records Wood’s sustained Stuart prejudices. John Locke, who attended a “Chymistrie” club with Wood in Oxford 1663, is described as “a man of a turbulent Spirit, clamorous and never contented” (93), and his uneven attitude to women, exemplified in a shocking dismissal of his mother’s death and burial in two spartan sentences (103-04). There is historical interest in Wood’s documentation of aspects of Oxford society during the 1650s and Restoration, including music-making societies (and who attended them), the first Oxford coffee-houses, and Merton College politics, on which he supplies a partial, rather sour perspective. The Secretum also documents the progress of his antiquarian researches, in Oxford and further abroad. In 1666, he encountered the great survivor William Prynne, Keeper of the Records at the Tower of London, who addressed him with “old fashion Complements, such as were used in
the raigne of King James I’ and dressed “in his black-Taffaty cloak, edg’d with black lace at the bottom” (105-06). In later parts Wood touches on the pre-publication travails of the Historia, including the interventionist supervision of the vice-Chancellor John Fell, and incipient controversy over Wood’s version of recent University history.

Little is disclosed about Wood’s actual scholarly methods, although there is nervousness about inaccuracies in his published works later seized on by enemies. John Aubrey, for example is introduced as a “pretender to Antiquities.” he would, Wood comments, “stuff his many letters ... with fooliries, and misinformations, which somtimes would guid him [Wood] into the paths of errour” (108). Aubrey, however, can hardly be blamed for Wood’s own failures of method, and readers of Brief Lives alongside Athenae Oxonienses will know he repeats from him not only possible inaccuracies but slanders and insinuations. Wood’s personal motivation for antiquarian study is, intriguingly, suggested to rest not only on his reading in 1656 of Dugdale’s Antiquities of Warwickshire, which made his life thereafter a “perfect Elysium,” but also his hostility to the “sacrilegists” of interregnum Oxford, who painted over, for example, ancient murals in Merton College chapel and desecrated other ancient objects (49, 70). He comes across as sharp-tongued, highly knowledgeable, gratified by the company of social superiors, and above all a scholar whose expansive gifts were matched and marred by narrow horizons: born opposite Merton, he lived and died near its walls and was always mentally in its sway.

Kiessling’s edition provides readers with a clear text of the autobiography supported by accessible textual notes and informative historical annotation, showing scholarly knowledge and discrimination that bests its subject’s in accuracy and even-handedness. A section after the Secretum tells the story of Wood’s life after 1672, supported by lengthy selections from his papers, including the almanac diaries and will. While informative—especially about the controversial reception of his major works—this section implies that Kiessling is offering an account of Wood’s actual life, rather than the rhetorically shaped one of the Secretum. It could better have been replaced by a critical introduction exploring the text’s strategies of self-presentation in relation not only to independently ascertainable events of his life but also the emergent genre of life- or diary-writing. At present the former has to be
pieced together by the reader using Kiessling’s notes and his very brief (three page) introduction. Meanwhile the adjustments from The Diarie to the Secretum, though clearly treated in the textual apparatus and an article Kiessling has previously published in the Bodleian Library Record, could helpfully have received some summary interpretation.

A critical introduction might also allow for one of Kiessling’s claims to be more convincingly settled. He contends that The Diarie, and the Secretum, were composed as self-vindications after the publication of Athenae Oxonienses had provoked attacks from several quarters and indeed a libel lawsuit (which Wood lost) from the son of Edward Hyde, first Earl of Clarendon. They were a “third defence of his life,” Kiessling claims, having the same purpose as the published note “To the Reader” inserted into copies of Athenae, and A Vindication of the Historiographer of the University of Oxford, (almost certainly by Wood) published in 1693. These are of course not defenses of his life—although they do touch on it—as much as his scholarship and integrity. Meanwhile the text edited here, though it defends Wood against accusers in places and clearly originated after Athenae’s publication, also contains much that is extraneous to any such narrow vindication, including for his example his Oxford boyhood and early school years. In its current form, it has no explicit or implied addressee and we remain at a loss what its eventual destination would have been. Its revised title suggests an archived treasure, a secretum, to be uncovered by future antiquarians not present opponents.

The Life of Anthony Wood In His Own Words is an excellent accompaniment to Wood’s better-known published works of, as Kiessling puts it, “controversial bio-bibliography” and antiquarian scholarship. Superbly edited by an accomplished Wood scholar, it makes readers amply aware of what Wood wanted them to think about him, and maybe also what he did not.
Sunderland Wills and Inventories is a transcription of wills and inventories found in the special collections at the Durham University Library that illuminates what people in the early part of seventeenth-century England owned and to whom they bequeathed their property when they died. Volunteers transcribed over a period of three years the wills and inventories for Sunderland, Bishopwearmouth, and Monkwearmouth of the old English county of Durham for the Victoria County History Trust of Durham. Sunderland is in the modern day English county of Tyne and Wear on the northeast coast of England and includes the villages of Bishopwearmouth and Monkwearmouth.

The book has a short preface; then it gives the editorial method, a long introduction, a list of the wills, and then the actual wills and inventories. These are followed by an extensive glossary of terms and conclude with an index of persons and places connected with the wills.

The introduction, full of valuable information for the researcher, provides an overview of what one can find in the wills and inventories which. It discusses how many wills and inventories there are in this book and where they came from and describes Sunderland and the area. The author of the introduction explains the dating of the wills based on how the will was written or the date written on the will: many wills were written many months before death and some were written as the person was dying. The role of the clergy as witnesses is examined in the introduction, which states that their role changed over time as the people became more literate. The author of the introduction says that the inventories were not just a list of items but included their appraised value attached. The author also explains the process of probate of a will and that wills and inventories provide information as to how large and kind of family there was in early seventeenth-century Sunderland and how much a wife or widow would receive from the estate. One would think the widow would get a large portion of the estate, but this was not always case. Many wills provided money to be given to the poor and told how much the deceased owed to a creditor and how much was owed to him or her. The introduction also
discusses how wills and inventories describe houses of the period and what other property people used and owned. The occupations of the deceased were also given in the wills. Through their wills, the deceased also provided instructions for their funerals and gave money to insure how elaborate it would be, for an elaborate funeral was a sign of status.

The wills and inventories section of the book gives the transcribed wills and inventories, which start with the will portion that tells who the benefactors were and how the deceased wished to be buried. This is followed by usually three witnesses and then the inventory which gives the items and their value, and each will and inventory ends with the source information as to where the actual will can be located. The wills and inventories vary in length with most not being too long.

The glossary explains terms that its definition, spelling, or understanding is not in common usage today, such as akers for acre, apparan for apron, potle, pecke, sope for soap, and other terms. This glossary helps the user to understand better what the wills and inventories are describing.

This book on the wills and inventories of Sunderland is a great resource into what people of the village owned and used in the early seventeenth century. This is not a source though that one will find in every library; it will probably be found in large academic and public libraries that have a section on seventeenth-century English history or a strong genealogical section, or one may find it with the other Surtees Society publications, of which this one is number 214. The introduction is a great source for describing and clarifying terms and usages used in the wills and inventories. Scholars and general readers (genealogy researcher) will be able to read and understand this book and greatly benefit from it; this book is highly recommended to these kinds of scholars.

This book begins and ends with Daniel O’Neill, a crafty Royalist agent whose strong survival skills, along with a host of other characteristics, allowed him to endure, with a few short prison stays, the British Civil Wars while working for the Royalist cause. O’Neill is but one of the numerous agents, conspirators and spies that Geoffrey Smith examines and whose actions and use by the Royalists leaders provide further insight into understanding the Royalist response to the events of this tumultuous period. For the author, O’Neill provides the cohesiveness to his work as he both survived and thrived, thereby providing a constant within the changing world of Royalist agents.

The importance of this work lies in its examination of the spies, agents and others who supported the Royalist cause throughout the British Civil Wars. The work, part of a growing trend in examining the other side of the Civil Wars, that of the Royalist cause, provides important insight into understanding how the crown reacted to the events of this period and how the factional nature of Royalist support created problems. Smith clearly illustrates how this “secret world” (3) of Royalist agents worked to sustain the Royalist cause. He argues, and clearly demonstrates, that as the political and military supporters of the crown became increasingly unable to protect the crown, through either a decisive military or political victory, the role of agents and spies increased in importance. Overall, the book provides insight into how the factional nature of the Royalist cause, mainly the competition between crown supporters for the favor of the king, created a varied, competing and problematic system of plots and policies. Many of these agents were drawn into the innumerable courts factions, and because of this, they came to compete against one another. Another problem discussed by Smith involved the lack of an individual granted the authority to oversee their actions. The closest to this was the secretary of state, Sir Edward Nicholas, but Smith shows that because of the multitude of issues that Nicholas faced, he could not control and direct the royalist agents; but his papers are
still important to this work. Because of this, the agents needed to find supporters within the royalist camp; for O’Neill this was James Butler, the Marquess of Ormond. Beyond the problems faced by the agents, Smith explores who these agents were. Primarily, the agents were employed as courtiers whose primary job was to deliver letters. Beyond this, they disseminated propaganda, worked to maintain open lines of communication, actively gathered intelligence, and occasionally they conspired. The men and women who became agents came from a variety of professions and backgrounds. O’Neill was a swordsman and courtier while others, such as Edmund Waller, were contemporary literary figures and some, such as Dr. John Barwick, were important members of the Anglican clergy. Beyond these figures from a more elite society were members of the general population. One example was David Kniveton, a haberdasher from Lugate Hill who was executed for being a spy. A final group who acted as agents and spies were women, with Jane Whorwood being one of the most well-established. The thing that tied all of them together was their loyalty to the Royalist cause.

Smith approaches his subject by dividing his work into ten narrative chapters that are each focused upon important events surrounding the Royalist cause from 1640-60. These chapters, which explore the endless array of victories and defeats, plots and counterplots, battles and conspiracies, and the immediate consequences of the Restoration, create specific opportunities through the major events to allow Smith to examine his subjects. The early chapters, which culminate in the execution of Charles I, work to place the agents and their activities within the war. The first chapter uses the Army Plots to establish the agents and their activities and to argue that the British Civil Wars were perfect for these types of individuals because of the intrigues involved. He also demonstrates in these early chapters the problems that the multitude of factions within the Royalist camp caused for these agents. Within this, Smith demonstrates that the majority of these individuals were not professional spies; rather, through a variety of reasons, most especially their support of the Royalists cause, they found themselves carrying letters or propaganda or even plotting to execute Cromwell. The execution of Charles I, the new place of Charles II, and the military and political defeat of the Royalist cause, the
subjects of chapters four and five, create important changes for these agents that Smith thoroughly explores. First, there was no longer a centralized court and thus a disbursement of agents and Royalists supporters occurred, thereby making their job more difficult. Beyond this, with Charles II becoming the new figurehead of the Royalist cause, the factionalism continued as individuals competed for his favor. The next few chapters deal with the royalists responses to Cromwell and the Commonwealth and the various plots to return the monarchy to power—often through the proposed execution of Cromwell. The book ends with the Restoration and the attempt by the Royalist agents to be awarded for their continued and dangerous service. Here, O’Neill became a groom within Charles II’s bedchamber.

Smith has produced a work that provides important insight into the Royalist cause during the British Civil Wars, especially how the factions/rivalries within the court hindered the cause and how the agents, because of this factionalism, relied upon patrons to protect their position. Because of this, there was not a unified Royalist cause; rather, various groups saw individual opportunities within supporting the King. The work is solid and straightforward and works to expand our understanding of the other side of the British Civil Wars.


Most of this book was first published in the 1990s as articles and/or as a book, in Italian. The research is thus rather dated, with few references in this heavily footnoted work much less than fifteen or twenty years old. The book surely reflects the political context of the collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War, and it was in part inspired by various “revisionist” interpretations of Communism and the Russian Revolution. But Benigno’s focus is on revolutions of the seventeenth century, and he makes a solid case for approaching them comparatively. More specifically, he examines in detail more or less contemporary revolutions of the 1640s: especially the English Civil
War, the French Fronde, and the Neapolitan Rebellion, while he also makes references to the Catalan Revolution in Barcelona.

Examination of revisionist historiography of the English Civil War, or the “English Revolution” as Benigno prefers to call it, and of the French Revolution, takes up an entire chapter, as does the consideration of the usefulness, or lack of it, of the concept of a “crisis” of the seventeenth century. Benigno suggests that there was indeed a crisis on a European scale, and that it was a crisis regarding the legitimacy of monarchical order; the question many were asking was were there alternatives, perhaps constitutional alternatives, to monarchy as it existed? But most of what Benigno discusses in these chapters reads like the kind of review of the literature that one often finds in doctoral dissertations: perhaps informative, but also quite tedious. Many of these pages have at least as much space devoted to notes as to text. The 1989 bicentennial of the French Revolution, and the publications it elicited, cast a long shadow here.

Benigno quite rightly points out that comparison of the various revolutions of the seventeenth century is not merely an exercise of interest to historians working in later centuries, but rather what was happening in England in the 1640s was of great interest, at the time, on the Continent, and what was happening on the Continent was followed with interest in England. How historians have or have not studied ways in which one revolution influenced another, even how there may have been a contagion factor, a kind of “spread of a fire or an epidemic” (128), Benigno highlights effectively.

The Fronde of 1648-52 has been interpreted variously, but some historians do indeed emphasize both foreign influence on events in France and the influence of events in France on revolutions elsewhere. There is also the matter of the relationship, if any, between the Fronde of the mid-seventeenth century and the French Revolution of the late eighteenth century. Some historians, inspired by Voltaire’s commentary on the Fronde, dismiss it as but a kind of intrigue, or series of intrigues, fostered by nobles and judges who did not even know what they wanted. Was the Fronde thus but a kind of parenthesis in what Voltaire called, admiringly, the century of Louis XIV? Benigno does a fine job of documenting these points of view, but also of showing their weaknesses.
Who the agents of revolution were is one of the questions historians ask, and perhaps never resolve to everyone’s satisfaction. On the cover of this book is a reproduction of a painting from seventeenth-century Naples showing a raucous crowd participating in executions, or lynchings as we might call them. The crowd is poorly dressed; some of the figures cheer and shout while others participate more directly in the grisly business at hand. One man, holding a severed head high on a pike, wears especially shabby and torn clothing. In this image, the people are the agents of revolution, yet some individuals may play larger roles than others.

In his chapter on Naples, Benigno stresses the centrality of one individual, Masaniello, the poor fisherman turned revolutionary leader, and yet he also emphasizes that the Neapolitan conflict of 1647-48 was one in which the people, collectively, were agents of revolution. The poor rose up against the rich, the nobility, the government, and Spanish domination. Many clergy, Benigno argues, supported Masaniello, and indeed did more than that by supplying the insurrection with a legitimizing religious language that lauded a divinely-approved just war in which those who gave their lives for the cause were martyrs. Thus when Masaniello himself was killed he was seen as “a Christ who was offered in sacrifice for his people, the lamb of God who knew he would be sacrificed…and who—obviously—will rise again” (307).

With the important exception of his analysis of Masaniello, Benigno in fact gives very little attention to religion in this book. This lacuna seems most problematic regarding England in the 1640s. How is one to understand the conflicts involved without attention to Puritan critiques of the Church of England? If the mid-century saw a temporary victory for Puritans, in the 1680s Catholics enjoyed a brief respite under James II (reign 1685-88). His defeat and replacement by Protestant monarchs is usually referred to as the Glorious Revolution, but it barely gets a mention in this book on seventeenth-century revolutions. This silence on the part of Benigno seems quite odd. And in the case of the Fronde in France, some historians place considerable importance on the Parisian parish clergy and on Jean-François Paul de Gondi, coadjutor to the archbishop of Paris. Here, too, this study could profit from more on religion and revolution.
This book is not as reader-friendly as it could be. There is no index, and no bibliography. With the exception of the cover image, no images whatsoever are included, though surely imagery must have played a major role in everything at issue in this book. At one point, images on coins in Naples are given brief attention, but discussed only briefly, and without any illustrations added to help the reader. Yet the book’s title is suggestive of seeing: does a mirror have any function but a visual one?

Despite its limitations, this book has much to offer historians of early modern Europe, especially those interested in comparing contemporary events in several countries.


Early in *Thomas Traherne and the Felicities of the Mind*, James J. Balakier observes that Traherne’s storied “Felicity” has not been the subject of a book-length study, a startling fact to consider given the centrality of the concept to Traherne’s work and thought. Balakier’s book provides a long overdue treatment of the recurrence of Felicity across the Traherne canon, with readings of *Centuries of Meditations*, the Dobell and Burney poems, *Christian Ethicks*, *Commentaries of Heaven*, and the four unpublished treatises in the rediscovered Lambeth manuscript. Balakier locates Traherne’s understanding of Felicity in the axes of the seventeenth-century sciences, with a particular emphasis on Bacon and Hobbes. “[A]t a time when philosophy, religion, and science were intertwined,” claims Balakier, “Traherne’s true importance lies in his endeavors to frame a modern science of cognition that complements and extends Hobbesian materialism” (28). Traherne’s aversion to Hobbes’s secular materialism has long been noted, but Balakier adds to the narrative by suggesting their common reliance on “thought experiments” as a means of developing a science of cognition. As Balakier explains, while the empirical bent of Traherne’s methods (particularly in the *Centuries* and the Dobell poems) owes chiefly to
Bacon, at heart both he and Hobbes are committed rationalists who deem the mind the highest source of knowledge.

The conceit of the “thought experiment,” with its dual acknowledgment of rational inquiry and empirical science, is crucial to Balakier’s effort to establish Traherne’s holistic understanding of cognition. Among the numerous thought experiments that Balakier identifies in Traherne’s work, two of the most salient are in the *Centuries* and in *The Kingdom of God*. In Century 2, Traherne posits various scenarios in which the sun deviates from its normal operations. He directs his readers to imagine an absent sun, a stationary sun, and a sun so vast and powerful that it eliminates life on earth. “Traherne concludes from the above demonstrations,” writes Balakier, “that nature ‘manifesteth the Power and Care of a Creator’ (2.8), that is, an all-mighty organizing intelligence” (44). In *The Kingdom of God*, Traherne conducts a thought experiment in which he and his reader chart the hypothetical progress of a particle of sand, which takes multiple material forms—gas, liquid, and solid—as it winds its way through the cosmos. Balakier gathers several such examples through the course of his study, collectively backing his thesis that Traherne’s canon be viewed as “an ongoing thought experiment aimed at placing Felicity in a rational, experience-based Framework” (28).

Balakier’s chapter on the rediscovered writings in the Lambeth manuscript will be of timely interest to Traherne scholars. It is gratifying to see these works receive critical notice—in particular *The Kingdom of God*, where Traherne undertakes his most deliberate and sustained foray into the discourse of experimental science. Balakier’s illuminating analysis of the treatise affirms his claim that the work deserves to be considered “a core Traherne text” (30). However, other texts in the manuscript seem out of place here. The theological dispute that Traherne takes up in *A Sober View of Dr Twisses his Considerations* does little to advance Balakier’s discussion of Felicity. Here as in *Roman Forgeries*, Traherne’s eagerness to insert himself into topical theological controversies—namely, the supralapsarian debate over the order of God’s eternal decrees—seems to strain against the infinite and radical optimism that Balakier ascribes to Traherne. Balakier quotes generously from *A Sober View*, but his discussion touches only briefly on the text’s treatment of Felicity. Likely it is beyond the scope of Balakier’s study
to provide a detailed analysis of the theology of Felicity, yet without it the purpose of his lengthy exposition of A Sober View remains unclear.

Nevertheless, Balakier’s book mainly succeeds in illustrating the common thread that unites Traherne’s body of works. His introductory chapter on “Thomas Traherne, Hobbism, and the Seventeenth-Century Sciences” provides an enlightening context for understanding Traherne’s work and his place in the evolution of scientific thought, and lays a strong foundation for the textual interpretations that comprise subsequent chapters. Balakier’s readings of Traherne’s texts are consistently thoughtful and extraordinarily diligent. He defines his terms clearly and demystifies abstruse subject matter in ways that readers unfamiliar with Traherne will appreciate.

Perhaps the most original and provocative part of Balakier’s study is his concluding chapter, where he claims that Traherne’s ideas anticipate modern-day consciousness studies. Balakier undertakes this argument by comparing Traherne to Edmund Husserl, the twentieth-century Moravian philosopher whose seminal work in phenomenology challenged preconceived notions of conscious experience. As Balakier explains, “the Husserlian examination of consciousness involves a suspension (epoché) of any beliefs about the character and makeup of experience as well as the ‘bracketing,’ or holding in abeyance, of any judgments about the ultimately subjective or objective reality of the thing perceived” (185). According to Balakier, this ideal of a pure consciousness, of an experiential and cognitive perspective undisturbed by theoretical speculations, resembles a fourth state of consciousness (beyond waking, sleeping, and dreaming) that has in recent years has been the subject of intense empirical research. Noting the parallels between this state and Traherne’s Felicity, Balakier concludes that “Traherne’s radical optimism results not from some unrealistic mood-making or escapist frame of mind but from multiple authentic experiences of a fourth state of consciousness” (190-91). For Balakier, the empirical basis of Felicity warrants reconsideration of Traherne’s importance in both the history and future of cognitive science.

Balakier’s conception of Traherne as a “pioneer of consciousness-based studies” (188) is ultimately more suggestive than prescriptive; a fuller treatment of the subject would be welcome. (In fact, Balakier addresses the Traherne-Husserl connection at greater length in a separate
essay from 2007.) Still, Balakier’s analysis admirably contemporizes Traherne’s work with an audacity that, with a few notable exceptions, remains too rare among critics. Having been so long marginalized as a mystic or metaphysical poet, Traherne’s intellectual achievements are easy to overlook. Balakier has given them due notice, by grounding the concept of Felicity in experiential principles whose relevance endures in cognitive science today. He is in this sense, like his subject, “radically optimistic.”


The researcher Ann Talbot presents in this book one of the more complex and in-depth studies ever written about the influence of travel literature on the work of the British philosopher John Locke (1632-1704).

At the end of the eighteenth century, the study of travel literature was an alternative to academic studies. The philosopher John Locke recommended with enthusiasm these books as a way to comprehend human understanding. Several members of the Royal Society like John Harris (1666-1719) affirmed that the learning that could be obtained through these books was different from the one that provided the educative system of that time. Travel literature could make one see the source of the ignorance of the ancients; it stressed the curiosities and extraordinary facts and led to a revision of beliefs and scientific theories of the ancient world. Besides, the account of a broad diversity of subjects contributed to the creation of matters of fact, and this was important in order to put rational limits to the descriptions of the world that were commonly accepted.

The book *The Great Ocean of Knowledge. The Influence of Travel Literature on the Work of John Locke* is an exhaustive and rigorous study of Locke’s thought. It shows a deep knowledge of postmodern critiques to the modern notion of Enlightenment and applies these historiographical critiques to a documented analysis of Locke’s library
and what could mean, for him, the travel literature he read. These are some of the most important contributions of a book that is a historiographical research work on travel literature and its intellectual effects; it sets a specific model in order to analyse the genesis of Locke’s thought and, besides, offers a critical and contemporary study of the significance of European Enlightenment. These aspects, that are to be associated to the character of the research carried out by Talbot and also to her intellectual disposal, have to do with the two questions the book answers to: what kind of works were in Locke’s library? how is the impact of travel books on the philosopher’s thought to be evaluated?

In a library of more than 3600 books, 269 works could be classified today as philosophy and 275 as travel or geography. This significant proportion is forwarded as an evidence of Locke’s interest for this kind of literature. But, what did he thought about this material? What did it mean to him?

First, Talbot raises these questions and analyses them as an historian. Afterwards she does it as a critique of the historiographical conceptions of modernity about the origins of Enlightenment. And finally, she analyses them as an expert in the political and moral thought of Locke.

The result is a reference work about the thought of Locke, but also about the history of the ideas of Enlightenment and about research models of historiography to deal with all this, and to present it. That is why, in my opinion, this book is an innovative work in all the three above mentioned fields.

Two important factors influenced Locke: the absolutist society he lived in, a society where the learning model was based on the study of the classics and of the Bible, and his knowledge of the research techniques he learned of two authors influenced by Bacon, Robert Boyle and Thomas Sydenhan. Locke used what he had learned from them in a unique way to examine contemporary questions on politics, human behaviour, beliefs and religion.

The 275 works of travel literature in Locke’s library are classified by Talbot into four categories: books related to projects of the fellows of the Royal Society, clearly linked to Baconian tradition; works influence by the Neo-Thomist School of Salamanca, in Spain; books that linked Confucianism to atheism and materialism, and finally,
travel books that had an utopian character. The author analyses the influence of each of these works of travel literature on the theory of knowledge of Locke, and also on his political and moral philosophy.

Locke’s library was comparable to those of other fellows of the Royal Society, but the impact of this literature on his work was unique and non-comparable to any other case. It seems that Locke selected his books patiently, in the same way a doctor looks for indexes, sig- nales, evidence, exceptional and challenging cases for himself and his theories. His bibliographic quest, similar to the one of a collector, was filled with true scientific and philosophical passion, as he saw each travel book as an opportunity to evaluate and check what he had proposed in his own work.

The problem of what laws do govern human behaviour, the variations between one society and another, questions that have to do with the problem of the universality of moral or the origin of human knowledge, can no longer be understood without the image of this library rich in travel literature, where Locke spent most of his life reading and writing, chewing, ruminating all these stories of extraordinary places and people.

The question of human nature transforms itself into a fascinating philosophical investigation thanks to Talbot’s book, and it is so for two reasons: it helps us to approach the figure of John Locke and the philosophical and political meaning of Enlightenment, and it does so without breaking its relationship with the experience of the discovery of other human beings and unknown places, which was a radical experience both for Europeans and for its “others” that was made possible by Enlightenment by means of travel literature.

The book is structured in fourteen chapters and a conclusion to which two appendices are added. In them, the author offers a list of the travel books cited by Locke, and a complete bibliography of the manuscript sources. In my opinion, the work of Talbot offers an interpretation of the thought of Locke made from the point of view of social anthropology.

Mark Netzloff’s critical edition of John Norden’s *The Surveyor’s Dialogue* presents the figure of the surveyor as an important agent of emergent capitalism. Netzloff’s introduction models how Marxist scholars might engage with the text in order to elucidate the economic processes and social negotiations in which a surveyor participated and through which he helped drive an agrarian society from obsolescent feudalism toward inchoate capitalism. Netzloff has solid credentials in Marxist approaches to early modern British history and literature; his first book, *England’s Internal Colonies: Class, Capital, and the Literature of Early Modern English Colonialism* (2003), studied nation and capital formation in terms of England’s treatment of its peripheral territories and marginal classes. In *The Surveyor’s Dialogue*, his interpretation of England in the early stages of capitalism operates on both the national and regional levels, leading him to explain, for example, how techniques of agricultural improvement allowed a national market to emerge out of a fragmented collection of localities. His edition of Norden’s manual is thus an investigation of the economic and social functions of a profession with perhaps singular impact on England’s entrée into capitalism: land surveying. A particularly compelling dimension of the project is its animation of the profession; in the behavior of the surveyor, we witness the ambition, social maneuvering, and contempt for the rural poor that surely explain why most of his interlocutors, from farmers to lords, regard him with considerable skepticism.

Aside from economic and agricultural historians, many readers may not know what a surveyor actually did in the early modern period (or at other times, for that matter). Netzloff anticipates this possibility and provides background information so that we may appreciate surveying as more than preparing estate maps for their owners and surveyors as more than the lackeys of their lords. Indeed, Netzloff’s explanation of the social and professional profile of a surveyor adumbrates how a successful yeoman might advance through the ranks of the
manorial estate on which he lived. From the position of a “capitalist farmer” (xxi), such a man might then serve as his lord’s bailiff and thus acquire experience that would qualify him to enter the profession of surveying. This career trajectory exemplifies how, on the threshold between feudal and capitalist order, men with expert knowledge of land management and improvement techniques could make decisions and offer advice that would steer their communities—and more broadly, the nation—toward the formation of more stable and expansive market economies. Netzloff displays a thorough knowledge of scholarship on surveying, as when he quotes an unpublished dissertation that detects an early modern shift in the profession, from surveying as “overseeing the relationships between landlords and tenants to overseeing the land as a thing in itself” (xvii). Such insights exemplify Netzloff’s effort to situate the surveyor in the broader landscape of capital formation, both in abstract terms as seen here and in concrete terms as seen when he interprets, for example, the Surveyor’s interactions with a bailiff.

Netzloff divides his introduction into three substantive sections: “Surveying and Social Dialogue,” “Manorial Culture,” and “The Country and the City.” The first section delineates the emergence of the surveyor’s professional identity and how his claims to specialized knowledge, grounded in antiquity (such as Euclidian geometry), enable him to acquire social distinction. The emphasis on social relations, Netzloff suggests, explains Norden’s choice of the dialogue form. Though less common in Jacobean England than it had been a half-century earlier, the dialogue suits Norden’s purpose especially well, according to Netzloff, because it foregrounds the process of knowledge production: “The dialogues themselves stage scenes of learning that provide models for readers’ own acquisition of knowledge” (xix). Over the course of six books, then, Norden puts the Surveyor into conversation with a Farmer, an absentee aristocratic landowner, a Bailiff (that is, the Farmer now serving as his lord’s legal officer), and a purchaser of land. The various scenarios compel the Surveyor to speak in different registers, depending upon who interlocutor is. To the Farmer in Book 1, he must justify his existence in the face of unbridled hostility: “[Y]ou look into the value of men’s Lands,” the Farmer sneers, “whereby the Lords of Manors do rack their Tenants to a higher rent and rate than ever before; and therefore not only I, but many poor
Tenants else have good cause to speak against the profession” (16). The Surveyor proves his mettle by accusing the Farmer of being himself guilty of dishonesty and rash judgment. But while speaking in Book 2 to an absentee landlord who professes his ignorance of surveying procedure, the Surveyor uses charm rather than severity. In response to concern about being “misled by an unskillful Surveyor,” he flatters the landlord by suggesting that a man of his “leisure” and “quality” knows enough to discern a worthy survey: “You have the matter and subject whereon a Surveyor worketh, and without which a Surveyor loseth both Art and Name, and therefore you cannot be altogether ignorant of the things required in the business: as the Master of a feast cannot dress the dainties, but the Cook, yet can the Master reprove the Cook if he do not his duty therein” (42).

In reading Netzloff’s introduction, one experiences the dizzying complexity of land ownership in early modern England. His introductory section on manorial culture explains the three main forms of land tenure at the time: freehold, copyhold, and leasehold. Freehold, the most stable and profitable of the three, dominates this section because surveyors typically held freehold tenures and were thus socially and economically positioned to enter the profession. Indeed, as Netzloff explains, “One can assume an implied readership of freeholder tenants for The Surveyor’s Dialogue due to the fact that the text addresses representatives of this class in five of its six books” (xxii). In general, Netzloff’s breakdown of the manorial system of land tenure is lucid and adept at explaining how it changed to accommodate a new market economy; however, non-specialists will occasionally puzzle over how the system he describes fits into the larger structure of land ownership. Thus my grasp of freehold in Netzloff’s account would have benefitted from a brief explanation of the terms by which the gentry (whom he calls “traditional landowners” [xxi] and distinguishes from freeholders) held their land, and how their tenure differed from the freeholders.

In keeping with the principle that a text reveals as much as it conceals, Netzloff uses his knowledge of early modern agrarian protest to assess Norden’s selective depiction of the national marketplace. He makes much of the total absence of the Midlands from the Surveyor’s cumulative depiction of the “the nation’s constituent ‘countries’” and commodities: “Norden’s image of England has an
absent geographic center, and his discussion omits an entire swath of the nation” (xxxiii). Netzloff attributes this absence to the Midland Rising of 1607, and argues that the first edition of The Surveyor’s Dialogue, written and published in 1607, expresses Norden’s effort “to suppress the memory of a context whose implications threaten to undermine his entire project” (xxxv). With such attention to Norden’s silent subtext, Netzloff inspires readers to track the status of those who became casualties of the new market economy. Yet he figures the Surveyor in three-dimensional terms, noting for instance the Surveyor’s gradual recognition that enclosure and deforestation lead to “devastation” and occasion “a search for alternative models of value” (xxxix). Thus Netzloff balances a critique of the Surveyor’s construction of and commitment to market values, on the one hand, and his entanglement in countervailing discourses such as religious devotion (xxxii, xxxv) and proto-environmentalism (xxxix) on the other. The Surveyor’s complex identity may be one of the most salient illustrations of Netzloff’s assertion that the Dialogue rewards thorough rather than piecemeal reading.

Netzloff delivers precisely what one expects from a scholarly edition: evocative context and informative annotations. Scholars interested in the intersections of land, capital, ecology, and literature will therefore appreciate this edition. Its sophisticated introduction is bolstered by an expert critical apparatus that provides footnotes glossing obscure vocabulary, biblical allusions, variations among editions, and details regarding Norden’s alternate careers as a religious writer and cartographer. One may hope that the edition inspires kindred scholars to take stock of the influence, whether beneficial or sinister, of the innovative and crafty Surveyor.


The amount of articles and books published on the broadly understood question of Utopia—both seen as a genre and a specific story—is enormous. There are different approaches and perspectives, many
interesting points of view and statements. Utopia had been examined by numerous scholars from various disciplines including gender, presence of science, religion, problem of property or slavery. The book edited by Chloë Houston (Lecturer in Early Modern Drama in the Department of English Language and Literature at the University of Reading) focuses on the question of a possible link between utopian and travel writings. Separately both utopian and travel writings have been studied intensively, but analyzing them together promises a fresh insight into the otherwise known tracts from the past.

The book’s introduction argues that travel writing and utopian writing in the early modern period were closely linked. Houston, who has written on both topics in the past, is a right person to edit the collection, which had its roots in a conference held at Birkbeck College, London in December 2005. Six of the nine chapters in the book are based on the papers presented there.

*New Worlds* is divided into three parts. The first one, titled *Utopia and Knowledge*, consists of three essays. Its aim, according to the editor, is to show “the relationships between utopia, travel, discovery and knowledge” (11). This part opens with David Harris Sacks’s “Rebuilding Solomon’s Temple: Richard Hakluyt’s Great Instauration,” which focuses on two early modern authors (Hakluyt and Bacon) and tries to find the link between them. One of them, Richard Hakluyt, who described journeys (an attempt to show the English path to the empire) was trying to present travels as a road to knowledge and salvation—a perfect beginning of a new era of science and faith in which the world would be united. The author analyzes Hakluyt’s words showing their deeply spiritual meaning and stressing the importance of a possible reunion (here in one true faith) which is about to happen with the English help, and which leads us to Bacon’s Solomon’s Temple—a utopian symbol of that reunion. The author of *New Atlantis* shares, according to Harris Sacks, Hakluyt’s fascination with discoveries and sees them, along with the development of science, as milestones of the new era. The text is logical and well written. Arguments show the path of thinking and guide the reader to the conclusions.

In the second contribution, “Kepler’s *Somnium* and Francis Godwin’s *The Man in the Moone*: Births of Science-Fiction 1593–1638,” William Poole sets out to present the two texts as the beginning of
science fiction literature and stresses their utopian character connected with the idea of journey and science.

The last essay of this part, “Utopia, Millenarianism, and The Baconian Programme of Margaret Cavendish’s The Blazing World (1666)” by Line Cottegnies, is also based on comparison of two texts. The author is trying to stress the influence of other utopian and travel texts, especially Bacon’s works, on Margaret Cavendish’s projection of a perfect world. We find here an examination of similarities and differences between the two approaches as well as an attempt to analyze the so-called Cavendish’s female utopia. The article is divided into sub-sections where Cottegnies examines particular plots such as connection with New Atlantis and science, problem of religion, “New World” or Millenarianism context.

The second part of the book, Utopian Communities and Piracy, focuses on the problem “how accounts of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century travels represented and negotiated the creation of or interaction with piracy or new societies” (12). The first article written by Kevin P. McDonald discusses “The Dream of Madagascar: English Disasters and Pirate Utopias of the Early Modern Indo-Atlantic World. The author shows the background and attempts to colonize Madagascar linking it with utopian ideas and its outcomes. Macdonald skips through promotional materials to examine how the island had been presented and what had finally happened to the colonization projects. It is worth mentioning that reality was not far from dystopia though with slavery and piracy rather than the ideal world. The second chapter in this section, “The Uses of ‘Piracy’: Discourses of Mercantilism and Empire in Hakluyt’s The Famous Voyage of Sir Francis Drake,” is written by Claire Jowitt. In this essay the reader finds an attempt to explain how an act known as piracy might be legitimate according to the state’s political doctrine and the pursuit for the new colonies. The case is obviously linked to Sir Francis Drake’s and his companions’ stories and their actions against the Portuguese and the Spaniards. In the text, we can also trace aspects dealing with the attitude of explorers towards the natives in the New World and colonies—a weak, albeit important link with utopian topic.

The last article in this part of the book focuses on a very interesting case of Palmares. Analisa DeGrave, in her “Palmares: Utopian
Representations of a Runaway Settlement in Colonial Brazil,” gives an account and examines the stories and texts about a phenomenon known as Palmares—a city of refugees, ex-slaves and free people in Brazil. We face a shocking paradox: for both sides of the conflict (masters and ex-slaves) the “others” are creating a potential threat to their own attempt of building utopia, bringing along the dystopian terror. DeGrave divides her text into thematic sections and underlines final conclusion what makes structure clear. Personally I found this contribution to be one of the most interesting articles in the collection—because of the topic, but also thanks to the conclusions which stresses the fact that our conclusions in the debate on utopias depend very much on the point of view we choose at the start, the side of barricade we are on.

The last part of the New Worlds, entitled “Utopia and the State,” includes three essays and refers to such problems as social reform, process of state creation or struggle for an ideal society. The editor of the book in the first article of this section focuses on Bacon’s impact. “Utopia and Education in the Seventeenth Century: Bacon’s Salomon’s House and its Influence” is a well written text which delivers interesting information how science and education had been used to shape and establish utopia. In it, Chloë Houston mainly concentrates on New Atlantis (especially the structure and impact of Salomon’s House) although we do find reference to The City of the Sun (by Campanella) and Christianopolis (by Andreae).

In the second essay in this section written by Rosanna Cox—“Atlantic and Eutopian Polities’: Utopianism, Republicanism and Constitutional Design in the Interregnum”—we can find information about political ideas of the seventeenth-century England. The author examines works of Milton and tries to show his attitude towards utopian writing in reference to state reform and the plausible ideal worlds. Cox also brings information about Nedham’s and Harrington’s works, ideas, and its outcomes in the real life. The text is very interesting with numerous citations.

Finally, Daniel Carey, in his “Henry Neville’s The Isle of Pines: From Sexual Utopia to Political Dystopia,” examines very interesting utopian vision of the land ruled perfectly in total patrimonial order. The author examines short and long version of the story to show the
way from ideal utopia to an almost chaotic state—a metaphorical
description of the decline of a patrimonial monarchy.

In the short afterword, Andrew Hadfield stresses the humans’
long lasting desire for an ideal, perfectly happy place which is easy
to observe through the centuries in the history. He shows how this
urgent need had been shaped in the sixteenth and seventeenth century
because of the possibility of finding new lands and a rebours—what
happened when utopian ideas reached the boundaries of the known
world. Finally Hadfield shows the importance of the New Worlds as
a book, which examines this important link and interaction between
Travel and Utopia. In my opinion the reader can find here really good
summary of that work, with really important final statement that both
topics had truly shaped each other.

The Bibliography is a great backup for further examination of
the topic for those who want to learn more about the subject. The
language of the book is professional and clear, its structure is very
good, and it makes a valuable contribution to the ever growing area
of utopian research writings.

Adam Smyth. Autobiography in Early Modern England. Cambridge,
UK: Cambridge University Press, 2010. x + 222 pp. + 7 illus. $85.00.
Review by Whitney Anne Trettien, Duke University.

Annotated almanacs, financial account records, commonplace
books, parish registers: in these four ostensibly mundane sources,
Adam Smyth uncovers a network of textual practices through which
early modern individuals wrote their own lives. The term “practices”
is key here, for Smyth’s book does not read autobiographies—an
anachronistic term first introduced at the end of the eighteenth cen-
tury—so much as archival artifacts. Although modern readers expect
(and impose) narrative coherence in life-writing, as well as truthfulness in the historical record, Smyth challenges these assumptions by
drawing attention to sites where early modern writers engaged with
the materiality of texts—that is, where they used pen, paper, print
and parchment to mark, doodle, cut, paste and port their life-writing
across different media platforms. In the process, Smyth not only
expands our understanding of early modern subjectivity (a theme he returns to throughout the book) but contributes to a growing body of literature within book history on what Bradin Cormack, Carla Mazzio and William Sherman have described as “book use” in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

*Autobiography and Early Modern England* is divided into four chapters, each of which tackles one of the genres listed above. In the first, “Almanacs and annotators,” Smyth discusses printed almanacs, which were “staggeringly popular” in the early modern period (3). Far more than simple guidebooks, these “cheap, diminutive, eminently portable books” were often interleaved with blank pages inviting readers to chronicle their daily lives in relation to the calendars, timetables and other miscellanea included in the printed book. While Smyth draws on a number of surviving examples of annotated almanacs by both known and unknown figures, this chapter focuses on three in particular: the manuscript of John Wyndham, in which Wyndham pasted printed calendars beside his annotations, showing the “flow of influence” between the printed artifact and Wyndham’s life-writing (25); Lady Isabella Twysden’s Civil War almanacs; and a copy of Arthur Hopton’s *New Almanacke* (1613), perhaps annotated by Matthew Page, which shows how the non-narrative accumulation of records can become autobiographic. Smyth points to a self-reflexivity of thought evident in annotated almanacs that is multiple and collaborative but not (contra modern tropes) fragmented. “To term it a shattering,” he argues, “or to detect an unrealised straining for coherence, is to misconceive the direction of change” (54).

In chapter 2, Smyth turns to financial accounts, examining how early modern methods of bookkeeping produced notions of reliability and truthfulness. Although many historians have treated account books as depositories of brute historical fact, they are, Smyth points out, rich with intertextual connections, showing that “life-writing was rarely a direct transcription of lived experience but rather the product of a process of textual transmission and revision” (60). In many cases, this process tended to reinforce the idea—disseminated in both printed accounting manuals and, interestingly, religious guidebooks—that orderly financial accounts evinced orderly spiritual accounts, and that messy records implied vice. Although this chapter is peppered with
interesting examples, Smyth’s reading of Lady Anne Clifford’s financial accounts is perhaps its most original contribution, presenting a new picture of Clifford’s authorship as a collaborative process literally written in the multiple hands of community members recording receipt of payment, as well as in the hand of her secretary, who performs a “calligraphic ventriloquising” of Lady Clifford’s voice (79). While many kinds of life-writing “efface signs of the labour of collaborators,” tidying up messy, multivocal notes into a unitary narrative, “Clifford’s financial accounts make explicit these multiple textual agencies” (80).

Chapter 3 covers commonplace books and, more broadly, how early modern readers and writers recycled proverbs, verse and other sententious sayings to produce a sense of identity. Although the critical literature on commonplace books is large, especially compared to that on financial account books, Smyth argues they have been treated largely as “disembodied text[s], a set of ideals rather than enactments” (123)—an oversight his chapter aims to correct through close engagement with the actual practices of individuals. This chapter especially focuses on the common-placing of the Royalist Sir John Gibson during his imprisonment in Durham Castle in the 1650s. For Smyth, the broader “commonplace book culture” (defined through its sixteen major characteristics [127-9]) is highly appropriative and adaptive, drawing on what contemporary readers might consider “unoriginal” texts to situate a unique self within a broader social, political and spiritual context.

Smyth ends with a chapter on parish registers. Although the registers are not typically autobiographic (except in at least one interesting case, that kept by the Reverend John Wade of Hammersmith from 1665-1671, discussed by Smyth), their inclusivity “demonstrated to parishioners that (almost) every life might be registered in written form” (6). In fact, as Smyth points out, burial notices of women and placeless individuals—strangers, vagrants, the unemployed—tend to be more descriptive than that of men with a secure social position. These “thicker records for the marginal” both grant them a textual prominence and “mar[k] them out, as, precisely, marginal, troubling, unstable” (172). Smyth also considers how the plague encouraged more narrative record-keeping, with some burial notices sliding into mini-biographies.
Although Smyth situates his work primarily within debates of early modern subjectivity and, to a lesser extent, current work on manuscript and print in the seventeenth century, scholars of book history, media history and new media will find much worth mining in his nuanced readings of earlier textual practices. Indeed, by grounding his discussion in archival artifacts, Smyth corrects many assumptions about early modern textuality made by even the most careful early modern historians. In doing so, he helps historicize the culturally-relative nuances of terms like “text,” “writing,” “originality,” “materiality,” and even “book.” At the individual level, one cannot read about how early modern individuals cut, paste, copied and annotated books without becoming unusually aware of one’s own (potentially autobiographic) note-taking methods. This form of historical self-reflexivity can be personally and professionally productive, inspiring scholars to read early printed texts within the material contexts of their use and transmission. For instance, one imagines and Smyth himself argues, that literary historians would not have misconstrued Pepys’s *Diary* as a transcription of bourgeois inner turmoil had they read it beside contemporary financial account books and almanacs. In this way, *Autobiography in Early Modern England* makes an original contribution to the study of self-writing in the seventeenth century; yet it is in the fields of book use and media history where Smyth’s careful archival readings may become most significant.


To call Milton a nationalist is at once uncontroversial and problematic. While Milton’s lifelong fascination with the English national character and its destiny are on rich display in his works, his attitudes toward his country, his countrymen, and the very idea of the nation are not stable; they shift with the context and subject of a given work as well as with the political circumstances in which Milton found himself. *Early Modern Nationalism and Milton’s England*, edited by
David Loewenstein and Paul Stevens, is therefore a welcome guide
to the variety of things that we (and Milton) talk about when we talk
about nationalism.

As the editors point out in their introduction, although it has
become increasingly common to read the emergence of nationalism
backwards into the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the works
of Milton and his revolutionary contemporaries have rarely been
examined in light of what they might tell us about Early Modern
conceptions of nationhood during those tumultuous mid-century
years (7-9). Moreover, to the extent that Milton’s nationalism has
been considered, it has tended to be read simplistically, as purely ex-
clusionary and as a justification for political and military aggression
(9-10). This volume offers a fuller picture, examining the different
and sometimes conflicting ways that Milton understood his nation:
as the product of language and ethnicity; as constituted by a common
religious identity; and as a shared political or civic enterprise (3-4). In
contrast with the prevailing view of Milton as an enthusiastic national-
ist, many of the essays in this collection consider Milton’s ambivalent
attitude toward nationalism. As several contributors note, Milton
was as often disappointed by or concerned about what he saw as his
countrymen’s tendency toward luxury and servility; the number of
those he considers his national kindred can also expand or contract
according to the values and commitments they share.

Loewenstein and Stevens’s collection is divided into five overlap-
ping sections, each dealing with a different aspect of Milton’s national-
ism. The first part examines Milton’s political nationalism: the relation-
ship between his revolutionary politics and his idea of the nation as
a self-determining assembly of free people (10). David Loewenstein’s
lead chapter traces the ways in which Milton uses the language of
nationhood throughout his career, in response to his political successes
and disappointments; Andrew Hadfield reads Paradise Lost through
the lens of Eikonoklastes’ idealized parliamentarianism; and Warren
Chernaik examines Milton’s ambivalence toward military action and
Oliver Cromwell. The book’s second part turns to the religious dimen-
sion of Early Modern national identity. Achsah Guibbory’s chapter
focuses on the ways nonconformists and supporters of prelacy alike
used the analogy between England and ancient Israel for rhetorical
effect; Joad Raymond examines guardian angels and European ideas of
nationhood in *Lycidas* and elsewhere; and Andrew Escobedo considers
the relationship between the state and the nation and its similarities
to the relationship between the visible and invisible church. This is an
especially strong section, one that provides illuminating new readings
of *Lycidas* and *Areopagitica* in addition to new and interesting contexts
in which to consider a number of Milton’s works.

The collection’s third section looks at the ways nationalism and
internationalism function in conflict or in harmony, and this section
dovetails nicely with the preceding one. Thomas N. Corns argues that
Milton’s nationalism is not narrowly ethnic, but informed by his Prot-
estant internationalism; John Kerrigan examines the important roles
played by Scotland and the United Provinces in Milton and Marvell’s
nationalism; Victoria Kahn places *Samson Agonistes* and Milton’s later
thinking about nationalism within contemporary debates about the
claims of the nation-state versus the law of nations; and Paul Stevens
makes the case for a *positive* nationalism, based on individual liberty
and dialogic interaction. In contrast with these more neutral or even
affirmative readings of Milton’s nationalism, the fourth section of the
book looks at its more negative aspects, especially when it comes to
matters of gender and race. Willy Maley surveys the way women are
depicted in the *History of Britain*; Laura Lunger Knoppers examines
Milton’s longstanding interest in the “effeminate” effects of luxury
and how its effects can be redressed by the body politic; and Mary
Nyquist looks at the ways that the metaphor of slavery, when applied
to tyranny by Milton and Locke, manages not actually to condemn
the institution of slavery itself. Both Knoppers’s and Nyquist’s essays
are among the strongest in the collection.

The fifth and final section, on the reception of Milton’s national-
ism, consists of one longer, excellent chapter by Nicholas von Maltzhan
that considers the ways *Paradise Lost* and its poetics were aligned with
nationalistic purposes in the late seventeenth century and afterwards.
As von Maltzhan demonstrates, although blank verse became the
standard form for nationalistic epic, the politics of those writers and
those poems were rarely reflective of Milton’s own.

While there are many fine essays in this collection and the volume’s
organization encourages a range of fruitful conversations among those
essays, occasionally its attempts to probe the complexities of Milton’s attitude toward the nation seem reducible to a shrugging “it’s complicated”: on the one hand, Milton’s nationalism does have an exclusionary aspect; on the other hand, it’s not narrowly so. While it is surely true that Milton’s nationalism is, as Stevens says, “Janus-faced”—and one of the volume’s most useful contributions is a reminder that nationalism is not always a dirty word—there are times when analysis seems sidestepped. Nevertheless, such moments do not change the fact that this collection is essential reading for anyone interested in Early Modern nationalism. It should be welcomed by all scholars of Milton.


Lauren Shohet’s *Reading Masques: The English Masque and Public Culture in the Seventeenth Century* is the first study to examine masques from a reception and production vantage point. Masque performances at the courts of James I and Charles I were significant, socially important, elite occasions for the aristocratic audiences who participated in them. Shohet expands conventional understanding of the form to examine the masque as written text, topic of oral exchange, subject of ballads and operas, and source for play adaptation. Her examination includes masque circulation and ways to ‘read’ a masque; she also investigates the role of music in signifying the masque’s occasion. What Shohet’s study makes clear is the form’s viability within an increasingly literary culture, a culture outside the masque’s original venue and one comprised of production modes such as printing and distribution alongside the dynamic news potential and public theatre of the time.

Chapter 1 enlarges the range of experiences between masques and their audiences. Arguing that masques “recycle the genre they inherit and adapt it to other uses,” Shohet notes the intertextuality between Jonson’s 1608 *Masque of Beauty* and Beaumont and Fletcher’s c. 1608-11 masque set in *The Maid’s Tragedy* (45). She notes similar arguments in *Cupid’s Banishment*, the girls’ school masque presented to
Queen Anna and her ladies and *Pleasure Reconciled to Virtue* (1617-18) performed eight months later. The masques offer different endings, however, as the masque for a queen suggests pleasure must disappear in order to maintain virtue, while *Pleasure Reconciled to Virtue* can be accomplished with concentrated effort. The illuminating discussion in this chapter addresses *The Triumph of Peace*, scripted by James Shirley, composed by William Laws and Simon Ives, and designed by Inigo Jones and John Webb. With two performances that originated in the public street and progressed to a performance venue, this masque argues for reception, dissemination, and public involvement (67). Its topical satire was not only viewed but also read; such reception, Shohet argues, suggests that the masque can include many views.

Chapter 2 considers masque publication history and speaks to the “double life” the form occupies in the private court milieu and in the “nascent print public sphere” (81). Shohet offers evidence of the emerging literary environment that indicates extensive masque readership. The number of print masques available for sale in publishers’ catalogues, listed in the Stationers’ Register, and published by scribes shows significant usage, suggesting there may well have been more readers than chronicled. Booksellers’ lists and printed collections indicate demand, and marginal annotations confirm readership. Shohet argues that the published masque “represents the invisible majority of early modern books” (86-87). She notes the performance details and reader-direction in the *Masque of Flowers* (1614) presented by Francis Bacon and Gray’s Inn for the Somerset wedding, which further enriches the exchange between masque and its reception.

Chapter 3 “unpacks how the modes of authority peformatively negotiate the conditions” of the genre’s “practices” (125). Reading *The Irish Masque at Court*, scripted by Ben Jonson, performed twice in 1613 and first printed in 1616, Shohet teases out the ways in which the masque weakens its own agenda. The masque posits a mockery of Irishmen and their language; however, the project backfires. As she notes, “If printed Irish language looks stable and deviant, by comparison the English language appears stable and normative” (140). The world of the King’s English is not the only linguistic choice. Similarly, *For the Honour of Wales* foregrounds the precarious circumstances language creates through metonymy. In *Honour*, a masque with a place
name as indicative of its entirety, Jacobean authority is exploited by destabilizing one linguistic type in favor of another “equally unstable one” (148).

In chapter 4, an exceptional survey of the masque and news nexus, Shohet argues for these forms as promulgating public opinion as a political force. Information viewed as news was communicated through personal letters, social gatherings, and public houses throughout the kingdom; masque content interested courtiers and outsiders. Participant roles, dance invitations, and audience behavior comprised epistolary accounts, especially because masques encoded political sub-text. Shohet points out that the audiences/readers not at court were knowledgeable and interested in masque content even amidst the dearth of printed and sanctioned public discussion. Examples of widespread public interest in masques conveying news include *The Golden Age Restored* (1616) as it addresses the trial of those suspected of poisoning Thomas Overbury, and *News from the World* (1620), which foregrounds the emergent news industry’s potential failings with volatile and empty information. Interpreting the start of the Thirty Years War, *Pan’s Anniversary* (1621) characterizes and reacts to public opinion; this masque also asserts the people’s concern for government’s ill-conceived decisions.

Chapter 5 positions the masques in a changing public culture. Shohet introduces *The Sacred Joy*, a welcome celebration for Charles II’s 1660 return to England. Offered in print before the occasion, the tale of rebellion and punishment highlights the masque’s political voice and points to “consensus” for the monarch’s restoration (193). The chapter further examines a variety of masque treatments of public-centered themes. In 1613, a Caversham entertainment questions public versus private life. *The World Tossed at Tennis* (1620) stages proscriptive virtues for the “civic business of public culture” (198). *Fancy’s Festivals* (1657) exploits the tensions and nuances between aesthetics and politics (202). Milton’s Ludlow masque interrogates subversions and the culture’s procedures for codifying information. In light of these examples, Shohet asserts the masque as a form that accommodates the discourses and events rendered by the culture that produces them. Later seventeenth-century masques by William Davenant, John Crown, and John Dryden inflect her deeply researched
and compelling argument: the masque enabled a sustained theatrical tradition.

Shohet’s Conclusion discusses *A New Masque Called the Druids* (1774), which echoes Jonson’s 1606 *Hymenaei*, and explores masques adapted from Shakespeare’s *Macbeth*, *Hamlet*, and *The Tempest* in ways that crystallized the form’s capacious drawing upon the past and its use in the present. Adaptability constitutes the performance, circulation, and dissemination of masques, and “precisely what makes aesthetics a medium of full historical participation” (242).

*Reading Masques* explores the engagement of masques in its private culture and within its public reception. Seventeenth-century scholars of history, politics, social life, and theatre will value the contextual grounding and contemporary specificity Shohet illuminates. Genre enthusiasts will appreciate the argument for masques as contributing to the national dramatic canon.


It is arresting to be asked to review a *Festschrift* dedicated to a former student, most of the contributors to which, having been my students or colleagues, have also become distinguished specialists. The present volume attests to both the accomplishments of the distinguished seventeenth-century specialist Frank Sysyn, which are considerable (see below), and to the efflorescence of Ukrainian Studies at Harvard in the 1970s and 1980s, when the majority of contributors were present in Cambridge.

The *spiritus movens* of Ukrainian studies at the time was Professor Omeljan Pritsak, who was invited to Cambridge by the distinguished Iranist, Professor Richard Nelson Frye. Frye, having known Pritsak as editor of the *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher*, discerned his merits and persuaded the sitting Dean, Franklin Ford, to invite him. Frye’s hunch was not frivolous: Pritsak proved to be a colossal dynamo, and the
true father of Ukrainian studies at Harvard (6-7). (He later returned to Ukraine, only to be frustrated by post-Soviet academic politics.) It is unlikely that any of the contributors to this volume would have met in Cambridge were it not for Professor Pritsak—and my own life would have been much less rich.

As things were then arranged, Pritsak became a professor in the Department of Inner Asian and Altaic Studies, and not in the Department of History. As a consequence, I—a very junior member of the Department of History—became nominal advisor of Ph.D. candidates of whom Omeljan was the true mentor. (I later was able as Chairman to rectify this situation when upon my invitation Roman Szporluk—also an author in this volume—joined us from Michigan as Hrushevs’kyi Professor of History.)

Frank Sysyn’s considerable accomplishments are enumerated in “Shaping Ukrainian Studies: A portrait of Frank E. Sysyn,” a collaboration of Professors Andriewsky and Kohut, which opens the volume (1-30). Professor Sysyn is now Director of the Peter Jacyk Program for Ukrainian Historical Research at the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies at the University of Alberta, Professor of History and Classics there, head of the CIUS Toronto office, acting head of the Ukrainian Studies Program at Columbia University, and a dean of the Ukrainian Free University in Munich. He is probably best known as the author of Between Poland and the Ukraine: The Dilemma of Adam Kysil 1600-1653 (22-24), but he is also the author of numerous other influential works—and, it should be stressed, the editor of the ongoing translation of Mikhailo Hrushevsky’s History of Ukraine-Rus’.

In order to avoid prolixity, I concentrate below on the contributions of the nominal editors of the volume, Professors Andriewsky, Kohut, Plokhy, and Wolff, but I should also say a word about the contribution of Professor Leonid Heretz, who has conducted a very convincing in-depth study of Professor Sysyn’s ancestral village in the Carpathian Mountains, Mshanets.

Another colleague represented here, Nancy Shields Kollmann, (293-301), who did her undergraduate work at Middlebury, is arguably the only contributor who came to Harvard to study with me, and not with Professor Pritsak—although she, too, was deeply influenced
by his example. (I had the additional pleasure of her having met her future husband, Dr. Jack Kollmann, in my seminar.)

Turning now to the individual contributions: I have a vivid memory of Ol’ga Andriewski and her perceptive contribution to this volume, “Reading the History of Ukraine Rus’. A Note on the Popular Reception of Ukrainian History in Late Imperial Russian and Revolutionary Ukraine” (45-60) sketches the complexity of what it meant—and continues to mean—to “read Hrushevsky,” on the basis of, *inter alia*, the diary of a modern Ukrainian peasant, Kost Fedorovych Kushnir-Marchenko.

I also have vivid memories of Professor Zenon E. Kohut. His contribution, “From Japeth to Moscow: Narrating Biblical and Ethnic Origins of the Slavs in Polish, Ukrainian, and Russian Historiography (Sixteenth–Eighteenth Centuries)” might well have included the later period, when Muscovites have “embraced” the notional thrust of the *Sinopsis*, but not Hrushevsky’s view of East Slavic history.

Professor Plokhy’s contribution, “Between Poland and Russia: Mikhailo Hrushevsky’s Dilemma, 1905-1907” (387-399) is perhaps most noteworthy for its chronological limits: this was the period (1904) of Hrushevsky’s seminal work, “*Zvychaina skhema “russkoi” istorii i sprava ratsional’noho ukladu istorii skhidnoho slov’ianstva*,” published—but never, unfortunately, delivered *viva voce*—in St. Petersburg.

Larry Wolff I came to know only later in life, but we have had much in common, including an abiding interest in Jewish life in East Europe. His contribution, “The Encyclopedia of Galicia: Provincial Synthesis in the Age of Galician Autonomy;” (471-485) traces the contributions of several Polish authors (Jósef Majer, Antoni Schneider, Izydor Kopernicki, Stanisław Szczepanowski, and Juluis Jandaurek) to the notional image of Galicia, on the basis of Wolff’s serious bibliographical and archival research.

One must hope, for the future of Ukrainian studies, that Frank Sysyn, unlike Omeljan Pritsak, doesn’t return to Ukraine, and continues to prosper in Toronto. This volume is a fitting tribute to his industry and accomplishments.

As we teach, research, and write about the early modern period, we encounter over and over again two milestones that marked the changing position of Europeans in the world, if not in the universe: I have in mind explorations and colonization opened with the Portuguese capture of Ceuta and the discovery of print by Gutenberg. New, strange, unknown, often fantastic and sometimes terrifying worlds opened to the sailors and soon after to all people of Europe. News of them were transmitted to various distant and obscure places in Europe and at times distributed in print, often being reprinted over and over again, having numerous translations and foreign publications. Europe joined the outside world, while Europeans were slowly learning about the distant places. Of course, information was available to a few who could afford buying prints and to the selected few who could write, yet nothing influenced human imagination more powerfully than images. While the first travel accounts carried either no pictures or barely a few of bad quality, the advent of the printing press led to a new genre that brought magnificent illustrations of the wonders, curiosities and terrifying scenes from abroad to travel writing. Not only did they enrich one’s imagination, but they became accessible to the illiterate members of various societies as well. In his recently published work, Michiel van Groesen presents the phenomenon of imaginative story telling about the overseas world(s) with the use of prints produced by the famous Dutch family De Bry.

Most historians teaching early modern world history are familiar with the De Bry collection, but its origins as well as its detailed history and contents remain sketchy at best. This volume opens a discussion of the image of the world at the eve of the Age of Exploration as well as the printed travel literature from those days. In particular, van Groesen recalls the works of Ramusio and especially of Hakluyt who stimulated Theodore De Bry to prepare and publish his collection (112). He was also the one who supplied the Dutch artist with drawings and water colors of the American continent by John White. In
effect a series of volumes, beautifully illustrated and described by the most known travel authors of the time, was produced that still sparkle like diamonds amidst the many volumes of the time.

In chapters 2-4, van Groesen describes the career of the De Bry family and their business, as well as their meandering from the trade of goldsmithery to publishing, before he turns to his chief concern—his discussion of the presentation of the outside world in De Bry’s prints. Van Groesen devotes the next four chapters (about 130 pages) to a discussion of the contents of these prints and the way in which the unknown world was brought closer to European readership. The author first addresses the problem of how plants and animals were presented. He reports that knowledge of the fauna and flora outside of Europe was rather poor and not very precise. Although he offers some specifics, I must confess I was expecting much more here—in particular a deeper analysis of how plants in a world becoming increasingly more accessible were reported by contemporary travelers as opposed to how plants were understood and categorized by the scientific community in the universities of those days. The chapter devoted to the presentation of native peoples as shown in the collection improved my humor, as we find discussion of how the nobles were presented, how their images were viewed against the present Europeans, and finally how body language and rites of passage were presented by the De Brys. What is interesting is the fact that, in some cases, the pictures are far more detailed than the descriptions of the travelers. For example, we find evidence in various scenes of cannibalism, which suggests a deep-seated fear among Europeans of the “other.” No less important is the question of religion or lack thereof, namely paganism, which the collection introduced widely to the European readers and which is discussed here in a separate chapter.

Having presented the main themes of the picture collection, the author returns to the analysis of the collection as a phenomenon functioning in seventeenth-century Europe. On the one hand, he discusses the differences between the various language versions, carefully changed not only in order not to limit the readership, but also not to insult it religiously. The importance of these endeavors is unquestionable, yet quite hard to grasp and expose.
What was the role of the collection in the contemporary society? What were its setbacks and positive impact? Has the collection added to the development of specifically qualified readers? Michiel van Groesen does not omit these problems and presenting his findings makes a clear suggestion about his opinion on the impact of this collection.

*The Representations of the Overseas World in the De Bry Collection of Voyages* is fascinating for a reader interested in the early modern prints or in the representations of the outside world based on the writings of contemporary writers. What I found especially inspiring were the fragments that point to the development and change in the public opinion of those times—discovery and colonization led to an expansion of the European consciousness about these unknown, new found lands. If one is looking for a detailed explanation and interpretation of De Bry’s presentation of the overseas world, one may be somewhat frustrated by the scarcity of such an approach. But on the other hand, Michiel van Groesen’s comparative analysis and interpretation of the images of travel writing has given us a lot of material for further study.


Anamorphism is a trick of perspective that allows two images to be inscribed within a single viewing area. Stand here and observe two Renaissance gentlemen at the height of their influence; move slightly and the skull appears, shadowing the worldly concerns of the painting with an imminent and inevitable mortality. Since the publication of Greenblatt’s analysis of Holbein’s *The Ambassadors* in *Renaissance Self-Fashioning*, anamorphism has served as a convenient trope for representing the instabilities of early modern subjectivity. Jen Boyle’s *Anamorphism in Early Modern Literature* returns to this well-traveled ground with a study of anamorphism as a cultural practice that anticipates the critical problems posed by new media. Boyle is particularly interested in the way that anamorphism, like more contemporary forms
of mediation such as “games, satellites, webs, and interfaces” (7), can serve as the catalyst for what Bryan Reynolds describes as “transversal effects,” which “make social change possible because they occupy and de-stabilize multiple conceptual and affective registers at once” (4). The burden of the project is thus to examine sites of anamorphosis in order to uncover alternatives to a post-Cartesian understanding of perspective as a rationalizing and disciplining formation.

The book is structured as a series of six chapters that span the second half of the seventeenth century and the first two decades of the eighteenth. The first chapter introduces the popular genre of the “mathematical recreation” or perspective manual. These works, often translated from Continental sources, include a varied collection of mathematical tricks and games, demonstrations of anamorphosis and other perspective techniques, and theoretical discussions of perception. Boyle argues that these books are significant because they demonstrate that perspective during the seventeenth century should not be understood solely or even primarily in terms of the production of the “points” or “subjecting gazes” of a Cartesian or Euclidean representational system (17). Rather, these texts suggest that perspective produces a richer and more varied “interface between the body and technology” (16). In these manuals Boyle finds a definition of perspective as an embodied and craft practice that provides a model for the function of perspective “techne” that she examines in the second half of the chapter. In works by Lucy Hutchinson and Thomas Hobbes, the Lucretian legacy is determinative: the image or simulacra functions to “re-produce” and also “transform” biopower (42).

The following three chapters look more specifically at the function of anamorphosis within literary texts during the middle decades of the seventeenth century. Two chapters on Milton examine the function of anamorphosis in Paradise Lost, first as an alternative to the panoptic or controlling perspective of God and Satan and second as a way of rethinking the problem of allegory. The second of the two Milton chapters is probably the best in the book. Here Boyle argues that “perspective is not just a metaphor in the poem, but an interactive system and procedural aesthetics that requires a continual renegotiation with a formal and technical limits of perception, and the means by which such techne mediate embodied agency and authority” (95). Boyle fol-
lows Karen Edwards in identifying Eve as a “historian-philosopher,” and suggests that the Fall, initiated by Satan’s appearance in her dream, is the fulcrum that divides the “anamorphic” Eve, fully embodied in the garden, from the disembodied dreams of the poem’s final books. The second half of this chapter provides a truly innovative reading of the anamorphic aspects of the allegory of Sin and Death by showing how the spatial dimensions of the episode allow Sin to function as an invitation to participate in the bodily and temporal disjunctions of anamorphosis.

For all of its strengths, however, this chapter also demonstrates the characteristic shortcomings of this book. The focus of each chapter is often dispersed and the argument hard to follow and sometimes insufficiently developed. In this case, the two topics of the chapter are not integrated or resolved. The attention to Eve and Sin implicitly raises the question of gender and anamorphosis, but Boyle does not address her reasons for linking these subjects in this chapter even though, as she acknowledges, the connection between Eve and Sin is an important topic in Milton scholarship. Throughout the book, there is an unfortunate tendency for Boyle’s interest in new media theory to swamp the historical and textual specificity of her materials. For instance, the opening of chapter 2 begins with a citation of Hobbes’s fascinating description of Davenant’s Gondibert as having an “affect in the imagination” not unlike that created by a “curious kind of perspective, where he that looks through a short hollow pipe upon a picture containing diverse figures sees none of These that are painted, but some one person made up on their parts” (45). Yet Boyle moves very quickly from this passage to a discussion of the image technologies of contemporary cognitive science and digital humanities, without interrogating the relationship between anamorphosis and the debates about the appropriate style and content of the Christian epic that provide the context for Hobbes’s comments. Thus Boyle misses an opportunity to show how her insights about the mediating powers of anamorphosis contribute to the scholarly debates that she herself raises in the argument about prolepsis in Milton’s epic that follows.

Sandwiched between the two Milton chapters is a discussion of Margaret Cavendish’s Blazing World in the context of the writing of
English contemporaries such as Robert Hooke and as an anticipation of Leibniz and later theorists. Focusing on the Empress’s “Cabbala,” Boyle suggests that this text models a “methodology and history that defies the prevailing empiricism” (82). Boyle’s approach yields insightful observations about the multiple mediations of a text such as *The Blazing World*, which is, Boyle points out, anamorphically joined to its philosophical companion, *Observations Upon Experimental Philosophy*.

The final two chapters extend the discussion of perspective technologies and anamorphosis into the eighteenth century through a discussion of Defoe’s novels *The Journal of the Plague Year* and *Robinson Crusoe*. Here Boyle returns to the perspective manuals and handbooks she discussed in the first chapter. By the 1680s these books have a new function through their association with commercial and military applications. Drawing upon Deleuze and Guattari’s concept of deterritorialization, Boyle argues that Defoe’s novels use techniques of narration to posit a space resistant to such forms of control.

The greatest success of *Anamorphosis in Early Modern Literature* is to bring contemporary new media studies into contact with the technologies of mediation that were increasingly significant throughout the seventeenth century. In an anamorphosis of history, Boyle suggests in the conclusion of her study, recent developments in neuroscience, the discovery of mirror neurons, offer “ghosts” of the Lucretian form of perception enabled by early modern anamorphosis (147).
Angelo Poliziano. *Lamia: Text, Translation, and Introductory Studies*. Ed. by Christopher S. Celenza. Brill’s Studies in Intellectual History, 189; Brill’s Texts and Sources in Intellectual History, 7. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2010. xiv + 272 pp. The text at the center of this book is a praenectio, or preliminary oration, delivered in the fall of 1492 to open a course on Aristotle’s *Prior Analytics* being taught at the Florentine university by Angelo Poliziano. The decision to teach Aristotle was a controversial one: no one challenged Poliziano’s ability to handle the Greek, but his background was in literature and he held the chair in rhetoric and poetics, not philosophy. The *Prior Analytics*, focused on the use of syllogisms, struck some of his contemporaries as an especially inflammatory choice, and as is always the case, the backbiting soon reached his ears. To Poliziano, a member of the late fifteenth-century Florentine intellectual community who gossiped about him as he sought to expand his teaching portfolio was a sorcerer or enchantress who sucked the blood of her victims—a lamia, in Latin. To these enemies, Poliziano devotes his attention here.

The actual argument is framed between two apologies, an introductory one by the lamias and a conclusion by the wise owl. In between, in deference to the subject of his upcoming lecture course, Poliziano proposes and defends a syllogism, first outlining what an ideal philosopher looks like, then allowing that it might be worth-
while to be such a person, then asking why one should not claim to be a philosopher. Ironically, however, Poliziano’s actual conclusion is just the opposite, that he is not a philosopher, just an interpreter. The real question revolves around what it means to be a philosopher in the first place. The root meaning of the word, of course, is ‘lover of wisdom,’ and Poliziano is actually asking whether those who were teaching Aristotle in the Florentine university were really questioning, looking for new evidence, and asking themselves ‘why?’ By framing the argument within fables, he is challenging his readers to search for wisdom in untraditional ways, and by proceeding as he did, he placed himself within the tradition of Socratic irony. In the end, Poliziano argues that the only way actually to attain wisdom is through philology, because only the philologist could examine all the evidence, be unimprisoned by disciplinary shackles, and pass dispassionate judgement on life’s problems. In the end his way did not prevail, but it did dominate discussion in many circles through the eighteenth century.

The book we have here offers an admirable model of how to take a text like this and bring it back to life. The late Ari Wesseling produced an exemplary text in 1986, which forms the basis for this edition, but Celenza made minor changes in punctuation and orthography in the name of uniformity, readability, and consistency. He has also provided a fluent translation, the first into English, that conveys the meaning, tone, and style of the Latin without sacrificing readability. Poliziano assumed a lot of knowledge on the part of his readers, so Celenza provides the necessary notes, often based on Wesseling’s work but with the source freely acknowledged.

As a guide to a first reading and a stimulus to further reflection, there are four lengthy essays preceding the text. The first, “Poliziano’s Lamia in Context,” by Celenza, provides historical background and a fairly detailed analysis of the points covered in the work. Francesco Caruso’s “On the Shoulders of Grammatica: John of Salisbury’s Metalogicon and Poliziano’s Lamia” reminds us that pre-modern intellectual discourse usually had traceable roots, in this case in parallels between the Lamia and the works of John of Salisbury and Petrarch. In “The
Role of the Philosopher in Late Quattrocento Florence: Poliziano’s *Lamia* and the Legacy of the Pico-Barbaro Epistolary Controversy,” Igor Candido traces another set of roots that go back to a discussion in the middle 1480s among Giovanni Pico della Mirandola, Ermo-lao Barbaro, and Poliziano. Denis J.-J. Robichaud uses his “Angelo Poliziano’s *Lamia*: Neoplatonic Commentaries and the Plotinian Dichotomy between the Philologist and the Philosopher” to show that the history of the philology—philosophy controversy is important as well: Neoplatonists from Proclus to Ficino allowed the philosopher to engage in philological commentary, but forbade the philologist to comment on philosophical texts. This, Poliziano argues, is backwards from the way things should be.

The book closes with a full bibliography and a brief, but adequate, index. In short, this is ‘must reading’ for anyone interested in the development of humanism in late fifteenth-century Florence, along with historians of philosophy and education. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

♦ *De officio legati, De immunitate legatorum, De legationibus Ioannis Langiachi Episcopi Lemovicensis.* By Etienne Dolet. Ed. and trans. by David Amherdt. Geneva: Droz, 2010. In 1541, the scholar-turned-printer Etienne Dolet published at his own presses in Lyon a relatively short work composed of three parts: *De officio legati, De immunitate legatorum, and De legationibus Ioannis Langiachi Episcopi Lemovicensis.* The entire work is dedicated to Jean de Langeac, bishop of Limoges, for whom Dolet had worked as secretary when Langeac was French ambassador to Venice at the end of the 1520s. In *De officio legati,* Dolet describes the external characteristics (e.g., age, class) an ambassador requires before detailing the function of the ambassador and the qualities needed to be successful. According to Dolet, the ambassador’s role essentially lies in the fulfillment of the orders (*mandata* as Dolet prefers, *quas instructiones vulgo vocant,* 66) received from a king. In the fulfillment of these, Dolet interestingly sanctions the use of spies and what might be called tactical generosity in order to win the favour of others. In *De immunitate legatorum,* Dolet uses a range of classical sources to elucidate the concept of diplomatic immunity in antiquity. The work concludes with *De legationibus,* a
309-line poem in hexameters which recounts the diplomatic career of Langeac in laudatory terms. Dolet claims to have composed this poem shortly after the end of his time as Langeac’s secretary, evoking its *iuvenilis ille calor lasciviensque stylus* (46).

Turning to the introduction that prefaces the edition and translation of this work, Amherdt usefully provides structured synopses of each of the three sections of the publication. In a number of cases, these reveal the coherency of Dolet’s thought, just as they generally help the reader to navigate the text. Discussions of each part of the publication are also provided. In relation to *De officio legati*, Amherdt appears to assume that this work represents Dolet’s attempt to answer perennial questions regarding ambassadors; on the back cover of the work, he suggests that Dolet’s work will interest those who wish to grasp the Renaissance understanding of the ambassador. As a consequence, he discusses the relationship between Dolet’s text and other treatises, both humanistic and scholastic, on the subject, as well as the extent to which it is contradictory to recommend apparently morally dubious tactics while simultaneously asserting that the ambassador needs to be moral. Such considerations should, however, have been secondary to a discussion of the possibility that Dolet’s comments were shaped by the desire to correct errors made by ambassadors and by those who choose ambassadors. Interesting in this regard is the fact that Dolet’s account of the diplomatic career of Langeac in *De legationibus* makes no reference to a number of tactics Dolet suggests in the *De officio*. The treatment that Amherdt offers of *De immunitate*, though brief, is much more successful. Specifically, he reveals how this text, which is essentially a series of direct citations of ancient works, could be read as a paean to ancient virtue. The discussion of *De legationibus* is again, however, somewhat disappointing. Amherdt does provide a useful précis of Langeac’s career, which interestingly makes clear that Dolet omits to mention certain diplomatic missions. The only real analysis, however, consists of the observation that the poem is mediocre. This view problematically implies that Dolet was working to a set of exclusively aesthetic criteria and ignores how the poem is presumably intended primarily as a monument designed to ensure the immortality of Langeac’s name. (Dolet defends this as a central function of poetry; see his *Carmina* (1538), ed. by C. Langlois-Pézeret (Geneva,
Indeed, it might also have been interesting to explore the notion that the opening two sections of the work were part of a broader epideictic strategy that culminates in Dolet’s laudatory poem.

Overall, if the introduction would have benefited from being more detailed in a few areas, Amherdt nonetheless does a great service both by making available this complex text with an accurate translation and detailed notes, and by providing a generally stimulating introduction. The volume is thus a welcome addition to the increasing number of editions of works by Dolet that have come into print in recent years. It will also be of great benefit to those interested in diplomatic and political culture in the Renaissance, though not necessarily in the transparent way that one might initially assume. (Harry Stevenson, Cambridge University)

♦ The Correspondence of Erasmus, Letters 1802-1925, March 1527 - December 1527. By Desiderius Erasmus. Annotated by James K. Farge, trans. by Charles Fantazzi. Collected Works of Erasmus, 13. Toronto, Buffalo, and London: University of Toronto Press, 2010. xx + 574 pp. This volume offers the first translations into English of the first 124 letters in vol. 7 of P. S. Allen’s Opus epistolarum Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami, along with five additional letters whose existence and history have been recovered since Allen’s edition was published. All of these letters were written during a nine-month period at the end of 1527, when Erasmus was in residence in Basel; more than half do not appear in his Opus epistolarum (Basel, 1529).

The overriding issue in the letters translated here is Erasmus’s continued frustration with his critics. It was his great misfortune to have ended up under attack by both conservative Catholic theologians and religious reformers. By this time he has finally broken with Luther, but that failed to silence his Catholic critics; indeed the crisis in Spain came to a head during this period. Epistle 1814, from Juan de Vergara, contains information about the inquisition into his orthodoxy that convened on 27 June 1527; its sudden termination marked only a temporary victory. This overshadowed to an extent the controversy with Erasmus’s French critics, but these problems continued as well, leading to a formal condemnation of 112 propositions drawn from Erasmus’s works at the end of the year. These problems made Erasmus
more dependent than ever on his powerful protectors, and a number of letters in this volume involve correspondence with people like Emperor Charles V and his ministers, William Warham (the Archbishop of Canterbury), and the Polish nobleman Jan (II) Łaski, who did him the great favor of purchasing his library, then leaving it to his use as long as he lived. Other letters exchanged with prominent humanists like Guillaume Budé and Juan Luis Vives bring out aspects of Erasmus’s cultural program, in which he insisted on the importance of studying the humanities to increase both knowledge and piety. The letters translated here also allow us to follow the progress of the scholarly projects Erasmus was working on during this period, like the collected works of Augustine and Ambrose. Now and again more personal elements emerge, as when Erasmus complains about his health (Epistles 1808-9); it is also worth noting that the complaints about money that were frequent in his earlier correspondence are largely gone here, due no doubt to Łaski’s purchase of his library.

This is in many ways a typical CWE volume, in which an elegantly polished translation is presented along with thorough notes that allow an appreciative first reading of the text. Given the size of the larger project, volumes like this one, which appears at about the two-thirds point in the projected twenty-two volumes of letters, are in danger of getting passed over. That would be a real shame. The two authors have obviously spent a good deal of time and effort on this project, and it deserves praise both as part of one of the great scholarly enterprises of our time and for the fine work of scholarship it is by itself. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

Bonaventura Vulcanius. Works and Networks: Bruges 1538 - Leiden 1614. Ed. by Hélène Cazes. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2010. xiv + 490 pp. In the fall of 2010, the Leiden University Library and the Scaliger Institute organized an exhibition entitled “Facebook in the Sixteenth Century? The Humanist and Networker Bonaventura Vulcanius.” De Smet (to go by his original Flemish name) was a genuine networker, who instead of modern tools like Facebook, started two Alba amicorum, filled with messages of friendship on the meaning of scholarship and humanism, which he consciously used as a tool for public relations. Born in Bruges in 1538, the son of a dis-
ciple of Erasmus, Vulcanius was a humanist without borders: he lived and worked in Spain and Germany, and was secretary of Philips van Marnix van Sint-Aldegonde. In 1581 he was appointed as Professor in Latin and Greek at Leiden University, a chair he would hold until his death in 1610. Vulcanius edited and translated rare texts, composed dictionaries, sent laudatory poems, and compiled the first chapters of a history of Germanic languages—and according to a famous remark by Scaliger, “had no religion but dice and cards.” He was also secretary to the Senate of the university, and his books and manuscripts are still one of the great collections of the Leiden University Library. Along with the exhibition catalogue, Hélène Cazes has edited this large and interesting collection of papers on this versatile philologist, including the first edition of many unpublished works and documents.

In her introduction, Cazes stresses the paradox that, although the scholar Vulcanius supervised his own initial biography and left behind a considerable number of documents and testimonies, a cloud of mystery still lingers around his name, his activities, and his beliefs. She finds an explanation for the paradox in the part played by Vulcanius himself in the composition of his legend, and in the nature of his scholarship and writing: devoting most of his life to editions and translations, Vulcanius defined his writing as that of an epigone. This volume does not seek to resolve the paradox, but rather “aims to restore the aura of discretion and silence in which Vulcanius wrapped his private life and opinions … gathering different perspectives, without excluding any of them, and propos[ing] various takes on the same question,” constituting thereby “an imaginary biography” (2-3).

In the opening paper, “Looking for Vulcanius: Plethora and Lacunae. The Many Lives of Bonaventura Vulcanius 1614-2010” (5-43, containing many sources in the ten appendices), Cazes herself explores the various biographies of the humanist, starting from Vulcanius’s own epitaph, a tetrastichon that as a “retrospective portrait and a prospective eulogy” illustrates how he wanted to picture himself as a Leiden professor and nothing else. In a first section, “Legacies and Portraits,” Harm-Jan van Dam’s “‘The honour of letters’: Bonaventura Vulcanius, Scholar and Poet” (47-48) provides us with a very perspicacious overview of Vulcanius’s work as a philological editor (interestingly, he seemed to have preferred editing only authors of
whom he possessed one or more manuscripts—hence the publication of quite a few obscure authors) and allows the reader to see how Vulcanius’s own poetical works are particularly informative about the poetical practice and principles of an international scholar, dedicated networker, and well-established professor—although prudence is always called for when it comes to the use of his poetry as a source of historical information. Van Dam then focuses on an analysis of Codex Vulcanius 103 (of the Leiden University Library, the home of most of the texts discussed in the present volume) and concludes with a convenient overview of works published by Vulcanius. In the second paper, Chris L. Heesakkers (edition and notes) and Wilhelmina G. Heesakkers-Kamerbeek (translation) present “Petrus Cunaeus, Oratio in obitum B. Vulcanii habita Lugd. Batav. in acad. MDCXIV” (69-101), the funeral oration that was held in 1614 upon Vulcanius’s demise, and that, in contrast with the common practice at Leiden University, was not published immediately afterwards (it was printed only in 1725). The next paper, “The Portraits of Bonaventura Vulcanius” (103-19) by Kasper van Ommen, discusses the first portraits of Vulcanius and supplies a succinct, nicely illustrated catalogue of all known portraits. While the policy of quoting original sources and/or translations of such sources in the main text or the footnotes is apparently deliberately inconsistent throughout the volume, the choice not to translate two quotes printed in old Dutch (106-7) might still be deemed awkward by an international audience. In his “Remarques sur les catalogues de vente aux enchères de la bibliothèque de Vulcanius” (121-44), Paul J. Smith surveys Vulcanius’s ‘untypical’ library, based on the catalogues of the two auctions of his collection. Vulcanius indeed had already sold part of his library during his lifetime, as he was losing his sight and in need of money. Interestingly, Smith in his listings of Vulcianius’s books adds an asterisk to the ones containing autograph annotations by their previous owner, a detail that will most probably be very useful for future research on Vulcanius.

The second section, “Routes of Exile and Convictions,” opens with “Vulcanius et le réformateur Théodore de Bèze,” by Elly Ledegang-Keegstra (148-65), who describes how Vulcanius beginning in 1574 spent thirteen months in Geneva, where he found his admired colleague Beza, with whom he shared an interest in Christian authors.
From that year on, Vulcanius seemed to be moving towards Protestantism, his firmly Catholic background notwithstanding, as is explained in Hugues Daussy’s “L’insertion de Bonaventure Vulcanius dans le réseau international protestant” (167-83). If any explanation for his alleged conversion can be found, it seems to be (scholarly) opportunism rather than anything else. At the very least, there was no question of a sincere conversion to Calvinism, not even when the very moderate (if not agnostic) Vulcanius moved to Geneva. After Kees Meerhoff’s discussion of “Bonaventure Vulcanius et Heidelberg, citadelle fragile du monde réformé” (185-214), mainly dedicated to the role of played by the *Album amicorum* in a world of Dutch exiles, Anton van der Lem in his “Bonaventura Vulcanius, forgeron de la Révolte” (215-22) examines Vulcanius’s possible role in the Dutch Revolt.

In the next section, “Homes: Looking Back,” Karel Bostoen in “Two Bruges Humanists: Vulcanius and Castelius. Good Friends or Mere Acquaintances?” (225-43) first takes us back to Vulcanius’s intriguing relationship with fellow-humanist Joannes Castelius, who also originated from Bruges. Vulcanius veteran Alfons Dewitte in his “Vulcanius, Marnix van St. Aldegonde, and the Spirit of Bruges: Remonstrant Protestantism?” (245-60) explores the circumstances of the complicated history of the publication of the *Psalms of David* by Gillis van den Rade in 1580. The next section, “Homes: Professor in Leiden” begins with “Bonaventura Vulcanius, Janus Dousa and the ’Pleias Dousica’” (263-86). Chris Heesakkers outlines how the rapid development of Leiden University at the end of the sixteenth century was mainly due to the success of the Arts Faculty, with its bright stars Lipsius and Scaliger. He tells the history of Vulcanius’s warm and lasting friendship with the whole Dousa family and his successful lobbying for a professorship in Classics at Leiden. In “Between Colleagues: Bonaventura Vulcanius and Justus Lipsius” (287-334), the most sizable contribution to the collection, Jeanine De Landtsheer provides us with a very well-documented survey of the relationship between the two humanists, when for a whole decade long they were both living in Leiden, and also when Lipsius after his departure hardly showed any interest in his former colleague, while Vulcanius himself, especially in his correspondence with the Antwerp humanists Ortelius and Sweertius, often mentioned Lipsius, whose publications—so we
can deduce from the auction catalogues—were almost all present in his library. Vulcanius furthermore seems to have been a keen reader of Lipsius’s letters. From her careful analysis, De Landtsheer concludes that the contacts between the two humanists may have been rather superficial and that despite their mutual esteem, they did not really get along very well.

The last section of the book, “Pioneering Philology: Greeks and Getes,” contains six mostly concise but nonetheless very stimulating contributions about Vulcanius’s scholarly activities. In “Vulcanius as Editor: The Greek Texts” (337-50), Thomas M. Conley surveys the Greek texts edited and published by Vulcanius. A striking aspect is the number of first editions, especially of authors from the fifth to the seventh centuries. Most editions were based on a single manuscript from Vulcanius’s library, to which he supplied numerous emendations. Yet his editions survived the test of time, and many of his conjectures are still honored by modern editors. In “Scholarly Stresses and Strains: The Difficult Dealings of Bonaventura Vulcanius and Henricus Stephanus over Their Edition of Arrian’s De expeditione Alexandri Magni historiarum libri VIII” (351-59), Gilbert Tournoy details Vulcanius’s strained relationship with the famous but no less greedy Estienne, who talked him into a new edition and translation of Arrian. As Tournoy notes, “Vulcanius felt bitterly disappointed: Stephanus not only had not paid him properly but beyond that fobbed him off with only 15 copies of the edition” (356), reminding readers that even in the sixteenth century, libido scienti alone was rarely enough to sustain humanistic practice. In “Scaliger, Vulcanius, Hoeschelius and the Pursuit of Early Byzantine History” (361-86), Dirk van Miert brightly analyzes the interest shown by Vulcanius (and Scaliger) for the history of the late Roman and early Byzantine empires. Their interest was fueled not only by the debate about the early history of Christianity, but also by the search for a historical identity within rising nation-states—and by the ongoing excitement of humanists over the discovery of new texts. The main interest of the aging (and ailing) Vulcanius was Procopius’s History. “Vulcanius and His Network of Language Lovers. De litteris et lingua Getarum sive Gothorum” (1597) by Toon Van Hal (387-401) shows how the polyglot Vulcanius’s composite opusculum about the Goths’ language—aimed at demonstrating the linguistic relation-
ship between Gothic, German, Frisian and Dutch—was stuffed with specimens that he acquired from his academic friends: Scaliger in the first place, but also Cornelius Gualtherus, Georgius Cassander, Paulus Merula, Raphelengius, and finally Marnix van Sint-Aldegonde. Van Hal thereby effectively illustrates the importance of Vulcanius’s network with very specific examples. In his second contribution to this collection, “On the Attribution of the 1595 Leiden Edition of Pauli Warnefridi De gestis Langobardorum to Friedrich Lindenbrog” (403-10), Thomas M. Conley proves convincingly that Vulcanius was the editor of the 1595 edition by Raphelengius, which has previously been ascribed to Friedrich Lindenbrog. Kees Dekker, finally, in his “The Runes in Bonaventura Vulcanius De literis & lingua Getarum sive Gothorum (1597): Provenance and Origins” (411-49) takes us back to the treatise already discussed by Van Hal. While most scholars consider the seventeenth-century Danish antiquarian Ole Worm the pioneer of runic studies, a considerable part of his collection of runes is actually borrowed from Vulcanius’s 1597 treatise. He must have had access to at least two transcripts of Gothic texts. Dekker compares Vulcanius manuscript BPL 1886 with the runic items and comments on his De literis, analyzing the runes and references to the origins of the inscriptions. Dekker illustrates how Vulcanius’s interest in the Gothic past connected him with his Scandinavian colleagues: his ground-breaking comparative setting of Germanic languages provides at the same time a unique insight into the history of early runic studies and allows for the reconstruction of a network of northern humanists in search of their distant past.

As indicated by Cazes in her Conclusion, the man who was the ‘last of humanists’ cannot easily be pinned down. This wide-ranging collection of papers therefore proves a successful approach: by touching upon numerous aspects of Vulcanius’s life and works, we get a better view of the multifaceted personality and activity of this formidably industrious humanist.

Despite its attractive appearances and solid content, upon closer examination this valuable collection is flawed by an intolerable proliferation of typographical errors, missing as well as superfluous spaces, inconsistent and wrong spellings of proper names, and inaccurate word divisions. Even unfinished sentences as well as repetitions of
sequences of words are unpleasantly common—and so are (in a few contributions) some amusing cases of Dunglish. I will not indulge in a pedantic listing of the scores of errors that caught my eye, nor try to single out the most striking examples in each of these categories, as such an undertaking would unjustly put the blame on the contributors from whose papers I would be quoting. Yet one cannot but wonder whether Brill had just fired its editorial staff at the time of the production of this volume, or was duly about to, upon taking even the haislest look at the embarrassing result of their performance. (Jeroen De Keyser, Catholic University Leuven)

♦ *La Columbeida*. By Julius Caesar Stella. Introduction, critical edition, annotated translation, and indices by Javier Sánchez Quirós. Palmyrenus, Colleción de textos y studios humanísticos, Serie textos. Alcañiz and Madrid: Instituto de studios humanísticos, 2010. CXVIII + 216 pp. Among the many surviving texts written on the encounter between the ‘old’ world and the ‘new’ are five neo-Latin poems whose subject in one way or another is Columbus and his voyages: Lorenzo Gambara, *De navigatione Christophori Columbi libri IV* (1581); Giulio Cesare Stella, *Columbeidos libri priores duo* (1585); Vincentius Placcius, *Atlantis retecta sive De navigatione prima Christophori Columbi in Americam* (1659); Ubertino Carrara, *Columbus. Carmen epicum* (1715); and Johann Christian Alois Mickl, *Plus ultra* (ca. 1730). None of these poems was ever on the best-seller list—Mickl’s, in fact, lay in manuscript for decades after it was composed—but all of them are worth reading today, for they tell us a good deal about the neo-Latin culture through which Europe viewed the ‘discovery’ of America.

The best known, and most studied, of these poems is Stella’s. The *Columbeis* tells the story of Columbus’s first voyage. The poem begins as Satan, disguised as an officer named Ascanius in Columbus’s fleet, incites a mutiny to keep the admiral from bringing Christianity to the new world. God sends an angel to warn Columbus, who rallies his troops; in fact their journey is almost over, and they soon touch land first in Cuba, then in Española, where Book 1 ends in the middle of an incomplete catalogue of heroes. The action resumes when Rumor stirs up the natives. They are calmed by their leader, Narilus, who then consults his oracle and receives a long prophecy foretelling the
coming of the Jesuits and the rule of Philip II. Satan then causes an Indian princess named Anacaona to fall in love with Columbus, who is forced to stay briefly in Española to repair his fleet. When the ships are ready, Columbus sails off and Anacaona faints away. Stella planned two more books, but the work as we have it ends here.

Sánchez Quirós gives us an edition of the text with notes, a translation into Spanish, and an extensive introduction. The introduction provides everything one needs for a first reading of the poem: an overview of the life and works of the author; an introduction to the poem that discusses its title, its relation to other Jesuit literature, its content and structure, and a brief look at Latin poetry about the ‘discovery’; sections on the *Columbeis* as an imitation of the *Aeneid* and on the Christianization of pagan poetry in the Renaissance; a survey of epic devices utilized by Stella and the poem’s metrical features; and, finally, an explanation of the criteria by which the text was prepared and a thorough bibliography. The poem itself follows, with Latin text on the left-hand pages and Spanish translation on the right, accompanied by two apparatuses (one of sources, the other of textual variants) keyed to the Latin and notes keyed to the Spanish.

It is worth mentioning that the preparation of this critical edition represents an unusual amount of effort on the part of Sánchez Quirós, one that took almost twenty years from the time when this project was initially presented as a doctoral dissertation. Initially the textual history does not appear to be such a problem, since there are only four important manuscripts and four early printed editions to work with. As Heinz Hofmann has shown, however, the 1589 Rome version is really a second edition, extensively reworked from the 1585 London editio princeps in accordance with several very precise goals. The year after Sánchez Quirós’s doctoral dissertation was presented, Hofmann published an edition of the poem with a translation into Dutch (Groningen, 1993) that was based on the London edition. This was a perfectly defensible decision, but a quick check of resources like WorldCat confirms that Hofmann’s edition is unfortunately very difficult to find, with (for example) no recorded copies in North America, which justifies Sánchez Quirós’s decision to continue working on the poem. He has chosen to base his text on the 1589 revision, as a representative of the author’s final intentions, but to show in his apparatus
how that differs from other versions, including the initial London text. The result should stand as the definitive text of the poem.

Sánchez Quirós’s book, however, should stimulate rather than close down discussion of the poem, for much can still be said about the _Columbaeis_ as a vehicle by which the ‘new’ world entered the consciousness of the ‘old.’ That it did so through the filter of the _Aeneid_ is also worth further reflection. Hofmann sees Stella’s poem as a rewriting of the so-called optimistic, or triumphal, _Aeneid_, while I see it as one that is unusually sensitive to the darker musings and other voices of Virgil’s poem; the jury is still very much out on this issue. It is abundantly clear, however, that the poem stands as an excellent example of how later Latin creates and maintains an international republic of letters: initially published in London, Lyon, and Rome with manuscripts now to be found in Italian libraries, the poem today has attracted attention from a German editor who was working in the Netherlands when he prepared his edition, two Americans (Nancy Llewellyn, who wrote an unpublished 2006 UCLA doctoral dissertation on it, and myself), and a Spanish editor. We can only hope that more such work follows. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

♦ _The Latin Poems_. By Archibald Pitcairne. Ed. and trans. by John and Winifred MacQueen. Bibliotheca Latinitatis Novae / Neo-Latin Texts and Translations. Assen: Royal Van Gorcum, and Tempe: ACMRS, 2009. xvi + 484 pp. Archibald Pitcairne was a noteworthy figure in late Stuart Scotland. He was a founding member of the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh and briefly professor of medicine at Leiden (where students apparently found his Scottish pronunciation of Latin difficult to follow); he made original contributions to mathematics; his conviviality was remembered for more than a century after his death in 1713; he wrote anti-Presbyterian satires in English verse and Latin prose. He was also a Latin poet of real distinction.

In 1671, when Pitcairne and his friend Robert Lindsay were young men, excited by the accounts of the afterlife which they had been reading in Plato, Ficino, and Henry More, they agreed that whichever of them died first should return to visit the other and tell him about his experiences after death. Four or five years later, Lindsay appeared to Pitcairne in a dream, saying “Archie perhaps you heard I’m dead.”
Pitcairne had not yet heard the news, but Lindsay had indeed died that day and told him that “they have buried my body in the Gray-Friars, I am tho alive and in a place the pleasures of which cannot be exprest in Scots Greek or Latin.” In his Latin poetry, the themes of the dead, the underworld, and revenants come back again and again: in that respect, the apparition of Robert Lindsay is an exemplary moment in his imaginative life.

As a friend and husband, he lamented the death of individuals close to him; as a Jacobite, he associated the return of the exiled Stuarts with the return of the dead from the underworld; as a drinking man, he celebrated the Stygian depths of the taverns in the cellars of old Edinburgh; as a physician, life and death were his stock in trade. As a neo-Latin poet, of course, he was in the ambiguous business of celebrating the immortality of a dead language. In a review of David Money’s *The English Horace*, James Binns summarizes Money’s sense of “the subversive, subtle, ironic opportunities which the Latin language offered those of the Jacobite persuasion,” and this is well and elegantly said, but one might also say that writing a neo-Latin poem is always an act of restoration. Since restoration was precisely what mattered most in the Jacobite imagination, Jacobitism had a profounder affinity with neo-Latin than with a living language like Scots or English, and neo-Latin was the natural medium for Pitcairne’s many Jacobite verses.

There was a “design of collecting” Pitcairne’s poems “and printing them altogether” just after his death, but this came to nothing, and they are collected here for the first time by John and Winifred MacQueen, in an edition with facing-page English prose translations, a historical and critical introduction, an ample commentary, and indexes. The MacQueens count 124 surviving poems, though in some cases it is difficult to decide whether two texts are drafts of the same poem or different but related works. They group them into nine thematic sections; many of the poems are difficult to date, and some of the reworkings took place at substantial intervals, so a chronological ordering would have been impractical. First come a group of Jacobite poems, those gathered in Pitcairne’s printed *Poemata selecta* of 1709. These are followed by a group of longer satirical and philosophical poems, then by groups on his first and second wives and his daughters, on medical figures, and on other friends and opponents. A second group of largely
Jacobite poems with a British focus is separated from a third with a European focus by a set on the calendar and church year: Pitcairne particularly liked to reflect on the dates of the birthdays of members of the House of Stuart. A couple of translations from English and Scots into Latin are followed by three *dubia*.

Although more thought might have been given to the relationships of the textual witnesses (we are told, for instance, that “We prefer printed to ms sources,” but we are not told why), the poems are clearly enough presented. Textual variants are sometimes placed in the commentary rather than the apparatus; the apparatus itself is oddly presented in full at the beginning of each poem rather than being distributed page by page. Little fault can be found with the translations, though at a couple of points the translation of one version of a poem which Pitcairne reworked is paired with the text of a different version. The commentary goes a long way towards explaining poems which even contemporaries found difficult and allusive (keys to some of them circulated in manuscript). The editors deal frankly with two characteristic kinds of problems. On the one hand, Pitcairne’s allegories are sometimes highly obscure. If, for instance, the *populum potenti Dite creatum* of one of the calendrical poems is the people of Britain, can *Dis* here stand for James VI and I, in whose person the crowns of England and Scotland were united? Perhaps, but the identification is far from obvious, and the editors cannot be blamed for admitting that “we do not fully understand the significance of this phrase.” On the other hand, Pitcairne’s topical allusions are sometimes likewise obscure. Perhaps, to take an example on which some light can possibly be shed, the *Normannus* who was being revered by Pitcairne’s enemies in late 1713 and *Qui Lutheri semper, Qui nunc Solennia Papae Sacra facit, si quid credis Amice mihi* was the Lutheran Georg Ludwig of Hannover, soon to become heir-apparent to the British throne—but in that case, why on earth was Pitcairne accusing him of Popery when Georg Ludwig’s hopes of succession depended entirely on his Protestantism? Again, the editors can hardly be blamed for saying simply that they have not identified this figure.

Overall, then, the edition is a great success. It presents an important and previously uncollected body of poetry, prepared to high scholarly standards. The book is attractively produced, and the price
is not unreasonable. It is hard to imagine that John and Winifred MacQueen’s work will be superseded in the foreseeable future. (John Considine, University of Alberta)

♦  *Anthea sive fabula “Eamus ad ipsum.”* By Henricus Sienkiewicz. Trans. by Petrus Angelinius, ed. by Theodericus Sacré. Pluteus Neolatinus, 1. Brussels: Melissa, 2010. This book recently published in Brussels as the first volume of a new series entitled “Pluteus Neolatinus” is highly recommended. The series is devoted to the Latin works written in the late modern period (from 1750). The book reviewed here depicts two admirers of antiquity from the second half of the nineteenth century. One of them was a great Polish writer, Nobel Prize laureate Henryk Sienkiewicz; the second one was an Italian clergyman linked to the papal court, Petrus Angelinius (Pietro Angelini).

The fact that the Polish original story *Let Us Follow Him* by Sienkiewicz was published in 1893 in three newspapers and that it was read in Krakow by the author himself confirms that the topic connected with the beginnings of Christianity was popular in the second half of the nineteenth century. It can be added that the first stage adaptation of this story was soon issued (in 1895).

The edition published by Dirk Sacré in a beautiful editorial and graphic design contains a text of *Anthea*, which is a Latin version of Sienkiewicz’s story with a scholarly commentary. The translation was the work of Petrus Angelinius (1847-1911). The book contains an interesting introduction where we can find information about Angelinius and Sienkiewicz and a history of the Latin editions of the text. Two appendices are also included. The first contains a Latin letter by Sienkiewicz and the text of his speech delivered in Krakow on the occasion of his jubilee. The editor also added the Latin text of the paraphrase of the Sienkiewicz novel *Quo Vadis* made by a Hungarian teacher Adalbertus Denczer. The second appendix contains Latin religious poems (*Carmina*) by Angelinius and his eulogy in honour of King Leopold II of Belgium (*Oratio in funere Leopoldi II Belgarum Regis*).

For those who are interested in the Latin text of *Anthea*, which, I should add, is not a completely faithful translation of Sienkiewicz’s story, this scholarly modern edition will be satisfactory. The previous
four editions of this text (in 1898, 1902, 1912 and 1935) are already completely forgotten and are difficult to access, and also not free from faults. The decision of the modern editor to choose the last version, which appeared during Angelinius’s life and which he himself revised as the basis for the critical edition, was correct. Dirk Sacré proves that it was the Latin text which was dedicated to Pope Leo XIII. It was also consecrated by this Pope (23). Then the editor mentions a poetic paraphrase of the story written by the Latin poet Franciscus Sofia Alessio (1873-1943).

Dirk Sacré decided to use philological methods which are applied in the editions of modern Latin texts. The edition contains the critical apparatus and similia. The confrontation of Angelinius’s Anthea with the texts of classical authors and Scripture allows access not only to the workshop of the translator of the text, but also to Sienkiewicz’s creative processes. The rich historical and factual commentary contained in Adnotationes deserves high praise. It was necessary to investigate many sources, which allows the editor to rectify some lingering errors and to give some more information about the meaning and function of Anthea.

The new edition of the Latin text of Anthea allows the reader to familiarise himself or herself with the forgotten story by the author of Quo Vadis and with its excellent Latin version. It also shows how the Latin text was received in the second half of the nineteenth century. The book can therefore become a valuable aid for teachers of Latin, because its literary content (which investigates such things as the purpose of life and the choice of a way of life) is certainly interesting even today for young people. (Barbara Milewska-Ważbińska, Warsaw University)

volume that followed constitute a sort of extended dialogue with one of the most influential books of this generation in neo-Latin studies, Françoise Waquet’s *Latin or the Empire of a Sign from the Sixteenth to the Twentieth Centuries*, trans. John Howe (London, 2001; first published in French in 1998 and reviewed in *NLN* shortly after the English translation appeared). Waquet’s book traced the role of Latin in early modern and modern culture, but like every other important book, it raised as many questions as it answered. Waquet inquired as to what Latin meant in the West and provided a good many interesting answers to this question, but that leads one to wonder what place Latin played in other cultures as Europe came into contact with Asia and the Americas. Waquet also outlined how Latin served as an instrument of oppression, of women and children and of non-Europeans and the lower classes. As the authors of these essays show, however, “Latin and its meanings were regularly contested, negotiated, locally appropriated, and sometimes cunningly subverted in the early modern period. There are, in short, plenty of other stories to be told about Latin since the Renaissance, stories which both complement and, in some instances, challenge Waquet’s compelling epic” (7). These other stories involve the relationship between humanist Latin and both medieval Latin and the modern vernaculars; European representations of, and encounters with, the East through Latin; Latin writings by and about women in the early modern period; and Latin in the ‘New’ Worlds, from the Americas to Australia.

Yasmin Haskell’s “Distant Empires, Buried Signs: In Search of New Worlds of Latin in the Early Modern Period (Introduction)” lays out the goals and scope of the volume in an eloquent, concise chapter. In “Other Latins, Other Cultures,” Ann Moss argues that the triumph of humanist Latin represents a change in mentality as well as medium of expression: someone like Montaigne shows how contact among the various linguistic options open to him allowed him to imagine the world from the perspective of the ‘other.’ Siobhan O’Rourke and Alison Holcroft’s “Latin and the Vernacular: The Silence at the Beginning of Bruni’s *Dialogi ad Petrum Histrum*” offers an important new reading of a text that has been much discussed lately, arguing that the main character is Salutati, not Niccoli, with the key point being an anxiety about the position of Latin eloquence in relation to a threat from the
vernacular. John Considine explores the early modern roots of the metaphor behind the concept of a ‘dead’ language in “De ortu et occasu linguae latinae: The Latin Language and the Origins of the Concept of Language Death,” while in “Translation and Re-Translation: Boileau’s Art poétique Latinized” Christopher Allen studies a phenomenon that is more common than many people realize, the vernacular work translated into Latin in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Juanita Ruys explores the early modern reception of Heloise as a Latinist in “From Virile Eloquence to Hysteria: Reading the Latinity of Heloise in the Early Modern Period,” suggesting that writing in Latin served in the end to accentuate the otherness of a female author. Andrew Laird challenges Waquet’s conclusion that Latin had little success in the Americas in the generations after the Encounter in “Latin in Cuauhtémoc’s Shadow: Humanism and the Politics of Language in Mexico after the Conquest,” while the next three papers shift the inquiry to slavery as seen through a Latin lens. Alexandra Mariano focuses on José Basílio de Gama’s Brasilienses aurifodinae, in which the African slave is constructed as ‘other’ and ultimately dehumanized through the author’s mixture of Latin literary pretension and scientific discourse. We might not be totally surprised that in John Gilmore’s “Sub herili venditur hasta: An Early Eighteenth-Century Justification of the Slave Trade by a Colonial Poet,” John Maynard uses Latin verse to defend slavery, but it is shocking indeed to see the same argument coming from a former black African slave in Grant Parker’s “Can the Subaltern Speak Latin? The Case of Capitein.” In “Latin Terms and Periphrases for Native Americans in the Jesuit Relations,” John Gallucci traces the historical development of the term and concept of the savage, while in “History and Poetry in Philippus Meyerus’s Literary Portrayals of the Prophet Mohammed and the Ottoman Rulers (1594),” Marc Laureys shows how a humanist writer from Artois uses a negative version of the viri illustres genre to paint the Turks as barbarians.

This volume is important for several reasons. The most basic one is as a series of microhistories, case studies that each merit reading and reflection on the new information being provided. From a broader perspective, these essays extend and qualify the conclusions of Waquet’s book, which has proved sufficiently influential to merit this kind of work. Finally, the material presented here is an important challenge to
those who claim that the classics at best have nothing to say to the issues of class, gender, and ideology that dominate scholarly discourse at the beginning of the twenty-first century, or at worst stand as the enemy to enlightened, progressive thought. As these essays show, “Latin, even humanist Latin, is just a language after all, and a language is only as good or bad, as oppressive or liberating, as its users and communities of users” (14-15). As long as we have multiple communities, we will have multiple perspectives, and it is that very multiplicity that makes the study of Latin so interesting and unpredictable. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

♦  Book on Music. By Florentius de Faxolis. Ed. and trans. by Bonnie J. Blackburn and Leofranc Holford-Strevens. The I Tatti Renaissance Library, 43. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 2010. xxiv + 340 pp. Sacred Painting. Museum. By Federico Borromeo. Ed. and trans. by Kenneth S. Rothwell, Jr., with introduction and notes by Pamela M. Jones. The I Tatti Renaissance Library, 44. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 2010. xxxvi + 298 pp. These two volumes, the latest to be published in the I Tatti Renaissance Library series, show that Renaissance Latin extended its reach well beyond the belles lettres usually conjured up by the term. Both writers had good humanistic educations, and both used their knowledge of classical texts to claim an authority and prestige for music and the visual arts that was designed to incorporate these disciplines into the humanistic realm.

Fiorenzo Fasoli is not well known today; indeed, as his editors freely acknowledge, there are references to such a figure in archival documents but his identity is still a matter of scholarly dispute. He wrote his treatise on music for the Milanese Cardinal Ascanio Maria Sforza, who was an accomplished musician himself, with the single surviving manuscript, illuminated by the great Attavante degli Attavanti and written by one of the most famous Quattrocento calligraphers, Alessandro da Verrazzano, being worthy of presentation to the brother of Lodovico the Moor. The treatise is in three books, with the first moving from a general praise of music to the fundamentals of sound, pitch, and mode, the second dealing with intervals, counterpoint, and composition, and the last with notation, mensuration, and proportions.
Sources include not only music theorists but also classical authors, church fathers, and medieval authors. The presentation is somewhat jumbled, suggesting that Fasoli was not accustomed to teaching, but the treatise is valuable as a window into musical theory and practice from a humanist perspective.

Federico Borromeo, on the other hand, is well known, as the Cardinal Archbishop of Milan at the beginning of the seventeenth century, the founder of the Biblioteca Ambrosiana, and the cousin of Carlo Borromeo. *Sacred Painting* and *Museum* demonstrate his wide-ranging concern with the visual arts, with the former focusing on how the power of sacred art could be harnessed to save souls and the latter functioning more as a work of connoisseurship. Borromeo wrote after the Council of Trent urged that bishops use art to teach and inspire their dioceses, and he is acutely aware that provocative nudes and manneristic contortions, for example, could distract the viewer and lead her away from God, while pious art could teach the articles of faith and guide the viewer toward the divine. *Museum* has a more intimate feel than *Sacred Painting*, serving in effect as a walking tour of Borromeo’s own collection and discussing it in terms of the major artistic currents of his day. Borromeo had very specific likes and dislikes: he did not care for works composed in the *maniera* style but did like naturalism; he knew Vasari, but insisted that the *colorito* tradition of Lombard and Venetian artists was just as satisfying as the Tuscan *disegno* approach. Here again, however, Borromeo remained true to his overriding principles, arguing that landscapes and still lifes like those of Bruegel should be appreciated as representations of God’s creation that could lead us back to the Creator.

Both volumes presented some unusual challenges to their editors. Fasoli’s text, unlike other ITRL volumes, comes with staves and musical notation, while the edition of Borromeo’s treatises includes black and white reproductions of ten paintings whose presence facilitates an understanding of the text. Each book has the textual notes and commentary that the series format calls for, along with a fluid English translation that gives the general reader his best shot at the sometimes technical material in Fasoli’s work. Again, two home runs for The I Tatti Renaissance Library.
Medien und Sprachen humanistischer Geschichtsschreibung. Ed. by Johannes Helmrath, Albert Schirrmeister, and Stefan Schlelein. Transformationen der Antike, 11. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2009. VI + 287 pp. The essays in the volume under review here had their beginnings in a conference held in November, 2006 at the Deutsches Historisches Museum in Berlin. The conference was devoted to the role of classical culture in the histories written by humanists. This subject was explored on two levels: how historiography served to stimulate a new national self-consciousness in the countries of Europe (example: Polydore Vergil), and how historiography affected discourse on the regional level (example: Erasmus Stella).

like Livy and the *Historia Augusta*. The contributions of Schlelein, Wallisch, and Völkel turn more toward linguistic questions as they examine the consequences, on several levels, of choosing a language in which to write. Schirrmüster focuses on regional history writing in relation to classical reference texts, while Hirschi concludes the volume by offering a broader perspective. Unlike many volumes originating in conferences, this one contains substantial essays (averaging thirty pages in length) that are of uniformly high quality and interest.

This book is one of several to have emerged thus far from a large group project in the classical tradition, Collaborative Research Center 644: Transformations of Antiquity. This center unites eleven disciplines from the social sciences and humanities at the Humboldt University of Berlin as well as one each at the Free University of Berlin and the Max Planck Institute for the History of Science. Around sixty scholars, representing five faculties altogether, work in sixteen projects designed to map the interdisciplinary contexts in which the productive appropriations and transformations of the ancient sciences and arts emerge into the system of sciences and the cultural self-construction that defines the European societies. Special effort is being made to break down disciplinary boundaries and to look at questions of larger social significance. Further information can be found on the project website: [http://www.sfb-antike.de/index.php?id=248&L=6](http://www.sfb-antike.de/index.php?id=248&L=6). (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)