



**EVENTEENTH-**



**ENTURY**



**NEWS**

**FALL - WINTER 2022**

**Vol. 80**

**Nos. 3&4**

Including

**THE NEO-LATIN NEWS Vol. 70, Nos. 3&4**

---

# SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY NEWS

VOLUME 80, Nos. 3&4

FALL-WINTER, 2022

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 twice a year with the support of the English Department at Texas A&M University.

**SUBMISSIONS:** As a scholarly review journal, **SCN** publishes only commissioned reviews. A current style sheet, previous volumes' Tables of Contents, and other information all may be obtained via at [www.english.tamu.edu/scn/](http://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](mailto:d-dickson@tamu.edu)  
[scn.sites.tamu.edu](http://scn.sites.tamu.edu)  
and  
[oaktrust.library.tamu.edu/handle/1969.1/94990](http://oaktrust.library.tamu.edu/handle/1969.1/94990)

ISSN 0037-3028

# SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY NEWS

## EDITOR

DONALD R. DICKSON  
Texas A&M University

## ASSOCIATE EDITORS

LIVIA STOENESCU, TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY  
MICHELE MARRAPODI, UNIVERSITY OF PALERMO  
PATRICIA M. GARCÍA, UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS  
E. JOE JOHNSON, CLAYTON STATE UNIVERSITY

## NEO-LATIN NEWS

PATRICK M. OWENS, EDITOR  
ACADEMIA LATINITATIS FOVENDAE, DONNELLY COLLEGE

## WEBMASTER

MEGAN N. PEARSON, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

## CONTENTS

VOLUME 80, NOS. 3&4..... FALL-WINTER, 2022

### REVIEWS

- Mykhailo Hrushevsky, *History of Ukraine-Rus' Vol. 5: Sociopolitical and Church Organization and Relations in the Lands of Ukraine-Rus' in the 14<sup>th</sup> to 17<sup>th</sup> Centuries*, trans. by Marta Skorupsky and Marta Daria Olynyk. Review by CAROL B. STEVENS..... 103
- Tatiana Tairova-Yakovleva, *Ivan Mazepa and the Russian Empire*, trans. Jan Surer. Review by GALINA YERMOLENKO..... 106
- Margaret Willes, *In the Shadow of St Paul's Cathedral: The Churchyard that Shaped London*. Review by P.G. STANWOOD ..... 112
- Chris R. Langley, Catherine E. McMillan, and Russell Newton, eds., *The Clergy in Early Modern Scotland*. Review by NEWTON KEY..... 115
- Chakravarty Urvashi, *Fictions of Consent: Slavery, Servitude, and Free Service in Early Modern England*. Review by RAY BOSSERT..... 119
- Frank Sobiech, *Jesuit Prison Ministry in the Witch Trials of the Holy Roman Empire: Friedrich Spee SJ and his Cautio Criminalis (1631)*. Review by JONATHAN DURRANT..... 125
- Thomas Festa and David Ainsworth, eds., *Locating Milton: Places and Perspectives*. Review by JASON A. KERR..... 130
- Laura Gowing, *Ingenious Trade: Women and Work in Seventeenth-Century London*. Review by JOSEPH P. WARD..... 135
- Ian Gentles, *The New Model Army Agent of Revolution*. Review by EDWARD M. FURGOL..... 138
- Sigrun Haude, *Coping with Life during the Thirty Years' War (1618-1648)*. Review by EDWARD M. FURGOL..... 142
- Ronald Hutton, *The Making of Oliver Cromwell*. Review by NIALL ALLSOPP ..... 146
- Hall Bjørnstad, *The Dream of Absolutism: Louis XIV and the Logic of Modernity*. Review by IVY DYCKMAN..... 150
- Boris Donn , *Moli re*. Review by DENIS D. GR L  ..... 153
- Pedro Valencia, Vincent Parello, ed. and trans., *Le trait  sur les Morisques d'Espagne*. Review by MAR A HERN NDEZ..... 155
- Ellen F. Weaver, *Le domaine de Port-Royal: Histoire documentaire 1669-1710*. Review by DANIELLA KOSTROUN..... 158

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Mathilde Bedel, <i>Mirabilia Indiae: Voyageurs français et représentations de l'Inde.</i><br>Review by LARRY W. RIGGS.....   | 162 |
| Charles Mazouer, <i>La Transcendance dans le théâtre français. Tome I. De l'origine aux Lumières.</i> Review by GUY SPIELMANN.....   | 166 |
| Vincent Grégoire, <i>Marie Guyart de l'Incarnation (1599-1672):Le singulier parcours d'une ursuline missionnaire de Tours à Québec.</i><br>Review by SUZANNE C. TOCZYSKI ..... | 169 |
| Molière, <i>Le Tartuffe ou l'hypocrite: Comédie en trois actes restituée par Georges Forestier.</i><br>Review by SARA WELLMAN .....  | 172 |
| Sarah Ward Clavier, <i>Royalism, Religion and Revolution: Wales, 1640-1688.</i><br>Review by PHILIP SCHWYZER, UNIVERSITY OF EXETER .....                                       | 175 |
| NEO-LATIN NEWS.....  | 179 |

Mykhailo Hrushevsky. *History of Ukraine-Rus'*. Volume 5: *Sociopolitical and Church Organization and Relations in the Lands of Ukraine-Rus' in the 14<sup>th</sup> to 17<sup>th</sup> Centuries*. Translated by Marta Skorupsky and Marta Daria Olynyk. Myron M. Kapral, Consulting Editor and Frank E. Sysyn, Editor in Chief with the assistance of Uliana M. Pasicznyk. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press: 2019. lxii + 550 pp. \$119.95. Review by CAROL B. STEVENS, COLGATE UNIVERSITY.

I must begin this review with acknowledgements and congratulations: to the editor-in-chief, Prof. Frank Sysyn; to HTP's managing editor Uliana Pasicznyk; to the many committed editors, translators, scholars, and bibliographers who worked on individual volumes; as well as to the generous contributors who supported the translation of Mykhailo Hrushevsky's ten-volume *History of Ukraine-Rus'*. The volume under review (2019) and the immediately subsequent volume #2 (2021) mark the completion of the project. Hrushevsky's magisterial work offers an unequalled, detailed overview of events in the territory of what is now known as Ukraine, prior to the eighteenth century. When first published, this careful, late nineteenth-early twentieth-century examination not only offered a wealth of detail and interpretation about an understudied area and period. For a long time, it also remained **the** important scholarly voice offering a 'national' history of Ukraine, which for many years after its publication was a kind of study severely discouraged. Hrushevsky's examination included institutional, legal, and political events, but also careful scrutiny of the social, economic, and religious history of the many ordinary folk of different strata and ethnicities who inhabited the area. The understanding that it conveyed of a national history was thus far from a simplistic political vision. The CIUS translation makes this remarkable study accessible to English speakers and readers, and the work of cooperating scholars also makes it clear to twenty-first-century readers how interpretations of this story have been supplemented and changed since these volumes were written.

The translation of this particular volume (#5) completes an important subseries (volumes 4, 5, 6) within Hrushevsky's larger work. Together these three volumes examine the so-called "Polish-

Lithuanian period;” that is, an era of complex transition between Old Rus’ (‘ending’ in the early fourteenth century) and the Cossack period (from the first quarter of the seventeenth century). The intervening years were a contingent moment when Poland and Lithuania each moved into, individually absorbed, and then jointly controlled broad stretches of what is now Ukraine. Their presence had varying impacts on the many peoples of area: economically, socially, politically, and religiously. Hrushevsky published these three volumes with amazing rapidity, at two-year intervals. At the same time, he recognized and dealt with the fact that these volumes broached matters that had not been well studied, and for which the source materials were not easily to be found. As a consequence, he not only used extant histories, often correcting them or disputing their findings, he also examined and often even published source materials that had not previously been widely available.

These historiographic problems were particularly complex because the territory of ‘Old Rus’ experienced these externally-imposed changes unevenly. In part of the area, the Polish presence and its influence was strongly and quite immediately felt. Elsewhere, the lands where the Grand Duchy of Lithuania had recently assumed control experienced more gradual and de-centralized change, while some other areas were only partially and ineffectively controlled by either outside power. In volume 5, Hrushevsky studies the resulting legal, administrative, and religious changes and their impacts on different strata of the population.

Broadly speaking, the first two hundred pages of the volume offer a closely reasoned and negative assessment of Polish influence. Redefinition of the nobility was the key factor. For this stratum, as for others, there were military obligations under the Polish crown, including the presence of land tenure conditional on military service. Ruthenian nobility in Polish Crown territories as a result had somewhat different, and in many ways, lesser rights than their Polish counterparts. By contrast, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania was more concerned with Ruthenian inclusion into the Lithuanian nobility, even permitting Ruthenian participation in many of the decisions that involved its status. But as Lithuanian norms evolved toward the Polish standard, the re-definition of noble status overall represented an expansion of

local noble privilege both legislatively and administratively. As a result, Hrushevsky argues, the expansion of noble privilege resulted in a diminution of peasant rights. The free peasants, landless peasants, and slaves of Old Rus' gradually lost rights, leading to the gradual enserfment of the peasantry. Hrushevsky further argues that burghers, who had hitherto operated under German town law, found it difficult to adapt this framework to the constraints imposed by their new rulers. In this context, since the Polish crown was disposed to privilege Germans and Poles, Ruthenian burghers were both the most numerous and the most negatively affected, as the system of governance and taxation changed, and the social standing and wealth of the stratum, as a whole, declined. Hrushevsky points out that these broad changes did not represent an approach to western-style feudalism, but rather were changes dependent upon the particular military structure and demands of (what became in 1569) the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. As Myron Kapral makes clear in his attachment to note 2, beginning on page 423, twentieth- and twenty-first-century scholars agree with this conclusion.

A slightly smaller section of volume 5 discusses the impact of these political and administrative changes on the local organization of the Orthodox Church, which ultimately led to the creation of the Uniate Church. For Hrushevsky, a key point was that Orthodox institutions in lands under the control of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the Polish Crown by definition occupied a status inferior to that of the Roman Catholic Church, with an attendant loss of privilege. The disorganization that resulted from this situation instigated a movement for reform, and forces in favor and against union with Rome (Council of Florence) developed in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. A variety of factors, from the role of the Orthodox Church to the activities of the Patriarch of Constantinople from 1589, led to the emergence of the Uniate (or Ukrainian Greek Catholic) Church from 1595–96.

As we have become accustomed to see in this series, volume 5 of Hrushevsky's *History of Rus'-Ukraine* is translated into fluent and easily-readable English, which is no easy task. The notes to the volume indicate the areas which have been significantly investigated by scholars in the Soviet and post-Soviet world. Although there have been significant studies of Ukrainian and other social groups in Ukrainian



territories in this era, contributed by Polish, Russian, and Lithuanian scholars, it is notable that, for a variety of political and other reasons, studies of the Jewish presence in the area have largely been contributed by contemporary scholars outside the Slavic world.

To conclude, this volume offers us a unique perspective written at the turn of the twentieth century about Ukraine before 1800, one that—unusually for its time—takes into account the social history of those resident in the territory of Ukraine. It offers us a unique and unparalleled vision of how a broad-minded and evidence-based scholar of Ukrainian nationalist persuasion viewed his subject at the turn of the twentieth century. It has a great deal to offer those of us who study this region and its impact on those further west.

Tatiana Tairova-Yakovleva. *Ivan Mazepa and the Russian Empire*, trans. Jan Surer. Montreal & Kingston, London, Chicago: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2020; xiv + 406 pp. Review by GALINA YERMOLENKO, DESALES UNIVERSITY.

Tatiana Tairova-Yakovleva's Russian-language 2007 book, updated by the author and translated into English in 2020, deals with a controversial figure of Ukrainian history, Hetman ('ruler') Ivan Mazepa (1639–1709). Due to his siding with the Swedish King Charles XII against Peter I, in the 1709 Battle of Poltava of the Great Northern War, Mazepa has been traditionally viewed as a traitor in Russian historiography but considered a hero in post-Soviet Ukraine. In the West, Mazepa was popularized in the works of such Romantic writers as Lord Byron and Victor Hugo. The latter recounted a piquant moment of Mazepa's youth, when he was tied naked to a wild horse's back and made to ride in that fashion through the Polish and Ukrainian landscapes in punishment for his adulterous affair with a Polish lord's wife.

Tairova is not interested in the popular legends about Ivan Mazepa, nor does she narrate his comprehensive biography. Rather, the author focuses on the key moments of Mazepa's political career, involving his relations with Peter I and the Russian political elite, on the one hand, and his interactions with the Cossack leaders and his twenty-

year-long hetmanship of Ukraine, on the other. Thus, the book is structured more by topics than by chronology. The topical presentation of the material allows the author to synthesize a great deal of material detailing Mazepa's navigating between the Russian court and the Ukrainian Hetmanate. On the downside, such a setup may be rather challenging for the non-expert English-language readers, as they will have to remember loads of names and events from the different years and decades of Mazepa's career.

The Ukrainian, Polish, Russian, and English sources, on which this study relies, are referenced in the end notes spanning almost seventy pages. The absence of a full bibliography does not make it possible to estimate the total number of works used, the variety of primary sources, or the recency of secondary sources; nor does it make it easy quickly to locate the full bibliographic citation for each source. The Russian sources (pre-revolutionary, Soviet, and post-Soviet) are frequently cited, but, as becomes progressively evident from more reading, largely for the purpose of refuting the traditional Russian historiography's view of Mazepa as a man who betrayed Peter I. The extensive use of Mazepa's archive, rediscovered by the author in 2004, yields a variety of new conclusions that "are important for Ukrainian studies, as well as for the Russian Empire and Eastern Europe" (4).

The book presents a very glamorous image of the hetman as a man of great talents, including his sharp intelligence, intellectual acumen and breadth, superb education, knowledge of 6 languages, personal charisma. Mazepa emerges as an exceptionally smart politician, a born diplomat, an experienced courtier, a visionary ruler, a manager ahead of his time, and a great patron of arts and architecture. In tracing Mazepa's career in the 1680s–690s (in the earlier chapters of the book), the author arrives at two major conclusions. First, Mazepa's skillful political and economic hetmanship of Ukraine had led to the flourishing of the Cossack land and its "re-emergence" as a major power (123). Second, Mazepa was "Peter's chief strategic and military consultant" (80), a role he performed as a ruler of a Russian protectorate at the time. His skillful management of Muscovy's foreign affairs is evident from his actions during the Azon war campaigns, which aimed at "neutralizing the Turco-Tatar danger" and preventing the Ottoman-Russian war (138). For his role in the successful second Azon

campaign, he was awarded the Order of St. Andrew the Apostle the First-Called, becoming only the second recipient of the award at the time (*sic!*). For his other services to Peter I and Russia, Mazepa was also lavished with rich gifts, lands, and broad powers (6, 78, 103).

The later chapters of the book are devoted to proving that Mazepa was not the “hetman-traitor” that he is painted to be in Russian historiography. Tairova traces, step-by-step, how Mazepa was nearing his decision to cross over to the Swedish side, leading to his tragic downfall after the 1709 Battle of Poltava. Tairova claims that Mazepa acted not out of personal interest, but rather out of his great concern for the autonomous status of the Ukrainian Hetmanate, which was threatened by Peter’s radical administrative reforms of 1707–1708 (252) and his plans to incorporate a significant part of the Cossack land into the Russian empire (280–81; 289; 292–93). To support this argument, the author mentions the elimination of the hetman post in 1722, after the death of Ivan Skoropadskyi, as well as the 1783 discontinuation of the Cossack regiments by Catherine II, which occurred sixty years later (293).

One cannot help but notice, however, that the author creates a rather exalted portrayal of Mazepa throughout the entire book. While his diplomatic role in Russia’s domestic and foreign affairs was undoubtedly very significant, and he was considered to be a strong hetman (80) and a well-educated and progressive person (213), claiming that Mazepa “participated in founding of the Russian Empire,” is somewhat far-fetched. It also contradicts the author’s later argument that Mazepa opposed Peter’s administrative reforms of 1707–1708, which aimed at establishing an empire. Since Russia officially became an empire after the Great Northern War ended in 1721, it can as well be maintained that Mazepa’s siding with the enemy earlier in that war bespeaks his attempts to prevent Russia from becoming imperial.

The inconsistent or anachronistic references to the Russian “empire” throughout the book could be dismissed as insignificant, were it not for a more serious reason behind the author’s use of that word – to contrast the oppressive “imperial” Russia to the “reasonably democratic” Ukraine (273) to demonstrate that today’s confrontation between Russia and Ukraine had started back then. (Curiously, the author’s definition of “reasonably democratic” rests on the idea of

“fairly effective governmental structures at each level of administration”; but then, by that logic, Peter’s effective and meritocratic Table of the Ranks could also be considered “reasonably democratic.”) This ideological interpretation of Mazepa’s figure and the status of the Ukrainian Hetmanate vis-à-vis Russia is vividly seen in the book’s concluding paragraph: “In the Russian Empire, Mazepa became a hated symbol of Ukrainian separatism; for supporters of the Ukrainian national idea, he was a freedom fighter” (326).

The characterization of Mazepa as a “freedom fighter” (326) deserves a little attention. Was he only concerned about the autonomy of Ukraine? Was he not trying to consolidate his personal power? It is noteworthy that when the Kolomak Articles were being revised in 1687, Mazepa demanded that a paragraph be included in the new Moscow Articles, stipulating his role as the “supreme administrator of all the lands” (85). Mazepa intended to exercise his sole power to resolve the problem with the Cossackization (*pokozachuvannia*), i.e., the demands by peasants that they be extended the same rights and liberties as Cossacks (83–85). While this policy may have strengthened the autonomous status of the Ukrainian Hetmanate (79, 87), it does not characterize Mazepa as a democratic ruler. It looks like he was tightening his control rather than giving away freedoms to his people. Why is then Peter’s consolidation of power deemed “imperialistic,” while Mazepa’s “democratic”?

It should also be noted that Mazepa’s fight for Ukraine’s freedom did not manifest itself until late in his career. For many years of his hetmanship, Mazepa was striving to “harmonize” his policies with Peter’s demands (81). Considering how much discontent Mazepa’s policies and reforms caused among the Cossacks and how “very much alone” (122) he was at times, he had to consolidate his own administrative power, and Peter’s strong support was indispensable for this purpose at the time. On many occasions and at various moments, Mazepa could rely on no one else: he was “unpopular in various strata of Ukrainian society” (81); was supported by very few Cossack leaders (67); faced Cossack officers’ discontent (82, 107, 109) and serious opposition from various Cossack factions (84). He witnessed frequent uprisings by peasants and their Cossackization demands (83–87). Even in 1708, the last year of his career, he faced a peasant

unrest in Ukraine. Mazepa's unpopular policies are often blamed on other figures or forces: e.g., his unfriendly relations with Zaporizhia and their constant discontent are explained by the inconstancy and lack of principles of the Zaporozhians' part (110 ff.). If Mazepa's progressive reforms were so opposed by so many people, was he then the only freedom fighter of the Cossack Ukraine?

The second grand conclusion about "Ukrainian separatism" (326) presupposes that Ukraine was unified in fighting for its independence against the imperial Russian. But, as mentioned above, there were serious social tensions and factional feuds within the Ukrainian Hetmanate. If Mazepa's reforms were so opposed by so many strata of Cossack Ukraine, then was the land really rallied around its strong leader Mazepa? As demonstrated by many historical studies, early modern Ukraine was torn between numerous cultural and religious groups. It has also been argued the Ukrainian Cossacks were fighting more for their own independence and estate privileges than for the land's overall freedom. Nor was the Russian society consolidated, for that matter, as it was torn between the westernized nobles and the conservative lower classes. Peter I was probably hated much less by the Ukrainian Cossacks and peasants than he was by the Russians Orthodox peasants, Old Believers, and traditionalists, who opposed his sweeping secular reforms.

In presenting her argument, Tairova works hard to undo the Russian historiography's "too many clichés" about Mazepa. While the author's use of Mazepa's letters certainly brings to light a great deal of interesting new evidence, one wonders whether so many primary documents (i.e., the papers of Muscovy's Little Russian Office or Foreign Office) held in the RGADA and other Russian historical archives should be dismissed from the Mazepa scholarship as unreliable (e.g., 47–48). At least, it is not clear why those primary documents are deemed less reliable than the "previously unused" (42) notes of the Scottish general, Patrick Gordon (1635–1699). Is it because the latter were written by a western (hence, more trustworthy) adventurer? In any event, it seems that a more rigorous and objective treatment of the historical sources on Mazepa would make the author's argument less subjective ("One can speculate," "It is likely," "There were probably," "It is highly unlikely," "High degree of certainty"—see pages 19, 42,

45) and, hence, more persuasive.

There is no doubt that Mazepa was a very gifted person and a shrewd politician. But to claim that he was more ethical in contrast to the corrupt Russian courtiers (e.g., Mazepa's unpleasant shock at the archaic Muscovite system of seniority/precedence [*mestnichestvo*], 19) is to paint a rather idealized portrait of the hetman. Was he not an expert power-player of his day? Did he not repeatedly change kings and masters throughout his career (5–7)? Did he not send a denunciation letter and give a bribe (pardon, the gift) of 10,000 rubles to Vasiliï Golitsyn to secure the hetman's position when his benefactor, Hetman of the Left Bank Ukraine, Ivan Samoilovych, got in trouble? Did he not take advantage of the warring factions by playing them against each other (e.g., his role in the Naryshkin coup, 64, 78)? Did he not use his friends and romantic interests (e.g., Anna Dolska, 295) for collecting intelligence? Many successful Russian courtiers and Ukrainian Cossack leaders of that time did just the same to survive and retain power. After all, 'Machiavellian' was the political flavor of the day.

The most engaging pages of the book (at least to this reader) are those where the author contributes to the Mazepa scholarship some interesting new findings, without making grand historical parallels: e.g., the production of Regent Sofia's portraits by Leontii Tarasevych and the long "Ukrainian history" of panegyrics in her honor (59–61); the detailed history of taxation in the Ukrainian Hetmanate and Mazepa's reform of the leasehold system (87 ff.); Mazepa's little-known economic activities (100 ff.); the flourishing of Ukrainian culture during his rule and its considerable effect upon Petrine Russia (198 ff.).

Unfortunately, the Ukrainian nationalistic ideology and obvious anti-Russian sentiment, which inform this book, make the author's argument too one-sided. While fighting the Russian historiography's old clichés, the author creates the new reverse clichés. (One cannot help but recall an adage, "He who fights too long against dragons becomes a dragon himself.") Indeed, we must try to abandon the old clichés and to "learn from the tragedies and mistakes of our ancestors" (326). But imposing current political ideologies and biases upon the events of the past will hardly help us to learn anything; it will only deepen the existing cultural divides.

Margaret Willes. *In the Shadow of St Paul's Cathedral: The Churchyard that Shaped London*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2022. xii + 299 pp. + 54 illus. \$35.00. Review by P.G. STANWOOD, UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA.

This book is an exceptional compendium and encyclopedic survey of historic events and actions, of reflections and anecdotes about the great cathedral church and its environs in the heart of the City of London. The title is suggested by the dreamy thoughts of Charlotte Brontë's heroine Lucy Snowe in *Villette*. She spends her first night at the Old Chapter Coffee House in the Churchyard, and falls asleep hearing "a deep, low, mighty tone . . . . At the twelfth colossal hum and trembling knell, I said—'I lie in the shadow of St Paul's'" (241). Thus begins the narrative of the final chapter, "Lengthening Shadows," in which the author typically draws upon and evokes the variety of life in and about the Churchyard—in the broad and hugely capacious orders of literary, ecclesiastical, mercantilist, and political action. The twelve chapters of the book all suggest by their titles this history which Willes chronicles, neatly dividing Old Paul's from "New": 1. Setting the Scene; 2. The Times Newspaper of the Middle Ages; 3. The Centre of the Book World; 4. The Fires of Reformation; 5. The Children of Paul's; 6. The Twilight of Old St Paul's; || 7. Resetting the Scene; 8. Resurgam; 9. A Place to be Seen; 10. Literary Circles; 11. Theatre for London, Britain and the Empire; and 12. Lengthening Shadows.

The Churchyard itself, Willes writes, is not easy to define for there were at various times several "churchyards" within the cathedral precincts, and after the Great Fire of 1666, some activities moved several streets to the north. "So it is the *idea* of the Churchyard that forms my theme" (2). But the cathedral itself has always been at the immovable center of London life, embodying and radiating a kind of authority. There were three Anglo-Saxon cathedrals, the first in 604, destroyed by fire, followed by second and third structures in 675 and 962, this last also destroyed by fire in 1087. Now began and continued work on the great building, admired throughout the Middle Ages and Early Modern times. With the destruction of the medieval cathedral in the Great Fire, a new St Paul's rose in its place. Willes recalls some well known features of Old St. Paul's—such as the great steeple, destroyed

by lightning in 1561—whose existence is invisible yet palpable, and she sketches the achievement of Wren's masterwork, finally completed in 1708—the cathedral we know today.

The author orders her narrative mainly in chronological sequence, favoring eventful incidents, such as the disputes connected with the reformers John Wycliff and his Lollard followers, who commonly defined their theological positions in sermons preached in the cathedral precinct known as Paul's Cross. From this outdoor venue came not only words of royally and ecclesiastically approved substance, but often also principal news of the day. And so "the fires of Reformation" burned with the particular heat that emanated from this pulpit, markedly so in May 1521 when John Fisher preached *Against the Pernicious Doctrine of Martin Luther*, rightly described as "the first public assertion of orthodoxy, ushering in a century of further assertions that reflect the troubled religious times in which the nation was embroiled" (62). Later in the century, for example, Richard Bancroft, a canon of Westminster (afterwards Bishop of London in 1597, and Archbishop of Canterbury in 1604) preached at Paul's Cross in February 1588 a rousing denunciation of "heretical groups, such as Arians, Donatists, Papists, Libertines, Anabaptists, the Family of Love, sectaries and atheists" (82).

Such dramatic presentations were characteristic of many preachers at Paul's Cross. Most familiar and best remembered is John Donne's sermon of 1622, commonly known as the *Directions for Preachers*. Willes briefly summarizes its importance, and gives also some further account of Donne, details well known to readers of this journal. Paul's Cross would fall into disrepair and neglect in the mid-seventeenth century, and so sermons were given in the cathedral itself. In consequence, almost a century later, a notable sermon—recollecting those of former times—was preached in St Paul's. Henry Sacheverell, an Oxford scholar, delivered the traditional Gunpowder Plot sermon, on 5 November 1709. A zealous High Churchman and a determined Tory, he condemned non-conformists and Whigs in a memorable fashion, with terms that parallel Whitgift's denunciations: "These false brethren ... suffer'd to combine into bodies, and seminaries, wherein atheism, deism, tritheism, socinianism, with all the hellish principles of fanaticism, regicide, and anarchy are openly profess'd and taught,



to corrupt and debauch the youth of the nation” (202).

Willes turns to another kind of dramatic action in her description of the Grammar School of St Paul’s, which provided choristers for cathedral services who would also become actors known as the “Children of Paul’s.” Their familiar history and importance is helpfully summarized, resting especially on the boy players’ performances of Marston’s *Antonio and Mellida*, and Thomas Middleton’s *The Puritaine, or the Widdow of Watling Street*, this latter work notably targeting separatists. This chapter recalls a similar, contemporaneous survey by Roze Hentschell, *St Paul’s Cathedral Precinct in Early Modern Literature and Culture* (reviewed in *SCN* 79 (1& 2) 2021). Unlike Willes, Hentschell writes a more particularly focussed, essentially academic, and thesis driven socio-geographical study; Willes, while typically fluent and informative, displays the features of a more general narrative.

Whether church or churchyard, St Paul’s presided over the dynamic and varied life at the center of London. One recurrent theme shows the making of books, from Wynkyn de Worde and Richard Pynson to John Cassell and Hodder & Stoughton, and Oxford University Press, at Amen Corner. Willes devotes the early chapters of the book to the development of printing and publication, and returns frequently to literary concerns. The reception of the fiercely partisan Sacheverell sermon, for one example, proved immensely popular and enabled the bookseller Henry Clements at the Half Moon in St Paul’s Churchyard eventually to produce 50,000 copies, with reprints and pirated editions following, reaching a quarter of a million copies.

Willes writes in a pleasing, clear, and lively style that lifts the enormously varied and rapidly changing topics from mere recitation into a continuous, often absorbing narrative, well suited for the intended broad readership. There is little new in this book but very much that is familiar, its achievement resting mainly on the skillful selection and arrangement of incidents and anecdotes across a very long period, divided naturally between the Old St Paul’s and the New—the Great Fire of 1666 marking the change. There are links between them, obviously not so much of physical or structural continuity, but rather of the ever pervasive “shadow” cast over this busy center of London’s life. Willes generously acknowledges her sources, noting, for example, “pre-eminent sites” for the study of early modern

sermons, such as Mary Morissey's *Politics and the Paul's Cross Sermons, 1558–1642* (2011), and as contributing editor to *Sermons at Paul's Cross, 1521–1642* (2017), gen. ed. T. Kirby (with P.G. Stanwood and John King), a unique collection of significant sermon texts—in the brief bibliography, this textual edition appears falsely among secondary sources. *In the Shadow of St Paul's Cathedral* is attractively printed, with many excellent illustrations and an inserted section of fine color plates. This is an ambitious book that has nothing to prove but an engaging story to tell; its incidents are intelligently selected, and the result is a highly condensed history presented in an appealing way.

Chris R. Langley, Catherine E. McMillan, and Russell Newton, eds. *The Clergy in Early Modern Scotland*. Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 2021. xviii + 270 pp. + 2 illus. \$99.00. Review by NEWTON KEY, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY.

From the pulpit to the pew and back again. The editors introduce this collection by noting historians' changing agenda for studying the first centuries of the Reformed Church in Scotland. A series of biographies and collected works of individual Scots clergy gave way to collective studies which highlighted clerical administration and finances, but historians despaired of using the resulting statistics to trace motives. Clergy were reduced to a "walk-on role" (4) regarding the Reformation's impact. Instead, a revolution in Scottish Reformation studies a quarter of a century ago—notably Michael F. Graham's *The Uses of Reform: "Godly Discipline" and Popular Behaviour in Scotland and Beyond, 1560–1610* (1997) and Margo Todd's *The Culture of Protestantism in Early Modern Scotland* (2003)—turned to parishioners' ideas and activities, that is, the bounds of lay religion. Only in the past decade has work, including that by several contributors to this volume, been redirected to sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Scots clergy. See, for example, the online clergy prosopographical project, Mapping the Scottish Reformation <https://mappingthescottishreformation.org/> initiated in 2017 and co-directed by contributors Chris Langley and Michelle Brock.

The essays in the collection are divided into two sections: Themes, which draw from evidence across Scotland, and Case Studies, which focus on individual types of evidence, clergy, parishes, or regions. In Themes, Brock examines sermons, parishioners' notes, and manuals to reveal the clerical ideal. What were the expectations placed on the cleric in his parish? Convincing preaching was one, and surviving sermon notes remind us that many parishioners listened pen in hand. One parishioner newly relocated to the northern Highlands bemoaned being surrounded by "legal lifeless sermons" (26) compared to those of the A-list, Edinburgh preachers he heard previously. Clergy realized their own human limits and that "expectations had to be managed" (30). Also needing managing were parishioners' duties and activities, and ministers had to walk a fine line between being both part of the covenanting people and making sure others honored the covenant. Russell Newton turns to the various ways the early modern Scots ministry used the Bible. For example, one seventeenth-century cleric led his family exercises by *singing* a Psalm, *reading* Scripture, *discoursing* about that, then *praying* from it. Clergy engaged in Bible study with parishioners or drew from it to counsel them and worked with other ministers to present a common public interpretation of the Bible. John McCallum's and Helen Gair's study of clergy and poor relief also reveals the collaborative nature of early modern clergy, in this case sharing work and goals with their parishioners. They question the view that a minister's role in shaping relief was limited to his individual vote, the same as an elder or deacon. Status and the power of the pulpit, they suggest, ensured rather more influence. Janay Nugent and L. Rae Stouffer attempt to uncover the mainly hidden lives of ministers' families. A shortfall of ministers before the 1620s made the available clergy necessarily peripatetic, sharing parishes and helping others. As a result, the "home" parish in effect was served at times by the minister's wife or even his daughter. And being at the wrong end of seventeenth-century religio-political shifts could cause hardships for ministers' families, exemplified by those orphaned when their father was incarcerated. The authors carefully navigate the available evidence and suggest avenues of future research. Langley's chapter on anticlericalism places seventeenth-century Scotland in a wider, continental context. Prevailing research has doubted whether anticlericalism was

an agent for change, though some scholars reintroduce the concept as a consequence of change. Although visitation records reveal more local disputes than clear anticlericalism, and, indeed, become increasingly formulaic over the period, parishioners' complaints about their minister do reveal expectations about clerical behavior. Complaints about external clerical representatives also reveal suspicion of outsiders, reminding one of the hatred against the *intrus* in the bocage region of France shown during the *Vendée* over a century later.

The essays in the Case Studies section provide exciting if exacting evidence for the larger picture. Elizabeth Tapscott notes how itinerants not parish clergy made the earliest calls for parochial reform. Printed calls for reform made "appeals to ever-larger circles" (128) from the academy, to the court, and, finally, to the nobility and wider public. Michael Graham's intricate study of the pulpit politics of St. Andrews in the 1590s shows the interplay of local and national affairs. Factions split over control of the pulpit. By the time the session felt it needed to specify that "no one should appear on the stool of repentance armed" (139), the split was clearly edging towards conflict and tumult. In 1596, when one minister preached that Queen Elizabeth "was an atheist" (141), the Court and James VI took more than a passing interest in local affairs. Ultimately, the burgh reasserted control over the kirk, and both could be used as the local arm of kingly government. If St. Andrews was tightly intertwined with central authority, the Orkney archipelago was distant from both the central Church and State. Peter Marshall draws from his current research on early modern Orkney, and shows the interaction of local, national, and even international religious currents. One seventeenth-century writer noted the islands conduct "ecclesiastical business as in Scotland" (155), suggesting the mainland was another country. Orkney ministers, necessarily trained and often from elsewhere, acted like Carlo Ginzburg's inquisitor, as "interpreters and ethnographers of the world they encountered" (156). Marshall compiles the number of outsiders versus insiders appointed (again, we might think of the Vendean *intrus*): Orkney-born ministers ranged from of twelve percent (1600-39) to nearly thirty-one percent appointed (1720-59). Even these, given there were a couple dozen inhabited islands, practiced a degree of island and parish hopping over any one career. At least one early modern minister was slandered as a

“ferry looper” (166), or outsider. Perhaps in response to local suspicions and outsider misunderstandings, the Orkney ministers formed a close-knit community. Claire McNulty’s examines James Sharpe’s reforming of South Leith from his appointment there in 1639 until his death six years later. Why were the South Leith parishioners and the patron of the parish, covenanting magnate Lord Balmerino, so keen to ensure Sharpe’s appointment and override the reluctance of the assembly from which he came? Given his actions, we must assume a local desire for moral discipline, as Sharpe quickly “sent elders into the streets to listen...and to report indiscretions” (179)! Surely no one would have been surprised to discover swearing and blasphemy among the sailors and dockworkers of Scotland’s busiest port. But records show increasing reports of “fornication under promise of marriage” (182), and Sharpe appears to have strived to enforce marriage bans and limit children out of wedlock. John Dury’s pastoral experience is examined by Felicity Lyn Maxwell for roughly the same period as Sharpe is by McNulty. But Maxwell can illuminate Dury’s personal life because correspondence survives regarding his courtship and eventual marriage to the well-educated widow, Dorothy Moore, from whom he arguably drew support and advice. Moore’s experience in less than five years from 1641 was peripatetic and international: a rector for an English parish, chaplain to the Princess Royal at The Hague, and minister to the Merchant Adventurers in Rotterdam. Through family exile and education he lived as “a Scottish clergyman abroad” (188), but he wrote widely and saw himself as a public intellectual influencing courts and nobles across nations as well as his own parishioners. The preaching of Hugh Binning in the mid-seventeenth century serves as the case for Nathan C.J. Hood’s study. Hood’s chapter contributes to the history of emotion, specifically the emotionalism of Scottish Protestantism. Binning attempted to moderate that emotional religious chord, urging and practicing restraint.

This collection concludes with an afterword by Jane Dawson who draws upon each of the preceding chapters and her own work (and a couple of images of clerical garments) to outline the transformation in the preaching and ministry of Reformation Scotland between 1500 and 1700. Overall, these chapters harvest rich details of the everyday lives of the early modern clergy and their collaboration

with their parishioners. The “qualitative approach” (234) embraced here demonstrates such success regarding the clergy’s *agency* that a return to counting clergy to revise our sense of the Church’s *structure* might be useful too in future. The editors are quick to admit that pieces here focus on the Protestant clergy, and that more work is needed on their Scottish Catholic counterparts. One might add work needed on would-be preachers—readers, chaplains, teachers, even clerks—to flesh out the life- or career-cycle of many parish clergy, though admittedly evidence for these are scant. The introductory historiography, various approaches, and combined bibliography might make this collection serve as a *vade mecum* to such future studies of the early modern Scottish Church.

Chakravarty Urvashi. *Fictions of Consent: Slavery, Servitude, and Free Service in Early Modern England*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2022. xiv + 295 pp. \$65. Review by RAY BOSSERT, INDEPENDENT SCHOLAR.

Early modern political polemics often relied on the trope of England as a nation of free persons, intolerant of slavery on its home island; but in what ways did English culture and society contradict this national self-image? And how might those structures, submerged under rhetoric of freedom, have contributed to the evolution of racialized human trafficking and trans-atlantic slavery? Urvashi Chakravarty probes these questions in *Fictions of Consent: Slavery, Servitude, and Free Service in Early Modern England*—a monograph that rewards the reader with essential concepts, unexpected evidence, and thought-provoking analysis.

Servants in early modern England wanted their role in the class system to be compatible with a belief that they still retained their native freedom as Englishmen. The title of the book points to ways English lawyers, dramatists, and others attempted to demonstrate that compatibility by distinguishing between a servant’s freedom and a slave’s bondage. Chakravarty argues these attempts are “fictions” by way of Derridean deconstruction. For Chakravarty, social conditions, slipperiness of language, and even illiteracy all undermine efforts to

preserve a freedom to consent that might not have ever existed to begin with. In deconstructing texts, Chakravarty considers how they could in turn justify if not create the emerging racialized slavery in English colonies.

In order to set its stage, *Fictions of Consent* delivers a valuable primer on servitude and racial history for the period. Chakravarty invites researchers to cast a wider net of less obvious sources when excavating the cultural history of slavery, and the book draws from an ecosystem of archival documents that are extremely useful and provocative—from pamphlets on the treatment of servants to actual contracts between masters and their subordinates. It provides a ready list of terms, images, and language and applies them as a framework of linguistic markers of service and servitude in thoughtful close readings. Readers will, no doubt, feel compelled to do the same when they return to primary sources.

Chakravarty's analysis follows a pattern: a juxtaposition of legal or epistolary evidence with literary works is followed by a deconstruction of language by way of etymology, especially in terms of the Latin used in Terence, which then leads to close readings of more literary texts. Chapters typically end by showing an example where the previous readings play out in terms of an early modern depiction of blackness. The five chapters suggest an evolution or "genealogy" of racialized servitude, beginning with livery and then moving through grammar schools, apprenticeship, consanguinity, and ending with indentured servitude. The book's epilogue applies its concepts provocatively to a sampling of eighteenth and nineteenth texts.

The first chapter focuses on livery, arguing that this system of relying on visual signifiers to denote class creates a fertile environment for moving that signifier from clothing to skin color (19). The reader is provided with a five-part taxonomy of livery: heraldic colors, badges or cullisons, apprenticeship, blue coats, and "cast" clothing. Those that wore livery experienced a paradoxical (one might say liminal) existence—it signified that they were bound to masters, but also gave them privilege, protection, and liberties based on those masters. Chakravarty notes that this was particularly valuable to actors, who relied on livery off stage, and frequently made

use of it onstage. Chakravarty concludes with a tantalizing example of the transition from clothing to skin from *The Merchant of Venice*, as the Prince of Morocco describes his skin as the sun's livery (43).

The second chapter observes various ways in which early modern English people living domestically might still have encountered slavery, bondage, and servitude. One significant source is grammar school where Latin assignments, particularly those of Terence, immersed English boys in a literary and theatric culture of slavery. Chakravarty goes further to assert that the experience of the pupil was compulsory and could often result in severe corporeal punishment (56)—therefore, the English pupil was essentially aligned to the slavery in his readings. For Chakravarty, ancient Terence primed young English minds to accept and enact forms of slavery in ways that would allow them to adopt its brutal form overseas.

Here, the text lays out a taxonomy of slavery, by way of Latin: the *servus* (captured in war, spared from death), the *mancipium* (property by way of transaction), and the *famulus* (household slave). Despite these distinctions, the chapter notes early modern English translations that often avoided the word “slave,” preferring phrases like “servant,” “page,” or “bondman” (54) in a kind of bowdlerization of literary servitude.

The chapter goes on to describe how English subjects would have been aware of or even victims of Mediterranean slavery—diplomatic processions featuring freed captives, documented accounts, petitions to raise funds for hostages, and, of course, the potential to find oneself captured by Mediterranean pirates or raiders. The chapter also includes discussion of the Ethiopian maid in Terence's *Eunuchus*, which Chakravarty sees as “the nexus between classical and contemporary racialized slavery” (75).

As with the previous chapter, all of this comes to bear on a Shakespearean text, this time *Othello*. Chakravarty focuses on Desdemona's tale of her mother's servant—whose name implies that she was herself of African descent, and how Desdemona then aligns herself with the black servant (88). For Chakravarty, this is evidence of the multivalent meanings of the word “family” to convey both one's kin and one's household servants.



The third chapter delves into the nature of early modern family and its roots in the *famulus*—the domestic slave. It shows how the early modern period was shifting the word “family” from a term for one’s household servants to a word meaning people connected by blood. For Chakravarty, this anticipates the idea that slavery will move from a condition of an individual to a condition of a race. The chapter pores over *Volpone*, in particular, Mosca’s description of the title character as the “true father of his family”—the “family” being his servants who (as Mosca implies) are also his actual offspring (101). Discussion of Mosca turns to the idea of the Roman parasites—the servant who is both close and stranger, foreign and familiar—anticipating roles of slaves in trans-atlantic texts.

Turning to *The Changeling*, Chakravarty teases out how Maussian gift economies create a sense of obligations between masters and servants that undermine the ostensibly voluntary nature of the relationships (118). *The Changeling* is significant to the argument because De Flores represents the potential for the servant to marry into the family that he serves and thereby unifying the bloodline—a frequent fantasy imagined in early modern literature.

From here, Chakravarty pivots to *The Fatal Contract*—a play in which a white aristocratic woman seeks revenge for an assault against her by posing as a male Ethiopian servant. The character delivers a speech where she imagines her male disguise reproducing with her female self, and producing a child of mixed race—bringing the servile black figure into consanguinity with the aristocratic white figure, but potentially marking the imaginary offspring in the process.

The chapter ends with literary examples of people being born with marks or born into slavery, culminating in the historical account of a how “a free Englishwoman who gave birth out of wedlock to a child who had been fathered by a black man would be fined, and could be indentured for five years; her child, however, ‘would be indentured until the age of thirty’” (130).

Chapter 4 analyzes a series of apprenticeship forms and contracts, and then compares them with indentureship contracts. Remarkably, the indentureships insist “upon volition” in ways that apprenticeships did not—which, for Chakravarty, signals an increased need to assert a performance of consent (145). This

free consent is problematic since illiteracy among servants makes claims of volition spurious (contracts frequently bear an X for the servant's signature and contain egregious and legally problematic typographical errors).

With the consensual nature of indentures undermined, Chakravarty deconstructs Milton's depiction of Eden to question how free Adam and Eve really are and how free they perceive themselves to be. This moves to a discussion of natality. First, the chapter notes that the first parents consider children when they describe their pressing need for extra labor, suggesting that children are imagined as a way of breeding servants. Later, they debate whether to reproduce if the offspring will be subject to the same punishment. The transferable nature of punishment through a bloodline prefigures the taint of slavery that will fall to slaves and their offspring in the next chapter (168).

Chapter 5 focuses on the *macula servitus* ("stain of slavery"). Terence's *Andria* and its translations show how the relationship between a master and a freed slave dooms the emancipated to indebtedness and continual threats of re-enslavement. Turning to *The Tempest*, the chapter questions the offers of freedom and threats of further enslavement that function as Prospero's tools to motivate Ariel (although Chakravarty asks why Ariel doesn't just fly away) (184). A provocative approach to Caliban observes how Prospero's lines "This thing of darkness I / Acknowledge mine" ring with uncanny similarity to the Roman slavery ritual of *mancipatio* (188-189), although it is unclear if this is intentional or coincidence on Shakespeare's part.

The chapter concludes by investigating 1694 court records of Adam Saffin, who was contractually promised freedom if he served "cheerfully," a requirement which the master predictably claims was not met by the time of Adam's anticipated release. The language of his master suggests belief in a firm connection between racial identity and servitude, and even though the court ultimately ruled in Adam's favor, he retained his master's surname, which Chakravarty reads as a stain of slavery.

The forward-looking epilogue demonstrates later periods' continued use of Terence in texts discussing servitude and service, from polemical tracts to the poetry of Phyllis Wheatly. It looks at children's

literature depicting “happy” slaves who identify with their master’s family, even those intending to serve abolitionist aims, as evidence that the previous conceptions of service and slavery have become firmly embedded in conceptions of blackness. It is a powerful payoff as the reader, now trained to see the linguistic resonances Chakravarty sees, shares in the moment of discovery.

The book is provocative and useful, and the analysis is at its strongest when focusing on individual texts. It has some especially striking readings of canonical texts (the reading of Kent’s final line is especially noteworthy). Chakravarty is very effective at demonstrating how freedom was a fiction—an illusion—at least when enshrined in verbal signifiers.

Chakravarty offers a reasonable concession in the introduction: “I invoke this association not to conflate blackness with slavery, nor to attempt to ‘determine’ the provenance of racialized slavery. Rather, the suggestive temporal confluence here, I propose, posits the collusion of early modern fictions of consent ... with the fictions of race” (7). Some readers’ doubts might arise precisely from the reliance on “temporal confluence.” At times, the analysis can jump over 100 years from one paragraph to the next. Civil wars, changes of dynasties, shifting global powers, reversals of national religion occur offstage, but the text is less concerned with why texts emerged as they did or what they might have meant in their own context than how they might function in a larger diachronic (or pan-chronic?) understanding of service and slavery. Perhaps readers do well to perceive Chakravarty’s examples like pieces of prehistoric amber that capture stages of evolving fantasies of servitude, slavery, and race.

Likewise, the text’s enthusiasm for its subject has a tendency to reify early modern England into a singular entity. We are told “early modern England was no stranger to the spectacle of slavery” because of a procession that happened in London in 1637 (47). In the epilogue, we read that the book “strives to hold early modern England to account for the discourses of race and slavery that it authorized and amplified” (198). This language might appear to conflate over 200 years of discourse and experiences among radically different individuals, geographical regions, and institutions into a single national body. This reification might be at odds with

the text's intentions.

Chakravarty's approach is rooted in an admirable and laudable belief that the seemingly "quotidian" aspects of the period offer overlooked evidence. A reader might find themselves often thinking about more obvious works that might play a role (possibly a larger one) in the shaping of English notions of slavery. The Bible would have been as likely a source to encounter images of slavery and service as *Paradise Lost*, and would have been far wider reaching than Terence, but it is conspicuously absent (perhaps the most theological text analyzed is a brief section of the *Book of Common Prayer*).

Still, the omission of such works falls in line with Chakravarty's call "that we must disorient and disrupt the spaces and places where we search for the archives and genealogies of slavery" (49). The approach, which stands almost as a dare to colleagues, will hopefully inspire more researchers to follow the approach of *Fictions of Consent* to go off the well-trod path.

In sum, *Fictions of Consent* is a provocative, wide-ranging analysis that lays down a solid foundation for those curious about servitude and slavery in the period. It offers compelling close readings of canonical literature and historical texts. I predict its taxonomies will direct the way scholars and students recognize the kinds of service they see depicted in early modern works, and that Chakravarty's framework will generate new curiosity for the "quotidian" and lead to greater scrutiny of how the familiar might capture unexpected fossils in the evolution of English notions of race.

Frank Sobiech. *Jesuit Prison Ministry in the Witch Trials of the Holy Roman Empire: Friedrich Spee SJ and his Cautio Criminalis (1631)*. Rome: Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu, 2019. xii + 539 pp. + 17 illus. + 2 maps. €60.00. Review by JONATHAN DURRANT, UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH WALES.

Frank Sobiech frames his study of Jesuit prison ministry to incarcerated witch-suspects as a multidisciplinary investigation into one of the most well-known works written about witchcraft in the early modern period, Friedrich Spee's *Cautio Criminalis* (1631). It

weaves biography and the histories of the Society of Jesus, spirituality, theology, law and witch persecution into a compelling study of the contemporary and historical importance of Spee's critique of witchcraft trials. In doing so, Sobiech demonstrates why Spee's intervention appeared only towards the end of the major witch-hunts in Germany, most of which ended in about 1630, and why *Cautio Criminalis* was a problematic text not simply for those credulous of witchcraft stories but also for members of his own congregation in its Upper and Lower Rhenish provinces. Furthermore, Sobiech's use of Jesuit circulars (*Litterae annuae*) and expert opinions sheds light on practices which help us understand why there was little sustained theological opposition to witchcraft trials in early seventeenth-century Catholic Germany and why Jesuits in Rome did not follow their German confreres and advocate for witch prosecution there.

*Jesuit Prison Ministry in the Witch Trials of the Holy Roman Empire* comprises five parts. Following the first part (the Introduction), we are provided with a biography of Friedrich Spee that focuses on his education and life in the Society of Jesus, and a lengthy chapter detailing the publication of the two earliest editions of *Cautio Criminalis*, the first in Rinteln in 1631 without Spee's knowledge, the second in Cologne in 1632 supervised in part by the author. Part III, the largest part, focuses on the prison ministry of the Rhenish Jesuits up to the publication of *Cautio Criminalis* and the influence of that ministry on Spee's doubts. The fourth part examines the reception of *Cautio Criminalis* from Spee's death in 1635 to the twentieth century and the difficulties securing an official commemoration of the author in the Society of Jesus. The final part summarises the conclusions of the study and suggests some research desiderata. Two appendices provide useful transcriptions and translations of original Latin manuscript reports, one a prison visitor's eyewitness account of the last hours of a condemned witch from 1628, the other a set of expert opinions relating to another case of 1629.

As Sobiech observes, the tendency in the historiography of the Society of Jesus to emphasise the Jesuits' educational works, based on their practice in many schools and universities, neglects the pastoral ministry to which they were assigned by Catholic territorial leaders in the Holy Roman Empire. This ministry brought them into close

contact with the ill and the incarcerated, including witch-suspects, providing them with a depth of experience of the human condition that few others could gain. Despite a professed desire to be sent to India as a missionary, Spee was retained in educational and pastoral roles in the Rhenish province and his experiences of both had a profound impact on how he viewed witch-suspects and the way they were interrogated. The regular *Annuae* issued by Jesuit houses and sent to Rome by way of the provincialate enable Sobiech to evaluate the orthodoxy of Spee's views as they record the experiences of many Jesuit prison visitors who ministered to condemned witches. First, however, he uses Spee's biography to try to tell us something of his character.

Most of the biography, lacking sufficiently robust sources, is factual when it comes to Spee's progress and appointments within the Society, but speculative when it comes to Spee's character. This chapter could have been more concise and more revealing of Spee's views; the summary of the chapter in Part V is more to the point. It is important to know that he ministered to the sick and prisoners and held several teaching positions, and that the Society's Lutheran enemies in Hildesheim tried to murder him because he had become involved in reconversion there. The most we can really gain from the chapter about Spee's character up to 1629, however, is that he was taught by Peter Cremer whose views on witchcraft and other matters may have influenced his own, that he was an above-average student, that he was not shy of writing to the Superior General Vitelleschi, mostly unsuccessfully, to promote his causes, and that it was claimed that he had "peculiar opinions on poverty and other matters" (88). Unfortunately, Sobiech's speculation does not extend to what these peculiar opinions might have been. In 1630, however, as Sobiech introduces the matter in Chapter 4, Spee seems to have strayed close enough to the mystical spiritualities of some French Jesuits that Vitelleschi first ordered that he remain unprofessed until he explained his claim that "he follows the Gospel in his way of thinking and living" (94) and then suggested that removal from the professorship of moral theology at Paderborn should be considered because he was "less prudent in the selection of opinions" (95). For speaking too frankly, Spee was demoted to father confessor. It is here that we finally reach the character who was prepared to write and

given time to finish, but not publish, *Cautio Criminalis*. A condensed biography might have got the reader to this point sooner.

Part III is the most rewarding of the study. Chapter 5 takes the reader into the prison by way of the Jesuit *Annuae*. Generally, historians of witchcraft only get glimpses into the prison incidentally when events happened there that were reported in the torture chamber, for example, succour offered to the imprisoned witch-suspects by their relatives or the occasional attempt to escape. The *Annuae*, alongside expert opinions, sermons and other sources, prove a rich source of Jesuit opinion and activity for Sobiech. Across the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, they detail encounters between Jesuit prison visitors and suspected witches, mainly at the point of spiritual confession as the Jesuits attempted to bring the condemned witches back to God before they were executed. Sobiech makes good use of these texts to establish the deeply entrenched orthodox Jesuit position in the Rhenish provinces, that witchcraft existed and should be punished by death even if a witch confessed and expressed contrition, contrasting it with their less convinced or wholly uninterested brothers in Rome.

In the *Annuae*, some of the condemned witches remained defiant, others despaired and attempted suicide, and many more professed to go to their executions gladly having confessed their crimes and their sins. This last group gives one pause for thought. In reading this lengthy chapter (143 pages), the lack of sustained cross-referencing with the interrogation transcripts becomes something of an issue. To anyone who has spent months reading harrowing transcript after transcript, the Jesuit reports of spiritual success just don't ring true. Sobiech does check the *Annuae* against the verdicts, where that is possible. The verdicts were, however, summaries of the crimes, spiritual and temporal, confessed by the condemned witches, designed to be read out to the spectators watching the executions. Inevitably, they corresponded to the spiritual confessions reported in the *Annuae*. They performed much the same function, too, justifying the action and edifying the audience. Within the Society of Jesus, one suspects that the reports of witches heading towards execution gladly, together with accounts of the efficacy of the *Agnus Dei*, were carefully edited to reflect well on the Jesuits. The same may be said

of the accounts of those who refused to confess or despaired; it was not the Jesuits' fault if they could not bring the condemned to a satisfactory state as they faced death. Sobiech does recognise these textual problems, but only in the further summary of the argument in the final part. Here, he amplifies a point made less effectively in Chapter 5, that the Jesuit reports "were heavily influenced by their theatre work" (381) and that they "possessed an expert eye for stage-worthy scenarios and the surreal" (382).

Chapter 5 is important because it emphasises the huge and courageous task that Friedrich Spee set himself in criticising the witchcraft interrogations. The weight of theological opinion and entrenched practice in the German provinces was against him, now a mere father confessor. Spee was not alone, of course, in his unease at what he was doing and witnessing and Sobiech is careful to locate his allies. Even so, it was a dangerous undertaking, to his soul and his faith as much as his position in the Society. Sobiech makes a striking observation in Chapter 6 that Spee's faith may well have been severely tested, quoting from another of Spee's works, the *Güldenes Tugend-Buch*: "Oh God, what atrocity is this? What kind of justice is this? [...] Oh you very mildest Lord Jesus, how can you bear that your creatures are tormented so despicably?" (318). The rest of Chapter 6 explains how Spee's own prison ministry and what he would have heard of the experiences of others when the *Annuae* were read out in the Jesuit houses informed his writing of *Cautio Criminalis*. The context of the work goes beyond Spee's disgust at his own experience to the very heart of Jesuit theology and practice. Rather than being isolated from the latter, Sobiech demonstrates that Spee was fully engaged with it, alongside others. The difference was that *Cautio Criminalis* did not remain a manuscript text for discussion within the Society but found its way into print, unauthorised by Spee or his superiors.

Part IV picks up where many discussions of Spee and his *Cautio Criminalis* leave off and plots their influence on German Jesuit practice when it came to witchcraft. It is all too easy turn the coincidence of the end of the major German witch persecutions (c.1630), the publication of the first and second editions of *Cautio Criminalis* (1631 and 1632) and Spee's death (1635) into the end of the story.



But witchcraft trials continued in Germany and Jesuits continued to minister to suspected witches in prison. In Chapter 7, Sobiech shows how Spee's criticisms infiltrated the Society's opinions on witchcraft trials over the rest of the seventeenth and much of the eighteenth centuries, if not always in a smooth fashion; in Chapter 8, he reports how Spee became reconciled to the Society posthumously through attempts to give him official commemoration. Sobiech ends Chapter 7, however, with an extraordinary example of the text's continuing importance. In 1939, a new German translation of *Cautio Criminalis* by Joachim-Friedrich Ritter was published with blurb quoting a review in the *Frankfurter Zeitung* noting its contemporary significance. That contemporary significance was the criminal trial in Munich of Walter Hildmann for stating that "the state of today is less interested in justice than it is in power" (351–352).

The final part of Sobiech's book summarises significant elements of the preceding chapters and offers some suggestions for further research. That some of the summary could have gone in the relevant chapters is fundamentally an editorial issue rather than a criticism of the argument. The scholarship is impressive as is the use of the Society's *Annuae*, and there is much to learn about Friedrich Spee and Jesuit prison ministry that enriches our knowledge of witchcraft experience in early modern Germany. Sobiech has also opened up an area of scholarship that should be extended to the Jesuits' Upper German province and, in keeping with Sobiech's multidisciplinary approach, will reinvigorate the history of the Jesuits in their German provinces, the intellectual history of witchcraft in Germany and, potentially, the history of incarceration in the early modern period.

Thomas Festa and David Ainsworth, eds. *Locating Milton: Places and Perspectives*. Clemson, SC: Clemson University Press, 2021. x + 231 pp. + 8 illus. \$120. Review by JASON A. KERR, BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY.

The essays in this book emerge (in expanded form) from the 2017 Conference on John Milton held in Birmingham, Alabama—the first time that the conference was held at a site other than its birthplace

in Murfreesboro, Tennessee. The collection continues a tradition of such volumes, with most of the earlier entries edited by conference founders Charles W. Durham and Kristin A. Pruitt. I understand that a similar volume drawing on the 2019 conference (also in Birmingham) is underway; it remains to be seen whether the 2022 conference in St. Louis will produce one.

As with most volumes of selected conference proceedings, the essays vary widely in content, and any attempt to marshal them around a single, central theme taxes the inventiveness of the volume editors. In this case, the subtitle, “Places and Perspectives,” enables to editors to enlist the very diversity of the entries in the cause of challenging the image of an authoritative and unchanging Milton. The essays dealing in reception history prove especially fruitful to this end, especially Miklós Péti’s essay on the reception of *Samson Agonistes* in socialist Hungary. Péti deftly pulls together reception histories in the American and British postwar left with the longer history of Hungarian Milton reception to show the complexities and contestations attendant on embracing Samson as a revolutionary hero. He also traces the dynamics of influence that crossed the Iron Curtain, as when a key early volume edited by Christopher Hill was translated into Hungarian, alongside Hungarian efforts to counter the pernicious effects of “bourgeois” critics like Douglas Bush and E. M. W. Tillyard. Péti rightly notes the incongruity of identifying the historical Milton as a socialist (he was no Gerrard Winstanley), and yet the popularity of *Samson Agonistes* among socialists and sympathizers (like William Carlos Williams) attests to the way that Milton’s influence exceeds what can be established through what editor Thomas Festa calls “positivist epistemology and intentionalist interpretation” (7).

Essays by John Rumrich and Elizabeth Sauer both explore gaps between Milton’s public self-presentation and documentary evidence from his life. Rumrich examines Milton’s “night at the opera,” referring to his attendance at *Chi soffre spera* in Rome on 27 February 1639 at the *palazzo* of Cardinal Barberini, who personally welcomed him. As Rumrich puts the question, “how did the thirty-year-old Milton come to spend Carnival at an opera in Rome among princes of a religion he considered false and mendacious?” (26). Rumrich proposes that the

answer has to do with point of tension that Milton leaves generally unacknowledged in his autobiographical passages—a tension between highly valued self-control and a profound personal susceptibility to music. The problem, in other words, is one of passion, a topic of noted ambivalence in Milton's oeuvre. Milton the man and Milton the author subtly diverge from each other, perhaps especially when Milton the author is writing about Milton the man.

Sauer's essay considers part of what she calls Milton's "bookscape," that is, the intellectual landscape mapped by the reading on evidence in his *Commonplace Book*. As an aside, Sauer relies on Ruth Mohl's edition of the *Commonplace Book* for the Yale Prose—as she had to in 2017—but in revising the essay has consulted William Poole's 2019 Oxford edition, alongside Poole's previously published scholarship on Milton's reading. Sauer pursues two inter-related theses: that being a "mental traveler in a bookscape" (49) made Milton a humanist and that "Milton often becomes someone else in his printed polemics" (54) than he appears to be in his *Commonplace Book*. To be a humanist meant reading promiscuously, and Milton's gathering of secular, pagan, and sacred sources under the same headings attests to this practice. But being a humanist also meant "digesting" what one read; so, although Milton manifestly read and made use of Machiavelli, he declined to name the influence in his published works. This example had me thinking about how, in *De Doctrina Christiana*, Milton declines to name Johannes Wolleb, the treatise's major interlocutor, generally preferring terms like "the Theologians" to more direct references. Again, Sauer's point is that self-fashioning can produce divergent results even in the same person.

Blurring Milton's place on the political spectrum is Clay Greene's essay about the anonymous 1714 poem *Praeexistence*. Greene begins on familiar historicist ground: noting the backdrop of the War of Spanish Succession and its role in forming the identities of England's Whig and Tory political parties while also making a case that the poem and its printer sit firmly on the Whig side. In this context, he reads the poem as correcting Milton's basically voluntarist (and therefore potentially tyrannical) God with a more rationalist one—an argument that leads him, again on familiar historicist ground,

to consider the poem's relationship to the Cambridge Platonists, those exponents of rational religion and the poem's eponymous doctrine of the soul's pre-existence. This historicist road results in an unexpected U-turn, however, as *Praeexistence* revises Henry More in ways that leave God finally inscrutable to disobedient humanity. At this point, the poem turns out to map uneasily onto the emerging distinction between early eighteenth-century "Miltons": the classicist Tory Milton and the republican-Dissenting Whig Milton. The possibility presents itself that *Praeexistence* is not a Whig poem at all, but a Tory satire of Whig values—perhaps. But the larger point is that it appeared in a moment when Milton's reception in England was heterogeneous in ways not reducible to the neat historicist categories the essay had begun by invoking.

One essay in the volume takes "place" very literally: Jameela Lares's "Milton for Mississippi." Rather than conceptually unsettle Milton's "place," as the essays described so far do, Lares documents a public Milton project that she undertook as the Charles W. Moorman Distinguished Professor of the Humanities at the University of Southern Mississippi. Her essay has a conceptual dimension, about which more in a moment, but largely it aims simply to describe her efforts and to report on their relative success, hoping to provide fodder for future public work on Milton by others. The conceptual aspects of place emerge obliquely, as Lares describes the various communities she is able to engage. Beyond English departments, where is Milton's "place"? Public radio stations, it turns out, and botanical museums, and various places on the internet, and more. Behind the essay's surface pragmatism, with its welcome plenitude of detail, lies a set of larger questions involving the place of the humanities not in America or the world more broadly, but in Hattiesburg, Mississippi. In a way, the pragmatism and detail offer a more hopeful response than more abstract ruminations on such questions often do.

Speaking of abstraction, at the heart of the volume are three essays on "Milton's Mathematical Models" by Matthew Dolloff, Christopher Koester, and D. Geoffrey Emerson. Dolloff and Koester cover similar conceptual territory, situating Milton amidst contemporary developments in the mathematics of infinity (or "indivisibles") by the likes of Torricelli and Wallis. Dolloff's essay centers Torricelli's

figure of “Gabriel’s Trumpet,” which has a finite volume and an infinite surface area, showing that the finite and the infinite can be in proportion to each other. At issue is the infinitude and intelligibility of Milton’s God. Dolloff distinguishes usefully between “negative” conceptions that can define infinity only as “not finite,” thinkable as potentiality rather than actuality, and “positive” conceptions that attend to actual infinities manifesting as extension, say, of a certain imagined “bridge of wondrous length” in *Paradise Lost* (2.1028). Ultimately, Milton engages both modes of thinking about infinity, showing clear debts to Aristotle while also hinting at awareness of the contemporary debates. Koester, working with similar materials (“Gabriel’s Horn” makes an appearance) argues for the influence of mathematical debates on Milton’s account of the Fall, holding that Adam chooses geometric oneness (love and connection) over arithmetic oneness (which depends on a sense of difference and distance between discrete entities). Between the two essays, the volume offers a good primer on seventeenth-century debates about the mathematics of infinity, with notes pointing interested readers to opportunities for deeper engagement.

Emerson’s essay operates in adjacent territory—the names of Galileo and Kepler connect all three essays—but to different ends. Rather than Milton’s engagement with mathematics, Emerson is interested in the ways that scientific writings use poetic tropes and narrative as means for inviting readers to think counterintuitively about cosmology. These literary modes thus serve as a point of continuity between overtly scientific texts and *Paradise Lost*: all traffic in simulation and kinds of scientific modeling. But whereas the scientific texts invoke multiple perspectives in service of stable models, Milton fixes perspectives less reliably (using the figure of Satan, for instance). The dizzying effects that result, argues Emerson, invite readers not only to participate in scientific modeling, but to think metacognitively about it. Milton models modeling.

As collections of essays drawn from a conference go, then, this volume is relatively coherent. Together, the essays invite readers (in the spirit of Emerson’s contribution) to think about the perspectives that produce the various models of Milton that populate our teaching and research—and then to consider not only alternative perspectives

but our very reliance on perspective in the first place. On that note, one might notice some perspectives not on evidence here, such as the emphasis on premodern race that has energized early modern studies in recent years. Even so, the volume puts forward a model that, far from precluding such work, opens space for the kinds of perspectival shifts that attend it. Beyond what the individual essays have to offer, the collection's conceptual framework is a welcome contribution to Milton studies.

Laura Gowing. *Ingenious Trade: Women and Work in Seventeenth-Century London*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2022. x + 275 pp. \$39.99. Review by JOSEPH P. WARD, UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY.

With this important new book, Laura Gowing compellingly expands our understanding of women's contributions to the preindustrial economy by demonstrating their ability to engage in formally recognized work outside the home. Largely focusing on the needle trades during the seventeenth century, she draws on a wide variety of archival, printed, and digital sources to demonstrate conclusively that women were highly capable of engaging independently in the economic life of the metropolis. Although she attends primarily to the experience of women, Gowing also sheds new light on daily life in London in ways that make this book essential reading for anyone interested in the society and culture of the early modern metropolis.

Gowing begins with a richly detailed chapter that reveals the prominent place of women in the manufacturing and distribution of high quality, fashionable clothing in shops located in the Royal Exchange. Working as both seamstresses and shopkeepers, women appear in archival records in several recognized economic roles, including as apprentices, shopkeepers, and tenants of shop stalls in their own right. Along the way, Gowing painstakingly reconstructs the social and economic connections among a subset of several dozen women, highlighting the ways in which kinship, apprenticeship, neighborhood, and executorship established and maintained durable networks of commercially active women.

Gowing's analysis frequently focuses on formal working arrangements, largely apprenticeships, which created relationships that were subject to review by a variety of government agents. Conflict regarding an apprentice's behavior, for example, could spark litigation, and the records of such legal disputes provide much of the evidence for her argument. She substantially advances her story by reading records from the Mayor's Court alongside the records of trade guilds (which were known as 'livery companies'). Different record series contain superficially contradictory data. The vast majority of male apprentices who sued in the Mayor's Court to dissolve their indenture also appeared in livery company records, suggesting that a very high percentage of apprentice bindings were registered with the appropriate company. By contrast, the great majority of female apprentices who sued in the Mayor's Court did not appear in company records. For Gowing, such evidence should meaningfully change our understanding of female participation in work, suggesting that "girls' apprenticeship in City companies was both more extensive and less intermittent than is apparent from the guild records" (80).

This is especially significant when we recognize that only a small portion of apprenticeship contracts generated litigation. Gowing suggests that, unlike a male apprentice, a female apprentice bound to a master or mistress but not registered with a company might not have expected to become free of the company at the conclusion of the term and then able to trade—and to take on apprentices—on her own. This perhaps reflects a difference in social and economic aspirations between female and male apprentices, but it obscures the extent to which young women were engaging in such work. Unlike some previous scholarship, which contrasted the dearth of female apprenticeships appearing in seventeenth-century company records with an earlier 'golden age' of recognized female work, Gowing's innovative methodology shows that female apprenticeship flourished in the latter period, although with variations among occupational groupings and social classes.

Gowing finds that both the number of female apprentices and the number of women who completed apprenticeships and gained the ability to work independently (including the ability to take appren-

tices as ‘mistresses’ rather than ‘masters’) increased during the course of the seventeenth century. She quite plausibly attributes this trend to a variety of factors including the labor shortages resulting from the demographic consequences of major events in the period—such as the Civil Wars during the 1640s and the Great Fire of 1666—and the growth of fashion trades associated with the nascent consumer revolution. Both female apprenticeships and freedom admissions declined at the end of the century, reflecting changes in the structure and geography of the dress trade, but women continued to appear in company apprenticeship and freedom records during the subsequent decades, and their presence increased in the middle years of the eighteenth century. Gowing’s detailed description of women as independent economic agents drawn from court records pushes well beyond what had been previously appreciated by scholars: “In the ambitions and competences of mistresses and their apprentices, late seventeenth-century London’s economic and legal landscape made it a hub of women’s enterprise” (105). The ability of women to support themselves and their households was an essential skillset during an era in which most women could expect to spend much of their adult lives single or widowed (if they married at all).

Although London’s livery companies are not the main focus of Gowing’s work, *Ingenious Trade* makes an important contribution to our understanding of these essential London institutions. Gowing occasionally mentions the historiographical commonplace that the guilds were in decline during the century—“corporate control generally was losing its grip” (213)—as the civic political rights associated, for men, with company membership became less appealing to some. That said, the place of women in company life was in some ways similar to that of immigrants from provincial England and abroad, the ‘foreigners’ and ‘aliens’ so often decried by contemporaries. Yet the companies, through the actions of their rank-and-file members as well as the officials tasked with enforcing the rules, often seemed comfortable bending, if not ignoring, customs and rules when it suited them; many of the court cases Gowing analyzes demonstrate this quite clearly. In such ways, the companies demonstrated their capacity for gradual adaptation to changing circumstances rather than standing rigidly in opposition to change. This may be among



the reasons why many of them have survived, albeit in quite different forms, to this day.

Gowing is a skilled storyteller. Throughout the book she reconstructs the social life of work, with multigenerational households teaming with activity and ties of kinship shaping economic opportunities. Many of the careers she reconstructs through court cases remind us that the margin between prosperity and penury was very fine, and lives as well as livelihoods could be overturned in an instant. In such an environment, partnership and shared accommodation could be crucial forms of social as well as economic support, perhaps especially for single women in an urban society based on the household. Gowing is able to illuminate such commonplaces because she has both a highly sophisticated command of methodology and an eye carefully attuned to nuances hidden in the turns of a phrase in court records. Finally, and perhaps best of all, she writes in a style that makes her book readily accessible to students and those generally interested in early modern daily life.

Ian Gentles. *The New Model Army Agent of Revolution*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2022. xii + 386 pages, illustrations, maps. \$38.00. Review by EDWARD M. FURGOL, MONTGOMERY COLLEGE-ROCKVILLE, MD.

Gentles has revised his 1992 study of the English New Model Army and expanded its coverage from 1654 to 1660. In doing so he has produced a thorough study of the Army and its impact on politics and political ideology. For the immediate future the book will serve as the definitive work on that subject. The author's mastery of the relevant manuscript and printed primary sources and secondary works is exemplary.

The political activity of the army dominates the book's fifteen chapters; thus, the book is not a military history. The first twelve cover the story from 1645 through 1653. Chapter one deals with the army's founding, which illustrates the author's incisive analysis. Three decisions made then had a crucial impact on its ideological diversity. One, not requiring the enlisted men to swear the Solemn League and

Covenant (9) prevented unity with the Scottish Covenanters and the Protestant forces in Ulster. The decision not to purge radicals (12) gave that group not only a safe haven, but the possession of weapons to obtain their ends. The failure to include a clause requiring the protection of the king's person (as opposed to rescuing him from wicked councilors, 14–15) planted the seeds of revolution. In chapter two we learn that service in the infantry required an act for drafting men. It was essential as the desertion rate for the foot soldiers was fifty percent. In the army's first two months it lost over 4,000 recruits, a situation that continued in 1646. By autumn 1645 it had only two-thirds of its authorized numbers. The challenge of adequately funding the army led to men living on free quarter, a situation that was never solved despite increasing taxes. Arrears in pay came after April 1647, but many had arrears for their pre-1645 service, which made them resistant to disbanding until paid. (Not mentioned by the author, but doubtless known to soldiers from coastal areas, was the fact that English governments in the 1500s and 1600s routinely discharged Royal Navy seaman without paying them.) Only chapter three deals solely with military operations, covering those of 1645–46. Chapter four covers religion and morale. The latter was high due to the army's "collective religious consciousness" (46). While Gentles cites Anne Laurence's work on army chaplains, he does not divulge if they were constantly present. The reviewer has long wondered if the absence of ministers led officers and soldiers to preach, a question which is not addressed. While the Covenanting armies replicated civilian religious practice—each regiment was a parish, and each army had a presbytery—some New Model units saw themselves as "gathered churches" separate from civil society (55). The issues of pay, an act of indemnity, and selection for service in Ireland are the well-known grievances that politicized the army. In chapters five and six Gentles, using pamphlets, petitions, and other primary documents, painstakingly discusses how the army transformed from being the servant of Parliament to its master. He deals with the defeat of the counter-revolution or Second Civil War in chapter seven. The political story resumes in chapter eight, dealing with the decisions to try and execute Charles I. Chapter nine harkens back to the pre-regicide period, dealing with the Levellers mutiny and its destruction at the hands of the Army's senior officers or grandees.

Diversions to army conquest and rule in Ireland and Scotland follow in individual chapters. Chapters 12–15 return to the political field, with the *Western Design* (261–67) serving as a break from political activity. (Intriguingly, there is no coverage of the army's more impressive intervention in Flanders nor its ideological components. How did the officers regard alliance with a Roman Catholic kingdom? Was antipathy to Catholics and kings offset by fighting soldiers of the militant Counter-Reformation? Nor do we learn anything about the units who went there—was it seen as chance to reduce the number of radicals in the Protectorate or was a chance for those most loyal to Cromwell to shine?) Gentles covers the political narrative in meticulous detail and analysis. In the 1650s the army's political consciousness came to rest in the officer corps (p.237) Was that due to the dilution of recruits or to a lack of hope in political change—due to the defeats of the Levellers and Fifth Monarchists—amongst the enlisted men? Given the strident political opinions of the officer corps the reviewer has always thought it odd that the republican officers did not fight Monck's army. Gentles explains that the prospect of political defeat paralyzed their ability to act (61). By 1656 the Army officers realized that their aspirations conflicted with those of the overwhelming majority of subjects in the three kingdoms (283), which enforced unity in the corps and may have enhanced its feeling of hopelessness. Lambert's republican force, which was in the path of Monck's advance from Scotland, suffered from low morale, no pay and desertion, thus convincing its commander not to fight (306, 308). Perhaps Gentles' most surprising find is Monck's conversion to royalism in August 1659 (315). The residue of republicanism in the horse regiments (thirty percent of the men) was insufficient leaven to outweigh the other soldiers' hope of arrears from a restored Charles II (316). The decline of the enlisted men's interest in politics, divisions within the officer corps and Monck's constant statements of support for the republic coalesced with the three kingdoms' desire for the restoration of the monarchy. While the New Model Army would eventually be seen as a force for representative government and law reform, its legacy also created antipathy to standing armies in Britain and its empire (321).

The book has some dubious elements. The book is obviously not a military history, despite its references to military operations. No

military historian would relegate logistics to the notes, as occurs for 1645 (330–31, notes 29–32) and for the invasion of Scotland (351, note 6). Although the author credits Cromwell with concentrating on pay, supply and naval aid in the Irish campaign (176–77), he also notes that half-pay led to poor conduct (184). In 1648 Gentles gives Cromwell credit for capturing Berwick and Carlisle, fortresses the Scottish Engagers evacuated not due to military action but to the Treaty of Stirling (126). While the recruiting of Irish Roman Catholics as replacements is acknowledged, there is no follow up (193). Did these men convert? If they did not, what impact did they have on unit cohesion? The Scottish chapter (eleven) is full of erroneous matter. That the Engagers contained mostly Covenanters, with a sprinkling of Hamiltonian Royalists, is entirely overlooked. The statement that the Kirk Party represented “A majority of Covenanters” is wrong, as is the assertion that it joined with the Engagers to resist Cromwell’s 1650 invasion (both on 205). Equally, incorrect is the statement that Cromwell weaned “many Scots” from supporting Charles II (206). Only three military officers defected (Strachan, Dundas, and Swinton), and the Western Remonstrants (who refused orders from the royal government in Stirling) hated the religious aspects of the New Model as much, if not more, than it distrusted Charles II. Assigning Cromwell and Lambert all the credit for Dunbar (213–14) overlooks Lieutenant General David Leslie’s failure to ensure a robust scouting/picket line, the officers’ desertion of their units, and Major General Holburn’s order that only ten percent of the musketeers should keep their matches lit, meaning that body of men was unready for immediate action. Calling Colonels Ker and Strachan “moderate Covenanters” (214) would receive no agreement from Leslie or any Scottish historian. The account of the battle of Inverkeithing (217) fails to analyze the Scottish force, which was too small, mixed veteran and raw troops, as well as Kirk Party and militant Royalists, and had no artillery. The gross mistreatment of the Dunbar prisoners of war is glossed over (“if they had not already died in England,” 223) with over half dying in captivity (making the army’s treatment of them like the Germans of Red Army prisoners in World War II). The brutal pillaging of Dundee is mentioned (223), but no explanation is offered for it lasting *two* weeks. Monck’s system of passes for people moving within Scotland

appears as an innovation when it copied the established requirement for testimonials if a person changed parishes. Similarly, his holding clan chiefs responsible for the behavior of clansmen copied pre-1639 Scottish Privy Council mandates (233). Gentles makes the fascinating statement (331, note 36) that the initial color(s) of uniforms was not necessarily replicated in new issues of clothing. Countless books, lacking the author's knowledge, have credited the army with making the red uniform coat a constant presence.

The supporting material in the book is of a mixed nature. The notes (fifty pages) sadly appear after the text. The sixteen illustrations are well chosen. Most of the nine maps are of questionable value. Six of them deal with battles in 1645–51, which in a book that is not a military history seem utterly out of place. One map showing sites of important army political events in England and another for London would have been more valuable. Another map is of Hispaniola for the 1655 campaign; a map of the Caribbean would have suited the narrative better. Only the maps of Monck's 1654 campaign against Glencairn's Royalist rising in Scotland and the provinces of the major-generals in 1655–56 add to one's understanding of events. The select bibliography (only a page and a quarter) is a disservice to the author whose knowledge of the sources is comprehensive. It diminishes the book's value as a foundation for future research.

The book should attract the attention of diverse readers. Those wanting to know the importance of the army—outside of its victories—will find the answer in it. Portions could be assigned to undergraduate and postgraduate students. Anyone dealing with English politics in 1645–60 should consult it.

Sigrun Haude. *Coping with Life during the Thirty Years' War (1618-1648)*. Boston: Brill, 2021, xvi + 311 pp. Review by EDWARD M. FURGOL, MONTGOMERY COLLEGE-ROCKVILLE, MD.

Sigrun Haude has authored an important book dealing with life during the Thirty Years' War. The expected details of theft, flight, assaults are present, as are the failure of local governments to provide protection and sufficient relief to their populations. What is unex-

pected is the positive agency and successes achieved by civilians.

Contrary to the title the book does not cover the full geographic scope of the war. It is a strictly regional history, covering Bavaria and Franconia. The chief areas of importance are the duchy of Bavaria and the imperial city of Nuremberg. The scale of devastation endured by the latter created a population loss only recovered in the mid-eighteenth century. Its economic and political status never regained its pre-war level.

Duke Maximilian of Bavaria (whose rule lasted from 1597 to 1651), appears as a meticulous autocrat. He issued many orders covering all aspects of life. These often originated from places of safety, for the duke never risked capture or experienced the hardships of his people. His instructions went not only to his civil servants, but also to city officials and priests. From the author's discussion of the latter, it appears that only the duke's instructions mattered for them and that their bishops and other members of the church hierarchy had no role in setting their goals. Conversely, for Lutheran clergy in Franconia the Brandenburg-Ansbach consistory provided orders and assistance to a degree throughout the period. Haude makes it clear that no civil or religious authority could cope with the magnitude of challenges created by years of war and its accompanying diseases, food insecurity and economic collapse.

In the book's four chapters the duke plus several Roman Catholic religious and Lutheran ministers will become familiar to the reader. Their personalities become memorable. The same cannot be said of the burger officials in Munich, Nuremberg and elsewhere. They, like the Lutheran consistory, appear as corporate entities lacking any individual expression. The same holds true for burghers and peasants, who are voiceless. Their behavior was observed, and interpreted by the clerical writers and official documents, as well as directed by officialdom.

One of Haude's major intentions is to show that the period was not one solely of property devastation, theft, demographic decline, and terror. The book's chapters and conclusion allow one ignorant of the Thirty Years' War, the region Bavaria-Franconia, and the responses or "coping" to learn how parts of the Holy Roman Empire experienced the war. Haude's first chapter introduces historiography, methodology, the war, and people one meets in the succeeding three chapters.

Chapter two reviews how the war was experienced. It follows the expected themes of anxiety, fear, instability, impoverishment, hunger, and violence. The third chapter deals with governmental responses, which with the constant presence of troops and their requirements for food as well as their desire for plunder, the length of the struggle, and the outbreak of epidemics appear have been largely inadequate. The fourth chapter addresses coping mechanisms both popular and originating from religious authorities. If flight became constant, people could suffer from *ins Elend* (entering misery) as the prospects of returning to their *Heimat* (homeland) receded. The book demonstrates that both individuals and groups had agency in responding to an unprecedented and unremitting crisis that brought food insecurity, disease (including an outbreak of the plague) and death. People benefited from living in cities, especially well-fortified ones, and from having a community/network (other houses of a religious order, for instance) or creating one (for example, peasants banding together against looting soldiers). Although the peasant effort in 1633 in southeastern Bavaria led to savage repression by the duke. Merchants with international links strove to make profits regardless of political and religious loyalties. The establishment of the *Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft* (a literary society) brought members of both faiths together. Sometimes flight was the only choice. Movement of troops and people created new contacts that allowed curiosity to create relationships that ran contrary to expectations such as Protestant Swedish officers providing protection to Roman Catholic Bavarians in religious orders. Occasionally, negotiation with enemy or one's own soldiers (who often treated their civilian counterparts like an enemy) bore fruit. At times hope and religion lifted people from the pit of despair. The growth of religious skepticism and pietism undermined the basis for future confessional conflicts. The maelstrom of war revived traditional magical practices (including by some clergy) as people sought any the means to survive. The refusal to accept victimhood as the only response appears in the personal accounts, which contained heightened appreciation of good outcomes, as well as humorous incidents. The official documents in their prescriptions on how people should behave towards onerous soldiers sometimes demonstrate a lack of reality or wishful thinking. The failure of state and civic authorities to provide protection and

poor relief weakened the bounds of allegiance.

The book's supporting material is impressive. Notes appear at the foot of the page—not at the end of a chapter nor at the end of the book as some publishers have done in recent years despite the arrival of digital typesetting. Usually, I complain about a paucity of maps. This volume has a plentiful supply ensuring that the reader is never lost when obscure German places appear in the text. The author has provided a useful glossary. The quantity and quality of the primary source material impresses. Nearly a fifth of the forty-one-page bibliography lists manuscript and primary sources. In addition to substantial ducal, city and consistory records the study benefits from a number of personal narratives covering many years of the period. The material suffices to provide a solid foundation for the author's analyses. The extremely thorough index covers over twenty pages.

The book may serve as a template for additional studies on the war, and more generally responses to warfare in early modern Europe. Peculiarly, Haude ignores other studies of civilians enduring military conflict in the period, such as Myron P. Gutman's *War and rural life in the early modern Low Countries* (twenty-one editions 1980–2016). Haude examines Bavaria and Franconia microscopically but fails to make any efforts to compare that region with anywhere else in Europe that experienced similar lengthy periods of warfare. That hole in the book is puzzling but provides the possibility for many future studies. The eight-page (133–41) discussion of the European news industry while valuable removes space that could have discussed whether the nascent illustration industry or if any local artist produced works covering the period. The use of a Dutch painting on the cover implies that the war and its associated activities failed to inspire any images, which is odd.

*Coping with Life during the Thirty Years' War* should attract a substantial readership. As noted above Haude clearly explains the situation in Bavaria and Franconia, making the book accessible to a general reader. It could serve as a text for courses dealing with the civilian experience of warfare, as well as seventeenth-century German history. The work should also serve as a template for similar studies, making it attractive for historical researchers.



Ronald Hutton. *The Making of Oliver Cromwell*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2021. xxii + 400 pp. + 20 illus. \$35.00. Review by Niall Allsopp, University of Exeter.

Ronald Hutton's fascinating new biography offers a compelling portrait of Oliver Cromwell's early life and initial rise to power. There is much here to engage a seventeenth-century specialist, especially in the rich endnotes, but the book will also appeal to a wider audience of general readers. In this regard, Hutton succeeds in producing a typically lucid and propulsive narrative history. His writing is particularly memorable in what he has described as "absurdly lavish" descriptions of the English countryside, evoking a tradition of English nature writers like Oliver Rackham. As Cromwell pursues Prince Rupert through the Trent Valley in the spring of 1644, for instance, we pause to observe that "the hawthorns had come into their creamy white blossom" (169). At one especially dramatic moment, Cromwell crests the ridge at Langport, Somerset and takes in the view of the Somerset levels, recognizing a miniature version of his native Fens (277)—Hutton's observation is characteristically acute, both in terms of topography and in the sense of narrative theatre, as anyone who regularly bursts through this very vista on the Great Western railway line can attest. This epic scale, however, works as a kind of displacement. Hutton conjures up the grandeur of the civil wars in England's landscape rather than in her people—who appear, like the grasshoppers in Marvell's "Upon Appleton House," cut down to size.

The question that any book on Cromwell must answer is: why another book on Cromwell? Hutton confesses to "trepidation" at contributing to an industry that is currently putting out a new biography of Cromwell every five years. Of direct contemporaries, only Milton can rival him as a subject for biographers. Hutton's effort joins Nicholas McDowell's recent landmark *Poet of Revolution: John Milton in the Making* (also from Yale, 2021) in a recent fashion for "Making Of" titles. For both of these recent books, this means stopping the story in the mid 1640s, arguably just when things are getting interesting. Hutton's book closes in 1646, with Cromwell the victorious general buying his first house in Westminster ready for the

political struggles ahead. The advantage of this framing, apart from keeping the book of a manageable size, is to remove the hindsight-goggles of what Cromwell later became, to reveal a Cromwell who was still becoming. It is in this sense a classically revisionist manoeuvre, revealing Cromwell the junior “enforcer and bully-boy” (104), being driven by events rather than driving them. The disadvantage of this approach is that it throws a lot of attention onto the long period of Cromwell’s life of which we know practically nothing, including the long list of apocryphal incidents that almost certainly *didn’t* happen. Conversely, to try to make sense of Cromwell without any mention of the regicide, or Drogheda, or the expulsion of the Rump, or the refusal of the Crown—this also seems arbitrary in its way. On the one hand, Hutton’s conclusion suggests, persuasively, that by 1646 the full complexity of Cromwell’s nature had been revealed: “courageous, devout, resolute, principled, intelligent, eloquent, able, adaptable and dedicated, but also self-seeking, unscrupulous, dishonest, manipulative, vindictive and bloodthirsty” (338). But on the other hand, Hutton slightly undercuts this by frequently writing as if Cromwell had arrived fully-formed from the beginning: doubtful anecdotes about his student life are dismissed because they “could have been deduced anyway from his later character” (19).

As the above list of his character traits shows, Hutton’s central and distinctive emphasis is on Cromwell’s powers as a politician (again, a feature that was not exactly diminished after 1646). The riddle that has always fascinated students of Cromwell is his amazing capacity to be “both godly and wily” (3), the possessor simultaneously of Providential gifts and inhuman guile. Many biographers, Hutton contends, have strived too hard to overturn the stereotype of “Craftie Cromwell,” the perfidious Machiavel of royalist tradition, by placing an over-correcting emphasis on Cromwell’s piety. Such biographers, following in the Victorian footsteps of Thomas Carlyle and S. R. Gardiner, have drowned in the torrent of words Oliver himself left behind him, pleading his zeal and earnest good intentions. Hutton the revisionist works to reinstate Crafty Cromwell. Craftiness, in fact, went hand-in-hand with piety, as being God’s instrument justified one in pursuing God’s ends with ruthlessness. There is a danger with this approach of inadvertently recreating the tactics of royalist propaganda, in which any routine

act of pragmatism can be seized on as revealing demonic cunning—a simple face-saving letter after a drawn battle, for example (111). But Hutton is restrained and forensic in unravelling the events of battles from Cromwell’s biased accounts of them. He reveals a distinct and repeating pattern, through battles at Lowestoft, Crowland, Belton, Gainsborough, to Marston Moor, and Naseby, of manipulation and inflation of his own achievements. All while subtly diminishing his rivals—often by attributing their successes, with seeming modesty, to the impersonal hand of Providence. These self-promoting reports were rhetorically effective and, crucially, were retailed as fact in London.

This highlighting of Cromwell’s rhetorical mastery is a significant and highly welcome contribution to the debate. But it also raises questions, and it is to be hoped that Hutton’s work, along with the imminent new edition of the *Letters, Writings and Speeches* under the general editorship of John Morrill (Oxford, 2022) will make possible further insights. As a literary scholar, I am especially keen to hear more detail on Cromwell’s style of rhetorical manipulation. Hutton offers some close readings, for instance on Cromwell’s “scatter-gun” approach to persuasion (338), but there is room for more precision here. Absent are the more textured attention to the language and metaphors of political persuasion in other recent historians of print campaigning, like Michael Braddick and Thomas Leng. My second question relates to the “reliable set of admiring journalists who could normally be relied upon to eulogize” Cromwell (331). These remain shadowy figures in Hutton’s account. It is always difficult when working with anonymous printed materials, but given their centrality to the story, I would have liked to learn more about them. Recent studies driven by book history, by Jason Peacey and especially David Como, have shown what can be achieved in unravelling 1640s printing campaigns and political networks. There is an opportunity here to uncover further new insights into who provided Cromwell’s loudhailer, what company they kept, and how they hoped to benefit.

These requests for further detail may not be consistent with Hutton’s professed aim of delivering a manageable and accessible book—but they should be seen in the context of the long passages given over not only to landscape description, but to the recounting of military campaigns, including several in which Oliver was not himself

involved. It is to military history that Hutton devotes most attention, in this sense returning to the subject of his first book, based on his Oxford D.Phil. thesis, *The Royalist War Effort, 1642–1646* (Oxford, 1982). The military historian's skills of teasing out the movement of a campaign on the ground—the logistical muddles, the interpersonal tensions, the seat-of-the-pants decision making—makes some of the most compelling material here. Hutton also shows the influence of his training by maintaining a revisionist's keen emphasis on the role of contingency in shaping events. Hutton's Cromwell is in some ways an ideal revisionist model: a quiet country gentleman, downwardly mobile, who became a revolutionary late in life, and almost by accident. Few of the political flashpoints of the early Stuart period touched Cromwell's life before 1640. And when they were unavoidable—such as the controversial Fen drainage schemes around the Isle of Ely—Hutton shows him to have been lukewarm on the issue, perhaps even mildly in favour (31–32). Hutton writes collegially and avoids controversy, but as with other historians of his generation, his account of the causes and outbreak of the war can feel bloodless at times. Some historians—like David Cressy and Joh Walter—have more recently stressed the simmering tensions and burgeoning popular politics of the early 1640s: it would be fascinating to read further reflections on how these contexts impacted on Cromwell the charismatic galvanizer.

Hutton provides an exemplary, cautious, and conservative account of Cromwell's early years. He suggests that Cromwell's merit lay as much in his virtues of competence and stubbornness as in his fire and zeal (326). He does give due weight to Cromwell's religion: we are told "it is clear enough that Cromwell's religion was one of the key aspects of his personal make-up" (269), he was "an absolutely stereotypical Puritan" (40), and even "a Puritan jihadi" (332). These observations stress religion, while remaining slightly formulaic—lacking the verve and depth of the descriptions of landscape and of battle. All of Cromwell's greatest hits are here—for instance, electrifying the Commons with his tearful defence of John Lilburne, specks of blood visible on his collar from a shaving accident (62)—but Hutton, persuasively, emphasizes the element of politician's performance in such occasions. The texture of godly life, the rituals and shared experiences that bound puritan communities together, which have been richly uncovered by

social historians of religion including Alec Ryrie, Ann Hughes, and Joel Halcomb, make relatively little impact in Hutton's book. There are, of course, limitations on available evidence, but only fleetingly do we see Cromwell attending sermons or prayer meetings (154, 296), or having a frosty encounter with Richard Baxter (269–70). Without this context it is harder to grasp the fervent personal loyalty—and equally intense feelings of betrayal—that Cromwell could inspire; the shared experience that bound him together with fellow believers, that made him capable of sending a “hit squad” into the Cambridge colleges, and of cutting off the king's head. In this sense I missed here some of the most deeply engaging facets of Hutton's rich, varied, and sometimes strange career: the bold juxtaposing of social history with high politics in his study of *The Restoration* (Oxford, 1985); the ethnography of parish community life in *The Rise and Fall of Merry England* (Oxford, 1994); or even the still more recent histories of witches, druids, and shamans. Not that there is much in the way of church ales or paganism in Cromwell's life, but there is more that a scholar like Hutton might interestingly tell us about the values and practices through which Cromwell and his allies sought to supplant such things.

Hall Bjørnstad. *The Dream of Absolutism: Louis XIV and the Logic of Modernity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2021. xii + 230 pp. + 21 illus. \$30.00 (paper). Review By IVY DYCKMAN, INDEPENDENT SCHOLAR.

If we as citizens of our planet are paying even minimal attention to the barrage of daily news throughout the ether, we know that democracies around the globe are facing existential crises. Whatever the principles espoused by autocratic leaders and governments, all of them adhere to a similar political playbook. Historically, we also know that repressive phenomena disappear and reappear in analogous forms fairly predictably. In this monograph, the author Hall Bjørnstad considers one of the world's most recognized authoritarian sovereigns. Louis XIV, whose epithets “Louis le Grand” and “le Roi Soleil” reflected both the image he had of himself and the one propagated inside and outside the confines of his realm, is deemed by many to represent

the absolute monarch par excellence. Rather than focusing on Louis XIV per se, Bjørnstad examines instead the dream or manifestation of absolutism that the king, together with his “image-makers, the court, if not the whole nation, dreamt together collectively and that perhaps remains latent in the collective political imaginary today” (xi). Throughout his study, then, Bjørnstad seems to encourage his readers to peer into the past in order to awaken them to the surge of dreams of absolutism occurring right now.

In between the lengthy introduction and the pithy conclusion, Bjørnstad sandwiches three chapters that support the argumentation of his book. He explores the expression of monarchal absolutism through cultural artifacts as opposed to the more concrete economic, political, and social avenues. He insists that what he proposes is not regime propaganda even if it may be interpreted as such. He explores the notion of the dream of absolutism through textual and visual examples. Chapters 1 and 3 rely on lesser-known writings from the period in question. Chapter 2 takes readers to the Hall of Mirrors in the splendid royal Palace of Versailles. While the chapters appear chronologically in the text, the order of discussion here will be slightly modified.

The title “Mirrors of Absolutism” aptly describes the contents of Chapter 2. The visual element of Bjørnstad’s analysis not only makes for a fitting introduction to his work but also generates a most convincing, clear-cut, and illustrative discussion of the dream of absolutism, which functions concurrently as a reflection of modernity. Beautiful color plates of Charles Le Brun’s decorative artwork facilitate the author’s vivid observations. In this section, Bjørnstad details the history of the Hall of Mirrors (in French “La Grande Galerie” or the more recent “La Galerie des Glaces”); the iconography; the technological innovations, placement, and symbolism of the mirrors; and the impressions of Louis XIV as well as those of visitors over the decades. Whether experiencing the Hall of Mirrors in person or virtually, one is bedazzled by the esthetics and majesty of the space. Perhaps the most fascinating, impactful passage of this chapter is the author’s in-depth examination of Le Brun’s mythological concept of the inception of Louis’s personal rule in 1661. The strategically placed painting, *Le Roi gouverne par lui-même*, 1661, appears on the ceiling of the vault of

the Hall of Mirrors. Within this depiction of the defining moment in the long reign of the Sun King, another image within the larger one reveals the sovereign's soul, which remains shrouded in the portrayal of the event itself. Upon close observation, the viewer may detect a reflection of the royal face in the shield of the allegorical figure of the Roman goddess Minerva. Here, the artist deviates from the king's public stoic persona. As First Painter to the King, Le Brun exposed an emotion-filled face heretofore closeted from view. A familiar anecdote recounted by Le Brun's hagiographic biographer Claude Nivelon attests to Louis's interiority. Upon first viewing Le Brun's *La Résolution prise de faire la guerre aux Hollandais*, 1671, the king remarked to the artist from his position on the floor well below the high ceiling, "M. Le Brun, vous m'avez fait voir des choses que j'ai ressenties." The painter was not only honored by Louis's unanticipated emotional reaction but also by the royal touch on his arm.

Bjørnstad's additional support of his argument relies on three lesser-known writings of the period in question. He devotes the first chapter to Louis XIV's *Mémoires*, whose content and grammar he analyses. This sort of how-to manual was devised for the purpose of transmitting to his successor the Dauphin royal advice and real-life examples thereby assuring the continuation of absolute rule à la Louis. The project began in 1661, which was simultaneously the year of the Dauphin's birth and the beginning of Louis XIV's personal reign. The irony of this book is twofold. By all accounts, Louis neither wrote the *Mémoires* himself nor did his eldest son ever see the work. Tragically for the king, the Dauphin's unexpected demise prevented him from ensuring the everlasting replication of his father's dream of absolutism. The king's desire for a *mise-en-abîme* type of governance was foiled. He failed to control "the future beyond his own reign" (42).

Bjørnstad offers two final texts to complete his probe into tangible evidence of Louis XIV's vision of absolutism. He classifies both as "Absolutist Absurdities," the title he fittingly conceived for Chapter 3, and selects as examples over-the-top writings associated with recognized literary genres, the parallel and the fairy tale. In fact, each comes across as a subtly irreverent, farcical image of the king, his rule, and his dream. Notwithstanding the inflated panegyric, these oblique portrayals of authority seem to emerge as subjects grow weary and

more critical of authoritarian patterns and behaviors. The first text, published in 1685, concerns Claude-Charles Guyonnet de Vertron's *Parallèle de Louis le Grand avec les princes qui ont été surnommés grands*. The author, who identifies himself on the title page as a historiographer of the king, talks about great sovereigns of the past, Louis being the greatest. He is so great, in fact, that it would be inconceivable to imagine a future king as superior as he. Vertron underscores Louis's greatness as existing only in the present. He stops short of acknowledging the predetermined role of his royal successor as outlined in the *Mémoires*. The fairy tale example that follows is decidedly more engaging simply due to the fantastical, cleverly subversive nature of the genre. After delving into the complexities and analysis of Jean de Préchac's tale, "Sans Parangon," first published in 1698, the reader may better understand why Bjørnstad chose it to conclude his book, since it acts as a summation of his previous discussions and serves as a vehicle for conveying reality through the intervention of the supernatural. Even as he celebrates the glory of his Louis-inspired fictional king, Préchac challenges the sovereignty of the fairies. The king is able to achieve greatness without their magic. There is no happy ending in this fairy tale, only a contest to continue waging war against them. In this instance, fairies, not human beings, are the casualties in the king's dream of absolutism. Louis's glory surpasses even the supernatural.

Boris Donn , *Moli re*. Paris: Les  ditions du Cerf 2022. 184 pp.  15.00. Review by DENIS D. GR L , THE UNIVERSITY OF MEMPHIS.

Another book on Moli re? Don't we know by now everything that needs to be known about Jean Baptiste Poquelin? But do we know Moli re the man? This is the question that Boris Donn  attempts to answer in this short book in the collection *Qui es-tu?* In order to do so, Donn  applies the traditional chronological framework to structure the life of Moli re around the three phases of his life: the first part (entitled "L' cole des hommes") retraces his youth with the experience of the Illustre th  tre and his long journey throughout France; the second part ("Le Comique honn te homme") looks at his march to glory when he comes back to Paris and becomes the author of



*Tartuffe* and *Dom Juan*; and then the last part (“Le Moi imaginaire”) examines the maturity and the death of the great man.

Donné’s objective is to discover Molière, the man behind the legend, using the few historical documents that exist. His method rests, like that of many who have studied Molière, on the study of archival material. He looks at the documents but notes that they are unfortunately few and already well known. The second group of sources studied are the various books written by people who knew Molière directly or heard from people who had known him. The problem with this lot is that many texts are unreliable at best (Grimarest’s *Vie de Molière*), questionable (*La fameuse Comédienne*, an anonymous pamphlet directed against Armande Béjart), or even malicious (Chalussay’s *Elomire hypocondre*). Faced with those difficulties, Donné tries a different approach: Still taking into account the context, the historical documents—especially in the first part of the book—as well as the dubious information gathered on Molière, Donné investigates what Molière himself left us: his plays. The essential objective is, as Donné puts it, “comprendre Molière de l’intérieur, en dévoilant ou en imaginant ce qui, dans sa vie, explique qu’il ait créé cet ensemble unique de comédie” (18) [to understand Molière from the inside, revealing or imagining what in his life explains how he was able to create this unique set of plays]. Whereas Laurent Tirard imagined in his movie *Molière* (2007) how the playwright came up with his ideas about his characters, Donné reconstructs in this book what Molière the man could have been based on the characters in his plays. Futile, some will say, unreliable if not deceptive, will state others, Donné makes the bet that it is not pointless or deceptive, and that it is worth looking into all those familiar plays to find “la présence humaine de l’auteur” (20) [the human presence of the author].

In order to do so, Donné puts everything that could be relevant about Molière the man flat out on the page, weaving, through this short narrative, seventeenth-century history as well as the different stories and the few probable biographical elements that can be gleaned in his many plays. So as to make sure that the reader is not misled, the use of italics to indicate some controversial elements helps greatly in differentiating ascertained facts from possible fantasy. This gives

Donné the opportunity to delve into some of the myths surrounding the life of Molière such as the dubious friendship that the playwright would have had with the Prince de Conti or, more controversially, the improbable incest with Armande Béjart. As we advance throughout the book, the personality of Molière is slowly developed. The reader is guided, as Don Cléofas by Asmodée, through much of the life of the author and actor. The goal is to try to lift the mask in order to glimpse a character trait, an experience, a fear that Molière would have left in the characters he was depicting. Ultimately, Donné shows how Molière, the man who fought to denounce hypocrisy and the false pretenses, became Molière, the man who renounced fighting the hopeless battle against human nature.

If Donné tends to reconstruct and sometimes imagine (too much?) what Molière could have been, his argument is nonetheless compelling, and the research is sound. Despite the absence of notes and the very short bibliography—probably due to editorial imperatives—it is obvious that Donné knows his Molière very well. If, at times, he lets himself be guided by a certain feeling he entertains about his subject matter and even if his book does not bring anything new on Molière the author, this new perspective on Molière the man is worth reading. Easily accessible to anyone speaking French and interested in Jean-Baptiste Poquelin, his life, and his personality, this very lively book is a pleasure to read.

Pedro De Valencia. Vincent Parello, ed. and trans. *Le traité sur les Morisques d'Espagne*. Paris: Classiques Garnier, 2021. 271 pp. €32.00. Review by MARÍA HERNÁNDEZ, ROWAN UNIVERSITY.

*Le Traité sur les Morisques d'Espagne* includes a new Spanish edition of Pedro de Valencia's text, *Acerca de los moriscos de España*, and an annotated, first-ever French translation by Vincent Parello. Born in 1555, Pedro de Valencia, often compared today to Erasmus (1466–1536), was a humanist, prolific writer, philosopher, translator, Spanish historian, and chronicler of King Philip III of Spain. *Acerca de los Moriscos de España* was authored around 1605 and circulated as a manuscript only in a limited erudite circle throughout the seventeenth century.

Parello's volume is divided into three sections: an introduction, a brief chronology on Moriscos between 1492 and 1614, and the treatise's text and translation, followed by a general bibliography and two indexes, one for noteworthy people, philosophers, writers, and biblical characters, the second for the names of different peoples quoted in de Valencia's treatise. In the introduction, divided into four subdivisions, Parello first describes that Moriscos were descendants of *Mudéjares*, Muslims who became subjects of Spanish Christian Kingdoms and were forced to become newly converted Christians in practice. At the same time, they experienced intense discrimination in the period that spans from the capture of Granada in 1492 to the phased expulsion of Moriscos from Iberian soil ordered by King Philip III of Spain and the Duke of Lerma, which started in 1609 and lasted until 1614. In the second part of the introduction, Parello presents a biography of Pedro de Valencia that situates the humanist in his historical context and offers the current state of academic knowledge about the author. Parello justifies the silence surrounding de Valencia and his work (14) due to the author's mistrust regarding the printing press, intellectual elitism, writing in Latin, and finally, his being ahead of his time. In the third section of his introduction, Parello dives into de Valencia's *Acerca de los Moriscos de España* by describing the three existing manuscripts at the *Biblioteca Nacional de España*. Parello explains that according to de Valencia himself, the text was not meant to be published but instead intended for King Philip III and his royal circle (16). De Valencia's work is part of the controversial literature that opposes the apologists in favor of the Moriscos' expulsion from the Iberian soil and the reformers opposing the expulsion; Pedro de Valencia was among the latter. In *Acerca de Los Moriscos de España*, de Valencia uses argumentative rhetoric devices to no avail to try to convince King Philip III and his advisors to be more sympathetic towards Moriscos. In the last part of his introduction, Parello reflects on de Valencia's modernity as evidenced by his hostility towards the barbaric and dehumanizing treatments promoted by contemporaneous authors and thinkers against Moriscos.

The most extended section in the book, some 230 pages, is devoted to Pedro de Valencia's Spanish text and Parello's translation and comments. Parello offers his readership a bilingual edition, with a

facing-page translation accompanied by comments in the footnotes under the French translation. In his first footnote, Parelo informs his readership that he has established his version of the text and his translation on the “manuscript 8888” (28), which is the most recent version dated from 1701, and that he also referred to Rafael Gonzales Cañal and Hipolito B. Riesco Alvarez’s editions. Manuscript 8888 is digitally available at *Biblioteca Digital Hispánica*, the online branch of *Biblioteca Nacional de España*. After comparing manuscript 8888 and this new edition, we observe that Parelo reproduces the original text, its punctuation, and its spelling as closely as possible without modernizing it. However, he obliterates the accents on “è,” “à,” “ò”; “ó” is also replaced by “y.” Parelo does not explicitly comment on his translation choices and methodology but having the Spanish text next to the French translation helps the readers conjecture about the translator’s choices. For that matter, Parelo sometimes resorted to replacing the Spanish parataxis with shorter sentences in his French translation. To achieve it, Parelo sparingly modified punctuation from commas to semicolons, inexistent in the original version, or added periods. For example, this sentence-paragraph in Spanish: “Esta desconfianza para vivir con prevencion [...] cercanos, y lexanos, fieles y infieles.” (34), is translated into two sentences in French: “Par le temps qui courent, [...] ou a existé dans le monde. En effet, [...] proches et lointains, fidèles et indifèles.” (35). It is common for seventeenth-century Spanish to favor unexplicit antecedents with pronouns that are understandable from the context. In his French translation, Parelo always clarifies the antecedents instead of using object pronouns: “En lo que menos conviene fiar para seguridad y descuido, es en la potencia, y grandeza del Imperio. Porque *al* que muchos temen...” (30, emphasis mine) is translated as “La puissance et la grandeur de l’Empire sont la dernière des choses sur lesquelles on puisse compter pour notre sécurité et notre insouciance. Car *l’Empire* que beaucoup craignent...” (31, emphasis mine). Instead of sticking to the use of capital letters found in the Spanish version for common nouns, Parelo standardizes the use of lowercase as in modern French: “las Ciudades y Republicas” (28) becomes “des villes et des républiques” (29). In the 227 footnotes below the French translation, Parelo comments on the numerous intertexts, quotes biblical references, and cites philosophes’

texts such as Aristotle, Plato, Socrates, and other famous Greek and Latin authors. By doing so, Parelo emphasizes that de Valencia was a complete and multifaceted erudite, and that his treatise followed Aristotle's rhetorical appeals, *logos*, *pathos*, *ethos*, and *kairos* as modes of persuasion.

This bilingual edition with the Spanish version facing the French translation offers a valuable research tool for Hispanists. Parelo brings Pedro de Valencia's *Acerca de los Moriscos* up to date with Hispanic studies and introduces an accessible literary source to non-Spanish readers and specialists. Ahead of his time, *Le Traité sur les Morisques d'Espagne* is worth discovering or rediscovering. From a lens of interdisciplinarity, ethic, and diversity studies, Pedro de Valencia's treatise displays a forward-looking vision that transcends its era and aims to be resolutely humanist, enlightened, and modern.

F. Ellen Weaver. *Le domaine de Port-Royal: Histoire documentaire 1669-1710*. Paris: Classiques Garnier, 2021. 338 pp. €39.00. Review by DANIELLA KOSTROUN, INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY INDIANAPOLIS.

Ellen Weaver's book examines the property of Port-Royal-des-Champs, the Benedictine abbey at the center of the Jansenist controversy that divided the French Church in the seventeenth century. Louis XIV persecuted Port-Royal for Jansenism when he came to power in 1661, but when the Jansenist controversy ballooned to the point that French bishops threatened to break from Rome (much like English bishops had done in 1534), Louis XIV backed down and brokered a peace agreement. As part of this agreement he divided Port-Royal's property in 1668 between two factions of nuns who had split over the Jansenist question.

This partition generated a lot of paperwork, some in the form of property assessments for the partition and tax purposes, and some in the form of lawsuits initiated by the two groups of nuns, neither of which was happy with the partition. The most vocal protestors were those supporting the Jansenist nuns. They maintained that the partition unfairly favored those nuns who had broken rank and

sided with Louis XIV. Weaver's book sets out to assess the legitimacy of this claim. The first 66 pages contain a brief history of the schism and a discussion of the main points of contention raised in the legal documents. The next 223 pages are copies of the property assessments and legal petitions (these had all been confiscated and placed in the state archives at the time of the French Revolution). The remaining pages contain some graphs, the bibliography, and index. The book was originally published in 2009 in the series "Univers Port-Royal" by éditions Nolin. This edition is a reprint by the series's new publisher, Classiques Garnier.

Port-Royal was located in an agricultural region known as the Hurepoix between Paris and Chartres. It was founded as a Benedictine abbey in 1204 by Mathilde de Garlande, the wife of Mathieu de Marly, a leader of the Albigensian crusades. Mathilde placed the abbey under the jurisdiction of the nearby Cistercian abbey Vaux-le-Cernay where her son was abbot. Port-Royal thrived in the thirteenth century as nobles from the region placed their daughters there and endowed it with property in the form of farms, mills, vineyards, etc.

Like many abbeys, Port-Royal's property was confiscated and plundered by warring nobles and their armies during the Hundred Years War (1337–1453). Its abbesses worked during the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries to reclaim this alienated property and repair the damages. The abbey fell into disrepair during the Wars of Religion (1562–1598) and then experienced a revival under management by the Arnauld family in the first half of the seventeenth century. Angélique Arnauld, the daughter of a lawyer in the Parisian parlement, was made abbess as a child through a deal brokered by her grandfather with the Cistercian order. In exchange for funding for the much-needed repairs on this ancient, venerated abbey, Angélique would become abbess.

Port-Royal remained Cistercian until 1623, when Angélique removed it from the order and placed it under the jurisdiction of the archbishop of Paris. To the surprise of many, she had rebelled in 1609 as a teenager against the corrupt cronyism that made her abbess in the first place by joining a Cistercian reform movement known as the "Strict Observance." This movement, which advocated purging the order of any customs that did not adhere to the letter of the Benedictine Rule,

became controversial when its members tried to enforce abstinence from meat consumption upon the entire order. When the general of the order promised to suppress the Strict Observance, Angélique moved the Port-Royal community to a house in Paris that her mother bought to protect her strict reform. Her move was facilitated by the decrees of the Council of Trent calling for nuns to be placed in urban centers and under the supervision of bishops. Another factor was the unhealthy climate at Port-Royal-des-Champs, where mosquitos from the surrounding swamps frequently spread malaria among the nuns.

In 1633, Angélique helped to found a new religious institute in Paris: the Institute of the Holy Sacrament. However, clerics from rival convents in Paris denounced the Institute for promoting dangerous religious ideas. When a popular religious reformer, Jean de Hauranne, the abbot of Saint-Cyran came to the defense of the Institute, the Cardinal Richelieu imprisoned him for spreading dangerous ideas. State suppression of Saint-Cyran increased the popularity of the Institute, which was officially incorporated into Port-Royal-de-Paris in 1642. Wealthy laywomen began investing money there to build exclusive apartments adjacent to the cloister. Meanwhile, a community of male scholars, many of them Angélique's brothers and nephews, moved back to the farm at Port-Royal-des-Champs. They divided their time between prayer, scholarship, teaching (they established a school for young boys), and manual labor. They repaired Port-Royal's buildings and drained the surrounding swamps. When the population of nuns outgrew the house in Paris, some returned to Port-Royal-des-Champs so that the community was now spread across the two houses.

While Port-Royal's popularity sparked a new wave of donations and investments from families, it also prompted further attacks from critics, who now labeled the religious movement at Port-Royal "Jansenism," after Saint-Cyran's friend and collaborator, Cornelius Jansen, the bishop of Ypres. Jansen had written the *Augustinus*, a study of Augustine's theory of human sin and the grace necessary to overcome it. The book made enemies by claiming that the Jesuit order, the order most responsible for religious education in France, promoted an erroneous and laxist approach to sin and salvation. Port-Royal was now at the center of this debate over education and the salvation of

souls in the French Church.

When Louis XIV came to power in 1661, he sought to suppress Jansenism at Port-Royal by requiring all clergy, including nuns, to sign a form denouncing Jansen's text. The requirement divided the nuns into two opposing groups and soon grew into a conflict that threatened schism among France's bishops. To prevent a permanent rift in the French Church, Louis XIV called for a truce. As part of the peace agreement, he partitioned the Port-Royal community, placing those who signed the form (a minority of nuns) in the Paris house with one-third of the property and those who refused, in the house at Champs, with two-thirds of the property.

Weaver describes (mostly by quoting the original sources) how each faction disputed the partition. These complaints highlight the complexity of seventeenth-century landed property and wealth in France. The nuns' lawyers challenged the accuracy of the property division using estimated costs of repairs to buildings and equipment, estimated agricultural yields, numbers of servants in residence, expected rental income, costs of bringing goods to market, and rising tax rates. Because wealth was calculated through rents and other fluctuating expenses and incomes, the lawyers found ample room to contest the stated value of property in the assessments. These lawsuits dragged on until Louis XIV finally ended them by dissolving the community at Champs and transferring all wealth to the nuns in Paris in 1709.

Looking at the documents, Weaver finds no clear evidence to support the claim that the nuns at Port-Royal-des-Champs had been treated unfairly. She could see that Port-Royal-des-Champs' finances—because they were based on the convents' oldest properties dating back centuries—were more complicated than those for the Paris house. Champs' wealth had been subject to multiple layers of rights, privileges, and exceptions negotiated over the centuries. She writes that “only a careful analysis of the properties, especially the farms” with a “year by year” tally of their harvest receipts could settle the question of whether they fared poorly (280). The Paris house, in contrast, whose wealth was based on forty years of urban real estate development, was much less complicated. Weaver's ultimate conclusion is that “both houses lost out with this tragic division (280)” Indeed, in hindsight, we can view the state's efforts to engineer Port-Royal's property during



this religious dispute, as a small prelude to its larger intervention in Church property during the Revolution.

Weaver highlights the financial dimension to Port-Royal's contentious history, an angle neglected in the literature. Given this fresh perspective, one might wish Weaver's book were more accessible to the general reader. Church institutions like Port-Royal provided important financial and investment services for families in France before centralized banks existed. The book assumes readers with prior expertise in these financial practices. It also assumes readers with an interest in Port-Royal. However, it has the potential to interest scholars of the Church more broadly. As an abbey that spanned the town-country divide when land prices were dropping and urban real estate was booming, Port-Royal had a uniquely diversified financial portfolio with the nuns living in and managing two houses, one as a rural seignury and the other as an urban landlord. Their property developed alongside their history of religious reform. The case raises questions about the relationship between trends in property values and religious movements. Although Weaver does not explore these questions, her book will make it easier for somebody else to investigate them.

Mathilde Bedel. *Mirabilia Indiae: Voyageurs français et représentations de l'Inde*. Paris: Classiques Garnier, 2021. 349 pp. €35.00. Review by LARRY W. RIGGS, BUTLER UNIVERSITY.

This volume is, in every way, a magisterial work of scholarship. The author defines the task clearly: "La dimension interdisciplinaire de cette étude nécessite également des connaissances historiques, géographiques et culturelles" (12). The book's voluminous documentation bears witness to the admirable completion of the project. The authentic interdisciplinarity of this study, as well as the enormously thorough scholarship overall, is attested to by the voluminous bibliography. In fact, there are multiple bibliographies: Sources primaires; sources secondaires; les études littéraires sur le récit de voyage; les études critiques sur la littérature, la philosophie et l'histoire antiques et médiévales; les études critiques sur la littérature française d'ancien régime; les études historiques sur la France et l'Europe d'ancien régime;

les études historiques sur la France et l'Inde; and les études critiques sur la littérature, la sociologie et l'anthropologie indiennes. These stunningly rich bibliographies are themselves usefully divided into appropriate sub-categories. It is difficult to imagine a more meticulously conducted, or more effectively presented scholarly enterprise than this one. The book will be of interest and real benefit to scholars in a number of fields, including the full range of seventeenth-century studies, cultural studies, literary history, and colonial and post-colonial studies.

Bedel begins with a Preface that clearly contextualizes the study in relation to the seventeenth-century French interest in "Turqueries" (12), and to the ability of travel literature to inspire "fascination et horreur" (14). Bedel notes that the popularity of the "Orient" as a theme "incite les auteurs sédentaires à développer le motif indien dans leur travail de fictionnalisation" (15). The line between real and fictional travels must have been blurred, often no doubt deliberately. Moreover, Bedel emphasizes that even in "real" accounts, certain conventions, convenient to Europeans' need to feel superior, were usually observed.

These early points prepare the way for Bedel's later suggestion that, much as it became a literal source of raw materials and valuable commodities for French industry and commerce in general, the East also provided profitable content for the growing text industry. Like the "New World" in the Americas, the "Indies" were a source of grist for the mills of mechanical printing, of book-selling, and of professional authorship. Moreover, Bedel states that a key motive in this process of cultural appropriation and representation was to make of a certain version of "l'Indien": "le représentant de la domination culturelle de l'Europe sur les pays d'Outre-Mer" (16). It seems clear that the French traveler to the East, whether actual or fictional, was an avatar of the Explorer/Conquistador, a participant in the overall scheme of colonization. Early traveler/rapporteurs, such as Pyrard de Laval and François Martin de Vitré, "raniment l'intérêt d'Henri IV pour le développement d'une Compagnie des Indes" (18). Commercial motives were fundamental.

Having effectively sketched context and motives in the Preface, Bedel presents an Introduction that launches the book's encyclopedic account of seventeenth-century French representations of the East. This Introduction supports the reader's suspicion, awakened by the

Preface, that travel literature was an element in the general commercial exploitation of colonized people and places. Essential to this larger enterprise was the role of textual representations in producing the “grande fascination et la répulsion” (27) supposedly experienced by the explorers, and systematically passed along to their readers. It seems as if the fascination energized the quest to penetrate the mysterious East and to gain knowledge of it, and the repulsion justified the mastery to be exercised by the intrepid seekers of knowledge.

The intersection of the motives for producing this literature and for consuming it is constitutive of the modern author and reader. It is a transaction that works to enrich the author—along with the publisher and bookseller—and to assure the reader that s/he is admirably inquisitive and well-informed. Bedel makes this point brilliantly: “Il s’agit à la fois de décrire ce qui est vu mais aussi d’être vu par le lecteur pour mieux en être admiré et ce, notamment, à des fins commerciales” (26). In the process, the reader, too, basks in some reflected glory. In reading Bedel, one is tempted to think “forward” to the panicked fear of “going native” expressed in Joseph Conrad’s *Heart of Darkness*, and to Chinua Achebe’s contempt for the colonizers’ pretense of knowledge in *Things Fall Apart*. The exoticism industry serves and exploits “un lectorat avide de littérature sensationnelle” (31).

Bedel catalogs many of the elements—often badly distorted—of the cultures of the Indies that awakened and rewarded curiosity and intensified the thirst for strong sensations, while also legitimating French/European dominance in the colonized East. Religious practices, languages, social forms, and other aspects of the societies described were used for these purposes. Bedel emphasizes the importance of “exotic” details in validating the writers’ accounts as accurate, and in denying to the Indian Others the status of full-fledged human beings. At the same time, as Bedel argues convincingly, the use of already-existing themes and tropes of European literature worked subtly to domesticate the fascinatingly, horrifyingly “wild” Others. For example, the picaresque novel provided some narrative conventions that conferred credibility on travel narratives, as they softened the potentially threatening impression of strangeness. In fact, of course, narration itself is a reduction-to-orderliness of

experiences which, recounted “raw,” might lead to what has been devastatingly described, by Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann, as the “vertigo of relativity.” Bedel puts this point about familiarizing the “exotic” well: “le stéréotype est alimenté par le lecteur qui s’attend à retrouver une image connue de l’Indien” (41).

Inevitably, skin color and other “racial” characteristics were cited as evidence of a human hierarchy, with Europeans at the top: “Intervenant comme la première propriété significative des Hindous, la noirceur de la peau est associée à un manque de Raison flagrant” (64). The impulse to classify what was observed, to create taxonomies taken to constitute knowledge, thereby establishing the potential to control the phenomena being classified, led travelers to invent categories and criteria consigning the “exotic” to low status in the hierarchy of human types. This nefarious error would be repeated by some Enlightenment thinkers, who relegated non-European “races” to a space outside the one in which enlightenment and human rights were operative.

One of the most interesting chapters of the book is the one in which Bedel explores the role of travel/exploration literature in the modern conception of the self, or the Subject: “L’émérgence de écriture du Moi.” It has often been shown that the Subject of modernity is closely connected with the modern epistemology being elaborated in precisely the period of European history focused on in this book. It seems clear that the relation between the European explorer and the “Indian” is analogous to that of Subject and Object in the epistemology propagated most famously by Francis Bacon and René Descartes. According to Bedel, the French or European traveler, in acquiring knowledge of exotic people and spaces, became the hero of what amounted to a mythic validation both of the explorer’s particular self and of the European enterprise of conquest and colonization: ... “l’Autre peut être décrit pour sa bizarrerie afin de valoriser le voyageur” (197). In narratology, as Bedel points out, this is called “l’héroïsation du protagoniste” (202). The “spectacle étrange et rebutant” (199) and the “coutumes horribles” (200) allegedly encountered in the East confirmed the intrepidity of the reporter and the defectiveness of the people encountered. Dehumanization of people being colonized was always essential to the colonial enterprise. Stories of the weirdness

and horror of the Indies validated and enriched the traveler/author, appealed to the curiosity and vanity of readers, and helped to mobilize support for the overarching colonial ambitions of France.

In the Conclusion Générale, Bedel recapitulates the most important points economically and powerfully. Literary representations of the Indies served the interests of “l’expansion commerciale française” (289). The set of literary strategies guiding representations of the Indies—at least until, in the eighteenth century, when Abraham Hyacinthe Anquetil-Duperron launched a more authentically ethnographic enterprise—aimed to “convaincre le lecteur sédentaire de l’importance d’établir un réseau commercial franco-indien” (289). A second, and complementary goal, was to establish the travel writer’s authorial prestigious identity in seventeenth-century literary circles. Bedel underlines the contemporary relevance of the study by asserting that certain elements of the conception of India and Indians studied in the book persist to this day among Westerners. Edward Said’s “orientalism” remains an obstacle to real acceptance of and respect for diversity.

Bedel’s book is extraordinarily valuable for its exhaustive scholarship and for its deep intellectual ambition and significance.

Charles Mazouer. *La Transcendance dans le théâtre français. Tome I. De l’origine aux Lumières*. Paris, Honoré Champion, 2021. 408 pp. €65.00. Review by GUY SPIELMANN, GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY.

In the context of contemporary France, a country that takes very seriously the concept of *laïcité* (state secularism), an essay such as Mazouer’s could easily be mistaken as reactionary, or perhaps nostalgic, of a bygone era. However, the term *transcendance*—i.e., transcendence: “Of the Deity: The attribute of being above and independent of the universe (*OED*)—chosen for the title points to a much wider spectrum of inquiry: not just about the place of God in French drama, but rather about the way in which the theatrical experience engages with the mystery of human life, and therefore with the relationship between humans and a “greater power”—whatever it may be. This is why the book opens with a survey of ancient

Greek tragedy and not with the actual beginnings of drama in France at some point in the tenth century (the first recorded instance in 965 being a “trope,” the enactment during mass of a passage from the Gospels, known as *Quem Quaeritis*). Just as logically, this first volume encompasses the Enlightenment but only until the Revolution, which would radically reframe transcendence in an attempt to uncouple belief in a nondescript God (aka “the Supreme Being”) and obedience to organized religion, especially Roman Catholicism.

The short but dense first chapter (“*La source antique*,” 13–44) provides an indispensable introduction to the Pagan notion of a force governing the various mythological, anthropomorphized deities, who are immortal but not all-powerful. Works by Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides, but also by Plato, Seneca, and Epictetus are brought to bear in an effort to define the *fatum*, a force greater than the gods themselves, which eventually governs all human actions.

Chap. II (*Des dieux au Dieu des chrétiens*, 46–60) demonstrates how early Christian theologians, rather than rejecting this concept outright, recast it as “Providence,” which brought destiny into the realm of divine will, thus ushering a new era—roughly six centuries long—in which tragedy became essentially religious and serious drama only dealt with holy figures and episodes drawn from the Old (or, more rarely, New) Testament, putting God, Jesus and various saints squarely center stage (Chap. III: *Dieu sur la scène*, 61–108). The end of this period predictably coincides with the Reformation, which became a powerful current in France, resulting in half a century of civil war only brought to an end by the Edict of Nantes, guaranteeing freedom of religious practice in 1598. In the meantime, conflicting views on transcendence (Chap. IV, “*Le conflit des transcendances*,” 111–161) renewed the French (and French-language) approach to tragedy, leading to a somewhat ambiguous stance on the role of God in tragic events in the first great playwrights of record, notably Jodelle, Robert Garnier, and Montchrestien.

At that point, the Renaissance’s focus on ancient drama, regarded as the ultimate standard from the 16th century onwards, seriously complicated matters, Mazouer shows, by pitching several irreconcilable visions of transcendence against one another (Chap. V, “*Présence et effacement des transcendances*,” 165–310) and by raising the issue

of *le merveilleux* (that which appears supernatural or beyond rational explanation), a significant factor in stage plays of the period, often conveyed through machine-induced special effects. In his analyses of works by Tristan l'Hermite, Rotrou, Corneille, Molière, and Racine, Mazouer highlights the contradictions faced by the authors and their audiences in dealing simultaneously with conventional Christian transcendence, which by then had become somewhat risky, as the Church took a dim view of any stage treatment of religious topics, with pagan mythological *merveilleux*—almost indispensable in neo-classical tragedy, especially in Greek topics favored by Racine—and, for some, with the possibility of a complete absence of divine intervention: Molière, as a disciple of the philosopher Gassendi, was accused of being a *libertin*, even as he seemed to stay within Christian orthodoxy when literally sending Dom Juan to a fiery Hell as a finale of his 1665 comedy. This is the book's most substantial chapter, not surprisingly for anyone who knows Mazouer's previous work on the *classique* era of French drama, but also because the early modern period was a time of profound upheaval in terms of relationships between faith, religion, and public life.

The next unit (Chap. VI, "*L'éloignement de la transcendance*," 313–374) is thus predictably shorter mostly because, after the death of Louis XIV, who had pitched himself as a hero of the "true" Catholic faith, religion in public life was largely relegated to a formality, while leading intellectuals and authors either professed a prudent non-denominational creed (Voltaire), or barely concealed their materialism and atheism (Diderot), getting bolder as the century unfolded towards the Revolution of 1780–1799. Although dominant rationalism in the age of Enlightenment did not completely abolish transcendence, Mazouer concludes, it did considerably loosen the grip of Religion, and even of the sacred on the people of France, once considered as "the eldest daughter of the Church." Theater, then the most reliable barometer of public mood—in spite of censorship and multiple restrictions on what could be said and shown on stage—betrays this progressive but inexorable rejection of transcendence, which became marginal as a central motive in serious drama, four centuries after being its exclusive focus.

Yet, throughout his essay, Mazouer keeps pointing at the frequent ambiguities in the approach to transcendence, thus resisting a facile dualistic account of drama moving from the centrality of religion to its eventual sidelining. “A sort of metaphysical uncertainty” (*une sorte de flottement métaphysique*, 195) often characterized the stance of playwrights who in some cases regarded God as little more than a contrivance, or a way to legitimize a kind of morality that would have worked just as well in a secular context.

Despite its chronological order, this book is less a survey than an attempt to define transcendence in light of its manifestations in French stage plays and to demonstrate that it remained a central concern over a millennium, though envisioned from varied, sometimes contradictory viewpoints. Mazouer suggests that this was an inherent feature of dramaturgy, as opposed to other types of writing, at a time when the majority of the population was unable to read, and theater allowed for the greatest possible dissemination of ideas and presentation of debatable issues in front of a relatively large audience. It will be most interesting to see how Mazouer, in the second volume, will account for the evolution following the French Revolution towards mass education and a general decline in spirituality.

Vincent Grégoire. *Marie Guyart de l'Incarnation (1599-1672): Le singulier parcours d'une ursuline missionnaire de Tours à Québec*. Brussels: Peter Lang, 2022. 182 pp. \$45.95. Review by SUZANNE C. TOCZYSKI, SONOMA STATE UNIVERSITY.

In this slim but impactful volume, Vincent Grégoire (Berry College) gives a stirring account of the life and apostolic ministry of the Ursuline nun Marie de l'Incarnation (*née* Marie Guyart), who was canonized in 2014 by Pope Francis, and who worked tirelessly for the education of young women, both indigenous and French-Canadian, in New France, in spite of and occasionally thanks to the obstacles she faced throughout her life. Volume 35 of *Etudes canadiennes*, Grégoire's work is one of only two in the multi-disciplinary series devoted to an individual writer, and the only one thus far that focuses on an early modern author. Parts of chapters II, III and V



of the present volume were previously published in conference *acta*, *Biblio* 17, and *Seventeenth-Century French Studies*, but taken together and augmented by additional compelling research, Grégoire's study of the seventeenth-century religious offers an excellent introduction to a life abundant in challenges and marked by an extraordinary and successful apostolic mission in France's most vast colonial territory of her era.

Grégoire's study relies extensively on letters written by Marie herself, as well as on two autobiographical *Relations* of her life (one written at the behest of her confessor, in 1633, and the other for her son, in 1654), in addition to the hagiographic *Vie* written by that son, Dom Claude Martin, himself a Benedictine member of the Congrégation de Saint-Maur, who highly redacted Marie's texts and published his biography of his mother five years after her death. Grégoire's introduction includes a biographical sketch of Marie, from her early mystical experiences to the birth of her son and her subsequent widowhood, to her efforts to establish an Ursuline convent in Québec and the myriad obstacles she encountered along the way. Indeed, it is these obstacles, or *épreuves*, which give structure to the monograph, as they become significant markers of Marie's personal *chemin de croix*. Grégoire highlights the role Marie's determination and strength and general passion for her cause played in her apostolic mission: "L'idée principale de cette étude peut ainsi être résumée: l'obstacle a fait Marie, n'ayant pu la défaire" (23). Marie de l'Incarnation flourished when tested by God, and was able to redefine the role of women religious at the time of the Catholic Counter-Reformation and beyond, all the while refining her own personal agency through her consummate ability to adapt to the circumstances at hand.

Following the schematic of the *chemin de croix*, Grégoire proposes five *épreuves*, or tests that Marie encountered in her lifetime, each furnishing the subject of one of the five main chapters of the monograph. Chapter I describes Marie's firm conviction that the devil himself constantly beset her with challenges, pursuing her in her day-to-day existence (in the form of a "mysterious woman" who nearly ruined her husband, for example) and in her mystical life, attempting to destroy Marie's relationship with God and eradicate her missionary spirit. The devil's nefarious efforts were primarily manifested while

Marie was still in France; her use of self-mortification enabled Marie to maintain her independence and claim her own agency. In Chapter II, Grégoire details a moment in Marie's life mostly neglected by other scholars: her crossing, with a handful of other women religious, of the Atlantic Ocean on the *Saint-Joseph*. Relying on three different individuals' accounts of the crossing (and near-shipwreck due to the vessel's close encounter with an iceberg), Grégoire shows how Marie's attitude toward this episode evolved over time, from her romanticized anticipation of the voyage to a more sobering appreciation of the perils encountered (their potentially deadly result), and from a sense of collective "sacrifice" to a more individualized contextualization of the episode in her faith journey. Grégoire cites the women's arrival in New France as a triumph of the Catholic Counter-Reformation.

Chapter III, the shortest but perhaps most poignant of the monograph, details Marie's ostensibly necessary but painful abandonment of her son Claude (twice, once upon entering the Ursuline order, and the second upon her departure for New France), yet another *épreuve* for her to face and therefore a vehicle for her mortification and salvation. Marie's sacrifice was encouraged by her confessor and other religious authorities, and Grégoire argues that Marie "instrumentalized" her son in her writings, rejecting any guilt on his account and steeling herself against the suffering both parties would face. In the end, Claude became his mother's most ardent champion, though his publication of writings she did not intend to be public was problematic.

Chapters IV and V concentrate on external obstacles Marie encountered on her *chemin* while in New France. Grégoire details the cultural hurdles Marie faced in her work with two very different sets of young women, one indigenous, the other ostensibly "French," though Marie would later argue that they should more properly be called "françaises-canadoises," given their "savage" nature due to life in the colony. An unanticipated cloistering of the women religious complicated their efforts, as did Amerindian morality and notions of the French, and difficulties in communication. Grégoire argues against the reading of Marie's linguistic abilities as limited, suggesting that she, in fact, succeeded admirably in this domain. Chapter V chronicles Marie's grappling with the requirements imposed by local Jesuits that contradicted her intentions for the women religious entrusted to her;

Grégoire makes a compelling case for Marie's discrete resistance to the Jesuits' demands through determination and an admirable sincerity of faith.

Throughout this short volume, Grégoire brings his own arguments into dialogue with other leading experts in the field, particularly Dominique Deslandres, Paul Renaudin, Marie-Florine Bruneau, Kathryn Ibbett, Cornelius Jaenen, Elizabeth Rapley, Dom Guy-Marie Oury, and Robert Sauzet, and the monograph's bibliography is solid and useful. Marie herself is portrayed as in dialogue with some of the most significant religious figures of her time, including Teresa of Avila, François de Sales, and Jeanne de Chantal (though the latter is excluded from the otherwise useful index, as is Louise de Marillac). There seems to be some potential confusion regarding dates; Marie was six months shy of twenty (not eighteen) when she gave birth to her son, and his *Vie* was published five (not fifteen) years after her death. But these are trivial matters in what is a beautifully constructed examination of the many crosses of one of the seventeenth century's most memorable female saints, and of her quest for agency in a period that would otherwise suppress her vision. It will be a welcome addition to the collections of all who seek to understand seventeenth-century spirituality and missionary activity as well as for feminist scholars of history and anyone interested in France's presence on the North American continent.

Molière. *Le Tartuffe ou l'hypocrite: Comédie en trois actes restituée par Georges Forestier*, 3. Arles: Portaparole France, 2022. 120 pp. €16.00. Review by SARA WELLMAN, UNIVERSITY OF MISSISSIPPI.

To celebrate the 400th anniversary of Molière's birth, the Comédie Française kicked off its 2022 six-month-long "Saison Molière" with a performance of *Le Tartuffe*. Adding to the specialness of the occasion, they performed a version of the play that had been considered completely lost to history until renowned Molière specialist Georges Forestier set out to uncover what the original might have looked like before it was banned and then buried under five years of rewriting. Forestier's reconstructed original three-act version of *Le Tartuffe ou*

*l'hypocrite* offers audiences, scholars, and students valuable new insights into Molière's work.

In his preface to this edition, Forestier describes the climate of religious tension that led Louis XIV to ban *Le Tartuffe ou l'hypocrite* after the play's first performance at Versailles in 1664. In his "Placet au Roi," and later in his preface to the revised play, Molière argued that his intent was not to satirize religious devotion, but rather to attack false devotion. A new five-act version entitled *L'Imposteur* was performed in 1667 with one key change that put the play in line with Molière's argument: the title character was no longer a hypocritical man of the cloth, but a "hypocrite de profession," an immoral imposter who used religious devotion as a mask in order to steal money from unsuspecting families. This version was performed one time before the ban was immediately put back in place. In 1669, with the easing of tensions between Louis XIV, the Pope, Jesuits, and Jansenists, the version of *Le Tartuffe ou l'Imposteur* that we read today was authorized for public performance.

In the absence of the original manuscript or any detailed descriptions of the 1664 version of the play, Forester uses a "genetic" analysis to create a reconstruction. He looks back into literary history at similar stories that Molière may have drawn on for inspiration. He finds that Acts I, III and IV correspond closely to the three-part structure of many of Molière's likely models: a holy man reputed for his devotion is welcomed into a family's home; the man falls in love with his host's wife and attempts to seduce her; a second seduction scene staged by the wife finally convinces the host that his guest is a hypocrite, and the holy man is chased from the home. This three-part literary precedent also bolsters Forestier's argument that the original version performed at Versailles was not, as previously believed, an unfinished play to which Molière later added two acts in order to complete the story.

Forestier finds further evidence for his reconstruction in numerous narrative "tensions" that he identifies in the final version. For Forestier, these tensions reveal where Molière added to his play as he revised it, signaling what might not have been part of the original. Several of these tensions are resolved by removing the characters of Mariane and Valère. For example, if we know that in the original version, Tartuffe was an actual holy man who would have taken a vow

of chastity, why would Orgon think of arranging his marriage with his daughter? The fleeting references to Damis's marriage plans in the final version, coupled with what seems like his overreaction in Act III after he learns of Orgon's plans to wed Tartuffe and Mariane, also serve as clues that lead back to an original version in which Damis's and not Mariane's foiled marriage plans are the "élément déclencheur" of the family crisis in the play.

Another tension noted by many of Molière's seventeenth-century spectators is the difficulty in reconciling what seem to be two Tartuffe's. At the end of Act IV and in Act V, we discover a cold, calculating professional imposter. How does this fit with the ridiculous, overindulgent Tartuffe from the beginning the play? Why would such an accomplished deceiver risk being discovered by declaring his love for the wife of the man he is trying to swindle? For Forestier, the Tartuffe of the final acts is clearly a product of Molière's revisions made under pressure by religious authorities. This points to an original version with a powerful critique of actual religious hypocrisy, rather than a critique of professional hypocrites using religion as cover for their own interests: "Molière avait voulu non point faire le portrait figé d'un hypocrite parfait, mais mettre en scène le caractère en mouvement d'un dévot ridicule chutant dans l'hypocrisie" (13). In the revised ending, who better than the king, whose support Molière needed to lift the ban on his play, to unmask Tartuffe and restore order to Orgon's family?

Building on all of these "hypothèses génétiques," the edition of *Le Tartuffe ou l'hypocrite* presented in this volume removes Acts II and V of the final version, as well as the ending of Act IV when Tartuffe announces that he is now the master of Orgon's home. Mariane and Valère are removed, as are all of Cléante's references to calculating, professional "faux dévots." In addition to restoring the three-part structure found in literary antecedents—in Act I, Tartuffe is invited into the home, in Act II, he attempts to seduce Elmire, and in Act III Orgon expels him from the house after witnessing his attempted seduction with his own eyes—it also restores the comedic narrative symmetry that Forestier imagines the first version possessed. In the final scene, Madame Pernelle refuses to believe her son's accusations against Tartuffe. The play begins and ends with Madame Pernelle and with Orgon experiencing the same frustration that his own disbelief

imposed on his family members.

Isabelle Grellet, a high school teacher who wanted to be able to perform the original version of the play with her students, collaborated with Forestier on this edition, helping him rewrite or redistribute certain passages to create better cohesion where verses or acts were removed. It was Grellet who encouraged Forestier to undertake this project, and indeed, the pedagogical and scholarly value of this reconstructed first version is clear. In addition to the exciting literary detective work on display, it provides anyone teaching or studying *Le Tartuffe* with a new understanding of the impact that censorship had on literary production in seventeenth-century France.

Sarah Ward Clavier. *Royalism, Religion and Revolution: Wales, 1640-1688*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2021. xii + 266 pp. Review by PHILIP SCHWYZER, UNIVERSITY OF EXETER.

In 1684, Bishop William Lloyd opened his *Historical Account of Church-Government* with a defiant assertion of Welsh staying-power. “We still live in that Country of which our Ancestors were the first Inhabitants. And tho we have been twice conquered since, yet we have still kept our grounds.” Lloyd went on to quote the words of the storied Old Man of Pencader, who informed an invading English king that though he might triumph temporarily, no other people than the Welsh and no other language would answer for Wales on the Day of Judgment. Although Lloyd acknowledged that many of the medieval legends of British origin associated with Geoffrey of Monmouth had been discredited, his vision of Welsh endurance is in accord with the sense of national consciousness and pride espoused by Welsh poets and antiquaries for centuries. As Sarah Ward Clavier argues in this illuminating study, Lloyd’s vision was rooted in the historical culture of the late seventeenth-century North-East Welsh gentry, and bolstered by evidence from manuscripts preserved in the impressive antiquarian collections of local worthies such as Thomas Mostyn. The gentry of North-East Wales still understood themselves in relation to a past far deeper and more alive than any to which their English counterparts could lay claim.

As Ward Clavier makes clear at the opening of this study, the Welsh gentry differed from the English not only in many of their ideals and attitudes but in their understanding of what made for gentility. “To consider the Welsh gentry without including those families of excellent pedigree but minimal financial power” would be to apply an English definition to a very different cultural situation. Whereas English gentlemen might take pride in their pedigrees and coats of arms, for the Welsh a family tree stretching back to the early Middle Ages and beyond was the very cornerstone of their status, preserving gentility even when lands and wealth had fled. Through their carefully-curated pedigrees, bolstered in the early modern period by an enthusiastic embrace of heraldry and historical portraiture, the Welsh gentry not only demonstrated the validity of their bloodlines but embedded themselves in a deeply-rooted cultural discourse. This deep relation to a living past, Ward Clavier argues, “is as true of the seventeenth-century Conways of Bodrhyddan or Mostyns of Mostyn as it was of a ninth-century Welsh king, and yet would be completely alien to an Englishman of either period.”

The Welsh gentleman’s pride in his familial past, even in the absence of any financial power in the present, had of course been the butt of English jokes (and English anxiety) for at least a century. The Welsh beggar Caradoc in Thomas Randolph’s comedy *Hey for Honesty, Down with Knavery* (1651) insists that “Her lice are petter a pedecree as the goodst of them all,” descended from the lice of Aeneas himself. Ward Clavier cites the parliamentarian satire *The Welsh Embassadour*, featuring one Griffith, “a Shentleman of Wales of fery ancient families,” whose ancestors were with Noah in the Ark. Members of the Welsh gentry were undoubtedly aware of the stereotype, and may even have collected examples of anti-Welsh satire. Yet, Ward Clavier argues, there is little evidence of a defensive or “emotional response” to such barbs before 1642, when the outbreak of Civil War unleashed a flood of pamphlets mocking the Welsh, who were overwhelmingly loyal to Charles I. Such smug parliamentarian satires may well have helped to confirm the Welsh gentry in their royalism (though it was never really in doubt), as well as exacerbating a sense of ethnic division from the English.

The emphasis placed on lineage and historical rootedness helps explain the complex attitude of the North-East Welsh gentry to the old faith (*yr hen ffydd*) of Catholicism. The majority of the gentry in this period adhered faithfully to the Church of England, not least in light of the argument that it constituted a restoration of the early Celtic Church, uncorrupted by the impurities of Rome. Such gentlemen might rail against the papacy and Roman superstition, and would stand firm against James II's attempts to introduce greater toleration of Catholics; yet in their dealings with their Catholic neighbours and relations, they displayed not only toleration but a degree of admiration for those who had remained faithful under persecution to their family traditions. In 1679, Thomas Mostyn wrote to his Catholic kinsman Edward Petre expressing disgust at the "horrid execrable & bloody" Popish Plot; yet in the same letter he acknowledged that he would "never advise any one to quitt his Religion for fear off ye laws nor esteem him for it." Mostyn was even instrumental in helping Petre, a suspect in the Plot, to conceal his assets and travel overseas. Such nuance and toleration were not extended in the same period to Protestant non-conformists, who, Ward Clavier writes, generally lacked kinship connections or historical ties to the gentry of the region, and were regarded instead as "a foreign element operating within local society."

Among its many strengths, Ward Clavier's study is notable for its attention to material culture alongside textual records: "objects, funerary monuments, and the built environment proudly portrayed the North-East Welsh gentry as they wished to be seen and remembered." The tribulations suffered by royalists in the Civil War and Interregnum, including the sequestering of estates and exiles beyond the seas as well as death in battle, were proudly recorded on their funeral monuments. The arms and armour they had borne in the wars were preserved and displayed for generations to come, as were the shot holes in the door of Gwysaney Hall, seat of the Davies family, which had been seized by parliamentary troops. By such material and visual means the Welsh gentry extended a culture of kinship, loyalty, and tradition into the future, while maintaining their unbroken connections with the past.

Focusing on a period that lies between the decline of bardic culture in the sixteenth century and the rise of non-conformity in the eighteenth, Ward Clavier's study illuminates an often neglected period of



Welsh social history. With their extensive and eclectic libraries, their interest in family and regional tradition, and even their eagerness, in some cases, to cultivate the last of the bards, seventeenth-century gentry families such as the Mostyns and the Wynns provided a bridge between the purported eclipse of native Welsh traditions in the preceding period and the Romantic 'revival' of those traditions in the next century. The significance of this book extends beyond the two counties of Denbighshire and Flintshire, and beyond the forty-eight year period on which it focuses. In *Royalism, Religion and Revolution*, Ward Clavier has provided a convincing new answer to Gwyn A. Williams' old question, "When was Wales?"

## NEO-LATIN NEWS

**Vol. 70, Nos. 3 & 4. Jointly with SCN. NLN is the official publication of the American Association for Neo-Latin Studies. Edited by Patrick M. Owens, Academia Latinitatis Fovendae, Donnelly College; Former Editor: Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University; Founding Editors: James R. Naiden, Southern Oregon University, and J. Max Patrick.**

◆ Réka Lengyel and Gábor Tüskés, eds., *Vergil, Horaz und Ovid in der ungarischen Literatur 1750–1850*. Wien: Praesens Verlag 2020, 320 pp. (Singularia Vindobonensia, Band 9) The present volume contains a selection of eleven papers delivered at a conference on “Roman Poets in Hungarian Literature of the 18th and 19th Centuries—Virgil, Horace, Ovid,” at the University of Miskolc October 6–8, 2016. The first publication of the papers in Hungarian appeared in Budapest in 2017,<sup>1</sup> the volume under review publishes six of the papers in English and five in German, thus making them accessible to a wider readership of the *Respublica Litterarum*.

In her preface, Réka Lengyel explains the choice of the hundred years between 1750 and 1850 with the argument that in the period from the beginning of the eighteenth until the middle of the nineteenth century the literature of ancient Greece and Rome had exerted a particularly strong influence on Hungarian literature and that Latin was until 1844 the official language of the government administration and the school system—an influence that only since the second half of the nineteenth century has faded considerably.

In the first contribution of the volume, Wilhelm Kühlmann presents “Johann Ladislaus Pyrkers *Tunisiás* (1820)” (13–47) with the somewhat pompous subtitle “Karl V. und die Nord-Süd-Konflikte der Frühen Neuzeit im klassizistischen Heldenepos der Restaurationsepoche” that would suit a lengthy monograph on that poem rather

---

<sup>1</sup> *Római költők a 18-19. Századi magyarországi irodalomban: Vergilius, Horatius, Ovidius*, szerkesztette Balogh Piroska, Lengyel Réka. Budapest: MTA Bölcsészettudományi Kutatóközpont, Irodalomtudományi Intézet, 2017.

than his 33 pp. article in which he briefly discusses that German (not Latin, as the title *Tunisiás* might suggest) epic poem in 12 books and ca. 10,000 hexameters written by the Austrian-Hungarian prelate and later archbishop of Eger/Erlau, Ladislaus Pyrker (1772–1847), on emperor Charles' V campaign in North Africa (1535), a *work in progress* on which the author has worked since 1810. The first edition was published in Vienna in 1820, followed by five later reprints (with corrections) in his *Sämmtliche Werke* between 1832 and 1857, and there were also translations into Italian and Hungarian (when and by whom, Kühlmann does not tell us). It is not surprising that this poem is heavily influenced by the ancient epic tradition, in particular by the *Aeneid* whose length and structure, especially in its second half, Pyrker meticulously imitates as Kühlmann demonstrates with a few examples from the first four books. Judging from the fact that the author was a Catholic clergyman and high functionary of the church and wrote “in der restaurativen Atmosphäre nach der Niederwerfung Napoleons und dem Wiener Kongress” (16), it is neither surprising that, in Kühlmann's words, the *Tunisiás* is a “weitläufiges Werk der historischen habsburgtreuen, demgemäß kontrarevolutionären Romantik” and depicts “den Traum einer christlichen deutsch-österreichisch-habsburgischen Universalmonarchie [...] im Schatten und im Widerschein der napoleonischen Ära und der postnapoleonischen Erfahrungen” (45).

Attila Buda and Anna Tüskés give an overview on “Works of Horace, Ovid and Virgil in the Collections of Aristocratic Houses,” using the example of “The Helikon Library of Festetics Palace in Keszthely and the Library of Károlyi Palace in Fót” (49–77). Both noble families had built up libraries of respectable size: that in Fót consisted of some 6,600 volumes in 1843, 10,000 in the second half of the nineteenth century and in 1927 of an estimated 20,000 volumes but it unfortunately perished after 1945, its books being scattered and mostly lost or, rather, not traceable any more except a few hundred that had found their way into other Hungarian libraries. There survive, however, two ms. catalogues dating from 1830 and 1843 that give us an impression of the richness of the collection. Concerning the three Augustan poets, Horace was represented by six printed editions, five in Latin dating from 1761 until 1829/31 and one in

French translation by the Jesuit Sanedon (Amsterdam 1756), Ovid with the *Metamorphoses* in French translation and, in Latin, the *Opera omnia* ed. Heinsius-Burmannus 1820/4 and the *Epistolae Heroidum* in a sixteenth-century ed. *sine loco et typographo* that has survived in the Rare Works Collection of the Metropolitan Ervin Szabó Library in Budapest,<sup>2</sup> and Vergil also with three editions: a Latin-French one of the complete works (Paris 1736), the Italian translation (1581) of the *Aeneid* by Annibale Caro (Venice 1734), both of them now also in the same library, and a Latin ed. of the *Opera* by the French Jesuit Charles de la Rue (Tirnaviae 1760). The Helicon Library, housed in an especially erected wing at Festetics Palace in Keszhtely between 1799 and 1801, is still preserved<sup>3</sup> and holds today eight editions of Horace (the oldest Antwerpiae: Stelsius 1563, the second oldest is the Jesuit ed. Monachii 1632, “Ab omni obscoenitate Romae Expurgatus”), eleven of Ovid (the oldest is Opera, Venetiis: Tauchini de Tridino 1518) and ten of Virgil (the oldest is *Poemata quae extant omnia*, Tiguri: apud Christoph. Froschoverum 1561). There are also twelve catalogues compiled between 1746 and 1894 whose listings show that in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries there were editions that are no longer present in the actual stock. The essay by Buda & Tüskés opens an interesting glance at those libraries and the primarily didactic (and moral) purposes for which the texts of the three Augustan poets mainly have served.

In her chapter “Zur Rezeption von Vergil, Horaz und Ovid in den ungarischen Übersetzungen des *Zodiacus vitae* von Palingenius” (79–103), Éva Knapp observes at the beginning that the *Zodiacus vitae*

---

2 Buda and Tüskés are here not precise in their statements: on p. 56 they write “Although the volume’s spine says *Ovidi Libri Amorum*, it does not contain the *Amores* but instead the *Heroides*,” but from their subsequent transcription of the title page follows that this volume also contained “*Amorum libri 3. De arte amandi libri 3. De remedio amoris libri 2*” (according to the practice of the majority of the younger mss. and early printed editions that divided the *Remedia* in two books with vv. 1-396 and 397-814 respectively). Anyway, this ed. is not mentioned in the 1843 catalogue of which they on p. 54 reproduce the relevant section with <Opera> ex rec. Heinsio-Burmanniana, Paris 1820/4, *Epistolae <seu Elegiae de Ponto>*, Tyrnaviae 1731 and *Met.* in French translation by J.G. Dubois-Fontenelle (Paris 1802).

3 A useful survey of editions of Horace, Ovid and Virgil in this library is added in an appendix on pp. 72-77.

has not been printed in Hungary but that numerous copies of it have been present in ecclesiastical and private libraries and that there were two Hungarian translations both of which, however, have never been printed: a complete one by József Elefánti Jáklín from 1771, transmitted in four handwritten copies, and a fragmentary one (only books 1 & 2), also in ms., by the Unitarian János Pettényi Gyönggyössi the Younger from 1820 that was intended for didactic purposes in the schools. Knapp finds that “Die Leistung beider Übersetzer bleibt hinter den Erwartungen der Zeit, sie ist in literarischer Hinsicht wenig inventiös, ihre ästhetische Qualität mittelmäßig” (89) and analyses a number of places in both the Latin text and the two translations where the three Augustan poets have been imitated and alluded to in different ways, but, as far as the translations are concerned, always with a view to their use in the curriculum in the 17th and eighteenth centuries and therefore, consequently, also expurgated from Palingenius’ views as far as these were not compatible with the doctrines of Catholic Faith.

János Rédey’s essay “The Poetry of Ovid and Virgil in István Agyich’s *Saeculum: A Survey of Classical Antiquity in Late Eighteenth-Century Latin Poetry of Hungary*” (105–139) traces imitations of and allusions to Ovid and Vergil in the poem *Saeculum liberatae a tyrannide Turcica Civitatis Quinque-Ecclesiae* (129 elegiac couplets),<sup>4</sup> published by István Agyich (1730–1790) in *Quinque Ecclesiae/Pécs* in 1786, in which the author celebrates the centenary of the liberation of the city of Pécs from Ottoman rule in 1686 and praises Count Ferenc Széchényi (1754–1820), a Hungarian politician and founder of the Hungarian National Library and National Museum, “for his revival and governance of the city and its environs” (111).

In her article “Horace and the Hungarian Art Theories in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries” (141–167), Piroska Balogh studies the way in which the German philosopher Alexander Gottlieb Baumgarten (1714–1762) “utilized the Horatian tradition in his works and particularly in *Aesthetica*, as his writings and methods formed determinative models for Hungarian thinkers” (143). Stating that “Horace’s works served as a particularly influential inspiration for the new discipline” (144) of aesthetics in Hungarian literary and

---

4 The poem is printed in the Appendix, 131–139.

philosophical theory of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, she analyzes “three main types of Horatian references” in the writings of Georg Aloys Szerdahely (1740–1808), Professor of aesthetics at the Faculty of Humanities of the Hungarian Royal University, of Johann Ludwig von Schedius (1768–1847), a student of Christian Gottlob Heyne in Göttingen and since 1792 Professor of Aesthetics in Pest, and of the Catholic priest Ferenc Verseghy (1757–1822), a Hungarian poet and linguist who wrote a Hungarian grammar in Latin, published many didactic works and became an important translator mainly of English and German literature and poetry into Hungarian. She concludes that Szerdahely and Schedius saw “Horace as a paragon—an ideal aesthete and theoretical thinker of arts” and “utilize Horace’s text, primarily *Ars Poetica*, to corroborate and support certain topics and discourses emphasised by Baumgarten’s *Aesthetica*” (145 f.), whereas to Verseghy Horace “was not an excellent poet writing exemplary poems” but “appears as a model for a severe and ironic critical reviewer” (161), i.e., “During the nineteenth century, Horace’s authority subsequently seems to have diminished” and “his texts now appeared [as] ironic reviews and satires” (167).

In her contribution “Scythischer Horaz,” Etelka Donczes is in search of “Antike Muster im Lebenswerk János Batsányi” (169–193), a Hungarian poet (1763–1845) who was called “scythischer Horaz” by his wife, the Austrian poetess Gabriele Baumberg (1766–1839): not only because Horace is “einer der am häufigsten zitierten antiken Autoren” (175) in his poems and writings, but also because he took a similarly ambivalent attitude to Emperor Franz II. (I.) as—in Batsányi’s view—did Horace towards Emperor Augustus, and compared himself to Horace in his long *Apology* although Horace, as Donczes rightly remarks, was not opposed to the regime, but “eher seine Kaiser Augustus verehrenden Texte, sein opportunistisches, der kaiserlichen Propaganda dienendes Verhalten im Vordergrund standen” (184). Batsányi, however, was a strong opponent of Habsburg rule in Hungary, a Hungarian Jacobin who for his liberal ideas, his anti-Habsburg agitation and his participation in the conspiracy of Ignác Martinovics (1794) even went to jail and was later confined to the Austrian city of Linz on condition that he never left the town. It would, therefore, be interesting to study closer how it came that

Horace could be conceived of as an opponent to Augustus (and not Ovid, as it was traditionally the case) both by Batsányi himself and by some members of the illuminated and patriotic circles of Hungarian poets and intellectuals in the eighteenth and eighteenth centuries.

Gyula Laczházi contributes some “Anmerkungen zum Verhältnis von Horaz-Rezeption und Empfindsamkeit: Pál Ányos, Ludwig Hölty und Dániel Berzsenyi” (195–217). In this paper he looks for thematic affinities between the poems of Horace and those by the three lyric poets, Hölty being chosen because Ányos’ poems also show parallels to the contemporary German lyric poetry, in particular to that of the Göttingen *Hainbund* of which Hölty, “auch ein begeisterter Leser des Horaz” (210), was a member. In both Ányos and Hölty “manifestiert sich die Affinität zu Horaz im Gedanken der Vergänglichkeit bzw. in der Thematik der Freundschaft und der heiteren intimen Gesellschaft,” a “Nebeneinander des Bewusstseins der Vergänglichkeit und der Sehnsucht nach Harmonie” (212) that also forms the thematic nucleus in the poetry of Dániel Berzsenyi (1776–1836), the ‘Hungarian Horace’, whose poem *Horác* stands as an example for the figure and the teaching of Horace who impersonates a “Lebensform, die für den Sprecher als harmonisch, aber unerreichbar erscheint” (215): love is not only a source of happiness but also of pain and grief. Laczházi considers it therefore as important that “die Aufgeschlossenheit für den *Carpe-diem*-Gedanken und für die Thematik der Vergänglichkeit stellen in der Rezeptionsgeschichte nicht zwei aufeinanderfolgende Etappen dar, vielmehr ist eine Gleichzeitigkeit dieser Motive erkennbar” (217).

Dániel Berzsenyi is also in the centre of Gábor Vaderna’s article “The Productive Moment: Imitation, Horace and Dániel Berzsenyi” (219–237), in which he scrutinizes Horace’s influence on the poetic practices of the Hungarian poet that had given rise to a controversy among contemporary literary critics concerning the originality of his poetry between intended allusions and sheer plagiarism.

Rumen István Csörsz’s article “*Vinum facit rusticum optimum latinum*: Latin Convivial Songs in Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-Century Hungarian Popular Poetry” (239–271) is a brief survey on Latin and Hungarian poems celebrating the drinking of wine and the joyfulness of drinking societies “which flooded manuscript collections

of poems and prints in surprising abundance during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries” (241) whereas they did not exist in earlier times. Csörsz ascribes this to the growing influence of student culture and Latin-language student songs in Hungary at that time and discusses a number of such poems, showing their dependence from Medieval Latin drinking poems as they were known from the 13th century ms. of the *Carmina Burana* that had been discovered during the secularization in the library of the monastery of Benediktbeuern and from which already in 1820 a fragment of CB 196 (*In taberna quando sumus*) had appeared in a Debrecen manuscript. But since the first publication of the *Carmina Burana* dates only from 1847, Csörsz supposes that this and other songs “must therefore have been introduced by wandering students returning from foreign universities,” but he also takes into account that the genre may have been known from other medieval collections that became known in Hungary in the eighteenth century. But also, the influence of Horace’s sympotic poems is clearly recognizable as the authors shows from the poems by Mihály Csokonai Vitéz (1773–1805).

Katalin Czibula’s essay “Naso unter Blumen und Gemüse: Ovid in protestantischen Dramenhandschriften des 18. Jahrhunderts” (273–291) draws the attention to the protestant *Schuldrama* in Hungary that since the second half of the eighteenth century has been “grundsätzlich ungarischsprachig” (275) and was the main genre for the transmission of the knowledge of ancient mythology and ancient authors; she shows this through an analysis of the drama *Nasonak Számkivetése* (“Naso’s Exile”) and its transmission in three manuscripts from the end of the eighteenth century two of which originate from the reformed lycea in Sárospatak and Lizenz/Losonc. The three mss. contain further dramatic and other texts, mainly occasional poetry among which several epitaphia on Ovid, with topics from ancient mythology (Pandora, Proserpina, Dido, Golden Age, Phaedra, Aeneas, Turnus, Thetis and Lyaeus a.o.). The play on Ovid’s exile—as do other plays of that kind – exhibits “eine eigenartige Aktualisierung [...] mit einer ironisch-komischen Färbung” (280), for instance, in Ovid’s comic dialogue with the Getes and in the fiction that Ovid on his way back from Tomis to Italy passed through Hungary: there he came to Losonc where he drank wine with the students and discussed with



them on poetry, and died in the town of Savaria. The main source for the play was, next to the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto*, Ovid's amatory poetry from which many verses are quoted and imitated so that the pupil-actors could acquire a rich thesaurus of original Latin verses from Ovid.

The last essay in this volume, Réka Lengyel's "*Ovidius est magister vitae (et litterarum): Language, Literature and Life through Ovid in Hungary in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries*" (pp.293–310), is a study of "Ovid's reception in early modern Hungarian literature". "By collecting data on printed editions, the manuscript tradition and translations of the Ovidian corpus," Lengyel intends "to explore the lesser-known aspects of the classical poet's historical reception" (296). She underlines that Hungarian readers usually acquired the Latin text or German and French translations from abroad because in Hungary printed texts of Ovid's works were available only from the second half of the eighteenth century on. What was available before were mostly expurgated textbooks for schools which mainly served didactic purposes of learning the Latin language, chief among them the *Metamorphoses*. The 'harmful' texts of *Amores* and *Ars Amatoria*, on the other hand, were difficult or impossible to get, because "according to the censorship decree of 1792, it was forbidden to distribute the works of Kotzebue, Wieland, Rousseau and Ovid in Hungary" (299)! Therefore, it is not surprising that "the first complete Hungarian translation of the *Amores* was published in 1820, its Latin text in 1907; *Ars amatoria* was first published in Hungarian as late as 1883" (300), whereas before that there circulated only manuscript texts and translations as, for instance, that of the *Amores* by László Kazinczy written in 1784, followed by full translations of *Heroides*, *Metamorphoses*, *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* until the middle of the nineteenth century. In general, Ovid's poems "not only served as reference points for works on historiography, philology and ethics, but also in textbooks on botany, dietetics and psychology" (303) and "instructed a wide readership on how to live and love" so that Josephus Dezericus (1702–1765), a Piarist priest, could state (with slight exaggeration) that "even pigherds in Hungary were able to speak Latin fluently and recite Ovid's verses" (310).

The rich volume gives a vivid impression of the reception of the three classical poets in Hungarian society, culture and literature and can be throughout recommended to all those who should like to learn more about a province and a period of the *Nachleben* of Latin literature and classical antiquity in general that up to now has not found the attention of scholars that it really deserves. (Heinz Hofmann, University of Tübingen)

◆ *François II Rákóczi, Confession d'un pécheur*. Traduite du latin par Chrysostome Jourdain. Édition critique avec introductions et notes établies sous la direction de Gábor Tüskés. Avant-propos de Jean Garapon. Avec la collaboration de Csenge E. Aradi, Ildikó Gausz, Zsuzsanna Hámosi-Nagy, Réka Lengyel, Zsolt Szebelédi, Ferenc Tóth et Anna Tüskés. Édition revue et préparée par Michael Marty. Paris: Honoré Champion Éditeur 2020, 777 pp. (Bibliothèque d'Études de l'Europe Centrale, 25. Série « Littérature »)

In *The Neo-Latin News* 67, 3&4, 2019, 226–232, I briefly reviewed the English translations of two works by the Hungarian nobleman Ferenc Rákóczi II (1676–1735): his *Confessio Peccatoris* of 1716, translated from the Latin and Hungarian and with notes by Bernard Adams (Budapest: Corvina 2019), and *The Memoirs of Prince Ferenc Rákóczi II concerning the war in Hungary 1703 to the end* (published posthumously in 1739), translated from the Hungarian and with notes by Bernard Adams (Budapest: Corvina 2019). There I mentioned that the *editio princeps* of the *Confessio Peccatoris*, though badly executed with numerous misreadings and misprints, was published by Ágost Grisza in Budapest in 1876, but has not yet been replaced by a modern critical edition, and that a first French translation had been made by the Camaldulian Chrysostome Jourdain of Grosbois in ca. 1776 which, however, remained unprinted and that a partial edition of that translation, together with extracts from the *Mémoires*, was published by Béla Köpeczi and Ilona Kovács (Budapest: Corvina 1977), but that a complete critical edition would appear in 2020 (Adams' English translation of 2019 does not give the full text). This complete edition has now been published, and not only will the friends and readers of Rákóczi be happy at this fine and beautifully produced book but also historians, philologists and literary critics

will be glad to have at hand this highly informative and well-written work of Rákóczi, “une grande figure de la culture et de la vie politique européenne” (Garapon in his *Préface*, p. 8), because it is an immensely important source for the history of Hungary and the Habsburg and Ottoman Empires and Europe in general in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.

While we still have to wait for a new edition of Rákóczi’s original Latin text of his *Confessio Peccatoris*, Jourdain’s French translation is now available in this exemplary critical edition, enriched with helpful introductory studies and copious textual and editorial materials, both rounded off with a detailed chronological table, an extensive bibliography and three indices (“citations, allusions et réminiscences, noms de personnes, noms de lieux”). The *Introduction* consists of four chapters: in the first (15–38), Ferenc Tóth gives a short biography of Rákóczi, “le prince et l’homme,” and in particular of his diplomatic and political activities which he deployed in order to restore Hungary’s independency from the Habsburg Empire and establish his own reign over his fatherland.

In the second, the longest and most ambitious chapter (39–141), Gábor Tüskés, no doubt the leading authority on Rákóczi, as his numerous publications show,<sup>1</sup> gives a careful and dense analysis of the *Confessio Peccatoris*, discussing questions of sources, motifs and the literary programme of the author, structure and themes of the work, typology and concept of “péch<sup>é</sup>” (*peccatum*), problems of language, rhetoric and “écriture de soi,” the balance between fiction and reality and the literary genre of the *Confessio*, and briefly sketches the *Nachle-*

---

1 For instance: “Les méditations d’un prince chrétien,” *XVII siècle* 46 (1994), 555–580; “Schuld und Süße in der *Confessio peccatoris* von Fürst Ferenc Rákóczi II.,” *Simpliciana* 38 (2016), 379–414; “Psychomachie d’un prince chrétien: au carrefour des genres autobiographiques et religieux. François II Rákóczi: *Confessio Peccatoris*. Première partie,” in *Louis XIV et Port-Royal. Chroniques de Port-Royal* 66 (2016), 401–426, and “*Ido.*, (Seconde partie),” in *Le Christ à Port-Royal. Chroniques de Port-Royal* 67 (2017), 323–341, further his essay “Ferenc Rákóczi II and *Confessio peccatoris*,” in *Ferenc Rákóczi II, Confessio Peccatoris. Translated from the Latin and Hungarian and with notes by Bernard Adams*, Budapest 2019, 367–382; “Ferenc Rákóczi II: Mémoires,” in *Ferenc Rákóczi II, Memoirs. The memoirs of Prince Ferenc Rákóczi II concerning the war in Hungary 1703 to the end. Translated from the Hungarian and with notes by Bernard Adams*, Budapest 2019, 225–236.

*ben* of the text and its French translations and its importance and later influence. But in spite of the work's moral and religious reflections and its confessional, self-deprecatory basis, it is also a work of eminent historical and political importance, for "il dépeint en miniature les principales idées, la vie religieuse, les valeurs morales et la culture du temps [...] Le narrateur réagit continuellement à la politique et à la diplomatie françaises, polonaises, autrichiennes et russes, à la situation en Italie et en Turquie" (41); therefore, Tüskés continues, it is regrettable that it has been unknown for such a long time, mainly because of the late discovery of the original Latin manuscript, the quality and 'anomalities' of its Latin in comparison to classical Latin, and the poor and unreliable edition of the Latin text by Ágost Grisza (Budapest 1876), so that even today it remains widely neglected and underestimated and "ne constitue pas une source historique établie pour l'appréhension de son époque" (44). He states that Rákóczi conceived his *Confessio* at a decisive turning point in his life, "à la suite de sa «conversion», au moment où il prenait conscience de la transformation de son émigration en exil," when he was forced to "se donner un nouvel objectif, une vocation nouvelle" (48) when, after the Peace of Rastatt (1714) and the war between the Ottoman Empire and the Venetian Republic and the Habsburg Empire, in which the latter acquired the Banat of Temeswar, western Wallachia, northern Serbia including Belgrade and the northern part of Bosnia, his political hopes for the restitution of his Duchy of Transylvania have finally faded away. Moreover, his work is "un chapitre distinct dans l'histoire de la réception de saint Augustin au début de l'époque moderne littéraire" (61). In the following paragraphs Tüskés investigates Augustine's influence upon structure and contents but also on single motifs of Rákóczi's *Confessio Peccatoris* as, for instance, his concept of "sin" according to the Augustinian triad of *concupiscentia*, *curiositas* and *superbia* (89). Very interesting and revealing the principles of Rákóczi's narrative strategy is the paragraph on "Fiction et réalité" (104 ff.) in which Tüskés, viewing the autobiographic genre in its *Spannungsfeld* between fiction and reality and its oscillating "entre mémoires et roman" (105), reminds the reader that "dans la mémoire de Rákóczi, les situations, les déclarations, les événements et les dates ont changé avec le temps et ont été modifiés" (111), that

“La relation entre la réalité et la fiction dans l’œuvre se caractérise par des changements fréquents de perspectives, les contradictions internes, une dichotomie particulière entre la représentation quasi réelle et la fiction, la transformation de la carrière consciemment théologisée, entre religion et mythe” and that “La fiction sert souvent à créer de la crédibilité” (113). In the discussion of the literary genre of the *Confessio Peccatoris*, Tüskés rightly sees its place in the autobiographic tradition as it has developed in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, as a means for the construction of identity, representing “le type d’autobiographie spirituelle dont le point de départ est l’acte de «repentance», qui résulte d’une crise de la vie, et dans lequel le cours de la vie et les événements historiques apparaissent principalement dans un contexte religieux” (116).<sup>2</sup> Finally, in the section on *Nachleben*, Tüskés carefully traces the history of the mss. of the *Confessio* and other works by Rákóczi<sup>3</sup> and their translations, starting from the only existing ms. 13628 Fonds St. Germain-des-Prés latin (1.111 pp.) of the BN in Paris that contains next to the *Confessio Peccatoris* (1–671, in autograph, written ca. 1716–1720) two other works by Rákóczi, written by a different hand but corrected by the author himself and bound together presumably by the Camaldulians of Grosbois: the *Aspirationes Principis Christiani* in Latin and French and the *Réflexions sur les principes de la vie civile et de la politesse d’un chrétien* (in French only), and discusses the two extant French translations of the *Confessio*: the complete one by Chrysostome Jourdain of the Camaldulians of Grosbois, executed between 1768 and 1778 (autograph transmitted in Troyes Ms. 2144) and an abridged and very short one (“*Sentiments*

---

2 In this context the author could have referred to volume VIII of the group “Poetik und Hermeneutik” on *Identität*, ed. by O. Marquardt and K. Stierle (München 1979) in which a section of shorter “Statements” deals with “Identität und Autobiographie” (685–717); here Manfred Fuhrmann sees “Rechtfertigung durch Identität” as a “Wurzel des Autobiographischen” (685–690), a line of argumentation that was taken up in the discussion by the other members of the group.

3 Tüskés uses the title *Confession* for both the Latin original and the French translation so that sometimes it is not quite clear of which of both he is speaking, for instance, at p. 125 he writes “Il n’est pas exclu que plus d’un manuscrit de la *Confession* ait existé après 1720,” but he means the Latin text so that he better should have written “*Confessio*”. Similarly at p. 126 “il (sc. Rákóczi) recommandait aux moines (sc. de Grosbois) la lecture de la *Confession*” (of course the Latin version), and elsewhere.

*de piété de François Ragosci Prince de Transylvanie ou Extraits de ses confessions, Traduits sur l'original latin*"), probably by the Benedictan monk Jean-Baptiste Bonnaud (1684–1758) of Saint-Germain-des-Prés, that "vise à résumer l'essence de la *Confession*" (135), executed already ca. 1740/50 and transmitted in BN Ms. Fr. 17690 fol. 236a–245b and also printed in the present volume (689–724). The biographical sketches of the persons involved in the translations and editions of Rákóczi's works and of the history of these texts are useful. Tüskés characterizes Jourdain's translation as "documentaire, fidèle, si possible, au contenu" and states that "Il ne voulut rien omettre du text ni rien ajouter et essaya de garder les images et les tournures, en plus des idées" (132)—a statement that can be assessed by the readers only when a reliable critical Latin edition will have been published whereas his judgement of Jourdain's style as "clair, souvent élégant et agréable" and of the translation in general as showing "des ambitions littéraires" (132) is, thanks to this excellent edition, already now thoroughly understandable.

In chapter III (143–167) Ildikó Gausz presents a short "Étude comparative du Latin original et de la traduction française," based on a selection of some 30 passages of which she analyses syntax, semantics, vocabulary, the omissions and imperfect renderings of the Latin text, arriving at the conclusion that in spite of some shortcomings and alterations of meaning, Jourdain's translation stands out thanks to its "fidélité à l'original" and avoids "la servilité d'une transcription littérale" and that the changements he made "contribuent à rendre la prose plus limpide et à rendre ainsi plus accessible ce texte de caractère méditatif," the translator showing by and large "un grand respect pour le texte latin" (167).

In chapter IV (167–189), Csenge E. Aradi and Zsuzsanna Hámori-Nagy briefly describe the two mss. of the two translations, the main attention, of course, lying on Troyes Ms. 2144, Jourdain's autograph of his translation, with observations on orthography and punctuation, corrections and additions by the writer. The abridged version of 10 folios, contained in ms. BN Ms. Fr. 17690 fol. 236a–245b, is kind of a first draft, "une version préliminaire, dont quelques parties sont faites d'une manière précipitée" (175), that, for reasons unknown, was not continued by the translator. He intervened more strongly in

the text, transposing the narrative from the first into the third person singular, but retaining the first person singular for the meditative sections which he put between inverted commas; in those sections he followed the Latin text much more closely, whereas the narrative of the events is considerably condensed so that it often comes down to a mere enumeration. The whole section is rounded off by a few remarks (181–184) explaining the textual and editorial principles of the following two editions.

The edition of Jourdain's translation that covers the largest and central part of the volume (185–622) is accompanied by a wealth of explanatory notes and verifications of the quotations and allusions in the text that are of great help for those readers who may not be so well acquainted with the historical events and persons of the period covered by Rákóczi's *Confessio*, and followed by "Notes textologiques" (623–688) that form the *apparatus criticus* of the edition.<sup>4</sup> In nearly the same way proceed Tüskés and his team with the "Sentiments de piété" (689–724), i.e., the abridged translation by (presumably) Jean-Baptiste Bonnaud, except that the notes are left out because the explanation can be found in the relevant passages of Jourdain's translation.

The volume is rounded off by a detailed chronological table in which the life of Rákóczi is related to the contemporary political and literary history (725–737), a bibliography (739–745), two maps with the itineraries of Rákóczi between 1676 and 1735 and various indices (751–773).

Rákóczi's "autoportrait idéalisé" is, according to Tüskés, "un document historique et la manifestation originale d'une personnalité tout à fait unique" and, from the literary point of view, "un mélange singulier de fiction et de réalité [...], une tentative de relier des pensées religieuses et profanes par des outils littéraires, une description des conflits intérieurs et de l'introspection de Rákóczi," by which "le narrateur cherche à réconcilier la tradition autobiographique et

---

4 On p. 184 the responsibilities for the edition are explained: Csenge E. Aradi made the transcription of Jourdain's manuscript and the textual notes, Zsuzsanna Hámori-Nagy that of Bonnaud's manuscript and the relevant textual notes, and both transcriptions have been checked and corrected by Anna Tüskés. The "notes historiques" were compiled by Ferenc Tóth, the "notes des références littéraires" by Réka Lengyel, the "notes des allusions bibliques et liturgiques" by Zsolt Szebelédi.

historique hongroise contemporaine et la réalité politique européenne du temps avec la spiritualité et la conception littéraire augustinienne et jansénistes, passées au tamis de ses expériences personnelles” (137 f.) and arrives at the conclusion that “avec cette œuvre, Rákóczi a créé une variante particulière de la prose néolatine autobiographique ou de confession, remplie d’émotions qui, à maints égards, préfigure le roman psychologique et l’individualisation” (139), but warning at the same time that the *Confessio Peccatoris* “ne peut être utilisée avec la même valeur historique que les sources primaires” whereas “les chercheurs n’ont réalisé que récemment le caractère essentiellement littéraire de l’œuvre” (141).

The present volume with its careful edition and the accompanying studies which provide an excellent access to Rákóczi’s main work should be compulsory reading for anyone studying European politics, history and literature of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. But it also increases the desire to read at last the Latin original of the *Confessio Peccatoris* in a reliable critical edition. (Heinz Hofmann, University of Tübingen)

◆ *Poema de Hibernia: A Jacobite Latin Epic on the Williamite Wars*. Edited by Pádraig Lenihan and Keith Sidwell. Dublin: Irish Manuscripts Commission, 2018. [LXXXIII] + 563 pp. €50. This hefty volume, bound in full buckram, printed on excellent paper sewn in signatures, furnished with color plates and a dust jacket depicting a classically attired James II in his glory, finished with a silk ribbon marker, and priced so that individuals can afford it, is a worthy monument to both the poetic achievement of an anonymous poet and to the editors’ scholarly industry. Upon opening the book and gaining acquaintance with its contents, the reader grows ever more convinced that such lavish production has been worthily expended to present the fruits of scholarship and the inspiration of the muses to a wider readership than has hitherto been possible. The *Poema de Hibernia*, as the volume’s subtitle makes clear, is a Latin epic poem more than half the length of the *Aeneid* composed by an eyewitness to the Williamite War (1689–1681), the Irish phase of the historical event generally memorialized in the Anglosphere as the “Glorious Revolution” and on the Continent as “The Nine Years’ War.” On this side of the Atlantic,



the conflict is remembered, if at all, as the relatively bloodless coup, supported by Parliament, that made possible a practical experiment of JoŃ Locke's political theories and inspired a later revolution, somewhat better remembered, in the thirteen colonies. That this edition grants access to a voice from the other side of that conflict, one that is Irish, Catholic, and royalist, will be justification enough for many readers to peruse its contents. That that voice chose to express itself by means of a Latin epic makes the prospect of undertaking a journey to the "foreign country" of the past all the more fascinating. That the *Poema* is one of only three contemporaneous Irish accounts of the Williamite War makes it essential reading for all serious students of both Jacobitism and the Glorious Revolution. That it is not unique but rather belongs to a small corpus of Latin poems recounting the war make it precious to those who wish to recover an important chapter in the history of Latin literature and recall that even in the last decade of the seventeenth century, there existed a class of warriors capable of recording their experience of battle and reflections on it in classical verse.

In their preface, the editors explain that the edition is the product of "a process of discussion, during which each author [made] important contributions towards every aspect of the joint work." In such complimentary endeavors, the editors consider the chief contribution of the philologist to be "notic[ing] important implications of language" while the historian's task is to remind the philologist "to take... account of realities." The team, with Sidwell serving as philologist and Lenihan as historian, has fulfilled this aim admirably, working to contextualize the *Poema* both as an exponent of the tradition of Neo-Latin epic in all its diachronic profundity, and as a valuable eyewitness record of an important chapter in Irish history. The editors relied on two manuscripts, one roughly contemporary with the author but difficult or impossible to read in places, and the other, an occasionally defective but much clearer nineteenth-century copy. Apart from a few extracts, this edition marks the first time the *Poema* has been printed.

As many Neo-Latinists know, it is difficult to work with texts that have attracted little scholarly attention. In the case of the *Poema*, the task is made harder since it has been impossible to discover the name

of the author. In the opening sections of their extensive introduction, the editors have used circumstantial evidence to narrow considerably the pool of candidates for the *Poema*'s author. He was, they demonstrate, involved in the upper echelons of the Irish legal system, a novice poet, in exile in France, charged with treason, and had direct experience of many of the events he describes. Lenihan and Sidwell rehearse the arguments for seven likely candidates before making their case for Thomas Nugent, Lord Chief Justice. They close their discussion of this tentative identification, by inviting further research and saying that though their case is strong, their evidence fails to support a definitive judgment. There follows a thorough codicological description of the manuscript, a discussion of the scribal practice and culture that produced it, and the annotations that sometimes illuminate and sometimes obscure the early history of its reception, the whole illustrated by two well-produced plates.

In their discussion of the poet's art, the editors call attention to his employment of ring composition, his deep knowledge of Latin epic, his connections to contemporary Hiberno-Latin literary production, and his interaction with Gaelic and English traditions. While the poet alludes to Vergil (nowhere more clearly than in his opening lines, which serve both as an homage to Vergil and as a *praeteritio*, wherein he implies that his poem will not aim to compete with the bard of Mantua), the substance derives from Lucan. Like Lucan, the author of the *Poema* at times reflects on the nature of history and politics, situating the recent past in the *longue durée* while laying out a program for the future that is at turns both hopefully idealistic and practically specific, giving his readers suggested invasion routes and the sort of logistical information that will be useful to military planners. The editors are careful also to point out the author's profound engagement with biblical sources and his skillful deployment of situations and motifs derived therefrom in classical dress. The introduction ends with a consideration of the poet's metrical practice and vocabulary, concluding that he was "by no means a bad versifier" and that he, like most Latinists of his day, was unafraid to draw on post-classical sources. Throughout, the editors draw attention to the author's knowledge of native traditions, which this unfortunately Gaelic-less reviewer found particularly useful and interesting.

The translator has chosen to maintain traditional English poetic diction while matching the Latin line-by-line, allowing the English to act as guide to the Latin and replicate the archaic diction that is proper to epic. The opening lines of Book 3 offer a soupçon of the effect produced: “Now two-faced Janus opens and pulls back / The bolts that put a stay upon his gates / And through all roads to War licence does give / To go and play his merry havoc there.”

The Latin text mostly preserves post-classical spellings and seventeenth-century use of majuscules, while the punctuation has been modernized. The translator is unafraid of employing “thee” and “thou” along with obsolete contractions like “whoe’er,” “twas,” and “th’,” which the reviewer regards as a feature rather than a defect. The Latin text is surrounded by indications of the manuscript’s foliation, notes concerning scribal practice, and a *conspectus fontium* of classical and biblical allusions. Endnotes follow each book, and these are mostly of an historical character. The whole is followed by appendices containing a list of similes, a glossary of allusions, an *index auctorum*, re-presenting the information contained in the *conspectus fontium* in a format that will aid readers interested in tracing the influence of a particular author or work throughout the *Poema*. Indices of Latin names of modern places, of rare Latin words, and of the edition as a whole bring Lenihan and Sidwell’s almost 600-page tome to a close.

The production of so expansive and luxurious edition of a Neo-Latin work is an event to be celebrated. Typographical errors are infrequent and limited to dangling punctuation and other such minor infelicities that in no way impede the reader. It is to be hoped that this edition of a poem composed in Latin by an English-speaking Irishman on behalf of a French-reared, Scottish-descended King against his Dutch rival finds a wide readership among students both of seventeenth-century history and of Neo-Latin epic. (Erik Ellis, Hillsdale College)

◆ *John Milton’s Roman Sojourns, 1638–1639: Neo-Latin Self-fashioning* by Estelle Hann. Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, Vol. 109. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society Press, 2020, 231 pp. \$37. This volume is another milestone in the prolific career of Professor Estelle Haan. She has long been a

leader among Milton scholars and her expertise in Neo-Latin poetry from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries is unmatched. Now an emerita professor of English and Neo-Latin Studies at Queens University-Belfast Haan's focus on Milton began with her dissertation titled "JoŃ Milton's Latin Poetry: Some Neo-Latin and Vernacular Contexts," and completed at Queen's University-Belfast in 1987 under Professor Michael J. McGann. Since then she has written numerous articles and contributed, either as an author, an editor, or both to many volumes including: *From Erudition to Inspiration: Essays in Honor of Michael* (Belfast: Queen's University of Belfast, 1992), *From Academia to Amicitia: Milton's Latin Writings and the Italian Academies* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1998); *Thomas Gray's Latin Poetry: Some Classical, Neo-Latin and Vernacular Contexts* (Brussels: Collection Latomus, 2000), *Andrew Marvell's Latin Poetry: From Text to Context* (Brussels: Collection Latomus, 2003), *Vergilius Redivivus: Studies in Joseph Addison's Latin Poetry* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 2005), *Classical Romantic: Identity in the Latin Poetry of Vincent Bourne* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 2007), *Sporting with the Classics: The Latin Poetry of William Dillingham* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 2010), *Both English and Latin: Bilingualism and Biculturalism in Milton's Neo-Latin Writings* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 2012), *The Complete Works of John Milton, Volume III: The Shorter Poems* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014) with Barbara Kiefer Lewalski, and *John Milton: Epistolarum Familiarium Liber Unus and Uncollected Letters* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2019) for which she was awarded the JoŃ T. Shawcross Award of The Milton Society of America in March of 2021.

All of this is to say that for those who relish JoŃ Milton's work in Latin this volume is a 'must read.' Its contents have been evenly divided into three sections, "Milton, Giovanni Salzilli, and the Academies of Rome," "Milton's Latin Epigrams to Leonora Baroni, and Milton," and "Lucas Holstenius, and the Culture of Rome." These are followed by two useful appendices providing both Latin text and English translation on facing pages of Milton's Latin writings during 1638–1639 and Milton's apologia for making his trip to Rome that appeared many years later in his 1654 *Defensio Secunda*. The book

is a fascinating investigation into the months that Milton spent in Rome during the extended tour of France and Italy he had begun in May of 1638 when he was 29 years of age and ended in the late summer months of 1639.

This was a formative period for Milton, when Milton had to calibrate his physical senses and his thoughts to a modern and vivacious Rome that had been built upon the ancient site. He was as well forging his own identity, and we find him styling himself in Latin as ‘MILTO’ in his letter to Salzilli (‘MILTO alumnus ille Londini,’ line 9 in *Ad Salsillum Poetam Romanum*). Using every available source including the Umbrian antiquarian, bookseller, publisher Pompilio Totti whose illustrated tourbook of Rome, *Ritratto di Roma moderna*, had come fresh from the shop of the printer Vitale Mascardi in late 1638, Professor Haan has made meticulous efforts to reconstruct and explain what happened during this period. No fault can be found in the text; the volume is beautifully edited. One wishes however that a set of illustrations could have been included such as the *impresa* of the *Accademia dei Fantastici* as well as that of the *Accademis degli Umoristi* studied in the first chapter, but perhaps that will be the subject of future work, an illustrated study of what our ‘MILTO’ likely saw during his sojourns in seicento Rome. (Michele Valerie Ronnick, Wayne State University)

◆ *David Salomoni, Educating the Catholic People: Religious Orders and Their Schools in Early Modern Italy*. Boston: Brill, 2021, [X] +220 pp. \$119. David Salomoni, an accomplished young scholar of early modern Italy, has made a significant contribution to the history of education with his book *Educating the Catholic People: Religious Orders and Their Schools in Early Modern Italy (1500–1800)*. By providing a comparative approach to the educational initiatives of numerous religious orders active in Italy, Salomoni overcomes the historiographical tendency to focus on one particular order—often the Jesuits—in favor of a panoramic perspective.

*Educating the Catholic People* is divided into five chapters. The first provides historical background for schools in Renaissance Italy, the second explores the pedagogical identities of various orders, the third explains the processes of settlement in the peninsula, the fourth

provides a taxonomy of schools operated by the orders, and the fifth discusses how the schools handled the scientific and political revolutions of the eighteenth century. A great deal of information, case studies, and synthesis are contained in this relatively slim volume.

The sixteenth century witnessed a proliferation of new active religious orders, but with the exception of the Jesuits, they were relatively slow to invest themselves in education. Learning and culture was seen as a potential source of pride or deviation for religious and students alike (41). Yet the educational needs of the period, as well as the pressures of the Protestant Reformation, led the new orders to increasingly embrace schooling as a major apostolate. Salomoni follows the respective histories of the Jesuits, Barnabites, Somascans, Piarists, Theatines, and Servites among male communities, and the Ursulines, Angelic Sisters, and Pious Sisters among the female communities.

Building on the work of Paul Grendler, the author presents a taxonomy of schools in the period. At the beginning of the sixteenth century, the Renaissance network consisted of three major elements: the municipally-funded public schools, schools in smaller settlements maintained by aristocrats, and the studia of Dominicans and Franciscans. The new religious orders continued to seek patronage from municipalities and aristocrats, but in various institutional forms. Some schools were independently owned and operated by the orders, whereas others were merely staffed by them. Some schools were established in large cities and taught a full humanist curriculum, whereas others imparted the rudiments of reading and arithmetic to younger students of humbler origins in smaller settlements. Boarding schools for the children of the nobility were also part of the landscape. Numerous factors led to the success of these new religious order schools: economic decline in Italy that undermined municipal independence in education, the increasing patronal role of the seigneuries, and the Catholic need, especially in the episcopate, for effective means of combating Protestantism (95–96).

Salomoni undertakes a painstaking examination of the spread of the various orders throughout the Italian Peninsula. The Somascans and Piarists, unlike the Theatines or Jesuits, preferred to build new schools in smaller settlements, rather than in large urban centers (103).

The Theatines aimed their activities, including education, at multiple social levels, which allowed them to have a deep impact on the general population (109). The author observes that the orders competed while simultaneously borrowing from each other. The Barnabites, for example, deliberately imitated the Jesuit Ratio Studiorum, and even took over some schools in the early seventeenth century from which the Jesuits had withdrawn. This takeover increased dramatically after the suppression of the Society of Jesus in 1773 (99). In a different vein, the Piarists thought they were the victims of a Jesuit plot in the early 1640s, although this was not in fact the case (163).

*Educating the Catholic People* has two particularly valuable features. The first is a robust treatment of women's education, which pushes back against the "boys only" stereotype of early modern Italy. The network of "Schools of Christian Doctrine" established in the middle decades of the sixteenth century, which Salomoni regards as paving the way for the entrance of the religious orders into the educational market, was explicitly committed to teaching boys and girls without distinction (37–39). With the assistance of Charles Borromeo, the Ursulines began establishing two basic types of schools: boarding schools for the daughters of nobles and rich bourgeois, and free schools that taught useful skills to poor young women (83). Salomoni provides additional case studies of women's education, such as the Educandato model, where nuns hosted and taught externs in their convent (155).

The second valuable feature is the treatment of the religious orders' scientific endeavors in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Against the persistent assumption that the Catholic Church was "anti-science" in this period, Salomoni explores Galileo's strong ties to the intellectuals of religious orders. The Piarist commitment to Galileo's theories, which brought them to the brink of suppression, became a defining aspect of their institutional identity (159–60, 167). The author claims that it was not so much the scientific backwardness of the religious schools that made them a target of Enlightenment rulers and French revolutionaries, but rather the latter's desire to wrest control of education away from the Church (169). The features that educational innovators disliked about the ancien regime more generally, namely, the lack of uniformity and irregularity in government structures, were characteristic of the religious schools as well (183).

With the suppression of the Jesuits and the French invasion of Italy under Napoleon, these networks were effectively dismantled, making way for new state-controlled educational institutions.

*Educating the Catholic People* might have benefited from closer attention to the curricular content and pedagogies of the religious schools. To what extent did the various orders teach the same materials according to the same methods? Did they generally follow the Jesuit example, or did they take other approaches? With its painstaking attention to the data, concise and insightful arguments, and panoramic perspective of the teaching apostolate of numerous religious orders, *Educating the Catholic People* merits a place on the bookshelves of early modern historians. (Sam Zeno Conedera, SJ, Saint Louis University)