



EVENTEENTH-



ENTURY



NEWS

FALL - WINTER 2018

Vol. 76

Nos. 3&4

Including

THE NEO-LATIN NEWS Vol. 66, Nos. 3&4

SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY NEWS

VOLUME 76, Nos. 3&4

FALL-WINTER, 2018

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

SUBMISSIONS: As a scholarly review journal, **SCN** publishes only commissioned reviews. As a service to the scholarly community, **SCN** also publishes news items. A current style sheet, previous volumes' Tables of Contents, and other information all may be obtained via at www.english.tamu.edu/scn/. Books for review and queries should be sent to:

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

E-Mail: d-dickson@tamu.edu
scn.sites.tamu.edu
and
oaktrust.library.tamu.edu/handle/1969.1/94990

ISSN 0037-3028

SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY NEWS

EDITOR

DONALD R. DICKSON
Texas A&M University

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

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

NEO-LATIN NEWS

CRAIG KALLENDORF, EDITOR
Texas A&M University

WEBMASTER

Megan N. Pearson, Texas A&M University

EDITORIAL ASSISTANT

Dorothy McIntush, Texas A&M University

CONTENTS

VOLUME 76, NOS. 3&4..... FALL-WINTER, 2018

REVIEWS

- Christopher M. Graney, ed. and trans. *Mathematical Disquisitions: The Booklet of Theses Immortalized by Galileo*.
..... Review by ELIZABETH SKERPAN-WHEELER..... III
- Tania Demetriou and Tanya Pollard, eds. *Milton, Drama, and Greek Texts*.
Review by LARA DODDS..... 115
- David Williams. *Milton's Leveller God*. Review by DENNIS DANIELSON 117
- Naya Tsentourou. *Milton and the Early Modern Culture of Devotion: Bodies at Prayer*. Review by DAVID AINSWORTH 121
- Kevin J. Donovan and Thomas Festa, eds. *Milton, Materialism, and Embodiment: One First Matter All*. Review by ERIC B. SONG..... 126
- Ellen R. Welch. *A Theater of Diplomacy: International Relations and the Performing Arts in Early Modern France*. Review by HALL BJØRNSTAD..... 132
- George Klawitter. *Marvell, Sexual-Orientation, and Seventeenth-Century Poetry*. Review by BRENDAN PRAWDZIK 137
- Heather Dubrow. *Deixis in the Early Modern English Lyric: Unsettling Spatial Anchors Like "Here," "This," "Come."* Review by NICHOLAS D. NACE 141
- W. B. Patterson. *Thomas Fuller: Discovering England's Religious Past*.
Review by NATHAN J. MARTIN..... 146
- Magdalena Naum and Fredrik Ekengren, eds. *Facing Otherness in Early Modern Sweden: Travel, Migration and Material Transformations, 1500-1800*.
Review by MARY ELIZABETH AILES 151
- Kirsteen M. Mackenzie. *The Solemn League and Covenant of the Three Kingdoms and the Cromwellian Union, 1643-1663*. Review by SIMON KOW 154
- Jonathan Fitzgibbons. *Cromwell's House of Lords: Politics, Parliaments and Constitutional revolution, 1642-1660*. Review by TED VALLANCE 158
- Martyn Calvin Cowan. *John Owen and the Civil War Apocalypse: Preaching, Prophecy, and Politics*. Review by CARRIE EULER..... 162

Paul Cefalu. <i>The Johannine Renaissance in Early Modern English Literature and Theology</i> . Review by JAMES ROSS MACDONALD	165
Gary Schneider. <i>Print Letters in Seventeenth-Century England: Politics, Religion, and News Culture</i> . Review by NICOLE GREENSPAN	170
Courtney Erin Thomas. <i>If I lose Mine Honour I Lose Myself: Honour among the Early Modern English Elite</i> . Review by R. MALCOLM SMUTS.....	173
Janine Rivière. <i>Dreams in Early Modern England: "Visions of the Night."</i> Review by DANIEL L. KEEGAN	179
Giuseppina Iacono Lobo. <i>Writing Conscience and the Nation in Revolutionary England</i> . Review by GEOFFREY VAUGHAN	184
Carme Font. <i>Women's Prophetic Writings in Seventeenth-Century Britain</i> . Review by MELINDA ZOOK.....	188
Bonnie Lander Johnson and Eleanor Decamp, eds. <i>Blood Matters: Studies in European Literature and Thought, 1400 – 1700</i> . Review by CELESTE CHAMBERLAND	190
Tristan Alonge. <i>Racine et Euripide; La révolution trahie</i> . Review by DENIS D. GRÉLÉ.....	195
Anne Cayuela and Marc Vuillermoz, eds. <i>Les Mots et les choses du théâtre. France, Italie, Espagne, XVI^e-XVII^e siècles</i> . Review by PERRY GETHNER.....	198
Katherine Ibbett. <i>Compassion's Edge: Fellow-Feeling and Its Limits in Early Modern France</i> . Review by KATHLEEN HARDESTY DOIG	202
Antonio Urquizar-Herrera. <i>Admiration and Awe: Morisco Buildings and Identity Negotiations in Early Modern Spanish Historiography</i> . Review by LIVIA STOENESCU	205
Gerlinde Gruber, Sabine Haag, Stefan Weppelmann, and Jochen Sander, eds. <i>Rubens: The Power of Transformation</i> . Review by ANETA GEORGIEVSKA-SHINE.....	210
NEO-LATIN NEWS.....	214

Christopher M. Graney, ed. and trans. *Mathematical Disquisitions: The Booklet of Theses Immortalized by Galileo*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2017. xxix + 145 pp. \$25.00. Review by ELIZABETH SKERPAN-WHEELER, TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY.

Very little is known about Johann Georg Locher, the author *Mathematical Disquisitions, Concerning Astronomical Controversies and Novelties* and student at the University of Ingolstadt, who published this work in 1614. As the title page of the book indicates, he undertook this work in pursuit of a Master of Arts degree under the mentorship of Christoph Scheiner, “professor of sacred languages and mathematics” and Jesuit scholar. Today, historians of science may recognize Locher as the original of the fatuous and ignorant Simplicio, the anti-Copernican target of the *Dialogue Concerning the Two Chief World Systems* (1632) of Galileo Galilei. Yet, as Christopher M. Graney, the editor and translator of *Mathematical Disquisitions*, argues, “If what one expects from an anti-Copernican work is (to borrow some phrases from Albert Einstein’s foreword to Galileo’s *Dialogue*) anthropocentric and mythical thinking, and opinions that have no basis but authority—then Locher’s *Disquisitions* in fact invites a re-evaluation of that expectation” (xii–xiii).

In this accessible and engaging translation, Graney makes a strong case for the value of studying the anti-Copernicans. As the translation reveals, Locher was far from a superstitious revanchist. He endorsed the importance of mathematics, “long observation,” and “recording data,” “much like a modern astronomer, scientist, and rational thinker” (xv). He also respected Galileo. A modern reader may wonder, then, why such a careful observer as Locher got his astronomy wrong. Graney translates and edits the *Disquisitions* to explain the problem. Ironically, it was Locher’s use of telescopes and observation that convinced him he had “proved *right* the key Ptolemaic idea of epicycles” (including the idea that Venus moved around the sun, that Jupiter was the center of its moons, and that sunspots moved around the sun). Therefore, as Graney shows, “Within the limits of the knowledge of his time, Locher is correct” (xviii). Moreover, of his six arguments against Copernicus, one of which he retracts, five “are matters of science and reason,” not authority. In fact, his objection to Copernicus’s argument about the

enormous size and distance of stars, part of the proof of heliocentrism, is based firmly on reason. As Graney explains, “If Earth circles the sun, then it moves relative to the stars and that movement should be reflected in the stars. But this effect, known as *annual parallax* . . . , could not be detected until the nineteenth century” (xx).

The *Disquisitiones* makes as solid a case as can be made for opposition to Copernicus. The case unfolds over forty-four disputations, moving from general principles to specific arguments and observations. The first six define and describe the discipline of mathematics, drawing on classical authors Plato, Proclus, and Euclid. Disquisitions 7 through 12 define astronomy, clearly distinguishing it from astrology. As Locher explains in Disquisition 8, astronomy “studies absolute and inherent qualities of the heavens—number, shape, position, motion, time of occurrence, time of duration, qualities of light such as color or brilliance, and so forth” (16), and “is the one friend with whom the heavens share their secrets” (17). Disquisitions 25 through 44 address the observation of celestial bodies, including the moons of Earth and Jupiter, and the use of telescopes and geometry to understand the observations. Locher is clearly aware of the challenges of observation, including various tricks of the eye (Disquisition 35), and concedes that much remains to be learned, especially about apparent variation in the form of Saturn (Disquisition 44) and whether this variation may correspond to a Ptolemaic epicycle.

The examination of and arguments against Copernicus appear in Disquisitions 13 through 24. Here, readers may be surprised to discover how much of the Copernican system Locher appears to accept. In fact, as he explains in Disquisition 22, he endorses the system of Tycho Brahe, whose hybrid cosmology, itself derived from that of Martianus Capella, acknowledges the movement of Saturn, Jupiter, Mars, Venus, and Mercury around the sun while maintaining that the sun moves around the earth. Thus, most of Locher’s observations do correspond to Copernicus’s, except in the most fundamental way. Locher’s discussion reveals that he is fully aware of the implications of Copernican astronomy. In his third conclusion to Disquisition 15, Locher explains that “Newly altered parts of Earth apply their weight continually until the center of gravity of Earth coincides with the center of the universe. Were this not the case, then Aristotle’s whole

reasoning on why the center of Earth coincides with the center of the universe would collapse" (41). Astronomy, and indeed the foundation of science, is undergoing a paradigm shift and Locher knows it.

While he is unable to draw the obvious (to a modern reader) conclusion to his own work, Locher ultimately writes with caution rather than fear. His attitude is manifest in his own preface to his reader: "*Tell me if you understand this study I have made. If your understanding is greater than mine, go before me, ...—I shall eagerly follow you. If it equals mine, go with me—I shall not refuse you. If it is lesser, follow me—I shall not impede you should you overtake me*" (11). In Graney's translation, Locher's *Disquisitiones* makes good on its promise. Each point is amply explained and demonstrated. A careful reader with nothing but a basic understanding of geometry and astronomy should have no difficulty following his reasoning or seeing its limits.

Graney's stated purpose in translating and editing is to make a "student-friendly book" (ix). His work achieves this goal admirably. He assumes a broad definition of *student*, which should include not only undergraduate students in astronomy, physics, and history of science classes, but also scholars in other disciplines who wish to expand their knowledge of early modern cosmology. The translation focuses on accuracy and accessibility rather than questions of style. For example, Graney translates Locher's word *universum* in Disquisition 9 as *multiverse*, using the modern term that accurately reflects what Locher is describing: the possibility (which he denies) of multiple and possibly infinite universes. In support of readers' comprehension, Graney provides extensive footnotes that not only identify and explain Locher's sources and cite historical scholarship on astronomy, but also include discussions that compare Locher's arguments to modern astronomical thought. Graney also adds modern illustrations, photographs, and analogies to describe Locher's observations. His comparison of Locher's description of the phenomenon of the morning sun appearing to have edges like teeth to the opening sequence in the film *The Lion King* (131, n. 172) is particularly vivid and appealing to non-specialist readers. Moreover, all illustrations are clearly reproduced. Locher's twenty-eight illustrations are essential to his argument and all reflect his care to document both his observations and his reasoning. Graney has modified only one illustration: the original is a large fold-out that

appears in the translation in both a condensed version (Figure 40-1) and a detail (Figure 40-1A).

Above all, Graney shows profound respect for his subject. Reflecting the tone and standards of Dennis Danielson, whose own work in early modern cosmology has proven invaluable to scholars of literature and who Graney acknowledges as the source of his own awareness of Locher, this translation and its editorial apparatus represent a young scholar seriously and honestly engaged in scientific inquiry. Despite Galileo's later characterization of him, Locher is no fool and no enemy of new ideas. To a twenty-first century reader, Graney's translation raises the timely questions of why such an intelligent, well-trained, and scientifically informed person missed what we know to be true; why he has been ignored or denigrated by subsequent scholars; and whether the dispute matters today. Graney himself discusses the last point elsewhere, in a piece that appeared in *Aeon Magazine* and *The Atlantic* (October 17, 2016): "Galileo Fought Dirty with His Fellow Scientists." After describing the characterization of Locher in the *Dialogue*, Graney notes that modern self-proclaimed advocates of "alternative science" portray themselves as Galileo, fighting a scientific establishment determined to protect its own status and privilege. To Graney, Galileo's polemic, written over a decade after his condemnation by the Inquisition (1615, the year following Locher's *Disquisitiones*) and reflecting the political and intellectual crises that followed, misrepresented both the work and attitudes of the anti-Copernicans, many of whom, like Locher, were far more committed to dialogue and the search for truth than censorship of opposing views. The recovery of Locher's treatise demonstrates that "Science's history matters" because it shows that true and honest debates within the scientific community have been part of the practice of modern science since its inception.

Ironically, modern advancements in science and technology present a challenge to the history of science. Graney notes that "thanks to the nature of technology, Lochner's original is today more readily available to scholars than is this translation" (xxviii). While scholars may indeed value and use the original, its language and scientific orientation make it virtually unreadable to students and non-specialists. Graney's translation is a testament to the value of both Locher's efforts to

advance scientific knowledge and the scholarship that keeps it alive.

Tania Demetriou and Tanya Pollard, eds. *Milton, Drama, and Greek Texts*. London and New York: Routledge, 2018. ix + 134 pp. \$140.00. Review by LARA DODDS, MISSISSIPPI STATE UNIVERSITY.

The editors of this focused collection have drawn together five essays about the intersection of Milton's approach to theater and his engagement with Greek antiquity. The central claim of the book is that church history and scriptural commentary are an under-recognized influence on the development of Milton's ideas about theater and that this conjunction allows Milton to explore the possibilities of theater as multivalent space for political, theological, and literary debates. The shared methodology of the chapters in this book is based on an understanding of Greek antiquity—both classical and Christian—as a “cultural corpus or archive” (2). Rather than focusing on the reception of individual texts, these chapters explore Milton's engagement with a tradition of reception, a critical move that places Milton's great poems alongside early modern commentary, scholarship, and history as participants in a larger humanist project.

The volume opens and closes with essays on Milton's early and late dramatic works. Sarah Van der Laan's “Circean transformation and the poetics of Milton's *Masque*” re-examines the unusual genealogy of Comus in the context of allegorical interpretations of Circe. Christian theology and epic literary criticism provide two distinctive traditions of commentary on Circe. In the former, Circe focalizes debates about whether human beings are susceptible to demon metamorphosis, but the latter, by placing Circe back into the context of her epic plot, is a “more frightening prospect” (16), because it must account for the fact that some, notably Odysseus, are immune to evil while others are not. Yet this version of Circe is well suited to Milton's aims in *A Masque* because Comus's Circean temptation does have “the power to assay the Lady's essence and to set in motion spiritual as well as physical transformation” (18). But if the Lady must resist both metamorphosis and mixture, the poet requires both, and the allusive poetics of the *Masque* propose a “more solid, and a more virtuous form of Circean

poesis" (23). In "The politics of Greek tragedy in *Samson Agonistes*," Hannah Crawford also examines the possibilities of allusive poetics, identifying Milton's late tragedy as a cento that "assimilates its genre" (123). Crawford traces the importance of Euripides to *Samson Agonistes* through an analysis of Milton's copy of the 1602 Stephanus edition of the Greek dramatist, now held at the Bodleian library. Crawford argues that this edition, which includes the commentary of Gasparus Stiblinus, influences both the form and the politics of *Samson Agonistes*. Milton's reception of Euripides through the tradition of Renaissance literary criticism shapes the form of the play—in both its multi-voiced Chorus and the character of the Messenger—and also the play's treatment of ideas of democracy.

The idea of Greek literary tradition as a corpus or archive unifies the remaining three essays in the volume. William Poole's "John Milton and the Beard-Hater: encounters with Julian the Apostate" uses the presence of an obscure Greek riddle on the title page of *Eikon Basilike* as the occasion for an exploration of Milton's interest in Emperor Julian, also known as Julian the Apostate. Poole examines the varied responses to Julian's complex reputation and to his satirical work *Misopogon* (or *The Beard-hater*). In this work of anti-theatrical invective, Julian rails against the people of Antioch for their conversion to Christianity and contrasts his own "piety and temperance" with "Antiochene irreligiosity and luxury" (45). In the polemic of the mid-seventeenth century, Julian could be recognized as "not simply a pagan but a kind of inversion of the martyred Charles" (48) and serve as an inspiration for Milton's own project: the purification of literature and drama. Julian also figures in Russ Leo's essay "Paul's Euripides, Greek tragedy and Hebrew antiquity in *Paradise Regain'd*." Leo recovers the "tragic archive" (63) that informs the conversation about drama in *Paradise Regained* 4.261–66 by showing how the Church Fathers, Clement of Alexandria and Socrates of Constantinople, shape Milton's understanding of debates about the use of pagan knowledge by Christians. In *Paradise Regained*, the character Jesus uses Clement's language to argue for the precedence of Hebrew learning and to elevate wisdom above other values.

The question of how Christian faith and pagan learning should be resolved is the explicit topic of Nicholas McDowell's chapter "Milton's

Euripides and the superior rationality of the heathen.” In this essay, McDowell surveys Milton’s references to Euripides throughout his writing career in order to argue that, contrary to expectation, Milton occasionally elevates classical literature above the Bible. Euripides, Milton’s “favourite Greek dramatist” (86) is the figure who enables this reversal—not through plot or character—but instead as a “textual locus of moral, political, and theological truth” (96). McDowell suggests that Milton turns to classical quotation, and to Euripides in particular, as a “release” from “irresolvable theological debate” (94) such as whether it is justifiable to kill a tyrant (*Tenure of Kings and Magistrates*) or mortalism (*De Doctrina Christiana*). Classical quotations accompany Milton’s most radical moments, an insight that suggests additional avenues of research as scholars continue to uncover the archive of Milton’s engagement with Greek literary tradition.

The five essays in this collection are universally well researched and admirably focused on the intersecting topics of Greek literary tradition, Milton’s drama, and reception theory. This volume, which was originally published as a special issue of *The Seventeenth Century* in 2016 (vol. 31, issue 2), will be primarily of interest to Milton scholars as well as to those interested in questions of reception, adaptation, and humanist tradition, and together these chapters make a compelling argument for an “archival” approach to reception studies.

David Williams. *Milton’s Leveller God*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2017. xviii + 494 pp. \$39.95 (paper); \$120.00 (cloth). Review by DENNIS DANIELSON, UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Repeatedly while reading David Williams’s sprawling 400-page discussion of Milton and the Levellers, I found myself reaching for analogies that might convey to others a taste of my experience. Perhaps the most apt (if imperfect) model that struck me was that of the multi-episode series tackling a huge topic or swathe of history—something akin to Ken Burns’s television war documentaries, perhaps. For Williams’s book is indeed a documentary, yet one notable for its effort to bring history into the present, and not in any politically neutral

manner.

Let me begin with *documentary*. As any reader of *Seventeenth-Century News* knows, one of the dominant modes of Milton criticism involves the offering of a new introduction to some historical body of work—be it that of a single author (such as Origen or Augustine or Dante), or of some sweep of literature that forms a potentially helpful background to Milton's work (such as the Genesis tradition, the Reformation, the cosmological revolution, and so on)—followed by or interwoven with fresh readings of (most often) *Paradise Lost* that emerge from a new awareness of those authors or traditions. Some of these studies are more successful (and more plausible) than others, but Milton studies are hardly imaginable in the absence of this broad genre—and David Williams's book fits squarely within it. However, researching it in a post-EEBO environment, Williams has transcended some of his predecessors in the genre by acquiring or creating full, searchable electronic texts of his target corpus so that he can apply them to Milton in a way that exceeds the limitations of simply a good memory or careful notes. As Williams explains in his Introduction, it was initially finding an "abundance of Leveller echoes in Milton's prose" that "drove" him to read the huge corpus of Leveller documents available online and to transcribe his own copies, thus creating a searchable database whereby to "track countless verbal echoes, conceptual links, and summary arguments from Leveller sources in Milton's prose" (12). This is a truly impressive feat, one that undergirds the principal value and interest of Williams's book—and one that succeeds frequently in conveying vividly the "you are there" frisson of a good documentary.

And the Levellers—mainly John Lilburne (1614–1667), William Walwyn (1600–1681), and Richard Overton (fl. 1640–1664)—are indeed worth getting to know. They wrote on topics dear to any seventeenth-century scholar's heart: politics (especially social liberty and equality in the face of monarchy or anything smacking of monarchy), natural rights (including engagement of pre- and post-lapsarian human nature), biblical interpretation, the nature of the human body-and-soul, and so on—and they're remarkable for the periodical nature of much of their writing. Despite opposition and imprisonment, they were a courageous, if ultimately suppressed, cohort among antiroyal-

ists during the period of the English Civil War. Moreover, the Milton of *Areopagitica* and *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates* quite credibly displays many affinities with them.

The argument for affinity and/or influence becomes thinner, however, when Williams turns, as he does in chapters 3 through 14 (there being sixteen chapters in all), to interpretations of *Paradise Lost*. I admit I'm regularly put on my critical guard when an author's approach is openly Whiggish. Already on page 3, Williams refers to the Levellers as "the English harbingers of Jefferson, Paine, and Voltaire [who] were three centuries or more ahead of their time," and whom "Cromwell crushed . . . with the same ferocity that he unleashed against Irish Catholics." Which is not to say that egalitarian or human rights readings of Milton's epic poetry can't be valid. On the other hand, it's not always the highest praise to suggest that a particular author is important or valuable because he or she is "like us." Williams is by no means so lacking in subtlety. But still, I worry.

Chapter 3—"The Tyranny of Heaven? Republican Language in Hell"—moves rather quickly to a parallel between Levellers' views of Cromwell and Milton's presentation of Satan in Book 1 of *Paradise Lost*: Cromwell "apes" kingship, and so does Satan. "The only difference is in the presentation" (109). In the next paragraph, Williams asserts that Satan's apologia, the one complaining about "the Tyranny of Heaven," "is obviously based on recent British [*sic*] history" (110). I generally take the position that if a claim requires specific evidence, then it's not obvious; and if it's obvious, why bother with specific evidence? Nonetheless, Williams presents a strong and thought-provoking series of parallels between Milton's devils and Cromwell in company with the New Model Army's "Grandees."

One of Williams's most striking theses begins to take shape in Chapter 5—"All power I Give Thee? Kingdom of Grace." In Book 3 of *Paradise Lost* and beyond, "God, it turns out, is less interested in the exercise of power than in its devolution" (151–52). Here is the core of the proposal that Milton's is a Leveller God. He doesn't *want* to be a tyrant, and the Incarnation itself is a levelling act. "In the person of the Son, humankind [is] set on the path of rising into godhead" (163–64). And accordingly, "the old conundrum of why Milton favoured monarchy in Heaven and republican government on earth

is resolved by God himself, who prophesies the end of monarchy. ... God's support for popular sovereignty ... is deeply antithetical to the political thought of Satan and of Cromwell. For Satan merely pretends to be a democrat to seize a throne, while Milton's God poses as a tyrant to test and confirm the commitment of his creatures to good 'Commonwealth principles' (168). It's a bold claim, worth pondering, and nicely complemented by Williams's strong sense of the dramatic (thus dynamic and "evolving") nature of the dialogue of Book 3.

By now no one will be surprised to hear that Milton also presents earthly marriage in a levelling kind of way. Williams offers liberal and often inspiring quotations from the Levellers themselves. John Lilburne wrote in *The Free-Mans Freedom Vindicated* (1646) that all who "ever breathed in the world ... are, and were by nature all equall and alike in power, dignity, authority, and majesty, none of them having (by nature) any authority, dominion or majesteriall power, one over or above another, neither have they, or can they exercise any, but meere by institution, or donation, that is to say, by mutuall agreement or consent, given, derived, or assumed, by mutuall consent and agreement, for the good benefit and comfort each of other." Thus, as Williams adds, "the story of the Fall is no longer used to justify the law of patriarchy as punishment merited by and from that lapse; instead, it is a founding text in a discourse that claims social and sexual equality from the first moment of creation" (170–71). This egalitarian emphasis is repeated in subsequent chapters focusing on the polity of Eden, which includes the teacher Raphael as a square, hierarchical peg in a round hole (Chapter 7) whom we can read as ironic insofar as he represents the old, feudal status quo of Heaven that is evolving into something more levelled. The picture approaches completion in Book 10, in which the old formulae of "Thrones, Dominations, Princedoms, Vertues, Powers" "has been dissolved as the deity now speaks in 'levelling' fashion to a *popular assembly*: 'Assembled Angels ...' (10.34–36). Heaven's feudal polity has evidently evolved into a Commonwealth" (300).

As already hinted, I find Williams's thesis a strong and fascinating one, even if I'm unsure of its plausibility. Other readers will have to judge for themselves. But if I'm not convinced by this book's conclusions, I am convinced at the worthiness of the attempt to present the

Levellers' writings and to examine them and Milton's together, and of Williams's capacity and integrity in making the attempt. I'm wary of reviewers' frequent tendency to ask for a book different from the one an author undertook to write. Still, I did find Williams's final two chapters, on *Paradise Regained*, especially with their (worthwhile) emphasis on Foxe's "Book of Martyrs," an awkward fit for the rest of this already very long volume. And its length is indeed an issue for any reader wishing to grasp the work's thesis in a focused manner. I mentioned earlier the book's main genre: that of documentary and historical presentation of materials that are then argued to be relevant to a reading of Milton. Yet much of this book verges into another valuable but demanding genre: the thematic reception history, most recently and impressively exemplified by John Leonard's *Faithful Labourers* (2013). For me, this aspect of *Milton's Leveller God* occasioned something of a trial of patience, and I often felt that reference to the work of others—instead of being tackled repeatedly, sometimes rather severely, in the body of Williams's text—could have been compacted and deposited decorously in his notes.

Naya Tsentourou. *Milton and the Early Modern Culture of Devotion: Bodies at Prayer*. New York and London: Routledge, 2018. ix + 176 pp. \$149.95. Review by DAVID AINSWORTH, UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA.

Milton and the Early Modern Culture of Devotion: Bodies at Prayer urges scholars to pay closer attention to the ways in which Milton connects bodies to faith, suggesting that the body at prayer both expresses internal devotion and produces and embodies that devotion itself. Tsentourou draws our attention to historical theories of genuine and expressive prayer to demonstrate how Milton locates true faith within the body of the believer.

After contextualizing her argument about embodied prayer in her introduction, Tsentourou considers material culture in its historical context in her first chapter. She takes up clerical garments generally and linen specifically to show how Milton attacks the material idolatry of Laudian liturgical garments. This chapter focuses on Milton's anti-prelatical tracts and *Areopagitica*, while also setting the Lady's

embodied devotion in *Comus* against the spectacle of Comus' court and of the bishops Milton derides. Milton can attack the spectacular performativity of faith, she argues, without rejecting the Lady's equally embodied performance.

In her second chapter, Tsentourou focuses on *Eikonoklastes*, suggesting that both it and *Eikon Basilike* present their readers with a model to differentiate between authentic and inauthentic prayer. After a very brief look at liturgical and participatory prayer in the period, she contrasts the set forms of performative prayer offered as authentic by *Eikon Basilike* with what Milton presents as more authentic: extempore prayer which emerges from the heart out of an "intercourse" between the human and divine (75) and which Milton conceives of using bodily language of digestion, reproduction, and birth. The chapter also looks at Milton's treatment of manna in *Paradise Regained*, arguing for a linkage between its materiality and its spiritual efficacy.

Tsentourou's third chapter turns to Adam and Eve's prayers in *Paradise Lost*, both before and after the Fall. Her examination briefly examines hymns, liturgy, and music before focusing on sighs and groans as an expressive and bodily form of prayer. The chapter ends by surveying medical understandings of sighs and groans in the period, drawing a linkage between deep emotional expressions of faith and these sounds, as well as connecting Adam and Eve's prayers in Books 10 and 11 of *Paradise Lost* to Donne and Herbert.

The fourth chapter draws upon the previous material to make a case for Samson's destruction of the Temple in *Samson Agonistes* as a material and embodied prayer. After discussing the function of gesture and bodily posture both in prayers and in rhetorical performance, Tsentourou examines the bodily aspects of Samson's performances in the tragedy, culminating in his twin performances before the Philistines (for them, and then for God). She concludes that Samson's violence, and the material violence it triggers, figures forth his prayer: destroying the Philistine temple is thus not the object of Samson's prayer but the vehicle of its expression. The chapter concludes by noting that the theatricality of the tragedy, as well as Samson's own theatricality, complicates its portrayal of prayer.

In a seven-page epilogue, Tsentourou looks briefly at prayer in *Paradise Regained*, looking at Jesus' hunger and his soliloquy on the

subject in Book 2 of the poem. She differentiates Jesus' prayers from those she's examined in the rest of the study (Adam, Eve, and Samson in particular) in that Jesus merges the spiritual and physical worlds and expresses a mediated linkage with the divine through his power to stand, bodily, on the roof of his father's temple.

Overall, I find Tsentourou's intervention useful and compelling, drawing scholarly attention to the specific and bodily aspects of prayer within Milton's work while being attentive to how Milton's contemporaries understood and construed the act of prayer. Her approach seems especially generative when applied to texts where scholars have already examined bodies (the Ludlow Mask and *Samson Agonistes*, especially), while also illuminating when applied to Milton's prose works. This book also demonstrates her strengths in synthesizing ideas, whether from theological tracts discussing prayer or from secondary criticism. Her discussion of Milton's use of linen as a symbol for the corruption of the Laudian church, for example, draws upon a range of work on material culture to read passages in several of the anti-prelatical tracts.

The deepest problem with this book is likely unsolvable: Tsentourou accepts (as do I) that Milton is a monist materialist, which necessarily bears upon any discussion of physical or embodied prayer. If no meaningful distinction exists between body and spirit—if, at best, they can be differentiated only through a degree of rarefaction, like that between ice and steam—then the state and work of the body must be a central characteristic of prayer. But given all of that, how can one escape from the many ways in which theological language encodes a difference between soul and body? Merely deploying the word "spirit" implies a distinction that materialism challenges. This study offers the possibility of rejecting the body/spirit distinction outright, and along with it, calling into question the obvious hierarchy of form which Raphael suggests when visiting Adam and Eve in *Paradise Lost*, where he suggests that angels have bodies but that they are better ones for being less grossly material. If Milton sees genuine prayer as expressed through the crude clay of the human form, might that offer some sense of rehabilitation for human bodies? And yet, both Milton and Tsentourou seem bound by the distinctions they might question: *Paradise Lost* differentiates between the excremental dregs of the material universe and the airy material abstractions of

Heaven, while Tsentourou treats the physical and spiritual as two distinct but related things throughout her book. Indeed, this book's unique contribution to the scholarly conversation draws our attention to material bodies at prayer in Milton's work; it thus focuses upon how the material matters spiritually, instead of calling into question its differentiation from the spiritual.

Tsentourou makes a second distinction in this study which requires a clearer sense of definition than she provides: a distinction between interiority and exteriority. Making the fair criticism that most scholarship on Milton's theology and on prayer in Milton, specifically, concentrates on the internal state of the believer and not on external forms, Tsentourou establishes convincingly that Milton pays close attention to bodies, to clothing, and to physiology. Without a clearer definition of how she distinguishes between interior and exterior faith and prayer, though, I am unsure how to parse some of her arguments. Some of what she classifies as being "interior" needs to be more clearly situated within her model of exterior and bodily prayer. If the Holy Spirit enters the hearts of believers and inspires their faith as well as guiding their interpretation of scripture, is that action taking place inside believers or is it an "exterior" process? Is an internal conversation between a believer and God necessarily involving externality, both in that God exists outside the believer, and in that the conversation involves a body as well as a soul? Because Tsentourou wants to examine external bodily expressions and to challenge the idea that these can only be expressions or signs of an entirely internal process, she naturally does not emphasize things that may happen within the body, but I doubt that she would argue that an internal organ isn't still a material part of the body as a whole. To what extent, then, can embodied prayer be internal? There's a blurring between physical internality and externality, both emphasizing the body, and between internality in the sense of interiority as set against a collective exteriority that necessarily engages with the world. Tsentourou does argue in her introduction for a blurring between the internal and external worlds, but stops short of making a case that Milton ultimately wants to demolish the distinction in favor of the material, external body and not the inward, disembodied life of the soul in direct relation to God.

The preceding complaints amount to wishing that this book was bolder in its argumentation. I also wish that it were longer. Tsentourou's brevity is often welcome, especially when she encapsulates contemporary debates on genuine prayer or draws upon broader scholarly discussions of things like material culture, the Derridean specter, or performativity studies to set up specific readings of Milton's poetry and prose. I found myself wanting more of her analysis of Milton's writing. This book draws upon a number of rich veins of scholarly discussion, from the eroticism of faith to the debate about the younger Milton's understanding of ritual, and it spends time with some of the less-studied prose. It offers lively and engaging readings of Milton's work. But in moving quickly and in opening up so many interpretative possibilities, these readings can be unsatisfyingly brief.

For example, the end of the first chapter looks at bodies in Milton's *Mask*. Over eight pages, it makes a case that the Lady's ideal of devotion as expressed through performance places an embodied experience of faith before the eyes of her audiences (human and divine). To do so, it first suggests that the mask comments on dramatic form at least as much as it does religious ritual, associates the bestial bodies of Comus' court with antitheatrical rhetoric to make a case for the dangers of performative embodiment, addresses the linkage between the Circean cup and the role of wine in embodied worship, relates Comus' disguise to Archimago's in Spenser's *Faerie Queen*, connects the Lady's entrapment to ritual conformity and the inescapable nature of the material world, looks at Comus' apparel, discusses the transformative power of song, and finally, connects the Lady's resistance to spectacle to the audience's. With so many ideas crowding for space, the section cannot do much close reading of the *Mask*, though it does some; the Lady's own words are covered in about a page, while the specific ways in which the *Mask* presents her body receive almost no attention. The book's generativity relates in part to this kind of analytic breadth, in the sense that it offers a great many ideas for others to develop, but it can also be unfocused or neglectful of important elements of or objections to its arguments. I wanted to know what Tsentourou thought of the specific ways in which the Lady's body is addressed within the *Mask*. What significance does the liberating power of Sabrina's song have on her larger arguments about a body entrapped by materiality?

And how does she reconcile her reading of a body-in-performance with the Mask in its published form, or with the specific implications of Milton using Alice Edgerton's body to make his point?

The brevity of the book's close readings can also leave me wanting more. The first chapter looks at the Lady's speech about her "rapt spirits" (46) without directly engaging with the Lady's threat that these spirits will provoke an earthquake, which looks to me like a direct connection being made between something coded as immaterial and something grossly material. The fourth chapter makes a strong case for reading Samson's inward meditations immediately before he destroys the Temple as expressions of an embodied, external, material phenomenon (see especially 119–22), but offers no analysis of that "great matter" (116) that the messenger speculates Samson may be thinking about. Here, the drama makes a direct linguistic connection between Samson's process of thought and the material world, which seems important, if not vital, to the chapter's larger focus. But the analysis concentrates entirely upon the way in which Milton's Samson omits the reference to God which is central in the Judges account, then moves on to Carey's article about Samson as a terrorist.

Despite spending so much space on complaints, I do recommend this book. Even, or especially, in its flaws, it will be richly generative of future scholarship, calling as it does upon Milton scholars to treat Christian faith as a material practice. I look forward to seeing how Tsentourou builds upon her work in the future.

Kevin J. Donovan and Thomas Festa, eds. *Milton, Materialism, and Embodiment: One First Matter All*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press. vii + 249 pp. \$70.00. Review by ERIC B. SONG, SWARTHMORE COLLEGE.

In the introduction to this collection, the editors signal the need for a "rapprochement" between historicist scholarship focusing on early modern monism and "the ecocritical concern for the nonhuman in contemporary vitalist materialism" (2). The editors leave unspecified exactly what kind of rapprochement they seek to foster. If this encounter involves Milton scholarship being informed by recent

theoretical trends, then certain essays in this volume live up to that calling. Yet I take it that a full rapprochement would involve a mutual, two-way conversation. It seems like a much more difficult task to show that current theoretical discussions responding to pressing social and political realities need to be informed by considerations of John Milton's religious and poetic thinking about the matter. I want to emphasize at the outset that each of the essays in this volume offer insightful, well-researched, and stimulating discussions. Even as I go on to describe the merits of each essay, my concern will be to evaluate the case that this entire volume offers for the cross-pollination between present-day materialisms and historically-minded literary scholarship.

The editors' introduction manifests the difficulty of sustaining this kind of two-way conversation. After calling for a rapprochement, the editors offer a narrow survey of the way Milton scholarship has attended to the topics of monism and vitalist materialism. Because the editors do not return to the question of how renewed considerations of Milton's writings might speak to broader theoretical concerns, the work of forging such conversations is left to the individual essays. The editors have divided this collection into four sections, each containing a pair of essays. Whether by design or by accident, the first three sections exhibit a pattern. While the paired essays consider related topics, only one attempts to link readings of Milton to theoretical conversations; the other, by contrast, pursues traditional questions of literary scholarship while engaging primarily with Milton scholarship. Precisely because both approaches yield real insights, the overarching question (or, at least, my question) intensifies: why and how should historicism, literary analysis, and "contemporary vitalist materialism" inform one another?

The first pair of essays concerns "Materiality and the Senses." In a sophisticated and persuasive reading, Lauren Shohet examines how *Paradise Lost* appeals to olfaction to achieve a complex poetic effect. Relying on terms used by Leibniz in the early modern period and then adapted by Gilles Deleuze, Shohet describes how fragrance "does not transcend or mitigate or contract space, perhaps, so much as 'fold' or 'pleat' it" (23). By performing this work of folding and pleating, smell enacts a multilayered experience of present sensation and past memory. By appealing to such sensations, Milton's poetry

blurs any simple distinctions between prelapsarian and post-lapsarian timeframes as well as among heavenly, earthly, and hellish locations. Shohet connects Milton's "polychronous semiotics" of aromas to recent studies that show that smell does, in fact, have a particular purchase on memory—a scientific fact that belies olfaction's low position in the traditional hierarchy of the senses (29). In the ensuing essay, Seth Herbst attends to the ear. He argues that as Milton shifts toward a monist worldview, he describes music as having a material existence. Such a claim is at once intuitive (insofar as a materialist orientation would lead to the conclusion that music can only have a physical basis) and powerfully counterintuitive (insofar as we think of music as having a formal existence apart from its physical manifestations). "Music provided, for Milton," Herbst concludes, "a surrogate discourse in which he could reason about the unity of seemingly separate things without the conceptual baggage of inherited Christian theology" (55). Through the ontological question of music's existence, Herbst presents a smart, detailed survey of Milton's thinking as it evolves within his poetry. If the physical effect of celestial music is merely a fantasy of restoration to be banished in Milton's early Nativity Ode, that fantasy nonetheless anticipates the elaborate accounts of music's material bases and effects in *Paradise Lost*. Herbst develops the provocative insight that the relationship between music and allegory in the earlier Ludlow *Masque* helps us account for the notorious criss-crossing of reality and allegorical abstraction in the early books of *Paradise Lost*, when Satan encounters Sin and Death.

The second section features essays that consider "Human Embodiment." Ryan Hackenbracht's essay examines the importance of walking in *Paradise Lost*. Classical epic places special significance on heroic strides. Hackenbracht reminds us that "Aeneas and Turnus are the sole striders in the *Aeneid*" (62). Yet Milton "reinvents the epic motif of walking" in the course of redefining heroism around Christian rather than martial values (64). Hackenbracht details how Milton associates walking with the humbler values of contemplation and learning. Satan's efforts to stride as a martial hero mark him as proud and sinful, in contrast to faithful angels such as Abdiel. Even after the Fall results in the construction of a footbridge between Hell and Earth, Hackenbracht concludes, *Paradise Lost* achieves a happier

conclusion by conferring heroic value on Adam and Eve's future perambulations outside of Eden. The next essay, by Erin Murphy, considers the political and religious significance of genealogy and kinship. Murphy locates within *Paradise Regained* Milton's "critique of the reproductive futurity that underwrites the Stuart project" (83). Whereas the Gospel of Luke locates Jesus in the royal lineage of David through Joseph, Milton highlights the irony of this patrilinear claim. In *Paradise Regained*, only Satan announces Jesus as a son of King David; the poem as a whole shows Jesus working to manifest the truth that he is not the son of Joseph but rather the Son of God. The manifestation of divine descent is not physical but rather verbal: the voice that proclaims Jesus to be God's beloved Son "establishes new relations among the characters rather than merely revealing a preexisting kinship" (94). Murphy argues that this turn away from reproduction and toward discursive faith governs Milton's thinking about Marian motherhood as well as divine fatherhood. The early use of the phrase "reproductive futurity" anticipates this essay's final turn to an explicit engagement with Michael Warner's and Lee Edelman's critiques of a modern, heteronormative political imagination that aims at a (perpetually deferred) future of and for children. In the 1990s, Gregory Bredbeck worked almost single-handedly to initiate a productive exchange between Milton scholarship and queer studies, yet that conversation has only resumed in recent years. Murphy's essay seeks to continue this work by suggesting that Milton thwarts a royalist politics of reproductive futurity—not in spite of, but rather alongside his particular commitment to heterosexual marriage.

The third pair of essays advances the question of how, exactly, a monist imagination can produce complex rather than uniform understandings of embodiment. Both Rebecca Buckham and Lara Dodds begin with the blush of Raphael, a blush that has long raised questions about sex, affect, and the materiality of Milton's angels. Buckham's essay is the most theoretically ambitious of this volume. She takes not only the angelic blush but also the worldview that Raphael articulates as invitations to a non-anthropocentric mode of understanding. Buckham cites Timothy Morton to describe how non-human alterity can foster an awareness of ecological "interconnectedness that is not holistic or totalitarian but rather quite vexed" (116). Raphael's descrip-

tion of a cosmos linked in a chain of digestion certainly does suggest a holistic and hierarchical interconnectedness, with God at the top. Yet Buckham locates in Raphael's poetic cosmology the indications of a more diffuse, non-hierarchical assemblage of material beings. In response to Raphael's articulation of a monist worldview, Buckham seeks an interpretive practice "informed by the sort of strangeness Morton describes," whereby the success of metaphors "reside not only in their ability to produce synthesis but also a fair amount of dissonance" (127). I remain genuinely uncertain about the ecocritical engagements that Buckham pursues. To what extent can a belief in Milton's presentation of angels (as a religious belief, as a literary suspension of disbelief, or as something in between) advance a non-anthropocentric understanding of the world (in which we know—in whatever sense—that very real non-human entities thrive and suffer)? Yet this uncertainty strikes me as productive—as a real inducement to further thought and inquiry. Whereas Buckham fosters this kind of theoretical conversation, Dodds appeals to "a more careful historicization" in order to reconsider the meaning of Raphael's blush (140). Dodds locates Milton's depictions of angels within a Homeric tradition of reporting heroic facial gestures. Yet the parallels between Miltonic angels and epic heroes do not suggest the angels' basic human qualities but rather helps to establish their "distinct ontology" (146). Buckham's theoretically-minded and Dodds' historicist readings converge on a shared sense that Milton's angels occasion an inter-species challenge of interpretation that always contains a degree of indecipherability. Dodds's essay ends with an explanation of how Raphael's blush is accompanied by a "contracted brow" that attempts to shore up the angel's heroic superiority. Yet Adam's ensuing questions about angelic sex throws Raphael off balance and occasions angelic self-consciousness—which undercuts the angelic bid for heroic condescension while also resisting full human comprehension. Taken together, Buckham's and Dodds' essays demonstrate how literary criticism can pursue its own concerns—heightening its own disciplinary self-consciousness—while adding historical and imaginative richness to our shared awareness of present-day realities. Even if performing both of these tasks simultaneously proves difficult, these essays demonstrate the value of doing them both and doing them together.

Yet this is not the final rapprochement that this volume offers. The last pair of essays redirects historicist literary scholarship toward the future of Miltonic thinking in nineteenth-century America and in twenty-first century America, respectively. John Rogers offers a vivid and powerfully lucid account of how Milton's vitalist monism—expressed both in *De Doctrina Christiana* and in *Paradise Lost*—influenced the formation of Mormon theology and church leadership. Rogers focuses specifically on Orson Pratt, who was (along with his older brother Parley) an important figure in the early development of Mormonism. After studying the monist views of Milton's theological and poetic writings, Orson Pratt sought to modernize "Milton's metaphysics with reference to post-Miltonic discoveries such as that of electricity" (170). Yet Pratt did not just update Miltonic thinking but rather pushed its theological implications to new extremes. Pratt's 1851 treatise *Great First Cause* argues that "God ... is himself a creature. God himself is but a belated effect of matter's capacity to combine and unite itself into meaningful formations" (178). Rogers—one of our canniest critics when it comes to the way philosophical and theological controversies express and feed into political struggles—traces how Pratt's radical theology was opposed by Brigham Young, who "only worked harder to affirm the eternity of Deity" as he sought to enhance prestige of the office of the Mormon Presidency (182). As Orson Pratt failed in his ecclesiastical struggle to have the Church led by the Quorum of Twelve rather than by a singular figurehead, his audacious theology was denied official church endorsement. Yet for this very reason, Rogers's excavation of the Miltonic (and post-Miltonic) thinking within Mormon history is consequential—not only for Milton scholars and for Mormons, but for anyone interested in the genealogy of religious life in America. David Harper's essay responds to a more current example of Milton's reemergence in the United States. In recent years, Cody Wilson has cited *Areopagitica* to argue for the social benefit of "distributing free, downloadable plans for the print-at-home gun he named 'The Liberator'" (190). For Harper, defining the exact contours of Milton's monism is not merely a matter of intellectual history but rather the grounds for an informed response to—and a rebuttal of—Wilson's claims. After revisiting Milton's oft-quoted descriptions of books as alive (as preserving the

essential qualities of their authors), Harper reminds us that *Areopagitica* “privileges original ideas, not the proliferation of mere copies” (201). For Harper, this means that the 3-D printing of guns (“a revolution in manufacturing rather than a revolution in ‘printing’” [199]) does not fall under the kind of personal freedom that Milton endorses. Harper finds validation for his reading of *Areopagitica* in Milton’s repeated poetic depictions of gunpowder. In *Paradise Lost*, Milton’s “apparent disdain for modern weaponry” intertwines with his monist cosmology: the satanic invention of gunpowder is a perversion of the vitality inherent in all matter (204). Rogers’s and Harper’s essays conclude this volume by demonstrating how a sustained, scholarly engagement with Milton’s writings can be put into the service of writing with a wider—and more politically urgent—appeal.

All of the essays in this collection originated as papers delivered at the 2013 Conference on John Milton; this conference did not have a more specific topical focus. It is all the more impressive, then, that the editors have been able to organize these essays in a way that demonstrates both eclecticism and coherence (thus recreating a productive tension internal to Milton’s thinking about monism). It would be too much to ask of a single volume to confirm decisively that current theoretical discussions on topics as wide-ranging as ontology, the environment, and animality in relation to the human should be more attuned to single-author literary studies. Yet this volume amply succeeds in showing how Milton scholarship continues to refine its own insights while also advancing our shared understandings of the religious, erotic, and political underpinnings of materialisms, past and present.

Ellen R. Welch. *A Theater of Diplomacy: International Relations and the Performing Arts in Early Modern France*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2017. 312 pp. + 10 illus. \$75.00. Review by HALL BJØRNSTAD, INDIANA UNIVERSITY.

A Theater of Diplomacy is an important and timely book that will reorient the way in which we think about both diplomacy and theater in early modern France and beyond. The book brings sharp scrutiny to

the all-important yet, until now, little-explored, constitutive intersection of the performing arts and international relations, as the subtitle of the book has it, especially as it evolves from the late sixteenth to the early eighteenth century. Drawing on an impressive command of a vast array of archives, disciplines, methodologies and scholarly traditions, Welch explores her materials compellingly, systematically, patiently, as much at ease in the historical archive of early modern diplomacy as when analyzing theatrical texts that stage diplomacy, and maybe at her best while exploring (often while establishing) the archive of the historical reception of diplomatic entertainment. Since the book has already been widely reviewed and celebrated, even consecrated by a H-France Forum in 2017 (vol. 12–13), I will focus here on what I see as two to three particularly important contributions, with special focus on the further inquiry that the book enables and necessitates, while also reflecting on a certain tension between what the book purports to do in its meta-reflective moments and what it actually does.

So how is the title *A Theater of Diplomacy* to be understood? There is an openness to the genitive construction of that title (as discreetly highlighted by the italicized *of* on the book cover), fruitfully exploited by the author throughout. On the one hand, we have the theater that diplomacy itself *is*, as highlighted by François de Callières often-quoted observation that “an ambassador resembles in some way an actor exposed on the stage to the eyes of the public in order to play great roles.” On the other, the book addresses a certain kind of theater that contains, is filled by, maybe even constituted by diplomatic themes and actors. Then, there is the middle ground hinted at above: grandiose court entertainments—allegorical ballets, masquerade balls, chivalric tournaments, operas, and comedies—which were “diplomatic” both in their purpose to honor and impress visiting diplomats and often in their themes (war, peace, and international unity). The eight chapters that make up the book survey some of the most important examples of diplomatic entertainment through the long French seventeenth century, as indicated by chapter titles that all refer to a phenomenon or event situated in time, as in “Chapter 4: Richelieu’s Allegories of War (1639–42)” or what, to this reviewer, was the most compelling among the eight strong chapters: “Chapter 5: Ballet Diplomacy at the Congress of Westphalia (1645–49).” While most of the chapters, like

the ones just referred to, are excellent case studies, others operate in a more synthetic mode, proposing impressive surveys of vast periods, as indicated, for example, by the title of the last chapter: "Chapter 8: Diplomacy on the Public Stage (1697–1714)." Taken together, the chronologically ordered chapters go a long way in delivering on the book's ambitious promise to "trace major evolutions in the theory and practice of diplomacy and court spectacle" (9). The choice of words here is telling: *major* but not *shifts*, rather *evolutions*, which, importantly, is plural. Accordingly, as stated in the last paragraph of the conclusion, the book offers "no grand theory of theater and the performing arts' effectiveness for international politics," but through the contrast it establishes, the inquiry is nevertheless successful in its ambition to "illuminate the unarticulated assumptions that underlie our own, contemporary practices" (212). The case briefly analyzed in the conclusion works beautifully in this respect: the diplomatic entertainments at the 1815 Congress of Utrecht in the aftermath of the Napoleonic Wars were perceived as empty and irrelevant, as "residual and retrograde" (211), concluding a development that started during the second half of the reign of Louis XIV, in stark contrast to the mid-century abundance of diplomatic entertainments (as analyzed in chapters 3–6), when the Theater of Diplomacy on stage in fact "produced new ideas and concepts for theories of political representation" (69).

To this reviewer, the most fascinating part of the book, and also the most daring, consists in the exploration of ways in which the earlier diplomatic entertainments may have influenced the conceptual vocabulary for thinking about politics. This also seems to have been the starting point of the whole project, as expressed most forcefully in the first phrase of the acknowledgments: "This project began as a simple thought experiment in taking metaphorS seriously" (301), and rephrased in the opening of chapter 3: "Dramatic metaphors (if metaphor is a sufficient term to describe theorists' reliance on theatrical concepts) did not simply emerge from the ether" (59). But what exactly does it mean to take a metaphor seriously? And how can we be sure we are not just projecting our understanding of the working of a metaphor back on the past? The author is clearly concerned about the risk of over-interpretation and always strives to anchor her own analyses of her corpus from the performing arts (typically based on the

written libretto) with reference to examples from actual reactions to the performances, preferably by diplomatic figures. This leads her deep into the archive of international politics and diplomacy, with impressive and often important results. However, this care also occasionally makes her less comfortable trusting her own bold interpretation of the materials at hand. It will also occasionally lead to the inclusion of slightly awkward disclaimers about her own hermeneutic activity as *speculation*, as in Chapter 1 when it is stated that “the resources of performance theory provide a way to speculate about the entertainment’s effect” on the aristocrats that took part in them, in the absence of “firsthand accounts of their experience” (21). A similar expression of the same discomfort from Chapter 4: “Considering the ballet’s diplomatic uses requires a certain amount of speculation” (114). As if speculation should and could be avoided while making sense of past materials. And as if the archive can liberate the historian from the task of speculation, rather than direct and assist that speculation. On the contrary, this book is at its most compelling when the author allows herself to speculate.

The author’s approach to what it means to take the dramatic metaphors seriously as a conceptual laboratory for political theory is worked out—even modeled—in the context of chapter 3 (“National Actors on the Ballet Stage (1620s–30s),” with a corpus of pieces like the *Ballet du grand bal de la Douairière de Billebahaut* (1626) and the *Ballet des nations* (1622), which staged the complex interaction of actors embodying national characters. As the author observes, at a general level, the “creative work of representation consists in forming concepts, through figures, that in turn shape the way people think and behave” (80). But this remains very abstract. The staging of these ballets literally plays out the shapes, forms, and figures of international political relations; they are fleshed out in front of the audience, at a historic moment where traditional modes of monarchical representation were perceived as inadequate. In a dense subchapter titled “Personifying the Body Politic” (68–74), the author argues forcefully that her corpus makes “available a new way to envision a collective (geographical, political) entity” (69), by providing a “creative supplement” (80) to a contemporary political thinking which was already steeped in a language of representation, impersonation, and incorporation. This

important discussion is rich and rewarding, while also doing important groundwork for the two following chapters on War and Peace (see titles quoted above). It indeed lives up to the ambitious promise of taking the dramatic metaphors seriously.

However, at the same time, the central part of the book is haunted by trends in recent scholarship that has little room for this taking-seriously of a corpus written for and staged for—and sometimes even by—the hegemonic power itself. Is there room for an engagement with this material in a mode that escapes dichotomies such as complacency or critique, propaganda or subversion? Will not these works already, through their proximity to the hegemonic power, by default take a stand either subserviently *for* or subversively *against* it? The methodologically most important part of the book is preoccupied with concerns like these: in chapter 3 by the observation that other scholars, as Mark Franko, have analyzed the same corpus in terms of “the affirmation of pure dissent” (81); and in chapter 4, through the looming suspicion voiced in earlier scholarship that the three allegorical entertainments under scrutiny—and which were all commissioned by Richelieu—present nothing more than propagandistic versions of recent history. The author deals with these concerns through negotiations at two very different levels. First of all, she makes an important distinction, by pointing towards a further richness in the materials, complexities, and ambivalences not necessarily part of the traditional interpretations, and which exposed the audience with the need to negotiate their way through the international interactions they were witnessing. To this reviewer, she thereby very effectively demonstrates a “third way” between propaganda and subversion. Second, however, she risks weakening this important methodological intervention in her own negotiating with prior scholarship, where she seeks to position her more nuanced reading in a way that doesn’t contradict but only adds to the earlier work. In this vein, the traditional view of Richelieu’s personal theater “as a form of propaganda is *convincing to a large degree*”; indeed, the triumphant role of France in this corpus “*justifies to an extent* their traditional characterization as propaganda” (85, 106, my italics). Here, one would have wished that the author were a less good diplomat than those under scrutiny in her corpus. By giving too much ground to prior scholars, the impact of her nuanced

argument is lessened. It is not that the qualification as propaganda is wrong or unfounded, but rather that it brings to the material a framework that is inadequate. It serves to close down the discussion in contrast to what Welch does so beautifully: to open it up, in new and important ways.

George Klawitter. *Marvell, Sexual-Orientation, and Seventeenth-Century Poetry*. Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson Press, 2017. ix + 269 pp. \$98.77. Review by BRENDAN PRAWDZIK, THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY.

When first taking an interest in Andrew Marvell, I was grateful to read George Klawitter's essay, "Andrew Marvell and the Nymph's Little Foot." Here, Klawitter demonstrated, provocatively, an anatomically precise, autoerotic sexuality in Marvell's lyric, "The Nymph Complaining on the Death of Her Fawn." Published in a collection of *New Perspectives on Andrew Marvell* (Reims: 2008), the essay was well situated. It focused a unique vision upon poetry and produced insight from its niche.

The scholarly monograph does not suit Klawitter. *Andrew Marvell, Sexual Orientation, and Seventeenth-Century Poetry* is a patchwork of meandering prose that, despite repeated stabs at the mysteries of Marvell's verse, remains unthreaded and wasteful. It offers no serious contribution to Marvell studies, in part because it pretends to be an alternative to scholarship that it portrays as pretentious and hypermasculine. Most of Klawitter's use of the existing literature on Marvell, seventeenth-century poetry, and theory of sexuality, gender, and identity is superficial and convenient. It does not demonstrate the intellectual gratitude that comes with digesting knowledge gathered, concocted, and presented in rigorous scholarship.

The book's broadest claims are correct. Marvell's poetry is richly and strangely erotic. The poems show, variously, an ugly heterosexuality, moments of attractive homoeroticism or queerness, scenes of autoeroticism, and suggestions of asexuality. The book's most welcome contribution is its placement of celibacy and asexuality within the spectrum of sexual identity.

At \$98.77 from an academic press, the book would seem to be written for scholars. On occasions, Klawitter distances himself from the scholarship, casting dubious generalizations without grounding them in responsible research. Several times, he refers to “macho man scholars” who are, apparently, too entrenched in heteronormativity to appreciate his approach. Who are these people? I am surprised to read that literary scholars have been reluctant to consider queer interpretations. Certainly, they have long abandoned any belief that Marvell was sexually normative. Rather, it has long been sensitive to the erotic fluidity of his verse.

Elsewhere, Klawitter suggests that his book might open means to sexual self-understanding. For instance, seventeenth-century poems with gender-neutral pronouns “can surely serve as essential a purpose for today’s gays and lesbians as any heterosexually flavored poems serve for heterosexuals.” The “Unfortunate Lover,” perhaps Marvell’s obscurest lyric, “can bring great homoerotic satisfaction to gay readers” (7). Yet the book cannot serve these purposes: “today’s gays and lesbians” will not be seeking self-understanding in publications from academic presses about seventeenth-century poetry. Thankfully, today’s LGBTQIA readers have, in their cultural landscapes, readily accessible, more reliable avenues toward sexual self-understanding.

Due to its investment in authorial fallacy, the book remains conceptually loose from its core. Klawitter writes, “It is time that we sound a death knell for the ‘authorial fallacy’ and let the flavor of a poem be attributed to the poet.” In “The Picture of Little T. C. in a Prospect of Flowers,” “there is no way to divorce . . . Marvell from the emotional vigor of his narrator. . . . They are one and the same. So anything I say about the narrator’s emotional state of mind I can safely attach to Marvell’s” (149). But Klawitter generates dubious, un-researched context to support his interpretations. Thus, in the book’s absurd reading of “The Garden” as an attack on the Diggers, the “true message . . . is, of course, only apparent to readers who can read in the poem Marvell’s disdain for the radical Levellers” (157)—no doubt, an audience of one. It is this practice—of attempting to discover the biographical truth of the poet in his verse while using frail assumptions about biography and context to ground interpretation that regularly insulates Klawitter within his own fancy.

Klawitter fails to engage with major works that are most relevant to his project. Derek Hirst and Steven Zwicker's *Andrew Marvell: Orphan of the Hurricane* (2011) is overlooked entirely. Their subject is Marvell's "written life" as revealed in his poetics; this "written life" includes sexual trauma, sexual ambiguity, and fantasies of sexual play. More importantly, Hirst and Zwicker appreciate the sophistication of Marvell's irony, the tangling vines of which Klawitter remains bound while laying claim to the poet's soul and "authentic" self (39). Also overlooked is Nigel Smith's *Andrew Marvell: The Chameleon* (2010), the most recent and important biography of the poet.

Certainly, the book lags far behind recent theory and scholarship focusing on gender and sexuality. Any serious engagement with queer theory would have helped Klawitter to avoid some of the book's outdated commentary.

Klawitter is best when reading the poetry closely. His unique eye throws numerous illuminating sparks. Yet the analyses often lead to cheap implications: "I doubt if Marvell ever kissed a woman. If he had, the kiss or the yearning for it would have settled somewhere into his verses" (46). Although there is "no overt reference to sodomy" in the poems, "we should not conclude that there is no nonsodomitical homoerotic underbelly in some of his verses" (99). (I leave the writing to speak for itself.)

- Too often, we are expected to accept wild claims and speculation:
- "Young Love" focuses on "a fifteen-year-old . . . who very well may be Marvell's poetic dalliance [sic] with King Charles [I]" (75).
 - "The Unfortunate Lover" owes to "an actual shipwreck and the actual loss of a person special to the poet or to a poetic coterie" (101).
 - "Marvell may very well have lived a double life in war-torn England, posing as celibate tutor to Maria Fairfax in the same year that he lusted after Damon, the mower of her father's fields" (104).
 - "We have little to no history of eighteenth-century lower-class banter—it may very well, however, have included generous references to clitoral excitement" (146).
 - "[R]eading Andrew Marvell's poetry closely, we could very well conclude that the man was celibate, given the dearth of serious love poems and given his attitude on women exemplified by Chloe

and Clara" (201).

- The Nymph's "fawn" represents her "clitoris" (138), and the fawn's shooting by "wanton troopers" is "a kind of poetic gang rape" (141).
- Marvell attacked the Diggers (and Levellers—Klawitter does not seem to realize the disinctio) in "The Garden" "because Marvell was young and brash and did not know any better" (160).

When Klawitter writes that he "sets" Marvell's lyrics "in a context of other Renaissance poems," he is referring to an organizational maneuver intended, it would seem, to give the book breadth and relevance. The chapters typically proceed from introductory mediations on Marvellian sexuality, to accusations against the scholarship in general, and to close reading of the poetry for evidence of sexual "orientations." (It should be noted that the problematic term "sexual orientation," part of the book's title, is left undefined.) In each of these chapters, two additional authors are then surveyed and brought heavy-handedly back to Marvell. Because these authors must answer to Klawitter's focus on "orientation" (?), they offer little to our understanding of "seventeenth-century poetry," the title's final term.

One of the book's priorities is to incorporate the essays that Klawitter has published about Marvell and other poets. The problem is that they seem incorporated more because they exist than because they enrich a cohesive project. It devotes nine pages to Richard Barnfield, who did not write in the seventeenth century. It devotes six to Erasmus, another sixteenth-century author.

The most bizarre inclusion involves the attempt to read "The Garden" as a parody of Digger (and Leveller?) ideals. Remote from the book's focus, these pages run counter to purpose.

One cannot help but think that Klawitter was disserved by his editors. Should this book have been accepted for publication? Should it have passed a post-contract review? Why was the author not guided or pushed to develop key terms, scholarly engagements, and theoretical, historical, and biographical assumptions? Why were so many of Klawitter's published essays imported, rather than integrated, into this project? In its published form, *Andrew Marvell, Sexual Orientation, and Seventeenth-Century Poetry* shows some potential for a book that may have been.

Heather Dubrow. *Deixis in the Early Modern English Lyric: Unsettling Spatial Anchors Like "Here," "This," "Come."* New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015. ix + 135pp. \$67.50. Review by NICHOLAS D. NACE, HAMPDEN-SYDNEY COLLEGE.

In the late 1990s, everyone studying early modern literature was writing about space and place, or so it seemed. Paul Alpers's *What Is Pastoral?* (1997) returned us to the pleasures of the *locus amoenus*. Tom Conley's *Self-Made Map: Cartographic Writing in Early Modern France* (1996) sent us looking into the gazetteers of the *imago mundi*. Just a few years later, we had Andrew Gordon and Bernhard Klein's *Literature, Mapping, and the Politics of Space in Early Modern Britain* (2001) to describe for us the "paper landscapes" that attempt to control human perception of the *verum orbis terrarium*. And, everyone, in whatever period of study, was still reading Jürgen Habermas to understand the public's sphericity and citing Benedict Anderson to explain how public spheres roll across national boundaries. At roughly this same time, Heather Dubrow, the most expert reader of Shakespeare's narrative poems and an editor, with Richard Strier, of the landmark historicist collection *The Historical Renaissance* (1988), offered one of her more forceful exemplifications of what had started to be called the New Formalism. In an essay for a special issue of *MLQ* entitled "Reading for Form," Dubrow argued, apropos of Marvell's *Upon Appleton House*, that "Social place is established and represented through decisive spatial placement." Fifteen years later, she offers a much-needed analysis of the precise mechanisms by which "spatial placement" can be "decisive" in *Deixis in the Early Modern English Lyric: Unsettling Spatial Anchors Like "Here," "This," "Come."*

That a newly emergent focus on spatial placement would be linguistic in nature was not, by the end of the 1990s, obvious. A few years into the new millennium, the abstractions of Franco Moretti (also a contributor to *MLQ*'s "Reading for Form") seemed ready to reposition literary analysis by pushing it away from close reading—however perfunctory it had gotten in the hands of New Historicists—and toward an opposite sort of formalism. His maps hoped to take literature through digital radiography into spatially rendered morphologies of formal textual attributes. But for all Moretti's interest in zooming

out into space in order to conduct “distant readings,” maps appear to have been the least valuable of his triad in *Graphs, Maps, Trees* (2005). Despite the promise of digital humanities to give us a better purchase on form, which has only truly happened with Dan Shore’s *Cyberformalism: Histories of Linguistic Forms in the Digital Archives* (2018), the best studies of space in early modern literature during the decade after Moretti tended to approach the issue either from a cultural studies perspective, as in Julie Sanders’s *The Cultural Geography of Early Modern Drama, 1620–1650* (2011), or a performance studies perspective, as in Tim Fitzpatrick’s *Playwright, Space and Place in Early Modern Performance: Shakespeare and Company* (2011). What these studies showed was that after the revolutions of New Historicism and the occasionally concerted effort at a New Formalism, the two approaches to literature seemed unable to exist at the same time, let alone in the same study. They had become incompatible.

After patiently waiting, Dubrow has finally arrived at a moment in which her historically informed attention to precise linguistic coordinates may finally have the influence it deserves. In recent years, her prescience has finally become clear and her persistence has finally been rewarded. Now we might list studies that have given formalism the rigorous theoretical re-rationalization it has deserved. Ric Bogel’s *New Formalist Criticism: Theory and Practice* (2013) and Caroline Levine’s *Forms: Whole, Rhythm, Hierarchy, Network* (2015) are two works that have made formalism viable once again. With the new theoretical interest in “lyric” among poets, theorists, and critics (of which Dubrow is all three), the formerly glamorous study of the Renaissance lyric seems destined for a restoration.

Deixis in the Early Modern Lyric gives us a sampling of what a Neo-New Formalist approach to lyric can be. As a sample, it perhaps also shows how various it must be by buttressing an attention to form with insights from various subfields of linguistics, early modern history, art history, literary history, and lyric poetry from Thomas Wyatt to Frank Bidart—often through Jonathan Culler, whose concept of lyric apostrophe is something of a counter-song of this study. And the authors studied are often elucidated with sidelights from classical antiquity (Quintilian, of course, should factor into any history of pointing).

Dubrow offers some general and methodological observations in her “Introduction: Delimitations, Definitions, Disciplines” as well as her concluding chapter, “Here Today and Gone Tomorrow? Conclusions and Invitations,” but the nature of deixis requires that its words be studied for—and in—their peculiarity. The book’s first chapter likewise offers a prospective view of what’s to come, pointing to a variety of stimulating if unlikely contexts from which the rest of the study will draw, demonstrating how polymathic a scholar of deixis must be. Here we find, among other things, discussions of installation art by James Turrell and Scott Burton, who create a conceptual “in” and museumish “out” that troubles the “here” and “there” of inter-architectural reference. The chapter ends with a brief discussion of what unfortunately can only be called the haecceity underlying the concept of *terroir* in viticulture.

Dubrow is among our most historically informed formalists, new or old. Chapter 2, focusing on Spenser’s “Epithalamion,” makes perhaps the best case in the book for the ways that attention to deictics can help make claims for issues operating at the national and political levels. Specifically the chapter examines Spenser’s “strategic spatiality” found in words like “come” and “go,” which the linguist Chuck Fillmore has described as “deictic motion verbs,” and what might be understood as purer indexical words such as “heere,” which, like the “now” with which it is often paired, relies for all its meaning on context. Prepositions such as “here” are not just a reflection of the world’s complexity but a constituent element of it, performing the task of forging connections, not just describing them. What Spenser strategically organizes with “heere” is precisely the relationship of the locale with the moment “now,” which hints at a disunity in this poem about unity as it “gathers together the elect while Othering those excluded from the wedding” (43).

The orders of Spenser’s colonialist bridegroom to “come” “heere” “now” are followed, in chapter 3, by those that cause us to recede ever inward toward the intimate “this” that Shakespeare shows us when he turns his sonnets’ pockets inside out at their ends. Given the highly pressurized nature of the sonnets’ final couplets, which are torqued by wit that must both summarize the poem and give it a closure effect, Shakespeare often resorts to a deixis that ties things

together rather than puts them asunder. Dubrow in this way delves into deictic metatextuality. Though probably more intricately organized in a prospective line like Marvell's "Within this sober frame" at the start of *Upon Appleton House*, the nested referents organized by a "colonesque" textual "this" in Shakespeare's sonnets likewise offer the created distance of authority that reenacts problems with the promissory nature of the genre, and perhaps of form itself.

Of course, pastoral writing, as a mode, has always played with a "now" that contrasts with a bucolic "then," even when that blissful pastoral "here" is challenged by the preposition in "et in arcadia ego," which in Poussin's painting involves a verifying pointing at textual detail. Dubrow's foray into pastoral deixis takes her to Lady Mary Wroth's *Pamphilia to Amphilanthus*. Song 1, "The Spring now come at last," offers what might be a synthesis of Dubrow's previous concerns with its Edenic "then" and rusticated "heere" that contrasts with the hustle and harangue of an urban or courtly "there." Drawing on work by Paul Alpers and Don Friedman, Dubrow offers a discussion of Wroth's use of "heere" that returns to the patch of soil in the first chapter in which she draws an analogy from *terroir*. The deictics aerate the "soil that generated the poem," we find, and the looseness of the loam, we might say, is what produces different varieties of pastoral.

Because Dubrow starts the entire book with a brief discussion of Donne's "The Flea," which requires the addressee to "mark in this" in a way that increased focus cannot clarify, we are primed for a return to Donne, which we find in the discussion of "Hymn to God my God, in my Sicknesse" that comprises chapter 5. After all, as Dubrow says, "If deixis had not already existed, John Donne would have invented it" (94). But our own inventiveness, elucidated by Dubrow, seems no less potent than Donne's. This most virtuosic of all the book's readings also constitutes the best proof that attending to deictics can provide a view of a poem simply inaccessible by other means (which is here proven by the fact that this reading diverges from nearly every other and still makes considerable sense).

Deictics in the devotional context seem especially ripe for interpretation because they appear to involve every aspect that Dubrow argues might have been in play in "The Flea": "linguistic, cognitive, and possibly even physical events" (2). Wielding the somewhat la-

bored concept she calls “prevenient proximity,” Dubrow documents the “spatial recording or negotiating of anticipated proximity to the divine” (94), an instance in which time is rendered as space. This chapter demonstrates Dubrow’s talents for perceiving ambiguity and performing the doctrinal hairsplitting that might offer clarity, though in the case of Donne, the acrobatics displayed by the reading, while impressive, seem to constitute the point of the chapter. Ultimately, the “prevenient proximity” found in Donne’s poem proves no more profound than the prognostication commonly found on road signs that “bridge freezes before road surface.” We do use the language of space to refer to time, and sometimes, looking toward the future, we cannot tell whether the bridge will freeze at an earlier moment in time than the road freezes or in the location directly in front of where the bridge meets the road surface. Such niceties of distinction do not often matter.

The people who teach prepositions require children to memorize vast lists of these spatial and temporal deictics (“aboard, about, along, among,” etc.), presumably on the assumption that the *raison d’être* of these words can only be surmised in a Morettian aggregate. But prepositions are much more interesting for their differences, as Dubrow repeatedly demonstrates. What’s most interesting, in fact, proves to be the way that difference itself is produced by prepositions—often in a way that conjures the specter of another term or dyad to which it is opposed (structuralism’s binarisms were, not surprisingly, drawn in terms of a spatial relationship of numerator and denominator). If, for example, someone were to offer an inducement on December 31st to “come watch the Times Square ball drop on our TV,” we get the sense that the word “on” can mean multiple—and very different—things in relation to a particular object. Poets have always exploited this, as have authors of children’s books and advertising agents. But the ends to which deictics are exploited reveal some very fundamental, though ignorable, ways by which our attention is configured for complicity.

While Dubrow’s book concerns mostly spatial deixis, time tends most often to be conceptualized through a graphic analogy and by means of many of the very same deictic words (“before,” “after,” etc.). As any writer knows, there are instances when the choice between the temporal “further” and the spatial “farther” requires the help of meta-

physics. But the methodological problems of seeing reading in terms of closeness instead of time remain with this study. As Dubrow admits in her concluding chapter, “Skimming is replacing scrutinizing”—not only in digital media, but also in many kinds of programmatic reading styles that have proliferated in the wake of New Historicism, some of which actively invite us to reduce our “attentiveness to the nuances of language” (121).

But “scrutinizing” and “attentiveness,” for all the depth these investments offer, generally occur in a piecemeal manner, in spots of time, whereas “skimming” performs what is considered the more valuable temporal work of connection, of moving forward quickly enough not to sink into the depths. While Dubrow prognosticates a “New Nationalism some years down the professional pike,” one that will no doubt mark out expansive new “theres,” perhaps the best way to describe what she has done in this book is create a New Reader Response criticism. This style of criticism can chart not only the way different deictics structure time, but it can unite them in time and offer some sense of our actual, not only our ideal, experience. After all, Reuben Brower insisted on the phrase “slow reading” to refer to what everyone else called “close reading.” The difference, of course, is how we orient ourselves: we either look for something “in” a text or find something “through” a text. Dubrow not surprisingly echoes this distinction, giving us a way to bring time and space together, to read both closely and slowly.

W. B. Patterson. *Thomas Fuller: Discovering England's Religious Past*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018. x + 368 pp. \$94.00. Review by NATHAN J. MARTIN, CHARLESTON SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY.

In *Thomas Fuller: Discovering England's Religious Past*, W. B. Patterson has written a thoughtful, insightful, and generally interesting account of Thomas Fuller, who had a unique position in the seventeenth century to view the chaotic political changes that accompanied his age. Patterson's ability to weave this intellectual biography between a micro and macro-historical study speaks to his ability as a writer and researcher. Patterson himself is a Professor Emeritus of History at the

University of the South and has previously published works focusing on the intersection of religion, politics, and culture, so it comes with little surprise that this present work focuses on the same. Apparently, the research for this work began as part of Patterson's Ph.D. dissertation research at Harvard, and his unpublished thesis did actually serve as an important supplement to other works dealing with Fuller. Now, however, the biography, published by Oxford University Press, will have wider availability and ease of access for scholars interested in this era.

Patterson's objectives in this biography are threefold. First, in his Preface, he states that he wants to "show how Fuller's distinctive ideas and engaging manner of expression emerged in the tumultuous era of civil wars in which he lived" (iv). In other words, Patterson wants to place Fuller within the historical context. Next, Patterson writes that he intends to "assess his achievements as a historian, religious writer, and commentator on current issues" (iv). Fuller's literary output was vast, and much of the biography is devoted to showcasing Fuller's perspectives and understanding of various ecclesiastical and political topics. Finally, this work attempts to "show that Fuller was nurtured by a distinctive English tradition of considering the past, a tradition shaped by a generation of Elizabethan writers and scholars" (?). In examining Fuller's educational progression and training, Patterson is able to demonstrate the influence of previous writers and philosophers on the subject. Patterson succeeds in each of these areas as he presents Fuller as both an innovator and product of his times.

One of this work's great strengths is the way Patterson is able to portray Fuller as an ordinary man at the center of extraordinary historical events. For example, Patterson recounts how Fuller was present at the contentious Convocation of 1640. Even though Fuller had wanted it disbanded as a result of Parliament's dismissal (Short Parliament), he participated and generally assumed an anti-Laudian and anti-Arminian position, though not vociferously. In another example, Fuller was listed as a member of an entourage tasked with presenting a declaration from the House of Lords to Charles I. The group was apprehended, apparently, before the mission could be completed, though the petition was ultimately received by the king. This event occurred during the time that Fuller was serving as minister for the

Savoy Chapel in London, and many of his sermons revolved around the theme of peace-keeping and avoiding conflict. Patterson masterfully shows how his sermons around the time just before and after the outbreak of civil war reflected a view shared by many in England based on negotiating with the king rather than engaging in conflict.

In addition to the political question surrounding Fuller's career, Patterson accurately represents his subject as attempting to navigate through the uncertain theological waters of his day. The main headwind of normative belief and practice in Fuller's early career was Laudianism, which Patterson succeeds in explaining. Instead of only presenting this theological position as a response to Calvinism and advocates of the Swiss Reformation, Patterson rightly presents Laudianism as an attempt to recover the ritual, ceremony, and additional trappings lost over the course of decades of reformation within the English Church. Named for the English archbishop who advocated this return to ceremony, Laudianism was frequently connected to Arminianism, the theological response to Calvin's ideas of predestination. Patterson also points out that the Synod of Dort, the Calvinist response to the Arminian argument for free will, was attended by John Davenant, a relative and mentor of Fuller. The University of Cambridge, where Fuller matriculated at the tender age of thirteen, was replete with Calvinist-leaning theologians. Yet, Patterson identifies Fuller not as a radical, but as a principled moderate. When Archbishop Laud's *Et Cetera* Oath was demanded, Fuller took it, though perhaps after some thought and consideration. In one of Fuller's later major works, *The Church History of Britain*, which Patterson analyzed over the course of two chapters, Fuller criticizes Arminianism and argues that King James had been judicious in resisting its influence in the English Church; Charles had not.

Patterson also does well to demonstrate how history as a distinct discipline developed in England and influenced Fuller through his intellectual maturation. He creatively begins the work by discussing the role of memory during the early modern period and extends this to the situation in England. He states, "the cultivation of memory is one way to deal with change: it provided the means to accept change, assimilate it, and redirect it" (1). History, then, as a study served a societal need to deal with the present. Also, Patterson states that "it was

also at the heart of one of the most important cultural achievements of sixteenth-century England—namely, the development of a way of historical writing that was as dispassionate, critical, and as firmly based on reliable evidence as any in Europe” (1). Here, the beginnings of the historical tradition in England are described. Patterson goes on to relate that the Society of Antiquaries, established by William Camden during Elizabeth’s reign, was unique in this ‘cultivation of memory.’ Later, in Patterson’s description, the tendency in English scholarship was to recognize history as a distinctive and separate field from others. The philosopher and statesman Francis Bacon attacked Aristotelianism and developed a tripartite epistemology. At Cambridge, as Patterson shows, history had become a separate discipline.

The author also succeeds in presenting Thomas Fuller as an innovator and a scholar who advanced the study of history substantially. Being a well-seasoned scholar and writer, Fuller is able to include even minor works, including sermons, into the discussion. For Fuller’s major works, such as *The Historie of Holy Warre*, which was regarded as Fuller’s first major work published in 1639 and several times thereafter, Patterson gives a thorough and contextualized analysis of the work. Being a history of crusades and written in the tumultuous period of the Bishops’ War with Scotland, Fuller gave more amenable treatment to Muslim figures like Saladin and the Mamluk sultans of Egypt, according to Patterson. In discussing other major works too, like the *Church History of Britain*, there is direct analysis of Fuller’s perspectives on theology which guide him throughout that famous work. For Fuller, the Reformation was seen positively and to be championed in his works, against those dissenting groups who were increasingly distancing themselves from it. But, perhaps the best-known work was Fuller’s *History of the Worthies of England*, which gave critical social commentary to the status of England and its people over the centuries. After devoting a sizeable chapter to this work, giving a strong summary of its contents, Patterson concludes: “the picture of England provided by Fuller’s account shows not only widespread poverty, but economic and social turmoil in which fortunes, reputations, and responsible positions were quickly won and lost” (332).

In addition to the robust analysis of those major and minor works, Patterson is also adept at integrating personal biographical material

into the various chapters to highlight the importance each work had on Fuller's advancement in career. It is in this area that the work has great value; the sources used are varied and comprise regional and local accounts in addition to national archival sources. For example, Patterson had to utilize local sources including those from the Dorchester Record Office, various parish registers, and other diocese records to reconstruct the basic outline of Fuller's early career in the church at Broadwindsor, his first investment. Or, in trying to analyze Fuller's participation at the University of Cambridge, Patterson consulted institutional archives, including an *ordo senioritatis*, a list of procession, with the idea that more successful student proceeded other less successful ones. Thus, Fuller's academic standing was estimable. Such an engaged approach indicates deep research and analysis and affords much to this work.

Patterson's prose and syntax are well-taken and there are no perceivable problems with the presentation. There is an index and a bibliography, though it is largely devoid of secondary sources (due in large part to the fact that no biography has appeared on Fuller since the nineteenth century), which assist the volume as well. As I understand, the author has also recently published another work, perhaps as a side-by-side with the present work, entitled *William Perkins and the Making of Protestant England*. After reading this biography on Fuller, I am intrigued by the prospect of having the same level of deep research and quality writing in that study as I have observed in this. I would recommend *Thomas Fuller: Discovering England's Religious Past* to any individual interested in the seventeenth century or in British history generally. It would also make a great addition to a graduate-level reading seminar or even as a reading for an advanced undergraduate course in the Tudor-Stuart era.

Magdalena Naum and Fredrik Ekengren, eds. *Facing Otherness in Early Modern Sweden: Travel, Migration and Material Transformations, 1500–1800*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2018. xvii + 367 pp. \$70.00. Review by MARY ELIZABETH AILES, UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA AT KEARNEY.

This book is a collection of eighteen articles analyzing the characteristics and impact of migration to Sweden, as well as Swedish involvement in overseas migration and colonial expansion during the early modern period. As the editors note in the Preface, their goal is to tap into the current scholarly reevaluation of Sweden as a kingdom that took part in, and was shaped by, the growing interconnectedness between Europe and the rest of the world that occurred throughout the early modern era. Rather than viewing the Swedish realm as an insular state on the periphery of Europe, the articles depict the kingdom as one shaped, changed, and challenged by the introduction of new ideas, economic trends, immigrant groups, and colonial experiences. Additionally, many of the articles employ new developments in early modern archaeology to address issues surrounding the changing nature of material culture and the interactions between different groups of people during this time period. The articles are grouped into three different sections that analyze the impact of immigrants on material culture in the Swedish realm, the characteristics of immigrant communities in Sweden, and the experiences of Swedes overseas.

Section one, titled “Material Transformations,” contains five articles that analyze how the introduction of new ideas, commodities, and immigrant groups impacted the Swedish kingdom’s material culture. The section begins with Cornell and Rosén’s article, which provides a very general overview of settlement and economic practices within Sweden. Their goal is to illustrate the complexity of early modern Swedish society and the possibility of uncovering the kingdom’s diverse characteristics. The next three articles investigate aspects of Swedish urban history. Employing findings from recent archaeological excavations, Tagesson examines how housing in Kalmar illustrates the royal regulations and policies that shaped urban centers in the seventeenth century. Salmi, Tranberg, and Nurmi’s article also uses archaeological discoveries to analyze the food culture in the northern Finnish town

of Tornio. They view the town's food culture as representative of a mixture of the many different ethnic groups found within the town and conclude that the choices people made about their food reflect strategies they used to define their status within the community. Heimdahl, in his article, also uses food as a means to study diversity. In investigating the town of Nya Lödöse, he focuses on archaeological finds regarding beer brewing, and reveals that beers from different regions in northern Europe were brewed in the town. He believes this finding suggests that Nya Lödöse was a diverse community that did not have set patterns of alcohol consumption among the town's various groups. Finally, Nordin turns to a discussion of Native American artifacts that Swedish elites collected as well as European goods that colonists in New Sweden traded with the Native Americans. He concludes that these items illustrate Sweden's colonial interests in North America, and that the exchange of such goods influenced and shaped cultures on both sides of the Atlantic.

Section two, *Migration and Neighbourly Interactions* discusses groups that moved within the Swedish empire as well as groups that moved to Sweden from overseas. Katajala's article begins the section with a study of marriages that occurred between Orthodox and Lutheran couples living in the eastern border province of Kexholm. According to Katjala, while mixed marriages were not the norm, they did occasionally happen. Investigating them reveals instances and circumstances in which spouses would convert to a different religion, as well as the difficulties that some individuals experienced with being accepted by the broader community. Pettersson then turns to a discussion of German weavers in Jönköping. Using archaeological finds, he concludes that the German craftsmen were an economically successful group, that they enjoyed a high standard of living, and that they represented the multiethnic characteristics of the town during the early seventeenth century. The following two articles investigate foreign merchants in Sweden. Dalhede gives a very detailed analysis of the familial and economic networks that merchants constructed and convincingly illustrates that such networks shaped immigrants' success in their new homeland. In contrast, Grimshaw provides a less detailed discussion of British migration to urban centers within the Swedish empire. While his article gives a general overview of Scottish

and English merchants' experiences, it would have benefitted from a more thorough engagement with the historiography of the field. The last three articles in the section discuss the interaction between groups that migrated within the Swedish realm. Elfwendahl uses archaeological findings to analyze the characteristics of households belonging to Finns who migrated from Finland to Sweden and the impact of this migration upon the immigrants' lifestyles. Ojala also employs archaeological sources in his discussion of Swedish missionary activities among the Sami during the seventeenth century. He sets his study within the context of seventeenth-century Swedish colonial expansion to illustrate the connections between Swedish colonial activities in the north and the broader European colonialism of the time period. The section concludes with Enbuske's article that analyzes the Swedish crown's taxation system in Lapland to investigate its impact upon the Sami and the role it played in unifying the region with the rest of the kingdom.

The last section, *Overseas Travel*, focuses on the varied experiences of Swedes who traveled or settled abroad during the early modern period. The first two articles analyze Swedish involvement in the North American colony of New Sweden. Naum's article discusses cultural practices among Swedish colonists to address how they both preserved their Swedish identity and at the same time adapted to their new surroundings. In contrast, Ekengren focuses upon the Native American communities already present in North America at the time New Sweden was settled. His purpose is to illustrate the connections between the two groups and the contributions of both to the region's cultural and economic systems. Hellman turns the discussion to merchants associated with the Swedish East India Company and their involvement in Canton. In her article, she addresses tactics merchants used to establish trust with both Chinese and other foreign merchants. Her purpose is to illustrate the social techniques used to successfully conduct business and how the merchants adapted in a foreign setting. Östlund also investigates economic activities, but his focus is upon merchants captured and enslaved by Barbary pirates in the Mediterranean. His article analyzes accounts of these events and how these stories shaped Swedish perceptions of Muslims in the Mediterranean region. The section ends with Nyberg's examination

of Pehr Löfving, a student of Carl Linnaeus, who served as a naturalist in a Spanish expedition to present-day Venezuela. Nyberg discusses Löfving's impressions about the peoples, cultures, and places that he encountered to show the fluid and changing nature of Löfving's ideas about foreign cultures and places.

The volume ends with a conclusion by De Cunzo that provides a good overview of the articles and draws the variety of themes addressed throughout the book together. Additionally, De Cunzo ends by posing questions for further thought and suggesting avenues for further research. Overall, the collection showcases new and innovative approaches to the study of Swedish encounters with foreign places, ideas, and groups during the early modern period. While some of the articles seem preliminary in nature, others provide detailed analyses of the issues under discussion. This volume is particularly valuable because it showcases recent developments in Swedish archeology and history and highlights how scholars from both fields are challenging accepted ideas about early modern Swedish society and culture.

Kirsteen M. Mackenzie. *The Solemn League and Covenant of the Three Kingdoms and the Cromwellian Union, 1643–1663*. Abingdon and New York: Routledge, 2017. xii + 210 pp. + 6 illus. \$119.96. Review by SIMON KOW, UNIVERSITY OF KING'S COLLEGE.

Kirsteen M. Mackenzie's monograph is a meticulously researched historical study of the "Covenanted interest" during the British civil wars, Protectorate, and early Restoration in the seventeenth century. The book's innovation for British historians is in providing "the first major analysis of the covenanted interest from an integrated three kingdoms perspective," and thereby countering the tendency to overlook "the corruption and dysfunctionality of the English government across the kingdoms" (2). For seventeenth-century specialists who are not scholars of British constitutional or ecclesiastical history, the appeal of Mackenzie's book should lie in its elucidation of the fortunes of Presbyterian Covenanters in England, Scotland, and Ireland in this cataclysmic period in British history. Those who saw the Solemn League and Covenant as the basis of settled religious reformation in

Britain would run up against the Independents in Cromwell's army and Protectorate, and unsuccessfully attempt reconciliation with the Royalist party in light of the English army's trial and execution of King Charles I. Mackenzie carefully charts the predicaments and ultimate defeat of the Covenanted interest in the three kingdoms.

Mackenzie's introduction situates the Covenanted interest in relation to events up to the Solemn League and Covenant of 1643. She traces the idea of the Covenant in the formation of a shared Protestant culture in England and Scotland, especially after the union of the crowns in 1603. Thus, the antecedent to the 1643 Solemn League and Covenant was the National Covenant of 1638, which upheld Scottish Reformation ideals in relation to Scottish law by stressing the King's duty to uphold the reformed faith. Mackenzie usefully shows how the National Covenant was followed by the establishment of connections not only between England and Scotland, but also with the Ulster Plantation and beyond in Ireland—though she consistently reminds the reader that the formulation of the Covenanted interest before and after 1643 varied across the three kingdoms as well. Although the Solemn League and Covenant laid out the institutional framework for union between England, Scotland, and Ireland, Mackenzie delineates the similarities and differences between the Presbyterian institutions in the three kingdoms. Furthermore, she details not just the Covenanted establishment of secular and church government, but also the recruitment of troops and raising of money for the war effort and reform of the universities as the breeding-grounds of future ministers.

Mackenzie then considers the "emergence of the anglocentric challenge" from 1643 to 1648, which she (somewhat confusingly) describes as "the emergence of a private interest at the expense of the public interest" (36)—"private" here, it seems, is equated with anglocentrism and Independency (including liberty of individual conscience), and "public" with the Covenanted interest and Presbyterian church government in the three kingdoms. In other words, given Cromwell's leadership of the English army, English propagandists denied that God favoured Anglo-Scottish union under the Solemn League and Covenant; instead, "success was a sign of God's blessing on the English Parliament and the English people, partly assisted by the Scots, but not in an equal partnership or union" (41). Mackenzie

charts the paper war between these two providentialist accounts, and ultimately the Covenanters' pursuit of aid from the King himself over the 1640s and 50s.

Faced, then, with the prospect of Cromwell and the Independents undermining the Solemn League and Covenant, the Anglo-Scottish Presbyterians sought accommodation with the King whom they interpreted as covenanted monarch. Charles I, however, rejected this interpretation. After his execution in 1649, Mackenzie argues, the Commonwealth actively opposed the potential for such accommodation across the three kingdoms, while the Royalists and Presbyterians failed to come to an agreement in the 1650s. After the regicide, Presbyterians sought to convince Charles II that the Covenant was the firmest basis for union between the three kingdoms against Cromwell's army. But Cromwell successfully invaded Scotland and declared the Anglo-Scottish Covenant dissolved by the English Commonwealth. Mackenzie details the various ways in which the Commonwealth then suppressed the Covenanted interest in England, Scotland, and Ireland.

The Covenanted interest did not disappear under Cromwell's Protectorate, established in 1653, but rather entered a new phase. Cromwell as Lord Protector sought to recruit and co-opt English Presbyterians through a committee system of Triers and Ejectors. As their names indicate, the Triers approved "new ministers and existing ministers in their new livings" while the Ejectors were tasked with ejecting "ministers who were deemed to be 'ignorant, scandalous, insufficient or negligent'" (124). In Scotland, the Protectorate attempted religious settlement through Gillespie's Charter of 1654, which entailed state control and regulation of universities and ministers. Under strident protest from Scottish Presbyterians, these plans for settlement were set aside in favour of strengthening the authority of Kirk synods and presbyteries. In the Ulster plantation, meanwhile, the Presbyterian church was re-established and expanded under the Protectorate. By the late 1650s, Presbyterianism flourished not only in Ireland, but also England through the formation of "Classical associations" in the English counties based on the pre-Protectorate Classical Presbyterian church government of the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. The Scottish Kirk, however, was divided over English policy and how to revive Anglo-Scottish cooperation under the Covenant.

The Covenanted interest across the three kingdoms strove to preserve itself in the period after Cromwell's death to the collapse of the Protectorate and the early years of the Restoration. The Presbyterian church continued its revival especially in England and Ireland under the Protectorate of Cromwell's son Richard. But by 1659, following Richard's deposition, many Presbyterian ministers supported the rebellion against the "Restored Rump" and the "Committee of Safety." Mackenzie points out, however, that the "Royalists were steering the agenda and not the Presbyterians and, as in the mid-1650s, the Covenant was rejected as a method to unite the King's allies" (178). Although many Presbyterians in Scotland, England, and Ireland supported the restoration of the monarchy on Covenanted terms, this was not the view of the Royalists and Charles II in particular. In 1660, the King "restored the Anglican Church, the Church of Ireland and bishops to the Kirk of Scotland and ordered the Solemn League and Covenant to be burned by the hangman at Tyburn" (184). Instead of an Anglo-Scottish or Presbyterian-Royalist alliance as the Covenanted interest hoped, the Presbyterians were seen as "fanatics" rather than "moderate" supporters of the King. Presbyterianism was disestablished in England, Ireland, and eventually Scotland (as the Court did not want to antagonize the Scots unduly by an over-hasty re-imposition of Episcopacy there). By 1661, the Solemn League and Covenant was null and void in Scottish as well as English law; the "Presbyterians in Scotland, like their counterparts in Ireland and England, were now firmly outlaws and outcasts" (193).

Overall, Mackenzie provides an informative and nuanced analysis of the Covenanted interest from the Solemn League and Covenant to the Restoration in the three kingdoms. Her conclusion nicely summarizes the narrative of the book, though this reviewer would like to have read her considerations on the legacy and implications of the rise and fall of the Covenanted interest for British history. Furthermore, while the chronological narrative is generally and admirably clear, given the range of material tackled and complexity of this historical period, the book would have benefitted from more exposition and summary in certain chapters. For example, Chapter Three associates the theme of "corruption" with "the private interest" (as opposed to the Covenanted interest) but could have expanded on what corruption

precisely means in this context. And the chapter on “Anglo-Scottish defence and Presbyterian fanfare, 1656–1658” does not explicitly explain why the terms “defence” and “fanfare” have been chosen for the chapter’s title. These are, however, minor quibbles over what is a sound and useful contribution to the historiography of the British civil wars.

Jonathan Fitzgibbons. *Cromwell’s House of Lords: Politics, Parliaments and Constitutional revolution, 1642–1660*. Rochester, NY: Boydell Press, 2018. viii + 274 pp. \$130.00. Review by TED VALLANCE, UNIVERSITY OF ROEHAMPTON.

Jonathan Fitzgibbons’ monograph, based on his 2010 doctoral thesis, tackles a subject largely ignored in the historiography of the Interregnum, the Cromwellian “Other House.” As Fitzgibbons acknowledges, this neglect may partially be explained by the institution’s very short lifespan (two Parliamentary sessions amounting collectively to no more than 14 weeks). Equally, the focus on the Second Protectoral Constitution has been directed primarily at the question of the offer of kingship, leading scholars to ignore the other developments from the Instrument of Government. This study, however, does considerably more than simply “fill a gap” in interregnum scholarship. Fitzgibbons argues persuasively that an analysis of the Cromwellian second chamber can provide a more detailed insight not only into Cromwell’s plans for settlement but also into the ultimate downfall of the Protectorate. Fitzgibbons contends that it was the intervention of the Army, rather than fundamental structural weaknesses in the second Protectoral constitution which led to the end of Richard Cromwell’s regime.

Fitzgibbons begins his study by exploring the place of the Lords in Parliamentary political thought of the 1640s, as outlined in the work of writers such as Henry Parker and William Prynne. He suggests that these texts display no significant hostility to the Lords as an institution and that, in general, these writers associated Parliamentary sovereignty with both the Lords and the Commons. Consequently, the abolition of the Lords in 1649 was fundamentally an act of political expediency, Fitzgibbons concludes, and not ideologically driven. The wider claim

successfully made here is that support for a second chamber was not necessarily indicative of a more conservative political position.

The following chapter then considers the genesis of the Cromwellian “Other House” in the drafting of the Humble Petition and Advice. Fitzgibbons suggests that Cromwell was aware of the provisions of the Humble Petition and may well have had a hand in developing them before the draft constitution was officially presented to him. He suggests that the formulation of the second Protectoral constitution was driven by a desire to check the legal as well as the legislative authority of the first Protectoral Parliament. The experience of the trial of the Quaker James Nayler for blasphemy had made the Protectorate’s unicameral constitution appear a threat to Cromwell’s cherished ideal of liberty of conscience. A nominated second house, it was hoped, might be able to restrain the persecutory impulses of some MPs.

The book then moves on to offer a detailed analysis of the composition of the first Cromwellian “Other House.” The prosopographical approach used by Fitzgibbons here is also adopted with respect to Richard Cromwell’s “Other House” in the fifth chapter of the book and supported by an appendix detailing the Parliamentary careers of all of the Cromwellian “Lords.” Leaving aside Fitzgibbons’ important arguments, his book will, therefore, be a valuable work of reference for anyone interested in the Parliamentary history of the Protectorate. Fitzgibbons’ exploration of the social status, political and religious outlook and familial connections of the “Other House” suggests that the Cromwellian “Other House” was more socially exclusive than post-Restoration satires of “Cobler Lords” suggested. However, the importance of the Lord Protector’s own networks to determining membership is also suggestive. Mark Noble’s eighteenth-century work of collective biography, *Memoirs of the Protectoral-House of Cromwell* (2 vols., Birmingham, 1784) might not then have been too far wide of the mark in presenting the Protectoral regime as a sort of dynastic agglomerate.

Fitzgibbons convincingly demonstrates the broader value of his study of the Cromwellian “Other House”: this is an important work which rightly questions historians’ assumptions about the innate conservatism of the Protectoral settlement. One of the many achievements of this book is to demonstrate that the Presbyterians

in the Cromwellian “Other House” ought to be taken seriously as something other than a reactionary force: the “new” Presbyterians’ support for the Humble Petition and Advice, he argues persuasively, was grounded on a positive view of a Cromwellian “monarchy” that would finally realize the kind of “Isle of Wight” kingship Parliamentary negotiators had sought to secure Charles I’s agreement to in 1648. Equally, he shows that the checks and balances of a bi-cameral legislature held considerable appeal for republicans, especially those like Sir Henry Vane influenced by the ideas of James Harrington. Finally, though not directly focused on the kingship debate, this book sheds important light on it, arguing that the offer of the Crown should be understood within the wider set of constitutional proposals that include the “Other House.”

Some of Fitzgibbons’ observations, however, do seem less persuasive. In an important article, Fitzgibbons has argued that it is likely that Oliver never named his son as successor but that Richard was effectively nominated by the Protectoral council to his father’s place.¹ Following this line of argument, Fitzgibbons suggests that Richard’s naming as first on a list of nominated Cromwellian Lords was not part of a wider attempt to prepare his son to succeed him, a trend identified by Peter Gaunt and Jason Peacey, but only a nod towards the hereditary principle, an important source of legitimacy in the debate that subsequently ensued over Richard’s succession.² While this line of argument fits with Fitzgibbons’ broader claim about the succession, it was not clear to this reviewer why these two possibilities were mutually exclusive.

In other places, Fitzgibbons also appears to over-estimate the importance of claims based on heredity, as around Richard’s succession where he claims that the Protectoral council effectively ignored the constitutional framework of the Humble Petition and Advice in defending the new Protector’s right. While it is true that many of the addresses issued to Richard on his succession could be seen to

1 J. Fitzgibbons, “‘Not in any doubtfull dispute?’: Reassessing the Nomination of Richard Cromwell,” *Historical Research*, 83 (2010), 281–300.

2 P. Gaunt, “Cromwell, Richard,” *ODNB*; J. Peacey, “‘Fit for Public Services’: The Upbringing of Richard Cromwell,” in P. Little (ed.) *The Cromwellian Protectorate* (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2007), ch. 3.

nod to the hereditary principle in their fulsome praise of Richard's father, contemporaries noted that it was divine providence, rather than lineage, which the majority of these texts saw as conferring the Protectoral title.³ The Council also acknowledged the hand of God in Richard's succession but in their proclamation of his title, they were also clear that he was the "*rightful*" successor under the terms of the Humble Petition and Advice.⁴

Finally, while Fitzgibbons' book makes a very good case for reconsidering the importance of Presbyterians within the Cromwellian "Other House," it could be argued that the Parliamentary groupings he maps out are identified a little too neatly. Certainly, it would have strengthened Fitzgibbons' claims if a little more justification had been given earlier in the book for his division between "old" and "new" Presbyterians. (The critical distinction between the two groupings—their attitude to political changes since Pride's Purge—is not clearly outlined until page 180.)

Overall, though, Fitzgibbons successfully demonstrates that the "Other House" and the second Protectoral Constitution that it brought it into being, was capable of garnering far greater political support than has previously been recognized. Gathering support from a broad range of Cromwellian "civilians," Presbyterians and some Commonwealthmen, the possibility of a longer lasting Protectoral settlement was only scuppered finally by the intervention of the army, fearful that this alliance would see the end of its political influence. The downfall of the Protectorate stemmed not from a paucity of political imagination (a retreat towards the familiar, old ways of governing) but arguably from its excess—the fact that the idea of Cromwellian "Lords" could appeal to certain varieties of republican as well as to crypto-Royalists. The ostensibly narrow focus of Fitzgibbons' work is therefore deceptive—this is a monograph that deserves to be read by all scholars of the Interregnum and Restoration England.

3 The compendium of these texts *A True Catalogue, or, an Account of the Several Places and Most Eminent Persons in the Three Nations, and Elsewhere, Where and by Whom Richard Cromwell was Proclaimed Lord Protector* (1659) noted the ubiquity of providential, Biblical allusions, 37-38.

4 John Prestwich, *Prestwich's Respublica, or a Display of the Honors, Ceremonies, Ensigs of the Common-Wealth under the Protectorship of Oliver Cromwell* (London, 1787), 204-6.

Martyn Calvin Cowan. *John Owen and the Civil War Apocalypse: Preaching, Prophecy, and Politics*. New York: Routledge, 2018. xvi + 219 pp. \$140.00. Review by CARRIE EULER, CENTRAL MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY.

At the end of this new study of John Owen's sermons, Martyn Calvin Cowan asserts that the "most significant conclusion of this analysis is that Owen cannot be treated as an abstracted academic theologian" (183). Someone who is not already an expert in John Owen might be forgiven for not coming to that conclusion, however, as this book is highly theological and fairly abstract in its approach. John Owen (1618–1683), for those who are not experts, was a Congregationalist minister, chaplain to Oliver Cromwell, preacher to Parliament, and Vice-Chancellor of Oxford University. While Cowan does do a fine job connecting the content of Owen's sermons with events going on in England at the time—namely his reactions to and interpretations of events in the roughly thirty-year period before, during, and after the Civil War and Interregnum in England—he does not always place the sermons specifically in chronological time or explain seemingly important things like, for example, how Owen came to be preaching before Parliament in the first place or how he was able to keep preaching and publishing at all after the Restoration of 1660. Furthermore, if Cowan's analysis is accurate, the contents of Owen's sermons do not appear to have been very concrete or practical. For example, he was quite vague on what England's church settlement should actually look like during the Interregnum or precisely what the duties of the magistrates were vis-à-vis the clergy.

There are some good reasons for this level of abstraction. Cowan's book is more a work of theology than of history—it is based on his doctoral dissertation in divinity at Cambridge University. In addition, other scholars have already produced books on Owen's life and his more practical theology. Nevertheless, Cowan's approach makes for difficult reading if the reader is not already familiar with this wider literature. This is primarily a book for specialists—not just seventeenth-century specialists, but specialists in Reformed Orthodox theologians of the mid-seventeenth century.

Cowan's main argument is that scholars should not make a sharp distinction between Owen's apocalyptic and his prophetic preaching, and that Owen did not transition in the early 1650s from one to the other, but rather was always both apocalyptic and prophetic at the same time. In making this argument, Cowan offers a corrective to the work of fellow Owen scholars John Wilson and Tai Liu, and he does so through an exhaustive analysis of Owen's sermons. First, he shows how Owen interpreted the events of the times as proof that the Antichrist was growing stronger, most specifically in the 1630s because of creeping Catholicism in the Church of England. Then, in the 1640s, Owen declared that God was showing favor to those that supported Parliament in the Civil Wars; Cowan offers lots of examples of how Owen interpreted various victories and defeats in battle using various passages in the Bible. For Owen, these events were signs that the millenarian rule of Christ on earth was growing nearer, and with God's favor came a responsibility to act and reform in order to prepare for the apocalypse. Thus, Cowan argues, he was prophetic because he thought of himself as a prophet helping the godly to "understand the times" (68) in the context of biblical eschatology and advising them on what to do in the present. However, he was also apocalyptic and, specifically, millenarian, because he thought a future golden age was around the corner.

Cowan offers various chapters on how Owen thought the godly needed to prepare for this golden age, much of which came under the broad, somewhat vague, admonition to strive for "universal holiness" (72). He proposed a set of reforms at Oxford in the 1650s that would have instituted more godly worship in the colleges and severely limited traditional celebrations at the end of the school year. He supported the abolition of episcopacy and encouraged the formation of gathered churches, and he also spoke out against many of the ceremonies in the Book of Common Prayer. Furthermore, he believed the church and state needed to be more separate. He (Owen) used a strange phrase in this context that Cowan never really explains, "the mystery of iniquity" (109), which apparently meant the blending of the powers of the clergy and the magistrate in Catholicism and some Reformed churches, including the Church of England. He declared that the godly in England needed to "untangle" this "mystery of iniquity," namely that

the clergy and the magistrates needed to work together but to respect each other's boundaries and separate duties. Nevertheless, these duties were not very clearly defined. The main duty of magistrates, according to Owen, seems to have been serving the "interest of Christ" (97), whatever that meant. Owen was also fairly ambiguous about what form the government and constitution of England should take and what a church settlement should look like. He claimed to be offering a new "via media" because he wanted limited toleration of dissenters; he thought the true church could accept people who disagreed on "truths which were non-fundamental" (130). (Surprisingly, Cowan does not use the term "adiaphora," so one assumes Owen did not either.) The only clear example of a "fundamental" mentioned by Cowan, however, is a belief in the Trinity, which leaves quite a lot open for discussion.

Cowan makes two further arguments about John Owen. First is that Owen became more and more disillusioned in the 1650s, convinced that the reforms to church and society that were necessary for the coming apocalypse were not proceeding as they should under the Protectorate. This is presumably why he supported the recalling of the Rump Parliament in 1659 and established contact with General Monck before the Restoration. Second, Cowan asserts many times and gives examples of how Owen's eschatology and that of his fellow Congregationalists—for instance, Jeremiah Burroughs—was different from that of the Presbyterians and the Fifth Monarchists, though precisely how it was different is not always abundantly clear.

John Owen and the Civil War Apocalypse is a well-written book. Cowan organizes the chapters very clearly and provides ample evidence for his arguments from Owen's sermons. (Whether or not he is correct in the finer points of theology will have to be left to other reviewers who are experts in seventeenth-century Reformed theology.) Moreover, while it is primarily a specialist contribution, the book is more broadly significant in that it confirms the importance of apocalyptic thought in mainstream Reformed Protestantism and helps to clarify the positions of different religious groups in the 1640s and 1650s. The main weaknesses have already been made apparent: Cowan could be clearer on the background and historical context for Owen and perhaps more honest about just how "abstracted" Owen's theology was. He may have used biblical passages to interpret contemporary and historical events,

but many of his theological and prophetic assertions still strike this reader as tolerably vague and abstract.

Paul Cefalu. *The Johannine Renaissance in Early Modern English Literature and Theology*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2017. xiv + 352 pp. + 7 illus. \$81.00. Review by JAMES ROSS MACDONALD, UNIVERSITY OF THE SOUTH.

In this learned, densely-argued study, Paul Cefalu shows how the writings ascribed to St. John the Evangelist exerted quiet but powerful influence in early modern England. Although his book's title consciously evokes John S. Coolidge's *The Pauline Renaissance in England* (1970), its scope is considerably different: while Coolidge traces the animating energies of English Puritanism back to St. Paul's epistles, Professor Cefalu explores the Fourth Gospel's imaginative imprint across a broad range of religious discourse. He suggests that four main features distinguish the Johannine sensibility from Paul and the synoptic gospels: "a high Christology that emphasizes the divine rather than the human nature of Christ...the belief that salvation is achieved more through revelation than objective atonement and expiatory sin...a realized eschatology according to which eternal life has been achieved and the end-time has already partially arrived ... [and] a robust doctrine of assurance and comfort, usually tied to Johannine eschatology and pneumatology." Moreover, early modern texts within this constellation are linked by "a stylistic and rhetorical approach to representing these theological features that often emulates John's mode of discipleship misunderstanding and irony" (21). This mode of exploring Johannine influence usefully cross-cuts the confessional binaries that frequently define the consideration of early modern religious writing, disclosing unexpected common ground among Catholic and Protestant authors, as well as deepening connections between the magisterial and radical strains of Reformation thought.

This process begins in the first chapter, which examines the institution of the Lord's Supper by way of John 6, above all its famous image of Jesus Christ as the bread of life. Tracing a line of interpretation from St. Augustine's homilies through the Middle Ages to Luther, Zwingli,

Calvin, and Archbishop Cranmer, Professor Cefalu shows how “Johannine emphasis on the Ascension warrants in both the theology and the imaginative literature of the period the Reformed claim that Christ cannot be present bodily in the elements of the sacrament because he remains in heaven with God” (44). The chapter then turns to an examination of literary influence that reveals surprising alignments. George Herbert’s poems “Peace,” “The Banquet,” and the divergent versions of “The H. Communion” that appear in the Williams manuscript and the printed version of *The Temple* (1633) suggest a poet “more interested in a post-Ascension communion with Christ than he is the ritual of the Eucharist” (76). In the Commonwealth context of his follower Henry Vaughan’s prose meditation *The Mount of Olives*, by contrast, “recasting the bread of life in Eucharistic terms is Vaughan’s way of cultivating, perhaps rationalizing, belief in the truth of the real presence in the absence of the practiced ritual” (83). The Catholic convert Richard Crashaw’s reflections on the miracle of the loaves and fishes (John 6:1–11) in his Divine Epigrams “convey the importance of belief in Christ and the Spirit rather than corporeal eating or a partaking of the real presence” (90), presenting unanticipated continuity with the Connecticut Puritan Edward Taylor’s *Meditations*, which also “consistently use John’s verses to identify their relevance not to the Supper proper, but to the required preparation thereof” (92).

The second chapter turns to Mary Magdalene’s encounter with the risen Christ at the empty tomb (John 20), a pericope unique to the Fourth Gospel. As Mary mistakes Christ for a gardener and must be warned not to touch him, John’s “ironic method of productive misunderstanding as a means of revelation” furnishes a model for texts by Robert Southwell, Crashaw, Vaughan, Anna Trapnel, and others (98). Beginning with an exploration of how early modern preachers found in the Fourth Gospel “an art-of-hearing manual” (106), Professor Cefalu shows how in *Marie Magdalens Funerall Teares* (1591), Southwell reads Mary’s initial misapprehension as an emblematic instance of how faith arrives “through a belief in what is heard rather than seen” (109); in place of a “metanarrative of loss,” the poem presents Mary’s growing recognition that “Christ’s death has indeed been expedient,” since it allows her to “find comfort in her savior’s continuing, immaterial presence” (118). A short excursus follows on

Hans Holbein's *Noli me tangere* painting of 1524–26, which presents visually the paradox that “the manifest distance that renders Christ’s body unavailable to Mary” is what permits her to “achieve intimate fellowship with Christ” (124). This irony forms the subtext for brief accounts of Crashaw’s “The Weeper” and Vaughan’s “St. Mary Magdalen,” two poems in which, Cefalu argues, Mary experiences “more of a state of glorification than initiation into the arduous process of conversion” (128). The chapter concludes with a discussion of how Trapnel finds in Mary’s experience “comparable comfort” to warrant her own spiritual assurance (130).

The third chapter examines the distinctively Johannine conception of the Paraclete, which “departs from Synoptic pneumatology in emphasizing the power-affirming rather than power-giving aspect of the Spirit once it descends on the newly arrived Christ” (133). In the context of heated debates over faith, perseverance, and assurance, passages from John became theological flashpoints: the works of experimental predestinarians like William Perkins, for example, “typically invoke yet then veer from the Johannine conception of the Paraclete,” in that “the Comforter does not recall us to the assurance of saving faith...[but] rather reminds us of the manner in which we can strive to prepare, maintain, and evince salvation” (137). Such differences serve to frame the chapter’s culminating discussion of Donne and Milton. While Donne’s sermons offer an “appreciative and largely traditional (not experimental) Calvinist understanding of the role of the Johannine Spirit” (140), the Holy Sonnets exhibit a much more turbulent subjective experience that ardently seeks an “*act or moment* of rebirth rather than an arduous, ongoing process of renewal riddled with backsliding and captivation by the enemy” (147, author’s emphasis). Milton, by contrast, treats the Spirit’s role with circumspect caution: as the archangel Michael unfolds for Adam a future-historical vision of the true church corrupted by episcopacy and superstition, the Paraclete’s temporal consolations for believers must “inevitably give way to the more distant comforts of the protevangelium” (163). Where Donne craves the unequivocal assurance provided by the Comforter, Milton fears “the seeming ease with which the soteriological and ecclesiological powers of the spirit can be suborned” (170).

Johannine *agape*—foregrounded in the fundamental claim that “God is love” (1 John 4:16)—forms the subject of the fourth chapter. Professor Cefalu argues that John’s treatment of the concept is distinguished by an “ontological and relational focus,” in which “God’s foundational love for the Son and, by implication, humankind” emerges with unparalleled clarity (181). This stance forms the basis for several Herbert lyrics that “position a speaker who determines that knowledge of God will issue from an understanding of God’s inimitable love” (183). A poem like “The Call,” for example, dramatizes a shift in spiritual vision, moving “from depicting *agape* as an act or quality to *agape* as God’s ontology or essence” (186). Herbert’s “Johannine optimism regarding the ease with which the communicant unites with the loving essence of God/Christ,” however, furnishes another point of divergence from Vaughan, whose “speakers recapitulate the ignorance, questioning, and fear that Christ’s auditors and disciples themselves express in John’s Gospel” (196). Despite close affinities with Vaughan, Thomas Traherne’s lyrics take an approach that Cefalu finds redolent of scholasticism: reasoning analogically, Traherne “incorporates an appreciation of the love of God found among the created orders into the love of God granted to the speakers through the vehicle of Christ” (210). Ultimately, however, Cefalu argues that these three poets are linked in spite of evident differences by their “prioritization of a metaphysics of love over the more practical-ethical horizontal conception of love that one finds more typically in both Synoptic and Pauline theology” (212).

The fifth chapter engages some of the monograph’s most overtly political matter, exploring the significance of Johannine discourses at the religious fringe of antinomian dissent. Such separatist groups found the Fourth Gospel particularly congenial because in place of a “futurist/apocalyptic eschatology,” John’s cosmology centers instead on a “vertical dualism that typically contrasts two realms of being: the sphere of immemorial light, divinity, and Sonship is counterpoised to the contingent, worldly Pharisaical sphere of darkness” (215). The chapter’s opening sections establish the central position of passages from John’s writings in the philosophies of radicals like Hendrik Nicolaes, John Traske, John Eaton, John Everard, Gerrard Winstanley, and George Fox, as well as in the Antinomian Controversy that convulsed

the Massachusetts Bay colony in the later 1630s. The argument then shifts to explore surprising affinities between such discourses and the lyrics of Crashaw and Vaughan. While these poets' establishmentarian sympathies seem wholly at odds with such bedfellows, Professor Cefalu shows how Crashaw shares with radicals an expansive idea of free grace, "not merely the Johannine notion that assurance naturally follows from faith but also a conception of faith as simple *belief* in Christ's message" (268, author's italics). Ironically, "Crashaw is most antinomian when he seems most mystical, when the faithful are united with Christ such that distinctions between self and Christ are diluted" (273). Vaughan, cut off from church ceremonies under the Commonwealth, evinces attraction to a dualist sensibility that presents the blessedness of eternal life as "a here-and-now possibility," enabled by faith (282).

The influence of John's literary style takes center stage in the sixth chapter: Professor Cefalu explores early modern appropriations of the Fourth Gospel's characteristic dramatic irony, as acts of correction within the narrative edify and enlighten the audience. Such a dynamic, he argues, is enacted throughout Herbert's poetry in lyrics like "The Bag," "The Bunch of Grapes," and "Love unknown," which move beyond irresolvable paradox by seeking "to illuminate knowledge of God's mysteries and Christ's redemptive actions ... through the route of stable irony in which meaning/knowledge increases as a particular poem's theological crux or spiritual conflict works toward resolution" (302). A final section explores Vaughan's remarkable rewriting of the Nicodemus pericope in "The Night," where the poet seems to reimagine the Pharisee's furtive nighttime visit to Christ as part of an effort to "rehabilitate spiritual darkness" by suggesting "the accessibility of God once God's brightness has been dimmed" (306). As it becomes clear in the final stanzas, however, that the poem "conflates the paradoxical sense of the benevolent darkness of God with the more straightforward sense of darkness as a hiding place" (310), Vaughan's evident irony comes to the surface: the poem's speaker "turns out to be quite like John's Nicodemus, after all, not quite sure of his conversion status" (312).

For Professor Cefalu, the Fourth Gospel often provides writers with irenic shelter from the storms of early modern religion: "insufflated

with the Johannine Spirit,” they discover imaginative resources sufficient to “elevate them above the theological quibbles and ideological wrangling of the time” (36). Perhaps, though, the monograph’s ambition to embrace fully both literature and theology invites reflection on the methodology of such interdisciplinary inquiry. Apart from the sixth, each chapter proceeds from an examination of exegetical tradition—amply documented in early modern sermons, tractates, and glossation as well as in modern Biblical scholarship—to close readings of selected literary texts. Implicit in this sort of structure is the danger of presenting intellectual history as a static, stable backdrop for the corybantic performances of literary imagination. While the chapters are more than subtle enough to escape this trap (in no small part because Cefalu brings the same nimble close reading practices to theological as to literary texts), at times the method produces the effect of two entangled discourses, or perhaps two distinct discursive stems nourished by a common taproot of learning. But perhaps this structure is merely the true reflected image of a Johannine Renaissance that appears to be deep but diffuse, less a cohesive movement than a surprising concatenation of affinities across a wide spectrum of religious opinion.

Gary Schneider. *Print Letters in Seventeenth-Century England: Politics, Religion, and News Culture*. New York: Routledge, 2018. x + 284 pp. \$140.00. Review by NICOLE GREENSPAN, HAMPDEN-SYDNEY COLLEGE.

In *Print Letters in Seventeenth-Century England*, Gary Schneider examines the intersection of epistolarity, ideology, propaganda, and news culture. The chronological focus is the 1640s and 1650s, which saw a rise in the numbers of printed letters and their regular deployment in political and religious contestations, though Schneider gives due attention to the earlier and later parts of the century as well. In contemporary debates over war and revolution, royalist and Parliamentary actions and aspirations, the veracity of Catholic conspiracies, and the fate of the monarch and monarchy, to name just a few, Schneider demonstrates that printed letters played vital roles. Some printed letters

engaged with circumstances and events at the micro-historical level, such as the Popish Plot, while others took macro-historical approaches, such as addressing supposed Catholic conspiracies over the course of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Epistolary publications took a number of different forms and ranged from fictional and satirical letters to authentic discovered, intercepted, and captured correspondence. While each type of printed letter had distinct characteristics, all in Schneider's analysis functioned as instruments of cultural narrative and vehicles for propaganda and ideology.

The book is divided into four chapters, each of which is devoted to a specific epistolary genre. The first two chapters examine different types of epistolary fiction. In Chapter 1, Schneider treats printed letters whose authors, recipients, and circumstances were invented. Here, he focuses on texts that were clearly fabricated, such as those with fictional authorial attributions whose genuine authors have been identified, or whose attributed authors could not have written the letters in question (as in, for example, they were deceased). The chapter moves roughly chronologically from the 1640s through to the 1688–1689 Revolution and includes discussion of fabricated letters attributed to the Earl of Strafford, various purported royalist and Catholic conspirators, and Popes. Printed fictional letters drew upon epistolary conventions (such as the date and place of composition) and invented customary markers of authenticity (such as recording the receipt of prior correspondence), in order to lend a sense of credibility and veracity to ideological or propagandistic texts. Some of these fictional letters may well have fooled contemporaries into accepting them as genuine, and indeed as Schneider demonstrates, modern historians have not always spotted fabrications. Chapter 2 examines printed epistolary satire. Satirical letters worked to ventriloquize political and religious figures who were well-known to audiences, or whose voices could be entirely fictionalized. Popes often were targets of satirical letters, as were others like Titus Oates. Even Lucifer was the subject of epistolary satire. In this type of letter, political and religious adversaries were made to confess to plots, sins, subterfuge, and other acts of malice, in order to show them to be silly or ridiculous.

Chapter 3, part of which was previously published in 2009 in *Renaissance Studies*, moves away from fictional letters and treats published collections of genuine correspondence. The focus is on four royalist collections from the mid-seventeenth century: those of James Howell, Robert Loveday, Thomas Forde, and Margaret Cavendish. Among the themes Schneider examines are friendship, civility, sincerity, news exchange, and criticisms of pamphleteering. Rather than individual letters composed and printed to address immediate political or religious circumstances or to contribute to a current topical debate, these were compilations of familiar or intimate letters amassed over long periods of exchanges between writers and recipients. Printing collections of letters enabled readers to trace the evolution of royalist critiques of the civil war, Commonwealth, and Protectorate. They also, Schneider argues, served to link the genre of the familiar or intimate letter, and the sincerity customarily associated with that form, to royalism and to cast individual, topical printed letters as both polemical and Parliamentary/republican.

Intercepted, discovered, and captured letters are the subject of Chapter 4. These are the most numerous sources of printed letters Schneider examines, the bulk of which were published in the decade 1641–1651. Captured and intercepted enemy correspondence revealing, or purporting to reveal, such issues as military and political plans, strategies, and maneuvers, had particular polemical value during wartime. In the mid-seventeenth century, Parliament took the lead in printing such letters to promote its political and religious aims and policies. Later in the century, during the Popish Plot and the 1688–1689 Revolution, discovered correspondence (found in a closet, accidentally dropped, picked up, and so forth) formed the majority of printed letters. The chapter adopts a broad chronological organization, moving from the Long Parliament in 1641 to the turn of the eighteenth century, with due attention given to major collections of letters including *The Kings Cabinet Opened*, George Digby's captured letters, and Edward Colman's discovered correspondence. Seized and discovered letters were used as documentary evidence in contemporary trials, including those of Charles I and Edward Colman, so this type of printed correspondence could carry particular legal weight. Schneider principally focuses upon letters in printed pamphlets and

broadsheets, though he gives consideration to newsbooks as well. Indeed, as Schneider observes, letters, whether summarized, copied, or referenced, formed much of the content of contemporary newsbooks.

Organizing the book according to genre enables Schneider to tease out important characteristics and nuances among different types of letters and the contexts of their composition and publication. On the other hand, it means there is overlap in material across chapters, which Schneider duly acknowledges. There is also some repetition of chapter sections. Chapters 1, 2, and 4, for example, each have sections devoted to the Popish Plot and the 1688–1689 Revolution, among other commonalities. Chapters 1 and 2 respectively discuss letters attributed to popes. This is understandable due to the book's focus on the type of letter rather than upon theme or event, though it can obscure comparisons of the ways in which different epistolary forms engaged in the same debate or controversy. These sorts of comparisons might have been examined in an overall conclusion, which unfortunately this monograph does not contain. Instead, the book abruptly ends at the close of Chapter 4. With the absence of a conclusion, the book seems a bit disjointed and misses an opportunity to tie the chapters together and to reflect on the relation of different types letters both to each other and to the wider contexts of seventeenth-century epistolarity and print. On the whole, however, this book is a welcome addition to the literature on epistolarity in particular and seventeenth-century print and news cultures more generally, and will be useful to students new to the subject as well as experts in the field. Schneider's study amply demonstrates the richness of the epistolary form and the centrality of printed letters to seventeenth-century political and religious debate.

Courtney Erin Thomas. *If I lose Mine Honour I Lose Myself: Honour among the Early Modern English Elite*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2017. xiii + 302 pp. + 8 illus. \$75.00. Review by R. MALCOLM SMUTS, UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AT BOSTON.

This book follows a trend in recent scholarship by treating honor not as a reified code, but as a protean concept that found expression in many different and sometimes contradictory ways. It endorses the view

of Linda Pollock while dissenting from those of some older studies, in contending that honor was concerned not just with female chastity and male displays of “militaristic bravado” but took “many different forms and was at play in a broad array of social interactions” (4). Thomas borrows Pollock’s description of honor as a “cluster concept ... ‘an umbrella term that linked together a diverse array of related ideas, providing bridges between and connective pathways through the associated attributes’” of behavior considered appropriate to men and women of rank (5). The precise meaning of honor varied depending on the specific contexts in which it was invoked, which included everyday social interactions as well as more extraordinary conflicts. By studying early modern honor from this perspective, Thomas seeks to develop a subtler and more “three-dimensional” picture of the concept’s role in English society, roughly between 1540 and 1640.

People regarded honor as both an inward quality and something bestowed by others. Although its meanings overlapped those of related concepts of credit, worth, honesty and reputation, honor applied especially to the elite, whereas these other attributes mattered to everyone. The growing number of families claiming gentility, from perhaps 4,000 in 1520 to as many as 16,000 by 1600, meant that increasing numbers of people became concerned with honor. In a discussion of her sources and methodology, Thomas contends that evidence generated by disputes, such as court records, furnishes invaluable insights but must be used with caution because it inevitably highlights conflict. Prescriptive literature is also useful, but since actual behavior did not always conform to prescriptive rules, it must also be interpreted with care. Family papers, especially letters, diaries and commonplace books, provide another major source of evidence. She cautions that because contemporaries took for granted the importance of honor they did not always discuss it explicitly, so historians need to tease out what the concept meant to them by reading between the lines of their documents.

The four main chapters of the book discuss honor in relation to men, women, the community and household, and the family. Older studies, especially by Mervyn James and Lawrence Stone, depicted male aristocratic culture in the period as highly violent, and male honor as a quality frequently asserted through affrays, duels and other

kinds of physical conflict. Thomas concedes that this picture contains an element of truth but views it as one-sided. "Elite men saw a range of behaviours as affecting their reputation" and honor, she contends, including "restrained maturity in the face of provocation" (25). Emphasis on restraint, especially in government edicts and prescriptive literature, "served to constrain, though not eradicate, honour-based violence" (25–26). With the support of medical literature, people generally assumed that men were better at controlling their impulses and emotions than women, and that mature men were more self-controlled than youths (35–36). Violent behavior that appeared rash and unjustified could, therefore, damage a man's honor, making him appear immature and effeminate. Since failure to control subordinates could harm an individual's reputation, quarrelsome behavior by clients or servants also needed to be discouraged. Serving the king as a county magistrate provided an alternative means of winning honor that entailed settling disputes and restraining violence in others.

While some men undoubtedly did employ violence to uphold their honor, in many circumstances it was therefore also possible to win honor by curtailing physical conflict. A refusal to respond violently to provocation might be construed as honorable. Thomas discusses a case in which Sir Francis Vere avoided a challenge to a duel by the earl of Northumberland, initially by invoking Queen Elizabeth's prohibitions against dueling, and subsequently by agreeing to fight but bringing several courtiers with him, knowing that this would deter the earl by drawing the conflict to the queen's attention. Vere also disparaged Northumberland's challenge as "not reasonable," apparently without damaging his reputation.

In this and other cases Thomas discusses, quarrels resulted in semi-public exchanges of letters in which the protagonists contested the meaning of honor as it related to their disputes. She likens these to the phenomenon of "paper dueling" that David Quint found in Italy during the same period, in which exchanges of insults and arguments either supplemented or replaced an actual duel. Even competitive and aggressive behavior did always entail physical violence: lawsuits and public accusations provided alternative means of injuring a rival and defending one's own reputation.

Thomas begins her next chapter by challenging the commonly held view that women's honor depended overwhelmingly on a reputation for chastity, which she attributes partly to the influence of anthropological studies of Mediterranean societies that may not be fully applicable to England. Although fundamentally important, chastity was only one of many qualities through which women acquired and displayed honor. Even slanders hinging on alleged sexual lapses often turn out, on close inspection, to have arisen from quarrels about other matters. Illicit sexual liaisons did not always destroy the reputations of upper-class women, as shown by the examples of Anne Vavasour, who once entertained Queen Elizabeth along with her adulterous lover, Sir Henry Lee, and Penelope Rich, whose open adultery with lord Montjoy was excused because her husband had mistreated her. On the other hand, transgressive marriages could do at least as much damage to female honor as illicit liaisons, in part because they showed disrespect for parents. Sexual lapses by servants also brought dishonor to a mistress by failing to control their behavior.

In addition to chastity, women gained honor by displaying piety and decorum and demonstrating ability as household managers. Thomas discusses cases in which women felt dishonored by their husbands' refusal to grant them authority over servants and other household matters. While acknowledging the duty to obey their husbands, they protested vigorously against this denial of their right to fulfill their proper role. Success in matchmaking and political assistance to male relatives also enhanced an elite woman's honor. A few women perceived their honor as implicated in their defense of title to lands disputed by other relatives. On occasion, they could be very aggressive in asserting what they perceived as their just property rights.

Cicero, Aristotle and other writers connected honor to the display of virtue in public life or the management of a household. Offenses like failing to pay debts, therefore, damaged the honor of an entire household and potentially other related individuals. Thomas discusses examples of wives and male relatives who became upset when the head of a household failed to honor his obligations or contracted too many mortgages, undermining family credit. Misbehavior and malicious gossip spread by servants also threatened household honor, whereas the provision of hospitality and good entertainment enhanced it. Women

commonly played an especially important role in managing hospitality and the exchanges of visits, social courtesies and gifts connected with it. Intended or accidental slights during social visits could also provoke quarrels over honor between neighbors and family members, eliciting demands for apologies and, in some cases, exchanges of recriminatory letters and the ostracism of offenders from household gatherings. Some individuals felt compelled to apologize for breaches of codes of hospitality by their kin, while others were pulled in as mediators when relations between family members broke down.

The book's final major chapter on "Honour and the Family" provides a close analysis of several disputes between husbands and wives and parents and children, in which those involved construed the meaning of honor in different ways. A relatively brief but skillful conclusion then draws together and summarizes the chief arguments of the book, while adding some brief suggestive comments on how concepts of honor may have evolved after the period it examines.

This is a rich and largely persuasive study, providing a balanced and nuanced account of the varied meanings attached to the concept of honor, but it does suffer from a few problems. The topics of the third and fourth chapters – honor in relation to households and to the family – overlap with each other, and to a degree with discussions of male and female honor, leading to some repetition of arguments relating especially to ways in which women's understanding of their honor conflicted with the views of their husbands. The order of these chapters should perhaps have been reversed, to create a more natural progression from a focus on individual men and women, and to immediate family units and finally households and wider communities. A slightly fuller account of the relationships between biological families, households and local communities in the early modern period would have been helpful, along with a more rigorous sorting out of which materials belonged in each chapter.

Although Thomas's argument that honor overlapped other concepts like credit and reputation, and that it was often invoked implicitly rather than explicitly in contemporary disputes is persuasive, these claims raise the tricky issue of how we can distinguish honor from everything else that contributed to an elite individual's sense of self-worth and social position. Because she does not always try to

make this distinction in the body of her book, Thomas's analysis of honor occasionally seems difficult to distinguish from a more general analysis of the contested values underpinning gender relations and family dynamics.

This book also illustrates the ways in which social history has so often become separated from political and religious history in work produced since at least the 1980s. Although she occasionally mentions the role of official pronouncements and devotes some attention to the importance of magisterial office in the operation of honor beliefs, Thomas never acknowledges the degree to which honor values functioned in the political arena and contributed to some religious controversies. She also fails to point out that restraints on violent conflict related to honor involved not only self-control and mediation by friends and relatives, but submission to various overlapping forms of hierarchical authority, belong to the king, the law and law courts, the collective judgment of elite local communities, which had their own leaders, and God and the Church. Each of these authorities possessed its own honor, which might be understood in somewhat different ways, and a great deal of conflict in the early modern period turned partly on efforts to reconcile the honor claims of different sources of authority with each other and with the honor of individuals and their families. Puritans, Laudians and Catholics, for example, interpreted God's honor in rather different ways that demanded different patterns of worldly conduct, some of which entailed potential conflicts with the honor of the king and his bishops, or with elite individuals whose religious views differed from those prevailing within their community and sanctioned by law. At the apex of society, the king's authority and honor also impinged upon that of his greater subjects through his sale of titles of nobility, the promotion of relatively low-born subjects like George Villiers to the top of the peerage, the conferring of offices and titles upon nobles and his personal interventions in settling quarrels and arranging aristocratic marriages. Richard Cust's *Charles I and the Aristocracy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), which has much to say on this topic, does not figure in Thomas's bibliography.

One cannot fault Thomas for declining to engage in a full discussion of how honor sometimes functioned is a contested political and religious concept, since this would have required a very different and

much longer book. But by failing to discuss even briefly the many ways in which honor values became entangled with beliefs about religion, royal and legal authority and other contentious issues, her book fosters an impression that we can fully understand the meaning of honor without reference to political and religious institutions and controversies. Plainly this was not always the case. In this, as in many other fields, Patrick Collinson's call for a "social history with the politics put back in" remains as relevant today as when first voiced in the 1990s. Nevertheless, Thomas's book remains a subtle, sophisticated and valuable study that deserves to be read by all students of early modern English social and cultural history.

Janine Rivière. *Dreams in Early Modern England: "Visions of the Night."* London: Routledge, 2017. x + 195 pp. + 8 illus. \$140.00. Review by DANIEL L. KEEGAN, AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF SHARJAH.

In *Dreams in Early Modern England*, Janine Rivière explores the frames through which early modern people experienced and conceptualized their dreams. Through these frames, she aims to resist the anachronistic psychological and psychoanalytic approaches that, for her, have characterized studies of early modern dreaming. The book is at its best when canvassing the broad archive of dream texts from the period and when it is highlighting "commonplace dreams" that did not fall into the "more rare, contested and ambiguous category of visions" (4). Its discussion of dreams as a means of spiritual instruction is especially illuminating.

Rivière breaks down early modern understandings of dreams into three categories: natural, divinatory, and spiritual. These categories, which organize the first three chapters of the book, indicate the uses to which early moderns put dreams and dream discourse: to understand the health, both spiritual and physical, of the dreamer and to grasp the shape of things to come. A fourth chapter on the history of the "nightmare"—which in the period named the phenomenon of sleep paralysis—concludes the book.

"Seasons of Sleep": Natural dreams, health, and the physiology of sleep," the book's first chapter, sketches the "longstanding and largely

uncontested" (17) practice of explaining dreams in terms of humoral physiology and psychology. Drawing on and Christianizing the Galenic system, doctors and medical writers came to think of sleep as a process of rebalancing and "equaliz[ing]" (24) the body's humoral complexion. Dreams registered a nocturnal process of digestion and concoction: bad dreams in particular could serve as a diagnostic tool. This theory of humoral rebalancing—in which the senses are closed as though in death (29–32)—was complicated by a conception of the sleeping body as vulnerable to environmental factors ranging from the position of the bed and the quality of the mattress to the influence of planets and of spiritual beings.

This chapter is one of the book's most satisfying, not least because it is first. It works through an impressive range of sources, including medical generalists like Thomas Elyot, Thomas Wright, and Robert Burton as well as more specialized studies on dreams like Thomas Tryon's *Treatise of Dreams & Visions* (1689) and Thomas Branch's *Thoughts on Dreaming* (1738). Rivière sketches the normative understanding of sleep and dreams that obtains until the decline of humoral medicine. As throughout the book, the archive here convened will help to sustain further studies of the place of sleep and dreams in early modern spiritual and emotional life. One area for further study is the frontier between early modern and medieval ideas of sleep and dreams: Rivière's focus in this chapter is on filling in cultural conceptions prior to the "significant transitional period in the history of sleep" marked by the eighteenth century (18); what concepts predominated before the sixteenth century popularization of Galenic medicine? A more material history of sleep and dreams would also be of interest: Rivière's history is an intellectual and conceptual one; gestures towards the "unhealthiness of . . . beds and bedrooms" (41) and the noises of the night (42) invite more practical questions. How was sleep's quality differentiated by social rank? How was it influenced by the phases of the moon or the cost of candles, torches, or firewood?

The "natural" framework of the first chapter dovetails nicely with the "spiritual" framework of the third. Both concern dreams as an index of health, and the former's discussion of sleep as an image of death strongly anticipates the latter. "'Nocturnal whispers of the Almighty': Spiritual dreams and the discernment of spirits" begins by situating

dreaming in the context of post-Reformation polemic, especially in this polemic's rejection of classical authors and its critiques of the "false prophecies and visions" (89) that proliferated in the wake of the Radical Reformation and in the runup to the English Civil War. Luther, followed by Calvin, worked to respect the Biblical heritage of prophetic dreams while inoculating his dream theology against both pagan influence and religious enthusiasm. These arguments were, in the century before the Civil War, taken up by a range of English writers, concerned "with the spread of witchcraft, astrology, superstition and irreligion" (103). Such projects, Rivière argues, "fundamentally reinscribe[d] the dream within a thoroughly Protestant discourse" (126), albeit one that coexisted with Galenic naturalism and divinatory practices

The most arresting, even affecting, passages of the chapter and the book come in the latter part of the chapter, following the discussion of more polemical authors. Here, Rivière explores three writers who contributed to and exemplified this "thoroughly Protestant discourse" by situating dreams as indices of spiritual health and as a means of spiritual instruction. In *The Mystery of Dreams, Historically Discoursed* (1658), which is "the only extant English Puritan discourse on dreams" (112), Philip Goodwin demonstrates the devotional usefulness even of dreams sent by the devil: all dreams, he argues, can serve as signs of the soul's health or sinfulness. In a series of notebooks that include records of dreams, the London turner Nehemiah Wallington (d. 1658) anticipates Goodwin's understanding of dreams as "a useful source of spiritual edification and insight into the soul" (116); Wallington's pious accounts shed light on the joys and anxieties stimulated by devotional dreams. John Beale, in a manuscript (*A Treatise on the Art of Interpreting Dreams*) circulated among the Hartlib circle in the late 1650s, endorsed the spiritual aspect of dreams while arguing for the persistence of prophetic dreams. These discussions and sources will repay close attention from those interested in histories of spirituality and emotion.

Rivière's second chapter, "Decoding Dreams: Dreambooks and Dream Divination," investigates the phenomenon of predictive dreams. Surveying "all extant English printed works that either featured or included sections of oneiromancy and discussions of prognostic

dreams" (53), Rivière shows that, despite controversies about the persistence of such dreams and the anxiety that the devil might have access to knowledge about the future, dream books enjoyed popularity throughout the period not only in works dedicated to dreams but also in other genres such as almanacs and courtship books. This popularity endured despite the fact that the bulk these texts were recycled and debased versions of a classical text, Artemidorus' *Oneirocritica*, fused with a medieval one, the *Somniale Danielis*. One author, Thomas Hill, attempted to produce a more sophisticated account of dream interpretation in the tradition of Artemidorus; his *Moste Pleasaunte Arte of the Interpretacion of Dreames* (1576) provides criteria and techniques for successful interpretation. Rivière also discusses the conjunction of oneiromancy with astrology, a conjunction exemplified by William Lilly's *Christian Astrology* (1647).

As throughout, the virtue of Rivière's approach in this chapter is her attention to the breadth of the archive. She provides the reader with a synoptic view of the continuities in divinatory practices across the period, from the formal elements (the repetitive phrasings inherited from the *Somniale*) to the persistent thematic concerns (love, sexuality, death) to the gendered aspects of dream interpretation, in which the "default dreamer" was male (72). As Rivière notes, however, there was "more continuity than change" across the period, with "little original content" being published (51). The wide-ranging survey is welcome, but the chapter's more interpretive moments feel unfinished, almost like attempts to squeeze an archival stone. A digression on the "universal nature of the human psyche" (64) chimes strangely with the book's historicizing program and, for a moment, invites back in the psychoanalysis that had been repudiated. The welcome effort to investigate the gendered nature of dream interpretation—which over the period seems to have increasingly catered to female readers—simply counts the references to male and female dreamers in different dream books: a more robust investigation and interpretation would be welcome, if it is possible at all.

The real interpretive interest in the discussion of divinatory dreams is in the Reformation polemics about the persistence of prophetic dreams, a discussion which must wait until Chapter Three. Although this is not an unjustifiable organizational choice, it indicates the central

difficulty of the book: an overinvestment in the tripartite framework of natural, spiritual, and divinatory dreams. Segregating these elements into distinct chapters hobbles attention to what seems to be the subtle, sometimes inscrutable, interplay of these frames in early modern dream experience. If nothing else, this organizational strategy begets a frustrating repetitiveness to the argument. Although this repetitiveness runs throughout the book—as when the argument of Chapter Three is substantially anticipated in the discussion of death in Chapter One—it is particularly in evidence in the final chapter. This chapter, though it provides an interesting history of the phenomenon of the “nightmare,” situates this phenomenon so firmly in the natural and spiritual frameworks that the chapter’s independent existence is questionable.

More significantly, Rivière risks occluding a more nuanced understanding of dreams, a phenomenon which was for early moderns manifestly fragile, shifting, and complex; comforting and anxious; natural, divine, and potentially diabolical. Although she repeatedly acknowledges that these frames were overlapping and interacting, an analysis that focused more on such interactions might have avoided the conceptual rigidity that characterizes the text. It might have more amply attended to the experience of early moderns who, it would seem, shifted often and often unproblematically between frames. The reorganization that I have performed here might point in this direction and even seems latent in the text: dreams were typically understood as indices of natural and spiritual health, although these understandings were haunted by the potentiality for divinatory dreams, whether divine or diabolical. This understanding persisted through the period, even as Reformation polemic “imbued” these prophetic dreams “with an even more problematic status” (126). Not discussed in detail until the third chapter, the concept of “spiritual discernment—how to distinguish between supernatural and natural, divine from diabolic dreams” (90)—would be a promising operative concept for the whole book.

These criticisms should not detract from the goals and accomplishments of *Dreams in Early Modern England*. If anything, they should speak to the book’s generative interest. Rivière’s ambitions are, in any event, more archival than theoretical. In this light, her book succeeds. It will be a very useful aid to students of early modern emotional and spiritual life.

Giuseppina Iacono Lobo. *Writing Conscience and the Nation in Revolutionary England*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2017. x + 253 pp. \$75.00. Review by GEOFFREY VAUGHAN, ASSUMPTION COLLEGE.

Giuseppina Iacono Lobo has taken up the history of conscience in the political, ideological, and theological conflicts of seventeenth-century England. This period is one of the best examples of the problems that arise when people are motivated by their consciences. As she demonstrates through exhaustive archival and textual research, conflicts over the meaning of conscience and the attempts to achieve a “clear” conscience or preserve freedom of conscience weave themselves through all the most contentious theological and political moments of seventeenth-century England.

The Introduction to the book gives a short account of the history of conscience, mostly in the wake of Henry VIII’s break with Rome. This reader found it the weakest part of the book. It is at once too apologetic, trying to justify the point of her study, and too superficial. This would have been the place to address the deep theology underlying the idea of conscience. When the theology changed, conscience took on a different role. Had she done so, there would have been no need for justifying her argument. For instance, in her brief look at one of the most famous engagements of conscience since the early Christian martyrs, she writes, “When faced with the scruples or grudges of their consciences, both Henry and More grounded their interior surety upon the exterior consensus of what they perceived as Christendom” (12). Up to a point. Thomas More described himself as God’s servant first, not a servant to the consensus of Christendom. This is the problem with the idea of conscience, a problem Christianity has struggled with since the beginning. On the one hand, it is a religion of right belief, orthodoxy, unlike Judaism which is a religion of right practice, orthopraxy. As she explains, because Christians were released from the practices of Jewish law, Paul had to introduce the idea of conscience as a means of knowing when one was in the right or the wrong. In other words, where the priest is commanded in Leviticus 1:16 to throw the crop and feathers of a sacrificed bird to the east of the altar, throwing them to the west is clearly wrong. But what does the Christian do?

Even the passage she cites from Paul contains the seeds of the problem: "For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh: How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?" (Hebrews 9:13-14 KJV). Those "dead works" might be left behind, but service still requires action on the part of the Christian, that is, it requires practice in the world. Some practices will be sinful and others not, presumably, so the distinction between orthodoxy and orthopraxy is not so clear.

While many cultures, religions and philosophies have adopted the idea of the conscience, or something like the tribunal within the self that we take it to be, it is at root a Christian concept. Even Greek philosophy did not develop a fully formed idea of it as the Christian theologians would do, starting with St. Paul. It is for this reason there is no equivalent of Augustine's *Confessions* earlier or elsewhere. Historians of ideas have studied the origins of the conscience and its spread. What they have paid less attention to is the question of why anyone would want to import a foreign idea that seems to bring with it nothing but trouble, both individually and politically. Lobo does not try to answer this question of why, but she does give a clear picture of the problems conscience can lead to.

Once one gets past the first chapter, the book and author come into their own. The close reading of the exchanges between Charles I and his advisors is exemplary. These men, and they were all men, truly struggled with their consciences. The fate of the kingdom and the king's head, ultimately, rested on how they judged their actions or thought God would judge them. Where does responsibility lie? Is it the case, as one of the soldiers Henry V spoke with while disguised on the eve of battle, that if "his [the king's] cause be wrong, our obedience to the king wipes the crime of it out of us" (Henry V 4.i 183-85)? But this puts all the blame on the king, meaning the king alone is responsible for the souls of his soldiers. Henry's response, "Every subject's duty is the king's; but every subject's soul is his own" (4.i 230-32), is as self-serving in this instance as it is well argued. It is also a literary miniature of what really went on between Charles I and his advisors John Ashburnham, John Culpepper, and Sir Henry Jermyn. As Lobo

shows, their arguments were not realpolitik dressed in theological language. Clearly their positions, lives, and monarchical government itself were at risk, but so was this precious thing called conscience. These men did not separate the two. The author quotes a letter from 1646 in which Charles I writes, "I stick not upon scruples, but undoubted realities, both in relation to conscience and policy" (31). Conscience was as real to him as were the armies massing in the field.

This correspondence would be remarkable enough, were it not that the *Eikon Basilike* was published immediately upon the king's execution. This book was presented as the private meditations of Charles I, a look inside the man and his relation to God. It was not a justification for his actions or retort to his detractors. One could imagine it having no political importance at all. But that was not the case. Quite the opposite. It became one of the most important tracts in the Civil War, going through many printings and distributed widely. As Lobo points out, many of the surviving copies are so worn by obvious signs of use as opposed to neglect, that it is clear the book was read and not simply purchased (37). "It was so popular precisely because it was not designed to look like propaganda; instead it was designed to look like and, as I argue, serve the function of a devotional book" (39–40). She certainly does not overlook the propagandistic elements and uses of the book: "Charles was a king in life, a king in his suffering, and he will be a king in death: his readers could hardly replicate this trajectory" (40). But such a book would have had no purchase with readers if they had not also the same concerns about their own consciences. They might not have the same royal trajectory as Charles I, but as Christians they did have a parallel trajectory. Again, it is this wariness about the theology that holds Lobo back from diving deeper into the subject.

She comes closest to a theological study in her chapter on the Quakers. According to Lobo, they had a peculiar understanding of conscience as an external entity in which we, as individuals, can share. Again, a more theological explanation would serve the reader and her argument. Is this Quaker idea a version of monopsychism, normally attributed to Averroes and roundly criticized by Aquinas in his *De unitate intellectus contra Averroistas*? It certainly seems similar. Or might it be connected to Justin Martyr's idea of the *logos sperma-*

tikos? More to the point, this kind of deep theological problem of conscience that long predates the seventeenth century underlies the arguments. Certainly, not all Quakers were reading Aquinas or Justin Martyr, but there were enough academics upon whom the king could call who were.

One of the more contentious arguments in the book is the author's claim that Thomas Hobbes was trying to use the idea of conscience as a means of bringing peace and obedience to the kingdom. According to Lobo, "Through his creation of the public conscience, then, Hobbes makes conscience itself the very cornerstone of the commonwealth" (117). Earlier she claims that "Conscience is thus a *civilizing force* in the condition of war, inclining the individual to give up his absolute liberty for the security and survival a commonwealth offers" (107). Her argument is that the public conscience developed by civil society replaces any private conscience an individual might have had in mere nature. This is how she explains Hobbes's insistence that it is seditious to claim that anything done against one's conscience is a sin (113). But it could be just as easily, and I think more convincingly, argued that what Hobbes was doing with the idea of conscience was redefining it into oblivion. If conscience were to become this "public" thing outside the individual and lodged in the institutions and laws of the commonwealth, the problem of individual conscience as a legitimate means of resistance to the state disappears. Indeed, conscience disappears into orthopraxy, just as Hobbes would have wanted.

The most interesting chapter of the book is that on Lucy Hutchinson. Where all other major figures Lobo addresses are men, here we have the case of a woman playing a central role in the debates and politics connected to conscience. The episode itself is rather complicated, as it involves Lucy Hutchinson trying to save her husband who had signed the death warrant of Charles I, by allegedly forging his recantation. All of it is ably handled by Lobo and the role of conscience, of both husband and wife, duly explored. As a poet in her own right and the translator of Lucretius, Lucy Hutchinson's thoughts on the matter and role in the politics of the time are a fascinating part of the book.

The final chapter is on Milton and is another strong piece. She reads his works closely and widely and records some impressive finds.

For instance, she tells us that a 1667 copy of *Paradise Lost* contains marginalia precisely on her theme. Someone wrote the words “Horrors of Conscience” beside Sin’s description of her children. It is probably here, in the chapter on Milton, that her thesis that conscience was central to the idea of the nation is at its strongest and may, in fact, be its origin. This reader finds it hard to accept the case for much of the rest of the book. Again, this is because of her allergy to theology. This tendency becomes all the more apparent in her *Afterward* in which she turns to Matthew Arnold. There she notes his distinction between the French Revolution, which pressed the case of rationality, and the English, which relied on conscience. But she seems insensitive to a problem of which Arnold was well aware and, in fact, for which he is famous. His “long, withdrawing roar” on *Dover Beach* was faith slipping away. The French Revolution was the most obvious and violent expression of this. The English Revolution was not that. It might be considered the last (violent) gasp of the wars of religion. Thereafter we had wars of ideology, where conscience spoke not at all.

This is a fine work of scholarship. The criticisms noted here cannot take away from the accomplishment that it is. Lobo has not taken the argument in all the ways this reviewer might have wished, but it makes no less of a contribution for that. Instead, the materials here assembled and the insights provided will be a source of many future debates and disagreements, all of them better because of this work.

Carme Font. *Women’s Prophetic Writings in Seventeenth-Century Britain*. London and New York: Routledge, 2018. xii + 250 pp. \$149.95. Review by MELINDA ZOOK, PURDUE UNIVERSITY.

Carme Font’s new book on seventeenth-century female prophets demonstrates how women were able to use prophetic writings as a catalyst for change, both personal and political. She examines prophecy as a literary genre of social transformation that empowered women, making them activists. Through a series of case studies, Font’s work follows female prophetic voices from the era of the Civil Wars, when prophecy peaked, into the early eighteenth century when, as she argues, many women writers remained committed to social change and

continued to be inspired by the prophetic tradition. Font's emphasis throughout is on empowerment. Prophetic writing is text-based activism. Women used their prophetic authority to gain power, as individuals, as believers, and as citizens in a male-dominated world.

The scholarship on women and prophecy during the seventeenth century is rich, to say the least. Font knows she is entering a crowded field and her introduction gives credit to the ground-breaking work on women, dissent, and prophecy by Christine Berg and Philippa Berry, Phyllis Mack, Hilary Hinds, Elaine Hobby, Elizabeth Bouldin, Esther Cope, Curtis Freeman, Diane Purkiss, Diane Willen, and Sarah Apetrei, among others. Considering the amount of scholarship produced on this subject, it is not surprising that we have seen many of the basic premises of this book before. This is true of Font's argument that women were both inspired by their religiosity and used it to challenge authority, along with her emphasis on the political content of women's prophetic writings, which is exactly where most scholars have placed their focus.

What is perhaps most fresh and exciting about this book is Font's analysis of prophecy as a literary discourse of social and personal transformation and empowerment. Thus, as Font points out in her Introduction, the Baptist writer, Anne Wentworth used prophecy to expose the abuse of her husband, using religious language to convey a secular message, one that her congregation had ignored. Empowered "by the might power of God," Wentworth demonstrated an awareness of her own ability to demand and affect change. The "religious tenor of the prophetic text and its 'lay' content," writes Font, "often appealed to political change, individual conscience, and a greater awareness of gender bias" (1-2).

Font's case studies are also lively and insightful. Her aim is to "explore the nature of women's political participation in seventeenth-century culture beyond their status as individuals whose private life (marriage, legal status, access to education) needed to be regulated by the state" (40). This is not exactly new territory either. But Font succeeds at embedding the relevant historiography, and she has an innovative approach as well. Her emphasis on prophecy as activism and as an intervention into state politics has women not just participating in the public sphere, but also seeking to create public opinion. In

December 1648, with the preparation for the trial of Charles I in progress, the Baptist Elizabeth Poole was invited to speak before the Army Council. Her “vision” of England’s future was warmly received and she was invited a second time, just days before the King’s execution. This time her visions, much to the Council’s dismay, recorded God’s command that the King’s life be preserved. As Font demonstrates, this anti-regicidal challenge to the Army was taken seriously and it “elicited a sustained negative response” (69). This time, unlike Poole’s first visit wherein she maintained common cause with the Council, her status as a prophet was questioned. What gave this woman the right to question the authority of men? Her visions garnered the Council’s respect just as long as she stayed within their accepted opinions.

The chapter on Poole is in Part I of this book on prophetic politics during the 1640s. In Part II, Font examines the prophetic content of devotional literature during the Interregnum, focusing on Anna Trapnel, Jane Turner and Sarah Wright, and An Turner. Part III concentrates on the language of prophecy and its ability to foster a personal, female authorial center through the writings of Eleanor Davies, Jane Lead, Ann Bathurst, Joan Vokins, Kathleen Cheever and Katherine Evans, most of whom (with the exception of Lady Davies) were active during the second half of the seventeenth century.

This is a book of many ideas and insights and not everyone will agree with all that Font puts forth. There are also times when the book’s arguments seem more suggestive than realized. Still, this is certainly a richly textured and complex study, written with sensitivity, clarity, and care, and it adds to our growing understanding of women’s understanding of themselves and their ability to affect change in the early modern era.

Bonnie Lander Johnson and Eleanor Decamp, eds. *Blood Matters: Studies in European Literature and Thought, 1400–1700*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2018. x + 354 pp. \$89.95. Review by CELESTE CHAMBERLAND, ROOSEVELT UNIVERSITY.

Typically associated with barber-surgeons and leeches in late medieval and early modern Europe, the language of blood has long

featured prominently in studies of medical practice and humoral theory that have emphasized blood's connection to phlebotomy, battlefield trauma, and the balance of bodily humors. As the essays in *Blood Matters* demonstrate, however, blood performed a much broader array of semiotic roles from the fifteenth through the eighteenth centuries. Associated with potent symbols of corruption, desire, and transubstantiation in literature, aesthetics, and stagecraft, the language of blood functioned as a fluid metaphor for the human condition and inspired a diverse array of figurative representations of political reform, liturgical controversies, and colonialism. According to Bonnie Lander Johnson and Eleanor Decamp, investigating these larger cultural implications not only necessitates a great deal of methodological fluidity, but also requires the expertise of scholars from a wide range of disciplines. Inspired by Carolyn Walker Bynum and Gail Kern Paster's analyses of medieval and early modern conceptions of blood and their intersections with gender, religion, and the body, the central premise of *Blood Matters* is that blood represented far more than a red fluid coursing through human veins in the fifteenth through seventeenth centuries. Based on methodologies drawn from literary criticism, new historicism, and cultural anthropology, these interdisciplinary essays provide an innovative and engaging assessment of the heretofore largely overlooked figurative capacity of blood in an era straddling the divide between the medieval and modern eras.

Organized thematically rather than chronologically or geographically, each of the five sections in *Blood Matters* focuses on a specific semiotic function of the language of blood: circulation, wounds, corruption, proof, and signs and substance. This scheme of organization effectively connects interdisciplinary and inter-period essays on a variety of otherwise unrelated topics, ranging from pedagogical theory to textile stains. By providing a coherent thematic focus, blood and its metaphors serve to connect seemingly disparate methodologies in new ways that shed much light on the nuances of late medieval and early modern symbolism. Based on analyses of a wide range of source materials, such as calendrical images of pig slaughter, legal theories of cruentation, and the plays of William Shakespeare, the essays in this volume effectively engage the many contradictions and complexities of blood's role in early modern thinking.

The book's first section, which focuses on circulation, features essays delving into the political implications of Harvey's discovery, along with representations of circulation and containment in the writing of Dante, Catherine of Siena, and Shakespeare. Although William Harvey's discovery of the circulation of the blood serves as an initial frame of reference, *Blood Matters* does not adhere to traditional medical narratives that lionize Harvey as a hero of modern science and political radicalism. Rather, the political implications of Harvey's anatomical observations form the focus of essays that explore the figurative connotations of the language of circulation. In her assessment of seventeenth-century physiological theories, for example, Margaret Healy challenges long-held assumptions about the political ramifications of William Harvey's anatomical investigations. She asserts that scholars such as Christopher Hill have traditionally interpreted Harvey's discovery of the circulation of the blood as a destabilizing narrative that called into question the heart's role as king of the body. However, as Healy points out, Harvey's rhetoric of circulation was inherently conservative and promoted harmony and the prevailing political order by reinforcing the traditional Aristotelian insistence on the heart's primacy in the body.

Whereas Healy explores and challenges prevailing interpretations of blood's symbolism in early modern medical and political theory, other essays in this collection delve into the gendered, religious, and aesthetic implications of metaphors related to blood. Gabriella Zuccolin and Helen King's essay, "Rethinking Nosebleeds: Gendering Spontaneous Bleedings in Medieval and Early Modern Medicine," for example, offers an innovative assessment of nosebleeds within the context of early modern medical theory. Zuccolin and King contend that although they seem ostensibly mundane and gender-neutral, nosebleeds were closely linked to menstruation as a means of evacuating excess menstrual blood from the body, and were, in some texts, gendered in ways that directly challenged the one-sex anatomical model associated with Aristotelian and Galenic theory.

Like Zuccolin and King, Ben Parsons explores the gendered implications of the language of blood in pedagogical treatises of the late medieval period. Based on his analysis of texts such as Vincent de Beauvais' *De erudition filiorum nobelium*, Parsons asserts that

pedagogical texts commonly drew links between students' behavioral shortcomings and blood's role as a central component in the constitutions of young men. Although blood's influence generated the potential for unruliness in students, its fluidity also served as a marker of their malleability in the classroom. By addressing the ways in which blood functioned metaphorically and physiologically in late medieval educational texts, Parsons sheds much light on the ways in which constructions of young male masculinity were shaped by notions of blood's essential characteristics.

Although many of the collection's essays explore the ways in which representations of blood intersected with ideas of the body and gender, other chapters focus on the connections between blood and material or alimentary culture. Frances Dolan's essay, for example, incisively explores the longstanding associations between blood and wine in Christian Europe. Rather than investigating this relationship solely through the lens of the Christian Eucharist, however, Dolan demonstrates that blood and wine were also analogous in medical theories that emphasized the visual resemblance of the two fluids and their respective associations with vitality. Reinforced by the doctrine of transubstantiation, the interchangeability of wine and blood in medical theory and religious belief led to concerns about wine's purity in England. As Dolan contends, fears about the impurity of imported wine and its lack of suitability for English blood led to a growing emphasis on proto-nationalist campaigns promoting the production of English wine—notwithstanding the limitations of the English climate—based on prevailing medical theories that emphasized the connections between “place, body, and plants” (221).

By laying emphasis on blood's unmistakable visual appearance, which was rooted in its distinctive color and viscosity, Dolan's essay connects images of blood to popular notions of vitality and regeneration. The striking visual similarity between blood and wine undoubtedly evoked a powerful response from early modern people well acquainted with the interchangeability and transgressive potential of the two fluids, which were typically connected through the ritual of the Eucharist. Although Dolan's essay calls attention to the ways in which early modern people responded to blood's distinctive appearance, analysis of the visual culture of blood is notably underrepresented in

this volume. The lone investigation of visual representations of blood in *Blood Matters*, Dolly Jørgensen's astute essay, "Blood on the Butcher's Knife: Images of Pig Slaughter in Late Medieval Calendars," explores depictions of pig slaughter associated with the month of December in medieval books and calendars. As Jørgensen points out, although such imagery had appeared relatively sanitized in earlier iterations, by the late medieval period, images of the pig slaughter became increasingly graphic and bloody. This bold shift towards explicit imagery, according to Jørgensen, was infused with spiritual meaning and functioned at a highly symbolic level that was tied to a rise in late medieval piety in which the pig slaughter not only symbolized the feast season, but also simultaneously functioned as a transgressive symbol of human sacrifice and salvation. Jørgensen's essay provides that exemplifies the innovative interdisciplinary synergy that pervades this volume. By challenging traditional narratives and schemes of organization, the authors of this collection have created fertile ground for understanding a powerful trope that permeated literature, stagecraft, and intellectual culture in the medieval and early modern periods.

Although one of the great strengths of this volume is that it does not adhere to conventional medical interpretations of blood that lionize William Harvey as a transformative figure in the shift from medieval to modern understandings of the body, notably absent is any reference to Andreas Vesalius and the ways in which he and his anatomist contemporaries began transforming attitudes toward dissected bodies from revulsion to wonder. Further investigation of the extent to which shifts in the cultural role played by dissections influenced literary and aesthetic representations of blood might contribute further insight into the impressive body of scholarship assembled by Johnson and Decamp.

Despite the predominantly literary orientation of this text, its innovative thematic structure and methodological ingenuity will undoubtedly be of great interest to scholars across a range of disciplines. Not only does *Blood Matters* challenge medical historians to approach assessments of anatomical knowledge and the body with a broader disciplinary perspective, but it also offers bold new insights into a powerful and widespread literary trope that has been largely overlooked by social and cultural historians. By connecting ostensibly

disparate topics and methodological approaches through the language of blood, this text underscores the valuable synergy of inter-period and interdisciplinary analyses in medieval and early modern studies.

Tristan Alonge. *Racine et Euripide; La révolution trahie*. Genève: Droz, 2017. 414 pp. €69.00. Review by DENIS D. GRÉLÉ, UNIVERSITY OF MEMPHIS.

In *Racine et Euripide; La révolution trahie*, Tristan Alonge retells the literary meeting between three eminent authors: Aristotle, Euripides, and Racine. Deeply influenced by Georges Forestier, Alonge argues that the confluence of these three exceptional minds gives birth to the “révolution racinienne”: the propensity to privilege the character over the plot. In order to explain this “révolution”, Alonge is led to analyze Racine’s composition in light of three main sources: history, literature, and seventeenth-century French culture. Regarding the historical approach, Alonge exposes how Racine interacts with his Greek models by looking at translations and notes Racine left in the margins of his Greek texts. By examining Racine’s library, Alonge is also able to relate the various possible French influences, especially on plot and characters. Alonge explores likewise how seventeenth-century culture weighs increasingly on Racine’s writings and determines how the tragedian had to modify his plays in order to fit with the expectations of the public and censors.

The first chapter deals with the importance of Greek language and culture in the education of Racine. Many educated people were able to read Latin, but few knew Greek and, in particular, Greek tragedies, and then only through less than trustworthy translations. Racine, however, was able to read the Greek masters without any interference. This direct contact with Antiquity helped him better understand Aristotle and Euripides. Alonge discovers that Racine did not just copy his Greek masters, but actively studied the Greek tragedies and their structures. In looking at Racine’s translations and at the notes in the margins, Alonge is able to show that Racine did not interpret Aristotle loosely, as Corneille did, but was careful to understand what the Greek philosopher was trying to convey, in particular regarding the notion

of character. Alonge successfully establishes that Racine, akin to his Greek models, places the tragic character at the center of the action.

The second chapter is devoted to Racine's early work, *La Thébaïde*, a play judged rather unfavorably by critics, but which is fundamental to understanding Racine's originality. In carefully studying Racine's interpretation and writings, Alonge argues compellingly that, rather than being considered a mediocre first attempt, the play deserves to be respected as a true chef-d'oeuvre. This chapter illustrates how Racine was able to rework the Greek myths in order to apply what he had learned from his studies of Greek tragedy: a simple plot; a character who is neither good nor bad; characters who are closely related. Here, Alonge is somewhat unfair towards Corneille, accusing him of being a distracted reader of Aristotle, when the French playwright was really reinterpreting Aristotle to suit his needs. This being said, by looking at Racine's notes as well as at works by other authors in Racine's library, Alonge is able to rebuild the French tragedian's writing process. Not so differently from an archaeologist, the author scrapes the different layers that build *La Thébaïde*. In the process, he successfully rectifies R. Knight's studies on Racine (*Racine et la Grèce* [Paris: Nizet, 1950]), in particular on Racine's Greek sources of inspiration. Ultimately, Alonge shows how Racine, very early in his career, favors the rule of the ambivalent character and how *La Thébaïde* remains the work that is most faithful to the Greek masters.

In the third chapter on *Andromaque*, Alonge explores the concept of verisimilitude in Racine's characters, for their behavior lies somewhere halfway between antiquity and seventeenth-century France. According to Alonge, Racine's plays, driven by ambivalent characters, start to find their limits with his contemporary critics. In order to satisfy the public as well as the erudite of his time, Racine has to give increasing importance to the plot. *Andromaque*, secretly inspired by Euripides (she is a woman who has to choose between her past with Hector and the future of her son), becomes a turning point in Racine's writings. The tragedian tends then to abandon the mix of vices and virtues in his characters in order to create a hero(ine) in conformity with the notion of verisimilitude to satisfy his most refined critics. This chapter might be the least convincing of Alonge's book. There is much speculation in this chapter about Racine's sources of inspiration,

which leaves the interpretation somewhat uncertain: Racine may or may not have read certain authors; he may or may not have known of specific versions. This being said, if the reader accepts Alonge's theory, his argument is convincing: Racine has created the character of Andromaque, both the widow and the mother, from his own readings.

In the fourth chapter dedicated to *Iphigénie*, Alonge examines whether the main character represents a return to Euripides or whether Racine has finally abandoned his mentor in order to meet the expectations of his public and his critics. After a six-year absence from the Greek plays, Racine comes back to Euripides, inspired by the theme of obedience/disobedience and the almost incestuous relationship between father and daughter. The conclusion of Alonge's analysis is that Racine betrays Euripides and Aristotle in creating a play where Iphigénie is not a conflicted character: she embraces her father's decision and, with the purest stoicism, accepts the sacrifice of her love and her life. In the end, Racine betrays Euripides in imparting the tragic aspects of the play to the plot (as does Corneille) and not to the character.

Phèdre closes this remarkable study with the question of the moral influence of theater, a question addressed by Racine for the first time. The problem in this chapter is to decide if the play places the character at its center—as many commentators of the play have stated—or if the play is driven by the plot—as was customary at the time. Alonge brilliantly demonstrates how Racine chooses to be unfaithful to his Greek masters by constructing a play driven by the plot and the *Peripeteias*. In addition, Racine rejects the mixed character (neither angel nor demon) despite what Racine claims in his Preface to the play: *Phèdre* is a character who, totally possessed by love, has lost all reason. *In fine*, Alonge shows how *Phèdre* wholly belongs to Racine.

Alonge should be commended for the close reading and careful analysis of Racine and his sources of interpretation. The only hesitation one may have with this otherwise outstanding book is that more time should have been spent examining Ancient Greek culture in order to better assess what influence it may have had on Racine's writings. If Alonge offers his reader some understanding of the context in which Greek tragedies were written and played, he could have delved deeper into particular notions such as guilt, destiny, and the relationship be-

tween Gods and mortals during Antiquity. While *Alonge* shows, for example, how Euripides has to change his tragedy (*Iphigénie*) because of public rejection, a comprehensive explanation of Greek religion as it is portrayed in Euripides would reinforce his claims. This being said, the pointed summaries of the plays as well as the clear and detailed analysis help the reader engage with the texts presented. The structure of the book, while at times conducive to repetition, is clear and easy to navigate. Rather than hiding under theoretical jargon, *Alonge* offers a breath of fresh air with this logical and well-crafted study on Racine. *Racine et Euripide* is truly a pleasure to read.

Anne Cayuela and Marc Vuillermoz, eds. *Les Mots et les choses du théâtre. France, Italie, Espagne, XVI^e–XVII^e siècles*. Geneva: Droz, 2017. 303 pp. 48.00 CHF. Review by PERRY GETHNER, OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY.

This volume, consisting of seventeen articles, comprises the proceedings of a conference held in 2015 by the research organization *IDT—Les Idées du théâtre*, devoted to the study of liminary texts of plays, especially prefaces, dedications, prologues, and critiques. The goal is to examine how playwrights viewed themselves and various aspects of theatrical activity and to compare those ideas across three neighboring countries: France, Italy, and Spain. The articles, focusing on specific points of terminology, are highly technical, and some of them require extensive knowledge of theatrical conventions in one or more of the three countries. However, most are accessible for the general literary scholar.

Sandrine Blondet examines the language used by French playwrights from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries to refer to the composition process. Obvious terms such as *labeur*, *effort*, *peine*, and their synonyms may serve multiple purposes, such as letting authors pride themselves on their hard work and professionalism, or instead on the ease and speed of their writing. The playwrights emphasize such features as solitude and help from the Muses, and their attitudes range from modesty (usually false) to vaunting of their creative genius.

Philippe Meunier examines how Spanish playwright Tirso de Molina designates plagiarists, never mentioning people by name but calling them drones and contrasting them with honeybees, traditionally viewed as models of productivity and good behavior. The contrast enables Tirso to glorify the creative artist in a manner compatible with humanistic and Catholic thought.

Emmanuelle Hénin shows how Georges de Scudéry developed the standard comparison between poetry and painting more often and in greater depth than his colleagues. Being a lover of painting and a collector himself, he devoted many poems to painters or to paintings, both real and imagined. Inserting himself into the early stages of French art criticism, he expressed a preference for color over line, for daring over regularity, and for sketches over finished work. This correlated with a fondness for experimentation, variety, and exciting subjects; hence, his preference for tragicomedy. Scudéry was apparently unique in extending the contrast in painting between design and color to the contrast in the drama between the printed text and the special attractions linked to performance, lauding the value of both.

Marine Souchier, in her analysis of the terms that French dramatists of the seventeenth century used to describe people of their profession, notes the gradual decline of terms emphasizing the reduction of art to mere craft (*faiseur*, *artisan*, *versificateur*, etc.) or the need to earn money at the expense of higher goals (*poète crotté*). Instead, there is more focus on writers' behavior, with criticism of bad models guilty of such sins as vanity, envy, pedantry, and engaging in cabals.

Juan Carlos Garrot Zambrana finds that Spanish Golden Age playwrights who contrast the experience of watching plays and reading them are more likely than their counterparts in other countries to prefer reading, often complaining about the poor quality of the performances. Calderón, who seems to have been ambivalent on the subject for much of his career, privileges performance in regard to the religious dramas of his late period, which, he acknowledges, give less pleasure when printed.

Enrica Zanin shows how dictionaries published in the three countries during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries treated vocabulary relating to drama. The differences are caused by the aims of the compilers: they may aim to be descriptive or prescriptive in regard to

usage, focus on differences between the drama of antiquity and that of the present day, include terms from various professions or focus on literary language alone, distinguish (or not) between poetic and theatrical concerns. At times the entries reflect views on the morality of drama or its value as a philosophical metaphor.

Fausta Antonucci (an article in Spanish with a summary in French) discusses how Spanish Golden Age playwrights came to adopt non-standard terminology for act and scene divisions, inspired by differences in dramaturgy.

Marc Douguet shows how the principles, adopted by the French, of linking of scenes and of not leaving the stage empty within an act, though related, are not identical. The latter, derived from the drama of the Ancients, is descriptive and helps determine when acts end and interludes begin. The former, prescriptive, is a technique to provide greater dramatic continuity (introduced at a time when dramaturgy favored fragmentation) and enhance the unity of action.

Christophe Couderc, analyzing the taxonomic vocabulary found in the paratexts of Spanish Golden Age plays, confirms the standard view that categories for dramatic genres were porous. He focuses on the usage of the terms *fábula* and *historia*, which could serve as a synonym of *comedia* in designating any type of play, or indicate the type of subject matter, or refer to the category of source material.

Coline Piot examines the terminology applied to the new type of short comedy that came into prominence during the third quarter of the seventeenth century. It would take time for the term *petite comédie* to become standard, thus aiding to distinguish this more refined sub-genre from the medieval genre of farce. However, the term *farce* was sometimes used to designate these plays, either to denigrate comedy in general or to discredit specific authors of short comedies (Molière by his opponents, or Molière's rivals by his admirers).

Emmanuele De Luca traces efforts to define the Italian term *lazzi*, as well as noting various etymologies given for it. He shows that, although the term does not appear in Italian sources until the middle of the seventeenth century and in French sources until the end of that century, the basic idea (comical improvisation constituting either independent scenes or interruptions within scenes) corresponded to well-known practice of Italian performers. The difficulty with trans-

lating it into French is that it designated improvisatory techniques, which were not the norm for French actors.

Véronique Lochert and Bénédicte Louvat make a comparative study of terminology from Italy, France and Spain used to describe actors and their activities. They note a gradual evolution away from terms inherited from Antiquity and relating to rhetoric, and toward an appreciation for what performers can bring to the theatrical experience. While the Italians show the most concern for theorizing performance practice (style of declamation, gesture, ability to inhabit a role) and the Spaniards the least concern, the trend toward recognition of actors' contributions is undeniable.

Teresa Jaroszevska studies the development in France of a caricatural character type, the *capitan* (braggart soldier). This figure, derived from both Latin comedy and the Italian *commedia dell'arte*, became especially popular during the first half of the seventeenth century due to the desire to satirize the armies of Spain while the countries were at war, and it largely died out during the second half of the century, due to the increased insistence on psychological realism. She enumerates over thirty names or titles of such characters, giving the etymology and history of each.

Céline Fournial studies the reception in France of Lope de Vega's theoretical treatise *Arte nuevo*. His defense of a new dramaturgy, not in conformity with the practice of the Ancients, was not invoked by French theorists until the Quarrel over *Le Cid*. Corneille's opponents took Lope's opening section out of context to suggest that the Spanish playwright was really making a public apology for violating the classical rules in order to pander to the bad taste of his audiences, thus justifying their own rejection of Spanish models.

Patrizia De Capitani, in a comparative study of prologues from Italian and French comedies in the sixteenth century, notes the frequent use of wordplay, often obscene, plus metaphor and personification, to convey matters of theoretical import in a light-hearted and non-technical way. Topics included fidelity to Latin models versus search for novelty (both in the type of plot and in dramaturgy), preference for hilarity or for seriousness of tone (including satire), and calls for the public's approval. Some comparisons, such as that between the comedy and the female body, were limited to Italy.

Hélène Tropé studies the development, in both Spain and France, of terminology relating to comic characters, to types of gestural and verbal humor, and to theories on the nature and purpose of laughter. Despite common influence from the Italian *arte* tradition, the countries evolved distinctive comic character types while sharing many theoretical notions.

Stéphane Miglierina, after tracing the uses of the Latin term *suavitas* in both the Vulgate and rhetorical treatises, shows that the word could retain either type of meaning in the modern languages. In a handful of texts written by or for Jesuits it could even be linked to laughter, but only the form of humor compatible with honest recreation.

Since this colloquium was linked to the establishment of a database, these articles are intended primarily as directions for future research that could be incorporated into a broader comparative history of drama. But they are inherently worthwhile in that they bring together great amounts of useful information.

Katherine Ibbett. *Compassion's Edge: Fellow-Feeling and Its Limits in Early Modern France*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2018. 296 pp. \$79.95. Review by KATHLEEN HARDESTY DOIG, EMERITA, GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY.

The image used on the jacket of this book seems at first glance remarkably inapposite. It features a profile sketch of a male head, labeled “compassion” in a series of illustrations of the passions by Charles Le Brun, but more suggestive to modern eyes of anger or consternation than tenderness. As Katherine Ibbett explains, our definition of compassion as an emotion with connotations of sympathy and heartfelt concern harks back to the meaning the term began to acquire in the eighteenth century. In the preceding early modern period, roughly from the end of the Wars of Religion through the era of Louis XIV, the conception and practice of compassion were subject to definite limits, limits that are clearly visible in Le Brun’s uneasy figure and which are explored in detail in this illuminating study.

A schematic list of the principal authors and genres examined here attests to the extensive research marshaled to support Ibbett's thesis. For the years during and immediately following the Wars of Religion, one finds analyses of poems (Jacques Yver, Agrippa d'Aubigné), *histoires tragiques*, Protestant martyrologies and histories, and two essays by Montaigne. Sources for the following century, the focus of the volume, are numerous. They include writings on moral and dramatic theory by canonical as well as secondary authors: Pierre Charron, Descartes, La Rochefoucauld, Jacques Esprit, Pierre Nicole, Hippolyte-Jules Pilet de la Mesnardière, Corneille, René Rapin, André Dacier, Pierre Le Moynes, Yves de Paris, Jean-Baptiste Saint-Jure, Pascal, Moïse Amyraut, and Pierre Jurieu. Novelists also pondered the edge of compassion, and Ibbett offers convincing interpretations of Madeleine de Scudéry's *Clélie* and Madame de Lafayette's *Comtesse de Tende*, *La Princesse de Montausier*, and *La Princesse de Clèves*. Two somewhat unexpected genres that add to the story are supplication literature in which an author begs the monarch for clemency, and a body of Protestant essays and pamphlets written in reaction to the Revocation of 1685, with special attention paid to those of Jurieu and Bayle. Racine's *Esther* also participates in this post-Revocation literary output, as a drama where religious difference gives rise to fears about the kind of pity a sovereign might exercise. Several even more surprising genres include the Jesuit Relations concerning New France, the rule manuals for a community of religious, and a memoir-history written by one of its members.

In this wide-ranging collection of texts, the author has chosen both obvious and subtle passages where fellow-feeling is at play. Through nuanced interpretations, she shows how compassion was defined, in the root sense of that word, during the period in question. Very briefly, the six chapters examine the following aspects of the history of this emotion as it was understood and practiced, and how its meaning shifted over time. The sixteenth-century use of the spectacle that arouses feelings of compassion would become a recurring theme in the seventeenth century. The Aristotelian coupling of fear and pity, with its ramifications for the meaning of compassion, is a prominent theme in numerous writings on moral and dramatic theory. The stances of religious groups towards compassion varied widely, usually depending on the geographical proximity of the pitied group—in

Ibbett's felicitous phrasing, a "theological gerrymandering of fellow-feeling" (27). Failed compassion is depicted in several of Lafayette's novels; Ibbett enlarges on this novelistic plot element to suggest that these miscarriages evoke the state of France after the Wars of Religion. Compassion was ascribed in diametrically opposed ways to certain royal edicts, especially the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes; for the orthodox Catholic, the Revocation was an act of compassion to save the erring Protestant, while the Protestant supplicant begged for the compassion of clemency. Finally, compassion, as prescribed to and lived by a small subset of the population, is analyzed in the section on a community of nuns laboring in a Montreal hospital.

A few specific examples can give a sense of how Ibbett reads these texts. On the subject of how religious groups viewed compassion, three Jesuits represent an orthodox Catholic viewpoint from three slightly different perspectives. Le Moyne posits the basis of compassion in the laws of nature, Yves de Paris extrapolates from this position to a theology of trans-national humanity (with an exception for recalcitrant Protestants), and Saint-Jure follows suit but emphasizes practice over theory. In the discussion of *La Princesse de Clèves*, Ibbett notes that the mutual pity evinced by the Clèves couple is the only example of reciprocal compassion that she has identified in the works cited in this monograph. This section is of particular interest to anyone who teaches *La Princesse de Clèves*. In the chapter on the hospital nuns in Montreal, the author contrasts the rule manuals for the order, which tell the sisters to project appropriate kindness in their manner but to keep their actual feelings under control, and the account written by Marie Morin, a nun-administrator in the hospital, which demonstrates that in practice the nuns developed a strong affect through their demanding and shared labor.

The author provides useful historical background on the Wars of Religion and their aftermath, seventeenth-century absolutism, the organization of hospitals, and missionary efforts in New France. Linguistic alterations are noted, for example, the various permutations of pity/pitiful. Of significance for this reviewer is the occasional linkage made between these efforts in the early modern period to decide on boundaries for fellow-feeling and our own challenges in this respect in contemporary times.

The numerous quotations in French are conveniently translated in the text. The twenty-two-page bibliography, printed in small font, is a rich source for scholars—as this finely argued and original study will also prove to be.

Antonio Urquizar-Herrera. *Admiration and Awe: Morisco Buildings and Identity Negotiations in Early Modern Spanish Historiography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017. 272 pp. + 15 illus. \$90.00. Review by LIVIA STOENESCU, TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY.

Urquizar-Herrera's well-researched book strikes deep into vital questions about the art history of Early Modern Spain. To date, the issues he addresses remain the conundrums facing experts who think along the lines: To what extent did the Visigothic past shape the identity of Christianity in Spain? How much borrowings did exist between Morisco architecture, the mosque, and the Spanish Cathedral? Was Early Modern Spanish historiography truthful to the state of an Iberian Peninsula deeply entrenched in a multi-layered society of Christian, Jewish, and Moorish ethnicities? Can we speak of classical antiquity in Early Modern Spain and thus formulate a more articulate framework for assessing the similarities between early modern Spain and Italy (similarities that appear to have been the focus of some original research developed over the past decade)? Remarkably, Urquizar-Herrera maps out alternatives and debates, leaving art historians and historians alike with the opportunity to walk on firmer ground. At the same time, Urquizar-Herrera provokes debates and revisionist methods, rather than pretending to hold the undeniable in writing on these topics.

The book consists of an introduction, three parts, and concluding ideas. At every step, Urquizar-Herrera presents his argument in the form of fact, argument, and reception, a strategy that makes this text all the more valuable. We learn in Part I about the worn-out slogan of the "loss of Spain" (30–49) identified with a time of a crisis allegedly inflicted on a society that lost significantly less than it gained from the Moorish conquest. The history of art over the centuries uncovers a variety of similar situations, triggered by both internal and external factors. In the realm of art history literature, for example, Hans Sedl-

mayr's *Verlust der Mitte* (1948) potently emphasized on the definition of "loss" as self-generated by the decline of Western civilization, which waned because its modern developmental character surpassed the manifestations of decay, weakness, hypocrisy, and degeneracy that struck at the foundations of the art of previous centuries. Part II of Urquizar-Herrera's *Admiration and Awe* tackles the antiquarian model as a pervasive mode of reassigning the Islamic architectural heritage and appropriating historical evidence to the imperatives of a smooth alignment with the Italian model, so popular in early modernity, and, implicitly, with the rise of Rome as a fabrication of the universal cult of the pope. To discuss the Spanish historiographical model as the kindred approach to the Italian effort is an extremely important discussion, which Urquizar-Herrera frames through citations and contextualization from Alexander Nagel and Christopher S. Wood's *Anachronic Renaissance* (2010). Nagel and Wood have examined the plural temporal character of artifacts, the notions of citation and spoliation, as well as the implications of the manipulation of visual evidence as forces that hindered the natural definition of the historical self. Urquizar-Herrera takes up these ideas in early modern Spain, analyzing through art and historiographical evidence the outcome of the antiquarian appropriation of Islamic monuments, an appropriation that converged with the construing of robust antiquarian literature on Islamic architecture. Part III engages with the use of the antiquarian model in establishing visual proof for demonstrating the endurance of Christian worship in the Iberian Peninsula, namely, the existence of a pre-Islamic past of Christianity. The arguments that Christian images, either icons or sculpted artifacts, predated the advent of Islam, and that Spanish ecclesiastical theorists only shed light on the rediscovery and unearthing (from the main mosques, known as *Aljama Mosques*) of the sacred imagery are key facts in this concluding chapter. Finally, Urquizar-Herrera ends by way on an epilogue in the form of another rhetorical, thought-provoking examination of the fallacies that Spain adopted when designing an archetypal model that refused to endorse the presence of other ethnicities. Worse, a model that attempted to align itself with the West as a place of origin, but without having proved any palpable argument to deny a Semitic (both Jewish and Arabic) past.

In Córdoba-based humanist Ambrosio de Morales's *Las antigüedades* (1575), the mosque was not damaged by the construction of a Christian cathedral inside. Instead, Morales' arguments provide one important stream for the justifications for demolition and substitution, as well as for the idea of monuments as trophies (25–26). Urquizar-Herrera frames the discussion through the analogies he establishes with Pierre Nora's *Les lieux de mémoire* (1984–1992), which offers a framework for understanding how early modern historiography actively intervened to change the symbolic content of Islamic mosques so as to make these serve the architectural memory of a Christian past that predated the Islamic period. The building of Gothic and Renaissance cathedrals was not perceived as a major alteration, but rather as an act of Christian restoration that once more justified the earlier demolition of the mosques of Zaragoza, Toledo, Valencia, and Seville. A recurring name in Urquizar-Herrera's book is Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada (c. 1170–1247), Archbishop of Toledo, a major driving force behind the construction of Toledo's Gothic cathedral and the writer of *Historia Gothica*, an account of the extraordinary deeds of Christian kings who stood up against the Muslims. Focused on the Christian conquest of Toledo and Córdoba, Jiménez de Rada's *Historia Gothica* was responsible for a historiographical vision based on the capturing of the mosques, their conversion to Christianity, and transformation of Islamic religious architecture into victory trophies. As Urquizar-Herrera tellingly sums up, “the inclusion of Islamic monuments in the medieval restoration discourse is based on two premises: that the remains belonged to the infidels who had interrupted Spain's naturally Christian journey, and that, after the Christian conquest, they were left standing to bear witness to Christian efforts to recover their religious continuity. Immediately after they were taken, the buildings were seen as memorials to Islamic defeat and Christian triumph” (28).

All approaches to Early Modernity weighing the influence of classical antiquity on Christianity have been focused solely on Italian Renaissance art, yet Urquizar-Herrera broaches the matter in Spain fearlessly. The loss of classical antiquity may not have happened, had it not been the Moors who destroyed the Roman antiquities in the Iberian Peninsula. This lament rings true in Pedro de Medina's *Libro de la grandezas y cosas memorables de España* (1548), in which the

Moors are to be blamed for “many things from Roman times [that] were destroyed and ravaged, so that no trace of them remains.” (57). A successful historiographical strategy emerged to attribute the lack of classical ruins to Islamic destruction, and to incriminate Islamic violence that ensured the incorporation of Roman capitals in the Córdoba mosque and the presence of Roman inscriptions at the base of Seville’s Giralda tower, a minaret and a remnant of a destroyed mosque, which had been transformed into a Christian belfry. After the conquest of Granada in 1492, the Catholic monarchs shared a positive reception of the Alhambra, which emerged in Charles V’s Renaissance palace that may be seen as a response to the Islamic sumptuary model of the Nasrid construction. To emphasize on Charles V’s palace as an extension of the Nasrid complex still leaves questions about the Spanish past unanswered: Was Alhambra a Christian triumph or the expression of Andalusian cultural achievements that preserved Christianity from the pre-Islamic age? Urquizar-Herrera provokes us to think critically about the issue of hybridity in relation to the Spanish past. If classical antiquity was not an unmediated criterion for assessing earlier liaisons with Rome, a look into the materials used by Roman architects throws into question the matter of Spain’s exposure to classicism. We learn that the use of regular stone ashlar, a defining feature of Roman architecture, was not employed in the building of Islamic monuments. Moreover, Iberian Peninsula humanism, including Ambrosio de Morales’s *Las antigüedades*, discriminated between Roman and Islamic masonry because of the use of either ashlar or bricks and mortar (89).

Because Islam enjoyed a “low status” in the views of Spanish humanists, an entire culture of Semitic recollections was denigrated by inference. Disapproval and disdain extended back as far as early Christianity and to the interaction with the Jews who inevitably lived side by side with the Christians in the Apostolic past. Constantinople, an archetypal case in point, became “the quintessence of political and moral chaos.” Spanish historians labeled Constantinople as “an urban metaphor [responsible] for the loss of order and classic regulation that had once characterized the Roman Empire” (115). Taking in earnest the objective to find roots in classical sources and to disparage all Islamic aesthetics, books such as Alfonso García Matamoros’s

Pro adserenda Hispaniorum eruditione (1553) put forward that being perceived as an anti-Vitruvian was more inappropriate and undignified than being anti-Christian (116).

The thesis of historical continuity, which the Spanish historiographical adopted primarily, sought to create new links with pre-Islamic and Mozarabic religiosity. The recovery of relics and the arrival of the remains of saints had a momentous role in the reorganization of the Spanish church. To early modern Spanish historiographers, restoration meant the restitution of Christianity as a natural feature of the Spanish nation. Urquizar-Herrera discerns in this context the unique role of Granada, which could not but contradict the idea that Christian worship endured or was preserved through a material culture of artifacts. When the Catholic monarchs conquered the kingdom of Granada, the absence of Christians at the time of the capturing of the city precluded all thesis of pre-Islamic Christianity. In Urquizar-Herrera's words, "Granada never severed its ties with its Islamic past" (167). Nevertheless, the Moriscos of Granada fabricated a collection of martyrs' relics, known as the Lead Books, with the aim of enlisting support for their practices of cultural and religious hybridity (168). The local histories of Granada argued that the Lead Books proved the archeological links among Granada, Iliberris (the site of the ancient Roman settlement of Elvira), and the martyred St. Caecilius, the first bishop of Iliberris and disciple of St. James the Great, who evangelized Roman Spain in the first century. Yet, despite the approval of archbishop of Granada Pedro de Castro, the Lead Books were taken to Rome to be examined in 1648. Whereas the church condemned the books as an Islamic forgery, the relics of the martyrs were approved out of respect for tradition.

Urquizar-Herrera wrote a book that advances the study of dissemination and reception of historiographical narratives. He brings in support of his claims both visual and written arguments that provide an extensive approach to the relationship between the manipulation of images and ideological appropriation. However, Urquizar-Herrera considers various sources, including those on the popular reception of the cult of martyrs. Even though all the sources were enlisted in a heavy historiographical apparatus to ensure religious and cultural homogenization, Urquizar-Herrera eloquently reveals that the interest

in, and acceptance of, hybridity remained the characteristic features of the Italian Peninsula.

Gerlinde Gruber, Sabine Haag, Stefan Weppelmann, and Jochen Sander, eds. *Rubens: The Power of Transformation*, ex. cat. Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna, and the Städel Museum, Frankfurt am Main. Munich: Hirmer, 2017. 336 pp. \$55.00. Review by ANETA GEORGIEVSKA-SHINE, UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, COLLEGE PARK.

This handsomely produced volume is the catalog to the exhibition organized by the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna, shown between October 17, 2017 and January 21, 2018, before its travel to the second venue, the Städel Museum, Frankfurt am Main, between February 8 and May 21, 2018.

The principal theme of the exhibition and this publication was Rubens's relationship to the visual tradition—from Italian and Northern European painters of the Renaissance, to those of ancient Greece and Rome, whose works he was able to study both during his sojourn to Italy (1600–1608), and in various private collections he got to know in the course of his prolific career.

The curatorial team—Gerlinde Gruber (Kunsthistorisches), Stefan Weppelmann (the director of the Picture Gallery in the Kunsthistorisches) and Jochen Sander (Städel)—set for themselves a rather ambitious goal: to present the varied ways in which Rubens absorbed, mastered, emulated, and transformed his sources in drawings, oil sketches, modelli, cartoons, as well as fully finished paintings. In pursuing this goal, they gathered a remarkable range of over one hundred and twenty works by the artist and his “models”, including some of the best-known ones from antiquity, such as the *Belvedere Torso* (Vatican), the *Centaur tamed by Cupid* (Louvre), and the *Crouching Venus* (Naples). Even when they could not secure a loan of the original—most notably in the case of the *Laocoön*—they managed to showcase those models through plaster casts or other replicas. Artists closer to Rubens's time include an equally impressive roster of Italians and Northerners, from Titian and Tintoretto, to Goltzius, Elsheimer

and Giambologna.

This conceptual framework proved to be a success. The exhibition visitors were treated to an unparalleled display of works organized according to formal and thematic affinities. In both venues, this was the artistic event of the season. In fact, due to the popular appeal of this exhibition, the Frankfurt museum extended it until June 3 of 2018.

Those unable to travel to either of these great European museums can gain a wonderful sense of the wealth and diversity of objects in this exhibition from the lavishly illustrated catalog. More importantly still, this publication brings together a collection of essays by an international team of scholars, with new insights into various aspects of Rubens's creative engagement with his sources of inspiration (Full disclosure: the author of this review was also one of the contributors to the catalog).

Despite the strict limits concerning the length of these essays, their sheer number and different perspectives add up to a rather informative and multilayered account of the artist's transformative approach to the visual tradition. The first of these contributions, by Stefan Weppelmann, reiterates Rubens's status as *pictor doctus* by drawing attention to his engagement with some of the most distinguished men of letters and scientists of his milieu. My own contribution addresses the poetic dimensions of his transformation of models, including the theoretical underpinnings of his use of classical motifs for Christian subjects. Alexandro Vergara points to the intellectual foundations of his work—notably his interest in Platonic and Aristotelian ideas, as well as in ancient rhetoric. His essay is complemented by that written by Nils Büttner, who highlights Rubens's unmatched ability to convey allegorical meanings in line with the rhetorical notion of perspicuity.

Another group of essays deals with more "technical" aspects of Rubens's practice. David Jaffé, for instance, suggests that in some cases, the artist may have used miniature replicas of classical sculptures and wax figures, in addition to drawings after the originals. Jochen Sander focuses on Rubens's relationship to his much-admired Northern peer, Adam Elsheimer: specifically, his emulation, rather than imitation, of this great German master of chiaroscuro. Nico van Hout focuses on a single composition—*The Washing and Anointing of Christ's Body* (1616, Cambrai)—to demonstrate the lasting impact of Caravaggio

on Rubens's interpretation of the passion of Christ, both in his own work and within his studio.

Closely related to this group is Jeremy Wood's discussion of the ways in which Rubens altered existing works—both his own and those of others—by adding strips of wood, cutting off sections of images and substituting them with others, or by literally drawing over works by other artists, including those of Mantegna. Similarly, George Bisacca looks at one of the masterpieces in the *Kunsthistorisches*, the *Stormy Landscape with Philemon and Baucis*, to point to the artist's tendency to revise his inventions—in this case by adding several strips of panel that allow him to expand the original composition. His essay is supplemented by one by Elke Oberthaler, Georg Prast, and Ina Slama, who did an extensive technical analysis of this painting in the course of its restoration for this exhibition.

Rubens's female "ideal" is addressed in an essay by Gerlinde Gruber, written in collaboration with three conservators, Geert van der Snikt, Stijn Legrand, and Koen Janssen. This contribution focuses on his use of classical prototypes such as the Medici Venus, or the Venus forms of Renaissance masters such as Antico and Giambologna—both in images of the Goddess of Love, but also in the portrayal of his second wife, Helena Fourment. In terms of its topic, this essay is complemented by the one written by Fiona Healy, who looks at Rubens's notions about the ideal female in representations of the Virgin Mary, specifically within compositions focusing on the Holy Family.

Rather than producing entries for individual objects, the authors of the catalog contributed another set of essays that correspond to the thematic units of the exhibition.

Thus Nils Büttner addresses a group of works of art that exemplify Rubens's notions of the heroic male. Gerlinde Gruber returns to his theory and practice of the representation of the human body in general—including his images of women and children. Jochen Sander provides an excellent summary of the portion of the exhibition focusing on Rubens's use of ancient sculptures.

In two related short essays, Stefan Weppelmann turns to one of the most remarkable characteristics of Rubens's work—the complex and dynamic figural choreographies of his compositions. Another section of the exhibition, which foregrounds Rubens's relationship

with Titian, is also addressed by Nils Büttner. Gerlinde Gruber takes another closer look at one of his most macabre paintings, *The Head of Medusa* (ca. 1617–18, Vienna). Together with the above-mentioned team of conservators, she also writes on a new discovery concerning that most exceptional of portraits of an artist's wife, *Het Pelsken* (ca. 1636–38, Vienna). Specifically, technical examination of this painting determined that the artist had originally included next to the figure of his wife a fountain with a urinating putto, a long-established symbol of fertility.

Though some readers might find the absence of individual catalog entries disconcerting, the curators' decision to write essays about various themes or groups of works makes perfect sense, given the overall theme of the exhibition and the wide-ranging connections drawn between Rubens and "others." Indeed, in view of the variety of threads that run through this show, this is a more cogent and satisfying approach.

While the question of influence has long been at the core of Rubens scholarship, both this exhibition and the accompanying catalogue reaffirm its central place for understanding his oeuvre as a continuous dialogue with past masters—from his favorite Northerners and Italians, to the most distant, yet foundational figures of the Western canon in ancient Greece and Rome.

NEO-LATIN NEWS

Vol. 66, Nos. 3 & 4. Jointly with SCN. NLN is the official publication of the American Association for Neo-Latin Studies. Edited by Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University; Western European Editor: Gilbert Tournoy, Leuven; Eastern European Editors: Jerzy Axer, Barbara Milewska-Wazbinska, and Katarzyna Tomaszuk, Centre for Studies in the Classical Tradition in Poland and East-Central Europe, University of Warsaw. Founding Editors: James R. Naiden, Southern Oregon University, and J. Max Patrick, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee and Graduate School, New York University.

◆ *L'Odisea Marciana di Leonzio tra Boccaccio e Petrarca*. By Valeria Mangraviti. Barcelona and Rome: Fédération Internationale des Instituts d'Études Médiévales, 2016. CLXXVII + 941 pp. €79. The work of a textual scholar is like protecting the witnesses of a crime. Enough scholars have certainly considered Leonzio Pilato's *ad verbum* translation of the *Odyssey* suspect enough to identify all the witnesses and preserve their testimony. When the trial is over, however, the value of a philologist's work will be judged by how many manuscripts might go up in flames with as little loss as possible to our knowledge of their contents. In this regard, Valeria Mangraviti's single-manuscript edition of Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Ms. gr. IX 29 is so meticulous that if we lost the codex tomorrow, we would be deprived of a precious object and little more.

Following the recent trend among Byzantine scholars, Mangraviti has issued a diplomatic edition of the autograph exemplar of Pilato's interlinear Latin translation of the *Odyssey*. This is a messy text whose margins are constipated with a commentary constructed not like a cathedral, as Mangraviti notes, so much as an abandoned shipyard (*cantiere*). With Carthusian attention to detail, she has refused to orphan even the infelicities in Pilato's accentuation and spelling, thus allowing us to enter his workshop as a translator for the first time. The principle that guides her reconstruction of the text is in my opinion

an aesthetic one: fidelity to the textual *facies* of the manuscript. One of her aims is to use this text-critical work to advance our historical knowledge of the origins of this manuscript and the respective roles that Petrarch and Boccaccio played in its making. The introduction alone is one of the most important contributions to this question in many years. It counts as another significant advancement beyond the work of Agostino Pertusi and the collar it has had on scholars since 1964. Mangraviti has taken the title of Pertusi's book—*Leonzio Pilato fra Petrarca e Boccaccio*—and switched the names of Petrarch and Boccaccio around in order to indicate who the protagonist of this story really was.

Among the major contributions that Mangraviti makes is a more precise understanding of the transmission of this manuscript and its place in the *stemma codicum* of the *Odyssey*. Her examination of the variants that Pilato left in the margins is the most exhaustive study of Pilato's procedure as a textual critic thus far and has allowed Mangraviti to increase the eight variants noted by Pertusi to twenty. Additionally, her study of the marginalia has led her to discuss many glosses that have hitherto gone unexamined or unidentified. Among them are about twenty glosses in Boccaccio's hand that consist almost entirely of comparisons between parallel passages in the *Odyssey* and *Aeneid*. Around ten marginal notes can probably be attributed to Petrarch, while five more in the same hand were later erased. Mangraviti has not only added more glosses in Petrarch's hand to those already examined by Filippomaria Pontani, but has also made significant contributions to our understanding of the relationship that this codex had to the "Odyssee pars" sent to Petrarch before completion and to the personal copy of the *Odyssey* that he later owned (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 7880.2).

With this cinderblock of a book Mangraviti has not only made one of the most important documents in the history of Homeric translation in the Renaissance available to the scholarly world, but she has also made an enormous contribution to the formation of a new scholarly consensus that has been taking shape for well over a decade. We now have enough evidence, for instance, to move beyond the idea that Pilato proceeded *verbum pro verbo* simply because he was incompetent. Although Vincenzo Fera may be right to call his

translation a “versione di servizio,” it would be a mistake to say that Pilato was not aware of the casualties that attend a literal translation. (Adam Foley, Villa I Tatti, The Harvard University Center for Italian Renaissance Studies)

◆ *Pietro Bembo on Etna: The Ascent of a Venetian Humanist*. By Gareth D. Williams. New York: Oxford University Press, 2017. 402 pp. \$65. In this erudite volume one finds an elegant translation and modern critical edition of Pietro Bembo’s *De Aetna* (1496). Beyond these already valuable assets, Williams sets Bembo’s dialogue within three important (and seemingly different) contexts: a literary tradition of conceptualizing the natural world that spanned millennia, specific transformations in Venetian political values right around the year 1500, and developments in humanistic and print culture across the Renaissance centuries. Along the way, we also get new purchase on early modern conceptions of collecting.

At the heart of Williams’s analysis, however, lies what he terms the “Etna Idea.” Far more than connecting references to this singular mountain, Williams conducts a rigorous diachronic analysis of conversations about nature and landscape (including theories and practices of mountaineering) that stretches from Pindar to Empedocles and Epicurus, then reaches to Virgil and Lucretius, and from there extends into medieval and early humanist writing (Petrarch’s ascent receives sustained attention), and finally digs into Bembo’s immediate milieu and his particular interventions. Listening in on this long and somewhat acrimonious conversation, we might think that we hear mythical and religious approaches vying with rational and “scientific” ones. As Williams points out, however, these perspectives collaborated as often as they competed, and some authorities (among them Pythagoras) voiced both (56)!

Williams also uses *De Aetna* to revisit tensions between political and literary honor in Venetian patrician culture during the last decades of the fifteenth century. In Bembo’s rebellious privileging of study over service to the Republic of the type his father shouldered, Williams locates emerging tensions between the civic emphasis of the Quattrocento *cursus honorum* and a sixteenth-century insistence on the value of literary and intellectual pursuits in their own right.

To understand Bembo's decisions, Williams reopens historiographical questions concerning the type of person a humanist education produced, whether more inclined to respect authority or to challenge it. In this line, he owes acknowledged debts to landmark studies by Anthony Grafton and Lisa Jardine, Margaret King, and Craig Kallendorf, among others. In Williams's claim that humanism instilled a rebellious spirit in Bembo, readers should also be aware that he aligns with recent research in the English context, especially by Lynn Enterline (*Shakespeare's Schoolroom: Rhetoric, Discipline, and Emotion*, Philadelphia, 2012) and Aysha Pollnitz (*Princely Education in Early Modern Britain*, Cambridge, 2015; paperback 2017).

Williams also traces developments in print technologies and marketing strategies, especially within Aldus Manutius's circle. Francesco Griffo's "Bembo" typeface rightly receives sustained attention, since its maiden voyage in Latin was none other than *De Aetna*. In truth, this historian found some of the interpretive riffs on "messaging" a bit of a stretch, particularly the one that situates the typeface and Bembo's mountain-climbing as comparable adventures in modernity (199–203). Still, "Bembo" as a medium clearly helped to accentuate *De Aetna's* novel messages.

Given that Williams befriends theory, I also found it odd that gender analysis played no role in his interpretive framework. *De Aetna* is a father-son dialogue, so perhaps it is not entirely surprising that the women of Bembo's family do not appear much in this study, beyond helping to date his writings (e.g., 170). Yet a problem of gender remains. Since Williams does not discuss Bembo's collaborations with and commitments to intellectual women—including the *letterate* with whom he conducted epistolary exchanges that ran to multiple print editions, and his preoccupation with the humanistic education of his daughter Elena—the reader misses the chance to consider that the masculine dynamic of *De Aetna* might be somewhat atypical of Bembo's oeuvre.

Quibbles aside, however, *Pietro Bembo on Etna* is an ambitious book that accomplishes a great deal. Classicists and early modernists alike will benefit from Williams's brilliant rendering of *De Aetna*, his meticulous tracing of the "Etna Idea," and his impressive leveraging of several scholarly literatures to excavate the poetic, scientific, and

historical layers of meaning in Bembo's brief but riveting dialogue. (Sarah Gwyneth Ross, Boston College)

◆ *Medievalism and Political Rhetoric in Humanist Historiography from the Low Countries (1515–1609)*. By Coen Maas. Proteus, 7. Turnhout: Brepols, 2018. xx + 540 pp. €125. As a result of the humanists' own self-definition, it has been a scholarly commonplace for generations that as part of their effort to effect a clean break with scholastic culture, Petrarch and his followers eschewed all things medieval. A growing number of studies of individual humanists and their works (e.g., Gianfrancesco Pico della Mirandola's *De adoratione*, reviewed in this issue of *NLN*, and Bruce McNair's *Cristoforo Landino: His Works and Thought*, forthcoming from Brill), however, have been revealing that the break was nowhere near as clean as the humanist propaganda suggests. *Medievalism and Political Rhetoric* takes this insight and spins out its implications in a key time and place within Renaissance humanism.

In his introduction, Maas explains very clearly what he intends to do and how he intends to do it:

In order to show in detail some of the intriguing ways in which early modern scholars related to the medieval past, I will study four humanist historians from the sixteenth-century Low Countries who all devoted a substantial part of their time to what was often regarded as a period of darkness: Reynier Snoy (1474/75–1537), Adrianus Barlandus (1486–1538), Petrus Divaeus (1536–81), and Janus Dousa Sr (1545–1605). The central idea of this book is that the choice of subject matter and the way the medieval past is represented in these authors' works can be explained, to a large degree, by the political context from which their writings originated and the political messages they wanted to convey. (4–5).

As one would hope in a 540-page study, Maas offers important observations within the four case studies on which his argument rests. Snoy's *Historia Hollandie*, for example, highlights the theme of liberty in the first full-blown humanist narrative history in the Low Countries, in contrast to Barlandus's *Cronica Brabantiae ducum*, which seems to back

up the Habsburg dukes and their autocratic ideology, while Divaeus's *Commentarii seu annales* and Dousa's *Annales* argue for the legitimacy of the Dutch Revolt and defend the supremacy of the States. These works are not well known, to say the least, and Maas has done a good thing in working through them and using them to provide insight into a turbulent period in the history of the Low Countries.

To my mind, however, the real value of the book lies in its methodology. It participates in several emerging trends in Neo-Latin studies, beginning with the revaluation of the relationship between humanism and the medieval past and including a discussion of how humanist historiography written in Latin relates to vernacular work in the same genre (chapter 8). Those readers who have been attending the last few congresses of the International Association for Neo-Latin Studies are aware of the musings of Hans Helander and Toon Van Hal on Meta-Neo-Latin as a stimulus to think more deeply about method, but Maas is correct when he states that literary theory, which has reshaped so many other areas in the humanities, has found it surprisingly difficult to gain a foothold in Neo-Latin studies. I suspect that Ranke's view of history as the effort to recover "what had actually happened" ("wie es eigentlich gewesen," qtd. on 13) has rather fewer adherents today than Maas seems to think, but it is one thing to acknowledge in principle that the historian's work is not purely objective and quite another to examine how this unfolds in practice. Maas does this, and does it well, by asking how history functions "as a form of communication aimed at persuading the contemporary reader of the historian's message: the historian describes the past for a particular audience on a particular occasion and, in all probability, for a particular purpose" (15). A generation ago this might have led to an analysis of historical writing based in the techniques of classical rhetoric, and to be sure some of those techniques are used in *Medievalism and Political Rhetoric*, but from within the broader framework of narrative theory. Maas also turns to some of the same theorists that he relies on here (e.g., Roland Barthes and Gérard Genette) to show how a careful use of intertextuality can help us unpack historical writing as a literary construct rather than a search for objective truth.

I would not, however, want to leave the impression that this volume is an exercise in high theory; as Maas put it, "For the purposes of

this book, literary theory has proven useful in a rather more humble way—as a means to refine the questions that are posed, as an aid in recognizing aspects of texts that were previously not recognized, and as a source of vocabulary to describe textual phenomena” (18). Maas’s real interest is not in methodology per se, but in how thinking about how we do what we are doing before we start doing it can help us see things about Renaissance medievalism that we might not otherwise see, like the use of periodization as a rhetorical tool, the role of the classical heritage in how the humanists viewed the Middle Ages, and the appropriation of medieval forms and ideas within early modern political debates. Once Maas’s theoretical position has been staked out and he has generated the questions he wants to ask, he provides extended passages of *explication de texte* that will also satisfy his most traditionally minded readers. The result is a valuable book that, like Susanna de Beer’s *The Poetics of Patronage: Poetry as Self-Advancement in Giannantonio Campano* (Turnhout, 2013) in the same series and Christoph Pieper’s *Elegos redolere Vergiliosque sapere: Cristoforo Landinos “Xandra” zwischen Liebe und Gesellschaft* (Hildesheim, 2008), exemplifies the way in which the work being done at the University of Leiden can use modern theory to support traditional philology as a way to bring Neo-Latin studies into the twenty-first century. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Schriften zur Dialektik und Rhetorik / Principal Writings on Dialectic and Rhetoric: Principal Writings on Rhetoric*. By Philipp Melanchthon. Edited by William P. Weaver, Stefan Strohm, and Volkhard Wels. Philipp Melanchthon Opera omnia, Opera philosophica, 2/2. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2017. LIV + 594 pp. €129.95. Ostensibly this book offers an edition of the most important works of rhetoric by Philipp Melanchthon. ‘Most important’ in this context includes the freestanding books on rhetorical theory and practice that were meant primarily for classroom use, but not, for example, Melanchthon’s commentary on the works of Cicero or the speeches he gave that can be seen as examples of applied rhetoric. ‘Ostensibly’ is meant to suggest that the texts are indeed presented, but that Weaver’s volume introduction is just as important, for it serves as a work of scholarship in its own right that is designed to provide for the first time a clear

understanding of Melanchthon's contribution to this crucial discipline.

As a sort of bonus, this volume contains a reedition of the *Dispositiones rhetoricae* (1553), Melanchthon's entry into the genre of *progymnasmata*, or prose composition exercises. This work was edited, and edited well, by Hanns Zwicker in 1911, so it was simply brought within the orthographical and punctuation guidelines of the *Opera philosophica* and reprinted. The problems center around the other three works in the volume: *De rhetorica libri tres* (1519), *Institutiones rhetoricae* (1521), and *Elementorum rhetorices libri duo* (1531, rev. 1539). The last of these works was published in 1846 in the *Corpus Reformatorum* edition of Melanchthon's *Opera omnia*, but the other two were not; they are both widely described in scholarship of the last 150 years as earlier "versions" or "editions" of the *Elementa rhetorices*. In part this is the result of an evolution in standards within the field of bibliographical and textual studies, so that more and more scholars have accepted the idea that when an author works within the same discipline over a period of years, the result is better seen as a series of discrete works than as deviations from an original authorial version, a sort of Platonic form, that never actually existed. It has also become clear, however, that many of the references to "versions" and "editions" of a single work were produced by scholars who had never read carefully the different texts that Melanchthon actually wrote. *De rhetorica*, for example, contains three books devoted to the principal duties of the orator (invention, disposition, and style), with didactic themes included within the demonstrative genre and Agricola's influence evident in the blending of logic with rhetoric and in the effort to teach through literary examples. The *Institutiones rhetoricae* draws from different sources, treats the first three duties of the orator in a more balanced way, and introduces an innovative doctrine of style that appears to have influenced sixteenth-century treatments of the schemes and tropes. The *Elementa rhetorices* in turn is the only work to have been written specifically to complement a textbook on logic; here judgment, which had been introduced in the *Institutiones rhetoricae* as one of the duties of the orator, appears to have been elevated to the end goal of rhetorical instruction. Its emphasis on controversy and judging written disputations, in contrast to the focus on composition and teaching in Melanchthon's earlier work, gives the *Elementa*

rhetorices a special place in the history of rhetoric (Gadamer described it as the first work of rhetorical hermeneutics). All of this is explained with admirable clarity in the volume introduction by William Weaver.

Weaver edited the *Institutiones rhetoricae* and the *Dispositiones aliquot rhetoricae*, with the presentation of *De rhetorica* being overseen by Stefan Strohm and *Elementa rhetorices* by Volkhard Wels. Each section has been presented carefully in accordance with the general principles of the series, beginning with an “Editorial Report” that serves as an introduction to the text being presented and offers information about how it was edited. This is followed by the text itself, with one apparatus containing textual variants and another containing references to sources. Relevant secondary literature is cited, and there are four indices, of Biblical references, citations, names, and terms. The texts are in Latin, but the paratextual material is divided between English (Weaver) and German (Strohm and Wels).

James J. Murphy, one of the pioneer scholars of Renaissance rhetoric, used to give talks that referred to a thousand unknown primary texts in this field. The fact that Melanchthon had written on rhetoric was hardly unknown, but until this volume appeared, it was difficult if not impossible even to say how many principal works on rhetoric he had written, much less to find a modern text of them. Weaver, Strohm, and Wels are therefore to be commended for straightening out a bibliographical mess and for presenting a first-rate edition of their material. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Dialogus de adoratione*. By Gianfrancesco Pico della Mirandola. Edited with an introduction by Alessia Contarino. Centro internazionale di cultura ‘Giovanni Pico della Mirandola,’ Studi Pichiani, 18. Florence: Leo S. Olschki editore, 2017. XII + 167 pp. €25. The subject of this book is the little dialogue *De adoratione*, by Gianfrancesco Pico della Mirandola (1470–1533), son of Galeotto I Pico, ruler of Mirandola, and nephew of Giovanni Pico della Mirandola, author of the famous *Oration on the Dignity of Man*. *De adoratione* is much less famous than the *Oration*, but as Contarino shows, it is worthy of attention in its own right.

The subject of this dialogue is the veneration of images. What makes it of special interest is the moment in which it was written (it

was completed at the beginning of 1524) and what it can tell us about how the church in Italy dealt with the religious upheavals caused by Luther in the years immediately after his break with Catholicism. Luther and his followers called into question the traditional practices of venerating saints, to which Pico responded by affirming the necessity of turning to images as a path to the contemplation of God, although he stressed that what mattered was an interior, spiritual practice, not an exterior, superficial veneration. Many of Pico's ideas were traditional—his foundation was solidly Dominican and Thomist, and his links with Savonarola were profound—and passages in which Luther is excoriated for being the devil had already become commonplaces. Nevertheless the work provides profound insights into the Italian church at a crucial moment and into its relationship with German Catholics. The principal inspiration for *De adoratione*, for example, was Nicolaus Schönberg, the Archbishop of Capua, who also served as one of the protagonists in the dialogue and the mouthpiece of Pico, and Pico was well aware of the iconoclastic controversies that rocked Germany and Switzerland in the early 1520s. *De adoratione* positioned itself in these controversies as a defense of orthodoxy, by arguing in favor of what Pico claimed were the original worship practices of the apostolic church. The gesture backward, however, was carefully calibrated: a syncretism like the Christianizing Neoplatonism of Ficino was not what Pico had in mind, to the extent that pagan statues of mythological divinities were presented as being just as dangerous as Luther and his diabolical ideas.

De adoratione is also important for the light it sheds on the relationship between Pico's family and the church. His uncle Giovanni had written a work entitled *Conclusiones apologales Ioannis Pici Mirandulani*, whose third *conclusio*, on the veneration of the cross and the image of Christ, had been attacked in Pietro Garsias's *Determinationes magistrales Petri Garsie contra Conclusiones apologales Ioannis Pici Mirandulani* and declared scandalous and offensive. Gianfrancesco responded by writing an apology in defense of his uncle that was never published and does not survive, but whose general contours can be recovered from the *De adoratione*, since this work repeats the general arguments about the *adoratio crucis* that had been set forth in the lost apology. In this way Gianfrancesco was able both to defend

his uncle against the accusation of heresy and to make what he felt was an important case for the proper kind of worship.

De adoratione was never published, and we can only speculate about why: did an opportunity not present itself? Did Gianfrancesco decide that its connections with the German church had become too dangerous? Did he fear that his ideas were too moderating, or too closely tied to Savonarola? We will never know, but we can be grateful to Contarino for transcribing the work and providing an annotated translation and a nice bibliography. One can quibble a bit, I suppose—an eighty-one-page introduction for a twenty-eight-page text might appear a little excessive, and in fact the preface would have benefited from some trimming and editing—but gratitude is a more appropriate response than carping. Not every Neo-Latin text merits a modern edition, but one that was born at the moment when the church in Italy could have gone down Luther's path does. We can now understand a little better why it did not. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *The Correspondence of Erasmus, Letters 2472 to 2634, April 1531–March 1532.* Translated by Charles Fantazzi and annotated by James M. Estes. *Collected Works of Erasmus*, 18. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2018. xxii + 422 pp. \$200. The letters translated in this volume chronicle a year in which Erasmus's principal concern was the fear that the religious controversy in Germany and Switzerland would erupt into war. He was living during this period in Freiburg im Breisgau, and while he had good friends there, freedom from responsibilities to a princely court, and the opportunity to practice his Catholic faith securely, the uncertainty of the political situation was accompanied by an upheaval in his living situation. The latter problem was eventually resolved through a complicated and expensive change in residences, but resolving the broader issues proved even more challenging. Catholic critics like Agostino Steuco, Alberto Pio, and Noël Bédá continued to berate him as the source of the Lutheran heresy, and his protestations to the contrary accomplished little if anything during this period. The situation was exasperated by the fact that his former friends in the evangelical camp continued to claim that he was the source of their unacceptable views. Particularly distressing in this

area was Erasmus's relationship with Martin Bucer, whom Erasmus succeeded in getting expelled from Strasbourg but who argued that the logic of Erasmus's position should have led him into the evangelical camp. The longest letter in this volume (Ep. 2615) contains Erasmus's response to Bucer, in which he explained point by point his doctrinal differences with the reformers, but he never published the letter and there is no evidence that Bucer ever saw it. Given these problems, it is not surprising that at least by his standards, Erasmus did not produce a great deal of pure scholarship during this year; more interesting is the insight into his financial affairs that is offered by the sixteen letters between him and his friend Erasmus Schets, who was overseeing this part of his life for him.

This volume contains 163 letters. Eighty-five were written by Erasmus and seventy-seven were sent to him by others, with one written by a third party at Erasmus's request. These surviving letters contain references to more than a hundred others that are no longer extant, and since some of the references are to more than one letter, a cautious estimate would be that at least 285 letters were written during this year. Erasmus himself published thirty-eight of the surviving letters, while fifty were first published by P. S. Allen, the modern editor of Erasmus's correspondence whose edition provides the basis for the CWE translations and annotations. As is always the case with CWE volumes, this one offers a clear, readable translation, and the annotations strike a good balance between concision and fullness of explanation. My only complaint has to do with the price of the volume. While a couple of the books reviewed in this issue of *NLN* sell for over \$100, many remain within the economic reach of most scholars, so that even in the midst of the current crisis in scholarly publishing, \$200 is a hefty price, which becomes especially distressing when one realizes that CWE is a series that contains dozens of volumes. Erasmus himself had a keen eye for the commercial end of scholarly publishing, but I suspect that even he would disapprove of what his works are selling for now. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Parables on a Roman Comic Stage: Samarites – Comoedia de Samaritano Evangelico* (1539) by *Petrus Papeus*. Together with the *Commentary of Alexius Vanegas of Toledo* (1542). Introduction, edi-

tion, and translation by Daniel Nodes. *Drama and Theatre in Early Modern Europe*, 7. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2017. xvi + 375 pp. \$148.00. Neo-Latin drama is in vogue. In the recent *Guide to Neo-Latin Literature*, the once rather neglected genre of Neo-Latin drama, and Jesuit theater in particular, has been labelled “one of the most active areas of Neo-Latin research.”¹ The area is vast indeed, with much work remaining to be done. A truly European phenomenon from the fifteenth through the eighteenth centuries, these Latin tragedies in the wake of Seneca and comedies modelled on Plautus and Terence were mostly written and performed within the context of schools, colleges, and universities and were considered a central part of humanist education. Not only did the students get a chance to hone their *Latinitas* and skills in public speaking, but they were also supposed to learn valuable lessons from these often morally edifying school plays. Not surprisingly, these moral messages were frequently drawn from the Bible.

Daniel Nodes has made a valuable contribution to the study of Neo-Latin drama by editing, translating, and analyzing one such Biblical play, *Samarites*, written by the Flemish schoolmaster Petrus Papeus and performed by the students of his school in Menen (now mostly known for giving its name to the Menin Gate) in 1537.² Papeus’s only known play is exceptional on several accounts: remarkably popular for a school play (going through six printings from 1539 to 1542), *Samarites* was the very first Neo-Latin play about the Good Samaritan, as well as one of the first (and few) plays to receive an elaborate humanist commentary, by the Spanish scholar Alejo Vanegas. This commentary has also been transcribed and translated (a rare phenomenon indeed), making this book interesting for students of Renaissance commentaries as well. Yet the title *Samarites* (The Good Samaritan) is rather misleading, as the comedy actually consists of a conflation of two popular Biblical parables: those of the Prodigal Son and of the Good Samaritan. Thus Papeus

1 N. Griffin, “Drama,” in *A Guide to Neo-Latin Literature*, ed. V. Moul (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 229–30.

2 Against all editions, Nodes writes “ex Athenaeo Meminiiano” instead of “Meniniano” (68).

applied the principle of *contaminatio* so typical of Roman comedy to his Biblical sources. Moreover, the Samaritan only comes into play in the final act, so that the vast majority of the drama actually centers around the Prodigal Son, who is called Aegio. In Papeus's reimagining, the Prodigal Son turns out to be the fallen traveler who is helped out by the Samaritan. The son therefore does not crawl back to his father full of contrition as in Gospel of Luke, but is saved by the Samaritan (i.e., the representation of Jesus Christ in the parable). Downplaying the role of contrition and emphasizing the importance of divine providence via the Church, *Samarites* is considered to be a Catholic counterpart of *Acolastus*, the immensely popular Prodigal Son play by the Protestant playwright Gnapheus from just a few years earlier.

Nodes's introduction focuses predominantly on the patristic and medieval exegetical background of the stories. Any literary or stylistic analysis of this Bible play in Roman dress—Papeus makes use of the typical style and stock characters of ancient Roman comedy—remains quite superficial.³ It is a pity that he did not discuss in greater detail the place of *Samarites* within the wider network of Neo-Latin drama. It is not clear, for instance, whether there is any intertextual relationship with Gnapheus's *Acolastus* or Macropedius's *Asotus*, or with any of the many other Prodigal Son plays, for that matter. A quick glance at Jean-Marie Valentin's repertory of Jesuit plays from the German-speaking countries, for instance, shows that almost sixty Prodigal Son plays have been attested (the story of the Good Samaritan did not seem as popular).⁴ It might have been interesting to investigate whether any of these betray any indebtedness to Papeus.

Although there are hardly any real typos (e.g., "Papeus, *Samarites*" instead of "Papeus's *Samarites*" (4); "hierarchy" (55)), it does seem that the text could have used a second review. The main problem with this (rather expensive) book is its overall inconsis-

³ On 22, Nodes makes the odd observation that Terence wrote *fabulae palliatae* and Plautus *fabulae togatae*, whereas both belonged to the former genre.

⁴ J. M. Valentin, *Le théâtre des Jésuites dans les pays de langue allemande: répertoire chronologique des pièces représentées et des documents conservés (1555-1773)* (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1983-1984).

tency and sloppiness. The Benedictine writer Heiric is called Hieric the second time he is mentioned (15–16); the quotation style mixes anglicized place names (9 n. 19: “Turin”) and original place names (21 n. 32: “Torino”), or creates non-existent names (22 n. 33: “Turnholt” for “Turnhout”); and the style of referring to acts and scenes (e.g., “actus primi scaena secunda,” that is, genitive + nominative) is suddenly abandoned on 210 (“actus primus scaena tertia”). Nor does Nodus stay true to his *ratio edendi*: although he claims to use classical orthography “for the inconsistent use of *e* for *ae* and *oe*,” for instance, he fails to restore “seculum” to “saeculum” (78), “irritate” to “irritatae” (80), “scenae” to “scaenae” (100), or “hibleos” to “Hyblaeos” (106); and he writes “sychophanta” (84) while all editions that I have been able to consult (A, T, C1 and C2 are available on Google Books) contain “sycophanta.”⁵ Words appear in italics for no apparent reason (“splendid,” 113), are entirely misplaced (“iam” in the English translation on 143), open verses without being capitalized (“in,” 154), or remain untranslated (“Devil Leno” instead of “Devil Procurer” on 77). Most inconsistent of all, however, is the use of consonantal ‘u’ for ‘v’; the examples of random application of this choice are endless, both in the play and in the commentary. The commentary itself is anything but user-friendly. Published as an appendix, both the Latin text and its translation are presented as one continuous text. It would have been better to cross-reference Vanegas’s comments in the edition of the play itself, so the reader at least knows when something is commented upon. At times, the 1542 commentary, presented as *scholia* or glosses next to the text, is even more accessible than its modern edition. The inconsistency continues with regard to the lemmata in the translation: sometimes they remain in Latin, sometimes they are translated, and sometimes they are translated with the Latin in brackets. The translation could have used another revision as well; to quote just one example: “And so a dimeter (...) is nothing other than than a verse made of only two measures, which, if it were to be named by the number of feet, it would receive the name quaternian” (181).

5 C2 being the basis for his transcription.

All in all, with this publication on a so-called first-generation Neo-Latin playwright from the Southern Low Countries, an area that has remained relatively understudied in this context, Nodes has made a valuable contribution for scholars of Neo-Latin drama and Renaissance commentaries. (Nicholas De Sutter, KU Leuven)

◆ *L'université, la robe et la librairie à Paris. Claude Mignault et le Syntagma de Symbolis (1571–1602)*. Par Florence Vuilleumier Laurens. Travaux d'Humanisme et Renaissance, 577. Genève: Droz, 2017. 332 pp. €49. Cet ouvrage constitue la réponse à une lacune constatée par Florence Vuilleumier il y a un peu plus de vingt ans, mais que les quelques travaux plus récents sur le sujet n'ont pu complètement démentir : jusqu'à ce jour, la littérature secondaire a surtout étudié Claude Mignault (1536–1606) à travers son monumental commentaire savant des *Emblemata* d'Alciat ; elle a néanmoins le plus souvent ignoré le *Traité des symboles*, pourtant porteur d'importantes implications théoriques, qui préface le livre dès l'édition de 1571. En outre, les chercheurs n'ont porté presque aucune attention aux états et accroissements successifs de ce texte liminaire dont l'élaboration se poursuit pourtant jusqu'en 1602.

Cette édition critique tente donc de remédier à ces insuffisances tout se positionnant dans la continuité directe d'investigations menées depuis la fin des années 1980 sur le sujet—la traduction du *Syntagma de symbolis* étant issue du mémoire de maîtrise de Fl. Vuilleumier—et jusqu'ici synthétisées dans le chapitre IV (« Claude Mignault éditeur et préfacier d'Alciat ») de *La raison des figures symboliques à la Renaissance et à l'âge classique* (2000). Amplifiant fortement cette recherche initiale, le présent ouvrage s'ouvre donc sur une introduction de près de cent cinquante pages divisée en quatre grandes sections.

Pour commencer, Fl. Vuilleumier réalise la première biographie approfondie de Claude Mignault, issue d'un impressionnant travail de dépouillement des sources. La carrière universitaire de l'auteur fait ainsi l'objet d'une étude permettant de mettre en lumière ses relations avec le milieu de l'édition et celui de la robe dont il fera lui-même partie ; ce faisant, l'auteure enrichit de façon non négligeable le tableau des institutions de la France humaniste sous les règnes d'Henri III et d'Henri IV. Sont également évoquées d'autres œuvres minoennes

moins importantes qui éclairent une conception du commentaire de texte non seulement grammairienne, mais aussi morale et historico-culturelle.

La deuxième partie complète ce constat en situant Claude Mignault dans l'évolution du commentaire de textes, à partir d'un rappel des grands jalons de l'évolution du commentaire à la Renaissance. Une analyse pointue de la méthode minoenne, dans ses volets à la fois théorique et pratique, met en lumière comment Mignault mobilise aussi bien la face humaniste que ramusienne de la pratique du commentaire, pour enfin s'attarder plus longuement sur les spécificités du commentaire des *Emblemata*, dont l'essentiel est constitué en premier lieu par le travail érudit d'identification des sources, suivi de l'éclaircissement de la pensée de l'auteur.

La troisième section retrace l'évolution du *Syntagma* depuis sa première édition en 1571, en décrivant les spécificités des sept éditions qui se succèdent jusqu'en 1602. Dégageant à partir de cette dernière version le plan général de l'œuvre, l'auteure aborde dans la quatrième et dernière étape de l'introduction les enjeux théoriques du *Syntagma*, organisés autour du concept fédérateur du symbole. Elle met ainsi en lumière les apports de Mignault, en particulier sa description spécifique de l'emblème, à savoir l'appartenance de l'image au passé gréco-latin ainsi que l'introduction du sens métaphorique ou métonymique du terme *emblema* en tant que poème descriptif de cette image. Comme héritage direct de Mignault dans le domaine de la théorie emblématique, on trouve l'insertion de l'espèce « emblème » dans le genre « symbole », l'illustration de la signification de quelques hiéroglyphes, l'énumération devenue canonique des sept acceptions du mot symbole et la distinction entre les divers modes ou types d'emblèmes (historiques, physiques, éthiques). Ces éléments, qu'on retrouve ensuite chez d'autres théoriciens, témoignent du statut d'autorité de Mignault et de sa postérité.

Vient enfin l'édition critique présentant en double page le texte latin et sa traduction française. Les notes de bas de page indiquent les différentes leçons, tandis que les commentaires à la traduction, à nouveau très complets, s'étendent sur vingt pages en fin d'ouvrage. Travail érudit à l'image de celui qu'il commente, l'ouvrage de Fl. Vuilleumier a le grand mérite de faciliter et de promouvoir l'accès à l'une

des figures fondatrices de la théorie et du commentaire emblématique en France. (Elise Gérardy, Catholic University Louvain (French))

◆ *Apta compositio: formes du texte latin au Moyen Age et à la Renaissance*. Edited by Christiane Deloince-Louette, Martine Furno, and Valérie Méot-Bourquin. Cahiers d'humanisme et Renaissance, 146. Geneva: Droz, 2017. 481 pp. €69. The papers presented here originated at a conference held at the Université Grenoble-Alpes in June, 2015. The subject was the forms in which Latin texts of the Middle Ages and Renaissance were presented, with the intention being to use techniques derived from the history of the book, the history of ideas, and the history of rhetoric to study the formal disposition of works, in manuscript or in print, during a period in which Latin largely dominated the production of scholarly and literary texts. Derived from the work of Henri-Jean Martin and Lucien Febvre, these kinds of issues have been studied with increasing intensity since the early seventies, from which it has become clear that the privileging of humanist script and the strategic placement of white space contributed to an increased legibility and a growing number of readers as the Middle Ages gave way to the Renaissance. But center stage in this research has been occupied by books written in the vernacular, so that the editors have set out to explore the extent to which books written in Latin reflect the same tendencies as those written in other languages. As the editors explain, “Les contributions réunies dans ce volume s’articulent selon quatre problématiques: celle de la mise en forme matérielle (support du texte, disposition typographique); celle de la composition d’ensemble (disposition rhétorique); celle de la langue (le latin, au Moyen Age surtout à la Renaissance, s’inscrit dans un contexte de bilinguisme, en témoignent les nombreuses transformations des textes induites par les pratiques de traduction ou d’adaptation); et celle de la réception (réorientation des intentions initiales par transposition dans d’autres recueils ou déplacement à l’intérieur d’une même oeuvre). Ces problématiques, complémentaires, sont abordées à travers des séries d’études de cas, disposées sous les trois rubriques suivantes: mises en page, mises en ordre, mises en oeuvre, la question de la langue, transversale, intéressant chacune des trois à des titres divers” (10).

The volume opens with two general essays, by Christine Noille and Brigitte Gauvin, that offer a new numerical approach to texts and describe a project that has been executed and made available on line. The first of the three major sections, "Mises en page," begins with an essay by Estelle Ingrand-Varenne that explores the placement of texts on funeral monuments; it is followed by two essays by Cécile Conduché and Francine Mora that show how the visual representation of the text on the page orients how it is read and used, then by two more written by Elie Borza and Max Engammare that focus on the title pages of printed books viewed from a diachronic perspective. The next section, "Mises en ordre," contains seven essays that focus on how a text is organized, composed, and set out, ranging from typographical disposition and marginal annotations to reading guides and the placement of poems in a collection. Danièle James-Raoul and Alice Lamy examine medieval texts, showing in turn how the arts of poetry and a commentary on Plato's *Timaeus* deal with questions of ordering. In the sixteenth century, principles of ordering open up ways of reading a text, as Thomas Pengilly shows with Alciato's emblem book. Two other essays focus on marginal notes, with Claude La Charité demonstrating that in the 1532 edition of Galen and Hippocrates, Rabelais' marginalia helped direct attention to the Greek as the source of a stable, precise text and Christiane Deloince-Louette showing how the notes in annotated translations of the *Iliad* guided the reader to an interpretation that focused on principles of rhetoric and poetics. Martine Furno shows how Robert Estienne used the ordering of texts to defend his life and works against censure from the Paris theologians, while Paule Demoulière argues that the placement of poems written in Latin in multilingual collections helps us understand how these poems took on a more and more ornamental function over the course of time. The final section, "Mises en oeuvre," concentrates on how texts were transformed in the service of new intentions or new works. Marie-Geneviève Grossel and Valérie Fasseur examine how medieval Latin works were refashioned when they were translated into the vernacular, while Florent Coste shows how Latin compilations from the second half of the Middle Ages were being continuously restructured and rewritten. Anne Raffarin and Anne-Pascale Pouey-Mounou tease out how this same principle of fluidity helps us appreciate certain

Latin texts composed by Italian antiquarians at the beginning of the sixteenth century, while Laurence Boulègue and Lucie Claire explore what happened when new editorial interventions repurposed old texts. The volume concludes with a solid bibliography of relevant primary and secondary sources.

This substantial collection, which extends to almost five hundred pages, signals a valuable effort to apply the principles of book history to Neo-Latin studies. I suspect that some readers will find the organizational structure of the volume a bit strained, and the inclusion of a couple of the essays in a volume with this theme to be somewhat problematic, but the individual case studies have been expanded beyond the twenty-minute conference paper into substantive chapters that are well worth reading and offer a model for further work in Neo-Latin from this perspective. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Théories poétiques néo-latines*. Edited by Virginie Leroux and Émilie Séris. Texte courant, 6. Geneva: Droz, 2018. LVIII + 1166 pp. €18.90. This anthology, more the size of a brick than the cinderblock to which Mangraviti's edition was compared in the review above, but still quite substantial, reflects the importance given to reflections about poetry and its nature in Neo-Latin culture. After a fifty-page general introduction, *Théories poétiques néo-latines* gives us forty-seven texts, divided into five chapters, each preceded by a substantive introduction that highlights the key issues being examined in the chapter and sets up an informed reading of the successive texts.

Chapter 1 is devoted to how Neo-Latin theorists argued for the legitimation of poetry. This was a serious issue, with opposition beginning in antiquity, extending through the Middle ages, and continuing into the early Renaissance. The chapter introduction begins with the debates about the status of poetry in antiquity (Plato and Aristotle, the defenses of poetry in ancient Rome, and Christianity) and then moves to an analysis of why the humanists needed to defend this activity, which they did by constituting a new discipline, then by writing treatises to justify it. They did this by focusing on the religious role of poetry, its civic and political utility, and its function. These points are supported by extracts from Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini's *Epistolarum liber*, Cristoforo Landino's *Praefatio in Virgilio*, Poggio Bracciolini's

De infelicitate principum, Giovanni Boccaccio's *Genealogie deorum*, Pietro Crinito's *De poetis Latinis*, Josse Bade's *Praenotamenta* to his commentary on Terence, Girolamo Fracastoro's *Naugerius*, Antonio Minturno's *De poeta*, and Julius Caesar Scaliger's *Poetices libri septem*.

Chapter 2 is devoted to the crucial topic of inspiration. Once again, the introductory discussion goes back to the ancient models, with nods to Plato and Aristotle, the *vates*, rhetoric, and Christianity. Space is devoted next to the humanist representations of the *furor divinus*, as elucidated through divine election, Neoplatonism, the divinities of inspiration, and the *daimon-genius*; this is followed by a discussion of the poetic temperament, as seen in melancholy, the *calor subitus*, and innate talent, and a consideration of whether poetry is the result of natural talent or art, as seen in the contrast between inspiration and imitation and in the conditions necessary for inspiration. The supporting texts for this section are Giovanni Boccaccio, *Genealogie deorum*, Marsilio Ficino, the argument to the *Ion*, the letter to Peregrino Agli, and *De vita*, Giovanni Pontano, *Actius*, Julius Caesar Scaliger, *Poetices libri septem*, Philipp Melanchthon, *De anima commentarius*, Marco Girolamo Vida, *De arte poetica*, Vadian, *De poetica et carminis ratione*, Angelo Poliziano, *Oratio super Fabio Quintiliano et Statii Sylvis*, and Giovanni Antonio Viperano, *De poetica*.

Chapter 3 picks up on a thread from the preceding section and discusses imitation. Since humanist thought looked instinctively back to antiquity, this section again begins with a survey of its theme in ancient culture, beginning with the dialogues of Plato and Aristotle's *Poetics*, then moving toward the definition of an ancient model and a discussion of *veri similia* and *decorum* in Horace, and concluding with later ancient elaborations. A subsection on imitating the ancients focuses on rhetoric, especially Cicero, on canons, and on methods, with a final subsection on imitation and fiction that touches on versification, probability, and the convergence between *imitatio auctorum* and *mimesis*. Neo-Latin excerpts come from Petrarch, *Familiarium rerum*, Angelo Poliziano, *Epistolae*, Giovanni Pico della Mirandola, *Epistolae*, Giovanfrancesco Pico della Mirandola and Pietro Bembo, *De imitatione*, Erasmus, *Ciceronianus*, Julius Caesar Scaliger, *Poetices libri septem*, Bartolommeo Ricci, *De imitatione*, Paolo Giovio, *Dialogus de viris et foeminis aetate nostra Florentibus*, and Iacobus Pontanus,

Poeticarum institutionum libri tres.

The next chapter is devoted to the poetic genres. As we have come to expect by now, the introduction begins with an overview of ancient genre theory: Plato and Aristotle, the Roman contribution, and the grammatical tradition. The next subsections are devoted to genre theory in the first humanist treatises, the influence of Aristotle's *Poetics*, and what the editors call 'the politics of genre,' i.e., classification and hierarchy. Supporting texts come from Bartolommeo Fonzio, *De poetice*, Francisco Robortello, *Eorum omnium, quae ad methodum et artificium scribendi epigrammatis spectant, explicatio*, Vincenzo Maggi, *De ridiculis*, Marc-Antoine Muret, *Scholia in Propertium*, Antonio Sebastiano Minturno, *De poeta*, Julius Caesar Scaliger, *Poeticæ libri septem*, Giovanni Antonio Viperano, *De poetica libri tres*, Antonio Riccoboni, *Ex Aristotele Ars comica*, and Iacobus Pontanus, *Poeticarum institutionum libri tres*.

The final chapter covers the relationship of poetry to the other arts, which was an important topic during this period. The first subsection is devoted to pre-Renaissance approaches to this subject: Greek theories about education and knowledge, the liberal arts in Rome, Middle Platonism and the preparation of a system, the Neoplatonic cycle of the arts, and the arts within scholasticism. Next comes an overview of the *studia humanitatis*: the dispute over the arts, philology, grammatical reform, the Jesuit *ratio studiorum*, and encyclopedism. The final subsection considers the universality and specificity of the art of poetry, as seen in the arguments for the supremacy of poetry, poetry and the *trivium*, and poetry within the *quadrivium* and the mechanical arts. Relevant texts come from Albertino Mussato, *Epistolae*, Cristoforo Landino, *In P. Vergilii interpretationes prohemium*, Girolamo Savonarola, *Apologeticus de ratione poeticae artis*, Agostino Nifo, *De amore*, Lorenza Valla, *Elegantiae linguae Latinae*, Giovanni Pontano, *Actius*, Marco Girolamo Vida, *De arte poetica*, Coluccio Salutati, *De laboribus Herculis*, Leon Battista Alberti, *De pictura*, and Pomponius Gauricus, *De sculptura*.

Someone who sits down to do an anthology like this faces a number of significant obstacles. The first is the sheer quantity of material: Bernard Weinberg restricted himself to Italian treatises of the sixteenth century only and produced four volumes that extended beyond a

thousand pages. Second is what we might call ‘the Italian bias’—that is, the temptation to immerse one’s self in the voluminous Italian material, which is where the action began, and stay there, ignoring what happened when the art of poetry became a European-wide phenomenon. Finally, the number of first-rate theorists and treatises is so great that even a doorstop of an anthology could stay there and never get to the interesting new ideas that came from less famous writers. The editors of this anthology have overcome all of these obstacles, having made a judicious selection from the mass of material that, to be sure, retains an inevitable Italian flavor but includes non-Italians like Melanchthon and some fairly obscure writers like Pomponius Gauricus. When I sat down to write an encyclopedia article about this material twenty years ago, hardly any new work was being done with it. Since then, however, as a glance at my bibliography in Oxford Bibliographies Online—Renaissance and Reformation (<http://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/abstract/document/obo-9780195399301/obo-9780195399301-0396.xml?rskey=vhkfSZ&result=12>, accessed 22 October 2018) shows, the field has taken on new life. The anthology under review here is therefore most welcome, both for the scholar working there and for someone who would like to teach a course over this key moment in the history of literary criticism. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Florilegium recentiores Latinitatis*. Edited by Milena Minkova. *Supplementa humanistica Lovaniensia*, 43. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2018. XIV + 289 pp. €59.50. This anthology contains forty-three texts, mostly excerpts, which illustrate the range of literary Latin that was produced from the fourteenth through the beginning of the twenty-first century. Included are Francesco Petrarca, *Epistulae ad Ciceronem*, *Epistula de ascensu Montis Ventosi*, *Africa*; Lorenzo Valla, *De elegantia linguae Latinae pooemium primum*; Giovanni Gioviano Pontano, *De amore coniugali: Naeniae*; Michele Marullo, *De laudibus Rhacusae*; Pietro Martire d’Anghiera, *De orbe novo*; Jacopo Sannazaro, *De partu Virginis*, *Galatea*; Giovanni Pico della Mirandola, *De dignitate hominis*; Desiderius Erasmus, *Stultitiae laus*, *Epistulae*, *Colloquium abbatis et eruditae*; Thomas More, *Utopia*; Girolamo Fracastoro, *De morbo Gallico*; Giulio Cesare della Scala, *Urbes*; Juan

Ginés de Sepúlveda, *De orbe novo*; Juan Luis Vives, *Linguae Latinae exercitatio: Corpus hominis exterius*; Philipp Melanchthon, *De laude vitae scholasticae oratio*; Nikolaus Wynmann, *Colymbetes*; Jan Everaerts, *Basia*; Juan Latino, *Ad catholicum et invictissimum regem Philippum elegia, Austrias*; Ogier Ghiselin de Busbecq, *Legationis Turcicae epistolae quatuor*; Marc-Antoine Muret, *Iulius Caesar*; Giovanni Pietro Maffei, *Historiae Indicae*; Iacobus Pontanus, *Progymnasmata Latinitatis sive dialogi*; Iustus Lipsius, *Epistulae ad Montanum, ad Iosephum Scaligerum*; Jacques-Auguste de Thou, *Historiae sui temporis*; Johannes Kepler, *Somnium seu de astronomia lunari*; John Barclay, *Argenis*; Hugo de Groot, *Mare liberum, Myrtilus sive Idyllium nauticum*; Thomas Hobbes, *De cive*; Matthias Casimirus, *Odae*; Jacob Balde, *Odae*; Anna Maria van Schurman, *De vitae humanae termino, Problema practicum: num feminae Christianae conveniat studium litterarum*; Pierre-Daniel Huet, *Iter Suecicum*; Ubertino da Carrara, *Columbus*; Ludvig Holberg, *Nicolai Klimii iter subterraneum*; Rafael Landivar, *Rusticatio Mexicana*; and Giovanni Pascoli, *Catullo calvos*.

Given the massive amount of material that was written in Latin during these centuries, the compiler of an anthology like this is faced with a series of agonizing choices about what to include or exclude. Not offering canonical texts like Petrarch's letter describing his ascent of Mt. Ventoux, Erasmus's *Praise of Folly*, and Thomas More's *Utopia* is unimaginable, but an anthology that contains only the old war horses, most of which are easily accessible elsewhere, will not achieve its potential. On the other hand, a *florilegium* that contains only material that is largely unknown even to specialists risks being seen as irrelevant for other reasons. In my opinion, Minkova's anthology strikes a good balance in this area and, by including authors from Africa, Poland, and Guatemala, it at least makes a gesture toward recognizing Neo-Latin as a world language. As a glance at recent programs from the congresses of the International Association for Neo-Latin Studies shows, much work has been done of late on Neo-Latin writers from central and eastern Europe, and I personally would have included a little more of that work in an anthology like this. Both the inclusion of a text by Anna Maria van Schurman, and the particular text selected, make a similar gesture toward women writers. Here the issues are more intractable, because the place of Neo-Latin in the early modern educational sys-

tem has tended to gender it male, but scholars like Brenda Hosington and Jane Stevenson have shown that there are notable exceptions to this generalization. I was also struck by the inclusion of only one writer from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries: to be sure, Latin continues to occupy a more and more marginal place in the general culture with each generation, but both poetry and prose are still being written in this language even now. Finally, a comparison of this anthology with, say, *Brill's Encyclopaedia of the Neo-Latin World*, edited by Philip Ford, Jan Bloemendal, and Charles Fantazzi, 2 vols. (Leiden, 2014) suggests that Minkova's vision of the field is more anchored in the literary orientation of its founder, Jozef IJsewijn, than in the expansive vision of today that recognizes that imaginative literature is only a part of what was produced in Neo-Latin over the centuries. But I am beginning, I fear, to sound more negative than I intend to be. Minkova did the work to prepare this anthology, and she did it well, which gives her the right to select the works that she thinks are important and to present them as she sees fit. Anyone who wants to teach a survey course in Neo-Latin will find more here than he or she can possibly get through in a semester, and both the compiler and the publisher deserve our thanks for creating an alternative to the course packet compiled in haste, and in violation of copyright laws, that has served as a textbook in this field for most of us. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *International Bibliography of Humanism and the Renaissance: A Multidisciplinary Bibliography of the Renaissance and the Early Modern Period (1500–1700)*. Available online from Brepols, http://www.brepols.net/pdf/Brepolis_BIHR_EN.pdf, accessed 22 October 2018. This bibliography is a continuation and expansion of the *Bibliographie internationale de l'Humanisme et de la Renaissance*, which was published by Librairie Droz since 1965. Work on the transfer began in 2013, and bibliographies for 2017 and 2018 are available in the new format. Over 300,000 entries have already been included, with 20,000 more appearing each year, taken from around 900 different journals. The focus is on European history and culture of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, including traditional fields like religious history and philosophy and less traditional ones like social and gender

studies. Interactions with the rest of the world through exploration, colonization, slavery, and missionary work move the project beyond Europe narrowly defined, and modern hermeneutics, reception studies, and the teaching of texts from the target period extend coverage chronologically as well.

This bibliography presents both the advantages and disadvantages that we have come to associate with digital research tools. The advantages offered by computerization are legion: the entries are searchable, compatible with OpenURL and thereby linked to full texts, and indexed via 120,000 index terms, with a thesaurus in both English and French and a multi-lingual interface, and there are numerous search fields (author, title, year of publication, subject, etc.) and export formats (EndNote, Zotero, RefWorks, and Word). Links also exist to encyclopedic works like the *International Encyclopaedia for the Middle Ages* and to permanent DOIs. This is all to the good, and Brepols is to be commended for adding this bibliography to several others it supports, extending back through the Middle Ages to *L'Année philologique*, which allows research in the humanities to extend through some two thousand years using resources available through the same publisher. All of this comes at a cost, however, which we know will be high when we see that the promotional material invites the interested reader to request a price quotation. Much time and effort, of course, has gone into preparing and maintaining a research tool like this, and it is only fair that the costs be recoverable. Ironically, however, the more bells and whistles the finished product contains, the fewer the number of people who will have access to it, and a library that considers subscribing will have to face the fact that the cost will be ongoing, to maintain the subscription. The result is that the gap between the handful of really major research libraries that can afford a bibliography like this and the other academic libraries whose mission also includes supporting faculty and student research is growing. The fact that *Humanistica Lovaniensia* discontinued its *Instrumentum bibliographicum* when it converted to an online, open-access version (<http://www.humanistica.be/index.php/humanistica>) confirms the fact that considerable resources are necessary to launch and maintain a bibliography that takes full advantage of everything that can be done in the digital environment and to gain access to the results. Readers of *Neo-Latin News* will find

much of value in the *International Bibliography of Humanism and the Renaissance*, but it comes at a considerable cost. If your library can afford it, it is a very valuable resource indeed; if not, then let us send our best wishes to the scholars and publishers who are struggling to find open access models that really work. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)