



EVENTEENTH-



ENTURY



NEWS

SPRING - SUMMER 2008

Vol. 66

Nos. 1&2

Including

THE NEO-LATIN NEWS Vol. 56, Nos. 1&2

SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY NEWS

VOLUME 66, Nos. 1&2

SPRING-SUMMER, 2008

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

University of Akron
Oklahoma State University
Texas A&M University

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

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

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

ISSN 0037-3028

SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY NEWS

EDITOR

DONALD R. DICKSON

Texas A&M University

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

James Egan, University of Akron
Jeffrey Walker, Oklahoma State University
Michele Marrapodi, University of Palermo
Patricia Garcia, Our Lady of the Lake University
E. Joe Johnson, Clayton State University

EDITORIAL ASSISTANTS

Mark A. Houston, Texas A&M University
Jacob A. Tootalian, Texas A&M University

CONTENTS

VOLUME 66, NOS. 1&2

SPRING-SUMMER, 2008

REVIEWS

- John Stubbs, *John Donne: The Reformed Soul*. Review by
SEAN MCDOWELL 1
- Jonathan Burton, *Traffic and Turning: Islam and English Drama, 1579-
1624*. Review by NABIL MATAR 5
- April G. Shelford, *Transforming the Republic of Letters: Pierre-Daniel Huet
and European Intellectual Life*. Review by G. MATTHEW ADKINS 9
- Alastair Hamilton, Maurits H. van den Boogert, and Bart Westerweel,
eds., *The Republic of Letters and the Levant*.
Review by JONATHAN BURTON 14
- Thomas Festa, *The End of Learning: Milton and Education*. Review by
JAMES EGAN 16
- Gavin Alexander, *Writing After Sidney: The Literary Response to Sir Philip
Sidney 1586-1640*. Review by ROBERT E. STILLMAN 19
- Mary C. Fenton, *Milton's Places of Hope: Spiritual and Political Connections of
Hope with Land*. Review by SARAH MOREMAN 22
- Thomas H. Luxon, *Single Imperfection: Milton, Marriage and Friendship*.
Review by W. SCOTT HOWARD 24
- Regina Buccola and Lisa Hopkins, ed., *Marian Moments in Early Modern
British Drama*. Review by NANCY M. BUNKER 28
- Murray Roston, *Tradition and Subversion in Renaissance Literature: Studies in
Shakespeare, Spenser, Jonson, & Donne*. Review by SEAN MCDOWELL...31
- Timothy Burberry, *Milton the Dramatist*.
Review by ANNA K. NARDO 34

John Mulryan and Steven Brown, ed. and trans., <i>Natale Conti's Mythologiae</i> . Review by STELLA REVARD	36
Jacob Blevins, ed., <i>Re-Reading Thomas Traherne: A Collection of New Critical Essays</i> . Review by A. LEIGH DENEFF	40
Linda Levy Peck, <i>Consuming Splendor: Society and Culture in Seventeenth- Century England</i> . Review by ELENA LEVY-NAVARRO	46
David Loewenstein and John Marshall, eds., <i>Heresy, Literature, and Politics in Early Modern English Culture</i> . Review by EUGENE D. HILL	48
Giles Worsley, <i>Inigo Jones and the European Classicist Tradition</i> . Review by ALLISON LEE PALMER	51
Su Fang Ng, <i>Literature and the Politics of Family in Seventeenth-Century En- gland</i> . Review by SHEILA T. CAVANAGH	55
Jessie Ann Owens, ed. "Noyses, sounds, and sweet aires": <i>Music in Early Mod- ern England</i> . Review by LAURA YOUENS	57
Teresa A. Toulouse, <i>The Captive's Position: Female Narrative, Male Identity, and Royal Authority in Colonial New England</i>	
Review by WILLIAM J. SCHEICK	60
Grant Tapsell, <i>The Personal Rule of Charles II, 1681-85</i> . Review by MOLLY MCCLAIN	62
Ronald Bedford, Lloyd Davis, and Philippa Kelly, <i>Early Modern English Lives: Autobiography and Self-Representation 1500-1660</i>	
Review by Elisa Oh	64
Elizabeth Teresa Howe, <i>The Visionary Life of Madre Ana de San Agustín</i> . Review by GRADY C. WRAY	67
Paul J. Smith and Karl A.E. Enenkel, <i>Montaigne and the Low Countries (1580-1700)</i> . Review by ZAHİ ZALLOUA	70
Emma Gilby, <i>Sublime Worlds: Early Modern French Literature</i> . Review by DAVID SEDLEY	72
Jason McElligott, <i>Royalism, Print and Censorship in Revolutionary England</i> . Review by ROBERT MCJIMSEY	76

R. Melvin Keiser and Rosemary Moore, eds., <i>Knowing the Mystery of Life Within: Selected Writings of Isaac Penington in their Historical and Theological Context</i> . Review by SUSANNA CALKINS	78
Clifford Edmund Bosworth, <i>An Intrepid Scot: William Lithgow of Lanark's Travels in the Ottoman Lands, North Africa, and Central Europe, 1609-21</i> . Review by M. G. AUNE	81
Miles Ogborn, <i>Indian Ink: Script and Print in the Making of the English East India Company</i> . Review by TILLMAN W. NECHTMAN	84
Jack Cunningham, <i>James Ussher and John Bramhall: The Theology and Politics of Two Irish Ecclesiastics of the Seventeenth Century</i>	
Review by JOSEPH M. MCCARTHY	87
Peter C. Mancall ed., <i>The Atlantic World and Virginia, 1550-1624</i>	
Review by TY M. REESE	90
Anne Goldgar, <i>Tulipmania: Money, Honor, and Knowledge in the Dutch Golden Age</i> . Review by LAURA CRUZ	92
Catherine Armstrong, <i>Writing North America in the Seventeenth Century: English Representations in Print and Manuscript</i>	
Review by GREG BENTLEY	95
NEO-LATIN NEWS	98
NEWS	118

John Stubbs. *John Donne: The Reformed Soul*. New York: W. W. Norton, 2007. 576 pp. \$35.00. Review by SEAN MCDOWELL, SEATTLE UNIVERSITY.

In John Donne scholarship, *the* nonfiction book one is most likely to find not just in libraries but also in chain bookstores across the English-speaking world is *John Donne: The Reformed Soul*, the new full-length biography of Donne's life by English scholar John Stubbs. Published first in the U. K. in 2006 and subsequently by W. W. Norton in 2007, *John Donne: The Reformed Soul* was the recipient of the prestigious Royal Society of Literature Jerwood Award in 2004 as a work-in-progress. It has received commendations from a host literary critics, poets, and writers, including Harold Bloom, Edward Hirsch, Peter Ackroyd, Andrew Motion, and Katherine Duncan-Jones and has garnered for twenty-nine-year-old Stubbs the kind of international fame that not many biographers of Renaissance writers enjoy. How many other biographers can boast of being a finalist in the annual book awards competition sponsored by the Costa Coffee chain?

The reasons for the popularity of Stubbs' biography are easy to see. In his attempt to steer somewhere between what he considers the "pious" account of R. C. Bald's *John Donne: A Life* (1970) and the "iconoclastic" account of John Carey's *John Donne: Life, Mind, and Art* (1981), Stubbs creates a lively representation of Donne that is at once critical and sympathetic, the product of someone who is dedicated to conveying the complexities of Donne's personality even while committing himself to the basic thesis that Donne was a "reformed soul" who moved away from the stridency of his family's illicit Catholicism and toward a broader, less partisan view of human community. The book is well-written stylistically. Indeed, it frequently possesses an almost novelistic energy, as when Stubbs characterizes the immediate aftermath of Donne's arrest after his clandestine marriage to Ann More in 1602 came to light: "Donne felt his life flaking apart. All that he had spent almost ten years trying to avoid had suddenly come to pass. His struggle to convert outwardly—and inwardly—to the prevailing religious orthodoxy, his ordeals at Cadiz and in the Azores, his day-to-day t-crossing and i-dotting for the Lord Keeper, might all be traced to the simple fear of being confined and hurt, even dying, merely for the sake of who he was" (165). A reader might find it hard not to get caught up in Stubbs' continual usage of the single character subjective point of view to convey the enigmatic Donne's most

intimate perceptions and attitudes.

Moreover, the book shows evidence of an excellent sense of humor, as when Stubbs discusses the knighting of Thomas Egerton, Jr., the Lord Keeper's son: on the "peachy shores" of San Miguel, Stubbs writes, "Egerton became one of the very few on the [Azores] expedition to receive a knighthood, which Essex conferred on him for reasons that aren't particularly clear—perhaps for services to beach sports" (89). As this passage suggests, Stubbs relishes trying to capture the personalities of the figures in Donne's life in lively, memorable strokes. Thus, Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex, "was a legend, the hero of flash young men . . . less for any tangible achievement than for his unfailing energy and panache" (53); Sir Robert Drury possessed "a heedless tongue and a hot temper, but what he lacked in discretion he was prepared to make for with pugnacity" (270); and James I's "fascination" with George Villiers, "which he expected every other loyal follower to understand and share, was a mixture of doe-eyed crush, paternal care and the love of a guru for his favorite disciple" (366). By far, the strength of the book derives from these characterizations and from similar fluid explanations of geographical and cultural contexts. Stubbs' treatments of the Cadiz and Azores raids, for instance, read like adventure narratives. Moreover, for those unfamiliar with the locations of the various episodes of Donne's life, Stubbs gives more than a name; he works to conjure an experiential sense of the habitation. Indeed, at their most successful, the localized parts of the book are reminiscent of James Shapiro's insightful *A Year in the Life of Shakespeare, 1599* (2005), a book at once a probing exploration of Shakespeare's creative development, a page-turner, and a guided tour of Elizabethan London.

While Stubbs' character sketches and place descriptions are wonderfully entertaining, the lynch pin of his account of Donne's personality is the poetry, which Stubbs reads, more often than not, as immediately responsive to Donne's biographical circumstances. Stubbs quotes Donne's poems more extensively than any other source materials, including Donne's letters. On the surface, this practice accords with the aforementioned entertainment value of the book: some lines from Donne liven and relieve blocks of plain text, and for Donne aficionados, who can complain about encountering stanzas of such poems as "The Extasie," "The Good Morrow," and "A Valediction: Forbidding Mourning," sometimes in surprising places? But for Renaissance scholars, Stubbs' usage of the poetry as biographical evidence skirts several important

critical issues. First, how does such a usage accord with Renaissance notions of persona and rhetorical theory? How does such a treatment of the poems as purely confessional, for the most part, square with our understanding of the coterie readers who originally circulated Donne's verse? Finally, how does this reading practice address the concerns raised in recent scholarship regarding thesis-driven interpretations of Donne's life, in the cases of the biographies of Izaak Walton, Bald, and Carey? Rather than address any of these issues in a substantive way, Stubbs treats the poems as key evidence, a practice that oversimplifies the complexities that many Donne scholars see in the relationship between the poet and the poems.

The greatest concentration of poems serving as evidence of Donne's perceptions, of course, concern his relationship with Ann, a relationship that fascinates the majority of Donne's modern readers, but about which we lack enough evidence to satisfy our collective curiosity. Stubbs sees in Donne's *Songs and Sonnets* especially a chronology of the relationship, as well as key indicators of Donne's attitudes about it at various junctures. "The Good Morrow," for instance, describes Donne falling in love with sixteen-year-old Ann, while "The Flea" expresses Donne's frustration at living under the same roof as she (York House) and beginning each day in a "separate chamber" from her. "The Extasie" concerns the love "without nervousness" they shared. Later, a few lines from "The Sun Rising" and "The Dream" become evidence for Donne's "complete fulfillment" in his early married life at Pyrford. After 200 or more pages of biographical readings of the poems, one's overriding impression is that Donne was a kind of proto-Robert Lowell, ready and willing to trot out with abandon his innermost thoughts, daily impressions, and frustrations to his circles of friends and patrons.

To be sure, several prominent scholars—Dennis Flynn, Ilona Bell, Camille Wells Slights, and others—have made persuasive cases for biographical readings of some poems and thereby have expanded the list of "biographical" poems that J. B. Leishman posited long ago in *The Monarch of Wit* (1951). Hence, it is as disingenuous to say we should treat all of Donne's poems as fictions as it is to claim all are autobiographical. Anyone who has written poetry knows firsthand how complicated the relationship between writer and writing can become. Even in the most intentionally fiction utterances, the poet must draw on his or her own experiences to create a persuasive version of the experience depicted. Yet the kinds of intrusions a poet's life may make

in his or her poetry far outnumber the simple reading of “true” stories in the poems. To treat “The Indifferent” as an accurate account of Donne’s views of women at a particular time in his life (pre-Ann) is to deny the possibility of dramatic irony as well as the number of rhetorical gestures that may be at work in this deceptively simple poem. The same may be said of Stubbs’ readings of poems he uses to corroborate his presentation of Donne’s mood, attitudes, or perceptions about life circumstances. Stubbs often writes a description of Donne’s state of mind and then locks it into place with poem. Speculation thus “proves” the evidence, as much as evidence “proves” speculation.

A related weakness in *John Donne: The Reformed Soul* concerns the many surprising scholarly omissions throughout the book: while Stubbs mentions a handful of American and Canadian scholars, he shows little, if any, awareness of the full range of Donne scholarship published outside of a small coterie of British scholars. As a result of this selective focus, he ignores important scholarly developments in regard to some of his source materials. For example, he treats Walton’s early *Life of Donne* as an authoritative account of key moments in Donne’s life, much the way R. C. Bald did before him, without acknowledging that scholars such as David Novarr and Dennis Flynn especially have demonstrated that Walton’s account of Donne’s life cannot be trusted because of Walton’s hagiographical intentions and his biased attitude toward his own source materials. Elsewhere there are other signs that Stubbs is not fully engaged in *international* Donne studies. Nowhere does he mention the work of Jeanne Shami on the sermons, for instance, even though he quotes sermons frequently; or that of Mary Papazian or Kate Gartner Frost on *Devotions Upon Emergent Occasions*; or that of Margaret Maurer and Ernest W. Sullivan on the prose letters; or indeed many of the non-British scholarly developments described recently by John R. Roberts in the *John Donne Journal* (vol. 23, 2004, pp. 1-24). Stubbs even prints a citation of *The Variorum Edition of the Poetry of John Donne* as if all of its volumes were currently in print, rather than just the four that have been published.

Perhaps Stubbs or his publisher is confident that his life of Donne will retain its currency long after the *Variorum* edition is complete. If so, he may be right. Readers interested in an entertaining passage through Donne’s life will enjoy *John Donne: Reformed Soul* for its vividness, pace, and speculative anecdotes about Donne’s milieu. These readers most likely will keep this book in

print for a long time. However, readers who want a definitive life of Donne, one that corrects the thematic biases of past biographies and recognizes the possibilities of both biographical truth and fiction-making in the poetry, will have to wait a little longer. Oxford University Press has engaged M. Thomas Hester and Dennis Flynn to edit a complete edition of Donne's letters, which will surpass in completeness even the I. A. Shapiro edition promised years ago but never published. Undoubtedly, these letters will offer a trove of material that could clarify some of the more obscure patches of Donne's life. Until then, the poetry may seem for some too tempting a source for biographical speculation to resist.

Jonathan Burton, *Traffic and Turning: Islam and English Drama, 1579-1624*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2005. Cloth \$ 55.00. 319 pp. Review by NABIL MATAR, UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA.

In *Orientalism* (1978), Edward Said wrote about the polarization between Western European countries, specifically Great Britain and France, and the Islamic East. He described the "discourse" about the East that underpinned the European imperial project on regions extending from Morocco to Iran and India. By focusing on the world of Islam, Said showed how the West had vilified the civilization and culture of the Muslims in order to justify domination.

While some scholars agreed with Said's thesis, others found it too damning and inflexible and sought evidence to challenge it. These latter critics contested the idea that the West was to blame for the "clash of civilizations" (a phrase that post-dated Said), and they turned to study medieval, early modern, and modern sources in the hope of demonstrating that the West had not really always vilified or demonized the Islamic world—especially when the West had not yet possessed the military or economic power to do so.

In *Traffic and Turning*, Jonathan Burton urges readers to move beyond the binarism of Said. For him, even critics who disagree with Said remain confined within the parameters of the established discourse. Burton therefore argues that early modern British drama—and the book is nearly all focused on English plays (*Tamburlaine*, *Lust's Dominion*, *Othello*, *A Christian Turn'd Turk*, and *The Renegado*) and some travel accounts—showed "more multiple, fluctuating,

and susceptible to Eastern influence than has been previously recognized” (15). Burton believes that Arabic and Ottoman (and in the case of Leo Africanus, Maghribi-Italian) portrayals and texts found their way onto the English stage and produced a Muslim who was not necessarily always polarized or demonized.

In chapter 1, he examines Christopher Marlowe’s *Tamburlaine* and shows how the play reflects the growth in contact between the Ottomans and the English during the reign of Queen Elizabeth, specifically from the 1580s on. Burton argues that Marlowe’s Turks are not presented as the “conventional stereotypes” of Muslims in binary opposition to Christian Britons. Rather they are part of a triangle that includes Protestant Britons, Muslims, and Catholic Spaniards. As a result, the Islamic identity of *Tamburlaine* is magnified or diminished, depending on the conflict with Spain. By carefully studying letters and other material published in Hakluyt (1589), Burton convincingly shows how extensive political and commercial relations were between Queen Elizabeth and her Ottoman counterpart. Burton then concludes that such negotiations influenced Marlowe’s construction of *Tamburlaine*.

This leap, however, is not corroborated by evidence from the play: what, one wonders, in the Ottoman correspondence that Burton cites, could have inspired the image of *Tamburlaine* burning the Qur’an? Or what Islamic sources inspired the bizarrely impossible names that Marlowe used for the “Muslim” potentates of North Africa? What is there in “Muslim” *Tamburlaine* that is “uniquely differentiating” or that is drawn from actual English interaction with Muslims? Burton cites Thomas Dallam, who went to Istanbul to assemble an organ sent as a present to the sultan, as proof of direct and first-hand English familiarity with Ottoman Turks. True, Dallam’s account shows that the “English discourse was not only permeable, but also permeated and influenced by Muslim voices” (52). But Dallam wrote years after Marlowe had died, and his account remained in manuscript. And of course, the image of Islam and Muslims that Dallam provides is vastly different from the “Islam” of *Tamburlaine*. Burton’s leap is unfortunately very similar to many such leaps in recent scholarship about Islamic influences on English literature: juxtaposing historical information with literary works and then assuming, without proof, that the former influenced the latter.

In order to refute Said and his followers regarding the demonized image of Muslims in West European Christian thought, Burton tries to show that

there were different representations of Muslims in English drama—different images that were inspired by different meetings with, or texts about and by, Muslims. In chapter 4, for instance, Burton turns to the discussion of Fulke Greville's play, *Mustapha*. Burton rightly shows that Greville presented Mustapha as a noble and Christ-like figure—and he seizes on Mustapha as proof of the “heroic” Muslim on the English stage. But that Greville's Mustapha is as Muslim as Dekker's Eleazer and Shakespeare's Othello needs strenuous proof. After all, both Eleazer and Othello are presented in the plays as converts to Christianity (Othello had been baptized), and neither playwright uses a single Muslim allusion or reference to establish a “Mahometan” identity for the protagonists. True, Mustapha does not reflect the stereotype of the stage “Mahometan”—lascivious and brutal; but then he is the figure who is murdered by his father and stepmother. Greville followed Knolles' *History of the Turkes* in portraying the stepmother of Mustapha, Roxolana, as cruel and amoral, willing even to condone the killing of her daughter, as well as her stepson. Suleyman too condones the killing of his son. While Mustapha is a Christ-like figure, all those around him are vicious Muslims, representing the stereotypical images of the fearful and “cruel” Turk, practicing polygamy and cold-blooded infanticide. Even Roxolana, who had been known to have been born Christian, once she enters the Muslim harem, becomes a ruthless woman who will not hesitate to use friends and family to attain power: “Vertue, nor vice shall in themselves have nothing” (2.3). If Mustapha is a Christ-figure, then Greville emphasizes the horrific viciousness of the Muslims in defeating the paragon of Christian virtue and the hero of the play.

Burton can only valorize Muslim Mustapha by associating him with Christian virtue—as if there is no model of virtue in Islam. The good Muslim has to fit Christian criteria—is it because there are no Muslim criteria? Such a construction of the Muslim is quite similar to what Said had pointed to in the Western discourse about Islam—of the West/Western inventing an image which is then presented as the “authentic” Muslim. Burton's use of the example of Abdul Hamid (16-17) merely confirms the bias that underlines such construction: Abdul Hamid is the name of the American terrorist who converted to Islam and tried to blow up an airplane. What does an example from the early 21st century have to do with the early modern period? Such a rush towards “relevance” is deeply disturbing. What is the reader to expect at the outset of the book other than that converts to Islam in early modern British (and since

Lindh is American, world) history are converts to terrorism? After all, there were numerous examples of converts to Islam in the early modern period who integrated happily into Muslim society. Why are they ignored in favor of a convert who is an infamous criminal?

Although Burton wants to go beyond Said's Orientalist thesis, he recognizes the value of Said's other thesis—"contrapuntal analysis" (47), which Said presented in his later work. Burton argues for the need to bring in texts that have been unused or marginalized—specifically texts from the Arabic and Ottoman legacy. Such texts, in his view, could show that English (and perhaps European) literature engaged Muslim self-representations and definitions. In the introduction, Burton draws attention to a wonderful autobiography by al-Hajari (which, however, was only published and translated in the late twentieth century) and to the text by Khoja Sa'd ud-Din about the fall of Byzantium. Burton briefly uses these two sources, and in the final chapter, turns to a detailed analysis of the relation between *Othello* and Leo Africanus' account, which had been translated into English in 1600. This possibility of an Africanus-Shakespeare construction of *Othello* is tantalizing but needs to be approached in the context of Shakespeare's undisputed source: Cinthio. How much of *Othello* is exclusively traceable to Africanus and not to Cinthio? Burton is commended for urging other students and scholars to reach for texts that record the Muslim voice and to explore the contrapuntal dimension of textual and cultural engagement. Modestly, he admits that he is unfamiliar with the languages of the early modern Islamic world; but then, he proceeds to reject adamantly conclusions, based on Arabic sources, which showed Muslim anger at Christians as a result of the "violence, expulsion, and autos da fé committed by the Christians against the Muslims" (qtd. in n. 11, 260). Having admitted unfamiliarity with the non-European sources, how can Burton be "troubled" with what these sources present?

Notwithstanding these drawbacks, Burton's study presents a useful analysis of the relation between commerce and religious conversion, from and to Islam, with an interesting chapter on the role of Jews in the triangle of Christian, "Turk," and Jew (chapter 5). The book is clearly written and Burton brings together a wide range of primary sources while citing numerous scholars who have been active in the study of Anglo-Islamic relations in the early modern period. The bibliography is thorough along with the "Chronological List of Dramatic Works with Islamic Characters, Themes, or Settings." My

graduate students found the book quite helpful, although they were startled to find that the Christ-like Mustapha was really a portrait of an Ottoman Muslim. Muslims hold Christ in very high esteem, but it is quite a stretch to view the son of Suleyman the Magnificent as Christ-like.

April G. Shelford. *Transforming the Republic of Letters: Pierre-Daniel Huet and European Intellectual Life, 1650-1720*. Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 2007. xii + 264 pp. + 7 illus. \$75.00 Review by G. MATTHEW ADKINS, QUEENSBOROUGH COMMUNITY COLLEGE OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK.

At a meeting of the Académie Française in 1687, Charles Perrault read his poem “Le siècle de Louis le Grand,” in which he insisted upon the superiority of modern culture and learning over that of classical civilization. Irritated by Perrault’s assertions, the poet and satirist Nicolas Boileau-Despréaux rose to object to the reading, but the érudit Pierre-Daniel Huet interrupted Boileau’s protest, stating flatly, “Monsieur Despréaux, it seems to me this concerns us more than you” (161-162).

The reading of Perrault’s poem, including Boileau’s interrupted protest and Huet’s retort, touched off, at least in the French Academy, the Quarrel of the Ancients and Moderns, a culture war that had been brewing for years and that would continue with skirmishes long after the main battles were over. Since scholars generally recognize Boileau as the leader of the “Ancients” in the quarrel, Huet’s rejoinder to him is puzzling. Devoted to ancient literature and a master of Latin, Huet was deeply critical of the decadence, as he saw it, of contemporary learning and had every reason to agree with Boileau. In the Quarrel of the Ancients and Moderns, Huet chose to side with the Ancients. Why, then, would he silence Boileau’s criticism of Perrault and even imply that Boileau was not one of “us?” April Shelford’s book, *Transforming the Republic of Letters* is ultimately an explanation of Huet’s hitherto poorly understood comment to Boileau. Shelford reveals that the Quarrel of the Ancients and Moderns went deeper than a debate over the relative merits of classical and contemporary learning, that the Quarrel represented a fundamental transformation of elite French intellectual culture. Boileau may have extolled the ancients, but to Huet he represented everything about contemporary intellec-

tual culture that Huet detested: cleverness without erudition, imitation without discernment, and egoism without humility. To Huet, Boileau was a *poseur* like so many others who had invaded the Republic of Letters, transforming it from a elite, erudite, Latin-writing correspondence network with “roots in Renaissance humanism” into a public, witty, vernacular social club whose members cultivated a contrived intellectual *négligence*—a *sprezzatura*—and brazenly demeaned the *érudits* as ridiculous pedants with bad hygiene (3).

Although about the life of Huet, *Transforming the Republic of Letters* is a cultural history disguised as intellectual biography. In fact, as biography the book is unsatisfying; the reader ends up with what feels like an incomplete understanding of Huet’s life—we do not even get a picture of the man although portraits are extant (and I for one would have preferred pictures of the interesting personages who populate the book to the boring illustrations graphing social networks). Huet serves rather as a lens through which to see the Republic of Letters transforming from one thing into another. Importantly, Shelford gives us a lens who was ultimately an opponent of the transformation, although not always a convinced enemy—which makes me think that Shelford mis-titled her book. *Transforming* connotes an active involvement that Huet rejected; he sought to prevent the *transformation*. Nevertheless, Shelford’s subtle and sympathetic study of Huet explodes the Moderns’ caricature of the Ancients as reactionary conservatives. Like Darrin McMahon in *Enemies of the Enlightenment* (2002), Shelford argues that those who opposed the more radical elements of the Enlightenment had a serious and viable intellectual and moral alternative that was not merely reactionary. Sometimes they were even right. Shelford also goes beyond caricature to demonstrate that there really was no Enlightenment/Counter-Enlightenment, or Ancient/Modern polarity—that, in fact, the battle lines were morally, intellectually, and socially porous. The Enlightenment was not merely the radical Enlightenment of Voltaire.

Cultural biographical studies such as this one are becoming more common it seems. Two recent ones that come to mind are Alyssa Sepinwall’s *The Abbé Grégoire and the French Revolution* (2005) and Judith Zinsser’s *La Dame d’Esprit* (2006). It may be that the renewed focus on the individual in history, even on elite men such as Grégoire and Huet, is part of the general reaction to the perceived excesses of the “linguistic turn” that seemed to demote living, breathing people to mere effects of discourse. The inability of discourse

analysis to account for human agency or to recount the human drama of history may explain the return to detailed studies of individuals and the changes they wrought in their lifetimes. Several recent works, including Jay Smith's *Nobility Reimagined* (2005) and William Sewell Jr.'s *Logics of History* (2005) even provide useful theoretical constructs for dealing with individual ideas and human agency. The case studies appearing now, therefore, approach biography with an eye to using the individual to illuminate cultural change, generally refusing to indulge the traditional hagiographic pieties of the genre—or, if they do then expressing discomfort with them. Sometimes, one must admit, this discomfort is due to intellectual snobbery: the public likes biographies, but scholars like to see themselves as above such vulgar concerns. At least Shelford does not belabor the issue as some scholars have and gets on with her story. And it is a good story. In five concise yet remarkably erudite chapters, Shelford unveils the intellectual world into which young Huet entered as a precocious student at the Jesuit collège of Caen, then details the slow transformation of intellectual fashion and style that eventually embittered the older Huet and which explains his obscurity today.

In the first chapter, Shelford builds upon L.W. B. Brockliss's *French Higher Education in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (1987) to demonstrate the successes of Jesuit pedagogy in producing “morally upright gentilhommes” with an excellent grasp of classical languages, history, philosophy, and the natural sciences—the study of which, as Brockliss claims, may have undermined the Jesuits’ confessional ends (18). Promising graduates of Jesuit education, such as Huet, entered into an elite intellectual world devoted to Latinity, bound together by the rules of friendship, transparency, and candid but courteous exchange—the opposite of the hierarchical and highly competitive society at large. Yet this Latin *Respublica litteraria* was already under siege when Huet came of age in the 1650s. As we find in Chapter Two, neo-Latin composition and poetry still retained its prestige by mid-century, even earning masters of it royal subventions for work that served the royal propaganda machine. But a growing reading public (Huet would not have considered them truly educated) could not understand Latin well and demanded the vernacular. The king’s advisors began to support the use of French for civic expressions. It did not matter that Huet and his friends judged vernacular literature and poetry inferior because of its “willful rejection . . . of the best models (the Ancients)” (71). By the 1670s, Colbert backed the advocates of French and in

1685 Louis XIV replaced the Latin inscriptions in the gallery at Versailles with French.

Why the abandonment of Latin? There were many reasons, of course, but Shelford examines a major reason in Chapter Three, arguing what may be hard news to feminist scholarship that has tended to highlight the positive contributions of women to the cultural achievements of the period. For it was clearly the feminization of the learned world that contributed to the downfall of Latin and to the transformation of the Republic of Letters into something perhaps more open, but also intellectually shallower, less scholarly and, despite the claims of some historians, less egalitarian. The rise of salon culture dominated by socially elite women gave rise to a parallel Republic of Letters: the Empire of Women. Focused on style over content, the Empire of Women *was* the Republic of Letters but operating according to a female mode of sociability. Although the reasons need further study, it is undeniable that by the late seventeenth-century, salons were becoming the “arbiters of language, taste, and literature” (91). Salon culture, ruled by influential *salonnières*, edged out the older, homosocial Republic of Letters, never entirely eliminating it, but reducing it to an object of ridicule. Because women did not receive the same education as men and were not educated for the same reasons, the *salonnières* were often antipathetic to erudition. Without rejecting traditional notions of gender difference, “salon ideology . . . transformed into strengths characteristics traditionally considered weaknesses” and vice-versa (92). Learning should not be work, but pleasure; appearance mattered more than reality; social exchange was not a dispute to uncover truth, but a form of play. Men had to be gallant, not serious; women must appear natural, effortlessly genial. In short, the entrance of women into the Republic of Letters brought about a sexual tension that made the older sociability impossible. As Huet wrote, “Men wanted to please women, so they echoed women’s condemnation of ‘pedantry’” (112). Even though Huet cavorted for a while in the courts of the Empire of Women, enjoying his female relationships, he never took women seriously as intellectual companions and eventually felt compelled to resist the threat the Empire represented.

Huet’s particular target was Cartesianism, which in the new Republic of Letters became a fad, a “cultural event” with a tenuous connection to the philosophy of Descartes—which Huet also rejected after an initial flirtation, but which he at least was willing to engage seriously. As Shelford demon-

strates in Chapter Four, Huet in fact was hardly uncritical of the Ancients or a slavish devotee to an outmoded Aristotelianism. Intensely interested in the natural sciences, Huet studied optics and anatomy, “was probably a Copernican,” and even argued in favor of Gassendist-Epicureanism and skepticism (121). He also established strong friendships with savants such as Christiaan Huygens and participated in the scientific academy of Caen. Not at all conservative, Huet’s problem with the Cartesianism of the salons was his problem with the decadence, in his view, of learning and literature in general: it was intellectually lazy. Learning required hard work, training, and good judgment; but idle people scorned erudition as pedantry or affected a “false erudition” (177, Huet’s phrase). Cartesiansism provided license to reject the Ancients without bothering to understand them. Shelford’s final chapter details Huet’s last, failed defense of his version of the Republic of Letters as he criticized every bogeyman of his learned world: Jansenists for failing to understand the historical contexts of theological debates; Spinoza for his lack of exegetical expertise; and Descartes for his arrogant dismissal of the Ancients even while he plagiarized their ideas. Arguing for a version of learning that was expansive rather than incisive, Huet—almost incredibly—seemed to believe that a display of superior erudition would convince his opponents that he was right. He was, of course, wrong. The intellectual world of the eighteenth century, as Shelford notes, did not succumb to decadence and triviality, as Huet believed—it thrived. But to Huet, the true Republic of Letters was dead.

In all, Shelford’s book is a well-researched, thoughtful, and critical study of Huet and the transformation of the older Republic of Letters into the more widely studied one of the eighteenth century. She demolishes the mantras of modernity that have burdened scholarship of the period and provides us with a more subtle understanding of the cultural changes in the period that does not read contemporary ideals backward, proleptically, into the past. For all her focus on the place of the individual in cultural historical change, however, Shelford is not able to account well for human agency. Agency appears rarely in her book, in fact. Huet, we are told, cannot change the culture in which he finds himself—“Huet and his female friends could not escape, much less change their social world,” Shelford writes—and yet that culture is changing around him (101). Nowhere are there agents of change, unless perhaps in the person of Descartes—but he is only a specter haunting the book. Culture is nothing but the aggregate practices of its participants, but

the culture of the Republic of Letters transforms due to contingencies seemingly beyond the control of its citizens. Even the *salonnieres* cannot help but be what they are. Change simply is. That may be true, though I do not believe it. Perhaps the lure of biography, both for scholars and everyone else, is that the messy details of “life” are easier to recount than the complicated processes of human agency that we barely comprehend.

Alastair Hamilton, Maurits H. van den Boogert, and Bart Westerweel, eds. *The Republic of Letters and the Levant*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2005, x + 302 pp. + 11 illus. \$129.00. Review by JONATHAN BURTON, WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY.

The eleven essays comprising *The Republic of Letters and the Levant* seek to “document some of the various links between the visible area of the Levant and the invisible Republic of Letters in Europe” (4). The Republic of Letters, of course, existed nowhere beyond the intellectual and epistolary relationships of a group of like-minded early modern scholars. Nevertheless, it has conventionally been seen as a small and exclusively European community sharing an erudite neo-Latin culture and ushering in the Age of Enlightenment with their free-thinking and secularism. The volume under review sets about expanding the narrow geographic spaces associated with this non-geographic republic, and thus acknowledging the place of the East in the formation of Enlightenment thinking. Yet while we learn of Dutch, English, French and Florentine figures who pursued eastern knowledges through their correspondence, travel, and manuscript collecting, this volume has virtually nothing to say about the participation of Levantine scholars in a broader Republic of Letters. Instead, one contributor goes so far as to argue that no “reciprocal current” of interest existed, an argument belied by the work of both historians and literary scholars including Jack Goody, Jerry Brotton, and Maria Rosa Menocal. Thus, where Goody makes a case for the eastern lineages of allegedly European cultural formations such as democracy and capitalism, the essays here generally go no further than demonstrating an interest among European intellectuals in eastern scientific and religious, and geographic writings. The single exception is Maurits H. van den Boogert’s essay on Ibrahim Müteferrika, a Hungarian convert to Islam who operated the first printing

press with moveable type ever to be operated by Muslims. This essay alone presents a history that argues directly for Levantine participation in the Republic of Letters.

The strength of this collection lies more in its archival discoveries than in its ambitious arguments. Thus while several of the contributions do not synthesize into argument the materials they present, there is nonetheless a wealth of fascinating material presented, often in impressive detail. Thus, Zur Shalev's essay on "The Travel Notebooks of John Greaves" includes photo plates of pages from the notebooks, testifying to "the wide gap between the messy reality of travel and the ideals of methodised observation and data collection" (78). Where some of the other essays do not clearly indicate the upshot of their findings, Shalev presents the notebooks to argue that "Greaves viewed Istanbul and Alexandria just as he did Leiden, Paris, and Rome, that is, as an active seat of learning and not as a petrified repository of ancient monuments and wisdom" (78). The ensuing essay by Peter N. Miller offers a corroborating argument drawn from an examination of the ledgers of Nicolas Fabri de Pieresc. Pieresc, Miller argues, "was as responsible as anyone else of his generation for the great advance in European learning about oriental languages that occurred in the seventeenth century." (103). Furthermore, his Levant was "part of the living, breathing reality of the early seventeenth-century Mediterranean" (104). Together, these two essays testify to an early version of Orientalism that was not characterized by a view of the Levant as culturally backwards or frozen in the antique past. This is not, however, an approach characteristic of all members of the Republic of Letters surveyed here. The English scientist Robert Boyle's sponsorship of translations of Muslim texts is, according to Charles Littleton's essay, testimony to a greater interest in the Levant's distant past than in its contemporary features. In addition, Littleton turns to the scientist's millenarian interests to explain the apparent contradiction between Boyle's Baconian claims of independence from previous scientific traditions and his interest in translating, compiling and analyzing medieval Arabic texts.

Several of the essays here tell interesting stories: Alastair Hamilton's account of "The unfortunate embassy of Henri Gournay de Marcheville" revisits the history of an embassy plagued with protocol gaffes in order to recognize the efforts of its historically condemned ambassador to draw figures as prominent as Descartes, Kepler, and Galileo to the Levant. In a

second contribution, Hamilton also chronicles the numerous, mostly failed, projects to find a translator of the Quaran in the last decades of the century, in the wake of the 1683 Turkish defeat. If, with his two contributions, Hamilton has a point to make about failure in the history of the Republic of Letters and the Levant, that point is never presented. The problem here, as well as in an essay on Albertus Bobovius and another on Dutch public collections featuring middle eastern manuscripts, is that a great deal of information is presented without adequate synthesis or claims. Thus, a particular letter may be meticulously presented in a photographic reprint, a diplomatic edition, a translation, and in a descriptive bibliography, yet, remarkably, we never learn why this letter is important. This is a significant shortcoming that hamstrings some of the fine archival research presented in this collection. As a result, I finish reading this book convinced of the need to expand our understanding of the Republic of Letters into the Levant, but uncertain as to what such an expansion will produce by way of new approaches to the Republic of Letters, the Levant, Orientalism, or the Age of Enlightenment

Thomas Festa. *The End of Learning: Milton and Education*. New York and London: Routledge, 2006. xiv + 238 pp. \$95.00. Review by JAMES EGAN, THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON.

Festa theorizes that education constitutes a “central trope” for Milton’s political and poetic writing, and *The End of Learning* is a study of both the restricted and extended meanings of “education” in the Milton canon. He reiterates the postmodern consensus that during the English Revolution, Milton thought of political education as tantamount to spiritual reformation, but proposes that Miltonic education ranges well beyond the brief treatment it receives in the early tract *Of Education* (1644). Importantly, Festa argues for the influence of Francis Bacon on Milton’s educational thinking rather than giving primary credit to Samuel Hartlib and other Comenian reformers. Equally important, he challenges Stanley Fish’s limitation of Milton’s historical and possible audiences in *Paradise Lost*, correctly observing that Fish’s reconstruction of the concept of education in the seventeenth century as well as his awareness of “actual historical readers” was often cursory (20). Festa notes, finally, that he will be particularly concerned with Miltonic conceptions of

several “philosophical paradoxes of learning” (20).

The opening three body chapters of *The End of Learning* are designed to create a conceptual foundation for a new interpretation of the pedagogy of *Paradise Lost*. Chapter One examines Milton’s annotating practices in the edition of Euripides he purchased in 1634. As an annotator, Milton showed his awareness of the margins of texts as pedagogical spaces, projected a future audience (albeit an ambiguous one) for his notes, and included corrections that do not alter the Greek text as matters of “practical pedagogy” (30). Festa considers both *Areopagitica* and *Of Education* as evidence of Milton’s metaphoric enhancements of the meaning of education, arguing, for example, that a reader who repairs the ruins of a text by emendation, as Milton himself had done with his copy of Euripides, “evinces godly reason” (38). Collectively, Milton’s practices as both annotator and reader illustrate his commitment to a paradoxical agenda, the first of several which Festa posits, namely to “sustain pure intentions in a fallen world” (44).

Chapter Two examines the “figure of the Hebraic pedagogue in the divorce tracts” (46), with most of the attention devoted to the 1643 and 1644 editions of *Doctrine and Discipline*. Milton develops the metaphor of the schoolmaster throughout the divorce tracts as a way of representing continuity between Hebrew and Christian scriptural traditions. Some contemporaries, notably Thomas Edwards in *Gangraena* (1646), associated Milton with sectarians who urged “tolerating the Jews” (56). Festa makes a strong case for Milton’s taking the “paradoxical stance of the Christian Hebraist” (62), much as he had elsewhere taken the stances of the prose-poet or the dissenting writer of a courtly masque.

Chapter Three addresses Milton’s prose and his republican ideologies in the context of the English Revolution. From the Defenses forward to the end of the protectorate, Milton remained convinced that the most critical dimension of education was the “moral fitness of the polity” (65). This emphasis on moral fitness was equivalent to an astute understanding of the political function of education in a republican polity. Festa’s discussion of Milton’s republicanism offers valuable support for and extension of current notions of republicanism advanced by Patterson, Sharpe, Norbrook, and Von Maltzahn. After the publication of the regicide tracts in 1649, Milton extended the meaning of education to include the “ongoing viability of revolutionary ideals” (68). By the time he had completed the Defenses, Milton had

assigned heroic roles to educators: Festa interprets the Defenses, then, as ample testimony to the epic scope and endurance of Milton's achievements and those of England. This is a persuasive, well detailed claim, as is Festa's observation that the 1673 republication of *Of Education* in the second edition of Milton's minor poetry represents a deliberate attempt to "inscribe its humanist agenda as an act of political radicalism" (80). Festa pauses in this chapter to rebut the once popular notion, held by Hanford and Bush, that the humanism of Milton's final years involved a retreat from politics. *The Ready and Easie Way*, he shows, clearly exemplifies Milton's preoccupation with educating the godly and perhaps even his dependence upon education to stabilize the crumbling commonwealth. In the preface to *Paradise Lost*, finally, Milton joined battle with Hobbes, Davenant, and Dryden over the "modern bondage of Riming," championing blank verse as the seventeenth-century manifestation of "ancient liberty." Here again, Festa takes a position in accordance with the consensus of post-1970 scholarship on Milton's final period.

Chapter Four treats the education motifs of *Paradise Lost*, notably the problem of evil, as "problems of moral perception in time" (100), with most of these readings substantially influenced by Lacan and Derrida. Festa demonstrates thoroughly how Milton builds the great argument of the epic out of biblical materials best described as "contradictory." He establishes that Milton employed the tropes and formulae of the Prophetic Psalms, in his 1653 translation of the Psalms, as conceptual settings for the epic. This is an important, intriguing assessment of a body of poetry usually neglected. Books 3 and 5 of *Paradise Lost* are studied for the relationship of educability to "merit" in them. A significant part of the overall argument for "contradictory" or paradoxical biblical materials as conceptual foundations for the epic is laid out in Festa's discussion of Raphael's lessons to Adam in Book 8, in that the language of education "ironically forms the primary rational for disobedience" (131). Festa identifies the intellectual framework of Adam's education in Book 8 as Socratic. With Michael as the angelic educator in the final books, the reader sees the "diminished capacity of fallen Adam," but also Adam's trial-and-error progress toward interpreting "history faithfully as a sacred text" (150) and ultimately his developing awareness of how the education of the spirit (as revealed in the nature of the Son's victory over Satan) is accomplished.

The End of Learning succeeds in several ways, from its localized interpreta-

tions of the relevance of Milton's republication of *Of Education* and the linkage of the 1653 Psalm translations to the process of epic composition, to its exploration of restricted and extended meanings of the trope of education in the Milton canon. If earlier work on this trope had been episodic and overly narrow, Festa's claims are appropriately inclusive and integrative, allowing for an appreciation of the paradigmatic importance of education to Milton's hermeneutic.

Gavin Alexander. *Writing After Sidney: The Literary Response to Sir Philip Sidney 1586-1640*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006. xlv + 380 pp. \$120.00. Review by ROBERT E. STILLMAN, UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE.

The importance of Gavin Alexander's *Writing After Sidney* is belied by the understated character of its title. For a figure whose significance has so frequently been misunderstood as residing more in the life than in the works, more in the mythology of Protestant martyrdom than in the reality of poetic production, Alexander's focus on the "literary" response to Philip Sidney is as wonderfully assertive as it is critically indispensable. Such an argument is indispensable because it recuperates brilliantly the fact of Sidney's domination over the literary culture of the 1590s as critic, as prose writer, and particularly as lyric poet, and the pervasiveness of his influence on the generation of English fiction makers that followed. Alexander's real interest lies not "in the broad outlines of [a] developing tradition"—as S. K. Heninger's does, by contrast, in his elevation of Sidney over Spenser as Elizabethan England's premiere exponent of the new poetry—but instead, "in its local details" because what fascinates him is the imitation that requires "some personal relation to animate it, even at one remove"—a kind of response that could last only a generation (337). With extraordinary erudition, an impressive command of the manuscript tradition, densely packed and rhetorically informed readings, Alexander attends to those "local details" of the literary dialogue that Sidney's texts sponsored with family and friends, with his sister Mary Sidney, his brother Robert Sidney, his friend Fulke Greville, and his niece Mary Wroth, and at one remove from that inner circle, to the complexly intertwined network of elegaic poets, sonneteers, prose romancers—extending from Samuel Daniel and Michael Drayton, Gervase Markham and William Alexander, to Ben

Jonson and George Herbert—who in various ways for various motives entered into that dialectic of writing and response. As we “hear again a dialogue begun by Sidney,” Alexander persuasively argues, “[w]e are taught how to read him” (338). No one writing about Sidney in the last two decades teaches that lesson better.

The analytic center of Alexander’s argument belongs to a rhetorical term: aposiopesis, the figure of leaving unfinished what you have started, since Sidney’s literary afterlife is determined both by an “intense interest in his death, and in the incomplete nature of his works” (36). The incompleteness of the texts—posthumously published, mostly unfinished, and radically innovative—compelled response, and Alexander argues that these facts, together with what he calls “the extraordinary openness of the texts” themselves, their dialectical inventiveness and conscious avoidance of closure, are what “enabled their completion to be so elegant” (337). Alexander’s first chapter on “Dialogue and Incompletion” treats aposiopesis in the Sidney canon generally, and identifies it as an especially vital figure within the revised *Aradia*, whose status as “incompletion . . . looks forward to the interpretation it necessitates” (47). That treatment, in turn, sets the table for many of the meatiest, most satisfying chapters to come: including, Alexander’s sharp study of Mary Sidney’s literary efforts, as skilled translator and zealous guardian of her dead brother’s fame, to have what the title calls “The Last Word” about Philip Sidney; and including, too, Alexander’s penetrating examination of that poet of “mental confusion and darkness,” Fulke Greville, the most brilliant of all the Sidney circle writers, to whom “[o]ur perception of Sidney as a dealer in paradoxes and polarities . . . owes everything” (261); and includes, also, Alexander’s sympathetic, finely tuned response to Mary Wroth’s “dizzingly syncretic, endless, constant” fictionalizing of subjectivity in the self-consciously incomplete, unfinished and unfinishable two-part (as if one were not enough) *Urania* (331). When *Writing After Sidney* turns to various versions of the *Aradia*—texts that “do not achieve much for themselves, and do not want to”—unsurprisingly (and against chronology) the climactic portion of the chapter is reserved for William Alexander’s bridge-text composed for the 1593 *Aradia*, since it is there that he can illustrate best the sophistication of Sidney’s best contemporaries in adapting the aposiopesis of the first maker to fictive constructs of their own.

In the literary responses of the Sidney circle, incompleteness—as Alexander

notes—sometimes achieves the status of “intentional action,” almost “as if Sidney meant not to finish the *Anadula*, or intended to die before his time” (36). Aposiopesis is itself open, by means of such logic, to idiosyncratic deployment, a swerve of the critical arrow from the scope of targeted reading. Alexander is not the sort of scholar who swerves much—or often—but that does not mean that his analysis is free from challenge. There can be no question about the dialectical character of Sidney’s texts, about his willingness to entertain contraries to every proposition, to put into play a vast plenitude of possibilities—from the poetic to the political to the perverse—but one need not be a Mary Sidney, arbiter of the last word, to wonder whether Sidney’s startling openness to interpretation and dialectical complexity are less a function of his commitment to a Gadamer-style phenomenology (much less a pre-Bakhtinian heteroglossia), than a measure of his cosmopolitanism, his studied invention of an art with scope—the freedom to range both playfully and purposefully amidst a zodiac of ideas. Paradoxes and polarities do not automatically signal texts “riven by contradictions” or post-modern anxiety (261); as fiction-spawning fish, such figures sometimes swim—surely Greville thought so—in literary oceans whose capaciousness is enabled by something so fundamental and so elusive as faith. Alexander’s is clearly a study conceived before the comparatively recent “religious turn” (Arthur Marotti’s phrase) in early modern scholarship, and more attention to the issue of piety as it impacts Sidney’s poetry and poetics might have enriched this study of his literary afterlife. Even that “might,” however, threatens excess. Gavin Alexander’s *Writing After Sidney* is so startlingly successful, so obviously among the best books of its generation about Philip Sidney and the Sidney circle that to ask more from it risks sharpening some serpent’s tooth of ingratitude. This is a book that every scholar of English Renaissance literature should read. It matters for understanding the writer, the circle, the culture, and for the reminder that literary scholarship can be a pleasure at once to contemplate and to relish.

Mary C. Fenton. *Milton's Places of Hope: Spiritual and Political Connections of Hope with Land*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2006. viii + 225 pp + 3 illus. \$99.50. Review by SARAH MOREMAN, SUL ROSS STATE UNIVERSITY, RIO GRANDE COLLEGE.

In *Milton's Places of Hope: Spiritual and Political Connections of Hope with Land*, Mary C. Fenton offers an imaginative view of the early modern concept of hope as both a virtue and as connected to space. Drawing from historicist, theological, and literary perspectives on the subject, Fenton argues that hope informs Milton's theology, Milton's political views about England's future, and Milton's ideas about individual power, faith, and responsibility. Fenton brings together wide-ranging sources to deliver this intriguing study of hope as related to literal and physical places as well as figurative and metaphysical spaces.

Fenton establishes her thesis with an etymology of the concept of *hope*, part of which examines Old Testament connections between God, place, and land. She then traces biblical conceptions of hope as place to seventeenth-century emblems of hope in the form of the anchor, the spade, and the plough. Fenton finds in these emblems an emphasis on the value of land stewardship, and on hope as a mode of purposeful living. Fenton explains the impact of English land law on the individual, contending that both "literally and symbolically, land fused itself with the English character" (24). Hope, both personal and political, stemmed from land, from literally and symbolically coming from "*England*" (23-24). Fenton extends this concept of hope as grounded in the land to a look at the ways in which property and propriety connected; that is, both individuals and the nation in early modern culture could hope for dispute-resolution through restructured access to land. Fenton balances examinations of cultural artifacts with interesting conclusions about figurative dimensions of the literal, so that "landscape is ultimately, then, less about geography and topography than about human imagination" (27). What Fenton achieves so aptly is an approach that "reunites the body and the spirit: hope is bound to both the internal and external, the spiritual and the material" (33). Fenton concludes the introduction with some remarks comparing early modern ideas about place with postmodern culture's more global, delocalized ideas of place. Fenton's work, then, explores the fascinating ways in which early modern English culture connected spiritual and political, personal

and national hope with literal and figurative place, or, the land of England.

In Chapter 2, Fenton analyzes the misguided nature of Satan's equating hope with power instead of with spirituality. This chapter explicates how Satan's materialized hope runs counter to spiritual hope generated through faithful stewardship of the land. Fenton interprets Milton's epic within the context of post-Restoration England's changing land laws and of Pauline and Augustinian views of hope as based on love. Turning to a view of hope in the realm of international politics, in Chapter 3 Fenton explores Milton's hope for Protestant reform in the context of colonialism and Ireland. Addressing Milton's hegemonic perspective, Fenton analyzes Milton's political hope for a unified Britain that included a reformed Ireland, and she explains Milton's idea of such reform in terms of a charity that would reform the misguided hope of the Irish rebellions of the 1640s. In Chapter 4, Fenton changes her focus from physical and political expressions of hope in Milton's works to "Milton's view of tending to the interior land of the human soul" (97). Fenton describes the shift in Reformation England of the "spatial relationship between God and humans" (98) from physical places such as cathedrals to spiritual terrains including the human soul, thus prayer creates an "interior, sanctified dwelling place" (99). Within this context of prelapsarian and postlapsarian hopeful prayer, Fenton elaborates on Milton's ideas about stewardship of land and stewardship of soul in *Paradise Lost*.

Complicating her definitions of hope, Fenton returns to further analysis of Milton's Satan and in Chapter 5, she distinguishes between *The Lord's Prayer* and Satan's and Beelzebub's inverted version of *The Lord's Prayer*, an antiprayer, that seeks to displace God. Chapter 6 offers a good discussion of hopeful journeys, both earthly and spiritual in terms of Jesus' combined human and divine nature. Fenton focuses on Milton's insistence upon the centrality of literal and figurative place and its relationship to hope" in the redemptive process(161). Exploring a version of hope that represents a more personal, uncertain struggle, Fenton contends in the Epilogue that *Samson Agonistes* falls outside the framework of Milton's other works that reveal connections between hope and place. Fenton suggests that Milton's view of hope in *Paradise Lost* and *Paradise Regain'd* reveals "the character of early modern culture"; whereas his view of hope in *Samson Agonistes* evokes the character of modern culture (195). To arrive at the significance of her work, Fenton concludes in the Epilogue that if Milton can lead readers back to "the very

old ground of hope,” then perhaps he can also influence the same readers towards a concern for ecology and an appreciation of place and its creatures (198).

Fenton’s analysis of hope in Milton’s works and his culture is rewarding, often surprising, and at times amusing. Her observation, for example, of Satan’s despair which detaches and displaces the individual from place and thus hope is intriguing. Similarly, Fenton’s discussion of the enclosure laws of early modern England and Satan’s “gesture to enclose the historical kingdoms” (190) is provocative. Fenton’s framing ideas about the role hope plays in our lives today are significant. Fenton’s book should reward any reader interested in an interdisciplinary history of thought, especially as it relates to politics and theology in Milton’s works.

Thomas H. Luxon. *Single Imperfection: Milton, Marriage and Friendship*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 2005. xvi + 215 pp. \$58.00. Review by W. SCOTT HOWARD, UNIVERSITY OF DENVER.

Single Imperfection: Milton, Marriage and Friendship is a lively examination of Milton’s divorce tracts, a selection of the minor poems (especially *Epitaphium Damonis*), *Paradise Lost*, *Samson Agonistes* and *Paradise Regain’d* with regard to classical, Renaissance humanist and early modern Protestant notions about marriage and friendship. The volume also cogently engages with key texts by a variety of literary, philosophical and religious figures, including: Montaigne and Shakespeare; Plato, Philo, Leone Ebreo and Erasmus; Saint Paul, Luther and Calvin. The book consists of a preface, an introduction, five chapters, notes and an index, but does not include either a conclusion or a bibliography. Chapter one was first published as “Humanist Marriage and *The Comedy of Errors*” in *Renaissance and Reformation* 25.4 (2001); chapter four, as “Milton’s Wedded Love” in *Milton Studies* 40 (2002). Apart from those two sections, *Single Imperfection* offers new writing that has emerged from Luxon’s research, teaching and conference presentations since 1995.

Working within a context of recent Milton scholarship by Barbara Lewalski, David Loewenstein and David Norbrook (among others) that emphasizes a synthesis of biographical, political, theological and textual criticism, Luxon delivers particularly strong readings of Milton’s “doctrine of conversation,”

his friendship with Charles Diodati and his persistent efforts (as a political and religious reformer) to reconcile the competing frameworks of classical-humanist homoerotic friendship, Judeo-Christian heterosexual marriage, and republican “manly” citizenship and liberty. Luxon represents Milton as a chief mover-and-shaker (among his contemporaries) who “took on the huge project of reinterpreting heterosexual Christian marriage . . . as a classical friendship”—an Anglo-American endeavor that continues to inform current US debates about marriage law reform, heteronormativity and homonormativity (x).

This last assertion, though plausible, underscores one of the volume’s major weaknesses. Luxon’s research, methodology and line of argument addressing, for example, the reasons why “Enlightenment and modern state constitutions do not stipulate sexual difference as crucial to marriage” (xi), or why “modern notions of marriage [are indebted] to Athenian doctrines of pederasty,” and why neither “feminists nor evangelicals will be overjoyed to learn how much equalist feminism owes to puritan formulations of companionate marriage” (4) may appear to less sympathetic readers as mere conjecture. Luxon’s polemical leap from the early- to the post-modern is certainly meritorious, but lacks sufficient grounding. Sweeping generalizations in the preface and introduction about “so many startling examples of emergent modern notions [of friendship and marriage]” (4) receive scant elaboration in any of the following sections. The final two paragraphs of chapter five reveal the book’s abrupt and awkward framework for that trans-historical critique: “When [Milton] tried to define marriage as being no more about sex and childbearing than friendship is, he never intended to clear a path for same-sex marriage, but now that path appears to many as inevitable” (192). Luxon’s intellectual history may strike some readers as both singular and imperfect—that is, except for his volume’s primary concerns with Milton’s documents and their direct contributions to a larger context of seventeenth-century cultural and social issues.

The phrase, *Single Imperfection*, alludes of course to Adam’s discourse with Raphael, when he recounts for the Angel what he remembers of his conversation with God about his solitude, desire for fellowship and recognition of his own creaturely singleness: “But Man by number is to manifest / His single imperfection, and beget / Like of his like, his Image multipl’d, / In unitie defective, which requires / Collateral love, and dearest amitie” (*Paradise Lost* 8:

422-26). Luxon grasps this pivotal passage in terms of a fundamental contradiction: "Milton shows us an Adam forced to choose between having a conversation that is virtually 'in heaven' and having continued conversation with his wife" (111). This onto-dialogical crossroads for Adam results directly from an aporia at the crux of Milton's split allegiance to both homoerotic classical-humanist friendship and heterosexual Protestant marriage. Luxon reasons thus:

Milton argued, perhaps more strenuously than any other in his day, that marriage should be principally a friendship, and he did more than anyone else to rearticulate marriage according to the terms and theories of classical friendship doctrine, but in the end . . . Milton's marriage theories finally fail to do the work he imagines for them because [he] withholds . . . the linchpin of classical and humanist friendship doctrine—equality. (2)

Reconfiguring recent interpretations from Janet Halley (1988), Louise Schleiner (1990) and Gregory Chaplin (2001), Luxon builds a two-fold thesis around that generative contradiction. On the one hand, Milton's early humanist documents embrace Plato's conception that the "offspring born of homoerotic higher love must be more nearly immortal than children born of heteroerotic marriage" (1). The divorce tracts, however, articulate a shift in Milton's poetics of friendship: a redefinition of heteroerotic marriage "using the terms and principles of classical friendship" in order to "promote [such a] newly dignified version of marriage as the originary human relation and, therefore, the bedrock of social and political culture in Protestant Christendom" (1-2). Luxon's introduction augments that rhetorical context by way of convincing (if brief) renderings of predominant models for classical friendship (e.g. Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* and Montaigne's "On Friendship"), Christian marriage (e.g. Genesis 2 and Paul's Epistles) and creation stories (via Plato, Xenophon, Aristophanes, Pausanias, Philo and Ebreo) with which Milton would have been familiar.

Individual chapters carry that argument forward. "Classical Friendship and Humanist Marriage" examines a variety of documents (e.g. *Comedy of Errors*, *Twelfth Night*, *Paradise Lost*, Calvin's *Commentaries*, Luther's *Lectures on Genesis*, Edmund Tilney's *The Flower of Friendship*) to argue that although many Renaissance and Reformation humanists re-imagined and rewrote marriage to suit an increasingly secular culture and society, "almost no one would allow classical notions of equality between friends to trump the Pauline

teaching about women's subjection and inferiority" (35). (On this particular point, it is worth noting that *Single Imperfection* does not acknowledge many works written by English women during the seventeenth century. The poetry of Katherine Philips, for example, would pose a formidable challenge to Luxon's thesis).

Chapter two, "The Sage and Serious Doctrine of Conversation," studies selected passages from Milton's divorce tracts (except for *The Judgement of Martin Bucer*), the anonymous pamphlet "An Answer" (which occasioned Milton's *Colasterion*), *Paradise Lost* and *Epitaphium Damonis* to formulate a complex, six-point analysis. Luxon asserts that *Colasterion* castigates the Serving-man because, according to Milton's neo-Platonic, Christian-republican principle of conversation, he is unfit to "converse in the world as a citizen of heaven" (76). For his part, however, the author of "An Answer" has scored a direct hit by rightly questioning Milton's first divorce tract's dubious distinction between "conversation that satisfies one's rational desires and conversation that satisfies one's irrational desires" (76). Milton's ideas about conversation and citizenship were not only deeply informed by his commitments to classical, Christian and humanist traditions, but also significantly shaped by his intimate yet disjunctive friendship with Charles Diodati—his dearest friend from St. Pauls, where they probably met in 1620 when Milton was twelve. *Epitaphium Damonis* expresses Milton's struggle to realize his doubled loss of Diodati (who died in 1638) and also of Italy (following his return to England in 1639) where Milton had enjoyed the "refined practices of homosocial friendship" (83). After those turning points, according to Luxon, Milton "convinced himself . . . that marriage could be elevated to such refined practices, that a man could find such friendship in a wife" (84). The divorce pamphlets, *Paradise Lost*, *Samson Agonistes* and *Paradise Regain'd* therefore illustrate developmental stages in that larger project of attempting to accommodate classical-humanist and republican friendship doctrines to Protestant marriage reform.

As noted above, however, Milton's efforts were conditioned by an enabling constraint—the single imperfection of onto-dialogical inequality between the sexes—that charges a cluster of contradictions in each text. Chapter three, "'Single Imperfection' and Adam's Manly Self," thereby frames *Paradise Lost* as a tragic song about Adam's loss of heavenly citizenship in exchange for fallen conversation (101)—an interpretive perspective that also motivates the

following chapter, "Milton's Wedded Love." Against the "generally accepted" views of John Halket (1970), James Grantham Turner (1987) and Stephen Fallon (1990) that Milton eventually became "prepared not only to speak of sensual matters with a civil tongue, but even to praise and celebrate sexuality as an essential element, even a defining aspect, of 'wedded Love'" (126), Luxon claims that in *Paradise Lost* Milton praises most highly neither sex nor friendship in heterosexual marriage, but manly eros "that tends away from the body and toward heavenly love" (126). Chapter five, "Heroic Divorce and Heroic Solitude," accordingly reads *Samson Agonistes* and *Paradise Regain'd* as progressive steps toward a recovery of manly eros (159) and homoerotic, onto-dialogical, higher citizenship (192). Samson achieves what Adam could not do—"divorce his unfit wife" (159)—and the Son of God attains what was far beyond either Adam's or Samson's capacity: mankind's redemption from "effeminate slackness" (192). If real manliness (like heavenly liberty) is hence neither singular nor imperfect, nor fully human, then Luxon's republicanism ultimately emasculates Milton's apt and cheerful conversations.

Regina Buccola and Lisa Hopkins, ed. *Marian Moments in Early Modern British Drama*. Hampshire, England: Ashgate, 2007. ix +173 pp. \$99.95. Review by NANCY M. BUNKER, MACON STATE COLLEGE.

In this meticulously argued, nine-essay collection, *Marian Moments in Early Modern British Drama*, editors Regina Buccola and Lisa Hopkins bring together investigations of the dynamic and complex relationship between the era's "religio-political culture" and its theatre (1). Each essay speaks to the importance of on-stage Marian references amidst newly Protestant England and the role of such subversive messages. Arthur F. Marotti's Forward addresses Catholic resonances such as Queen Elizabeth's "appropriation of idealized womanhood from the cult of Mary" (xiv) and church members' yearning for pre-Reformation ritual expressions, which existed alongside overt antagonism to Marian devotion. He also notes the collection's evidence that early modern women may well have felt empowered by theatrical references to the figure of Mary and devotion to her.

Buccola and Hopkins's Introduction gives special attention to the Virgin Mary's changing status from Catholic "touchstone for religious piety to litmus

test of heretical idolatry" (2). Reverence to Mary's "quasi-goddess" position and as "mediatrix" with the God the Father and his Son found new limits although Virgin motherhood remained within Reformed doctrine (2). The range of possible interpretations, direct and indirect dramatic Marian moments, and the culturally inflected theatrical performances mark the era's gendered expectations for women even as they reveal the period's fraught nature.

The volume's first five essays deal with Marian moments in Shakespeare plays. Helen Ostovich reads Isabel's garden scenes in *Richard II* as mirroring Renaissance art depictions of Mary in gardens with fruit and flower motifs. Although she does not become a mother, the young queen metaphorically functions to revive her dying husband's spirit and enables him a peaceful passing. Marian iconography, as Alison Findlay's essay argues, serves as a powerful means to rewrite the relationship between knowledge and sexuality in *All's Well That Ends Well* (11). The treatment of virgin re-birth, female pilgrimage, and the poetry of St. Teresa of Avila are viewed as key contexts for Helen's plot. The "contours of grief manifested in the inverted *pieta*" at the end of *King Lear* constitute Katharine Goodland's examination (12). She studies Shakespeare's inversion of Mary mourning her son as Lear mourns his daughter; her commentary on "natural grief—the idea that sorrow should be something felt and expressed rather than obligatory and performed—emerges out of earlier ritual forms" shows Lear's unmediated agony (11).

Lisa Hopkins argues for reading *Othello* in light of world-wide devotion to Black Madonnas such as Our Lady of Loreto in Italy and its copy in Walsingham, England. Her discussion links the miracle cloth images tradition of Our Lady of Guadalupe with Desdemona's handkerchief, the fabric upon which the plot hinges. Desdemona takes the focus of Greg Malliet's essay as he examines the Mariological motif contrast in the philosophy of will demonstrated by Desdemona and Iago. Not simply reducing her to a Mary figure, Maillet suggests Desdemona, as Othello's Marian intercessor, acquires added valence through her unwavering character and purposed choices.

Four essays deal with lesser-studied Jacobean plays and contain Marian moments demonstrating the fluid nature of this dramatic landscape. John Marston's *Tragedy of Sophonisba* (1606), names its heroine on the play's title page as "the wonder of women" Exploring female virginity, Thomas Rist notes Sophonisba's wondrousness includes Mary's qualities of "womanhood, ho-

liness, female constancy, and glory” as well as her status as a married virgin (115). The final two acts of George Chapman’s *The Widow’s Tears* (1605) often critically overlooked, according to Alice Dailey, prove integral for understanding the play’s moral concerns. In a parodic revision of Christ’s empty tomb on Easter morning, a scene where Mary was believed to be present, Chapman’s Cynthia weeping at the tomb of her husband recalls the Virgin Mary. Dailey compares the play’s intrigue and deceit to Shakespeare’s *A Winter’s Tale*; however, the ideal marriage of Shakespeare is not replicated in Chapman. His play portrays women and humans as “ultimately microscopic representation of God;” Dailey asserts the imposed doctrinal distancing from Mary may have diminished faith in her, and with that, a “cataclysmic loss of faith in all women” (15-16). Regina Buccola explores Thomas Dekker’s *The Whore of Babylon* (1607) analyzing cultural conflicts derived from and resolved within fairy lore (142), allegorical links to Queen Elizabeth, and Protestant feminizing of Catholicism that circumscribed the Roman “church as whore” (144). Her argument illuminates the fissures present at a time when dramatic invoking of fairies, once “defense of Protestant righteousness,” were “increasingly becoming associated with the false, Catholic Church” (158), and although marginalized, the figure and resonance of the Virgin Mary continued to captivate audiences.

The Tragedy of Mariam is this collection’s sole play written by a female. The well-rehearsed Catholicism of Elizabeth Cary is not Stephanie Hodgson-Wright’s concentration; rather, she reads the play within dramatic conventions drawing upon the Corpus Christi Cycles and King Herod. The Marian connections include the heroine’s name, Mariamne–Mariam being the Latin form of Mary in the accusative case—to evoke the Virgin Mary; Mariam’s refusal to submit to Herod, her husband and king, cause her execution and the “erasure of the pure Hasmonean dynasty” (171). Her tragedy points to their relationship conflicts as metaphor, and Hodgson-Wright asserts the play refers to “Catholic cultural production suppressed as a result of the Protestant Reformation” (172).

In the first systematic study of its type, *Marian Moments in Early Modern British Drama*, analyses will benefit all students and scholars of this period, as they offer glimpses of popular conceptions and attitudes toward the place of woman in the family, the political community, and the religious hierarchy (70). Marian moments, themselves contested rhetoric, contributed to an on-

going discourse interrogating “English Catholicism’s cultural centrality” (xix). Each essay makes clear, through investigation of both obvious and subtle dramatic messages, a sustained affinity for and resonance of the Virgin Mary in the wake of Reformation theology.

Murray Roston. *Tradition and Subversion in Renaissance Literature: Studies in Shakespeare, Spenser, Jonson, and Donne*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 2007. xii + 258 pp. \$60.00. Review by SEAN MCDOWELL, SEATTLE UNIVERSITY.

In this time of “post-theory” (or “post-post-theory,” according to some), one might consider Murray Roston’s *Tradition and Subversion in Renaissance Literature* something of a throwback to earlier attacks on the excesses of literary theory. But such an impression would do an injustice to Roston’s often insightful discussions of Shakespeare, Spenser, Jonson, and Donne. The book undertakes contextual readings of each author in an effort to refute the deconstructionist principle of *aporia*, in which the presence of competing voices within a text is seen to create an interpretive impasse beyond which a critic cannot proceed. Rather than show that multivocality results in indeterminacy, or “undecidability,” as J. Hillis Miller called it, Roston demonstrates that the “co-presence” of text and subtext or tradition and innovation creates a complexity of meaning that can be interpreted by the reader sensitive and knowledgeable enough to recover the contexts great writers often bring into tension with one another (x-xiii). He develops this thesis through five in-depth analyses of works in which a tradition (literary, philosophical, or religious) collides with, or is subverted by an innovation. Thus, he investigates the “merger” of the “contemporary acquisitive impulse” and Christian teachings in *The Merchant of Venice* (29); the collision of the Stoic allowance of suicide and Christian strictures against it in *Hamlet*; the resistance to accommodate fully classical materials to Christian themes in *The Faerie Queene*, the “inconsistency between the amusing licentiousness of the opening section” of *Volpone* and its “somber moral conclusion” (169); and the tensions between Anglican theology and Catholic “process of thought” in Donne’s poetic and prose meditations (180). The result is an engaging exploration of specific literary and cultural contexts that also elucidates the processes through which writers

transform received materials.

The chapters on *Hamlet*, Spenser, and Donne are particularly noteworthy, each for a slightly different reason. Roston sees in Hamlet's obsession with mortality a profound conflict between the logic of the Stoics' allowance of suicide in cases of unrelenting suffering and the fear that "self slaughter" would result in damnation. To make his case, Roston explores a variety of classical and Renaissance comments on suicide, thereby underscoring Hamlet's precision of reference in his speeches. His interpretation works well in clarifying Hamlet's predicament.

The benefit of Roston's Spenser chapter comes in its corrective of scholarly assumptions about syncretism in *The Faerie Queene*: rather than assume classical references are subsumed by the Christian allegory, Roston argues, we should understand that the "epic achieves its major effect by its separation of the two forms, deriving its theme from Christian tradition, but embellishing it with imagery that is pagan in source" (133). The "richness" and "uniqueness of Spenser's poetic achievement" results from his "refusal to remain within the restrictive borders either of the Puritan or of the secular configuration." This argument would provide an excellent point of departure for an upper division class discussion of Spenser's use of source materials.

Roston's discussion of "Donne and the Meditative Tradition"—by now, a well-trodden path in Donne scholarship—advances a distinction between theological content and structure of thought that would be similarly helpful in classroom teaching. Roston objects to scholarly readings that posit theological principles alone as the only keys fit to unlock Donne's religious expression. Instead, he shows that Donne wrestled with Protestant ideas not through a decidedly Protestant poetics, as Barbara Lewalski and others have claimed, but through the received meditative structures of his Catholic heritage. Donne's methods, in other words, are Catholic in inspiration, while he uses them to assess Calvinist ideas. After converting to the Established Church of England, Roston argues, Donne doctrinally "conformed" but also "remained indebted to the spiritual exercises in their original Catholic form" (209). He also "eschewed" all "controversial elements" and thereby furnished an individualized alternative. In these three chapters especially, Roston follows contextual threads as if he possessed reading glasses with a greater magnification than those of other scholars.

Of the five chapters, perhaps the one on *The Merchant of Venice* proves the

most controversial and is at times the least persuasive. While useful in his discussion of then contemporary attitudes toward usury, Roston argues that the tension in current readings of Shylock's character as both conventional villain and wronged man are based on a misreading of Shakespeare's adherence to the traditional vilification of the Jewish stereotype. "Any attempt in a modern staging of the play to avoid the anti-Semitic implications is, however admirable in its intent, not only a violation of the text but also a misunderstanding of the play," Roston argues (7). He bases this conclusion primarily on the association of Shylock with both the devil and Judas Iscariot, as well as the staging of similar villainous characters in other plays. But the dismissal of the polyphonic nature of Shylock's character runs counter to Roston's more careful discussions of multivocality elsewhere. It also detracts from the poignancy of Shakespeare's implied critique of the mob mentality on ample display during the trial scene. Still, Roston's discussion of Shakespeare's merger of "Christ with the professional merchant" in the second half of this chapter compensates for what seems a reductive reading in the first half.

Overall, in a book full of common sense readings of both early modern texts and of critical responses to those texts, Roston illuminates and successfully counters the oversimplifying tendencies of the deconstructionist agenda. To slight Roston's book as merely or untimely reactionary, however, would be to ignore its clear-headed treatment of the relationships between tradition and innovation, as well as its insights into the ways in which some of the best English Renaissance writers conceived of their work. As a group, Shakespeare, Spenser, Jonson, and Donne were particularly apt at noting and probing the many contradictions they saw around them, and *Tradition and Subversion in Renaissance Literature* provides ready access to this habit of engagement in their work. Consequently, it is useful both to scholars and to teachers faced with the task of helping their students learn to see the workings of literary complexity in the English Renaissance.

Timothy J. Burberry, *Milton the Dramatist*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 2007. 206 pp. \$58.00. Review by ANNA K. NARDO, LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY.

Timothy J. Burberry's *Milton the Dramatist* contests what he cites as "something of a truism"—that "Milton was not a dramatist and his poems are not dramatic" (x). Focusing on *Arades*, *Comus*, the Trinity manuscript plans, and *Samson Agonistes*, Burberry's project complements the many studies of the dramatic qualities of Milton's major epic (e.g. John Demaray, *Milton's Theatrical Epic: The Invention and Design of Paradise Lost* and Barbara Lewalski, *Paradise Lost and the Rhetoric of Literary Forms*) as well as his vision of history (e.g. David Loewenstein, *Milton and the Drama of History: Historical Vision, Iconoclasm, and the Literary Imagination*). But Burberry does not merely claim that "a dramatic quality suffuses all [Milton's] work" (xvi). Rather he attempts to make the case that Milton was, "in addition to being a superb writer of epic and lyric, . . . a dramatist, and a considerable one at that" (x).

Foundational to his case is the evidence that Milton probably saw live theatre in London, as well as Rome. Expanding Gordon Campbell's argument that the "John Milton, gentleman" who was a trustee of the Blackfriars Theater was also the poet's father, Burberry argues that not only may the play-going references in Milton's first elegy and *L'Allegro* refer to actual attendance at plays, but also "the debate between Comus and the Lady, and the entrance of Dalila—are significantly indebted to plays shown in the theater" (23): Ben Jonson's *The Staple of News*, which ran in 1626 during Milton's rustication from Cambridge, and Thomas Randolph's 1630 comedy *The Muses' Looking-Glass*, which is "set in the Blackfriars Theatre, and depicts two Puritans . . . who have come to the theater to condemn the day's performance" (19). Indeed, Burberry reads Milton's call in *The Reason of Church Government* for the current government to stage "paneguries" (or solemn assemblies) as an argument to reform, rather than close, the playhouses, in one of which Milton's family held a financial interest.

After establishing that Milton was a spectator, reader, and editor of drama, Burberry turns to Milton's masques to demonstrate that *Arades* creatively blends the conventions of the *al fresco* entertainment and the court masque, and that *Comus* is more drama than masque, especially in its unusual physical and verbal clashes between main masquers and antimasquers. Whereas "In court masques,

main masquers did not speak at all, nor did they interact in any way with the antimasquers" (48), the complex characterization of the villain and his debate with the Lady make *Comus*, according to Burberry, "a literary achievement that is virtually without precedent" (54). In Milton's revisions for publication in 1645, then in 1673, Burberry agrees with the critical consensus that "Milton was thinking of *A Masque* in terms of poetry when he published it," but he also finds, especially in "the revisions in the stage directions . . . an attempt to provide increased dramatic clarity as well as more compelling poetry" (58).

The subsequent chapter entitled "Problem-Solving in Milton's Biblical Drama Sketches" details how Milton's dramatic ambitions grew beyond commissioned masques to plans for Biblical and historical tragedies, many of which would have required spectacular staging of large-scale disasters that befall the wicked. In these sketches, Burberry finds Milton wrestling with problems of staging: e.g. Adam and Eve's nudity, and Biblical cataclysms too expensive for presentation and too protracted for stage report. Eventually, Milton resolves these problems—first by escaping "from the confines of the stage for the greater scope afforded by the epic" (77), and second by finding in the Samson story "a swift, compact catastrophe" (89) suitable for a messenger's report.

Of course, Samson's cataclysmic destruction of the Philistines is the crux of the post-9/11 controversy over Milton's only drama. Burberry contributes to this debate by arguing that the failure to attend to *Samson Agonistes* as a stage-worthy drama accounts, in part, for the misconception that Samson is guilty of the indiscriminate slaughter of the innocent. Burberry finds in *Samson Agonistes* "an abundance of implicit spectacle" (98). Analyzing the descriptions of Samson's body, Dalila's dress and train, and the Temple of Dagon, Burberry contends that Samson is not a terrorist—nor Dalila, a Philistine heroine.

Although not intended for the stage, Milton's tragedy resembles the neo-classical theatre of Jean Racine, to Burberry's mind, more than the closet dramas of Samuel Daniel or Elizabeth Cary. In order to solidify this claim, Burberry devotes his fifth chapter and appendix to a detailed account of *Samson Agonistes* in performance.

Milton the Dramatist is well researched and tightly reasoned. The chapter on Milton's Trinity manuscript sketches for tragedies is, I believe, the most successful. In his analysis of how experiments and false starts exposed prob-

lems of form that Milton solved in later works, Burbery's close reasoning from probabilities is convincing and enlightening. I find his method less persuasive, however, in his attempts to establish precise sources in plays that Milton may have seen, or to explain physically how Samson's guide could have possibly escaped from the falling pillars of Dagon's temple, or how the generous and civil lords who agreed to a ransom just might have arrived late to the festival, or how the messenger doesn't really mean that "all [Gaza's] sons are fall'n" (*S*.4ll58). The reasoning in these sections depends too heavily on "it may be that . . . might seem . . . is possible . . ." (131-33) to win my full assent.

Nevertheless, theatre historians, as well as Milton scholars, will appreciate Burbery's extensive list of stagings, dramatic readings, and adaptations of *Samson Agonistes* from 1717 to 2003.

John Mulryan and Steven Brown, ed. and trans. *Natale Conti's Mythologiae*. 2 vols. Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2006. xlvii + 978 pp. + 1 ill. \$110/ £89. Review by STELLA REVAR, SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY, EDWARDSVILLE.

In the sixteenth and seventeenth century Natale Conti's *Mythologiae* was the most popular myth book for poets, scholars, and general readers alike; in the twentieth century it also long served as an essential book for scholars writing about Renaissance poets and their myth sources. Its Latin was simple and straightforward, its organization helpful, and it came with an index. Now John Mulryan and Steven Brown have made this premier of myth books available for the first time in a complete, modern English translation in a handsome, two-volume edition. The *Mythologiae* passed through twenty-one Latin editions and six French translations in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. But it was not the only myth book of its time nor was it the only publication of its author Natale Conti (Natalis Comes), who was known as a prolific translator, principally of Greek works into Latin, and also as a poet and imitator of classical poetry in his own right—both in Greek and Latin. His poetic talents were to serve him well in the *Mythologiae* which includes generous examples of Greek poetry translated into Latin.

The myth book, of which the *Mythologiae* was the most popular

example, was not exclusively a Renaissance invention. Ancient mythographies include Hesiod's eighth-century B.C. *Theogony*, Hyginus' *Book of Fables* (1st century B.C.), Apollodorus' *Bibliotheca*, and Fulgentius' fifth-century A. D. *Mythologiae*. The myth book was popularized in the early Renaissance by Boccaccio's *De Genealogia Deorum gentilium libri* (1472), to be superseded in the sixteenth century by Georgius Pictor's *Theologia Mythologiae* (1532), Lilio Gregorio Giraldi's *De deis gentium . . . historia* (1548), Vincenzo Cartari's *Imagines de I dei de gli antichi* (1548), composed in Italian and illustrated, and finally by Conti's *Mythologiae* (1567). Usefully, all these mythographies are described in the Introduction and their methods compared and contrasted with Conti's *Mythologiae*. Conti approaches myth allegorically, providing ethical or moral, historical and finally natural or "scientific" interpretations. His emphasis is on the ethical and moral interpretations, however, for he looks at classical myth syncretically and attempts to show how the Greek gods anticipate and affirm the Christian God. This approach made Conti acceptable to the Renaissance world. Copies of Conti were to be found in schools and colleges throughout England and in James I's own library, and he was readily cited as an authority by writers such as Chapman, Jonson, Burton and many others. Moreover, when not cited directly, it is often clear from the detail and emphasis when poets are employing Conti. Some merely treat Conti as a source for myth; others draw ethical interpretations of myth from him. Indices of names, places, and events make the *Mythologiae* eminently useful as a reference work, and Mulryan and Brown argue that even from the first edition, this is what it was intended to be. Moreover Conti added to these indices in subsequent editions in which he incorporated notes of classical scholars and other mythographers into his text.

Conti's *Mythologiae* is divided into ten books, with each book subdivided into chapters. His first book attempts to justify myth as not merely a useful study, but also a philosophical one, arguing that the ancients employed myth as a means to disseminate under a secret guise the essential truths about human life. Ancient writers such as Dionysius of Halicarnassus pointed out the usefulness of myth for explaining natural phenomena by allegory, for consoling human beings about the miseries of life, or for freeing the mind from terrors and unsound opinions. Conti traces the Greek mythical system back to the

Egyptians, but he points out that though all civilizations have their gods, it was the Hebrews who first discovered true religion and the true worship of God. After a lengthy consideration of the ancients' order of sacrifice to the different gods in book 1, Conti commences in book 2 an account of the major deities of the Greeks and Romans, beginning with their principal god Jupiter, who, as he explains, may be three distinct "gods," the third being the well-known son of Saturn, who at birth escaped being swallowed by his father once a stone was substituted in his place. Conti's aim in describing the classical deities is to collect as many as possible accounts from ancient sources, accounts that range from simple narrative to philosophical justification. His view is that the gods were originally human beings who exercised great power and so after their death were deified. He is predictably severe about Jupiter's sexual mores, but nonetheless catalogues his three wives and many mistresses.

Readers can approach the *Mythologiae* in several ways. They can use it as a reference work and consult only a pertinent chapter on a deity for the information that Conti has collected from different ancient sources. However, read straight through, the *Mythologiae* is a cultural text from the Renaissance that analyses the ancients' approach to their gods. Conti liberally cites ancient stories together with Plato's, Cicero's, and even the Christian Lactantius' commentaries, which attempt to explain the fables scientifically. However, Conti is often just as critical of these philosophical justifications as of the fables themselves. After the opening books Conti organizes his material on topics, including relevant deities or persons in the chapters that pertain to the topic. For example, book 7—"How Famous Men Sought Glory"—contains an account of Hercules and his labors; book 6—"That We Should Accept God's Decisions Calmly"—recounts the cautionary tale of Phaethon's disastrous borrowing of the Sun's chariot as well as those tales of famous sinners consigned to the underworld. The underworld itself he investigates in book 3. With Christianity, he points out, the ancients believed in the immortality of the soul and that every individual faced judgment after death. The ancients' graphic picture of the underworld, he believed, not only responded to human fears about the afterlife but also encouraged human beings to lead virtuous lives. Conti introduces us to the classical judges—Minos, Rhadamanthus, and Aeacus, and also gives us a detailed tour of the underworld, beginning with the rivers Acheron and Styx and continuing with its well-known inhabitants—Charon and Cerberus—as well as a host of monsters, most of them children of

Erebus and Night. However, it is here that we find the Fates and also Diana and the Moon as the terrestrial and extra-terrestrial aspects of Hecate. Readers might have expected to find Diana together with her twin Apollo, but it is not until book 4 that we meet Apollo. Interestingly, Conti cites divergent opinions on the parentage of Apollo and Artemis, noting that Herodotus claimed that the twins were born, not from Jupiter and Latona, but from Isis and Dionysus, with Latona only their nurse.

One of the most useful aspects of Conti's approach is that he regularly presents heterogeneous points of views. Conti is relatively dispassionate about Apollo, recording with interest his different roles as healer, prophet, and poet. In contrast to his outrage at Jupiter's conduct, he refrains from rebuking Apollo for vengefully attacking the Cyclopes, and merely notes that, banished by Jupiter from Olympus, he tended Admetus' cattle, a tale Milton lovingly includes in his poem *Mansus*. It is sometimes difficult to understand why Conti includes certain deities under the certain topics. For example, book 4 begins by discussing how the Moon controls childbirth, but very soon digresses to other topics and other persons, concluding with Venus and the cluster of deities associated with her—Cupid, the Graces, and the Hours. Book 5 begins with chapters on the four principal athletic contests in Greece—the Olympian, Pythian, Nemean, and Isthmian games—but concludes with chapters on several important deities—Mercury, Ceres, and Bacchus. Book 10, the final book, recapitulates briefly myths and figures Conti has dealt with before, reiterating his earlier point that myth is designed to teach human beings moral behavior. From Jupiter's example we learn, Conti succinctly comments, that "anyone who dedicates his life to sexual lust will be changed into all kinds of different beasts" (2.889).

Conti's sources range throughout classical literature. As we would expect, Hesiod's *Theogony* is a standby, as are Homer's epics. Though he refers to Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, he does not let Ovid overshadow older Greek sources such as Pindar, the Homeric Hymns, and Callimachus. He sometimes makes mistakes in citing book and line numbers of ancient texts, which our translators helpfully identify and correct. Particularly useful are the footnotes Mulryan and Brown provide that point us to other sources, elucidate or correct Conti's commentary, and generally fill in classical and neo-Latin background. In the

appendix they provide a detailed description of the most important editions of the *Mythologiae* from 1567 to 1653. We must be grateful to them for this clear, correct, and eminently readable translation and for the scholarly apparatus attached to it that makes it all for more useful for early modern scholars.

Jacob Blevins, ed. *Re-Reading Thomas Traherne: A Collection of New Critical Essays*. Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval & Renaissance Studies, 2007. xviii + 254pp. \$39.00. Review by A. LEIGH DENEFF, DUKE UNIVERSITY.

For many students of late seventeenth-century literature, Thomas Traherne is readily characterized by an unbridled optimism about man and his potential for recovering the blessed state of Felicity, about the glories of infancy and childhood, and about his own capacity to see God everywhere. While scholars have long recognized that his charming delight in things is not really pre-Romantic, they have generally accepted that Traherne's intellectual lineage can be tracked smoothly through the idealisms of Christian mysticism and Cambridge Platonism. *Re-Reading Thomas Traherne* complicates this relatively serene overview. As Alan Bradford puts it in his excellent Epilogue, the author who emerges from this collection "is an oxymoronic figure more complex, contradictory, and controversial than we had once imagined him to be."

Although Traherne was an indefatigable writer, much of his work remains either unpublished or inaccessible. This material includes Roman Forgeries, the enormous *Commentaries of Heaven*, the notebooks, and, until recently, the newly discovered Lambeth manuscript. Admittedly, the work that is available is not trifling—*Centuries of Meditation*, *Christian Ethics*, *The Church's Yearbook*, *the Dobell poems*, *Poems of Felicity*, etc.—but any attempt to summarize Traherne's thought or to trace its development is practically impossible. Presumably, completion of the Boydell and Brewer definitive edition of Traherne's works (the first volume of the projected eight appeared in 2005) will provide a basis for a more encompassing survey, although it will still be difficult to trace development over a life we know so little about. As a result, scholars are left in the position of suggesting plausible avenues for further inquiry drawn from re-readings of available texts. The positive side of this state is that virtually all approaches seem promising; the negative side is the difficulty of proving their staying power over the broader stretches of a canon still in the

process of being formed. So there inevitably gathers about Traherne studies both the excitement of a new beginning and the resignation of a certain belatedness.

There is no question that the nine essays in this volume pose significant, sometimes shocking challenges to traditional Traherne scholarship. Susannah B. Mintz, for example, in "Strange Bodies: Thomas Traherne's Disabled Subject," takes issue with overzealous views of Traherne's glorification of the body as proof of God's perfect handiwork by tracing images of deafness and muteness in his poetry. She notes that while Traherne tends to idealize the sense of sight, deafness and muteness become symbols of, as well as deliberate preparation/protection for, a hermetically-sealed existence, for a "solitary inwardness associated with mystical apprehension of God." Images of physical impairment, in other words, are structurally necessary in order to establish "a superior sense of selfhood." At one level, this argument would seem to repeat the charge of solipsism often levelled at Traherne, but Mintz's catalogue of the language of physical disability drives towards a darker point. The deaf-mute, Mintz insists, is conceptually powerful to Traherne "only to the extent that it is read figuratively, not actually." Such symbolic appropriation of disability is, she argues, an erasure of the social/material circumstances of the time, and critics who continue to celebrate Traherne's "so-called 'vision'" are only perpetuating this erasure.

Lynne A. Greenberg continues the focus on Traherne's language in "Cursed and Devised Proprieties: Traherne and the Laws of Property." Greenberg's general argument is that Traherne's work reflects the steady reconfiguration of property law in the late seventeenth-century. Building upon the historical work of Christopher Hill and others, Greenberg suggests that Traherne's "landscape of the mind" fluctuates between the views of such Interregnum radicals as Digger Gerrard Whitstanley (communal rights of access, boundless public lands) and the more proprietary rights of an emerging class of landowners (private boundaries, hereditary rights, the responsibility to increase the value of property by proper use of it). She is thus able to demonstrate a closer connection than has been noted between Traherne's writing and the material conditions of Herefordshire, one of the earliest counties to experience widespread enclosure.

Cynthia Saenz is interested in Traherne's view of language itself. In "Language and the Fall: The Quest for Prelapsarian Speech in the Writings of

'Thomas Traherne and his Contemporaries,' Saenz, like other authors in this collection, tries to position Traherne more carefully within his Restoration context. She shows that Traherne agrees with Willet, Hughes and other Biblical commentators on the pure qualities of Edenic speech; that his views of infancy and childhood align him with a Latitudinarian (Whichcote, More, Smith, Cudworth) and Pre-Nicene tradition; and that his celebratory embrace of all forms of diversity—including linguistic—can be seen as a revisionist view of the destruction of the Tower of Babel as a *felix culpa*. Saenz's point here is not that Traherne is interested in language reform *per se*, but rather that he sees his task as cleansing human perception by teaching his readers how to praise and to "prize." As Traherne puts it in *Commentaries of Heaven*, man's (here Adam's) duty is "to Prize all the Blessing he had so newly received. And not only prize them but . . . to prize nothing over or under its value, but evry thing according to the measure of its goodness. . . ." Saenz's suggestion that Traherne espouses three states of perceptual development is less convincing than her demonstration that Traherne's embrace of linguistic diversity often forces him into ambiguous and contradictory arguments about the dangers as well as the potentials of language.

Kevin Laam, in "Thomas Traherne, Richard Allestree, and the Ethics of Appropriation," compares Traherne's *Christian Ethicks* (1675) with Allestree's *The Whole Duty of Man* (1658) and *The Art of Contentment* (1675), in part to complicate the usual distinction between "popular" and "elite" audiences. Since Traherne directly incorporated portions of Allestree's extremely popular *Whole Duty* into his work, this comparison is appropriate and overdue. In a sustained and detailed reading of all three works, Laam is able to reveal both similarities (for Traherne, *Christian Ethicks* is not, as sometimes argued, just a plan for thought, but for pragmatic ethical action) and differences (Traherne is not, as Allestree, sounding an Anglican call for conformity). Laam is surely correct in arguing that traditional distinctions between "modes" of seventeenth-century writing have often led to a failure to put Traherne into conversation with his own contemporaries.

Focusing largely on *Centuries of Meditation*, Raymond-Jean Frontain, in "Tuning the World: Traherne, Psalms, and Praise," sets Traherne's use of the Psalms in the context of late seventeenth-century tensions between private acts of devotion and renewed emphasis on the ecclesiastical custom of communal singing. Although many scholars have traced the tradition in which

Psalm-singing was promoted as a model by which an individual might participate in the spiritual renovation of the world, the Psalms are still often seen as individual acts of praise rather than public ones. Frontain's reminder of this tradition—from Paul, through Athanasius, Jerome, Richard Rolle, Langland and Erasmus—serves to buttress his argument that Traherne's goal in the *Centuries* is to promote “a circle of praise” that derives from Paul to Traherne to Mrs. Hopton and, eventually, to the reader of the printed volume. The model of David, in this reading, saves Traherne from the charges of solipsism by teaching him and us that “private prayer is now part of a larger, cosmic operation.” In this argument, Frontain, like Laam, calls useful attention to the often arbitrary divisions scholars have tended to draw between private and public, popular and elite modes of seventeenth-century writing.

Finn Fordham, in “Motions of Writing in *The Commentaries of Heaven*: The ‘Volatility’ of ‘Atoms’ and ‘Aetymos,’” insists that Traherne's modes of composition (particularly his revisions) not only reveal “the intentions and preoccupations of his work,” but actually shape much of its visionary substance. This is a rather grand claim, but Fordham's careful analyses of discrete passages in the *Commentaries* is convincing. Examining what he calls “the fault-lines” of the text, Fordham shows three kinds of revision at work in the *Commentaries*: 1) eliminating doubt, especially in instances where linguistic representation might be suspect or imperfect; 2) eliminating confusion, since writing “upon the wing” may produce disordered consequences; and 3) eliminating “affections,” particularly those of premature pleasure and enjoyment that might weaken the logic of a specific argument. Fordham's detailed readings demonstrate in material form the paradoxes of a writer of such polixity continuously anxious about writing itself. This is not only an important new perspective on the *Commentaries*, but a compelling argument for a facsimile edition of this immense, fascinating, but still relatively unknown work.

One of the more surprising arguments in the collection comes from Carol Ann Johnston, who proposes, in “Masquing/Un-Masquing: Lambeth MS. 1360 and a Reconsideration of Traherne's ‘Curious’ Visual Language,” that the poet uses the court masque as “the fundamental structure in his imaginative spiritual configuration of interior space.” Johnston is fully aware of the apparently contradictory nature of this assertion, particularly for someone with clear anti-royalist and anti-court sentiments, but her argument is based upon competing seventeenth-century theories of perspectival versus linear

vision. In her account, Traherne constructs perception as a three-part process (compare Saenz): 1) the pre-spectival anamorphic vision of a child, decentered and fractured, unable to bring the whole world into focus; 2) the single-point, totalizing perspective of faithless adulthood, which offers a broader and more coherent but also falsely objectified view; and 3) the Christian vision—"a rediscovery of decentered perspective through the visual field of linear perspective, offering the Christian the best of both visual systems." Johnston suggests that, to Traherne, the cosmos is crisscrossed with centric rays, from God and from the faithful: multiple souls watch God watch each of them (a combination of multiple frames and centrist points). And this enclosed visual cosmos "finds its perfect expression in the image of the court masque as [Inigo] Jones designed it." Presumably this means that all perspectives in the masque converge on the king, but when Johnston subsequently argues that the king is the only figure who can view the masque correctly, the analogy becomes somewhat shaky. Even if one assumes that Traherne understood the masque as Inigo Jones did, it is not clear that visual field of the masque is equivalent to the mirrored vectors of God and the faithful each seeing correctly because each is seeing as the other. Whatever the validity of Johnston's argument about the importance of the masque in Traherne's account of human vision, she has certainly provided an entry into the relatively unstudied Lambeth MS.

At several points in the present collection, individual authors suggest that Traherne's texts are haunted by uncanny others of various kinds—the disabled others in Mintz's article, the "faithless" adults in Johnston's essay. Gary Kuchar, in a brilliant study of "Traherne's Specters: Self-Consciousness and Its Others," provides a theoretical basis for these figures of dialectical and uncanny otherness. As Kuchar sees it, self-consciousness, to Traherne, is understanding the soul's potential as a teleologically oriented image of God. Indifference—living without being fully conscious of how one's mind animates things, including the self—is to live as if the world had never been created, to live in a radically de-animated state of life-in-death. Traherne calls this uncanny life-in-death a dumb show. (Compare not only the masque form suggested by Johnston but the artificial mechanistic model of the state proposed by Hobbes). Using models of spectral otherness drawn from Freud, Derrida, Lacan and, less anachronistically, Jacob Boehme, Kuchar convincingly argues that this actively indifferent and spectral other is not merely the opposite of the fully

conscious self, but its double, “the inhuman dimension within human subjectivity itself,” a self-negating “dead puppet” (Kuchar recalls Restoration “Punch and Judy” shows). What haunts Traherne, Kuchar argues, is fear of the future as an on-going dumb show in which human actions are not “emenations of gratitude but are materializations of something radically inhuman [i.e., indifferent] and yet profoundly familiar.” Such a view may seem overwhelmingly negative to those reluctant to view Traherne through any post-modern lenses. But Kuchar’s broader point is that by analyzing Traherne’s early diagnosis of the paradoxical effects of modern disenchantment, we can better appreciate his precarious historical position “between Renaissance Neoplatonism, with its epistemological optimism and overall vision of the harmonious relations between soul and cosmos, and the demystifying force of seventeenth-century natural philosophy, exemplified by the objectifying and epistemologically skeptical thought of Bacon, Descartes, Hobbes, and the Royal Society.”

James J. Balakier also takes up the question of consciousness in “Traherne, Husserl, and a Unitary Act of Consciousness,” but his models are quite different from those of Kuchar. Arguing that Husserl gives “theoretical strength” to a budding area of Traherne studies and that Traherne work itself “affirms Husserl’s notion of an ultimate transcendental self,” Balakier seems intent on countering some lingering ideas of Traherne as a sentimentalist or a lightweight idealist, or of his writings as exhibiting “an immature, facile optimism.” In urging us to take Traherne seriously, Balakier invokes the “scientific studies” of modern-day psychologists and physiologists who have described the “fourth state” of consciousness (waking, sleeping and dreaming being the other three) in a variety of documents published primarily by Maharishi International University Press. Balakier surveys Traherne’s writings for characteristics of the “Wondrous Self,” as Traherne calls it in “My Spirit” (the Dobell poems), and discovers, unsurprisingly, that such qualities “correlate with the personal descriptions of the fourth state of consciousness collected by researchers.” Whether that correlation “points clearly” to the validity of the “fourth state” or whether Traherne’s own statements about his interior consciousness are “validated by [modern] research findings,” Balakier seems to be fighting a battle that, in this collection at least, is long over.

In his introduction, Jacob Blevins hopes that *Re-Reading Thomas Traherne* will serve as the beginning of a new era in Traherne studies by making inaccessible works more widely known, by better positioning Traherne within his

own historical contexts, and by bringing analyses of his work more directly into contact with modes of contemporary criticism. While it is difficult to predict what “Thomas Traherne” will emerge from the Boydell and Brewer definitive edition, there is little doubt that he will be in the very good hands of a new generation of thoughtful and promising young scholars. The essays collected here show a richness of historical engagement and careful textual analysis that promise the new era in Traherne studies should be both exciting and challenging. Whether this will be enough to bring Traherne to center stage in late seventeenth-century studies or leave him in the wings with a few dedicated enthusiasts remains to be seen.

Linda Levy Peck. *Consuming Splendor: Society and Culture in Seventeenth-Century England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005. xvi + 431 pp. + 48 illus. \$38.00. Review by ELENA LEVY-NAVARRO, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-WHITEWATER.

If not quite a luxury good itself, *Consuming Splendor* with its 48 illustrations certainly is pleasing to the eye. It also offers a wealth of examples that will be of interest to scholars of literature, art history, and history. Levy Peck offers a bold corrective to previous history that sees the eighteenth century as witnessing the emergence of a market for luxury goods. Such a market actually started much earlier in the seventeenth century, Levy Peck argues. Her analysis also seeks to correct the tendency in the previous scholarship to see this market as emerging with the rise of the “middling group” (352). In turning to the seventeenth century, she asks us to consider how the crown and court contributed to this luxury market. In particular, Levy Peck seeks to redirect our attention to King James and the powerful Jacobean aristocracy, who instituted projects to modernize London and England generally. King James had plans to improve urban infrastructure, encourage foreign exchange, and improve the manufacture of luxury goods in Britain itself.

To make this argument, Levy Peck examines the emergence of “shopping” among the upper classes, and elites in particular (chapters 1 and 2), the rise of the new desires for luxury goods among these same groups (chapters 3 and 4), and the increased attention on architectural improvements both in London residences of the elite and in the broader urban landscape (chapter

5). The chapters as a whole examine how such a taste for luxury items was driven by foreign exchanges, especially with the Continent, but also with the New World. Chapter 6 argues convincingly that luxury goods continued to be consumed and desired in the years of the Civil War and Protectorate. Chapter 7 offers a fascinating case study of one such Englishman's purchase of foreign luxury goods, especially a funeral monument for his wife. The example of his negotiations suggests the degree to which such exchanges had become common, if not yet routine. That there had been contact between the Catholic continent and Protestant England is proven, in part, in seeing the extent to which Bernini refashioned his famed, Catholic Baroque style to accommodate the needs of his Anglican patron. Chapter 8 argues that the Royal Society took a keen interest in luxury goods with an eye toward their manufacture. Returning to her central idea that such a market was driven by the elite, more generally, and the court, more specifically, she argues that the society was not so much the group of "puritan bourgeoisie" that some take them to be, but a group closely affiliated with the most powerful aristocratic families, especially Henry Howard, the Duke of Norfolk.

Through these chapters, Levy Peck argues both implicitly and explicitly that the seventeenth century gives rise to a Habermasian "public sphere." To those who would argue that it comes into being in the eighteenth century, Levy Peck responds, "I argue that, in many respects, that public was already in place" (352). Her argument depends on employing the word, "public," often in regard to new architectural spaces. The New Exchange is described as a "new public sphere," even as one museum is described as offering a "new public space" (52, 157). As she discusses these sites, Levy Peck suggests that a new public space is created when people come together to consume luxury goods. In her discussion of the New Exchange, established in 1609 in London's fashionable West End by Robert Cecil, the Earl of Salisbury, Levy Peck focuses on how it brought ladies out in new ways into a public space. She focuses, then, on how such shopping brought them in contact with others of their social group but also with the shopkeepers, employees, and others who assembled at the site. Perhaps a closer consideration of documents that would demonstrate that news and gossip that were exchanged in such locales would strengthen her claim that the Exchanges did, indeed, create a new public sphere.

Levy Peck makes this same point elsewhere when, for example, she

argues that the new buildings of the Jacobean aristocracy were designed to court “public view” of their collections of luxury items like art (207). Levy Peck considers the intriguing case of John Tradescant. Originally, a collector for the influential George Villiers, the Duke of Buckingham, he subsequently left Villiers’ employ, settled in South Lambeth, and created a museum, “The Ark,” where he “publicly displayed his natural history collections” (157). Here again, Levy Peck offers an argument in which a “public space” is created when a number of people, especially the “well-to-do,” come together to consume luxury items.

Her argument may be, however, that this “public” is created as much by subsequent events than it is by the space of the museum itself. In her discussion of “The Ark,” Levy Peck focuses much more on its afterlife than she does on the site of the museum itself. Not only does she detail how the collection itself formed the basis for the Ashmolean Museum, established in Oxford in 1677, but she also describes in detail the way this collection was represented in the 1656 publication, *Musaeum Tradescantianum*. In focusing on the latter, Levy Peck describes how Tradescant’s son “expand[ed] the audience for his father’s collection to include scientists, artisans, and the nation as a whole” (161). Given the intriguing relationship between the initial site as perhaps a proto-public sphere and the book itself as something that expanded this sphere, more explicit discussion of the relationship would be warranted.

In sum, Levy Peck demonstrates how luxury goods are at the center of crucial cultural shifts of the early modern period. Scholars of race, class, colonialism and social history, to name just a few areas, will find much of value in this work. In this, *Consuming Splendor* may promote the most valuable exchange of all.

David Loewenstein and John Marshall, eds. *Heresy, Literature, and Politics in Early Modern English Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006. X + 318 pp. \$96.00. Review by EUGENE D. HILL, MOUNT HOLYOKE COLLEGE.

“For there must be . . . heresies among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest . . .,” the Scripture asserts categorically, though

where King James cited here (with the Rheims) transliterates the Greek *haereseis* of I Corinthians 11.19, more recent Bibles give the safely insipid “factions.” Thereby hangs a tale, indeed many tales, not least in Elizabethan and Stuart England, as this valuable collection of a dozen articles by as many hands makes evident. Just what, after all, is a heresy? The strongest papers here exhibit seventeenth-century authors posing just that question.

The pieces may be divided into three rough groups: those exploring authors recognized or claimed in their day as heretics; pioneers of tolerationist thought who downplayed the role of heresy in their writings; and philosophers of heresy who offered synoptic accounts or phenomenological or genealogical definitions of the phenomenon of heresy.

Worthwhile contributions here explore in welcome breadth Anne Askew, the Anabaptists and their opponents, the so-called Family of Love, and Gerrard Winstanley. By way of contrast, the essay on *Paradise Lost* by John Rogers focuses on a brief passage early in Book Eleven (14–44), in which we are asked to locate the poet’s “curious amalgam of Arminianism, Socinianism and . . . Arianism” (204). This Polonian classification Rogers explains as follows: “the actual work that the Socinian Christ performed as priest stands in the starkest possible opposition to the work of Christ as represented by mainstream Trinitarian theologians. Christ’s priestly sacrifice, for example, has to be imagined as comprising two distinct actions, mactation and oblation.” The analysis continues: “What the Socinian Father accepts at the altar of the heavenly tabernacle, after the Resurrection and Ascension, is not Christ’s life, or his body, but his *offer*; he accepts Christ’s voluntarily undertaken act of oblation. And it is the freely willed gesture of the priestly offering that is the single most consequential act performed by the Socinian Christ, and the primary reason he merits his elevation to the Father’s right hand” (209). Not all readers will easily and happily follow Rogers’ invitation to view this distinction of priestly offices as vital to the passage in question, or to the epic as a whole.

The collection ends with a pair of worthwhile papers on late seventeenth-century tolerationist thought. John Marshall provides an exemplary account of the context in which Locke penned his three Letters on Toleration in the period 1685–89, reminding us of how alive virulent earlier views remained in those years. “For Beza, whose 1554 *De Haereticis* remained the subject of widespread discussion as late as the 1680s, liberty of conscience was a ‘diabolical doctrine.’ Edwards asserted that toleration was ‘a most

transcendent . . . and fundamentall evil'; as 'original sin ' was the 'most fundamentall sin, all sin: having the seed and spawn of all in it: So a Toleration hath all errors in it, and all evils." And "Jurieu argued that toleration was itself 'a Socinian doctrine, the most dangerous of all those of that sect, since it was on the way to ruin Christianity and place all religions on the same plane,' holding that only Arminians and Socinians had supported universal religious toleration" (265-66). Marshall makes it clear how carefully Locke had to tread in arguing for generosity toward readily bruised consciences, as does N.H. Keble in an informed essay on Richard Baxter.

Some of the best pieces in Loewenstein and Marshall consider the curious genre of heresiography—"a neologism derived from Ephraim Pagitt's 1645 book of that title" (137), as Ann Hughes notes in her fine contribution entitled "Thomas Edwards's *Gangraena* and heresiological traditions." John Coffey (in the preceding piece, also of great merit) views Edwards' panoramic taxonomy of heresy as one of several "rambling hate lists" in which, "beneath the veneer of objectivity and precision, Edwards's method was pretty haphazard. He made no effort to grade his sects and heresies in order of seriousness, and implied that all of these movements belonged to a single demonic conspiracy against the kingdom of god" (111). Hughes assumes a more sympathetic stance: for her the constant breakdown of systematic arrangement betokens an historical moment and a stylistic choice: "The structure (or lack of structure) . . . parallels his account of the 'reality' of religious turmoil." "The organization of the text is always breaking down in the face of the pressures of his immediate situation, with the continued emergence of ever more horrifying errors. The very look" of the tome "was affected, as the last pages of each part resorted to a tiny type in order to incorporate information pouring in at the last moment" (150-51). Hughes takes this stance of overwhelmed chronicler very seriously, seeing it as vouching for the reliability of *Gangraena* as a historical source. Perhaps she's right, though a touch of Defoe-like posing may underlie the faux naïveté.

The two most sophisticated analyses of heresy in the period, not surprisingly, came from Milton and Hobbes. The former (in the words of John Coffey) "redefined the term so that it bore little resemblance to its traditional meaning." Indeed, "Milton defined it as a *subjective* attitude of blind submission to tradition rather than to scripture" Thus Milton's criterion "was *procedural* rather than *substantive*. Heresy was about theological method rather than

theological *content*. One might arrive at erroneous conclusions, but if those . . . were reached after an earnest endeavor to ascertain the meaning of the scriptures, and . . . could be backed up by a plausible biblical argument, one could not justly be called a heretic” (130-31).

Even more radical than this procedural reinterpretation was Hobbes’ genealogical one, adeptly expounded by J. A. I Champion by way of a reading of Hobbes’ neglected *Historical Narration Concerning Heresie*, published posthumously in 1680 but evidently completed in 1668 and “published” in scribal form during the later years of Hobbes’s life in the mid-1670s” (224). I leave to my reader the pleasure of following Hobbes’ wickedly anti-clerical tracing of the term heresy from “private opinion” (228) among the ancient philosophers to sect then to creed, this last a tool for self-seeking prelates to enforce their interests by the most extreme means. As Coffey summarizes the development, “heresy was a device originally employed to denote diversity that had been turned into a powerful weapon of priestcraft” (232). There was of necessity no objective source of truth (or of its opposite): what mattered was what the civil sovereign prescribed.

Champion’s piece, the gem of a good set of articles, concludes with a discussion of Thomas Barlow’s unpublished “Animadversions on a MS. tract concerning Heresy” of 1676. Barlow takes issue precisely with the Hobbesian genealogy—no fool Barlow, who recognizes how much depends on what we take the necessity of *haereseis* to mean.

Giles Worsley. *Inigo Jones and the European Classicist Tradition*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007. xi + 220 pp. + 218 illus. \$65.00. Review by ALLISON LEE PALMER, UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA.

In this text on the English architect Inigo Jones, author Giles Worsley provides a needed re-evaluation of the topic of seventeenth-century classicism, which to date has been a little-studied area of European architectural history. Baroque architecture has for the most part been defined largely by the Roman architecture that coincided with the Counter-Reformation and that can be characterized as theatrical, monumental, ornate and sculptural. The Baroque is thought to transcend the more narrowly-defined Renaissance principles of Vitruvius to embrace a more eclectic style. Early scholars such as

Heinrich Wölfflin (in his *Renaissance und Barock*, 1888), who first gave this era its stylistic category and did much to dispel its negative connotations, considered the Baroque the antithesis of Renaissance style, and although this formal definition is largely outdated, a lingering misunderstanding of seventeenth-century classicism has remained. Within this traditional framework, then, the classicizing style of Inigo Jones can only be seen as either a delayed attempt to emulate the Renaissance style or as an incredibly progressive anticipation of mid-eighteenth century Neo-Classicism. Worsley instead argues that Inigo Jones was not an anomaly, but rather he was very much a product of his time period and led the way in the shift from Mannerism toward a “purer” form of classicism that drew upon the ideas of a variety of classical architects such as Vitruvius, Alberti, Bramante, Raphael, Palladio, Serlio, Sanmicheli and Scamozzi. John Summerson, in his *Architecture in Britain 1530-1830* (1953), and Rudolf Wittkower, in his *Palladio and English Palladianism* (1974), both established a clear connection between Palladio and Jones, a comparison that Jones himself capitalized upon, but Worsley goes further to provide a fuller range of sources for Jones. Specifically, Inigo Jones wanted to develop the ornate Jacobean architecture in England toward a simpler version of classicism found not only in Italy, but also in France, Germany and the Netherlands in the early seventeenth century. Furthermore, what Inigo Jones added to this style was an intellectual framework that included a discussion of decorum and its relationship to function and patronage, whereby the richness of a building’s design was to be proportional to its status and inhabitants.

In developing his thesis, Worsley first clarifies Jones’ early years to provide a fuller understanding of his career within the court prior to his mid-life shift toward architectural design. Jones traveled extensively before his 1613 Italy tour, likely within a court entourage to France, Germany, Italy, and Denmark. During these formative years, Jones began to study architecture, focusing on Vitruvius, Palladio, and on the more practical and technical aspects of construction needed for his role as a royal masque designer in England. From this foundation Jones then began to grapple with the differing architectural needs of seventeenth-century England, arguing that one must first learn the rules of proportion, and only then can one begin to make such adjustments to the overall design. Jones’ tour of Italy then allowed him to look at classical buildings first-hand, and it was this trip that helped Jones to establish himself as an architect in addition to an architectural theorist. Worsley carefully tracks

these visits from archival records, notations found in Jones' numerous texts, and the notations of his student, John Webb, in order to trace a much fuller reading of Jones' design influences. Through travel correspondence, Worsley provides suggestions of where the royal entourage might have stayed, to include the Villa Molin, recently completed outside Padua by Scamozzi. Although most interested in Rome and the Veneto, Jones also spent time in Milan and Naples, where Worsley details buildings likely studied by Jones that might have influenced his later work. Royal patronage through Italy would have allowed Jones access to many places, including private homes, government buildings, and churches. Here Jones began to develop not only an interest in classicism, but also a particular notion of sovereignty that he applied to his buildings back in England.

North of the Alps, classicism began to take hold in the early seventeenth century, and despite the lack of extensive research on this style in Germany, Worsley demonstrates how the commissioning of classically-inspired buildings by several wealthy southern German families led the way in this stylistic development. Although it is not possible to confirm where in Germany Jones traveled, several drawings in the Jones-Webb collection suggest a possible trip through Germany. For example, two drawings of Elias Holl's Augsburg Rathaus, begun in 1615, were perhaps acquired by Jones during his return to England from Venice, the likely route of which could have brought him through Augsburg. Documentation confirms that Jones traveled quite extensively through France, where classicism was more fully developed than in Germany, whose classical tradition was cut short with the advent of the Thirty Year's War in 1618. In France, the Mannerist tradition was more widely acceptable than in Germany and England; nonetheless, a more restrained classicism, as seen in the work of Jones' contemporaries Salomon de Brosse and Jacques Lemercier, offers some intriguing parallels with Inigo Jones' work. Worsley then focuses on early seventeenth-century Netherlandish architecture to demonstrate how Dutch classicism was far more widespread there than traditional scholarship suggests. For example, the church of San Carlo Borromeo in Antwerp, designed by François d'Aguilon and Pierre Huyssens beginning in 1613, is described today as a Baroque building due to its opulent façade, but in its day it was considered Vitruvian, and that is the way Jones likely understood the building through contemporary descriptions he was certainly privy to.

Next, Worsley focuses not only on Jones' annotated edition of Palladio's *Quattro Libri*, which has been widely studied, but also on his unpublished annotations to the texts by Vitruvius, Alberti, Serlio and Scamozzi. Expanding upon Gordon Higgott's studies of Jones' design principles, Worsley offers a fuller understanding of Jones' sources. For example, his most famous building, the Banqueting House at Whitehall (1619-22), which is perhaps his clearest Palladian building, also reflects Scamozzi's hierarchy of orders, with the Composite order placed over the Ionic order in a system not seen in any of Palladio's designs. In addition, Jones' Queen's House at Greenwich (1632-38), recalls the cubic massing found in the Villa Medici at Poggio a Caiano, built in the 1480s by Giuliano da Sangallo, and in Scamozzi's Villa Molin outside Padua, where Jones likely stayed in Italy.

Finally, Worsley concludes his discussion of Inigo Jones with a full examination of the use of the portico and the Serlian window configuration, called the *serliana*, as symbols of sovereignty. In England, Jones' use of the portico, which harks back to the early Christian church, was reserved for royal buildings or churches that received royal patronage, while the *serliana* served as a reference to papal authority. Its origins can also be traced back to antiquity, and are seen in Imperial residences such as the Palace of Diocletian in Split. This imperial symbolism, then, confirmed the authority of the English monarchy during a politically tumultuous time period. Ultimately, Whitehall Palace must be understood in this context, as one aspect of a broader architectural campaign to aggrandize the reign of Charles I at a time of civil war, military losses to France and Spain, and persistent tensions between the monarchy and Parliament.

This study provides a scholarly and engaging account of Inigo Jones' style, motivations, his inspirations, and the broader historical and architectural context of his career. It is an innovative work that contributes greatly to the examination of English Baroque architecture. Unfortunately, this book also serves as the conclusion to Giles Worsley's fruitful career due to his death from cancer at age forty-three, merely a few weeks after the completion of this text.

Su Fang Ng. *Literature and the Politics of Family in Seventeenth-Century England*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007. Viii+236 pp. Review by SHEILA T. CAVANAGH, EMORY UNIVERSITY.

Su Fang Ng's comprehensive new book explores conceptualizations of families in literature and political thought of seventeenth-century England. Casting a wide net, ranging from Milton and Hobbes to Margaret Cavendish and early Quakerism, Ng's monograph will be of interest to scholars working in disparate areas of seventeenth-century studies, since it brings together issues and texts from literature, political theory, history, religion, and gender studies. She frequently replicates a stylistic flaw she finds in Milton: "whose writings are so peppered with quotations [that] . . . they frequently overwhelm his prose (144). Nevertheless, readers will doubtless appreciate the breadth of material she draws from as she constructs her detailed and persuasive argument.

Ng explains her methodology in the introduction: "By examining the field of discourse defined by its use, this study historically contextualizes the family-state analogy to offer a better sense of the political debates" (8). Claiming an affinity with the tenets and practices of new historicism and cultural materialism, she declares that "this study is unabashedly historicist in blurring the boundaries between historical and literary material" (10). Although these boundaries are not as indistinct in her work as this statement suggests, the monograph's argument is strengthened by its juxtaposition of texts that have not always been read together in such a context. Her inclusion of Margaret Cavendish, for example, an author who is still not widely read outside of select early modern circles, brings a new perspective to the more familiar works of Robert Filmer and others. Ng's study, therefore, provides historians and political scientists access to some of the recent literary scholarship that helpfully illuminates germane issues that transcend traditional disciplinary distinctions.

The book is divided into two major sections that generally follow chronological categorization. The first, "Revolutionary Debates," includes chapters on the Stuart court, Milton, Hobbes, and Cromwell. The second, "Restoration Imaginings" is comprised of an "interchapter" followed by considerations of Milton, Cavendish, and Quakerism. This segment of the book also includes an epilogue that looks ahead to uses of the family-state analogy

in the eighteenth century. The chapters work well either in isolation or as part of her overall argument, so scholars and graduate students who are most interested in a particular author will be as well-served as those readers who will benefit from the entire monograph.

The “Revolutionary Debates” section interweaves historical research with readings of literature and political philosophy. Although the chapter concerning Queen Anna’s court pales in contrast to Leeds Barroll’s ground-breaking work on this topic, it helpfully contextualizes the court—and that of King James—in the framework offered by the family-state analogy. As Ng comments, “Queen consorts’ unsettling representations of sovereignty are but one example of how reiteration of family tropes did not exactly duplicate a single model of the analogy” (45). The chapter usefully reiterates material from Jonathan Goldberg and other scholars of the Stuart family in order to establish the ways that articulations linking families and states are being used for a variety of political purposes, despite the deceptive parallels that the use of similar language may suggest.

The Milton and Hobbes chapters continue this work, as Ng details Milton’s use of families to encourage political reformation: “With family standing in analogical relation to the state, new configurations of family—in particular, Milton’s republican troping of family—make possible new forms of government” (53). This Milton chapter highlights the author’s prose writings, as it details his unsuccessful attempts to create and support “a fraternal republic of peers uninfected by the disease of rank” (73). Hobbes, on the other hand, is shown to “[dramatize] a confrontation between two of the most pervasive metaphors for polity in the early modern period: the family and the human body” (79) in his effort to lodge power in the sovereign “with no intermediate levels of authority” (100). These adjacent chapters offer valuable considerations of the contrasting viewpoints of two major thinkers of the time. The section ends by reminding readers of the political quandary caused by the actual family of Oliver Cromwell, who failed to produce a reasonable heir or to address adequately the issues of succession within a republic.

The second section concerns fictive writings and religious ruminations on the relationships between families and politics after the Restoration. The second Milton chapter considers *Paradise Lost*, which Ng argues “can be compared to a number of major works of political philosophy in the period” (143). In this context, she cites works by Robert Filmer and John Locke

which, like Milton's epic, use *Genesis* to support a patriarchal view of the state. This Milton piece provides an informative reading of the epic which is enriched by its placement within the broader context provided by the larger study. Likewise, the subsequent interpretation of Margaret Cavendish's *Blazing World* is strengthened by being placed within a framework created by texts that will be more familiar to many of this book's audience. Here, Ng offers a snapshot of the important work being done on Cavendish in recent years. As she notes, modern scholars "have been [slow] to treat Cavendish seriously as a political theorist" (175). Ng's study demonstrates the folly of such myopia as she offers an insightful reading of this unusual work that casts family and political structures in quite a different light than do the writings of many of her prominent male counterparts. Cavendish also provides a valuable segue into Ng's consideration of Quaker perspectives on leadership and the family, particularly since Quaker women "were insisting on their central place in the sect and refusing to be relegated to a peripheral role" (220).

Ng's brief epilogue gives summary of the ways that the family-state analogy was sustained and reconceptualized in the eighteenth century. Like the rest of her book, this postscript is pointed and articulate. Although brief, it succinctly illustrates the reemergence of the family-state analogy in the works of Mary Astell and others, further indicating the prominence of this trope throughout the period in question.

Jessie Ann Owens, compiler and editor. *"Noyses, sounds, and sweet aires": Music in Early Modern England*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2006. 222 pp. + 51 illus. \$34.95. Review by LAURA YOUENS, THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY.

From June 2 through September 9, 2006, the Folger Shakespeare Library in Washington, DC, hosted an exhibition inspired by Elizabethan "soundscapes." An ethnomusicological term introduced in the late 1960s, a "soundscape" consists of "the sounds heard in a particular location, considered as a whole." As such, it incorporates not just performances of documented music, but also such other aural experiences as bells and street vendors' cries. The library's exhibit boasted a fascinating array of engravings, music prints and manuscripts, commonplace books, musical instruments, catches and ballads, chant

sources, and treatises, not all of them English, but all drawn from the library's extensive holdings.

This catalogue of the exhibition is preceded by slightly under 100 pages of an introduction by Jessie Ann Owens, past president of the American Musicological Society and author of *Composers at Work: The Craft of Musical Composition 1450-1600*, just to mention one item among her scholarly offerings, and six short essays by well-known authorities in Renaissance music and theatre. The first three, by Bruce R. Smith, Ross Duffin, and Stacey Houck, fall into the "noyses, sounds" arena of the title phrase (a quote from *The Tempest*), while those by Jeremy Smith, Craig Monson, and Nicholas Temperley belong in the "sweet aires" category, although they deal more specifically with the tensions of religious and political life as reflected in music. Eighteen scholars are credited with catalogue descriptions. On page 221 one learns that the unsigned entries were written by Owens and that the descriptions are largely independent of Richard Charteris's *An Annotated Catalogue of Music Manuscripts in the Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington, D.C.* (Hillsdale, NY: Pendragon Press, 2005).

Of the 109 items in the exhibit, forty-one are reproduced in gray, white, and black tones, some with beige borders. This is adequate for most of the manuscript and printed items, but I will admit to wishing that the viola da gamba and the lute had been photographed in color. The rich detailing of the viol's back is almost entirely lost in this photograph. However, those consulting this catalogue will surely know that wooden instruments could not be this color.

On the "noyses, sounds" side, Bruce Smith, an English and theatre scholar and the only non-musicologist to write an essay, employs numerous quotations from Elizabethan and Jacobean plays to center a discussion of "noise" and the relative positions of ambient noise (bells, barking dogs, rustling fabrics, clashing swords, and more), music, and speech. Ross Duffin opens his entertaining survey of the ballad literature with a clever one of his own directed to Jessie Ann Owens ("The subject was crass,/ The writer an ass; / The music like fingernails scraping on glass"); his comparison of tabloid headlines to ballad titles is laugh-out-loud funny. Stacey Houck focuses on John Playford, who published such collections as *The English Dancing Master* and *Catch that Catch can* (no. 47) during the tumult of the Civil War. His royalist leanings seem to have led to a careful, but biased choice of musical selections.

Some of the most famous of the sources from the exhibit figure in Jeremy Smith's "Music and the Cult of Elizabeth: The Politics of Panegyric and Sound." He starts with no. 60, the *Cantiones, quae ab argumento sacrae vocantur*... of 1575, composed by two known Catholic composers, William Byrd and Thomas Tallis, in 1575, the seventeenth year of Elizabeth's reign, celebrated on November 17, the date of her accession. It is thus no coincidence that each composer contributed seventeen motets, but Smith argues that each used the opportunity both to plead for mercy for Elizabeth's Catholic subjects and, in the opening motet *Emendemus in melius*, to alert her subliminally to turn back to Catholicism lest she suffer the dire consequences to which the text alludes. Some of John Dowland's lute ayres (no. 58), are given a political spin said to have been inspired by Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex, to whom *The Triumphes of Oriana* of 1601 is also linked. Craig Monson, in "Reading Between the Lines: Catholic and Protestant Polemic in Elizabethan and Jacobean Sacred Music," pursues Smith's first theme, although he makes the valuable cautionary observation that audiences of that time "familiar with a time-honored tradition of biblical allusion, and accustomed to thinking metaphorically or allegorically—could be encouraged to read and hear sacred music in particular, and sometimes symbolic, ways." Nicholas Temperley lays out the history of English psalm settings, whose value to the service was made explicit in the "Table for The Ordre of the Psalmes" in *The Book of Common Prayer* (see nos. 101-3).

The last item in the exhibit was John Coprario's *Funeral teares* ..., composed on the death in 1606 of Charles Blount, who had been married only the year before to Lady Penelope Rich, his longtime mistress and Sidney's Stella. Those songs, including the first setting of *In darknesse let me dwell*, made famous by John Dowland's chilling lute ayre, were beautifully recorded by Emily Van Evera (soprano) and Christopher Morrongiello (lute) on *My Lady Rich: her Teares and Joy* (Avie AV 00545). While this recording was only released in 2005, possibly too late for the contributing scholars to be aware of it, I wished that the contributors had recommended a judicious selection of musical performances, especially *The Byrd Edition* by Andrew Carwood and The Cardinal's Musick (*Gaudeamus*) for exhibit nos. 60, 91, 93, 94 and 107. (Do not be confused by references in "Notes to the Catalogue" to *The Byrd Edition*, the modern edition of the music edited by Philip Brett, Alan Brown, and others since 1976.) The Cardinal's Musick performances, currently through

Vol. 9, will be difficult to better. No Renaissance musical repertory has been so often recorded as England's.

The format both puzzled and irritated me. The cover, with its detail from *Nieuwen ienicht spiegel* of 1620 on both the front and back, was eye-catching. However, I was astounded to find the almost 3 ¼ inches of white space at the tops of the covers and of every subsequent page occupied only by titles and phrases lifted from the essays, a significant waste of paper in a book that is eleven inches tall. That aside, the combination of authoritative essays and informative catalogue descriptions makes this volume well worth adding to one's library.

Teresa A. Toulouse. *The Captive's Position: Female Narrative, Male Identity, and Royal Authority in Colonial New England*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007. v + 225 pp. \$49.95. Review by WILLIAM J. SCHEICK, UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN.

Teresa Toulouse begins her book with a straightforward question: "Why do narratives of Indian captivity appear in New England between 1682 and 1707?" (1). A second question quickly looms on the horizon of the first: "What was at stake—personally as well as socially, politically as well as religiously—in prominent New English ministers' appropriation of the position of the female captive at this particular moment?" (2).

The works under consideration include accounts of the abduction of Mary Rowlandson, Hannah Dustan, Hannah Swarton and John Williams. These narratives were authorized by second and third generation Puritan ministers who, in Toulouse's argument, struggled with a crisis in their authority. These ministers insisted that their identity as religious leaders derived from their strict adherence to the orthodox ways of the first-generation divines. But, in fact, that prior ministerial model was only imaginary and, even more vexing, subsequent ministerial generations found themselves living in a time of post-Restoration political, social and economic change that they could not reverse and in some ways actually preferred.

The captivity narratives of the 1680s and 1690s, Toulouse finds, register apprehensions aroused by so much disconcerting socio-political change. The most obvious fear concerned perceived threats to New England from such

external forces as French colonization, English imperial policies and Indian territorial resistance. A second ministerial concern derived from perceived threats from within New England settlements—the sort of disturbance evident, for instance, in the conflict between Increase Mather and William Hubbard concerning whether or not magisterial and ministerial authority could be divided into separate spheres of influence. Least obvious, but highly influential, was an end-of-the-century ministerial fear embedded in an unwitting, deep-seated ambivalence toward their personal political and social differences from the revered first generation.

This last anxiety, Toulouse contends, profoundly informs the identification of these later ministers with female captives.

Fearful of their own desires to separate from these ‘fathers’ and consciously to embrace the cultural changes they have experienced since the Restoration, in the years after the conflict with Metacom, such men not only renew and transform the jeremiadic rhetoric of generational declension by turning to a rhetoric of passivity, they also actively support the publication and republication of a new postwar type of providence tale—the narrative of an orthodox woman’s captivity by Indians. (71-72)

Cotton Mather, for instance, tried to negotiate his personal unease relating to ministerial identity, particularly his unacknowledged “competing desires” (114) concerning the paradoxical preservation and destruction of power based on weakness. He attempted this negotiation by featuring versions of Hannah Dustan’s “unconverted violence” (99), which he failed to contain and transform when he turned his attention to Hannah Swarton’s more paradigmatically conformist account.

The female captive, in short, served as a type for ministerial ambivalence about all manner of end-of-the-century developments. The captive’s textual performance is informed by a ministerial psycho-dynamic of attraction-repulsion. So she is obedient and loyal, and only against her will transgresses in the course of her compulsory, boundary-crossing experience of an altered social condition. The female captive is restored to her proper community, but of course she is not the same person.

This impossible double valence—restored to a prior condition, yet also necessarily different—made the figure of the female captive an attractive stand in for ministers who were unwittingly ambivalent about their own present colonial circumstances. The female captive provided them with a representa-

tional, if unstable, fantasy of reaffirmed loyalty to and (at the same time) escape from the traditions and authority attributed, out of filial-piety, to a venerated first generation of Puritan leaders.

The Captive's Position has been years in the making, with remarkable results. It meaningfully engages a wide range of pertinent prior scholarly work by others, and its uncommonly lucid sentences are crafted with care and skill. It is a book that takes the reader deeply into the investigative ruminations and convictions of its author but also, as in all good teaching, proceeds in a manner designed with an audience in mind.

Toulouse's opening question, implying a Newtonian world of simple cause and effect, gives way to a more subtle and complex encounter with hard-to-pin-down motives which necessarily remain as elusive as sub-atomic eventuation. The result, however, is a provocative psycho-cultural interpretation comprised of diverse particles—historical details, circumstantial associations and hypothetical propositions—strategically and imaginatively combined to convey a plausible cause-and-effect finale.

Grant Tapsell. *The Personal Rule of Charles II, 1681-85*. Woodbridge and Rochester: Boydell, 2007. \$90.00. Review by MOLLY MCCLAIN, UNIVERSITY OF SAN DIEGO.

A more accurate title for this book would be “Whigs and Tories after the Exclusion Crisis.” Grant Tapsell does not deal with King Charles II as a historical figure nor does he pay much attention to “personal monarchy” as a concept. Instead, he provides a survey of political opinion in the early 1680s, relying heavily on the work of Tim Harris, Mark Knights, and Jonathan Scott. His most useful contribution is his wide-ranging archival research.

The Exclusion Crisis (1678-81) gets a good deal of attention from historians as it represents the first major political challenge to James, Duke of York, later James II. The second, in 1688, would lead to his abdication and the accession of William and Mary. The Exclusion Crisis also divided the British into the first recognizable political parties—Whig and Tory. For the past fifteen years, historians of the late Stuart period have been preoccupied with questions about partisanship and public opinion. Jonathan Scott fired the first salvo in what became a lengthy battle about the nature of political alliances

when he argued that organized parties did not exist before the changes brought about by the Revolution of 1688. Tapsell refrains from engaging in what became a “rebarbative” debate on the existence of parties (15). Still, his analysis is deeply affected by this body of work. The Exclusion Crisis ended with Charles II’s dissolution of parliament. The king did not call it again before his death, hence the description of the period 1681-85 as a “personal monarchy.” In fact, Charles II was so far from being “arbitrary” that he did not even try to proscribe the Whigs. When asked in 1682 “whether he had information or any apprehension of tumults and risings among the Whigs,” he replied “none that he believed,” and then went hawking (43). An earlier generation of historians assumed that, after 1681, political passions died down as the crown pursued an “absolutist” policy of purging local government and punishing dissent (32). The so-called “Tory Reaction” pushed the Whig party underground.

Tapsell, among others, provides evidence that the Whigs remained politicized, and politically organized, after the end of the Exclusion Crisis. Many expected parliament to be called again. Others took advantage of the disunity within the king’s government to promote their own ends. Newsletters, pamphlets, and tracts furthered partisan politics by blackening reputations and polarizing public opinion. Arguments in coffeehouses and alehouses continued to distance neighbors, relations, and friends. According to Tapsell, James II inherited a country divided between Whigs and Tories with relatively little “middle ground” (193). It would be useful to know if, and how, this interpretation changes our understanding of his reign.

The book is divided into six chapters: “The Shape of the Period,” “Political Partisanship and Government without Parliament,” “The Politics of Religious Persecution,” “News and Partisan Politics,” “Print and Polemical Politics,” and “Partisan Politics in the British Monarchies.” The last chapter focuses on partisan politics in Scotland and Ireland.

Tapsell is to be commended for his very clear and accessible writing style and his valuable footnotes. His work provides a useful summary of the most recent scholarship on the late Stuart period. It is also the only monograph to focus exclusively on the years following the Exclusion Crisis. One hopes that, in the future, the author will take a cue from late seventeenth-century partisans and refrain from exhibiting quite so much deference to authorities in the field.

Ronald Bedford, Lloyd Davis, and Philippa Kelly. *Early Modern English Lives: Autobiography and Self-Representation 1500-1660*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Ltd., 2007. viii + 241 pp. + 5 illus. \$99.95. Review by ELISA OH.

Contributing to the conversation on the early modern subject, Ronald Bedford, Lloyd Davis, and Philippa Kelly's *Early Modern English Lives: Autobiography and Self-Representation 1500-1660* examines a welcome variety of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century texts that construct different kinds of "selves." Though the chapters feature texts ranging from religious writings and travel narratives to diaries, journals, wills, and brief literary examples, the authors consistently ask the same questions: to what extent does each text represent a contingent "early modern" subject defined by collective social structures and institutions, and to what extent does it represent a more autonomous individual "modern" subject? In this study a majority of the works yield consistent evidence of the former kind of identity with occasional glimmers of the latter.

This book introduces a crucial theme of time in early modern English autobiographical writings and develops a concept of "double time" that is echoed throughout the work. Thomas Wythorne's 1576 account of his own life provides an example of an early modern tendency to consider how a "self" succeeds or fails at conforming to a general pattern of humankind. Whythorne's writing "points to the paradox of a socially and theologically determined early modern world whose temporal paradigms are indelibly blue-printed upon every individual, but whose subjects nevertheless seek, through self-representation in diary, journal, life-writing, or portraiture, to discover and measure the extent both of their authenticity and autonomy and of their relation at any given moment to the inevitable succession of birth, maturity, and death"(19). This study claims that an early modern "self" can be found in the life writers' anxious measuring of individual events, thoughts, and actions against that set of universal ideals. Qualified individuality appears in the strategic rhetorical moves of selection, omission, or interpretation that must occur in order to construct a satisfactory narrative of a life and self. This self-construction depends on a constant attention to the simultaneous position of the individual in earthly time and in God's timelessness. Early modern life writing wrestles with the difficulty of representing a self that is subject to the passage of time, because this earthly time will eventually give way to a Chris-

tian eternity, thus jeopardizing the authenticity of the self-within-time. Autobiographical writings counteract the imagined annihilation of the mortal self at the end of life by recording one's double temporal "self-location"(31) in time *and* in God's providence.

The second chapter discusses acts of self-memorialization in texts and portraits, which represent intersections between the human temporal and divine atemporal realms. Records of early modern bereavement, particularly for infants, attempt to locate symbolic patterns in the dates, times, or days of the week of birth and death. The authors assert that this tendency to highlight dying on one's birthday, for example, reveals a conviction that temporal symmetry indicates a significant correspondence with the parallel eternal scheme of God's grace. Visually producing the same kind of alignment through time, portraits' "concern with the generations suggests an individual self portrayed as a kind of palimpsest of faces"(48). That is, early modern portraits construct one person's identity as something that accumulates over time, collectively authored by the generations that came before.

Introducing the genre of travel writing, chapter 3 traces the definition of English selves in relation to foreign people, experiences, and physical hardships. "[T]he self seems to appear most graphically when encountering a cultural other . . . or, in some of the most striking cases, the person whom one was *before* one travelled"(63). Unlike the solitary individual of eighteenth-century travel narratives, the early modern travel writers do not seek subjective detachment or independence; rather, they depict selves that are firmly linked to a social nexus, whether English or other. *The begynnyng and contynuaunce of the Pilgrimage of Sir Richard Gylforde* (1511) presents a remarkable illustration of an early modern "corporate experience"(68) of identity represented in a pilgrimage to Jerusalem. Gylforde himself dies halfway through the narrative, which is continued—without comment or change of collective viewpoint—by his servant. In contrast, another narrative of shared selfhood, Robert Couerte's *A True and Almost Incredible Report of an Englishman* (1612), shows a group identity breaking into diverse individual identities as the men on a voyage to India accumulate difficult experiences and opposing opinions. Unpublished travel journals such as Richard Norwood's (1613-1617) also yield evidence of a concept of identity that is in transition from early modern to modern: "[n]either an outwardly focused social character nor an inwardly reflective one can wholly explain his sense of identity to himself"(85).

Chapter 4 takes up early modern mirrors and the artistic tropes of specular self-reflection in visual art, sermons, drama, and life writing texts. Representations of mirrors provide a rare early modern vocabulary for individual introspection about “moral development or direction, standards of ideal conduct, and reflections of sins such as vanity and worldliness”(98). Mirrors also foster a consciousness of existential paradoxes such as the coexistence of temporal and eternal identities and socially contingent and independent “selves.” Shakespeare’s sonnet 24 and Montaigne’s reference to “My looking glass” depict this combination of self-knowledge and separation from a stable self, as does Francesco Mazzola Parmigianino’s *Self-Portrait in a Convex Mirror* (c.1523-4). Mirrors in the writings of Walter Devereux and Robert Devereaux “affor[d] both father and son . . . a means of self-scrutiny that combines intimacy and display . . . [and] suggest the multiplicity of perspectives from which a self can be known, and the diversity of functions that it serves”(115).

The comparatively short chapters 5 and 6 consider competing accounts of the failed expedition to Cadiz in 1625 and siege narratives from the civil war years. Upon returning from Cadiz, three different writers negotiate the public construction of a self in their published descriptions of a disastrous military mission: John Glanville writes a dry, factual report as the official Secretary to the Lord Admiral, though other texts show him to have been an unwilling participant in the voyage; the Lord Admiral of the Fleet, Edward Lord Cecil, writes his own self-defensive version; and a Richard Peecke [sic] or Pike produces a description of his solid English heroism in a work of popular propaganda that owes much to contemporary theater and fiction. Unsurprisingly, each man selects “facts” and manipulates generic expectations to present himself in the best possible light. Chapter 6 makes the somewhat self-evident point that an early modern self is threatened by literal siege attacks that dismantled the locations, institutions, and social hierarchies that informed the construction of that self.

Despite the emphasis on socially constructed selves in the autobiographical writings of Lady Grace Mildmay, Lady Margaret Hoby, and Lady Anne Clifford, chapter 7 also detects aspects of individual inwardness. Mildmay celebrates details of her life that affirm how she fits into divine and secular “blue-prints” for a good woman’s life. So strong is her desire to align her temporal life with a greater preordained ideal, however, that at times she “practices a willful concealment or ‘alternative construction’ of events”(169).

In contrast, Hoby's record of her detailed but subjectively opaque daily activities anxiously measures her distance from a template of a well-lived Christian life. In Clifford's diary, worldly affairs outshine the spiritual events, and, unlike Mildmay and Hoby, she often considers her spiritual life only in reaction to her secular troubles. The final chapter on women's wills similarly comprises the textual intersection of an individual gendered self's desires and the mediations of legal, ecclesiastical, and community discourses of inheritance. Chapman's *The Widow's Tears* (c. 1605), Heywood's *The Fair Maid of the West* (1603), and excerpts from a few wills and mothers' advice books comprise related instances of "early modern individuality as social identity in action" (211).

The study is strongest in its analysis of travel texts, mirrors, and portraits. The authors also have astute observations about how early modern self-representation attends to secular time within providential timelessness. The work might have asserted whether there was a noticeable change in the individuation of the subject in textual and pictorial representation during the designated time period, 1500-1660, but this book will nevertheless be of use to early modern scholars interested in various genres of life writing and how they portray the nature of the early modern subject.

Elizabeth Teresa Howe. *The Visionary Life of Madre Ana de San Agustín*. Woodbridge: Tamesis, 2004. xiii + 131pp. + 16 illus. \$90.00. Review by GRADY C. WRAY, UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA.

The Visionary Life of Madre Ana de San Agustín functions as a good introduction to the life of Ana de San Agustín (1547/55-1624), and it provides a faithful and accessible edition of her writings. In a broader sense, it contextualizes the lives lived by women religious in late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century Spain. More specifically, it deepens the understanding of the life of one of the most famous figures of the period, Saint Teresa of Ávila, and the events that surround the Teresian reform and struggles of the order of the Discalced Carmelites. Because Ana survived Teresa, readers of Howe's edition can follow the events that occurred after Teresa's death. This text will be useful to scholars of history, women's studies, religious studies, and Hispanic cultural, linguistic, and literary studies because it touches on several issues of importance to these disciplines.

Howe begins with a chronology (x-xiii) that proves extremely useful as one compares Ana's biography with events that affect her activities. Then, Howe divides the book into two principal sections. The first section or introduction (1-41) gives a comprehensive review of the history surrounding Ana, her visions, her relationship with St. Teresa, her writing style, and the sources from which Howe prepares the edition. The second section includes the detailed and annotated transcription of two *relaciones* (45-107 and 108-118) that Ana wrote at the behest of her confessors.

Howe grounds her study in up-to-date scholarship on women writers of early modern Spain as well as medieval scholarship that elucidates the possibilities of interpretation of female-authored texts. Her critical introduction somewhat juxtaposes the life of Teresa of Ávila with Ana. Ana corresponded with Teresa until Teresa's death in 1582, and Ana learned much from Teresa, who remained a principal influence in her life through visions. In fact, Howe finds Ana's accounts reminiscent of Teresa's *Fundaciones* (21) and signals that Ana's life straddles the turmoil in the Carmelite order both during Teresa's lifetime and after Teresa's death. Howe relates the possible influence of other spiritual texts of the period and those that predate Ana's writing. Apart from references to literary history, Howe highlights the influences of devotional art on Madre Ana's texts, an approach that other scholars have incorporated effectively in recent scholarship on religious and devotional writing.

As Howe's title plainly suggests, the visions of Madre Ana overtake the major portion of the *relaciones*. Her visions include Christ, Christ as the Infant Jesus, Teresa of Ávila, Saint Anne (the Virgin Mary's mother, who especially guides Ana as she oversees the construction of convents), and demons who appear as gallant men or Christ. Others who are present in Ana's visions are: St. Augustine, St. Eustace, guardian angels, the Trinity, John the Baptist, Lucifer, Judas, gentleman donors accepted on the authority of St. Anne, Christ as mother, and poisonous reptiles. When Ana specifically describes heaven and hell, Marta, María, other unnamed saints, martyrs, virgins, confessors, and souls of the blessed make appearances. Apart from the visions, Ana reflects on when the visions occurred, how long they lasted (confirmed by references to other female religious), and her feelings after experiencing them.

Howe presents the politically motivated interpretations of Ana as well as how Ana presents her inner life. At times, Ana conflates the doctrines of the Incarnation, the Virgin Birth, and the Trinity, but her visions of hell and heaven

are the most lengthy passages in the *relaciones*. Ana shares with St. Teresa similar visions of heaven and hell, the suffering Christ, and the Infant Jesus. Ana also presents Teresa as an important authority even above her religious superiors. However, although Teresa plays a pivotal role in Ana's life and visions, there is an absence of introspection in Ana and more self-doubt. Ana does not focus on her own transformation but rather that of others. In fact, Howe states that Ana's "descriptions of the torments of others are less personally instructive than admonitory of others' conduct" (38). Ana's accounts of her life are not treatises on prayer. Unlike St. Teresa's writings, Howe notes that there is no "consideration of Ana's visionary experiences as lessons for a wider audience in the *relaciones* of Madre Ana" (39). Ana's visions tend to underscore the terrors that await others if they do not follow an exemplary lifestyle while Teresa's tend to function more as discourse on self-improvement/criticism.

Ana's narrative reflects other texts of religious writers who use rhetorical devices to control the narrative and to balance self-expression, self-validation, and self-promotion with humility and ignorance topoi in order to relate their stories without appearing prideful. Often Ana shows more obedience to St. Teresa than other authorities who ask her to write. In addition, Christ grants authority for certain sections of the text, and thus, Ana shows measured compliance with her contemporary religious authorities. She obeys the confessors who request her *relaciones*, but she complies on her own terms. She continues to control her text when she decides how much information or history to share. What Ana omits may be more tantalizing than what she includes. Ana directs her text, as do many other Spanish-speaking authors of religious documents, to both a female and male readership by not only using the all-inclusive *vosotros*, but rather specifically addressing both *vosotros* (second-person plural masculine) and *vosotras* (second-person plural feminine). The *relaciones* allow readers to see examples of how Ana exerts authorial control of the narrative to suit her own purposes. Her use of compromise shows the interior workings of a mind that has to express itself within a highly contrived rhetoric that limits self-expression. She must couch her own experience in accepted terms of the period. Of course, present day readers may interpret her words differently, but a modern interpretation was not available to her.

Howe carefully documents her sources and editorial conventions and clearly states that she bases her edition of the *relaciones* on manuscripts 6.472

and 13.751 of the Biblioteca Nacional in Madrid with additional information from MS 13.292 that is attributed to Ana. Her edition is indeed well documented and exacting: an intricate transcription with great fidelity to the original text. She maintains the original spelling and punctuation and does not try to modernize the text. She carefully codes the transcription with markings that shows from which manuscript certain clarifications come, and she provides complete explanations of any abbreviations. She helps readers follow the text by clearly indicating to which person Ana refers (Christ, St. Teresa, a confessor etc.). The transcribed text reflects the paleographic markings of the time, and can be of great use to scholars who study the history of the Spanish language. Overall, Howe's edition is a necessary contribution to scholarship on early-modern women's religious writing and represents another important link that gives voice to one of many women who have been silent for too long.

Paul J. Smith and Karl A. E. Enenkel. *Montaigne and the Low Countries (1580-1700)*. *Intersections* 8. Leiden: Brill, 2007. xii + 372pp. \$155.00. Review by ZAHIA ZALLOUA, WHITMAN COLLEGE.

This volume is the fruit of a conference in Leiden that took place in September 2005. Taking as its subject matter the relation between Montaigne (1533-1592) and the Low Countries, each contribution addresses this question in its own way, though as Paul J. Smith points out in the Introduction, an exploration of a "threefold relationship" between the essayist and the Low Countries structures the hermeneutical gaze of the study (2). The first type of analysis is perhaps the most expected: interpreting "the Netherlandish presence in the *Essais*" (2). While Michel Magnien tackles this topic through an investigation of Montaigne's relation to the great Dutch author Erasmus of Rotterdam, addressing with care the relative silence of Montaigne in regards to his indebtedness to his humanist predecessor, Anton van der Lem approaches it as an historian, looking at Montaigne's "regrettable" (non)engagement with the Netherlands' recent past (such as the Dutch Revolt against the Spaniards), and concluding unconvincingly that the *Essais* would have been benefited from it. To be fair, van der Lem does recognize the potentially reductive results of his interpretive angle: "J'ai bien conscience de faire peu honneur

aux *Essais* en les utilisant comme document historique” (60). This critical observation can indeed be applied to many of the contributions to the volume, in which an attentiveness to (the reception of) Montaigne’s poetics is often eclipsed by contextualist concerns.

The second type of analysis undertaken in this volume involves the historical relationship between Montaigne and Louvain professor Justus Lipsius. As a reader and interlocutor of Montaigne, Lipsius understandably receives a great deal of attention in this collection. Jeanine De Landtsheer does not limit her study to the dialogue between the two, but also covers Lipsius and Marie de Gournay’s correspondence surrounding the death of the latter’s spiritual father. The figure of Lipsius continues to inform the third and last kind of relationship structuring the volume: Montaigne’s reception in the Netherlands. As Smith observes, this third topic is the least studied yet “quantitatively speaking the most extended form of relationship between Montaigne and the Low Countries” (3). Though it is a commonplace that Lipsius played a key role in the dissemination of Montaignian ideas during the early modern period (he is responsible for Montaigne’s designation as a “French Thales”), the volume does shed light on the specificity of the Netherlandish reception of the essayist. Kees Meerhoff, Olivier Millet, and Johan Koppenol deal with the first receptions of Montaigne in the intellectual climate of Leiden. Meerhoff deals with the Leiden professor Bonaventura Vulcanius, Millet with another Leiden professor Dominicus Baudius, and Koppenol with the Leiden magistrate and poet Jan van Hout. These three articles persuasively tease out the assumptions underlying the interpretive horizon of Montaigne’s first Dutch readers, who, as in the case of Baudius, tended to “normalize” its author’s unruly thoughts “en les inscrivant dans un système de représentation traditionnel... Le texte des *Essais* est donc reçu en fonction de l’idée que l’on se fait de Montaigne comme Thalès français” (136). Likewise, van Hout displays in his choice to translate Montaigne’s chapter “De la modération” a penchant for the “useful and pleasant,” conforming to the taste of the period: “Dutch literature served as a vehicle for ethical views and concrete moral lessons” (167).

Turning to the next generations of readers and key figures in the Dutch literary scene, Jeroen Janse examines the aristocratic poet and historiographer P.C. Hooft (focusing on his humanist art of *imitatio*) while Frans Blom discusses the emblemist and politician Jacob Cats (documenting his lifetime’s

engagement with the *Essais*, starting with “Sur des vers de Virgile?”). Ton Harmsen and Alicia Montoya, for their part, examine less known and discussed Dutch readers of Montaigne: Jan de Brune the Younger, who creatively imitated Montaigne’s colloquial style in his *Whetsone of the Minds*, and Maria Heyns, who deployed a double strategy of literary *appreciation* and *appropriation* in her translation of Montaigne. Next, Pieter van Veen’s illustrations to the *Essais* are addressed from an art-historical point of view by Elmer Kolfin and Marringje Rikken, and from a contextualist one by Warren Boutcher. Taking as his subject “a copy of the 1602 Paris edition of Montaigne’s *Essais* owned by a Dutch lawyer and painter Pieter van Veen,” Boutcher “approach[es] this object not as a work by Montaigne that reached a Dutch context, but as a work by Van Veen that originated in a Dutch context” (263).

The last two contributions contextualize the *Essais* further by considering their editorial history. Kees Meerhoff and Paul J. Smith trace the history and explore the implications of the recent rediscovery (in the University of Leiden library) of Montaigne’s lost letter to Mlle Le Paulmier (1588), a letter which had played an important role in shaping the image of Montaigne in later eighteenth-century editions of the *Essais*. Finally, Philippe Desan takes us through the complex editorial reality of seventeenth-century Holland, examining the reasons why French and Genevan publishers used Dutch addresses for their pirated editions. As a whole the volume makes a significant contribution to the Dutch reception of Montaigne’s *Essais*. And while the editors do not proclaim to have been exhaustive in their study (it is “only a beginning” [5], they assert), they do succeed in offering readers numerous lines for future inquiries.

Emma Gilby. *Sublime Worlds: Early Modern French Literature*. Oxford: Legenda, 2006. 170 pp. £45; \$69.00. Review by DAVID SEDLEY, HAVERFORD COLLEGE.

In her book Emma Gilby formulates a theory of the sublime and applies it to a series of key authors and texts of French classicism. The result is a solid contribution to the study of early modern sublimity and a useful rethinking of several episodes in the literary history of seventeenth-century France.

In her introduction Gilby announces the central elements of her approach. She construes sublimity as a movement that instigates encounters between human beings and that blurs the difference between such categories as force and weakness, great and small, extraordinary and ordinary. She argues that this notion of sublimity “troubles” the texts of Corneille, Pascal, and Boileau, whether or not they explicitly invoke the treatise of Longinus, *Peri Hypsous*, whose fortune scholars such as Jules Brody and Marc Fumaroli have traced. (As she explains her interest in both direct and indirect influence, Gilby cites Terence Cave’s method in *Seuils de la modernité* as a model). By reading these texts through a revised Longinian lens, one may correct the tendencies of some critics to focus exclusively on the “grandeur” of sublimity, and of others to impose modern perspectives on its early modern fortune. Gilby also proposes to mitigate the dominance of Cartesian selfhood in critical conceptions of classicism.

The subsequent chapters execute this plan straightforwardly. Chapter one establishes the conception of sublimity that Gilby wants to deploy. On the one hand she contends that sublimity happens, according to Longinus, when one is moved into the position of a subject other than one’s own. She finds support for this idea in Longinus’ remark that in the sublime moment it is “as if we had ourselves produced the very thing we had heard” (25). On the other hand, in order to sustain her interpretation, she rejects the Deconstructionist understanding of the moment as a super-cognitive event. That is, she insists that the projection of the self into encounters with other selves occurs through—rather than beyond—the human, cognitive efforts to make sense of the world. In Gilby’s view, therefore, sublime ecstasy (as opposed to Plato’s *furor poeticus*) pushes its subjects not so much toward the absolute, simple, and divine as toward the contingent, complex, and human.

Chapters two, three, and four concern Corneille. Beginning with Corneille’s theory of tragedy as expressed in *Trois discours sur le poème dramatique*, Gilby notes that the kind of tragedy deemed sublime by Corneille is precisely the dramatic formula that Aristotle rejects as untragic in the *Poetics*: a situation where the hero is about to act, knows full well what he is doing, and then does not act after all. Rather than concentrating emotional impact in a single moment of recognition, Corneille favors a scheme that spreads passion throughout the plot. According to Gilby, this diffusion leaves cognition unravished and intact. The lack of a sudden, overwhelming passage from ignorance to

knowledge deflects sublimity from no-holds-barred grandeur and attaches it instead to the limitations that arise due to one's encounters with others in the world. The fact that recognition is an ongoing process for Corneille means that Cornelian sublimity involves a "curtailment" or "purchase" that such encounters have regarding what is possible for human beings to accomplish (42). Gilby then shows how Corneille practices this theory in *Edipe* by rewriting *Oedipus Rex* in such a way that "a single extreme ignorance is shattered into multiple unknown quantities provided by multiple intersecting relationships" (47). Gilby substantiates her reading of *Edipe* with seventeenth-century reactions to the play (primarily those of Sévigné and Saint-Evremond), which emphasize human encounter and communication rather than the superhuman grandeur that has preoccupied twentieth-century critics (such as Paul Bénichou, Fumaroli, and Sophie Hache). She thus offers a caveat to their accounts.

In chapters five, six, and seven the focus turns to Pascal. Here Gilby explains that Deconstructive critics have taken the Jansenist sense of an incommensurability between human and divine discourses as a manifestation of the limits and instability of human discourse. Against these critics, Gilby holds that Pascal is indeed interested in human knowledge, that he in fact does believe in the accessibility of divine truth to human beings, and that he tries to make such truth available in his texts by investing them with the experience of human relations. Gilby explores how this is so by examining Pascal's opposition of "experience" to "indifference," which he associates with Descartes. According to Pascal, Descartes reduces the world to a "machine" in such a way as to preclude the dynamic life of experience. Pascal inserts such experience—which is also a series of "experiences" in the sense of "experiments"—into his discourse by insisting on the extent to which the human condition is fraught with movement and peril. Gilby completes her analysis of Pascal by arguing that he reads Augustine and Montaigne against the grain of orthodox Jansenist interpretations in order to promote "the fact of human encounters, and the need for them" as a precondition to the reception of divine grace (112).

The eighth and ninth chapters present the articulation of sublimity by Boileau and another, anonymous translator of *Peri Hypsous* along the lines of human communication established from the start of Gilby's study. Here she uses her version of the Longinian perspective to review Boileau's dispute with

Perrault, and thus a major issue of the *Querelle des anciens et des modernes*. Whereas critics such as Joan DeJean have seen Boileau as pitted against an independence of mind supported by Perrault, Gilby shows that, to Boileau and other ancients, such independence looks like a narcissistic satisfaction with the contents of the modern mind and a narrow resistance to the alterity offered by sublime experience.

This last point typifies a strength of Gilby's book. It makes a significant contribution to the ongoing and collective project launched by Brody and Fumaroli of filling in the early modern history of sublimity in France. And in the process of doing so, her book casts some features of the landscape of seventeenth-century French literature in a different and interesting light. Some readers will disagree with the definition of sublimity, which Gilby formulates and applies. She sometimes seems over-committed to wresting the sublime from its senses of ecstasy, grandeur, divinity, and so on that critics have not entirely imposed on Longinus. I for one would find her reading of Pascal more convincing if it took into account his concepts (e.g., "disproportion" and "divertissement") that seem to indicate an absolute distance between human and divine, which would preclude their communication, via sublimity or otherwise. Perhaps a finer explanation of what such communication actually consists of and what enables it would clarify the relation between Gilby's account of the sublime and the ones she criticizes. But she is in any case right that "sublime," long before Burke and Kant got their hands on it, is not just another way of saying "superhuman."

Gilby argues efficiently, which on the whole I consider a virtue. At times, however, she presents her evidence without enough analysis to make it speak to her point. As a result it is not always clear what the "communication" that she says sublimity enables actually entails. And Gilby relegates her intriguing suggestions about the yield of her argument for the history of the self to footnotes. Elevating them would have added to the book's interest for early modern scholars. But as it stands, it gives substantial food for thought to those seeking to teach and write about the sublime in the literature of early modern France.

Jason McElligott. *Royalism, Print and Censorship in Revolutionary England*. (*Studies in Early Modern Cultural, Political and Social History*, Vol. 6). Woodbridge, U. K.: The Boydell Press, 2007. vi + 274pp. + 6 illus. \$90. Review by ROBERT MCJIMSEY, COLORADO COLLEGE.

The author focuses upon royalist newsbooks printed roughly between 1647 and 1650 and uses them to define royalism, analyze their production and study the measures by which the Cromwellian Republic suppressed them. In the process he offers alternatives to current historical scholarship. The presentation is well-organized and documented.

The purpose of these newsbooks was to comment on current events, arguing all the time for the best terms possible for the monarchy and slamming the opposition with a variety of invectives. Because much of this writing followed the twists and turns of events, the analysis was often, as in the case of Charles I's relations with the Scots, contradictory. More consistent themes came from portraying monarchy as the source of law, order and stability and characterizing Parliament and the army as the sources of anarchy and their leaders as debauched sexual adventurers. This latter gambit, to which an entire chapter is devoted, aimed at the forms of prurient and popular character assassination familiar at the time of the Overbury scandal during the reign of James I. These sallies were aimed at a readership of gentlemen, and the middling sort of Londoners who would be affected by high taxes, the loss of trade and the uncertainties of parliamentary and army rule. Governed, as they were, by events, the effectiveness of these arguments waned along with the progress of Charles I's capture, trial and execution. Royalism was thus a protean notion, better understood as a disposition rather than an ideology or fixed set of values.

Turning to the role of authors in the understanding of royalism, the author identifies nine London writers and provides detailed information on four of them. This information reveals the heterogeneity that lay behind the royalist publicity campaign. Each of these writers joined the cause at different times, came from differing backgrounds and pitched their appeals in a variety of ways. Of central interest was the career of Marchmont Needham. His royalist writings followed traditional themes of hierarchy and order versus anarchy, adding an interest in the avoidance of religious persecution, an apparent feature of Puritanism. Under the Commonwealth, Needham changed

sides and published the influential *Mercurius Politicus*, a publication giving the regime a thoughtful argumentative underpinning. This difference between the royalist Needham and the Needham of the Commonwealth illuminates an important interpretative point considered below. For the moment, the author uses his analysis to argue that royalism lacked any central direction and should be known for its diversity of backgrounds and opinions.

The study concludes with an examination of the revolutionary regime's efforts at censorship, and ultimately on its ability to stifle royalist writing by 1650. The formula for success depended upon a centralization of efforts at identification and apprehension, matched by a latitude of judgment concerning the punishments to be imposed. Authors could be bullied with jailing, fines and recantation, and made exemplary warnings to their fellows. Printers could be routed out and closed down. In the end the regime's success depended upon elevating the certainty of punishment over the severity of punishment, including a pragmatic willingness to allow royalist leaning writings such as Isaac Walton's *Compleat Angler* a free pass. (Here one is reminded of the Younger Pitt's willingness to allow the publication of William Godwin's ponderous *Political Justice* nearly 150 years later.) From this commentary the author argues that the early modern state possessed the means to censor effectively, provided it used these means with discretion, distinguishing between quality of high profile royalist publications and their volume of output, and allowing a high degree of on-the-spot decision making concerning apprehension and punishment.

Throughout the work the author's method of analysis is severely empirical. This approach moves his interpretative points in two directions. First, he takes issue with the efforts of others to group royalist writings under general headings, such as absolutist and constitutional, and to generalize about the inability of an early modern state to enforce censorship. Second, having eschewed any royalist ideology, he emphasizes the importance of the flow of events over the decisions of both writers and government officials. Thus he assumes that when hostility to the Commonwealth died down the rulers decided to relax their efforts at censorship, a claim for which no direct evidence is offered. In the same way he offers to reveal the blood and guts of censorship, without a single example of writers and printers being dragged out, worked over or "shown the instruments." In fact the generally scant nature of his evidence leaves the impression that the author could not have

based his interpretation of royalism on anything other than a focus on the specific and the particular. This point is revealed again when the author, near the book's end, refers to the sociology of power, a term he leaves both under developed and ungrounded in his commentary.

One interpretative point remains. At the book's beginning the author refers to England's "unacknowledged republic," a phrase, which in its medieval sense meant "self-government at the king's command." More recently, under the influence of J. G. A. Pocock and others, this medieval term has given way to an emphasis on the independence of the localities and their willingness to embrace ideas and actions critical and even hostile to royal authority. Although McElligott does not go this far, his book does much to redress this change of direction. Here Marchmont Needham provides a plausible key. Whereas Needham's royalist writings were in step with the general tenor of that of his fellows, his later advocacy of the republic featured reasoned discourse. This distinction makes sense if Needham and his royalist colleagues were assuming that the disposition of their audience was royalist, in whatever degree. (One should always remember the groaning reaction of those who beheld the raised and severed head of Charles I.) By the same token, the novelty of Cromwell's republic required that it have clear and cogent argumentation. This interpretation is consistent with McElligott's view that a royalist was a member of an undifferentiated mass, defined simply as someone personally disposed to royalism and recognized by his associates as a royalist. Royalism was thus a common disposition among English subjects, even those who formed the "unacknowledged republic."

R. Melvin Keiser and Rosemary Moore, eds. *Knowing the Mystery of Life Within: Selected Writings of Isaac Penington in their Historical and Theological Context*. London: Quaker Books, 2005. xiv + 322 pp. \$36.00. Review by SUSANNA CALKINS, NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY.

As one of the more prolific writers in the early Friends movement, Isaac Penington is often linked with some of the sect's most important and influential figures. Yet unlike George Fox, Margaret Fell Fox, Edward Burroughs, and William Penn, Penington's life and writings have never before been systematically analyzed in their theological and historical context. R. Melvin Keiser

and Rosemary Moore seek to correct this omission with *Knowing the Mystery of Life Within*, an edited volume of Penington's more significant works.

In Part I, Rosemary Moore offers a straightforward biography of Penington, describing his family background and marriage, his spiritual awakening as a Quaker, his long stints in various jails, and his final years. While the overall portrait is not overly complex, Moore portrays Penington as a man struggling with depression, seeking to understand and communicate the unconventional beliefs and customs of the early Quakers. Described by his contemporaries as a "mournful" man, he viewed himself as weary and unsatisfied with life. In an early letter to a close friend he wrote, "I am weary of all things, of religion, reason, sense, and all the objects that these have to converse about, but yet there is somewhat instead of these that I would fain find within ... which if once my spirit might be satisfied in, I should find some rest ..." (9-10). Like many disenchanted with the conventional—or "oppressive," as Moore suggests—Protestant doctrine, he sought solace elsewhere, first joining one of the many Independent congregations, then the radical Ranters, before he became a Friend.

How the Peningtons were personally affected by the mid-seventeenth-century political turmoil and the Quaker lifestyle is one of the more interesting aspects of Moore's narrative. Carefully selected personal letters illustrate how difficult it was for Penington and his wife, Mary, to adjust to their new lifestyle, in their struggle to accept the loss of "language, fashions, customs, titles, honour, and esteem in the world" (17). Similarly, Moore's depiction of Penington's public chastisement for his support of the well-known schismatic John Perrot, helps illuminate how the sect internally regulated itself in its first complicated decades.

While readers unfamiliar with the struggles of the early Quakers may find Part I illuminating, those with more background knowledge will find few new insights here. It is unclear, for example, how comparable Penington was to his Quaker peers. Outwardly, his confrontations with the law and community seem fairly typical of the harsh circumstances experienced by the early Quakers in mid-seventeenth-century England. More about what made Penington different or notable may have added a needed richness and contextualization to his life story. Even more problematically, Moore is so respectful of Penington, often sliding over apparent contradictions in his life, that the narrative lacks much in the way of critical analysis at all. But despite

these limitations, Moore should be commended for piecing together Penington's biography in so clear a fashion, for as anyone familiar with the far-flung and often haphazard nature of Quaker records can attest, it is no easy task to recreate the lives and experiences of the early Quakers.

In Part II, "The Spirituality and Thought of Isaac Penington," R. Melvin Keiser takes a more critical approach to the texts in his exploration of Penington's theological writings. Penington's works, commonly deemed cumbersome and unwieldy, are excerpted and analyzed in such a way that their meaning becomes more accessible, especially to Quakers today—the book's intended audience. As the authors quip, "It is best to read Isaac Penington slowly, at the pace of the quill pen he used for writing" (ix). The wide selection of Penington's works drive this point in nicely.

Keiser's insightful analysis of Penington's texts is certainly one of the strengths of the book, although non-Quaker readers will likely find the frequent references to "we Quakers" and "our" spiritual selves disconcerting. Despite this intimate tone, Keiser makes several points that scholars and general readers alike might find compelling. For example, to explain why Penington's early modern writings have gradually lost their ability to connect to others, Kaiser explains, in fascinating detail, how they "are metaphorical, biblical, theological, stylistically difficult, combative, and Christian" (121). But asked a different way, readers less concerned with understanding modern Quaker spirituality could use his analysis to better understand Penington's seventeenth-century mentality. Similarly, Keiser's thematic analysis of Penington's use of metaphors, his understanding of the Bible, and his theological understanding of life and God not only clarify Penington's difficult prose, but also provide a well-conceived interpretive framework for understanding Penington's own contextualized frame of reference.

Yet, as in Part I, what distinguishes Penington's ideas from those of his contemporaries is not altogether clear. Superficial distinctions are made: apparently Penington's style is less linear and more wandering, even chaotic at times, than that common to his equally prolific peers. Keiser suggests that this lack of structure is in itself indicative of how the Spirit 'moved' Penington, a claim best left with theologians. A thoughtful comparison to the ideas of other early Quaker writers might have helped here. For example, Keiser does a nice job explaining what Penington meant by certain metaphors, such as 'seed' and 'light,' and how those meanings have changed over time, but most

of the early Quakers used the same metaphors as well, so it is difficult to see what was so different about Penington's use of the terms.

Overall, this book was written by Quakers, for Quakers, about a Quaker, and makes no claims to do otherwise. Almost all of the secondary sources were published by Quaker presses, and almost without exception, are generally sympathetic to the Quaker cause. In many ways, *Knowing the Mystery of Life Within* is a highly insulated text, untouched by the major developments in Quaker historiography made over the last two decades by scholars such as Phyllis Mack and Christine Trevett. While theologians and scholars of Quaker history may welcome the interpretation of key Penington texts, the book would most appropriately be found in Friends' meeting houses, rather than on the shelves of university libraries.

Clifford Edmund Bosworth. *An Intrepid Scot: William Lithgow of Lanark's Travels in the Ottoman Lands, North Africa, and Central Europe, 1609-21*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2006. xxiii + 193. \$89.95. Review by M. G. AUNE, CALIFORNIA UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

In 1942, the scholar and antiquarian Boies Penrose published *Urbane Travelers: 1591-1635*, a collection of brief biographies of the early modern travel writers, Fynes Moryson, John Cartwright, Thomas Coryate, William Lithgow, George Sandys, Sir Thomas Herbert, and Sir Henry Blount. For Penrose, to be an urbane traveler (coined by E.G.R. Taylor), the men had to have traveled far and often alone, visited continental Europe and the Mediterranean rim, and upon returning to Britain, published narratives of their adventures. These travelers were not unusual because they traveled—many English and Scots men did so at the time and wrote about their experiences. They were urbane travelers because they all had their travel writings printed, something comparatively unusual at the time. The books were popular as well, both in their initial printings and since. The late 19th and early 20th centuries in particular saw a renewed interest in early modern travel writing. Scholarly attention, especially in the writings of the Middle East, Asia, and North Africa, also increased after mid-century. Michael Strachan produced an elegant, well-researched biography of Thomas Coryate in 1962. George Sandys, perhaps because of his later travels to North America and reputation

as a poet has been the subject of three books, by Richard Davis (1955), Jonathan Haynes (1986), and James Ellison (2002). If one wanted to learn about the other five, a range of articles and book chapters had to be located and surveyed. If one were interested in William Lithgow, the name C. E. Bosworth would inevitably appear as an authority on, and the author of half a dozen or articles and chapters on Lithgow over the past thirty years. He has now collected those writings, revised and updated them, and published them in one of Ashgate Publishing's continuing series on early modern travel writing and European relations with the East.

Bosworth, currently Emeritus Professor in the Department of Middle Eastern Studies at the University of Manchester, has published extensively on ancient and early modern Middle Eastern history and culture, including works on Islam, translations from Arabic and Farsi. In his preface, he writes that *An Intrepid Scot* is the result of an interest in Lithgow that began decades ago and had recently been renewed by a conference on Renaissance relations between the East and West. The book is a strong testament to Bosworth's erudition and experience and the willingness of his publisher to produce a well-documented and well-illustrated work.

Born in Lanark, Scotland about 1582, William Lithgow is best known for three lengthy journeys he took, largely on foot, and the series of books he wrote about those travels. He seems to have made several brief and unrecorded trips through Scotland. The first excursion he wrote about (1609-12) took him through France, Italy, Greece, and the eastern Mediterranean including Istanbul, the Holy Land, and Egypt. The second journey (1613-16) began in the Low Countries, followed the Rhine to Switzerland, Italy, and North Africa, and returned via Italy and a lengthy detour into Central and Eastern Europe. The last journey, 1619-21 began in Ireland and ended miserably in Spain at the hands of the Inquisition. Lithgow was rescued, returned to London, and convalesced at King James' expense. After futilely seeking recompense from the Spanish government, Lithgow returned to Scotland. In the last decades of his life, he traveled domestically, attempted to visit Russia, and published works on London and some of the early battles of the Civil War.

Lithgow's travel writings began with *A Most Delectable and True Discourse, of an admired and painefull perigrination* . . . published two years after his first journey. He revised and expanded it in 1632 to include his second and third journeys

and re-titled it *The Totall Discourse, of the Rare Adventures, and painefull Pergrinations of long nineteen Yeares Travayls*. . . . In many ways, the books are familiar mixtures of previously published material, rumors and hearsay, and personal anecdotes. It is largely in these anecdotes, however, that Lithgow's narratives possess value and interest. The Scot is blunt in his judgments of the people and places he visited, Catholics, Jews, and Orthodox Christians in particular. He is also unafraid to embrace the hypocrisy that often characterizes travel writers. He is quick to condemn what he sees as Catholic idolatry in Jerusalem, but not afraid to collect relics to bring home as souvenirs and gifts.

Bosworth's book is structured, like Strachan's, as a narrative biography. The first section presents a biography of Lithgow, before his first journey. The balance of the book is divided into three further sections, one for each of Lithgow's journeys. Bosworth acts as a guide to the travels. He identifies the people and places Lithgow encounters, giving extensive historical, cultural, and linguistic background. He identifies many of the sources Lithgow used and plagiarized. Other passages are compared to those of other travelers looking for patterns of influence. Not surprisingly, given Bosworth's expertise, the sections on the Mediterranean world are the strongest and most detailed. For example, while traveling along the Dalmatian coast Lithgow mentions a martial group of locals he calls "Scoks" (32). Bosworth clarifies the people as *Uskoiti* or Croatian soldiers, and proceeds to describe them in detail and give a footnote with a recent book on the subject.

Bosworth does not try to use Lithgow to advance an argument. He mentions orientalism briefly, but sees his project as much more akin to Gerald MacLean's post-orientalism *Rise of Oriental Travel* (2004). Aside from this preference, Bosworth is catholic in his resources, reaching back to Samuel Chew's *Crescent and the Rose* (1937) and across disciplines to cite the work of Ferdinand Braudel and Bernard Lewis, among many others. Bosworth appropriately engages with James Burns' two unpublished Oxford theses on Lithgow (1994, 1997), alternately expanding on the material he finds useful and correcting or amending what he finds to be amiss.

For those whose interests and research includes the early modern English encounter with the Ottoman Empire and continental Europe, William Lithgow's works are indispensable. As Michael Strachan did with Thomas Coryate's works, Professor Bosworth's biography has helped make Lithgow's writings much more accessible and provided a rich trove of insights and

information. The numerous maps, illustrations, and bibliography of primary and secondary sources only enhance the volume's value. One hopes that Moryson, Herbert, and Blount will find similar treatment.

Miles Ogborn, *Indian Ink: Script and Print in the Making of the English East India Company*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2007. xiii + 318 pp. + 22 illus. \$40.00. Review by TILLMAN W. NECHTMAN, SKIDMORE COLLEGE.

The India Office Records, now housed at the British Library in London, occupy more than nine linear miles of shelf space. From this trove of archival material, scholars have produced countless lectures, essays, articles, and monograph-length studies of the English East India Company (EIC) and the English/British empire in South Asia. Miles Ogborn's impressive new book, *Indian Ink: Script and Print in the Making of the English East India Company*, approaches this same archive from an important new direction. Rather than reading the words on archival documents to discern what they can tell us, Ogborn looks at texts produced by and about the EIC as material objects in their own right.

Indian Ink is, then, a history of writing, but it is simultaneously situated against historiographic work on the English/British empire in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century South Asia. Moreover, *Indian Ink* is a history of information and knowledge that insists on the interactivity between the technologies that produced texts, prints, scripts, and books as well and the geographic history, the movement, of these textual objects from the local context in which they were produced through the global landscape of trade, commerce, and empire. As he maneuvers adeptly in, through, and across these diverse historiographic trends, Ogborn convincingly demonstrates that Britain's archive from imperial India is itself a material manifestation of the technologies that simultaneously produced and recorded the imperial encounter. As Ogborn notes, "writing was not simply a commentary upon what happened, it was very much part of the action." (26)

Indian Ink consists of six chapters, a preface, and a prologue, and the narrative of the chapters moves, more or less, in chronological order. In the first chapter, *Indian Ink* is at its most theoretical. Here, Ogborn argues for the

substantive merits of linking the history of empire, the history of the book, and new trends in history that offer geographic interpretations. Stated differently, Ogborn argues that power and knowledge hinge simultaneously on both the forms in which they are communicated and the modes by which the communications are disseminated. "Following the written word through these spaces and journeys," Ogborn suggests, helps us "map out a geography that traces how trade and empire were done in place and in the relationships between places" (21).

Ogborn's second chapter, cleverly titled "Writing Travels," is a focused study of the movement of royal letters back and forth between London and Asia and the concomitant networks of meaning and power that these physical objects forged. Here, Ogborn turns away from the much-studied genre of "travel writing" to present a valuable study of "how writing travels" (32). By studying the forms and styles that letters from monarch to monarch or Company to prince took across the early years of the seventeenth century, Ogborn is able to highlight the value of these texts not only because of the ink they carried but also because they were the tools of a collaborative diplomatic process. These texts, in short, quite literally produced the space in which global trade and commerce could function between East and West.

If letters helped shape commercial space, written words proved equally valuable as the EIC worked to control the global network of employees and agents who operated in its name. The third chapter of *Indian Ink* offers a new and much-needed investigation of the precise form, schedule, and structure of communications between the London-based leadership of the EIC and its employees in the East. Here, as elsewhere, Ogborn takes pains to note, though, that writing was not, as we might too easily assume, a simple tool for imperial power. Rather, the textual relationship between London and places like Fort St. George was often fraught, contested, most remarkably thin. In any given year, an average of only a handful of letters passed between the EIC's directors in London and the Company's agents in the East, which meant that a few folio pages of paper both structured and sustained the EIC's global trading system. Company directors were, Ogborn shows, only too aware of the structural and instructional work their letters had to do, often dedicating space in their annual letters from London to coach overseas agents on how to read and respond to letters from London.

Though the Company's leadership was aware that writing functioned as

the means by which to regulate collective corporate authority across vast distances, Ogborn argues that the EIC's directors were less than eager to involve themselves in England's prolific, mid-seventeenth-century print wars. As domestic turmoil from the 1640s to the 1660s produced an explosion in English print culture, the printed word became a potentially dangerous political tool, one that the Company would have preferred to avoid. However, that same proliferation of print cultivated a space from which the Company's critics could attack its policies and practices. The fifth chapter of *Indian Ink*, then, argues that the EIC was drawn into the politics of print in seventeenth-century England precisely because it "depended upon privileges that could be removed by political authorities for whom print had become the medium of politics." (155) The Company made use of political print culture to counter objections from those who would have seen the Company reconfigured, if not completely undone, and who expressed their own arguments in print. As Ogborn notes, "the power of the press meant that print had to be countered with print." (155)

Likewise, in chapter five, Ogborn demonstrates that printed lists of Company stock prices were also constitutive print contributions to the public debates around the EIC in this period, particularly as the relationship between Company stock and the national debt grew more and more tangled in the last decades of the seventeenth century. On the one hand, printed lists of stock prices were one of the most transparent ways in which the Company could present itself to the public. On the other hand though, public suspicions of the Company coupled with rumors that stock prices were artificially manipulated and inflated complicated the meaning of stock lists. Though such lists quite literally constituted the public value of the Company, they also engaged the Company further in the contentious world of late-seventeenth-century print politics. For better or worse, the public saw the EIC through the lens of the printed word.

In its last substantive chapter, *Indian Ink* turns its attention to print culture in India. Here, Ogborn admits that the only printed documents in seventeenth-century India were the texts sent from London by the Company's directors. Prior to the late-eighteenth century, writing in India referred to manuscripts rather than printed texts. To get to the history of print in India, then, Ogborn is forced to make a rather large chronological leap from the late-seventeenth century to the late-eighteenth, but the jump is well worth

making. By taking the opportunity to explore how print culture was introduced and used in late-eighteenth-century India, Ogborn offers us a history that overcomes the temptation to read print culture in British India as intrinsically either neutral or imperial. Rather, Ogborn introduces us to contentious conversations among EIC agents about how best to translate Indian manuscript literature to print and how best to understand that literature within the context of the Company's expanding Indian empire. At the same time, Ogborn also offers a magnificent discussion of the work of men like Nathaniel Halhed and Charles Wilkins, whose efforts transformed Bengali as they "translated" it from a manuscript to a print language. The printed word, in this instance, became the literal geographic space at which imperial power was contested and contextualized.

As Ogborn argues in this book's prologue, "*Indian Ink* argues for an engagement between the histories of overseas trade and empire and the history of the book in order to understand a changing world." (275) *Indian Ink* insists that we take a new look, in a new way, at the writing produced by the EIC's engagement with the East. It insists that we see the writing less as a product of that engagement and more as an active part of the process of engagement. Writing is not the result of history, Ogborn argues. Rather, it is a "vital part of the practices that are actively involved in shaping how the world works" (274). Seen in this light, those nine miles of records at the British Library are incorrectly seen as mere records of history. They are the history itself.

Jack Cunningham. *James Ussher and John Bramhall: The Theology and Politics of Two Irish Ecclesiastics of the Seventeenth Century*. Aldershot and Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing, 2006. xx + 233 pp. \$99.95. Review by JOSEPH M. MCCARTHY, SUFFOLK UNIVERSITY, BOSTON, MA.

John Bramhall, responding to James Ussher's biographer, Nicholas Bernard, who suggested that Bramhall's theological viewpoint was antithetical to Ussher's, denied any meaningful breach between them. Their differences, Bramhall contended, were merely peripheral, their foundations common. He adduced the analogy of the *menorah*, whose branches were oriented the each other by being joined at the base. The inadequacy of traditional catego-

ries of sixteenth-century Protestant theological positions in the British Isles (Arminian, Calvinist, Anglican, Puritan, Presbyterian, Laudian) has led Jack Cumnningham to base his comparative study of the theological and political views of these two thinkers on this analogy, contending that, while Ussher and Bramhall were about as far apart as they could be, the grounding of their theologies in scriptural notions that were different but not exclusive meant that their deep and serious disagreements could and did stop short of mutual rejection. The essential glue in this instance was the Biblical notion of fear of the Lord. On the one hand, the fear of the Lord as an inevitable consequence of human inadequacy in the face of Yahweh's judgment finds elaboration in a *justive motif*, whose constituent descriptors are law, word, individual, internal, exclusive, pessimistic, certainty and prophetic. On the other hand, fear of the Lord combines existential dread with joy and fascination and is worked out in a *numinous motif*, whose corresponding descriptors are sacred, numinous, communal, external, inclusive, optimistic, mystery and priestly.

When John Bramhall came to Ireland in 1634, accompanying Wentworth as Archbishop Laud's emissary, James Ussher's church was "at best moribund and at most destitute," (41) affording the Laudians the opportunity to write on a blank canvas, not merely clarifying their differences with lower-church Calvinism and prevailing over it in Ireland, but also adumbrating the future pattern of religious thought and practice in England. This conflict, which has great significance for the causes of the political/religious conflict that underlay the wars of seventeenth-century Ireland, appears in the polarities of their dogmatic theology. Ussher argued that humans are utterly depraved as a result of Adam's sin, capable only of rebelliousness and unable to be saved except by God's free gift of grace that confers on the regenerate person the ability to be good. This extreme statement of the justice motif is challenged by Bramhall's defense of the sacraments as channels of grace and of the residual grace that is available to every believer by contact with the community of the people of God that perpetuates the experience of the numinous. Consistently, Bramhall could agree with the Catholics Molina and Suarez that man tends toward the good and could staunchly oppose Hobbes's determinism. At first blush, it would appear that Ussher and Bramhall were diametrically opposed, yet pursuit of the nuances of their sacramental theologies indicates a receptivity on Ussher's part, rooted in an appreciation for liturgy, to the practice of the sacraments as useful adjuncts to the Word, while

Bramhall's advocacy of the power of the sacraments, that leads him to emphasize their mystery and grace and go so far as to accept sacrificial references to the Eucharist, nowhere leads him to defend them as necessary rather than desirable. Their differences seem less extreme when viewed not as the clash of rigidly opposed principles but as the result of diverging preferences for justice and the numinous as organizing themes.

Examination of their views on ecclesiastical histories, ecclesiastical politics, secular politics and practical policy usefully clarify this notion. The accounts presented by Ussher and Bramhall of salvation history and the emergence of national Churches are conditioned by the justice and numinous motifs, Ussher taking up the Mosaic-Covenantal strand of biblical history and emphasizing an ancestry of underdog champions who rely on divine intervention that illumines the struggle of the bishops against Rome, Bramhall favoring the Davidic-Royal emphasis on continuity of authority through the apostolic line to the bishops as guardians of national Church independence. In secular political theory, Ussher's allegiance to the justice motif expressed itself in fervent advocacy of divine right monarchy scripturally justified, while Bramhall expressed a more supple and modern vision of monarchy as justified by natural law and circumscribed by the law and custom of the land, clearly drawing heavily on the communitarian emphasis of the numinous motif. To Cunningham, the agreement of the two that their king was both a secular and religious leader appointed by God constituted the stem and base of the menorah that contained and circumscribed their doctrinal differences, which are less a matter of particular tenets and more an expression of a preference for either the justice or numinous motif as organizing thought and experience. What is true of Ussher and Bramhall, Cunningham suggests, is generally true of post-Reformation theologians from Calvin to Cajetan and allows us to place them on a continuum of theological discussion rather than situating them over against each other.

Doctoral dissertations are a form of scholarship much maligned for poor writing and overstretched conclusions but this betrays neither fault. It begins with carefully researched biographies of Ussher and Bramhall, not the sort of potted lives so often offered pro forma (by a fortunate accident of publication, we also have available Alan Ford's *James Ussher: Theology, History, and Politics in Early-Modern Ireland* [2007], very useful as parallel reading to Cunningham). The theological issues uniting/dividing the two are carefully

presented in a well-structured account. There is, of course, a great deal of difficulty in pinning down something as elusive as a motif in theological writings so closely reasoned and often highly apologetic. What is capable of being described as a motif by reference to specific descriptors may well originate not in intellectual analysis but in temperament (as psychologists define it). Nonetheless, Cunningham's proposal is intriguing and deserves consideration in the study and interpretation of seventeenth-century Christian theology.

Peter C. Mancall ed. *The Atlantic World and Virginia, 1550-1624*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007. xi + 608pp. + 25 illus. + 6 maps. \$65.00 cloth/\$27.50 paper. Review by TY M. REESE, UNIVERSITY OF NORTH DAKOTA.

During the spring of 2007, commemorations occurred that marked that 400th anniversary of Virginia's founding and the permanent start of English activity in North America. The anniversary created an opportunity for historians of Virginia, colonial America and the Atlantic World to reflect upon the current state of early American scholarship and how the rise of Atlantic Studies shapes our understanding of this period. This volume of collected essays emerged out of a 2004 conference held at Williamsburg that sought to understand Virginia within the context of cultural interaction within the early modern Atlantic World.

The volume begins with an introduction by Peter Mancall who works to bring cohesion, and develop themes, from the collected group of diverse essays. The work is divided into five sections that each examine different thematic/temporal areas that either directly or indirectly deal with the Atlantic World and Virginia. The first section focuses on 'Native America Settings' and includes essays from Daniel K. Richter, Joseph Hall and James D. Rice. This section is the work's most cohesive in that each essay explores similar themes in different contexts. They all deal with interaction from a native perspective and in doing so explores the relationship between goods and power. Because of the redistributive nature of Native society and politics, many local leaders saw in the English and Spanish presence an opportunity to acquire 'prestige goods' (32) that increased their power and standing. Thus, from a

native perspective the local elite gained from early interaction and utilized their relationship with Europeans to increase their power. What all three essays make clear is the ability of the local peoples, leaders and societies to understand, incorporate and utilize this new presence. A secondary theme involved a call to move beyond European-Indian interaction as the major type of interaction in this period by investigating the relationships that existed between Powhatan and other Native groups. Section two turns away from the Americas to examine West Africa through essays by E. Ann McDougall, David Northrup, Linda Heywood and John Thornton and James H. Sweet. The essays on Africa, and Africans, are diverse yet they too develop important themes about Africa's place in the early Atlantic. The essays illustrate that when the Europeans arrived in West Africa, and both cultural and economic interaction commenced, that the coastal peoples already had long and important experiences with trade and interaction that they utilized in their dealings with Europeans. The first three essays clearly show that Africans, through a position of power, obtained what they desired from Europeans while the fourth discusses issues of both identity and resistance as Africans arrived in the Americas and directly and indirectly defined their place there. Their ability to define themselves was regulated by the region within which they toiled.

The third section, on European Models, lacks the cohesion of the first two as the essays by Marcy Norton and Daviken Studnicki-Gizbert, Philip P. Boucher, Peter Cook and Philip D. Morgan deal with broad themes/processes within this period. What these essays do show is that European ventures into the Atlantic were not minutely planned; rather, most voyages and ventures involved contacts and reactions. This ranges from the discovery and commodification of tobacco, which was very important to Virginia's development, to a narrative on the French Atlantic that stresses the catalysts and restraints upon French expansion into the Atlantic. The third studies how French descriptions of Native political systems evolved from 16th c. monarchies to 17th c. captaincies, mainly for European not Native reasons, while the final one utilizes English experience in the Caribbean to further understand the events of early Virginia. The next section, on European 'Intellectual Currents,' builds upon the previous one as the essays by Andrew Fitzmaurice, David Harris Sacks, Benjamin Schmidt and David S. Shields examine the intellectual context of colonization. This begins by exploring the role that natural rights, within the Salamanca school, played in justifying the taking of Native lands

and how by 1607 this provided a strong justification for settlement. The next three essays are more cohesive in that they each re-examine the important individuals of early English expansion. One examines the discourses that surround the works and promotions of Richard Hakluyt, the second explores what Sir Walter Raleigh read and how the works of this period were consumed, while the final one works to reconsider John Smith. Each essay looks at these familiar individuals in new ways. The final section, on the Atlantic World and Virginia, contains essays by James Horn, J.H. Elliot and Stuart B. Schwartz that each work to provide an Atlantic context for the events at Virginia. The first explores the role of uncertainty in Virginia by showing that both sides interacted with the other, and often predicted what they might do, based upon either imperfect or insufficient knowledge. The next places Virginia within the context of the Iberian Atlantic and argues that Atlantic history involves both connections and comparisons. The final one, like Mancall's introduction, tries to tie all of the essays together by explaining what they teach us about, and how they shape, our current historical understanding.

Like many edited collections that develop out of conferences, this one has both strengths and weaknesses. Each essay is a solid piece of scholarship that refines our understanding of the subject of each yet the work lacks cohesion. Thus the volume can be read in its entirety, it can be read as individual essays or it can be read as sections. In the end, the editor picked the right title in that the work is much more about the Atlantic World than Virginia. The volume examines the numerous ways in which Atlantic history is done, understood or utilized yet in the end it shows that the dominant interest in these new directions involves an attempt to understand the multiple layers and perspectives of interactions within the Atlantic World.

Anne Goldgar, *Tulipmania: Money, Honor, and Knowledge in the Dutch Golden Age*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2007. 425 pp. \$65.00
Review by LAURA CRUZ.

The story of tulipmania is well known to scholars. The frenzied trading and high prices it engendered constitute a cautionary tale, one that reveals the universal folly of relying on innate human economic rationality. Recent com-

mentators, for example, have drawn parallels between tulipmania and Beanie Babies and dot.com stocks. Anne Goldgar's *Tulipmania* begins with the author acknowledging the success of her predecessors (the best known of whom is probably Charles MacKay) in propagating the moral lesson inherent in the seeming madness of the Dutch crowds clambering for a rather ugly, even at times non-existent, bulb. The fabulist value of tulipmania, in other words, has been well established and is relatively incontrovertible. Goldgar's book is testimony to the power of the scholarly imagination to crack even the toughest and most enduring of historical chestnuts.

Part of the reason for the enduring legacy of tulipmania is that previous scholars have relied upon the copious works of propaganda that surrounded the phenomenon at the time. In good Dutch fashion, these works play up the lessons to be learned and the tragic folly of the poor *bloemisten* who chased after a single ephemeral flower. Goldgar, on the other hand, digs much deeper and eschews the colorful portraits in the pamphlets and plays for the relatively more staid archival, especially notarial, resources. Her research on the topic is both intensive and extensive, even after she limits the scope of much of her demographic research to three towns, Haarlem, Amsterdam, and Enkhuizen. Based on this research, she turns the methodology of her predecessors neatly on its head, looking not at the universal qualities inherent in the spectacle, but rather the distinctive qualities it displays and the richness of the insight it provides into a culture and a people very much different than today.

In Goldgar's hands, tulipmania does have much to tell about the precocious republic and the culture of early modern Europe. She organizes the book thematically, though the themes coincide with the rise and fall of tulip adoration. She first establishes the reasons why tulips in particular were the subject of such fascination and appreciation by the Dutch. It is in the second chapter, however, where the full power of her explanatory framework takes flight. Prior to the full outbreak of tulipmania, these singular flowers played a role in a culture of curiosity that preoccupied many of the elites in early modern Europe. She painstakingly reconstructs a small group of connoisseurs who collected and discussed tulips, along with maps, paintings, shells, and other diverse and exotic objects. These *liefhebbers* (loosely translated as fans in English) recognized, Goldgar argues, no inherent contradiction between their exchange value and their beauty. In other words, tulips were at once commodities, works of art, and objects of scientific inquiry. By blending

rather than dividing these perceptions, Goldgar crosses what have been great divides in Dutch history between art history and history and between cultural history and science. Her research suggests that the niches of contemporary scholarship have produced myopia in dealing with an era where such compartments did not yet exist.

The third chapter, *Bloemisten*, and Goldgar's desire to uncover the social networks of exchange that underlay the tulip trade, owe some debt to the groundbreaking methodologies of her mentor, Jon Michael Montias. While much of the pamphlet literature depicted tulipmania as infecting even the poorest Jan on the street, Goldgar is able to establish the phenomenon as more limited particularly to groups of people connected to one another for other reasons, such as marriage, religion, or trade. For example, the chapter begins, as all of them do, with a story. In this case, it is of a dinner party where negotiations are being conducted by different members of an extended family of relatively well-to-do Mennonites, all of whom it turns out, are connected or will be connected, even if only tangentially, to the tulip trade. As in the previous chapter, Goldgar highlights another potentially rich area for renewal in early modern scholarship; the reconstruction of informal networks of exchange and how these inform the operations of more formal market systems. While lacking the revolutionary quality of her mentor's work, she nonetheless lays bare a methodology that has widespread applications outside of the tiny northwestern corner of Europe.

The last two chapters, *Grieving Money* and *Bad Faith*, both look at the long-term impact of tulipmania on Dutch society. Goldgar deftly dispels many of the long-held myths about the devastating blow the crash made on the overall health of the Dutch economy and even notes that the commentators and playwrights greatly exaggerated the number of individual hardships and bankruptcies associated with the popping of the tulip bubble. That said, she argues that the exaggerations served a purpose to bring to public attention the very real dangers inherent in the rise and fall of the subjects of the capricious goddess Flora. The threat of tulipmania was not to the pockets of the unlucky left holding the tickets of receipt, but rather to the collective fabric that held Dutch society together. The failure of buyers to collect over-priced bulbs threatened the nature of trust in personal relationships. It tore asunder established social bonds and led to a collective anxiety about the deeper meaning of market exchange. The propaganda literature, taken collectively,

heavily implied that without such an infrastructure, neither Dutch society nor the economy based upon it, could subsist. Goldgar makes a leap of faith herself to reach so deeply into the minds of these Dutch observers, but she has painted such a rich portrait of a vibrant and cohesive society that she can perhaps be granted license for her more intuitive and empathetic conclusions.

The inside pages of *Tulipmania* are adorned with many colorful plates and interesting drawings of, among other things, a group of men farting into the wind. In her prose, Goldgar does not do the usual historiographical name checking and disguises her knowledge of a highly cross-disciplinary literature behind a rolling narrative style. When appropriate, she provides clear explanations for events and people not well known outside of the Netherlands. Each chapter (as stated previously) begins with an evocative vignette that illustrates the deeper issues in the ensuing chapters. Despite all this, *Tulipmania* is not a work primarily intended for a popular audience or an undergraduate classroom, nor should it be. This is a book for historians. Critics often excoriate the inaccessibility of historical prose, but there is nothing that can match the satisfaction a scholar finds in reading a text that speaks to a deep understanding of historical phenomenon, advances that understanding, and inspires new directions in historical research. These goals are incompatible with those of popular literature. In Goldgar's hands, the moral of the story of *Tulipmania* is not about admonitions regarding economic behavior, but rather the satisfaction of rich and imaginative scholarship.

Catherine Armstrong. *Writing North America in the Seventeenth Century: English Representations in Print and Manuscript*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007. vi+226 pp. 6 illus. \$89.95. Review by GREG BENTLEY, MISSISSIPPI STATE UNIVERSITY.

In another handsome volume from Ashgate Press, Catherine Armstrong differentiates travel narratives of the 15th and 16th centuries from those of the seventeenth century. As she says "*Writing North America* explores the intellectual framework of Englishmen who were beginning to break free from the confines of classical knowledge" (3), the primary vehicle of Elizabethan travel narratives. In addition, Armstrong states, her book challenges "over-simplified arguments about the intellectual history of the nascent British Empire by exploring the English reactions to the challenging conditions experienced in

the New World" (3-4).

In order to support her claims, Armstrong has assembled and assessed an impressive number of texts. Her bibliography, for example, includes 30 manuscript sources, 130 printed sources before 1700, 59 printed sources published after 1700, and 307 secondary works. The sheer quantity of material indicates not only the inclusiveness and comprehensiveness of her research and scholarship, but it also reveals her thorough coverage of the subjects and periods she addresses.

The strength of this book lies in Armstrong's attention to how the print trades of both England and America contributed to perceptions of and attitudes about the New World. Indeed, Armstrong examines numerous travel journals, broadsides, pamphlets, histories, letters, diaries, and even poetry to explore the tensions between an "imagined landscape" and the "realities of America" (17). These "tools," as Armstrong says, can be used "to re-examine the traditional controversy: how similar or different were the various North American colonies?" (17).

Armstrong frames her work with chapters that focus directly on the print trade. In chapter one "Printing and Adventuring: The Convergence of Literature and Discovery," she investigates four interrelated topics: (1) "the significance of the chosen material form of the texts"; (2) "the tropes and genres used to convey certain messages and opinions about the New World"; (3) "the role of the intellectual networks of the authors" and (4) "the intended readership of these words" (20). In chapter eight "Transmission and Reception of American News in England," Armstrong focuses on the relationship among audience, writer, and text, and she again explores four overlapping issues: (1) "the medium in which the text was reproduced"; (2) "the cost and means of production"; (3) the choice authors made "to distribute their texts in England and in the colonies," even after the establishment of the first printing press in America in 1638; and (4) "the networks of readers who pursued information on North America, and [who] formed communication connections that were utilized to spread the word" (173).

In the middle chapters, Armstrong focuses on how authors combined "two themes in their writing on America: that of 'place', the landscape, climate, flora and fauna, and of 'potential', expansion of commerce and empire . . ." (17). Of the middle chapters—(2) *The Geography and Climate of North America*, (3) *Representations of the American Landscape*, (4) *Colo-*

nists and the Flora of America, (5) The Fauna of North America, (6) Representations of English Society in Virginia: Intentions and Realities, and (7) Representations of Society in New England: Intentions and Realities—chapter two—"The Geography and Climate of North America"—serves as a good exemplum of Armstrong's focus and approach. She centers on three interrelated subjects: cartography, navigation, and meteorology. As Armstrong points out, even the seemingly objective practice of map-making functioned as a tool in the discursive representation of the New World: "The commission of maps and representations of the world in map form became part of the European power discourse in which the hegemony she aspired to over the continents of Asia, Africa, and newly discovered America was represented symbolically To know and define an area and so be able to map it accurately was to assert control over it" (44).

In her final chapter, simply entitled "Conclusion," Armstrong draws a number of significant inferences from the wealth of information that she has gathered and digested. Her final self-reflexive comment is perhaps most worth noting. Her book, as she says, ". . . is distinctive in placing equal importance on the authors' intentions for the colonies and their reactions to the realities of the life they experienced. Rather than claiming that understanding was influenced *either* from Europe *or* America I have highlighted the importance of the diverse cultural connections. These connections were forged in part by the circulation of print and manuscript news relating to the 'place' and the 'potential' of the New World" (201).

Armstrong's style, while it occasionally borders on the mechanical, is direct and unpretentious, and thus her book is accessible and worthwhile. Because it is both informed and informing, this book is exceedingly useful for the novice student of early modern literature—both English and American—and it is an excellent resource for the seasoned scholar.

NEO-LATIN NEWS

Vol. 56, Nos. 1 & 2. Published jointly with SCN. Send inquiries to the editor, Craig Kallendorf, 4227 TAMU, College Station, Texas 77843-4227. NLN is the official publication of the American Association for Neo-Latin Studies and is edited by Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University; Western European Editor: Gilbert Tournoy, Leuven; Eastern European Editors: Jerzy Axer, Barbara Milewska-Wazbinska, and Katarzyna Tomaszuk, Centre for Studies in the Classical Tradition in Poland and East-Central Europe, University of Warsaw. Founding Editors: James R. Naiden, Southern Oregon University, and J. Max Patrick, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee and Graduate School, New York University.

◆ *De arte exxerpendi. Imparare a dimenticare nella modernità.* By Alberto Cevolini. Biblioteca dell'«Archivium Romanicum», Serie I: Storia, Letteratura, Paleografia, 333. Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 2006. 458 pp. 45 euros. The subject of this book is the *ars exxerpendi*, or the art of extracting information from one's reading and organizing that information in such a way that it can be reused to prepare new texts. In various forms this practice extends from antiquity (the *loci classici* are Pliny the Younger, *Epist.* 3.5.10-11, 6.20.5, and 9.36.6) into modern times (Hegel copied interesting extracts from his reading onto blank pages, which he preserved in alphabetical order according to the titles he added at the top of each page), but it flourished above all in the Renaissance. As Cevolini rightly argues, the printing press led to an explosion in knowledge that was accompanied by a corresponding difficulty in organizing and retaining what was read. Various solutions were devised, ranging from indexing books to preparing catalogues that grouped books according to interconnected subject headings to the development of encyclopedias and other general reference works. The *ars exxerpendi* developed within this context, retaining firm roots in the rhetorical system from which it was born. Anyone who has looked at a large number of early printed books has noticed that many of them have passages that are underlined and key phrases

(‘indexing notes’) in the margins. The information in these volumes has been prepared for transfer to a commonplace book, in which the reader copied the underlined passages under the rubrics written in the margins. Sometimes these commonplace books themselves were published, producing books with, for example, classical content reorganized according to Renaissance mental categories.

After explaining how all this works, Cevolini prints translations into Italian of all or part of several books on the subject: Francesco Sacchini (1570-1625), *De ratione libros cum profectu legendi libellus* (1613); Jeremias Drexel (1581-1638), *Aurifodina artium et scientiarum omnium* (1638); John Locke (1632-1704), *Méthode nouvelle de dresser des recueils communiquée par l’auteur* (1686), later published posthumously in English as *A New Method of Making Commonplace-Books* (1706); Vincent Placcius (1642-1699), *De arte exerpendi* (1689); and Johann Jacob Moser (1701-1785), *Vortheile vor Canzleyverwandte und Gelehrte* (1773). Also translated in the same appendix is an article of Niklas Luhmann (1927-1998), “Kommunikation mit Zettelkästen. Ein Erfahrungsbericht” (1981). The primary sources are the usual suspects in this field: Drexel, Sacchini, and Placcius, for example, are discussed in an informative essay by Jean-Marc Chatelain, “Humanisme et culture de la note,” in *Revue de la Bibliothèque nationale de France* 2 (1999): 26-36 (not mentioned in Cevolini’s notes). It is, however, useful to have large chunks of this primary material readily to hand. One could argue that it would have been even more useful to have these chunks in the original languages, or at least in facing-page presentations that provide the original text along with translations, but this book is probably long enough already, and given that the relevant material is in French and German as well as Latin, the decision to translate is a reasonable one.

This book provides a very useful introduction to anyone who wants to know more about how knowledge was retained and reused in early modern times. The 137-page narrative is well annotated, with a larger percentage of non-Italian references than one often sees in Italian scholarship, and the bibliography contains three double-columned pages that list other books on the *ars exerpendi*. A surprising bonus is the list on pp. 141-43 of Italian translations of Latin technical terms in this area: readers at the Cambridge University Library, for example, need not be puzzled any longer at what the library’s collection of *adversaria* contains, since Cevolini explains that they are “(estratti in forma di) annotazioni; quaderni di annotazioni” (141). Students of neo-

Latin will come away with a better understanding of how books were read during this period, along with why books like Orazio Toscanella's *Osservazioni . . . sopra l'opere di Virgilio, per discoprire e insegnare à porre in pratica gli artifizi importantissimi dell'arte poetica con gli essempli di Virgilio stesso* (Venice, 1567) are important (this is simply a printed commonplace book, the product of the *ars excerptandi*). The fundamental issue here, of how knowledge could be retained, organized, and reused in the post-print period, has attracted some very renowned scholars of late (e.g., Anthony Grafton, Roger Chartier), and Cevolini's book makes a useful contribution to this discussion. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Chrysis*. By Enea Silvio Piccolomini. Ed., trans., and com. by J.-L. Charlet. Paris: H. Champion, 2006. 149 pp. Enea Silvio Piccolomini (1405-1464) was undoubtedly one of the most important representatives of Italian humanism, both for his literary activity and for the promotion of culture carried out after his election to pontiff (1458) with the name of Pius the Second. Nevertheless, part of his production was considered by Piccolomini himself to be too licentious to be the work of a pope; therefore, as Pius the Second, he effected a kind of 'self-censorship' with which he somehow abjured his past as a writer, from which the famous sentence *Aeneam reuicite, Pium suscipite* was born. As a consequence of this 'refusal,' some works of Piccolomini have gone lost, while others have come to light only in the nineteenth century after decades of oblivion; among the latter we find the comedy *Chrysis*—written in 1444, probably in September—which Jean-Louis Charlet (henceforth C.) now furnishes with a new critical edition, with translation and commentary in French.

In the introduction (7-38), after a brief presentation of Piccolomini's rich personality and biography, C. dwells especially upon one of the main problems faced by research on *Chrysis*: whether this is a comedy intended for reading or for presentation? After a careful and deep discussion of the text's external and internal elements and of the different positions of the critics, the French scholar maintains that the play was probably recited by many actors (probably by Enea Silvio himself and his friends), rather than staged as we nowadays mean (24); the occasion of the recitation could have been the Nuremberg Diet in 1444, during which Piccolomini would have submitted to his friends and to some officials the roles to play. Nevertheless, C. sharply

moves the subject of the debate from the destination to the dramatic characterization of the comedy, remarking that the main point of the *quaestio* is the strong theatricality of the *pièce*, conceived by Piccolomini as a potentially presentable text; such formulation of the *Chrysis* derived to the author from his familiarity with the ancient Latin theater, particularly with the comedies of Plautus (24-26). As for its birth and literary significance, C. believes that we do not have to consider the *Chrysis* as the *lusus* of an amateur, conceived and composed to animate spare time during the Diet of Nuremberg, but rather as a work that holds a prominent position in the survey of humanistic Latin comedy, halfway between the first Latin *pièces*, still influenced by medieval novels and farces, and the Latin comedy of the end of the fifteenth century, inspired by philological and scenographical reflections on ancient theater. The closing pages of the introduction are devoted to the names of the characters, to the meter (with a precise analysis of the characteristics of the *Chrysis* that also keeps in mind some relationship with contemporary metrical theories and with Plautine metrics), to the principles of the edition, and to the rich bibliography.

The parallel text (48-93) has the merit of preserving the verve of the original without excessively sacrificing the Latin text; particularly effective is the effort to give to the French text a rhythm that corresponds as much as possible to that of the Latin verses. In the commentary (95-141) C. focuses his attention above all on the linguistic and formal aspects of the text, underlining the archaizing imprint conferred by Piccolomini, revealed by the frequent choice of lexical solutions typical of the language of Plautus and Terence. Since the *Chrysis* is a relatively short work (812 lines) with a single-codex tradition, we can commend C.'s choice to omit a 'conventional' critical apparatus and to place in the commentary the discussion of the main textual problems, as well as the grounds of the corrections (few, in truth) brought to the text. This book, which will surely be a useful tool for research on humanistic Latin comedy, concludes with an index of names and words (143-45) and another of sources and parallels to classical texts (147-49). (Claudio Buongiovanni, Università di Napoli "Federico II")

◆ *Patronage and Humanist Literature in the Age of the Jagiellons: Court and Career in the Writings of Rudolf Agricola Junior, Valentin Eck, and Leonard Cax.* By Jacqueline Glomski. Erasmus Studies, 16. Toronto, Buffalo, and London:

University of Toronto Press, 2007. xiv + 336 pp. \$75. This book focuses on the intellectual climate at the Jagiellon court in Cracow during the period from 1510 to 1530. The dates are important because these were the years in which the characteristic forms of Renaissance culture took root at Cracow. And the place matters, too, for it is here that King Sigismund I transformed the world around him, starting in Cracow but spreading out from there, through the university and the printing presses of the city, then throughout the region east of Vienna.

Glomski's thesis, quite simply, is that this transformation reflects a localized version of the same patronage process that spread throughout the rest of Europe. The taste for a literature based on imitation of the classics began in this area at the end of the fifteenth century, when Filippo Buonaccorsi and Conrad Celtis passed through Cracow. It was established between 1510 and 1530 by a second wave of humanist activity that centered on three itinerant scholar-poets and their work at the University of Cracow: Rudolf Agricola Junior (*ca.* 1490-1521) and Valentin Eck (*ca.* 1494-1556?), both originally from southern Germany, and Leonard Cox (*ca.* 1495-*ca.* 1549), an Englishman. This taste was advanced by humanists like these, who used their abilities as a way to advance their own positions among the rich and powerful. They could provide what the elite wanted: not philanthropy or knowledge for its own sake, but fame, disseminated through flattering verses composed in the newest style. The literature that resulted was the product of negotiation, as patron and client found ways to make their very different agendas coincide. Glomski begins her study by examining the writers' strategies for career-building. She then examines how Agricola Junior, Eck, and Cox used the panegyric poetry they wrote to create the image of a great man, a "humanist hero." The public image of the Polish and Hungarian kings and ecclesiastical and lay dignitaries formed by Agricola Junior and Eck in their occasional and political poetry is examined, along with the poets' role in producing propaganda that furthered the political aims of their patrons and simultaneously advanced their own positions at court.

As Glomski notes, it is curious that there has been before now no effort to produce a synthetic study of these three men and that basic bibliographical information and even modern biographies of Agricola Junior, Eck, and Cox have only appeared recently. As she notes, her project has come up against a basic methodological issue in neo-Latin studies: should the neo-

Latin literature printed in Cracow be considered part of the corpus of a national literature, or part of a supranational European literature in Latin that exists separately but on the same basis as the national literatures? If the former option is preferred, into which national literature should this material be placed? Polish, one might be tempted to say—but none of the writers was Polish by birth, all of them left Cracow and did much of their work elsewhere, and Poland in the sixteenth-century did not even include the same territory as it does now. Some of these same issues come up in the article on “Central-Eastern Europe” by Jerzy Axer, with the assistance of Katarzyna Tomaszuk, in *A Companion to the Classical Tradition*, ed. by C. W. Kallendorf (Oxford, 2007), 132-55. Axer and Tomaszuk argue that this region is a sort of “borderland” between western Europe, where the classical tradition had a more natural home, and Russia, which received it in effect only in the nineteenth century; as such, the appearance of the classics in central-eastern Europe must always be placed carefully against the intellectual, cultural, and political background of those who were working for its importation. This is what Glomski does. Her larger reliance on the patronage model in one sense confirms what we might expect, since as she herself admits, it is the same model that prevailed elsewhere in Europe as well (4), but this is an unusually interesting local variation on the usual theme. As the 2006 Budapest congress of the International Association for Neo-Latin Studies showed, a great deal of interesting work is going on in central-eastern Europe, but much of it remains inaccessible to scholars who do not read Hungarian, Polish, etc. Glomski is thoroughly at home in both the Latin writings of her subjects and the modern vernacular scholarship on them, making this book an excellent introduction to neo-Latin studies in the region it treats. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Die Mutineis des Francesco Rocciolo: Ein lateinisches Epos der Renaissance.* Ed. by Thomas Haye. Noctes Neolatinae / Neo-Latin Texts and Studies, 6. Hildesheim, Zürich, New York: Georg Olms Verlag, 2006. 254 pp. 58 euros. The text printed here, almost unknown to modern scholarship, is the *editio princeps* of the epic poem *Mutineis*, by the Modenese poet Francesco Rocciolo. Rocciolo was born in the late 1460s or early 1470s in Modena and died there in 1528, producing in the last thirty-four years of his life a series of poems in various formats on the turbulent history of his native city. A few

of these works were published by his uncle, the Modenese printer Domenico Rocociolo; the majority survive in manuscript only. The events described in the poem took place between 1510 and 1517, when Modena served as a political football for the Holy Roman Emperor, the Pope, the French king, and the local Italian nobles, with the poem being written (most probably) between 1517 and 1521. The *Mutineis* is essentially a poetic *laus urbis*, a panegyric epic comparable in some ways to the *Historia Bononiensis* of Tommaso Seneca or the *Tarentina* of Paracletto Malvezzi. It presents to the reader a mixture that is typical of the Renaissance, including panegyric portraits of famous people, pathos-infused contemporary history, folk wisdom with a Christian coloring, ancient history, and pagan myth. Virgil, Ovid, Lucan, Statius, and Claudian all provide intertextual reference points for Rocociolo.

The poem survives in three manuscripts—Modena, Biblioteca Estense, cod. lat. 661 (Alpha O. 9, 30) (=M); Turin, Biblioteca Nazionale, cod. G. VI. 46 (=T); and Bologna, Biblioteca Universitaria, cod. 1097 (=B)—with Modena, Biblioteca Estense, cod. lat. 265 (Alpha Q. 8, 30) suggesting that a fair copy, now lost, may well have passed into the possession of the Este family in Ferrara. Haye's edition is based on T, which represents the final authorized version of Rocociolo's text, but readings from M appear in an apparatus. M was a working draft of Rocociolo's, so that this apparatus allows the interested reader to follow the evolution of the *Mutineis* as it was revised by its author. This is an interesting editorial decision, one that could be followed profitably in the preparation of other editions if the appropriate evidence survives. There is no apparatus containing references to the classical texts referenced by Rocociolo; that is a pity. There is, however, a thorough index of proper names.

In his forward Haye suggests that the *Mutineis* offers four appeals to the modern reader: it paints portraits of a number of key political figures of the Renaissance, it represents a literary effort to stimulate the patriotism and communal sentiments of the citizens of Modena, it offers an exceptionally lively and realistic picture of life in the early sixteenth century, and it presents unusual insight through the surviving manuscript witnesses into the compositional process of a humanist epic. Readers will have to decide for themselves whether these appeals are enough to justify this edition. Haye has done his work competently, but at a certain point one has to wonder when circumstances have changed sufficiently to warrant overturning the judgement of the

centuries and printing a poem that has not been considered worth printing for five hundred years. Nevertheless for readers whose interest extends to the neo-Latin epic, the *Mutineis* merits a look. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *La recepción hispana de Juan Luis Vives*. By Valentín Moreno Galego. Valencia: Generalitat Valenciana, 2006. With CD-ROM. “Juan Luis Vives was lost to Spanish humanism, but this loss was more than offset by the European projection that his thought achieved thanks to exile,” as Luis Gil Fernández has written. Sent from Valencia in his mid-teens to study in Paris by his Jewish *converso* family (grievously afflicted over the years by the Inquisition), he thereafter began his lifelong association with the southern Netherlands and the world of northern humanism. After being invited to succeed to the chair of Antonio de Nibrija, ‘father of Spanish humanism,’ at Alcalá (*egregius ille senex planeque dignus*, as Erasmus wrote of him to Vives in 1520), he set out for Spain in May of 1523 (*Ego nulla ratione subtrahere me potui Hispanico itineri*, as he put it somewhat ambiguously to Erasmus) but got no further than London and Oxford. To Juan de Vergara, through whom the Alcalá invitation had come, he later wrote lamenting the dire shortage, as he saw it, of humanistic knowledge and endeavor in his homeland. Nevertheless, now, Dr. Valentín Moreno Galego has been able to give us a magisterial 800-page study of *La recepción hispana de Juan Luis Vives*, a work already honored with the Premio Rivadeneyra de la Real Academia Española.

After a survey of Vives historiography from the start of the nineteenth century down to the present day (41-65), Dr. Moreno gives us two detailed chapters (67-133) on aspects of the response to Vives’ works outside the Peninsula—especially in France and England—down to ca. 1800. The account of Vives’ *Receptio Hispana* falls into three parts. The first, and by far the longest (chaps. 4-14), covers the period 1522-1620. Beginning with attitudes to the acquisition of literary fame, it goes on to examine Vives’ part in the transmission of Greco-Latin authors; then disciples of his from Spain in the Low Countries in the 1520s, such as Honorato Juan, later tutor to Philip II’s son Don Carlos, and Pedro de Maluenda, the future theologian at Trent; and finally, the circles of admirers at Toledo, Burgos, and Valencia. Subsequent chapters are centered on responses either to particular works by Vives (his commentaries on St. Augustine’s *De civitate Dei*, his *De institutione feminae christianae*,

and *De subventionem pauperum*) or to his treatment of the topics of historiography, rhetoric, grammar, and psychology. Dr. Moreno notes that, *malgré tout*, it was in the reign of Philip II that Vives was most often cited in works of Spanish authors, those citations including Vives' commentaries on the *De civitate Dei* (placed, however, on the Expurgatory Index of 1584). Part II, covering the period 1620-1723, is chiefly focused on the response of the Spanish Jesuits to Vives, particularly as regards their use of his *Dialogues* in their teaching. Part III (1723-1817) deals, in four chapters, with the eighteenth-century recovery of a due sense of the stature and significance of Vives' work viewed as a whole, pre-eminently achieved through Gregorio Mayans, to whose long devotion to Vives we owe the posthumously published *Opera omnia* of Valencia (1782-1790), not intended as a critical edition but, more modestly, *ut editio sit correcta, et probabilis hominibus fastidiosis*. It bore witness, as Antonio Mestre Sanchis has stressed, to the enormous importance of the religious values of sixteenth-century Spanish humanists for the aspiration to religious reform entertained by the eighteenth-century Spanish Enlightenment.

Dr. Moreno's study rests on a massive foundation of primary and secondary sources. The 3,700 or so notes that remain of the nearly 6,000 (as he records) in his doctoral dissertation offer a bibliographical treasure-house of precise information and guidance that will be of the greatest value to students of Vives. A detailed inventory of manuscripts consulted is provided in the printed text. Beyond that, a CD-ROM reproduces the entire work and offers a comprehensive search facility. Dr. Moreno has not only made an outstanding contribution to Vives scholarship, but he has also put himself to much trouble to make his study a helpful *instrument de travail* to others. For all, and from all, he will receive his readers' very great gratitude. (R. W. Truman, Christ Church, Oxford)

◆ *De officio mariti*. By J. L. Vives. Ed. by C. Fantazzi. Selected Works of J. L. Vives, 8. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2006. The series bearing the title 'Selected Works of J. L. Vives' was conceived more than twenty years ago by an international team of scholars under the presidency of the late Constant Matheeußen of the Brussels Catholic University. It aimed primarily at producing a critical edition of the text of Vives' works, which until now have had to be read for the most part in the old, and often unreliable, *Opera omnia* provided by Gregorio Mayans (Valencia, 1782-1790). Now, some ten years

after the publication of *De institutione feminae christianae* by C. Fantazzi and C. Mattheeussen in two volumes (1996-1998), its pendant, the *De officio mariti*, has been brought out by C. Fantazzi.

At first glance this again seems to be a well presented volume of the highest quality. Even a somewhat cursory reading, however, reveals a number of troubling features. For this short review I shall restrict myself to the part of the introduction dealing with "Editions and Constitution of the Text" and to some random checks within the Latin text and notes.

On p. xix one finds two different editions represented by one single siglum (W²): an edition by Robert Winter (Basel, 1540) and another by Joannes Oporinus (Basel, s.d.). There is no indication of the location of the copy of the Oporinus edition used by the editor, but a copy of the 1540 Basel edition of Robert Winter is said to be found at the "Biblioteca (sic) Universitatis Lovaniensis." This designation fails to acknowledge the splitting of the old University of Louvain into two entirely independent universities, each of them with its own library, neither of them being called "Biblioteca Universitatis Lovaniensis." Using the Latin name for a library would have been more appropriate in the case of the Royal Library at Brussels (same page), its official name being "Bibliotheca Regia." However, to use the Latin name for the library of the University of Leuven/Louvain only adds to the confusion. The fact is that this particular copy is kept in the Central Library of the University of Leuven, not of Louvain-la-Neuve. It has been described in the catalogue *Vives te Leuven*, ed. G. Tournoy, J. Roegiers, and C. Coppens (Leuven, 1993), pp. 115-19, nr. 33, where the correct signature is also given (CaaA844). The number "PR 278" is misleading and erroneous in that it relates back to the number "PK 278," which is only an administrative number indicating that this particular volume has been bought thanks to the private endowment of the university.

On the same p. xix the next edition listed is the *Opera* of Basel, 1555 (=B). Contrary to the information supplied here, where we read "Colophon: Basilaë, per Nic. Episcopium Iuniorum anno MDLV vol II, pp. 595-647," the colophon at the end of the second volume reads "Basilaë, apud Iacobum Parcum impensis Episcopij Iunioris, Anno salutis humanae MDLV mense Augusto."

Still on the same p. xix, among other editions not consulted by the editor, is quoted an edition from the press at "Hannover, Wechelianis 1614." It is in fact clear that this "Hannover" is an erroneous translation of the Latin

“Hanoviae,” i.e., Hanau (in the neighborhood of Frankfurt am Main), where the heirs of the printer Andreas Wechel were active during the first two decades of the seventeenth century. There are two more typographical errors on this same page: *lege editio princeps* (not *princep*), and *Johannes Maire* (not *Mairs*). A recent study on this important Leiden printer is by R. Breugelmans, *Fac et spera: Joannes Maire, Publisher, Printer and Bookseller in Leiden, 1603-1657* (Houten, 2003).

I should like to finish this short review with a few remarks on the text and the notes. To begin with the notes, the interested reader would certainly have been more pleased if a reference was given for the information supplied. One example only: on p. 5 there is a short note explaining who Honorato Juan was. But one misses a reference here to so fundamental a work as Francisco José Sanchis Moreno, *Honorato Juan vida y recuerdo de un maestro de príncipes* (Valencia, 2002).

Some random checking of the text reveals that it is not always reliable. The very first lines of the Latin text in Fantazzi's edition read (2): *IOANNIS LODOVICI VIVIS AD ILLUSTRIS. D. IOANNEM BORGLAM, GANDLAE DUCEM, PRAEFATIO*. To start with, in the *editio princeps* (C), as well as in the three Basel editions of 1538, 1540, and 1555 (W, W², B), we read *Candlae*, not *Gandlae*. Furthermore the apparatus criticus states that somewhere in this title the words *in librum suum de officio mariti* are added in the *editio princeps* and in the 1540 Basel edition. In fact they are also present in the 1538 edition, and, what is more important still, there is no reason whatsoever why these words should be relegated to the apparatus criticus: they are neither a later addition by some editor or printer, nor a first version corrected afterward by the author.

On the same page 2, l. 24, instead of *Latina non intellexisset*, W, W², and B read *Latinam <viz. linguam> non intellexisset*, which is not mentioned in the apparatus criticus but seems to be the better reading (I did not check the *editio princeps*). On p. 6, l. 6, the reading *comitem* instead of *et comitem* appears not only in C and W², but also in W. On p. 6, l. 19, the three Basel editions read *insinuat se* instead of *insinuat*, probably presenting the better reading and anyhow one not mentioned in the apparatus criticus. On p. 8, l. 1, one reads *Ludovici*, not only in W², but also in WB, contrary to what is written in the apparatus criticus. On p. 98, ¶ 88, the text reads *inbemur esse bonus oculos*, exactly the reading of the 1555 edition. The apparatus fontium, giving *bonos (sic) oculos*, refers to “Vulg. 2

Cor. 2, 15,” where one reads, however, *bonus odor*. The list of corrigenda at the end of vol. II of the 1555 edition offers the correct reading as well. On p. 124 ¶ 114 *ingenium . . . flectile*, the 1555 edition does not present the erroneous reading *flexile*, as is given in the apparatus criticus, but the correct reading *flectile*. On p. 140 ¶ 127 the name *Godolina* needs to be corrected to *Godolina*, the name of the Flemish saint murdered by her husband, mentioned later by Vives as *Godeliva* in his twelfth dialogue (cf. the recent edition of Vives, *Los diálogos*, by M.^a Pilar García Ruiz (Pamplona, 2005), p. 230). On p. 182 ¶ 166, the source for the Candaules story is not “Hdt 1, 7, 1-13,” but Hdt. I, 8-13. On p. 226, ¶ 208-9, the line numbering in the apparatus criticus is wrong: instead of “18, 24, 27,” read 17, 23, 26.

Sadly, it seems likely from this evidence that a more extensive investigation would bring further cases to light. However those presented here are sufficient in themselves to cast at least some doubt on the character of this edition. It is a pity that, as it seems, it lacked the advantage of a second editor or the scrupulous involvement of a real editorial board. (Gilbert Tournoy, Catholic University of Leuven)

◆ *Thuanus: The Making of Jacques-Auguste de Thou (1553-1617)*. By Ingrid A. R. De Smet. Travaux d’Humanisme et Renaissance, 418. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 2006. 348 pp. De Thou was a famous man in his own day: offspring of France’s judicial elite who rose to the position of *Président à mortier* in the Parlement of Paris, a man whose house and library attracted Europe’s finest minds, and author of the *Historiae sui temporis*, which earned him the title of ‘father of modern history’ in his lifetime. His standing has declined since then, with many scholars treating his *Historiae* as a primary source to be pillaged for anecdotes and historical evidence, but during his lifetime he was regarded primarily as a man of real influence. Indeed he became a high-ranking magistrate and politician in the second half of the 1580s, well before the first volume of his *Historiae sui temporis* was published (late 1603), so that he was many things in turn: historian, president, poet, patron, and peace-maker. De Smet’s goal is to investigate how he constructed his personality as both magistrate and intellectual in the tumultuous times in which he lived.

De Thou left an autobiography, the *Commentarii de sua vita*, but like every other such work, these so-called *Memoirs* are a part of this process of self-construction, not an objective analysis of it. De Smet therefore turns to the

full variety of sources about de Thou and his life, producing not a chronologically ordered continuous narrative, but a thematic study designed to shed light on important points. Chapter One focuses around the theme of *réécriture*, especially de Thou's use of poetry to project a carefully fashioned public and literary *persona*. Chapter Two uses his poetry and correspondence to show how he operated on the national and international scenes as both a writer and an officer of the French state, worthy to stand alongside Scaliger, Lipsius, and Casaubon. Chapter Three turns to the women in de Thou's life, both real and fictional, to show how they helped him shape his role in society, through marital politics, the poetry of love and mourning, and childbirth. Chapter Four focuses on the role of books and reading in de Thou's development and on his pursuit of knowledge in relation to both the political backdrop of the day and his network of educational and literary friendships. Chapter Five turns to the *Historiae*, not in order to provide a comprehensive analysis, but to anchor his *magnum opus* in his life world, where it contributed to defining his role on the national and international stages. The conclusion outlines de Thou's fall from favor, years that are not covered in his autobiography but that contribute nonetheless to the refining, then the shattering, of his public image.

The picture that emerges is complex. Throughout his life de Thou's self-construction remained embedded in his family and their web of alliances, in political circles, and in the world of scholarship in his day. He thought of himself as an inadequate courtier and a reluctant public servant, but as a loyal subject of France who wished only the best for his native land. He claimed that his basic values remained constant, but his friendships waxed and waned according to changes in his personal and political life. His dealings with Scaliger, Casaubon, and Lipsius gave him standing as a mediator in the Wars of Religion, but became a liability in the more rigorously Catholic environment that developed after the arrival of Marie de Médicis. The result is a conflicted psyche whose panoply of values included prudence, the ability to adapt to changing circumstances, but which remained unified and stable over time—a marked contrast to Montaigne's fragmented and multiple depictions of himself (“Si je parle diversement de moi, c’est que je me regarde diversement”).

De Smet's is not the first, or the only, treatment of de Thou in modern times: she acknowledges generously her debt to Samuel Kinser's fundamental study, *The Works of Jacques-Auguste de Thou* (The Hague, 1966). Scholarly fashions change, however, and De Smet's study is very much of our day, bringing

the concerns of scholarship at the beginning of the twenty-first century to one of the more intriguing figures of neo-Latin letters. Solidly based in unpublished material and primary sources, this is an engaging study that can provide a good model for how other figures in humanist scholarship can be treated. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Natale Conti's Mythologiae*. Trans. and annotated by John Mulryan and Steven Brown. 2 vols. Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 316. Tempe, Arizona: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2006. xlvii + 978 pp. \$110. The *Mythologiae* of Natale Conti (1520-1582) was influential during the Renaissance, going through at least twenty-one editions in Latin and six in French, early enough to influence Spenser's *Shepherd's Calendar* and late enough to influence Milton as he began *Paradise Lost*. Yet there is no modern edition of the Latin text or of the seventeenth-century French translation, nor is there a complete English translation. Mulryan and Brown set out to provide an English translation, in an effort to make this major text in western intellectual history more accessible to modern readers.

Little is known of Conti's life. His minor works consist chiefly of translations from classical Greek into Latin and of his own imitations of Greek and Latin verse. These translations are generally direct and accurate, but are nowhere near as ambitious as the *Mythologiae*, which attempted to extract a code of conduct from Greek and Latin myth that would be applicable in Conti's day as well. As mythography, both a compilation and an interpretation of myth, the *Mythologiae* joins a tradition that ranges from Fulgentius, the Vatican mythographers, and Boccaccio to Giraldi, Pomey, Alexander ab Alexandro, and Cartari. Although the immorality of pagan myth gives him occasional pause, Conti justifies its study on ethical and intellectual grounds: "We intend to gloss only those stories that raise men to the heights of celestial knowledge, that counsel proper behavior and discourage unlawful pleasures, that reveal nature's secrets, that ultimately teach us all we absolutely need to know to lead a decent human life, that enhance our understanding of the great writers" (1.1). The organization in turn is straightforward: the introductory chapters outline Conti's philosophy of myth and interpretive schemata, books two through nine present Christianizations of the myths, and the concluding tenth book serves as an epitome of what has gone before.

The translation reads well, neither overly formal nor excessively collo-

quial; this section is typical: “Just to cut short this discussion of such futile enterprises, which I know for a fact have brought nothing but pain and misfortune to the cash boxes of many people, and will certainly continue to do so in the future, suffice it to say that many men have interpreted these myths as a way of rationalizing their own designs” (135). The thirty-five-page introduction, which is well annotated and clearly written, provides an introduction to Conti’s life and works and to the *Mythologiae*; there is also an appendix that discusses key editions and a detailed index. One can, of course, quibble a bit. The introduction, for example, now and again presses a bit too vigorously in support of Conti, as sometimes happens when scholars devote many years of work to one subject. It would also have been nice, given the lack of a modern critical edition, to have had Latin text and English translation on facing pages, although this would have doubled the size of an already-substantial set of books. Nonetheless this edition meets its stated goal, to make the *Mythologiae* accessible once again to a broad audience, well. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Iusti Lipsi Epistolae, pars XIV: 1601*. Ed. by Jeanine De Landtsheer. Brussels: Vlaamse Academie van België voor Wetenschappen en Kunsten, 2006. 591 pp. 97.60 euros. In 1601 the Augsburg humanist Marcus Welser encouraged Lipsius to publish more of his letters. “Do you really think they are worth it?” Lipsius replied. He continued that they were not very important, but concluded, “I will nevertheless obey you” (01 08 16). And he would soon send Welser a *Centuria*, a hundred letters to German and French scholars. Needless to say, this *Centuria* was already in an advanced state when Lipsius feigned his submission to Welser’s opinion. Such professions of modesty followed the rules of epistolary rhetoric, although this letter to Welser itself was not included among the letters which Lipsius published during his lifetime. ILE XIV contains many of the letters he did publish, lavishly quoting from Horace and above all from Statius’s *Sylvae*. They are full of good advice, moral lectures (e.g., 01 02 27), Stoic *sententiae* (a beautiful one in 01 04 01 (?) [sic] B, ll. 16-18), and complaints about the state of affairs in Flanders, where much of the Dutch revolt was carried out. They carry the hallmark of Lipsius’ style: the reader stumbles over short rhetorical questions (01 09 24) and over the staccato of his sentences: pronouns linked together with the verbs omitted, sometimes almost to the point of defying grammatical rules

(01 09 23, ll. 8-9). Occasionally his style is copied by his correspondents (e.g., 01 01 14).

Lipsius's strategy of self-fashioning is unmasked in ILE. The chronological juxtaposition of all remaining letters, irrespective of their original purposes and addressees, uncovers the rough path which he himself smooths so carefully in his printed collections. The uniformity of a modern edition can be deceptive: at first sight it tends to obscure the variety of forms and purposes the letters had. But a modern edition also brings to light that Lipsius, naturally, presented different faces to different correspondents. From matter-of-fact scrawls about finances to the carefully crafted letters from his *Centuriae* (styled *cottidianas Epistolas* by Lipsius himself in 01 02 20 Z, some of which were perhaps never sent in the form they were printed), these letter collections also show how he built his alliances, trying to be friends with everyone, from the Protestant Scaliger, whom he respected (the respect was not quite mutual), to Scaliger's despised opponent Martín del Río. Lipsius was extremely skilled in navigating between Scylla and Charybdis. Another way of putting it is that he was anxious to avoid conflicts and was interested primarily in his own fame.

The letters give insights into the preoccupations of Lipsius and his correspondents: numerous deaths, but also the wedding of his servant Anna, the siege of Ostende, the aftermath of the Savoy War, and the situation at Europe's eastern border. They speak about anti-Semitism in Poland (01 01 04) and Lipsius' sexism (01 12 27 M; n. 3: "Nicolas" should be "Daniel"), but also voice his support for a pregnant teenager abandoned by "her boyfriend" (01 10 13 S). The correspondence with Balthasar Moretus gives detailed insight into the genesis of Lipsius' works (and stands out from other letters for its lack of rhetorical amplification), and in her annotations De Landtsheer proves to be intimately familiar with the archive of the Museum Plantin-Moretus (e.g., p. 233). A fascinating letter in which Lipsius looks for historical precedents of extreme drought (it had hardly rained for six months) could be of interest even today for the history of global warming. Of course Lipsius writes many a letter of recommendation, and people write to him recommending themselves (*Qui sim, quaeris?* 01 09 01). One Fitzherbert forgets all about *brevitas* in his long and rhetorical letter (note the alliterations in ll. 141-42). A liminary poem is even included, on the assumption that it accompanied a now-lost letter ([01 11 02] P²).

The synopses of the primarily Latin letters (there are some in Greek,

French, Italian, and Dutch) are extremely helpful and have the advantage over translations more quickly digested by readers who have little patience with laborious rhetoric, even in translation. The footnotes contain more information than one would dare to ask from an editor (and sometimes more than is relevant, e.g., 01 01 21 H, ad 22; or 01 01 31 W, ad 22-24), especially where it concerns political news (e.g., 01 01 06; 01 07 02, ad 17). They often refer to unpublished letters of others, or otherwise not easily accessible (manuscript) sources, to clarify issues (e.g., 01 01 24, ad 12). The quality of the English is high, better, in my opinion, than in that of previous volumes which have appeared in English (the series is in Dutch up to vol. VII). Gerlo and Vervliet's *Inventaire* of Lipsius' correspondence (1968) is corrected on so many points that I have decided not to consult it anymore for the years up to 1595 and 1600-1601.

There remain, however, some drawbacks, for which De Landtsheer cannot be held accountable. When the project began three decades ago, certain conventions were established that I do not think are ideal but that are to be maintained for all nineteen volumes. There are no paragraph divisions in the texts of the edited letters; capitals and italics are maintained as they appear in the original editions or even as in the manuscripts; abbreviations, even the most common ones, are always resolved between brackets, which (especially in the formulaic salutations and valedictions) appear a bit messy to the eyes; the letters are numbered but (cross-) reference to these numbers is never made; the sigla are not always convenient codes for the sources, combining bold, roman, subscript, and Greek fonts; and the Greek in the text body of the letters is printed in italics for no particular reason. Fidelity to source texts leads to not separating *revera* (395, l. 6), which could be supported; but *iamante* looks odd (76, l. 25; 268, l. 10; 466, l. 10, but not so on 550, l. 11), and so does *iamunc* (413, l. 4). Classical sources are referred to with an economy that is puzzling even for classicists (189, ad 25: "Ar. Fr. 31"—is this Aristophanes' *Frogs* or *Fragments*?). 01 06 22 V is fictitious, we learn, but the fictitious letters from Lipsius' 1577 *Epistolicae quaestiones* were not included in ILE I (cf. ILE XIV, p. 269, ad 12), maybe because they lack a date?

De Landtsheer's accuracy is phenomenal. Considering the variety of source material, one is bound to come across transcription mistakes. But De Landtsheer's diligence made it a challenge to spot them. I take pride in having found three mistakes in the Latin (248, l. 3: pro *patrocionio*, lege *patrociniu*; p. 369,

ll. 30-31, pro *ad diem VI Kal[endas] Aprilium*, lege *ad diem VI Kal[endarum] Aprilium*, cf. the next line, *Kal[endas] (Apriles)*; p. 462, l. 44: pro *ille*, lege *illi*). The minor observations that follow now carry little weight in comparison with the excellent job De Landtsheer has done. The copious use of exclamation marks should be avoided. Neologisms could have been identified with more consistency: *dissertatiuncula* (439, l. 3, with a reference to Hoven's *Lexique*) hardly defies understanding, but in the annotation to a letter, obviously not written by Lipsius, which within six lines has the words *verbotenus*, *plataforma*, *mosqueta*, and *locumtenens*, only *plataforma* is identified as non-classical, this time without reference to Hoven's lexicon (01 01 23, ll. 15-21), although only *locumtenens* is in Hoven (ed. 1994; 2006). The non-classical *capis me*, for "you understand me," is also not commented on (01 10 31 P). In the synopses those things made explicit which in the letters are only implicit are sometimes put between square brackets, sometimes not (compare [00] 01 29 W, "[at Nieuwpoort]" with 01 01 14, "[Josephus Justus Scaliger]"). Instead of speaking of Oldenbarnevelt's "obstinacy," I would have chosen a more neutral expression, like "refusal" (one could even argue, in Lipsian terms, for Oldenbarnevelt's "constancy"). In addition I counted in the head notes, annotations, and critical apparatus less than fifty instances of insignificant mistakes in spelling and punctuation (mostly in the English) and absences of source references. But in a book of almost 600 pages these inevitable lapses are hardly noticed in the *cornu copiae* of what will remain the definitive edition of Lipsius' letters. (Dirk van Miert, The Warburg Institute, London)

◆ *On The Donation of Constantine*. By Lorenzo Valla. Trans. by G. W. Bowersock. The I Tatti Renaissance Library, 24. xvi + 206 pp. *Bald*, vol. 1: Books I-XII. By Teofilo Folengo. Trans. by Ann E. Mullaney. The I Tatti Renaissance Library, 25. xxiv + 471 pp. *Ciceronian Controversies*. Ed. by Joann Dellaneva. Trans. by Brian Duick. The I Tatti Renaissance Library, 26. xl + 295 pp. Cambridge, Mass. and London: Harvard University Press, 2007. \$29.95 per volume. The three volumes reviewed here constitute the 2007 installment in the I Tatti Renaissance Library; as such, they represent well the diversity and quality of the series. *On the Donation of Constantine* is a work of great seriousness which won for its author a reputation for philological brilliance and (ultimately) a place on the Index. As Valla shows, the Donation of Constantine, which justified the claims of the Papacy to political authority

over the western Mediterranean, cannot be what it purports to be. Valla was not the first to question its legitimacy—Nicholas of Cusa, for example, beat him to it—but the grounds of his attack were new: Valla challenged the treatise first rhetorically, arguing that there was no reason for Constantine to have given away half his empire, then philologically, showing that on the basis of its language and style, the treatise could not have been written by Constantine. Initially there were no signs of outrage from the Papacy—indeed Valla was named apostolic *scriptor*, then papal secretary, after writing the treatise—but the work became much more incendiary after the Reformation, finally appearing on the Index in 1559, more than a hundred years after it was written. But Valla was right, as the subscription at the end shows, for Constantine and Gallicanus never served as consuls together, as the subscription says they did.

Folengo's *Baldo* is a horse of a totally different color. It is ostensibly an epic in the romance tradition of Pulci and Ariosto by one Merlin Cocaio. The author was actually Teofilo Folengo, a Benedictine monk who lived from 1491 to 1544 and wrote a variety of other works ranging from sacred literature to the *Chaos del Triperuno*, a remarkable self-exploration in Latin, Italian, and macaronics. This linguistic dexterity is also the key feature of the *Baldo*, for which style is everything. There is a plot based around the exploits of the poem's eponymous hero, but much of the humor—the poem is very funny indeed—is linguistic. Nearly every hexameter contains a humorous word like *sledammaverat*, “had taken the crap out [of his eyes],” from *ex* and *laetamen*, “manure.” Lines like *Quo fugis? Unde venis? Quis te facit ire galoppum* are typical, with the vaguely Virgilian beginning leading to the thud of the non-Latinate *galoppum*. I generally do not comment on the translations in volumes in this series beyond noting that they are uniformly accurate and readable, but more must be said here: I simply cannot imagine trying to reproduce Folengo's macaronics in English. Here is the first sentence of the poem: *Dudum, Serinissime comes, adeo meum imbalordasti cervellum ut tibi de retrovatione huius voluminis aliquid scribere, quod de memoriae cadastris quasi mattus caschaverim, et ne tantum mihi prebeas amplius impazzum, accipe rem non quam audiui sed his manibus pertocavi*. Now, after trying to translate this yourself, consider Mullaney's rendering: “Oh most illustrious magnate, you have been driving me nuts asking me to tell you about the discovery of this book, so that I have almost fallen mad from the annals of my memory, and so that you don't make me even crazier, here's the story that I did not simply hear but experienced firsthand.” Reading over two

hundred pages of this is one thing, but producing a printable, precise translation is quite another—and there is a second volume to come.

Dellaneva and Duvick's *Ciceronian Controversies* in turn offers the major texts from one of the great arguments in Renaissance culture, the one about how a proper Latin style should be developed. As the controversy developed, positions were nuanced and compromises devised, but the debate in general was over whether Cicero should serve as the model for a revived classical Latin or whether a more eclectic approach was preferable. Round one involved an exchange of letters between the Roman humanist Paolo Cortesi (1465-1510) and Angelo Poliziano (1454-1494); round two, between Gianfrancesco Pico della Mirandola (ca. 1469-1533) and Pietro Bembo (1470-1547); and round three, between Giambattista Giraldis Cinzio (1504-1573) and Celio Calcagnini (1479-1541). Also included are extracts from two works of Antonio Possevino that comment on the debate. Other figures entered in, so that early on one line links Vergerio, George of Trebizond, Bruni, Poggio, and Guarino as Ciceronians and another links Barzizza, Alberti, Salutati, and Valla as eclectics. Geography also matters: the real home of Ciceronianism was Rome, whose humanists saw themselves as the descendants of the great Roman writers in ways that humanists of other cities could not. This quarrel matters, both in and of itself and for its connections to the broader *questione della lingua*, the educational theory of the day, and the religious turmoil that characterized the later Renaissance; it is therefore valuable to have the key texts brought together in one place.

As is usual with this series, the texts rely on critical editions established by others and the notes are minimal, what is necessary for an informed first reading. Everything is done to a uniformly high standard, and it is worth pausing for a moment to note that there are now more than twenty-five volumes in this series. That this milestone was reached in only seven years is a remarkable accomplishment, a tribute in particular to the general editor, James Hankins, whose work for the series was honored by a conference, 'Thrice-Born Latinity,' held at UCLA in November of 2007. (The proceedings of this conference will be published, then reviewed in NLN.) (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

**Proceedings of the
Milton Society of America**

**W Chicago City Center, 172 W. Adams St., Chicago
December 28, 2007**

Secretary: A. C. Labriola, Dept. of English, Duquesne University,
Pittsburgh, PA 15282 (Labriola@duq.edu)

The officers and Executive Committee met in a preliminary session at 4:00 PM at the W Chicago City Center. Present were Paul Stevens (President), Kristin Pruitt (Vice President), Labriola (Secretary), Diana Treviño Benet (Treasurer) and the following members of the Executive Committee: Margaret Arnold, Mary Fenton, Thomas Luxon, William Shullenberger, and Nicholas von Maltzahn. Excused was Gregory Machacek.

1. OFFICERS AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE. The following members of the society were nominated for offices: Kristin Pruitt for President; Tom Luxon for Vice President; and for three-year membership (2008-2010) on the Executive Committee Ken Hiltner and Nigel Smith, succeeding Margaret Arnold and Tom Luxon.

2. TREASURER'S REPORT. Benet indicated that the assets and net worth of the society as of July 1, 2007, were \$11,529.59. Benet and Labriola stressed the importance of donations and space advertisements as sources of revenue in order to stabilize the cost of the annual dinner at \$55.00. This year, there were 12 full-page advertisements.

3. COMMITTEE ON SCHOLARLY AWARDS. The chair of the Committee on Scholarly Awards is David Loewenstein, and other members are Barbara K. Lewalski and John Rogers.

4. SECRETARY'S REPORT. Labriola indicated that his announcements are printed on pages 5-7 of the annual booklet. He announced the names of the members of the society who are recently deceased: Kelsie

Harder, Gregory Bredbeck, and Michael Fixler.

He also reported on proposed changes in the structure of the MLA, changes that would reduce the number of open meetings sponsored by allied organizations from two to one. He indicated that the Milton Society of America will join with other allied organizations, most notably the ones dealing with literature before 1800, to contest this proposal.

5. OPEN MEETINGS AT MLA 2008 in San Francisco. The following open meetings, each 75 minutes long, were approved:

A. "John Milton at 400: A General Session (I)," Kristin Pruitt presiding;

B. "John Milton at 400: A General Session (II)," Margaret Arnold presiding

**NOTE THE FOLLOWING RULES FOR THE
ABOVE-MENTIONED MEETINGS:**

A. The chairs should receive papers, not longer than 8 double-spaced pages, by e-mail not later than 15 March; or at least a 1-page abstract. Usually three papers are chosen, and the chair may appoint a respondent; or two longer papers may be selected, with or without a respondent; or a panel discussion might be organized. It is essential, however, to provide time for questions and comments by attendees.

B. The chairs must submit the names of participants, academic affiliations, and titles of presentations to Labriola not later than April 1st (Labriola@duq.edu).

C. Labriola will place an announcement concerning the open meetings in the upcoming *MLA Newsletter*; Jameela Lares, who succeeds Diana Treviño Benet as treasurer, will also include notice in her upcoming letter to all members; and the chairs of the open meetings are urged to publicize in other ways.

D. All presenters must be members of MLA. If not, they must join by April 1st unless their specialty is something other than language and literature, in which case they must seek, through Labriola, special permission for their participation from the MLA Executive Director.

E. Chairs are encouraged to be in contact with each other in order to coordinate the makeup of their programs.

6. The officers and Executive Committee deliberated on the possibility of a special program for the dinner and meeting in 2008, which is the 60th anniversary of the Milton Society (1948-2008) and the 400th anniversary of Milton's birth (1608-2008). Ideas that were considered include the following: (1) an invitation to Philip Pullman to speak about Milton's influence on his writing. Milton's influence on children's literature and popular culture would thereby be stressed. (2) brief presentations by previous honored scholars of the society, who would recount highlights or memorable experiences from the dinner-meetings.

Approximately 75 members and guests attended the dinner and meeting at which Stevens presided.

1. The nominees for office (see item 1 above) were elected by acclamation.

2. Labriola announced that Diana Treviño Benet was stepping down as treasurer after a decade of service. The attendees gave a standing ovation as a gesture of gratitude.

3. Labriola announced the two open meetings at MLA 2008 (see item 5 above).

4. The James Holly Hanford Award for a distinguished book recognized the Excellence of Gordon Teskey's *Delirious Milton: The Fate of the Poet in Modernity* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2006). The James Holly Hanford Awards for distinguished essays recognized the excellence of Daniel Shore's " 'Fit Though Few': *Eikonoklastes* and the Rhetoric of Audience," *Milton Studies* 45, ed. Albert C. Labriola (U of Pittsburgh Press, 2006), 129-148; and of Elizabeth Sauer's "Milton's *Of True Religion*, Protestant Nationhood, and the Negotiation of Liberty," *Milton Quarterly* 40.1 (March 2006), 1-19.

5. The Irene Samuel Memorial Award recognized the excellence of the multiauthor collection titled *Milton in the Age of Fish: Essays on Authorship, Text, and Terrorism*, ed. Michael Lieb and Albert C. Labriola (Duquesne UP, 2006).

6. The John T. Shawcross Award for a distinguished chapter on Milton in a monograph that covers other authors or engages topics that bear on seventeenth-century England recognized the excellence of Jason P. Rosenblatt's "Selden and Milton on Gods and Angels," in *Renaissance England's Chief Rabbi: John Selden* (Oxford UP, 2006), chapter 3 (pp. 74-92).

7. The featured address, "A Checkered Career: Fumbles, Foibles, and Luck," was given by Robert T. Fallon.

8. Albert C. Labriola, Acting Dean, McAnulty College & Graduate School of Liberal Arts, Duquesne University, cited Robert T. Fallon, Emeritus Professor of English, La Salle University, as Honored Scholar 2007.

At the executive session after the general business meeting, the following were present: Pruitt (President), Luxon (Vice President), Labriola (Secretary), Lares (Treasurer), and the following members of the Executive Committee: Mary Fenton, Bill Shullenberger, Ken Hiltner, Nicholas von Maltzahn, Gregory Machacek. Excused was Nigel Smith.

1. Labriola was reappointed Secretary for 2008.

2. Jameela Lares succeeded Diana Treviño Benet as treasurer. Diana was praised for her decade of service. Lares was empowered to choose a site for the 2008 dinner and meeting in San Francisco.

3. Kristin Pruitt requested further recommendations for the special program at the dinner-meeting in 2008.