



EVENTEENTH-



ENTURY



NEWS

FALL - WINTER 2004

Vol. 62

Nos. 3&4



Including

THE NEO-LATIN NEWS Vol. 52, Nos. 3&4

---

# SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY NEWS

VOLUME 61, Nos. 1&2

SPRING-SUMMER, 2003

**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:** Though primarily a review journal, *SCN* publishes shorter articles and scholarly notes (3000 words). Manuscripts should be submitted in duplicate (with the author's name and institutional affiliation on the cover page only), accompanied by a stamped, self-addressed envelope. As a service to the scholarly community, *SCN* also publishes news items.

**SUBSCRIPTIONS,** Domestic and International. \$15.00 (\$20.00) for one year; \$28.00 (\$37.00) for two years; \$40.00 (\$52.00) for three years. Checks or money orders are payable to *Seventeenth-Century News*. A current style sheet, announcements, previous volumes' Tables of Contents, advertising rates, 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@tam.u.edu](mailto:scn@tam.u.edu)  
WWW: <http://www-english.tam.u.edu/pubs/scn/>

ISSN 0037-3028

# SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY NEWS

## EDITOR

DONALD R. DICKSON  
Texas A&M University

## EDITOR EMERITUS

Harrison T. Meserole  
Texas A&M University

## ASSOCIATE EDITORS

James Egan, University of Akron  
Jeffrey Walker, Oklahoma State University  
Michele Marrapodi, University of Palermo  
Patricia Garcia Ocañas, Our Lady of the Lake University

## EDITORIAL ASSISTANTS

Christopher E. Garrett, Texas A&M University  
Michael Mattair, Texas A&M University  
Christopher L. Morrow, Texas A&M University

## CONTENTS

VOLUME 62, NOS. 3&4

FALL-WINTER, 2004

### REVIEWS

- The Hartlib Papers: A Complete Text and Image Database of the Papers of Samuel Hartlib* ..... DONALD R. DICKSON 165
- Hannibal Hamlin, *Psalm Culture and Early Modern English Literature* ..... ALAN RUDRUM 169
- Michael Dobson and Nicola J. Watson, *England's Elizabeth: An Afterlife in Fame and Fantasy* ..... BRYAN N.S. GOOCH 173
- David Colclough, ed., *John Donne's Professional Lives* ..... RAYMOND-JEAN FRONTAIN 176
- Mary Arshagumi Papazian, *John Donne and the Protestant Reformation: New Perspectives* ..... JEFFREY POWERS-BECK 179
- D. Doerksen and C. Hodgkins, eds., *Centered on the Word: Literature, Scripture, and the Tudor-Stuart Middle Way* ..... JACOB BLEVINS 182
- Richmond Barbour, *Before Orientalism: London's Theatre of the East* ..... NABIL MATAR 186
- Ronald W. Cooley, "Full of all knowledg": *Herbert's Country Parson and Early Modern Social Discourse* ..... MARGARET OAKES 189
- Olav Laustund and Stein Olsen, eds., *Self-fashioning and Metamorphosis in Early Modern Literature* ..... DAVID GRANT MOSS 193
- Margaret W. Ferguson, *Dido's Daughters: Literacy, Gender, and Empire in Early Modern England* ..... JULIE D. CAMPBELL 196
- Kristin A. Pruitt, *Gender and the Power of Relationship* ..... JAMES EGAN 200
- Reid Barbour, *John Selden: Measures of the Holy Commonwealth* ..... ROBERT C. EVANS 203
- Juliet Cummins, ed., *Milton and the Ends of Time* ..... ELIZABETH SKERPAN-WHEELER 205

Laura Lunger Knoppers and Joan B. Landes, eds., <i>Monstrous Bodies: Political Monstrosities in Early Modern Europe</i> .....	LAURA FEITZINGER BROWN	208
James Grantham Turner, <i>Schooling Sex: Libertine Literature and Erotic Education</i> .....	TOM LUXON	213
Ina Habermann, <i>Staging Slander and Gender in Early Modern England</i> ...	NANCY M. BUNKER	216
Michael Bryson, <i>The Tyranny of Heaven: Milton's Rejection of God as King</i>	SUSANNAH B. MINTZ	220
Jacqueline Broad, <i>Women Philosophers of the Seventeenth Century</i> .....	JAMES FITZMAURICE	223
Jennifer L. Morgan, <i>Laboring Women: Reproduction and Gender in New World Slavery</i> .....	ELISA OH	226
Robert Tarule, <i>The Artisan of Ipswich: Craftsmanship and Community in New England</i> .....	WILLIAM J. SCHEICK	230
David Como, <i>Blown by the Spirit: Puritanism and the Emergence of an Antinomian Underground in Pre-Civil War England</i> .....	WILLIAM J. SCHEICK	233
Theodore Dwight Bozeman, <i>The Precisianist Strain: Disciplinary Religion and Antinomian Backlash</i> .....	WILLIAM J. SCHEICK	233
David J. Rempel Smucker and John L. Ruth, eds., <i>Hans Landis: Swiss Anabaptist Martyr</i> .....	NILES S. ILLICH	239
Eveline Cruickshanks, Stuart Handley, and D.W. Hayton, eds., <i>The House of Commons 1690-1715</i> .....	VICTOR STATER	241
W. C. Utt and B. Strayer, <i>The Bellicose Dove: Claude Brousson and Protestant Resistance to Louis XIV</i> . Review by THOMAS WORCESTER .....		246
Brennan C. Pursell, <i>The Winter King: Frederick V ... and the Coming of the Thirty Years' War</i> .....	MARK CHARLES FISSEL	249
Nicholas McDowell, <i>The English Radical Imagination: Culture, Religion, and Revolution</i> .....	JASON PEACEY	253
Brian Weiser, <i>Charles II and the Politics of Access</i> .....	TY M. REESE	257
Clare Jackson, <i>Restoration Scotland, 1660-1690: Royalist Politics, Religion and Ideas</i> .....	ROBERT LANDRUM	260
Kathleen Wellman, <i>Making Science Social: The Conferences of Théophraste Renaudot</i> .....	KAROL K. WEAVER	263

Vickie B. Sullivan, <i>Machiavelli, Hobbes, and the Formation of Liberal Republicanism in England</i> .....	SIMON KOW	266
Robert Bireley, <i>The Jesuits and the Thirty Years War</i> .....	MARK CHARLES FISSEL	269
Katherine Lynch, <i>Individuals, Families, and Communities in Europe</i> .....	ALISA PLANT	272
William R. Shea and Mariano Artigas, <i>Galileo in Rome: The Rise and Fall of a Genius</i> .....	ALESSANDRO GIOSTRA	276
Sophie van Romburgh, <i>“For My Worthy Friend Mr Francisus Junius”: An Edition of the Correspondence of Francis Junius FF.</i> .....	ERNEST B. GILMAN.	280
Jeremy Black, <i>European Warfare, 1494–1660.</i> .....	MITCHELL MCNAYLOR	283
Edward Corp, <i>A Court in Exile: The Stuarts in France.</i> .....	MOLLY MCCLAIN	286
Joad Raymond, <i>Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain.</i> ...	TIMOTHY RAYLOR	290
István György Tóth, <i>Literacy and Written Culture in Early Modern Central Europe.</i> .....	JAKUB BASISTA	294
Paul M Hunneyball, <i>Architecture and Image-Building in Seventeenth-Century Hertfordshire</i> .....	MARTYN BENNETT	296
Janis Bell and Thomas Willette, eds., <i>Art History in the Age of Bellori: Scholarship and Cultural Politics in Seventeenth-Century Rome.</i> .....	MICHAEL J. REDMOND	299
Michael Bath, <i>Renaissance Decorative Painting in Scotland.</i> .....	WILLIAM E. ENGEL	303
Christopher Hogwood, ed., <i>The Keyboard in Baroque Europe.</i> .....	GRAHAM H. PHIPPS	308
NEO-LATIN NEWS .....		313
NEWS .....		347

*The Hartlib Papers: A Complete Text and Image Database of the Papers of Samuel Hartlib (c.1600-1662)*. Second edition on CD-ROM. HROnline for the Humanities Research Institute: University of Sheffield, 2002. £1,570. Review by DONALD R. DICKSON, TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY.

One of the great untold stories of intellectual influence in the seventeenth century is that of Samuel Hartlib. The MLA International Bibliography currently lists only a handful of articles and books about him (sixteen in all), despite the many enterprises in which he engaged. Most know that Milton dedicated *Of Education* (1644) to him, but his role in many of the intellectual debates of his day in such practical fields as optics, mathematics, agriculture, and politics is not so well known. In 1995 the Hartlib Papers Project brought out the first edition of the papers of this influential man (on an MS-DOS platform), though the cost of the CD-ROM made it scarce. Only a handful of research libraries subscribed. Now that a second edition is available in a Windows format and at a greatly reduced price, the remarkable story of this Renaissance polymath may begin to emerge.

Samuel Hartlib was born in Polish Prussia at Elbing about 1600. His father, a Polish merchant of German extraction, married the daughter of an Englishman with the Eastland Merchants. The details of his early life are not fully clear. Based on clues from his letters, G. H. Turnbull argues that he studied until 1621 at the Gymnasium at Brieg, a well-known center of Protestantism in Silesia, then at Cambridge from 1621 to 1626, where he may have read law. Though all his early education at Brieg would have been in German and Latin, he was probably raised bi-lingually amidst the small English community on the Baltic. When he began recording noteworthy events in 1634 in his *Ephemerides*, he wrote mostly in English (with occasional passages in Latin).

After his probable stay at Cambridge, Hartlib returned briefly to the Baltic, before resettling in London in the spring of 1628. The impetus to return came not only from conditions in Prussia

but from the desire to help bring about the kingdom of God in England where millenarian expectations ran high. Hartlib encouraged others to read Bacon's *De Augmentis Scientiarum* and sought throughout his life to develop England's agricultural and horticultural resources; helped establish schools (in 1629 and 1630); offered succor—often at his own expense—to exiled scholars and ministers from the continent, especially Calvinists from the Palatinate; became the London agent for John Dury who hoped to promote ecclesiastical pacification among protestant divines by establishing “correspondency” to enable communication on spiritual matters; and promoted utopianism by bringing Jan Amos Comenius to England and having J. V. Andreae's utopian writings translated and broadly disseminated. He was filled with zeal for *pansophy* whose goal was the recovery of the knowledge that postlapsarian mankind had lost. Disseminating information within the European *republic of letters* became something like a religious obligation for Hartlib and his circle, and it explains why his epistolary networks were so extensive.

Furthermore, Hartlib believed that such a reformation of society would be aided by the establishment of a model college of learning, such as Bacon had imagined in his “Solomon's House” or Andreae in his *Christianopolis*. Hartlib hoped Chelsea College might become such an institution in London; and Comenius would later come to regard the Royal Society as the fruition of these long-held schemes. Because of his pansophical and utopian interests, Hartlib became known as an “intelligencer” or agent for the dissemination of news, books and manuscripts. With his scribes and amanuenses, he maintained regular and extensive correspondence with continental and English authorities. He was sent books, manuscripts, and letters filled with knowledge of all kinds for his review and assessment. The responses were themselves duplicated, opinions collated, and digests sent to members of his immediate circle or others who might benefit from the knowledge he had gained. He even collected the responses of his friends and returned them to the original author; so that ideas crossed frequently between England and various places in northern Europe. In this, he acted like



the Internet of the seventeenth century. While his printed works, such as *A Description of the Famous Kingdome of Macaria* (1641), list him as the author, Hartlib actually wrote little (Gabriel Plattes is now known to have authored this utopian treatise). He was more an impresario for the ideas of anyone who could improve society in some way.

Hartlib's correspondents included many of the most distinguished individuals of his generation: Milton, Marvell, Robert Boyle, John Pym, Oliver Cromwell, Americans such as John Winthrop and George Starkey, as well as leading luminaries in Europe such as Descartes, Pascal, and Comenius. The papers also contain in-depth information about a host of lesser and even previously unknown figures, whose role has gone largely unrecorded. As a result the Hartlib Papers contain enough material to rewrite the history of many subjects. Our understanding of agricultural and horticultural reform may certainly be transformed by the rich materials within this collection. The history of optics in Britain and Europe in its formative years when the microscope and telescope were first developed, may also be modified by the extensive body of information on early instrument makers contained within his papers.

The Hartlib Papers Project diligently collected all of the extant papers, but of course not everything survived. Shortly before his death Hartlib complained to a friend that his papers were being lost through carelessness, pilferage, and fire. After his death in 1662 his archive was purchased by William Viscount Brereton and put in order by Hartlib's friend John Worthington. What survived until the twentieth century was seventy-one bundles of documents (comprising some 5,234 individual documents). A few items had been acquired by Hans Sloane and so ended up in the British Library. One bundle was purchased for the Osborn Collection of the Beinecke Library at Yale in 1957. The bulk of the Hartlib archive was discovered among the family papers of a defunct line by a London solicitor and given in 1933 to a professor of education at the University of Sheffield, George Turnbull, who had written a recent biography of Hartlib. Turnbull made great

use of these newly discovered archives for his monumental study of the interrelations of Hartlib, Dury and Comenius (1947), but the 25,000 pages of manuscript will add considerably to the intellectual history of the seventeenth century in due course. The Second Edition of the Hartlib papers happily reunites the missing bundles (some 445 documents) and includes other Hartlib-related materials, such as correspondence between Hartlib and Robert Boyle, John Worthington, Joseph Mede, John Pell, and Johann Hevelius. In addition, translations of some of the most important Latin texts in the collection are included.

As an electronic edition, *The Hartlib Papers* offers up its riches with extraordinary ease. Its search engine is simple to use as well as sophisticated. One can perform a simple Boolean search, or a search using multiple Boolean operators. The index was constructed using a built-in stemmer, which makes word searches more efficient by identifying standard morphological variants of a word. Thus a search for "alch-" will find all of the documents in which forms of alchahest, alchemia, alchemiam, alchemista, alchemistarum, alcherm, alchimi, alchimia, alchemist, alchimista, alchimestam, alchimestarum, alchimestica, alchymi, alchymia, alchymic, alchymica, alchymical, alchymici, alchymicum, alchymisch, alchymist, alchymista, alchymisten, alchymisterei, alchymisti, alchymistical appear (55 in all). One can also search with a wildcard suffix (an asterisk on the end of a string of characters). The software also has a split-screen facility that allows comparison of two documents. Full on-screen help is provided at the touch of a button. Text can of course be easily saved and pasted into another text with a word processor.

The Hartlib archives are still organized by the topical bundles into which Worthington first organized them and can be browsed (as can the various collections from other libraries included). A tab discloses the inventory by title and date. Where images exist of the original manuscript, an icon within the document takes one to the image or prompts one to load the second CD to recover it. Since *The Hartlib Papers* is a diplomatic edition, all the details of the original manuscript are preserved, with editorial comment con-

fined to italic text in brackets. Each document has a header with three fields: the title, which describes the document type, the hand (where relevant), writer, recipient (where relevant), and the language (where other than English); the date (given in New Style usually); and the complete reference to the manuscript.

The electronic edition of *The Hartlib Papers* is an extraordinary resource that all research libraries ought to acquire. Scholars of seventeenth-century studies are much in the debt of those who worked so hard to bring this project to fruition: the directors, Michael Leslie and Mark Greengrass, and to their principals, Michael Hannon, Patrick Collinson and W. J. Hitchens, Judith Crawford and Timothy Raylor.

Hannibal Hamlin. *Psalm Culture and Early Modern English Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. xl + 289 pp. \$75.00. Review by ALAN RUDRUM, SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY.

Professor Hamlin's starting point is the fact that the culture of early modern England involved the translation of two ancient literatures, and the perception that less critical attention has been paid to biblical than to classical influences. The ubiquity of psalm translations and paraphrases suggests their study as a natural starting point in correcting this perceived imbalance. Hamlin begins with two apparently simple questions which prove on examination not to have simple answers: what is a psalm and what is a translation? Complexity arises from the facts that most translators did not read Hebrew and that there was universal ignorance regarding the formal workings of Hebrew poetry (3). It is pleasant to be returned, after some discussion of these complexities, to the observation that early modern man was convinced that the psalms were indeed poems and to the assurance that we shall be concerned with what contemporaries thought, rather than with current debates (6). Hamlin sees *use* as pointing to the important distinction between translations of classical texts and translations of psalms: their use in the liturgy, in family devotions, in sermons. This distinction itself becomes complicated by his apparent agree-

ment that early modern translations of Plutarch, Pliny and Montaigne take those authors “deep into the national consciousness.” The conclusion of this part of the discussion is the unassailable assertion that “the formation of culture has thus been typically and fundamentally an act of translation” (8). Later in the book, close readings bring this truism more vividly to life, as in the sixth chapter, where Hamlin shows, in relation to discussion of the fourth verse of Psalm 51, how “one of the central theological cruxes of the Reformation,” that of justification, “hinges on a question of translation.”

The first chapter, on the popularity, absurdities and longevity of the Sternhold and Hopkins psalter, offers an interesting history, much of which came as news to me, while simultaneously evoking familiar memories and sensations. Between the ages of seven and eleven I sang (for want of a more exact word) in the choir of a small village church; the psalms were almost always set to simple tunes and sung antiphonally. Throughout life since then I have always felt disappointed, indeed excluded, when churches put on airs and relegated the congregation to the status of a concert audience. That such experiences have a long history is indicated in Hamlin’s statement that “the congregational singing of psalms became entrenched in parish churches, while in the cathedrals and collegiate chapels the ‘Anglican’ practice of more elaborate music sung by the choir was upheld” (32-3). This chapter ends with three musical examples which can be followed by anybody who has had three or four piano lessons. While noting that Sternhold and Hopkins owes its longevity in part to publishing monopolies, Hamlin concludes that people enjoyed singing from it because of the melodic outline, rhythm and overall structure of the music to which its psalms were set, “well within the vocal range of the average untrained singer” (45). It was not to be supplanted until 1696, and even then the Tate and Brady *New Version of the Psalms* “perpetuated the meters [it had] established as normative for English metrical psalms” (84).

In the meantime, as everyone knows, a great many writers essayed metrical versions of the psalms. These “rival psalters” are

discussed in Hamlin's second chapter, where the versions of George Wither, George Sandys and Henry King are given especially detailed attention. One suspects that many readers have over the years dipped into such writings without feeling drawn to total immersion; it was for one of them a relief that Hamlin's discussion provoked a sense of vindication rather than of guilt. Many of these versions are execrable as verse, and, as Hamlin shows in the case of Wither, their authors were capable of being in a state of conceptual muddle rather resembling that of the many today who employ the vocabulary of theory with no sense of what its usable meaning might be: see the discussion of Wither's distinction between form and matter (56). Hamlin points to the reasons suggested by previous critics for Milton's translation of Psalms 80-88 into common meter, saying that there is "no conclusive evidence" for any of them and confessing to puzzlement as to why Milton should have departed so far from his usual style. He is puzzled too by Milton's sparrow "freed from wrong" (Psalm 84) and, less interestingly, by the swallow's "brooding nest" (75). Milton may have been slightly more anthropocentric in his theology than Henry Vaughan, but Vaughan would I think have understood the sense in which the sparrow was freed from wrong.

The first, and slightly longer, part of the book is concluded by two chapters on the psalms and English poetry, a relationship fuelled presumably by the recent availability of biblical translations and by the Puritan attack on "fictions," as Hamlin's citation of *A Defence of Poetry* and of *Paradise Regained* 4:331-49 serve to remind us. Enthusiasts of metrics will enjoy the section on the quantitative movement; others may want to fast-forward to the more general discussion of the relationship of psalm translation and paraphrase to the development of English verse. The earlier work of Wyatt, Gascoigne and Anne Vaughan Lock is fairly acknowledged, and the Sidney Psalter, seen as the preeminent influence, is discussed in convincing and enjoyable detail.

In the second part of the book, headed *Case studies in psalm translation*, Hamlin deals with Psalms 23, 51, and 137, in relation to pastoral, sin and sacrifice, and exile. In each of these studies

Hamlin employs a verse-by-verse organization, more familiar as he says from biblical commentary than from literary criticism. Given the richness of the three psalms studied, this seems sensible in principle and turns out to be rewarding in practice. Dr. Johnson's failure to appreciate the pastoral of "Lycidas" surely ranks with his failure to appreciate the "agon" of *Samson Agonistes* as marking his lowest point as a literary critic, and seems all the odder given that readers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries had "recognized the basic congruence of subject matter between [Psalm 23] and the pastoral of Theocritus and Virgil" (148). Hamlin surveys "the great variety of ways in which sixteenth- and seventeenth-century writers adapted their treatments of Psalm 23 to the conventions of classical pastoral (or to their perception of those conventions)" (149). Interesting discussion is generated from the perception that Psalm 23 marks a modal shift in being "primarily about sheep rather than shepherds" (156), a shift that does not exclude it from consideration as a pastoral because it takes to a further degree the "humbling" which, as Empson had suggested, puts the complex into the simple, or as Alpers had formulated it, represented "some other or all other men and / or women" as simple shepherds. That is, it represents an intensification of pastoral rather than a deviation from it. Early modern English writers, of course, read Psalm 23 as a Christian rather than a Hebrew poem, so that the meal in verse 5 becomes the feast of the Eucharist. By that stage of the psalm the metaphor has shifted, and the Shepherd has become the Lamb of God. Distressing as all these considerations may be to agnostic vegetarians, there is much "added value" when this particular Hebrew poem is read through Christian spectacles.

Hamlin's conclusion points to possibilities for further research, while at the same time suggesting a concern as to how many future scholars are likely to undertake or to profit from it, given the dwindling number of those of us for whom the Coverdale Psalter was both abiding presence and the most intense literary experience of their formative years.

Michael Dobson and Nicola J. Watson. *England's Elizabeth: An Afterlife in Fame and Fantasy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002. [xii] + 348 pp. \$29.95 Review by BRYAN N.S. GOOCH, UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA.

There is a temptation—not always easily rebuffed—to respond to real or apparent biographical lacunae with speculation and suggestion, to contemplate a whole picture, as it were, in a potentially convincing way, and the more prominent the figure, the greater will be the desire to fill the blanks. Elizabeth I, who was in many ways, one suspects, the conscious architect of her considerable mystique, is a splendid case in point (William Shakespeare is another): Michael Dobson and Nicola Watson, in their exhaustively researched and often witty *England's Elizabeth: An Afterlife in Fantasy*, offer a fascinating review of the responses, from the seventeenth-century to the present, in art, literature, and, more recently, film, to Elizabeth's life and reputation. Such an exploration not only quickly and clearly reveals the extent to which post-Elizabethans distinguish (or fail to differentiate) between fact, near-fact, and fiction—some of the more inventive treatments verging on the ludicrous and the funny (if one can suspend irritation at thinking of unwary audiences misled by fabulous and entertaining scenarios), but also the predilections, political, social, and moral, of the eras in which such reconstructions were produced.

The Introduction considers the range of variation in the portrayals of the Queen's mythic legacy, noting that not all approaches have been particularly positive (Gloriana could appear less than lustrous in some presentations), and offers an outline of the book's direction. Though not claiming inclusiveness—a wise precaution given the sheer volume of material—Dobson and Watson present a mass of documentation, certainly enough—and perhaps more than enough—to support their portrayal of changing reactions to Queen Bess, her character, and her private and public life. Even the portraits of the monarch's death, as they note, cast very different lights on that sombre occasion. The chronology ([32]–42), with its prefatory note and list of twentieth-century biographies, is a valuable

tool for the student of history and helps to keep the reader on sure ground as the authors take him or her into the often shady woods of re-creation and fantasy.

Chapter 1 focuses on seventeenth-century reactions, especially in the theatre, while the second chapter—"The Private Lives of the Virgin Queen"—moves to the eighteenth century and the fluctuations between seeing Elizabeth as a strong heroine, a female victim of her imposed role as Queen, and a thoroughly aggressive monarch. Her relations with Mary, Queen of Scots, and with Essex come into play, and pondering about these matters, of course, remains popular to this day. Part of the difficulty rests with the way in which one views the actions of both Mary and Essex, and, hence, the view of Elizabeth is necessarily altered accordingly. Was she, as some thought (and think), a sensitive woman, facing enormous conflicts on private and regal levels, forced into unpleasant action by virtue of clear threats to the throne; or were these two figures really victims of a hostile ruler determined to remove them under the guise of legal necessity? Was Essex's true problem his move from a position as attractive, romantic courtier to that of military failure and conspirator, and was the Queen's reaction more that of outraged, betrayed admirer than of objective monarch? Dobson and Watson do a thorough and intriguing job with their literary and artistic sources, and their material raises significant questions as it displays shifts in view across the decades.

The third chapter moves into the nineteenth century and its view of Good Queen Bess, the subject of souvenir and story for a legend-hungry, beef-eating public happy to believe in an heroic past depicted in drama and painting, leading to twentieth-century teaspoon portraiture and other desirable gift-shoppe items. At the very least, the Elizabeth myth, in its more positive configurations, was becoming a commercial boon, whether for the novelist (e.g., Walter Scott) or the purveyor of stories of the supposed Elizabeth-Shakespeare connections and accounts of the Queen's progresses through the counties. Dance where Elizabeth footed featly. Why not? It's all good, harmless fun even if facts seem to be continuously treated to a relentless stretch on the rack of fiction.



At least Dobson and Watson make every effort to keep the reader's eye on the historical ball, and thus the scope of an era's myth-mongering becomes a source of intrigue and fancy itself.

As the discussion moves to the Victorian period in Chapter 4, the authors review the Victoria-Elizabeth connections and comparisons and the political implications of a polished Gloriana as an accoutrement to a country and empire headed by a Queen and mother. Yet here again the Essex story play its role, and even Elizabeth, in the 1820s portrayed as scary and fraudulent (161) (consider the work of Mary Roberts and William Savage Landor) would again be in need of memorial rehabilitation, even in sentimental portrayals of her childhood (rather than as a vicious, sexless old woman), perhaps, as the authors suggest, to draw attention away from Victoria's increasing age and her mourning for Prince Albert (168). Chapter 5 continues the Victorians' restoration of Elizabeth as heroine and the virtues of the Elizabethan heritage, conjoined with religious (Protestant) renewal. While the issue of Mary, Queen of Scots, meanwhile would not go away (184), James Froude's *History of England* (1858-70) offered a more positive and, one might think, objective view (185). National pride was stimulated by Thomas Macaulay, espousing the notion of the Elizabethan Settlement and the hardiness of English seafarers, along with the work of the Parker Society, the Hakluyt Society, and authors such as Charles Kingsley with *Westward Ho!* (1855). The old Queen could now be seen by some to mark the beginning of a modern, outward-looking, and imperialistic England. The defeat of the Armada also comes to the fore, as does the German menace in the beginning of the twentieth century. Patriotism could—and did—appeal to ancient roots.

The ninth chapter focuses on more recent treatments, e.g., those of Lytton Strachey, the work of Virginia Woolf (including *Orlando* [1928]), Edith Sitwell, Margaret Irwin, et al., as well as Benjamin Britten's opera *Gloriana* (1953) and modern films (including *Shakespeare in Love* [262]), while the Afterword looks at a variety of North American reactions from the 17<sup>th</sup>-Century on, the acquisition of Elizabethan material by the Widener and Folger librar-

ies, and, again, film productions (e.g., involving Bette Davis and Errol Flynn in *The Private Lives of Elizabeth and Essex* [1939], *The Virgin Queen* [1955, with Davis again]), etc. Even the foundation of the United States can be celebrated within the utterly flexible confines of Elizabethan myth—for pleasure, profit, and, indeed, patriotic indulgence. The book concludes with a set of textual notes (itself a valuable bibliographic source), acknowledgements, and an index.

While this volume may not be exhaustive in the sense that it covers all the attempts to treat (or mistreat) the life and legacy of the first Elizabeth, it is certainly more than adequate in covering the sequence of accounts/portraits in a variety of media. It is well thought out and well written—something, indeed, of a *tour-de-force*. It is a valuable contribution to the study of historical and fictional adaptation of a famous life and offers clear insights not only into the nature of the Queen, but also into revealing interpretations by later generations. Now, will there be yet more portrayal/renderings of Elizabeth and Essex (as Dobson and Watson point out (161), Essex at his death was 35, the Queen a mere 68) or the sad fate of Queen Mary? Probably. Are more really needed? That is another question, and the answer depends on the definition of “need.” Certainly, the implication of this book’s survey are that the story of Elizabeth and her associations and impact is marketable—indeed, profitable—and commerce will have its way, especially with mystique of such compelling allure.

David Colclough, ed. *John Donne’s Professional Lives*. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2003. xiii + 272 pp. \$75.00. Review by RAYMOND-JEAN FRONTAIN, UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL ARKANSAS.

John Donne has lacked neither for intelligent biography nor for engaged biographical criticism of his work, the most recent examples being Dennis Flynn’s effort to situate Donne within a specific religio-social context and M. Thomas Hester’s edition of essays examining the central role played by Donne’s wife, Ann More, in the poet’s emotional life and imaginative writing.

Colclough's collection serves as a further prelude to, and implicit argument for, a much needed revisionist biography of Donne. The essays present new evidence of Donne's work as a controversialist, while effectively reminding us of Donne's training in and lifelong practice of the law, and recovering some of the politically complex conditions under which Donne preached both at court and at Paul's Cross.

Jeremy Maule's posthumously published "Donne and the Words of the Law" argues that all his adult life Donne practiced law, even when he was without formal employment. Maule is particularly effective in showing—through a close reading of "Holy Sonnet: Father, part of his double [sic] Interest"—the extent to which law and theology "were disciplines in which an acute mind trained itself, . . . discourses in which prayer or plea are intricately bound up . . . with judgement" (28). Maule's essay, the most important in the book, is supported within the collection by Louis Knafla's systematic review of what is known of Lord Keeper Thomas Egerton's career and the household in which Donne lived as secretary from 1597 to 1602. Knafla speculates on the projects which Donne would have undertaken for Egerton, evidence for which is available in Donne's satires. Maule's thesis is corroborated as well by John N. Wall's ongoing research (not represented in this collection) concerning Donne's drawing upon his legal training while dean of St. Paul's to write the charter of a public school still in operation.

Essays by Johann Sommerville and Alison Shell document Donne's career as a controversialist. Sommerville argues that Donne probably expected to be remembered for works like *Pseudo-Martyr* rather than his poetry, while demonstrating the extent to which Donne attempted to save lives, secure the state, and "clear the path to truth by exposing forgeries, corruptions, and misinterpretations" (94-5) through such polemical writing. Shell's identification of Donne as a heretofore unacknowledged ghost writer for Sir Edward Hoby's religious polemics sheds important new light on Donne's coterie activity.

Part II of Colclough's collections assembles essays by Jeanne Shami, Mary Morrissey and Peter McCullough on Donne's career

as a preacher. Shami examines Donne's goal of "mutuall [sic] consent" (145) through religious debate as the primary motive for his forswearing religious labels in his sermons, suggesting that he saw his role as a Church of England preacher to be pastoral rather than controversial. After analyzing the function of a Paul's Cross preacher as a commentator on public events, Morrissey considers three sermons in which Donne adeptly negotiated the conflicting demands of his public functions as preacher and as government spokesperson. McCullough revises our understanding of Donne's career as a court preacher, analyzing Donne's brief "intronization" in Charles I's court pulpit and subsequent entrapment in Laud's net to "subordinate preaching to prayer" (199).

The remaining essays, while worthy of publication, fit awkwardly under the collection's rubric. James Cannon astutely analyzes how Donne's sermon preached at the consecration of Lincoln's Inn chapel successfully bridged the views of both the moderates and the Laudian camp regarding the sacred character of church buildings, but comments only implicitly on how Donne functioned professionally as a preacher. Likewise, Stephen Pender's superb review of Donne's "sure command of the terms and concepts, and of the metaphorical fecundity, of medical semiotics" (247)—and his corresponding analysis of the ways in which Donne considered sickness as a theological and epistemological problem—do much to advance our understanding of Donne's imagination, but Pender's essay relies upon Donne's experience as a patient rather than as a practitioner of medicine. More problematically, David Cunnington's analysis of the verse epistles to the countesses of Huntingdon and Bedford stretches the profession (as in "expression" or "protestation") of friendship into a profession (as in an "employment").

Collectively, these essays offer deft challenges to Dennis Flynn's reading of Donne's Catholicism as well as John Carey's assumptions regarding Donne's recusancy; to Deborah Shuger's arguments regarding Donne's absolutism as well as Annabel Patterson's reading of Donne's Republicanism. The importance of these essays makes D. S. Brewer's sloppy delivery of them the more aggravating. One typographical problem (the absence of the opening mark

in a set of parentheses) recurs more than 230 times in two essays. While most likely the result of the press's converting the essays from one word processing program to another, it is difficult to understand how a problem that is so disruptive to the reading process escaped every eye at Brewer. In other instances, it is the copy editor who apparently nodded. Several instances of Louis Knafla's shoddy syntax are left uncorrected, and he is allowed to refer to "Donne's second 'Satyre II'" (42) as though there are two versions of the poem in question. Worse, no one thought to challenge editor Colclough's faulty mathematics when referring, in the opening sentence of his introduction, to "the two hundred and seventy years" that have lapsed since Donne's death (2), when the poet has been dead more than three hundred and seventy.

Mary Arshaguni Papazian. *John Donne and the Protestant Reformation: New Perspectives*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2003. viii + 385 pp. \$39.95. Review by JEFFREY POWERS-BECK, EAST TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY.

John Donne's theology and its relation to the Protestant Reformation are by no means new subjects. They were already long-time subjects of inquiry when Barbara Lewalski led the biblical poetics examination of Donne and other seventeenth-century poets in the 1980s. But upon old subjects, good scholars discover new perspectives, and such is the case in Papazian's volume of thirteen essays. This tightly focused collection brings together an impressive international group of Donne scholars, each with something new to say.

Donne's place in the Reformation, and his balancing of Roman Catholic and Reformed religious doctrines have long been thorny subjects. They are no less thorny here, although the picture that emerges of Donne throughout the collection is remarkably uniform. Donne in this volume is a Protestant divine in the Church of England, deeply influenced by the Reformation as well as by his Roman Catholic roots, but primarily a conciliarist who is non-polemical by nature.

Overall, the writers in this collection posit a balanced view of Donne as the author of sermons, prose meditations, and devotional lyrics.

Donne's secular verses and love poems are nowhere addressed in this book. The editor summarizes the overarching view of the writer: "Donne does not reject out of hand everything from the Catholic background, [but] readers [nevertheless] will see a Donne committed to fundamental articles of the protestant Church of England" (11). This does suggest a slight shift back from the heavy influence on Calvinism in Protestant poetics criticism.

If one term could be said to bring unity to this collection, it is the label "avant-garde conformist," first applied to Donne in Richard Strier's 1996 article, "Donne and the Politics of Devotion." In the first essay of the book, "Polemicist or Pastor," Daniel Doerksen distinguishes Donne from the "avant-garde conformists," men like Richard Hooker and Lancelot Andrewes. Instead, Doerksen claims that Donne was a "Calvinist conformist," like Bishop Arthur Lake and Samuel Ward. Notably, although Doerksen emphasizes Donne's Calvinist theology, he also accepts Donne's conformity to the Church of England, calling him a "moderate Calvinist." Likewise, in the second essay in the book, Jeanne Shami describes Donne's theology as a "middle way" between the opposing camps at the Synod of Dort (1618-1619), and thus a qualified form of Calvinism. This "middle way," she says, "is located more in their [the sermons'] processes of inquiry than in dogmatic pronouncements" and is "infuriating to those, consequently labeled as extremists" (37). And in her own essay in the collection, "The Augustinian Donne," the editor Papazian defines the author of the sermons as a proponent of "Reformed Augustinianism," with elements of both Catholic and Reformed religions.

In another remarkable essay on this topic, "Breaking Down the Walls that Divide," Elena Levy-Navarro finds that none of the recent theological labels (e.g., "avant-garde conformist," "conforming puritan," etc.) properly apply to Donne, as all such labels place him in an exclusionary faction. Rather, Donne's religious rhetoric was first of all "anti-polemicist," seeking to heal the Reformation

scars caused by factionalism (273, 287). Levy-Navarro's essay indeed offers a truly new and exciting approach for scholars of Donne's religious works.

Other essays in the collection determine yet other ways to define Donne's theological uniqueness. Catherine Gimelli Martin's brilliant piece, "Unmeete Contraries," describes the frequent theological conflicts in Donne's religious lyrics as a sign of something other than a balanced or compromised theology. Instead, she finds that the "unmeete contraries" of Donne's theology articulate an "aesthetic instability" produced by a "culture of anxiety" (193). The contraries of Calvinist and Roman Catholic doctrines are reconciled in Donne's lyrics aesthetically rather than logically. This aesthetic resolution produces an incomplete and divided speaker, realizing a sacramental unity in an "eternal moment" of "sacrificial crisis" (215).

Yet other essays find further new avenues. In "From 'Tav' to the Cross," Chanita Goodblatt argues for the importance of Donne's Hebraic learning in his biblical exegesis, making a strong case that Donne had at least a basic lexical understanding of Hebrew, which he supplemented with translated sources. In the ninth essay of the book, Brent Nelson contends that Donne's "pathopoeic appeal" is central to Donne's method in his *Devotions*. This is a successful extension of Debora Shuger's work on *pathopoeia* in Donne, by which the writer makes "the very greef it selfe (in part) cure of the disease" (268).

And in his essay "Donne's Protestant *Paradiso*," Raymond-Jean Frontain explains masterfully how Donne departed from Dante's visionary poetry and developed his own Protestant form of visionary prophecy in "The Second Anniversary."

A group of essays in the collection are decidedly historical in their approach. Jeffrey Johnson in the fourth essay sleuths through John Donne's complex relation to the Roman Catholic reformer Paolo Sarpi, and he finds that the two came to similar conclusions about the Council of Trent (both felt it reinforced a disastrous schism in the Church), but from very different theological directions (Donne from an idealist position, and Sarpi from that of an

intellectual pessimist). And in the extremely dense sixth essay, Paul Sellin shows through massive research into English military participation in the Netherlands from 1595-1625, that Donne was involved in marginal ways, but that many of his important patrons, friends, and family allies were deeply involved. Sellin hypothesizes: "Had Donne's enlistments for Cadiz and the [Azore] Islands' voyage been crowned with a knighthood, might he not have been as likely . . . to have ended his days as a valorous captain or colonel in Dutch service" (184).

The final three essays in the collection add more about Donne's sermons and devotions: Annette Deschner details the author's search for the primitive theological roots of baptisms in Luther's *sola scriptura* and *sola fide*; Maria Salenius finds Donne's "Protestant rhetoric" in his Candlemas sermons to be highly rhetorical and symbolic; and Gale Carrithers Jr. and James D. Hardy Jr. state that Donne in his two sermons on Matthew 4:18-20 "supported Protestant moderation in a time of increasingly radical Calvinist sectarianism" (337). The book ends as it begins with a portrait of Donne as a moderate religionist.

In conclusion, there are indeed "new perspectives" in Papazian's volume, although some readers will regret the exclusion of Donne's love poetry. Although the volume's focus is narrow, the portrait of Donne is clear and consistent. The quality of these essays is quite high, and the best of them (by Martin, Levy-Navarro, and Frontain) make outstanding contributions to Donne scholarship.

Daniel W. Doerksen and Christopher Hodgkins, eds. *Centered on the Word: Literature, Scripture, and the Tudor-Stuart Middle Way*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2004. 367 pp. \$62.50. Review by JACOB BLEVINS, MCNEESE STATE UNIVERSITY.

Every once and a while, a monograph or edited volume is published whose central thesis is so obvious, yet so relevant, it begs the question, "Why hasn't this been done before?" *Centered on the Word* is such a work. Daniel W. Doerksen and Christopher Hodgkins have put together a collection of essays that centers itself on the



word-centered dominance of Calvinism and its influence on English poetry during the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Their premise is a basic one: a belief system focused on the "Word," one grounded in the emphasis on the written text of the Bible as the most direct link to God, must have had an influence on writers for whom "words" (both their own and those of others) were so important. The editors believe that the literary implications of Calvinism have been underestimated because historians and literary scholars have too often concerned themselves with the "extremes" of the church and have reduced Calvinism simply to a faith based on the idea of predestination; Calvinism was, these editors would argue, rather a moderate middle-road adhered to by most in England, and, in its various manifestations, Calvinism attached a significance to Scripture by which writers could not help but be influenced. Doerksen and Hodgkins believe it is no coincidence that the dominant Calvinist "word-centeredness" of this period "coincided with perhaps the most diversely accomplished literary season that England has yet known" (15). In varying degrees, the fourteen essays included in this volume work to support that.

One of the most laudable characteristics of this collection is the range of topics addressed. The first two essays deal with Spenser. Carol V. Kaske reopens the discussion of Spenser's *Amoretti* and *Epithalamion* and their dependence on the substance and style of the Psalms; Lorena Henry addresses the Protestant conception of prophecy in *The Faerie Queene*, arguing that Britomart "has a Protestant Christian outlook that sees in prophecy an opportunity to engage willingly in her ordained destiny" (17). Susanne Woods compares the role of Peter in Robert Southwell's *St. Peter's Complaint* to the Peter of Aemelia Lanyer; while Southwell (a Jesuit) depicts Peter as a victim of women, Lanyer (a "Reformist") views Peter as a representation of the general failure in humanity. David Evett's discussion of Shakespeare's *The Tempest* is based on the idea that "service" and "servitude," once accepted, ultimately bring spiritual freedom to the servant. Kate Narveson argues that the genre of "Holy Soliloquy" is inherently a moderate genre, one that

is quite different from Puritan “teleological” works and one that “tends to record the continuing experience of an inner tension between sin and grace” (122).

In the first of four essays specifically dealing with Donne, Raymond-Jean Frontain believes that Donne engages in “biblical self-fashioning” (127) as he models his own sense of lamentation on that of Jeremiah. Daniel W. Doerksen, recalling Narveson, contends that some of Donne’s *Devotions upon Emergent Occasions* are less “soliloquies” as they are dialogues between man and God, which show a conformist emphasis on “hearing or detecting God’s voice” (149). Jeanne Shami examines Donne’s sermons and the interpretations of the Bible therein as a reformed “middle path between left-handed and right-handed” (20) readings of the text. And Robert Whalen looks at one Donne sermon to show that despite Donne’s dislike of Calvinist predestination and despite his own sacramentalism of sorts, he still engages in a personal, interior quest characteristic of moderate Calvinism.

In many ways, the most intriguing essays are saved until the end. Paul Dyck discusses Herbert as a church architect (in the material and figurative sense), whose physical and textual constructions reflect the importance of Scripture in the daily life of churchgoers. Kathryn Walls shows how William Baspoole’s annotations of a medieval text entitled *Pilgrimage of the Lyfe of Manhode*, which Baspoole gave to Archbishop Laud, are not theologically “neutral” but serve to align the medieval message of the text “on the Laudian side of the intense religious controversy” (245) that existed among Protestants just prior to the English Civil War. John N. King looks at Milton’s movement from an early moderate Calvinist to a more left-wing antiprelatist, and he argues that Milton’s “middle-road,” one that emphasized pastoral direction, remained with Milton until the political/religious uprisings of 1640. Christopher Hodgkins posits that the first closing of theatres by the Puritan Parliament in 1642 was much more moderate, and much less “antitheatrical,” than historians typically claim. Finally, L.E. Semler shows how *Eliza’s Babes* (1652), the work of an anonymous female Puritan, is influenced by the works of three writers

of different theological orientations: Richard Sibbes (Puritan), George Herbert (conformist), and Robert Herrick (Laudian). While all three of these writers are appropriated by the author of *Eliza's Babes*, Herbert and Herrick are also "adapted" to reflect a more "midcentury Sibbesian Puritanism" (22).

Although one may find points with which to quibble here and there, all of the essays are accomplished, well thought out discussions that add not just to the theme of the volume, but to the more specific subjects of the individual essays.

Despite the obvious relevance of the volume's theme and the high quality of the essays themselves, there is one potential problem with the overall conception of this collection. One could argue that the definition of "conforming Calvinist" used by the editors and contributors is simply too inclusive; at times it appears as if anyone during the seventeenth century who was not an obvious radical could be considered to be of the same basic theological belief system. By lumping nearly everyone into a single group, and by asserting that emphasis on "the Word" is a defining characteristic of that group, there is a danger of reductionism. Certainly, when one considers how many writers fall under the "conforming Calvinist" definition, finding texts that are "Word-based" does not seem to be a difficult task. However, the editors are clear and upfront as to exactly what their definitions are of such terms as Calvinist, Arminian, Laudian, and conformist, and while they admit the imperfections of such labels, they still find that such terms are "indeed, unavoidable in practice" (23). They even provide a useful—albeit simplified—chart that shows the spectrum of religious orientations during the period (24).

Although some generalizations are definitely present here, they should be seen as the kind of generalizations that are helpful in seeing the larger picture. In addition, the fact that so many of the essays address the struggle between the various particulars of religious faith during the period and the fact that they examine the intricacies of how writers fashion their own "word-based" faith, a charge of reductionism would be unfair by the volume's end. Ultimately, each essay is valuable in its own right, and considered as a

whole, this collection does indeed help clarify the impact of Calvinism on the literature of the period. This book is of real importance to historians and literary scholars alike.

Richmond Barbour. *Before Orientalism: London's Theatre of the East, 1576-1626*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. xii + 238 pp. \$60. Review by NABIL MATAR, FLORIDA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY.

The title of this book identifies its three foci: a theoretical engagement with Edward Said's theory of orientalism; theatre and pageant in the London of the Elizabethan and Jacobean periods; and the "East," by which is meant the regions east of the Ottoman Empire, regions which, as the author accurately notes, have not been sufficiently studied. The book is a welcome addition to the growing body of literature on England's commercial and diplomatic expansion into the early modern world.

Barbour divides his book into two equal units: the first examines dramatic representations of the East, both on stage and in pageants; the second historical and autobiographical documents. He moves from the Ottoman Levant to India, and from London drama and mayoral pageants to tourist, diplomatic and East India Company accounts. The first part, "Staging 'the East' in England," opens with a discussion of Richard Knolles' influential *The Generall Historie of the Turkes*, a book that yet awaits a modern edition and a detailed study. Barbour uses the text to show that "Before orientalism expressed western imperial power in Asia, early 'orientalist' tropes, provoking alternate alarm and complacency at home, helped writers decentered by travel to worlds east of England to reorient themselves" (15). This argument accurately conveys the position that developed in Britain toward the powerful Ottoman Empire: of recognizing similarities (both English and Ottoman potentates executed rivals and relatives to ensure succession) and differences, as in the "eastern shows of opulence and power . . . [that were seen to be] deceptive, effeminate, and debasing" (29). Barbour then discusses *Tamburlaine* and *Antony and*

*Cleopatra*, important plays that have received extensive coverage in recent criticism, and situates them in the context of England's commercial ventures, arguing against the oft-repeated claims that the plays belong to a colonizing imagination. As he succinctly states, "England's eastern initiative," and the representation of the East on the Swan and the Globe, "was driven by capital investment, not dynastic political design" (40). The third chapter examines public pageants, especially the royal entry of King James into London in 1603, court masques, and mock battles on the Thames, and their role in staging, in proto-orientalist terms, the "Muslim-Christian strife." These presentations showed the far reach of English geographical imagination and the acquisitive impulses of merchants, sailors, stock-holders, theater-goers and royalty. Although some writers criticized trade with the East, there was admiration for the commercial links that brought to London exotic products which made it appear the emporium of the world: "English ethnocentrism," observes Barbour, "dominate[d] an emergent orientalism" (74).

After a brief "Interlude" on the advantages and disadvantages of travel in the writings of English humanists, Barbour crosses to the second part, "Inaugural scenes in eastern theatre," which examines two accounts about the East by a tourist and a merchant/diplomat: Thomas Coryat and Sir Thomas Roe respectively. Barbour describes Coryat as the first English tourist in the East—a man who traveled not for any trading or religious goal, but simply to observe and then write down his observations for his countrymen—thereby transforming the East from a threat to a thrill (144). Coryat is a curious figure, and worthy of study, but it is not clear why Barbour chose to focus on him and ignore the extensive accounts about the "Persian" East that appeared from the Shirley brothers and their circle at the same time. Unlike eccentric Coryat, the Shirleys represented the kind of diplomatic and commercial ventures in Safavid Persia that numerous other Englishmen would attempt elsewhere in Asia: Persia was as much of the "East" as the Ottoman Levant and India. Sidestepping Persia, Barbour discusses the career of Sir Thomas Roe, the first Englishman to go to India

in an official capacity, and to attempt to “charm” (155) the Mughal court. Although supported by the East India Company, Barbour notes that Roe lacked the linguistic skills to negotiate directly with the Indian potentates, and the financial affluence to impress them. Still, Roe theatricized his arrival in Surat, believing himself capable of fulfilling his Company’s and king’s wishes, but when he presented his gifts to King Jahangir, the latter found them amusing and soon had his artisans imitate and improve on them. English skill and self-presentation were thus eclipsed by Indian industry and wealth. Roe found himself “fantastically upstaged” and marginalized by his hosts.

*Before Orientalism* is informative and clearly written. It is rich in detail and elegantly presented, with very helpful illustrations. Its juxtaposition of literary descriptions with personal accounts sharply shows the difference between English hopes and Eastern reality. In this respect, it was unfortunate that Barbour omitted Persia, and that he did not try to situate the English experience within the larger European encounter with the East. Knowlles’ account of the delay which European ambassadors experienced before being granted an audience by the Grand Signior is seen by Barbour as a “ceremony of humiliation” and “subjection” (32), but descriptions in Ottoman and other “Eastern” sources show that the same delays were often experienced by Muslim ambassadors and that Muslim ambassadors also experienced them in Christian courts. Similarly, Roe’s experience in Mughal India would have been enriched if it were seen in light of the very similar experience of Vasco da Gama, over a hundred years earlier. Works by Michael Fisher and Sanjay Subrahmanyam, along with sources from the “East,” would have helped decenter this highly Anglo-centric study. Furthermore, the relationship between the pre-orientalism of the title and all the proto-orientalism allusions in the book remains unresolved. What exactly does it mean to state that English writers were pre-orientalists, or proto-orientalists, or orientalists (used interchangeably)? Prefixes are ambiguous. If orientalism is a movement, as Said defined it, that was a product of the modern European state with its institutions of administration, scholar-

ship, and power, how could a 1580s play by Marlowe express “proto-orientalist conceits” (46), or “Enobarus’ rhapsody” in 2.2.201-8 be “a set-piece of proto-orientalist vision” (65) when it was taken verbatim, as Barbour carefully notes, from Sir Thomas North’s translation of Plutarch?

*Before Orientalism* is an important book. In an ideal world, its impressive scholarship would have been accompanied by a rigorous theoretical formulation.

Ronald W. Cooley. *“Full of all knowledg”: George Herbert’s Country Parson and Early Modern Social Discourse*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004. 238 pp. + 1 illus. \$50.00 Review by MARGARET J. OAKES, FURMAN UNIVERSITY.

It has become a commonplace to warn students encountering *The Temple* for the first time not to dismiss these poems as Sunday School-ish sing-alongs—the poetry is deceptively simple. The nursery rhyme-like appearance of some poems in the collection and their seemingly straightforward ideas belie intricate schemes of rhyme and rhythm, explorations of profound theological puzzles that parallel historical disputes over both theological tenets and those matters supposedly belonging to the “adiaphora,” and mature, multi-layered modes of approaching the divine. Ronald W. Cooley argues that the same principle of critical attention to an illusory simplicity should apply when encountering *The Country Parson*. Just as we cannot assume that the *via media* of the seventeenth-century English church (if such a thing actually existed) presented a smooth and internally consistent set of values and practices, we cannot assume that Herbert is following previously “constructed” positions and policies on ecclesiastical or doctrinal matters. In fact, Cooley argues that Herbert is actually part of a series of church figures who were in the process of negotiating among conflicting positions in the Church on numerous matters after it was freed from the oppressive stasis of the Elizabethan Compromise in his “effort to steer a course between a retreating conformist Calvinism and an advancing Arminian authority” (41).

Cooley theorizes, rather, that this complicated, sometimes even apparently contradictory, text is a reflection of the tensions in the Jacobean and Caroline courts and churches, and of the changing social and economic life of potential parishioners.

Cooley grounds his argument theoretically by employing the contradictions of a Foucaultian picture of power relations and a Marxist, materialist view of history. He says that *The Country Parson* manifests contradictions that are “discursively constructed and nonsubjective” in the Foucaultian tradition, and that also create “the political, social and material advantage of some, to the disadvantage of others” (11). The aim of Cooley’s approach is to acknowledge these contradictions in seventeenth century culture and find their reflections in Herbert’s prescriptive work.

In the first chapter, the popular characterization of Herbert in criticism of the last twenty years, of “Herbert’s commitment to a common core of [Protestant] ideas” (27), is rejected. Gene Veith, Richard Strier, and Christopher Hodgkins, the mainstays of Herbert criticism in the 1980s and 1990s, are said to ignore the possibilities of the array of ecclesiastical and theological opinions circulating in the decade or so in which Herbert was considering or participating in the clerical profession. Cooley reiterates the notion of the complete overhaul of the English clergy after the Reformation in terms of higher standards of education and clerical responsibilities to oversee and improve the morality of his parishioners through preaching and godly example. He goes on to outline the delicate balance of tensions described above through figures such as Laud and John Davenant, the Calvinist Bishop of Salisbury. While Davenant was best known for being such an opponent of Arminianism that he was one of the English delegates to the Synod of Dort, Cooley points out that he and Laud might agree in situations where “lay encroachment on episcopal authority” was a threat (39). Cooley emphasizes the function of the Jacobean church as a social force to promote a particular picture of public order and morality that could be reached through “the range of stances available” to a parson (50).



These differing stances on offer for a parson to reach his flock are outlined in the third chapter, the strongest and most innovative in the book. Entitled "*The Country Parson and the Enclosure of Professional Fields*," this chapter seeks to explain the borrowings in *The Country Parson* from the discourses of law and medicine, and the sometimes-problematic relationship revealed in the positioning of the cleric to his professional counterparts. The use of the word "professional" gets to the heart of the matter for Cooley, who describes the members of these specialized areas as simultaneously engaging in a process of "professionalization and self-definition" (58) that seemed to result in a zero-sum game for the three groups: Herbert paradoxically borrows from the terminology and concepts of law and medicine to, in the author's terms, "enclose" and expand the role and authority of the clergy. In this chapter, Cooley adopts another theoretical framework, that of the Weberian notions of the "traditional" and "legal-rational," to describe Herbert's intentions and actions. Herbert plays on the strengths and weaknesses of the other two professions to promote his own: the parson (and his wife) has the authority to attend to the health, both spiritual and physical, of his parishioners in a traditional fashion opposed to the supposedly "book learned," quasi-official practitioner of medicine supervised by the Royal College of Physicians (a notion perhaps more popular in a rural area such as Bemerton). Similarly, he casts the parson in legal terms at the beginning of "The Parson's Completeness" as a strategy to appropriate the authority of the law to both regulate the behavior of his fold and, on a larger scale, maintain control over the role of the church in social reform, especially for relief of the poor. Cooley argues that Herbert promoted the traditional role of the church in the political tool of the dispensation of charity, a "powerful means of generating dependence and compliance" over the emerging power of the civic authorities in that area (79). This chapter is especially persuasive of Cooley's thesis in its expansion of Herbert's view of the world from the rural Wiltshire pulpit to the events of his time; he is not just using the discourses of law and medicine to advise his fellow parsons in regulating the spiritual health and moral behavior of

their parishioners, but is actually creating the profession that he also professes to advise. Cooley regrettably does not include the obvious reference to Stephen Greenblatt's *Renaissance Self-Fashioning*, thereby disregarding critical support for his view of Herbert's desire to "consolidate and extend [the] influence" of the clergy (56) through a conscious process of subjective definition and separation from other roles.

Cooley goes on in the following chapter to develop the idea that Herbert was involved in a negotiation of evolving social forces in rural Wiltshire and throughout England. The physical enclosure of land for pasturing is continued as a metaphor for the negotiations involved in refining the profession role of the clergy: Cooley points out that enclosure was not, in fact, always the evil condemned by More a century earlier in the *Utopia*, but was in fact a shift from common arable land, subject to lax maintenance by the slothful, to a system "facilitating more intensive cultivation rather than conversion of arable to pasture" (87). In other words, a negotiation process was taking place that redefined a change which was once viewed as ruinous of traditional practices as a practice which could be used to enforce proper social and economic behavior. While Cooley seems to strain the argument by claiming that Herbert's physical residence in the "two very different rural economies" (95) of Wiltshire would cause "Herbert's conversion to the cause of agricultural innovation," it does seem generally arguable, and more to the point, that the flux in social and economic practices in general that he witnessed could result in "the generally contradictory character of his portrait of rural life" in *The Country Parson* (97).

The paternal and patriarchal nature of the clerical profession is the subject of Chapter Four. Cooley succinctly and persuasively draws out the parallels and dissimilarities between the fathering of a family and the fathering of a parish, and also highlights the tensions involved in the latter caused by these parallels; specifically, how does a clergyman approach a titled parishioner about some objectionable behavior, in a role which at once positions him as moral teacher and social inferior? He concludes that Herbert's intention was to have clergy delegate the enforcement role; i.e.,

shift the policing of the family unit onto the appropriate figure, relying on “the diffusion of disciplinary power throughout the community” (132).

Despite the title of the book and its emphasis on historical contextualizing, Cooley seems to feel compelled to turn to *The Temple* to reinforce his points about the prose professional manual. The fifth chapter examines in scrupulous detail connections between the poetry and historical issues in the court, the cloth trade, evolving agricultural techniques, and other areas. This chapter is not as connected to Cooley’s overall thesis as it might be, and draws conclusions about extremely specific historical information being reflected in this spiritual poetry that sometime seem speculative. The information about “The Water-Course” is illuminating, but the arguments about the differences between the Williams and Bodleian manuscripts do not result in a point that seems useful to a greater understanding of *The Country Parson*.

In situating *The Country Parson* deeply in its social, political, and economic environments, Ronald Cooley takes seriously the title of the work: The country parson is truly a member of a religious professional cohort and is a fully participating member of his society, attendant to its larger problems and pressures from many quarters. *The Temple* is frequently studied in the context of the theological and ecclesiastical disputes of Herbert’s day. The relationship between *The Country Parson* and the universe in which that parson operates deserves similar consideration, and Cooley has done significant work to that end.

Olav Lausund and Stein Haugom Olsen, eds. *Self-fashioning and Metamorphosis in Early Modern English Literature*. Oslo: Novus Press, 2003. xx + 260 pp. □32.80. Review by DAVID GRANT MOSS, VIRGINIA TECH UNIVERSITY.

*Self-fashioning and Metamorphosis in Early Modern English Literature* is a collection of articles gathered from the proceedings of a conference on early modern literature at the University of Oslo. The book’s strengths and weaknesses are in many ways connected

to its origin. The subject of the conference was “metamorphosis, self-fashioning, and power” (v), and those topics, as one would expect, are found in the book.

However, the general and inclusive themes underlying an academic conference do not necessarily make the best foundation for a collection of essays. This work would have benefited greatly from a narrower focus. Self-fashioning and metamorphosis, although related, are discrete topics in early modern studies, and each could warrant a volume of its own. Some essays deal with self-fashioning, some with metamorphosis, and some with both; the resultant collection seems more patched together than edited, composed of essays which, although well-written and interesting on the whole, do not hold together as a unified work.

The term “self-fashioning,” of course, is derived from Stephen Greenblatt’s well-known work, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning*, first published in 1980. The editors contend in their introduction that “the importance of Greenblatt’s book was neither in its historicist nor in its postmodernist assumptions but in that it introduced and demonstrated the critical usefulness of a set of concepts,” concepts which are useful regardless of their “theoretical underpinnings” (x). This may be, but not all of the contributors to this collection use or react to Greenblatt’s idea of self-fashioning (metamorphosis, presumably, predates Greenblatt). The final product is a collection of worthy essays lacking a central focus to link them together.

Seven of the book’s thirteen essays deal with Shakespeare, and this creates something of a problem, as the essays on other authors feel somewhat out of place in comparison. After reading six essays on Shakespearean drama, followed by one on Webster’s *Duchess of Malfi*, by Roy Eriksen, the reader then encounters two essays on Milton’s *Paradise Lost* by Margaret Kean and Ann Torday Gulden. And although the research done in these essays is excellent, it is difficult to see—even through the filters of self-fashioning and metamorphosis—how they relate to the rest of the work. Even more problematic is H. Neville Davies’ study of the little-known poet Thomas St. Nicholas. Although well-written, this essay seems more

of an introduction to the life and work of St. Nicholas than it does a treatise on Renaissance self-fashioning or metamorphosis.

Despite these problems, the book contains a number of notable essays which shine new light on early modern texts. Robin Headlam Wells's "The Metamorphosis of Othello" is an intriguing look at the tragedy and its connection to contemporary beliefs about and attitudes toward the savage (noble or otherwise). After demonstrating that the plot of *Othello* does not conform to the typical revenge tragedy *topos* of a society with a corrupt or dysfunctional system of justice (as defined by Katherine Maus), Wells argues that Othello's transformation from noble soldier to brutal murderer is not due as much to revenge as it is to an obsession with personal honor "in the precivilized sense of personal prestige or reputation" (127).

Catherine R. Eskin's "The Rhetorical Double-Bind: Self-Representation and Self-Fashioning in Court(ier)Ship" is another example of this book's best efforts. Eskin begins by examining the paradoxical advice of works such as Vives' *The Instruction of a Christian Woman*, Wilson's *The Arte of Rhetorique*, and Catiglione's *The Book of the Courtier*, all of which recommend the same seemingly impossible suggestion: that "in order to find favour, social and political aspirants must maintain a modest silence while still shamelessly portraying their worth" (45). She then goes on to use the character of Terentia from Robert Greene's *Cicero's Amor* as an example of just how someone might hope to perform what initially seems an impossibility.

Thus, *Self-fashioning and Metamorphosis in Early Modern English Literature* does indeed contain some interesting and even ground-breaking work. It is, however, unfortunate that the book's overall concept and organization could not be honed to present those works in a better, more focused light.

Margaret W. Ferguson. *Dido's Daughters: Literacy, Gender, and Empire in Early Modern England and France*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003. xiv + 506 pp. + 8 illus. \$25.00 paper. Review by JULIE D. CAMPBELL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY.

Basing her exploration of literacy, gender, and empire upon the premise that literacy was a site of social contest in the European past, Margaret W. Ferguson argues that "literacy is a social phenomenon surrounded and often constituted by interesting lies, as well as by highly interested constructions of evidence on the part of writers from various historical eras, including our own" (5, 7). With this observation in mind, she seeks to "disrupt the still-dominant scholarly consensus that neither historical women nor cultural theories about gender difference had much to do with the changes in literacy that have been seen as causes—or effects—of the modernizing process" (13). To accomplish this task, Ferguson engages with and problematizes numerous ideas popular in the history of literacy studies, then provides insightful analyses of texts by Christine de Pizan, Marguerite de Navarre, Elizabeth Cary, and Aphra Behn.

In the three chapters of Part One, Ferguson gives a dense overview of approaches to "defining and valuing literacy" in late medieval and early modern France and England (6). As she interrogates the history of literacy studies, she stresses that the notion of "contestable inheritance" is a metaphor central to her argument, and she invokes Marx as her muse, especially making reference to his ideas about the transition from feudalism to capitalism (14). Beginning with relatively recent literacy theories, Ferguson critiques the Lévi-Strauss-Derrida debate over writing, ultimately arriving at a theoretical model derived in part from both. She argues that the "hierarchy of superior/inferior is labile," positing that "part of the educator's task is to stabilize it, and part of my task here is to look again at the evidence of instability that the written record provides" (59). She details the "two main positions" in the modern literacy debates as those of the Great Divide theorists, who see literacy as a specific set of skills engendering specific

(but transcultural) mental effects in individuals and in groups, and . . . the ‘culturists,’ who see literacy as a socially embedded and highly-variable set of meaning-making activities that . . . are not necessarily tied to the alphabetic letter but are definitely tied . . . to the epistemological problems of the so-called observer effect. (61)

With these theoretical considerations in place, she proceeds to look at the “intertwined linguistic matrices of the territories claimed by French and British monarchs,” noting that the era in question was characterized by competition among languages and especially by what Renée Balibar terms *colinguisme*, “the association of certain state languages within an apparatus of languages in which they find their legitimacy and their working material” (101).

Ferguson refers to *colinguisme* to construct a critical perspective on three key facets of clerkly language use, “(1) the emergence, in discursive sites ranging from thirteenth-century Latin grammar books to sixteenth-century English courtly poems, of powerfully gendered figures of the vernacular; (2) the increasing use of a ‘regulated’ metropolitan vernacular for literary and bureaucratic purposes in French and English territories; and (3) the developing concern, among *litterati* trained in humanist books to ‘illustrate’ the vernacular so it could compete with Latin and Greek . . . as a language fit for ‘noble’ literary expression” (105). Traversing readings from Chaucer, Thomas Madryn, William Caxton, Gawin Douglas, Roger Ascham, Richard Pynson, and César de Rochefort, as well as Thomas Wyatt, Joachim du Bellay, and Dante, she examines how class signifies regarding “ideologies of gender in connection with ideologies of language” (134) as an “emergent clerkly class or class fraction” sought to shape “vernaculars as tongues suitable for ‘illustrious men’” (129).

Next, Ferguson invokes Benedict Anderson’s notion of nations as “imagined communities” to interrogate issues of imperial nationalism “as a matrix for gendered theories and practices of literacy” (135, 138). Asserting that there was “no such thing as a pure and uniform mother tongue,” she argues that the “feminine personifications of the concept arguably attest to the anxiety that many *litterati* felt about a situation of linguistic variety” (140). To

that end, she surveys examples of conflicted notions regarding the concepts of "Patria" and "mother tongue." She concludes with consideration of goals of "uniformity" for literacy acquisition, commenting especially upon the ways in which such educators as Richard Mulcaster, Erasmus, Edmund Spenser, and Roger Bacon sought to shape notions of literacy.

In Part Two, Ferguson dedicates a chapter each to de Pizan's *Livre de la Cité des Dames*, de Navarre's *Heptaméron*, Cary's *Tragedy of Mariam*, and Behn's *Widdow Ranter* and *Oroonoko*. She chooses such disparate authors and texts because, as she puts it, all four "offer searching commentaries, in writing manifestly aimed at future as well as contemporary readers, on women acting in two apparently contradictory roles: as oppressed subjects of imperial regimes and as rulers, or potential (that is, self-imagined) rulers, of new worlds" (26).

Regarding the *Cité des Dames*, Ferguson focuses on de Pizan's shaping of "personae to articulate a complex vision of empire that included prominent roles for female scribes, prophets, evangelists, and governors," noting that her vision of empire is one of a "universal" or "world monarchy" (180). She asserts, moreover, that the *Cité* is written "in a clerkly variant of a courtly, metropolitan dialect," with its diction and style "shaped by the bureaucratic writing practices developed by the clerks of the Curia . . . and adapted by servants of the French monarchy" (285). Moreover, since De Pizan's writing "became an influence on fifteenth-century English prose through the translation of several of her works . . ." (185), Ferguson concludes that through this "French/English connection, we can glimpse some but not all of the ways in which multilingual women with alphabetic literacy sought . . . to educate some portion of a once and future audience about what queens, or potential queens, might do to reform the world" (224).

Suggesting that de Navarre, like de Pizan, "appropriates both oral and written materials to construct an imperialist ideological project of her own" (225), Ferguson especially focuses on story 67 of the *Heptaméron* in which a virtuous woman journeys to Canada. During her trip, she is exiled on an Atlantic island due to treason



committed by her husband. Because of her personal piety and good reputation, however, when she finally returns to France, she lives “through her literacy,” as the ladies of La Rochelle send their daughters to study with her. Ferguson analyzes this story in terms of its associations with the “Imperial Project,” its narrative frame, and some “costs and benefits” of de Navarre’s literacy as evidenced in the story.

Moving to English texts, Ferguson examines *The Tragedy of Mariam* in light of the way it illustrates “a mode of female literacy that relies on several types of equivocation to articulate (but also to disguise) a critical perspective on England as an imperial nation” (265). She argues that the “Jesuitical theory of equivocation, like the discourse of casuistry to which this historically specific type of equivocation arguably belongs,” was influential upon Cary’s play in which the “verbal universe” hovers “like Jesuitical theories and practices of equivocation on the border between written, spoken, and ‘mentally reserved’ statements . . .” (281). She also goes over the familiar ground of issues regarding women’s speech and divorce that are intrinsic parts of Cary’s commentary in this play. She concludes that although the play “offers a commentary on, but no political alternative to, life in an imperial regime riven by differences among subjects and within them,” Cary articulates small differences regarding Marian’s experiences that do matter regarding issues of empire, gender, and literacy (332).

Finally, Ferguson examines aspects of literacy as colonization in Behn’s works. Specifically, she argues that “Behn’s vision of England as an imperial nation was critically colored by her experience as a woman writer who had worked in the theater—exploiting the anomaly of her gender while also defending against attacks on her status as a ‘public woman’” (333). Looking at *Oroonoko* and *Ranter*, she closely analyzes character development, as well as historical and political contexts. She suggests that Behn “uses her self-fashioned female literacy as she exposes and hides the historical subjects—including herself—about whom she is writing” (372).

Clearly, other interesting cases could have been explored in this study (Mary Wroth’s *Urania*, Margaret Cavendish’s *Blazing*

*World*) as, indeed, other theories on women's writing and Otherness could have been included (those of Julia Kristeva or Hélène Cixous), but Ferguson sets the parameters of her study to contain a just-manageable, lively discussion of the vast concepts of literacy, gender, and empire and the ways they intersect in these four particular texts. A gift of this study, then, is the way in which it inspires one to consider elements of Ferguson's ideas and textual analyses in conjunction with numerous other texts and theories. In general, the book is a useful one for anyone interested in early modern literacy and women's commentaries on issues of empire.

Kristin A. Pruitt. *Gender and the Power of Relationship*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 2003. xvi +196 pp. \$60.00. Review by JAMES EGAN, THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON.

*Gender and the Power of Relationship* begins with a metaphysical definition of divine "unity in diversity," a definition offered in the Father-Son colloquy of *Paradise Lost* III and reiterated throughout the epic. Unity in diversity is, of course, a perfect relationship, one which prelapsarian Adam and Eve are made aware of and urged to imitate in the series of lessons they receive in Paradise. Chapter Two reviews the educational process as a whole in the poem, from the divine education of Books V and III, to Adam's conversation with God in Book VIII, and finally to Eve's progress from self-knowledge, to awareness of Adam and their relationship, and to understanding of the "hierarchy of values on which the harmony of Paradise is based" (35). God, in turn, "examines" Adam on his understanding of relationship, and the human couple is allowed ample opportunity to "work out their relationship" (41). This chapter effectively establishes the meaning of "relationship" in two of the three primary settings of the poem, while confirming that the goal of divine pedagogy is to explain how Adam and Eve can "grow into relationship with each other and with the Creator" (44).

Chapter Three links the topic of relationship to the Miltonic motifs of hierarchy and equality, arguing in the process that his

stance on gender cannot be dismissed, as it often has been over the past thirty years, as merely masculinist. The marriage of Adam and Eve allows Milton to act out the dialectic of hierarchy and reciprocity and to generate thematic tension from the dire consequences which follow when Adam and Eve try to balance the conflicting demands of hierarchy and reciprocity. In his lecture to Adam, Raphael misjudges Eve physically and intellectually, thereby indicating that he understands only hierarchy, not the interplay of hierarchy and reciprocity. Pruitt stresses an essential distinction here: Raphael, not Milton, takes a masculinist position on Eve. For his part, Milton proposes equality between the sexes, shown by the couple's complex expressions of love, including their conversations. At this point, again with solid evidence, Pruitt connects relationship to another of *Paradise Lost's* most familiar concerns, the dialectic of reason and faith. Adam's misuse of reason after Eve confesses that she has sinned suggests his obsession with reason for its own sake, rather than as a path to faith. Eve had subscribed to Satan's argument for diabolical sexuality, sexuality based on self-love and division rather than on her relationship with Adam and "the God in him" (79), thereby opting for a hellish parody of mutual love, the antithesis of the divine love displayed in the Incarnation. Pruitt's discussion of the implicit Ovidian subtext of Satan's temptation, his evocation of the courtly lover, will allow readers to see useful parallels between the temptation and the seventeenth-century love lyric as well as the meditative tradition of Donne and Herbert.

Chapter Five, "God is also in sleep," returns to the notions of process treated in the opening chapters. Both God and Satan, Pruitt demonstrates, work through and in dreams. Adam and Eve learn of the "fruit of relationship" in theirs (95), while Eve's Satan-inspired dream urges self-exaltation, thus becoming a demonic perversion of mutuality and a reversal of the sacred into the secular. Because Satan controls this early dream, Pruitt reasons, following John Diekhoff, that Eve is not culpable here and remains innocent; only Satan can be legitimately indicted. In contrast, Eve's final

divine dreams empower her and confirm her “sufficiency” to have withstood temptation.

The last chapter of *Gender and the Power of Relationship*, “The Many Faces of Eve,” elaborates Pruitt’s case for Milton’s positive characterization of Eve and her egalitarian relationship with Adam by comparing his character to the normative interpretations of Genesis found in eight seventeenth-century exegetical commentaries published before *Paradise Lost* and available to Milton, those of Andrew Willet, Henry Ainsworth, John Salkeld, William Austin, William Whately, John Downname et al., John Trapp, and John White. These exegeses enable Pruitt to identify both the standard perspectives of Milton’s contemporaries on gender issues and significant variations from the normative interpretations of Eve. Generally, his Eve resembles the more exalted readings of woman found in the exegeses. While most interpreters follow the Pauline interpretation of female subservience before and after the fall, *Paradise Lost* accentuates both Eve’s refusal to be reflexively and invariably submissive and Adam’s lack of enthusiasm for patriarchal authority over her. Milton enhances Eve’s status in many ways—by playing up the intricacy and skill of Satan’s temptation, her prolonged resistance to it, her blunt admission of guilt and responsibility, and Adam’s rapid surrender to her temptation. In short, the epic presentation of Eve’s character proves more psychologically complex, and therefore more realistic, than any account found in contemporary exegeses. As Adam and Eve leave Paradise, they walk hand in hand, a visual image which signifies the final equality of their relationship.

*Gender and the Power of Relationship* offers a mixture of strengths and weaknesses. Pruitt makes the case for Eve’s “sufficiency” capably and non-polemically, reassessing with detailed evidence earlier indictments of Milton’s masculinism. The tone of her reading is free of ideological jargon, question-begging, and stridency. Her best chapter contextualizes Eve well historically by measuring Milton’s version against those of his exegetical peers. This well-researched conclusion offsets an opening chapter with an overly abstract, clinical quality, one which rests more on implication and

assumption than it should; readers might have been better served early on had Pruitt carefully and overtly linked the sub-sections of evidence to be presented. She defines “relationship” inductively and accumulatively, an acceptable practice, but one which may cause the reader to hesitate before apprehending the overall movement of the argument. Finally, the book’s prose style, generally clear and readable, sometimes overindulges the scholarly affectation of beginning sentences in the analytical voice and syntax of the critic and completing them with lines from *Paradise Lost*. Though this affectation can enrich, or even entertain, it can also work as a sort of interpretive sleight-of-hand which nudges readers to agree with unstated conclusions. On the other hand, Pruitt’s style is also good enough on occasion to be delightfully quotable, for example, her reference to Satan’s “one-noon stand” with Eve (87) and her suggestion that “if Milton’s Eve is the ‘author . . . of transgression,’ his Adam is its licenser and publisher” (154).

Reid Barbour. *John Selden: Measures of the Holy Commonwealth in Seventeenth Century England*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2003. 384 pp. \$70.00. Review by ROBERT C. EVANS, AUBURN UNIVERSITY MONTGOMERY.

This study, its jacket flap notes, “is the first text in over a century to examine the whole of Selden’s works and thought.” That fact alone would make the book significant, but even more important is the further claim that “Reid Barbour brings a new perspective to Selden studies by stressing Selden’s strong commitment to a ‘religious society,’ by taking a closer and more sustained look at his poetic interests, and by systematically examining his Latin publications (particularly those using Jewish sources).” Barbour, the flap continues, “posits that the overriding aim of Selden’s career was to bolster religious society in the face of its imminent demise. He argues that Selden’s scholarly career was committed to resolving an essentially religious question about how best to establish the holy commonwealth in both lawfulness and spiritual abundance.” In academic publishing, at least, there is still truth in

advertising: Barbour's lengthy book does all these things in extensive detail.

Barbour demonstrates a commanding familiarity with every aspect of Selden's writings and career; he seems to have read, and thought seriously about, everything Selden wrote and said, and his book is especially useful for the copious overview it provides of Selden's even more copious texts. Barbour places each of Selden's writings within contexts both immediate and broad, and he helpfully relates Selden to an enormous range of other writers, including Bacon, Jonson, Milton, and many others, both English and Continental, both of the Renaissance and of ages past. He explains the debates in which Selden participated, the historical events in which he was caught up, the reactions (sometimes admiring, sometimes negative) of contemporary readers, and the varied assessments and interpretations offered by Selden scholars from the time of Selden's death down to the present day. He is especially at pains to refute the common view that Selden was a secularist; he shows instead that Selden took religion extremely seriously and indeed spent a lifetime meditating on how to construct or recover a healthy home for the spiritual impulse in a well-ordered society.

Barbour knows his Selden so well that he can constantly shuttle back and forth between one text and another, showing how the concerns that seem to predominate in one phase of Selden's life are linked to similar concerns in other phases. In general, though, his book exhibits a loosely chronological structure, so that a reader has a sense of how Selden's thinking developed in response to the specific issues he faced in particular moments of his career. And, just as Barbour knows his Selden well, so he also shows an easy grasp of the work of other modern scholars. He cites them generously, and his occasional debates with them are always civil. His book, indeed, seems written primarily for an audience of readers who are already fairly familiar with the terrain he covers; this is definitely not a book aimed at undergraduates (unless they happen to be unusually well informed!). Anyone seriously interested in Selden, however, will find it indispensable.

The book is well indexed (the index includes topics as well as names) and, in typical Toronto fashion, is very handsomely produced. It should appeal to anyone with a genuine interest in the intellectual and religious history of seventeenth-century England and should, after a century or more of relative neglect, help give the author of *Table Talk* a central place at the table once more.

Juliet Cummins, ed. *Milton and the Ends of Time*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. x + 254 pp. + 5 illus. \$55.00. Review by ELIZABETH SKERPAN-WHEELER, TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY.

In recent years, scholars of seventeenth-century England have revived interest in the idea that the Revolution of the Saints was exactly that: a movement fusing politics and the belief in the millennium, understood as the imminent, temporal reign of the saints with Christ. Orthodox Christianity traditionally followed St. Augustine in interpreting the millennium as the thousand-year “*spiritual* reign of Christ and his saints from the time of Christ’s resurrection until the rising of Antichrist” (2, emphasis added) mentioned in Revelation 20:4. In the early seventeenth century, however, the passage came to be taken literally. This vision, of course, had profound implications for political thought, expression, and action in the mid-century, in particular for the work of John Milton. “Milton and the Millennium” was the main theme of the Sixth International Milton Symposium, held in York in 1999. Expanded versions of several papers from that symposium, together with several others, are collected in *Milton and the Ends of Time*. Editor Juliet Cummins has assembled twelve essays, six addressing the millennium and six the related idea of apocalypse. Although the quality of the essays is uneven, nevertheless the anthology contains enough learned and stimulating contributions to make it important reading for any student of the period.

Two essays by senior scholars stand out among those in the section devoted to the millennium: Stella P. Revard’s “Milton and Millenarianism: From the Nativity Ode to *Paradise Regained*” and

John T. Shawcross's "Confusion: The Apocalypse, the Millennium." Revard traces the development of millenarian thought from the sixteenth century, when it followed Augustine's interpretation and connected the Second Coming with judgment of the papacy, to the seventeenth, when it took on political overtones as Revelation, together with the Book of Daniel, began to be understood as references to the future, rather than the past. She then turns her attention to Milton, contending that he never abandoned his millenarian beliefs, and showing how the war in heaven in *Paradise Lost* and numerous references to the "saints" kept millenarian hopes alive during the Restoration, when such ideas were linked with dissent.

Shawcross offers a complementary perspective in his spirited response to William B. Hunter's essay in the same volume. Hunter shocked the world of Milton scholars in the early 1990s by questioning the authorship of *De Doctrina Christiana*. Here, he continues his case against Miltonic authorship by showing that the work follows continental, rather than English, tradition in focusing on the apocalypse rather than the millennium, and arguing that Milton's beliefs were not strongly millenarian before or after the 1640s. Shawcross answers by distinguishing between apocalypse ("revelation") and millennium ("manifestation"), and contending that the millennium is merely "one element" (110) in a larger vision that includes the apocalypse. Further, *De Doctrina Christiana* is "not a polemical work" (111), but an effort to present a theological system, so absence of millenarian arguments does not resolve the authorship controversy.

The section on the millennium also offers essays by Barbara K. Lewalski and Sarah Hutton that examine Milton's early years, especially his probable association at Cambridge with Joseph Mede, the most prominent English interpreter of the apocalypse. Lewalski emphasizes Milton's differences with Mede, especially Milton's lack of apocalyptic exegesis, while Hutton believes that Milton was influenced by Mede's synchronic method of reading scripture and emphasis on prophetic language. Finally, Malabika Sarkar offers an engaging reading of the Satan of *Paradise Lost* as a "travesty"



(89) of a millennial hero by placing Milton's characterization within the context of contemporary astronomical interest in new stars (which appeared in 1572 and 1604) and the visitation of a comet in 1618.

The section on apocalypse is stronger than the one on millennium, containing three noteworthy essays: Catherine Gimelli Martin's "The Enclosed Garden and the Apocalypse: Immanent Versus Transcendent Time in Milton and Marvell," Claude N. Stulting, Jr.'s "New Heav'ns, New Earth': Apocalypse and the Loss of Sacramentality in the Postlapsarian Books of *Paradise Lost*," and Karen L. Edwards' "Inspiration and Melancholy in *Samson Agonistes*." Martin's perceptive juxtaposition of texts reveals that "the difference between Milton's monist conception of apocalyptic redemption and Marvell's dualist conception of time and eternity produces two very different Protestant visions of history, progress, ethics, and eschatology" (154). In a response to editor Cummins's chapter, which depicts continuity between this world and the next in *Paradise Lost*, Stulting examines the concept of *theosis* in the Greek patristic tradition. Finding no evidence of the possibility of "the redemption of the entire creation" (198), he provocatively pronounces Milton's theodicy unsuccessful. Edwards presents an anti-regenerationist reading of *Samson Agonistes* through her analysis of Samson as a melancholiac. Instead of medicalizing melancholy, as his contemporaries were doing, Milton returned to the traditional link between melancholy and prophecy. Ultimately, *Samson Agonistes* demonstrates the unpredictability of revelation.

Rounding out the section on apocalypse are Ken Simpson's essay, which offers a complement to Sarkar's argument in the first section by analyzing the Satan of *Paradise Regained* as a comet, and Beverley Sherry's presentation of John Martin's early nineteenth-century, mezzotint illustrations of *Paradise Lost* as imaginative interpretations of "Miltonic space" (124). Sherry's essay is accompanied by five reproductions that unfortunately do not capture the luminosity of the originals, although they do support the argument about the uniqueness of Martin's work. The collection concludes with an afterword by David Loewenstein in which he

offers the observation that the dual volume of 1671, containing both *Paradise Regained* and *Samson Agonistes*, provides a “double-edged response to the crisis of the Restoration” (247). *Paradise Regained* represents the millenarian perspective, while *Samson Agonistes* is apocalyptic; the two works are complementary rather than contradictory.

Cummins is correct when she argues in her introduction for the current relevance of this volume. She cites the “human concern with endings” as well as the continuing search for “structures of meaning” (7). Unmentioned is the rise of apocalyptic and millenarian political movements around the globe today. The contributors show how understanding visions of the ends of time enhances our appreciation of Milton and his times. The best essays also provide the historical and theological knowledge essential to comprehension of our own. For both purposes, the collection makes a persuasive case for the value of seventeenth-century scholarship.

Laura Lunger Knoppers and Joan B. Landes, eds. *Monstrous Bodies: Political Monstrosities in Early Modern Europe*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2004. xi + 304 pp. + 40 illus. \$59.95. Review by LAURA FEITZINGER BROWN, CONVERSE COLLEGE.

Laura Lunger Knoppers and Joan B. Landes have assembled a fascinating interdisciplinary anthology of essays about interactions between the concept of monstrosity and ideas of the body politic in early modern Europe. Using eight essays by well-regarded scholars, the book pairs essays according to related themes. Covering texts from Germany, Austria, Holland, France, Spain, and England, the book also contains the editors’ introduction, an afterword by Andrew Curran, nearly fifty pages of endnotes, short bios of contributors, and an index. The collection features a wide range of relevant illustrations, such as woodcuts of grossly deformed “monstrous births,” photographs of early modern preserved anatomical specimens, and politically charged prints from the French Revolution of guillotined heads and of cannibals. Essays vary in approach, with some focused on particular texts and others

offering a broader discussion of one angle on politics and monstrosity. Despite some problems discussed below, overall the collection is thought provoking, well researched, and creative, likely to inspire more fine interdisciplinary work.

After a helpful introduction that summarizes the articles and recent scholarship, the book opens with Part 1, "Monstrous Races, Boundaries, and Nationhood," the focus of paired essays by Peter Burke and David Cressy. Burke's essay, "Frontiers of the Monstrous: Perceiving National Characters in Early Modern Europe," examines the intersection of beliefs about "monstrous races" and stereotypes of national character. Burke gives examples of ways in which one European nation used the idea of the monstrous or the bestial to characterize other European nationalities. Cressy's compelling piece, "Lamentable, Strange, and Wonderful: Headless Monsters in the English Revolution," focuses on two English pamphlets from the 1640s, each an account of a woman bearing a headless child. Both pamphlets claim the mother rebelliously caused her child's deformity. Since one pamphlet blames the mother for resisting the Church of England, and the other condemns the mother for resisting the Puritans, Cressy concludes that both pamphlets fed the appetite for Civil War propaganda. He adds, "Both stories drew attention to the problem of controlling unruly women at a time when patriarchal discipline, like other forms of authority, seemed to be crumbling" (54). This excellent essay contains a clear argument and a powerful conclusion.

The second pair of essays develops the theme, "Apoc-alypticism, Bestiality, and Monstrous Polemics." R. Po-Chia Hsia's article, "A Time for Monsters: Monstrous Births, Propaganda, and the German Reformation," explores difficulties in interpreting the political and religious significance of monstrous births. He begins with a 1495 German broadsheet about stillborn twins joined at the head, a sign that the German author interpreted as meaning, "God wants to bestow/ Unity to our Empire" (69). Hsia then explores nuances of Lutheran versus Catholic discussion of monstrous births. He finds that "the advent of the monstrous discourse on the eve of the Reformation reflected a profound anxiety about redemption, a fear

fueled by the expectation of the end of time that resulted in the births of multiple bodies of Christendom" (71-2). Furthermore, Hsia argues that as the German Reformation reshaped the political and religious landscape, the monstrous ceased to effect social and religious change and in its place came "a new language of discipline and sin." Hsia's balanced essay contains especially interesting comments on Luther, whom Hsia represents as being careful *not* to assign theological meaning to strange births.

Knoppers's essay "The AntiChrist, the Babilon, the Great Dragon': Oliver Cromwell, Andrew Marvell, and the Apocalyptic Monstrous" shows how civil war polemic in England used monsters from Revelation alternately to praise or damn Cromwell. The engravings and written texts that Knoppers analyzes richly exemplify changing attitudes toward Cromwell, who appears in some texts as the archangel Michael, and in others as the Whore of Babylon. Knoppers's analysis of her visual and written texts is compelling and interesting, particularly as she reveals relevant details of the international diplomatic scene.

Part 3, "Medical Knowledge, Grotesque Anatomies, and the Body Politic," pairs Marie-Hélène Huet's "Monstrous Medicine" and Joan B. Landes's "Revolutionary Anatomies." Both articles discuss early modern French approaches to the monstrous. Huet explores French physicians and the debated roles these men played in interpreting the monstrous. Her essay also includes a helpful summary of the era's medical beliefs, as well as interesting material on serpents as symbols both of healing and of evil. Landes's intriguing, well-written essay focuses on French Revolutionary concepts of the anatomical body and the body politic. Analyzing photographs of Honoré Fragonard's fascinating anatomical specimens, which bridge the boundaries between art and science, she shows how developments in anatomy gave new emotional charge to political prints of severed heads and intensified portrayals of political opponents as monstrous cannibals.

In Part 4, "Displacing Monsters: Sign, Allegory, and Myth," the paired essays straddle the Channel. Timothy Hampton explores political uses of simile, metaphor, and allegory in sixteenth-

century French works. His article, "Signs of Monstrosity: The Rhetoric of Description and the Limits of Allegory in Rabelais and Montaigne," contains the clearest explanation of figurative language I have ever read. He illustrates the problem of describing monstrosity as he shows a pattern in sixteenth-century accounts of monstrous births: writers shift without warning from simile to metaphor, so that "the child 'becomes' the figure to which he is initially only compared" (180). Hampton sees this "slippage of language," first, as indicating monsters' powerful place in rhetoric, and second, as affecting complex battles over "interpretative and rhetorical authority," especially in Reformation and Counter-Reformation struggles in France. He proves both patterns with nuanced explications of three texts: Montaigne's essay "D'un enfant monstrueux," Calvin's 1550 *Des Scandales*, and an episode from Rabelais' *Quart livre* of *Pantagruel*.

The second essay, David Armitage's "Monstrosity and Myth in Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*," extends the early modern period into the early nineteenth century, paralleling Landes's forays into that era. After demonstrating the modernization of classical mythology, he shows how unusual Shelley's novel was in combining myth, the monstrous, and prose, especially when prose was thought too dull a medium in which to explore the edges of the real. He also explores the influence of her unusual combination on two other writers, John William Polidori and William Hazlitt.

Although extremely interesting and containing some excellent essays, the anthology has some problems. First, a few essays needed better revision, either to clarify focus or to smooth out logical problems. Burke's article, for example, while clearly structured, covers so much ground and so many countries in a few pages that I longed for a fuller treatment of fewer points. Huet's essay sometimes lacked important logical transitions. Second, holes and errors in the treatment of early modern religious thought were troubling. Some gaffes merely needle observant readers without impairing an essay's overall argument. For example, in otherwise excellent articles, Hampton calls Lent a Catholic "sacrament" instead of a liturgical season, and Knoppers, in analyzing an Andrew Marvell quotation,

completely misses Marvell's direct allusion to John 5:1-9, an important reference that would strengthen her analysis on this point (186, 114). Other holes in understanding religion, however, harm the argument or our confidence in the author's grasp of the material. For example, Huet makes an unsubstantiated claim about Luther's attitudes toward monstrous births that evidence in Hsia's article clearly contradicts (131, 78, 80). Her essay also suffers when she oversimplifies early modern beliefs about knowledge and sex in the Fall narrative, neglecting other early modern Europeans such as Milton who viewed sex and humble learning as created and experienced as *good* before the Fall.

The collection would improve if all authors had imitated the excellent balance in Hsia's essay, where he carefully admits the theological complexity of early modern interpretations of causes for the suffering that monstrous births bring. The introduction and several essays tend to stress that early moderns viewed monstrous births as a warning of God's judgment, often on the parents' sins, sometimes on society's sins (44-45, 49-51, 62-63, 131, 143). While this emphasis indeed occurs in the texts discussed, some essays should acknowledge that other early modern texts assert that not all who suffer, suffer because their sins were worse than others' sins. One thinks, for example, of the 1560 Geneva Bible glosses or introductions to the Book of Job, the story of the Tower of Siloam (Luke 13:1-5), and the account of the man born blind (John 9:3). Finally, the collection sometimes muddles early modern theologies by conflating dualism with early modern apocalyptic writing, while downplaying the powerful Protestant and Catholic beliefs in the eventual triumph of good over evil because evil is parasitic (derivative, not equal to the Creator) and because Christ's resurrection ensures victory over evil. Acknowledging and clearly articulating early modern theological complexity would allow the entire collection to live up to its editors' high goals of showing the tensions and ambiguities inherent in representing monstrous bodies in early modern Europe.

Despite these shortcomings, however, the collection is well worth having on college and university library shelves. It brings readers

a rich, elaborate tapestry of ideas, gathering together many fascinating strands of solid research on early modern political uses of monsters, the grotesque, and monstrous births.

James Grantham Turner. *Schooling Sex: Libertine Literature and Erotic Education in Italy, France, and England 1534-1685*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003. xxviii + 408 pp. \$80.00. Review by TOM LUXON, DARTMOUTH UNIVERSITY.

“Why is the cunt masculine and the prick feminine?” roughly translates a Johannes Secundus epigram on the gendering of genitalia and language that serves as the primary epigraph to this, the third volume in James Grantham Turner’s decades-long effort to write the literary and intellectual history of carnal knowledge. The first volume was *One Flesh: Paradisal Marriage and Sexual Relations in the Age of Milton* (Oxford, 1987, 1993) and the second *Libertines and Radicals in Early Modern London: Sexuality, Politics and Literary Culture, 1630-1685* (Cambridge, 2001). This epigram, or translations and interpretations of it, gets repeated at frequent intervals throughout this long and learned book (6-7, 55, 116-17, 153, 172, 175 fig. 9, 186, 190, 257, 272-73, 291, 296, 307, 311-12 fig.15, 323-25). From epigraph to conclusion, this wee paradox serves as a major motive in a dazzlingly elaborate survey of the early modern “hard-core” canon, ranging from Pietro Aretino and the Florentine courtesan Tullia d’Aragona to the English libertine poet John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester and genteel porn consumer, Samuel Pepys. Erotic philosophers and libertine pornographers persistently cast sexuality, seriously and sarcastically, as an academic discipline, a schooling of the body and the mind, or, defying simplistic versions of Platonic dualism, a schooling of the mind through the body, a sensually-grounded education not entirely unrelated to Comenian theories of education.

The titles alone of the works Turner treats illustrate this point: Ferrante Pallavicino’s *Retorica delle puttane*, Antonio Rocco’s *Alcibiade fanciullo a scola*, *L’Escole des filles* ou *La philosophie des dames*, Aretino’s *Library*, *The Whore’s Rhetorick*, and *L’Academie des dames*. Part One

of *Schooling Sex* performs a thorough investigation of the erotic education trope in hard-core libertarian literature. All the anxieties and fascinations (mostly male) surrounding the erotics (homonormative and heteronormative) of education, women's education, the constructedness and maintenance of masculinity, the place of the senses in learning, the performance of pleasure, its deceptions, and threats find articulation, willing or unwilling, in the various versions of the schooling sex trope.

Part Two of *Schooling Sex* turns attention to the reception—translation, adaptation, reading, and responses—of the hard-core libertine canon, mostly in England. Pepys claims that he bought and read the “mighty lewd book,” *L'Escole des filles*, in order “to inform himself” of matters he regarded as disgraceful and shameful; nevertheless he also confesses that his “prick” was made to “stand all the while” he read and even “una vez to decharger” (2). Turner returns throughout the book to this particularly graphic image of the coincidence of erotics and education. Reading Wycherly's *The Country Wife* as a deliberate response to and even adaptation of *L'Escole des filles* makes perfect sense, foregrounding what Turner calls the “phallic epistemology” that runs throughout the play, as well as its debt to the hard-core canon in Italian and French. Likewise, Turner situates the libertine verses of Rochester and John Oldham squarely in this tradition where they no longer are made to appear quite so special, weird and exceptional.

I have said that the book is dazzling in its learning and its range. I say this with admiration, but it is also worth repeating as a warning. Most of Turner's readers will not have read most of the French and Italian titles he treats. And this will be true of the more obscure, anonymous and pseudonymous English translations and versions. When he treats texts more widely familiar, Turner's analyses often betray stubborn errors. For example, Turner confidently repeats the claim from his earlier *One Flesh* that Milton imagines Adam and Eve with “a full sexual life in Eden” (14) even though such a reading has been seriously challenged more than once (myself in *Milton Studies* 40 and Kent Lenhof in *Milton Quarterly* 34.3). Turner takes no notice of these challenges



and continues to insist, without argument, that Milton's panegyric to wedded love in book four of *Paradise Lost* is "uttered over the copulating bodies of Adam and Eve in Eden and [is] thus unmistakably sexual" (49). Elsewhere he implies that Milton would have equated the "best substance" (from *Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce* 1.10) of a man's body, his sperm, with "the precious life-blood of a master spirit" (from *Areopagitica*) as if Milton's monism regarded the "soul as mortal and the sperm as 'the best substance' of body and soul combined" (102). Milton, I am convinced, would have been appalled at such an equation, and I suspect Turner thinks so too, and that's why he quotes these phrases without Milton's careful hedge: "as some think." Turner also imagines a Milton who "wistfully admired the male libertines" who practiced frequent sex before marriage and so made more successful first marriages than sober modest gentlemen (*DDD* 1.3). Turner knows that Milton was busy arguing that modest men like him deserved another chance after a bad match, not wistfully admiring those "who have liv'd most loosely by reason of their bold accustoming" indulging "their wild affections unsettling at will." If he takes such obvious hermeneutic liberties with texts we know well, perhaps he's just as free with those we do not. Such caution may apply even more to Turner's readings of *The School of Venus*, an English translation of *L'Escole des filles* that appears to have made quite a stir in the 1680s, but not a single copy of which survives (226).

Sometimes Turner indulges in the less than scholarly pleasure of allowing his own language to slide off into pornographic puns: "In Aloisia Sigee's letter from the Elysian Fields, written later as the preface for a six-dialogue version, the identical language of salt and charm appears in the mouth of the pseudo-author herself, applied not merely to the coming attraction but to the entire work" (180). However amusing to some (including me, I confess), such liberties encourage one's suspicion that Turner sometimes simply reads what he wants to see.

That said, this is easily the fullest and best treatment of the subject to date. *Schooling Sex* makes generic and historical sense out of one of the most under-studied intellectual currents and many

of the most misunderstood artifacts of early modern culture. The book successfully initiates a new sub-discipline in the field and it does so with a scholarly breadth unlikely to be equaled soon. We'll be arguing, fruitfully I am sure, with this book for a long time.

Ina Habermann. *Staging Slander and Gender in Early Modern England*. Hants: Ashgate, 2003. 202 pp. \$79.95. Review by NANCY M. BUNKER, MACON STATE COLLEGE.

Breaking new ground in the critical debate regarding slander and defamation, Ina Habermann's *Staging Slander and Gender in Early Modern England* addresses the signifying structures in which slander is embedded. She explores linguistic and rhetorical systems, social and legal practices, literary and creative conventions, as well as religious and physical/sexual/gendered intricacies while never losing sight of the aesthetics of slander (13). Habermann's chapters masterfully situate juridical texts alongside literary material and show slander's existence as a symbolic practice, a practice which in turn contributes to a historical and cultural phenomenon.

Her study traces slander's trajectory from "negative fashioning of others" (1), spoken with "malicious intent," to the "assumed or recognized" defamation that eventually "becomes a public event" (2) and lodges itself within community relations. Habermann's "slander triangle" of accuser, victim, and audience (2) creates a "theatricality" for connecting "othering with constructions of selfhood" (3). She argues that drama, a privileged site for examining slander, performs as equity in society, a force that mitigates between the general legal applications regarding human action and the particular individual discretions necessary in certain situations (5). Regardless of equity's fairness and "common denominator" properties, "dramatic bad faith" encroaches because of "language and its susceptibility to slander" (7). Habermann's "slandered heroine" (135) labors within blatant and negatively gendered discourse; however, she notes the emergence of a new type of tragic or tragicomic heroine.

In an impressive listing of early-modern treatises on slander and the law, Habermann clearly identifies embedded signifying structures within legal history. *The Orator*, a collection of exemplary legal cases that interrogate persuasive power, is examined in light of Thomas Wilson and George Puttenham's concerns regarding eloquence. "The Law of Slander," her most important addition to the legal discussion, explicates the *mitior-sensus* rule, with its requirement that no legal action should be taken if the potentially "slanderous words could be construed in a milder sense" (45). Such interpretations modified the veracity of legal judgments for centuries. Her arguments for humanist influences on the law include *The Reports of Sir John Spelman*, Rastell's dictionary, and St. Germain and John Cowell's pioneering law books. The commentary on the role of equity or fair judgment associated with Court of Chancery illuminates the core of early modern common law, and Habermann makes clear the exclusively male legal authority that "determined meaning and consequences of verbal actions" (43) as well as the "authority to judge and define slander" (58).

An important feature of Habermann's discussion about women's position in the discourse of slander is her critique of accepted texts that were acclaimed to treat slander in general terms. *The Lawes Resolutions of Women's Rights* (1632) with its education ideal and the "first legal text to treat slander at some length and to advertise in title" (59-60) and John March's *Actions for Slander* (1647) reveal misleading premises, overt political agendas, and a narrow audience base. Treatises on detraction, such as works by Richard Brathwait and Charles Gibbon, were not general but instigated by particular grievances and crystallized the discourse of slander into an evil displaced onto women; her female tongue acts as the unruly member responsible for transgressive speech (116). Habermann notes that William Vaughan, the only author who does not conspicuously displace anxiety about slander onto femininity, nonetheless infuses his personal motive to maintain his wife's reputation.

Making well-argued connections between the legal and social attention to slander and its literary representations, Habermann characterizes Shakespeare's *Much Ado About Nothing* as a "paradigmatic representation of the discourse of slander as treated in this book; the play's "rumour, gossip, hearsay, intrigue, and slander" (9) infuse negative fashioning for Beatrice and Benedick, while implicating their community. Arguing for *Romeo and Juliet*, a play not directly concerned with slander but which identifies the susceptibility of language to slander due to its metaphorical nature, Habermann deftly illustrates the "fractured and yet not quite arbitrary relationship within words which ultimately make slander possible" (13). *Othello* serves as a model for investigating both slanderer and listener. Eloquence and persuasion possess the power to do harm, that is, to injure others with verbal signs, and *Othello* illustrates the potency of such persuasion, a species of deviant speech originating in medieval religious discourse on the "sins of the tongue," within the slander triangle.

Gendered literary remedies for sexual slander can be found in Habermann's explication of John Webster's *The Devil's Law Case* and *A Cure for a Cuckold*, as *Devil* suggests a system "structurally unable to alleviate anxieties such as those caused by feminine sexuality" (70), and *Cure* recalls *mitior sensus* with an eye toward community standards. Shakespeare's *Merry Wives of Windsor* portrays women as responsible brokers of oral reputation who refuse slander among themselves because they know females are its "most conspicuous victims." Instead they act together, preserve their sexual honor, and circumvent negative eloquence while also recognizing their "precarious and contradictory position within the social fabric" (76).

Habermann addresses an early modern femininity constructed between praise and slander. She uses literary examples from Giovanni Battista Guarini's pastoral comedy *Il Pastor Fido* which stages the oscillations between praise and slander, and Ben Jonson's *The Devil is an Ass*, which develops a fantasy of positive femininity through praise of chastity and silence. These male-authored fantasy portraits contrast with Mary Wroth's *Love's Victory*, a pas-

toral tragic-comedy that does not conform to construction of femininity between praise and slander but reconfigures the genre in search of a more comprehensive or equitable negotiation of gender relations (77). However, Habermann notes Wroth's "profound skepticism" for "active self-fashioning and a social agency that escapes slander" (98).

Literary treatment of the poisoned tongue, as in *Lingua, or the Combat of the Tongue and the five senses for Superiority*, illustrates the anxiety and ambiguity regarding language; the manipulative power of rhetoric becomes displaced onto women and their tongues. Habermann skillfully includes Mary Sidney's translation of the *Psalms*, an unprecedented declaration of the female's religious and aesthetic right to use her tongue with authority, as legitimization of her speech. *Othello* resurfaces in Habermann's examination of the slandered heroine Desdemona, "the virtuous woman wrongly accused of incontinence" who is both the victim of slander and a "fantasy of femininity" (135). Desdemona's place in the slander triangle and her idealistic portrait guarantee her demise. In contrast, Elizabeth Cary's *The Tragedy of Mariam* vindicates an assertive heroine who prefers "human dignity over wifely submission," but her "*hamartia*, resignifies the position of victim, drawing on discourse of slander for strongly political vision of female agency" (135).

*Staging Slander and Gender in Early Modern England* situates law and theatre jointly on a common humanistic stage, one which illustrates "profound gendering" (2) in the legal and secular discourses and contributes to constructions of femininity. Useful for scholars of law, gender studies, and Renaissance literature, this text promises to be seminal in the study of early modern legal applications.

Michael Bryson. *The Tyranny of Heaven: Milton's Rejection of God as King*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2004. 208 pp. \$43.50. Review by SUSANNAH B. MINTZ, SKIDMORE COLLEGE.

Michael Bryson's *The Tyranny of Heaven* is a smart and lively provocation of established readings of the God of *Paradise Lost*. The book begins with two important distinctions. First, Bryson insists that the poetical deity not be conflated with Milton's own God; too many readers, he suggests, have mistakenly addressed the epic's Father as an "absolute representation" (24) of the God of heaven, thereby turning "Milton *studies* . . . into Milton *ministries*" (23; italics in original). Second, the Father is to be understood not as a textual manifestation of God in some essential sense, but rather as the depiction of a certain *image* of God—an authoritarian and violent monarch—that prevailed in seventeenth-century England, and that obstructed, Milton believed, his nation's ability to free themselves from tyrannical rule. Bryson's insistence that the Father is a poetic character, and not the God of heaven, allows him to disentangle the Father and the Son as separate entities and thus to make his book's central claim: that it is the Son who embodies Milton's most cherished ideal of non-hierarchical, private, and rational connection with the divine.

Though he is not, of course, the first to broach head-on the contentious issue of how to square an obviously monarchical God with Milton the regicide, Bryson does deliver here a refreshingly risky discussion of a figure he calls deliberately "off-putting," *Paradise Lost's* "manipulative, defensive, alternately rhetorically incoherent and evasive" Father (24–25). His assertion is that Milton "creates a Father who is profoundly disturbing" on purpose, in order to illustrate "what can and will go wrong with deity imagined in absolutist and monarchical terms" (115). This argument hinges on the idea that Milton rejects *all* forms of monarchy: not just earthly tyrants who debased a heavenly ideal, but the very notion of a pure and paradigmatic kingly reign in heaven. In this, Bryson writes against the many scholars who have attempted to defend the epic's God as both equivalent to Milton's personal God

and prototypically 'royalist.' Bryson's convincing and detailed dismantling of the Father as the "proper moral center of *Paradise Lost*" (114) suggests, quite to the contrary, that the Father is precisely the sort of ruler that English Protestant revolutionaries had fought to overthrow, a "top-down leader inclined to dictatorial pronouncements, war, and destruction" (83).

According to Bryson, the question that propels Book 3 of *Paradise Lost, Paradise Regained*, and much of Milton's later prose, is how to know God "aright." To dramatize the urgency of the matter and the potentially disastrous results of answering that question wrongly, Milton stages a tripartite debate between the Father, the Son, and Satan as representations of conflicting expressions of deity and connection to the divine. In the middle three chapters of his study, Bryson works through a careful demonstration of how fundamentally similar the Father is to Satan—two versions, he proposes, of the same problematic image: "the idea of God as a king" (62). Against these paired tyrants, both of whom deploy fear and force in their campaigns to compel obedience, the Son stands as Milton's exemplar of properly conceived faith, not a power-wielding king but an "inward oracle." The persuasiveness of this reading depends not only on aligning the Father and Satan as militaristic leaders immersed in patterns of dominance and hatred, but more significantly, on disentangling the Father and Son as "different and separate entities" (66), a point Bryson acknowledges may make some Milton scholars balk. In defense of this position, Bryson relies primarily on the resonance between Book 3's Son and Abraham. Like Abraham challenging "the often irascible Yahweh" (67), he argues, the Son "speak[s] back to power *in his own voice*" (70). Deny him "an active and crucial agency," Bryson goes on, and we render the Son "a figure merely ridiculous and sycophantic."

The emphatic assertion of Bryson's book—that Milton refuses not simply local and historical kings but the very principle of kingship altogether—is also potentially its sticking point. The fact that Milton beheld earthly kings as a punishment imposed on humanity after the Fall does not inevitably correlate with a belief that heavenly monarchy is equally "deplorable" (44), since one can al-

ways contend (as indeed many previous scholars have) that human habits simply fall short of the prime example. Bryson's strategy is repeatedly to stress the incoherence created by *Paradise Lost's* presentation of God in terms of the exact political structures Milton abhorred—rank, hierarchy, spectacle, autocratic rule—and to argue that faith in a fear-mongering, untruthful, unrepentant God obstructs the ability to re-envision the operations of government, and thus to challenge oppression. Bryson proposes that Milton distinguished his “fit” audience from a population wearily acquiescent, even in their notions of God, to “the yoke of kingship” (111), and that he hoped the fit few would recognize in the Son of *Paradise Regained* a “lamp to guide their footsteps” (74): a model of truth defined as reasoned, internal, and private.

It is similarly risky to make the case that “kingly” (the word Milton uses to describe God's state in Sonnet 19) can be understood to mean “nobility, dignity, passion governed by wisdom, justice tempered by mercy, confidence without arrogance, intellectual weight, empathy, and patience” (73)—not because these qualities don't rightly pertain to God as Milton imagined him, but because the possibility of a “kingly' *character*” threatens to throw into some doubt the strenuous eschewal of all things kingly that Bryson is claiming for Milton. If the word remains a viable descriptor, would it not be possible to argue for some version of a heavenly monarchy, one that is of a higher order than corrupt, human kingship? Bryson's approach here is to insist on “kingly” as a spiritual rather than political designation, a mark of “noble and virtuous character” and not power (75). His more potent offense, however, is simply the book's overarching thesis: that at no point does Milton actually present “God” as *both* monarchical and noble. It is finally the private, quietly obedient, inwardly divine Son of *Paradise Regained* who is “yet more kingly.”

Though occasionally repetitive (reading at times like an extended essay), the book's methodical quality is also one of its most successful tactics, in that Bryson anticipates and steadily addresses potential objections to his claims. He has an impressive command not simply of contemporary Milton studies but also the necessary



biblical, historical, and theological references that buttress his position. Bryson's style is appealingly witty and accessible; this book would work well in both graduate and advanced undergraduate courses. In the manner of such fellow *provocateurs* of established readings as William Empson, Joseph Wittreich, John Rumrich, and John Rogers, Bryson offers in *The Tyranny of Heaven* a learned, stimulating, and welcome intervention into one of the most controversial arenas of Milton scholarship.

Jacqueline Broad. *Women Philosophers of the Seventeenth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. x + 191 pp. \$55.00. Review by JAMES FITZMAURICE, NORTHERN ARIZONA UNIVERSITY.

Seventeenth-century women's writing on philosophy, once a scholarly backwater, has become a mainstream of research in the last seven or eight years. Books written or edited by Sarah Hutton, Stephen Clucas, Eileen O'Neill, Susan James, and Sylvia Bowerbank have appeared, together with a good many journal articles. A new sense is emerging that women philosophers had a great deal to say, especially about political and natural philosophy. Religion, if not foregrounded, is almost always a backdrop, in particular as regards anxieties about what notions might contribute to or be consistent with atheism. Jacqueline Broad's study helps to situate several of these early women mostly by defining their thinking in relationship to that of Descartes and in particular with respect to his advocacy of soul/body dualism. She also states, and this observation is crucial, that Descartes opened the way for women to enter philosophical dialogue because his method did not require a contributor to have a classical education. Chapters are devoted to treatments of Elisabeth of Bohemia, Margaret Cavendish, Anne Conway, Mary Astell, Damaris Cudworth Masham, and Catherine Trotter Cockburn.

While many who study the history of philosophy look to published, systematic works, Broad often examines letters, which tend to deal with philosophical problems piecemeal. For instance,

Elisabeth of Bohemia, the Winter Queen, corresponded with René Descartes who, Broad tells us, described Elisabeth in a preface as “the only person I have so far found who has completely understood all of my previously published works” (13). There is plenty of evidence of Descartes’ respect for the views of Elisabeth in the letters, so Broad might have omitted the flattering quotation from the preface. Indeed, praise for royalty found in prefaces is so common as to be almost meaningless. Elisabeth, Broad goes on to say, had one major criticism of Descartes’ soul/body dualism. If soul and body are of completely different substances, then how does the soul induce the body to move? Substances completely alien to one another presumably cannot interact. Elisabeth also felt, according to Broad and *contra* Descartes, that “the body cannot be ignored when one is discussing the conduct of human beings, if only for completely pragmatic reasons of a social nature” (32). Simple suppression of emotion does not work, and, as Broad asserts, “Descartes’ neo-Stoicism seems particularly unpalatable for women thinkers” generally (33).

Broad is quite bold in pairing Margaret Cavendish and Anne Conway, two woman philosophers whose reputations have been regarded very differently. Cavendish for many years was generally seen as a slightly daft writer on natural philosophy, while Conway was taken to have been a serious correspondent with the highly respected Cambridge Platonist Henry More. Broad, however, is so daring as to suggest that Cavendish and Conway have more in common than Conway and More and treats the two women as something like intellectual equals, mainly noting as a difference that Cavendish was a materialist and Conway a spiritualist (78). As a materialist, nevertheless, Cavendish is like Conway in “ascribing life, perception, and a principle of self-movement to material things.” The materialism of the one and the spiritualism of the other have striking similarities. Further “both overcome the soul-body problem by making soul and body of the same substance” (71). Another difference, though lesser in importance, between the two women’s thinking, according to Broad, is that Cavendish felt

that faith was beyond reason while Conway found faith and reason to be compatible (88).

Much of Mary Astell's philosophical writing can be found in letters to John Norris, who was an occasionalist and who has been taken to be a Cambridge Platonist. As an occasionalist, Norris believed that God alone was the causal agent of all sensations and that when one tastes a "delicate fruit" the fruit itself is only the occasion for God's gift of a delightful gustatory sensation (100). If one accepts the occasionalism of Norris, Astell asserts, then one must agree that "God's workmanship [is] vain and useless" (104), which she refuses to do. God's workmanship and God generally, she says, are, to the contrary, characterized by "infinite wisdom." Broad, in her descriptions of the differences between Astell and Norris, denies that Norris ought to be labeled a Cambridge Platonist, and finds him rather to have been a Cartesian. Astell is, of course, best known for her advocacy of the founding of a female academy, which enterprise Broad feels is supported by Descartes' notion that "anybody can attain knowledge" (112). That is to say, women are not inferior to men intellectually and hence should not be excluded from learning. This position had an unexpected or unintended benefit for Astell, given that, when her proposal was ignored, Astell was able to call for "a course of study that women can pursue at home" (112).

Broad connects Astell's thinking to that of Damaris Cudworth Masham and plays down the connection that has been made between Masham and Ralph Cudworth (father to Masham), as well as the association between Masham and John Locke. Broad does, however, agree that Masham conducted an important correspondence with Locke. More importantly, Masham, like Astell, rejects occasionalism, though Masham does so by way of the "common-sense philosophy" of Edward Stillingfleet (119). Where Masham and Astell part company is in their understanding of how people love creatures on the one hand and God on the other. For Astell, people may love creatures with benevolence but only God with desire. Masham believes that "The only difference between our

love of creatures and the love of God is that we ought to love God above all things" (121).

The last of the women philosophers in the book, Catherine Trotter Cockburn, is perhaps better known as a playwright than as a writer on philosophy. Most of Cockburn's writing on philosophy came in the early years of the eighteenth century, but Broad justifies Cockburn's inclusion in the book because "in style and content she might be considered the last of the seventeenth-century women philosophers," for Cockburn opposes "Cartesian dualism and the Cartesian theory of substance" (141, 142). Like Damaris Masham, Cockburn felt that human beings should act as "members of the same body" (149). Hence women, and especially wives and mothers, should be educated for the sake of society.

All in all, *Women Philosophers of the Seventeenth Century* is pleasant to read, because it is lucidly written, and highly informative.

Jennifer L. Morgan. *Laboring Women: Reproduction and Gender in New World Slavery*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004. xi + 279 pp. + 16 illus. \$55.00. Review by ELISA OH, BOSTON UNIVERSITY.

In *Laboring Women: Reproduction and Gender in New World Slavery*, Jennifer L. Morgan explores how early modern English travelers and slaveowners constructed a gendered ideology of inheritable, racialized slavery that underpinned slave-owning societies in the Americas. Morgan argues that this system of beliefs about race was based on crucial definitions of the African woman's body and its potential to perform both agricultural labor and reproductive labor. Her overarching goal is to draw necessary attention to the presence of enslaved women in the archival record of early colonial life, particularly in Barbados and Carolina. Morgan goes on to assert that the English colonial understanding of race in the New World was fundamentally rooted in the gendered issue of reproduction. Her wide range of source material from the early sixteenth to mid-eighteenth centuries includes travel narratives, probate records, wills, inventories, letters, runaway advertisements,

court cases, and traders' records of transportation and sale. In this book she traces the development of distorting and contradictory, but powerful English constructions of African femininity and the way that these ideologies came to justify and naturalize the commodification of non-white peoples. From the opposite perspective, she also attempts to reconstruct African women's experience of colonial slavery as it was shaped by their reproductive realities in a society that exploited them.

Morgan begins her chronological study of the evolving English ideologies of race in the travel narratives and images of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. She shows how European explorers encoded assumptions about "civility, nationhood, citizenship, and manliness"(13) in physical appearance during their early encounters with other races. Rather than focus on one travel writer, Morgan excerpts depictions of the indigenous African or Native American female body from writers such as Columbus, Vespucci, Raleigh, Hakluyt, Ligon, and others to show the development of European ideas about reproduction and race. Ideological contradictions accumulate in these attempts to understand racial difference through women's bodies. The female African body was described as "both desirable and repulsive, available and untouchable, productive and reproductive, beautiful and black"(16). Furthermore, its reproductive aspects were used to establish a basic racial differentiation between white and black: descriptions and images of indigenous women with pendulous breasts mark them as monstrous savages and represent them performing reproductive labor by breastfeeding over the shoulder. Similarly, many travel narratives claim that African women experienced no pain during childbirth and that it barely interrupted their labor in the fields. This apparently mechanical ease in childbearing distinguished them from Christian European women, who, as daughters of Eve, experienced pain and lengthy recoveries. Morgan also draws attention to terminology used by European writers to construct Africans as less than fully human. For example, "[t]he metaphor of domesticated livestock introduced a notion that became a recurrent theme concerning indigenous and enslaved women's twofold

value to the European project of expansion and extraction”(19). Defining the African woman’s body as sexualized, beast-like, and fertile served to demarcate boundaries of racial difference and to “naturaliz[e] the subjugation of Africans and their descendants in the Americas”(49).

According to Morgan, this ideology of inherited slavery based on a racial hierarchy culminated in its codification in law during the 1630s and 1640s. For instance, legislation in both the West Indies and Virginia defined the difference between white women’s temporary, *nontaxable* indentured labor and black women’s perpetual, *taxable* enslaved labor. “The 1662 Virginia act that defined all children born of the bodies of black women as slaves, even if the fathers were free and white, simply cemented things further”(71). Chapters 3 and 4 examine the assumptions white slaveowners made about reproduction when they wrote inventories and distributed their property in wills. Morgan finds that from the very earliest examples of colonial slaveholding, owners exploited African women’s reproductive capacities and speculated on the economic gain that was made possible through their future “increase.” White slaveowners selectively acknowledged and violated familial relationships among the enslaved: on one hand they commonly maintained balanced sex ratios on each plantation in order to foster reproductive partnering; on the other hand, the slaveholders disregarded these emotional and physical relationships when it was convenient or profitable. In general, an enslaved woman was sold or gifted with her children along with any future “increase” she might produce, tacitly disregarding paternity. “Despite being occasionally listed alongside adult men, enslaved women’s familial identity, when acknowledged, was almost universally linked to their children”(110). For the profit and enrichment of their descendants’ properties, slaveowners also routinely bequeathed an enslaved man and woman together, regardless of their emotional connection to each other, as a “seed” couple to produce new generations of workers and wealth (84–7). Thus she refutes the argument that early plantation life, with its small-scale ownership and

close living and working environments, bred a kind of egalitarianism between owner and slave.

In addition to assessing the white ideologies of race, Morgan also aims to recreate the experience of slavery, focusing on the women's perspective and the way their lives were shaped by their reproductive realities. Unfortunately, the archival clues that survive were created by white slavetraders and owners, and Morgan attempts to translate their perspectives and demographic records into a description of lived experience. In Chapter 2, she reconstructs the women's social roles, work, and rituals in the West African societies of their origin. Traders' records provide statistics of numbers bought and captured, sex ratios, and, to some extent, the locations and ethnic groups from which the women came. Though English buyers constantly requested men, women and children together outnumbered the men transported throughout the entire period (59). Furthermore, Morgan gathers data on buying, selling, and gifting patterns established over time by the slaveowners in the New World. Facts such as slaveowners' ability to gift an enslaved woman to one person and all her future offspring to another demonstrate how the white ideologies of race and reproduction concretely affected an enslaved woman's life. In Chapter 4, Morgan describes the birth of enslaved children in the Americas as the literal embodiment, both physical and cultural, of creolization. Through mechanisms such as permission to visit, slaveowners exploited these familial bonds as "tools of control"(142). Morgan also devotes a chapter to the ubiquitous, heavy fieldwork that always accompanied enslaved women's reproductive labor. These enslaved women never attained the mobility and degree of freedom from fieldwork that men could through skilled labor, and only a tiny percentage of the women worked as house servants, whereas the majority did the agricultural labor that was thought unfit for white women. The final chapter considers the strong ties of a community network, both in rural and urban areas, and "explores enslaved women's urge to contest enslavement both inside and outside their identities as mothers"(167). Mid-eighteenth century

documents provide examples of mothers running away with their children, and participating in and revealing revolt conspiracies.

Morgan's dependence on demographic evidence throughout this study foregrounds the problem of what can be known and recreated about the enslaved women's experience through the data left by the white slaveowners. While the modern historian has little access to the perspective of non-literate enslaved people in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, Morgan still walks a fine line between legitimate and excessive extrapolation from data to subjective experience. Though she claims that motherhood is a culturally individualized experience, Morgan risks essentializing childbearing potential as *the* defining aspect of enslaved women's experience to the exclusion of other factors such as the size and location of the plantation, the crop cultivated, or how many generations separated individuals from their origins in Africa. Finally, there is the problem of representing the agency of an enslaved person, especially in terms of choosing to pursue or avoid pregnancy, which undoubtedly was imposed on enslaved women in many cases. Morgan, however, avoids the issue of paternity almost as assiduously as the slaveowners' wills did, and though she mentions women's "vulnerability" to both black and white men, her prose tends to credit the women with the ability to make reproductive choices. Undoubtedly, the realities of rape and the lack of reliable birth control also shaped the experience of reproduction for enslaved women. Nevertheless, Morgan's book will be of use to those who study the slave trade in the Americas from its beginning to the mid-eighteenth century and to those who are interested in tracing the evolution of gendered ideologies of race from sixteenth century travel writings through its reification and practice in New World slavery.

Robert Tarule. *The Artisan of Ipswich: Craftsmanship and Community in Colonial New England*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004. xi + 155 pp. \$42.00. Review by WILLIAM J. SCHEICK, UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN.



Robert Tarule has written a fascinating book that initiates the reader into the secrets of seventeenth-century colonial American woodworkers. Included are carpenters, coopers (barrel-makers), wheelwrights, turners (lathe-workers), and joiners (furniture-makers). In many ways, the skills of these artisans represented a medieval rather than an early modern world. It was a time when settlements passed law after law in an ongoing desperate effort to protect their trees, which were particularly vulnerable to the colonists' need for firewood during New England's long winters. Approached in an agricultural manner, wild arbors were "managed" through selective harvesting and reforestation practices. Trees, especially oaks, were considered so valuable that tradesmen had to petition their community for grants to fell them or else face censure and fines. Prepared pieces of white oak, moreover, were sometimes used as currency, paralleling the occasional function of tobacco as currency in the southern colonies.

Tarule, who fashions replicas of seventeenth-century furniture, focuses primarily on Thomas Dennis, an English joiner who immigrated to Ipswich in 1663. By the time of his death in 1706, his particular joining skills were passé, supplanted by more fashionable sawn-board cabinet work. Nevertheless, in his day Dennis was highly regarded as an artisan, and today his carved furniture is collected by connoisseurs. In 1670, it is interesting to note, he was convicted of and fined for felling more trees than his community grant permitted.

Much of what Tarule reveals is imagined through Dennis's eyes, as in this well-wrought description of an early morning in his shop, located in the center of Ipswich village:

Dennis could hear cow bells here and there and the sounds of chickens and pigs. Up the river to the west a few hundred yards away the gristmill had begun its work, the slapping of the stones muffled but distinct. Down the river from the mill, the cooper Wilson was driving hoops onto a barrel, which echoed like a drum. A little farther beyond, the quick regular blows of a heavy hammer on an

anvil came from John Safford's blacksmith shop, followed by a short pause as the smith waited for the iron to reheat in the charcoal fire. (89)

It is particularly an oak chest fashioned by Dennis in the late 1600s that interests Tarule, who reads this artifact closely (as if it were a text) in the course of retracing every step the joiner took while creating it.

*The Artisan of Ipswich* is replete with illuminating details, including how joiners identified the right kind of trees for their various products. White oak, the reader also learns, splits easily in half, yielding two pieces with little to plane. Only pieces cleft on a tree's radius do not become deformed when they dry. Another little-known fact: protecting a field from domestic animals was the responsibility of the field's owner rather than the animals' owner.

A book so full of facts is liable to err here and there. Tarule is mistaken when he mentions that each tree ring represents a year of growth. Trees, especially when rainfall is plentiful on both sides of an extended period of drought, can produce more than one annual growth ring. Likewise Tarule's economic explanation for the decline in English immigrants to the American colonies in 1643 is not quite on the mark. The majority of New England settlers were non-conformist émigrés fleeing persecution in their homeland. When non-conformists were perceived as likely to prevail during the Civil War in England, the previous rationale for leaving their homeland significantly diminished. In fact, a reverse migration occurred, causing economic discomfort in New England. Such non-essential slips, however, hardly detract from Tarule's informative and well-told story.

David Como. *Blown by the Spirit: Puritanism and the Emergence of an Antinomian Underground in Pre-Civil War England*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004. xiii + 513 pp. \$65.00.

Theodore Dwight Bozeman. *The Precisianist Strain: Disciplinary Religion and Antinomian Backlash in Puritanism to 1638*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004. xv + 349 pp. \$49.95. Review by WILLIAM J. SCHEICK, UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN.

The antinomian crisis in New England between 1636 and 1638 is too often scrutinized *in vacuo*, as if it had emerged *ex nihilo*. Sometimes the cause of the crisis is attributed to John Cotton's doctrinal ambiguities and his possible duplicity during a time when colonial Puritanism was essentially a yeasty mix of competing discourses. Sometimes the cause is attributed, far less probably, to the proto-feminist disposition of Anne Hutchinson, considered by some to be a cultural heroine martyred by powerful elite male persecutors. Oddly, not enough has been made of the connection between antinomianism and the Reformation roots of Calvinism, so insistent on the complete powerlessness of the human will in its unmediated, free-grace, *sola fides* relationship with its creator.

The Reformation uprooting of the Roman Catholic understanding of visible signs, especially of sanctified and sanctifying action, proved utterly radical. The insistence upon justification by faith alone effectively disqualified external signifiers, including works, as an aid, a measure or a comfort concerning an individual's spiritual status. As a result, it is indeed hard to fathom just what, at the very core of Calvinism, could be the *real* function of such a human contrivance as church government. To be sure, pastors serve in a certain educated ambassadorial capacity following the example of Jesus's apostles; and Reformed theology elevates the function of their spoken word in the inauguration of the conversion process. Yet, given all ministers' powerlessness even in the matter of their own spiritual destiny, how authoritative, how necessary, how useful are they finally in a belief system that emphasizes each

individual's personal, direct relationship with a deity who has already predetermined the fate of everything for reasons beyond human understanding? The Calvinist claim that ministers, whether or not they are themselves redeemed, serve as divine instruments in the working out of the saints' predestination only goes so far—and not very far at that—in making a case for church oversight.

It is understandable, then, that during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries Calvinist denominations such as Puritanism struggled again and again with the place of the visible church and pious works. It was not merely due to the need for social management or governmental order that a pietistic scheme, under the guise of methodical steps toward and through the course of conversion, found a place in various developments in Puritan theology. The laity understandably desired hopeful external indicators of their spiritual situation. If, on the one hand, a certain liberation from personal responsibility ensued from an unmediated, free-grace, *sola fides* relationship with the deity, so too a certain terror ensued from such personal blindness and powerlessness concerning salvation. Some gave way to suicide, albeit doctrinally designated a damning expression of despair. Many needed reassuring signs on which to anchor their hope for eternal life, the only thing that mattered ultimately.

Hence various Puritan denominations drifted into legalistic morphologies of conversion. Such stages of conversion, however, were to be assessed *a posteriori* as possible clues to sanctified actions rather than approached *a priori* as a regimen of assured sanctifying behavior. Nevertheless, while this distinction was intended to instate works or “duties” in ways that did not replicate the Roman Catholic elevation of human will, it always resisted clear definition and so easily mutated to meet various individual and communal needs. Moreover, the *a posteriori* model tended to value the rational over the emotional in religious experience. There was, as well, always the vulnerability of effectively inclining toward a pre-Reformation program of pious works.

It is curious that deep feelings relating to personal salvation encouraged a conversion morphology that elevated reason over

affections. The problem was not a theological one: the Calvinistic distinction between justification and sanctification remained clear enough. The problem was a human one. Puritans, it seemed, could never resolve the *human* dilemma posed by the comforts of sanctified action (visible signs) in a theology that, instead, stressed justification by (invisible) faith *alone*. Even as late as the Great Awakening of the 1740s, this very same lingering issue marked one divide between Old and New Light divines.

That such contrary vectoring characterized English Puritanism from the outset is David R. Como's well-made point in *Blown by the Spirit*. Como highlights diverse theological disputes of the 1620s through the 1640s, when sporadic English antinomian groups sought to live closer to a more radical understanding of Reformation piety. While antinomians during these encounters cannot be codified to a precise system of belief, most thought of themselves as reformers of Puritanism rather than as break-away groups. They were, in short, a subculture within an already pluralistic Puritan community where clear boundaries concerning belief and practice simply did not exist. The acrimony between the competing parties on these occasions stemmed precisely from this fact of close association. Their debates were like fierce arguments among members of the same family. Moreover, Como argues, these ongoing religio-political encounters anticipate and explain the infighting that led to the later breakdown of the Long Parliament.

In general, antinomians insisted on the direct, immediate and unmediated work of saving grace. Human effort, the exertion of post-lapsarian will, counted for nothing. An emancipating spiritual assurance, not progressive stages of conversion assessed through *a posteriori* self-examination, mattered above all else. Theirs was an all-or-nothing claim that sometimes elevated the antinomians over those fellow Puritans who were following an emerging stress on imperfect faith and fluctuating affections. Even so, there were significant differences among antinomians. The Familist version envisioned earthly perfection, whereas more restrained claims characterized the opposite "imputative" version.

Como provides rich, in-depth profiles of the careers of John Traske from 1617 to 1620, John Eaton during the 1620s, John Everarde during the 1620s and 1630s, and Roger Brearley during the 1640s. Eaton emphasized an “imputative” understanding of conversion, Everarde stressed perfectionism, and Brearley highlighted some middle ground between these two. Whatever their differences, however, they each maintained that Christians must fully live in the spirit, free from the inhibiting formalities and legalisms of Mosaic Law. Freed from the external guide of the Law, they argued, personal government and piety would emanate solely from within their divinely enlightened souls, as directly inspired by the Holy Spirit.

Saved for last is the *piece de resistance* of Como’s study: a close consideration of Edward Howes’s drift into antinomianism. With his longtime friend John Winthrop, Jr., Edward Howes delved into alchemical mysteries, especially as they informed Everarde’s mystical teachings. Later, during the 1640s, Howes would become a Familist extremist maintaining that the deity exists within the believer. In lieu of Scripture, then, revelation emanated from the believer’s own spiritual experience. Particularly noteworthy is Howes’s sense of still being a Puritan, so much so that he contemplated settlement in New England as if his views would not be problematic there. Como rightly suggests that Howes’ case indicates the blurred boundaries among competing doctrinal positions within Puritan culture.

Whereas Como delves into the lineage and beliefs of English antinomians, in *The Precisianist Strain* Theodore Dwight Bozeman primarily examines the development of federal Puritanism. This pietist strain, linking “faith alone” dogma and Scriptural rule, originated in Henrician times. Elizabethan Presbyterians, in turn, significantly advanced the case for church regulation and individual duty. Richard Greenham (1535-1594), Bozeman convincingly shows, exerted a major influence on the development of this pietist emphasis on the letter of the law over the spirit. Greenham inaugurated a scheme of spiritual exercises designed to aid pious self-examination. By Stuart times, such methods defined what Bozeman

calls mainstream Puritanism, which required self-scrutiny without offering any promise of spiritual completion or comfort. In this precisionist model, the penitent effectively remains suspended between presumption and despair, the Scylla and Charybdis of the soul's tempest-tossed life-journey.

Bozeman refers to Como's work (in its dissertation stage) once and in a footnote: "Como's critique of my earlier description of the first-wave antinomians as 'post- and contra-puritan' persuades me that the language is too unqualified, and I revise the emphasis here" (210). In fact, however, Bozeman is still inclined toward his earlier approach. In his introductory comments he speaks of the 1620s as a time when "the level of disciplinary demand had risen so high as to generate a virtual counter-Puritanism" (7). In the last third of his book Bozeman addresses what he calls the "theological insurgency" of the "antinomian backlash" (181, 183)—in short, the "counter-Puritanism" of his earlier phrasing. In his concluding comments he directly speaks of antinomianism as "Puritanism's ideal 'other'" and as "a charter for *post*-Puritan" Christianity (334). He is careful to include a reservation aligned with Como's argument: "Non-separatists of a sort, [antinomians] did not aim to secede from the larger godly community, but to reform it from within" (184). He likewise acknowledges that the early antinomians "remained children of the Puritan movement in several respects" (207). "In several respects," however, effectively registers a qualification within a qualification. Despite the footnote, then, Bozeman seems inclined to read antinomians as break-away groups, rebels against a "despotic" federal theology (185).

Bozeman's proclivity in this matter may be encouraged by his tendency to reify the *precisionist strain* as a mainline Puritanism with an essentially monolithic identity. He never makes such a claim, it should be clearly said. But the thrust of his language and rhetorical strategies slants in that direction, as if positing a genuinely definable, stable mainstream Puritanism. Puritanism was hardly systematic, and within the more dominant pietistic sects, not to mention within the antinomian groups, there existed a considerable spectrum of doctrinal possibilities. The spectral doctri-

nal bands of one group would at one or another point overlap various bands of another group. That is why, as Bozeman says, "There was a surprisingly large cast of antinomian characters" (186). But the number is not so surprising if we recall that Puritanism, early and late, remained essentially a yeasty mix of competing discourses, even among the emergent pietists. There is no end of examples of Puritanism's unconsolidated character even in the eighteenth century, including the exchanges between Increase Mather and Solomon Stoddard, the so-called Pope of the Connecticut Valley, and the numerous issues addressed by Stoddard's grandson, Jonathan Edwards.

Bozeman indeed identifies such "contrary tendencies" in the teachings of John Cotton (211), the subject of four chapters. He finds that as Cotton struggled to negotiate a middle way between pietist and antinomian inclinations, elements of his thought coalesced with elements of antinomian thinking. But Bozeman never quite applies Cotton's experience to his own representation of mainstream Puritanism itself. He seems uncomfortable with the numerous contrary tendencies of Puritanism, so polymorphous that the antinomians perhaps should be considered "children of the Puritan movement" much more than (as Bozeman hesitatingly and somewhat disqualifyingly puts it) merely "in several respects." Is it not possible, given the radical nature of the Reformation break from Roman Catholic practical piety, that antinomianism might have been at heart a spontaneous development firmly within Puritanism from the outset, and not necessarily a "theological insurgency" or "backlash"? Bozeman's separatist inclination may hamper his case—his prose (repetitively dependent on weak *was/were* constructions) can also be off-putting—but his consideration of the rise of English pietism significantly deepens our understanding of that school of Puritanism.

Both Bozeman's *The Precisianist Strain* and Como's *Blown by the Spirit* are restricted to English Protestantism. This is a reasonable boundary, given the complexity of their subject. But it would be interesting to place both of their findings in the context of developments in Reformation theology elsewhere in Europe. To what



extent, in other words, did antinomian expression in England parallel or depart from certain diverse, extreme religious discourses arising from within other European Christian denominations devoted to Reformation theology?

David J. Rempel Smucker and John L. Ruth (eds.) and James W. Lowry (intro. and trans.). *Hans Landis: Swiss Anabaptist Martyr in Seventeenth-Century Documents*. Millersburg: Ohio Amish Library, 2003. xi + 233 pp. + 18 illus. \$14.95. Review by NILES S. ILLICH, TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY.

In 1614 Hans Landis, a leader of the Swiss Anabaptists, became a martyr. His execution by the Swiss catalyzed a Landis mythology, which as the author indicates had at least two general schools: "Hans Landis as a civilly disobedient leader of a troublesome sect; and Hans Landis as a sturdy hero of the Christian faith" (2-3). The purpose of this book is to provide "a useful tool to those who want to carry research forward in the areas that these documents touch [the life and death of Hans Landis]" (12). While this goal appears to justify the book's publication, a reader may quickly develop misgivings that other, less-scholarly motives inspired the editors. Such suspicion may be piqued early on when the author asks, "What kind of society would deem a Hans Landis as an intolerable presence?" (4). Following a broad and sometimes clumsy introduction that provides background information on the Swiss, Hans Landis, and (only briefly) the issues of early modern conflict between church and state, are twenty-five documents that are otherwise generally unavailable to scholars.

The twenty-five documents, which constitute the heart of the text, are published on opposing pages in both German and English, providing capable scholars the unusual opportunity to interpret them without the hindrances of another's translation. The final document (in the appendix) is the *Ausbund* song; composed to memorialize the interrogation and execution of Landis, it is especially interesting because instead of transcribing the document into contemporary German, the translator elected to leave this en-

tire document in its original German script, accompanied by an English translation (there are occasional passages of other documents where the editors included a portion of the document in the original German script). The documents all somehow relate to the life, but more frequently the death, of Hans Landis. Predictably, most documents address theological issues, but one can also find passages relating to civil and governmental affairs. Although one might suspect dislike between the Swiss officials and the accused, some of the documents convey affable, but firm, confrontations between the two.

Ranging from church documents to court transcripts and even some personal recollections, the twenty-five included documents come from a variety of individual sources. They do as reasonable a job as any twenty-five documents can do in chronicling a period of one's life. Broadly, they focus on the persecution of Hans Landis; some documents cover the same events from different perspectives. Although the text contains a brief description of which archives produced these documents, there is no discussion of how or why these individual documents were selected over others. Nor is there any sense that these documents are representative of the collections from which they came or were instead selected because they were in some way unique.

Generally, historians always welcome the publication and translation of documents; this collection, however, is so focused that it may only be relevant to those specifically interested in Landis. Further, it fails to answer the question posed on the fourth page: "What kind of society would deem a Hans Landis as an intolerable presence?" I suspect that the answer to the author's question would necessitate a general look at early modern Europe and the relation between religion and the state, instead of twenty-five narrowly focused documents. While there was no expectation of a broad survey of early modern history, an introduction that successfully placed the documents in their historical context would have broadened the book's appeal.

The general value of this publication is quite limited. Those specifically interested in Hans Landis and the Anabaptists should

find it worth consulting; however the publication of such a book, by a press and by individuals so closely associated with the subject, should make all readers suspicious about the selection of these specific documents. The text lacks convincing evidence of impartiality, a necessity exacerbated by the close relationship between the publisher, authors, and the subject. While there are elements in these documents that add to broader concerns such as the Swiss government and religion, generally the book is so tightly focused that its broader historical application is rather narrow.

Eveline Cruickshanks, Stuart Handley, and D.W. Hayton, eds. *The House of Commons 1690-1715*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. 5 volumes. \$400. Review by VICTOR STATER, LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY.

How does one review a monument to scholarship? Certainly no brief review can do justice to the work under consideration. A few statistics might help readers get a grip upon this latest installment of *The History of Parliament*. Five volumes. 5,051 pages. 1,982 biographical articles of members of Parliament. 314 constituency articles. Twenty-seven appendices. And all of these compiled by a team of fifteen dedicated and careful scholars. The first volumes of the *History*, focusing upon the years 1754-1790, appeared in 1964, under the editorship of Sir Lewis Namier and John Brooke. In succeeding decades new installments have emerged, each more eagerly awaited than the last. This section of the *History* has gestated for more than thirty years, under the successive leadership of Eveline Cruickshanks, David Hayton, and Stuart Handley. These historians have built a scholarly edifice which will undoubtedly stand the test of time.

For students of Parliamentary history, these volumes, it might be argued, are the most interesting. The period it covers marks the emergence of Parliament—the House of Commons in particular—as the cornerstone of a new English (British, after 1707) constitution. Party strife, encouraged by triennial elections, a vigorous political press, and near-constant continental war, peaked during

these years, and Parliament's significance burgeoned. For the first time in its history, Parliament was indispensable: meeting annually, it raised the men and money needed to forestall Louis XIV's ambitions. For the first time in its history, Parliament (or the 'king-in-parliament,' at least) was recognized as sovereign by the majority of the political nation.

Hayton and his contributors provide a sure guide for students making sense of a complex period, when election succeeded election with unprecedented frequency. Volume One is Hayton's introductory survey, and in many ways it could stand alone as a history of the Commons. In it he does a masterful job of putting all that follows into context. Hayton first treats the constituencies and their elections. The focus here is upon change. He notes a rise in electoral contests—almost 40% of seats were contested during the period, a record. Every borough in the country experienced at least one contest between 1690 and 1715. Even Old Sarum, a notorious pocket borough with only ten voters, had a contest in 1705. In 1710, at the peak of partisan excitement, nearly 50% of seats were contested. Election expenses, Hayton shows, ballooned as candidates spent ever-increasing sums to woo voters. Some spent thousands treating voters—or buying them. Sir James Etheridge, for example, spent £18,000 nursing his constituency at Great Marlow from 1695-1715. Parliamentary acts forbidding electoral bribes did little to stop the open sale of votes in some places, though few went as far as one election agent who followed a bagpiper through the streets of Wotton Bassett, distributing fistfuls of half-crowns to an eager electorate. Yet even in the midst of highly charged partisan competition, continuities may be found. More than a few seats went uncontested for years—Truro, in Cornwall, for example, saw only one contest from 1690-1715. Many still clung to the notion that MPs ought to be chosen by consensus, although in the end very few could resist the pull of party loyalty.

The political loyalties of every MP cannot be known; party labels, in some cases, are very slippery. But Hayton shows that the overwhelming majority of members voted the party line, whether Whig or Tory—70% of those whose party is known voted with

their fellows 70% or more of the time. And general elections could bring significant shifts in membership of the Commons as the electorate made its will felt, from the decisive Whig victories of 1695 and 1708 to the Tory landslides of 1710 and 1713.

Although partisan divisions went deep, and affected politics in new ways during the later Stuart period, in one important regard things had changed very little. Hayton demonstrates that the House of Commons remained the preserve of the gentry, country fears of a rampant 'monied interest' notwithstanding. Most MPs were drawn from the upper ranks of the gentry; about half were descended within two generations from a titled family, and almost half were the sons or grandsons of MPs. By contrast, Hayton's team has identified only thirty-three members—of almost two thousand—of humble birth. 'Businessmen,' broadly defined, made up perhaps 20% of the Commons' membership, although here definitions are blurred. Viscount Fermanaugh (of Ireland) was a Levant merchant—but also the son of a prominent Buckinghamshire gentry family. Thomas Pitt, who ruthlessly squeezed a vast fortune out of India, was the son of a country rector, and so had his own claim to gentility.

Most MPs were at least nominal members of the Established Church. Excluding those with close ties to Dissent, but who conformed, over 90% of members were Anglicans, though some, like Sir Edward Seymour, Tory and scourge of Dissenters, rarely darkened the door of their parish church. Only a handful stand out for their refusal to conform, such as the Presbyterian Sir Robert Rich, Gregory Page, a Baptist, and Edmund Waller, a Quaker.

Hayton's coverage of the elections and membership of the Commons is further enriched by a detailed examination of the business of Parliament—which grew dramatically during this period—as well as the physical space within which members worked. Modern complaints about the legislative workload and inadequacies of the Palace of Westminster are nothing new. Late Stuart MPs toiled in cramped, uncomfortable quarters, hard by the stinking Thames.

Not least of Hayton's contribution might be found in his appendices, where he lists every member elected, defeated candidates,

and principal officers of state. He also offers lists of MPs known as men of letters and science (Newton, Christopher Wren, Joseph Addison, and Richard Steele, among others). Perhaps the most fascinating appendix is number nineteen, "Rogues, madmen, bankrupts, and suicides." This category includes wifebeaters such as Sir Hopton Williams, the pious swindler Sir Humphrey Mackworth, and Goodwin Wharton, whose friends the fairies showed him where to find buried treasure. Or so Wharton said.

Volume One is accompanied by a searchable CD-ROM. Though not—for this reader at any rate—very intuitive, a thorough introduction explains its use. Researchers may mine the CD for details of all manner of subjects relating to the work of the Commons. Searches for personal names, subjects, places, or categories put what amounts to the contents of the Commons' Journals at one's fingertips. It is an invaluable aid for scholars, and the editors should be commended for including it.

Volume Two provides a detailed account of every constituency returning a member in every election or by-election from 1690 to 1715. A few boroughs dozed through the period with few moments of partisanship or controversy—often thanks to the iron grip of some powerful local figure. The three-score voters of West Looe, for example, rarely ventured to cross Sir Jonathan Trelawny, their neighbor and Bishop of Exeter. The bishop, said one disgruntled freeman, "kept us in captivity forty years...." (2: 86). At the other extreme were the larger counties, like Kent or Middlesex, where lively contests were routine, and some of the exceptionally large boroughs—such as Westminster—where electoral battles were constant. Westminster had some 14,000 voters and was impossible for a patron, however powerful, to control. The constituency articles reveal much about the stratagems of candidates and their backers—fraudulent election returns, hastily-called polls in obscure places, bribes, treats, and petitions to the Commons. The articles, taken as a whole, form a comprehensive picture of the great age of party from the bottom up. A minor irritation is that the volume follows its predecessors by organizing boroughs by county and lacks an index. The geographically-challenged—who might not

know, for example, that Chippenham is in Wiltshire or Milbourne Port in Somerset—must search a map of boroughs at the start of the volume, and then, perhaps, a map of the counties, to find where to look for an article. This information can be found in appendix twenty-two of Volume One, but it would be far more helpful in Volume Two.

As important as Volumes One and Two are, the scholarship represented by Volumes Three, Four, and Five is truly impressive. They contain nearly two thousand articles covering the parliamentary career of every MP serving for a generation. The careers they recount span a century or more—from Sir John Maynard, who first sat in the Short Parliament of 1640, to Sir Robert Walpole, whose service extended into the 1740s. Some members remain obscure. John ‘Vulture’ Hopkins, for instance, was known for his greed as a London money man, but no one knows where he was born or who his parents were. It seems very likely that if any information is available about any MP, the *History’s* diligent researchers have found it. Articles on major figures are significant monographs in themselves—Sir Robert Harley earns forty pages, and others, such as Paul Foley and Sir Edward Seymour, rate equally weighty essays. The focus remains upon a member’s career in the Commons—for example Isaac Newton and Christopher Wren were both MPs, but their articles are not essays on baroque science and architecture. Nor do the articles cover a subject’s earlier or later political careers in much detail, as with Sir John Maynard’s Short Parliament service or Walpole’s later dominance of the Commons.

The *History’s* virtues as a scholarly resource are almost matched by the sheer pleasure it affords a reader dipping in at random. Scattered throughout the biographies are gems such as the life of Sir Humphrey Mackworth, “ruthless, devious, hypocritical, self-seeking, and corrupt,” (4:732) or the tragic case of Stephen Evance, merchant, bankrupt, and suicide. But of course it is the coverage and the scholarship which makes the *History* worth its substantial price. At \$400 few individuals will place it on their own shelves—but anyone with an interest in late Stuart politics, culture, and

society, will do well to reserve for themselves the table nearest the *History of Parliament* at their favorite library.

Walter C. Utt and Brian Strayer. *The Bellicose Dove: Claude Brousson and Protestant Resistance to Louis XIV, 1647-1698*. Brighton: Sussex Academic Press, 2003. x + 220 pp. \$69.50. Review by THOMAS WORCESTER, COLLEGE OF THE HOLY CROSS.

At his death in 1985, Walter Utt left an unfinished manuscript on the life and death of Huguenot Claude Brousson. As edited and completed by Brian Strayer, this work reveals both a Brousson utterly unyielding and indefatigable in his polemics against what he considered the idolatry and the multiplicity of errors of Catholicism, and a Brousson much more changeable and uncertain in his political strategies for responding to the French state as it strove to eliminate the Reformed Church. While invariably 'bellicose' in his preaching and publications against the Catholic clerics and their teachings, this Huguenot at times advocated armed resistance against the state, and at times promoted a dove's peaceful endurance of oppression and martyrdom at the hands of the king's agents.

A native of Nîmes, and a lawyer by profession, Brousson lived in an era that saw Louis XIV take away step by step even the limited toleration that had been granted Protestants by Henry IV in the Edict of Nantes. In revoking that Edict in 1685, Louis but completed a process already underway for decades. The state exerted much pressure on Protestants to convert to Catholicism; Brousson offers an example of one never tempted to give in to such pressure, no matter what the cost or consequences of resistance. When Brousson (along with all his co-religionists) was banned from exercising the legal profession, he turned to a myriad of ways of defending and aiding his fellows Huguenots. In 1683, Brousson played a central role, in Toulouse, in organizing a clandestine Committee of Resistance, devoted to upholding and exercising a right of resistance to royal edicts when they violated God's laws. When some members of the Committee were captured and executed,



Brousseau fled to Switzerland for what would be the first of several periods of exile.

Lausanne, Amsterdam, The Hague, London, Berlin: Brousseau made the rounds of these and other places where Huguenot exiles could count on being welcome. Utt and Strayer do a good job of showing how and why Brousseau never settled permanently in any of these places. While a great many Protestants in the late seventeenth century tended to move away from the prophetic and virulently anti-Catholic zeal that had characterized the early generations of Reformers, Brousseau remained a kind of Old Testament prophet, never tiring of denouncing the evils of idolatry. Using “the most graphic language imaginable,” Brousseau condemned in particular the “pernicious maxims” of the Jesuits, whose “damnable” doctrines, he warned, promoted blindness, avarice, impurity, deceit, injustice, infidelity, and impiety (46). Though he grew fat in Amsterdam, Brousseau remained ill at ease with the bourgeois complacency of the Reformed Church there. He was also profoundly out of step with Protestants sympathetic to a developing Enlightenment agenda of reason and moderation. Many Huguenot exiles found permanent, comfortable homes in Holland, Switzerland, England, or northern Germany; Brousseau felt again and again a call from God to return to France and to minister to the oppressed faithful.

Brousseau became an itinerant preacher and ordained minister upon his return to France in 1689. Using various names and disguises to elude capture, he succeeded in gathering large crowds to hear him preach lengthy sermons (some at least as long as three hours), and in leading services. For a while, Brousseau also allied himself with François Vivent, a Huguenot advocate of not only armed resistance to the state, but of assassinations of Catholic clergy. Such resistance and assassinations did not remain purely theoretical. Though Brousseau eventually broke with Vivent’s violent tactics, Utt and Strayer tend to be rather sympathetic to Languedoc *intendant* Bâville. The authors treat skeptically any use of the term martyr for Brousseau, even as they recount how Bâville put a bounty on his head and succeeded, in 1698, in capturing and executing him. By the standards of that era, Bâville showed mercy

to Brousson, by having him strangled before being broken on the wheel.

The main lacuna in this book is the paucity of comparative study. Brousson was born in France in the 1640s, the decade of the English Civil War. Some comparison of Brousson's brand of zealous Calvinism with that of his Puritan contemporaries across the Channel would have broadened the narrow focus of this study. Moreover, no reference is made to Brad Gregory's excellent work, *Salvation at Stake: Christian Martyrdom in Early Modern Europe* (Harvard University Press, 1999). Utt (d. 1985) could not have known of this book, but Strayer ought to have engaged with it, especially since Brousson's rightful reputation as a martyr (or not) is one of the central issues in *The Bellicose Dove*. Though Utt and Strayer state several times that Brousson was more extreme in his anti-Catholic polemics than were most Huguenots, concrete examples of the more moderate voices are not examined. A brief contrast with the economically prosperous but not so religiously zealous Dutch Protestants is suggested, but not developed. More on Reformed diversity would be welcome.

Comparison with other oppressed religious minorities within France would have also strengthened this book. Utt and Strayer mention the Jansenists but in passing (49); they merit further attention than they give to them. Another comparative approach that could be taken concerns the Society of Jesus. The authors demonstrate repeatedly how Brousson blamed the Jesuits for the Revocation and for all that he thought was wrong with Catholicism. For Brousson, the Jesuits were the evil force behind the French state's intolerance of the Reformed. Whether or not they were in fact the chief advocates of such policies of exclusion, the Jesuits themselves would be expelled from France in the mid-1700s by the centralizing, intolerant French state.

Utt and Strayer retain the merit of having distanced themselves from a Protestant hagiography that treated Brousson as but a holy martyr above reproach, as one who died heroically for his Reformed beliefs. They convincingly reveal a human Brousson

more complex than a faultless saint. This book is well worth the attention of serious scholars of seventeenth-century France.

Brennan C. Pursell. *The Winter King: Frederick V of the Palatinate and the Coming of the Thirty Years' War*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003. xviii + 320 pp. \$89.95. Review by MARK CHARLES FISSEL, THE AUGUSTA ARSENAL.

This is a most auspicious inaugural monograph from a young scholar. Brennan Pursell begins by committing the sin of writing a biography for his first book. The personality under scrutiny is the star-crossed Elector Palatine, Frederick V, whose election to the throne of Bohemia by Protestant rebels in 1618-1619 prompted the Holy Roman Emperor to drive the Elector from his territorial possessions and thus ignited three decades of warfare. The author is then guilty of the heinous crime of suggesting that classifying the Thirty Years' War as primarily a war of religion is a misnomer, despite contemporary descriptions to the contrary.

One might conjecture that in place of religion, the author would ascribe a greater causal role to blind and overpowering forces such as social change and economics. Instead he resuscitates a pair of factors from nineteenth century historiography: constitutionalism and human free will (144). If the paradigms sometimes appear to be Victorian and Edwardian, however, the breadth of research is of twenty-first century caliber. *The Winter King* reflects a maturity characteristic of the work of a distinguished senior scholar.

Pursell demonstrates facility in languages, palaeography, and diplomatic. He discloses what manuscript collections were most useful and where he has used microfilms in place of the original sources. When discussing Czech sources, the author acknowledges that these came with German language summaries, and that he used the latter. In short, he is forthright about the evidential basis of this book, which is impressive in its scope. Resting securely upon these foundations, *The Winter King's* succinct introduction outlines Pursell's argument. The narrative that follows is punctu-

ated with subheadings and analyses that are mostly of a political nature.

The author sees constitutional issues at the heart of the Thirty Years' War. The "constitution" of the Holy Roman Empire incorporated an electoral system, and after 1555, the protection of Protestant worship in many quarters. The imperial constitution therefore entwined within an ancient electoral framework the secular and the spiritual. The order and peace that resulted from good government included the *cuius regio, eius religio* that was the legacy of the Golden Bull (1356) and the Peace of Augsburg (1555). In other words, the ruler oversaw the practice (and safety) of the "official" religion within his domains. In the Erastian tradition that in the late 1700s would inform "constitutionalism," the secular sword was sharper than the spiritual sword. Paraphrasing Swedish Chancellor Alex Oxenstierna, "Religion was an aspect of public peace that needed protection" (267).

Safeguarding Protestant worship within the Empire and elsewhere was a major preoccupation for Frederick. While the Winter King was a "deeply religious man" (293), Pursell downplays his religious zeal: "Frederick's personal attitudes about religion . . . [have their place], but an exclusively Calvinist confessionalism seems to have had at best a limited influence in making his political decisions" (4). The Elector Palatine was not so much championing his personal faith of Calvinism, Pursell argues, but rather was defending his honor and status as Elector Palatine, the imperial constitution, and the rights of the Bohemians.

The defenestration of Prague signaled the assertion of the "constitutional religious rights" (44) of the Bohemians, not a rebellion against their monarchy or the Empire. Thus the assumption of the throne of Bohemia by the Elector Palatine was a defense of the Empire and its constitution against a subversive Emperor (*pace* Professor Koenigsberger). Frederick alone of the German princes possessed the prerogative to judge an Emperor in the event of an alleged violation of the imperial constitution. In such a situation, the Elector Palatine would summon an Imperial Diet and require the Emperor's attendance. In the case of an interregnum, Frederick

and the Elector of Saxony would serve as the two Imperial Vicars, maintaining a protectorate until the next imperial election. The integrity of the electoral nature of the Holy Roman Empire made inviolable the rights and privileges of its princes and prelates, the foremost of whom was the Elector Palatine.

At the risk of sounding pedantic, “constitutionalism” rested upon religious foundations, not vice versa. This is not merely a Whiggish cavil or a case of putting carts before horses. Was contractual government in the “constitutional” sense possible before religious pluralism and *de facto* toleration were secured in the seventeenth century and after? Pursell very reasonably admits of the possibility of anachronism in separating church from state (289), so perhaps it is not ungracious to suggest that in the seventeenth century (as was the case in the centuries that preceded the 1600s) affairs of state reflected a divine order. This would be particularly true for a devout Calvinist such as Frederick V and within a predominantly Calvinist state such as that of the Palatinate.

The pervasiveness of the Calvinist Covenant (witness the Scots’ attempts to make the Solemn League and Covenant the “constitutional” basis for an international Protestant Cause in the 1640s) provided a spiritual framework for worldly pursuits. Contemporaries (i.e. the Scots) saw the wars as a cosmic struggle between Christ and anti-Christ. James I, Frederick’s father-in-law from whom he sought aid, certainly judged the conflict swirling around Bohemia, disapprovingly, as a war of religion, and told his son-in-law as much. The Thirty Years’ War was described to the Doge of Venice in identical terms, if in a different language: “questa guerra si facesse per guerra di religione” (90). Perhaps Frederick was at pains to emphasize constitutional aims because perpetrators of religious violence were breakers of the peace and destroyers of the polity.

Frederick’s view of an ordained polity was reminiscent of the world of the Old Testament. Further, his almighty was a God of Battles, or in Frederick’s own words, “God the Most High Prince of War.” It was divine will that kings fight steadfastly and uphold their honor. Frederick’s heavenly sanctioned bellicosity was shared

by his primary antagonist, Emperor Ferdinand II. Divine war-mongering was a conviction held by the Swedish king Gustavus Adolphus, whose battlefield successes rejuvenated the Protestant Cause when he intervened in the war in July 1630.

Personal honor made individual initiative and free will important causal factors in the events of the Thirty Years' War. Pursell sees Frederick's conscience as an amalgam of religious faith and personal honor. Each ruler's (Frederick's, Ferdinand's, and Gustavus's) individual sense of honor narrowed the choices that he would allow himself to make. Ferdinand could not compromise with the Elector until the latter admitted he had erred in assuming the throne of Bohemia. However, Frederick refused steadfastly to admit wrong, which would be "an offense against his honor" (153). First, Ferdinand must acknowledge his violations of the elective nature of the imperial constitute (the most flagrant being the Edict of Restitution of 1629) and his unjust campaign against Protestant worship guaranteed under the law. Stubborn personalities armed with dogmatic constitutional principles thus perpetuated the first phase of the war.

In the final measure, *The Winter King* does not denigrate the importance of religion in understanding the Thirty Years' War. Pursell succeeds in balancing the holy and the profane, thus expanding our conceptualization of the place of religion in the seventeenth century. Justice, personal honor, consent, the preservation of the well-ordered polity, and the maintenance of individual conscience, were as much a part of the confessional divisions of seventeenth-century Europe as were liturgy and ecclesiastical organization. By emphasizing the constitutional dimensions of the wars of religion, Brennan Pursell places the conflict in a more authentic contemporary historical context. His careful dissection of the personalities involved and the decisions they made proves that while the wars of religion were distressingly endemic, they were not inevitable, but rather were within the grasp of free will.

Nicholas McDowell. *The English Radical Imagination: Culture, Religion, and Revolution, 1630–1660*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2003. x + 219 pp. \$72.00. Review by JASON PEACEY, HISTORY OF PARLIAMENT TRUST, LONDON.

The ‘radicals’ of the English Civil Wars, according to the author of this stimulating and subtle book, have virtually become the preserve of literary scholars. They have, he states, faded from view for a historical profession still reeling from the assault launched upon the likes of Christopher Hill by the revisionists of the 1970s and 1980s. Historians, he argues, are still seeking to respond to this assault with weapons of its own creation, namely archival sources rather than printed pamphlets. McDowell arguably underestimates the extent to which ‘post-revisionist’ historians—not least Alasdair Bellany—have begun to reassert the legitimacy of historicising and contextualising such tracts. Nevertheless, he is surely right in claiming that there is much to be learnt about the early modern period, and seventeenth-century radicalism in particular, from literary analysis, and that “questions of rhetoric, style, genre, allusion and audience” are “as relevant to a reconstruction of the past as the traditional political, social, and economic concerns of the historian” (26).

McDowell’s literary treatment of mid-century radicals—Levellers, Ranters, and Quakers—pursues a grand purpose through a specific project. He suggests, quite rightly, that “to understand the culture of radicalism in the English revolution we need to develop a greater understanding of how that culture was shaped not simply by conflict between the cultural worlds of the high and the low, of the learned and the unlearned, but by their interaction” (9). His more precise aim is to suggest that what might be called the “radicalism industry” has too often fallen into the trap of accepting the ideas of the radicals’ contemporary opponents: that they were misguided, worthless, and indeed heretical, because of their lack of learning. McDowell seeks to show that, although part of the rhetorical strategy of writers such as Richard Overton, William Walwyn, Abiezer Coppe, and Samuel Fisher involved valorising

ignorance in order to boast of their “holy simplicity,” they nevertheless blended this with displays of learning which reflected the fact that some of them were demonstrably learned, and even university educated. As McDowell claims at the outset: “I show how university educated radicals drew on their knowledge of learned culture and their experience of institutional education to expose those systems and structures of knowledge as a means of preserving hierarchical and anti-Christian relations of power” (9).

McDowell’s aim, therefore, is not merely to challenge authors such as Christopher Hill who consider radicalism to be the authentic voice of popular culture, written by and for a popular rather than an elite audience. He also questions the work of more recent authors, such as David Norbrook, in terms of their assumption that the radicals understood little of the intellectual and literary culture of their times. Like Roger Chartier, McDowell resists any notion of predictable relationships between particular social groups and specific cultural forms. Moreover, he argues that literary analysis provides one of the most important ways of challenging those scholars—notably Colin Davis—who assert that at least some radical groups had little identity beyond that which was imposed upon them by outsiders and opponents. He seeks to demonstrate that the tools of literary analysis, namely scrutiny of “rhetoric, style, genre, allusion and audience,” can help recover the sophistication of the radicals (26).

In chapters on Levellers, Ranters, and Quakers, therefore, McDowell combines biographical detail with literary analysis, focusing largely upon those authors whose backgrounds can be shown to have involved a university education, although highlighting also learned autodidacts such as the Leveller William Walwyn. Contemporary critics, including Presbyterian parliamentarians, vilified such men as being “representative of the ignorant and irreligious multitude, evoking the threat of popular disorder and the subversion of social, religious, and educational hierarchies” (35). Like earlier Protestant martyrs, such writers sought to identify themselves with “the simple and mean things of this earth,” but beyond the deployment of such rhetoric, they often flaunted their learning



in order to defend their particular visions, whether political, religious, or spiritual. As McDowell states, they “satirically applied their humanist education to reject the religious, political and cultural values which they associated with that education” (184).

The Leveller Overton, therefore, invoked his university experience to “satirise the institutional connection between universities and the clergy” (65), and in order to claim that the common people were prevented from exercising their rational capacities by the monopoly of knowledge maintained by the elite (67). Turning to the Ranter Abiezer Coppe, McDowell highlights his rhetoric of holy simplicity, while also demonstrating how his university education enabled him to formulate a more complex argument than that of his associates, attacking formal grammar and syntax, and ideas regarding the value of ancient languages. Ultimately, McDowell argues, it is difficult to conclude that Coppe was writing for a constituency of illiterates. The Quaker Samuel Fisher, meanwhile, penned prose which was “full of...rewritten or adapted classical references” (151), and he produced a “radical enlightenment” critique of scriptural authority. Like Coppe, Fisher equated formal education with the subjection to religious and moral laws from which he had been liberated.

McDowell’s recovery of the learning which underpinned the works of at least some radical authors is extremely valuable, but there is a nagging sense that he places too much emphasis upon the role of universities in providing the source for such erudition. McDowell denies that he seeks to “valorise those with education and culture and exclude the many unlettered” radicals of the period, or that he regards those radicals with formal educations as being inherently more interesting than those without Oxbridge degrees. He stresses, indeed, that he merely seeks to recover the extent to which some radicals were more learned than others, and the importance of appreciating the “diversity and complexity of the English radical imagination” (21). The problem here lies in the rather limited biographical background that the author provides. We learn about the education of Overton, Coppe, and Fisher, but little about that received by fellow radicals such as Clarkson or

Coppin, and to the extent that we lack information on their background and training, the link between the experience of university and enhanced erudition appears somewhat shaky. The criticism which McDowell ought to have addressed is not that he valorizes education, but that he assumes that education is a prerequisite for learning. McDowell might respond that he has addressed Milton's ideas regarding the self-taught citizen-scholar, and that he has highlighted the perfect embodiment of this ambition in William Walwyn, an autodidact who challenged the relevance of formal education to religious knowledge, and who stands as "a warning against underestimating the intellectual resources of 'popular' radicalism in the English revolution" (88). However, McDowell then stresses that Milton always boasted of the respectable and formal nature of his own education, and that he eventually abandoned his optimism regarding the capacity of the masses. Moreover, McDowell's analysis of Walwyn's genteel background suggests a desire to reclaim him for the elite, and hints at an assumption that learning reflected social status as well as educational training.

Turning from McDowell's precise project to his more general aim—to improve our understanding of radicalism through a recognition of the interaction between high and low culture—the concern must be that he remains locked into an outmoded notion of radicalism, which is limited to Levellers, Ranters, and Quakers. Perhaps a more fruitful way both to re-examine radicalism and to stress the importance of interaction between elite and popular culture would be to address the radicalism of those who fell outside such groups. These include relatively humble polemicists and propagandists such as George Wither and Henry Walker, as well as intellectuals from the elite such as Cheney Culpeper and even Sir Roger Twysden. The erudite radicalism that we need to recover, in other words, is that which was produced by those who may not have had formal education, by those who became, and remained within, the social, cultural, and political elite, and even by those who are traditionally regarded as 'royalists.'

Brian Weiser. *Charles II and the Politics of Access*. Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 2003. xii + 208 pp. Review by TY M. REESE, UNIVERSITY OF NORTH DAKOTA.

The English Civil War and subsequent restoration of Charles II to the English throne constitutes a subject of great historical interest, investigation and debate. While Louis XIV and other continental monarchs increased their power through the development of an absolute state, Charles II worked to consolidate and protect his power in a state still divided from the Civil War. Traditionally, historians have utilized this division, and Charles's desire to re-unite England, to argue that he consistently maintained a policy of open access to accomplish this. In his work *Charles II and the Politics of Access*, Brian Weiser successfully challenges this idea of continual access by arguing that Charles II skillfully controlled access for political reasons. The book's main argument, that access was one of the "most effective political implementations" of Charles II's reign is clearly and fully supported, although the limitations of access, and what individuals gained from it, is not always so fully explored.

Weiser's examination begins with the 1651 clash between Charles II and Cromwell and Charles's subsequent experience as an incognito king during his escape to the continent. Weiser postulates, not necessarily convincingly, that this experience as an incognito king proved formative to Charles's attempt to become an accessible monarch. From this introduction, which includes a general treatment of the decline of monarchical access, the book is divided into a series of thematic/narrative chapters that each examines different aspects of access during the reign of Charles II. One device utilized throughout is the division of Charles's reign into different periods where access was either necessary or not. The periods are, with some variations between chapter, from 1660 to 1666, from 1667 to 1673 and from 1674 to 1685. A second and important argument is that over time, Charles went from being a unifying monarch to a party leader.

The book's introduction examines the role of, and changes within, accessibility in medieval and early modern Europe. In the latter period, as the state grew and bureaucracy expanded, accessibility became less practical, causing monarchs to utilize distance to maintain their status. Chapter One explores the "meanings, ideology and symbolism of access" (13) and illustrates how Charles II manipulated and utilized access. Weiser attempts to create a "more nuanced model" of access to replace David Starkey's binary view of participation versus distance. In the end, Weiser's nuanced model involves the fact that neither participation nor distance was a constant; rather, each could serve various political goals, thereby creating a more nuanced interpretation of the original binary relationship. Early in his reign, Charles effectively utilized access to heal divisions by allowing two oppositional lords, the Earl of Holland and the Earl of Essex, to control access. This illustrated that he would not play favorites, but over time, because of political necessity, this changed. The chapter ends with an interesting section on the relationship between sex and access, and how Charles became too accessible, through accounts of his sexual exploits. Chapter Two turns to the relationship between architecture and access. Weiser charts Charles's residences (in 1661 Charles spent 359 days at Whitehall) to explore how issues involving both the length and place of residency corresponded to the rise and fall of access. Chapter Two includes an interesting examination of the construction and reconstruction of space to control access. In this chapter Weiser introduces his periodization of open and restricted access, showing that access was more often controlled than open, although Weiser never makes much of this fact.

The third chapter explores Charles' effective utilization of access as a political tool. Weiser does this by exploring the rise and fall of Clarendon, the Cabal, the issues surrounding the Test Act, and the rise of the Ultra-Royalists from 1674 to 1685. This exploration of high power and access is followed by a chapter concerning local access. Charles attempted to heal the wounds of the Civil War early on, but over time his relationship with local municipalities centered on the continued centralization of power. Rebellion

was a constant fear, and therefore Charles worked hard to control and limit discontent. The rise of the Ultra-Royalists, coupled with the issues surrounding his brother, created greater control over access on all levels. The final chapter explores the relationship between access and trade, especially within the growing struggle between monopoly and free/open trade. Weiser clearly shows that Charles often picked national interest over privilege, also showing the process that mercantile interests utilized to influence the king. When Charles does start to deny access, the anti-monopoly element turned to Parliament as the voice and protector of their interests.

Throughout his work, Weiser demonstrates Charles II's effective utilization of access for political means. Yet his work raises new questions. The first involves the process of properly measuring the political necessity of access. Weiser needs to more clearly explore who was affected by the regulation of access. While he does this both directly and indirectly for local issues and the economy, the reader is left with an understanding of access among only an extremely small segment of English society. If Weiser wants to truly argue the effectiveness of access as a political tool for Charles II he must fully explore its consequences upon a broader segment of English society. A second question involves an examination of those who looked to gain the king's ear versus those who looked to Parliament. While Weiser touches upon this in his final chapter, the reader is left wondering exactly what individuals, beyond the elite, gained from their access to Charles. A final criticism concerns the work's organization, as much of the narrative/factual material that explains the rise and fall of access appears in the latter chapters rather than earlier ones. Because of this, the reader needs to piece together the periodization of access along with making connections between many of the chapters. Weiser has created a work that clearly accomplishes its stated purpose, with very strong chapters on both architecture and economics, yet his work raises questions for further exploration.

Clare Jackson. *Restoration Scotland, 1660-1690: Royalist Politics, Religion and Ideas*. Woodbridge: Boydell, 2003. ix + 258 pp. \$85.00. Review by ROBERT LANDRUM, UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA BEAUFORT.

The title of Clare Jackson's new book, *Restoration Scotland, 1660-1690*, is deceptive. The work is not a survey, nor does it attempt to be one. It is, rather, a well-defined, closely-argued academic monograph. The title appears to be an editorial choice intended to give a small-market volume a broadened appeal. It is a pleasure, then, to discover that *Restoration Scotland* is not another chronologically-driven and fairly predictable account of the "killing times" and Presbyterian resistance. Jackson has attempted something far more important, illuminating, and unlikely: "the first full reconstruction of late seventeenth century Scottish intellectual culture" (1).

The first task for such a reconstruction is to demonstrate that there actually *was* a Scottish intellectual culture in the late seventeenth century. The period has been maligned by several historiographical schools: from Presbyterian apologists like Robert Wodrow to those who look ahead to 1707 and celebrate the transformative effect of the Union on Scotland, while denigrating the seventeenth century as a point of departure. The combined effect of these detractors has been an orthodoxy, "a perceived background of unremitting government oppression and widespread popular distress [that] rendered the very notion of Restoration Scottish intellectual culture a contradiction in terms" (4). Given such an orthodoxy, Jackson proclaims herself a revisionist, advancing a very different image of late seventeenth century Scots debate.

To construct this vision, Jackson has ventured beyond the corpus of traditional sources. Although political participation was severely restricted, Jackson finds that political interest nevertheless was widespread, and an informed, literate, Bible-quoting and argumentative people stood ready and willing to debate their leaders. This increased depth of discussion suggests that intellectual culture will be found outside the Privy Council and Parliament. Accordingly, Jackson's sources embrace a range of innovative ma-

terial: “anonymous political memoranda, sermon notebooks, manuscript legal depositions, private correspondence, commonplace-book reflections, diary entries and bardic poetry” as well as “devotional writings, moral and natural philosophy, legal theory and imaginative literature” (216, 8). Surprisingly well represented here are the ideas of lawyers and the legal community, especially two successive Lord Advocates: the absolutist Sir George MacKenzie of Rosehaugh and his constitutionalist colleague Sir James Steuart of Goodtrees. Similarly surprising are some of the concepts Jackson assumes as a starting-point: “ecclesiastical erastianism and religious adiaphorism” along with political pragmatism. None of these are compatible with popular accounts of “the killing times,” which generally careen between nonconformist fanatics and order-obsessed martinets. Jackson’s revisionism, then, gives us what must be considered a more plausible seventeenth century.

If Restoration-era Scottish intellectual culture produced any points of general consensus, the first must be royalism. Indeed, Scottish national identity was inextricably bound up in Scotland’s ancient dynasty and monarchical tradition and the trauma of the mid-century wars and conquest only cemented loyalty to the Stuarts and the civil order that was restored with them. Beyond the near-universal maxim that identified the monarch as “the political authority to whom obligation was owed,” though, lay significant theoretical debate. Some—like MacKenzie—argued for absolutism as a bulwark against civil disorder. Others contested the crown’s supremacy to the law, while dismissing any suggestion that arguments for legal limits to kingly authority necessarily encouraged resistance. Still others referred to ancient precedent and asserted the contractual nature of the Scottish crown. Resistance theorists, thin on the ground in 1660, grew more vocal in the 1670s and 80s. When opposition did appear, it usually focused on Charles II’s Scottish Secretary and High Commissioner, John Maitland, Duke of Lauderdale. Charles and Lauderdale restrained potential opposition through infrequent Parliaments and skillful, if heavy-handed political management. In the absence of Parliaments, Charles II found it convenient to govern Scotland through Royal proclama-

tion, a legal if unpopular gambit that James II would employ with disastrous consequences.

Though her revisionist stance might disincline Jackson to treat the religious divide in the traditional way, any history of the period must address the issue of Episcopacy and Presbyterian non-conformity. Jackson shows how the restored bishops squandered their opportunity and failed to establish any Scriptural or popular mandate. The established Church remained, beloved only to the regime as a political device. Presbyterians were themselves divided between extremists who refused compliance and moderates who professed their discomfort with episcopacy while emphasizing their unswerving loyalty to the crown. More importantly, Jackson finds a convergence of moderates within and without the established Church who sought common ground and eschewed theological dispute as damaging to religion in general and thereby anti-Christian. This well-documented "latitudinarianism" is in contrast to the received accounts of the period but, once again, results in a more plausible past.

Surely the most important contribution of *Restoration Scotland* is an amended narrative of the Revolution in Scotland. Traditional accounts of 1688-89 have emphasized the passivity of Scots and the delayed reaction of Scottish institutions to events in England. Jackson, however, reveals vigorous debate swirling around James' flight and William's claim. Copious political literature emerged, "offering active ideological justifications of, as well as objections to, the sequence of revolutionary events in Scotland" (191). In March 1689 the traditions of Scottish royalism, contractual theory, and resistance collided in the Convention of Estates. An allegiance debate was carried out in print, independent of and different from its counterpart to the south. Some asserted that James had never sworn the Coronation Oath and was therefore never king of Scotland, others argued that through his illegal actions as king James forfeited his sovereignty. The Convention eventually settled on the former, and invited William and Mary to rule according to a distinctive set of conditions and a distinctive Scottish



Oath. James' ace in the hole, the Bishops, were unable to save his regime or, in the end, their own.

Jackson's conclusions are neatly summarized in her final section. Among these the discovery of a specifically Scottish allegiance debate and the substantial contribution of Scots lawyers to intellectual culture are perhaps most important. Also significant is the inclusion of ideas like "pragmatism" and "adiaphorist" to a period and a people that have for too long been given over to mischaracterizations. Lastly, Jackson criticizes the capacity and enthusiasm for British history to undermine the study of a uniquely Scottish political and intellectual culture; a culture that was not British and certainly not English. The Scottish Enlightenment did not spring, fully-formed, from the head of David Hume; it had antecedents and a foundation at least as deep as this most unenlightened of periods.

Inclusive title notwithstanding, Jackson's book will not reach the best-seller list. This, however, is not a measure of her success. She has illuminated a poorly-understood period, and replaced voiceless caricatures with thoughtful individuals. For this service as well as the laborious unearthing of a new range of sources, *Restoration Scotland* is an important and instructive work.

Kathleen Wellman. *Making Science Social: The Conferences of Théophraste Renaudot 1633-1642*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2003. xviii + 461 pp. + 4 illus. \$39.95. Review by KAROL K. WEAVER, SUSQUEHANNA UNIVERSITY.

Kathleen Wellman's *Making Science Social: The Conferences of Théophraste Renaudot 1633-1642* traces the history of the seventeenth-century conferences led by Théophraste Renaudot to elucidate the characteristics of early seventeenth-century science, to show the connections between the conferences and the French Enlightenment, and to demonstrate the contributions that the conferences made to the development of the human and social sciences. Wellman recounts the biography of Théophraste Renaudot, the eccentric intellectual who led the conferences. A seventeenth-cen-

tury medical and social reformer, Renaudot brought intellectuals together to discuss a diverse array of scientific and social topics. He publicized these discussions by printing them as inexpensive reports as well as leather bound volumes. These reports are the primary sources that Wellman uses to consider seventeenth-century science. Wellman's exploration of the conferences reevaluates major ideas in the history of science, the history of gender and science, and the history of biology.

Historians of science have noted the contributions that scientific institutions made to the practice of science in the seventeenth century. Many scholars have described the significant role that the academies played in the development of science. Other scholars have concentrated on noble networks, and the ways these networks allowed women of the upper class to participate in science. While acknowledging these institutions, Wellman considers the conferences as important but forgotten subjects in the history of scientific institutions. She points out that, unlike state-sponsored academies like the Academie des Sciences, the conferences prized open and anonymous discussions of scientific topics.

Specialists in the history of science also emphasize the important influence that the mechanistic philosophy of seventeenth-century science had on the development of the social sciences during the eighteenth-century French Enlightenment and during the nineteenth century. Wellman contends that scholars must consider the connections that join the conferences' interest in the human sciences with the Enlightenment's emphasis on politics and economics. She asserts that the intellectuals who attended the conferences were predecessors of the French *philosophes* and presaged the scholars who participated in the Enlightenment republic of letters.

Wellman not only urges scholars to rethink their understanding of the history of scientific institutions and the connections between seventeenth-century science and the Enlightenment, but also insists that her readers reconsider the history of gender and science. Specifically, she states that historians who have stressed that the early modern period was a time when women participated freely in science have put forth a "simplistic" argument (360). On

the basis of the conferences' discussions of women, she contends that the early modern period was an era during which "science sustained the predominant gender roles" (360).

Wellman's analysis of seventeenth-century science also makes a significant contribution to the history of biology. She points out that traditional histories of the scientific revolution focus on physics, mathematics, and mechanics. Using the conferences as evidence, she asserts that historians need to be aware of the emphasis that was placed on the biological and natural sciences. She offers a new way to think about the scientific revolution in order to challenge "the history of science [which] has privileged astronomy and physics" and which has downplayed "the biological and natural sciences" (152). In Wellman's formulation of the history of the scientific revolution, "the role of Aristotle...would be far different if the biological sciences were seen as central" (152).

Unfortunately, Wellman's treatment of the history of medicine is not on par with her examination of the histories of science, gender and science, and biology. Specifically, Wellman denigrates some aspects of early modern medicine by considering it from the perspective of modern medicine. Despite this shortcoming, she does a fine job establishing the skeptical, humanitarian, utilitarian, and optimistic qualities of the medical discussions that took place among the members of Renaudot's group, and associates these characteristics with the Enlightenment's view of medicine.

Several audiences would benefit from reading Wellman's text. Historians of science, gender and science, and biology will find an engaging reconsideration of some of the most important debates within the history of science. Specialists in the history of France will also benefit from Wellman's investigation into the age of absolutism and the Enlightenment, and the conferences' connections to these two periods.

Vickie B. Sullivan. *Machiavelli, Hobbes, and the Formation of a Liberal Republicanism in England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. x + 284 pp. \$75.00. Review by SIMON KOW, UNIVERSITY OF KING'S COLLEGE.

Vickie B. Sullivan attempts to counter readings of early modern republicanism as a strain of modern thought opposed to that of liberalism. For example, J.G.A. Pocock and Quentin Skinner have both argued that seventeenth- and eighteenth-century republican writers drew heavily from Machiavelli's works, and in turn developed civic humanist ideas which were to influence the founding fathers of the United States. Thus, classical republicanism should for these scholars be seen as a countervailing intellectual tradition in America to the liberalism of thinkers such as Locke. Sullivan contends that liberalism and republicanism should not be regarded as opposed. Instead, English republican thinkers combined the republicanism of Machiavelli with the liberalism implicit in the thought of Hobbes (and fully realized in Lockean political thought). She devotes the first part of the book to the ideas of Machiavelli and Hobbes, stressing that despite the differences between the two thinkers concerning their evaluations of war and peace as well as of pride and ambition in politics, there are common elements which tend to be emphasized by several English republican writers: the fundamentally passionate nature of human beings, and an instrumentalist conception of politics as serving to satisfy the passions. In the second part, she turns to the writings of Marchamont Nedham, James Harrington, Henry Neville, Algernon Sidney, and Cato—the pseudonym of John Trenchard and Thomas Gordon—to show that each of these writers were influenced by both Machiavelli and Hobbes in various ways. The liberal and republican tendencies are often in tension, but Cato's thought can be regarded as “the final synthesis of Machiavellian republicanism with Lockean liberalism” (228).

Sullivan's detailed discussion is a useful reminder of the difficulty in separating republican from liberal elements of early modern English political thought. English republican writers were

often as concerned with protecting property rights and fostering commerce as they were with resurrecting classical sources in their struggles against the monarchy. Sullivan is surely right to emphasize the characteristically modern preoccupations of such thinkers. Nevertheless, the work suffers from the tendency, epitomized by the writings of Leo Strauss and his followers (which she frequently cites), to simplify and de-contextualize early modern thought. Indeed, Sullivan shares their view that modernity is a monolithic intellectual project, thus eroding the fundamental theoretical and contextual differences between modern thinkers. For example, her chapter on Machiavelli omits virtually any discussion of his conception of fortune, while her treatment of Hobbes does not address his mechanistic and materialist account of nature. These foundational chapters thus neglect the profound historical and metaphysical gulf separating the instability of Machiavelli's Italy from Hobbes's quest for scientific certainty amidst the British civil wars. Moreover, she characterizes Machiavelli and Hobbes as theorists who broke from the Aristotelian concern with moral education because they both thought that "fear of punishment is the best motivator of human beings" (107). This caricature of noble ancients and nasty moderns is objectionable in several respects: it underplays Aristotle's recognition in his *Politics* of the fundamental need for coercion, overlooks Machiavelli's preference for republican virtue to the use of fear necessitated by corrupt regimes (a preference which she dismisses as disingenuous), and contradicts Hobbes's assertion in chapter 30 of *Leviathan* that the rights of sovereignty must be "diligently, and truly taught; because they cannot be maintained by any Civill Law, or terrour of legall punishment."

Her reading of English republicans is similarly flawed. Each of the chapters in the second part consists of laboured comparisons between English republican writings and the thought of Machiavelli, Hobbes, and Locke. She appears to subscribe to a view of intellectual history as dominated by the influences of great thinkers in arguing, for example, that Nedham's republicanism draws upon a "Machiavelli transformed for liberal purposes" (116), or that for Cato, "liberty—a liberty that is largely Lockean—must be

sustained with a Machiavellian spirit" (257). She also concludes the second part with a sketch of the "modern philosophic and scientific project" (260) spearheaded by Machiavelli, Descartes, and Hobbes to reinterpret Christianity. Yet, she acknowledges in a footnote in her chapter on Nedham that he cites Salmasius and Grotius as well as Hobbes (116, n.14), and so the reader is left wondering about the validity of an analysis of English republicans which centres so much on canonical texts and lumps them together in a single package.

The preoccupation with the influence solely of canonical thinkers is not the only anachronistic feature of her interpretation. Under the sway of Strauss's esoteric reading of Machiavelli, Sullivan maintains that Neville embraced the "vehement anticlericism of the Florentine" (190), who mischievously sought to "transform Christianity to permit it to serve as a resource for his political purposes" (263). Machiavelli was no fan of the conduct of the Catholic Church in his time, but his political writings show little interest in Christian theology. Sullivan's reading thus stems from the Straussian view that Machiavelli's silence on such matters reveals to the careful reader his project to undermine Christianity with a new philosophical teaching—an ambitious claim wholly unsupported by textual or historical evidence. Indeed, she goes so far as to attribute to the English republicans the art of esoteric writing. For example, Nedham reports Machiavelli's view that "not he that placeth a virtuous government in his own hands or family and governs well during his natural life, but he that establisheth a lasting form for the people's constant security is most to be commended," and cites *Discourses on Livy* 2.11 (which Nedham's modern editor corrects as 1.11) as his source. Sullivan contends that neither chapter of the *Discourses* contains the statement cited by Nedham, because he deliberately softened Machiavelli's teaching to make it compatible with a liberal concern for the security of the people (125). In fact, Nedham's assertion is correctly drawn from 1.11 of the *Discourses*, where Machiavelli writes that "it is the safety of a republic or a kingdom to have not one prince who governs prudently while he lives, but one individual who orders it so that it

is also maintained when he dies." There may be subtle differences between Machiavelli's words and Nedham's paraphrase, but the citation is surely intended to be faithful and not a conscious revision of Machiavelli's thought.

Most alarmingly, Sullivan fails to note the religious influences on American political thought. To argue that English liberal republicanism influenced the founding fathers requires that the puritan elements, for example, in the thought of Locke and the English republicans be considered. In turn, such considerations would cast doubt on the connections she makes between these writers and Hobbes, who was vehemently opposed to radical Protestantism. The assumption underlying these lacunae in her account—that liberalism and liberal republicanism are self-consciously and unambiguously hostile to revealed religion—explains her decision "not to treat John Milton...who was a very prominent republican during the Civil Wars...[because] ultimately his thought is too deeply embedded in biblical revelation to qualify as a precursor to liberal thought" (9, n.19). One is led to conclude that Sullivan is extremely selective in her choice of thinkers and topics in order to justify an ideological caricature of modernity.

Robert Bireley. *The Jesuits and the Thirty Years War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. xii + 330 pp. + 10 illus. + 1 map. \$65.00. Review by MARK CHARLES FISSEL, THE AUGUSTA ARSENAL.

In *The Jesuits and the Thirty Years War*, Robert Bireley constructs a narrative of the Jesuits' activities in church-state politics, diplomacy, and strategic decision-making in the period 1618-1648. He ventures into the four most important Catholic courts of Europe: Vienna, Munich, Paris, and Madrid. Using original manuscript sources Bireley interprets the activities of members of the Society of Jesus collectively and individually. He provides background and analysis that is both chronological and geographical in scope. The author then lays bare the influence of individual Jesuits (particularly confessors) at Catholic courts. Bireley man-

ages this complex balancing act beautifully. The result is a polished study based upon a wealth of manuscript evidence from archives across Europe.

Bireley has produced a refined rendering of church-state relations in post-Reformation Europe. Omnipresent historical phenomena, such as the coalescing of a "national spirit" (in the words of Muzio Vitelleschi, the Jesuit superior general (16)) and the mechanics of state formation, loom over the actions of individuals in this book. Yet one rarely feels lost in the turmoil of the Thirty Years War. Bireley prepares the way with succinct commentary and essentially chronological chapters whose themes snap together crisply. His summary of the causes of the Thirty Years War is clear-headed and insightful. Transitions from the European macocosm to the microcosmic labors of individual Jesuits blend seamlessly.

Thought-provoking conclusions are reached: "the Jesuits were not a monolithic organization" (267). The book resoundingly demolishes the myth of a Jesuit consensus regarding a grand strategy to extirpate Protestantism. Certainly from 1517 to 1648, Jesuits, like most Roman Catholics, desired the annihilation of the heretics. However, honest differences of opinion among the more conciliatory members of the Society and the Jesuit militant wing prevented the superior general from imposing a common political agenda upon his brothers. Even more broadly, no uniform and practical directives could mold the diverse relationships between religion and politics at the Catholic courts. How far did the personal relationship between confessors and their respective princes extend into the sphere of advising on political and military decisions? At Vienna and Munich the stakes were high, for Bireley demonstrates that at those courts the Jesuit confessors did affect the prosecution of the war.

Far from appearing as calculating conspirators, the Jesuits are revealed to be divided amongst themselves, leaning after the Peace of Prague in 1635 toward a mediated settlement with Protestant powers. With the new circumstances resulting from the signing of the Peace and the entrance of France into the war, there resulted



many Jesuit "positions." Some Jesuits favored a European (indeed, global) peace that might arrest the bloodshed that seemed to be swallowing the civilized world, even if that course permitted the temporary survival of Protestantism. Compromise would ultimately benefit and complete the Catholic Reformation.

A danger in viewing the Thirty Years War from the perspective of Catholic diplomacy is that the wars of religion can too easily be seen as yet another period of chronic instability in Europe. One observes the machinations of princes and the inevitable marches of armies. From a Protestant viewpoint, the post-Reformation era was a desperate struggle for survival. That the Vatican might be swept away seemed unlikely. However, that the Protestant heresy would be crushed mercilessly, and thousands of believers murdered (as had happened to Albigensians, Hussites and other proto-Protestants), was a real and terrifying possibility.

The fundamental difference in world view can be seen in Bireley's treatment of the Cleves-Julich War of 1610-1614. Seen from the eyes of diplomats, princes, and the superior general, events such as the Cleves-Julich crisis appeared to be violent adjustments of spheres of influence, not entirely unlike the events that led to the Peace of Augsburg (1555) and then the Edict of Nantes (1598). However, the assassination of Henry IV of France (by a former student of a Jesuit College) had proved that no one was safe from the long knives. Memories of the St. Bartholomew's Day massacre and fears that the dynastic contest in Cleves-Julich might turn the tide and overwhelm the Protestant powers triggered defensive preparations as far afield as England. Bireley notes that despite traditional animosities between France and Spain, the latter countries, with a papal blessing, seriously considered amassing an allied Armada to invade Britain in the late 1620s and topple Charles I. Protestant paranoia was grounded in real events.

In fact, the traditional Whiggish Protestant association of absolutism with Jesuitical Catholicism might not be so farfetched. Bireley observes, "The foundation and development of the Society of Jesus has generally, and correctly, been interpreted as bolstering the role of the papacy. But one can argue, on the other hand, that

Jesuit support of princes in the seventeenth century also contributed to the advance of princely absolutism vis-a-vis the Church” (274). In 1640 a papal nuncio acknowledged the heartfelt religiosity of the Jesuits but opined that the order more promoted the interests of Catholic princes than was a champion of the papacy. Considering the oft-recited allegation that the Jesuits strove to bring temporal powers under the authority of the Holy See, Bireley’s point is notable (particularly considering the constitutional dimensions of the Thirty Years War in the Empire and elsewhere).

It was in the Empire, where the chaos of the Reformation had so damaged the older religious orders, that Jesuits occupied with some intimacy the imperial and princely courts. In France the Huguenots had made significant advances against Catholicism. Gallican sentiments inclined French institutions to be suspicious of Jesuit influence. So members of the Society of Jesus aligned themselves closely to the French monarchy. At Madrid (as was the case in many Italian cities) the older orders maintained their pre-eminence and thus the Jesuits did not insinuate themselves as easily in the corridors of power as they did in Munich and Vienna.

Bireley’s research reveals a great deal about the rise of absolutism, the emergence of modern European states, and the origins of nationalism (Vitelleschi’s “national spirit”). Rarely does an academic work reach so many audiences: specialists can glean all sorts of evidence hitherto inaccessible, graduate students may emulate a master historian’s methodology and exposition, and undergraduates will find the synoptic overview that makes a complex period more comprehensible. In short, *The Jesuits and the Thirty Years War* confirms Robert Bireley’s reputation as one of the most skilled early modernists in North America.

Katherine A. Lynch. *Individuals, Families, and Communities in Europe, 1200–1800: The Urban Foundations of Western Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. xiii + 250 pp. \$65.00. Review by ALISA PLANT, TULANE UNIVERSITY.

As its title makes plain, this is an ambitious book. Attempting to encompass the whole of Western Europe over the *longue durée* in a relatively short volume is setting the bar high. While *Individuals, Families, and Communities in Europe, 1200–1800* has the limitations of its virtues, Katherine Lynch has succeeded in her goal, which is “to show how family forms and organizational or ‘community’ forms developed together as interdependent parts of the same society” (1-2). Her focus is on continuity, not change, and she justly stresses the fact that many aspects of urban communal life remained basically unaltered from the high Middle Ages until the Industrial Revolution. She also makes a forceful and convincing case for “integrating family history more fully into the history of the public world” (18). To do this, she adopts the concept of “civil society,” which she delineates as a “sphere of public life lying outside the narrow confines of household or family life, but that is distinguishable from formal political life” (19). Among other things, this approach allows her to highlight the contributions of women in urban society, as well as to discuss larger kinship networks beyond the confines of the household.

Chapter 1, “Fundamental features of European urban settings,” provides an overview of urban life in western Europe in the high and late Middle Ages. By setting low population thresholds for towns and cities—3,000 and 10,000 respectively—Lynch is able to make the case that western Europe was more urbanized than many historians have allowed. She convincingly argues that even small towns depended on in-migration to meet their labor needs (and to offset the high mortality rates that habitually plagued urban areas). Yet concurrent with this in-migration was a steady stream of out-migration (especially among members of more prosperous and enduring families), which helped to “intermix rural and urban habits and beliefs” (33). Lynch suggestively links marriage to economic conditions and outbreaks of pestilence (better standards of living meant that fewer people married); she notes the relatively small size of the urban household compared to its rural counterpart and considers the “plebeian” and “patrician” forms of kin interaction, distinguishing broad variations between northern and southern

Europe. She also analyzes continuities—and fluctuations—in the types of work done by urban women, the numbers of women who worked for pay, and the extent to which women worked within the context of the family.

Chapter 2, “Church, family, and bonds of spiritual kinship,” explores how the medieval church tried to shape notions of family and kinship by subsuming individual families into a mystical “family” of Christian believers. The institution of godparenthood, for example, was part of a “system of spiritual kinship to rival or at least complement ties of blood” (70). Communities of the regular clergy were ideally supposed to fulfill the same function. Lynch also examines the various models of community—both familial and extra-familial—provided by the Church, arguing that “religiously inspired organizations,” such as confraternities or communities of beguines, “furnished men and women with forms of solidarity that proved quite useful for surviving in the city” (68). Often, confraternal relations supplemented rather than supplanted the ties of kinship; yet they importantly also helped men and women “establish and maintain networks of friendship and mutuality in ways not permitted through family or kinship alone” (100).

Building on these notions, Chapter 3, “Charity, poor relief, and the family in religious and civic communities,” considers the less fortunate members of urban society. Lynch focuses not on “strangers,” the vagrant poor, but on the “familiar poor”; she is thus able to draw a somewhat happier picture than that of the familiar repress-or-expel measures that were increasingly adopted by sixteenth-century municipal authorities in the wake of negative economic pressures. As she contends, “face-to-face relations and reciprocity were key to establishing and maintaining relationships based on charity” (109). In the late Middle Ages, both lay organizations and civic governments were actively involved in poor relief efforts; in the sixteenth century, poor relief became entwined with confessionalization, frequently transforming notions of the “deserving poor” as a general construct into specific, church membership-driven categories.

Lynch expands her argument still further in Chapter 4, "Individuals, families, and communities in urban Europe of the Protestant and Catholic Reformations," which looks at how the continued religious divisions affected the creation of both civic and confessional communities. Ultimately, she maintains that the manifold expressions of confessionalization—such as the Calvinist consistory or church courts—"had important effects on domestic life and were . . . shaped by the needs that individuals felt to express both individual and family identities" (169). Although the sixteenth century was in some ways a period of declining economic power and status for women, for example, Lynch argues that many women, especially elite and/or married women, gained new opportunities to establish their own spheres of communal action, primarily through charitable work. In short, both Protestants and Catholics "used their domestic identities as fathers and mothers—whether real or fictive—in organized community-building activities that shaped and enlarged the sphere of civil society" (170).

While Lynch ably and imaginatively draws together various skeins of historiography—urban, gender, religious, demographic, familial—to show how urban families and communities coped with incrementally changing pressures and conditions, the first four chapters of *Individuals, Families, and Communities in Europe* are largely a synthesis of recent research within the context of her interpretative framework. In contrast, Chapter 5, "Constructing an 'imagined community': poor relief and the family during the French Revolution," is largely based on archival research. Perhaps because of this, it is the most interesting. Restricting her focus to poor relief, Lynch situates the nation-building efforts of the revolutionaries against a backdrop of earlier models of community formation. She provides a stimulating discussion of how poor relief was seen as a national responsibility, even as efforts to help the poor focused on individuals and the creation of "virtuous republican families centered on the household" (197).

The leap from Chapter 4 to Chapter 5—from the Reformation era to that of the French Revolution—is somewhat curious; how did the Enlightenment or early industrial growth, for example,

affect family and community development? But this quibble should not detract from the fact that Katherine Lynch has produced a valuable, well-argued, and thought-provoking contribution to the fields of family history, urban history, and community formation, among others. In her conclusion, she writes, "If this study encourages research on the sorts of factors and interrelationships explored here, I will count my work a success" (221). It will, and she should.

William R. Shea and Mariano Artigas. *Galileo in Rome: The Rise and Fall of a Troublesome Genius*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003. xii + 226 pp. £ 16.99 / \$ 28 paper. Review by ALESSANDRO GIOSTRA, ACCADEMIA GEORGICA, TREIA.

William R. Shea, holder of the Galileo Chair of the History of Science at the University of Padua, and Mariano Artigas, professor of Philosophy of Science at the University of Navarra, reconstruct Galileo's personal life by highlighting his six trips to Rome. This is surely an original point of view, allowing the authors to lay stress on the famous case between Galileo and the Church, which "remains as fascinating as ever, and it has much to teach us that is relevant to our own day" (xi).

In the first chapter, "Job Hunting and the Path to Rome" (1-18), Shea and Artigas deal with early moments in Galileo's career. The meeting with Ostilio Ricci during this time, which brought about Galileo's conversion to mathematics, can be deemed the beginning of his scientific path. Galileo's first trip to Rome is set within the cultural milieu of the Counter Reformation. He arrived in Rome in 1587 under the pontificate of Sixtus V, namely the pope who "was more active than any pope within living memory" (11), because of his own tireless action for architectural modernization, public works, the advancement of learning, and against criminality. The most important scientific figure in Rome was "the leading Jesuit mathematician" (5) Cristopher Clavius, the main protagonist of the "Calendar Reform" (6), whom Galileo met in the autumn of that same year. It is uncertain whether at this time he

also met “the leading Jesuit theologian” (7) Cardinal Robert Bellarmine, who in the following years would play a key role in Galileo’s life.

The second trip to Rome is outlined in Chapter 2, “The Door of Fame Springs Open” (19-48). The situation of the 1611 trip was totally different from Galileo’s previous one in 1587, when he was still an unknown researcher searching for a job. The Tuscan scientist had just ended his eighteen year professorship at the University of Padua; furthermore, the publication of *Sidereus Nuncius*, regarding celestial novelties observed through the telescope, made him famous all over the scientific world. After a brief description of the results he achieved with that instrument, Shea and Artigas describe Galileo’s Roman meetings. On this occasion the Jesuit astronomers agreed with his discoveries, as one can read in their response to Cardinal Bellarmine, and congratulated him on his astonishing outcome. After meeting Prince Federico Cesi, Galileo officially became a member of the Lyncean Academy, a cultural institution which contributed greatly to his scientific work. Galileo left Rome in April 1611 and in a letter to the Florentine grand duke sent by Cardinal Francesco Maria del Monte his triumph was made clear.

In the third chapter, “Roman Clouds” (49-93), the authors highlight the events that led to the first decree against Copernicanism. The work on sunspots and the *Copernican Letters* increased suspicion against Galileo, even if at this point his works were still not banned. “Had Galileo been able to demonstrate the truth of Copernicanism, all would have been well, but he did not have and was never to have such proof” (73); such is the main reason inducing the Church to reject the new astronomic theory. The distinctive features of that debate can be seen in the famous letter to Paolo Antonio Foscarini by Cardinal Bellarmine, whose opinion was fundamental for the decision made in 1616. It was just the lack of a physical proof of the Copernican theory which led Bellarmine to believe in an astronomy that saved the phenomena. In his letter Bellarmine remarked that the Council of Trent had prohibited the Scriptures from being interpreted in opposition to the common

agreement of the Holy Fathers. Whenever a proof is given, according to Bellarmine, it is better to establish that we do not understand Scripture than to affirm that what has been proven is false. In Bellarmine's mind it is necessary to concede that the ideas for a physical proof of the terrestrial motion and astronomy as a mathematical device are connected with more complex questions related to the Aristotelian arrangement of learning. His letter to Foscarini, however, makes clear that the lack of a demonstration of the motion of the Earth was a crucial point in the opposition to Copernicanism. Indeed, the Decree of the Congregation of Index did not consider Copernicus' work "formally heretical," as the Holy Office had done, but only "false and contrary to Holy Scripture" (85).

Galileo's Roman journey in 1624 is the subject of Chapter 4, "Roman Sunshine" (94-122). Cardinal Maffeo Barberini had been elected to the papal throne, taking Urban VIII as his name. The new pontiff had expressed very favorable opinions on Galileo's activity until this time. Thus, Galileo strongly hoped that even the Church would accept the new astronomical theories; the events of the following years, however, gave Galileo the lie. The authors lay stress on the ideas held by the pope about astronomical theories as simple mathematical conjectures, in accordance with the contents of Andreas Osiander's preface to Copernicus' *De Revolutionibus Orbium Coelestium*. At the end of this section, Shea and Artigas treat the denunciation to the Holy Office of Galileo's *Assayer*, since the atomic theory upon which it is founded clashed with the dogma of transubstantiation. The question was put to rest by the theologian Giovanni di Guevara, "who read Galileo's work and saw no reason to pursue the matter" (119).

As one can read in one of Galileo's letters to Prince Federico Cesi, the *Dialogue on the two Chief System* was almost ready at the end of 1629, although health problems beginning in 1625 made for "slow progress" (127) in writing it. The attempt to publish the *Dialogue* in Rome led to his penultimate trip to The Eternal City, which is treated in Chapter 5, "Star Crossed Heavens" (123-157). Galileo's endeavor was unsuccessful because of a combination of



circumstances, among them the death of Federico Cesi. After editing his masterpiece in Florence in 1632, Galileo took his last trip to Rome the following year, the one during which he was condemned (Chapter 6, "Foul Weather in Rome," 158-200). Shea and Artigas further emphasize that the final judgment against Galileo was the result of contemporary circumstances such as political tension in the Church, Galileo's wish to conceal Bellarmine's admonitions of 1616, the attempt to hide the Copernican meaning of his work, and the lack of ecclesiastical permission for its publication, coupled with the lack of a valid proof of Copernicanism, which had been the main reason for the Decree of 1616. The last pages of the book are devoted to Galileo's final years. It is outside the authors' task to go deeply into the contents of Galileo's scientific testament, the *Discourses and Mathematical Demonstrations concerning Two New Sciences*, as it was published in 1638. There were no problems for the publication of the *Discourses*; "since the book did not mention Copernicanism, the Church decided to let the matter drop" (198).

Shea and Artigas' work reaches its aim to "avoid technicalities" (xi) and at the same time offers a detailed biography of Galileo. Galileo's case has too often been deemed an instance of Catholic deafness to scientific progress. A more careful consideration of the facts and attention to recent discoveries concerning the history of science shows the insubstantiality of such a vision. It is not wrong however to consider the different viewpoints upheld by Galileo and Bellarmine as the clearest example of the relationship between Copernican astronomy and scriptural exegesis in the early seventeenth century. Galileo supported the impossible literal interpretation of those biblical passages concerning astronomy; thus, the Bible is not a scientific book. In this way he proved to be a better theologian than Bellarmine, who at his turn surpassed Galileo in the epistemological dimension of knowledge. Indeed, in opposition to Galileo, who was sure of having gotten a true demonstration of the motion of the Earth, the cardinal relied upon the lack of evidence for the new cosmology. Although some lay readers interested in the history of scientific thought could deem such a

conclusion to be paradoxical, it should be esteemed quite otherwise by specialists.

Sophie van Romburgh. *“For My Worthy Friend Mr Franciscus Junius”*: *An Edition of the Correspondence of Francis Junius F.F. (1591-1677)*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2004. x + 1134 pp. \$317.00. Review by ERNEST B. GILMAN, NEW YORK UNIVERSITY.

The indefatigable Dutch polymath whose letters are here collected was a jack of all scholarly trades and the master of them all. Medievalists are aware of Junius's pioneering contributions to the study of Anglo-Saxon and Germanic philology. He was an expert in the comparative study of Old Norse, Old High German, Old Frisian, and Gothic as well as Old English. The codex in the Bodleian containing the Old English texts of Genesis A and B, Exodus, Daniel and “Christ and Satan,” still bears his name as “The Junius Manuscript.” For Renaissance art historians, *The Painting of the Ancients* (published in Junius's own Latin, English and Dutch versions over the period 1637-1641) represents the first comprehensive account of the visual arts in antiquity, and a central document in the history of *ut pictura poesis*. It stood as the standard work on the subject until the age of Winckelmann. This book was commissioned by Thomas Howard, 14<sup>th</sup> Earl of Arundel, in whose household Junius served as tutor and librarian for twenty years before the civil war. It was in this office that Junius supplied the scholarly expertise, and perhaps also his share of the enthusiasm, behind the transnational antiquarian ventures of the “Collector Earl.” Among the projects that occupied a long life devoted to scholarship was a posthumously published *Catalogus*, arranged alphabetically, of all the references to objects of art (painting, sculpture, architecture, pottery and much else) that Junius could delve out of the archive of classical literature.

A new edition of *The Painting of the Ancients* was published in 1991 by Philipp and Raina Fehl. Yet with no full biography of Junius, and—given his prominence in the age—relatively few special studies (my own among them) in print, our image of the industri-

ous and retiring scholar behind these achievements has until now been partial at best. Sophie van Romburgh's painstakingly documented edition of Junius's correspondence goes a long way toward completing the picture. The volume includes 226 extant letters—many others having evidently been lost. Most of the letters are in Latin, some in English and Dutch (the Latin and Dutch are translated into English on the facing page). Half are from Junius, the rest from a total of sixty-four correspondents in England and Holland. Fourteen are family members (most prominent among them, the Leiden classicist and theologian Gerardus Vossius). Junius's chief scholarly correspondents also include Grotius, Willem de Groot, Thomas Marshall, Rubens, Meric Casaubon, and William Dugdale. There are letters to, or from, Selden, Casaubon, John Cotton, and Van Dyck, among others on the English scene. One might have expected to find a substantial correspondence with Arundel, but considering that over the many years of their association Junius lived in his patron's house, there would have been little need for him to write. In the first letter, as van Romburgh notes, we find an eleven-year-old in 1602 "struggling with Latin to inform his father of his progress at school" (9). In Junius's last, written almost seventy years later in 1671, the still-vigorous octogenarian discusses the state of Restoration politics with his countryman Geeraert Brandt (1051).

Most readers, lacking Junius's stamina, will be daunted by the prospect of plowing through so long an epistolary record occupying more than eleven hundred pages. Happily, van Romburgh's extensive apparatus (including a list of correspondents and letters exchanged, an inventory of the corpus, exhaustive footnotes with cross-references, and a detailed index) makes it easy to track the correspondence and to locate particular individuals and topics discussed. Many of the letters deal with books borrowed and lent, money forwarded, the difficulties of seeing manuscripts through the press, Junius's research interests and philological methods, family problems and (to the reader's occasional relief) the minutiae of daily life: On one occasion, Junius asks his sister to be on the lookout for a certain kind of market basket fancied by the Countess of

Arundel, one of those “neat little straw baskets embroidered in black and having some bleached linen on the inside” (693). Interestingly, some of Junius’s more highly wrought Latin letters were composed as a kind of *cento*, stringing unacknowledged but (to his learned reader) familiar passages of classical quotation together to make up his own narrative. This, as van Romburgh notes, is the same “mosaic” style as Junius used in *The Painting of the Ancients* (44).

Browsing through the volume offers its own serendipitous satisfactions. Many of the letters are both elegant and deeply meditated. Thus Vossius recounts to Junius an elaborate dream in which the blessed Chrysostom appears to the dreamer to offer guidance for Vossius’s sermons before disappearing in a white cloud (109-11). In a letter from 1615 Junius shares with Vossius his own apprehensions about the Dutch body politic, in danger of being torn apart by the Remonstrant controversy—in Junius’s Latin, *Graviter vulnerata, corpori tamen adhuc annexa membra, remedium expectant, non autem a reliquo corpore avulsa* (128). Two years later Junius offers Willem Roels, a prominent public figure in Middleburg, a reflection on the Last Judgment, counseling him that “the heart which imagines the final hour . . . does not allow for hypocrisy, just as a consideration of this solid heavenly bliss also scatters the empty shadows of frail worldly vanities” (149). In 1635 Junius sends Vossius a lengthy report on his *Painting of the Ancients*, then nearing completion. By way of William Boswell, secretary to Fulke Greville, Junius has been made aware of a request from Claudius Salmasius, Milton’s future antagonist, for some drawings from the Arundel marbles of a certain kind of Greek military attire. Although the question interests Arundel himself, Junius confesses that he knows little about the subject and recounts his repeated but unsuccessful attempts to arrange a meeting with John Selden, who apparently could not find time in his busy schedule to consult with Junius on the matter (497-99).

In the broadest context, the correspondence provides more than a glimpse into the working life of the scholar and his associates. Taken together, the letters now published by van Romburgh make

available the record of an erudite pre-technological chatroom whose contributors, as the editor notes, are members of a scholarly “community which was cherished for, and existed by virtue of, these reciprocal bonds of learned exchange” (29-30). Ideas and books were shared along often complicated routes involving intermediaries who joined in an ongoing and far-flung conversation. As we can discern from the earlier correspondence of figures like More and Erasmus, and as Peter Miller has shown in the case of Junius’s contemporary Nicolas-Claude Fabri de Peiresc, humanist letter-writers constitute a community independent of, but also interconnecting, the spheres of the university, the court, and the church. Junius’s network of correspondents and their epistolary relations form such an institution, both social and material, that is the very medium of European intellectual life in the early modern period. It is worthy of study in itself, not as adjunct to the printed book but as the vital matrix in which the published products of humanist culture took shape.

Jeremy Black. *European Warfare, 1494–1660*. London: Routledge, 2002. xii + 244 pp. \$25.95. Review by MITCHELL MCNAYLOR, OUR LADY OF THE LAKE COLLEGE, BATON ROUGE, LOUISIANA.

This is a very broad book in conception and the author covers an enormous amount of ground in just over two hundred pages, ranging from North America, throughout Europe, to Siberia, and across 166 years of history. Jeremy Black seeks to build on his earlier work *European Warfare, 1660–1815*, and describes the aim of the work thusly: “The book combines operational history with an analysis of structures and long-term change, and with cultural, social, and political contexts” (x). Black includes chapters on “Cultural and political contexts,” “A military revolution?,” “European expansion and the global context 1490–1578,” “European warfare 1494–1559,” “European warfare 1560–1617,” “European warfare 1618–60,” “Naval developments,” and “European expansion and the global context 1578–1660.”

Unlike other works in a “war and society” vein, *European Warfare, 1494–1660* attempts to introduce operational matter, remembering the lesson of Keegan’s *The Face of Battle* that military organizations exist for one main purpose: combat—a topic too often neglected by academic historians. His operational accounts are extremely brief, however. This is not a campaign history, nor a book that features rousing tales of martial valor. Rather, Black’s examples are there to support the argument. It is hoped that other scholars may also take an interest in operational histories of early modern military engagements.

*European Warfare, 1494–1660* de-emphasizes the link between military activities and state formation and centralization. Black contends that, “for most Europeans, the state was more peripheral than the harvest or the conflict with disease. War, the damage it could create, and the need to support it, through finance, recruitment and supplies, were the most significant impact of politics and the state. . . . In war, armies and navies were capable of considerable achievements. However, their organizational and technological capabilities were limited, particularly in terms of resource availability, mobility, and firepower. Nor was there any fundamental alteration in the nature of war. As a result, successful military powers did not need to alter their economic system or develop a sophisticated industrial capability” (31).

Black also takes another crack at the military revolution debate. While he states early on that he does not want this to dominate the book, the military revolution has its own chapter, and Black proceeds to return to it in every other subsequent chapter. This book is a call for an emphasis on continuity. Black presents no bold thesis on the order of Geoffrey Parker’s revised military revolution thesis, or Victor Davis Hanson’s *Western Way of Warfare*. He remains dubious about the idea of a military revolution, claiming: “the general conclusion is that the military realities were both too complex (geographically) and too much dependent on previous experiences (political, cultural and economic) to make the term ‘military revolution’ useful as a phrase to encapsulate military changes in the period. There were changes, in technologies,

organizations, and attitudes, but they were neither revolutionary, nor universal" (215).

This book is a systematic attempt to go after the basic points of the military revolution thesis and to present a model of military change based on continuity, rather than dynamic revolution. Black contends that the European nobility continued to exert a great deal of power throughout the period under consideration, and that the history of the period is not solely that of monarchies consolidating their power. In addition, he questions whether military changes in the period "deserve the description 'revolutionary'" (47). Although, one might also speculate that getting academic historians to agree on a specific definition of "revolutionary" is task of extreme difficulty.

Indeed, Black also suggests that academics may cynically overuse the term revolution in order to gain more attention, arguing that "most authors seek to emphasize the importance of their subject, and for many decades it has been customary to do so by stressing its revolutionary character and consequences" (215). This is a well-taken point, for anything containing the word "revolution" sounds more dynamic than, for instance, a debate over early modern European army size. Young academics looking to publish an article in their particular subfield of history could do worse than to attempt to tie their research into a debate containing the word "revolution" or "crisis."

Jeremy Black possesses an astonishing temporal and geographical range in this book. These qualities are of great help in commenting on early modern military history, although they can also leave readers wishing for more details in a book that is so short. For general readers not current on the twists and turns of academic controversies, some passages might prove confusing. For instance:

In recent decades, structure has dominated non-operational (i. e., non-campaign) accounts of war, particularly with the emphasis on technological analyses of development, that present an almost automatic corollary in military effectiveness, and also with the interest, in the 'new military

history,' in social contexts. This structural emphasis has a number of weaknesses, not least its proneness to determinism and the extent to which it does not match the emphasis on agency seen in operational military history and in the studies of the international relations that helped determine military tasking. In the case of the Dutch Revolt, the range of Philip's options included different political strategies in the Low Countries, the choice of subordinates and the allocation of resources between different spheres. It is difficult to see how structural interpretations can be sustained. (117)

Those not familiar with the cut and thrust of recent academic debates might be unaware of Black's specific targets; those who are aware of such debates might wish that Black pressed his points home with more vigor and specificity. Despite Black's tendency to move from point to point too swiftly, students of early modern European military history overlook Jeremy Black at their peril.

Edward Corp. *A Court in Exile: The Stuarts in France, 1689-1718*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. xvi + 386 pp. + 25 illus. \$85.00. Review by MOLLY MCCLAIN, UNIVERSITY OF SAN DIEGO.

This is the first analysis of the Stuart court in exile in France after 1689. It draws on an impressive array of primary sources, including documents which escaped the general destruction of manuscripts during the French Revolution. Thanks to the efforts of Edward Corp and his contributors, Edward Gregg, Howard Erskine-Hill and Geoffrey Scott, the court at Saint-Germain emerges as a center of artistic and literary production as well as a safe haven for James II, Mary of Modena and the young James III.

Edward Corp is professor of History at the University of Toulouse. In addition to producing an impressive array of articles, Corp has curated and written the catalogs of two major exhibitions, *La Cour des Stuarts à Saint-Germain-en-Laye au temps de Louis XIV* (1992) and *The King over the Water, 1688-1766* (2002).



With this work, he attempts to shift historians' focus from the question, "How popular was Jacobitism?" to the question of how the exiled court actually worked. It suggests opportunities for further research on leading courtiers such as the John Drummond, Earl of Melfort, and on the internal dynamics of the Jacobite cause. It also illustrates the need for a new biography of Mary of Modena who appears to have been the most powerful figure at the court of Saint-Germain.

In Chapter 1, Edward Gregg provides a detailed account of the activities of the exiled Stuarts from the Revolution of 1688-89 to the Treaty of Utrecht in 1713. He suggests that James II and Louis XIV were not friends until after the former was forced to flee England, and perhaps not even then. Louis XIV remained suspicious of his cousin. James II, meanwhile, "displayed an incredible degree of self-delusion concerning the French and their intentions" (11). It was not personal or professional sympathy which caused Louis XIV to support James II against William III but the knowledge that France had no important allies in the ongoing war for the Spanish Netherlands. His best hope was to weaken England's position in that struggle by fostering internal civil war.

To that end, Louis XIV provided his cousin with a home at the Château-Vieux de Saint-Germain-en-Laye and a very generous income of 600,000 *livres* a year. In 1696, the household contained around 225 people, including secretaries of state, musicians, messengers and pensioners. The majority of the servants were English but there were also Irish, French, Italians and Scots. Corp makes a point of emphasizing the small number of Scots because "so many historians, and notably the French, have assumed that the Jacobite court was essentially a Scottish court" (137). Fewer than one-third of the household servants had followed the king and queen from Whitehall; many more were recruited in Ireland and France.

Between 1690 and 1712, the court was permanently based at Saint-Germain. The chateau was located 16 kilometers to the west of Paris on a plateau which provided spectacular views east over

the river Seine. Louis XIV and his court had resided at this palace before moving to Versailles.

Previously-undiscovered plans from the Bibliotheque Nationale reveal what the palace actually looked like and how rooms were used. In 1684, the French king had introduced a *Grand Appartement du Roi*, without a bedchamber, to be used for receptions and entertainments, as well as the normal *Appartement du Roi* where he actually lived and had his formal bedchamber. Since the palace had been designed to suit the peculiar ceremonial practices of French court, the Stuarts had to adapt their household and ceremonial to take account of the available space. The *Grand Appartement du Roi* was transformed into an apartment for the queen while the king had to make do with the limited number of rooms in the north wing. The second-floor rooms were furnished with rich tapestries and paintings, including a copy of Van Dyck's *Three Children of Charles I*. The chapel, meanwhile, was decorated in white and gold, with sculpted and varnished boiseries and a particularly rich collection of church plate. The first thing that Jacobites would have seen upon entering the chapel were paintings of severed heads in Matteo Rosselli's *Le Triomphe de David* and *Le Triomphe de Judith* with the result that they were constantly reminded of the fate of the martyred King Charles I.

During the 1690's, a large expatriate community gathered around the royal household. It was so self-contained that many of the exiles never learned to speak French. Entertainments included suppers, billiards, hunting, visits to the gardens, court balls, and music in the chapel, the theatre and the apartments. Protestants were tolerated and protected from the consequences of the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. The needs of impoverished exiles, particularly the Irish, were provided for by the sale of jewels. By the end of 1698, James II had raised over 31,000 *livres* for the "relief of such distressed families" from the sale of diamonds, pearls and gold plate (121).

Together, Louis XIV and Mary of Modena worked to foster close relations between the two courts. The French king often visited Saint-Germain while the Stuarts spent time at Versailles,

Fontainebleau and, later, Marly and Trianon. The queen became close friends with Madame de Maintenon. She was also popular with other members of the royal family. The Duchess of Orléans described her as “courteous and pleasant and always cheerful” (170). According to Corp, she and Louis XIV used the supper parties, concerts and holidays “to pave the way for an extended period of Anglo-French peace, when James III would be restored, and the dauphin and then the duc de Bourgogne would be kings of France. They were trying to provide France and England (as well as Spain) with kings who had known and even loved each other throughout childhood, adolescence and early manhood, something which would have been unique in European history” (179).

This book provides a wealth of information on the cultural patronage of the Stuart court. Chapter 7 focuses on portraits of the Stuarts and their leading courtiers, a topic that is explored in more detail in Corp’s *King over the Water*. Chapter 8 looks at the court as a center of Italian music. A brief article by Howard Erskine-Hill considers poetry as part of the cultural legacy of the court.

Religious literature was also produced at the exiled court, most notably by James II. Geoffrey Scott analyzes the king’s devotional writings which were published in 1704 as *The Pious Sentiments of the Late King James II of Blessed Memory upon Divers Subjects of Piety*. He suggests that “the guiding spirit in James’s conversion and devotional life was the Society of Jesus” (247) as understood through the writings of St Francis de Sales. This argument deserves attention and further consideration. Scott also contributes a very useful chapter on the education of James III.

The final chapters of the book describe the transformation of the exiled court after 1713 when James III was obliged to leave France to settle, first, in Lorraine and, second, in the Papal States following the failure of the rebellion of 1715-16. During these years, Mary of Modena returned to Saint-Germain from her increasingly lengthy stays at the Couvent de la Visitation at Chaillot. Corp examines both the exiled court at Saint-Germain during its

final years and the Jacobite community which remained there for several decades after the death of the queen in 1718.

*A Court in Exile* is an important addition to the history of the Jacobite cause which should stimulate further research. It is recommended for graduate students and others interested in the question of how the royal court maintained its tradition, organization and ceremonial in the face of exile and military defeat.

Joad Raymond. *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. xviii + 403 pp. + 41 illus. + 6 figs. \$70.00. Review by TIMOTHY RAYLOR, CARLETON COLLEGE.

Over the last decade, Joad Raymond has emerged as one of our foremost analysts of the early modern English newsbook, leading us to a new understanding of its rhetorical and political dimensions. This latest book draws upon his expertise in the field of cheap print while extending his view to an even larger topic. Or rather, topics: for, as its title indicates, this book is concerned with both pamphlets *and* pamphleteering. These are of course different aspects of the same phenomenon, but (as the divided title indicates) they do not necessarily invite (or easily permit) a single analysis. Raymond's study ambitiously brings them together, discussing the pamphlet in bibliographic, rhetorical, and socio-political terms, tracing its rise through a series of richly evidenced essays arranged in broadly chronological sequence. The governing thesis of a rise is not always the focus of his efforts, and he seldom presses it directly, but the wealth and weight of the evidence he presents and the order in which he presents it are such that, by the end of the book, one is amply persuaded of its justice.

The book begins by asking, appropriately, "What is a pamphlet?" to which several not entirely satisfactory answers are given from a number of different angles, including the bibliographical (a printed work of no more than ninety-six quarto pages), the etymological (deriving from the name "Pamphilus"), and the polemical (a scurrilous squib, written by somebody else). It quickly

becomes apparent that Raymond's concern is more functional than bibliographical: his focus is the short polemic rather than the larger material genus of which it is a species; he is not concerned, for example, with the advices of the economic projectors or educational reformers. The formal origins of the polemical pamphlet emerge in the following chapter: a lively survey of its locus classicus, the Marprelate controversy, with its pitting of cheap print, subversion, and racy wit against longwinded clerical orthodoxy.

In the third chapter Raymond turns (either a little belatedly or perhaps, strictly speaking, unnecessarily) to the bibliographical foundations of his discussion. The chapter offers a lucid overview of "printing practices and the book trade" with particular reference to the pamphlet. For a book aimed at a scholarly audience and focused on polemic, the necessity of so full an account here is debatable (especially given the effectiveness with which both Peter Blayney and Adrian Johns have recently surveyed the same territory). But Raymond's understanding of these practices is so clear, and his mastery of anecdote so appealing and enlivening, that even the accomplished book trade historian will, I imagine, find much here to enlighten and entertain.

In Chapter 4 Raymond examines what we might regard as the prehistory of those newsbooks of the 1640s which formed the subject of his previous monograph; it surveys the occasional news pamphlets of the late Elizabethan and the corantos of the Jacobean to early Caroline periods, with their accounts of domestic marvels and foreign battles. It is an authoritative, wide-ranging overview, which sets the growth of news in a European context while examining the anxious responses of native writers like Jonson to the phenomenon. And yet the chapter feels slightly broken backed: while it purports to address the period 1580-1660, its emphasis is squarely on pre-Civil War developments, to which is added a brief account of government attempts to control the press up to the Restoration.

The narrative proper is picked up in what is surely the most surprising chapter of the book: a striking piece of original research which (bringing a "three kingdoms" approach to bear on

book history) adds a new dimension to our understanding of the information revolution of 1641-2 by arguing for the “Scottish origins of the explosion of print,” in the impact of covenanter polemics (printed in Scotland and the Low Countries) on the London media. If the precise impact of the Scottish dimension is not, in the end, completely clear (it “precipitated and accelerated trends in the British book market” (201)) the chapter’s introductory “Statistics” should be pondered by all concerned with press output and, more particularly, by anyone who (like the present reviewer) has ever made confident claims about that output on the basis of the Thomason collection, the idiosyncracies of which Raymond clearly reveals and persuasively explains.

The long sixth chapter feels like the heart of the book, tracing the “printing revolutions” after the breakdown of authority in 1641-2 through to its partial reconstitution in 1659-60. Here Raymond considers the use of the pamphlet by Levellers, Ranters, and Quakers (he is especially fresh and rewarding on the Quakers), and discusses a handful of pamphleteering genres: the animadversion (usefully taxonomized with help from the late Jeremy Maule), the letter, the dialogue, and the character sketch before breaking with chronology and taxonomy to conclude with a close reading of *Areopagatica* against this background: a reading which demonstrates how deeply mired in the world of the pamphlet Milton’s tract is.

The question of female involvement in the production and consumption of pamphlets (whether as writers, stationers, or readers) is entertained in Chapter 7. This is a difficult area, in which Raymond is understandably keen to find evidence of female participation but too scrupulous to make overmuch of the rather small and often ambiguous fragments he is able to unearth. His familiarity with the rhetoric of pamphleteering renders him skeptical of any naive quest for authentic female voices; yet that same rhetorical sophistication allows him to uncover some remarkable strategies for justifying female authorship in Quaker exegesis of what look like insuperable scriptural objections.

The final chapter offers an overview of the Restoration period (up to about 1689), focusing, reasonably enough, on the role of pamphlets in shaping the Popish Plot and its disputatious fallout. Once again, new developments in historiography are brought to bear on publication history: this time, Jonathan Scott's thesis that the crisis of the 1680s was a carbon copy of that of the 1640s is vividly illustrated through the detection of reprints (and purported reprints) of earlier works. At the end of the chapter, Raymond once again traces his preferred movement from the ephemeral to the canonical, briskly situating both Dryden's *Absalom and Achitophel* and Locke's *Two Treatises* in the contexts from which they arose.

If there is one aspect of Raymond's argument I find less than convincing, it is his claim that the pamphlet was a coherent literary form. It seems rather to have been a bibliographical unit (and a rather protean one at that) which served as a vehicle for a bewildering variety of literary forms, including several not addressed here. Even the conventions of the polemics on which Raymond focuses seemed to me generated primarily by the demands of the moment and the nature of the immediate argumentative context rather than by any larger sense of form (other than the need for brevity).

Another possible objection arises from the fact that *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering* surveys a lot of ground, some of it already traversed and mapped by other scholars. Raymond's syntheses of such material and his engagements with the work of his precursors are always illuminating, but the book is, I think, at its strongest and most focused in its central chapters, which break new ground on the author's home turf. Some of those outlying chapters could probably have been condensed without damaging the overall argument, but I should be very reluctant to sacrifice any of the volume's wealth of judiciously selected, perceptively analyzed, and stylishly arranged detail for the sake of argumentative efficiency.

*Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain* is the work of a scholar whose familiarity with the primary materials in his field is probably unmatched and whose grasp of current historio-

graphical debate is flawless. It is a marvelously vivid study that brings forgotten texts to life and makes us look afresh at many of those we know. It will be read by all concerned with print culture and its role in the emergence of a public sphere.

István György Tóth. *Literacy and Written Culture in Early Modern Central Europe*. Central European University Press, 2000. x + 266 pp. Includes b&w illustrations, 31 tables and 2 maps. £13.95 paper. Review by JAKUB BASISTA, JAGIELLONIAN UNIVERSITY, KRAKÓW.

When I saw the title of this book for the first time on a web page, I felt real excitement and knew that, sooner or later, I had to get access to it. Today's world makes certain things much easier than they were in the times discussed by the author, and several weeks later I could open the discussed work and place it on my desk. The early discussion, and particularly the introduction, were somewhat disappointing. The author sets out to discuss the level of literacy in Central Europe on the base of research carried out in one region of Hungary. I realize that the notions of Central, Eastern, Central Eastern Europe, etc., are far from being precise, but I have problems accepting Central Europe as being limited only to Hungary—even when Hungary was at its largest historical extent. It cannot be assumed that results from one specific region in this part of Europe are applicable to other regions. This book is not about literacy and written culture in Central Europe, but in Hungary, or even more precisely, in Habsburg Hungary. I see no reason for such a misleading title, especially as Tóth does eventually compare the results of his research with available studies for other European countries (including Central European Poland), placing the literacy rates of Early Modern Hungary in a wider European context (203–208). Fortunately, the deeper I carried on with the book, the better my opinion



became.

Like all early modern historians dealing with the question of literacy, Tóth had to face the great challenge of a lack of good source material for his work. All we really possess are signatures and crosses executed on various contemporary documents (48). Even David Cressy, in his excellent study on literacy in Tudor and Stuart England, could supplement himself with much richer evidence. The author is fully aware of these limitations and of the accuracy of his own work based on such sources. The book begins with an analysis of the situation of elementary schools in Hungary. Using among others the results of church visitations to parishes, Tóth recreates the rather gloomy picture of elementary schools and elementary school teachers in early modern Hungary. Schoolmasters who could not read, teachers who were themselves unable to write, and schools without students appear to be realities in those days. On top of this, the author estimates that barely 14.9-18.6 per cent of children attended any school (21). The rest were rarely even given a chance for study. This picture is compared with the situation in other regions of Austria, and the results are not very encouraging.

Having lain down the foundations of his research, Tóth concentrates on the slow advance of literacy in peasant culture (Chapter 2). Here he utilizes scarce testimonies, which unfortunately do not always reveal their secrets. Was someone who signed a document with a cross illiterate (61-69)? And did someone who signed himself necessarily know how to write? What conclusions can we draw from the fact that peasants possessed prayer books (69-72)? Once again we recall England, where Bible possession was obligatory regardless of literacy, and hence can be no proof of literacy. Unfortunately, we are unable to answer these questions precisely, and are forced to make assumptions. The author is fully aware of these limitations and illustrates his work with numerous documented stories that back his conclusions. In Chapters 3 and 4 the

question of literacy among the nobility is analyzed. With it Tóth discusses the importance of oral tradition and its existence among the lower nobility. In the final paragraphs of his work István Tóth compares his findings with the findings of historians regarding other European countries, thus placing his research in a wider European context. Literacy in Hungary comes off poorly when compared with England or the Netherlands, but is much richer and better developed than in Eastern European countries such as Romanian or Ukrainian lands.

Overall we have received a very valuable study, so long as we remember that it does not refer to early modern Europe in general, but only a small fragment. We do not get an exact, precise picture or map of literacy for the discussed territory. What we do get is a very clear and picturesque analysis of what can be said about the ability to read and write in early modern Hungary based on the existing evidence, which is far poorer than in most of Western Europe. Numerous charts nicely supplement the author's conclusions. This work should definitely find its way into libraries and seminars examining written culture in early modern Europe. It is the first of such significance on the subject for a relatively poorly examined part of Central Europe.

Paul M. Hunneyball. *Architecture and Image-Building in Seventeenth-Century Hertfordshire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. xiv + 218pp. + 12 maps and plans + 42 illus. \$99.00. Review by MARTYN BENNETT, NOTTINGHAM TRENT UNIVERSITY.

It can be argued that the seventeenth-century Englishman and Englishwoman were obsessed by their image. Twenty-first century celebrities and their obsessions about personal presentation and style are often advanced as modern phenomena created by paparazzi and the constant glare of visual media. Yet this is not an original phenomenon. In the early modern period, image did not merely keep you in the gaze of an easily bored public; it gained a person power, prestige, and social status. The key to becoming gentrified was conducting yourself in a manner becoming a gentle-

man. The trappings of gentility from livery to a magnificent tomb were about presenting an image, both expected and exceeding, without vain display, the image of a gentleman.

There was no more suitable way of self-presentation than creating a home or public edifice that presented an image to a wide public. Paul Hunneyball's fascinating study explores this phenomenon through a close study of Hertfordshire: a compact county north of London through which many of the important roads north and south passed. This book looks at the nature of building, of patrons and architects and the men who built the houses of the county, the town houses of the urban gentry, and community projects such as almshouses. The author also looks most importantly at the way that architectural taste percolated down to sub-gentry levels.

Hunneyball explores the way patrons, whilst using architects and artistic advisors, were intimately involved in the creation of the county's major houses. This was also possible for ecclesiastical building, where the wealthier benefactors were concerned. Whilst precise relationships differed from project to project and depended upon individual characters and trust between patron and architect, the patron was most often the dominant partner. The same is often true of funerary monuments, especially because as many as a third of them were constructed during the lifetime of the eventual dedicatee whilst others left instructions behind.

Building of course entailed innovation, and Hunneyball devotes two chapters to this issue. Innovators, Hunneyball argues, were the serious patrons amongst the builders of Hertfordshire. Many patrons could impress the onlooker with size and scale and with the clear opulence of a building, but real impressions were related less to these simple material concepts than to innovation. Such innovation included importing ideas about decoration from the capital, but could also run to the installation of sash windows from the 1660s onwards. Not all innovations were adopted wholesale. The four-side symmetry of Balls Park, for instance, was too bold for some, and two-sided symmetry sat more comfortably with other patrons.

Renovation offered a cheaper way of entering the fashionable housing game, especially given the costs of demolition and completely rebuilding a house. Local workers were often employed on such work despite variations in quality and the generally inferior standard of work in the eyes of those looking with a capital perspective. New work could therefore have some of the gloss knocked off simply to account for the abilities of local architects and builders. Hunneyball selects Stagenhoe as a prime example of this. Clearly based on the grander Balls Park, Stagenhoe was built by a very different hand: the inspiration is clear to see, but the result involved a reinterpretation of classical design, whilst restraint and balance were lost.

The book explores the concept of architecture as a mirror of society. It thus points out that whilst men such as the Bishop of Salisbury might look to London for styles upon which to base his new almshouses, the architectural requirements of communal buildings were not the same as those of the homes that benefactors built for themselves. Houses the author argues were not static representations of the ambitions of one builder, but performed the role of a palimpsest as succeeding generations responded to societal change and expectations.

The overall result of the rebuilding of Hertfordshire was the dissemination of classical styles into the county community. This not only represented the difference between the social elite and their neighbours, but also helped define the functional meanings of classical architecture in the rural landscape. Naturally these messages were read and understood at sub-gentry level. In some cases they were emulated, but, Hunneyball argues, they were not dependent upon the tastes of the elite.

The book is written in a monograph series and is thus rather pricey. This is a pity, for what Paul Hunneyball says and the material he uses to do so deserve a very wide readership. The contribution to the understanding of the environment of seventeenth-century England and the societies which inhabited it is not to be underestimated. It is a book to be pocketed on a trip to Hertfordshire—useful for understanding that which is often viewed

rather than read, but which really should be read as closely as any text. Paul Hunneyball has read these buildings for us, but they will bear re-reading. This book is highly recommended and is a great exponent of the notion that to understand the architectural world, look around you.

Janis Bell and Thomas Willette, eds. *Art History in the Age of Bellori: Scholarship and Cultural Politics in Seventeenth-Century Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. xvi + 396 pp. + 106 illus. \$90.00. Review by MICHAEL J. REDMOND, UNIVERSITY OF PALERMO.

For historians of seventeenth-century art, Giovan Pietro Bellori is best known as the author of *Le vite de' pittori, scultori, ed architetti moderni* (1672), a book of essays on the lives and works of the most significant artists of the period. The final chapter on Poussin remains an essential source for studies of the French painter, given his close friendship with Bellori and acknowledged involvement in the creation of the *Vite*. Although the volume may have been envisaged initially as a continuation of Giorgio Vasari's *Le vite de' piu eccellenti pittori, scultori e architettori* (1550), the standard for artistic biographies, what distinguishes Bellori's approach is the selective discrimination in the choice of subjects and the detailed descriptions of individual paintings. Bellori concentrates on twelve major European figures, in contrast to the biographies of almost one hundred and sixty renaissance artists found in Vasari. Through his concept of the ideal, put forward as the underlying principle of his discernment, the Roman theorist, antiquarian, and collector made a fundamental contribution to the promotion of classicism throughout Europe.

While traditional scholars have plundered the *Vite* for documentary evidence, privileging Bellori's blend of firsthand knowledge and critical selectivity, what comes to the fore in *Art History in the Age of Bellori* is the intense effort that went into fashioning such a lasting impression of personal authority. The eleven contributors to the collection, arising from a 1996 conference at the Ameri-

can Academy in Rome, trace the social and political negotiations through which the son of a poor farmer established himself as the rightful heir to Vasari. An important consequence of the volume's focus on Bellori the individual is that it underlines the continuities between his art criticism and his career as an official antiquarian, legitimated by the preferment of Queen Christina of Sweden and Popes Clement X and Alexander VIII. It is telling that, as Janis Bell suggests in her extensive introduction, Bellori had a constant "concern for quality and standards" (3). The question that remains is whether that concern was the product of aesthetic values or the desire to cast himself as an arbiter of taste.

The first part of the collection deals with Bellori's place in Roman cultural politics. Giovanna Perini's provocative opening chapter contends that Bellori's aesthetics were conditioned by his need to attract patronage. As the growing power of France became obvious, Perini argues, the ambitious young intellectual made a strategic decision "to attend the workshop of a Frenchman, Poussin, when Rome was swarming with Italian artists of talent" (60). By taking on the role of "Roman spokesman [...] for cultural policies established in Paris," with his systematic promotion of French artists in the *Vite*, Bellori ensured international acclaim and support (64). Bellori's talent for self-promotion was also a constant in his antiquarian career. In considering the rhetoric of seventeenth-century antiquarian writing, Louis Marchesano suggests that Bellori exploited his position as Commissioner of Roman Antiquities for both profit and prestige. At the same time as he cultivated an image of erudition in his writing, using descriptions of individual artifacts to display the breadth of his cultural knowledge, he made the most of his opportunity "to monopolize the antiquities market" (75). When he gained the patronage of Queen Christina of Sweden, as Tomaso Montanari points out, Bellori's continuing advancement further enhanced the standing of his publications. Indeed, by writing works based on Christina's royal collections, Bellori took care to foreground his relationship with the monarch. The value of such efforts to cultivate prestige becomes apparent in Ingo Herklotz's discussion of competing pub-

lications about the friezes on Trajan's column. With his power and influence, Bellori's "archeological coffee-table books" earned greater acclaim than serious scholarly studies (143). For although Bellori "had probably not invested more than a couple of weeks" in his lavishly illustrated book about the column, Herklotz claims, the reception of subsequent works was conditioned by its inflated reputation (143). When Bellori turned to the field of iconography, the subject of Eugene Dwyer's chapter, he brought with him his combination of rhetorical skill, high production values, and sharp practices. Bellori's work on the history of portraiture appropriated the previous scholarship of Fulvio Orsini, even discussing unique coins in the collection of Queen Christina that had belonged to Orsini. The problem with mentioning these coins, as Dwyer shows, was that their provenance was legally suspect and Bellori was obliged "to suggest that Christina's specimens were different from the ones formerly owned by Orsini" (159). The first section concludes with Hetty E. Joyce's account of the efforts that Bellori made to commemorate the life of Annibale Carracci. As proud owner of Annibale's *Coriolanus*, a drawing inspired by ancient paintings, Bellori took care to augment the reputation of its creator. Apart from celebrating the artist in his publications, guaranteeing that ownership had its privileges, Bellori was involved in the project to create a monument to Annibale and Raphael in the Pantheon.

In the second part, entitled "Bellori's *Lives*: History, Criticism, Theory," the editors are less successful in arranging a cohesive group of essays. The diversity of the contributions, however, is an indication of the rich critical and historical implications of Bellori's great biographical project. Claire Pace and Janice Bell argue that the allegorical engravings which prefaced the life of each artist in the original edition of the *Vite* were an essential part of Bellori's allegorical strategy. While Bellori clearly liked an attractive book for its own sake, Pace and Bell demonstrate that the symbolic images serve to "reinforce Bellori's assessment of each artist and his historical importance" (222). Such a strategy is particularly evident in the engraving dedicated to Caravaggio, where the depiction of an aged woman in a plain space accentuates the criticism of his

lack of innovation in the printed text. For all of his social ambitions and political astuteness, Martina Hansmann's chapter confirms that Bellori did make a significant contribution to the development of art criticism. His descriptive method, responding to the aesthetic content and historical implications of individual paintings, "created a modern approach by virtue of an analysis that was both critical and reflective" (238). In contrast to Hansmann's focus on his modernity, Anthony Colantuono's discussion of the *scherzo*, a playful poetic conceit, locates Bellori within the context of *Seicento* literary practice. Colantuono notes that Bellori obviously had a great admiration for wit and stylistic refinement, given his repeated use of the term to describe not only "the conceits embodied in works of art but also in designating the verbal conceits that characterized seventeenth-century speech" (251). Although Bellori did not provide a theory about color in the *Vite*, in spite of the manifesto for classical style in its preface, Janis Bell's close reading of his description of a painting by Domenichino may offer some clues. The aesthetic principles that Bellori invokes to justify the importance of Domenichino's *Last Communion of St. Jerome*, Bell claims, "reveal that *colore* can be evaluated by the same high standards as *disegno* and *invenzione*" (259). The attention to color in the description underlines its importance to the critic and, implicitly, to his classicizing agenda as a whole. The final chapter of the book addresses the successive reputation of Bellori's biographical work. By recounting the publishing history of the second edition of the *Vite*, reprinted in 1728 with significant additions and alterations, Thomas Willette examines how Bellori's carefully constructed reputation became a resource that could be appropriated and exploited for partisan interests. With the interpolation of a new biography of the painter Luca Giordano, Willette makes clear, the republication was designed to elevate "the most celebrated Neapolitan artist of the second half of the seventeenth century into the Bellorian canon of exemplary modern artists" (279).

For researchers interested in cultural transactions in seventeenth-century Rome, *Art History in the Age of Bellori* offers a wide-ranging survey of the artistic and social environment of the city.



The importance of the collection is obvious for art historians. Though Bellori's reputation for accuracy has already been challenged, the essays in the first part definitively explode the myth of a reliable observer and disinterested proponent of classicism. The fact that the essays were completed prior to the publication of Evelina Borea and Carlo Gasparri's edited exhibition catalogue *L'idea del bello. Viaggio per Roma nel seicento con Giovan Pietro Bellori* (2000), as Bell and Willette take great pains to emphasize, does detract from the collection's claims to represent the latest scholarship on Bellori. As befits a study dealing with the author of some of the first coffee-table books, Cambridge University Press has produced a handsome volume with numerous illustrations.

Michael Bath. *Renaissance Decorative Painting in Scotland*. Edinburgh: National Museums of Scotland Publishing, 2003. ix + 286 pp. + 255 illus. \$49.95. Review by WILLIAM E. ENGEL, NASHVILLE AND SEWANEE, TN.

Although concerned primarily with painted ceilings of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, this copiously illustrated volume reveals much about the "history and culture of Scotland at this period and, particularly, about its Renaissance pretensions and European connections" (vii). It does so by focusing, painstakingly, on what these paintings mean, and how they function in the buildings they decorate. Michael Bath, well-known for his research on applications of Renaissance emblem books, looks here at how emblems take part in "the wider systems of representation, the visual economies, and grammars of ornament that were current at this period throughout Europe" (vii). As a result, this book will be indispensable to emblem specialists, as well as to scholars working on transnational cultural exchanges and affinities.

Additionally, this is the most detailed and up-to-date guidebook of period houses owned by the National Trust of Scotland (as well as some privately-held properties), with a listing of locations open to the public at the beginning. And the final section, an "Inventory

of examples and locations" (215-75), could stand on its own as a checklist of many of Scotland's most treasured national sites. Notable examples include the Nine Worthies Room in Crathes Castle, Deeside; the John Knox House in Edinburgh (where, Bath clarifies, the great reformer never lived); the emblematic motifs at Culross Palace seen alongside those copied from Whitney's 1586 woodcuts (249-53); and even decorations no longer extant but nonetheless worthy of having been recorded, such as Defoe's mentioning the Earl of Orkney's panels "curiously painted with Scriptural Stories" in Kirkwall Palace (264).

Treated seriatim, the nine chapters bring into focus Bath's steady argument about the indebtedness of Scottish decorative arts to commercial prints and pattern books from the continent. Collectively they point the way toward our understanding, in its original context, this larger transnational consciousness, at once emblematic and mnemonically oriented. Beginning with "A National Style," Bath introduces the vernacular and more cosmopolitan elements of the Scottish baronial style. Limiting himself to the time between the Reformation and the Civil Wars of the 1640s, he pursues the question of how far this national style was regionally or geographically distinctive. He looks at decorative paintings on plaster, stonework, walls of houses, window embrasures, overmantels, and vaulting; though, to be sure, the greater part is on wooden boards on ceilings: "This alone makes the Scottish tradition somewhat exceptional" (7).

Irrespective of what is painted, how it is done or in what medium, Bath insists we understand "what we are looking at and what it represents" (11). From here he develops his larger argument about the centrality of continental iconography in Scottish decorative painting, contextualized in terms of the traditional *ars memorativa*. Although this method was "taught and practiced in Scotland in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries" (16), a topic to which he will return in the penultimate chapter, Bath recommends it be applied circumspectly. Another caveat, concerning inscriptions, calls on us to abandon our modern assumption that popular

proverbs were an unsophisticated “commodity whose natural home would have been the kitchen” (18). This chapter also covers heraldic painting, illustrations from classical literature and mythology, religious subjects, *trompe l’oeil* effects, and antique—or grotesque—painting, with its strong links to the wider development of European Mannerism in the visual arts (the subject of Chapter 5).

Chapter 2, “Applied Emblematics,” is among the strongest; as well it should be given the author’s lifetime of achievement in this area (the bibliography lists only eight of Bath’s many important publications along these lines). We learn here that, although complete cycles of Renaissance emblems appear in many Scottish houses, few if any examples of their own were produced in Scotland during the period when decorative painting was fashionable (29). Bath is at pains to show the extent to which emblems, in the stricter sense of the term, were well known in Scotland; his ensuing discussion of the *impresa* and specific heroic devices is exemplary. Readers can take Bath at his word that “two of the most elaborate and interesting examples of applied emblematics in Scotland—at Culross, Fife, and at Pinkie House, Musselburgh—have yet to be described” (55). This then becomes the burden of the next two chapters: “Emblems Newly Devised,” which concerns George Bruce’s Palace, and Chapter 4 on “Alexander Seton’s Suburban Villa,” which demonstrates, among other things, that “Seton’s false architecture,” such as the extraordinary “*trompe l’oeil* cupola at the centre of the gallery,” was modeled “on a design from one of the most advanced European pattern books devoted to the mathematics and theory of perspective” by Jan Vredeman de Vries (101).

Chapter 5, “Mark Kerr’s Dreamwork,” looks more closely at the grotesque images that seem to be out of keeping with the context of Reformation Scotland. In the library of Adam Bothwell, Bishop of Orkney, Bath has tracked down, in addition to Rabelais’ *Oeuvres*, a collection of 120 fanciful engravings by François Desprez (117). From the range of examples he has found, and drawing on the work of Anne Lake Prescott concerning how Rabelais was received and incorporated across the channel, Bath argues for the status of

these “drollities” as “products of the unregulated free play of imagination” (119). Moreover, Kerr’s ceiling confirms that what he thought he was producing in 1581 was a consistent piece of “dreamwork” (120), and not, as some have speculated, images associated with Scottish witchcraft. Still, Bath admits, it is not unlikely that Kerr combined “crypto-Catholic tendencies with an educated interest in Renaissance hermeticism” (120).

Chapter 6, on an outstanding survival of Catholic Scotland’s ecclesiastical painting, Grandtully Chapel, is titled “Monuments of Idolatrie,” derived from a phrase in the 1612 minutes of the Synod of Fife that ordered “the destruction of the paintings at Foulis Easter near Dundee” (124). Insofar as the paintings were not destroyed, opinions must have been divided, thus confirming that the zeal of reformers varied from place to place and time to time. Then Chapter 7 takes us into “Earlshall,” near Lauchars, Fife. The painted ceiling “is remarkable for the sheer prolixity of its detail” (147). Unlike other Great Halls of the era, no overall sequence seems to be followed. Still, its “local, numbered and labeled schemes may nevertheless have been designed to function as memory schemes”; and, quoting Christy Anderson, Bath remarks on how such schemes allow viewers to “recall information in a flexible order and not only in a linear, sequential structure” (160). Even taking into account the Art of Memory’s more traditional function (going back to rhetorical *loci communes* used for defining seats of an argument and assisting the memory), Bath does not think this can explain the extent of the decorative program (166). And yet he does acknowledge it may have some relevance, for the divisions can be seen as being adaptable as, to use Aubrey’s phrase, “Topiques for Locall memorie” (167). With this, Bath turns in the remaining chapters to the traditional arts of rhetoric and of memory.

Chapter 8, “Grave Sentences,” teases out the ways “the moralising and proverbial sayings” (169) were used in the spirit of externalizing, on architectural features, things one would have by heart. For precedents Bath looks to William Engel’s analysis of Montaigne’s famous library (169-72) and Sir Nicholas Bacon’s

Long Gallery at Gorhambury, “whose Senecan inscriptions so closely resemble the Stoic emblems in Alexander Seton’s gallery at Pinkie” (170). Bath stresses how much of this proverbial philosophy and such “moralising verses” also circulated in other media, and suggests that “many of our elitist assumptions about a radical break between educated and popular culture at this period are misleading and likely to prevent us from getting adequate theoretical and historical purchase on how these ceilings work” (183). While this chapter treats grave sentences as representing the fundamentally written textual medium, the final chapter treats iconographic schemes as being primarily a visual medium.

Chapter 9, on “Topics and Schemes,” reprises Bath’s earlier theme of Renaissance Speaking Pictures. Accordingly he treats a series of traditional sequences frequently associated with painterly programs and mnemotechnical sequences alike, such as the four seasons, five senses, nine Worthies, twelve signs of the zodiac, and labors of the months (185). The resulting iconographic discussion discloses what is unique in the Scottish decorative arts, even if they are found to be grounded in pan-European applied emblematics. For, as Bath makes clear through his precise interpretations of local treatments of Renaissance schemes, works such as the Cullen pictures “certainly represent a significant Scottish response to the pervasive *paragone* debates about the respective claims of word and image at this period” (212). Notwithstanding the importance of this book for Scottish architectural historians and ambitious tourists, it will be invaluable to scholars of applied emblematics and mnemonic culture, as well as to art historians and students of early modern print culture more generally.

Christopher Hogwood, ed. *The Keyboard in Baroque Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. xviii + 245 pp. \$75.00. Review by GRAHAM H. PHIPPS, UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS.

This “*florilegium* of essays,” as Christopher Hogwood describes it (xvi), is offered as a tribute to Gustav Leonhardt, scholar and performer, for his seventy-fifth birthday. Hogwood chooses the metaphor to convey Leonhardt’s influence as the “head gardener” of “early keyboard’s *hortus musicus*,” binding together work of the scholar and performer that had previously so often operated in mutually exclusive spheres. The book contains thirteen contributions on a variety of different topics, organized chronologically under five headings: seventeenth-century keyboard music, the early eighteenth century, the Bach family, the later eighteenth century, and a final section titled “musical envoi.”

The four topics in Part One are a testament to the breadth of coverage in this book. Alexander Silbiger’s essay, “On Frescobaldi’s recreation of the chaconne and the passacaglia,” complements his earlier essay, “Passacaglia and ciaccona: genre pairing and ambiguity from Frescobaldi to Couperin,” *Journal of Seventeenth-Century Music*, 2 (1996), by adding musical examples. Together these two essays provide carefully formulated definitions for the two musical terms as they might apply to Frescobaldi. The present essay nicely situates Frescobaldi’s work in this multifaceted genre in respect to works of other composers. In particular, Silbiger demonstrates how Frescobaldi’s *magnum opus*, his *Cento partite* from the *Aggiunta* supplement of 1637 to his first book of toccatas, avoids the “anxiety of influence” à la Harold Bloom, from Monteverdi’s *Zefiro torna* that characterizes much of mid-seventeenth century Italian keyboard music.

In his essay, “Johann Jacob Froberger’s travels 1649-1653,” Rudolf Rasch provides documentation and interesting anecdotal information about the third extended travel period of this composer. Included are stops in Dresden, Brussels, Utrecht, London, Paris,

and Regensburg. The reader learns that, during his time in Brussels, Froberger was not in the service of Archduke Leopold Wilhelm of Austria, as has been asserted by Froberger scholars. This evidence also calls into question an often-cited reference to a concert given by a certain “piffre d’allemand,” claimed by the Parisian chronicler Jean Loret to be the king’s organist and in the service of Leopold Wilhelm (26). Rasch also demonstrates the unreliability of accounts regarding Froberger’s visits to London. In one of these, according to Johann Mattheson, an obscure harpsichordist in disguise played “some difficult dissonant chords and resolved them in a unique manner.” Subsequently, as the account goes, his music betrayed his identity and the consequence was a musical audience with the king (25). The reader of this essay would dearly love to have a musical record of these “dissonant chords.” From these and other bits of documentary evidence, Rasch speculates on stylistic aspects of Froberger’s music and on the dissemination of his works throughout Western Europe during the seventeenth century.

Pieter Dirksen devotes his essay to a large manuscript *MS Lübbenau Lynar A1* housed in the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin. This manuscript is known as a principal source for the keyboard music of Jan Pieterszoon Sweelinck. Dirksen, however, devotes his attention to the large English and French repertoires that are also found in it. The reader is treated to comparative passages between works by Giles Farnaby and John Bull as they appear in the *Fitzwilliam Virginal Book* and in this manuscript. From these comparative passages and other evidence in *Lynar A1*, Dirksen develops compelling arguments regarding authorship of anonymous unica in the manuscript. Similar discussion is devoted to the French section of *Lynar A1*, with a particularly fascinating observation that suggests a connection between the Frenchman La Barre and Girolamo Frescobaldi (49–50). Dirksen concludes that the manuscript must be dated earlier than has been assumed, most likely from the 1620s.

Christopher Hogwood's contribution is intended as a "prelude" to the Purcell Society's planned new edition of Henry Purcell's complete keyboard music. The essay deals with authenticity of manuscript materials, criteria for ornamentation with a critical view of the composer's "instructions for Beginners," tests for evaluating original and arranged movements, and questions about the treatment of "doubtful" works.

Despite its heading, Part Two of this volume, with its two essays, spans the first two thirds of the eighteenth century. In the first essay, John Butt presents a genealogy of keyboard writing from the earlier practice of "condensing a polyphonic texture into chords that matched the progress of the voices" to the development of a thoroughbass practice that was "the primary medium of compositional thought" (109). Butt finds early evidences of this "keyboard-based approach to composition" in organ writing by Handel, Bach, and Vivaldi from 1707-8. The essay traces changes in conventions of notation during the seventeenth century—particularly in Italy, Germany, and England—that led to this "sea-change in compositional thinking."

From the French *L'Art de toucher* to the German *wahre Art*, Davitt Moroney explores the conjunction of French keyboard method and German keyboard composition over a period of eighty-eight years, linking high Baroque with stylistic characteristics of the mid-eighteenth century. As early as 1680, Jean Le Gallios had described a *belle manière du toucher* (112). Citing Gallois and the writings of François Couperin (1716), Friedrich Wilhelm Marpurg (1750/56), Valentin Roeser (1764), and Monnier le cadet (1768), Moroney seeks to dispel the notion, often cited today from nineteenth-century scholarship, that French aspects of J. S. and C. P. E. Bach's styles derive primarily from Couperin. Of particular interest is the discussion of Marpurg's little known first harpsichord book from the 1740s, which, as Moroney points out, remains without citation in *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians* (122).



This “genuine French *Livre de Pièces de Clavecin* written by a German composer” provides evidence for direct linkage between the Bach family and French harpsichord playing (122).

Part Three is a “*florilegium*” of four essays on the Bach family. Through investigation of three collections by J. S. Bach—Well Tempered Clavier, Inventions and Sinfonias, and the Little Organ Book—Christoph Wolff discusses the composer’s “principle of inventing and developing ideas” (135). Using examples from the Inventions, Wolff illustrates how the pure nature of scale or arpeggio serves as a point of departure that, through “true artistry . . . actually strives to invent an idea, that is to improve its condition” (138). In the next essay, Peter Williams wonders if there might be an “anxiety of influence” discernible in J. S. Bach’s *Clavierübung*. Williams’s discussion of the six partitas ranges from the more obvious connections between Bach’s partitas and those of Kuhnau to much more conjectural ones that he sees with Rameau, whose gestures and textures often resemble features of Bach’s individual movements. While this essay is refreshing in its numerous allusions to a multiplicity of works, many of the “anxieties” mentioned here are certainly tenuous. David Schulenberg’s essay on developments in keyboard accompaniment from J. S. to C. P. E. Bach makes an attractive companion piece to Moroney’s essay on solo playing. Schulenberg outlines salient features of *galant* accompaniment, with emphasis on matters of chord spacing and tasteful ornamentation, as described in C. P. E. Bach’s *Versuch über die wahre Art das Clavier zu spielen*. The essay concludes with a brief discussion of dynamic capabilities afforded by new experimental keyboard instruments of the 1750s and 1760s. Yet, it was also important to maintain these “refinements” on the older instruments. As an example, the author recalls Gustav Leonhardt’s “rediscovery” of a technique mentioned by Bach, whereby “unaccented chords would have been slightly broken in order to ‘soften’ them” (168). Peter Wollny’s essay on the polonaises of Wilhelm Friedemann Bach provides an excellent summary of the salient characteristics of Bach’s “highly

stylised and individualised realisations of the original Polish dance model" (179), as well as a thorough discussion of their place in the composer's *oeuvre*.

Part Four of this volume, on keyboard music of the later eighteenth century, opens with Menno van Delft's essay on use of the technique, *schnellen*. The essay includes explanations from Quantz, C. P. E. Bach, Ernst Wilhelm Wolf, Daniel Gottlob Türk, and Johann Nikolaus Forkel, with examples of application and a summary of technical problems. In the final essay, Robert D. Levin discusses Mozart's non-metrical keyboard preludes written for his sister Nannerl in the 1770s. Evidence suggests that she committed these works to memory and subsequently performed them as though they were her own. Levin provides a summary of their provenance and information about the bass lines. The "musical envoi" that concludes this volume presents Lars Ulrik Mortensen's transcription for keyboard of J. S. Bach's Violin Partita, BWV 1004.

Taken as a whole, this compendium of twelve essays and a transcription makes a valuable contribution to scholarship on keyboard music of the eighteenth century. With its new findings and wealth of documentation, the book should be welcomed by specialists. At the same time, the broad range of topics and examples of music literature constitute a valuable addition to readers with more general interests in eighteenth-century Europe.

## NEO-LATIN NEWS

Vol. 52, Nos. 3 & 4. Jointly with SCN. Subscriptions: \$15.00 (\$20.00 international) for one year; \$28.00 (\$37.00) for two years; \$40.00 (\$52.00) for three years. Checks or money orders are payable to *Seventeenth-Century News*, 4227 TAMU, College Station, Texas 77843-4227. NLN is the official publication of the American Association for Neo-Latin Studies.

Edited by Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University; Western European Editor: Gilbert Tournoy, Leuven; Eastern European Editors: Jerzy Axer, Barbara Milewska-Ważbińska, 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.

◆ *Humanism, Scholasticism, and the Theology and Preaching of Domenico de' Domenichi in the Italian Renaissance.* By Martin F. Ederer. Lewiston, Queenston, Lampeter: The Edwin Mellen Press, 2003. xviii + 337 pp. Born in Venice and recognized in his own day as a successful preacher and curialist, Domenico de' Domenichi (1416-1478) was bishop of Torcello and then Brescia. Vespasiano da Bisticci wrote a laudatory life of Domenichi, and Paolo Cortesi praised him for his eloquence. Martin F. Ederer has sought in this study to illuminate Domenichi's life and work by focusing on his preaching; Ederer has gathered together a great wealth of sources, focusing on over a hundred sermons or orations which are scattered throughout a number of manuscripts. The picture of Domenichi that emerges is one of an active cleric and church politician who

took his public presentations seriously and who had a demonstrable interest in church reform. After a chapter outlining Domenichi's career and sketching out some of the main lines of his thought, Ederer moves to Domenichi's preaching, sorting out how the genre of Domenichi's preaching works—*sermo* or *oratio*—was determined by audience and context. As a theologian, Domenichi emerges as a prudent Thomist who uses the *quaestio*-format often while at the same time not avoiding classical imagery and, at times, extended *ekphrases*. Order and “fittingness” are recurrent tropes in Domenichi's theological thinking: God did things for fitting reasons that, in most cases, human beings could be confident of finding out. Domenichi also believed scripture should be studied for relevance and to teach real-life virtue. When it came to humanity and its relation to divinity and in his more general views on moral theology, Domenichi reflected conventional late medieval viewpoints, stressing the importance of time-honored virtues, excoriating those who practiced vice, and at times terrifying his audience with detailed images of hellfire to dissuade them from vice-filled activities. Domenichi also believed in the utility of astrology, provided it was properly understood, and he wrote two orations defending the art. Importantly, he was a proponent of church reform; not only did he write a treatise on the reformation of the papal court during the pontificate of Pius II (preserved in MS Vatican City, BAV Barb. Lat. 1201, ff. 1–20), he also stressed the need for reform in curial morality in two important orations delivered before conclaves of cardinals, one after the death of Calixtus III, the other after the death of Pius II. When it came to his style of thought, the positions he stressed, and the formats in which he did so, Domenichi was in many ways a traditionalist. What is distinctive about his case is the many available works which Ederer has now admirably located; in their relative profusion, they offer insight into the preaching practice of a “rank-and-file” intellectual, in Ederer's terminology (257). Ederer's study should be supplemented with the 1991 article on Domenichi by H. Smolinsky (in the *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, vol. 40, 691–95). Also, it would be remiss not to point out that there are problems in the extensive citations of Latin texts in

the endnotes: there are passages in which the Latin given cannot be made sense of as is, and at times the notes do not seem to correspond to the assertions made in the text. Still, the work is a valuable contribution to the study of fifteenth-century Italian religious and intellectual culture and a welcome excavation of much little known but important material. (Christopher S. Celenza, Michigan State University)

◆ *Paraphrase on Luke 11-24*. By Desiderius Erasmus. *Collected Works of Erasmus*, 48. Trans. and annotated by Jane E. Phillips. Toronto, Buffalo, and London: University of Toronto Press, 2003. xvi + 318 pp. \$115. In August, 1523, eight months after the publication of Erasmus's *Paraphrase on John*, the Froben press in Basel brought out his *Paraphrase on Luke*. Three more editions, with some changes, appeared during Erasmus's lifetime, in 1524, 1534, and 1535. The volume under review contains the second half of the *Paraphrase on Luke*, translated from the 1535 edition, the last one in which Erasmus himself is likely to have intervened.

The series in which this volume appears is so well established at this time that there is probably little point in expressing even faint irritation at some of what we find here. Erasmus's work was published as a whole, but the editorial staff of *CWE* evidently felt that this was impossible here, even though, if part 2 offers any indication, the two parts together will come to some six hundred pages—a big book, but not an impossibly big one (see the next review below). The real problem, though, is that part 2 is finished now and part 1 is not. The press certainly made the right decision to go ahead and publish what is ready, but the result is that for now at least, the reader has to begin *in medias res*, without the first half of the *Paraphrase* or the Introduction and Translator's Note that will introduce the work properly.

Some things, of course, can still be said. Phillips is an experienced translator and has made a special, and to my mind successful, effort to reproduce in English something of Erasmus's Latin style, which moves from swift and colloquial, to quoting the Bible with varying degrees of fidelity, to alluding to the classics as a

source of stylistic elegance and insight into human nature. Some of the longer sentences that work well in Latin are broken up in translation, but not all of them, which suggests that a skilled translator can ask more of the English reader in this area than is often done. Phillips has also paid careful attention to word choice: *sermo*, for example, is usually rendered as ‘word’ rather than ‘conversation’ because Erasmus preferred *sermo* to *verbum* as a translation of *logos* at the beginning of the Gospel of John and English readers are most familiar with ‘Word’ as the theological concept referred to there.

It is easy, when reviewing a *CWE* volume, to concentrate on the translation at the expense of the notes, but that would do a disservice to what Phillips has achieved. Her annotations are focused on four areas: citations from the classics and from Scripture, to enrich context and add polish to the style; references to the basic works of Christian exegesis on which we know Erasmus drew in preparing the *Paraphrase*; parallels to Erasmus’s other writings, especially those that precede the *Paraphrase* or are more or less contemporary with it; and the criticisms directed against Erasmus’s work on Luke and his responses to those criticisms. The value of these notes, I think, speaks for itself, as the following example (101, n. 34, on Luke 16:23-25) shows: “Awash in balm and his whole skin glows’ is *delibutus unguento ... totus nitidus*. Hugh of St. Cher (*moraliter* on 16:25) 233r cites here the oil of gladness in Isa 61:3; cf also Ps 23:5. *Nitidus* ‘sleek,’ ‘shining,’ ‘well groomed’ is a favourite word of Horace, where it appears to connote the attractive appearance of skin and hair, both of which the Romans groomed with oil. Cf Horace *Epistles* 1.4.15: *me pinguem et nitidum bene curata cute vises* ‘You’ll find me plump and glossy, my skin well tended.’”

All in all, another successful volume in a consistently successful series. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *The Correspondence of Erasmus: Letters 1658 to 1801, January 1526-March 1527*. By Desiderius Erasmus. Trans. by Alexander Dalzell, annotated by Charles G. Nauert, Jr. *Collected Works of Erasmus*, 12. Toronto, Buffalo, and London: University of Toronto

Press, 2003. xl + 744 pp. The letters in this volume cover 1526 and the first quarter of 1527, during which time Erasmus never left Basel, in part because of the demands of his work, but more importantly because of ill health. During this period the Reformation party gathered strength there, making him increasingly uneasy: he distanced himself clearly from his former associates Johannes Oecolampadius and Conradus Pellicanus and reiterated his refusal to depart from the Catholic church, so that when the Reformers prevailed, he left Basel. During this same time, he also had to deal with *De servo arbitrio*, Luther's defence of the bondage of the will that attacked his spiritual and moral integrity as well as his theological competence. Erasmus had trouble getting a copy of the book, but when he did, he composed a short preliminary reply (*Hyperaspistes*, Part I) in ten days and, with the cooperation of Froben and his press, got his response to the Leipzig book fair in March, 1526, in time to compete with Luther's attack. Even this, however, was not enough to end the assaults from conservative Catholic theologians. Bédá's attacks on behalf of the theology faculty at the University of Paris were derailed, but only temporarily, by a direct appeal to King Francis I; similarly, even though Erasmus asked for, and got, direct orders from Pope Clement VII and Emperor Charles V that attempted to rein in the theology faculty at the University of Louvain, the attacks did not go away.

The letters in this volume document Erasmus's relations with a half dozen influential individuals in eastern Europe; Italians like the jurist Andrea Alciati, the humanist Giambattista Egnazio, and the publisher Gianfrancesco Torresani; and influential people in the British Isles like Thomas More, Cuthbert Tunstall, the bishop of London, and Polidoro Virgilio, the Italian-born court historian. During this period Erasmus also gained an enthusiastic following in Spain, although a number of Spanish theologians complained that his ideas were dangerous; word reached him shortly after the period dealt with in this volume that charges that had been brought against him to the Inquisition had been dismissed, but his followers in Spain were systematically silenced over the succeeding years. Not all his correspondence, however, dealt with elevated matters

of religion and ideas: the largest single series of letters in this volume was exchanged with Erasmus Schets, a merchant in Antwerp who took over the collection of his revenues from pensions drawn from ecclesiastical benefices in England and the Netherlands.

A group of prefatory letters to his readers documents his scholarly activity during this period. Erasmus published editions of the work of John Chrysostom, Athanasius, and Irenaeus, along with the fourth edition of his New Testament, which was the last to undergo significant revision at his hand. His *Institutio Christiani matrimonii* appeared in August, 1527. He also published several works of classical scholarship during these fifteen months: a Latin translation of Plutarch's *De vitiosa verecundia*, three philosophical treatises by Galen (also in translation), an expanded edition of the *Adagia*, and a reissue of his edition of the *Disticha moralia* for school use. The letters in this volume attest to his pursuit of manuscript sources for his work, and his letters to humanists like Guillaume Budé and Reginald Pole provide insight into his development as a humanist. In short, Erasmus's writings during these few short months are voluminous, but seldom dull.

As we would expect, the translator and annotator have taken full advantage of scholarship from the last several generations that has uncovered new letters written during this period and new sources for improving the texts. A number of documents are appended to the 148 letters in the main series, including a half dozen letters and extracts from letters written between Erasmus's Spanish admirers, and his first will, which not only shows who he felt closest to during this period, but also is the only one of his three wills that sets out the plan for a collected edition of his works to be published after his death. A curious addition is "Money, Wages, and Real Incomes in the Age of Erasmus," by John Munro; the information contained in this appendix is very useful, and very hard to come by, but at more than 150 pages in length, it seems out of place in a book like this. Nonetheless this volume, like the others I have seen in the series, is an invaluable resource for the study of one of history's greatest Neo-Latinists. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)



◆ *Contemporaries of Erasmus: A Biographical Register of the Renaissance and Reformation*. Ed. by Peter G. Bietenholz (editor) and Thomas B. Deutscher (associate editor). 3 vols. in 1. Toronto, Buffalo, and London: University of Toronto Press, 2003. \$95 paper. The volume under review here reprints in unchanged, paperback format the three cloth volumes published between 1985 and 1987. Given the reputation that the original has attained as a reference work for Neo-Latinists, the reprint should be noted by readers of this journal.

*Contemporaries of Erasmus* (hereafter *CE*) offers concise biographical information about the people mentioned in the correspondence and published works of Erasmus. Not all of these were people that Erasmus had actually met—if he knew enough about an individual to mention his (Erasmus's scholarly world was almost exclusively masculine) name, the person receives mention in *CE*—but all of them were people who in some way defined his personal and professional world. They come from the generation that was contemporary with him, the people who died after 1450 and with whom Erasmus therefore could interact and exchange ideas, either directly or indirectly. Not everyone who qualifies for inclusion could be identified, but some 1900 individuals were, making *CE* both an indispensable beginning place for research on Erasmus and a handy ready reference work for the period, since it seems that Erasmus either knew directly, or knew of, everyone who was someone in his day.

It is worth noting what *CE* is not as well as what it is. Given the need to provide some information on so many people, the entries in *CE* are relatively short, even the ones on people who are very famous and important (we get, for example, only three pages on Aldo Manuzio, Thomas More, and Martin Luther, even though each of these men played a pivotal role in Erasmus's life and work). What is more, due again probably to space constraints, the biographies of well-known individuals turn quickly to their relationship with Erasmus, which is where their real value lies. The merit of this approach, however, is that there is something on everyone, no

matter how obscure, about whom some information could be unearthed. This is where much of the value of the book lies, in providing dates and basic information in English, in readily accessible form, about hundreds of people from all over Renaissance Europe. Sometimes the entries take a peculiar form: the one on 'Gerardus' (by Bietenholz), for example, tells us that the person to whom Erasmus sent greetings in Saint-Omer was probably not the Gérard d'Haméricourt with whom Allen had identified him. *CE* is also valuable for providing balanced, nuanced analysis in concise form of some of the knottiest issues in Erasmian scholarship. The entry on Luther (by E. Gordon Rupp) states concisely and clearly both the grounds on which Luther and Erasmus respected one another and those on which they disagreed, such that Erasmus could deplore Luther's violent tongue and Luther could declare that "Erasmus is an eel; only Christ can grab him" (qtd. on p. 363 of vol. 2). Even Erasmus's relationship with Aldo Manuzio is not without its ambiguities: he clearly traveled to Venice to see his *Adagia* through the Aldine press and learned much at the time (see the review of *L'eredità greca e l'ellenismo veneziano*, below), yet also took a friendly dig at Aldus as an over-scrupulous grammarian who published his own work five times. It is worth a good deal to have all this straightened out by Martin Lowry, the acknowledged expert on Manuzio.

The major difficulty with *CE* since its original publication has been the price, which has placed it out of reach for all but the most serious, or financially successful, scholars. \$95 is not cheap, but it is within reach, and that is very good indeed. The press made the decision simply to reprint from the original plates in order to keep the cost as low as possible, which may well have been the best decision under the circumstances, but it also leads to my only real regret here. No reference work with 1900 entries can aim to do anything other than introduce its subjects, but this one is especially good at providing bibliography for follow-up. Given, however, that the first volume of *CE* appeared almost twenty years ago, these bibliographies are now becoming a bit dated. It would have been nice if these bibliographies could have been updated, even in a supple-

ment or appendix if resetting the articles would have been too expensive. Nevertheless the paperback *CE* is an investment worth making, and I recommend it strongly. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Ad Erasmi Roterodami expostulationem responsio accurata et paraenetica*. By Alberto Pio da Carpi. Ed. and trans. by Fabio Forner. Biblioteca della Rivista di storia e letteratura religiosa, Testi e documenti, 17. 2 vols. Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 2002. lxiv + 652 pp. 51€. This two-volume work must be considered indispensable for any student of the Reformation, not only for the interest the conflict between Alberto Pio da Carpi and Erasmus inherently holds, but because of the impressive erudition of Prof. Forner in the editing of the text, the clarity of his translation, and his exhaustive commentary and notes. Simply a first-rate work of scholarship.

Alberto was born on July 23, 1475. His mother, a Gonzaga, was the sister of Giovanni Pico della Mirandola and, upon the early death of Alberto's father, Lionello Pio, his education was entrusted to a paternal cousin, Marco Pio. He, however, had a son of his own and saw to it that Alberto would not have a political career in Carpi. His mother, therefore, turned to her powerful brother, who secured for Alberto as tutor Aldo Manuzio (Aldus Manutius). From him Alberto received a first-rate education which destined him, not for a traditional family career in the military, but for one in literature, philosophy, and theology. With the aid of the Gonzaga and Pico families Alberto did gain control of Carpi for a short period (1490-1494), but the opposition of his cousins forced him into exile in Ferrara. This second setback to his career proved to be not a curse, but a blessing like the first one, since in Ferrara he became acquainted with the powerful and leading men of the day, including Giovanni de' Medici, who later became Pope Leo X and Alberto's powerful patron and protector.

The paths of Erasmus and Alberto crossed in Venice, at Manutius's workshop, ca. 1497-1499, when the *editio princeps* of Aristotle was being prepared for publication (335 n.18). *Tunc enim*

*primum ego adolescens audivi Erasmi nomen ab Aldo commendari et, ni fallor, etiam te vidi et Thomam Linacrium.... Deinde, crescente in dies laudis tuae fama, amor etiam augebatur* (16). The feelings of esteem and affection were mutual, even though the future was to take these two friends along widely divergent paths.

When the Protestant Reformation broke out in Germany under Luther and not only Germany, but all Europe was shaken and convulsed, Erasmus came under attack by many who thought he had provided the intellectual underpinning for Luther (“Erasmus laid the egg which Luther hatched”). The closeness of Luther and Erasmus, Alberto expresses in this way: *Tam multa enim consentiunt in placitis utriusque ut aut Lutherus videatur erasmizare aut Erasmus lutherizare ... quod quae tu admonendo vel dubitando notas, ille definiat; quod tu modeste tangis, ille arrogantissime tractet; ubi tu scrupulum iniicis, ille sententiam proferat* (26).

Thus when reports reached Erasmus that even his friend Alberto was party to spreading calumnies about him in the highest ecclesiastical circles in Rome, Erasmus resorted to writing Alberto directly in a letter dated October 10, 1525 (text, pp. 2-9). Erasmus’s letter is short, only 109 lines in the Latin text. He gets right to the heart of the matter by saying that Alberto, ... *Principem Carpensem, doctum magnaepue apud purpuratos patres autoritatis*, has been heard to say, ... *passim ac palam ... Erasmus nec esse philosophum nec theologum, nec ullius solidae doctrinae* (2), and rebuts the charge that he was in Luther’s camp, *Quum prodire coepisset Lutheranae tragoediae proemium, eique fere totus orbis applauderet, ego primus omnium dehortatus sum amicos ne illi negocio admiscerent, cuius exitum augurarer fore cruentum* (4). He states that he had even warned Luther himself that he had embarked on a path that would lead to sedition: *Ipsum Lutherum admonui, rem Evangelicam ita tractaret ne quid ambitioni, ne quid odio datum videretur; caveretque ne res in seditionem exiret* (4). Nevertheless, Erasmus charges that the specter of a revolution had arisen, not because of Luther, who was not its cause, but instead as the consequence of the corruption, pride, and tyranny of priests and monks: *Sacerdotum quorundam palam impia vita, theologorum*

*quorundam supercilium, monachorum quorundam non amplius ferenda tyrannis, huic tempestati locum fecit* (6).

In contrast to the shortness of Erasmus's letter, the response of Alberto runs to 157 pages and, with the Italian translation, occupies pages 12 to 326 of this edition. Thus, the response is more than a reply to Erasmus's complaint; rather, Alberto used it as a *point de départ* to review in detail all of Erasmus's writings and Luther's doctrines as well. Early in his response Alberto denies that he had spread malicious rumors about Erasmus, and could not have done so, because ... *ego, inquam, ut Erasmo viro eruditissimo, de studiis tam benemerito et ubique eloquentissimo, detraherem? Aliena haec sunt a consuetudine mea, nimis abhorrent ab consuetudine mea, nimis abhorrent ab instituto* (18). His response to Erasmus's letter is composed with consummate skill, authority, and sadly, it must be said, in an aggressive manner which Erasmus's circumspect letter did not deserve. Thus because Erasmus did not seem to oppose Luther energetically enough, he scolds him, saying, *Quod si pateris me adhuc liberius agere, dicam te in causa fuisse et magnam tuam fuisse culpam ut in hanc suspicionem apud multos venires: participem te ne dicam auctorem fuisse huius dissidii idque duobus diversis modis: altero quod quae minime oportebat protulisti; altero quod te intra silentium continuisti nec tuum stilum luterano furori opposuisti* (28), and *Haec te non excusat, Erasme, quin officium deserueris, immo quanto maiori plausu virus hauriebatur, quanto a pluribus et clarioribus, tanto ut magis noxio et contagioso diligentius opportuno antidoto fuit occurrendum atque citius obsistendum* (52), and *Qui enim reipublicae labenti operam non praestat, cum valeat, eam perdere videtur; sancta quippe rusticitas accusatur quod valeret si sacris literis incubisset; quanto magis accusandus homo doctissimus cum non praestat quod valet, praesertim in tanto discrimine?* (96)

Alberto attacked Erasmus not only because he did not protest energetically enough against Luther, but, as mentioned above, because of his writings. He excoriates Erasmus for his *Encomium Moriae*, saying, *Quo libello tam noxia sparsisti semina ut ex agro sic infecto procerae arbores ultro provenerint, quae pestilentes fructus peperint ...* (32). Therefore, he writes, it would be better if all copies were found and destroyed, *Quapropter tibi optandum esset, ut quotquae sunt*

*ipsius exempla pereant prorsusque ipsius memoria, si fieri possit, aboleatur* (36). Turning, then, to the *Paraphrases*, Alberto upbraids Erasmus for daring to criticize and emend the New Testament, asserting that *Anunt enim nefas esse quenquam hominem vices Spiritus Sancti supplere velle, ut quo ille parcius esse voluit, paraphrastes prolixior sit, quo ille diffusior et amplior, hic brevior et pressior, asseverantes divinum spiritum arcana suae sapientiae iis verbis quae probavit, eo ordine, ea phrasi qua maxime decuit espressisse* (40), and cites with apparent approval the common opinion that Erasmus's aim was to substitute his version of the New Testament for the received versions! Thus, Alberto writes, ... *non desunt qui suspicentur te forte animo concepisse eventurum aliquando ut homines, fastidita lectione illius subrusticae orationis, oblectati autem nitore et facundia tua, illam reiicerent, tuam vero reciperent, quae loco illius succederet in publicis lectionibus* (44).

Volume II contains the extremely valuable "note di commento," that is, not simply notes that supply basic information, but indispensable comments to clarify the historical, literary, and biblical background of the topic under discussion. This second volume also contains the text (A1) of the Ambrosian manuscript, a bibliography of titles cited in abbreviated form, and indices of manuscripts, biblical passages, and names. Perhaps other typographical errors lurk in the text and escaped me, but I came across just one, *inpos* for *inops* on page 170, line 81.

In a discussion of this limited scope, it has not been possible to pass in review all of Alberto's response to Erasmus, in which he undertakes to answer and refute reformist attacks on the sacraments, monasticism, the Catholic hierarchy, the wealth of the Church, and the papacy. This he does by citing Church history and the Bible itself as the two foundations for Catholic doctrine, and he does so with formidable skill and erudition. In Fabio Forner, Alberto Pio has found a critic and scholar eminently qualified to comment on his learned response to Erasmus. (Albert R. Baca, California State University, Northridge)

◆ *Peter Martyr Vermigli. Humanism, Republicanism, Reformation [Humanismus, Republikanismus, Reformation]*. Ed. by Emidio Campi

in cooperation with Frank A. James III and Peter Opitz. *Travaux d'Humanisme et Renaissance*, 365. Geneva: Droz, 2002. 326 pp. Piero Mariano Vermigli (1499-1562), son of a middle-class Florentine shoemaker and a cultured mother who taught her son Latin through Terence, became Pietro Martire Vermigli in 1518 upon taking vows as an Augustinian monk of the learned monastery at Fiesole. His choice of namesake proved ironically fitting. The austere Dominican San Pietro Martire (d. 1252) died combating a heretical sect to which his own parents belonged. This new Peter Martyr was to campaign up to his dying breath as a writer, teacher, and preacher against what he was convinced were heretical tendencies in his spiritual parent, the Church.

Vermigli's learning was exceptional even for the high standards of his time and place. He was steeped in Aristotelian Thomism at Padua but also experienced in the Augustinianism of the *via Gregorii*, the Church Fathers, and the Hebrew language. His Augustinianism notwithstanding, he preferred direct, logical expression and disliked paradox and mystical language. He became the first Protestant Regius professor of divinity at Oxford. He campaigned vigorously for a definition of the Church as a body characterized by discipline as well as faith, of justification as accomplished by faith but combined with ideas of regeneration and sanctification, of the Eucharistic presence as commemorative, and of Scripture as absolute authority. He influenced the development of Puritanism. His writings, chiefly as assembled into the *Loci communes* soon after his death, were widely circulated in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. He continues to emerge as a key figure for the history of Reformed Protestantism and of European spiritual history of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

The nineteen essays in this collection, a scholarly contribution to the attention Vermigli deserves, issue from a symposium held near Zurich in 1999. The meeting and its proceedings are seen as both "a milestone and a gateway," as J. C. McLelland notes in the opening article (12), commemorating Vermigli's five-hundredth birthday and the fiftieth year since an initiative to study Vermigli was undertaken at Montreal. The essays also call attention to

basic topics needing further research, including Vermigli's hermeneutics and especially their patristic dimension, the extent and the limits of his influence, and his relation to his peers, who included virtually all the major figures in the European Reformation. The collection is especially strong on that point, with individual essays on Vermigli's relationships with Pighius, Calvin, Musculus, Smyth, Crammer, Bullinger and the biographers Gwalther, Wolf, and Simler. Still other persons not mentioned may prove important to understanding Vermigli, such as Egidio of Viterbo, who as prior general of the Augustinian Hermits from 1507 to 1518, enacted an observant reform movement in his order.

A comprehensive biography of Vermigli may not be possible until more basic research is done, but Emidio Campi's "Streifzug durch Vermiglis Biographie" sketches Vermigli's life in its Italian, German / English, and Swiss phases. Among the other important essays is Alfred Schlindler's "Vermigli und die Kirchenväter" (37-43), which acknowledges Vermigli's extensive but still undetailed patristic knowledge. Schlindler's statement, "what was in print, he knew, and some other works besides, namely in manuscript" (38), illustrates the need for a documentation of Vermigli's patristic sources. By remarking that "Augustine was no Calvinist and Ambrose no Catholic in the sense of the 16<sup>th</sup> Century and the Council of Trent" (42), Schlindler also notes Vermigli's tendency toward a polarized, ahistorical reading of the Fathers in the heat of polemic, which also awaits further analysis.

J. Andreas Löwe's "Peter Martyr Vermigli and Richard Smyth's *De Votis Monasticis*" (143-72) treats the bitter polemic between Vermigli and his predecessor at Oxford, who was then living in exile at Leuven. It is a substantial article that reveals Vermigli's reformed theological stance, and, together with Philip McNair's closing reflection on Vermigli the preacher, actually examines some of Vermigli's Latin writings. The main issue is the interpretation of vows by Smyth, a moderate Catholic and defender of the religious vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, and by Vermigli, who rejected the permanency of vows as well as the forced vow of celibacy for clergy. The article shows Vermigli and Smyth vari-



ously using levels of scholastic argumentation, biblical exegesis, appeal to patristic tradition, and personal invective. Diarmaid MacCulloch's "Peter Martyr and Thomas Cranmer" (173-201) argues that "Martyr was involved in an unprecedented fashion in forming religious policy for the kingdom of England" (189). Thomas Krüger's "Peter Martyr Vermigli's Hermeneutik" (225-40) illustrates Vermigli's application of Kings I and II to contemporary issues in sacramental theology and ecclesiology.

From the Montreal initiative, new editions and translations have come forth as the Peter Martyr Library series, as have studies and dissertations. Valuable references to much relevant scholarship can be found in the footnotes to each article, but no collected bibliography is included. The essays are carefully printed with only occasional errors of transcription (e.g., *congoverat* [20, 21], *Praeperatio* [38], "full of with" [143], *Papsiticorum, petentum* [145], "Aristoteleanism" [283]).

The opening article offers reasons for Vermigli's short term as a major Reformer: his movement from country to country, his erudition, and the fact that he did not found a church (10). The closing article praises him as a preacher for being "eloquent, erudite, evangelistic, and effective: the four E's" (311). Both statements are true. Between them there is much to value and an acknowledgement that there is still much to learn about this important Reformer. (Daniel J. Nodes, Ave Maria University, Naples, Florida)

◆ *Un professeur-poète humaniste: Joannes Vaccaeus. La 'Sylve parisienne' (1522)*. Ed., trans., and com. by Perrine Galand-Hallyn, with Georges André Bergère. Travaux d'Humanisme et Renaissance, 369. Geneva: Droz, 2002. lxxxviii + 220 [122] pp. Edited in true Renaissance fashion, with a lucid introductory *praelectio*, running translation, and informative commentary, this 'Parisian' poem (911 hexameters) by a Spanish *régent* at the Collège de Lisieux (1517-1522) –'Vázquez', of a wealthy Murcian family, educated 1514-1517 at the Parisian Collège de Montaigu (a half-way house between scholasticism and humanism)– embodies and reveals Renaissance France's 'first love' for humanism. This project arose

from the editor's own research seminar in Paris, and the participation of her *auditeurs*; it also stems from her numerous publications on the reception of Poliziano and the *sylva* genre in France. Vaccaeus's poem, dedicated to Budé—and celebrating, by its title, his adoptive city—*nutrix*—represents a step in the importation of this Statian genre into French poetic consciousness, in imitation and emulation of Poliziano. The latter had called his university *praelectiones* in hexameters *Sylvae*, intending them for the preparation of students studying Virgil: *Manto*, *Rusticus* (for Hesiodic / Virgilian *Georgics*), *Ambra* (for Homer), and *Nutricia* (verses for one's *nutrix*, on the civilising role of poetry). This last didactic *Sylva*—the most difficult and least published—furnished Vaccaeus's stylistic and thematic model, transposed now, with more marked didacticism, to the more 'modest' subject of oratory. Vaccaeus was also capping his own *Sylvula* of 1518 (70 verses, praising the Collège de Lisieux [*Appendice 5*]), appended to his edition of Domizio Calderini's commentary upon Statius's *Silvae*). In Vaccaeus's *Sylva* of 1522, the praise of Eloquence, and the description of its nature and parts, are crowned by a catalogue of orators ancient and modern—Poliziano and Budé, as also Valla, Barbaro, Pico della Mirandola, Erasmus, Lefèvre d'Étaples, Nebrissa, Martyr, Émile, Longueil, de Brie, Bérauld, and Vaccaeus's teacher Dubois (*Sylvius*). Their names or qualities, like the attributes of rhetorical eloquence, are linked to mnemotechnical devices drawn from Cicero or Quintilian (more than from the 'fluid' mental associations of Poliziano): anthropomorphic (usually feminine, 'eroticised') representation; spatial location (in a 'Palace of Eloquence'); and (like Poliziano) etymological or onomastic association, by similarity or contrast ('pious' Martyr, or *un*-barbaric Barbaro). With Vaccaeus (unlike Poliziano) the subject of his *Sylva* is presented not by a narrator, but by Eloquence herself, whose inspiring presence is encountered by the pedagogue-author, as an epiphanic vision, redolent of Aeneas's of his disguised mother, Venus.

The reason for this scenario (initiatory, oneiric, deeply affecting the poet-narrator) is, in part, the poetics of the *sylva* itself—compelling *varietas* and inspired improvisation, generated by a *calor subitus*

(not a Platonic *furor poeticus*). It is also determined by Quintilian's similar conception of oratory in his *Institutiones oratoriae*, which had been graced in Bade and Petit's Paris, 1516 edition by epigrams of Vaccaeus. Significantly, the latter avows (to Budé) that he had been inspired by his own lectures on Quintilian in 1521 (just as he had been influenced by Quintilianism under Dubois, whose *In artem oratoriam progymnasmata* [Paris 1516, 1520, 1522], featured liminary poems by the Spaniard). In harmony with Vaccaeus's choice of the *sylva*, as mediated by Poliziano, is Quintilian's stress upon oratory's civilising force (like poetry's in the *Nutricia*), but also upon its inspired, improvised nature, the fruit of 'impregnation' and 'innutrition' by the reading of other inspiring models. Vaccaeus's synthesis anticipates the conceptual framework of Du Bellay's vernacular *Deffence* (1549) and the casual, 'spontaneous' aesthetic of *Les Regrets* (1558). The importance of this rhetorical-poetic legacy was recognised in the *Sylvae* (Paris, ca. 1522) of Nicolas Petit, in whose preface (to the Collège de Montaigu's administrators, decried by Rabelais) Vaccaeus's *Sylva* is identified as a model, along with Pierre Rosset's *Paulus* (dedicated in 1522 to Antoine Du Prat) and an earlier 'Parisian' *Sylva* (1514) composed by Quinziano 'Stoa' (of Brescia). Perrine Galand-Hallyn and her Parisian collaborators have compellingly restored Vaccaeus's pioneering poem to its place in the dynamic tradition of the *sylva* in the humanist France of Budé. (George Hugo Tucker, University of Reading)

◆ *La France des humanistes. Henri II Estienne, éditeur et écrivain.* By Judit Kecskeméti, Bénédicte Boudou, and Hélène Cazes. Europa humanistica, Collection publiée par l'Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes. Tournhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2003. LXVIII + 764 pp. 95€. In preparing a catalogue of a special collection of books by the Estienne family of scholar-printers that is now at the University of North Carolina, Fred Schreiber drew special attention to Henri Estienne and wrote, "It is astounding that there exists no modern study of this giant of sixteenth-century scholarship; yet, the makings of a serious biography are available in the form

of the numerous dedicatory epistles with which Estienne prefaced most of his books. These present a vivid picture of the state of sixteenth-century scholarship, as well as of the relations which Estienne enjoyed with some of the most eminent political and literary figures of the day. A collection of these prefaces would be the obvious first step in preparing this yet unwritten chapter on one of the most fascinating personalities of the Renaissance" (*The Estiennes: An Annotated Catalogue of 300 Highlights of Their Various Presses* [New York, 1982], 128). The book under review here was designed to meet this need. It has been put together by three well qualified researchers—Kecskeméti is a specialist in classical philology, Boudou has published extensively on Henri Estienne, and Cazes (the author of the introduction) has studied Estienne's *Parodiae morales*—who have found a press willing to publish a very substantial work of serious scholarship.

The book proper is a collection of what Girard Genette would call 'paratexts': prefaces, afterwords, introductions, and commentaries written by Henri Estienne for the editions he published during his long career, beginning with the dedicatory epistle of a young scholar just leaving adolescence in 1554 through the meditations of a mature humanist on his accomplishments and his disappointments in 1596. In Greek, French, and Latin, in prose and in verse, for editions, anthologies, and lexical compilations, Estienne begins with his work, but the critic, philosopher, typographer, insatiable reader and pursuer of manuscripts becomes inseparable from the anecdotes, judgments, recollections, and professions of faith of the man himself. The result is a surprisingly full self-portrait—not a Romantic introspection, but a construction of the self in active interchange with the world around him.

Addressed to friends, collaborators, masters, and hoped-for patrons, Estienne's dedicatory letters marked the process by which he inserted himself into the Republic of Letters. Up to around 1559, he boasts of his relationships with Italian scholars like Pietro Vettori, Giovanni della Casa, and Carlo Sigonio; with the *editio princeps* of Diodorus Siculus, he turns his attention to Protestant, often German, correspondents like Ulrich Fugger, Conrad Gesner,

Joachim Camerarius, Théodore de Bèze, and Philipp Melanchthon. As we might expect, Estienne presents himself using many of the same topoi that other humanists of his day adopted: e.g., the linguistic prodigy who received a wonderful education, then set out to restore culture by returning to its classical roots through philology. He bore a special burden, however, as the son of an accomplished father, Robert, against whom he first struggled to define himself, then joined in the scholarly pantheon with the publication of his *Thesaurus graecae linguae*. Indeed, the thread that holds all this together is his masterpiece, the *Thesaurus*. Estienne announced this work in 1557, and from that point on the succession of editions that came off his presses served as source material for the *Thesaurus*, which he regularly blamed in turn for diverting his attention from these editions. The *Thesaurus* appeared in 1572, but it brought him no peace, for he made constant notes to use in revising it, then complained with increasing bitterness against a public that did not appreciate it and other scholars who plagiarized from it. His reputation for embittered isolation rests on what he wrote during these later years. To be sure, Estienne saw little difference between a typographical mistake and a textual error put into print through scholarly ignorance; like many scholars who held themselves to high standards, however, he found himself increasingly impatient with the mistakes of others. Budé and Erasmus both fell short; in the end, Estienne found himself both praising and condemning the same people.

The bulk of the book is texts, but the whole is well indexed, so that the reader can begin with a favorite classical author, find the date in which this author was published by Estienne, and then turn to that year to find the relevant paratexts. Estienne's own works, along with the translators and editors whose works he printed, are made accessible in the same way, and those to whom dedicatory letters and prefaces were written are also indexed. This is a work of true scholarship, done to high standards, and Brepols is to be commended for agreeing to publish it. That said, I do have to note that the cover is bound upside down and backwards onto my copy, and that quite a number of pages in the introduction are

printed so badly that I had some trouble reading them. Material like this, however, is too little studied by Neo-Latinists, and I hope that the service that has been done here by making it easily accessible will stimulate similar efforts for other authors. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Rhetoric and Dialectic in the Time of Galileo*. By Jean Dietz Moss and William A. Wallace. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2003. x + 438 pp. \$69.95. At first glance, this is an unusual book: after a forty-page introduction on rhetoric and dialectic in the Renaissance, Moss and Wallace present translations of part or all of six works by three writers, Cipriano Soarez (1524-1593), Ludovico Carbone (1545-1597), and Antonio Riccobono (1541-1599), who are hardly household words today, even to scholars working in the area. Questions arise immediately: why would anyone today be interested in this material—or more precisely, wouldn't the few people who would have need to read it be able to handle the Latin in which it was originally written? What connects these six treatises to one another? And what does Galileo have to do with all this?

Fortunately all becomes clear in the first few pages of the introduction. The project began with the authors' interest in Galileo's *Dialogue on the Two Chief World Systems* (1632), about which each has written previously, and the trial that resulted from it. The famous (or rather, infamous) trial came about, as is well known, because church authorities believed that Galileo had violated the edict of 1616 that forbade the teaching of the Copernican system as true, since it appeared to contradict Scripture. Moss and Wallace focus not on the content of the *Dialogue*, but on its form. Galileo seems to have felt that if he presented the Copernican system as debatable, credible but not unequivocally true, he would not be violating the edict. He based his discussion of the earth's revolution around the sun on the ebb and flow of the tides, and was careful (for example) to claim in the title page of the *Dialogue* that he was "proposing indeterminately philosophical and natural arguments as much on the one, as on the other side" (quoted on p.

10). What he actually did, however, was to present Copernican arguments as highly probable, indeed verging on the certain, and the arguments defending the Ptolemaic system as foolish. Once he began down this path, he ran into an even greater problem, for the church demanded necessary demonstration of the Copernican system before Scripture could be reinterpreted to agree with the truths of science. In other words, in the 1633 trial, church authorities took most seriously indeed the traditional hierarchical distinctions that separated the certain knowledge of scientific demonstration from the probable reasoning of dialectic and the probable discourse of rhetoric.

Moss and Wallace thus began from their belief that methods of proof and argumentation figured prominently in Galileo's trial, and then worked backward to find material that would illuminate these methods and that was written by individuals who had crossed paths with Galileo. Attention is focused on two northern Italian institutions that played an important role in Galileo's intellectual development: the Collegio Romano in Rome and the University of Padua. One of the most important texts in the history of rhetoric in the Renaissance was the *De arte rhetorica* of the Spanish Jesuit Cipriano Soarez, whose pupil Peter Perpinian taught Carbone; we cannot say for sure that Galileo knew Carbone, but we are sure that both men studied many of the same texts at the Collegio Romano. The relationship between Galileo and Riccobono is more secure, for Galileo wrote to him in 1588 to seek his help in obtaining a professorship in mathematics in Padua. Accordingly Moss and Wallace present excerpts, in translation, from the following six works: Carbone's *Introductio in logicam*, which summarizes Jesuit teachings on logic and presents Aristotelian ideas about human nature and the operations of the intellect; Carbone's *Tabulae rhetoricae*, which orders and summarizes Soarez's *De arte rhetorica*; Carbone's *De arte dicendi*, a companion to the *Tabulae* that offers disputations on various parts of rhetoric; three essays by Riccobono on Aristotle's *Rhetoric*; Carbone's *De oratoria et dialectica inventionione*, a comparison of the aims and methods of the two arts that is suitable for an advanced course; and Carbone's *Divinus orator*, which

serves as his most sophisticated treatment of rhetoric, ordered to the aims of preaching.

The texts presented here, then, are connected to one another and of importance not only to specialists in rhetoric and dialectic, but to anyone who has a serious interest in Galileo and the history of science in the early modern period. In laying out a background for the appreciation of these texts, the introduction becomes in itself a masterful summary of argumentation in this period and its roots in the classical past. As such, it provides another piece of evidence that humanism stimulated new translations and commentaries on Aristotelian logic and rhetoric and redirected scholastic method to classical works on rhetoric, but did not simply replace what it found as the polemics of the new learning claim. In the end, my one lasting regret about this book is tied to its price: at almost seventy dollars, I fear it will be beyond the reach of many of those who could benefit from reading it. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *L'eredità greca e l'ellenismo veneziano*. Ed. by Gino Benzoni. Fondazione Giorgio Cini, Civiltà veneziana, Saggi, 46. Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 2002. vi + 364 pp. 39€. The early humanists were divided about whether Venice could really be called *altera Roma*, but there was no question that unlike Florence, the city on the lagoon was indeed *alterum Byzantium*. This was true before 1453, and even more true afterward, when Cardinal Bessarion left his massive Greek library to Venice and Aldus Manutius began a systematic program to print all the major texts of Greek antiquity: *Venetiae ... Athenae alterae ... dici possunt, propter litteras graecas* (vi), as one of Aldus's associates put it.

The essays in this volume grew from a conference devoted to this theme. After a brief preface by the editor, the volume contains the following essays: Giovanni Pugliese Carratelli, "Bessarione, il Cusano e l'umanesimo meridionale"; Giorgio Ravegnani, "I dogi di Venezia e la corte di Bisanzio"; Gherardo Ortalli, "Venezia mediterranea e grecità medievale: relazioni, conflitti, sintonie"; Silvia Ronchey, "L'ultimo bizantino. Bessarione e gli ultimi regnanti di



Bisanzio”; Marino Zorzi, “Bessarione e i codici greci”; Irene Favaretto, “Sculpture greche nel territorio della Repubblica”; Ugo Tucci, “La Grecia e l’economia veneziana”; Ennio Concina, “Il quartiere veneziano di Costantinopoli”; Luigi Balsamo, “Aldo Manuzio e la diffusione dei classici greci”; Jean-Claude Margolin, “Érasme et Venise”; Cesare Vasoli, “Guillaume Postel e l’eterodossia”; Marc Fumaroli, “L’ellénisme vénitien et les origines du Collège de France”; Lionello Puppi, “«Quelle cose ... che solo i Greci per magnificenza ... poterono fare». Consapevolezza ed esperienza dell’architettura ellenica da Palladio a Scamozzi”; Augusto Gentili, “Tiziano, la tragedia e il crepuscolo degli dei”; Gino Benzoni, “Ellade e non solo Ellade: qualche appunto a e da Venezia”; Vincenzo Di Benedetto, “Il neoclassicismo del Foscolo: avvisi di un percorso”; Lorenzo Braccesi, “Il mito ellenico e il fallimento di Campofornio”; and Giorgio Orelli, “«Un perenne ronzio» (releggendo le *Grazie* del Foscolo).”

Benzoni, who is himself an acknowledged expert in Venetian studies, has succeeded in an impressive number of cases in getting contributions from those scholars who have dominated research in their fields for years: Favaretto, for example, on the collection of Greek art in Venice, and Balsamo on Aldus Manutius and early Greek printing in Italy. The essays by experts like these tend to cover ground that is in many respects familiar, but with a depth and bibliographical completeness that make them very valuable indeed: it is no secret that Erasmus’s stay in Venice, for example, was important, but Margolin documents precisely how the Dutch humanist availed himself of the resources there to transform himself with impressive speed from an apprentice in the Greek language and culture into a master, able from that point on to make scholarly contributions at the highest levels. In covering familiar ground, several essays offer unexpected conclusions along the way. Take, for example, the essays of Ronchey and Zorzi on Bessarion. Most of us tend to see Bessarion through the eyes of the Italian humanists who embraced him in the fifteenth century and saw what they wanted to see, a philologist and learned bibliophile like themselves. Ronchey, however, shows us a “Bessarione orientale”

(75) who transformed himself, like Proteus, from a disciple of Pletho and courtier of the *basileis* into a Christian humanist according to the western model, leaving at least some modern scholars to wonder what, if anything, he actually believed in. Zorzi in turn recounts the well-known story of the donation of Bessarion's library to the Venetian state, but in such a way that the nuances become important. In 1455 the Papal library, the most illustrious in the world, had 414 manuscripts; twenty years later the collection left by Bessarion to Venice was almost two and a half times that size, and notwithstanding the difficulties Aldus Manutius had, access to the books was granted regularly even before Bessarion's library was opened to the public in 1560. Also worth mentioning is the essay of Fumaroli, who traces the rise of Greek studies in France, a story that has often been told before, but without such a clear emphasis on its dependence on Venice.

Collections like these tend to focus on literature, perhaps on art as well, but this one provides the broader background that is often lacking: Tucci, for example, unravels the economic connections between Greece and Venice, and Concina studies the Venetian quarter of Constantinople, the physical setting from which cultural connections were made. This volume, in short, ranges widely and with authority, making it the essential starting place for anyone interested in the connections between the Greek world and Venetian culture. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Cantabrigiensis: Proceedings of the Eleventh International Congress of Neo-Latin Studies*, Cambridge 30 July-5 August 2000. Edited by Rhoda Schnur (general editor), Jean-Louis Charlet, Lucia Gualda Rosa, Heinz Hofmann, Brenda Hosington, Elena Rodríguez Peregrina, and Ronald Truman. *Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies*, 259. Tempe, Ariz.: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2003. The International Association for Neo-Latin Studies, which is the major scholarly association in its field (and with which the American Association for Neo-Latin Studies is affiliated) meets every three years, usually in Europe but occasionally in North America. The

proceedings of these meetings are published by MRTS and serve as an invaluable record of recent work in Neo-Latin. This volume contains the following essays: the "Presidential Address," by Gilbert Tournoy; five plenary papers, one in each of the official languages of the society: Jean-Louis Charlet, "Une querelle au sein de la *Res publica litterarum*: la question de Pline l'Ancien de 1469 au milieu du XVI<sup>ème</sup> siècle"; Julia Haig Gaisser, "Allegorizing Apuleius: Fulgentius, Boccaccio, Beroaldo, and the Chain of Receptions"; Heinz Hofmann, "Die neuen Leiden des jungen Aristaeus: Mythologische Kreativität in neulateinischer Lehrdichtung"; Lucia Gualdo Rosa, "L'Accademia Pontaniana e la sua ideologia in alcuni componimenti giovanili del Sannazaro"; and Elena Rodríguez Peregrina, "Lutero y su influencia en la España de Carlos V"; and the following 'communications': Sylvia Brown, "In Praise of the *Filia Docta*: Elizabeth Weston and the Female Line"; Davide Canfora, "L'anonimo carme pastorale intitolato *Cinthias*"; Avelina Carrera de la Red, "¿Por qué se prohibieron las *Adnotationes* de Philipp Melanchthon a la obra de Salustio en México a finales del siglo XVI?"; Robert W. Carrubba, "The *Preface* to the *Amoenitates Exoticae*"; Donald Cheney, "Elizabeth Jane Weston as Cultural Icon"; Jean-Frédéric Chevalier, "La victime tragique depuis les premières tragédies néo-latines jusqu'à *Jephthes* de G. Buchanan"; John Considine, "Philology and Autobiography in Isaac Casaubon, *Animadversionum in Athenaei Deipnosophistas libri XV* (1600)"; Judith Deitch, "Prefacing *Axiochus*: The Renaissance Plato and the *Res publica litterarum*"; E. Delbey, "Pontano élégiaque: l'énonciation de la subjectivité élégiaque dans la République des Lettres"; Sigmar Döpp, "Ioannes Fabricius Montanus: The Two Autobiographies"; Agnieszka Dziuba, "The Renaissance Portrait of the Polish King Sigismund I in Bernard Wapowski's *Chronica Polonorum*"; Peter Fisher, "What Is a Hippopotamus? A Problem in Renaissance Taxonomy and Description"; Richard I. Frank, "Budé and the Republic of Letters"; Maia Wellington Gahtan, "A Renaissance Treatise on Time: Lilio Gregorio Giraldi's *De annis et mensibus*"; Benjamin García Hernández, "Los reflejos plautinos en la latín de Descartes (*Med.* 1-3)"; Donald Gilman, "Petraarch's Poetics: A Definition and Defense of Creativity in the

*Familiares and Seniles*”; Robert Ginsberg, “Philosophy and Pedagogy in the Rhetoric of Giambattista Vico’s *De nostri temporis studiorum ratione* (1709)”; Ferran Grau Codina, “*Orationes* concerning Letters at the University of Valencia in the Sixteenth Century”; John K. Hale, “George Herbert’s Oration before King James, Cambridge 1623”; Michael J. Heath, “Confession and Concession: The Texts of Erasmus’s *Exomologesis*”; Gerhard Holk, “Petrus Martyr de Angleria (Pietro Martire d’Anghiera): A Remarkable Italian Humanist and Historian of the New World”; Brenda M. Hosington, “On the Glory of Women: English and French Translations of Agrippa’s *Declamatio de nobilitate et praecellentia foeminei sexus* (1542-1726)”; August A. Imholtz, “Neo-Latin Nonsense in Nabokov”; Hans-Erik Johannesson, “Poetics and Ideology in Neo-Latin Poetry”; Hilaire Kallendorf, “Exorcism and the Interstices of Language: Ruggle’s *Ignoramus* and the Demonization of Renaissance English Neo-Latin”; Arnold L. Kerson, “Fray Alonso de la Veracruz’s Views on the Legitimacy of the Spanish Conquest of America as Revealed in His *De dominio infidelium et iusto bello* (1553-1554)”; Thomas Lindner, “Bemerkungen zum *Trophaeum Anglicum* von Lionardo Dati”; Daniel López-Cañete Quiles, “Un soneto de Quevedo y un epigrama de Falcó”; Mariano Madrid Castro, “Fuentes para los Comentarios de Jodocus Badius Ascensius”; John R. C. Martyn, “Memory Training in Renaissance Education”; Elizabeth N. McCutcheon, “Laughter and Humanism: Unity and Diversity in Thomas More’s *Epigrammata*”; David Money, “The Politics of Poetry: A Quick Look at Robert Walpole and Two Thousand Other Cambridge Latin Poets”; Clare M. Murphy, “Thomas More’s *De tristitia Christi* as Theo-Drama”; Stephen Murphy, “The Metamorphoses of *De vita monachorum*”; H. M. Nellen, “Hugo Grotius’s Correspondence with His Brother Willem de Groot”; Karl August Neuhausen, “*Lusus quidam Westmonasteriensis ab oblivione nunc vindicandi: Appendix sive Contemporaneas res bina per saecula (1704-1905) orbe toto terrarum feliciter gestas quam lepide nonnulli poetae Londinienses Latinis versibus singulas usque depinxerint*”; Howard B. Norland, “Gager’s *Meleager*: An Inventive Adaptation of Senecan Form”;

Juan M<sup>a</sup> Núñez González, “In Gasparini Barzizzii *De compositione opusculum quaestiunculae*”; Klára Pajorin, “La funzione e l’importanza dei nomi umanistici”; Joaquín Pascual Barea, “Coincidences and Differences between the Latin and the Spanish Poems, Treatises, and Epistles of Rudericus Carus (Rodrigo Caro)”; Vicente Picon García, “Nuevos textos del teatro jesuítico en España, II: las comedias *Techmitius* y *Triunfo de la fe*”; Olga Zorzi Pugliese, “The Role of Latin in the Composition of Castiglione’s *Il libro del cortegiano*”; Stella P. Revard, “Milton and Cambridge”; Vibeke Roggen, “Entertainment and Learning in the Neo-Latin Rebuses by the Seventeenth-Century Norwegian Nils Thomassøn”; François Rouget, “*Illustris Blondelli Comparatio Pindari et Horatii*: les commentaires sur les œuvres de Pindare et d’Horace à la fin du XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle”; José Manuel Ruiz Vila, “Personajes femeninos en el *De viris illustribus urbis Romae a Romulo ad Augustum* (1779) de Charles François Lhomond”; Carlo Santini, “La versione latina dell’*Iliade* di Giuseppe Pasquali Marinelli”; Paul Gerhard Schmidt, “Erasmus von Rotterdam, ‘Ratio seu methodus verae theologiae’”; Angel Sierra de Cozar, “Nuevos textos del teatro jesuítico en España, I: *Paronesia* y *Demophilus*”; Jerzy Starnawski, “Zamoc: Das letzte Bollwerk der Renaissance in Polen”; Fabio Stok, “L’umanesimo scandinavo di Olaus Magnus”; László Szörényi, “L’epopea di Elia Berger sulla Santa Croce e la storia ungherese”; Nikolaus Thurn, “Die Aeneis-Allegorese in Cristoforo Landinos *Disputationes Camaldulenses*”; Piotr Urbański, “Joannes Dantiscus and Italian Neo-Latin Poetry”; Sebastiano Valerio, “Paolo Paladino: militare e umanista alla corte di Federico d’Aragona”; Juan Jesús Valverde Abril, “Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda, *Epistolarum libri septem*, Salamanca, 1557: testamento literario de un humanista”; Dirk van Miert, “The Religious Beliefs of Hadrianus Junius (1511-1575)”; Michiel Verweij, “The Cranevelt Letters and Rome”; Zweder von Martels, “The Central Position of the Authors of Late Antiquity in Humanist Thought: The Case of Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini.” (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Catalogus translationum et commentariorum: Medieval and Renaissance Latin Translations and Commentaries, Annotated Lists and Guides.* Edited by Virginia Brown (editor in chief), James Hankins and Robert A. Kaster (associate editors). Vol. 8. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2003. xxiv + 365 pp. Readers of this journal are doubtless familiar with *CTC*, a series which began in 1960 under the leadership of the late Paul Oskar Kristeller with the intention to “list and describe the Latin translations of ancient Greek authors and the Latin commentaries on ancient Latin (and Greek) authors up to the year 1600” (xiii). In his preface to that first volume, Professor Kristeller noted that generalizations about the ‘classical tradition’ would benefit greatly from documentary precision, from a precise knowledge of what each postclassical generation knew about each author from Greco-Roman antiquity, as measured by the surviving evidence from manuscripts and early printed books. A few areas in which the amount of material is overwhelming are left out—commentaries on Aristotle; on medical, legal, and canonistic works; on the Bible; and on medieval Latin authors—as are scattered, anonymous glosses and miscellaneous observations on various ancient writers. Each article on a relevant classical author, however, contains a wealth of information, beginning with a chronological list of translations and / or commentaries, then offering for each item in the list the name of the author, the circumstances of composition, a list of copies (in manuscript and early printed editions, with bibliography), a list of relevant scholarly literature, a brief *incipit* and *excipit* of the dedication, preface, introduction, and main text, and a short biographical note on the translator or commentator.

This, the eighth volume in the series, contains the following articles: Damianus (Heliiodorus Larissaeus), by Robert B. Todd; Geminus Rhodius / Pseudo Proclus, by Robert B. Todd; Hanno, by Monique Mund-Dopchie; Themistius, by Robert B. Todd; Thucydides, by Marianne Pade; and Sallustius, by Patricia J. Osmond and Robert W. Ulery, Jr. There are also additions and corrections to the following articles, published in earlier volumes: Columella, by José-Ignacio García Armendáriz; Tacitus, by Robert W. Ulery,

Jr.; Vegetius, by Michael Idomir Allen; and Xenophon, by David Marsh. As has been the custom with the series, these articles are the ones that were on hand when it was time to send the volume to press, but they sometimes complement one another. Geminus and Damianus were both scientific writers, the former the author of an astronomical survey (*Elementa astronomiae*), the latter of a treatise on optics (*Capita optitorum*). Geminus's work illustrates nicely the accidents of transmission of classical texts: four chapters were excerpted in the fifteenth century and attributed, under the title of *Sphaera*, to Proclus, the Neoplatonic philosopher, at which point they exceeded in popularity the correctly attributed and complete work from which they had been taken. The *Periplus* of Hanno the Carthaginian is the account of a voyage made around the coast of west Africa and of the marvels seen there; although there are only two surviving manuscripts and one Latin translation and commentary, the work seems to have aroused considerable interest from antiquity through the Renaissance, having helped motivate the explorations of Vasco da Gama and Pedro Álvarez Cabral and providing information to mapmakers like Abraham Ortelius and to Portuguese and Spanish authors staking their claims to Africa and America. Themistius in turn paraphrased the treatises of Aristotle on logic, philosophy, and natural science and wrote official speeches to the emperor in the fourth century AD. The commentaries were very popular, being translated into Arabic, Hebrew, and Syriac and circulating widely throughout medieval and Renaissance Europe, with the University of Padua playing a leading role in their study and dissemination. The centerpieces of this volume, as one might expect, are the lengthy articles on Thucydides (80 pages) and Sallust (140 pages), two influential and complementary historians who exercised a profound impact from antiquity through such important figures of the early modern period as Macchiavelli, More, and Hobbes.

The major problem in reviewing volumes in this series lies in finding enough superlatives to do them justice. Each volume represents the ideals of international scholarly collaboration at their best: this one, for example, contains articles by scholars at the

University of British Columbia, the Catholic University of Louvain, the University of Copenhagen, Wake Forest University, Iowa State University, the University of Barcelona, the University of Chicago, and Rutgers University. Professor Kristeller warned at the inception of the project that its results might appear to be of modest significance, even pedestrian (xiv), so it is important to note that the longer articles in particular represent years of painstaking research; indeed, younger scholars who have accepted assignments with *CTC* are well advised not to start work until they have been tenured, since it will take far longer than they anticipate and the work may well not be appreciated for what it is. Yet Professor Kristeller also forecast, again correctly, that many valuable interpretive studies in the classical tradition would be generated from the articles in the *CTC*, so scholars who prefer analysis to bibliography should also be cheering this project through to its conclusion. I should note as well that an enormous amount of largely thankless effort has been expended by the editors, whose meticulous and probing work ensures the kind of definitive articles that we have come to expect from the series. It has been eleven years since volume seven was published, and while the series will certainly not be complete within my lifetime, we can certainly hope that volume nine at least will appear soon. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *O abies (O, Christmas Tree): Christmas Carols in Latin*. Arranged, produced, and performed by Teddy Irwin and C. C. Couch. Nashville, Tenn.: Sound Inventions, 2003. Distributed by Bolchazy-Carducci Publishers. This compact disk contains a half hour of Christmas music in Latin: *Serena nocte media* ("It Came upon the Midnight Clear"), *O laetissimum nuntium* ("God Rest You Merry Gentlemen"), *Tinniunt, tinniunt Tintinnabula* ("Jingle Bells"), *Domus visco exornemus* ("Deck the Halls"), *O abies, o abies* ("O, Christmas Tree"), *Sit prosperus Iesus nati dies* ("We Wish You a Merry Christmas"), *Gaudete* ("Joy to the World"), *Primum Noel* ("The First Noel"), *Adeste, fideles* ("O Come All Ye Faithful"), *Nox silens* ("Silent Night"), *Gloria novo principi* ("Hark the Herald Angels Sing"), and *O urbs*



*pusilla Bethlehem* ("O Little Town of Bethlehem"). The lyrics are taken from *Latine cantemus* (Wauconda, Ill., 1996), and are performed here by two established artists. In general it all works well. Some of the lyrics (e.g., *Tinniunt, tinniunt, tintinnabula*) are more inspired than others (I'm still having trouble fitting the Latin lyrics of the first verse of "The First Noel" into the melody I know), to be sure. And while the performers are hardly novices, there are places where they seem to try too hard to infuse drama into carols that are very familiar, and the occasional intrusions of elements from children's songs and country music jar a bit. Nevertheless I would certainly recommend the CD, both as background for the office Christmas party and as a teaching tool for an elementary Latin class.

I should also note that the distributor, Bolchazy-Carducci Publishers, offers a number of other compact disks, cassettes, and music scores with lyrics in Latin. Some of these are recordings of classical music standards like Carl Orff's perennially popular *Carmina Burana* and Jan Novák's *Dido and Minus Magicus*. Others, like "Rome's Golden Poets," present texts from Catullus, Virgil, and Horace in settings from Josquin Des Prez and Adrian Willaert through Randall Thompson and Zoltán Kodály, as performed by the St. Louis Chamber Chorus. And others are totally unexpected: two CDs that blend Spanish Jesuit liturgical music with native Bolivian rhythms and melodies, and a rendition of twelve Black Sabbath songs translated into Latin and performed by the early music group Rondellus. Here are stocking stuffers for your favorite Latinist.... (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Mundus emblematicus: Studies in Neo-Latin Emblem Books*. Edited by Karl A. E. Enenkel and Arnoud S. Q. Visser. Imago figurata, Studies, 4. Turnhout: Brepols, 2003. x + 383 pp. 75€. The first emblem book, Andrea Alciato's *Emblemata* (Augsburg, 1531), contains woodcut illustrations accompanying epigrams written in Latin, so it should not surprise us that many of Alciato's followers, men like Achille Bocchi, Joachim Camerarius, Hadrianus Junius, and Johannes Sambucus, followed his example and wrote in Latin

as well. Greek and Latin literature in general, and the Latin poets in particular, provided subjects, quotations, and models for the Neo-Latin emblem book, which flourished for several generations after its establishment. As Enenkel and Visser point out, however, one would not necessarily know this from modern scholarship, which has focused instead on basic bibliography, emblem theory, and the vernacular emblem tradition in France, Britain, and the Netherlands. Alciato himself is an exception, but little is known about other Neo-Latin emblem books. What do they contain? What is the relationship in them between word and image? Between writer, illustrator, and publisher? Between one emblem book and another? Between the Neo-Latin emblem book and related genres like commonplace or fable books?

The editors of this volume have begun here, with the current state of scholarship, and tried to offer a series of studies on some of the most important emblem books, and on the connection between the emblem and related areas. The emphasis is on the historical and literary context, with a structural analysis of the work opening into a consideration of more theoretical questions, like the relationship between word and image. In "Emblems into Commonplaces: The Anthologies of Josephus Langius," Ann Moss traces how an influential series of commonplace books both drew from emblem books and provided, in turn, new material for emblematisers, with both genres often being organized in similar ways. Daniel Russell shows how in his commentary on Alciato, Claude Mignault turned the *Emblematum libellus* into a commonplace book in "Claude Mignault, Erasmus and Simon Bouquet: The Function of the Commentaries on Alciato's Emblems." The next three essays focus on intertextuality, the relationship between one emblem book and the literary field within which it is situated, but each of them heads off in a different direction: in "Hadriani Iunii Medici *Emblemata* (1565)," Chris L. Heesakkers turns to the relationship of word and image; in "The *Emblemata* of Théodore de Bèze (1580)," Alison Adams shows how the first Protestant emblem book can be placed at least historically, if not doctrinally; and in "Achille Bocchi's *Symbolicae Quaestiones*," Anne Rolet shows how

this emblem book played a role in creating and maintaining a social network for its Bolognese author. Elisabeth Klecker and Sonja Schreiner focus on a series of Latin epigrams and the German verses that accompanied them in “How to Gild Emblems. From Mathias Holtzwardt’s *Emblematum Tyrocinia* to Nicolaus Reusner’s *Aureola Emblemata*,” concluding that differences in the Latin and German show how illustrations in emblem books could be interpreted in different ways. The next two essays explore natural history as a source for emblems: in “Arnold Freitag’s *Mythologia Ethica* (1579) and the Tradition of the Emblematic Fable,” Paul J. Smith explores the implications of the sub-genre of the emblematic fable book, while in “Joachim Camerarius’s *Symbolorum et Emblematum Centuriae Quattuor: From Natural Sciences to Moral Contemplation*,” Jan Papy shows that topical *ordo* guides the structure of this encyclopedic work. Two works highlighting iconography follow: “The Seven Liberal Arts into Emblems, in Olomouc, 1597,” in which Lubomir Konečný and Jaromír Olšofský show that the newly discovered emblematic engravings by Andrzej and Krzysztof Koryciński derive from true *inventio*, a playful humanistic effort; and “The Painter and the Poet: The *Nucleus Emblematum* by De Passe and Rollenhagen,” in which Ilja Veldman and Clara Klein stress the originality of De Passe’s *picturae* to argue the priority of the illustration over the epigram. György Endre Szönyi explores the relationship between the emblem and alchemy in “Occult Semiotics and Iconology: Michael Maier’s Alchemical Emblems.” The two final articles discuss the Jesuit emblem: in Hieremias Drexel’s Emblem Book *Orbis Phaëthon* (1629): “Moral Message and Strategies of Persuasion,” Toon Van Houdt shows that the *picturae* provide an important initial stimulus for spiritual exercise, while Richard Dimler analyzes emblematic rhetorics and shows how the emblem book can be related to the structure of the Psalms in “Herman Hugo’s *Pia Desideria*.”

It would be nice, of course, if one could come to some grand, sweeping generalization at the end of a collection of essays like these. What emerges from this volume, however, is a strong sense of how much basic work remains to be done on the Neo-Latin

emblem book, and how much variety there is in the materials to hand. For now, this will have to be conclusion enough. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

## News

**Seventeenth-Century Imprints on the Antiquarian Book Market****Brett-Smith Library Auction, Sotheby's (Spring, 2004)**

The John R.B. Brett-Smith Library, a collection long distinguished for its holdings in early-modern English books and manuscripts, was the subject of much chat this past spring in London. The library's auction on 27 May 2004 (641 lots) attracted an exuberant mix of international collectors, dealers, and institutions. Bidding was vigorous, bringing in a stunning grand total of £761,582, well above the pre-sale estimate.\* The auction's strong results testify to the continuing commercial appreciation of these early imprints for rare book collectors and financial investors, as well as their special significance for students of Book History. The most noteworthy, high-end sales, particularly those of pre-Restoration imprints, are as follows:

John Donne's *Poems, By J.D. with Elegies on the Authors Death* (quarto, first ed., 1633; John Marriot imprint); this copy of the first edition of Donne's collected poems brought £15,600 from "an overseas dealer"; the auction catalogue features a handsome full-page photo of the title-page (106).

David Loggan's *Oxonia Illustrata* (folio, first ed., 1675), contemporary Oxford binding by Roger Bartlett, in blue morocco, tooled in gilt; engraved throughout (39 double-pages and one folding plate by Loggan), being illustrations of Oxford, its libraries, theatres, and sites; with presentation inscription from the Master and Fellows, Pembroke College, Oxford, to Sir John Benet; fetched £9000 from a "Continental dealer."

\*Sale figures cited here include the usual surcharge or buyer's premium.

*George Herbert and Richard Crashaw*. Two works in one volume. Herbert's *The Temple* (duodecimo, sixth ed., 1641; University of Cambridge: Roger Daniel) and Crashaw's *Steps to the Temple* (duodecimo, 2nd ed., 1648, Moseley imprint); in contemporary Parisian mottled calf, for John Evelyn, whose crest appears (center oval) on the top board. A special offering that brought £6600.

Andrew Marvell's posthumous *Miscellaneous Poems* (folio, first ed., 1681; Boulter imprint), with engraved frontis of Marvell; provenance, Wm Stirling Maxwell; "one of the major poetical publications of the seventeenth century" (auction catalogue, p. 196); sold at £5760.

Henry Vaughan's *Silurist...Poems and Translations* (octavo, first ed., 1651; Moseley imprint). With additional engraved title by Robert Vaughan. Provenance: Harold Greenhill; H. Bradley Martin; sold at £4200.

John Milton's *Paradise Lost...in Twelve Books* (folio, fourth ed., 1688; Jacob Tonson imprint); the first illustrated edition (twelve engraved plates), with engraved frontis of Milton by White after Faithorne; provenance, Philip Hofer, with Hofer book-label; sold at £3120.

---

Restoration imprints also made a strong showing. The top sale, £39,600, from an unidentified London dealer, was a bound manuscript volume (some 85 pages) of twenty-four uncollected verses by Anne Wharton. This is a major contribution to the canon of Englishwomen's writing in the second half of the seventeenth century, and it surely invites an updated edition and reassessment of Wharton. Sales in Dryden were predictably high: a first edition of *MacFlecknoe* (quarto, 1682) went to an "overseas collector" for £21,600; Dryden's *Poems and Letters* (octavo, 1685), brought £14,400 from "a London dealer." Other sales of note include the Britwell Court copy of Sarah Egerton's *Female Advocate* (1686),

her famous reply to Robert Gould's *Love Given O're* (1682), fetching £5040 from "a private library." Also to this same buyer went Katherine Philips' *Letters from Orinda to Poliarchus* (2nd ed., 1729), at £4800, and at £3360 the Sir Edmund Gosse copy, with bookplate, of the elegant octavo, *Female Poems...by Ephelia* (1679), attributed to Mary Stuart *née* Villiers, Duchess of Richmond (*ESTC* R21721, R40072, NAFL8557363; see also *SCN* [vol. 52, Spring-Summer 2004, 119-123] and a multimedia archive at <http://www.millersville.edu/~resound/ephelia/>). The Lord Rolle (Bicton Library) copy of a first edition of Jane Barker's *Poetical Recreations* (1688), with bookplate, sold for £2880.

---

Offerings in other Restoration figures – Behn, Buckingham, Anne Killigrew, L'Estrange, Mulgrave, Rochester, Sedley, Wincherley, *et al.*—are listed in the Author Index of the auction catalogue (341-46).

---

For further details on the auction's offerings and the history of the Brett-Smith Library, see Sotheby's handsomely illustrated auction catalogue (366 pages), compiled by Peter Beal, Peter Selley, Tessa Milne, and Philip W. Errington, an essential bibliographical resource for seventeenth-century specialists. See also, Sotheby's online 'Auctions Results' and Sotheby's 'Press Releases,' as well as Ian McKay's illustrated coverage of the auction in *The Antiques Trade Gazette* (3 July 2004), pages 49-50 (with correction addendum, 24 July 2004, page 3). James E. May's popular column, "Scribleriana Transferred," hosted by the scholarly journal, *Scriblerian*, also will report on this important London auction.

Maureen E. Mulvihill  
Princeton Research Forum

