



EVENTEENTH-



ENTURY



EWS

SPRING - SUMMER 2016

Vol. 74

Nos. 1&2

Including

THE NEO-LATIN NEWS Vol. 64, Nos. 1&2

SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY NEWS

VOLUME 74, Nos. 1&2

SPRING-SUMMER, 2016

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

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

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

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

ISSN 0037-3028

SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY NEWS

EDITOR

DONALD R. DICKSON

Texas A&M University

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Michele Marrapodi, University of Palermo
Patricia Marie García, University of Texas
E. Joe Johnson, Clayton State University

EDITORIAL ASSISTANTS

Joannah Crosby, Texas A&M University
Megan N. Pearson, Texas A&M University

CONTENTS

VOLUME 74, NOS. 1&2 SPRING-SUMMER, 2016

- Nancy Mohrlock Bunker, *Marriage and Land Law in Shakespeare and Middleton*. Review by ELISA OH, HOWARD UNIVERSITY 19
- Nabil Matar, *British Captives from the Mediterranean to the Atlantic, 1563-1760*. Review by ROBERT BATCHELOR 25
- Ryan Netzley, *Lyric Apocalypse: Milton, Marvell, and the Nature of Events*. Review by JOHN MULRYAN 29
- James D. Mardock and Kathryn R. McPherson, eds. *Stages of Engagement: Drama and Religion in Post-Reformation England*. Review by DANIEL L. KEEGAN 32
- Sarah Apetrei and Hannah Smith, eds. *Religion and Women in Britain, c. 1660-1760*. Review by C. JAN SWEARINGEN 36
- Jennifer Evans, *Aphrodisiacs, Fertility and Medicine in Early Modern England*. Review by CELESTE CHAMBERLAND 39
- Sarah F. Williams, *Damnable Practises: Witches, Dangerous Women, and Music in Seventeenth-Century English Broadside Ballads*. Review by JULIE D. CAMPBELL 41
- Jonathan Healey, *The First Century of Welfare: Poverty and Poor Relief in Lancashire 1620-1730*. Review by TY M. REESE 44
- Alexandra Walsham, *Catholic Reformation in Protestant Britain*. Farnham: Ashgate. Review by JONATHAN WRIGHT 47
- Chloë Houston, *The Renaissance Utopia: Dialogue, Travel and the Ideal Society*. Review by JOSEPH M. MCCARTHY 48
- Mykhailo Hrushevsky. *History of Ukraine-Rus'. Vol. 10: The Cossack Age, 1657-1659*. Review by CAROL B. STEVENS 51
- NEO-LATIN NEWS 55

Nancy Mohrlock Bunker. *Marriage and Land Law in Shakespeare and Middleton*. Madison and Teaneck: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2014. viii + 267 pp. \$80.00. Review by ELISA OH, HOWARD UNIVERSITY.

Nancy Mohrlock Bunker's *Marriage and Land Law in Shakespeare and Middleton* traces the representation of economic laws and social practices of inheritance in early modern marriage comedies from 1590-1615. She contextualizes the 10 focal plays and the 21 marriages they encompass by analyzing each financial transaction in relation to contemporary changes in marriage and property laws in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In each chapter Bunker pairs a Shakespeare and a Middleton play that highlight the deceptions used to try to achieve both the free choice of spouse and inheritance of land. Each marriage negotiation between two generations also "brings into direct competition two social and legal orders—one feudal and patriarchal in its assertion of kinship, the other mercantile and negotiative in pursuit of individual desires" (3), and the triumph of a manipulative and materially self-interested younger generation marks a cultural move toward individual choice and companionate marriage. Though the individualistic younger generation apparently "wins" in the comedic resolutions, Bunker finally argues that the plays do not wholly embrace these new value systems and that relations between generations as well as the landed gentry and the rising merchant class remain in flux.

The most interesting ideas Bunker's study brings to the surface are the ways that these plays only selectively represent existing land inheritance laws and often omit typical legal modes of transferring property through marriage. For example, in these plays she notices the prominence of young grooms inheriting volatile fee simple estates and the comparative lack of jointure bargains. She interprets this emphasis as "anticipat[ing] a legal practice codified nearly a century later in the Strict Settlement" (4). The plays show that women who enter the marriage market in unconventional ways are especially vulnerable to impoverished widowhood, and the grooms have either a history of profligate financial mismanagement or no experience that would help them to guard and increase the inheritances they receive. Other than the two marriages in *Taming of the Shrew*, Bunker notes

the consistent absence of the plays' consideration of jointures and widows' dowers, which would provide economic safeguards for the future of the brides if they were widowed. However, as each chapter's investigation shows, this is but one of many ways that a patriarch can fail in his responsibility to broker prosperous and satisfying marriages for the next generation.

Chapter One juxtaposes *The Taming of the Shrew* and *A Chaste Maid in Cheapside* to study the weaknesses of controlling patriarchs who are manipulated by the younger generation. Bunker notes the attractive financial assets that Baptista has to give his two daughters in the absence of a male heir: a large dowry upon marriage and all of his land equally divided upon his death. She also points out Petruchio's generous offer to give all his wealth to his wife after he dies, far more than the one-third that common law demanded. Bunker sees a partnership of equals in Kate and Petruchio's sexually charged wooing banter, and she reads companionate mutuality based on trust even in apparently antifeminist metaphors such as Petruchio's claim that he will tame Katherine, his "haggard" hawk. By misreading his daughters' outward behavior as indicative of their inner submissiveness, bargaining with imposters, and not recognizing disguised suitors, Baptista becomes a weak and failed patriarch. Similarly, the patriarch Yellowhammer in *Chaste Maid* proves to be a failure at socially advancing and financially protecting his children in their marriages: he neither investigates the validity of offers such as the true identity of Whorehound's "niece," nor does he propose establishing a jointure for Moll. Furthermore, he puts money and status ahead of his daughter's health, happiness, and choice. Bunker also usefully explicates how the law of entail affects Whorehound, Allwit, Kix, and the Touchwood Senior families and claims that "Middleton interrogates the definition and exploitation of terms such as family, legitimacy, husband, and father" (47).

Chapter Two demonstrates how absent patriarchs in *All's Well that Ends Well* and *A Trick to Catch the Old One* allow the children to have greater agency in their marriage decisions. Both plays "show class-disadvantaged women using deception to gain respectable marriage ... [but] [m]oney, status, and inheritance differentiate *All's Well* from *Trick* because Shakespeare's Bertram is stridently conscious of the social order and Middleton's Witgood shows minimal attention to such matters" (54, 55). Bunker illustrates how Bertram's agency is

limited by wardship laws, which produce tension between a spirit of parental protection and a practice of exploiting wards' property and marriages for the crown's material gain. Bunker reads Bertram's letter to Helena as a legal contract that "establishes the *assumpsit* parameters" (62), which she enterprisingly fulfills in order to achieve her desired spouse and raise her social position. The speed with which Helena moves from being scorned by Bertram to "strategic planning" leads Bunker to interpret Helena's "suffering as momentary" (68), but this argument could stand to converse directly with the critics who look askance at Helena's problematic decision to stay with this hostile spouse. Bunker contends that in the city setting of *Trick*, "experience and savvy are more important than untouched innocence or an unbroken continuity of legal possession of land. Both chastity and land tenure are demystified as commodities that can be lost and recovered by those clever and opportunistic enough to seize the advantages" (69). *Trick* also features foolish patriarchs in the greedy and competitive uncles, Pecunius Lucre and Walkadine Hoard. Bunker draws attention to Witgood and Lucre's use of premarital legal contracts to their advantage: Witgood's fictional contract with Jane serves to compel Hoard to pay off Witgood's debts in order to "release" Jane from that contract, making her available for Hoard to marry. Although neither Joyce nor Jane receives protective jointure offers, Bunker holds up Jane as a model of female intelligence and friendship and a "formidable competitor" (80) in the London marriage market. Jane's fluid identity and skilful social performances enable her to rehabilitate her reputation and acquire property through marriage.

Chapter Three contrasts *Measure for Measure* and *A Mad World, My Masters* to show how the traditional social order of marriage "reclaims" men and women who have engaged in illicit spending or premarital sex. This chapter could benefit from a clear definition of what it means to "achieve success in relation to marriage" (87). It seems that Bunker means a multifaceted "success" that combines agency in choice of partners, companionate attraction and respect, and a legally durable inheritance. However, for some characters, "success" might just mean social climbing or an honorable reputation for an unchaste woman. While Bunker sees Duke Vincentio as an initially failed patriarch due to his leniency followed by his "experiment" with his excessively strict

deputy Angelo, she believes he learns to govern with equity, the legal principles of flexibility that take intent into account to make judgments that are balanced and compassionate. Bunker emphasizes the positive social and intellectual choice Isabella and the Duke make to marry: she claims this last-minute match “signals each partner’s respectful engagement with the other and similar attention to living life utilizing the principles of equity ... the couple seeks a type of marriage founded on partnership” (101). This argument could respond to the decades of critical debate about Isabella’s final silence after the Duke’s repeated proposal to her, as it has also been persuasively interpreted as rejection or deferral of marriage on her part. In *A Mad World*, Sir Bounteous Progress comprises another failed patriarch in his callous self-indulgence, while Bunker admires Mother Gullman and her daughter Frank, the Courtesan, because both women infiltrate and manipulate the patriarchal system of reputation and inheritance to achieve a socially advantageous marriage for Frank. Bunker praises Mother Gullman as the “savvy negotiator” (88) who does the job of a patriarch better than any of the male characters. The fact that Frank Gullman is able to transition from an unchaste unmarried woman to a respectable wife without “any apocalyptic fuss” (122) and the fact that there is not an equivalent character arc in Shakespeare’s plays lead Bunker to “place Middleton on the side of liberal flexibility and parity between men and women and Shakespeare on the side of authoritarian morality and double standard” (122).

Chapter Four asserts that the strong and wealthy female protagonists in *The Merchant of Venice* and *The Roaring Girl* “defy gender conventions and utilize patriarchal restrictions for their own ends” (127), which are to “broker themselves” despite the opposition of cruel male antagonists. Though Portia is bound by postmortem patriarchal control over her marriage and dowry, she tries to help Bassanio choose the correct casket, and she lets him know “that she intends to retain some agency in the marriage” (135), particularly over the money, which comes entirely from her. Her agency in the marriage takes the form of her generous gift to Bassanio to pay Antonio’s debt, and her fortune, body, and promised marital fidelity are all conflated in the symbolic ring she gives him. Jessica brokers herself by stealing from her father to finance her marriage portion. Bunker points out how each of the

“three grooms in *Merchant* are without parents, inheritance, or personal fortune with which to start marital life” (140) and consequently cannot provide the security of a jointure for the brides. As Shylock loses his estate in court, Antonio steps in to act the part of the patriarch for Jessica and Lorenzo rather than for Bassanio. Bunker describes each major character as “embrac[ing] excessive credit or gamb[ing] recklessly” (149), but in the end agency and authority reside with Portia. In *Roaring Girl*, Bunker argues that Moll’s male attire disrupts traditional hierarchies of class and gender distinction. By unsettling Sir Alexander Wengrave so deeply that he releases Sebastian’s rightful inheritance, thus enabling the companionate marriage with Mary, Moll takes the place of an effective, selfless patriarch who should broker a good personal and financial match for his children.

In Chapter Five Bunker pairs *Much Ado About Nothing* and *No Wit, No Help Like a Woman’s* to discuss companionate marriage and the ever-shifting role of patriarch, which is played by uncle, friar, friend, women brokering themselves, and women on behalf of other women. Though no one speaks of jointure, dowry, or inheritance in their courtship or marriage, Beatrice and Benedick are held up as the consummate example of a companionate couple, since they have long known each other, test their individuality and equality within the relationship, and grow in self-knowledge. An orphan, Beatrice is little controlled in her marital choice by her uncle Leonato, and comparatively poor soldier Benedick must broker his own marriage. Bunker suggests that the “marriage between Claudio and Hero suffers from too much patriarchal intervention as family friend Don Pedro matches the couple” (180), and patriarch Leonato unconventionally abandons his daughter and heir Hero when he sides with her accusers at the abortive wedding. Bunker asserts that this play’s marriages “illustrat[e] the vulnerability of passivity and the virtues of active self-presentation, even for women” (180). In *No Wit*, the wealthy widow Lady Goldenfleece suffers acute personal and social pain as a result of “tak[ing] on patriarchal characteristics” (180) and brokering her own remarriage: Lambstone is revealed to be a heartless fortune hunter, and Mistress Low-water traps her in a fictional marriage and then publicly shames her as a form of community discipline for the Goldenfleeces’ usury. Low-water’s revenge makes Lady Goldenfleece

take moral responsibility for the unethical financial practices of her late husband by turning inheritance law against her. So infatuated with cross-dressed Low-water that she does not take legal precautions to protect her estate from her new “husband,” Lady Goldenfleece finds herself accused of adultery on her wedding night and yet apparently unable to break the marriage or control any of her own fortune due to the husband’s legally guaranteed marital right over her estate. Bunker finds Lady Goldenfleece to be well matched with a poor but companionate partner in Beveril, and she also notes the companionate pattern in the Twilight and Sandfield couples, who all have chosen their respective partners for personal compatibility and attraction rather than patriarchal command.

Bunker’s observations such as that the characters’ language in these marriage comedies is highly sexualized, that female characters play an active role in choosing their partners and effecting their own marriages, and that disguise is an integral part of each plot are not always original. The introduction and each chapter would benefit from a more comprehensive integration of additional critical opinions to broaden and deepen the close readings. Although Bunker cites selected opinions of other scholars, her readings of each play are not consistently presented in dialogue with this critical commentary, and her own assertions are often expressed as tentative or conditional “suggestions” that require more boldness. There is no sustained theoretical framework that shapes the analyses of the plays, other than the premise that the plays reflect and evaluate the historical and cultural context of early modern marriage laws. However, the subject matter of social climbing, challenging patriarchs’ control of marriage, self-interested economic trickery, and the fluctuating agency and social protection of women in early modern marriage suggest fruitful possibilities in Marxist and feminist theories. More careful editing would catch slips like Portia’s love for “Bertram” (6). Historians of early modern English land law and scholars thinking thematically about these marriage plays will find this study useful.

Nabil Matar. *British Captives from the Mediterranean to the Atlantic, 1563-1760*. Leiden: Brill, 2014. xv + 334 pp. \$150.00. Review by ROBERT BATCHELOR, GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY.

In *British Captives from the Mediterranean to the Atlantic, 1563-1760*, the esteemed scholar Nabil Matar attempts to give an account of British captives in North Africa from the Elizabethan period to the Seven Years' War. Captivity narratives have been at the center of early modern English literary studies—from Shakespeare's Caliban to Swift's Gulliver—and they have been important in the analysis of encounters in the Atlantic World ranging from Mary Rowlandson to Olaudah Equiano. Matar thinks that this large academic literature has had the effect of focusing attention on Christians as captives—as in Cotton Mather's account of Hannah Duston's capture during King William's War—thereby creating binaries between the savage and evil other and the good suffering Christian. His book tries to use the surviving archives to make a rough accounting of how many Christians were actually captured. Not only does he find that the numbers have been exaggerated, but also the English state was largely indifferent to their fate and its policies encouraged the practice.

Matar himself was a captive, abducted in 1986 from the American University of Beirut and held for five months. A professor of Christian Lebanese background, he was taken by the Islamic Independent Committee for the Liberation of the Kidnapped in an effort to arrange a prisoner exchange with Christian militias. It was clearly a transformative experience. Like his near contemporary Wadad Kadi, to whom this book is dedicated, Matar was born in cosmopolitan and independent Lebanon where the religious boundaries were fluid, a world shattered by civil war between 1975 and 1990. Like Edward Said, Matar's Palestinian Christian family and English education gave him a double outlook and a multivalent approach. In *British Captives*, he describes his own journey as one from "horror to humanity" ("Apologia"). The verse from the Qu'ran (25:63) that serves as the book's epigraph says to speak words of peace to the ignorant.

Academically, in the background of this book are not so much the various discourse analyses and new historicists anecdotes produced by English departments, but two historical works by Linda Colley,

Captives (2002) and *The Ordeal Elizabeth Marsh* (2007), both in part about experiences of captivity in North Africa. *Captives* became an important book for the New Imperial History, which returned to the late nineteenth-century writings of J. R. Seeley. Seeley had argued that the British Empire in India was not a product of intentional planning but the result of political collaborations that the British entered into almost accidentally. Colley similarly argued that the success of the empire in the nineteenth century has blinded scholars to weaknesses like captives in North Africa and the loss of colonies like Tangiers (1684). Matar's work is more in line with the Hobson school of strategic imperialism—the British actively searched for markets, sought to monopolize routes, were willing to use piracy as a tool of statecraft and in the process built up a powerful warfare state.

Unlike many studies that loosely employ concepts of empire and imperialism, Matar's is rich in sources and data. Even his introduction contains much new and tantalizing material about the complexities of captivity in the Mediterranean, in Northern and Western Africa, and in the Atlantic World more broadly. An early example is the largely untouched topic of British enslavement of North African Jews, who evidently worked on the fortifications at Gibraltar in 1715 (5). But for Matar, the "complexity of captivity" should not be addressed through the telling anecdotes of New Historicism and popular history but with "precise data about who and how many ... captives [there] were and why they were seized" (9). To this end, fully a third of the book (197-299) transcribes the surviving archival lists of captives from 1563 to 1760 in their totality. In this regard, it substantially compliments Daniel Vitkus's collection *Piracy, Slavery and Redemption: Barbary Captivity Narratives From Early Modern England* (Columbia University Press, 2001), for which Matar wrote the introduction.

Despite this deep research, Matar is early on hampered by a lack of sources from telling more systematically the broader and complex history of captives in the region. Instead, he chooses to break down myths—notably the absurd claim that over one million Christians were taken in captivity during this period (11). Even though the records indicate that such figures are unsubstantiated, Matar does find that in many cases no records were kept because the people captured were unimportant—indentured servants, criminals, sailors from the streets

of London, religious non-conformists, and fishermen from the margins of the “British Empire” (Ireland, Wales, Cornwall and Devon). Even the ministers seemed indifferent to those captured in North Africa, the Mediterranean and the Eastern Atlantic, unlike Cotton Mather and others in New England. If the American colonists had a sense of missionary purpose in relation to those taken captive by Native Americans, a powerful economic logic was at work on the other side of the Atlantic. North African captives were more expensive to ransom than North American ones, and in general, “impressing sailors was cheaper than ransoming captives” (50-51). Many were never actually captured but died in shipwrecks or of sickness, and in general the government had no idea which or how many Britons were in captivity. The petitions Matar collected are interesting in part for the sense of uncertainty they reveal among those hoping for their husbands, wives and relatives to return. They also reveal the broader political activity of women in this period, who as Miles Ogborn has suggested were increasingly living global lives at home as well as abroad.

The result is no Whiggish history of British progress but a largely revisionist and at times even Namierite assessment of captivity. Initially, no particular logic emerges from the comprehensive survey of captivity documents. The very long central second chapter is divided into historical categories based on the monarchy (Elizabethan, Jacobean, Caroline, Interregnum, Restoration, William and Mary to Anne, George I and II). There seems little justification for this given that the only ruler who appears to have been interested in coherent policy in terms of captives was Oliver Cromwell. The approach makes it difficult to track changes over time. The problem of captives seems to have arisen in Matar’s account largely as a response to the practice of English and Dutch piracy and privateering. The role of individuals and diplomacy—like James Frizell, the first English consul in Algiers in the 1620s—or the complex politics of Algeria, Morocco, Tunis and Salé all take place in the background of such acts of war (80). This rather suddenly changes, however, on page 152. There the Seven Years’ War looms large as an endpoint, and the capture of Elizabeth Marsh and others by Sidi Muhammed of Morocco seems far more geopolitically connected. What follows (153-9) is a kind of revision of the earlier parts of the chapter into a much more coherent narrative, a narrative

that indicates more of a progression of policy connected with both domestic pressures and international affairs.

The third chapter entitled “The Northern Invasion” (a phrase borrowed from Braudel) then takes this further, so much that it seems in sharp contrast with what has come before in the book. Here Matar borrows an argument that Gillian Weiss (*Captives and Corsairs*, Stanford, 2011) has made about France, that from the late seventeenth century Britain pursued a deliberate “strategy aimed at disabling North African seafaring in order to monopolize Mediterranean and Atlantic trade” (162). The 1678 treaty with Salé becomes a watershed in the sense that Charles II wanted to use it to establish a ‘thousand year’ empire (160). Surely this was a fantasy, however, one buttressed by those wishing to portray the king as more absolute than he was. Salé itself, like Morocco, receives scant attention, despite the fact that the chronological argument hangs on both polities. Instead, this chapter includes interesting case studies of Tripoli (165-172) and Algiers (172-189) because these cities were bombarded in 1675 and 1664/1669 respectively. Bombardment of civilian populations becomes a key theme in this chapter. In the British case, the idea that it was “strategic” seems a stretch, given that the decisions were largely made by merchants and naval commanders in the field with, as Sir John Narbrough said, “Gods permission” (167). It was the French who were shockingly strategic—in 1685 a continuous bombardment leveled Tripoli (170) and in 1688 a second bombardment of Algiers using new long range cannons left 800 houses habitable out of 10,000 (184). This attack most certainly shattered the commercial power of these North African ports and, as Matar argues, opened the way for more direct French colonialism and more indirect British commercial power. It also, as the conclusion argues, encouraged an attitude of Orientalist fantasy towards the Islamic world, an attitude born out of warfare.

In some ways, tensions over agency and the complex spatial dimensions of captivity remain unresolved in this book. Matar is right to hint at the problem of twenty-first century scholars who remain unaware of their own imperialist assumptions—Linda Colley’s references to North Africans as “stinging insects” (161, from *Captives*, 67) and “terrorists” (2, from *Captives*, 50). He also recognizes that the “Barbary Coast” is a kind of fantasy term (3) that was not used by North Africans and is

still regretfully employed in scholarship about the region. The book highlights the need for a broader reassessment of the nature of captivity, war, state formation, imperial politics and commerce in the early modern western Mediterranean and eastern Atlantic. Matar himself could have gone further along those lines, even in terms of visualizing the data. The images and maps are limited and not tightly related to the research so the graphic of the population of cities of Great Britain (43) could have been replaced by one indicating home towns of captives from a 1647 petition on the facing page (42) to give a sense of what “Britain” means here. Likewise maps of the various actors and trade routes in the Mediterranean and Western Atlantic would have been helpful. Matar has written numerous books and articles on the broader topic of Britain and the Islamic World, and some of his best stories like that of Ahmad al-Mansur and Queen Elizabeth I negotiating for the release of British, Dutch and French captives are told elsewhere. This book is probably not the place to start in order to get a broad sense of the important work he has done. However, there is something poignant about Matar’s “last foray into the area of captivity studies,” as he is a true master of the field.

Ryan Netzley. *Lyric Apocalypse: Milton, Marvell, and the Nature of Events*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2015. x + 269 pp. \$45.00. Review by JOHN MULRYAN, ST. BONAVENTURE UNIVERSITY.

This rather difficult book seems to claim that, for both Milton and Marvell, the apocalypse is not a past or future event, but, unbeknownst to the practitioners themselves, a dynamic creation of seventeenth-century Protestantism, happening in their own times, a dynamic agent of positive change. In his “presentist,” ahistorical approach to the text, Netzley swims against the stream of Renaissance apocalyptic thought. As stated by C. A. Patrides, “Yet the difficulties stalking all [Renaissance] explicators of the Book of Revelation did not prevent their unanimous conclusion that it appertains, after one fashion or another, to ‘history’ past and ‘history’ future . . . [It] had to be firmly connected to the historical process, not severed from it as a mere ‘prophecy’ of the obscure future” (“Something like Prophetic

strain': Apocalyptic Configurations in Milton" in *The Apocalypse in Modern Thought and Literature*, ed. C. A. Patrides and Joseph Wittreich [Ithaca, New York, 1984], 208).

Netzley's ahistorical theme is explored in four chapters and the conclusion of the book: "Marvell's reconceptualization of the target of praise" (21),

"the nature of imaginary potential in Milton's sonnets" (22), "Milton's depiction, in *Lycidas*, of a potentiality that does not tend toward actualization" (23), "Marvell's "Upon Appleton House" . . . Explor[ing] what it means for revolution itself to happen in the present" (23), and "the consequences of Milton's and Marvell's reconceptualization of events for our understanding of crisis, freedom, and learning" (24).

"Apocalypse" has become a popular critical term, but, while it is a frequent topic in Milton's prose, it is worth noting that the term appears in Milton's poetry in just one instance (*Paradise Lost* 4.2), when the narrator bewails the lack of a warning voice for Adam and Eve similar to the warning voice announcing the devil's presence in Revelation 12:12. Netzley exhibits ill-concealed contempt for religious interpretations of the "end times," indeed for Protestants themselves: "Milton's and Marvell's appropriation of Reformation apocalypticism does not represent the naïve hope of the optimistic or the resentful despair of the failed revolutionary. Their poetic uses of revelation are not merely a peculiar Protestant historical novelty consigned to a benighted past of lockstep scriptural allegories and superstitious countdowns to destruction. Their lyrics' emphasis on present occurrence requires concomitant revisions to our own understanding of repetition, finality, and the new" (20). Again, he seems to be equating a futuristic view of the apocalypse with "outmoded ideas" of an afterlife: "Milton's formal experiments with the sonnet and Marvell's generic alterations of the encomium each seek to unseat the futural orientation of poetic forms designed to curry favor, even in *cravenly mercenary* [emphasis mine] or in sincere fashion. Their revisions strip these traditions of their implication in a system of future rewards, not out of a principled moral objection so much as out of a commitment to a more basic question of the ontological nature of temporal change" (16).

The idea if not the term “apocalypse” is clearly important for both Milton and Marvell, but it is used by many contemporary critics as a very fluid term of indeterminate meaning, often divorced from its original context, the Book of Revelation, the final book of the Bible. Netzley appears to employ the word *ad libitum* as a synonym for other critical terms, e.g. “events or apocalypses” (162), “pastoral escape or apocalyptic transformation” (144), “a poem, apocalyptic or otherwise” (180). He is also fond of telling us what the apocalypse is *not*: “The apocalypse is not a conclusion, conceived either as a bare terminus or a resolving interpretation. Revelation does not arrive either as a bare terminus or a resolving interpretation. Revelation does not arrive from elsewhere in order to tie off dynamic development in a now static continuity. Yet neither is it the hermeneutic unveiling of a more primordial narrative gurgling beneath the surface of phenomenal events. For Milton, it means neither history, nor allegory, nor dialectical unfolding” (115). As that last sentence suggests, Netzley, like many contemporary critics, has a unique insight into the mind of the poet.

It sometimes seems that Netzley is attempting to turn Milton into a postmodern critic, embracing not only Agamben, Adorno, Deleuze, Guattari, Levinas, and Derrida, but even Hegel. I find his claim (based on his reading of Milton’s sonnet 7, “How soon hath time”) that “Milton’s sonnets highlight resolution as the chief culprit in buttressing a distinction between action and thought” both problematic and troubling. Although I don’t follow his reasoning, he claims that the lines “All is ... As ever” indicate that “we are waiting for the end of the notion that hope must always be deferred into the future” (85). In my view, this is another restatement of his thesis, rather than an explication of the lines cited by Netzley.

Again, in commenting on *Lycidas*, Netzley asserts that “the evocation of the two-handed engine demonstrates that the apocalypse itself, if we imagine it as a coming finality, does not and will not happen.

The desire for finality ultimately turns the apocalypse into a metaphor” (118). Ironically, that is exactly what the apocalypse is in this study: a metaphor rather than an event, a metaphor, not engaged with directly by either Marvell or Milton (at least in their poetry), and used by the critic as a straw man to reject the idea of closure and to embrace Derridean concepts of indeterminacy and undecidability,

concepts (perhaps) foreign to both Marvell and Milton.

Netzley provides many insightful readings of Milton and Marvell, but his anti-historical and polemical tone is rather hard (for this reviewer) to swallow. I, for one, do not apologize for “our modern bourgeois notion of significant historical happenings” (3). If attaching significance to “historical happenings” is a bourgeois mistake, I suppose it would be more acceptable to focus on *insignificant* historical happenings. That way madness lies!

James D. Mardock and Kathryn R. McPherson, eds. *Stages of Engagement: Drama and Religion in Post-Reformation England*. Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne UP, 2014. vii + 351 pp. \$58.00. Review by DANIEL L. KEEGAN, UNIVERSITY OF WYOMING.

This edited collection seeks to contribute to what editor James D. Mardock describes as the “second wave” in the religious turn in early modern literary studies. In contrast to the “first wave” of the turn to religion, exemplified by claims of Shakespeare’s crypto-Catholicism by critics including Gary Taylor and Richard Wilson, this “second wave” aims to be more sensitive to “post-Reformation England’s often chaotic confessional sea” and to “the blurry spectrum of individual religious experience” (9). The complex, intermingled religiosity of post-Reformation England resists the grand narratives proposed by “first wave” studies of early modern religion and drama. This landscape of theology and belief, one that Mardock writes “had as many confessions as congregants in its parish churches and in its playhouses” (9), calls for detailed attention to the “confessional ambiguity” (6) that characterized the early modern scene. The essays in this collection make persuasive, detailed contributions to our understanding of early modern religion and drama. Several provide profound, even startling, insights and shed new light on neglected texts and topics.

Robert Hornback’s essay on “The *Jacob and Esau* Paradigm: Nicholas Udall’s Predestinarian Problem Comedy” provides a powerful case in point. The majority of the piece is dedicated to examining the authorship and dating of the Tudor drama *Jacob and Esau* and to arguing for Udall’s authorship in the early 1550’s. Hornback’s argument

proceeds by integrating Udall's play into the "controversial milieu of late Edwardian Windsor" (64) and especially by linking the play's predestinarian ethos to the rising influence of Calvinism in that moment. This argument for context and authorship is enormously persuasive. Hornback's most striking contribution is, however, reserved for a coda: here, he argues for a "*Jacob and Esau* paradigm" for subsequent English comedy and especially for *City Comedy*, which Hornback calls "predestinarian problem comedy" (79). In contrast to the Prodigal Son plot typically assumed to be the basis of *City Comedy*, the *Jacob and Esau* paradigm supports a new "Calvinist understanding of economic ethics" (77), one that, Hornback writes, "better reflects the plot, tone, and audience reactions produced in this subgenre" (79).

Elizabeth Pentland's "Martyrdom and Militancy in Marlowe's *Massacre at Paris*" provides a similar combination of detailed textual study and compelling intervention. Her essay shifts attention from the well-known English sources for Marlowe's play to the "French and Latin works that also shaped the play and its reception" (107). Attending to these sources, which register the shift in Huguenot writing from a "rhetoric of martyrdom" to a "rhetoric of resistance" (111), helps to explain the apparent structural inconsistency by which Marlowe's protagonist, Henry of Navarre, moves "from a passive victim to a militant defender of the Protestant faith" (114).

Pentland's essay further contributes to our understanding of the English reception of continental resistance theory, including the *Vindiciae Contra Tyrannos*. Adrian Streete's "Conciliarism and Liberty in Shakespeare and Fletcher's *Henry VIII*" investigates another neglected topic: "the political role of councils and counsellors" in the political thought and practice of both Henry's reign and the Jacobean moment of Shakespeare and Fletcher's play (84). The complex negotiations at the "nexus of papal authority, monarchical power, and the claims of various councils and counsellors, Privy and ecclesiastical" (90) disclose the self-interested strategies to which this venerable religious theme was put as political actors sought to negotiate, first, "the relative political authority of monarch and pope" (95) and, later, of monarch and Parliament. For Streete, this analysis helps to situate the "fierce anti-French rhetoric" of *Henry VIII* (97), which, he argues, emerges as a claim in favor of James taking the counsel (and the money) of

Parliament instead of cashing in on “an unwanted French union” (102) for Prince Henry.

Brian J. Harries, in his essay “Sacral Objects and the Measure of Kingship in Shakespeare’s *Henry VI*,” presents a striking revision of our understanding of Henry VI’s weakness in Shakespeare’s first tetralogy. Observing the association between Henry’s piety and “a series of distinctly Catholic devotional and sacred objects” (136), Harries argues that this association “presents [the post-Reformation] audience with a difficult paradox of virtue” (141). Henry—like Richard II before him—mistakenly assigns too much agency to God: while Richard “believes that he functions as an embodiment of God’s power” (143), Henry “uses divine providence as a crutch and repeatedly abdicates his power to a concept of God’s will” (145). Both consequently neglect the practical duties of kingship that Henry V and VII attend to effectively.

Harries sheds new light on how Shakespeare’s early kings “wade into the sea of confusion and uncertainty that defines the religious upheavals of sixteenth century England” (151).

Lisa Hopkins catalogues the uses of color in Philip Massinger, shedding new light on the theatrical artistry of this understudied author. Terri Bourus engages a detailed study of the dimensions and consequences of Thomas Middleton’s (co-)authorship of *Measure for Measure*. Other essays provide insights into the workings of “The Reformed Conscience” (William W. E. Slights) and the works of Fulke Greville (Daniel Cadman), the histories of catechism (Kathryn R. McPherson) and of theatre’s negotiations with antitheatrical attitudes (Katherine A. Gillen), as well as the fate of Catholic ceremony in *Henry VIII* (Jay Zysk).

With its wide range of concerns and its detailed interest in playwrights other than Shakespeare, this collection will be valuable reading to specialists in seventeenth-century literature, especially those with an interest in religion. Although its essays focus on the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, its polemical thrust and scholarly accomplishment pose timely challenges to the thought of early modernists of all stripes, asking them to rethink the heterogeneity of early modern religion.

The theoretical framing of the volume—or, more precisely, its aversion to theoretical framing—calls for a more robust conceptualization

of this heterogeneity. In Mardock's introduction, the approach of the contributors is framed mostly in terms of a rejection or avoidance of previous approaches: he writes that "[c]ontributors to this book are uninterested in recovering or reconstructing the specific belief systems of playwrights or their audience" (9), as Taylor and Wilson sought to do, and that they "avoid the first wave's common habit of conflating religion with politics" (10). Similarly, Mardock writes that this volume does not bring "a single theoretical perspective to bear" as did earlier contributions to the "second wave" of the religious turn by, for example, emphasizing the "traces of the traditional cult of Mary" on the early modern stage (Regina Buccola and Lisa Hopkins's *Marian Moments in Early Modern British Drama*), the dialectics between "early modern and postmodern perspectives" on early modern drama (Arthur F. Mariotti and Ken Jackson's *Shakespeare and Religion: Early Modern and Postmodern Perspectives*), or "the materiality of performance" (Jane Hwang Degenhardt and Elizabeth Williamson's *Religion and Drama in Early Modern England*) (11). *Stages of Engagement*, by contrast, "uses a methodological rather than a theoretical anchor," emphasizing "the experience and assumptions of [early modern] audiences" and "close scrutiny of the texts through the lens of their historical contexts" (12).

Such close scrutiny provides many of the collection's most powerful insights, and the absence of a "single theoretical perspective" speaks to the admirable diversity and specificity of the essays. Both Mardock's introduction and John D. Cox's afterword persuasively argue for the value of attending to early modern religious heterogeneity and "confessional ambivalence" (11) in our current scholarly discourses. But how was this heterogeneity and ambivalence experienced (or not) and theorized (or not) by early modern confessants "in a public religious culture that," as Streete writes, "tended toward polemical extremes" (94)? How did the radical individuality that Mardock diagnoses in early modern theology—where there were "as many confessions as congregants"—interact with religious movements and institutions? In its "methodological" specificity and detail, this volume provides many new insights into the relationship between drama and religion in post-Reformation England. In its broadest framing—or avoidance thereof—it raises potentially fruitful questions.

Sarah Apetrei and Hannah Smith, eds. *Religion and Women in Britain, c. 1660-1760*. Farnham, Surrey, and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2014. viii + 217 pp. \$124.95. Review by C. JAN SWEARINGEN, TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY.

The essays collected here, including an excellent Introduction, substantially revise and update extant approaches to women's religious roles in early modern Britain. While attending to the familiar categories of wife, mother, celibate, nun, and non-public presence each of the essays problematizes these categories by noting how in specific denominations, contexts, and periods women's self presentations in writing and speaking advance deliberate revisions in those roles. Apetrei and Smith ask several questions to frame the collection as a whole. To what extent has the history of women's roles in this period reinforced rather than challenged very old notions of oppression? How much has the narrative of secularization that has shaped so many studies of early modern Protestantism obscured vital, energetic innovations promulgated by women in the public and not just the private sphere? Among the notable contributions of this collection are innovative and well-documented treatments of the concepts of marriage advanced by women in different denominations, promotions of women's education as essential to religion and virtue, attention to writings by as well as about women in the new periodical culture, and women's public speaking in a variety of religious roles. It is too simple, the collection as a whole proposes, to suggest that religion in this period suppressed public roles for women that only rebellion could overcome. Instead, example after example illustrates that whether Whig or Tory, Catholic or Protestant, numerous women shaped a revised and reanimated practice of religion, and brought others with them. The overall dual focus on roles in and responses to religion is amplified by two further objectives. By looking at "women" rather than "gender" as an organizing category, the aim is to seek out "hitherto neglected female identities and experiences" (16). The Introduction and several of the chapters give ample attention to how the narrative of secularization shaping many studies of early Protestantism has neglected the substantive contributions made by women to insure its religious progress and improvement, "to privately and more publicly contribute to, and

intervene and adjudicate in, their religious communities” (18).

Alison Searle’s “Women, Marriage, and Agency in Restoration Dissent” provides a fresh look at how concepts of marriage and the roles of husband and wife were altered by emerging self understandings of dissenters within the vexed climate of post-Restoration religion and politics. Sarah Apetrei’s “Masculine Virgins: Celibacy and Gender in Later Stuart London” explores a similar theme, with an eye to the unease created by High Church practices that verged too closely upon Catholicism, including Mary Astell’s proposals for celibate women’s communities. Hannah Smith’s essay, “‘Our Church’s Safety’ and ‘Whig Feminism’” highlights similar concerns among Whig women, whose anti-clericalism, while typical of Whig views more generally, was far from secular, given its attention to “our church.” Two essays illuminate specific groups of women in denominational contexts; Alasdair Raffé’s “Female Authority and Lay Activism in Scottish Presbyterianism 1660-1740”; and Claire Walker’s “‘When God Shall Restore them to their Kingdoms’: Nuns, Exiled Stuarts, and English Catholic Identity, 1688-1745.” Four essays on individual figures and their importance provide case studies of little-known ecclesiastical activism, correspondence, and presence in the culture of polite letters: Melinda Zook’s “A Latitudinarian Queen: Mary II and her Churchmen”; Sarah Hutton’s *Religion and Sociability in the Correspondence of Damaris Masham (1658-1708)*; William Kolbrenner’s “Slander, Conversation, and the Making of the Christian Public Sphere in Mary Astell’s *A Serious Proposal to the Ladies* and *The Christian Religion as Profess’d by a Daughter of the Church of England*”; and Emma Major’s “The Life and Works of Catherine Talbot (1721-70).”

The essays provide rich sources for cross-referencing themes, movements, and individuals as they were seen in and responded to a variety of related religious and political contexts. Many are concerned with women’s presence in the new print culture of polite letters, attending to the religious genres they advanced in media that are often thought of as a largely neo-classical Republic of polite letters. It is notable that when they adopted or were assigned neo-classical characters such as Aspasia, Steele’s tribute to Lady Elizabeth Hastings, it was in praise of virtue and learning, and not with the mockery usually associated with that name in classical literature. The marriage of neo-classicism

with Christian virtue is a striking synthesis in many of the women's writings and speaking genres. Mary Astell, in particular, is credited with forging a "Christian Public Sphere" (131-143). Alternately, Dissenters and Evangelicals made good use of pamphlet and periodical literature to defend their liberties and advance their challenges to the Established Church. It may come as a surprise to many readers that Presbyterian women, before and after the restoration of Scotland's established Kirk were active in prayer societies and field preaching promoting the Covenanter cause. Even Whig women, associated with an anti-clerical movement often thought of as secularist, produced writings devoted not only to the cause of the Revolution, but also to the "political and religious developments that accompanied it" (147). On this point it is again evident that the approaches pursued in these essays are moving away from a secularist, Namierite (15) historiography and toward more nuanced attention to women's self-understandings as religious figures or at the very least as thinkers advancing political views that were irreducibly theological in their implications. The chapter on Mary II details a number of achievements of this activist, forthrightly latitudinarian regnant Queen who did much to secure religious toleration and liberty for the eighteenth century by appointing twenty-five bishops opposed to preaching against Dissenters, and making Tillotson Archbishop of Canterbury. I wanted more attention to Quaker women. Like the Particular Baptists, they are examined here as examples of innovative freedom given to women preaching in several denominations that was in the second and third generation rescinded. Rebecca Larson's *Daughters of Light* documents the careers of over a thousand Quaker women itinerant preachers circulating in Britain and America between 1770 and 1775. One of them, Rachel Wilson, whose preaching was acclaimed on both sides of the Atlantic, was invited by the student body to speak at the College of New Jersey in the late 1760s. Along with the defenses of "The Liberty of Women Preaching" that appeared in pamphlets and periodicals during the first half of the eighteenth century, Quaker women's presence as preachers was perhaps the most controversial and provocative to defenders of women's religious roles.

Jennifer Evans. *Aphrodisiacs, Fertility and Medicine in Early Modern England*. Suffolk and Rochester: Boydell Press, 2014. xvi + 257 pp. \$90.00. Review by CELESTE CHAMBERLAND, ROOSEVELT UNIVERSITY.

As the microcosm of the larger social order in early modern England, the family functioned as a template of stability, a model of normative gender roles, and the foundation of the household economy. As a result, the ability to procreate and protect the legacy of familial patrimony was of great concern to early modern people. In response to prevailing anxieties about infertility, medical writers provided a host of solutions designed to generate lust and ensure conception. As Jennifer Evans contends in *Aphrodisiacs, Fertility, and Medicine in Early Modern England*, frequent references to aphrodisiacs in sixteenth- through eighteenth-century English medical texts not only demonstrate that early modern people understood that lust and procreation were intricately intertwined, but that the desire to enhance fertility was fairly commonplace. By adopting an analytical approach that explores the connections between gender, medical theory, and constructions of normative sexuality, Evans' engaging monograph contributes an important new dimension to existing scholarship in early modern medical history. Whereas many scholars have heretofore dismissed early modern concerns with sexual desire and fertility as peripheral, Evans contends that such issues were shared by a relatively broad segment of the population and that attitudes toward fertility and sexual desire shed much light on the historically specific ways in which gendered bodies and norms of sexual health were constructed. In seeking to expand the conversation about the relationship between context and medical knowledge, Evans urges readers to consider the ways in which norms of reproductive health and sexuality function in culturally specific ways. Rather than assessing early modern aphrodisiacs through the lens of the modern sexual body in which desire and fertility represent distinct concerns, Evans contends that the socially complex ways in which early modern aphrodisiacs functioned can only be fully understood if the intersection of lust and reproduction in Tudor-Stuart England is recognized.

Based on an analysis of extensive source materials, including domestic medical receipt books, handbill advertisements, ballads,

newspapers, and a vast array of printed medical treatises, *Aphrodisiacs, Fertility and Medicine* explores the intersections of humoral medical theory, theological perspectives on marriage, and popular literature from the sixteenth through the eighteenth centuries. Over the course of this time span, Evans' monograph demonstrates that the market for popular and elite aphrodisiacs remained fairly consistent. The flourishing early modern book trade, moreover, created an informed populace that facilitated the widespread dissemination of knowledge about fertility and reproductive health. As a result, until the end of the eighteenth century, aphrodisiacs were fairly common staples of the early modern diet that were regularly grown in gardens and purchased at the market. Evans points out, for example, that based on the humoral association between foods that ostensibly produced heat in the body and sexual desire, frequently prescribed aphrodisiacs included food as common as warm meat, cress, and cinnamon (90). By warming the body, medical writers, such as Jacob Rueff, argued that such remedies would promote lust and increase the chance of conception.

Reflecting broader social anxieties about depopulation, medical and theological attitudes toward barrenness and impotence stressed the importance of enhancing fertility and maintaining reproductive health. Due to the widespread nature of such concerns, medical theorists and practitioners viewed aphrodisiacs and medicines prescribed to enhance fertility as commonplace components of the early modern pharmacopeia. According to Evans, aphrodisiacs belong within the larger taxonomy of early modern medicine, alongside other ordinary medicaments, such as cardiac remedies and cephalic treatments. She contends that medical writers applied the same logic of humoral theory to stimulating sexual pleasure that they applied to other conditions. For that reason, lust and sexual desire were far from taboo, but rather central components of reproductive health within the framework of marriage.

Although the central argument of Evans' study—that lust and fertility were intertwined in the mental and medical landscape of early modern Europe—becomes somewhat repetitive over the course of her analysis, some of the book's related sub-arguments provide important new insight into the connections between ideas of reproductive health and historical constructions of gender. One of the more intriguing

sections of Evans' study, for example, lies in her astute analysis of the development of gendered distinctions in the language used to describe sexual deficiencies and infertility. According to Evans, the development of gender-specific language reflected the growing tendency of anatomists and medical writers to reject the one-sex model that traditionally depicted women's bodies as imperfect variations of the male body. In texts such as John Ball's *The Female Physician* and Nicholas Venette's *Conjugal Love Reveal'd*, for example, there is a clear tendency to ascribe the category of impotence to men and barrenness to women. However, as Evans points out, this dichotomy is somewhat paradoxical, because although male and female procreative roles were clearly delineated, the use of aphrodisiacs was not inherently sexed.

In an era of high infant mortality, reproductive health and anxieties about fertility were exceptionally common. As Jennifer Evans has skillfully asserted, a deeper analysis of the ways in which medical writers and popular practitioners sought to mitigate such concerns yields important insight into the construction of gendered bodies, attitudes toward the family, and medical theory in early modern England. Inasmuch as Evans' study dovetails effectively with existing scholarship on the culturally-specific elements of early modern medicine, it will undoubtedly be of great interest to those seeking to broaden their knowledge and understanding of the emergence of modern attitudes toward sexuality and the ways in which the spread of Cartesian rationalism intersected with and ultimately dismantled the early modern association between lust and procreation.

Sarah F. Williams. *Damnably Practises: Witches, Dangerous Women, and Music in Seventeenth-Century English Broadside Ballads*. Farnham, Surrey and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2015. xii + 225 pp. + 12 illus. \$109.95. Review by JULIE D. CAMPBELL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY.

In this examination of ballads focused on witchcraft and female malfeasance, Williams reminds her readers that most English citizens saw, sang, or heard ballads on a daily basis and that this common experience "straddled oral and literate culture, the material and the

ephemeral, and print and performance” (1). Drawing on the work of historians Sara Mendelson and Patricia Crawford as well as that of musicologist Linda Austern and literature and theatre scholar Bruce Smith, Williams explores what the modern reader/listener might glean from consideration of this composite art form. She notes that the broadsides examined here “feature stories of witchcraft, husband-murder, and scolding—transgressions that intertwine the fears of female power, musical and acoustic disorder, loquacity, and social imbalance” (4). A central question of the book is how such women were represented in the ballad trade as “musical—and acoustic—disorder,” illustrating the “sound of witchcraft and a society turned upside down” (5). While the book is concerned with historical accounts of such women and the general acoustic world of ballads, Williams also considers the intersections between ballad-performance and theater, as well as specific tunes and typical woodcut illustrations that were repeatedly used for such broadsides.

In the first chapter, Williams addresses the textual content of the stories presented in the ballads, noting that the information inevitably came from “medical tracts, incendiary treatises, court documents, trial accounts, folkloric beliefs and superstitions, Biblical stories, and contemporaneous dramatic works” (14). She points out that James I’s *Daemonologie*, Reginald Scot’s *The Discoverie of Witchcraft*, and his teacher, Johann Weyer’s *De praestigiis daemonum*, along with works by numerous others “circulated information on the perceived efficacy of witches’ powers, their acoustic qualities, and methods of identification” (14). She also explores pamphlets and trial accounts addressing scolds, the “scold’s bridle,” and connections between the devil and scolds, as well as how the language and imagery found in these sources may also be seen in xenophobic texts addressing Catholics and “popish” rituals (41).

Williams next examines ballad culture. In her second chapter she discusses its presence wherever people gathered and its use as a conduit for news. Moreover, she examines its appearance in dramatic texts, such as Margaret Cavendish’s *The Comical Hash*, in which Lady Censurer offers to perform ballads, and Samuel Rowley and Thomas Dekker’s 1634 drama *The noble souldier*, “which includes mention of ‘the hanging tune,’” a popular ballad melody well-known to “ac-

company grisly stories of murderers and hangings” (49). She includes samples of music and lyrics to illustrate meter in broadside texts and provides useful tables of ballads that use the tunes “Fortune my Foe,” “Bragandary,” and “The Ladies Fall”—three key pieces of music used for songs about women’s witchcraft and malfeasance. In the tables, she provides ballad titles, dates, English Short Title Catalogue numbers, and subjects. Williams argues that there were “specific tunes to accompany narratives of witchcraft and associated female domestic crime” (86) and that these three were in frequent use, as her tables illustrate.

In the third chapter, Williams examines the “acoustic profile of female transgression” and the “power of wicked voices and injurious speech” (89). She does so through close-reading of broadsides, especially commenting on ballad writers’ consultation of court trials and confessions. She also observes that broadside ballads drew their norms for appropriate feminine behavior from conduct books and marriage guides, such as William Whately’s *A bride-bush* and William Gouge’s *Of domesticall duties*. . . . Moreover, she points out how the popular medical assertions based on work by Aristotle and Galen arise in ballad contexts, as writers draw upon their notions that, as a sex, “women were considered more apt to experience excessive passions. . . and unruly natures” (98). In this chapter, she also discloses the backlash to ballads, pointing out, for example, that Thomas Brice in *Against filthy writing and such like delighting* “rails against the ‘rimes’ sold in London’s shops as nothing but ‘wanton sound and filthie sense’” much as Thomas Lodge did in his *Defence of poetry, music and stage plays* (100).

Williams argues in her fourth chapter that the visual and performative display of broadsides in early modern culture “was crucial to disseminating stereotypes of female transgression” (111). Here, she comments on how the “public theater and the ballad trade worked in concert, and competition, to publicly communicate depictions of feminine malfeasance” (112), noting the ballad monger characters in Shakespeare’s *Winter’s Tale* and Ben Jonson’s *Bartholomew Fair*. She also assesses woodcuts frequently used in the broadsides, surveying popular images from *Damnable Practises*, *Anne Wallens Lamentation*, *The Devil’s Conquest*, *Witchcraft Discovered and Punished*, and *The Unnatural Wife*. Additionally, she briefly considers typology and “its implications for assessing a ballad’s oral (and aural) performance” (127).

Damnable Practises is a valuable addition to studies of seventeenth-century popular culture. Detailing many textual, visual, musical, and performative elements of a group of ballads that offer cautionary and sensational information about women accused of witchcraft, murder, or general unruliness, Williams offers a fascinating glimpse into the world of ballad-making and ballad consumption. In addition to her erudite commentary, Williams' book includes useful appendices that contain samples of ballad verses. Her work has much to offer scholars interested in music history, women's history, and literary history of this period.

Jonathan Healey. *The First Century of Welfare: Poverty and Poor Relief in Lancashire 1620-1730*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2014. xvi + 319 pp. \$29.95. Review by TY M. REESE, UNIVERSITY OF NORTH DAKOTA.

In the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, the early modern English state became concerned with the welfare of the deserving poor. The resulting acts, known generally as the Poor Laws, became a national system of poor relief and created, according to Jonathan Healey, the first welfare state.

While the Poor Laws hold an important place within Healey's work, he is more concerned about understanding how people became poor. The reaction to this poverty, the Poor Laws, served as a way to alleviate the adversity of the newly poor or deserving poor. This work is a history from below that explores how, within this newly developing national system of welfare, things worked on a local level. While Healey is concerned with the poor, he creates an engaging work that explores the entire system including both how people became deserving poor and how local officials/structures dealt with them. Healey avoids theory and in doing so provides a straightforward and engaging work that explores the place of poverty within early modern England. Healey relies upon a case study of Lancashire to better understand first how people became poor and then how poor relief functioned on a local level. According to Healey, one of the most important aspects of the Poor Laws was that they developed a system that recognized the strengths and weaknesses of all sides involved. Healey selects Lancashire

for his case study not because of the number of overseers of the poor accounts, but rather because of the large number of petitions to the Lancashire Quarter Sessions that exist. While these petitions cover a wide variety of political, economic and social issues, Healey found over 3,000 first poor relief petitions of those who were originally denied relief and then petitioned to be reconsidered. For someone who wants to understand how people became poor, these petitions are the perfect source in that the petitioner explains to the overseers, or others, as to how they came to require relief. These petitions clearly show how the deserving poor came to deserve relief and how quickly fortunes could change in one county undergoing economic and social change. Healey's examination of these petitions allows him to argue that people became members of the deserving poor, and thus entitled to relief, when marginal members of society, those who were poor but getting by, faced a crisis that diminished their ability to continue in their circumstances.

Healey begins his work with the story of William Bank, and his son Abraham, of Hawkshead, and that of Thomas Gerrard. William was born into a yeoman farmer family in 1639 and upon marriage took over the family farm until the mid 1670s when something happened that made William and his family move. The Bank family then suffered a series of deaths and other events that forced them, by the early eighteenth century, to apply for relief. The troubles of Thomas Gerrard and his young family commenced when he became ill and could no longer work. He was so sick that he needed to ask his neighbor to travel to Wigan to petition for relief for him. The situation of Gerrard and his family entitled him to relief. While neither of these stories are complete, and as historians and readers we want to know more, they clearly establish Healey's argument concerning unfortunate events. These early vignettes also demonstrate the compassion that Healey brings to his study of the Lancashire poor.

Healey divides his work into three sections – Contexts, Marginality and Misfortune – that includes three chapters for the first section, and two each for the next two. This organization provides the reader first with the necessary context to understand what was happening in Lancashire, then the situation of the poor there, and finally how hard luck created the deserving poor. The work begins by exploring

Lancashire, which was an under-developed region in England at the start of the period under study because of its endemic wetness. While this condition led to Lancashire being 'backward and conservative' [37], by the seventeenth century Lancashire started to change because of industrialization, including both coal mining and textile production. Liverpool served as a primary driver of this development. Socially, industrialization meant that Lancashire was experiencing the development of an entrepreneur middle class along with a lower class that combined traditional means of subsistence farming with the industrial textile work of spinning and weaving. From here, Healey traces, both nationally and on the local level, the development of the Poor Laws. He then follows this with an examination as to why the poor in this period are so well documented (a bureaucratic requirement of the Poor Laws), why these sources can be problematic, and finally the important role that petitions played for those who were initially denied relief. Healey's use of the petitions provides a clear voice to the poor of this period and the crisis that they faced.

The introductory nature of this first section effectively sets up the next two as Healey moves into exploring how people became members of the deserving poor. In many instances, as the petitions show, it was relatively minor events that could drastically change an individual's, or family's, life and make them into deserving poor. An important point here was that not only those on the margins could become deserving poor, but also many people in relatively comfortable positions could find themselves in dire straits. Many of the poor people of Lancashire, before they turned to poor relief, found different ways to try to improve their situations. As Healey shows, the support networks in Lancashire were complex and not always reliable, but people searched for ways to either maintain or improve their situations before asking for relief. These searches included asking for support from their family, neighbors and the local community, begging on a local level, applying to local charities and finally, turning to crime. If none of these provided the solution, then they turned to poor relief, which meant that they had to prove to the system that they were deserving poor. Healey illustrates that contemporary conceptions of the deserving poor focused upon age, especially the elderly or young, health issues, and the breakdown of family and local support structures. Secondary to these were eco-

conomic factors such as price fluctuations and unemployment. Healey ends by exploring the economic cycles and other events that caused crisis within Lancashire and thus increased burdens upon poor relief. Within this scope, he explores how the system responded and how different crises, such as a famine or a pestilence, challenged the system in different ways.

By avoiding theory, and effectively utilizing his sources, Healey provides an important history of the Lancashire poor. These were people who did not want to be poor, who worked, who looked for ways to avoid having to ask for poor relief but who, in the end, could only survive by becoming deserving poor. The work provides a complete history of poverty within Lancashire and demonstrates the consequences that the economic changes of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, especially in regards to manufacturing and resource extraction, wrought upon traditional societies.

Alexandra Walsham. *Catholic Reformation in Protestant Britain*. Farnham, Surrey and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2014. xviii + 490 pp. \$139.95. Review by JONATHAN WRIGHT, UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM.

This volume brings together eleven major pieces previously published between 2000 and 2010. They will be well known to scholars of the period and many have received extended discussion elsewhere. I therefore dispense with a detailed piece-by-piece description but, make no mistake, they demonstrate how profound and fruitful Professor Walsham's impact has been in the field of early-modern Catholicism. They assuredly make for "a coherent vision of how ... minority Catholic communities energetically resisted their absorption into the Protestant kingdoms that comprised the British Isles" (xiii). Subjects covered include the moral dilemmas faced by Catholics, with focus on issues of conformity, conscience and the phenomenon of Nicodemism. The significance of the Jesuit mission, especially in the realm of miracles and cults, is also given close attention, as is the Catholic response to developments in print culture and the era's changes in ritual life. Walsham has written a lengthy introduction for this collection. It stresses a number of important themes: the international context of

events in Britain; the necessity of comparing and contrasting Protestant and Catholic experiences in the period – often a tale of meaningful mirroring and reciprocity; and the lasting legacy of persecution in forging British Catholic identity. There are also musings on a host of additional topics—including the role of Catholic exiles, interconfessional relations, and contemporary discussions about supernaturalism and divine intervention—and a first rate historiographical analysis that covers an impressive amount of ground and points towards future avenues of enquiry.

Chloë Houston. *The Renaissance Utopia: Dialogue, Travel and the Ideal Society*. Farnham, Surrey and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2014. vii + 190 pp. \$109.95. Review by JOSEPH M. MCCARTHY, SUFFOLK UNIVERSITY.

This contribution to our understanding of utopian literature focuses on the changing form of the English utopia from Thomas More to the middle of the seventeenth century. Houston calls attention to the simultaneous preoccupation of utopian writings with their own literary form and with the imagined social forms of the societies they portray, charting their development from dialogue/travel narrative to their employment of multiple forms, an evolving “discourse of human perfectibility” aimed at perfecting the forms of society. The time period under consideration saw the transformation of the Utopia from an exercise in deploying dialogue as a means of philosophical interrogation into a narrative-based conceptualization of pragmatic reform.

The *terminus a quo* of Houston’s investigation is the publication of More’s *Utopia* in 1516, a time of widespread concern throughout Europe for reform that would not only address religious, political and social abuses and deformities but also provide opportunity for the spiritual renewal of individuals. More’s contribution to the discussion appropriated the best forms of ancient utopian writing and mediated them into the Renaissance in a production both at once powerful, exciting and puzzling, one that could be described in relatively current terms as self-referential, ironic, subversive and post-modern. *Utopia* is clear about the need for reform, ambivalent about the means of achieving it, and pessimistic about the possibility of success. More’s

sophisticated construction of a dialogue of multiple voices draws upon his legal training and experience to furnish insight by exploring a variety of positions dialectically while withholding authorial endorsement. The adroit opposition of viewpoints, the commingling of truth with obvious fiction, particularly in the travel narrative, the difficulties and contradictions evident in the portrayal of the ideal society, all combine to prevent the reader from taking *Utopia* as prescriptive. The form fosters skepticism about the practical possibility of reform, a skepticism that Houston follows Richard Marius and G.R. Elton in ascribing to More's deep religious belief in original sin, a burden barring humankind from perfectibility.

Published in Latin on the eve of the Reformation, *Utopia* did not appear in English until 1551. Responding to the change in attitudes toward social and religious reform, Ralph Robynson produced a version that was less a translation than a transformation, one in which More's emphasis on the philosophical concerns of a European audience was replaced by commentary on English problems for a mixed audience. It thus became more of a piece with the proliferating dialogues of the later sixteenth century, which compared contemporary society with an ideal model and were didactic in encouraging social change rooted in individual change. Analysis of two of these, *A pleasant Dialogue between a Lady called Listra, and a Pilgrim, Concerning the gouvernement and common weale of the great prouince of Crangalori* (1579) by Thomas Nicholls and *Sivquila, Too Good to be True* (1580) by Thomas Lupton, indicates that their dialogic form is less nuanced than More's work, having only two voices, both of them in agreement with the authors' positions and with irony sadly absent. The dialogue has become what Virginia Cox called "elaborate monologue."

While Houston's primary concern is the evolution of the English utopia, she devotes a chapter to two continental utopias, *Christianopolis* (1619) by Johann Valentin Andreae and *La Città del Sole* (1623) by Tommaso Campanella, both of whom believe that ideal societies can exist, that humanity can improve itself. Such dialogue as exists in these works is conversational more than dialectic, presenting and describing the attainable ideal society and serving as an educational and improving experience for the narrator. Clearly, the changing form of the dialogue and its turn in the direction of conversation and

instruction was a European phenomenon in utopian literature, not simply an English one.

Conversation assumes an even greater role in the creation and transmission of knowledge in *New Atlantis* (1627) by Francis Bacon, an unfinished work published a year after his death together with his *Sylva Sylvarum: Or a Naturall Historie*. In Salomon's House on the island of Bensalem, which is often read as the first blueprint for a research university, the role of conversation in scientific discovery and the way in which flawed conversation may inhibit the refining and sharing of knowledge and undermine the publicizing of Bensalem means that conversation must be carefully organized and controlled, an important concept in the institutionalization of the production of knowledge with obvious consequences for the role of dialogue in utopian works. In Bacon's hands, dialogue means monologue.

He did not intend to discuss the nature of the ideal society but to set out the requisites for proper pursuit of natural philosophy. At this point, the travel narrative has replaced the dialogue as the dominant form of utopian discourse.

The influence of Bacon and of European utopian writing combined with the political/religious events of the 1640s in Britain and the growth of millenarianism led to a heightened interest in the ideal state expressed in a changed utopian discourse. One strand of this discourse was more imaginative, utopian narrative fiction leading the direction of the utopian novels of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The other strand emerged in the correspondence of the circle surrounding the polymath Samuel Hartlib, which rejected dialogue and travel narrative in favor of an extended conversation focusing on the achievement of a truly ideal society as soon as possible. The utopian moment was shortlived, fading as the Commonwealth disappeared.

Contemporary discourse is a slippery beast even though we are thoroughly steeped in its context. To chart the transit of utopian literature in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as Chloë Houston does and demonstrate the transformation of dialogue from dialectic promoting divergence to apparent dialogue or conversation that is in reality a monologue aimed at pragmatic convergence is no mean feat. To describe at the same time the persistence and usefulness of the travel narrative in utopian writings does much to advance the enterprise of

conceptualizing and clarifying the nature of the discourse of social reform in early modern Europe. Her treatment of utopian discourse in Renaissance England benefits from consideration of authors whose inclusion borders on the counterintuitive. Scholars of the period will find it perceptive and insightful; those concerned with utopian discourse in a later period will find it a sound and helpful starting point.

Mykhailo Hrushevsky. *History of Ukraine-Rus'. Vol. 10: The Cossack Age, 1657-1659*. Edmonton and Toronto: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 2014. c + 327pp. + 3 maps. Review by CAROL B. STEVENS, COLGATE UNIVERSITY.

Another volume of Mykhailo Hrushevsky's magisterial *History of Ukraine-Rus'* has become available in English translation, thanks to the efforts of the Peter Jacyk Centre for Ukrainian Historical Research at the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies. It will take its place alongside earlier English-language translations of the *History*. Currently, volume one is in print, while volumes 2–5 are projected; this sequence, volumes 1–5, covers the time period through the fifteenth century. The translation of volume ten represents something a bit different—the completion of a four-volume subseries (#7–10) within the *History*; these volumes deal with the early modern history of Ukrainian Cossacks from the fifteenth century through to 1659 and the ratification of the Treaty of Hadiach. Mykhailo Hrushevsky was at work on this, the tenth volume of his history of Ukraine-Rus', when he died in 1934. When he died, only the first part of a longer intended volume was substantially complete. The original edition of the present translation was further edited and corrected by Kateryna Hrushevskya after her father's death. She succeeded in seeing it through to publication in 1936, which was, as Serhii Plokyh has said elsewhere, “nothing short of a miracle” in a Stalinist Soviet Union so hostile to Hrushevsky's historical approach. Its publication narrowly preceded Kateryna's arrest in 1938.

The central historical figure of volume ten is Hetman Ivan Vyhovsky, whose portrait appears on the dust jacket. Vyhovsky succeeded Hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky who, as leader of the Cossacks, had

attempted to separate from the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and to create a permanent autonomous Ukrainian Cossack state. Volume ten explores the tense situation among the Cossacks after Khmelnytsky's death, Vyhovsky's succession as Hetman, and subsequent military efforts and diplomatic negotiations directed at maintaining an autonomous Ukraine. The tension between "bringing Ukrainian life into closer dependence on Muscovite control and the defense of ancient Ukrainian liberties against such restrictions" (65) forms a central theme. Among many other international dealings, the fluctuating possibility of a Ukrainian military alliance with Crimea appears occasionally as an interesting and underestimated subtext. When the volume was initially published, its use of heretofore little studied materials made it a particularly important contribution to the diplomatic history of Ukraine.

Part I chronicles disputes over the election of the new Hetman, Ivan Vyhovsky. Muscovy at first tried to use these disagreements to extend its dominion over Cossackdom. However, in the context of a promising but ultimately failed Ukrainian-Swedish alliance, Moscow apparently held back. The Hetmanate negotiated directly and intensively, not only with the Muscovite capital but also with its military representative in the south, Grigorii Romodanovskii; Vyhovsky's interpretation of these events was that Romodanovskii was not well disposed towards him. The process of selection of the metropolitan of the Orthodox Church in Kyiv also contributed to the renewed growth of tensions with Muscovy.

Part Two presents a detailed and lengthy examination of the internal conflicts and other affairs of the Cossack Zaporozhian Sich. It analyzes the sources of resistance to Vyhovsky's election as Hetman, and illustrates Muscovite efforts to cultivate divisiveness in order to promote its own involvement in Ukrainian affairs and to expand that involvement at the expense of the Hetman's authority. Nonetheless, a military campaign undertaken by Vyhovsky against his internal opponents in June of 1658 led to the death of one of their leaders, Martyn Pushar, and victory for Vyhovsky at Poltava. The battle was not the triumph it might have appeared to be. According to Hrushevsky, it also marked the moment at which massive Ukrainian outmigration into southern Muscovy began; there the migrants would establish the

Slobodskaia Ukraina.

The third and final part of the volume begins with the acknowledgement that Vyhovsky's efforts against his opponents nonetheless represented a victory for Ukrainian autonomy and for Ukraine's existing social hierarchy. The chapter however was not closed. Vyhovsky launched further military efforts against persistent opposition to his Hetmanate. Breaking with Muscovy, he also attempted to block Romodanovskii's continuing intrusions in Ukraine. While this did result in the capture of another of Vyhovsky's principal enemies (Barabash), these efforts were otherwise an unfortunate failure. The remainder of part III largely focuses on the various discussions, most significantly between Poland and Ukraine, leading to the Treaty of Hadiach—in the context of which the autonomy to be enjoyed by Ukraine remained a central matter of contention (see, for e.g. 255). Extensive negotiations initially produced a Treaty (dated 6/16 Sept. 1658), which was however amended before it was subsequently ratified by the Polish Diet. Hrushevsky's analysis is critical of the agreement, viewing it as focusing on the rights of the Ukrainian nobility rather than on the role of Cossackdom—an evaluation that remains controversial.

One of Hrushevsky's important historiographical contributions in volume 10 was the uncovering of previously unavailable primary sources. Many of these were from Moscow Archive of the Ministry of Justice (now housed in RGADA (Russian State Archive of Ancient Acts)), but Hrushevsky also referenced archives in Lviv, Cracow and Warsaw. He also made extensive use of printed primary sources. Especially in its latter sections, volume ten is prolific in its quotations from primary documents and from selected secondary sources, sometimes with relatively little interpretation by the author. Nonetheless, the research upon which the volume is based—even if it was less complete than in some earlier volumes in this series—continues to reveal valuable information and important contributions to the history of Ukraine specifically and to the history of eastern Europe as a whole.

As with previous volumes, the English translation of volume ten (by Marta D. Olynyk) is excellent: clear, accurate and readable. In this case, the translation includes some explanations for English-language readers as well as sensible corrections to obscure passages. Two extensive introductions precede the translation. One, by Andrew Pernal,

discusses the organization of volume ten; the second, by consulting editor Yaroslav Fedoruk, describes Hrushevsky's final years, which were characterized by increasing surveillance, then arrest and exile by the Soviet government. Helpful addenda by the editors to this English-language edition are three very useful maps (following *c*), an extensive glossary, and a list of sixteenth and seventeenth century "Hetmans and Rulers." As has become the custom with the translations of earlier Hrushevsky volumes, volume ten includes not only Hrushevsky's bibliography but also extensive addenda to that bibliography. For this volume, the bibliographic addenda include (1) a list of materials published since Hrushevsky's time relating to volumes seven–ten and (2) a much longer list of materials—with some specific references to the Treaty of Hadiach and the Battle of Konotip—that relate to volume ten alone. The latter includes a record of archival primary, published primary and secondary materials in a wide variety of languages, divided into categories of those available before 1934 (even if Hrushevsky was unable to make use of them) and those that have been printed since; they are divided into categories such as "seventeenth-century imprints," "diaries, descriptions, memoirs," "documentary collections," and secondary works. This volume is an invaluable resource that is sure to be put to good use by the historical profession and all those interested in the Cossack Age.

NEO-LATIN NEWS

Vol. 64, Nos. 1 & 2. Jointly with SCN. NLN is the official publication of the American Association for Neo-Latin Studies. Edited by Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University; Western European Editor: Gilbert Tournoy, Leuven; Eastern European Editors: Jerzy Axer, Barbara Milewska-Wazbinska, and Katarzyna Tomaszuk, Centre for Studies in the Classical Tradition in Poland and East-Central Europe, University of Warsaw. Founding Editors: James R. Naiden, Southern Oregon University, and J. Max Patrick, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee and Graduate School, New York University.

◆ *The Deeds of Commander Pietro Mocenigo*. By Coriolano Cippico. Translated by Kiril Petkov. New York: Italica Press, 2014. XXXVIII + 109 pp. The author of this book, Coriolano Cippico (1425–1493), was a Dalmatian nobleman who worked within the orbit of Venetian humanism, having received a good education at the University of Padua and associated with such intellectuals as Marcantonio Sabellico and Palladio Fosco. He left Trogir (Trau), his ancestral home, to serve for four years with Pietro Mocenigo after the Venetian Senate launched a naval force against the Ottoman Turks in response to the capture of Negroponte. Composed shortly after his return, *The Deeds* was dedicated to Marcantonio Morosini, who was then the Venetian ambassador to the duke of Burgundy.

The Deeds offers an account of Cippico's service in behalf of the Venetian republic, but as the lengthy introduction explains, it is a complex work that resists easy categorization. Cippico was drawn into this adventure because his home town was under the control of Venice, and his work is certainly an encomium of an exemplary Venetian noble, but it is not an unvarnished praise of Venice, for Cippico was motivated as much by patriotism toward Trogir as he was by his obligations to Venice. Mocenigo is presented as a model of civic duty, loyalty, and service to the state, but the values Cippico is prais-

ing are more universal than restricted to the Venetian Renaissance. By education and temperament, Cippico was a humanist, and his treatise was constructed in the manner of Plutarch's *Lives* and written in a straightforward Latin prose that met the avant garde standards of the day, with sources including Pliny the Elder and Strabo and with Mocenigo coming to resemble Julius Caesar. But in many cases, the ethnographic and antiquarian lore seems more ornamental than substantive, since the guiding structure looks like a throwback to the Venetian tradition of maritime warfare. Religion is an important part of the narrative, but in the end the treatise fails to present a clear differentiation between Christian and Muslim that could provide a sustained high moral ground: indeed more than once, Mocenigo and his troops resemble thieves more closely than pious crusaders. Petkov explains this as resulting from the fact that the period in which *The Deeds* was written "reflects a period during which the moral certainty of the traditional crusade had given way to a confused double standard through which the paradigm of encountering the 'other' was incorporated into Western political practice" (XXXV). This analysis may reflect more of our values than Cippico's, but Petkov is certainly right to note that the interplay of the various strands within the work gives the treatise unusual interest for the modern reader.

The volume contains a translation, but not a Latin text. This is a pity, since a modern edition was made by Renata Fabbri in her *Per la memorialistica veneziana in latino del Quattrocento. Filippo da Rimini, Francesco Contarini, Coriolano Cippico* (Padua, 1988). Since the translation comes to only a little over a hundred pages, it would have been nice to have a bilingual edition. Petkov explains in his introduction (XXXVII) that he had aimed for a literal translation and apologizes for what he considers an unfortunate amount of clumsy phrasing that resulted from this goal, but I have to say I failed to notice this: the translation is straightforward and perhaps not elegant, but these are really qualities that are inherent in Cippico's Latin. The translation is lightly annotated and supplemented with a good bibliography, which is important given that even specialists in Renaissance humanism are often not very familiar with what went on in the eastern Mediterranean basin during that period. All in all this is a nice little book that will make interesting reading for anyone interested in humanist history

written within the Neo-Latin tradition. (Craig Kallendorf)

Review Essay: The Worldwide Web of Erasmus

Desiderius Erasmus Roterodamus (1467-1536) left a huge written legacy.¹ To this day, many people are still working hard to manage this abundant inheritance, and there are countless readers who draw upon the richness of his works. Erasmus himself had no doubts about the value of his legacy and designed a publication schedule that formed the basis for the most important editions. A version of that design can be found in the volume of letters under discussion here.² In 1540, Erasmus' loyal friend and pupil Beatus Rhenanus (1485–1547) worked with Sigismund Gelenius (1497–1554)—corrector at Froben from 1524 until his death³—on the first publication of his *Opera omnia*. Between 1703 and 1706, a new, expanded edition was published, identified as LB (Lugduno-Batavorum), after the place of its publication.⁴ As well as editions and translations of separate works by Erasmus across the world, the 1960s also saw the start of a major project on a new edition of *Opera omnia*, referred to as ASD, an abbreviation

¹ C. Reedijk, *Tandem bona causa triumphat. Zur Geschichte des Gesamtwerkes des Erasmus von Rotterdam*. Vorträge der Aeneas-Silvius-Stiftung an der Universität von Basel XVI (Basel-Stuttgart 1980); cf. J. Coppens, 'Où en est le portrait d'Érasme théologien?', in: J. Coppens (ed.), *Scrinium Erasmianum* (2 vols.; Leiden 1969) II, 569-620; 594-598: schematic chronological survey.

² Letter 2283, to Hector Boece (Freiburg im Breisgau, 15 March 1530), CWE 16, 210-218.

³ Klara Vanek, 'Der Philologe und Übersetzer Zikmund Hruby z Jelení, Gen. Gelenius (1497-1554). Ein Porträt', *Acta Musei Nationalis Pragae Series C: Historia Literarum* 57.3 (2012) 69-74.

⁴ Cornelis Reedijk, 'The Leiden edition of Erasmus' *Opera Omnia* in a European context', in: August Buck (Hrsg.), *Erasmus und Europa*. Wolfenbütteler Abhandlungen zur Renaissanceforschung 7 (Wiesbaden 1988) 163-182; Marc van der Poel, 'Over de rol van Jean Leclerc bij de Leidse uitgave van Erasmus' *Opera omnia*', *Neolatinistenverband, Nieuwsbrief* 25 (2012) 13-20; the edition of 1540 and the LB-edition are both accessible via www.erasmus.org.

of its place of publication, Amsterdam. Not long after, the decision was made in Toronto to publish translations of Erasmus' works, the *Collected Works of Erasmus* (CWE). These were published from 1974 onward and based on the ASD edition wherever possible.

The first volume of the ASD edition was published to mark the major Erasmus commemoration in 1969, based on the controversial assumption at the time that Erasmus had been born in 1469.⁵ Now his year of birth is generally considered to be 1466, although my personal preference is for 1467.⁶ Since 1969, 47 volumes in the ASD series have been published, the last five of which are our subject here. Three volumes in the CWE series have also been recently published. Volume 16 contains the letters 2204 to 2356, numbered according to Allen's *Opus epistolarum*,⁷ which forms the basis for the letters series (envisaged to be 22 volumes, with which the CWE starts). Occasionally letters that were previously unknown to Allen emerge, enabling letters he had published earlier to be included in a new, more correct

⁵ ASD I.1 (Amsterdam 1969), 'General Introduction', XV; cf. Johannes Trapman, 'Editing the works of Erasmus: some observations on the Amsterdam edition (ASD)', in: Erika Rummel and Milton Kooistra (ed.), *Reformation Sources* (Toronto 2007) 87-101.

⁶ Jan van Herwaarden, 'Erasmus of Rotterdam: the image and the reality,' in: Jan van Herwaarden, *Between Saint James and Erasmus. Studies in late-medieval religious life: devotion and pilgrimage in the Netherlands*. Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought 97 (Leiden-Boston 2003) 509-533; 513-514; 1466: Harry Vredeveld, 'The ages of Erasmus and the year of his birth', *Renaissance Quarterly* 46 (1993) 754-809; John B. Gleason, 'The birth dates of John Colet and Erasmus of Rotterdam: fresh documentary evidence', *Renaissance Quarterly* 32 (1979) 73-76: Colet, born in January 1467 (following the *mos anglicus*: 1468); Vredeveld 776 and n. 53 (reference to Gleason) passes (778-779) too carelessly to two Erasmus letters (Allen nrs. 844 en 867, cf. also nr. 392).

⁷ P.S. Allen, H.M. Allen and H.W. Garrod (eds.), *Opus Epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterodami* I-XI; XII: *Indices* (Oxford 1906-1958); cf. *La correspondance d'Érasme*, sous la direction d'Aloïs Gerlo et de Paul Foriers (up to vol. V) I-XI (Brussels 1957-1982) XII: *Tables générales* (Brussels 1984) and the Dutch edition: *De correspondentie van Erasmus* 1-12 (Rotterdam 2004-2014), up to letter 1801, March 1527.

position; both of these things occur in these publications. The two other volumes are *Spiritualia* and *Pastoralia* (CWE 67 and 68), which include the translation of *Ecclesiastes sive de ratione concionandi* (1535; ASD V.4 and 5),⁸ preceded by *The manner of confessing* (the translation of *Exomologesis sive modo confitendi*, 1524), based on the text of the LB edition (the relevant treatise has not yet been published in the ASD series).⁹

CWE 16: Letters, August 1529-July 1530

These CWE letters cover the period between 9 August 1529 and 31 July 1530, which Erasmus spent in Freiburg im Breisgau. He had moved there from Basel on 13 April 1529, after the Protestant Reformation arrived in that city. In a letter to Thomas More on 5 September 1529, Erasmus wrote that his departure was caused by the (alleged) plotting by a Dominican who advised him in his polemic with the Parisian theology faculty.¹⁰ During this period, Erasmus was seriously ill for a time—suffering from a difficult-to-define *carbunculus*—which hindered his correspondence and movement, but did not prevent him from working.¹¹

⁸ *The correspondence of Erasmus. Letters 2204 to 2356, August 1529 – July 1530*, translated by Alexander Dalzell, annotated by James M. Estes. *Collected Works of Erasmus* 16 (Toronto-Buffalo-London 2015); *The manner of confessing. Exomologesis sive modus confitendi*, translated and annotated by Michael J. Heath, in: *Collected Works of Erasmus* 67 (Toronto-Buffalo-London 2015) 1-75; *The evangelical preacher*, book one. *Ecclesiastes sive de ratione concionandi* I, translated by James L.P. Butrica, annotated by Frederick J. McGinness, *CWE* 67, 77-443; *The evangelical preacher*, books two to four. *Ecclesiastes sive de ratione concionandi* II-IV, translated by James L.P. Butrica, annotated by Frederick J. McGinnis. *Collected Works of Erasmus* 68 (Toronto-Buffalo-London 2015).

⁹ ASD-text *Exomologesis*-edition in press (ASD V.8; information by Prof. Dr J. Bloemendal).

¹⁰ Letter 2211, to Thomas More (Freiburg im Breisgau, 5 September 1529), *CWE* 16, 38, ll. 66-69; James K. Farge, 'Introduction', *ASD* IX.7, 17-18.

¹¹ J.M. Estes, 'Erasmus' illness in 1530', *CWE* 16, 410-411.

In a lengthy letter to his correspondent and member of the Papal Curia Jacopo Sadoletto (1477–1547), the longest letter in this volume, Erasmus complains about the ferocious conflicts but remains optimistic despite everything.¹² Somewhat later, in a letter to one of his closest correspondents, the papal diplomat Lorenzo Campeggi (1474–1539), he would demonstrate his preoccupation with the Turkish peril—“On top of all this there is the ferocity of the Turks”—and his dislike of the Anabaptists: “Think how blindly the hapless [better: calamitous, JvH] Anabaptists are rushing to their deaths.”¹³

Fear was ever-present and Erasmus was convinced of being in the gravest danger, since “once the signal for war is given, Erasmus will perish like the proverbial bean at the end of the row.” Erasmus is here referring to a proverb that, although not included in his *Adagia*, was at his disposal. It is interesting to note the lack of any annotation to this passage, just as in Allen, despite the fact that it could have been known that the source was to be found in Erasmus’ library.¹⁴

‘New’ letters here include a scribbled note to Bonifatius Amerbach (1495–1562), who continued to represent Erasmus’ interests in Basel (in terms of the number of letters, their correspondence is the most

¹² Letter 2312A [=Allen 2315], to Jacopo Sadoletto (Freiburg im Breisgau, ca 16 April 1530), CWE 16, 306, ll. 294-296: “two things give us some hope: one is the wonderful genius of the emperor Charles, and the second is that these people disagree among themselves over their own doctrines”; cf. James D. Tracy, *Erasmus of the Low Countries* (Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 1996) 171-174.

¹³ Letter 2328, to Lorenzo Campeggi (Freiburg im Breisgau, 24 June 1530), CWE 16, 328-333, ll. 81-83; 99-100; 123-124; “disastrous” instead of “hapless” (cf. Allen VIII, 451, l. 123: *Iam infelices Anabaptistae quanta coecitate in mortem ruunt*): Erasmus did not mean the disposition of the Anabaptists but hinted at what they brought about, namely disaster; 107-108.

¹⁴ Frits Husner, ‘Die Bibliothek des Erasmus’, in: *Gedenkschrift zum 400. Todestage des Erasmus von Rotterdam*, herausgegeben von der Historischen und Antiquarischen Gesellschaft zu Basel (Basel 1936) 228-259; 242: nr 286: *Nonius Marcellus, Festus Pompeius. Varro*; cf. Margaret Mann Phillips, *The ‘Adages’ of Erasmus: a study with translations* (Cambridge 1964) 91: Erasmus had an excerpt from Flaccus (55BC-AD 20) *De significatione verborum* by Sextus Pompeius Festus (2nd century) at hand.

substantial in this volume). “I am very anxious to know what *Borus* is doing,” Erasmus wrote on 6 November 1529 from Freiburg im Breisgau.¹⁵ Reading that, an immediate association with Luther, who was, after all, Katherina von *Bora*’s spouse, sprang to my mind. I soon discovered that Rotterdam-based Erasmus expert Niek van der Blom (1917–2006) had got there before me.¹⁶ However, in his annotation to the letter, Peter G. Bietenholz refers to Martin Borrhaus from Stuttgart (1499–1564), thought to have been called Martinus Cellarius and included in the *Contemporaries of Erasmus* under the keyword *Borus*, but who had virtually no other associations with Erasmus.¹⁷ It seems to me that Van der Blom’s suggestion is more likely than the far-fetched identification of Borrhaus, especially since the comment about ‘Borus’ is in line with the way in which Erasmus thought of Luther in that period: “As for Luther, I have no idea how things stand between him and me,” he wrote in August 1529.¹⁸

CWE 67–68: *Exomologesis* (1524) and *Ecclesiastes* (1535)

The *Exomologesis* dates from 1524 and the *Ecclesiastes* from 1535, and however significant these time differences may be, Erasmus’ work also seems to form a consistent whole here, too: in letter 2205 to Johann von Botzheim, a passage is based on a view of the proper effect of confession, according to the *Exomologesis*.¹⁹ A little later, it is evident from letter 2225, written in October 1529, that Erasmus was

¹⁵ Letter 2233A, to Bonifatius Amerbach (Freiburg im Breisgau, 6 November 1529), CWE 16, 89, ll. 9-10.

¹⁶ *Correspondance d’Érasme* VIII, 388, n. 5; N. van der Blom, ‘Qui était Borus?’ *Moreana* 33 (1972) 51-58.

¹⁷ P.G. Bietenholz, ‘Borus’, in: Peter G. Bietenholz and Thomas B. Deutscher (ed.), *Contemporaries of Erasmus. A biographical register of the Renaissance and Reformation* 1-3 (Toronto-Buffalo-London 1985-1987) 1, 174.

¹⁸ Letter 2204, to Janus Cornarius (Freiburg im Breisgau, 9 August 1530), CWE 16, 2-4, ll. 19-20.

¹⁹ Letter 2205, to Johann von Botzheim (Freiburg im Breisgau, 13 August 1529), CWE 16, 8, n. 10.

already hard at work on what would later become the *Ecclesiastes*.²⁰ He had already started on this as early as 1519, although at that time it concerned something that Erasmus “had promised by way of a joke” (*ioco promissus*), as he testified much later.²¹ For that matter, this brooding over *Ecclesiastes* can be seen far earlier, in the way in which *Concio de puero Iesu* (1511) was drafted.²²

Ecclesiastes is Erasmus’ most substantial writing, in which he re-emphasises “that grammar is the basis of all disciplines” and “dialectic is blind without grammar.”²³ He once more addresses almost every subject that ever mattered to him throughout his life: the work “virtually recapitulates the entirety of the man’s career.”²⁴ However the lack of his opinions about Turks, pilgrimages, and indulgences is striking—opinions that he repeatedly included elsewhere in his works and particularly in the other writings under discussion here. In only a single comment, albeit a very characteristic one, does Erasmus give his judgment on one of these subjects in the *Ecclesiastes*: “How many set out for Jerusalem through so many dangers, leaving at home their sweet children and dearest wife.”²⁵ It is probably because he adopted

²⁰ Letter 2225, to Ludwig Baer (Freiburg im Breisgau, 22 October 1529), CWE 16, 70, n. 10.

²¹ Letter 932: proposal by Johan Becker van Borselen (28 March 1519); Letter 952: Erasmus’ reaction (24 April 1519), Allen III, 514-516, ll. 16-18; 555-556, ll. 1-15; cf. CWE 67, 86-87; Letter 2979, to John Cochlaeus (Freiburg im Breisgau, 24 November 1534): Allen IX, 51, ll. 3-4: *ioco promissus*.

²² E. Kearns (ed.), *Concio de puero Iesu*, ASD V.7, 159-188; 160-161.

²³ CWE 68, 473, 474; ASD V.4, 252, ll. 138-139: *Primum illud constat grammaticen esse disciplinarum omnium fundamentum, ...*; ll. 150-151: *Atqui dialectica caeca est absque grammatica*; cf. Jacques Chomarat, *Grammaire et rhétorique chez Érasme* (2 vols.; Paris 1981) I, 165-167.

²⁴ CWE 67, 78: ‘Introductory note’, cf. Christine Christ-von Wedel, *Erasmus of Rotterdam: advocate of a new Christianity* (Toronto-Buffalo-London 2013) 140-141; 140: “the whole of salvific history as an epic story,” cf. 237-238.

²⁵ *Ecclesiastes* I, CWE 67, 367; ASD V.4, 156-158, ll. 480-482: *Quam multi sunt, qui per tot rerum discrimina proficiscuntur Hierosolymam, domi relictis dulcibus liberis et uxore clarissima?*

such a skeptical approach to these kinds of phenomena that he did not wish to consider them as a subject about which to preach. Erasmus ends the *Ecclesiastes* with a reflection about unity, *concordia*, “the agreement of good men in a good cause,” and the statement that nothing corresponds more to human nature than friendship, *amicitia*.²⁶ In one of his very first writings, Erasmus had responded to the Hook and Cod Wars (*Hoekse en Kabeljauwse twisten*) of the County of Holland by expressing his views on the theme of *discordia-concordia*, and it is no coincidence that both of the first *Adagia* are on the subject of *Amicitia*.²⁷

ASD V: *Spiritualia et Pastoralia* 7

ASD V.7 contains 5 annotated writings that relate to pastoral care and a commentary on 2 hymns by Prudentius. First of all, these concern “A sermon on the immense mercy of God,” *De immensa Dei misericordia concio* (1524),²⁸ intended for pupils at the school run by John Colet (1468–1519) in London, that particularly struck a chord in Italy.²⁹ With the second text, “The Comparison of a Virgin and a Martyr,” *Virginis et martyris comparatio* (1523 abridged, 1524 full text),³⁰ Erasmus was fulfilling a promise made to the rector of a nunnery in Cologne, where Maccabean remains were to be found. He had previously edited a text for him about the Maccabees that was at that time attributed to Flavius Josephus. His *Comparatio* partly

²⁶ CWE 68, 1098-1104; quotation: 1103.

²⁷ Marc van der Poel, ‘Erasmus’ *Oratio de pace et discordia contra fictiosos ad Cornelium Goudanum*, in: Dirk Sacré and Marcus de Schepper (ed.), *Et Scholae et vitae* (Amersfoort 2004) 45-62; ASD II.1 (Amsterdam 1993) 84-86, ll. 684-741: *Amicorum communia omnia* (I.1.1); 86 (-114), ll. 742-766: *Amicitia aequalitas. Amicus alter ipse* (I.1.2; + extension i-xxxvi).

²⁸ CWE 70 (Toronto-Boston-London 1998) 69-140, translated and annotated by Michael J. Heath.

²⁹ ASD V.7, 6; Silvana Seidel Menchi, *Erasmus als Ketzer. Reformation und Inquisition im Italien des 16. Jahrhunderts*. Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought 49 (Leiden-New York-Cologne 1993) 97, 202-203.

³⁰ CWE 69 (Toronto-Buffalo-London 1999) 153-182, translated and annotated by Louis A. Perraud.

formed the inspiration for the creation of a new gilded reliquary for the Maccabees, which is now in Cologne's St. Andrew's Church.³¹

The third text is "A Sermon on the Child Jesus," *Concio de puero Iesu* (1511), a didactic text intended for John Colet's School in London, including a remarkable observation: "In fact, to sum up, Christianity is nothing other than a rebirth and a sort of renewed infancy": *Omnino Christianismus nihil aliud est quam renascentia, quam repuerascentia quaedam*.³² In the same context, but originating from earlier, "A short debate concerning the distress, alarm, and sorrow of Jesus," *Disputatiuncula de tedio pavore tristitia Iesu* (1503), dedicated to Colet, plays on a reaction from Colet and Erasmus' answer to it.³³

Shortly after Erasmus arrived at Oxford in October 1499 and met John Colet (1468–1519), they became involved in a discussion of the interpretation of the events at Gethsemane (Mt. 26:36–46), with Erasmus taking the commonly-held view that Jesus felt a human fear for his imminent suffering, whereas Colet followed in Jerome's footsteps in thinking that Christ has a presentiment of the guilt that the Jewish people were about to take on for their role in Jesus' death.³⁴

The fifth piece of writing is the "Exhortation to the pious reader," *Paraclesis ad lectorem pium*, an introduction to *Novum Instrumentum*, the original title of Erasmus' edition of the New Testament. Erasmus again emphasised some of the key principles of his *Enchiridion* (1503), "imploring readers to put off all human pretence and embrace

³¹ Werner Schäfke, *Köln. Zwei Jahrtausende Kunst, Geschichte und Kultur* (Köln 1989²) 135; Roswitha Hirner, *Der Makkabäerschrein in St. Andreas zu Köln* (Bonn 1970) 20–36; 42; cf. Pál Ács, *The names of the holy Maccabees. Erasmus and the origin of the Hungarian Protestant martyrology*, www.academia.edu/4145179 (2002).

³² ASD V.7, 178, ll. 199–200; CWE 29 (Toronto-Buffalo-London 1989) 51–70, translated and annotated by Emily Kearns; 62; Georges Chantraine, *'Mystère' et 'philosophie du Christ' selon Érasme. Étude de la lettre à P. Volz et de la 'Ratio verae theologiae'* (Namur-Gembloux 1971) 215–217.

³³ CWE 70, 1–67, translated and annotated by Michael J. Heath.

³⁴ For this see G.J. Fokke, 'An aspect of the Christology of Erasmus of Rotterdam', *Ephemerides theologiae Lovanienses* 54 (1978) 161–187; ASD V.7, 194–195: 'Le montage de G.J. Fokke'.

the simplicity of the Gospel.”³⁵ The 2 commentaries on poems by Prudentius concern one on the subject of the Nativity and one on the Epiphany.³⁶ They are dedicated to Margaret Roper (1505–1544), Thomas More’s daughter, highly esteemed by Erasmus, who had just become a mother.³⁷

ASD VI: New Testament and *Annotationes* 10

ASD VI.10 is the final volume of the series on the New Testament, the first 4 volumes of which contain the Greek-Latin edition and the subsequent 6 contain Erasmus’ annotations on it, the *Annotationes*. This corpus, completed by the *Paraphrases*³⁸ (published later) that make up the *Ordo VII* in the ASD edition, forms the core of Erasmus’ work.³⁹ This volume contains the annotations from 1 Timothy up to Revelations. Here again we can see the extent to which Erasmus had been inspired in this work by the *Annotationes* of Lorenzo Valla (1407–1457),⁴⁰ although “his textual scholarship surpassed that of

³⁵ Tracy, *Erasmus of the Low Countries*, 75.

³⁶ Up to 1540 both comments followed on Erasmus’ *Commentarius in Nuce[m] Ovidii*: Ch. Béné, ‘Introduction’, ASD V.7, 308-309.

³⁷ Erasmus commemorated Margaret also in his Colloquy *Abbatis et eruditae* (ASD I.3, 403-408); inversely Margaret translated Erasmus’ *Precatio dominica*: John Archer Gee, ‘Margaret Roper’s English version of Erasmus’ *Precatio dominica* and the apprenticeship behind early Tudor translation’, *The Review of English Studies* 13 (1937) 257-271; see also R.J. Schoeck in CE II, 455-456; cf. Hilmar M. Pabel, *Conversing with God: prayer in Erasmus’ pastoral writings* (Toronto-Buffalo-London 1997) 109-154: ‘Interpreting the Lord’s prayer’, esp. 112-124.

³⁸ R.A.B. Mynors, ‘The publication of the Latin *Paraphrases*’, in: Robert Dick Sider (ed.), *New Testament Scholarship: Paraphrases on Romans and Galatians*, CWE 42 (Toronto-Buffalo-London 1984) xx-xxix; cf. Christ-von Wedel, *Erasmus of Rotterdam*, 97-110: ‘Erasmus the paraphrast’.

³⁹ Christ-von Wedel, *Erasmus of Rotterdam*, 79-96: ‘The New Testament Scholar’; cf. Jerry H. Bentley, *Humanists and Holy Writ. New Testamental scholarship in the Renaissance* (Princeton 1983) 112-193: ‘Desiderius Erasmus: Christian humanist’.

⁴⁰ R.J. Schoeck, ‘Erasmus and Valla: the dynamics of a relationship’, *Erasmus of Rotterdam Society Yearbook* 12 (1992) 45-63; Christ-von Wedel,

his predecessors.”⁴¹ Valla’s name occurs by far the most frequently in the references, even more so than that of Jerome, who was after all Erasmus’ mainstay in this: it is no coincidence that Erasmus is referred to as *Hieronymus redivivus*.⁴²

This volume includes the annotation to verse 7 of 1 John 5, with Erasmus’ commentary concerning the notorious *Comma Johanneum*: “dieser Konflikt um das *Comma Johanneum* dauert noch immer an” (this conflict over the *Comma Johanneum* still rages on).⁴³ The oh-so-intriguing digression about the trinity that bears witness to faith in Jesus Christ is shown in square brackets in many newer translations of the Bible. In the original version of the text, the Spirit and the water and blood sufficed in bearing witness in the earth, supplemented in the *Comma* by: “in heaven: the Father, the Word and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one.” This is not to dwell on this theological nicety and its impact on the religious contradictions of the time, but to highlight that Erasmus was very much aware of the historic nature of his texts and that it was only after some hesitation that he reached the textual version that, because it had been included in the Vulgate, would be authoritative.⁴⁴

Erasmus of Rotterdam, 54-59.

⁴¹ Bentley, *Humanists and Holy Writ*, 155.

⁴² Eugene F. Rice, Jr., *Saint Jerome in the Renaissance* (Baltimore-London 1985) 116-136; 242-248 (notes): “Hieronymus redivivus: Erasmus and St. Jerome.”

⁴³ M.L. van Poll-van de Lisdonk, ‘Einleitung’, ASD VI.10, XI-L; XLVIII.

⁴⁴ ASD VI.4, 27-111; extensive examination of ‘Codex 61 (Monfortianus) and 1 John 5, 7-8’; 482-484; VI.10, XLVIII, 540-551 and references, esp. H.J. de Jonge, ‘Erasmus and the Comma Johanneum’, *Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses* 56 (1980) 381-389 and Grantley Robert McDonald, *Raising the Ghost of Arius. Erasmus, the Johannine Comma and the religious difference in Early Modern Europe* (Brussels 2011).

ASD IX: *Apologiae* 6, 7, and 8

This concerns 3 volumes with apologies.⁴⁵ The first in this series contains Erasmus' contribution to the polemic with Alberto Pio (1475–1531),⁴⁶ the diplomat robbed of his principedom, Carpi, who, during the period in which Erasmus was polemicising with him, died in France as an asylum-seeker dressed in a Franciscan habit (which Erasmus would reveal in his Colloquium *Exequiae seraphicae*⁴⁷). Even though he realised that he was conversing with a dead man, Erasmus persisted with his polemic—*ludus exit in rabiem*, “the game became a fury.”⁴⁸ The second is addressed to the scribes at the theology faculty at the University of Paris.⁴⁹ The third—the first of the three chronologically—is a continuation of the publication of the polemic that the

⁴⁵ Erika Rummel, *Erasmus and his Catholic critics I: 1515-1522; II: 1523-1536* (Nieuwkoop 1989).

⁴⁶ *Apologiae adversus Albertum Pium*, ed. C.L. Heesakkers in collaboration with W.G. Heesakkers-Kamerbeek, ASD IX.6 (Leiden-Boston 2015); vgl. CWE 84: *Controversies*, ed. by Nelson H. Minnich, translated by Daniel Sheerin, annotated by Nelson H. Minnich and Daniel Sheerin: *Controversy with Alberto Pio* (Toronto-Buffalo-London 2005).

⁴⁷ ASD IX.6, 38-39; cf. Letter 2441 to ‘Eleutherius’ = Sebastian Franck (Freiburg im Breisgau, 6 March 1531), Allen VIII, 153-156, ll. 64-77; the colloquy: ASD I.3 (Amsterdam 1972) 686-699; CWE 40 (Toronto-Buffalo-London 1997) 996-1032 (with extensive annotation by the editor, Craig R. Thompson).

⁴⁸ ASD IX.6, 34: quotation from Letter 2108 to Hermann Phrysius (Basle, 25 February 1529), Allen VIII, 66-67, ll. 15-16; dispute with dead individuals, etc: ASD IX.6, 248-250, ll. 14-19; 364, l. 877: *Non est phas antipaizein* (in Greek) *in mortuum*; 552, l. 735: *Sed desino ludere in mortuum*; Chris L. Heesakkers, ‘Argumentatio a persona in Erasmus’ second apology against Alberto Pio’, in: J. Sperna Weiland and W.Th.M. Frijhoff (ed.), *Erasmus of Rotterdam: man of letters* (Leiden etc. 1988) 79-87; 81: colloquy *Exequiae seraphicae*.

⁴⁹ *Declarationes ad censuras Lutetiae*, ed. C.H. Miller and J.K. Farge, ‘Introduction’, ASD IX.7 (Leiden-Boston 2015); vgl. CWE 82: *Controversies* (Toronto-Buffalo-London 2012).

Spanish theologian Diego López Zúñiga,⁵⁰ later supported by Sancho Carranza de Miranda, had entered into with Erasmus, in particular concerning his publication of the New Testament.

Erasmus' initial response had already been published in this series (ASD IX.2), in which Erasmus' reactions to both criticisms now continues, whereby it should be noted that the whole of this polemic should be placed in the context of Erasmus' responses to critical comments made by a number of Spanish monks, which first appeared in 1528.⁵¹ It is hard to imagine that Erasmus was able to write these exhausting polemics, and indeed how he did so. In his ever-valuable Erasmus biography, Huizinga refers almost with sadness to these polemical activities:

Erasmus never emerged from his polemics. He was, no doubt, serious when he said that, in his heart, he abhorred and had never desired them; but his caustic mind often got the better of his heart, and having once begun to quarrel he undoubtedly enjoyed giving his mockery the rein and wielding his facile dialectical pen.⁵²

In his letter to Jacopo Sadoletto referred to earlier, Erasmus viewed the battlefield himself and concluded regretfully: "If only it were possible to unweave the past and begin again!"⁵³ Erasmus' regret primarily concerned his plea for the *libertas spiritus* that had led to no shortage of misunderstandings, when in fact all he had intended was to provide believers with some relief from ceremonial obligations in

⁵⁰ *Apologia contra sanctium Caranzam et quattuor contra Stunicam*, ed. H.J. de Jonge, ASD IX.8 (Leiden-Boston 2015).

⁵¹ Letter 1967, to Alfonso Manrique (Basel, 14 March 1528), Allen VII, 348-354; text: LB IX, 1015-1094.

⁵² Johan Huizinga, *Erasmus and the age of Reformation* (London 2002 [=1924]) 158; 177, cf. Allen I, 56-71; 68, ll. 445-447: "had he known that an age like theirs was coming, he would never have written many things, or would not have written them as he had."

⁵³ Letter 2312A [=Allen 2315], CWE 16, 295-306; ll. 308-309; cf. Allen VIII, 428-436; 435, ll. 299-300: *Utinam liceret omnia ab integro retexere!*

order to make them more open to true piety (*vera pietas*).⁵⁴ It is not too far-fetched to see in this one of Erasmus' reasons for going on to complete his *Ecclesiastes* after all.

* *

*

Erasmus, the networker in his letters, Erasmus the pastor, or at least the sympathetic adviser *in spiritualiis* in his pastoral writings, the grammarian / theologian in his edition of the New Testament with all the accompanying writings, and Erasmus the polemicist—all these aspects of his life and works complement each other. These publications, with their meticulous annotations and descriptions, form an almost inexhaustible source from which to draw freely, not least thanks to the registers. (Jan van Herwaarden, Erasmus University Rotterdam; translated by UvA Talen, University of Amsterdam, Translations)

◆ *La correspondance de Guillaume Budé et Juan Luis Vives*. Introduction, critical edition, and notes by Gilbert Tournoy. Preface and introduction by M. Mund-Dopchie. Supplementa Humanistica Lovaniensia, 38. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2015. 160 pp. This volume constitutes, by its own admission (7), a slim chapter in the history of the life and work of two giants of early sixteenth-century humanism. Only 10 of the letters exchanged by Guillaume Budé (1467–1540) and Juan Luis Vives (1493–1540) between 1519 and 1533 are known to us today. Indeed, one of these letters, the last presented in the present volume (Vives to Budé, Bruges 1533, 145–48), was included as a model letter in Vives' *De conscribendis epistolis* (1534) and, as such, was probably never intended to be sent. While thin, however, the book represents a new and genuinely interesting contribution to knowledge about the life and preoccupations of Budé and, to a lesser extent, Vives. The volume's success is in no small part due to the masterful treatment of the material by the two experienced editors, whose careful French translation, thorough critical handling of the Latin and Greek texts, and informative commentary make the

⁵⁴ Letter 1887 (15 October 1527), Allen VII, 198–201, ll. 11–15: ...; *ut vehementer doleam me quondam in libris meis praedicasse libertatem spiritus ... Optabam sic aliquid decedere ceremoniis ut multum accresceret verae pietati.*

book at once a useful tool for specialists and rewarding material for the interested reader.

The book's introduction (11–22) is economical, but nonetheless effectively contextualises Budé and Vives' correspondence: Intellectual life in Europe is dominated by Erasmus, but the figures of Budé, Vives, and Thomas More (1478–1535), whose surviving letters are outnumbered by those of Erasmus by more than ten to one (11), also have significant roles to play. Budé and Vives had met twice in Paris in May and then June of 1519. Their correspondence began shortly afterwards with a letter from Vives in June or July of the same year. This letter is now lost, but the reply from Budé survived, and it is with this letter (19 August 1519, 25–43) that the present volume begins. There followed an intense exchange of letters until 1521, the surviving testimony of which takes us to letter 7 of the present volume, before their correspondence dwindled for reasons proposed in the introduction (13–15). Towards the end of 1529, Vives wrote to Budé (letter 8, 129–36), expressing his wish to resume their fruitful discussions, and in the final surviving letter actually sent between the two (letter 9, 137–44), Vives responds to a request for advice from Budé by saying that it is not for him, as the younger of the two, to counsel the elder statesman. He does nevertheless eventually advise Budé to take care of himself and to take up a role as mentor if his health and competing commitments prevent him from standing in the first line of scholarship. Indeed, Vives' position in this letter is representative of his attitude throughout the correspondence, that of the younger and less experienced scholar who, though admiring his elder, nonetheless eloquently expresses his opinions to Budé and achieves his ends through careful writing.

The 10 surviving letters edited here represent a tiny fraction of the total correspondence between the two men. While Budé reworked and published the 6 letters in the collection that survive from him, the 4 by Vives had more varied fates (7). It is perhaps for this reason that the overall impression of the present volume is one dominated by Budé: it is Budé's personal life that is most often at the centre of discussion (his move to Marly, the slow unpacking of his library, his responsibilities in Paris, etc.); Budé's need for rest after the publication of his *De asse et partibus eius* (1515/1516) and, perhaps most

interestingly, Budé's reflections and concerns on his growing rivalry with Erasmus—often only tactically expressed in these letters—come to the fore. But this is not the fault of the editors, who have provided neat summaries and perceptive comments on each letter with a balanced respect for both authors.

Thus Tournoy and Mund-Dopchie's edition assuredly takes its place alongside the recent modern editions of Neo-Latin scholarly correspondence. The desire that some readers may feel for more detailed reflection on the literary aspects of the letters in the commentary (Budé develops, for example, a long combat metaphor in letter 2, which receives only cursory explanation in the notes) may well be better satisfied in a separate study. And specialised readers will appreciate the translation of Vives' eulogy of Budé (1522) in the volume's appendix, and the presence of a formal bibliography of secondary source material at its end. (William Barton, Ludwig Boltzmann Institut für Neulateinische Studien, Innsbruck, Austria)

◆ *Praelectio et commentaire à la Silve Rusticus d'Ange Politien (1518)*. Par Nicolas Béraud. Édition, traduction et commentaire de Perrine Galand, avec la collaboration de Georges André Bergère, Anne Bouscharain et Olivier Pédeflous. Travaux d'Humanisme et Renaissance, 537. Genève: Droz, 2015. LXX + 618 pp. Depuis son élégante traduction des *Silves* d'Ange Politien, précédée d'une substantielle introduction (Paris, 1987), Perrine Galand n'a cessé d'explorer à la fois l'histoire de ce genre protéiforme et la réception de l'humaniste florentin, en particulier dans la France de la Renaissance, comme en témoigne un grand nombre de ses travaux, parmi lesquels on rappellera son édition et sa traduction de la *Sylve Parisienne* de Joannes Vaccaeus (Genève, 2002) et plus récemment le collectif *La Silve. Histoire d'une écriture libérée en Europe, de l'Antiquité au XVIII^e siècle* (éd. avec Sylvie Laigneau, Turnhout, 2013). C'est donc tout naturellement que P. Galand s'est penchée sur le professeur et philologue natif d'Orléans Nicolas Béraud (c. 1470-ap. 1545), ami d'Erasme et de Guillaume Budé qui a contribué à introduire, avec l'éditeur Josse Bade, les travaux du Florentin dans les milieux humanistes parisiens. Dans ce volume, elle livre une édition critique du texte latin et une traduction française de la *praelectio* (leçon inaugurale) à la silve *Rusticus* de Politien pro-

noncée par Béroul à Paris au collège Tréguier le 9 novembre 1513, ainsi que des textes liminaires et du copieux et érudit commentaire qui l'accompagnent dans l'édition publiée chez Froben à Bâle en 1518. Le geste de Béroul forme une sorte de mise en abyme, puisque la silve *Rusticus* de Politien constitue elle-même une *praelectio* écrite en hexamètres dactyliques par laquelle le professeur introduisit son cours sur la poésie géorgique à Florence en 1483. Dans la fidèle traduction que donne P. Galand des textes de Béroul, le lecteur pourra regretter à l'occasion une absence d'actualisation qui aurait été bienvenue: pour rendre *Lutetia*, l'anachronique «Lutèce» a été préféré à «Paris»; quant aux dates, P. Galand a choisi de conserver le système du calendrier romain, utilisé par Béroul certes, mais qui s'avère d'une lisibilité discutable aujourd'hui et qu'il faut par conséquent gloser en note. A l'exclusion de cette (petite) réserve, la qualité de la traduction offerte par P. Galand force l'admiration, tout comme l'incroyable richesse de l'appareil de notes qui vient mettre au jour l'immense culture encyclopédique de Béroul en identifiant avec précision ses sources, tant antiques que médiévales ou modernes, et souligne les multiples enjeux de l'œuvre.

L'ensemble des textes de Béroul est précédé d'une introduction qui les replace dans leur contexte de composition et en dégage les principaux apports. Après une indispensable synthèse critique, P. Galand fournit d'importants renseignements bio-bibliographiques sur Béroul. L'introduction sait en outre mettre en évidence le rôle crucial qu'a joué Béroul en commentant la silve *Rusticus*: ce choix original d'auteur permet à Béroul de diffuser à Paris les théories poétiques novatrices de l'humaniste florentin d'une part, de montrer que la *translatio studii* se poursuit en France d'autre part. Une analyse de la *praelectio*, avec une utile mise au point sur ce genre pédagogique encore imparfaitement étudié, et du commentaire de Béroul vient nourrir une part importante de l'introduction, qui s'achève par la présentation des principes d'édition retenus.

L'ouvrage se clôt sur une bibliographie, en toute logique plus axée sur Béroul que sur Politien, ainsi que sur un précieux index des noms d'auteurs anciens, médiévaux et humanistes cités aussi bien par Béroul que par P. Galand; cet outil permet de circuler aisément dans le volume.

Avec ce beau livre, P. Galand procure au public savant une étude qui passionnera tous ceux qui s'intéressent non seulement au genre de la silve dans l'Europe de la Renaissance, mais aussi aux relais grâce auxquels l'héritage de l'humanisme italien a pu se diffuser dans les cercles intellectuels français au XVI^e siècle. Cette étude présente en outre un intérêt majeur pour qui travaille sur les productions littéraires pédagogiques telles que les leçons inaugurales ou les cours, encore trop peu connues en dépit de l'importance avérée par de multiples témoignages de ces pratiques scolaires et universitaires. (Lucie Claire, Université de Picardie Jules Verne, Amiens, France)

◆ *The Correspondence of Wolfgang Capito*, vol. 3: 1532–1536. By Wolfgang Capito. Translated by Erika Rummel. Annotated by Milton Kooistra. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2015. xxx + 515 pp. \$175. The book under review here constitutes the third of four volumes of the complete correspondence of the reformer Wolfgang Capito (1478–1541), the first part of which appeared in 2005. The first volume's themes were formative in nature, depicting a young humanist Erasmian advisor to the Archbishop-Elector of Mainz slowly losing and finding himself on the canvass of spreading confessional and doctrinal skirmishes of the budding Reformation. The second volume's horizons are broader and more open-ended, illuminating both the man who seems to have accepted his role as one of those "whom God has sent to defend the Word!" and his efforts to foster the victorious Reformation's blossoming in his adopted Strasbourg, with all the vicissitudes such an avocation entailed. The third volume covers correspondence from the years 1532 through 1536, which culminated in the Wittenberg Concord, a compromise negotiated by Capito and his colleague Martin Bucer between the Lutheran and Reformed churches. During this time Bucer became the leading theologian in Strasbourg, as Capito found that his efforts to mediate were not up to the increasingly partisan environment in which he found himself. The letters in this volume illustrate Capito's efforts to negotiate the Concord and to encourage churches in the various cities to accept it, along with his efforts to help settle other disputes that arose at this time. His reputation extended through Switzerland, Germany, and France, as his correspondence shows, but the majority

of the official letters from this period concern internal matters that needed the attention of the authorities in Strasbourg. These included financial questions and matters concerning the administration of the church, doctrinal questions as they affected public order, and the education of future ministers, and they often indicate collaborative efforts between the magistrates and the church. Many of the letters also contain information about Capito's personal life. He remarried during this period and also struggled against illness and financial difficulties. This was nevertheless a productive time for him, in that he published a translation of one of Erasmus's works, editions of two of Oecolampadius's commentaries, a pamphlet, and a volume of prayers. Much interesting material is to be found here.

Like the first two volumes, this one is based on Olivier Millet's finding list of Capito's letters, increased by about 20% to reflect a broader definition of what constitutes authorship by Capito. Texts that are easily accessible in modern works like the editions of Amerbach, Bucer, Luther, Vadianus, and other prominent scholars are summarized here but not translated, a decision that is debatable but that admittedly kept an already large project from expanding to possibly unmanageable proportions. The Latin and German texts on which the translations are based are also not printed, but they can be found on the project website, <http://www.itergateway.org.capito/>. As was the case with the previous volumes, the letters here are translated into idiomatic English and provided with a level of annotation that is more than adequate for an informed first reading of the text. All in all, this volume continues the success of its predecessors and offers a sense of relief that after more than a decade, the end of this worthy project is in sight. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Aulularia and Other Inversions of Plautus*. By Joannes Burmeister. Edited, translated, and introduced by Michael Fontaine. Bibliotheca Latinitatis Novae. Leuven: Leuven University Press 2015. XI + 278 pp. In contrast to other modern Neo-Latin editions, Fontaine (hereafter F.) starts the introduction (1–91) of his masterful edition of Johannes Burmeister's (1576–1638) 'inversions' of Plautus not with the ordinary bio-bibliographical information, but with a demonstration of what makes these receptions of Plautus peculiar and unique:

Burmeister had discovered that some of Plautus' comedies follow the same plot as certain biblical episodes. On this basis, he decided to rewrite biblical stories in the form of a Latin comedy and thereby to follow as closely as possible his formal model Plautus. In doing so, he had to change the names of the characters, but he kept the series of scenes and even the order and sequence of Plautus' single lines. In the best-case scenario, this meant not having to change a single element of a line, which got its new (i.e., biblical) meaning from its new context alone. This mixture of Plautus and the Vulgate, together with Burmeister's obsession with pranks and puns, makes his comedies an extraordinary example of the role that baroque form plays in the reception of Plautus. F.'s new edition of these comedies is therefore very welcome. In the following chapters of the introduction, F. deals with Burmeister's biography (17–32). Here he is able to correct some mistakes that have occurred in earlier studies on this Protestant pastor and author. F. gives an overview of Burmeister's other works (32–37), among which is also a *carmen heroicum* on St. John the Baptist. Then F. treats the single comedies in more detail: *Mater Virgo* (1621) tells the story of Christ's birth, modelled on Plautus' *Amphitryon* (37–49). Although the text of Burmeister's play is lost today, it was known to 2 scholars in the nineteenth century, out of whose works F. edits the fragments of the play (203–247). Completely lost is *Susanna* (1622–1624?), which rewrites Plautus' *Casina* (49–55). F.'s sketch of the 'Forschungsgeschichte' (55–64) of the lost *Asinaria* (1625) in the next chapter is very impressive; it is now clear that our knowledge of the play does not go back (as previously thought) to Sulzer, but to a handwritten note in Johann Albert Fabricius' *Bibliotheca Latina*—an impressive and convincing discovery. The longest chapter (64–91) deals with the *Aulularia* (1629), the edition of which forms the core of the book (93–201). In this play, Burmeister combines Plautus' *Aulularia* with the biblical story of the Israelites after their conquest of Jericho; the prostitute Rahab had hosted 2 spies before the conquest and was therefore spared. Although the Israelites' commander Joshua had declared the entire booty God's possession, Achan stole a treasure. God became angry and foiled the Israelites' attack on the city of Ai. Only when Achan, in whose tent Rahab sought refuge, is stoned to death, can the Israelites conquer Ai. Burmeister uses not only Plautus'

(incomplete) text, but also later supplements, one by an anonymous author and the other by Codrus Urceus. He wrote the play in exile in Hamburg, where he had to flee during the Thirty Years War. This biographical background is for F. the reason that frequent mention and criticisms are made of the destructive acts of plundering soldiers in the *Aulularia*. There follows a solid and reliable edition of the Latin text of the *Aulularia* and *Mater Virgo* (the line numbers of the Plautine model are indicated throughout). F. provides his reader with an English translation, where he attempts to imitate the numerous puns; if he does not succeed, he explains the pun in a footnote. The series Bibliotheca Latinitatis Novae can be proud of this volume from a distinguished Plautus expert, presenting an extraordinary piece of reception to their readers. (Florian Schaffenrath, Ludwig Boltzmann Institut für Neulateinische Studien, Innsbruck, Austria)

◆ *Oedipus Aegyptiacus* (1652-1654). By Athanasius Kircher. A facsimile edition with an introduction by Wilhelm-Schmidt Biggemann and an annotated index of authors and passages by Frank Böhling. Athanasius Kircher Hauptwerke, 3. Hildesheim, Zürich, and New York: Georg Olms Verlag, 2013. 4 vols. cxxiv + 440 + 470 + 572 + 851 pp. with 4 fold-out plates. In 1968 a West German organization calling itself the International Society for Research on Athanasius Kircher announced an audacious plan to publish the seventeenth-century Jesuit's *Opera omnia*, including reprints of all his books, collected correspondence, and unpublished manuscripts. Although a 1972 promotional brochure proclaimed the publication of the first of 66 promised volumes (available both in a standard edition and in a highly limited luxury edition "for Kings and State Presidents," priced at DM 50,000), in fact, the society never issued a single volume. The venture collapsed in scandal amid charges of financial malfeasance (attributed by the society's president and editor-in-chief to postwar Germany's most vicious character assassination campaign). Regardless of the proximate cause, it must be said that the time was not ripe for such an undertaking. In the 1970s Kircher was a marginal historical figure, typically dismissed as a fool or charlatan by those few scholars who mentioned him. But times change. In dramatic testimony to Kircher's twenty-first-century rehabilitation, the quixotic vision of the

Internationale Athanasius Kircher Forschungsgesellschaft has largely come to pass, albeit under the auspices of more conventional academic forces. First, the Institute and Museum of the History of Science in Florence and Stanford University made Kircher's surviving correspondence available online. And now, the German publisher Olms has begun to issue reprints of Kircher's *Hauptwerke*, including the work here under review. Ultimately, fourteen titles are slated for publication.

Oedipus Aegyptiacus is a remarkable specimen of seventeenth-century erudition. Ostensibly a solution to the riddle of the hieroglyphs, its 2,000 Latin pages—heavily larded with quotations in Greek, Hebrew, Arabic, Coptic and other oriental languages as well as hundreds of woodcut and engraved illustrations—amounts to a baroque encyclopedia of Egyptology, occult philosophy, antiquarianism, sacred history, paganology, and oriental philology. As such is it a valuable source for scholars interested in any of those topics. The book is divided into 3 main parts, distributed among 4 volumes. In part 1, Kircher lays the historical groundwork for his interpretation of hieroglyphic inscriptions by demonstrating the supposed links connecting ancient Egyptian culture to other pagan civilizations as well as ancient Judaism. The 2 volumes of part 2 comprise a dozen treatises devoted to sundry traditions that, according to Kircher, preserved aspects of the “hieroglyphic doctrine,” including Jewish Kabbalah, Arabic magic, astral medicine, and Hermetic theology. Part 3 presents Kircher's famously wrong interpretations of obelisks and other hieroglyphic monuments in Rome and elsewhere.

Wilhelm Schmidt-Biggemann, Germany's leading scholar of early modern philosophy, has supplied the first volume with a deeply learned introduction that readers of German will find quite useful. Following a summary of the structure of *Oedipus Aegyptiacus* (essentially, German translations of the titles and subheadings of the work's many divisions), the introduction comprises a concise overview of Kircher's life and works and descriptions of the book's main sections. Schmidt-Biggemann is primarily interested in Kircher as the architect of a philosophical system based on the ideal of universal knowledge and traditions such as *philosophia perennis* and Christian Kabbalah, and his interpretation reflects this outlook. Volume 4 has an extensive annotated index of all of the authors mentioned by Kircher in the course

of his work, compiled by Frank Böhling. Anyone wishing to study *Oedipus Aegyptiacus* deeply will find this section invaluable. Kircher's text is presented in a photographic facsimile of the original edition, similar in quality to a good microfilm. This is not a critical edition.

When I wrote my doctoral dissertation, I spent months working through *Oedipus Aegyptiacus* in the reading room of the Vatican Library. A decade later, as I completed the ensuing book, I consulted one of the numerous digital copies that by then had become freely available on the Internet. Both formats have advantages. But for sustained, slow reading of a long and difficult text, it is hard to beat the ease of use of an old-fashioned book. The miraculous proliferation of online digital copies of early modern books has been a tremendous boon to scholarship, but it inevitably threatens the viability of traditional reprints. Olms and the series editors are to be applauded for making hard copies of Kircher's work accessible beyond the confines of rare book rooms. (Daniel Stolzenberg, University of California, Davis)

◆ Siegmund Döpp. *Vaticinium Lehninense—Die Lehninsche Weissagung. Zur Rezeption einer wirkungsmächtigen lateinischen Dichtung vom 18. bis zum 20. Jahrhundert*. Noctes Neolatinae, 21. Hildesheim, Zürich, and New York: Georg Olms Verlag. 132 pp. 34.80 euros. Although the last few years have seen an increased interest in Neo-Latin works and, as a result, a remarkable number of editions, commentaries, and the like, an incredible number of texts still remain to be presented to a larger public. This is notably the case for smaller and relatively unknown texts, which have so far received minor attention from scholars but which have had particularly interesting historical impact.

The book under review represents a substantial effort to fill this gap: Siegmund Döpp dedicates an entire monograph to a hundred-verse prophecy poem, the *Vaticinium Lehninense*, including the Latin text, its German translation, a linguistic and historical commentary, and an overview of reception from the eighteenth up to the twentieth century. The prophecy treats the rise of the Protestants, the different dynasties reigning over the Mark Brandenburg (one of the most important provinces in the Holy Roman Empire), and their decline.

Döpp starts with a short, informative introduction to the *Vaticinium*, which is essential for the reader to deal with the text and the following chapters. The *Vaticinium* purports to be written by a monk, Frater Hermannus, in the monastery of Lehnin (situated near the city of Potsdam) in the thirteenth century. Döpp, however, informs us right at the beginning that this ascription is most likely not to be trusted: it is more plausible that the text is a forgery from the seventeenth century produced for the purposes of propaganda and manipulation.

After a short summary of the textual tradition (we lack an autograph but do have a large number of early modern manuscripts), he presents the Latin text, without an apparatus, to allow a quicker comprehension. The text is followed by a translation into German, which follows the original very closely. This helps provide an impression of the style in which the *Vaticinium* is written, but in some cases it might also obscure the meaning. The choice to structure the different paragraphs by using subtitles, as in prior editions of this text, is a helpful one, as it also supplies a summary of the content.

Then follows a short excursus on the word Israel (v. 94), which suffered from extensive misinterpretation and improper use during later centuries, especially in anti-Semitic contexts. This chapter is fundamental for the subsequent part focussing on the text's reception, but it might have been preferable to treat this particular aspect at a later point in the book, perhaps after the information of a more general kind that Döpp supplies in the next part. After a comprehensive overview of the contents, he starts with the interpretation of the *Vaticinium* by discussing the historical context and the origins of the text. He presents different theories about the identity of the author, which he carefully invalidates one by one, before arriving at the conclusion that the real author cannot be uncovered with our current state of knowledge. The only fact we can be certain about is that the text was written in the early modern era as a product of the religious tensions due to the Reformation and the Counter-Reformation. Döpp then focusses on linguistic aspects, such as the metre, the prosody, and other particularities that also strengthen the argument for the seventeenth century as the time of origin.

Especially attractive is the elaborate and lucid examination of the *Vaticinium's* reception. We are informed that the prophecy had gained popularity in the eighteenth century and became an important matter of interest in the nineteenth century. It had a considerable influence on German literature (one might mention Theodor Fontane and Margarete von Bucholtz), polemical writings during the revolution of 1848, and even sacred architecture. During the twentieth century, the *Vaticinium* was (mis-)used for political purposes such as the promotion of World War I or, later, as anti-Semitic propaganda. The book ends with a fine conclusion, condensing and explaining the reasons for the great importance of the *Vaticinium*. A very extensive bibliography as well as an index follow.

With his monograph about the *Vaticinium Lehninense*, Döpp presents a highly informative and fascinating work that illustrates the historical and political importance of a minor Neo-Latin text. It is to be hoped that more books like this will appear in the coming years. (Caroline Weber, Ludwig Boltzmann Institut für Neulateinische Studien, Innsbruck, Austria / Universität Würzburg, Germany)

◆ *Andreas Friz's Letter on Tragedies (ca. 1741–1744): An Eighteenth-Century Jesuit Contribution to Theatre Poetics*. By Nienke Tjoelker. Drama and Theatre in Early Modern Europe, 4. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2014. x + 295 pp. This book contains an edition and translation into English of a lengthy *Letter on Tragedies* and the Latin text of the *Analysis tragaediarum Racini* of Andreas Friz, a Jesuit who taught the poetry class at the University of Graz. The importance of this material is not immediately obvious, since the general assumption has been that Jesuit school drama had retreated into the colleges and was dying out in the eighteenth century. However as Tjoelker shows in her lengthy introduction, more plays were actually performed in the German-speaking areas between 1701 and 1773 than had been recorded for the period 1555–1700, and a significant amount of theoretical effort was still being expended by the Jesuits themselves during this later period. And Jesuit drama continued to develop in new directions, with meditational plays emerging in significant quantities, more plays getting into print, and additional performances taking place in individual classes.

Friz's treatise on tragedies takes the form of a letter to an unknown addressee, which allows him to react to common ideas about the Jesuit stage and to develop his own ideas. The letter discusses the purpose of drama, verisimilitude, and procuring the attention of the audience through clarity and delight. The main purpose of drama, he argues, is to purge the emotions and to instill the love of virtue and aversion to vice, such that the play teaches through pleasing, as Horace had recommended. Many of his contemporaries placed so much emphasis on spectacle and music that the moral imperative got lost. As one can see, Friz was influenced by Aristotle and Horace, but he developed an interpretation of classical French tragedy that differs from many of his colleagues, who preferred a moderate respect for the dramatic rules combined with an ornate and festive kind of theater; for Friz, the overriding aim of moral improvement could only be achieved by strict adherence to the three classical unities and to the concept of verisimilitude. A lengthy appendix takes up a second document, Friz's analysis of the tragedies of Racine. Each play is discussed using the same interpretive scheme: description of the story, list of characters, discussion of the plot, how the passions are aroused to evoke the love of virtue and hatred of vice, reflections on the relationship of the action to verisimilitude, characters, quotations regarding emotions and the most elevated feelings, and (sometimes) identification of prophetic scenes. In other words, Racine's plays are presented as if they were Jesuit dramas suitable for performance in the schools.

The texts for these two documents are found in Manuscript 938 of the University Library in Graz. Tjoelker's edition is the first published version of each. At the end of the day, one cannot argue that this material marks a decisive intervention into the history of drama as a genre, but it is valuable indeed for calling into question some of the prevailing assumptions about eighteenth-century Jesuit drama and showing how the broader quarrel of the ancients and moderns played out in this often-neglected area. Rescuing forgotten texts has always been an important part of what Neo-Latinists do, and Tjoelker has performed that service admirably here. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *El Latin en el Perú colonial. Diglosia e historia de una lengua viva.* By Ángela Helmer. Lima: Fondo editorial de la Universidad nacional mayor de San Marcos / Grupo Pakarina, 2013. 376 pp. Diglossia is not the same as bilingualism. In 1959 Charles A. Ferguson first applied the term ‘diglossia’ to situations in which the principal spoken language of a society has, in addition to its primary dialects, a ‘high,’ more codified variant. The high language acquired through education is used in writing and in formal speech, but not in ordinary conversation. Joshua Fishman enlarged this notion of diglossia in the 1970s to accommodate societies in which the high language was not related to the low varieties. Such scenarios are familiar to historians of Latin and vulgar Latin in Europe from late antiquity onwards.

Theories of diglossia have provided Ángela Helmer with a framework for her study of Latin in colonial Peru, in terms of relations between languages and the different kinds of status accorded them. This framework is outlined in Chapter 1: in accord with Fishman’s model, the high language, A, of power was Spanish; and the indigenous languages of Peru, such as Quechua or Aymara, constituted the lower variant, B. (That could not have been the case all over Peru: in some rural areas those Andean *linguas generales* must have retained their elevated position.) Helmer has discerned another diglossia between two further variants *within* A: cultivated written Spanish, and Latin, which was acquired exclusively in the urban environment of universities and seminaries.

As hinted by the parenthesis above, the geographical extent of *el Perú colonial* for this study is never directly defined, but Helmer is concerned with ‘the colonial Peruvian city’ (25). In fact her focus is on the lettered elites of Lima alone, although Chapter 2 adumbrates the broader social hierarchy, in terms of ethnic groupings. There it is shown that the colonial system of education served Spaniards, and the position of Latin in the curriculum led to its function as a ‘social marker’ (71–95). Chapter 3 then offers a cursory panorama of Latin’s reach from antiquity to the Renaissance (drawn from Roger Wright, Joseph Ijsewijn, Hans Helander, and others), with a notice of its presence in the Americas, especially in New Spain (113–16), before concentration on Peru (116–38). Richard Kagan’s chapter on Latin in *Students and Society in Early Modern Spain* (1974), which examined

the position of Latin in relation to Spanish with statistics for book production in both languages, would have usefully informed this account of Latin's role in Lima.

The account is presented synchronically, giving the impression that neither Latin nor the *virreinato* itself were subject to historical change or transformation. There are no references to successive European debates about Latin's value and utility (which came to have ramifications throughout Spanish America in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries) and barely a mention of the expulsion of the Jesuits from Spain's territories in 1767. The decree of expulsion had an immense impact on education and the social order all over the Americas, permanently diminishing the presence of Latin in school curricula in one stroke, if not eliminating it altogether. In a letter translated in Chapter 4, the Prior General of the Augustinians endorsed Charles III's decree, urging Provincial Fathers not to communicate with the Jesuits (157). Helmer herself had earlier referred to the events of 1767 to explain why the Guatemalan Jesuit Rafael Landívar composed his *Rusticatio Mexicana* in exile (116). But the drastic consequences for Latin in Peru of the sudden removal of the Jesuits are never addressed.

In Lima, as in Mexico City, Latin had been used in education and in religious and secular ceremonial contexts, and was a vehicle for poetry, academic treatises, eulogies, and inscriptions. Helmer comments on the obstacles to producing a comprehensive collection or survey of the texts: fire, war, neglect, and longstanding antipathy to scholastic and oratorical productions of the colonial period. Her study is confined to printed works in Latin or combining Spanish and Latin, listed in *Anexo 1* (193–302). Two catalogues, purportedly of all items printed in the colony, provide most of her primary data: *Imprenta de Lima* (1904–1907) compiled by José Toríbio Medina and volumes 7–12 of Rubén Vargas Ugarte's *Impresos peruanos: Biblioteca peruana* (1935–1957). As well as subsuming these, Helmer incorporates additional Latin and Latin-Spanish works she has located in library collections in Peru and the United States. Her more comprehensive catalogue usefully organises its entries into groupings according to their subject or context (religion, science, education, jurism, etc).

Four short exemplary texts are transcribed and translated to illustrate the varied functions of Latin in Chapter 4: an anonymous

Asclepiadaeum published in 1816 to honour Viceroy Joaquín de la Pezuela y Sánchez; the aforementioned 1767 letter to the Augustinian Provincial Fathers by their Prior General, Francisco Javier Vazquez; an 1804 treatise on chocolate by a student named José Urreta; and a 1716 oration by Pedro Peralta y Barnuevo to close his first year as Rector of the University of San Marcos—the speech is in Spanish but peppered with Latin tags and quotations. Helmer's translations of the Latin texts are provisional and approximate, as she indicates (153, 188), and they do contain errors. Oddly, the facsimiles of the imprints in *Anexo 2* are easier to read than the transcriptions: the latter are packed together without paragraphing, and with line divisions of the originals indicated by numbered *virgules*.

In her conclusion Helmer reaffirms her objective: to 'analyse the role Latin played in colonial Peruvian society from the perspective of diglossia' (189). This objective has been fulfilled, given the open acknowledgement that the 'colonial Peruvian society' surveyed here is that of the ecclesiastical and academic elites in Lima. Other scholars, as the author observes, have considered diglossia in Peru for its bearing on the power struggle between Spanish and indigenous languages, but the purpose of this study has been to highlight the extent to which Latin provided a 'mechanism of division.' That is a fair enough point to make, which no historian of Latin, whether in Europe or the Americas, would contest.

The interlingual dynamics, though, are more complicated than even the most flexible analysis conceived in terms of diglossia alone could reveal. Latin was not just a language which served as shibboleth at the top of the social pecking order. Latin was identified with grammar itself and was often referred to in Spanish as just that: *gramática*. As such, Latin was believed to have been refined from the vernaculars with which it coexisted, whether it had a close linguistic connection to those vernaculars (as with romances) or not (as with Germanic or Scandinavian languages). In the Americas, Latin arguably had a more intimate and intrusive relationship with indigenous 'vernaculars' than it did in Europe, in that it supplied a structure for systematising them in the process known as *reducción*. Leaving aside the contents of Fray Domingo de Santo Tomás's foundational *arte* of Quechua, published in 1560, the first word of the title—*Grammatica o Arte de la lengua*

general de los Indios de los reynos del Peru—bespeaks the extent to which Latin interacted and interfered with Amerindian languages.

With regard to diglossia *per se*, much more could have been revealed if manuscripts had been part of Helmer's purview: no reason is given for the stated decision not to take account of relevant manuscripts in Latin, Spanish, and other languages (124). Handwritten letters, journals, and memoirs can sometimes reveal or suggest patterns and practices in spoken language which printed texts do not. In the case of New Spain, for example, written sources reveal far more than printed materials about the role and function of Latin in relation to Spanish and indigenous languages, especially Nahuatl and Purépecha. Such evidence has to be taken into account to prevent a linguistic history from remaining grounded as a history of the book. As well as the documents in the Archivo de la Nación in Lima, there are heaps of papers in the Jesuit Historical Institute in Rome that were produced in Peru and remain to be edited. Fortunately those recording the Society's educational and missionary endeavours between 1565 and 1604 have been published in eight substantial volumes: the *Monumenta Peruana* (1954–1986) are daunting but essential sources. Archives in other Italian cities hold further writings by creole Jesuits from Peru who settled in the Papal States in the later 1700s.

The observations in the preceding paragraphs of this review are really offered as suggestions for future investigation and should not detract from the hard work that has gone into this book. *El latín en el Perú colonial* is an ambitious and complicated venture, attempting to stretch beyond linguistics and Hispanic studies to traverse Latin philology and cultural history. The 100 pages of Helmer's *Anexo I* alone, as a digest of the Latin and Hispano-Latin items collated from Medina and Vargas Ugarte, supplemented with new additions and classified by their subjects, are no mean feat and will serve as an enduring scholarly resource. Ángela Helmer ends her work by expressing the hope that others will be encouraged to pursue research in the same field. It is a field she has envisioned herself, and her contribution will make subsequent endeavours easier. (Andrew Laird, Brown University and University of Warwick)

◆ *Humanism in the Low Countries*. By Jozef IJsewijn. Edited by Gilbert Tournoy. *Supplementa Humanistica Lovaniensia*, 40. Leuven: Leuven University Press. 568 pages. 79.50 euros. The republication of previously published essays is often a fraught venture. My university's bibliometrics specialist recently told me that the most common number of citations received by scholarly articles is zero, which ought to give pause to someone thinking of republishing anything. And by definition, all the essays in this volume are available somewhere else; if someone wants to read an essay and incorporate it into his or her research, it can often appear in a researcher's inbox in 24 hours or less, given the increase in digital resources and the ever-growing sophistication of interlibrary loan services. Occasionally, however, there are good reasons to republish, and this is one of those cases. The author of these essays, Jozef IJsewijn, was one of those rare scholars who could truly be said to have established a field—in this instance, the modern discipline of Neo-Latin studies. He was the founding father of the International Association for Neo-Latin Studies and attended every one of its congresses until 1997, when the illness to which he would soon succumb kept him away. His *Companion to Neo-Latin Studies*, first in the single-volume edition of 1977, then in the 2-volume expanded version of 1990–1998 (prepared with Dirk Sacré), was until very recently the only such guide to the field and is still consulted regularly by everyone in the discipline. With Gilbert Tournoy, he edited for many years the journal of record in Neo-Latin Studies, *Humanistica Lovaniensia*, and ran the major research institute in the field, the Seminarium Philologiae Humanisticae at Leuven University. So the decision to republish these essays makes sense.

We find here 21 essays that cover the life and / or work of a single humanist from the Netherlands, the development of Neo-Latin literature in the Low Countries, or the relationship between humanism in the Low Countries and its counterparts elsewhere in Europe: “Un poème inédit de François Modius sur l'éducation du prince humaniste,” “The Beginning of Humanistic Literature in Brabant,” “Erasmus ex poeta theologus sive de litterarum instauratarum apud Hollandos incunabulis,” “Alexander Hegius († 1498), *Invectiva in Modos Significandi*: Text, Introduction and Notes,” “The Coming of Humanism to the Low Countries,” “The *Declamatio Lovaniensis de*

tutelae severitate: Students Against Academic Authority at Louvain in 1481,” “Annales theatri Belgo-Latini: Inventory of Latin Theatre from the Low Countries,” “Theatrum Belgo-Latinum: Neo-Latin Theatre in the Low Countries,” “Lo storico e grammatico Matthaëus Herbenus di Maastricht, allievo del Perotti,” “Het humanisme, de Nederlanden en Spanje,” “La fortuna del Filelfo nei Paesi Bassi,” “Supplementum *Phoenissis* seu *Thebaidi* Senecanae adiectum ab Henrico Chifellio Antverpiensi,” “Theognidis Sententiae a Francisco Craneveldio Latine versae (1541),” “A Correspondent of Lipsius: Roeland van Winckel / Rolandus Vinchelius,” “Humanism in the Low Countries,” “Humanisten uit de Nederlanden en Portugal [French translation],” “Umanisti del Nord in difesa dell’etica e della vera scienza: Erasmo-Vives-Tommaso Moro,” “La filologia umanistica nei Paesi Bassi,” “Latin and the Low Countries,” “Humanistic Relations between Scandinavia and the Low Countries,” and “Emblems in Honor of a Dead Poet (Natalis Rondinus).” Each essay appears as it was originally published, except for the correction of a handful of minor typographical errors. This was a good decision: the editor was tempted to add information and update bibliography, but this would have created a bibliographical mess, in that scholars would be forced ever after to indicate clearly which version of the ‘same’ essay they had used.

The republication of these essays constitutes a fitting homage to a giant in our field, a scholar whose work remains as relevant today as it was when the first of these pieces originally appeared exactly 50 years ago. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Poematia Moderna: Modern Latin Poetry*. Edited and translated by William Cooper. Wilmington, NC: Scaeva Press, 2014. xi + 298 pages. While the Golden Age of Neo-Latin poetry is undoubtedly long in the past, everyone knows that even today, some poets are still composing in Latin. The problem is that it is not easy to find this material. Other efforts to collect contemporary Latin poetry have been made—one thinks of the volumes edited by Dirk Sacré and Anna Radke—but these anthologies are often difficult to find, and none offers any pretense of completeness. So the volume under review is welcome indeed.

Poematia Moderna presents over 300 Latin poems by 69 poets from 17 nations, most from the preceding century but some from this one as well. Many of these writers, as we might expect, are not household names, but some, like Giovanni Pascoli, are well-known poets in their own right and a couple, like Wolfgang Schadewaldt and Michael von Albrecht, are renowned classicists whose verse compositions will come as a surprise to those who know only their traditional scholarship. The most common meters are elegiac couplets, Sapphic and Alcaic stanzas, and dactylic hexameters. Poets like Fidel Rädle use rhyme successfully, Ton Smerdl writes in a kind of free verse, and on p. 94 we even find Latin haiku. The themes, in the end, are not much different from poems written in any language, at any time—love, friendship, nature, mortality, God, and family—but there are peculiarly modern takes, including the Big Bang, bikinis, cell phones, heart transplants, and skateboards, things that initially, at least, sound odd in Latin.

The best way to sing the merits of this collection, I believe, is to let it speak for itself, through a range of examples. Some of the poems, like “In patris obitum” of Orazio Bologna, could have been written two thousand years ago:

Te Deus, alme pater, iustis soletur in aevum
 Muneribus. Lumen luceat ipse tibi.
 Terra levis solamen adhuc tibi praebeat alnum,
 Collacrimante, pater, coniuge, prole tua.

Others, like “Quaeris cur” by Eric Johnson, are just as serious, but are clearly the products of our time:

Puer vidi fratres slavos
 Et Judaeos condemnatos
 Capitis Germanice;

Deinde Mortem exaudivi
 Voce saeva et servili
 Eloqui Slavonice;

Posthoc ipse cum Vandalis
 Militans Americanis
 Deliravi Anglice.

Quaeris cur Latina canam,
 Cur hac lingua versus pangam.
 Quod non olet sanguine.

Not everything has to be serious, although for soccer fans like Pietro Bruno, the tirade against the hated Roman squad Lazio mixes humor with venom in “In quondam arbitrum certaminis harpasti dirae”:

O barbe arbiter ac inique iudex
 Tu quid saepe aciei nihil merenti
 Mendosae Latiae favere es ausus,
 Quae in rete ingerere impotens habetur
 Follem (nam manibus vetatur uti):
 Quaenam convicia probrosiora
 Pro tuo crimine, ultor haud benignus,
 In tuum facinus vomam pudendum?
 Rebus qui Latiis studet misellis
 Profari nequit intumente bile,
 Quod indigna satis putatur certe
 Quam Victoria das ei repente,
 O trifucifer arbiter spuende!

Others, like the two little poems entitled “Telephonum mobile,” incline still further toward the *dulce*, although there is just enough *utile* to make them worth a moment’s thought:

Machina parva tibi, quamvis sit noxia, prodest:
 Dum delet cerebrum, nuntia multa tenet.

Effigies passim rapide transmittere possum:
 Ne tunicam ponas, casta puella, cave!

Enough said, I think. Just order the book, and enjoy! (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)