

chosen an enviable human being for much of their mature scholarship. In *Orphan* they have brought to their study of Marvell's texts a great respect for the man not only as a writer but as a servant of the realm, and if they at times bludgeon their readers with over-zealous rapidity of referencing, their good intentions are always evident. For seasoned Marvellians *Orphan* will be a welcomed exercise in textual engagement.

Reid Barbour and David Norbrook, eds. *The Works of Lucy Hutchinson*. Volume I: Translation of Lucretius. 2 parts. Latin text ed. by Maria Cristina Zerbino. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012. cxlvi + 797 pp. + 11 illus. \$375.00. Review by TANYA CALDWELL, GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY.

This first volume of *The Works of Lucy Hutchinson* establishes the project that raises to a status among the key authors of the seventeenth century a writer too long considered anomalous and relatively insignificant. Reid Barbour and David Norbrook acknowledge at the start that the unexpected size of this two-part edition of her translation of Lucretius may seem disproportionate to its history, but they argue that the text requires renewed attention for the various spheres of seventeenth-century philology and life into which it feeds. In particular, they endeavor to place the translation within the context of Hutchinson's "wider canon in new ways" in light of recent scholarly work revealing that "her literary ambitions extended to a long biblical poem" (xv). This scholarship is the culmination of many years of work and a body of publications by a coterie of scholars on both sides of the Atlantic headed by Barbour and Norbrook. The pioneering work on Hutchinson's surprising Lucretius began with Hugh de Quehen's edition in 1996.

Barbour and Norbrook's introduction (with a contribution from Jonathan Gibson) approaches monograph length as the scholars provide the most comprehensive discussion to date of the contexts of Hutchinson's translation. Dividing their introduction into seven major sections, each with several subsections, the editors range over a wealth of subjects. These include the controversial likely composition period of the translation; the English and European traditions of

Epicurean thought and Lucretius's cosmology within these traditions; what Hutchinson's 1675 completed translation can tell us about radical changes since the 1650s in theological, political, and literary history; and the editing decisions and procedures of the present volume.

By placing Lucy Hutchinson's translation dynamically within the major cultural debates and traditions of its time, the introduction provides a vital resource for early modern women's studies, scholarship on seventeenth-century atomism and Epicureanism, translation studies, and the complex political and religious intersections of the Interregnum and Restoration. Most important, this work of criticism grounds the task of the Oxford *Works of Hutchinson* by elevating Hutchinson fully into the world she inhabited as well as this translation into her corpus as a whole. Until de Quehen's edition, Hutchinson's translation was not really taken seriously, her own dedication offering a red herring: "I turn'd it into English in a roome where my children practiz'd the severall qualities they were taught, with the Tutors, & I numbred the sillables of my translation by the threds of the canvas I wrought in, & sett them downe with a pen and inke that stood by me" (7). Just as problematic has been the issue of the inconsistencies of a Puritan woman, who wrote the life of her husband, a man arrested for the regicide of Charles I, yet who translated a notoriously atheistic text, which is dedicated to the "Lord Keeper of His Majesty's Privy Seal & One of His Majesty's Most Honorable Privy Council." However, the contradictions surrounding Arthur Annesley, Earl of Anglesey (1614-1686), who may well have "come to her husband's aid in 1660," simultaneously highlight and reflect the complexities involved in the text as a whole, and the editors here do the first extended work at unfolding them (cxiii).

The key development in scholarship on Hutchinson, Barbour and Norbrook argue from the beginning, has been the discovery of her Christian poem *Order and Disorder* (xv). In their discussion of her Lucretius, they consequently reinforce their major arguments through comparisons between her approach in the translation and the philosophy underscoring the poem, which they see as epitomizing her poetic stance. In addressing how Hutchinson can possibly have been inspired by Lucretius's atheism, for example, the editors demonstrate the probable influence of her contemporaries Pierre Gassendi

and Robert Boyle as she worked through the translation to reconcile Lucretian atomism and a Christian god. They then point out that she “does something similar in *Order and Disorder*, where she feels able to transfer the language she had used in describing Lucretius’ gods to the Christian Trinity” (lxvii). Her reconciliation of her Calvinism with historical shifts and her attraction to Lucretius is also effected through her manipulation of language. In the life of her husband (“The Life of John Hutchinson”) she consistently uses the word “priest” pejoratively to express “anticlericalism” (lxviii). She similarly makes Lucretius denounce idolatry, and, as the editors also point out, uses the same recurrent language in *Order and Disorder* (lxviii).

As well as the introduction, part one includes Hutchinson’s dedication to the Earl of Anglesey as well as all six of the books of her translation. These are each prefaced by an argument and juxtaposed with the Latin text that she used, prepared by Maria Cristina Zerbino. The translation appears on the right hand page and the Latin on the left. The texts are presented, as the editor’s note, as close to the original form as possible. There is no modernization of spelling or letters, and the font indicates where the manuscript (British Library Additional MS 19333) is either in Hutchinson’s hand or that of a professional scribe. The demarcation, Barbour and Norbrook argue, is a crucial one, for it indicates Hutchinson’s own editing of her complete manuscript and so her “complex relations of involvement with and distancing from this ‘atheistical’ text” (cxxxvii). Part two contains the extensive commentary, bibliography, and index. That the commentary warrants a whole volume, the editors suggest, simultaneously indicates the importance of the groundwork laid with de Quehen’s edition and the limitations of the concision that he strove for. This present edition is a response to the need for a “lengthy commentary” that de Quehen noted (cxxxvi).

The elevation of another complex and multi-faceted early modern women writer is always a major accomplishment and provides new foundations for scholarship. This work will remain a wonderful resource for generations to come.