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The story of the Gunpowder Plot and its importance and remarkable endurance in the English calendar are well known. Less well known, it turns out, is the remarkable cultural industry it spawned in the political manipulations and negotiations of the long seventeenth century. Anne James’s magnificent study tells the story of the complex interplay between government attempts to maintain an official version of these events in the public memory and the inevitably divergent interpretations, both official and non-official, literary and non-literary, that sprung up around the Plot’s anniversary remembrances. James’s main contribution to scholarship on the Gunpowder Plot is her focus on genre—specifically, how this contested event led to generic adaptation and modification—with a secondary interest in audience and reception, specifically, how these representations enabled audiences to engage in the interpretation and meaning-making opportunities of these annual commemorations. Thus, a third interest is to see these forms of cultural engagement as eruptions of a nascent public sphere (building on the work of Rebecca Lemon and others), where interest and engagement by the public in political events is assumed, but where representation of these events often escapes official control by the state, leading to generic adjustment and modification and opportunities for various public voices to present differing versions of these events and their meaning for the English nation.

After laying a clear roadmap for her study in an introductory chapter, James establishes historical context in chapter two, outlining the way in which King James developed a culture of commemoration to disseminate a providential view of England’s Protestant history and identity. This history begins with Queen Elizabeth and her government’s use of printed material, alongside other public channels (chiefly the pulpit), to contain and control public knowledge and opinion on key moments of national deliverance in forging a national memory through occasional acts of thanksgiving. North of the border, in response to a threat of his own in the Gowrie conspiracy, King James
of Scotland adopted and adapted this tradition, adding the crucial element of annual celebration. In merging and consolidating these traditions in the Gunpowder Plot anniversary within the national calendar and collective consciousness, James saw opportunity to memorialize the founding of a new national identity in a unified England and Scotland. Attempts to shape public memory through sermons, liturgies, and official printed accounts, however, were from the start undermined by competing voices in print and pulpit that engaged and involved the public in remembering and interpreting political events. While King James was able to knit these English and Scottish traditions in the annual Gunpowder Plot remembrances, he and his successors were not so able to maintain an official narrative or control the form and tack these remembrances would take.

Chapter three demonstrates King James’s failure to control the narrative of events with an examination of how the theatre evoked, alluded to, and invited reinterpretation of the Plot and its aftermath (in particular the spectacle of the plotters’ trials) and raised questions about the motives of the conspirators and the response of the King and his advisors. This chapter looks at how the trials and official representations of them were shaped by dramatic convention (particularly tragedy), and in turn, how the stage itself adopted and adapted its own theatrical conventions to interrogate that official narrative. James examines three plays written and performed within a year of the Plot—John Day’s *The Isle of Gulls*, Ben Jonson’s *Volpone*, and Thomas Dekker’s *Whore of Babylon*—and how they responded to the Plot and to each other, the first two adopting a satiric mode to echo suspicions of Cecil’s motives and handling of the Plot, and the latter resurrecting Elizabethan allegory to question James’ role and efficacy in managing the Catholic threat. Critique of this failure to contain the threat posed by the conspirators is the central theme in the author’s extended analysis of Jonson’s *Catiline, his Conspiracy*. In Sylla’s ghost, which opens the play, Jonson adapts the conventional ghost of Elizabethan theater as an elusive specter of ambition-fueled rebellion and destruction whose threat is expressed in Catiline, an infection that cannot be contained or managed by the ruling authorities and institutions, whose own rhetoric and posturing raise complicating questions of motive and ambition. Jonson also brings back into the public memory the role
of women, elided in the official narrative of the Plot, who are recast in *Catiline*’s context as recusants working behind the scenes to enable the conspirators, raising again the suggestion that religion served as a support for the plotters’ ambition. The chapter ends by briefly tracing the resurgence of Jonson’s play later in the seventeenth century and various adaptions of Jonson’s ghost of rebellion into non-dramatic forms, from an unpublished epic by Thomas Campion to anonymous satire in the 1680s.

Chapters three and four focus on Virgilian epic and King James’s project of a new Protestant Britain comprised of a unified England and Scotland founded in a historic moment of providential deliverance and sustained through the king’s self-styled paternal care. Those seeking patronage at court in the early aftermath of the Plot recognized and responded to the king’s agenda in kind with Latin epics circulated in manuscript; but again, these authors exploited the epic tradition to both praise and offer critique and advice, urging vigilance in the face of continuing threat from the Catholic other. This chapter takes us into relatively unfamiliar territory, with works by lesser known authors like Michael Wallace, William Gager, and Francis Herring, as well as Phineas Fletcher and Thomas Campion. More strident Protestant voices take over as epic narrative moves from manuscript into print and from Latin into English. Particularly interesting in this context is the curious case of Herring’s 1609 sequel treating the Midlands rebellion, which signals a turn to a more militant form of protest epic as it becomes oriented toward a broader general public. This history provides context for an extended reading of Milton’s *In Quintum Novembris* (the last extant Latin epic), where Milton expresses doubt about the ability of the monarch to preserve the Protestant nation, concerns that are completed in John Vickars’s “dilations” of Herring’s poem, which “completes the genre’s transformation from court panegyric into godly propaganda” (25). This backdrop sets the stage for Milton’s re-envisioning of a Christian heroism located not in the state or its institutions, but in the individual, leading to a much enriched reading of Milton’s use of gunpowder in the war in heaven.

The final chapter returns to one of the state’s official channels of commemoration to re-examine the founding of a new genre, the anniversary sermon, which became not only an opportunity for the
ruler to reestablish authority, but also a platform for the preacher to provide counsel to power and to negotiate the role of church and state in the face of threats from Catholicism and then Puritanism. Again, the author’s interest is the development of genre in relation to official versions of events. This is perhaps the most vivid example of how King James’s success in establishing an enduring tradition of official memorialization yielded unintended consequences. After a brief introduction to the establishment of the anniversary sermon and some of the factors involved in interpreting sermon literature, James focuses on four sermons as examples of how preachers adapted the form to address their particular circumstances and, in particular, how they related the Plot to their audiences. John Donne’s 1622 anniversary sermon, intended for Paul’s Cross and delivered in the shadow of King James’s Directions for Preacher, sought to maintain obedience to the king in avoiding blatant anti-Catholicism while structuring key points of the sermon in such a way as to open up opportunity for his congregation to interpret events for themselves. Reading practices and interpretation become explicit points of controversy in the Laudian establishment’s attack on Henry Burton for his series of controversial Plot sermons in 1636, where the preacher employed critical close-reading of recent revisions to the Plot liturgies to call into question Laud’s Protestant commitment. Seth Ward, preaching to Charles II in 1661, viewed his court congregation quite differently than either Donne or Burton, “seeing them not as competent interpreters, but as potential subversives needing to be coerced into submission” (239).

Poets, Players, and Preachers is an ambitious book, as rewarding as it is challenging, covering a wide range of genres stretching across a hundred years of history and drawing on a wide range of scholarship and theory. In covering such vast territory, James wisely chooses to focus on a few illustrative (rather than entirely representative) samples contextualized by historical surveys of their respective generic fields. In some of the more unfamiliar terrain (the Latin epic chapters, for example), I found myself wishing for a bit more context, but the author makes excellent use of chapter introductions and conclusions to recap and continually reorient the reader.
Angela Andreani. *The Elizabethan Secretariat and the Signet Office: The Production of State Papers, 1590–1596*. xvii, 204 pp. $149.95; eBook $49.46. Review by Dennis Flynn, Independent scholar.

The inaugural volume in a monograph series to be published by the Society for Renaissance Studies, this book examines in detail papers that were produced by central offices of the Elizabethan regime between the death of the queen’s principal secretary Sir Francis Walsingham and his replacement by Sir Robert Cecil. Study of this six-year vacancy is informed by the research of G. R. Elton on Tudor administrative processes as means to gauge how the Tudor state worked and by the work of Penry Williams on change and continuity in Tudor governance.

During the first three years of the vacancy William Cecil, baron of Burghley (who had been Walsingham’s predecessor), continued as the most senior and active Elizabethan administrator, gradually doling out secretarial responsibilities to his son, who was being trained as an administrator through “a hands-on approach” in both reading and revising “a vast amount of papers,” thus gaining familiarity with the processes and jurisdictions of a “network” of offices and officers within and intersecting with the sphere of the royal secretariat. About halfway through the vacancy, while this education of Sir Robert Cecil was proceeding, Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex, received appointment to the Privy Council and became a competing factor in influence, if not control, over state administration. Here the work of Paul E. J. Hammer informs Andreani’s analysis. Essex developed his personal secretariat and tried with some success to place clients within the existing structure of scribal and secretarial functions.

These already included a work force of secretaries and scribes stationed in Burghley’s household (principally Henry Maynard), clerks of the Signet Office (Thomas Lake and Thomas Windebank), the Latin and French secretaries (Sir John Wolley and Charles Yetsweirt), the Keeper of the State Papers (John James), and the clerks of the Privy Seal, among other secretaries and scribes. Key figures were the signet clerks, Lake and Windebank, and the Latin secretary Wolley, all members of an “‘inner circle’ very close to the Cecils and to the monarch.”
The work was carried on in a number of locations, mainly depending on the whereabouts of the royal court from time to time. Whitehall was the chief royal residence, but Hampton Court, Greenwich, and Richmond palaces were also used by the secretariat at times during the year. At Whitehall palace the administrative offices were near the Privy Council chamber, separated from the royal lodgings by the same narrow gallery, so that clerks and councillors alike were within easy reach whenever papers in production needed to be reviewed or signed by the queen. Thus “the activity of clerks physically took place across the precincts of the inner court as they moved to and from the privy lodgings and their offices.” At the same time, some of the work was also done by non-governmental, personal secretariats of chief ministers, predominantly (especially early in the vacancy) by Burghley’s secretaries at Cecil House in the Strand.

By 1590 an official State Paper office had been established in a muniment room at Whitehall. Papers kept here circulated to the rooms of clerks and secretaries and even to private residences, where work sometimes went on. The systematic accumulation of these records, beginning in the 1590s seems to have been begun by John James, Keeper of the State Papers, prior to whose work the papers were “scattered” among the shelves and storage chests, a number of them “on loan to government departments and antiquaries.” But the collection of James at Whitehall was not the only collection; another quantity were the property of Burghley, accumulating since then and now known as the Cecil Papers at Hatfield. Other collections also existed or came into existence.

These accumulated documents were of several kinds, all “official instruments of state governance.” Another important repository already before the end of the sixteenth century was the court of Chancery at Westminster, where writs drawn up by the royal secretariat would end in grants of land, appointments, and treaties, through a process leading, after warranting by the Privy Seal and signet, to documents issued under the Great Seal. These warrants under the smaller seals initiated all letters patent, leases, warrants, and legal writs. Another major category of documents issuing from the secretariat was royal letters, both personal and diplomatic.
The vital center of Andreani’s research is presented in two chapters: “The State Papers and Cecil Papers” and “Work in the Signet Office.” These survey and analyze the contents of repositories of royal papers, then comparing them to the registers used by clerks of the secretariat to record their activities. By these means the aim is to “reconstruct the dynamics of production at court” and the “inner workings of the Elizabethan secretariat” in order to analyze quantitatively and qualitatively the “forms and physical characteristics of the papers.” Production of royal letters is distinguished from production of various executive instruments (e.g. warrants and letters of instructions), revealing the relationships between autograph and scribal copies, multiple versions of single letters, sealing, and other multiple layering and complexity in the modes of production.

Building on the work of such scholars as Sarah Jayne Steen, Henry Woudhuysen, Heather Wolfe, James Daybell, and Daniel Starza Smith, Andreani brings the material features of manuscript letters to indicate the nature of the documents, including revisions by separate hands in multiple copies; various techniques of record-keeping; and secretarial folds, creases, and uses of white space; handwriting; paper; and watermarks. These can establish social implications of the material artifacts, scribal identities, and lines of transmission between offices and persons. Among question addressed are “how many people put hands on papers; who they were or to which offices they can be associated (hence, which offices were involved in the production of state papers); how papers passed through offices; why certain types of papers survive in the archives; and how they reflect the material reality of production.”

Of special interest is the role played both before and during the vacancy by the queen’s Latin Secretary, Sir John Wolley. A letter by Thomas Lake to Sir Robert Cecil shortly before Cecil’s appointment as Principal Secretary reviews the full process carried out by the royal secretariat from the point of view of a signet clerk. “As can be sensed from these dense lines and specific instructions, the work of the secretariat surrounding the production of royal papers was a complex matter, and even a single letter could involve several people.” Among the people with functions mentioned by Lake to Cecil, only Wolley is named. Wolley may have been uniquely able to maintain continu-
ity during the vacancy after the death of Walsingham, sharing the responsibilities of a principal secretary. He was “a senior minister, in service as secretary since the 1560s, and was sworn to the Privy Council on 30 September 1586. He held many positions at court: he was chancellor of the Order of the Garter on 23 April 1589, keeper of the records of the court of augmentations, and clerk of the pipe in the exchequer from 19 February 1592 until his death” in February 1596. Only after Wolley’s death did Cecil secure the official secretaryship.

This book is informative and generally important for anyone working with early modern English State Papers and other collections of government instruments and correspondence; it is a book such as many scholars for many years have imagined in desideration; historians, literary scholars, and editors will find it useful.


This immensely erudite book focuses on Milton’s rich and varied experience with Italy—its art (particularly opera), its people, its theology, its literature, and the myths that surround it in Protestant England. At times, Martin is relentlessly polemical and seems to imply that everything valuable in Milton’s life and thought emerged from Italy, almost to the exclusion of the native tradition. While her enthusiasm for Renaissance Italy is infectious and admirable, an unfortunate byproduct of her Italophile perspective is her tendency to ignore or depreciate other influences and to focus on Milton’s putative Italian sources at the expense of the intrinsic value of his own art and the originality of his thought.

It is difficult to engage with all of the complex and challenging subjects related to the themes of this rich and challenging book, so I have restricted myself to four topics: Milton and Dante, Edmund Spenser, Freedom of Expression, and Italian Opera. I shall conclude with an account of my appreciation of Professor Martin’s contribution to the subject of Milton and the totality of the Italian experience
during the Renaissance.

**Milton and Dante**

There is no shortage of comparisons between Milton’s *Paradise Lost* and Dante’s *Divine Comedy*, but I want to restrict my remarks to Beatrice, Ulysses, the Son, and Satan.

Martin traces Milton’s concept of the beatific vision back to Dante, where it is enshrined in Beatrice, who combines the radiance of the Son and the musical harmonies of God’s angels: “This beatific vision is at once indescribable and summed up in Beatrice, the counterpart of the Son’s light-reflecting face and the angel’s musical harmonies in *Paradise Lost*” [*Paradise Lost* 7.179–91] 258. The comparison of Beatrice and the Son is boldly intriguing, connecting the two poems in a new and startling way.

Martin also explores a parallel between Dante’s Ulysses and Milton’s Satan. According to Martin, “Milton’s Satan is a type of Ulysses as surely as Beelzebub is a type of Diomedes. All are ‘nobly’ dedicated to courageously forging ahead against impossible odds, successfully rousing their troops … but he [Ulysses] leads them only to a miserable death and then to hell. Yet Dante’s hypocritical, self-serving, but also attractive Ulysses seems ‘marked by greatness’ and even as implicitly exalted by his author as Milton’s Satan, creating obvious problems for readers” (252). Of course Milton was free to encounter Ulysses directly in the *Odyssey* without experiencing the ambivalence of Dante’s portrait, or creating problems for his readers.

**Edmund Spenser**

The poetry of Edmund Spenser was obviously important to Milton, but Martin attempts to marginalize and even to trivialize its significance. Milton is said to prefer the dialogic mode of Dante, as opposed to the narrative mode employed by Ariosto, Tasso, and Spenser (76). As for Spenser’s characters, his Una and Florimell are taken to task because, unlike Milton’s Lady, “neither can repel lustful intentions without an entire host of helpers” (236). Milton is also praised for his supposed “refusal to follow Spenser in taking entire episodes or characters from a single Italian source [Ariosto]” (236). There is no evidence that Milton made a conscious refusal to follow Spenser’s
example here; it is simply a way of suggesting that Spenser’s practice was inferior to Milton’s. Martin then goes into full polemical mode, praising Milton’s originality over Spenser’s, and claiming that Milton achieved greatness by rejecting the native tradition and embracing the great traditions of Italy: “Milton’s borrowings remain far less obvious than Spenser’s wholesale adaptations because his epic plot is at once more original and more completely blended with classical antecedents.” (245). “Spenser’s appropriation of Ariosto and Tasso may have led the way, but *Paradise Lost* is not in the end a very Spenserian or even terribly English poem. Its greatness lies in transcending its roots by absorbing the vast epic, pastoral, and tragic traditions ultimately inherited from abroad” (260-61). In my view, Martin depreciates Spenser’s influence on Milton to divert the reader from the native to the Italian tradition.

**Freedom of Expression**

Martin’s analysis of Milton’s writings indicates that he was no advocate for freedom of speech or expression, particularly for Catholics. According to his tract *Of True Religion*, “even the private practice of Catholicism should remain illegal” (97). Milton also “agreed with the Italian controversialist Paolo Sarpi that there must be limits to free discourse” (203). He was also in favor of limiting “unbalanced” speech (97). And although Martin does not refer directly to the work, of course, in *Areopagitica* Milton denies the right of free expression for Roman Catholics. Milton also had an almost fanatical obsession with beneficed clergy and the church they represent, coming up with a plan to destroy church and clergy altogether: “Milton simply applied the most extreme solution to clerical malfeasance, denying the church and its clergy state property as well as income” (205). Thus in proposing an extreme solution to alleged “clerical malfeasance,” Milton struck another blow at freedom of expression. There is also Milton’s shameful attack on Alexander More for a work that Milton knew that More had not written (53).

It would appear, then, that Milton was hostile to both personal and institutional freedom of expression. The question of whether anyone was listening or cared about Milton’s religious opinions is not taken up by Martin. Despite objections from some scholars, there is no hard
evidence that Milton ever joined a particular religious community or participated in church services of any Protestant sect. He was, in fact, a church of one. The *De Doctrina Christiana*, even if he did write it, does not in any way prove that Milton was a practicing Christian. He was in the thick of religious controversy, but his poetry, in my view, stands apart from his prose tracts and maintains its enduring value irrespective of his religious opinions.

**Italian Opera**

While Milton was present in Italy when operas and oratorios were extremely popular, their influence on his actual works is highly speculative. We do know that Milton attended one comic opera at the invitation of Cardinal Barberini; in his thank-you note, he “waxes ecstatic over the singing of the Roman ‘swan,’ Leonora Baroni” (49). In a highly subjective analysis of *Samson Agonistes*, Martin connects the poem and Milton himself both to opera (which Milton had seen) and oratorio which, (as far as we know), he hadn’t. Thus Samson is taken to be an operatic victim, perishing to the discordant strains of operatic melodrama. But it is a bit over the top to claim that “Milton’s emphasis on emotion creates [in *Samson Agonistes*] an ‘operatic’ tragedy of human suffering” (271) or indeed to claim that “Milton is also closer to both the Italian opera and oratorio composers since his tragic hero experiences the catharsis that Aristotle thought the audience should undergo” (273).

**Milton and the Italian Experience**

Martin makes it very clear that Milton, from an early age, loved everything about Italy (save Catholicism): its language, its poets, its music, its art and literature, its landscape, and its people. It was in effect his second country, if not his first.

According to Martin, the diehard Protestant Milton separated, in his own mind, his many Italian friends from the institution of the Roman Catholic Church, which he despised (41). Milton also claimed that he always supported Protestantism in the midst of Italy’s Catholic state and people, but we have only his word for that. Martin refers to this situation as “the almost monumental problem of reconciling Milton’s at times virulent anti-Catholicism with his almost equally
astonishing tolerance toward his Italian Catholic hosts and their co-
religionists” (81).

Martin is very perceptive in exploring the connections between
Dante’s Beatrice, Petrarch’s Laura, and Milton’s Eve. She does, how-
ever, place too much significance on Milton’s (perhaps fictionalized)
encounter with Amor in Elegia Septima, turning Milton into a woebegone
Petrarchan lover: “Like Dante’s initial vision of Amore, Milton’s
experience—although highly fictionalized—signals a key turning
point in his life. He now recognizes that the onset of manhood does
not mean liberation but submission to the feminine principle” (188).
I can’t fathom how Martin derived such a conclusion from Milton’s
dreamy erotic experience!

Martin speaks eloquently on Reformed and Roman Catholic
doctrine, the Council of Trent, Roman politics, Neoplatonism, and
possible Italian sources for Milton’s Grand Style. She has written
an ambitious, controversial, eloquent study of the relation between
Milton and all phases of Italian culture.

David Marno. Death Be Not Proud: The Art of Holy Attention. Chicago:
University of Chicago Press, 2016. xi + 315. $40. Review by Darryl
Tippens, Abilene Christian University.

If literary criticism at its best awakens one to fresh ways of see-
ing old texts, makes insightful connections previously missed, or
broadens the horizon of interpretation, then David Marno’s study
of John Donne’s Holy Sonnets counts as a major new book in the
world of Donne studies, as it delivers admirably on all counts. In this
phenomenological approach to the Holy Sonnets, Professor Marno
takes the reader on a long and historically rich journey through major
philosophical, religious, and literary sources to demonstrate that early
modern philosophers knew something that contemporary scholars
generally do not, namely that religious practices, sacred poems, and
thinking are related matters: “early modern projects of devotion,
devotional poetry, and philosophy had a shared interest in holy at-
tention” (218).
“Attention” holds a particular meaning in Marno’s study, transcending the modern psychological sense of a faculty of the mind (“the mind’s capacity to focus” 227). Employing theological and philosophical insights from late antiquity to the early modern period, Marno maintains that in its seventeenth-century context “attention” signifies both a disposition and a practice. It is:

…both the beginning and the end of philosophy, a disposition necessary to start thinking, and a disposition that is the result of thinking. In this book, I have tried to show that the precedent for attention’s role in thinking is holy attention’s role in prayer and poetry. By making attention a foundational concept in their philosophical and scientific systems, seventeenth-century thinkers such as Descartes and Malebranche participated in the process of appropriating a religious ideal…for them the devotional associations of attention as a practice and as a disposition were still primary. Their philosophies simultaneously enact the art of holy attention and begin the process of secularization. (227-28)

Malebranche’s claim that philosophical thinking is a form of devotion is central to Marno’s project: “The mind’s attention is a natural prayer that we address to the internal Truth, so that it may reveal itself to us. But this sovereign Truth doesn’t always answer our desires, because we do not know how to pray to it” (1, 229). With the essential connection between early modern philosophy and Christian devotional practices in mind, Marno finds much to say about Donne’s Holy Sonnets, which can be read as both lyrical prayers and attention exercises, simultaneously manifesting innate challenges to holy attention and providing the means to overcome them.

In Marno’s approach to Donne’s religious poems, doctrinal content recedes in importance: “propositional knowledge is subordinated to devotion, and devotion itself becomes a form of knowledge” (131). The critic employs a literary-critical approach called epoché, which entails a suspension of judgment, allowing the sonnets to “raise their own questions about their historical and conceptual contexts.” The reader, then, “instead of making assumptions about the ontological status of any entity the texts refer to (the ego, God, the resurrected body) … [tries] to rely on the poems’ language to recover how these entities are
construed in and by the poems” (34). While Marno acknowledges that Donne’s sonnets “gesture toward a theological concept or devotional practice whose understanding necessitates going beyond the poem itself” (34), a phenomenological approach liberates the reader from the need to establish Donne’s particular theological orientation in any particular work. Instead, the book privileges “the literary over other types of evidence” (5).

Marno is devoted to a close reading of Donne’s religious poetry “to see how it might confirm or problematize the conceptual or historical information [gathered] from external sources” (34). The poems do not “posit propositionally anything about their references,” Marno maintains, but serve as “representations of their speakers’ thought experiments” (34). Donne “audaciously experiments with a poetics whose ultimate aim is not only to cultivate attention or to depict the struggle with distraction, but to actually achieve a state of intransitive attention. This objective sets Donne’s poetry apart from virtually all of its precedents” (145).

To demonstrate that the poems “are already phenomenologies” (34), Marno offers close readings of selected Holy Sonnets and “La Corona.” “Death be not proud,” is analyzed with particular care twice—first in Chapter 1 and again in Chapter 7. The author shows how the art of attention works:

…Donne’s poems are meant to be devotional proofs insofar as their purpose isn’t just to allow a speaker to think a Christian doctrine but also to think it with cognitive certainty. This suggests an unusual sense of proof. In the poems, the doctrine appears certain, not when it is logically or empirically proven, but when the speaker experiences it as a thought occurring to him. Since this experience occurs within and because of the poem’s attention exercises, the poem turns out to be a type of proof that provides evidence only insofar as it is being attended to. In other words, the poem is a proof that cannot be abstracted from the act of thinking it. (4, emphasis added)

Thus, the Holy Sonnets offer:

…insight not only into the history and phenomenology of holy attention, but also into how the protocols of liter-
ary close reading are themselves influenced by devotional precedents. In other words, what is at stake in attending to Donne’s poems isn’t just the knowledge we might gain from them but also how we gain that knowledge. (5)

Donne’s sacred lyrics, to summarize, can be understood (and experienced) as both attention exercises and experiments in poetry.

By appealing to diverse sources—including the epistles of St. Paul, the works of Augustine (especially the *Confessions*), various ascetic figures, Aquinas, Luther, Calvin, Catholic spiritual exercises (especially those of Ignatius of Loyola) and Protestant prayer manuals—Marno demonstrates how vast and enduring in the West has been the anxiety over (and the need to ameliorate) humanity’s incapacity to attend. Distraction is Augustine’s preoccupation, and it is Donne’s too. The Holy Sonnets “tend to dwell in distraction” (152).

Marno’s argument is presented in seven chapters with a concluding Coda. In Chapter 1 (“The Pistis of Faith”) Marno articulates Donne’s model of devotion. The goal of “Death be not proud” is “to provide a radically subjective proof, a proof that is certain because it pertains only to the subject” (35). The poem allows the speaker “to think a religious doctrine with a certainty that is subjective and existential” (33). In Chapter 2 (“The Thanksgiving Machine”) Marno argues that thanksgiving is “a telos inherent to the devotional life” (65), and “Death be not proud” is a thanksgiving poem. Marno faults past critics for failing to note how central thanksgiving is to Donne’s devotional poetry: “thanksgiving is the end of the devotional poem” (66). Chapters 3 and 4 (“Distracted Prayers” and “Attention Exercises”) survey various late antique, medieval, and early modern works concerned with attention and distraction. In Chapter 5 (“Extentus”) Marno explores an Augustinian theme pervasive in the West, namely that, as creatures of flesh and blood, situated in space and time, humans are necessarily subject to distraction. Donne too feels the inevitable “scattering of the self” and seeks “to overcome distraction by poetic means, by turning distraction against itself” (37). In chapters 6 and 7 (“Sarcasmos” and “The Spiritual Body”) we learn that Donne is riveted to the problem of the physical body’s distractions, but finds that the inattentive fleshly body (sarb) can be transcended through the recognition of a “spiritual body” not subject to distraction (199-201).
Marno’s knowledge of Scripture, the Christian tradition, philosophy, and rhetoric is considerable, but his close readings may not always convince. His analysis of “At the round earth’s imagined corners” is a case in point. The author cites the poem as evidence of the narrator’s distraction, evident in the poem’s discrepancy between form and content, with its dramatic break between the octave and the sestet. Many critics have noted the abrupt shift between octave and sestet, but Marno notes an earlier fissure in lines 7-8, where the narrator includes living believers (“and you whose eyes / Shall behold God, and never taste death’s woe”) in the scene of the Last Judgment.

Why are the living imagined as present with the dead? Marno wonders. And how can the narrator order the living to rise? Marno states what seems obvious: “those who are not dead yet…can therefore hardly ‘arise’” (156). The living belong to “a category that does not really belong there” (156), Marno argues. This seems like an odd position to advance, given that Scripture and Christian tradition suggest otherwise. According to St. Paul, “the quick and the dead” belong together at the Eschaton, both rising in the air, sequentially—first the dead, then the living:

> For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with voice of the Archangel, and with the trumpe of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first. Then we which are alive, and remaine, shallbe caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the aire.” (1 Thess. 4:16-17, emphasis added)

Marno calls the inclusion of the living in this scene an “accident,” “an anomaly,” one of the poem’s “mistakes,” evidence of “the inattentive collapsing of the living with the dead” (159). However, the Bible declares that the “quick and the dead” appear together at the Last Judgment (2 Timothy 4:1). This theme is repeated in the Nicene Creed and the Book of Common Prayer, a fact not lost on Donne. In Sermon XXV, preached on Easter Day, Donne reminds his hearers that at every service the faithful recite these creedal words: “He will come again to judge the quick and the dead.” Donne elaborates: “That Christ shall judge quick and the dead, is a fundamental thing. We hear it in St. Peter’s sermon, to Cornelius and his company, and we say it every day in the Creed, He shall judge the quick and the dead.”
Marno asks: “What could have caused the apostrophe [the prayerful appeal to God in the sestet], what might we find behind the poem’s volta?” (156). A plausible answer is that the transition at the volta, rather than signaling distraction, instead mirrors the devotional practice that meditation on the Last Judgment naturally serves as a prompt for a change of heart. The sestet, rather than presenting “a sudden withdrawal from the apocalyptic tone,” is a fulfillment of it. According to a longstanding meditative tradition, reflection on the “Four Last Things” (death, judgment, heaven, hell) is intended to stir the heart to repentance, which is exactly what happens in the sestet. The sonnet demonstrates attention, one might say, not distraction.

Despite these reservations about the author’s interpretation of “At the round earth’s imagined corners,” he deserves praise for creatively linking devotional practices, philosophy, and religious poetry. *Death Be Not Proud* is “a book about poems that pray, prayers that think, and thinking that attends, a book that tries to extend Donne’s poetic invitation to rethink each of these three categories” (38). We owe the author thanks for presenting a new account of attention’s (and distraction’s) role in some of Donne’s best-known sonnets. His arguments are finely wrought, useful not only to students of Donne and early modern literary studies, but also to others engaged with questions of philosophy, literary interpretation, and even pedagogy. (Marno’s work illustrates the relevance of Simone Weil’s prescient insight in *Waiting for God* that “devotional models of attending should serve as models for modern thought in education, ethics, and philosophy” 38.)

I recall a memorable lecture at Pepperdine University some years ago by Lee Shulman, former President of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, who explained how his own intellectual formation began at an early age through intensely close readings of Talmud and Torah. He claimed that those early reading exercises in yeshiva were superb training for graduate school research. Franco Moretti observes that close readings are, “At bottom…a theological exercise” (32). Marno similarly invites readers “to consider the devotional precedents of literary criticism and to compare the kinds of knowledge devotion and literary criticism are supposed to yield” (35). Marno’s claim that “the modern protocol of close reading” has been much “influenced by devotional precedents” (2, 25) deserves
greater attention.

The author notes that Donne’s devotional verse, in contrast to the poetry of George Herbert, “has still not seen a book-length study” since the scholarship of Barbara Lewalski (31). One can hope that other scholars will address this unhappy lacuna in the years ahead. Though his study only considers selected sacred poems, David Marno’s *Death Be Not Proud*, in laying such a massive scholarly foundation, gestures in a hopeful direction. The seventy additional pages of endnotes will reward the curious reader with a bounty of historical, philosophical, literary, and theological data—opening promising new areas of inquiry.

In an age in which attention deficit disorder appears to be a chronic and universal malady, *Death Be Not Proud* deserves special notice for recovering ancient and early modern attention exercises, which not only invite us to read Donne afresh, but which may also help us to consider other writers’ works with finer and more fruitful attention.


There was a time when the poets told us what to read. Poetic canon making may be an interest of the scholar, especially today, but scholarly rigor does not necessarily entail the kind of aesthetic sensitivity that can draw out the lines that poets will take and follow. Enthusiasm for what we might call a poem’s aesthetic attributes sharply rises and falls with academic fashion, and the paths of poets as they burrow and borrow only occasionally align with the interests of the academy. With the ascendancy of the poet-critic in the middle of the twentieth century, however, things were different—for a while. George Gascoigne and Fulke Greville, for instance, were actively promoted by critics like Yvor Winters, the “sage of Palo Alto.” Winters’s revaluation of the renaissance canon seemed especially suited to produce poets; among his students were Thom Gunn, Robert Pinsky, and Robert Hass, all of whom went on to demonstrate the value of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century verse in their own poetry seminars and workshops. Greville’s poems were rescued from obscurity by Gunn, who put out an edition
of them in 1968 (reprinted with heavier scholarly contextualization by Bradin Cormack in 2009). Robert Pinsky’s 2013 *Singing School*, a “personal anthology” of seventy-seven poems from throughout history meant to demonstrate “the vital unity of writing and reading,” features not only poems by Gascoigne and Greville, but also single poems by Walter Ralegh, Thomas Campion, Chidioc Tichborne, and two each by the seventeenth-century poets Ben Jonson, Robert Herrick, and George Herbert. Shakespeare and Milton each get one. John Donne, however, makes no appearance.

Working against the enduring resurrection and revaluation of Donne by Herbert J.C. Grierson and T.S. Eliot, Winters asserted in the 1960s that Donne was esteemed for his poetic weaknesses. A. Alvarez, who also championed Gunn, provided a counterbalancing effect of poetic-critical enthusiasm for Donne and the Donnean influence throughout the 1960s and ’70s. In the present era, when the concept of the poet-critic has broken apart at its flimsy hyphen, Donne and Herbert, even more than Shakespeare and Milton, have been the primary renaissance influences on new poetry. These two poet-clerics, motivated as they were by humbler ambitions, have not dominated the canon as Shakespeare and Milton have. They are far less likely to have college syllabi devoted exclusively to their works. But Donne and Herbert nonetheless have been supremely influential to those who have continued the craft of writing poetry.

However, the gradual separation between the aims of scholar-teachers and poet-teachers has left two distinct ways to study Donne and Herbert—and two distinct populations of readers, both of which, it seems, will always find these two poets but will be doomed to think themselves alone in their admiration.

While Herbert has had a far greater share of essays written on him in relation to his twentieth-century poetic imitators (see, for example, the 1994/1995 issue of *The George Herbert Journal*, edited by Jonathan F.S. Post), Donne has been equally influential on “contemporary” poets, if not always studied in a way that reveals this fact. *John Donne and Contemporary Poetry: Essays and Poems*, edited by Judith Scherer Herz, therefore aims to repair both a gap and a rift by offering an assessment of Donne’s particular influence on contemporary poetry that is accessible both to scholars and practicing poets. The impulse is laudable, the
objective is both challenging and urgent, but the result makes a reader wonder if the project is, these days, too idealistic to succeed. Perhaps the two camps have by now pulled too far apart. Perhaps poets do not have the necessary rigor or historical understanding to articulate trustworthy lines of influence, or perhaps scholars do not have the sensitivity or eye for art to turn in a close reading able to elucidate technique. Perhaps there are too few readers who even see a problem with the polarization within literature departments that leads to two groups studying the same poet in isolation. This present collection of essays and poems, indulgent as it sometimes feels and insightful as it sometimes becomes, is foremost intended to produce an arc of enthusiasm for Donne across these poles. But is enthusiasm enough?

The chapters are unusually diverse in focus and design, and the poems that thicken the middle of the book sometimes display signs of their prior life before they were meant to show Donnean techniques. The chapter authors have diverse backgrounds and appear to write for equally diverse audiences. There are essays by poets who are also distinguished Renaissance scholars (Kimberly Johnson, who offers an essay and several poems, and Joseph Campana) that would be appropriate in a specialist journal; there are insightful meditations by poet-critics (Cal Bedient, Alicia Ostriker, and Carl Phillips) who have had a long and productive relationship with Donne; there are relatively fresh poems by poet-critics (Stephen Yenser and Stephanie Burt) who offer brief discussions of Donne’s influence on those poems; there are essays by poets who are known mostly as Donne specialists (Sean H. McDowell); and there are poems by those who are known mostly for being poets (Katie Ford, Molly Peacock, and Rowan Ricardo Phillips). And then there are the usual suspects: Heather Dubrow, who offers a contextualizing essay as well as a separate cluster of “Epithalamia and Aubades,” and Jonathan F. S. Post—both scholars who in many ways and for many years have advanced the notion that poets have something to show scholars.

But at which audience is the collection addressed? Its steep price tag says “scholars” not “poets,” but its content says “probably not scholars of Donne”; even in its digital form, it is too expensive for graduate students to buy, but one hopes they will download it from their libraries. But in appearing to be designed for no audience in
particular, the book perhaps will find one among those who wish to better understand the poets and poet-critics who contributed to the book. Such was certainly the case with the most enduring attempt to demonstrate the depth of contemporary poetry’s debt to renaissance poets, *Green Thoughts, Green Shades: Essays by Contemporary Poets*, edited by Post in 2002. This book features essays on different early modern poets written by famous contemporary poets, including, among others, Phillips, Yenser, and Bedient (who wrote the essay on Donne). It comes as no surprise that this earlier book—referred to in academic parlance as having “anticipated” the present one—has become a reference point for several of the contributors, though the inevitable comparison leaves a reader puzzling over whether the reach of *John Donne and Contemporary Poetry* is hampered by its specificity.

So what does Donne look like when viewed from creative writing departments? The Donne canon is small but lively, consisting primarily of Meditation 17, “Batter My Heart,” “The Flea,” “The Sun Rising,” “A Nocturnal Upon St. Lucy’s Day,” “Go and catch a falling star”—essential poems, all of them. And what does “contemporary poetry” look like when we trace out the Donnean line? Judging from the volume’s two essays (Johnson’s and McDowell’s) that follow what Herz calls the “Donne and Poet X” model (7), those who might be classed in the present-day “school of Donne” turn out to be two poets who died in the past five years: Seamus Heaney and Brett Foster. Yet in just two paragraphs of her introduction Herz gives a sketch of Donne’s tremendous influence throughout the twentieth century, briefly mentioning Joseph Brodsky, Yehuda Amichai, Paul Muldoon, Adrienne Rich, Mark Jarman, and even Bob Dylan’s “Oh, Sister” (mistakenly titled “Sister”). If Stephen Yenser is right to claim that Donne appears “everywhere in recent American poetry” (120), this volume clearly does not hope to be as comprehensive about its subject as its title might lead one to expect.

However, the title’s vague “and” defers the question of what a reader might hope to expect from the volume. A more conventionally focused collection might have studied this line of influence, adding to it substantial examinations of other poets who get mere mention: Elizabeth Bishop, Robert Lowell, James Merrill, John Ashbery, Jorie Graham, Clive James, A.D. Hope, Alice Fulton, Stephen Edgar, as well
as Linda Gregerson and Timothy Donnelly (both of whom were once part of the gatherings that gave rise to this book). And a yet different collection might have discussed how and why Thom Gunn became a less Donnean poet in his middle career, or how Stanley Kunitz works through Donne’s “harsh” metricality to arrive at a concept similar to what Herz herself has brilliantly analyzed as Donne’s “voiceprint.” A different collection still might focus on even more mainstream negotiations with Donne’s canonicity in Billy Collins’s “Memorizing ‘The Sun Rising’ by John Donne” or Van Morrison’s bizarre “Rave on John Donne,” or it might examine the gargantuan presence of Meditation 17 in popular songs such as, say, Paul Simon’s “I Am a Rock” or the Van Dykes’ “No Man Is an Island.”

The essays we do get range widely in every sense. In addition to Heather Dubrow’s articulation of the institutional problems the book seeks to address—which might be all too clear for anyone who has sought this collection out—we have a number of highlights worth anyone’s attention. Carl Phillips’s chapter, “On the Road with Donne,” offers a compelling reading of Holy Sonnet 5 and tempting conclusion that, for Donne, God is “restlessness itself” (27). Molly Peacock’s discussion of Donne’s “vital verbs” demonstrates that the relation of “motion” and “emotion” is based on more than mere sound. Cal Bedient’s essay offers many insights into three aspects of Donne’s rhetorical-poetic achievement: his “verbal gusto,” his “stanza motions”—which like Peacock’s “vital verbs,” constitute “figures of feeling and motion” (181)—and finally his metaphors and images, which are in Bedient’s account the “very axis of [Donne’s] thought” (187). Joseph Campana’s anchoring essay on “turning” as an act and a figure of what he calls “Donne’s Kinetic Poetics” allows him to work through “conversion” and the “turning away” of shame in order to give us, yet again, a Donne whose “concrete poetics derive from a kinetics of motion” (204). This entire collection could be linked by the interest some of its best pieces display in the concept of motion.

Donne’s influence on the collection’s featured poems, however, is sometimes hard to divine, even with the ensuing explanations, which point us to concepts like “mysterious alchemy” (82, 112) just as often as to the more helpful elucidations of Donne’s “medial off rhymes” to be adopted (107) or his absence of “compromise” to be worked
Kimberly Johnson’s wit is undeniably Donnean in poems such as “A Nocturnall upon Saint Chuck Yeager’s Day,” where we can clearly recognize the precursor in Donne, while Ostriker’s “Question and Answer” feels as if it might have a more Herbertian analogue. On the other hand, Stephen Yenser’s “Musing” offers a tremendous amount more than its accompanying process note indicates. The poet’s customary etymological flair and “Yensership,” too, can be aligned with the concept of motion as it offers a “melismatic” distortion of the name Melissa in a wild series of associations brilliantly structured as an epanalepsis starting and concluding with the name Melissa—thus making the poet end where he begun. The poems are most interesting when they perform a feat Donne might have performed rather than imitate something he did do, and the essays are at their strongest when they undertake a careful and close analysis of Donnean technique.

Yet the very nature of close analysis requires that one’s fidelity to the text be matched by fidelity in representing the text. It is deeply regrettable that the publisher of this book did not share the enthusiasm its contributors had for their work. Each essay or clutch of poems is presented with utter indifference to its being a chapter of a physical book; each bears at the bottom of the first page a DOI and other emblems of the brutish efficiency with which the book was made to live in both paper and electronic worlds. After each author’s name there is an icon of a little envelope that, once clicked, presumably would have launched an e-mail to the author—a helpful thing to have while proofs are being prepared on screen, but a comically ineffectual thing to run one’s finger across in a book. But again, this is just an accompanying emblem. Far more troubling is the negligent copyediting. Lines are misquoted (“Dull sublunary sense” [174]), Latin is botched (“Donne redivus” [2]), and, to take one of many examples, the name of a contributor is misspelled—twice—in a single index entry (“Phillios, Rowan Ricado” instead of “Phillips, Rowan Ricardo”). Problems of this scale make one less apt to balk at the batch changes that were haphazardly performed, or at the trouble that was evidently had typesetting even transliterated Hebrew, or at apostrophes turned so as to be confusable with quotation marks, or at punctuation that is simply missing, or at bold type randomly applied, or at book titles that have been mysteriously shorn of their italics. With this kind of
carelessness, ironies abound. Molly Peacock’s essay talks about the implications of a missing word in the first line of Herbert’s “Prayer (I),” yet those responsible for her contributor biography have omitted a word from its first line.

The majority of the pieces in *John Donne and Contemporary Poetry*, whether essays or poems, are linked by their ruminative method, which possibly gives too much authority to personal recollection and self-expression. In our current climate, the expressive liveliness of this unusual volume comes closest to that of a festschrift—for Donne, perhaps, or even for the self as it negotiates with Donne—and as such it suffers from its tendency toward chatty and unhurried discussion. But the benefit of all this is a volume-length colloquy that does not need to frame its revelations with scholarly impersonality. In what is the heart of this collection, the essay by Jonathan F.S. Post assembles three poems to create “a little biographical story” (71) that reflects his own life. Perhaps this is where Donne’s unique resonance can be found. With short poems focused through certain emotions or emotional compounds (“kind pity” comes to mind), he is a writer of poems that are valuable in their very modularity. Those poems offer themselves to be assembled in a unique—Stephanie Burt might say an “inconsistent”—way that in combination makes sense for the individual. The collage we might construct of Donne’s poems makes them things we turn to “in times of trouble” (68). Katie Ford turned to Donne “during a time of [her] own instability” (83). Alicia Ostriker proclaims heritage from Donne by learning from him to “take God personally” (86). Heather Dubrow talks about a “love affair with Donne that started in college” (103). In the case of Rowan Ricardo Phillips, the “Donness of Donne,” encountered in an inherited copy of *The Love Poems of John Donne*, “bled into” him (112).

Can criticism perform the same expressive function as Donne’s verse? After reading Mark Dow’s chapter, I think this may be possible. Dow’s polymathic argument moves from Hebrew to Malayalam, from Cotton Mather to New Criticism to the linguist Alvin Liberman, then into the intrigues of paraphrase among translators at the United Nations, then on to Bob Dylan, John Cotton, a brief digression into a quote from Expostulation XIX, then to the Hebrew Psalms, then to what Donne called “Sidneian Psalms,” then the thirteenth-century
Zohar, then an eccentric game of “jinx” Dow used to play with his brother, then to a story about a subway drummer named Bongo, then to Nicholson Baker’s The Anthologist, then to the Bay Psalm Book, then back to Cotton Mather, then on to reproducing a letter Dow’s mother sent to him “when an ex-girlfriend’s mother died,” then to Kierkegaard’s discussion of inner voices, before concluding by saying, “Often we have something to say. Most of the time we just want to be heard.”


The Memory Arts in Renaissance England is a wonderful compendium of excerpted texts ranging over two centuries, from 1509 to 1697. Its distinguished editors—William E. Engel, Rory Loughnane and Grant Williams—have divided the collection thematically into six parts: the art of memory, rhetoric and poetics, education and science, history and philosophy, religion and devotion, and literature. Each part and excerpt comes with a helpful introduction, as does the volume as a whole. The book is unusual on at least three counts: its focus on England as an intellectual sphere separate from Europe, the wide variety of texts sampled, and its inclusive sense of what constitutes the memory arts. It also makes interesting claims, declaring, for example, that “the art of memory as understood in England was much different from the continental tradition [Frances] Yates describes” in her seminal 1966 work, The Art of Memory (4). The editors disagree with Yates’s view that “after the 1580s in England the art of memory can be understood as a Brunian phenomenon, infused with occultish energies of Neoplatonism and hermeticism, and innately related to the Italian tradition.” They argue that Yates’s focus on Bruno implies a “univocality” about the memory arts in England that “simply does not accord with the facts” (4). But if Yates errs by engaging with “outliers … writing on the Rosy Cross” and thereby narrowing her focus, this volume may over-compensate by offering a definition of the memory arts so capacious that it encompasses all manner of ways
of thinking about the past. That said, the volume’s strength may well lie in its commitment to “the radial, rhizomatic pathways of memory, recollection and commemoration through the early modern archive.” As if selected to prove Yates wrong, the seventy excerpts demonstrate “the extraordinary religious, epistemological and social diffusion of the memory arts” in England during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (16).

The book is not so ecumenical, however, that it extends its purview to contemporary theoretical frameworks for discussing memory. While it incorporates modern vocabularies like circuitry, mentalité, episteme, heteroglossia, and even terms like collective or cultural memory, it resists forms of presentism by insisting that the purpose of the volume is corrective, designed so that scholars and students acquire a “mnemonic literacy” particular to the Renaissance (17). The editors state at the outset that the volume “endeavors to preserve the historical and cultural difference of premodernity, a difference that contemporary memory studies threatens to collapse with its distinctly post-Enlightenment orientation around trauma, repression and political protest as well as issues of cognitive philosophy and evolutionary psychology” (10). However, the emphasis on Renaissance difference and on the memory arts as a distinctively Renaissance techne itself threatens to collapse when English mnemonic culture is described as touching on, well, just about everything: “the liberal arts; the art of rhetoric; the art of logic; ars poetica; the arts of genre; imitatio; memoir; Ramism; the art of printing; iconographic arts including emblematics, painting and allegory; ars historia; antiquarianism; the scriptural arts such as typology and numerology; the art of meditation and devotion; ars notaria and the occult arts; alchemy; Lullian ars combinatoria; horoscope astrology; ars moriendi; the funeral arts, burial rites and monuments; the architectural arts; the juridical arts, the medical arts; etc.” (11). Oof! What’s left? Still, this global approach, colonizing every territory in its sights, is instructive and produces the mnemonic literacy the adventurous editors intend.

The book does an excellent job imparting the visual literacies involved in mnemonics, thereby improving us as readers of images. Arguing that the emblem is “fundamentally mnemonic in nature,” the editors construe the various ways it was “conceptualized and discussed”
For example, the standard tripartite structure popularized by Andrea Alciato—motto, picture and explanatory poem—could be read in “incarnational” terms, meaning that the picture operated as the body and the words as the soul. “Paralleling in secular terms the religious notion of the word made flesh,” they explain, “the soul of the device, the word, animates or quickens the body or picture” (27). Emblems could be read allegorically, their symbolic attributes signifying in specific ways designed to organize knowledge and recollection. Emblems also operated as thought-images (Denkbilder) capturing memory traces of what Ernst Cassirer describes as a mythological consciousness (32). Yet the book’s goal of improving our visual literacy goes beyond decoding emblems. It coaches us on interpreting frontispieces, for example, as mnemonic instruments—from the architectural niches illustrating Thomas Lodge’s translation of Seneca (1614) to the self-reflective depiction of Hermes delivering the “ars memoriae” in Marius D’Assigny’s The Art of Memory (1699). An engraving of a busy landscape populated by diverse creatures and figures turns out to be a visual catalogue of chapter highlights in George Sandys’s Englishing of Ovid’s Metamorphoses (1640). Hans Holbein’s title page for Strabo’s Geography illustrates the so-called Table of Cebes (1523). Initially overwhelming in its intricacy and apparent clutter, the image displays a visual itinerary through various allegorical tableaux, leading the viewer towards the highest good (110). The editors describe it “as a kind of graphic reversal of the rhetorical trope of ekphrasis upon which the narrative itself is based” (25). Cumulatively, then, the volume achieves its purpose, offering multiple close-readings of diagrams, charts, figures and representations that together teach us to see and understand how mnemonics functions as an informing principle for visual representations of all kinds.

I am glad the editors recognize the element of fantasy involved in some of these mnemonic schemes. Peter of Ravenna, for example, is explicit about the way a woman’s body serves as a handy perch for his to-remember list. He recommends the alphabetization of images as a way of ensuring orderly recollection, but then he adds: “And I do set by the letters some fair maidens, for they excite greatly my mind and frequentation. When I was young I did collocate Juniper Pistoia or of Pisa which I loved greatly” (49). Juniper reappears in the treatise,
“once ‘giving a harp to a Florentine’ and once saying a confession to Peter for ‘her light sins’” (50). Aware that this “secret” might lend itself to prurient interpretation, he says defensively that he “set[s] the fair maidens most facilely and decently,” which prevents any “fear of blame or shame” regarding “a remembrance incontinent,” a phrase the editors footnote as a memory “incapable of storing, retaining” (49). Shifting to the offensive, he elaborates that “this behoveful precept cannot profit to them that have women in hate and despoil them” and only benefits “good and chaste men.” That he protests too much emerges in the double negative: “I ought not to hide saying that I desire,” speaking of the mental images he invents of fair maidens (49). Most writers on memory are not as frank as Peter of Ravenna in praising the mnemonic advantages of sexual fantasy. Yet many use the human body as a background for their exercises in memorization. In Filippo Gesualdo’s *Plutosofia* (1600), there is a picture of a naked man in a loincloth with 42 numbers keyed to different parts of his body. D’Assigny’s treatise makes it clear that it was standard practice to “fix the ideas of things to be remembered on his head, forehead, eyes, mouth, chin and so downwards on all his members” (96). Although John Brinsley warns that “we never help the mind by any filthy object” (165), most writers believe that in order for mental images to be memorable, they need to be extravagant and a little wild—preferably in motion and in vivid color. They encourage creativity even at the risk of being “fantastical” (97).

Among my favorite selections in the volume were those that captured emotions attached to forgetfulness and evinced skepticism about mnemonic efforts. William Basse, for example, has one of the characters in his dialogue wax poetic in his bitterness: “our knowledge is always in the autumn, withering, and decay.” Noting its “brittle and slippery footing,” he adds, “I know all memory to be *infida & labilis*, untrustly to keep, and trusty only to deceive” (70-71). In *The Unfortunate Traveller* Thomas Nashe opines that “as it is not possible for any man to learn the art of memory, whereof Tully, Quintilian, Seneca and Hermannus Buschius have written so many books, except he have a natural memory before, so is it not possible for any man to attain any great wit by travel, except he have the grounds of it rooted in him before” (322). So much for the value of training! Francis Bacon
also takes a dim view of mnemonists, dubbing their feats no more than “the tricks of tumblers, funambulos, baladines, the one being the same in the mind, that the other is in the body—matters of strangeness without worthiness” (201). Thomas Hobbes folds memory into imagination, showing how “the imagination of the past is obscured and made weak” (219). He continues, “When we would express the decay, and signify that the sense is fading, old and past, it is called memory. So that imagination and memory are but one thing, which for diverse considerations hath diverse names” (220). With regard to memory’s fallibility, the editors observe that Hobbes supplies “a physical rationale for what previously had been taken merely as a metaphor” (219).

The book’s attention to the material basis for memory emerges in a few fine scientific excerpts. Robert Hooke, for example, “situates Aristotelian recollection and the Ciceronian storehouse within the context of mechanistic philosophy,” describing memory as “a continued chain of ideas coiled up in the repository of the brain” (180). Sir Kenelm Digby uses charming similes to convey his atomistic view of memory, mentioning beads and a “beaderoule,” inhabitants in a “numerous empire,” and floating bodies that “are in the caves of the brain wheeling and swimming about (almost in such sort, as you see in the washing of currants or of rice, by the winding about and circular turning of the cook’s hand),” not to mention “a tuned lute string” with its vibrating “curlings and folds in the air,” a comparison that prompts him to cite Galileo (216-17). The point, according to the editors, is that the scientific revolution did not spell the demise of the memory arts although they “underwent revisions according to materialist assumptions” (147).

The collection more than fulfills its aim of surveying enough texts related to memory to provide a starting point for further research on the topic. The list of recommended readings after each excerpt accomplishes this. While occasionally startled—for example, by the claim that “the cento is a memory art” and Robert Burton’s Anatomy of Melancholy implicitly a cento because it is “a patchwork” of quotations—I now see these surprises as one of the volume’s virtues. It’s an excellent thing to have one’s preconceived notions challenged and suddenly to view the anthology in one’s hands as itself a cento of sorts. To all the
memory experts and aficionados out there, this book is one to own and keep nearby.


In *Women, Poetry, & Politics in Seventeenth-Century Britain*, Sarah Ross employs a variety of manuscript sources written by women to “redress the unrepresentative prominence of printed texts in our critical narratives of seventeenth-century women’s poetic history; at the same time, the manuscript culture(s) and practices explored here are multi-layered and variant” (218). In other words, Ross very deliberately addresses our critical biases regarding printed vs. manuscript sources, and in doing so “it [becomes] very clear that identifying a female political poetic and a coherent grouping of women political poets is no longer a matter of looking for those who speak in an assertively proto-feminist voice, or those whose work appeared in print” (218). This interesting correlation between the emerging importance of both manuscript culture and the differences among feminine voices is a refreshing and much-overdue correction to our critical approaches; it recovers otherwise “lost” material, while at the same time redefining the notion of female voices in such a way that masculine values do not continue to determine them.

Ross organizes her book into five extensive treatments of lesser known texts by women writers, without neglecting to trace the varieties of influences on them including other male authors in both manuscript and print. Notably, and interestingly, each chapter concludes with a brief overview of the material history of the manuscripts and their traceable transmission, along with commentary, that extends our sense of the contemporary reading of the work just discussed. The varied works of Elizabeth Melville, Anne Southwell, Jane Cavendish, Hester Pulter, and Lucy Hutchinson are all treated as components of networks, both literary and social as well as familial, and what emerges is the defining significance of families as the basis for networks—as
well as the centrality of these women within their networks. Indeed, they are in some ways the imaginative authors of the networks themselves, as Ross shows how family letters often point to less than ideal relationships than the poems construct. Such authority, in the sense of authorship, is significantly constitutive in a way that has been overlooked at times because it tends to cast itself in relationship to various patriarchal figures (fathers, husbands, brothers), but Ross also shows how important daughters, mothers, and sisters are in family and social networks, which corrects our view of patriarchal family structures as necessarily misogynistic. Families are made up of more than one gender, and adoring a husband or father does not necessarily make a woman poet subservient, regardless of her diction; she still writes herself within her chosen and self-determined form(s).

In Chapter One, “‘The right vse of Poësie’: Elizabeth Melville’s Religious Verse and Scottish Presbyterian Politics,” Ross begins her examination of the “female tradition” in manuscripts that she identifies not simply through the sex of the authors but through the common “poetic tropes, genres, and material forms” that she finds. Unsurprisingly, religious and familial tropes articulate political ideas and ideologies; in the century following Elizabeth I, this is hardly novel. What is interesting is how Ross engages the “networks and communities that are neither private nor strictly public” through her engagement with the material manuscripts themselves. In the case of Elizabeth Melville’s Ane Godlie Dreame, for instance, “the dream vision genre enables [her] to extend the relevance of her dream to the community of the elect with a remarkable authority that escapes the constraints of gender.” Indeed, as Ross points out, “it is notable that while Speght and Lanyer use the dream vision to claim authority to write, Melville claims authority via the dream vision only for the authenticity of her spiritual vision. Her right to speak is assumed based on the authenticity of her prophetic vision or visio, the providential dream vision experience.” Furthermore, her poetic voice is notably and very deliberately not identified as female. Her gender is not significant for her message, so she speaks with the same authority as any other writer. Similarly, Ross’s examination of Melville’s lyrics “use the trope of the Puritan soul’s pilgrimage that appears in her Dreame, and they draw extensively on the Song of Songs and on the
language and structures of Petrarchism to construct Christ as the heart and soul’s absent but only true lover” (42). Yet while Ross identifies this connection, she does not elaborate how, in traditional exegesis of the biblical love song, the soul’s female status also overlooks the gender of the writer. Ross also neglects to note that the tropes that identify the soul in relationship to the community of the faithful (in Melville’s case, Scottish Presbyterians) are derived not only from the Song of Songs, but also from the exegesis that links the lovers there with Christ and the Bride of Revelations. Ross does discuss the adaptation of the Song’s biblical exegesis in Petrarchan lyrics throughout the seventeenth century constitutes a secondary and contemporary tradition that Melville draws on as she describes her intimacy with Christ, but again she does not address that this is a long-standing tradition dating back to the medieval period and courtly love tropes.

Here I must point to my only critique of this work, which is that, as with many books on the seventeenth-century corpus of literature, it neglects to incorporate the continuities and disruptions of manuscript traditions and culture that perpetuate from the medieval period. Especially in a book that focusses so steadfastly on manuscript sources, I find this particularly odd. I would have liked to have seen how Ross’s arguments might have benefitted from a brief discussion or even occasional notes pointing to the exegetical tradition of marginal commentary in manuscripts; instead, there is a single footnote that refers to E. Ann Matter’s *The Voice of My Beloved* (on page 47). From a different point of view, a brief consideration of Julian of Norwich, Christine de Pisan, or Marie de France as reference points and influences on her subjects would also give strength and context to Ross’s work. The absence of these potentially enriching directions isolates Ross’s approach and confines it, I would argue, too narrowly. Such narrowness runs the risk of making her subjects seem to have sprung up only in the seventeenth century, and without the authority of previous women authors—similar to how, until recently, many “History of Feminism” courses began with Mary Wollstonecraft, because she spoke with a recognizably proto-feminist voice. Ross’s claim to promote a different kind of reading in order to see beyond our own critical concerns with authorship in print seems, in this sense, undermined by her own lack of context and precedent for the seventeenth century itself.
Chapter Two, “‘Thou art the nursing father of all pietye’: Sociality, Religion, and Politics in Anne Southwell’s Verse,” addresses the attempt to broaden the scope of her project by incorporating Anne Southwell’s influences, many of whom were men. Guillaume de Saluste Du Bartas, Francis Qualres, and Roger Cox “require us to redefine biblical verse paraphrase as a mode in which poets male and female could—and did—speak on wide-ranging moral, social, and political issues” (67). This broadening of the sphere of an under-examined genre to include both male and female poets, again, might be usefully contextualized with reference to medieval manuscript exegesis, which is yet to be acknowledged properly as a precedent for biblical verse paraphrase in the Reformation. Ross’s engagement with Arthur Marotti’s notion of “social authorship,” however, is a fascinating development of how she employs the materials of manuscripts as constitutive of community: “Southwell adapts and reworks Gorges’s sonnet on the level of trope and form, using and reusing a poetic text that she treats as malleable in order to enact a kind of social authorship that is contextual and constitutive of community” (72). Southwell’s uses of biblical and secular sources, then, are continuous; each is “a pliable, malleable poetic form that can be rewritten, reworked, and readdressed to forge and foster social and political networks, as well as to address social and state political issues” (89–90). Tracing this common critical theme in the period through women’s manuscripts renders them as participants, and accomplished ones, in the larger cultural and political sphere in which they lived.

In Chapter Three, “‘When that shee heard the drums and cannon play’: Jane Cavendish and Occasional Verse,” Ross traces the ways in which the “familial forms” include and promote political identifications, namely between Cavendish’s (absent) father and her (also absent) king: her verse “evinces the intertwining of familial and kinship loyalties and political ideologies, and the emergence of female political articulation out of the discourses of the familial relationship. … [T]he authorizing figure of Jane Cavendish’s politicized occasional verse is, in every way, her absent father” (102). In troping her father and her king together as absent presences whose physical return she desires, she also, like Melville, invokes the Song of Songs, and triples the association with Christ as the soul’s absent lover. And as
Ross points out, this triple invocation—father, king, and Christ—is profoundly informed by the familial form, and all the intimacy that such a domestic relationship would bring: “it is this latter mode [of the character poem] that Cavendish adopts, writing in the brief form that is more modest and gives a stronger sense of intimacy” (113). In other words, what an early feminist approach might disdain as an imposed modesty can also be seen, in context, as purposefully conferring intimacy between the writer, her father, their king, and their God. This network defines each element as critically engaged to each other element, and “underscore[s] the extent to which it is Cavendish’s imaginative construction of a familial ideal in her poems that carries the greatest political import. … It is unlikely that Cavendish’s imagined community, the familial unit that she tropes in her poetry, corresponds exactly with a lived interchange between the Cavendish sisters and their male relatives on the continent. Rather, it is in the very ideal quality of the family and its literary culture that is imagined in Cavendish’s poetry and in her manuscripts that her engagement in the politics of the 1640s is most acute, the fantasized family unit becoming a trope—or even the emblem—of a familial and political desideratum” (133). In this way, Ross re-appropriates the “modesty” of women writers in the period as a rhetorical conceit, redefining it with a new and deliberate sense of authorship, one that participates in and depends on a larger circle or community of known readers or other writers, all of whom are identified by common domestic and political desires regardless of gender.

Hester Pulter’s grief, both familial and political, are the subject of Chapter Four, “‘This kingdoms loss’: Hester Pulter’s Elegies and Emblems.” Here Ross again examines how Pulter, like Cavendish, constitutes a figure of herself as mourning and secluded from society that is not necessarily matched by her “lived interchange” with her family and social circle: “her discourse of isolation notwithstanding, she is likely to have engaged actively with prominent examples of politicized verse that circulated in manuscript culture during the 1640s and 1650s” (138). Like many Royalist sympathizers during the Interregnum, she idealized solitude and isolation as figures that evoke pastoral complaints; both ideal and problematic, the paradox of retreat complicates the voice of desire. (Again we see the influence
of Song of Songs traditions: the enclosed garden, the spring shut up, the fountain sealed [Song 4:12]; yet Ross’s commentary, while often interesting, neglects the extensive traditions associated with the biblical exegesis that linked the Song of Songs and Revelations in medieval and early Reformation periods.) Ross’s reading of Pulter draws attention to how her “poetic and fluvial tears respond to political events in an explicitly personal and female way, one that is tied to her sexed female body, and so they provide a vital, female variation on the feminine, passive aesthetic that is seen to mark much of the lamenting literature of response to Charles’s death” (154). This variation of an explicitly female voice distinguishes Pulter from Melville, the subject of Chapter One, who insisted on a non-gendered voice, and such variation within female writers’ techniques is itself an indication of vibrancy and heterogeneity.

Finally, in Chapter Five, “‘I see our nere, to be reenterd paradice’: Lucy Hutchinson’s ‘Elegies’ and Order and Disorder,” Ross illustrates the trope of grief and loss associated with Republicans in the Restoration through an examination of the trope of Hutchinson’s loss of her husband and her literal and literary isolation. And yet this educated and intellectual poet does not, in her “grief-stricken isolation,” neglect to invoke more than her own grief: “Lucy mourns deeply and personally the loss of a beloved husband and the end of the Good Old Cause” (175). Again, Hutchinson draws extensively on the Song of Songs traditional exegesis, although Ross’s discussion of it remains frustratingly under-developed. In particular, she describes how Hutchinson draws her isolation as the hortus conclusus or enclosed garden without her gardener, which is significantly political in exegetical terms as it echoes the figure of the Church without a head. As well, Hutchinson’s suffering and grief for her husband echo the “dark night of the soul” which illuminates many female voices in the complaint genre: they speak the female voice of the Song of Songs, searching in vain for her absent beloved. Ross’s discussion of Hutchinson’s Order and Disorder, her retelling of the Creation and Fall, might have continued this connection as Ross distinguishes Hutchinson’s work from Milton’s to good effect: “Her discourse is one of rhetorical modesty and unadorned scripturalism, even as she insists on the Bible as a model of divine poeticization in ‘psalms and hymns and spiritual
seventeenth-century news’ … [H]er discourse of contemplation and spiritual song, as she describes a ‘ravished soul’ that wishes ‘To sing those mystic wonders it admires,/ Contemplating the rise of everything’” (192). While this discussion does much to establish and elaborate the female rhetoric of modesty, it again misses the point of the poet’s direct influences from exegetical works that employ a similar rhetoric, and use a feminine pronoun to engender the human anima regardless of the writer’s sex. Ross also confuses tropology with typology on page 198 when she compares Hester Pulter “read[ing] the biblical Esther as an emblematic type for herself, so Hutchinson reads Eve’s creation as an emblem for seventeenth-century marriage, and Noah as an emblematic type of the dissolute English Restoration king” (198, emphases mine). The turn of tropology toward the self and present, everyday application is not the same as the allegorical sense of typology, when biblical types figure ideological echoes in the present day of history. Similarly, there seems to be an equivocal relationship between emblematic figuration and typological figuration; they are not always the same, especially in Quarles’s work, which tends to emphasize the individual soul of tropology.

That being said, Women, Poetry, & Politics in Seventeenth-Century Britain is an important achievement for literary and feminist scholarship in a variety of fields: “Rewriting the narrative of women’s political poeticization in the seventeenth century requires us to read less selectively, to read different genres and to read them differently, and to focus not only on ‘the birth of the modern woman author’ as she is recognizable to our twenty-first century tastes and literary-critical habits, but on more foreign and at times less pleasing modes of poetic authorship, and on poetic acts that were in some cases less successful” (213). In other words, Ross manages to shift our focus toward a different way to read that widens the context considerably and undermines the usual sense of isolated differences: reading manuscripts alongside print, and women alongside men as poets, is a re-imagined and more appropriate way to consider such early modern (and, potentially, medieval) texts, which did not privilege print as we do, and in many cases did not privilege gender or authorship in quite the way we do either. Indeed, Ross redresses “[t]he early feminist critical sense that women were ‘silent but for the word’ … [which] was based on an as-
sumption that religious practice was a domestic and private affair in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and that women’s religious writings were ephemeral to intellectual and sociopolitical cultures. … It is, however, a mistake to regard these writings as safe, acceptable, or marginal. Reformation religion was inherently the religion of the book, and it is now well recognized that a number of sixteenth-century women became ‘influential agents of religious and political change’ through their textual and interpretative activities” (11-12, qtg Femke Molekamp). Indeed, despite the problematic sense of English Renaissance women emerging out of nothing, Ross’s focus on the book as a material manuscript directs our attention toward a new perspective that includes manuscript material alongside printed works. Such a wider ground from which to work gives us a renewed perspective: “If we are going to understand women’s emergence as published political poets of state in the mid-seventeenth century, we need to read poetic genre differently – or, rather, we need to read different poetic genres” (17).


This collection of essays provides a rich discussion of Western witchcraft and magic, focusing mainly on the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, but often extending both forward into the present and back into the ancient past. It provides a reasonable overview, while at the same time includes detailed evidence and examples that help it avoid a sense of the over-generalized. Many chapters are accompanied by good quality images, as one would expect in a volume of this sort. The collection begins, after a short foreword, with Peter Maxwell-Stuart’s chapter on magic in the ancient world. He provides a definition of magic as “a constellation of what are officially regarded as deviant ritualistic or ritualized ways of dealing with an individual’s immediate problems” (1). What follows is a survey of magic or ritualistic texts under the subheadings of Mesopotamia, Egypt, Jewish magic, Greeks, and Romans (early Christians and magic are included briefly under this sub-heading). A number of practices are described and the
contribution of magic in creating a stable culture is touched upon. Greater clarity concerning the relationship between magic and religious practice would be useful here, as a great deal of overlap is noted.

Sophie Page’s chapter on medieval magic begins again with a definition of magic: “magic was thought to strengthen or sever relationships between people, to overcome material obstacles, and spread good or evil” (29). She describes magic as rituals and practices that were not Christian, but also acknowledges that these were derived from other religious belief systems. The chapter explores medieval attempts to define magic, referring to Isodore of Seville’s *Etymologiae*, and notes the medieval connection of magic with the supernatural world of the demonic. Page also discusses the relationship between “philosophy, magic, and spiritual inspiration” (34). Particular attention is paid to the increasing traffic of magical texts between Europe and the Middle East and the contributions of Arabic texts to occult sciences and magic.

James Sharpe begins his chapter on demonology texts by emphasising the sophistication of early modern writers of this material. Sharpe poses the question, “Why was a science of demons necessary?” (65), and uses this question to open up a discussion on the widespread acceptance and historical depths of belief in the intervention of demonic spirits. The intersection between this aspect of magic and religious beliefs of the period is considered with reference to biblical texts and other textual authorities circulating widely. The importance of the specific as a catalyst for writing on demonology is noted. The chapter provides a general overview of the development of demonological systems (71-82), citing important works including *Malleus Maleficarum* (*Hammer of Witches*) written in response to increasing numbers of witch trials in the fifteenth century. The decline of demonology is also charted, with reference to Reginald Scot’s *Discoverie of Witchcraft* and a connection between anti-papal sentiment and the association of witchcraft with ‘erroneous papist writing’ (89). The dialogue between the sceptical tracts of the early seventeenth century and challenges to these are discussed, including the work of Balthasar Bekker. Sharpe ends his essay with an acknowledgement that the rejection of the possibility of the demonic required “a major intellectual break” that could result in “accusations of atheism and, by extension, of subverting the social order” (95).
Rita Volmer’s chapter discusses early modern witch trials. This chapter starts with a definition of concepts, in this case that of the “witch trial,” though acknowledges that “different languages throw up different definitions” (97). Volmer notes that “witch trials targeted women in greater numbers than men” and that accusations against women made up “75-80 per cent” of all witch trials (99). This chapter usefully includes a series of tables listing European countries, territories, dates, numbers of trials, and numbers of executions. Here it would be useful to know the source of the figures that are provided. The discussion provides a general overview of the cultural environment where witch trials took place and the practical ambiguity which surrounded many trials, noting that “in dealing with the crime of witchcraft, clear evidence...was hard to find” (112). The role of torture in prosecutions is discussed, again emphasizing the ambiguity of this practice within the legal systems of several European countries. The chapter also discusses the role of scribal recording and the influence of the reportage of witch trials on cultural reception. Volmer attributes the decline in witch trials in the eighteenth century to more centralized and close supervision of local courts and the repeal of a number of witchcraft laws, though she ends on a rather chilling note: that today beliefs in witchcraft continue, and that “the African period of witch trials seemingly has just begun” (133).

Charles Zika engages with the visual heritage related to witchcraft and magic in European art. He rightly notes the importance of printing in circulating and promoting a sense of the diabolic in fifteenth-century Europe. Zika suggests that images such as Hans Baldung’s *The Witches Preparing for the Sabbath* and Dürer’s *Witch Riding Backwards on a Goat* became influential in defining the diabolic visually. Within this discussion is the relationship between religious iconography and the diabolic, and also the way in which the representation of the diabolic changed from earlier medieval imagery, noting that in early modern imagery “this new scourge of witchcraft not only involved individual women and men, but was as group activity, and one orchestrated by the Devil” (140). Zika suggests that representations of the diabolic emerged as a sense of the social threat through magic heightened in the early seventeenth century and cites the centre for this iconography in northern Europe. This is a rich chapter that
surveys important individuals and sites of visual reproduction of the demonic. This discussion is accompanied by several full and half page images (many in color), which provide useful exempla for the discussion. It also follows this imagery in to the nineteenth century, as well as including more modern imagery that draws upon an earlier representational heritage.

The popularity of magic evidenced in the visual record is more fully discussed in Owen Davies chapter on popular magic. Davies explains that, “while witchcraft was largely an imaginary crime in terms of what those executed were accused of doing, there is ample evidence for the use of harmful magic in popular culture” (169). Several examples of the use of harmful magic by members of the public for specific purposes such as revenge, spite, and influencing the behavior of others are provided. The defensive nature of popular magic is also discussed, including the hiding of objects within the structures of homes. The hiding of children’s shoes is a particularly intriguing example. The chapter explores the rationale behind beliefs in the operational effectiveness of magical practice and interestingly suggests a connection with humoral theory, and here we recognize the close relationship between the magical and natural philosophy. Davies also suggests that the popularity of magic was connected to “the sense that anyone could perform it, the knowledge being widespread orally and transmitted through generations of families” (174). The chapter discusses the way in which popular magic responded to social change, and even to enlightenment science, and takes this discussion into the twentieth century. The chapter provides a strong rationale for the continuation of occult practices through the centuries and its influence on twentieth-century occult practices.

Robert J. Wallis also engages with occult practices from the perspective especially of the twentieth century. His chapter describes the influence of anthropology on modern views of witchcraft. He places this within the historical context beginning with sixteenth-century accounts of indigenous practices in the Americas. These “early ethnographic accounts” (227) are presented as mainly descriptive, though colored by religious perspective and identified as diabolic. A description of the development of anthropology is provided before returning to European anthropological interest in indigenous com-
munities. A number of twentieth-century approaches are discussed, including Malinowski’s structural functionalism, Levi-Strauss’s use of semiotics, and Victor Turner’s ideas of ritualism as social drama. The chapter also includes a discussion of the shift in anthropological methodology in the late twentieth century, with a new emphasis on participant observation, which Wallis describes as an “experimental approach [that] facilitated a remarkable ethnography which would otherwise have been impossible” (242). Wallis explores the work of a number of “insider” and auto-ethnographies” of western witchcraft including the work of Jenny Blain on Norse culture and mythology. Wallis ends with a discussion of the use of auto-ethnography in current anthropological research into the occult. This chapter provides a useful lens for modern readers to consider witchcraft in a more nuanced manner.

The book ends with Willem de Blécourt’s chapter discussing on-screen witches. The chapter opens with an acknowledgement of the Harry Potter phenomenon, and Blécourt challenges readers to look beyond the ubiquitous boy wizard. He usefully identifies the “absence of any explicit references to religion or demonology” (255) in the Harry Potter films. Blécourt usefully identifies Western witches as “internal others” (256) and provides a historically based definition of Western witches similar to previous definitions in earlier chapters. The presence of “ancestral” witch-related imagery in the representation of contemporary on-screen witches is noted. The role of the Wizard of Oz for future depictions of witches in twentieth-century cinema is described as significant, as is contemporary imagery of members of the Wiccan movement. The chapter discusses housewife witches, including the long influence of sixties series Bewitched on American screen depictions of witches. In his final section he engages with issues of male anxiety, female power, and the efforts of these screen depictions to domesticate female power or eradicate it. He ends the chapter with a return to the Harry Potter films, noting the gender bias of the film towards powerful male witches, which “marginalized the gender issue” (280).

This collection of essays provides the reader with a detailed and nuanced discussion of (mainly) Western magic and witchcraft, and the long social engagement with these ideas. The collection could use
a more developed introduction in place of the short foreword at the beginning. This would have been a useful place to provide a definition of witchcraft and magic that is fairly consistent across the essays and thus save each author from having to include an often repetitive definition. This would also have been a good place to do some work regarding the relationship of religion with magic, again saving individual authors from repeating work which appears in places throughout the book. The collection of essays is accessible and provides a good starting point for readers interested in the ubiquitous discourse of witchcraft and magic still prevalent in our culture.


On 2 September 1666, an improperly extinguished fire in Thomas Farriner’s Bakery shop on Pudding Lane caught the structure on fire. This fire, aided by a variety of elements including a long dry summer, the medieval and crowded layout of the City of London, and the fact that most structures were made of wood, quickly spread. Over the next three days, the City of London burned as its inhabitants fled.

This fire, an important seventeenth-century event for both the city and for England, as one-sixth of the total population lived there, is the subject of Jacob F. Field’s work. While the story of the fire is well known, Field adds to our understanding by exploring the fire beyond the City of London and by effectively utilizing a variety of records to expand our knowledge of the demographic and economic consequences of the fire. The short, but insightful, work is divided into two parts with part one exploring the events of the fire and the attempts to rebuild, while the second part works to understand the demographic and economic consequences.

If one just wants to know the story of the fire, part one is an excellent place to find it. Here, Field has constructed an engaging narrative that explains the start of the fire, the reasons why the fire spread so rapidly, why it spread to some areas and not others, and how the city
and state responded to the fire. We learn why the Lord Mayor was blamed for its spread though his options were limited, how Charles II and the Duke of York viewed the fire from a barge, how inhabitants started to flee with their property, and how cartmen and porters took advantage of the situation by increasing their fees, and finally how the fire came to an end. In just a few days, the fire destroyed St. Paul’s Cathedral, 84 parish churches, over 13,000 homes and 44 out of 55 livery houses; but very few died. With the fire extinguished, the narrative then turns to the rebuilding process, the plans for a new city and the development of acts and regulations, especially the stipulation that new structures be made of brick, came about. In the end, the city was not re-envisioned because of property concerns but the rebuilding did change the look and character of the city.

The importance of Field’s research comes in part two as he explores the demographic and economic consequences of the fire. The population of London was mobile but for the most part people moved within neighborhoods based upon their socio-economic status. Many of the people affected by the fire were either tenants or sub-tenants, and the new regulations of rebuilding increased the costs of living in the city. To understand the demographic consequences, Field utilizes Hearth Records and finds that after the fire, there were more hearths than before and that many structures, once rebuilt, remained uninhabited. Field also finds that the consequences of the fire varied greatly depending upon one’s means and occupation. He shows that booksellers were greatly affected by the fire because their stock was easily combustible and that numerous tradespeople were affected as their homes were also their business. From the Hearth Records, Field then moves to the records of the Merchant Taylors and Booksellers to explore the economic consequences of the fire. What he finds is that the fire caused a decline in the activity of both, as would be expected, but that the booksellers recovered within the city more than the merchant tailors who became more dispersed after the fire. Much of this most likely comes from the rebuilding of the city and how increasing costs drove some out. There was, both before and after the fire, a cliental within the city that wanted access to books and information. Field ends his work by looking at the cultural reaction to the fire and how both the French and Catholics often appeared in the various conspiracies about
the fire. Beyond this, the fire became politicized on a local, regional, and national level.

The nature of the sources utilized and the attempt to understand the demographic and economic consequences means that the second part of the work reads very differently from the first. The second part, except for the final chapter on cultural reactions, is dominated by data and charts which all provide important insight into the consequences and allows Field to develop an intimate understanding of the fire’s consequences. Overall, in a time when disasters are increasing—floods, fires, and artic vortexes—Field’s work provides one example of how communities respond to these crises. What he clearly demonstrates is that while the short-term consequences proved disruptive to many, over time the city and its activities recovered.


Craig Spence’s *Accidents and Violent Death in Early Modern London, 1650-1750*, is a data-driven analysis of the many ways in which primarily accidental violence injured and killed people in early modern London between the years of 1650 and 1750. Not consisting of mere lists of accidents and their causes across the century indicated in the title, *Accidents and Violent Death in Early Modern London* contains a great many anecdotes as well as literary references that make the book a valuable resource to historical and literary scholars of the period and perhaps to creative writers who might rely on the book for factual information about events in works set in the era. Accurately and thoroughly indexed, *Accidents and Violent Death in Early Modern London* is, in short, a useful tool for people interested in the subject and period.

Spence makes the book’s purpose clear in the Introduction, where he states:

> The aim is not to reduce portrayal of such [violent] incidents and fatalities to anecdotal tales of ‘human interest’ or, for that matter, to see them as a window onto ‘everyday life’ in
the past. Rather, it is to comprehend who, among hundreds of thousands of Londoners, encountered such events, how the city’s bureaucracy recorded and elaborated their circumstances and why they did so, and what practical responses might follow. (2)

More specifically, the book aims to consider the early modern accidents primarily from two perspectives: first, as “lived events” and, second, as “transmitted accident narratives” (14).

The mechanisms of reporting accidental death are outlined so that readers learn about the communal responses to such death. Responses to deaths followed a regularized sequence of procedures that involved the following: the death; a notice to two “searchers,” who were mature women from the parish where the death occurred who would look at dead bodies and officially make judgments about the causes of deaths; reports by the searchers of the deaths to parish clerks who would maintain records of deaths for their parishes; reports by parish clerks to the official Bills of Mortality for London that recorded and described violent deaths for other official responses as necessary and for informing members of the public; and reports by clerks, the searchers, or even compilers of The Bills of Mortality to sheriffs or justices of the peace when foul play was suspected. In addition, accidental deaths and homicides might be reported to newspapers and even to relevant courts of law (such as the Old Bailey) when cases were criminal. The people of London thus had an orderly, institutionalized, metropolitan response to deaths.

The searchers in the above process generally took “a view” or made “a search” by examining a dead body. As mentioned, the searchers were mature women, and their office first arose from the need for competent people in London parishes to examine the dead in times of plague. The office of searcher first came about from the Plague Orders of 1592 that required the Churchwardens of each parish to appoint two “sober ancient women … to be viewers of the dead” (44). The practice of employing searchers continued in non-plague years and was further legally institutionalized in 1603. Most of the searchers were widows of good character and members of their parish churches, so they were expected to conform to the Church of England. Despite efforts to have searchers of good character, searchers, through their constant
association with death, acquired the same sort of negative cachet that apparently leads to the use of so many present-day euphemisms with respect to cultural practices concerning death (such as calling coffin carriers “pall bearers”). Besides modest pensions from their parishes, searchers were generally paid a going rate of 4 d. per death—though as the period passed this rate increased slightly.

The most common form of accidental death in early modern London was drowning. London, as the most important port for ocean-going vessels in England, had a high rate of drownings. In addition, people drowned because of accidents that occurred when people used the Thames as the primary transportation artery for the city. People would fall out of the small boats of watermen, and watermen’s small craft would not infrequently capsize or collide with other vessels. People drawing water from the river for domestic or industrial use would sometimes accidentally fall in and often drown. Relatively few people knew how to swim, and techniques for artificial resuscitation did not yet exist. People, especially small children, were susceptible to accidental drowning in domestic settings in tubs for bathing, brewing, washing dishes and clothes, and cooking. Somewhat older children were liable to drown during play near the Thames or near pits dug to extract gravel or building stones. Some children were vulnerable to accidental drowning, moreover, in ponds and other watercourse besides the Thames when children fetched water for domestic use, went fishing, or simply played in open spaces near bodies of water.

If drowning was the most common form of accidental death, death by fire was, Spence demonstrates, the most feared—probably because fire was a spectacular form of urban mishap. Fire with open flames was an essential part of early modern life, as fire was necessary for cooking, heating, lighting, and serving in many manufacturing processes such as blacksmithing, smelting, and brewing. Stoves for containing fire for cooking and heating were not particularly common, so most cooking, especially for people from the lower classes, was done in open hearths. Chimneys would, of course, build up combustible soot and sometimes catch fire that could easily rage out of control and ignite thatched and wooden-shingled roofs. In an era in which building codes were just beginning to be promulgated, chimneys might be poorly constructed using lumber supports for parts exposed to intense heat,
which could easily catch fire. Lighting was accomplished primarily through the use of candles and rush lights—though poorer households would rely heavily upon light from hearth fires made of wood and coal. Lamps were used in the period, but even they often had open flames that could easily ignite clothing and other combustibles with which they came in contact. Furthermore, after the European discovery of tobacco in English-owned Virginia, accidental conflagrations started by careless smokers became common.

Of the large number of actual fires that Spence describes, not surprisingly the urban fire that he pays the most attention to is the Great Fire of 1666. The Great Fire burned for over four days and “destroyed more than 13,000” of London’s houses (71). Despite this huge level of destruction, Spence says that apparently “no more than seven Londoners were ‘burnt’ to death (72). The Great Fire “clearly overwhelmed London’s rudimentary fire-fighting defenses” (72) so that the City and its parishes in their post-fire responses made sure that in the future that London had the resources (such as hooks for pulling down burning roofs, fire buckets, water squirts, and, later, engines) to fight fires and prevent their growth into major conflagrations. Another important response to the Great Fire was that after 1666 a growing number of entrepreneurs began to sell fire insurance. In order to reduce their financial vulnerability to accidental fire, these insurers began to hire watermen and porters as salvagers after fires and even to retain such men to serve as regular firefighters who became known as “firemen” (73). Although the entries in The Bills of Mortality, Spence’s most important primary source, contain notices of many deaths from 1665, a year of one of the most severe instances of plague in England and London (commonly referred to as “The Great Plague”), the publication of The Bills was interrupted for several weeks by the destruction of the Parish Clerks’ Hall in the Great Fire. The Parish Clerks’ Hall is where The Bills were printed and published. This interruption in The Bills lasted from August 28 to September 18, but they continued to be published thereafter until the middle of the nineteenth century. Interestingly, the Great Fire resulted in the creation of stricter building codes within the City walls so that after the Great Fire the rate of fatalities in that part of the city fell. Perhaps the most important legal response to the Great
Fire was the Rebuilding Act of 1667, which mandated that exterior and party walls of new buildings be made of stone or brick to help stop the spread of fire from one edifice to another. The rebuilding of London after 1666 also led to an increase in construction accidents from falls from scaffolds and roofs, from structures collapsing while under construction, and from the accidental dropping of stones, bricks, and tools by workers on Londoners below. Typical of these sorts of accidents is one that was noted when John Tillison, the clerk of the works for Sir Christopher Wren’s demolition and reconstruction of St. Paul’s, was reimbursed for payments he made to a “chyrurgeon” to treat a worker whose skull was injured when a tackle rope broke and let a battering ram fall that struck the man. Another aftereffect of the Great Fire was the equipping of London streets with water conduits and hydrants, often by private water-supplying companies, to permit fire-fighting teams to have ready access to water.

Another important form of accident and death was that which constantly threatened London’s pedestrians. In particular, accidents that involved horses and carts, coaches, and wagons that would strike and injure and not infrequently kill people on foot receive considerable attention in The Bills and in Spence’s text. The incidence of severe death and injury from draft, pack, and riding animals and the conveyances such beasts pulled was common enough that the civil authorities put in place measures to help keep people safer. One important safety measure was the installation of protective railings along major streets to protect pedestrians from animal-based transportation. Other rules were established to limit the number of carts and wagons on the streets, for too much traffic of such vehicles led inevitably to higher rates of injury and death. Moreover, reckless behaviors, such as racing horses and horse-drawn vehicles on the streets, were discouraged by having offenders who injured innocent walkers brought to justice in criminal and civil legal proceedings.

Just as civil authorities created responses to the dangers posed by animal-drawn vehicles and by horses ridden for transportation, the civil authorities also crafted improved responses to other common urban dangers. Rules were made to regulate transports on the Thames, which was the major transportation artery across early modern London. These rules included limiting the number of passenger a craft could
carry and set a minimum age requirement for watermen. Another regulatory improvement of note occurred in 1745 when the barbers and the surgeons were split into separate professional companies, a division which became useful as the medical knowledge and skills of surgeons began to exceed those of barbers.

The wide range of accidents led also to a wide range of literary responses to mishaps and accidental death in the period. Besides *The Bills of Mortality*, accidents received frequent attention in broadsides, ballads, and newspapers, and Spence liberally quotes and analyzes passages from these sources. In addition, Spence relies heavily on the ample ecclesiastical records (such as parish registers and vestry records) available from the period. Moreover, Spence has carefully combed through and draws upon laws, ordinances, and proclamations that address issues of public health and safety. In addition to the regulatory records, first aid manuals such as Stephen Bradwell’s *Helps for Suddain Accidents* of 1633 and Richard Hawes’ *The Poor-mans Plaster-box* of 1634 provide instructions on how Londoners could treat such common problems as poisonings, insect bites, stings, injuries from falls, near drownings, choking, burns, broken bones, bruises, bites from larger animals, and small wounds from edged tools and weapons. Medical treatises began to be published during the period, and of these especially important were works on surgery such as John Woodall’s *The Surgeons Mate or Military & Domestic Surgery* of 1617. The first systematic study of occupational health, *A Treatise of Diseases of Tradesmen* by Bartolomeo Ramazzini of Modena, Italy, was translated into English and made available to Londoners by 1705. Scholars who study John Gay will find frequent references to his poem *Trivia: or, the Art of Walking the Streets of London*, where the perils of being a pedestrian in the metropolis are thoroughly explored. Importantly the diaries of Samuel Pepys and his friend John Evelyn record personal reactions not only to the Great Fire but also to the many specific instances of other types of accidents that happened in the city.

Perhaps most interestingly Spence traces a widespread change in philosophical attitudes toward mishaps and accidental violent death over the course of the period. Earlier in the period accidents and their attendant narratives generally treated such occurrences as acts of God—as instances of an often inscrutable Providence inserting
itself into the lives of mortals. As certain types of accidents became recognized and expected as regular and frequent realities of urban life, the perception of violent accidents as providential or fated occurrences shifted to simply being seen as part of the urban environment. This shift in perception allowed people from the end of the period to move toward institutionalized, rational, and remedial responses to common urban dangers. This shift in attitudes thus led to efforts to make the urban environment of London safer and healthier for the city’s early modern population.


Another new volume has now been added to the projected nineteen-volume edition of the collected works of Johann Valentin Andreae (1586-1654), under the general editorship of Wilhelm Schmidt-Biggemann of the Free University of Berlin. A number of others have already appeared: *Veri Christianismi Solidaeque Philosophiae Libertas* in 1994; some biographical works in 1995; the *Theca Gladii Spiritus* (in 2000; *Theophilus* in 2002; *Schriften zur christlichen Reform* in 2010; and of especial interest to many, the *Rosenkreuzerschriften* in 2010. To these may now be added a volume with Andreae’s fictional utopia *Christianopolis* (1619) and his allegorical poem “Christenburg.”

Schmidt-Biggemann’s introductory essay places Andreae within the context of the Holy Roman Empire in the Thirty Years’ War and his struggles to maintain his Lutheran identity. He offers a brief sketch of Andreae’s life and of the intellectual circle in Tübingen, notably the Paracelsian Tobias Hess and Christoph Besold, who were moved by Johann Arndt’s *Wahres Christentum* (1605) towards Lutheran reform. Andreae saw himself as a Christian Hercules capable of rescuing church and state from its moral decline and became the force behind the Rosicrucian writings, which were written just after his expulsion from
Tübingen (in 1607) as compensation for his disappointments. For centuries the only real link between Andreae and these two manifestoes was the name Christian Rosenkreutz taken from Andreae’s youthful romance, the *Chymische Hochzeit Christiani Rosenkreutz. Anno 1459*, written *ca. 1605*. Evidence of Andreae’s direct involvement in the composition of the *Fama fraternitatis* and the *Confessio fraternitatis*, though, was discovered independently and nearly simultaneously by Roland Edighoffer and Martin Brecht in the late 1970s. In a commemorative work for his friend Tobias Hess, titled *Theca gladii spiritus: sententias quasdam breves, verèque philosophicas continens*, Andreae had gathered together thoughts and notes from Hess’s manuscripts. The *Theca* contained enough citations from Andreae’s own published work to make clear that they had worked collaboratively. Most importantly, it also contained quotations from the recently published *Confessio* and *Invitatio fraternitatis Christi*, which was issued in two parts in 1617 and 1618. Andreae, who alone was responsible for these selections, can thus be linked definitively to one of the central Rosicrucian tracts: the *Confessio*. Edighoffer’s and Brecht’s scholarship led to a renewal of interest in Andreae as an intellectual figure in the early seventeenth century and gave a certain momentum for this massive collected works edition.

Despite the public outcry over the Rosicrucian manifestos, Andreae and his circle continued to advance utopian ideals through these his fictional utopia *Christianopolis* (Strasbourg, 1619) and his two utopian tracts, *Christianae societatis imago*, published anonymously in Strasbourg (1619; Tübingen, 1620), and *Christiani amoris dextera porrecta* (Tübingen, 1620; Strasbourg, 1621). While manuscript copies are rare, they did circulate as scribal publications, as demonstrated by the copies discovered by G. H. Turnbull among the papers of Samuel Hartlib, who had them translated by John Hall and published in 1647 at Cambridge as *A Modell of a Christian Society* and *The Right Hand of Christian Love Offered*. From Andreae’s important letter of 27 June 1642 to Duke August of Braunschweig-Lüneburg, we know that these utopian writings were a reaction against that “undignified jest of the fictitious Rosicrucian Fraternity” (*informem hanc Societatis alicujus Christianae imaginem, machinatus sum, quam fictitiae Fraternitatis Rosecruciae ludibrio indigno opponeremus*). Schmidt-Biggemann argues
that *Christianopolis* is a key work of this explosive creative period (“Die *Christianopolis* ist ein Schlüsselwerk in Andreaes geradezu explosiver Schaffensperiode als Diakon in Vaihingen zwischen 1614 und 1620” [36]). His introduction places it in the company of other early modern works, such as More’s *Utopia* and Tommaso Campanella’s *Civitas Solis*.

Written in Latin (only translated into German in the eighteenth century [1741, 1754] and English in the twentieth [1916]), *Reipublicæ Christianopolitane descriptio* garnered praise from learned readers such as Robert Burton, who placed it alongside the “witty fictions” of More, Bacon, and Campanella. Like the *Utopia* it was framed as a traveller’s tale and conformed to already conventional generic codes: the island of Capharsalama was given impossible geographical coordinates within the “Academicum mare” to render it a u-topia or nowhere-land. The narrator is a pilgrim, who embarks on a ship named Phantasiae and is shipwrecked on the triangular island of Capharsalama. That Andreae chose the Arabic rather than the Hebrew name for the “village of peace” reminds us of the Arabic contributions to the esoteric education of Frater Christian Rosencreutz in the *Fama*. At the heart of Christianopolis stands a circular temple enclosed by a square *collegium*. Here the institutions of religion, justice, and education are housed; here, their creed is displayed on two tablets. Twelve articles inscribed in gold outline their religious principles; ten articles (based on the commandments) prescribe the rules of daily life. The religion practiced on Capharsalama can be described as ecumenical Protestantism. The first article upholds Scripture as the “interpreter of all wisdom” and the ninth mentions only baptism and communion as sacraments, but the citizens are respectful of piety wherever it is practiced and only intolerant of factiousness.

Most of the *Christianopolis* is focused on the spiritual and intellectual life of the inhabitants, particularly the educational system. The pursuit of science coupled with worship seem to be the main occupations at Christianopolis where scientific instruments and laboratories are widely available and scientific research is officially enshrined in the *collegium* at the heart of the city. Andreae’s educational system is reminiscent of the emblematic method inscribed on the walls of Campanella’s *Civitas Solis*, which in turn influenced Comenius whose *Orbis sensualium pictus* was fully given to this approach. Nevertheless
Andreae’s emphasis on utopian education and the ongoing scientific inquiry were the most original aspects of his work.

The textual editor Frank Böhling offers a straightforward German translation of Andreae’s elegant Latin style on facing pages. The few textual variants are given at the bottom of each page. The commentary is helpful though modest: for the 330 pages of Latin and German text, there are only ten pages of notes at the end of the volume. Also included is the text of Andreae’s didactic poem “Christenburg” (1626) that shows how the situation of the Protestants had deteriorated during the Thirty Years’ War.

This new edition of the Reipublicae Christianopolitanae descriptio makes available to German readers an essential legacy of Johann Valentin Andreae, a legacy that has been unfortunately obscured by the unavailability of texts, though German translations in 1972 by Richard van Dülmen and in 1977 by Ingeborg Pape made Christianopolis the most well-known of his works. English readers were able to use Felix Held’s Christianopolis: An Ideal State of the Seventeenth Century (Oxford, 1916) and the splendid new translation of the Christianopolis by Edward H. Thompson (Kluwer, 1999). With each new volume of the Gesammelte Schriften that appears, the portrait of this educational and social reformer, who so embodied the Protestant culture of Germany, and whose theological-political vision influenced English republicanism in the seventeenth century, becomes more distinct.


This exemplary critical edition by Mariette Cuénin-Lieber collects for the first time the complete works of Henriette de Coligny, comtesse de La Suze (1623–1673). Cuénin-Lieber draws on exhaustive archival research to recover the known oeuvre attributed to Mme de La Suze, providing modern readers with a meticulous account of the poet’s life and works in all their complexity. Cuénin-Lieber’s remarkable attention to detail comes to the fore in prefatory remarks that explain
various spellings of Mme de La Suze’s name and then the title chosen for the edition to highlight the poet’s diverse production.

In her rich introduction (11–124), Cuénin-Lieber deftly weaves together numerous pages of the poet’s personal history and literary accomplishments. Yet Cuénin-Lieber does not allow biography to usurp an encounter with Mme de La Suze’s actual texts, which she prepares with the section, “Principes d’édition” (125–49), and a brief chronology (151–52). The poet’s collected works ensue, divided into three sections: “Élégies” (155-198), “Chansons” (199–210), and “Autres poésies” (211-240). Cuénin-Lieber amplifies her extensive work of recovering Mme de La Suze’s place in French literary history with the following material: “Notes de variantes” (241–54); “Appendice I: Lettres d’Henriette de Coligny et trois fragments” (255–64); “Appendice II: Relevé des recueils” (265–99); “Appendice III: Relevé des poèmes” (301–35); “Appendice IV: Vers et dédicaces” (337–47); “Appendice V: Portraits” (349–58); “Illustrations” (359–66); “Glossaire” (367–71); “Bibliographie” (373–92); “Table des incipit” (393–94); “Index des noms des personnes. XIIe-XIXe siècles” (395–402).

Modern scholarship on women’s literary past continues to expose the uneven history of the reception of the works they produced. Conservative critics have tended to obscure the attention given to women’s creativity and originality by correlating women’s writings with their lives, casting moral judgment, moreover, on what women write. The case of Henriette de Coligny, later called the comtesse d’Haddington and in turn comtesse de La Suze, is no exception but more complex, with the young poet hailing from the most noble of families, as Cuénin-Liber states: “Race noble, suite de gens illustrés, valeur, emplois, grandes dignités: on ne saurait mieux caractériser les Coligny” (14). Her famous ancestor Gaspard de Coligny was not only an admiral but also a leader of the Huguenots in the French religious wars and thus “a fait des Coligny une grande famille réformée et transmis ainsi à ses descendants, dont Henriette, un héritage qu’ils ont diversement assumé,” as Cuénin-Liber further observes (17–18). Henriette married twice, first, in 1643, to Thomas Hamilton, 3rd Earl of Haddington, who died just two years later. In 1647, she married Gaspard de Champagne, comte de La Suze, against her will. Henriette, originally a Protestant, converted to Catholicism in 1653, which left
her open to suspicion and criticism, as did her decision not to remarry after her second marriage was annulled in 1661 on the grounds of impotence. Cuénin-Lieber masterfully recounts these episodes by linking historical, political, and religious contexts (43–57).

“La noble comtesse de Suze / Qui fait des vers mieux qu’une Muze,” wrote a critic by the name of Loret, to introduce his account of Henriette de Coligny’s public abjuration of Protestantism (58). By 1653, she was already known as a poet, having acquired her reputation “par la diffusion orale et manuscrite de ses poèmes,” as Cuénin-Lieber notes (58). That same year, some of Mme de La Suze’s verse appeared in a collection with that of other poets, Poésies choisies, and again, in 1663, in Recueil de pièces galantes en prose et en vers, des plus beaux esprits du temps. The poet adopted her second name as a writer, hence the title of her individual volume in 1666: Poésies de Madame la Comtesse de la Suze. None of her work, however, has survived in manuscript form. Thus, in collecting her writings for this modern edition, Cuénin-Lieber carefully compared all existent volumes in which the poet’s work appeared along with versions of individual poems, discussed in her introduction (see especially 59–72) and in Appendices II and III. By drawing out the aesthetic quality of Mme de La Suze’s poetic work, Cuénin-Lieber disputes the following assertion in the preface to the 1725 edition of the Recueil de pièces galantes en prose et en vers: “Quoique née avec un génie si puissant pour la Poësie, Madame de la Suze ne put jamais enchainer la rime. Elle digeroit ses pensées; elle les exprimoit poëtiquement; mais pour les rimer, il falloit qu’elle employât un secours étranger” (93). The view that Mme de La Suze’s poetic genius was natural, rather than acquired by education and work, gained ground during the nineteenth century when poetic women came under serious attack and were systematically grouped in a separate canon of sentimental “poésie féminine.” Mme de La Suze’s reputation as an elegiast was, ironically, the source of her marginalization in the early twentieth century and further reduced her legacy as a poet.

In elegies that brought her renown in her day, Mme de La Suze treats love with a passion recalling Louise Labé’s sensual lyricism. To this point, Cuénin-Lieber cites the appraisal of Odile Biyidi in a 1984 dictionary entry: “[Mme de La Suze] dépeint le trouble de la présence,
le tourment de l’absence, la morsure de la jalousie, avec un réalisme psychologique déjà racinien, Elle y ajoute une véhémence singulière dans ses protestations contre la raison, contre les lois humaines opposées aux lois de la nature, une revendication de la liberté de la passion qui préfigure celle de George Sand” (123). Other dictionaries and anthologies preserve Mme de La Suze’s writings, albeit not in their entirety nor in their original context. However, as shown by the texts and paratexts collected in this edition, aptly titled Élégies, chansons et autres poésies, Henriette de Coligny, comtesse de La Suze enriched French poetic production together with her seventeenth-century male peers. Indeed, Henriette de Coligny, comtesse de La Suze has found in Mariette Cuénin-Lieber a most astute reader who has assured that the poet’s fuller legacy as a creative thinker will survive the vicissitudes of reception for posterity.


In 1609, Louise Bourgeois published the first volume of her Observations diverses sur la stérilité. She followed this publication with two more volumes in 1617 and 1626. Bourgeois, an experienced midwife who attended Queen Marie de Médicis of France and other royal family members, wrote the gynecological manuals to educate those who desired information on female anatomy and obstetrics and to prove the efficacy of midwives in assisting with pregnancy and childbirth. She was married to Martin Boursier, an army surgeon who had studied with Ambroise Paré, and many of their children would choose go into medical professions. Indeed, a section of the second volume of Observations diverses is entitled “Advice to My Daughter,” in which Bourgeois elaborates on her chosen career for her daughter, who followed her mother’s path and became a midwife. Bourgeois herself became a midwife in order to support her family when they lost their home and possessions during the religious civil wars of the late 1580s and 90s. In her work, she claims to have delivered over
2,000 babies in the course of her career. Bourgeois took great pride in her profession and advocated for recognition of its importance in women’s lives. As Bourgeois states in her first volume, she was “the first woman of my art to take pen in hand to describe the knowledge God gave to me” (90).

Stephanie O’Hara’s translation of Bourgeois’s manuals, entitled *Midwife to the Queen of France: Diverse Observations*, offers this pioneering work in English for the first time. The edition is a thorough, well-annotated translation of all three volumes with an introduction and supplemental material by Alison Klairmont Lingo.

Stephanie O’Hara’s translation introduces readers to a fascinating woman whose insights into women’s issues in early modern France offer the unique perspective of a professional woman. O’Hara exhibits a masterful command of the medical and scientific terms and language of the early modern France. Volume 1 begins with a series of poems celebrating Bourgeois’s patrons and defending her professional talents. After these paeans, Bourgeois mainly details various women’s reproductive issues, from “Why Women Cannot have Children” to “How to Choose a Good Wet Nurse and What Qualities are Required in One” to “Of a Very Plump Woman who Died from Eating Ice Cream.” Volume 2 is more autobiographical. Besides continuing her account of obstetrics, Bourgeois explains why she became a midwife and how she became midwife to the Queen of France and other royal women. One of the most riveting parts in Volume 2 is the section in which Bourgeois offers advice to her daughter. In this section, she reveals more about her life: “I was the head of the household with children to care for. I was overcome with the vicissitudes of war and the loss of our land and possessions,” (266); her pride in her profession: “Let me tell you, then, that what you have undertaken is something tremendously important” (268); and her struggles with the medical field: “My daughter, I will tell you that you must not be surprised to see the profession of midwifery held in contempt. Nor must this cool your ardor to practice thus profession as perfectly as you can. Its perfections are incomprehensible to those who look down in it” (276). Readers will inevitably be drawn into Bourgeois’s story, her struggles, and triumphs, as well as be fascinated by her appreciation of the female physiology. Volume 3 is much briefer and deals not only with
women’s issues, but also with wider health issues of the times, such as hernias and gout. Bourgeois published this final volume shortly before she lost her position as midwife to the court because of the death of the Duchess of Orleans after childbirth. Throughout her translation, O’Hara’s extensive footnotes offer further insights into the text and its author. The notes supplement Bourgeois’s material and give valuable information on relevant texts and current secondary sources.

Lingo’s critical introduction supports O’Hara’s translation and notes. Lingo divides her introduction into four sections: “The Writings,” “Life and Times,” “Reception and Afterlife,” and “Louise Bourgeois’s Approach to Health and Disease.” Lingo pays particular attention to what contemporaries wrote about Bourgeois, such as the verses found in the beginning of Volume 1. Lingo explores those writings within the context of the “Querelle des femmes,” the debate that questions “women’s morality, intellectual capacity, and physical abilities” (13). This debate underscores not only the first section of Lingo’s introduction, but also the next two sections, which explore Bourgeois’s life, the environment in which she worked and wrote, and the reception of her writings. The final section of the introduction serves as a guide to medical terms and concepts of the early modern period, explaining and clarifying language with which the present-day reader may not be conversant. This guide bookends the glossary of Materia Medica found at the end of the text. In the glossary, Lingo alphabetically lists and translates “all of the therapeutic methods and animal, mineral, and plant-derived ingredients” (313), described in the 1626 edition of Bourgeois’s text. Thus, the introduction in conjunction with the glossary helps the reader to navigate unfamiliar medical diagnoses and remedies.

In her translator’s introduction, O’Hara states that her purpose in publishing these gynecological manuals is to offer in one volume a “complete scholarly translation of one of the most significant texts in the history of medicine and in women’s history” (76). She achieves her mission with this comprehensive text. Through this dynamic translation, we become immersed in Bourgeois’s world. The volume will serve as an indispensable new source for those who are unable to read it in the original French. It will be a helpful work for those researching in many diverse disciplines. Its critical apparatus makes
it a valuable edition for scholars in fields including the evolution of medicine and midwifery’s role in medicine, as well as scholarship on woman’s body and form and on the early modern period in France.


In *Royal Favouritism and the Governing Elite of the Spanish Monarchy*, Alistair Malcolm analyzes Luis de Haro’s rise to power in the court of Philip IV following more than twenty years of the Count-Duke of Olivares’ unwavering influence on the Spanish monarchy. Historians have studied at length Philip III and Philip IV’s tendency to appoint powerful *validos*, or the king’s favorites, who in theory wielded the power of the monarch on his behalf. Yet such a position inevitably suggests usurpation, and *validos* and monarchs alike engaged in a careful balancing act which sought to legitimize the favorite’s power while at the same time not diminishing the king’s authority. Making the position even more complex was the fact that it depended solely on the monarch’s pleasure, and was therefore inherently unstable. Indeed, the *valido* could fall from the king’s favor at any moment. Most studies to date on early modern political favoritism focus exclusively on the first half of the seventeenth century. Antonio Feros analyzes the rise of the Duke of Lerma to power from 1598-1618 (*Kingship and Favoritism in Spain, 1598-1621*) and J. H. Elliott’s biography of Olivares (*The Count-Duke of Olivares*) looks at the Spanish court dominated by Olivares after Lerma’s demise in 1618 until 1640. J. H. Elliott and L. W. B. Brockliss’ edited volume *The World of the Favourite* studies similar political structures across Europe, including the Duke of Buckingham’s prominence in the English court of James I and Cardinal Richelieu’s iron grip on French politics during the reign of Louis XIII. Despite the attention given to early modern political favorites and their power in the seventeenth century, however, nearly all studies end with Richelieu and Olivares’ removal from the French and Spanish courts in 1642 and 1643, respectively.
Malcolm’s monograph looks at the power vacuum created by Oliva-
res’ removal and how Luis de Haro, the seventh Marquis of El Carpio,
avigated court politics by presenting himself as a perfect courtier,
a stark deviation from Lerma and Olivares’ tendency to dominate
court life. Overall, the book is a methodical study of the second half
of Philip IV’s court and sheds new light on a critical phase in early
modern Spanish history. As Malcolm points out, Luis de Haro presents
serious problems for historians attempting to delve into his influence
on Spanish politics. As he preferred to conduct business orally and
without a record, he left very little paper documentation. The only
available documentation, therefore, is found through the correspon-
dence and records of secondary ministers and court visitors, which
Malcolm painstakingly reconstructs through primary sources scattered
throughout thirty archives in Spain, Italy, and the United Kingdom.

Part one examines the contradictory role of the valido, which was
often seen as necessary for managing the increasingly complex burdens
of a modern state yet at the same time was considered antithetical
to ideals of good kingship and direct rule. The confusing nature of
the position resulted in a flood of treatises and political pamphlets
produced in the early seventeenth century, including Francisco de
Quevedo, Mateo López de Bravo, Francisco Suárez, Baltasar Gracián
and others, and Malcolm recounts in detail dozens of early modern
attempts to define the position. Rather than continuing Olivares’ ef-
forts to legitimize and aggrandize the valido position, Haro, however,
eschewed such language in favor of presenting himself as having the
attributes of a “perfect courtier”: discretion, modesty, affability, and
nonchalance. Haro’s discreet court machinations remain difficult to de-
tect in the early years after Olivares’ demise, as his influence remained
largely informal. Nevertheless, Malcolm recounts how Haro placed
key figures within the king’s household to ensure a court environment
that was beneficial to his own position.

Part two delves into the court’s restructuring after Olivares’ depar-
ture and the delicate alliances between various court ministers. Here,
Malcolm interjects broader historical study with fascinating anecdotes
of court life, detailing the nuances of how the king’s inner circle choreo-
graphed their every interpersonal relationship. The carefully scripted
system stems from the old valimiento form of government under
Lerma and Olivares being largely discredited, yet at the same time Haro sought to legitimate his position as the king’s advisor-minister by bringing select allies into the folds of power. Particularly interesting is how Malcolm combs through the wills of dozens of grandees to trace to whom they bequeathed valued positions as a means of strengthening ties between noble families and as a way solidifying the position of non-noble relatives at court. This seeming alliance between Spain’s noble families produced a period of remarkable success and, despite a few noted exceptions, Philip’s government ran relatively smoothly largely thanks to Haro’s policy of building alliances among the nobility.

Part three looks at the evolution of foreign policy under Haro and how he dealt with Spain’s continued losses to France during the Franco-Spanish War. Olivares’ regime had prioritized victory over foreign belligerents and Spain’s authority over its vast territories, yet several staggering military defeats left Spain in a vulnerable position. In 1658, for example, Spain’s army in Flanders was nearly wiped out, and at the same time Portugal positioned an army so massive on its Extremadura border that a Portuguese invasion looked almost certain. The accumulating dangers prompted Haro to turn inward to a strategy of preserving stability at home. As a result, Philip IV made overtures indicating that a road to peace with France was desired under the right conditions. Malcolm maintains that Spain’s peace with France was in large part due to the personal relationship that Haro cultivated with his French equivalent, Cardinal Mazarin. Haro’s negotiations proved wildly successful at the subsequent Treaty of the Pyrenees in 1659, as France agreed to extremely favorable terms under the circumstances, including withdrawing their support of Portuguese aggressions and a marriage proposal between Philip’s daughter Maria Teresa and the future Louis XIV. The treaty was seen as a major success for Haro and an achievement that would solidify his position within the Spanish government. Despite Haro’s enthusiasm for the treaty, however, historians frequently interpret 1659 as a conspicuous sign of Spain’s decline. Malcolm argues, however, that Haro and the Spanish elite’s primary goal was never Spanish military superiority, but rather the maintenance of the Spanish monarchy’s prominence in both domestic and European spheres.
Luis de Haro’s efforts to create a sense of shared influence among the Spanish elite quickly fell apart after his death, and without a *valido* figure around which to organize the court, Spain’s government became chaotic with various grandees acting unilaterally and in their own interests. Malcolm also points out that after Philip IV died in 1665, the Council of Castile explicitly rejected the office of *valido* and stated emphatically that the monarch should not elevate a single individual to manage all government functions. Yet while the great *valido* office of Lerma, Olivares, and Haro disappeared in name after 1665, Malcolm reminds us that Haro’s careful alliances insured that his descendants formed the subsequent Spanish monarchs’ inner circles for generations to come.

Malcolm’s study of court politics in the second half of Philip IV’s reign represents a substantial contribution to an overlooked period in early modern Spanish history. The author draws from the established works of J. H. Elliott and others, yet he also pulls from a substantial body of new archival research and primary documents, offering details which illuminate the inner workings of Haro’s circle. Malcolm’s monograph will undoubtedly become an instrumental source for anyone studying Philip IV and early modern Spanish politics.


This volume serves as the final collection of the correspondence of Theodore Beza, the Reformed theologian and John Calvin’s successor in Geneva. The 43 volumes of the series were published between 1960 and 2017 and covered Beza’s massive correspondence from 1539 until 1605. Volume 43 addresses the final three years of Beza’s life before his death on October 13, 1605. This volume also serves as the final project of Alain Dufour, the archivist and paleographer who served on the project since the beginning and served as its director from 1968–1995 and who sadly passed away shortly before its publication. Dufour spent more than a half-century editing the correspondence of Beza.
The layout of this final volume is consistent with previous books in the series, including an introduction that summarizes the major topics addressed in the correspondence, brief biographies of significant individuals, and an abbreviation list for frequently used bibliographical references. The numbering of the letters is continuous from the beginning of the series. Each piece of correspondence has a heading that includes who the letter is to and from, the date it was written (both for the Julian and Gregorian calendars since Geneva stayed on the Julian calendar until 1701), where it was written, where the original is archived, and a brief abstract in French.

Beza maintained a prolific correspondence for much of his life, but not surprisingly, his letter production declined in the last years of his life. This volume contains 37 letters written either by or to Beza. Friends and colleagues continued to write Beza with greetings and requests. Letters from 1603 processed the surprise late night attack by the forces of the Duke of Savoy, Charles-Emmanuel I in December 1602. In this infamous attack, known as L’Escalade, the citizenry of Geneva successfully repelled the attack of the Duke’s forces, a feat commemorated to this day in Geneva. The volume includes letters from prominent French Huguenots Philippe Duplessis-Mornay (no. 2763) and his wife Charlotte Arbaleste (no. 2757) to Beza, informing him that their son was being sent to Geneva to help with military matters in the aftermath of the attack by the Duke’s forces.

The Company of Pastors corresponded widely in 1603 with other Protestant churches and nations in the aftermath of the L’Escalade. While Beza was no longer the vigorous and active figure in international Protestantism he had once been, he was the grand old man of the Reformed tradition, and as a result, his signature on letters still held great value especially on important correspondence. His name appears on official letters in the name of the Company of Pastors to Queen Elizabeth I of England in January 1603 and, after her death, to King James I in the summer of 1605. As the editors note, Beza probably did not actually compose all of these letters, especially those signed on behalf of the Company, but he was still active in the affairs of the pastors and the city.

A significant number of the letters were to and about Beza’s extended family. There is back and forth with relatives on family matters
pertaining to properties in Vézelay, France. Several letters were from Beza’s nephew Jean Beza, who had spent a good portion of his youth in the household of Beza, and the reformer continued to be involved in his life. Beza did not have children of his own, but he helped raise and support extended family, particularly the children of his younger siblings. The letters pertaining to the Beza family illustrate the continued relationships between Protestants who had sought refuge in Geneva and their families who remained in France.

This final volume also includes a funeral oration by Gaspard Laurent, Professor of Greek in Geneva, delivered just days after Beza’s death. The laudatory piece highlights Beza’s role in critical moments of the French Reformed movement including the establishment of the Academy of Geneva in 1559, the Colloquy of Poissy in 1561, and the Synod in Nîmes in 1572. There is also selected poetry written across Europe in memory of Beza. The pieces are appropriate for the final volume of a series that provided so much primary source material on the life and influence of Beza. While less dense than earlier volumes, the correspondence from the final years of his life help place Beza among the other Protestant reformers who had passed before him. Beza was not John Calvin, but he was critical to the spread and influence of the Reformed tradition beyond Geneva.

This series has proven invaluable to scholars researching Geneva, the Reformed faith, and the later Reformation. The meticulous footnotes included with each letter place Beza’s correspondence within the wider context of Reformed scholarship. There are still vast amounts of material to mine from Beza’s life and work, and he has yet to receive the attention from scholars that other Reformation figures have received. This volume completes a project that has made the work of one of the most important men to International Protestantism widely accessible. Hopefully there are scholars out there that will put this valuable collection to use and provide a fuller interpretation of Theodore Beza and his contribution to the early modern world.
Voices of Conscience: Royal Confessors and Political Counsel in Seventeenth-Century Spain and France explores the problem of conscience and political counsel in the early modern Catholic world. This subject is novel, since political historians and political theorists have rarely delved into the theory and practice of confession. Indeed, Nicole Reinhardt indicates that “the rise of confessors as political councilors in the early modern period has been often noted, but its social and political meaning has not been adequately explored” (67).

Reinhardt constructs an intellectual history of early modern Catholic notions of the confession and its implications for the royal person. Drawing on Marc Bloch’s analysis of sacral kingship and the royal touch, Reinhardt probes a largely unexamined aspect of the intimate life of the king: the royal confession. Her analysis of the discussions of the monarch’s public sins and private sins by Catholic confessors and theologians evokes Ernst Kantorowicz’s classic study of the king’s two bodies. The author might have adopted a history of emotions to consider the intimate dimensions of the royal confession, but the book instead focuses on the figure of the royal confessor in the rival monarchies of Spain and France during the seventeenth century.

Reinhardt offers an in-depth portrait of the royal confessors by “embedding the confessor’s role in a broader counselling culture which, contrary to the overwhelming focus of intellectual history, was not exclusively moulded by an allegedly secular humanist culture” (14). The analysis concentrates on the most famous royal confessors: Gaspar de Córdoba, Luis de Aliaga, Antonio Sotomayor, and Tomás Carbonell in Spain; and Pierre Coton, Jean Suffren, Nicolas Caussin, François Annat, and François de La Chaize in France.

Reinhardt exploits a range of manuscript and printed sources written by and about royal confessors: confession manuals, theological treatises, confessors’ writings, and polemical pamphlets. The book’s chapters present a series of close readings of these largely unfamiliar theological and polemical texts. As a result, despite the introduction’s
engaging opening discussion of a West Wing episode, the book will appeal primarily to an audience of specialists in seventeenth-century Spanish and French history. Nonetheless, these sources provide fascinating evidence of the intersections of religion and politics in early modern monarchical states. Martín de Azpilcueta’s *Manual de confessores & penitentes* (1552) provided a list of public and private sins, which was particularly influential in forming confessors’ notions of their practice. The collection of the *pareceres* (manuscript advice statements) by Luis de Aliaga, royal confessor to Philip III, is particularly revealing, since “we almost hear the confessor speaking in his own voice,” as he assesses candidates for royal *mercedes* (church benefices) (161–62). In addition to such pragmatic spiritual advice, some of the confessors’ writings stressed spiritual renewal and spiritual exercises (309).

Cardinal Robert Bellarmine articulated an influential model for royal confessors in his *Duties of a Christian Prince* (1619). Bellarmine envisioned the royal confessor as simultaneously judge and doctor, tending to the public and private sins of a monarch (69). Royal confessors were expected to engage with court society, but Bellarmine stressed that they should never act as courtiers. Instead, confessors should take Biblical prophets as models for action. Nicholas Caussin’s *La Cour Sainte* (1646) presented a gallery of exemplary prophets—including Elijah, Elisha, Isaiah, and Jeremiah—who had delivered sage advice and divine truth to the kings of Israel. Royal confessors, Caussin believed, had to remain confident and firm in the face of royal power, since monarchs might or might not accept their prophetic advice. At times, he argued, confessors might even have to oppose tyrannical monarchs who threatened the polity.

Royal confessors were immersed in the field of moral theology, examining theological questions and engaging in pragmatic discussions of conscience. According to Reinhardt, “moral theology aspired to be a meta-discipline, which, unlike mere technical knowledge (law), conferred comprehensive science that provided superior insight and allowed intervention in all spheres of human action” (74). Reinhardt argues that the rise of a particular branch of moral theology, known as probablism, shaped royal confessors’ approaches to counseling monarchs in the seventeenth century. A “grammar of moral theology”
pervaded confessors’ writings and structured their counsel on matters of conscience (159).

The Spanish and French monarchies both relied on royal councils to provide them with advice and formulate policies. Royal confessors sometimes served directly in royal councils, such as the consejos and juntas in Spain or the conseil privé du roi in France. Even if they were not councilors, however, the confessors always had a duty to counsel the monarchy on matters of conscience. Confessors regularly offered advice on how to use royal powers such as declaration of war, taxation, official appointments, and distribution of favors. Theological contemplations of doubt seem to have raised new moral questions about just war, but the book does not consider the evolving concepts of jus ad bellum and jus in bello. Theologians actively discussed new methods of providing counsel of conscience, as France experimented with a conseil de conscience in the mid-seventeenth century, and Spanish ministers debated instituting a general confession.

The positions of royal confessors were clearly affected by sweeping religious transformations in early modern Europe. Voices of Conscience begins after the Reformations of the sixteenth century, which had already altered the theory and practice of confession considerably. The book examines how royal confessors engaged in expansive theological debates within the Catholic world, which involved Dominicans, Jesuits, dévots, Gallicans, and Jansenists. The book could have also considered the complex relationships between royal confessors and the other Catholic institutions (such as bishoprics, cathedral chapters, colleges, diocesan assemblies, religious orders, assemblies of clergy, and the Papacy) that were involved in early modern political culture. Comparison with confessors in the Holy Roman Empire, Portugal, Savoy, Tuscany, Poland, and other Catholic realms might provide diverse perspectives on confessors’ roles in Catholic political culture.

Royal confessors also intervened in major policy debates to advise kings on key decisions such as the expulsion of the Moriscos from Spain, intervention in the Valtelline Crisis, the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, and the Unigenitus Affair. In the case of the Moriscos, Juan de Ribera argued that Philip III “was ‘obliged in conscience’ to take swift action and to eradicate all enemies of God and country from Spanish soil” (199). Père de La Chaize influenced Louis XIV’s decision
to revoke the Edict of Nantes in 1685 (331–32).

A new trope of the scandalous royal confessor emerged in the seventeenth century, according to Reinhardt (322). Royal confessors interacted closely with kings, but also with their courtiers and royal favorites such as Richelieu, Mazarin, Lerma, and Olivares. The growth of the state and the expansion of royal offices created new conflicts, as “the problem of venality tested the limits of reasoning in moral theology” (152). Reinhardt examines in detail the principled stand of Nicolas Caussin and his resulting dismissal by Cardinal Richelieu. “The ‘scandalous confessor’ came to enter the imaginary repertoire of early modern political culture that could mobilize and capture a wide audience, but he was not a fixed or trans-historical topos” (345). One wonders how polemical attacks directed against the two cardinal-ministers in France, and particularly at Cardinal Mazarin during the Fronde Civil War, may have affected anti-confessor attitudes. A broader discussion of anti-clericalism might have deepened the analysis of scandalous confessors. Molière’s Tartuffe curiously never makes an appearance in the book.

Reinhardt perceives a major transformation in moral theology during the course of the seventeenth century, as “the notion of ‘royal conscience’ came to be limited to the private person, losing its original political contours” (303). She observes that royal confessors were gradually restricted from providing public counsel and limited to attending to the monarch’s private conscience. “I would like to suggest that ideology and institutions developed more coherently than has hitherto been recognized, and that together they lay the ground for a ‘privatization’ of royal conscience” (347).

This argument relies significantly on a Rise of Absolutism narrative of state development. Reinhardt describes absolutism “not as a socio-political fact, but as an ideology or juridical fiction to (re-)construct royal authority in the early modern period” (16). But, this narrative nonetheless portrays absolutism as gradually displacing confessors by linking the concepts of “reason of state” and “good counsel.” Certainly, the confessors’ roles in royal councils and state institutions evolved during the early modern period, but an examination of court politics and state development would be needed to investigate fully the position of confessors with monarchical states.
The proposed narrative of “privatization of conscience” also employs a rather Habermasian notion of the “public sphere.” The distinction between public and private sins had been employed as early as the sixteenth century. But, Reinhardt utilizes Max Weber’s “vocation of politics” and Habermas’s conceptualization of the “public sphere” to assess the changing roles of the royal confessors: “At the turn of the eighteenth century the king’s private sins, traditionally of no great concern to the moral theological concept of ‘royal sins,’ came into focus to a degree unknown before. ‘Privatization of royal conscience’ thus operated in two directions: the first was one by which the royal conscience was increasingly defined and explored as a sphere of the king as a private man” (371).

Voices of Conscience: Royal Confessors and Political Counsel in Seventeenth-Century Spain and France makes a significant contribution to political theory and to the history of early modern European political culture by demonstrating the entanglement of religion and royal politics in early modern states and court societies. Far from being confined to obscure theological debates, royal confessors shaped morality at the Spanish and French royal courts and provided monarchs with direct advice on matters of conscience, both personal and public. This is a welcome reminder that religion and politics can never be separated, since conscience constantly shapes decision-making.


The enigmatic paintings of Georges de La Tour (1593-1652), rediscovered by Hermann Voss in 1915, have continued to fascinate and perplex art historians and the modern public. Beyond his surviving pictorial corpus, almost nothing is known about La Tour’s artistic training or professional life. Although scholars have traditionally distinguished the daylight works from the nocturnes and profane and sacred subjects, the division is not absolute and his works fall outside conventional genres. Compounding the lack of historical evidence, La
Tour scholarship is plagued by attribution problems and the lack of firm dates, complicated by the existence of multiple versions of many compositions, muddying the distinction between original and replica. Although La Tour’s art is strongly indebted to Caravaggio’s tenebrist style, we do not know where he encountered it or how he arrived at the mysterious lighting effects that permeate his nocturnes. Dalia Judovitz’s extensively documented, theoretically informed interdisciplinary study analyzes La Tour’s paintings, especially the function of light, in relation to the Catholic Reform and the debates surrounding the role of sacred images, underscoring the opposition between the visible and the invisible and Judovitz’s interrogation of spirituality and broader meta-reflection on the nature of painting.

The introduction provides a brief overview of the state of La Tour scholarship and discusses the innovative naturalism and distinctive treatments of light and shadows that define his pictorial style. As Judovitz observes, for La Tour, the transcendental is often evoked through the faithful representation of things seen (3). The five chapters that follow examine these central issues through close visual analysis of thematically related works and detailed explication of their relation to religious texts and early modern religious thought as well as through the lens of contemporary theoretical discussions about the phenomenology of painting and the role of the beholder.

Chapter One considers the enigma of the visible as evidenced in La Tour’s allegorical depictions of blind hurdy-gurdy players and his parallel representations of the penitent St. Jerome, with his averted meditative gaze and bloodied scourge, which evoke seeing and hearing and repetition through performance, undermining the image’s uniqueness and, Judovitz argues, challenging the vanity of painting. In the four devotional nocturnes of the repentant Magdalene, among La Tour’s most celebrated works, light and darkness are subtly orchestrated, bridging the gap between the human and the divine and physical and spiritual vision. The illumined profile and blank gaze of the contemplative Magdalene, absenting fingering a skull, is juxtaposed with a flickering candle and in two of the versions, a mirror, emblematic of vanity and Christ’s double nature, which Judovitz suggests, functions as a metaphor for the duplicity of painting.
Chapter Two focuses on the transformation of the concept of spiritual passion in the seventeenth century and the betrayal of painting as evidenced in La Tour’s depictions of St. Peter, which affirm spiritual passion through their dual emphasis on Peter’s denial and the iconography of repentance. Judovitz links the renewal of interest in St. Peter to his foundational role in the formation of the Catholic Church and his role as forerunner of the papacy. In the Denial of St. Peter (1650), La Tour’s last signed and dated painting, the sacred and the secular are dramatically juxtaposed through the inclusion of the soldiers gambling for Christ’s clothes, recalling the display of trickery in the Card Cheats, which Judovitz links to the betrayal of painting. The competing sources of light and reflection demonstrate La Tour’s consummate mastery of lighting effects.

Chapter Three examines visibility and legibility, focusing on the presence of books and the act of reading, recurring tropes in La Tour’s depictions of St. Jerome Reading and the Education of the Virgin. Judovitz links the enigmatic act of reading to spiritual illumination, underscoring Mary’s ambiguous status as both messenger and message that holds the candle and points to the Bible, serving as a gateway to pivot back and forth between past, present, and future. In the Discovery of St. Alexis, the interface between the visible and the legible is thematized and the vision of the beholder is decentered. La Tour represents the moment of discovery whose true meaning was only revealed by reading the note clutched by St. Alexis, which recasts legibility by insisting on the beholder’s participation.

Chapter Four interrogates the vanity of painting through La Tour’s puzzling Flea-Catcher and his late depictions of blowers of light in which the rekindling and the transfer of light are foregrounded. Judovitz suggests that the humble but luminous Flea-Catcher, which has been linked to Dutch genre painting, is actually imbued with Biblical references, arguing that the woman appears to hold a rosary (rather than a flea), and linking the red chair and burning candle to the Virgin’s role as spiritual portal. Likewise, she suggests that the blowers of light possess religious significance through their association with the rekindling of the spirit.

Chapter Five considers the notion of painting as portal in relation to the legacy of iconoclastic destruction and post-Tridentine devotional
painting. Judovitz analyzes the ambiguous shifts between the secular and the sacred in the Newborn Child and the Adoration of the Shepherds, which, she suggests, seek to evoke the mystery of Incarnation through the juxtaposition of spiritual as opposed to physical illumination and the double illumination of the Christ child and the candle. Shadows also play a preponderant role in St. Sebastian Tended by Irene, in which his spiritual passion and martyrdom are evoked through a single arrow and a drop of blood, functioning as a punctum, which reaches out to directly engage the beholder. For Judovitz, St. Sebastian both recalls the martyrdom of painting provoked by iconoclasm but also offers hope for renewal and redemption through its hidden geometric scaffolding.

In the epilogue, Judovitz addresses the insoluble dilemma of the reception and impact of La Tour’s paintings during his lifetime due to the absence of historical evidence. Writing a century later, Dom Augustin Calmet noted that La Tour’s St. Sebastian was held in high regard by Louis XIII (105). Although the glowing illumination, humble naturalism, and spiritual dimension of La Tour’s paintings continue to resonate with twenty-first-century viewers, it is impossible to gauge their impact on his contemporaries. Judovitz’s densely argued, meticulously researched, and beautifully illustrated study opens the door to the broader artistic, religious, and philosophical implications of La Tour’s mysterious paintings through her insightful readings and broad interdisciplinary perspective.


Giancarla Periti’s engaging and well-illustrated book on the visual culture surrounding patrician religious women in Renaissance Italy investigates the inherent contradictions between rules of monastic decorum that were understood to guide female religious communities in the late medieval and early modern period and the material splendor once actively promoted within their conventual spaces. Based on analysis of extant artistic and architectural evidence largely
found in Parma, Brescia, and Milan, as well as extensive archival and secondary sources, Periti argues that, in spite of efforts to limit the access of the secular world to female religious spaces and promote visual cultures of modesty with them, monastic spaces inhabited by aristocratic women demonstrate acute affinities with refined courts in their social organization and material decoration. The aim of the book is to reconstruct and examine “monastic spatial contexts and the historical modes of looking at images made for noble religious women” (4). The chapters examine a variety of works in different mediums, including panel paintings, frescoes, maiolica tiles, wood intarsia, and *pietra serena* inscriptions, to establish the motivation for and use of art in elite Benedictine female convents during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries before the Council of Trent and to offer new interpretations of works by leading artistic figures in northern Italy, ultimately with the goal of offering a contextual understanding the decorative program created by Correggio in 1518–1519 at the convent of San Paolo in Parma.

The first chapter establishes the rich context for understanding the complex ideologies embedded in the architecture of female religious spaces and the attendant social behavior performed in them to define patrician nuns in terms of their “institutionalized liminality” (22). As opposed to a complete renunciation of familial and civic ties expected of female religious, the patrician nuns under investigation retained and made use of their secular identities to subvert controls normally placed upon their bodies and minds. As Periti demonstrates, patrician nuns often were distinguished by material signs of their status, including elaborate garments and accessories, and by their sustained access to the secular world outside the convent’s walls.

Chapter Two reconstructs the physical experience of engaging with the decoration of the convent of San Paolo in Parma in an effort to redefine the gaze, touch, and perception of nuns in relation to their decorated surroundings within the convent. Periti proposes a new interpretation of Jacopo Loschi’s frescoes, today preserved in detached and fragmented form in the conventual museum, as the original decoration of the Chapter House, which she argues represented living female members of the San Paolo community, including the Abbess Maria Benedetti, the noblewoman (and former wife of the signore Pier
Maria Rossi) Antonia Torelli, and the abbess’s sister Simona. While based on circumstantial evidence, Periti grounds her claim within the institutional politics of the convent and the struggles demonstrated by Benedetti and Torelli in archival documents to maintain independence from local ecclesiastical regulation. In this context, Loschi’s paintings are framed as an assertion of female authority and agency. In the same chapter, Periti offers a reconstruction of the tin-glazed, or maiolica, tiles of the original floor pavement—today removed to the Galleria Nazionale of Parma—as products of two distinct, but related, patronage campaigns under Abbess Maria Benedetti (after 1475) and Abbess Giovanna Piacenza (after 1507). While again Periti’s claims in this section are based on circumstantial evidence, she grounds her argument within the complex political context of the convent’s shifting allegiance from Rossi to the Sforza family after 1477 and connects the iconography and medium of the tiles to distinct emblems and tastes of the Sforza. Particularly convincing is the author’s approach to the maiolica tiles as *picturae* (paintings), whose meanings were only activated through the simultaneous movement and visual engagement of the nuns who tread upon them with downcast eyes. The portraits of living members of the convent found in Loschi’s Chapter House paintings were matched by portraits found in the maiolica tiles, a claim that Periti explores to investigate the genre of what she calls “convent beauties” (57) and uses to recontextualize Jacometto Veneziano’s sumptuous oil painting of a *Portrait of a Nun from San Secondo* (ca. 1485–95) at the Metropolitan Museum of Art as “material evidence of a courtly monastic tradition” (60). The male counterpart to these female convent beauties was also represented in the maiolica tiles, at times with inscriptions that record love messages connected to “games of courtesy and gift exchanges between lovers” (63). These and other tiles bearing representations connected to court culture are held up as evidence of the ties between the secular and sacred worlds embodied in the personal histories of patrician nuns.

Noble religious female spaces—in particular nuns’ choirs—are the focus of Chapter Three. Periti argues that the range and quality of objects and images that adorned these spaces were a means to assert the status of their inhabitants and to ensure a continuity with their secular female counterparts outside the convent. Particular attention
is given to Girolamo Romanino and Bernardo Luini’s frescoes for nuns’ choirs at Santa Giulia in Brescia and San Maurizio al Monastero Maggiore in Milan, respectively, and Luchino Bianchino’s intarsiated choir stalls at San Paolo in Parma (today at Santa Teresa del Bambin Gesù). Periti fleshes out the context for these commissions and their iconography within the political dimensions of female conventual authority, particularly tied to abbesses’ elite familial identities and ties to ruling parties. At the same time, Periti establishes a wider range of humanist subjects as appropriate for the decoration of female religious spaces than has been previously acknowledged and emphasizes the nuns’ overt appreciation and demand for aesthetic refinement in their artistic commissions.

Chapter Four turns to Giovanna Piacenza’s abbatial apartment at San Paolo in Parma as an adaptation of male ecclesiastical palace spaces. Periti’s nuanced understanding of the diverse spatial paths offered to visitors from the outside and nuns on the inside of the walls enables her to suggest a convincing multivalent reading of the convent’s decoration made during Giovanna Piacenza’s tenure as abbess. The chapter investigates the sites of encounters with visitors—the convent’s gates, garden loggia, and audience hall—to explore their “semantic richness” and conceptualize the convent as a “ conventual court” (110). Periti provides a detailed analysis of the relatively understudied inscriptions found in intarsia friezes by Marco Antonio Zucchi as cryptic, witty word puzzles and “passages of ethical import” (116) that were in alignment with word games popular in the Italian courts and featured in courtly literature, such as Baldassare Castiglione’s Libro del Cortegiano. Likewise, the tituli carved into pietra serena lintels of the abbess’s apartment are approached as erudite signs of her patronage and learning that invited the nuns “to reflect on ethical and spiritual matters” (123).

Periti’s investigation of Alessandro Araldi’s painted ceiling of one of the rooms of the abbatial apartment of San Paolo—the theme of Chapter Five—posits the decoration as an assemblage of Classical, Christian, and occult sources that communicated sophisticated messages pertaining to female virtue to the patrician nuns. Emphasizing the decoration as an open invitation for nuns to disregard their instructions to maintain a downward gaze, Periti investigates the
secret knowledge of magic embedded in the iconography of the various registers of signs and images within the decorated room. Periti invites her readers to make links between Araldi’s frescoes and the woodcut illustrations of the enigmatic *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili* and a variety of other source material, including local frescoes in Parma, prints produced by Marcantonio Raimondi, and Andrea Mantegna’s pictorial conceits at the Palazzo Ducale in Mantua. By exploring the visual culture that informed Araldi’s work, and the intellectual traditions that it may have instigated in the minds of patrician religious women, Periti lays the foundation for her approach to the decoration in the remaining room in Giovanna Piacenza’s abbatial apartment.

As promised, the last chapter of the book culminates in an analysis of Correggio’s “revolutionary” paintings in the private chambers of Abbess Giovanna Piacenza (167). Periti aims for a recovery of “the full import of images that stage a spectacle for ambulatory viewers, whose gazes and movements complete the decoration and make it a living presence” (172). While claims to recovering the active, sentient, and ambulatory spectator are asserted here (and throughout the book), the chapter’s strength lies less in a somatic exploration of viewership and more in the author’s command of the vast repertoire of Latin, Greek, Egyptian, and Arabic textual sources that informed viewers’ intellectual appreciation of its content. Grounded in erudite consideration of literary sources in circulation in Parma in the early sixteenth century, the chapter reconceives Correggio’s pagan subjects and allegories as contingent on the *serio-ludic* poetic conception.

Considering the complete or partial destruction of many of these patrician female religious spaces and the widespread displacement of their original decoration, Periti’s arguments throughout the book rely on a certain level of hypothetical reconstruction to establish her claims. Indeed, the loss of a comprehensive visual and material register of patrician female religious spaces necessarily limits the extent to which one can analyze the relationship between embodied viewers and their sensory activation by and reception of the artistic decoration that once enfolded them into viewing scenarios. Yet, the lavish and extensive illustrations of extant works, coupled with helpful floor plan reconstructions, provide visual evidence to the reader that is thoughtfully explicated in the text. Periti’s book provides important
groundwork for the recovery of female patrician religious sensibility in relation to Italian Renaissance visual and material culture and convincingly presents these conventual spaces as courtly spaces run by and for patrician women in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.


The four-hundredth anniversary of Bartolomé Esteban Murillo (1617–1682) yielded significant curatorial projects to commemorate the birth of one of the most celebrated painters of the Spanish Golden Age. *Murillo: The Self-Portraits* documents his two celebrated self-depictions in the holdings of New York City’s Frick Collection and London’s National Gallery, respectively. Both gallery-hosted exhibitions devoted to the understudied identity of Murillo as a portraitist, the Frick Collection being the first ever to have displayed Murillo’s only two known self-portraits. In March 2018, rounding up Murillo’s anniversary, a four-day symposium conjoined art historical and historiographical commentaries with a thematic exhibition at the Capuchins convent in Murillo’s native Seville. “Murillo and the Capuchins of Seville” reassembled in original setting Murillo’s series of altarpieces he executed for the Capuchins of Seville. The altarpieces, dispersed among several owners and institutions, were brought together in the Capuchin convent of Seville for the first time.

As a token of remembrance, the curatorial idea to focus *Murillo: The Self-Portraits* on the painter’s activity as portraitist is relevant. The editors, Xavier F. Salomon and Letizia Treves, wrote essays to investigate the career of Murillo by way of his portraits of Sevillian people, dignitaries and, more especially, his self-depictions. The emphasis on the self-portrait associates the Spanish Baroque mode with the Italian Renaissance slogan “every painter paints himself.” Yet the book accomplishes even more than a substantial context for the self-portrait as an artist’s highest mode of self-expressing. Xavier F. Salomon underscores the Sevillian environment in which Murillo received formation at a
school with an established tradition. Seville gave Murillo exposure to significant patrons of the arts, such as the Antwerp-born Nicolás Omazur, who secured through engraving the fame of the London self-portrait outside of Spain; the Flemish ecclesiast and canon of Seville Cathedral, Justino de Neve, who collected art and supported Murillo as a close friend; and many others. The choice of the oval frame for both the Frick and London self-portraits emerges as a calculated measure on Murillo’s part to ensure his posterity with recourse to the roundel format for ancient portraiture (43). The use of the roundel format from funerary art and the stone medium for the effigy of the deceased were key portraiture tools derived by Murillo from the antiquities of Seville, a town steeped in Greco-Roman culture and in the remnants of ancient civilizations preserved in the historical town of Hispalis, the older name for Seville (61). Murillo added in the London self-portrait the protruding hand as an illusionistic feature, one aligned with the Baroque trompe l’oeil but at the same time consistent with the call to make the portrait as vivid and alive as possible. By way of the hand resting on the outer edge of the stone frame, Murillo animates his effigy and brings himself closer to the words of the Latin inscription below, reminding the viewer that he created his self-image as a gift to his nine children. Xavier S. Salomon did a fascinating job in addressing the layered meaning behind Murillo’s self-portraits as an object with substantial outreach: the stony oval frame and the half-length format imbued with ancient recollections, and the semi-profile view, all of which heighten the personal overtone from the London self-portrait, wherein the inscription and the prominent white collar, or golilla (the sign of the Spanish upper class) were emphasized by Murillo.

The story of the transferring of the Frick Self-Portrait from Seville to Manhattan and implicit acquiring by American steel industrialist and art collector Henry Clay Frick (1849-1919) is an informative account about the nineteenth-century climate of masterpieces’ switching owners and the role of prints in establishing the critical fortune of the painted portrait. Xavier F. Salomon testifies to the significance of prints made after Murillo’s self-portraits as effective in raising awareness of the artist’s physiognomy in an age that recognized Murillo as to be the most accomplished Spanish artist, yet without knowing his true likeness. In this respect, art collectors, including royal figures
such as Catherine the Great, never knew how he would have looked like until the advent of his printed portrait (70). Salomon underscores the printmaker Manuel Alegre, who engraved the Frick self-portrait presumably for the first time in 1790. From its location in Paris, at the Louvre’s Galerie Espagnole, the Frick self-portrait helped consolidate Murillo’s preeminence in France and earned him a place in Paul Delaroche’s fresco *Hemicycle* (1837–43) next to Titian, Veronese, Antonello da Messina, and Jan van Eyck. Acquired by Frick in 1904, Murillo’s Self-Portrait had never been publically displayed until after a century, but it remained highly valued in the New York’s Frick collection for the lengthiest period.

Letizia Treves studies the trajectory of Murillo’s popularity in Europe and ascendancy in eighteenth-century Britain, where his religious compositions were avidly collected and associated with the works of Carlo Maratta (94). The reception of the National Gallery’s self-portrait relies on its fame outside of Seville, primarily secured through engraving. Richard Collin executed an engraving in Brussels, shortly after the death of Murillo’s in 1682, working on commission from the artist’s friend and patron Nicolás Omazur (101). Colin’s engraved likeness of Murillo was replicated by Joachim von Sandrart’s *Academia Nobilissimae Artis Pictoriae* (1683) and displayed on the frontispiece of Antoine-Joseph Dezallier d’Argenville’s *Abrégé de la vie des plus fameux peintres* (1762). Treves emphasizes the London Self-Portrait as a work of art that inspired the engravers to produce equally powerful statements on Murillo’s likeness. However, Murillo’s initial intention to have a painted portrait remained a creative act in the medium of painting only, distinguishing itself from the printed image, which the artist did not request to be made during his life. This perception changed in Britain where the rise of engraving actively influenced the art of painting. As Treves argues, for William Hogarth’s self-portrait *The Painter and His Pug* (1745) the combined merits of painting and engraving that ensured the fame of the London Self-Portrait transformed into an ambition for Hogarth to produce a work of conflation—a painted self-portrait executed with the art of engraving in mind (107).

The excellently edited volume *Murillo: The Self-Portraits* concludes with “Technical Studies,” a chapter that helps us better understand
the technical complexity and the intricacies of Murillo’s brushwork. Dorothy Mahon and Silvia A. Centeno speak of Murillo’s ability to sketch with the brush and black paint on a brown background, as revealed by the infrared reflectography pointing to the hair, facial features, and preliminary modelling of the face (116). Nicole Ryder noticed the peculiarity of Murillo’s choice of the material quality of his painting, namely, the clay from Seville’s Guadalquivir river, which ensured the shimmering qualities of many seventeenth-century Sevillian paintings, as Francisco Pacheco admitted (129).

*Murillo: The Self-Portraits* certainly undertook significant steps into studying his skill as a consummate portraitist, one at the forefront of Sevillian artists who impressed contemporary and subsequent generations of painters and art collectors alike. While the volume carefully includes many statements on Murillo’s legacy over the centuries, a stronger emphasis on the Sevillian humanism would have been desired for a study that focuses on one of the most powerful local artists. Seville at midcentury 1640–1660 was a town brimming with academic tradition. Murillo’s well-informed brushwork is not an isolated episode, but the outcome of a highly intellectual environment in matters of Renaissance and Classical cultures. Murillo’s leadership became actively involved when, together with Francisco de Herrera the Younger, he established the drawing academy of Seville in 1660.


Brian Howell’s *The Curious Case of Jan Torrentius* is a series of historical tales about Johannes Symonsz van der Beeck, alias Jan Torrentius (1589-1644). Torrentius was a Dutch painter whose problematic, libertine lifestyle landed him in trouble; he was arrested and tortured in 1627 as a religious non-conformist, blasphemer, and an alleged Rosicrucian adherent with atheistic and Satanic beliefs. When he was arrested, his paintings were ordered to be destroyed, and thus Torrentius’s only surviving work is “Still life with Bridle,” which features within the text of Howell’s work with a different sec-
tion of the painting occurring opposite the title page of each volume. Torrentius was rescued from prison after two years by King Charles I of England, an admirer of his work, and hired as court painter. After twelve years he returned to Amsterdam in 1642, where he remained until his passing in 1644.

Howell’s fictionalization of Torrentius’s life and involvement in Rosicrucianism is told in the form of a manuscript collection of letters, purported to have been published by the Dutch physicist, mathematician, astronomer and inventor Christiaan Huygens; the physical text is broken into six hardback volumes with a slipcase to fit them. The preface “written” by Huygens tells the reader that he inherited the collected manuscript from his father Constantijn Huygens (the famed poet) and has only changed the title (which reflects Howell’s title change between the first three volumes and the last three volumes) as well as added a concluding section. Otherwise, he presents his father’s manuscripts as he found them. Constantijn Huygens’s preface to the manuscripts tells the reader of the wish to “compile an account of this man, Jan [Torrentius], and to this end I have collected together five accounts, if I include my own, by those persons most knowledgeable about, and, indeed, decisive in, their contact with him.” The following four accounts are from Cornelis Drebbel; Dudley Carleton, Lord Dorchester; Elizabeth Stuart, Queen of Bohemia; and John Donne D.D., each account being a volume of the text. The final account and volume is from the view of Torrentius himself, recounting his arrest and release into the court of King Charles I. The volumes are titled Ex Anglia Reversus, Cornelis Drubelius Alcmariensis, A Small Picture of Torentius Hand, The Vowell That Makes So Sweet a Consonant, All States and All Princes, and Vandike and I.

In general the format works well for the material story, as Howell’s use of biased, varying recollections reflects the uncertainty of the life story of Torrentius; however, in the case of imitating the supposed authors, the style falls short. Donne’s prose section is flat and unmoving, without any of the wit or stylistic features that Donne’s readers appreciate and love. Likewise, there is license taken with the Rosicrucian leanings: there is no evidence to suggest that Donne or Lucy Countess of Bedford were involved with the Rosicrucians. While the text is modernized (the only early modern spelling occurs in direct
quotes from seventeenth-century material, e.g. Donne’s sermons and poetry), it is easily accessible and tells an entertaining and possible (if not improbable) story of Jan Torrentius. The story is well researched; in the final volume Howell lists many of his sources, including works by scholars such as Nadine Akkerman, R. C. Bald, Frances A. Yates, and Stanislas Klossowski de Rola. The gathering of the brotherhood attributed to Donne in the novel is taken directly from the *Fama Fraternalitatis* (1614), and the secret emblem given in the book (see below) is taken from historical alchemical symbols (the base is Mercury, with a sun symbol for a face, a moon symbol instead of mercurial horns). Cornelius Drebbel’s *camera obscura* is a central focus in Torrentius’s interest in and plan to assist the military efforts of Elizabeth Stuart and her husband Frederick V during his brief reign as the winter King of Bohemia, though it seems the concept of optography has been introduced a couple centuries too early. All in all, *The Curious Case of Jan Torrentius* is an enjoyable read.
‘Moribus antiquis sibi me fecere poetam’: Albertino Mussato nel VII centenario dell’incoronazione poetica (Padova 1315-2015). Edited by Rino Modonutti and Enrico Zucchi. mediEVI, 15. Florence: SISMEL / Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2017. xx + 287 pp. €46. As we all know, for centuries the story that Francesco Petrarca told about himself and the origins of humanism prevailed: the study of antiquity had remained dormant through the centuries of the Dark Ages, but serious interest in and understanding of ancient Greece and Rome returned almost instantaneously in the fourteenth century, thanks to Petrarca. Occasional discussions of figures like Lovato dei Lovati (1240/41-1309) took place within the context of Paduan prehumanism, but since the publication of Ronald Witt’s ‘In the Footsteps of the Ancients: The Origins of Humanism from Lovato to Bruni’ (Leiden, 2000), it has become clear that Petrarca actually represents the third generation, not the first, of Italian Renaissance humanists. To be sure, the new movement caught fire with Petrarca and he deserves credit for rocketing it forward to new scholarly and creative heights, but humanism did not spring forth fully formed from his head like Athena from Zeus.

A key figure in this revisionist history is Albertino Mussato (1261-1329), who was the principal second-generation humanist. On December 3, 1315, in an effort to revive what was understood as an ancient ceremony, Mussato was crowned with laurel, ivy, and myrtle

I must say that when I began work in this area some forty years ago, I knew who Mussato was but I could never have imagined an entire collection of essays devoted to him and his works. Thanks in good part to Witt’s prize-winning book, a new understanding of the origins of humanism has emerged, which has helped to restore Mussato to the position of cultural prominence that he deserves. This conference and
its proceedings stand as a fitting record of this development. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

♦ *Plato's Persona: Marsilio Ficino, Renaissance Humanism, and Platonic Traditions.* By Denis J.-J. Robichaud. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2018. 344 pp. $79.95. Anyone who knows anything about Renaissance humanism knows that Marsilio Ficino published the first complete Latin translation of Plato’s dialogues, wrote a huge tome that tried to reorient theology by aligning it with the Platonic tradition, and played a central role in the Platonic Academy of Renaissance Florence. Yet there are significant obstacles to studying Ficino. Like anyone who wrote in Latin, he threatens to overwhelm the modern scholar who by definition is not as comfortable in the language as the Renaissance intelligentsia was, and the language problem is complicated by the fact that Ficino was a scholar of Greek as well. A good amount of material survives that can allow us to reconstruct his work habits, but here the language problem is exacerbated by the need to read drafts and comments in crabbed hands on manuscripts that resist scrutiny even when they are studied in person, much less in reproduction. In Ficino’s case, simply the amount that he wrote has discouraged all but the most intrepid scholars from wading into a flood of material that threatens to overwhelm the investigator. In *Plato’s Persona,* Robichaud takes his place alongside Chastel, Kristeller, and Allen as one of the new generation’s leading Ficino specialists.

He does this by attempting something that has not been done before, “writing a single volume analyzing Ficino’s hermeneutics for understanding the Platonic corpus as a whole” (341). To do this, Robichaud focuses on the role of personae, arguing that Ficino fashions a humanist rhetorical persona for himself as a Platonic philosopher and interprets the dialogues by extracting and analyzing the three voices—Socratic, Pythagorean, and Platonic—through which Plato speaks in his dialogues. While modern scholars have often used a developmental approach, with the idea that Plato’s ideas evolved over time, Ficino sought to interpret Plato’s dialogues as a coherent corpus. Later scholars like Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768-1834) proposed that the authentic Plato can only be recovered from within his writings, but Ficino went in a different direction by placing Plato into a tradition
and reading him in relation to Iamblichus, Proclus, Plotinus, Porphyry, Hermias, and Pseudo-Dionysius. By working in this way, Robichaud is able to demonstrate that Iamblichus’s *De secta Pythagorica* played a greater role in Ficino’s thought than had previously been understood. He is also able to nuance Ficino’s relationship to Augustine in an important way. As Robichaud notes, “Augustine’s attitude marginalizes Platonism as a whole even as he makes his study of the ‘books of the Platonists’ the crucial propaedeutic for his conversion to Christianity” (21). Yet while Augustine sought to appropriate from Plato what was compatible with Christianity and discard the rest, Ficino did not see the birth of Christ as a fundamental break in history between pagan philosophy and Christian revelation, but instead placed Christianity among the other philosophical schools that postulate the existence of God and the human soul.

*Plato’s Persona* is a work of serious scholarship that gives us a Ficino for our time. For one thing, it challenges the humanist claims of a clean break with the barbarism of the Middle Ages by demonstrating that Ficino’s work demonstrates a continuity with medieval thought, especially with such authorities as Boethius, Aquinas, and Pseudo-Dionysius. We are coming to understand now that he is not alone in this. Robichaud also helps us understand that our own interpretation of Plato does not exist in a timeless vacuum, but takes its place at the end of a chain of previous interpretations that begins in late antiquity, extends through the Renaissance, and ends with us. This approach adds a new urgency to the role of history within the discipline of philosophy and parallels the growth of reception studies in the more literary-oriented part of the classical tradition. Finally I would like to commend Robichaud for writing a book that is refreshingly clear and easy to follow. Ficino’s writings are dense, and they seem to have attracted modern scholars who do not always succeed in offering a clear ‘through line’ as they unpack an admittedly challenging source. Robichaud has avoided this problem nicely, which makes it unusually easy and pleasant to recommend this book to anyone with a serious interest in Renaissance Platonism. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

of Toronto Press, 2017. xx + 278 pp. $80.00. In the early decades of the Reformation, Erasmus was often the elephant in the room. An accomplished biblical scholar well prior to the Reformation, he published the Greek New Testament with a new and controversial Latin translation, followed that with provocative annotations and biblical paraphrases, and prepared numerous patristic editions. The sometime friend of many reformers, he was just as often an adversary. An advocate for a reformist Catholicism, he never joined the Protestant cause—yet, long after his death, the legacy of Erasmus would haunt the work and texts of reformers all across Europe, John Calvin not least of all.

In a revision of his 2014 dissertation at Florida State University, Kirk Essary attempts to probe Erasmus’ convoluted legacy for Protestant biblical scholarship as well as the larger question of how the philosophy of biblical and humanist scholarship in the sixteenth century departed from prevailing scholastic models. Essary’s study is constructed cogently, even cleverly. Obviously an exhaustive comparison of the writings of Erasmus and Calvin would be unworkable. Essary rather situates his project within the limits of two intersecting lines of inquiry: the exegesis of the Pauline motif of “God’s foolishness” in Erasmus and Calvin, as expounded largely in the opening chapters of 1 Corinthians; and their appropriation of this same theme as part of a larger “Christian philosophy” that discloses their “approaches to Christian preaching” as well as their “conceptions of religious knowing and feeling” (xv). The topic of folly provides especially effective access to Erasmus, whose well-known *Praise of Folly* was but one of his many writings that took up this theme.

Accordingly, several chapters trace various aspects of the foolishness of God and of the gospel message through 1 Corinthians, addressing implications for religious epistemology, for eloquence and rhetoric, and for rhetorical and theological accommodation. Two further chapters examine, in turn, the implications of Paul’s seeming dismissal of philosophy in Colossians 2:8, and the legitimate place of emotions in Christian knowing and living—an arguably anti-Stoic emphasis embraced by both Erasmus and Calvin. The latter topic retains the book’s exegetical focus by examining the reception history of Jesus’ fear in Gethsemane and the emotions he allegedly expressed earlier, at the raising of Lazarus. Erasmus and Calvin occupy center stage
throughout, but Essary attends also to figures who may well have been influences or conversation partners along the way, including Philip Melanchthon, Heinrich Bullinger, and Konrad Pellican. (Here one may wonder if Pellican is not a rather barren candidate, insofar as his commentaries on the epistles are routinely a pastiche derived from Erasmus, Bullinger, Chrysostom, and others, which would appear to diminish the evidentiary value of Pellican “repeating” Erasmus.)

The argument through most chapters consists largely of a serial comparison of biblical passages and regularly interacts with others who have explored or contested how to read the Reformation’s humanist roots. Essary’s prose, however, is not always an easy read, given his penchant for parenthetical constructions and vague reference, and the views and arguments of his modern interlocutors are occasionally dismissed or demeaned too cursorily. Still, such flaws notwithstanding, Essary appropriately corrects many caricatured comparisons of Erasmus and Calvin—such as “the oft-repeated theme in Protestant historiography” that Erasmus was “merely a moral theologian” (123)—and does so with more than ample evidence. Indeed, one of the highlights of the book is the way Erasmus’ own theology and piety shine forth with impressive fervor and substance. Another highlight emerges from Essary truly having given his sources the “close reading” that he promised, such that Calvin’s tacit indebtedness to Erasmus for matters of both form and substance is identified over and over again—in instances sufficiently numerous that this reviewer would have appreciated an appendix to tabulate and categorize Calvin’s dependencies. Nonetheless, Essary’s book ought to change the way many have read Erasmus, as well as the way many have insufficiently gauged Calvin’s literary relationship to Erasmus. (John L. Thompson, Fuller Theological Seminary)


These three volumes advance two of the most ambitious, long-standing, and comprehensive international publishing initiatives of our times, one based in Amsterdam and the other in Toronto. In the best spirit of a new *respublica litteraria*, scholars from many national, linguistic, and disciplinary backgrounds have brought us closer to a critical edition of Desiderius Erasmus’ (*ca.* 1469-1536) *Opera omnia*, known as ASD, and to annotated English translations of his complete works (*Collected Works of Erasmus*, or CWE). The spirit of cooperation towards a common goal is evident, not just in the variety of names appearing on title pages, but also in the broad network of scholars mentioned in acknowledgements and notes.

Jane Phillips’ translation and annotation of the first half of Erasmus’ *Paraphrase on Luke*, first published in 1523 as part of the humanist’s effort to adapt New Testament texts for the sixteenth-century reader, brings to completion the series of CWE volumes dedicated to his *Paraphrases*. It precedes by one year the critical edition of the Latin text, published in December 2017 in the ASD series, and succeeds by more than ten years the publication of its companion volume in CWE. This is Philipps’ third contribution to that series, and as in previous instances she renders Erasmus’ Latin in clear, readable prose that takes into account his ability to interweave varied modes of expression. Her rich annotations make Erasmus’ paraphrase, itself an accommodation of a different sort, accessible to modern scholars. As outlined in her translator’s note, Phillips is especially attentive to four types of annotations: notes that show how Erasmus applied his knowledge of classical literature and Scripture to enliven the text; notes that situate Erasmus’ Biblical interpretation within an exegetical tradition; references to Erasmus’ other writings, particularly his *Annotations*; and notes explaining which parts of the text were subject
to criticism by contemporaries, what those criticisms were, and how Erasmus responded to them. Perhaps because the ASD critical edition of this work was not yet available, Phillips also provides abundant commentary on Erasmus’ Latin word usage. This reader appreciated the decision to employ footnotes instead of endnotes, a format that greatly facilitates use of the work for scholarly purposes, even if the notes sometimes tend to overwhelm by their sheer volume the paraphrase itself.

In line with a practice begun in earlier volumes of the series, the *Paraphrase on Luke 1-10* contains an “Index of Greek and Latin Words Cited” that allows readers to zero in on how Erasmus uses key terms in his hermeneutical vocabulary, such as *fides* or *sermo*. This index is considerably fuller than some of those accompanying other volumes of the series, but other indices that certain scholars might have found useful are absent. For example, there is no index of classical or patristic and medieval references as in some of the other *Paraphrases*. The reader may be surprised to discover that neither Robert Sider (General Editor of all New Testament scholarship in the CWE), nor Philipps in her translator’s note, covers some of the typical topics one might expect in prefatory material, such as the genesis of the *Paraphrase on Luke* or the particular features that distinguish it from other *Paraphrases* in the series. Readers are, however, invited to consult Sider’s excellent introduction to the whole series of *Paraphrases* that appears in volume 42 of the CWE, and of course now one also has access to the ASD edition. Sider does offer a brief but interesting retrospective on how the project has evolved since its inception and reflects on what a monumental achievement it is to have produced annotated English translations of all of Erasmus’ *Paraphrases*. Indeed!

If Erasmus trumpets the victorious march and rapid spreading of the Gospels in his dedicatory epistle to the *Paraphrase on Luke*, the letters collected in CWE 17, which cover the period from August 1530 to March 1531, sound a more somber tone overall. With the Empire on the verge of religious war, the threat of a Turkish invasion on the rise, and renewed disputes with old adversaries, the humanist is faced with the fragmentation of Christendom and continued accusations from both reformers and conservatives. Although he prudently did not attend in person, Erasmus offers us valuable insight into the hap-
penings at the 1530 Diet of Augsburg, organized by Charles V in an attempt to achieve religious reconciliation within the Empire, and its ultimate failure. The volume’s translator, Charles Fantazzi, gives us a lively version of Erasmus’ prose, one that captures in turn his moments of despair or defensiveness, the festivitas of his epistolary exchanges with like-minded humanists, and the reverence with which he writes about early religious texts. The task of annotating this sequence of letters was made more complex by the fact that, for the first time in the CWE correspondence series, the source text was not seen to press by P. S. Allen, who edited an authoritative critical edition of Erasmus’ letters in the early twentieth century (Opus epistolarum, 1906-1958), but by his widow, H. M. Allen, and their longtime collaborator H. W. Garrod. As a consequence, James Estes and the various specialists on whom he relied for assistance were more active in augmenting or correcting the notes found in the source volumes. The product of their work is an apparatus that effectively highlights a wide array of literary, historical, and polemical aspects of the letters. Estes proves especially adept at identifying and clarifying the way in which Erasmus, and often his correspondents, deploy adages and other classical references to enliven their epistles and strengthen their intellectual bonds. Preceding each letter there is a brief note that specifies from which manuscript it is drawn and where it was initially published. When addressees have not yet figured in previous volumes in the series, Estes adds biographical information, and when appropriate he engages in a more detailed discussion of an epistle’s contents.

Representing the forty-ninth volume to have been published in the collection, ASD IV-7 contains critical editions of six short works belonging to the fourth “ordo” of Erasmus’ opera, the one which relates to moral instruction. As is invariably the case with the ASD, the volume is of the highest quality, and the editorial board has assembled an impressive team of scholars. Each work is preceded by an introduction detailing the editorial history of the text and the context for its composition. In many cases these introductions also contribute insightful analyses on topics ranging from Erasmus’ use of Latin and his skill as a translator to the role of marginalia. Meticulously researched footnotes complete the critical apparatus for each text.
Terence Tunberg oversees the edition of the *Declamatiuncula* (1518), developing in his introduction a brief but stimulating discussion of how this short work provides a good case study of the ways in which humanist authors might approach a Christian theme. Tunberg shows that even the author of the *Ciceronianus*, agreeing with Lorenzo Valla’s recommendation to prefer syntax and word-choice from Latin authors active during the first century BC to the second century AD, frequently employed pagan religious terms to express Christian ideas and concepts, although he was not dogmatic in doing so.

Lucia Gualdo Rosa’s edition of *Isocratis ad Nicoclem regem de institutione principis* (1516) contains in its introduction a stimulating discussion of the marginalia that accompanied early editions of Erasmus’ translation, but which were excluded from the 1540 and 1703-1706 versions of his *Opera omnia*. Gualdo Rosa argues for their value, whether or not they were written by Erasmus himself, and includes them in her footnotes. Also worth noting are Gualdo Rosa’s introductory comments on Erasmus’ qualities as a translator. She concludes that Erasmus’ version is an independent creation rather than a mere reworking of a previous translation. This, according to Gualdo Rosa, shows how seriously he took the work of Isocrates, despite his ambivalent attitude towards the ancient Sophists. Less original, argues Jeroen De Keyser, is Erasmus’ 1530 Latin rendering of Xenophon’s *Hieron* (1530). In his introduction to Erasmus’ last known translation of a Greek pagan work, De Keyser demonstrates, in fact, the degree to which the author emulates Leonardo Bruni’s 1403 translation.

The shortest work in the volume is the *Epistola consolatoria in adversis* (1528), which Edwin Rabbie edits and annotates. Occupying roughly half the volume, on the other hand, are the texts and critical apparatuses of the *Oratio de pace et discordia* and the *Oratio funebris in funere Bertae Goudanae viduae probissimae* (both first published in 1706, but likely composed in the late 1480s), edited by Marc van der Poel. His introduction to the orations provides important information on the probable dating and circumstances of their composition, and includes useful outlines of their structure. His most remarkable contribution, however, is an eighty-page appendix in which he offers a thorough and copious examination of the so-called ‘manuscript of Scriverius’ (*Scri*), our only source for the two orations. Van der Poel
covers in masterful detail both the history of the manuscript and its treatment at the hands of copyists, printers, and scholars over the more than four centuries following its creation. His conclusions are relevant, not just to readers wishing to explore the two orations published here, but also to those interested more generally in Erasmian paleography.

Together, the three volumes reviewed here contain material of great interest to scholars from numerous disciplines, including rhetoric, theology, history, Neo-Latin studies, Renaissance studies, Reformation studies, translation studies, and early modern paleography. (Robert Kilpatrick, University of West Georgia)

♦  *The Stoic Origins of Erasmus’ Philosophy of Christ.* By Ross Dealy. Erasmus Studies. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2017. 424 pages. $90. For some time now it has been commonly held that Erasmus’ thought should be approached from the viewpoint of rhetoric rather than philosophy. Contrary to that position, emeritus professor Ross Dealy upholds that *philosophia Christi* takes its origin in late classical stoicism and attempts to demonstrate the philosophical consistency underlying Erasmus’ works. His inquiry draws on a thorough and convincing reading of the *Disputatiuncula de taedio, pavore, tristitia Jesu* (1499-1501) (A Short Treatise Concerning the Distress, Alarm, and Sorrow of Jesus) and the more famous *Enchiridion militis Christiani* (1503). Stressing that these two books should be read together, as two important stages of Erasmus’ early thinking, Dealy uses those two treatises to highlight all the possible evidence of a stoic background to his thought, drawing from Cicero, Epictetus, Gellius, and Panaetius.

Part one illustrates what the early humanists thought of stoicism. From Petrarch to Machiavelli we are told that they failed to grasp the core of real stoicism, which lies in what Dealy coins a “both/and” rather than “either/or” mindset. They believed that stoicism was about *apatheia* achieved through reason, leading to a mastery over the “passions,” and they thus concluded that the wise man was impervious to desire or suffering. On his part Erasmus would have understood that the wise man felt fear and other passions like any other mortal, but that those would not overwhelm him. Dealy uses Erasmus’ interpretation of the story of the stoic in the typhoon found
in the *Attic Nights* as evidence of his proper understanding of stoicism. At odds with Gellius, Erasmus asserted that the stoic was struck by fear as any other person would be, for his affliction was nothing but a natural reaction to the circumstances he found himself in. Wisdom is thus set apart from what is thought to be a spontaneous response. (Note that Erasmus called those late stoics over whose works he built his own view of stoicism *mei stoici*.)

Part two is an attempt to resettle the debate over Erasmus’ youth. Dealy’s demonstration at that point is driven by psychological concerns over the reasons why Erasmus would have had recourse to stoicism at that period of his life. Erasmus uses as evidence his own experience of monastic life. His alleged physical inability to fast as well as his mental inability to follow one rule demonstrates his point against monastic life. By the time he left the orders, this experience having shattered his ideal of *vita contemplativa*, Erasmus would have found in stoicism a theory of different constitutions and tempers that led him to believe that *monachatus non est pietas* unless one has the right temper for it. It simply appeared to him afterward that this was not the case for him.

Parts three and four examine key concepts of stoicism and the arguments Erasmus might have drawn from them. It discusses at length the distinction in late stoicism between *katekon* and *katorthoma*—efficient action and right action—over which Erasmus’ ethics are built. Common people and wise men alike undertake efficient action, but what makes them right actions is that the wise men knowingly conform themselves to universal harmony by doing so. For Christians that would imply that morality can only be judged from the inside: the appearances of piety, like ostentatious prayers or fasts, are mere appearances, useless as such unless the mind is pious. At the same time, stoic *oikeiosis* would also prove useful to Erasmus in his demonstration against the commonly believed wise man’s *apatheia*. Natural instinct cannot be denied, and it is absurd to think of the wise man as insensitive to natural urges such as hunger or fear of death. Moreover, by acknowledging the human nature of Christ, Erasmus claims that Jesus did undergo fear of death at Gethsemane, and not just the “propassion” of it—a sudden outburst of fear—as the dominant Catholic dogma after Saint Jerome maintained. Erasmus made this demonstration the pivotal point of his line of argumentation against Colet. Christ
overcame fear of death, showing more courage than if he had not felt it, while his real suffering makes him closer to mankind. Thus Christ fully deserves to be an object of love for Christians, while the exalted martyrs are worthy of “mere” admiration.

Part five looks back to late antiquity and medieval Christology to give a fair account of the status quaestionis on Christ’s suffering at Gethsemane. This overview will prove useful to every scholar who is not familiar with the theological thought of Hilary of Poitiers, Bonaventure, or Alexander of Hales. The next part deals with the intellectual context of the De taedio Christi and shows that there was enormous interest in the Passion by the time of Erasmus’ debate with Colet. Stressing the originality of Erasmus’ thought, Dealy shows that most contemporary authors thought of Jesus Christ as a “super martyr” facing death with alacritas (eagerness)—the exact opposite of fear. This part duly complements part four’s demonstration.

In part seven, Dealy opposes André Godin’s thesis expressed in his seminal work Érasme, lecteur d’Origène. According to Godin, Erasmus would not merely actualize Origen’s trichotomic anthropology, but would have bent it in a stoic way. In the thought of Origen and his followers, the soul, anima, is torn between spirit and flesh, and in every choice it has to cling to one or the other. Hence adiaphora (the indifferent things) form the matter over which spirit and flesh contend in order to rule over the soul. On the other hand, Erasmus, following “his stoics,” would have thought of the adiaphora in such a way that satisfying natural urges does not always imply a moral issue. There can be indifferent things for Christians as long as the way they are handled is worthy of a Christian. Though this position asserts the consistency of Erasmus’ thinking, note that Dealy here has less factual proofs to display than the evidence Godin has drawn from Erasmus’ letters to support his views.

While everyone acknowledges the importance of the Enchiridion militis Christiani in Erasmus’ works, Dealy successfully shows that the lesser known De taedio Christi involves philosophical issues of Christology that are fundamental to the spiritual warfare handbook he would compose two years later. Even if the debate is still open about whether the stoics or Origen had a deeper influence over Erasmus, the debt of those two books to late stoicism has been overlooked for

Shkodër (also Shkodra, Latin Scodra, Italian Scutari, German Skutari) is one of the biggest and also oldest cities in the modern Republic of Albania, situated in its northern region. The area has been inhabited since antiquity, first by the Thracians and later by the Illyrians, and it was conquered by the Romans in 168 BC. In the Middle Ages, periods of Byzantine, Slavic, Venetian, and Ottoman rule followed. Shkodër was held by the Turks until 1913, when it became a part of modern Albania. Although Shkodër had already been under the control of the Ottoman Turks from 1392 to 1396, the centuries-long Turkish rule effectively began with the very event described by Barletius: the siege of 1478-1479, which ended the Serenissima’s control of the area.

The author of De obsidione Scodrensi, the priest and humanist Marinus Barletius, was born around 1460 in Shkodër but emigrated to Venice after the city he helped defend was captured by the Turks. His other works are a biography of George Castriota alias Skanderbeg, Historia de vita et gestis Scanderbegi, Epirotarum principis, and the Compendium, a collection of vitae of popes and emperors. De obsidione Scodrensi is divided into three books, the first being, as Zathammer notes, a kind of archaeology (38), including a history of the Turkish people and descriptions of Macedonia, Epirus, and the Shkodër region. In books II and III Barletius relates the siege of his hometown in detail,
counting every stone and flammable projectile directed at the city, and praises the faith and courage shown by the besieged in the face of adversity. Descriptions of life inside the city walls are particularly memorable: bells were rung to alarm the citizens and warn them of danger, but, as Barletius gravely notes, [c]ampanis numquam otium dabatur (2.15.4), and the inhabitants were reduced to living like rabbits in caves they had to dig themselves (2.15.5); equally disturbing is the description of malnourishment and famine (3.5.2-7). Orations by Christians and Muslims are inserted into the narrative at dramatic points, illustrating the piety and valour of the former, and the vanity and bloodthirstiness of the latter. Barletius' black-and-white portrayal of the barbaric, perfidious Turks and morally superior Christians is hardly surprising, especially when compared to other humanist representations of the Turks, discussed in the introductory part of this book. Zathammer provides a concise and well-balanced introduction that helps the reader understand the historical background, especially the geopolitical importance of today's Albania for both Venice and the Ottoman Turks. Furthermore Zathammer tells the story of Albanian humanism, mentioning other important figures like Paul Angelus, Johannes Gasulus, Nikolaus Leonicens Thomaeus, and Marinus Becichemus, and presents the reader with what is known of the life and literary works of Marinus Barletius. Barletius the émigré is also set into the context of Italian humanism. Zathammer establishes the terminus post quem for De obsidione Scodrensi, lists Barletius' sources other than autopsy (local oral tradition, classical historians, and contemporary sources), identifies his classical role models (Sallust, Livy, and Vegetius among others) and the use of topoi like the aforementioned orations, and finally assesses his trustworthiness. The text is based on the editio princeps of Barletius (Venice, 1504) and accompanied by a critical apparatus and a facing German translation that is faithful and easy to follow.

This edition will certainly be of interest to historians and neo-Latin scholars, especially those studying the rich corpus of Antiturcica writings. It is also an important contribution to the study of a humanist tradition that is less well known, but, as demonstrated by Zathammer's highly commendable work, quite intriguing and deserving of more attention. (Petra Šoštarić, University of Zagreb)

Der Band zerfällt in insgesamt fünf Teile: I. allgemeine Einführung von Tilman Repgen (XVII-LVIII); II. Vorbemerkungen des Übersetzers Joachim Stüben (LIX-CIX); III./IV. lateinischer Text mit deutscher Übersetzung gemäß den stark differierenden Versionen, die die erhaltenen Textzeugen (Salamanca, Biblioteca Universitaria, ms. 43; Rom, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, cod. Ottobon. lat. 1015) jeweils bieten (2-169; 170-256); V. Appendix mit Verzeichnissen, Anmerkungen und Registern (259-355).

früheren Zustand des durch Rückgabe oder Ersatzleistung versteht und als heilsrelevant charakterisiert.


Zudem wird nicht immer deutlich, ob die identifizierten Fehler in der jeweiligen Handschrift zu finden sind oder auf ein Missgeschick von de Heredia zurückgehen, etwa in folgendem Eintrag: S.170, Z.18 de K (=Konjektur) ] de de BH 3 (=Heredia) – wenn der Fehler nicht auf die Handschrift zurückgeht, ist der Anspruch auf eine Konjektur unberechtigt, wenn er dagegen tatsächlich auf die Handschrift zurückzuführen ist, sollte, um Missverständnisse zu vermeiden, deutlich gemacht werden, etwa durch Hinzufügung des Zusatzes ms., dass der
Textzeuge diesen Fehler enthielt und de Heredia ihn abdruckte, ohne zu konjizieren. In einigen Fällen findet sich ein solcher Zusatz, der eine falsche Transkription de Heredias berichtet (z.B. S.186, Z.15 BH3 hinter transferre setzt hinzu [ms. transferri]), aber mir ist unklar geblieben, ob Stüben eine systematische Neukollation der Handschriften durchführte, oder lediglich einige problematische Stellen überprüfte, und ich vermute, dass die Beseitigung von Irrtümern de Heredias, wie im oben angeführten Fall, manchmal zu Unrecht als Konjektur bezeichnet wird. Eine Einsichtnahme in die Handschriften, die mir nicht möglich war, könnte hier Klarheit schaffen.


Die deutsche Übersetzung dagegen ist als rundum gelungen zu bezeichnen: sie ist flüssig lesbar, lebendig, stets genau und erfüllt somit die translatorische Maxime „So wörtlich wie möglich, so frei wie nötig“ auf vorbildliche Weise. Die in der Appendix enthaltenen Anmerkungen zu erklärungsbedürftigen Passagen sind hilfreich und die Auflösungen der Quellen und Anspielungen Vitorias sind von erstaunlicher Fülle und demonstrieren eindrucksvoll Stübens Fachwissen, dessen Texterschließung weit über de Heredias Ausgabe hinausgeht.

Insgesamt ist die Qualität der Publikation, abgesehen von den oben genannten Schwächen, als sehr erfreulich zu bewerten. Die durchgehende Verwendung von Kurzformen bei der Zitation und die Kursivierung lateinischer Zitate in den Einleitungen und im Anhang hätten jedoch zur Entschlackung der Fußnoten und zu einem größeren Lesefluss beitragen können. Der Leinen-Einband ist qualitativ hochwertig, das Layout und die Textgestaltung vorbildlich, der Text erfreulich frei von Tippfehlern (nur ein einziger auf S.VI: Augleich).

Nundinarum Francofordiensium encomium / Eloge de la foire de Francfort / Ein Lob auf die Frankfurter Messe / Encomium of the Frankfurt Fair. By Henri Estienne. Else Kammerer, editorial coordination; Anne-Hélène Klinger-Dollé, Claudia Wiener, Maria Anna Oberlinner, and Paul White, translators. Texte courant, 5. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 2017. CVI + 130 pp. The author of this work, Henri II Estienne (1531-1598), was simultaneously a critic, a philosopher, a printer, a humanist, a voracious reader, a manuscript hunter, and an author. He fell in love with classical Greek as a child, which led him to complete and publish the *Thesaurus linguae Graecae*, a monumental dictionary that is still worth consulting today. The *Thesaurus*, however, was expensive and the market for it was limited, so that publishing it left Estienne in precarious circumstances financially. His *Encomium of the Frankfurt Fair* was published partly in an effort to get on to the market something that would sell, but partly as a way to express genuine admiration for a major commercial event that geopolitical circumstances and financial innovations had made into a vibrant, exciting semiannual event. Books were not the only thing for sale in Frankfurt, but the printer-bookseller Christian Egenolff and the publisher Sigmund Feyerabend had made the city into a major publishing center and the Fair attracted authors as well as publishers from all over the continent. As a result, every All Saints’ Day and Easter, Frankfurt became a new Athens, a place where the Muses and the printing arts combined to provide a tangible center to the Neo-Latin culture of the Renaissance. This is what Estienne’s *Encomium* praises.

This is not the first edition of the *Encomium*, nor is it the first translation into a modern language: as soon as it was published, its
early readers took it as a praise of internationalism and of peaceful exchange, both commercial and literary, so that it has been republished several times after the wars that have wracked Europe over the last hundred and fifty years. This is an unusually appealing edition, however. Everything, even the introduction, appears in French, German, and English, and the inclusion of a Latin text as well means that the book is accessible to most readers through one of these languages and can be used in teaching as well as research, on both the undergraduate and graduate levels. The role of the fair in literary and publishing history comes through clearly, but it is presented in a light and playful spirit that recognizes that the Fair was also a place of drunkenness and public disorder, which adds a different kind of interest to the work. The book is generously illustrated, with a nice little bibliography of primary and secondary sources. All in all an interesting diversion that shows a side that is seldom seen of the scholar-printer who produced the justly famous Thesaurus and adds a material underpinning to the field of Neo-Latin studies. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)
mencionados; un índice de autores y obras citados de forma abreviada, y otros de fuentes, de nombres y el general.

Roa fue una autoridad en asuntos de Antigüedad, y entre otros méritos supo reconocer que las ruinas de Medina Azahara eran de época islámica, interpretando correctamente la denominación de Córdoba la Vieja que tenía entonces. También rechazó la nómina de Hércules y reyes legendarios que habrían fundado ciudades en Hispania, ya procedieran de falsificaciones recientes o de la Antigüedad. Aclarando que el historiador Juan de Mariana le reconoció personalmente que, cuando llamaba a Sevilla capital de la Bética, se refería a la Andalucía de su tiempo, defendió justamente el principado de Córdoba en la Bética romana, aunque trató de extenderlo sin razón más allá del siglo IV, e incluso al reino visigodo y a todo el periodo islámico. Tampoco tiene razón cuando atribuye las Etymologiae a un obispo de Córdoba llamado Isidoro; cuando hace cordobeses a los mártires San Lorenzo – enfrentándose al cronista aragonés Juan Francisco Andrés de Uztároz –, y a Olimpias, Parmenio, Elimena y Crisotelo si la Iglesia lo consintiera, o a los autores árabes Avicena y Abenzoar entre otros. Pues el amor a su patria entorpecía su buen juicio y vasta erudición, lo que entonces como ahora llevó a destacados historiadores a manipular la verdad en defensa de la gloria y los intereses de su nación o lugar de nacimiento.

Ello explica la influencia en su obra de las falsificaciones de Román de la Higuera y de los moriscos Alonso del Castillo y Miguel de Luna, a quien trató personalmente. Resulta interesante su conversación con Román en Toledo en 1611 camino de Roma sobre la ciudad de Baetis mencionada por Estrabón (Geog. 3.2.1) y que Hübner con buen criterio interpretó como un lapsus por Italica: Román acabó identificándola con Utrera en uno de los fragmentos que atribuyó a Dextro, garantizándose así el apoyo de Caro, natural de Utrera, para la defensa de su falsificación.

En la traducción del tratado latino (Lyon, 1617) solo cabe disentir en algunos detalles, como el título De Cordubae in Hispania Betica principatu liber unus (“El principado de Córdoba en la Hispania Bética, libro único”), en vez de “Libro sobre el principado ...,” o la dedicatoria ad S.P.Q. Cordubensem (“al Cabildo y pueblo cordobés”), en lugar de “al Cabildo y pueblo de Córdoba”; admodum por ‘aún’ en lugar de ‘muy’ (pp. 17 y 19), o unus Asdrubal como “un Asdrúbal” en vez
de “solo Asdrúbal” (21). Las anotaciones a la traducción son útiles y abundantes, aunque se echan en falta aclaraciones al sentido del epíteto Patricia de Corduba (9) o a las derivaciones de topónimos en 119.

El libro está cuidadosamente revisado, por lo que apenas he detectado leves erratas, como el espacio que falta en XIII en Anisson, 1667; verdadero en LIII por verdadero; el punto final que falta en la nota 205, o la tilde que falta en “no sé con que fundamento” (65). Deberían ir en mayúscula inicial algunos nombres propios y sintagmas como nuevo mundo referido al continente americano (29), molino perdido y puerta de los sacos (47).

Grau nos ofrece en suma el fruto de estas investigaciones de Roa en una espléndida edición, valorando adecuadamente sus aportaciones y carencias en el contexto cultural y religioso de su tiempo, y con los instrumentos necesarios para uso y provecho del lector. (Joaquín Pascual-Barea, Universidad de Cádiz)

♦ La paideia degli umanisti: un antologia di scritti. By Lucia Gualdo Rosa. Opuscula collecta, 17. Rome: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 2017. x + 356 pp. €70. The author of the essays in this collection, Lucia Gualdo Rosa, needs no introduction to those who work in Italian humanism. As she notes in a poignant preface, “Un album di fotografie,” the process of contemplating a lifetime’s work after you have passed your eightieth birthday is rather like turning over the pages of an album of photographs—a pleasure that our younger readers, whose pictures are all archived on their phones, will probably never have. But if the process is pleasurable for the author, it is equally pleasurable for the reader when the photographs were taken by someone like this.

The essays reprinted here, selected from more than a hundred items in Gualdo Rosa’s bibliography, extend back some thirty-five years. Not all essays merit reprinting, but these do: their author is well known for her careful, meticulous efforts to answer questions that are worth asking, and while some of the essays originally appeared in journals like *Rinascimento* and *Lettere italiane* that are fairly easy to find, the majority were initially published in conference proceedings, Festschriften, and smaller journals that can be difficult to locate even in Italy, much less abroad. It is also worth noting that this volume is much better produced than many collections of republished essays. The articles are grouped logically into three sections, on the recovery of antiquity and various aspects of humanism, on Leonardo Bruni, and on humanism in southern Italy, especially Naples. The original publications have been reproduced here, which avoids citation problems but makes for an annoying read when various fonts and letter sizes are juxtaposed. The book is also paginated throughout, however, and concludes with a glorious twenty-six-page index, which is not always present in Italian essay collections.

All in all, a worthy monument to a great scholar. May she continue to prosper—and publish! (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)
The Invention of Rome: Biondo Flavio’s Roma Triumphans and Its Worlds. Edited by Frances Muecke and Maurizio Campanelli. Travaux d’Humanisme et Renaissance, 576. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 2017. 292 pp. This essay collection began as a Discovery Project funded by the Australian Research Council and started to take shape at conference held at the British School of Rome in 2014. The goal of the project was to increase the understanding of and appreciation for the last of Biondo Flavio’s major works, Roma triumphans. Roma triumphans is an encyclopedic work that inaugurated a new discipline, which we might call ‘antiquarianism,’ that aimed at the virtual reconstruction of the ancient world by using all the tools at the scholar’s disposal (philology, history, archaeology, etc.) to furnish models for the construction of a new world based on a proper understanding of the old one. As the only comprehensive treatment of the Roman world written in the fifteenth century, it was well known and often consulted in its own day, but the lack of a modern edition and translations, coupled by a lack of appreciation for its nature as a compilation of citations, summaries, and paraphrases of ancient Roman sources, has led to its being undervalued today. This is beginning to change, however. The first volume of the edition and translation in the I Tatti Renaissance Library appeared in 2016, and critical editions of all of Biondo’s works will eventually appear through the Edizione Nazionale delle Opere di Flavio Biondo. The essays in this volume contribute to the revival of interest in a key work of Italian Renaissance humanism by showcasing a variety of possible approaches to Roma triumphans.

The essays in Part I are devoted to context, genre, and purpose. Anne Raffarin and Angelo Mazzocco compare the epilogues of Roma instaurata and Roma triumphans, with the former scholar stressing the importance of the ancient Roman triumph for Biondo’s presentation of the triumph of a restored Christian Rome and the latter emphasizing the differences between the two epilogues. Frances Muecke considers the nature and composition of Roma triumphans, concluding that it should be situated within the genre of the compilation. Part II explores some of the main topics of Roma triumphans: religion, government, the army, and private life. Frances Muecke discusses the inherent ambiguity in Biondo’s attitude toward the religion of pagan Rome, observing
that as a Christian, he could hardly endorse everything he saw there, but he found Roman religion superior to other pagan religions and noted that “survivals” color the Roman religious life of his day. James Hankins offers an exciting argument that *Roma triumphans* is not just an ideologically neutral source book, but offers instead a reading of the dynamics of Roman government that sees its strengths not in a specific constitutional form but in the adherence of its leaders to public and private virtue. Giuseppe Marcellino offers a solution to one of *Roma triumphans*’ puzzles, about why the digression on writers and literary production is set into a discussion on slavery and manumission in ancient Rome; his conclusion is that it was intended to contribute to a discussion of the “free man,” made so by the study of the liberal arts. Ida Gilda Mastrorosa focuses on Biondo’s treatment of the central importance of discipline as an explanation for Roman military success, while the last two essays in this section discuss the buildings of ancient Rome. Maurizio Campanelli argues that for Biondo, the unimpressive physical remains of ancient Rome cannot lead to an appreciation of its past magnificence, but that we must rely on literary sources for this, while Peter Fane-Saunders examines Biondo’s responses to three characteristic structures from Roman architecture, the tower-shaped pyre, the villa, and the mansion. Part III contains four essays. Maria Agata Pincelli focuses on the manuscripts of *Roma triumphans* and concludes that it was indeed published as Biondo claimed, as a finished work in multiple copies produced under the author’s supervision. Paul Gwynne documents the reception of *Roma triumphans* in the generations after its publication; Anne Raffatin focuses her study of the same topic on one later reader, Andrea Fulvio; and William Stenhouse explores the survival of this treatise in the sixteenth century, when scholarship on Roman topography and institutions took new paths but scholars in these areas continued to draw from *Roma triumphans*.

Essay collections that are born in conferences do not always move definitively past their origins, but this one does: the essays average twenty-five large pages in length and are richly documented and well argued. As such, they perform in an excellent way one of the core functions of scholarship in Neo-Latin studies: exhuming lost works and demonstrating their importance. My congratulations to the editors and authors for a job well done. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M
Renaissance Encyclopaedism: Studies in Curiosity and Ambition. Edited by W. Scott Blanchard and Andrea Severi. Publications of the Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, Essays and Studies, 41. Toronto: Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 2018. 467 pp. As the editors of this essay collection note in their “Introduction,” there is an irony that drives scholarship on Renaissance encyclopaedism: “… the Renaissance, in contrast to the middle ages, was in fact a period that did not produce many works that we could call ‘encyclopaedias,’ yet it was nevertheless a seminal period in the development of an encyclopaedic approach to knowledge that would later become one of the most central concepts of modern scholarship, one that still informs the humanistic disciplines in both Europe and the Americas: the ideal of a total, interdisciplinary knowledge that nineteenth-century German classicists would term Altertumswissenschaft, that is, scholarly inquiry fully informed by historical context, philological precision, and critical (or skeptical) habits of mind” (15). The roots of Renaissance encyclopaedism go back to the Hellenistic enkyklios paideia, a general educational program that was described fully by Quintilian and seems to have been revived in the teaching of Vittorino da Feltre. The humanist version of all this has often been located in the Florentine circle surrounding Poliziano in the late 1480s and early 1490s, but this volume suggests that the origins of Renaissance encyclopaedism rest instead in Rome, in the circles around Pomponio Leto and Cardinal Bessarion, which pushes things back into the 1450s. In time, however, the emphasis shifted from an educational program per se to a physical object like Pliny’s Natural History that would contain the information necessary to understand and appreciate ancient literature. This transformation drew from three sources: a Pythagorean / Platonic one that stressed the harmony and organic nature of knowledge; an Aristotelian one that had remained strong in the Middle Ages and focuses on the sheer quantity of information; and an impetus that is in the spirit of Quintilian or Aulus Gellius but is really sui generis, the philological miscellany that is sometimes called an incipient dictionary, sometimes a commentary, and sometimes an encyclopaedia (an example is Perotti’s Cornu copiae).

I have to admit that I often approach the collection of essays by diverse hands with a certain amount of trepidation, in fear that I will find short, unrevised conference papers, or papers that often have only a tangential relationship to the expressed theme, or *saggi* that for various reasons would not survive a rigorous refereeing on their own at a top journal. I am pleased to report that there is nothing to fear here. The essays average almost forty pages in length, and each of them provides a substantive piece of the puzzle that constitutes Renaissance encyclopaedism. What I particularly like here is the introduction, which goes beyond summarizing the contents of the essays to become a mini-history of the genre that offers a new interpretation of its genesis and development. In short, *Renaissance Encyclopaedism* is a great read. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)