



EVENTEENTH-



ENTURY



EWS

SPRING - SUMMER 2011

Vol. 69

Nos. 1&2

Including

THE NEO-LATIN NEWS Vol. 59, Nos. 1&2

SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY NEWS

VOLUME 68, Nos. 1&2

SPRING-SUMMER, 2010

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 Texas A&M University.

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

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

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

ISSN 0037-3028

SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY NEWS

EDITOR

DONALD R. DICKSON

Texas A&M University

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

James Egan, University of Akron
Michele Marrapodi, University of Palermo
Patricia Garcia, University of Texas
E. Joe Johnson, Clayton State University
Matthew E. Davis, Texas A&M University

EDITORIAL ASSISTANT

Elise A. Beck, Texas A&M University

CONTENTS

VOLUME 69, NOS. 1&2 SPRING-SUMMER, 2011

| | |
|--|----|
| Helen Wilcox, ed. <i>The English Poems of George Herbert</i> . Review by JEFFREY P. BECK..... | 1 |
| John Gouws, ed. <i>Nicholas Oldisworth's Manuscript (Bodleian MS. Don.c.24)</i> . Review by A.H. DE QUEHEN..... | 4 |
| Joad Raymond. <i>Milton's Angels: The Early Modern Imagination</i> . Review by ADAM SWANN | 7 |
| Reid Barbour and Claire Preston, eds. <i>Sir Thomas Browne: The World Proposed</i> . Review by JOSEPH L. BLACK..... | 10 |
| Achsah Guibbory. <i>Christian Identity: Jews and Israel in Seventeenth-Century England</i> . Review by WILLIAM E. ENGEL..... | 13 |
| Noam Reisner. <i>Milton and the Ineffable</i> . Review by PETER E. MEDINE..... | 16 |
| Paul Davis. <i>Translation and the Poet's Life. The Ethics of Translating in English Cul- ture, 1645-1726</i> . Review by ALAN RUDRUM..... | 20 |
| Julie D. Campbell and Anne R. Larsen, eds. <i>Early Modern Women and Trans- national Communities of Letters</i> . Review by COLLEEN E. KENNEDY | 24 |
| Ian McAdam. <i>Magic and Masculinity in Early Modern English Drama</i> . Review by GRACE TIFFANY..... | 27 |
| Jonathan Gil Harris. <i>Untimely Matter in the Time of Shakespeare</i> . Review by BOYD M. BERRY | 30 |
| Judith Haber. <i>Desire and Dramatic Form in Early Modern England</i> . Review by ELISA OH | 34 |
| Peter Hinds. <i>'The Horrid Popish Plot': Roger L'Estrange and the Circulation of Political Dis- course in Late Seventeenth-Century London</i> . Review by ADAM SWANN..... | 38 |
| Michael North. <i>Artistic and Cultural Exchanges Between Europe and Asia 1400- 1900</i> . Review by NAGENDRA RAO | 41 |

| | |
|--|----|
| Joanne Rochester. <i>Staging Spectatorship in the Plays of Philip Massinger</i> . Review by NANCY MOHRLOCK BUNKER..... | 44 |
| Peter E. Medine, John T. Shawcross, and David V. Urban, eds. <i>Visionary Milton: Essays on Prophecy and Violence</i> . Review by ANTHONY WELCH..... | 47 |
| Maria Rosa Antognazza. <i>Leibniz: An Intellectual Biography</i> . Review by JONATHAN WRIGHT..... | 50 |
| Craig Ashley Hanson. <i>The English Virtuoso: Art, Medicine, and Antiquarianism in the Age of Empiricism</i> . Review by JAMES FITZMAURICE..... | 52 |
| Jamie C. Kassler. <i>The Honourable Roger North, 1651-1734: On Life, Morality, Law and Tradition</i> . Review by ELLEN J. JENKINS..... | 55 |
| Malcolm Wanklyn. <i>The Warrior Generals: Winning the British Civil Wars 1642-1652</i> . Review by CHRIS R. LANGLEY..... | 58 |
| Imtiaz Habib. <i>Black Lives in the English Archives, 1500-1677</i> . Review by BABACAR M'BAYE..... | 61 |
| Kevin Sharpe. <i>Images Wars: Promoting Kings and Commonwealth in England, 1603-1660</i> . Review by TILLMAN W. NECHTMAN..... | 65 |
| Thomas N. Corns, Ann Hughes, and David Loewenstein, eds. <i>The Complete Works of Gerrard Winstanley</i> . Review by TOM HAYES..... | 68 |
| Mogens Laerke, ed. <i>The Use of Censorship in the Enlightenment</i> . Review by ROBERT H. BLACKMAN..... | 70 |
| Elvira Vilches. <i>New World Gold: Cultural Anxiety and Monetary Disorder in Early Modern Spain</i> . Review by ELIZABETH R. WRIGHT..... | 74 |
| Alban K. Forcione. <i>Majesty and Humanity: Kings and Their Doubles in the Political Drama of the Spanish Golden Age</i> . Review by LAURA BASS..... | 78 |
| Xavier Bray. <i>The Sacred Made Real. Spanish Painting and Sculpture 1600-1700</i> . Review by JOSEPH R. JONES..... | 82 |
| John A. Marino. <i>Becoming Neapolitan. Citizen Culture in Baroque Naples</i> . Review by R. BURR LITCHFIELD..... | 85 |
| Catherine Gimelli Martin. <i>Milton Among the Puritans: The Case for Historical Revisionism</i> . Review by JOHN MULRYAN..... | 87 |
| NEO-LATIN NEWS..... | 91 |

Helen Wilcox, ed. *The English Poems of George Herbert*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007. xlv + 740 + 5 illus. Review by JEFFREY P. BECK, EAST TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY.

Historians of the book sometimes refer to the codex book form itself as a distinctive technology and compare the book to a machine. Never is a reader more aware of the “book as machine” as when confronting a meticulously edited text with a rich scholarly apparatus. *The English Poems of George Herbert* is such a machine, a complicated and fascinating one with many moving parts and an immense weight of scholarly tradition. The editor’s work in assembling the machine of Herbert’s poetry with a variorum of commentary is no simple one, and she undertakes it with great industry. Her goal, described in her introduction as an appreciation of the paradoxes of Herbert’s English verse, however, she characterizes with modesty in Herbert’s own phrase from “Prayer (I)” as “something understood” (xxxvi).

So what “something” is Wilcox attempting to understand in *The English Poems*? And, just as importantly, what is she not seeking to understand? Obviously, the volume contains none of Herbert’s Latin verse, nor does it contain his prose in either English or Latin. The focus of the volume is on the English lyrics of *The Temple*, upon which she rightly says “Herbert’s fame rests” (xxii). The main contents of the volume are divided by the sections of *The Temple*: The Church-Porch (37-86), The Church (87-663), and the Church-Militant (664-687). Aside from these verses, only fifteen other English poems from Izaak Walton’s life of the poet and other manuscript sources are included in the volume. “These [fifteen] works show H. [Herbert] writing in more familial, social and public contexts,” says Wilcox correctly (xl), although only thirty-four pages of the book are devoted to such poems. Since the volume is principally devoted to line-by-line commentary from twentieth-century critics on the poems of *The Temple*, Wilcox’s edition amasses a formidable variorum commentary on topics such as Herbert’s use of the Bible in his verse, his stylistic innovations and paradoxical use of English verse forms, his remaking of secular forms for spiritual uses, the resonant speakers and voices of *The Temple*, the liturgy and sacraments of Herbert’s church, and the

theological controversies of the poems, among many others. Naturally, when an editor makes choices to include, she also makes choices to exclude, and these choices do both enable and limit the reader's ability to understand the paradoxes of George Herbert's poetry. About this, more later, after an examination of the text of the English poems.

Since Wilcox's *English Poems* is an edition, scholars will ask about the editorial assumptions behind the volume. As do most scholarly editors, Wilcox prefers the historical text closest to the author's intentions, and she settles firmly on 1633 edition of *The Temple*. She soundly argues that the historical text with its original spellings is preferable for appreciating Herbert's puns, word-play, and verbal texture to a modernized text. The chief difficulty in producing such a volume is deciding between the claims of the first printed edition of *The Temple* in 1633, the Bodleian manuscript of 1633, and the earlier Williams manuscript. In studying Herbert's verse, editors have been almost equally divided between the authority of the 1633 print edition and the Bodleian manuscript. Most critics believe the elegant Bodleian manuscript was produced by a member of Nicholas Ferrar's Little Gidding community for the licensing of *The Temple* in 1633, but that it was NOT the "little Book" manuscript of *The Temple* that Herbert himself gave to Ferrar's friend Edmund Duncon shortly before his death in March of 1633. Unfortunately, Herbert's "little Book" is not among the Ferrar Papers and so Herbert's own death-bed manuscript of *The Temple* has almost certainly been lost. Wilcox then comes to the conclusion that "the work of a skillful printer overseen by H's close friend's [i.e., the text of the printer Thomas Buck in 1633, overseen by the Ferrar family] is preferable to an elegant but sometimes idiosyncratic manuscript [i.e., the Bodleian manuscript]" (xxxix). Having come to this conclusion, Wilcox makes a thorough-going use of the 1633 text, with only three minor exceptions. First, she corrects a few obvious misreading in the 1633 text (from the second printed edition of *The Temple* or the Bodleian manuscript); second, she substitutes lower-case "s" for the long "s" of Buck's text; and third, she removes the capitalization of the second letter of each poem in 1633. While these final decisions appear somewhat arbitrary, given the overall reliance on almost everything else in 1633, they do remind me of a story Elizabeth Bishop used to tell of asking a student to read the

opening of “Love unknown” with the famous long “s,” and hearing, “Dear Friend, fit down, the tale is long and fad.” While Wilcox’s text is overall an homage to the work of Herbert’s original printer, it does solve this one modern problem.

In thinking about Wilcox’s choice of copy-text and her close allegiance to 1633, it is instructive to compare *The English Poems* to *The Works of George Herbert*, edited by F.E. Hutchinson, published in 1941. In his magisterial volume, Hutchinson came to very similar conclusions about the Bodleian and 1633 texts but chose a more nuanced editorial approach, preferring the Bodleian text for substantive verbal differences and stanza patterns and preferring the 1633 text for spelling, punctuation, and use of capitals. So readers will notice that while Hutchinson retained the stanza numbering of “The Church-porch” or the eight-line stanzas of “Even-song” in the Bodleian manuscripts, Wilcox removes the numbering of “The Church-porch” and uses the four-line stanzas of “Even-song” in the 1633 text. In comparing the Hutchinson and Wilcox editions, one also notices that Hutchinson notes almost every variant between the Bodleian, Williams, and 1633 editions, whereas Wilcox notes only those she considers “major variants.” The overall effect is of an accurately but minimally edited text, very close to the 1633 edition, with less emphasis on editorial apparatus. Instead, Wilcox’s emphasis is on modern criticism of *The Temple*, and this is the predominant strength of the volume.

If one is looking for commentary on any individual poem of *The Temple*, seeking to discover what Chana Bloch, or Richard Strier, or Helen Vendler, or John Shawcross, or any other critic had to say about any line of the poem, and to know about the Biblical allusions, literary forms, and other stylistic matters of the verse, there is no better volume than Wilcox’s *The English Poems of George Herbert*. It certainly provides plenty of scholarly commentary on the paradoxical poet-priest’s best work. However, the very strengths of the volume (its many pages devoted to this commentary) prevent it from exploring other elements of Herbert’s life and art. For example, one of Herbert’s most commented upon poems in recent decades has been a Latin poem about beauty in blackness, “Aethiopissa ambit Cestum Diversi Coloris Virum.” Although Wilcox refers to the poem several times in her notes, the rather arbitrary exclusion of Latin poetry from the

volume prevents a more thorough-going analysis of the important social issues of race and class in Herbert's poetic world. Similarly, the exclusion of Latin verse from the volume removes any possible mention of William Kerrigan's provocative essay "Ritual Man" (1985) on Herbert's Latin poems on his mother's death. Of course, Wilcox is not attempting in her volume to address other texts, and she is only marginally concerned with the social and political issues that arise in Herbert's prose and Latin poetry. As Wilcox never purports to understand entirely Herbert's social and poetic world, or even all the paradoxes of this poet-priest, one can very much applaud the "something understood" in *The English Poems of George Herbert*.

John Gouws, ed. *Nicholas Oldisworth's Manuscript (Bodleian MS. Don.c.24)*. Tempe, AZ: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2009. xlv + 256 pp. \$54.00. Review by A.H. DE QUEHEN, UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO.

Nicholas Oldisworth was a Gloucestershire man, the nephew of Sir Thomas Overbury, about whose murder he made a collection of papers now in the British Library. He was baptised at Bourton-on-the Hill in 1611, and after his education at Westminster School and Christ Church, Oxford, he became the rector of that parish. He married in 1641 and died four years later, survived by his wife and two of their three children. At Christ Church, where he was an exact contemporary of William Cartwright, Oldisworth wrote a quantity of poetry, which he transcribed the year before his death and dedicated to his wife. John Gouws has edited this holograph of 119 poems (Bodleian MS. Don.c.24), supplemented by additional poems, and variant readings, from several manuscripts and printed books (in particular, Folger MS. V.a.170, which contains forty-two of his poems). The edition includes a biographical and critical introduction and fairly detailed explanatory notes.

Oldisworth writes mostly decasyllabic couplets; also octosyllabic and stanzas of several kinds. There is not much modulation in his verse as he hastens on from line to line, but that is not to be expected from an enthusiastic novice. Had Oldisworth persisted as a poet, he

would no doubt have improved the sound, and hence sense, of his poetry. This may be seen in a lyric, occasioned by the silence of the heavenly spheres, of which he provides two versions. The undergraduate original reads:

The truth is (Madam) modest they
 Hearing how well you sing and play,
 Doe cease their Musick, and stand still
 To listen to your better Skill.

Compare the mature revision of 1644:

Lady, your Lute makes them stand still.
 For, modest they
 Nor sing, nor play,
 But listen to your better Skill. (98)

In some poems Oldisworth's discursive patter is entirely appropriate; for example, in the longish "Iter Australe, 1632, Or, A journey southwards," modelled, as Gouws notes, on "Iter Boreale" by the Dean of Christ Church, Richard Corbett. It starts with a visit to Ben Jonson, from whom the awed and reverential travellers anticipate "some Flashes and fantastique Guere"; but to their surprise and disappointment, "His whole Discourse / Was how Mankinde grew daily worse and worse, / How God was disregarded, how Men went / Downe even to Hell, and never did repent" (104). Oldisworth is at his best here, when he has something interesting to say and is not taking himself too seriously. From time to time he offers the modern reader a glimpse of the seventeenth-century England, including filthy, crowded London, where you "suck-in Death, / Halfe-smoak, half Plague, instead of wholsom breath, / And smell such Stinks, as rose-upp from the mudd / When heav'n had washt the Earth's face with a Flood" (60-61). In the city, "but for to sweat, their Doctors send / Sick folks to church. The preacher, to ascend / Into his pulpitt, is constrained to tread / On this man's shoulder, and the next man's head" (59). In the tradition of Juvenal's *Satire 3*, the diatribe opposes city to country—in this case Isleworth in Middlesex, where the poet's addressee and cousin Susan is removing. Apart from occasional details—for example, a drowned ewe, which Oldisworth makes an occasion for wit—the country appears agreeably pastoral. One poem, "On an Arbour made by Master Richard Bacon, on the sea-shoar opposite to the ile of Wight," may

put one in mind of Marvell's "Upon Appleton House":

No jutting Stumpe, or testy Thorne.
 Noe clownish Bramble dares dwell nigh;
 But all base Shrubbes, which there are borne
 Doe learn good manners straight, and die:
 If any Broome there happes to bee,
 It chandges to some better Tree;
 Furz too and Thistles, in fewe daies,
 Doe turne to Eglantine and Baies. (127)

This witty turn of mind is well adapted to satire. "To a Separatist, that spoiled mens tombes, and built his house with the tomb-stones" predicts the confusion on "the finall Morning" when the dead try to reassemble their own bones and "what uncouth Feare / Shall make thee start, and flie thou knowst not whither, / To see thy House and Thee arise together?" (33). One would like more such poems; Oldisworth has an unfortunate predilection for strained and ingratiating compliments addressed to prospective benefactors from the king downwards. "On his Majesty's Recovery from the small pocks" may not have seemed pretentious or disgusting at the time when a side-note tells us it was even presented to Charles; a poem to the Earl of Carlisle, where self-mutilation and suicide are twisted into a compliment, may once have seemed ingenious; yet, as Gouws says, "these are his least attractive, rather embarrassingly sycophantic, poems" (xxxiv). Like them—though more innocently—the love poems rework their literary models; for personal feelings one should look to the poems "To his Friend beyond sea," Richard Bacon, Oldisworth's schoolfellow at Westminster, whose Catholicism would take him abroad to Douay.

The publication of Oldisworth's poems is a worthwhile undertaking, but the editor's Introduction goes further and claims it challenges our present credulities: the undeclared freight of critical practices which constitute our readings of poems is now a matter of controversy, but only in the case of those poems and authors whose history has already naturalized them within such practices, and the false consciousness of much recent theoretical posturing that has encouraged a witch-hunt by readers who, offended by what might be regarded as clandestine ideology, have arrogated to themselves

the right to function as year-zero scrutineers of custom. In the case of poems and authors without a critical history, all such pretenses are rendered ineffectual, because we simply do not know how to read without presuppositions and established practices. More importantly, the real, as opposed to the occluded, absence of factual information about the poet compels us to acknowledge how important such information about previous literary incarnations is for the location of our discursive engagement with poems. (xv-xvi)

Perhaps a manuscript reposes in the Bodleian of poems so historically alien as not even to qualify as the other and hence unintelligible without the contextual grounding of a learned commentary. But MS.Don.c.24 is not that: its poems fit easily into our construction of the seventeenth century, and would do so even without Gouws's helpful annotation. Whatever the fate of our present credulities, Oldisworth will not hasten it.

Joad Raymond. *Milton's Angels: The Early Modern Imagination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010. xviii + 488 pp. + 8 illus. £30.00. Review by ADAM SWANN, UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

Joad Raymond observes that “very little has been written about early modern angels, particularly in a Protestant context” (8), and *Milton's Angels* aims to address this oversight. While it is often assumed that the importance of angels diminished after the Reformation due to their association with Catholic doctrine, Raymond demonstrates that angels in fact continued to permeate the thought of even the staunchest Protestants. Milton provides an ideal case study because, while he exhibits a typically Reformed providential understanding of the role of angels, his angels also possess a remarkable tangibility, as they “sing, watch, play games and exercise, eat, sleep [and] make love” (272).

Raymond's most eminent predecessor in the field of Miltonic angelology is Robert West, and the latter's *Milton and the Angels* (1955) provides the structural template for *Milton's Angels*. Raymond follows West by dividing the text into two sections, the first discussing early

modern angelology and the second investigating Milton's representations of angels. A scathing reviewer of *Milton and the Angels* described "the first half of Dr. West's book [as] a barely readable 'digest' of 'Christian angelology'" (*Review of English Studies* 8: 348), but Raymond is much more successful in this regard.

While Raymond notes that "angelology, a systematic examination of angel-doctrine (written in isolation from a full theological system) is a rare genre" (45), the first section of his book can certainly be considered as a contribution to this field. He draws on a wealth of sources to trace the development of angelology from the oldest church fathers to contemporary seventeenth-century polemicists, constructing a comprehensive account of the perception of angels in early modern thought.

Of course, early modern accounts of angels were often coloured by sectarian interests, as "one's faith in angels or scepticism of them marked the distinction between the Protestant and Catholic faiths" (94). Raymond aims to provide a more impartial view—he asserts his atheism at the outset (14)—and this is manifested in his exposition of a "synthetic survey of widely held beliefs and knowledge" (65) regarding angels, with little concern for which side of the denominational divide these beliefs originated. Interestingly, the religious roots of angelology persist in the question-and-answer catechistic format adopted by Raymond in his exposition of the characteristics of the early modern angel. Far from undermining the authority of Raymond's argument, this provides an ideal way to accommodate angels, rendering them more palatable for modern secular literary criticism.

The doctrine of accommodation itself is the subject of one of the more illuminating chapters in the book. Raymond explores the development of the doctrine of accommodation, with particular interest paid to the thought of prominent reformers such as Calvin. Instructive parallels are drawn between Calvin's thought and Peter Martyr's rejection of divine anthropomorphism and their shared belief in the doctrine of accommodation. Angels are, of course, a vital manifestation of such accommodation in their role as comprehensible, tangible reifications of God's divinity. Angels occupy the nebulous liminal space between God and man, thus perfectly embodying the doctrine of accommodation through language that "is *neither* figura-

tive *nor* literal” (177).

Accommodation is, of course, the technique which underpins *Paradise Lost* on every level, and Raymond astutely notes that it allows Milton “to justify what would otherwise be an unsustainable, even outrageous, incursion into the unknown” (184). A large portion of the book is justifiably devoted to an investigation of the angels of *Paradise Lost*. Raymond departs from normative critical opinion by suggesting that Milton’s angels are more than mere facilitators of accommodation (although they undoubtedly serve this purpose on occasion), but are in fact real, tangible beings. The fundamental importance of angels to Milton’s great epic is made clear as Raymond demonstrates how they shape, propel, and relate the narrative. The discussion of *Paradise Lost* is strengthened considerably by Raymond’s frequent references to *De Doctrina Christiana*, which provides a vital systematic framework within which to read the angels.

Raymond’s argument really comes alive when he analyses *Paradise Lost* in relation to other Milton texts and contemporary debates, which leads Abdiel’s exchange with Satan to be depicted as an “interpret[ation] and reappropriat[ion of] the debates of the 1650s” (223). However, there are points where Raymond’s readings are somewhat less convincing; for instance, his representation of the Abdiel episode as an example of an unfallen angel telling an untruth is based on rather convoluted reasoning.

The next chapter delineates the characteristics of guardian angels in Milton’s thought, providing a solid foundation for the discussion of *Lycidas*. Raymond offers an intriguing reading of the poem in terms of the guardian angel functioning as “a substitute, or a metonym, for a missing notion of nationhood” (242). While Raymond’s mention of Marvell’s construction of an angelic Cromwell in his *First Anniversary of the Government under O.C.* is far from innovative, it provides interesting support for the *Lycidas* section.

While the discussion of *Lycidas* is competent, it nevertheless seems strange to discuss one of Milton’s earliest poems after one of his latest. It would have perhaps been more logical to arrange the book in a largely chronological fashion, as it would allow the reader to see the birth and gradual maturation of Milton’s angels. *Lycidas* could fruitfully be read as the birth of Milton’s angels, which then came to

maturity in *Paradise Lost* and *De Doctrina Christiana*.

The topic of early modern angels can be rather daunting to those unversed in the intricacies of angelological debates. Yet, an understanding of this topic can shed vital light on much of Milton's canon, and Raymond's work excels in this regard. While *Milton's Angels* draws on an ostensibly dizzying array of sources, Raymond always keeps the narrative fresh and engaging, offering a readable and instructive passage into what is surely one of the most important topics for readers of Milton.

Reid Barbour and Claire Preston, eds. *Sir Thomas Browne: The World Proposed*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008. xii + 368 pp. + 3 illus. \$120.00. Review by JOSEPH L. BLACK, UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST.

As the editors note, Thomas Browne is "among the most influential of writers in the history of English literature," with an impressive list of admirers and imitators over the centuries. And yet his works, in "a paradox worthy of one of Browne's own meditations," have for some time been "largely relegated by the academy to the category of literary curiosity" (1). Building on the renewed interest generated by the 2005 quatercentenary celebrations of Browne's birth, this important collection invites us to revisit the achievements of a writer Herman Melville classified among the great "thought-divers": "any fish can swim near the surface," Melville wrote his friend Evert Duyckinck (in an 1849 letter not cited here), "but it takes a great whale to go down stairs five miles or more." Browne, unsurprisingly, could have discoursed at length with Melville on the properties of sperm whales, having not only read all there was to read on the subject but also examined one that had washed up on the Norfolk coast (*Pseudodoxia Epidemica*, book 3, ch. 26).

The revival of interest in Browne follows a willingness to ask new questions of his life and work, and this collection features many of the scholars most actively asking these questions. Of course, Browne's singular style remains central: every essay here illustrates the extent to which after four centuries we continue to learn how to *read* Browne.

But collectively, these essays also situate Browne among concerns central to current investigations of early modern literary and intellectual culture. Browne, the editors observe, is a key figure for work on the history of science and seventeenth-century communities of learning; on interdisciplinarity, particularly the intersections among literature, science, medicine, philosophy, religion, and antiquarianism; on the evolving roles of early modern physicians; and on issues of textuality. Like many of his contemporaries, Browne participates in complex textual economies of manuscript and print, coterie and public circulation. More unusually, we can with Browne trace stages of composition from reading, commonplacing, or epistolary exchange to more formal text, and observe patterns of revision that reflect his ongoing engagements with changes both within himself and in the world around him.

The collection offers sixteen essays grouped into three sections, “Habits of Thought,” “Works,” and “Life and Afterlives.” The first opens with a useful overview by Sharon Cadman Seelig of the difficult subject of Browne’s style. What is it about his way of writing, she asks, that arouses such passion among admirers and detractors alike? Seelig summarizes the history of efforts to classify Browne, then illustrates the diversity of his stylistic effects in readings that focus on the varied ways Browne enacts the process of investigation, discovery, and judgment. Debora Shuger addresses the equally tricky subject of religion, reading Browne alongside William Laud, Kenelm Digby, Edward Herbert, and Alexander Ross to characterize the qualities of Browne’s tolerance, trace the rise of a “secular theology” in the mid-seventeenth century, and argue that its elite culture could be “more multiform, heterodox, even ‘post-Christian’, than generally thought” (61). Graham Parry explores “the uses of antiquity,” demonstrating that Browne was an established figure in antiquarian circles, participating fully in their projects and methods, yet also unusual for the ambivalence that attended his love for antiquity. Brent Nelson draws on Browne’s correspondence with his sons Thomas and Edward to discuss the “culture of curiosity”: to Browne, a trained curiosity was an essential professional tool, and Nelson reads these letters for evidence about the kinds of knowledge Browne valued and reminds us of the role played by social networks across Europe in Browne’s

own training and in the training he provided for his sons. Karen L. Edwards reads Browne's treatment of classical lore concerning pygmies, seeing in these passages an implicit refusal to acknowledge the reality of royalist defeat. Victoria Silver revisits Browne's role in the Lowestoft witch trials of 1662, offering a nuanced treatment of the interplay in these proceedings of issues concerning faith, reason, magic, science, evidence, and equity.

The seven essays in the second section address the full range of Browne's writings, not only *Religio Medici* (Brooke Conti), *Pseudodoxia Epidemica* (William N. West and Kevin Killeen), *Urne-Buriall* (Achsah Guibbory), and *Garden of Cyrus* (Kathryn Murphy), but also *Letter to a Friend* (Claire Preston) and *Repertorium* (Jonathan F.S. Post). Conti traces the evolution of Browne's thoughts on the nature of belief through successive stages of revision in *Religio Medici*, arguing a move toward increased rhetorical and philosophical certainty. West reads Browne's characteristic digressiveness in *Pseudodoxia* as an instrument for bringing different voices into a shared discursive arena, with contradiction and inconsistency acting as touchstones for further discussion. Killeen argues that Browne's insistence in *Pseudodoxia* on accuracy in illustrations of sacred narrative puts him in the terrain of the period's literalist iconoclasts. Preston, in what is now the best discussion of an understudied text, reads *Letter* as an exercise in mixed modes but also (with the help of a manuscript poem written by a relative of one of Browne's grateful patients, newly discovered by Reid Barbour) offers a detailed portrait of Browne as physician. Guibbory makes a compelling case for *Urne-Buriall* as an implicit engagement with contemporary debates about Jewish readmission, seeing in Browne a capacious intellectual vision and a willingness to accept religious and cultural difference. Murphy explores the disordered order of Browne's *Garden*. Like Preston on *Letter*, Post on *Repertorium* is now the fullest treatment of this text: in an essay that speaks productively to discussions elsewhere in the collection of antiquarianism, iconoclasm, politics, religion, communities of learning, style, and textual revisions, Post reads Browne's account of Norwich Cathedral as an exercise in knowledge in the making.

The three essays in the final section comprise Barbour (who is completing a biography of Browne) in a brilliant meditation on

Browne's medical, scientific, and figurative engagements with skin as barrier, boundary, and text, and two concluding influence studies that might have seemed less out of place if joined by additional examples of Browne's afterlife: Rosenstein on Browne and Borges (focusing primarily on issues of imitation and translation) and Miller on Browne and Sebald (via the antiquarian project of the search for truth).

The experience of reading the collection in its entirety reproduces in some ways the experience of reading Browne himself. What seems certain in one place gets questioned in another, and we return repeatedly to certain key concerns and questions, encouraged each time to rethink what we first thought. To a degree unusual in collections, these essays speak to and enrich one another, even when they disagree. Several of the contributors have written on Browne before, in works cited often in the essays here (particularly Preston, Barbour, Post, Parry, Silver, and Guibbory). Along with the essays by Shuger and Nelson, their contributions seem likely to become standard treatments of these respective texts or subjects. Furthermore, six contributors (Murphy, Barbour, Nelson, Preston, Killeen, and Edwards) appear in another recent collection, though in each case writing on a different text or subject from what they write on here: *'A man very well studied': New Contexts for Thomas Browne*, ed. Kathryn Murphy and Richard Todd (Leiden: Brill, 2008). The two collections complement one another, with the Brill collection strong on such issues as Browne's time in Leiden, his responses to the civil wars, and the early translation of his works. Both together are indispensable, and it seems appropriate that a writer known for amplification requires two collections to capture the full range and complexity of his achievement.

Achsah Guibbory. *Christian Identity: Jews and Israel in Seventeenth-Century England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010. xi + 328 pp. + 11 illus. \$110.00. Review by WILLIAM E. ENGEL, THE UNIVERSITY OF THE SOUTH: SEWANEE.

Achsah Guibbory's new book is a wide-ranging account of the presence of Jews in England from the Renaissance to the Restoration. At the same time it is a lucid assessment of the dominant metaphors

associated with Israel having a destiny as a “chosen people,” with themes ranging from bondage and deliverance, to exile, captivity, and redemption. Guibbory deftly bridges the traditional academic disciplines of literary criticism, history, and religious studies to substantiate some very specific claims about the formation of early modern Christian identities. She succeeds in this endeavor both because of her astute critical judgments about how to weigh the textual evidence and also because of her years of painstaking archival research. Readers of this journal will be familiar with her award-winning *Ceremony and Community from Herbert to Milton* (1998) as well as her groundbreaking essays published in *Milton and Gender* (2004) and in *Milton and the Jews* (2008).

Much of the success of this book can be attributed to Guibbory’s eschewing any reductive template treating Jews simply as “the Other” (220). Such an approach, she discloses early on, is inadequate for taking into account the historical shifts of the period and tends to collapse the range of English attitudes toward Jews, which would prevent us from “recognizing that some English people felt certain kinds of continuity and identity with the ancient Jews, and occasionally with contemporary ones” (2-3). Fully cognizant of recent studies of the Bible in the seventeenth century (most notably by Christianson and by Shuger) and of Philo-Semitism (by Katz, by Rosenblatt, and by Shoulson), Guibbory argues persuasively that the Hebrew Bible was “foundational to English Protestant Christianity”—a tool of “both the powerful and the powerless—helping to imagine the nation” and also “inspiring ideals of justice and equality” (295).

Her exposition is built on queries posed periodically that are as far from rhetorical questions as Elijah is from the priests of Baal. Three examples will serve: “What values did the English see in the ancient Jews, to whom early modern English writers repeatedly returned as they defined their present experience and institutions, or sought to reform them?” (1); “But what exactly was a ‘commonwealth?’” (167); and, “Was there a place in England for Jews who continued to think of *themselves* as God’s Israel?” [original emphasis] (220). Her responses carefully reconstruct the original contexts of the key debates, for example regarding the readmission of the Jews into England in 1655.

With special attention initially to the writings of Calvin, Foxe, and Hooker, *Christian Identity* moves ultimately to Milton’s major prose

and later poems, and then Dryden's *Annus Mirabilis* and *Absalom and Achitophel*. Guibbory judiciously sifts through then current ideas about Jews and Israel seen as historical realities, as politically charged symbols, and as the basis for Christianity. She investigates how they reflected the polemics of Christian writers who sought to tap into the range of meanings afforded by Old Testament heroes and villains as well as, more generally, the notion of Israel as a nation. Along the way, she provides cogent close readings of Herrick's *Hesperides*, Vaughan's *Silex Scintillans*, and Bunyan's *Grace Abounding*. Also of note is her subtle treatment of William Prynne, Oliver Cromwell, Gerrard Winstanley, Margaret Fell, George Fox, and Menasseh Ben Israel, as well as of self-proclaimed prophets such as John Rogers, Abiezzar Coppe, and Anna Trapnel.

Notwithstanding the many figures discussed, readers never lose sight of the guiding principle implicit throughout—that knowing more about how Christians thought about Israel sheds light on issues still of great consequence. The epilogue nods in passing to the importance of Handel's Old Testament oratorios for Hanoverian England, to the sense of Biblical destiny that inspired the American Revolution, to the Balfour Declaration of 1917 which led to the establishment of a Jewish homeland, and to the famous poem on the Statue of Liberty written by Emma Lazarus who was, we are reminded, “from an old Sephardic family that was among the first Jewish settlers in America” (297).

Another virtue of *Christian Identity* is its organization. Even though some of the material already has appeared in different forms, this book is all of one piece. It is organized with an eye toward doing much more than simply identifying uses of the Hebrew Bible as typology which tends to gloss over “the complexity of Christian relations with the Old Testament or Jewish Israel and its narratives” (18). Accordingly, the first two chapters concern the development of Israelite narratives prevalent in English histories and institutions. The third looks at Puritan preachers and the invocation of Israelite history. The fourth, focusing on the other side, looks at Royalists who insisted they were Israel and depicted their opponents as Israel's biblical enemies. The fifth chapter concerns the political experimentation and alternatives for society leading up to and following the execution of Charles I.

This conduces gracefully, in the sixth chapter, to a detailed exploration of the Jewish presence in millenarianism while the seventh examines the controversy surrounding the readmission of the Jews into England. A final chapter assesses what happened when the Church and monarchy were restored.

The 18-page bibliography is complemented by a serviceable ten-page index. The main headings give a good idea—at a glance—of some of the important issues covered in this book as well as suggesting how, conceptually, they have been broken down and treated. There is no heading for “Bible,” but instead one for “Hebrew Bible” and another for “New Testament” (with individual books arranged alphabetically rather than canonically). The topical design of the index thus reinforces a principal consideration of this book, namely, how interest in biblical Israel “intensified the problem of Christian-Jewish relations, since ingrained theological anti-Judaism was at odds with the growing English experience of identification with ancient Jews” (13). This is an important book both because of its explicit recognition of the complexity and fluidity of Christian identity and also because of what it reveals about the specific ways the Reformation precipitated a renegotiation of the relations between Christianity and Judaism in the West.

Noam Reisner. *Milton and the Ineffable*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010. Xiii + 321 pp. \$95. Review by PETER E. MEDINE, UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA.

As the title suggests, Noam Reisner’s book addresses itself to the subjects and critical interests dealt with by Rudolph Otto (*The Idea of the Holy* [1917;1978]), Michael Lieb (*Poetics of the Holy* [1981]), and Stephen M. Fallon (*Milton Among the Philosophers* [1991]). The book moves away from the historicist and political readings of Milton’s poetry which have loomed large over the last several decades. Echoing Lieb, Reisner summarizes his argument when he says that he wishes to examine Milton’s “poetics of the ineffability.” The examination rests on an analysis of the “crisis of mimesis in relation to apophatic discourse which Milton inherits from the humanist-Protestant tradi-

tions" (11), a crisis Milton undertakes to resolve in his poetry. In the first two chapters, Reisner traces the development of speculation about the ineffable and the radical changes in the "intellectual presence of ineffability in Western thought" (9) following the rise of humanism and the advent of the Reformation. In the three succeeding chapters, Reisner discusses Milton's struggle with the ineffability of godhead throughout his poetry.

In chapter 1, Reisner surveys several questions about divine ontology, including: Why is God ineffable? How can we know that which is ineffable? And what terms can be employed in describing human knowledge of the ineffable? The discussion ranges from the Hebrew Scripture (especially Exodus 3-4), through Augustine's *De Doctrina Christiana*, to Aquinas, and Reisner concludes that the answers that emerged led to a relatively unquestioned belief in the philological integrity of the Latin used for the principal theological inquiries. The changes that were to radically affect all this form the subject of chapter 2, which outlines the emergence of Italian Neoplatonism and European humanism along with the beginnings of modern biblical scholarship and philology. These two impulses had radically different outcomes. The first gave rise to the idealist concept of man as a creature of limitless potential, and the second to an undermining of the fixity of God's Word and the concomitant view of man as strictly limited and dependent on God's grace. In Reisner's judgment, Milton struggles with these warring forces. On the one hand, he aspires to a kind of "vatic soaring and privileged vision" (104); on the other, he confronts the dreadful silence accompanying the reformist internalization of "rightly reading the fixed meanings of inspired texts." For Reisner, much of the power of Milton's poetry derives from this struggle.

In chapter 3, Reisner deals with the *Poems 1645* and attends to some fifteen poems, dealing in relatively greater detail with six or seven, including the translation of Psalm 114, the "Nativity Ode," the "Passion," "At a Solemn Music," *A Masque*, "Lycidas," and "Epitaphium Damonis." The poems of the volume can be fairly precisely dated and Reisner proceeds chronologically and traces Milton's coping with the "problem of soaring," in the words of the Chapter's subtitle. The young Milton would appear to be a straightforward Platonist

yearning for escape and God but at the same time impeded by a Protestant, not to say Calvinistic, fear of mystery. Reisner detects a “rational discomfort” at the *mysterium tremendum* of the deity in Psalm 114 and a vacillation in the “Nativity Ode” between a desire to aspire to prophecy and ultimately only a pretence “to soar.” So, in various ways, are the “Passion,” “At a Solemn Music,” and *A Masque* analyzed. Finally in the twinned pastoral poems, “Lycidas” and “Epitaphium Damonis,” Milton adumbrates a “way forward . . . toward his role as a poet-prophet” (158). Reisner sees in the first of these two poems a charged and often anxious meditation on the dilemma confronting an aspiring poet who is also haunted by a fear of the ineffable presence. The resolution occurs in the elegy’s consolation of the beatific vision, where the poet relegates the “unexpressive nuptial song” into the distant apocalyptic future. The far more personal “Epitaphium” concludes in what Reisner describes as the “sedate but highly eroticized realms of pastoral song” which then give way to a “paradoxically virginal Bacchic frenzy amid the ‘hosts of heaven’” (167). To Reisner, Milton grows in “sophistication and vocational confidence” in the last great poems.

In chapter 4, he deals with *Paradise Lost*, a poem in which the ineffable is ubiquitous though variously rendered. While Reisner does not put it this way, he finds Milton’s heroic undertaking in no respect more remarkable than in the ways in which Milton “violently dislocates its [i.e., the ineffable’s] presence away from its natural place with God to rest finally with himself” (179). The four proems exhibit this dislocation most notably, though the invocation to light in Book III is especially relevant to the traditions of ineffability and apophysis. Reisner examines Milton’s raising the question of whether he may “express [the Holy Light] unblamed,” and his alluding to the myth of Philomela and so harnessing and redirecting the myth’s violent energy toward “the object of the ineffable *mysterium*” (187). As a result, the entire invocation is suffused with a “brooding anxiety over the loss and recovery of the powers of representation” (187). The chapter ends with a discussion of the ways in which the dislocation of the ineffable appears “in a wide range of affective registers and where ineffable mystery is not suppressed but carefully displaced and diffused” (217). From this perspective, Reisner analyzes the speech

of God, the Son, Adam and Eve, and Satan, and concludes that the concept of ineffability becomes both the “object of the poem’s loss as well as a final mark of the Fall itself” (233). Ultimately Satan and the devils’ denial of deity results in nihilistic silence.

In chapter 5, Reisner deals with the 1671 volume of *Paradise Regained* and *Samson Agonistes*. Reisner approaches the final poems as spiritual meditations on the consequences of individuals submitting to sacred silence in confronting the ineffable God, not as he is but as he reveals himself to his chosen creatures. In the case of *Paradise Regained*, the consequences for Jesus are triumphant and redemptive. Reisner’s discussion of the climactic pinnacle scene is summary. To Satan’s temptation that He should demonstrate His divinity prematurely, Jesus responds with Scripture and so defeats his adversary and prevails. Reisner observes that what happens is that the “ineffable”—that is, the Word made Flesh—speaks, and “it is this final glimpse of the truly miraculous which smites Satan . . . and causes him to fall” (248). Self-effacing silence is linked to redemption as a “form of poetic *mysterium*” (p. 258). In contrast, *Samson Agonistes* illustrates the tragedy of one of God’s chosen who violates the ineffable mystery. Samson divulges the “secret gift of God / To a deceitful woman” (*SA* 201-202) and breaks the “seal of silence” (*SA* 47). On the enduring critical question of whether Samson is regenerate, Reisner is agnostic, claiming unimpeachably that it remains open. His position follows from the argument he pursues throughout: “There is no moment of declarative clarity [in *Samson Agonistes*], only the unsettling presence of mysterious interiority, silently propelling Samson toward the final catastrophe” (272-73). It is a fitting observation on *Samson Agonistes* and well illustrates what Reisner means by the “poetics of the ineffable.”

Reisner has undertaken the formidable task of writing a book that is comprehensive of Milton’s major and minor poetry, and he has done an admirable job. In particular, he engages generously and instructively with other critics, and extends an important line of Milton criticism. The book is complete with a full bibliography, a feature that would almost alone make it valuable. Reisner writes with refreshing clarity. Oxford’s editors should, however, have worked harder with him than they did on chapters 1 and 2, which are unnecessarily dense and difficult to follow. The book is handsomely produced, though I’ve

noted the following mistakes: Mason Lowance's name is misspelled on page 101 and 314; typos occur on page 235 (*than* for *then*) and page 245 (*temp* for *tempt*—twice).

Paul Davis. *Translation and the Poet's Life. The Ethics of Translating in English Culture, 1645-1726*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008. xi + 324 pp. Review by ALAN RUDRUM, SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY.

Paul Davis begins his impressive book by commenting on the extraordinary amount of academic work on translation in the ten years that preceded it. He adds that two instances of stigmatization still obtain: translation remains discouraged by copyright law and exploited by publishers, corporations, governments and religious organizations. There is certainly evidence to support his case. Michael Henry documents a hair-raising instance of discouragement in the *The London Review of Books* (August 19, 2010). An instance of publishers in effect blocking access to an author's work by being overcautious in commissioning translations is put forth in a letter to the *Times Literary Supplement* (October 8, 2010) headed "Easy Modiano."

Davis points to the difficulties that editors of anthologies have had in deciding what is and is not a translation. He reports Steiner (1966) as permissive; Tomlinson (1980) as opting against the liberties of the imitation; Poole and Maule (1995) as adopting a rainbow policy, where the term "after" shows up frequently in the annotations. I was glad to be made aware of these. I especially enjoyed Steiner's small volume and would like to see it reprinted. None of these anthologies admitted one of my favorite imitations, Edgell Rickword's "The Encounter," which takes off, loosely but certainly, from Horace, *Satires*, I: ix.

Davis declares at the outset that probably no watertight theoretical distinction between translation and imitation is possible; nevertheless the distinction is important, since if imitations were included a study would become unmanageably vast. He aims to examine translation as a distinctive mode of imaginative conduct for the five principal Augustan poet translators; his concern is what the poets themselves thought they were doing.

Some philosophers had rejected metaphor as an impediment to the proper conduct of reasoning, as a form of words rather than as a form of thought. Aversion to metaphor was of course implicit in the Royal Society's resolution requiring its members to adopt a "close, naked, natural way of speaking." Following Poole and Maule, Davis points out that translation is "doomed" to metaphor, since "translation" comes from the Latin word for carrying something across, and "metaphor" from its Greek equivalent. This discussion, which occupies several pages of the Introduction, is enlivening, so that it seems amazing that a book should be needed which complains that "reviewers have no language for discussing translation," and often fall back on simply disregarding the translator's contribution (Grossman, *Why Translation Matters*). An impressive example of a writer who has a language for discussing translation is Julian Barnes, reviewing Lydia Davis's translation of *Madame Bovary* (*London Review of Books*, 18 November 2010).

Davis constructs each of his studies around a metaphor current in translation-discourse at the time and which had particular significance for the poet discussed: the translator as exile: Denham and Vaughan; the link between translating and the revelation of secrets: Abraham Cowley; translators as slaves: Dryden; the alignment of translation with trade: Pope. Then there are subsidiary metaphors: the translator as child: Vaughan, Pope; as agent of divine judgment: Vaughan; as victim of predestination: Dryden; translation as political loyalty: Denham; as personal friendship: Cowley, Pope; as sexual congress: Dryden; as transcendence: Vaughan, Cowley, Dryden; as horticulture: Cowley, Pope; as metamorphosis: Dryden. Some of these metaphors are virtually exclusive to the poet who uses them, such as the apocalyptic vision of the translator in Vaughan's rendering of Juvenal's *Satire 10*. Then there are metaphors such as "Life is a Journey," which distinguishes journeys from other kinds of activities but do not rule out any particular kind of journey. This metaphor splendidly informs Vaughan's poem "Joy of my life!" which I discuss in my Festschrift volume, *Of Paradise and Light*, edited by Donald R. Dickson and Holly Faith Nelson.

Davis makes the interesting point that translation was a "natural medium of self-examination for the poets who practiced it"; and he

suggests that for that reason Denham, Vaughan, Cowley, Dryden, and Pope all took up translating at moments of crisis or transformation in their lives: “when they were in dire straits or at a fork in the road.” He begins his discussion of them by suggesting that Charles I, under house arrest in 1647, was pleased by Denham’s aristocratic disdain for those who could not write themselves and resorted to translation (borrowing the words of others) in order to make themselves heard in the “regrettably democratized” public sphere of the English polity. This brought to mind that in the preface to the 1655 edition of *Silex Scintillans*, Henry Vaughan, himself no democrat, hoped that his poems would be as useful in the public realm as they had been to himself in private.

Davis rightly stresses the role of royalist defeat in instigating the golden age of poetic translation, though the association between exile and speechlessness ran deep in early modern English culture, recurring throughout the work of the Elizabethan poets and dramatists who witnessed the exoduses of their Catholic and Puritan countrymen. This is beautifully illustrated from *Richard II* (I.iii.153-63). Henry Vaughan’s “exile” in his native Breconshire after being forced from London by the outbreak of war brought forth his translation of Juvenal’s *Satire 10* and selections from Ovid’s exile poetry between 1647 and 1651. Incidentally, Davis describes Breconshire as being by this time a stronghold of radical Protestantism; it is worth noticing that it was also a stronghold of intransigent ultra-Royalism, as I make clear in my essay, “Resistance, Collaboration, and Silence,” listed in Davis’s bibliography but not engaged with at this point.

In the section on Denham I found especially interesting the observation that the word “faith” was integral to Cavalier ideology and linked with fidelity in translation. The former point is certainly borne out by Vaughan, since it occurs some thirty times in *Silex Scintillans*. As to fidelity in translation, where a Latin scholar would say that Vaughan is in error, one may be sure that the “error” is deliberate and signaling a contemporary allusion, as in lines 441-42 of his (very free) rendering of Juvenal’s *Satire 10*, the title-page of which indicates that he had no intention of being a “slavish” translator.

Vaughan is not Davis’s major concern, as he is mine. I shall now concentrate on his Vaughan chapter, which is bracketed with that on

Denham in a section headed *Wanting Voices*. It begins with an unfortunate error, attributed to my ODNB *Life*, which the Press should have picked up. Vaughan did not “at the age of seventeen,” leave South Wales for Jesus College, Cambridge, but for Jesus College, Oxford. “At the age of seventeen” seems to follow Wood’s assertion in *Athenae Oxoniensis* that he went up in the Michaelmas term of 1638, some months after his twin brother Thomas. This, which is also suspect, is dealt with in the second paragraph of the section *Education* in the ODNB *Life*. To this I would now add that the intended pun, or perhaps a secondary one, in Vaughan’s poem on the Bodleian library might be on Bodley and Bibliotheca.

Davis notes that editors assume that the language Vaughan spoke as an infant was Welsh, here citing a note at p. 497 of my *Collected Poems*. This rests on Thomas Vaughan’s assertion that “*English is a Language the Author was not born to*” (*Works*, p. 94), but Thomas in self-justificatory mode may well be unreliable; as stated in the ODNB *Life* their father “had a command of English, and they were probably bilingual.” What Davis has to say on this subject is interesting: “Silence was what Vaughan found most golden about infancy; children in his poems should not be heard but seen”; and he cites from “The Retreat” the lines “Before I taught my tongue to wound / My conscience with a sinful sound.” He backs this up with a splendid analysis of “The Burial of an Infant,” arguing cogently that the root meaning of “*infans*” (unable to speak) is “unspokenly present, an undocumented source of its widely admired unity.” “Abel’s Blood,” with its clear reference to current politics and to Vaughan’s attempt to imitate Jesus in avoiding hatred and bitterness, is, with its similar linking of speechlessness and watching, also interesting: “Aye, may that flood, / That proudly spilt and despised blood, / Speechless and calm, as infants sleep! / Or if it watch, forgive and weep / For those that spilt it.”

Davis’s chapter on Vaughan is both substantial and impressive. It makes an especially valuable contribution to critical work on the translations of Ovid and Ausonius in *Olor Iscanus*. I am not quite convinced that the translation of Ovid’s *ex Ponto* IV. iii (“To his inconstant friend”) is aimed at Thomas, in spite of Davis’s use of Stevie Davies’s writing on twinship; if it is, then surely in a half-joking, half-serious way. Is it not just as likely to refer to a former close friend distancing

himself when Vaughan's fortunes fell as a result of his uncompromising royalism? Readers who have never experienced such a situation have been fortunate. The section on the Ausonius poem, in which Cupid, rather than Jesus, is crucified, is original and convincing.

As Jonathan Nauman has pointed out, Louise Imogen Guiney—a pioneering student of Vaughan—wrote that “Whenever [Vaughan] falls to translating, it is time for the sympathetic reader to prick up his ears” as Vaughan “seeks often this oblique outlet for his inmost thought.” Paul Davis has “pricked up his ears” to good purpose.

Julie D. Campbell and Anne R. Larsen, eds. *Early Modern Women and Transnational Communities of Letters*. Surrey, England: Ashgate, 2009. xxii + 330 +18 illus. \$124.95. Review by COLLEEN E. KENNEDY, THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY.

Kate Chedgzoy, in her article “The Cultural Geographies of Early Modern Women’s Writing: Journeys Across Spaces and Times” (2006), makes a call for larger, more interdisciplinary, and highly transnational studies of early modern women’s writing:

What I am imagining is a criticism concerned with the local, regional, national, and transnational dimensions of women’s participation in literary cultures. Requiring extensive new archival research and competence in several languages, it will have to emerge from the kinds of collaborative efforts that have in recent decades so dramatically reshaped our understanding of British and European women’s cultural production in the early modern period. (*Literature Compass* 3.4 [2006]: 893)

Julie D. Campbell and Anne R. Larsen’s edited collection of essays, *Early Modern Women and Transnational Communities of Letters*, beautifully and thoroughly answers Chedgzoy’s urgent, yet intellectually demanding, call. The contributors to this collection, scholars and professors from varied departments—History, Medieval and Early Modern Studies, English, French, Italian, Classics—around the United States, Italy, and Australia, create the very sort of cross-national, polyglot, and interdisciplinary community of female scholarship so deftly

studied in this collection. The diversity of disciplinary and theoretical approaches; the breadth of archival researching, especially tracing out international epistolary circles; and the translations of multilingual texts circulating throughout Europe are some of the highlights of this erudite and much needed body of work. The words and works of women—from Italy, France, the Low Countries, England, and Scotland—cross, challenge, and erase geopolitical, religious, linguistic, and generic borders while creating and continuing familial, religious, political, and literary communities.

Several of the essays demonstrate how women used their written correspondence to maintain or create familial bonds. Susan Broomhall's opening chapter demonstrates how the women—especially Louise, the fourth wife and widow of the William the Silent—of the Nassau family used their letters and the rhetoric of shared familial alliances to forge and maintain bonds within an extended family that was dispersed geographically, politically, and religiously. Carol Pal studies how Anna Maria van Schurman of Utrecht also created a sense of family, the *famille d'alliance*, in her extended correspondence with male and female intellectuals of the Republic of Letters, with Michel de Montaigne as founding *père d'alliance*. Julie D. Campbell considers the relationship between tutors and influential political families. Nicolas Denisot, tutor to the daughters of Anne Stanhope and Edward Seymour, and Charles Utenhove of Ghent, tutor for the children of Antoinette de Loynes and Jean de Morel, used the circulated works of their pupils to advertise their didactic skills, but also to create alliances between politically important families.

Women's writings also allowed them to intercede into the often patriarchal discourse of religion. Sharon L. Arnoult skillfully demonstrates how allegiance to the Book of Common Prayer was the norm during the English Reformation, and that women writers internalized the sanctioned rhetoric, rhythms, and phrases when composing their own personal, familial, and even political prayers. Meredith K. Ray challenges the boundaries between the convent and secular world by studying how the polemicist Suor Arcangela Tarabotti lived in a cloistered space, but how her pen and needle transcended her physical limits. As the broker for the convent's main source of income—its production and sale of fine lacework—Tarabotti becomes intermedi-

ary between the women of the secular and cloistered worlds via her intervening letters. Camilla Russell follows two decades worth of the religiously subversive writings shared between the cloistered Giulia Gonzaga and the convicted heretic Pietro Carnesecchi. While the patroness continued to support her friend after exile and extend his influence, her letters eventually were used to convict and execute him, demonstrating the papal anxieties caused by such correspondence. From Anne Vaughan Locke's early friendship with John Knox to the publication in England of the first English sonnet sequence, based on Psalm 51, along with translations of Calvin's sermons, Susan M. Felch traces Locke's influence in diverse sources: a Scottish wife's letter to her erring husband, Mary Sidney's Psalm 51, and even Edmund Spenser's character of Despair.

Women's voices also entered the conversations about publishing, printing, patronage, and popular circulation of works. Leah Chang substantiates how a female printer, Jeanne de Marnef, created a "gendered publication" of Prenette du Guillet's work by boldly using her own printer's mark and making editorial decisions—excluding male-narrated poems, assigning titles, rearranging poems, etc.—that created a decidedly feminine and "perhaps even feminist conceit" (99-100). Sarah Gwyneth Ross proves that Esther Inglis defies simple classification as her fifty manuscript copybooks contain lengthy dedications to patrons, her calligraphy and portraiture skills, and poems by her father and husband. Negotiating her place between French and British intellectual communities of women and Christian humanists, Inglis's manuscripts brought her attention not only for her artistry, but also as an intellectual. Matine van Elk deftly determines how three female emblem writers—Georgette de Montenay, Anna Roemers Visscher, and Esther Inglis—all appropriated the same set of emblems (created by Montenay) to display their Calvinist beliefs and, through variations in their translations, their own topical political leanings, while creating this community of women with shared religious beliefs. Anne R. Larsen posits how female intellectuals conceived of one another as Catherine des Roche compiles a list of her contemporary female peers that demonstrates her knowledge of foreign women's intellectual and humanist contributions beyond her borders.

This work reconsiders and disrupts the notion of the isolated female writer and instead establishes new circles of literary and epistolary production and consumption with women as the central agents. In many instances, we see alternate communities of female intellectuals created, or we see that female writers were often viewed as peers and essential communicants in more familiar and often male-dominated circles. This collection is an indispensable and learned enterprise that forces readers to reconsider women's mobility in traversing both physical and culturally sanctioned boundaries.

Ian McAdam. *Magic and Masculinity in Early Modern English Drama*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 2009. v + 466 pp. \$60. Review by GRACE TIFFANY, WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY.

Ambitiously, Ian McAdam surveys over half a century's worth of selected plays by seven major authors to advance his thesis regarding the changing significance of magic and magicians to the early modern English intellect. This book's eight chapters deal significantly with Robert Greene, Christopher Marlowe, William Shakespeare (treated in five chapters), Thomas Middleton, Ben Jonson, George Chapman, and John Milton, discussing these authors' relation to each other as well as to Renaissance humanism, alchemical and scientific theories, early-modern ideas about black and white magic, and the influence and legacy of the Protestant Reformation.

McAdam's complicated thesis is grounded in the puzzling but undeniable fact that, though English Protestant Reformers decried Catholicism as a religion of magical hocus-pocus and preached skepticism about many alleged manifestations of the miraculous in modern life, many Reformers showed profound interest in magic, demons, exorcism, and witchcraft. Some Puritans even practiced exorcism. Many early modern English plays displayed a like concern with the powers and dangers attendant on human involvement with the spirit world through the pseudo-science of alchemy or other ways of spirit-trafficking. So far, so good. Had McAdam been content to explore various plays' or even various playwrights' distinct treatments of magic without tying each author to his own master narrative, his

book would have made for easier and more informative reading. He sows confusion, however, by insisting that a “Protestant” crisis of masculinity is being worked out in various ways in the plays through characters’ engagement with feminizing witchcraft. McAdam finds that Protestant “inwardness” precipitated a horror at what a modern age would call the irrational subconscious, and that magicians in Elizabethan, Jacobean, and Caroline plays and masques were seen struggling between “narcissistic self-containment” (through masculine control of nature’s secrets) and “sensual indulgence” (in a feminized and eroticized world of magic). From McAdam’s modern, skeptical perspective, belief in and struggle with the magic world of spirits was an early-modern way of coming to terms with the powerful subconscious energies of the human mind. Thus the Protestantism that informs the plays is less a form of Christianity than a way-station on the road to enlightened secularism.

There is more than one problem with this thesis, but one of the most obvious is that we cannot assume all these playwrights’ Protestantism. Indeed, especially recently, it has been argued that Shakespeare’s plays show not a Protestant but a Catholic sensibility. (McAdam partly acknowledges this in his discussion of *The Tempest*, but gives the idea short shrift.) McAdam’s interesting discussion of “emasculating” magic in *Volpone* and *The Alchemist* assumes Jonson’s Protestant bias without mentioning the playwright’s (admittedly short-lived) conversion to Catholicism. (I happen to agree with McAdam that, as Jonas Barish showed long ago, Jonson’s views were in many ways like those of the Protestant moralizers, but certainly his professed religious sympathies are a complicating factor that should be mentioned in any discussion of the “Protestantism” of his plays.) Another problem is McAdam’s only partial historical contextualization of these dramatic explorations of magic. We might, for example, agree with him that Greene’s *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* suggests that “magic as practiced by men, while linked with masculine aggression, is also in some ways paradoxically a compensation for the failure of masculine assertiveness and of what [Lyndal] Roper terms ‘phallic confidence.’” But without a demonstration that Greene’s characters’ use of magic to try to control women is somehow different than the actions of a medieval character who dabbles in the occult with the same aim—as

does John the carpenter in Chaucer's *The Miller's Tale*—we cannot be convinced that Greene's stagemagic is a Protestant innovation. The public stage was new, certainly. But was the idea?

As though aware that his theories are somewhat speculative, McAdam consistently frames them with tentative language: "The misogyny implicit in Mercutio's anti-Petrarchan stance *may* ... align itself with ... Renaissance magical aspiration," and one of Mercutio's lines "*may* recall ... the historical association of sodomy and sorcery" (163, my emphasis). *Comus's* Lady's "magical, virginal potency can be related to"—not "is related to"—the renewed English interest in the mid-seventeenth century" in hermetic philosophy (360), and another scholar's argument about *Othello* "*seems to me* to confuse a ... patriarchal social structure with a possibly more benign Oedipal structure" (227, my emphasis). McAdam's imposition of Freudian terms on Renaissance masques and plays, as in the just quoted sentence, sorts with his view that modern psychoanalytical theory is the valid science to be set against the religious "ideology" that hampers the plays' authors. A psychoanalytical understanding of human self-formation is the truth toward which Marlowe, Shakespeare, and Milton were all groping. Their magicians were early-modern therapists: "[a]n astrologer is like a skilled psychiatrist, plumbing the depths of the patient's unconscious and discovering connections to his or her broader social and physical context" (186). In *Othello*, "the movement from Venice to Cyprus" is "symbolically, a voyage into the unconscious" (209). McAdam finds Renaissance plays progressive insofar as they show "an increasingly metaphorical presentation of witchcraft—that is, an emphasis on psychological rather than theological meaning" (229). In statements such as these, McAdam seems unaware that psychoanalytical theory and practice, far from being universally recognized as a coherent science, is mired in charges of anti-scientific methods and occultism which are often levied by psychoanalytical practitioners themselves (against other psychoanalytical practitioners). McAdam is also unaware of the strength of his own anti-religious bias, which is evident in details like his casual use of the word "sodomasochistic" to describe the "Calvinist theology" of "self-sacrifice" (222) and his observation that Anthony Elson's discussion of *The Tempest* would be more helpful were it not "undermined by a critically reductive piety" (352).

Charmingly, McAdam admits that his judgment of Elson may “seem uncharitable,” since there is much “relevant material” in discussions that “take pains to reconstruct the religious context of Shakespeare’s cultural moment” (352). And, to his credit, McAdam himself gently criticizes discussions of Shakespeare and his contemporaries that project on them an anachronistic secularism. Crucially, however, he is himself guilty of such an anachronism in his insistence that Shakespeare’s great theme is “the sanctification of nature” (232, 338, 340). That phrase could mean several things, some of them credible, but to McAdam it means Shakespeare’s celebration of processes by which human nature can be purified without supernatural assistance. To many scholars, this Shakespeare will not sound like the author of *King Lear* or *The Tempest*.

Still, lest I “seem uncharitable,” let me quickly affirm that McAdam’s secular bias, though it limits what he can see in the plays, is not cripplingly “critically reductive.” McAdam’s primary and secondary research is thorough and everywhere evident in the book. He not only makes available to readers a fascinating array of selections from early modern texts discussing magic but draws into his discussion the comments on Renaissance magic of a wide variety of contemporary scholars, including many who hold viewpoints opposed to his. Further, his discussion of this broad range of plays discloses valid and interesting connections between early-modern magic and modern psychoanalysis. Finally, while his categorizations of the plays’ “ideologies” as Protestant ones are not always convincing, McAdam’s explorations cast real light on the vexed relation between staged magic and early-modern performances of masculinity.

Jonathan Gil Harris. *Untimely Matter in the Time of Shakespeare*. Philadelphia. University of Pennsylvania Press. 2009. 4+278. \$59.95.
Review by BOYD M. BERRY, VIRGINIA COMMONWEALTH UNIVERSITY.

Overall, one could say that Jonathan Gil Harris’ *Untimely Matter in the Time of Shakespeare* mounts a well-connected argument against linear and single readings and the distinctions and discriminations they have produced—that is, against what he takes to be dangerous nonsense.

Whereas English departments once trained to find the single best reading of a text, the word-play in Harris' title points in a multitude of other ways or directions. The argument proceeds in three movements: "Supercessions," "Explosions," and "Conjunctions"—that is, away from divisions and rankings finally toward "touching." Highly abstracted ideas in almost every sentence (including the titles of the three movements above), the book attends to matters in ways which often depart from conventional discourse. If humans disappear from the prose and abstractions only come to have agency, the third step—focused on touching—materializes abstractions, to adopt the lingo of this present, concluding the course of the whole. This is certainly not a textbook for beginning studies in English or literature, which is a pity, but my point raises indirectly the question whether there is any reason to think of a future for English departments.

Harris is focused upon visions of supersession that appear at first to be progressive—past to future—but which generate their own contradictions. Notice first of all that no humans are represented in his prose as acting; visions create change, which then create nominals (words that function as nouns but are transformations of verbs). The nominal "supersession" is only one such construct which it is difficult to de-transform. Who or what supersedes whom or what? When? How?

In the first of the three movements of his argument Harris turns, not unexpectedly given his concerns, to writing of Christian typology, which at its heart certainly involves supersessions. Many Christians employed typological language in and about "the time of Shakespeare," creating what are generally considered or treated as non-literary texts. His first example, presumably non-literary, is drawn from the poetry of George Herbert, commonly thought of as a literary text. Harris reminds us that typological writing can veil anti-Semitic traces. Christian doctrine sits atop Old Testament writing and supposedly goes beyond it, heading the reader into the untimely future. The chapter on Herbert would make a fine point of departure for the troubled history of the *literary*, though such an excursus is not undertaken.

Harris next takes up an east-west movement in the language of the second *Henriad*, which on the surface privileges European over Oriental practices that reinforces his point about east-west language

in Herbert's poetry. He focuses here on what he proposes was a self-conscious audience responding to self-conscious players who mimed elements of old fashioned bravado in early representations of over-bearing monarchs. The actors' bodies as well as their language gave the audience cues by moving from ranting to more moderate tones to show their skill in acting self-consciously in modes of both the past and present. (Machiavelli pointed out in passing that Islamic monarchs had a much simpler way to reform the situations of kings than did the king of France.) How one, at this distance, can determine to what extent an utterance or audience is or is not self-conscious is not addressed.

The second of the three movements of his argument is titled "Explosions," although he has very little to say about the original, purely dramatological sense of the word—hissing or driving (by making noise) a bad actor off stage—its sole sense in the time of Shakespeare. Explosions here create ruptures, breakouts, disruptions, and, in a way, discoveries.

The first part of this section focuses on John Stowe's *Survey of London*, especially his concern for Old Jewry. Reading his city as antiquarian, Stowe notes the uncovering of stones in the recent rebuilding of Ludgate—stones with Hebrew inscriptions. Harris takes seriously the charges of Richard Grafton, who ceased to be printer to the crown with the death of Lady Jane and who interested himself, like his fellow "commonwealths men," in antiquities. Grafton can here illumine Harris' over-arching resistance to Protestant visions, thus Stowe resisted the glorious triumph of Protestantism in London via his *Survey*. Stones from the Old Jewry did not form the conventional old version cancelled by the new Christian types according to Protestant visions of the New Jerusalem. Rather, they served to explode or "explode" conventional apocalyptic dreaming.

Chapter Four focuses on "the smell of gunpowder in *Macbeth*" and thus carries on a movement focused on seemingly more concrete matters. To be sure, we cannot recapture the smell of *Macbeth* in Shakespeare's time, but that has not been a problem so far. The smoke produced from an explosion of gunpowder was commonly likened to devilish matters, and so the thunder and lightning with which the play opens might perhaps have warned the audience of impending trouble.

The speculative mode of Harris's argument stands out when Harris writes concerning one Ralph Fitch and his report of his journey toward Aleppo that "it is tempting to speculate that Shakespeare, writing an exchange between characters who supposedly frequent 'the pit of Acheron' remembered the Tiger's [Fitch's ship's] journey to Aleppo precisely because" Fitch's narrative "led inexorably to the stink of sulfur" (137). This speculation, with its nested possibilities, is a temptation that Harris basically cannot resist.

As Harris' argument progressively and studiously, yet partially, materializes itself, his third and final section takes up "Conjunctions," first in considering how Hélène Cixous and Margaret Cavendish touch (an example of untimely conjunction) and then in considering the history of the fated handkerchief in *Othello*. Partly because he works close to the texts of the first pair, or perhaps because the reader gradually has seen the mode of his argument, or perhaps because both texts are unusual in their time, Cavendish's writing makes a kind of unexpected and rich sense growing out of that penultimate chapter. Both chafe "against singularity" (149)—that is, a sense of singular identity, by turning "texts" into "texxts." Their writings allow past, present, and future anachronistically to conjoin and transform each other; insofar as they produce palimpsests, they provide a way of looking (or touching) which does not write over past, present, or supposed future rankings. They are preposterous, shaking up past, present, and future in non-apocalyptic ways.

Completing the third movement, in Chapter Six, Harris proposes to depart from convention and take as his task to work out "another understanding of temporality" (169) via consideration of the fated handkerchief and what have been considered some of the play's problems, pursuing the napkin "in proximity to [Michel] Serres' ... crumpled handkerchief," to uncover "the crumpled time of Shakespeare's play" (170). The play challenges "conventional understandings of agency, and hence to tragedy" (177). Given the several readings which various characters give of the napkin, it is clearly a palimpsest, "a writing surface upon which multiple signs and narratives are inscribed and erased" (179). The play requires not "a willing suspension of disbelief" but rather a "willingness to abide with contradictions" (183) so that it may be seen as preposterous. When he refers to the

handkerchief, he points to some joining or touching of disparate: “The task of thinking across and beyond the temporal partitions that subtly inform notions of racial and religious identity is thus a timely one,” he closes (18).

Lest it seem this tripartite argument enacts a Hegelian synthesis, Harris appends “Dis-Orientations” as Coda: “Untimely matter . . . challenges the fantasy of the self-identical moment or period, of the sovereign moment-state divided from its temporal neighbors. It materializes instead a temporality which is not one” (189). Summing up, Harris brings his argument directly to our time. His argument helps “confound the fantasy that insists on treating the past as synonyms partitioned from the west. And in our war-addled time, such untimely dis-orientations couldn’t be timelier” (194).

Judith Haber. *Desire and Dramatic Form in Early Modern England*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009. xi + 212 pp. \$90.00. Review by ELISA OH, HOWARD UNIVERSITY.

Departing from New Historicist emphasis on early modern plays’ social and political context, Judith Haber’s study raises the provocative question of how sexuality and sexual difference affect formal aesthetics. She posits that the plays of Christopher Marlowe, John Webster, Thomas Middleton, John Ford, and Margaret Cavendish represent varying degrees of non-phallic sexuality. That is, Haber claims that these plays feature “pointless play” (1) or infinite foreplay and the absence of a one-directional trajectory. By drawing attention to these plays’ alternatives to traditional forms that parallel the consummated and reproductive heterosexual act, Haber suggests “that narrative ‘history’ necessarily partakes of the same culturally created connections to patriarchal, heteroerotic masculinity as all narratives, and needs to be radically reconceived if it is really to represent other positions” (2). Therefore, Haber asserts that attention to the “subversive power of the aesthetic” (4) is a critical necessity, because looking beyond the historical embeddedness of a text allows us to perceive the dominant discourse’s pretense of being the only norm, though in actuality it is phallic and patriarchal. She argues that analyzing the aesthetic, long

associated with the subordinated yet liberating viewpoints of the feminine and sodomitical, enables a critique of the ideology in which contemporary critical discourse is deeply implicated.

Part I concerns the plays of Christopher Marlowe and ends with a “Shakespearean interlude” in which Haber looks at key narratives, such as *Romeo and Juliet*, that are rewritten by the later plays, and Part II examines the desiring women in *The Revenger’s Tragedy*; *The Duchess of Malfi*; *The Changeling*; *’Tis Pity She’s a Whore*; *The Convent of Pleasure*; *The Female Academy*; *The Unnatural Tragedy*; *Youths Glory, and Deaths Banquet*; and *Loves Adventures*. Each of her examples “enact a tension between the two opposed connotations of ‘play’—between unified, teleological dramatic structure on the one hand and static lyric or improvisational performance on the other” (5).

Haber focuses on Marlowe’s construction of sodomy and destabilization of social structures of masculinity. In a valuable reading of the homoeroticism in “The Passionate Shepherd,” she posits that what is less important than the gender of the beloved is the alternation between movement and stasis, the lack of hierarchies or linear narrative, celebration of pure aestheticism, and the implication that desire is without need for conclusion. She demonstrates that this refusal of consummation also appears in Tamburlaine’s blazon and later reification of an impenetrable Zenocrate and homoerotic negotiations with Theridamas.

While Marlowe’s Edward II seems to be suspended in indeterminacy, Haber claims that his dramatic narrative must ultimately submit to linear history and its brutally “intelligible” closure of sexual consummation. Death in this play is at once a reliable consummation and an absent center that negates all meaning. “Playing the sodomite” allows Edward to resist heteronormative meaning, and this unfixed identity threatens the business of running a kingdom. However, finite socially determined meaning cannot be evaded forever, and Edward’s death enacts a submission to it. In contrast, Haber argues that *Hero and Leander* effectively suspends and critiques “his society’s dominant fiction” (39) of conventional coherence by disrupting linear narrative and phallic sexuality.

Shakespeare’s *Romeo and Juliet* provides a disturbing “image of perfect union in orgasm / death ... and helps define the erotics of

patriarchy and the form of romantic tragedy in the Renaissance” (50, 54). In a later play Haber shows that the obsessively repeated male consummations in *The Revenger's Tragedy* at once critique this patriarchal “self-defeating phallic orgasm and death” (61) but also never fully escape its misogyny and linear narrative. Vindice does not make progress toward revenge for much of the play, and characters’ identities are shifting and unstable, but revenge itself is figured as a violent, phallic sexual penetration that reestablishes the dominant discourse’s need for comprehensible order, reason, and stable truth. Since Castiza is ultimately impenetrable and is entangled in the same paradoxes as her brothers, who must be “‘false’ to be ‘true’” (68), Haber asks whether women in this play “can be really said to exist *as a woman* at all” (69) and claims that the play does not engage with the problems of representing female subjectivity but treats the women as containers of male sexuality and subjectivity.

In contrast, Webster’s *The Duchess of Malfi* inverts the erotic structures of patriarchy and “engages in a self-consciously contradictory effort to construct a subjectivity that is specifically female, to reimagine speech, sexuality, and space—most particularly, the space of the female body—in ‘feminine’ terms” (72-73). He does this by exploiting contemporary ideas about pregnancy in order to disrupt dominant discourses. By reversing the traditional power relations between men and women, inverting verbal and physical logistics of penetration and agency, and rendering sexual pleasure more interested in foreplay than a specific conclusion, the Duchess suggests that her feminine subject position depends upon her own choice in deciding who ‘enters’ her heart and body rather than on remaining as chaste or passively penetrated as patriarchal ideology attempts to make her. Her words transform her threatening brothers into Antonio’s “gossips” or female friends who would be invited into the exclusively female space of a woman’s lying-in. Thus Webster opens up a genuinely different space of the feminine, “reclaiming the female body for women” (85).

Haber’s reading of *The Changeling* focuses attention on the deeply disturbing lines De Flores speaks to Beatrice Joanna when he is about to rape her: as he claims she will soon love what she now fears, Middleton and Rowley present the “coincidence of fear and desire, of virgin and whore, of marriage and rape” (88). De Flores’ lines also

reference Ben Jonson's masque *Hymenaei* and its occasion, Frances Howard's marriage to the Earl of Essex. Howard's contemporary reputation for being a woman who changed from virgin to scheming, murdering whore after sexual initiation haunts this play, and Haber shows how the play criticizes and yet participates in the misogynist fantasies of the epithalamion tradition.

Ford's *'Tis Pity She's a Whore* also enacts a linear narrative of tragedy and, by taking patriarchal desires and forms to improbable extremes, critiques those very assumptions. Haber considers this play in light of its predecessors, *Romeo and Juliet* and *The Duchess of Malfi*, making the argument that Ford "undoes" Webster's replacement of ultimate erotic consummation in death with a female space of "pointless play" and pregnancy. *'Tis Pity* reinscribes heterosexual love within a patriarchal consummation that is effectively an exchange between men, Annabella's father and brother, then brother and husband. The play's obsession with fathering—producing children without a troublesome mother—is literalized in incest that destroys the purity of the parthenogenesis it desires.

Margaret Cavendish's self-conscious disruptions of traditional dramatic forms and rewriting of her predecessors make her work an appropriate place to end this study. According to Haber, Cavendish "views traditional, unified dramatic structure (which is productive of conventional meaning) as expressive of reproductive sexuality" (118), and she constantly revises this patriarchal literary genealogy. Cavendish's prefaces, for example, announce her awareness of and disregard for formal dramatic conventions and gender expectations. Similarly, *The Convent of Pleasure* resists closure by rendering the heterosexual union of the cross-dressed Prince and Lady Happy ambiguous and inconclusive. Moreover, in *The Unnatural Tragedy* Cavendish reworks her predecessors by "counter[ing] the narratives of patriarchy with the stories told by young virgins, which suggest different possibilities for the future" (125).

Critics who emphasize historical context in their own work will find Haber's work challenging and instructive, as it forces them to examine patriarchal and heterosexist ideologies embedded in conventional dramatic structures, particularly in tragedy. This study also enables the reader to see how feminist and queer theories' interests

can be applied in fruitful ways to formal analyses. The book will be valuable to scholars of early modern aesthetics, Christopher Marlowe, and women and sexuality in seventeenth-century tragedies.

Peter Hinds. *'The Horrid Popish Plot': Roger L'Estrange and the Circulation of Political Discourse in Late Seventeenth-Century London*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010. xiv + 457 pp. + 37 illus. £60.00. Review by ADAM SWANN, UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW.

Roger L'Estrange was arguably one of the most prominent figures in the pamphlet wars of Restoration England through both his activities as press licenser and direct participation as a pamphleteer. Peter Hinds recognises that "reaction to L'Estrange has been characterised by a neglect that is out of all proportion to his importance and prolific writing output" (43), as Anne Dunan-Page and Beth Lynch's *Roger L'Estrange and the Making of Restoration Culture* (2008) was the first in-depth study since the publication of George Kitchin's *Sir Roger L'Estrange: A Contribution to the History of the Press in the Seventeenth Century* in 1913. Critical attention to The Popish Plot has also been scant until relatively recently, with the two foundational texts being John Pollock's *The Popish Plot* (1903) and John Kenyon's *The Popish Plot* (1972). These works, Hinds argues, exhibit a preoccupation with the development of the Plot at higher levels of Parliament and court. In this period, political discourse was conducted as much in the coffeehouse as the court, and Hinds' book therefore seeks to recover the reception of the Popish Plot on the streets. Roger L'Estrange provides an ideal prism through which to investigate these events, and Hinds uses him "as a narrative anchor to some degree ... to help make sense of the morass of comment on the political events in the period covered" (15). L'Estrange is suited for this because he associated with royal and rude equally as a press licenser who was also willing to wade into the mire of Restoration pamphleteering.

Many of the details advanced as evidence of the Popish Plot seem implausible to modern readers, leaving it difficult to understand how contemporaries believed in its existence. There are two strands in

Hinds' attempt to demonstrate the plausibility of the plot to Restoration Londoners: he explores the background anti-Catholic sentiment of the period and marshals a wealth of contemporary evidence to unpick the development of the Plot. This is achieved by drawing on printed, written, and spoken accounts, but one of the potential problems of attempting to collect such a diverse range of sources is the potential dissolution into diffuseness and incoherency. This is avoided, however, by Hinds' adherence to a strict, methodical structure which is replicated in each chapter.

The first chapter offers an introduction to the central figure of the Popish Plot, Titus Oates, who is succinctly described as L'Estrange's "nemesis throughout the 1680s" (35). This largely biographical chapter presents a wealth of details about Oates' early life, with particular emphasis of his early accusations of perjury, misbehaviour and expulsion from universities. Considerable attention is paid to Oates' apparently disingenuous conversion to Catholicism while abroad and his involvement with Jesuits with whom he quickly fell out of favour. In light of Oates' early experience, Hinds argues that "it is not difficult to find a possible motive in Oates's past for his charges against Catholics" (32).

Hinds devotes a number of chapters to unpicking the complexities of the Popish Plot in a methodical manner, yet his argument really comes alive in the later sections of the book. The chapter concerning the death of Edmund Berry Godfrey is exemplary in this respect, as the pamphlet debate regarding the different theories for Godfrey's death is analysed in incisive detail. This episode is also notable in that it is one of the instances when L'Estrange's opposition to the plot was believed to be unconvincing. L'Estrange was surely one of the most assured and tenacious of Restoration pamphleteers, so it is surprising to see him fail to convince his audience that Godfrey was not in fact murdered by Catholics. Hinds asserts that by this point, anti-Catholic hysteria had reached such a pitch that the notion of Godfrey's murder "fitted into the notion of a grand Catholic plot too neatly for [L'Estrange's] rebuttal, however lengthy and detailed, to be given much credit" (288). An interesting parallel may be drawn between the initial public unwillingness to believe in Oates' claims of a Catholic plot and their unwillingness to now believe L'Estrange's claim that a Catholic plot was not to blame, although such a corre-

spondence is not remarked on by Hinds.

There are a number of points in the text which would have similarly warranted further discussion. Hinds describes coffeehouses as “venues where groups of people gathered to read and discuss foreign and domestic news ... and debate politics and religion” (319), and they are therefore one of the primary locations of quotidian political debate which is the central concern of the book. Moreover, pamphlets were often read aloud in coffeehouses to the illiterate, and so are a crucial instance of the popularisation of political debate which occurred during this period. Yet, coffeehouses are given only the most cursory of mentions, and a chapter devoted to the coffeehouse debates would have been a valuable addition to the book.

There are also some issues with the overall structure of the book. While the structure within each chapter progresses in a methodical fashion, the arrangement of chapter topics sometimes seems rather illogical. For instance, chapters four and five, which explore the widespread anti-Catholic sentiment of Restoration England, are placed after chapter two, a narrative of the plot itself. It seems strange that Hinds would situate the chapters which show “the importance of the representation of Catholics and Catholicism ... and how this representation could work to stimulate and sustain belief in the Popish Plot” (141) long after the chapter which covers “how plot information was represented, received, interpreted, and why it was believed” (71). It would arguably have been more logical to establish the wider anti-Catholic context first, then present the details of the plot, rather than giving the reader the bare facts, then leaving them to read the context back into them afterwards.

These are only minor complaints, however, in an otherwise superb study. Hinds’ densely researched analysis is the ideal tool with which to unravel the sprawling complexity of the Popish Plot. This book offers a vital, lucid insight into the Popish Plot, the career of Roger L’Estrange, and the ideological context which made it seem so plausible.

Michael North. *Artistic and Cultural Exchanges Between Europe and Asia 1400-1900*. Surrey, England: Ashgate, 2010. xv+197 pp. + 35 illus. \$114.95. Review by NAGENDRA RAO, GOA UNIVERSITY.

Cultural interactions between Europe and Asia existed since the ancient times, but it is only in the Middle Ages that European intellectuals and travelers noted, with considerable interest, the Asian art and culture, which resulted in close interaction between two cultures. Traditionally, European scholars had hegemonic attitude towards Asia, wherein Asia was considered as less civilized when compared with European civilization, but recent studies have highlighted need for a different approach towards Asia. Consequently, the European discourse uses the concept “cultural exchange,” which assumes equality between two cultural zones, wherein Asia is not considered as periphery that accepted dominant European ideas.

In the pre-modern period, political, economic, social relationships prevailed between the two regions. European traders maintained trade relationship with Asia, primarily to satisfy demands of European population for both essential commodities and exotic goods. Trade in luxury goods might imply role of elite communities, but one cannot deny huge European demographic base that demanded supply of essential commodities including spices and textiles. In actuality, the Europeans came to Asia as traders, but became interested in Asian art, literature, and religion.

A notable feature of this opus is that it has understood need for replacement of Euro-centrism by the theory of cultural exchange or cultural assimilation, thereby indicating considerable progress in this area of study. One can comprehend reasons for hegemonic perception concerning Asia, as the European powers such as England and France considered and ruled Asian regions as colony. The colonial mindset, nevertheless, is replaced by egalitarian approach. One cannot deny that fact that in pre-modern period, European scholars had accumulated considerable information and material from Asian countries. Large numbers of illustrations in the book exhibits this phenomenon. Apart from Europeans, the Asians were also interested in European culture and scientific advancements. This implies emergence of reciprocal relationship between two zones. The work, however, considers Asia

as a homogenous cultural territory, despite subtle and definite differences between countries such as India and China, even though there are distinct sections that deal with these regions. The work has not differentiated between colonial and non-colonial Asian territories. One is curious know differences between English and Danish experiences with reference to Asia. However, these experiences are indirectly represented in this work.

Another notable aspect of this work is that it covers most of Asian and European regions, both colonial and non-colonial powers. In this sense, one can suggest that this work is not influenced by European hegemonic discourse. The chapters deal with various topics such as: Asian objects and European court culture, Asia as a fantasy of France, European society in colonial India, Mughal architectural elements in European memorials, the role of European companies, the Netherlands experience in Japan, and assimilation between Japan and the west.

It is curious to note that like in the modern period, global exchanges affected culture of different countries of the world. Import and export of commodities had an impact on domestic production and consumption pattern. In the pre-modern period, in the absence of colonialism, European and Asian countries could compete with each other. One notes domination of Asian traders in global trade that compelled England to ban import of printed Indian textiles. This decision encouraged domestic artisans to produce local variety of printed textiles. Indian cotton export to England had positive impact on domestic fashion industry (3). The English artisans assimilated Indian culture by modifying cotton textile designs, which were exported to India. The Chinese and Japanese porcelain had become popular in Europe. At the same time, Japan and China imitated European cookware, and this implies modification and re-creation of products to cater to the needs of large numbers of European consumers.

European and Asian rulers and the elite class played an important role in accumulation of products of other cultures. The European kings, traders, and other nobles accumulated Asian goods such as coconut goblets and Nautilus vessels. The European diplomats, missionaries, and traders acted as medium of cultural exchange, wherein there was exchange of goods and ideas. The Asian rulers and elite

communities did not lag behind in accumulating European 'exotic' goods. As Asian commodities became fashionable in Europe, European commodities became prestige goods in Asia. The medieval kingdom Vijayanagara of South India was known for gem production and exchange (21). Thousands of gems were exported from India to Europe, as there was demand for luxury commodities in the European market, even though it is not possible to locate these gems today due to their modifications over a period of time. European countries looked to East with a view to establish and reassure their own identity. In the case of France, for example, Japanese exotic goods were eulogized, thereby enhancing status of France in the world of nations.

The coming of the Portuguese to Asia was an important development that contributed to enhanced exchange of luxury goods. Asians obtained knowledge concerning European technology while Europeans imported Asian goods, as proved in the case of Bezoar stones that were collected from different Asian animals. Cultural exchanges between Europe and Asia can be divided into two categories. One was the pre-colonial period when Europeans in Asia needed to obtain legitimacy from the local population. During this period, the Europeans, in Bengal for example, constructed buildings based on Asian architectural styles. In the second phase—the colonial period—there was a process of Anglicization wherein buildings were constructed use styles from English architecture, a process that continues in modern times, which represents an exchange of cultural symbols between Europe and Asia.

An important feature of this work is that it has done justice to the topic, as it has covered different cultural zones and located them in time and space. The work has questioned hegemonic perspective, which implied domination of one culture by another. The work has used the appropriate term cultural exchange, which implies reciprocal relationship between the Orient and the Occident. In this way, the work has challenged notions pertaining to Oriental Despotism or Asiatic Mode of Production. The work is useful in offering new perspectives in cultural studies.

Joanne Rochester. *Staging Spectatorship in the Plays of Philip Massinger*. Surrey, England: Ashgate, 2010. 166 pp. + 3 figures. \$99.95. Review by NANCY MOHRLOCK BUNKER, MACON STATE COLLEGE.

Joanne Rochester's important study addresses staged spectatorship in plays by Caroline playwright Philip Massinger. Each chapter presents a different form of metatheatrical inset: plays-within of *The Roman Actor* (1626), masques-within of *The City Madam* (1632), and the miniature portrait of *The Picture* (1629). The conclusion interprets paradramatic and trial scenes. Rochester argues that Massinger's onstage spectators typically "misread, overinterpret or otherwise misconstrue the metadramatic insets they watch, and their responses to these interpretations structure the plots of his plays" (1). She explores the vitality of insets in the Introduction, and assertively points out the presentation and representation of spectatorship as commentary on Early Modern audiences.

A key issue in the text is Massinger's status as a "transitional figure" with a career spanning the reign of two monarchs, three theatrical venues, and ever-changing audiences (3). As head playwright for the King's Men 1625-1642, both plays and their insets demonstrate staged spectator response as fundamental to the plot. Because Massinger foregrounds ethical issues, audiences both on and off stage must be aware of theatre's capacity to create moral judgments. In this way, Rochester argues, the playwright's dramaturgy is "exploration and analysis" (10).

Chapter 1 focuses upon *The Roman Actor* (1626), Massinger's most complex examination of theatrical process and interrelation of staging and spectatorship. Rochester reads the play through the lens of how theatre works, using the series of plays-within to instruct staged spectators toward judgment. Her seminal commentary deals with the tribulations of Paris, who "gets ambiguous admiration awarded to an actor, who cuckolds an emperor, and he gets it because of *what he cannot help*—the interpretations spectators put on what they see" (41). His destiny controlled by an onstage audience even as the theatre's real audience also is a fictional audience. For Rochester, Massinger's inset points out the critical responsibility imposed upon audiences who view public performances; they must look beneath the surface to

determine the playwright's message. Massinger's manifesto, the power of the theatre is that it provides the space for all types of discourse, informs this chapter and the balance of Rochester's study.

An overview of masquing culture begins Chapter 2; Rochester then examines masques-within in *The Duke of Milan* (1621), *The Picture* (1629), *The Guardian* (1633), and *The City Madam* (1633) suggesting Massinger's use of masque speaks to the form's popularity. Employing masques in a conventional manner as structural elements, Massinger writes them to serve as markers for plot shifts. Rochester explicates the masques in *The Duke of Milan* and *The Picture* that comment negatively on the courts which stage them; she also notes that these masques invert the accepted sexual hierarchy in marriage. Massinger's most elaborate and most complex masque-within, found in *The City Madam*, includes all spectacular forms of mythological characters as well as transformation through love. In its duplicity and deception motifs, the masque exploits onstage audiences' inability to see truth. Massinger, Rochester argues, expects offstage audiences to cut through the masque performance, and mitigate the weaknesses of the onstage spectators. The theatre audience witnesses Luke, the master actor, getting "caught in his own theatrical trap" (87). As the most inadequate spectator in the play's inset, he recognizes neither fiction nor truth, he is unable to distinguish between appearance and reality, and he is insufficient to provide the moral lesson. The theatrical audience then must be able to grasp the "allegorical truth the fiction contains" (92).

Chapter 3 first contextualizes the social and cultural environment alongside the intellectual notion of artist as "part of the theatrical world, influencing presentation of art on stage" (102). Rochester discusses pieces of visual art as spectatorial objects for the onstage audience in *The Renegado* (1624) and *The Emperor of the East* (1631); she closes with attention to the magical miniature in *The Picture* (1629). These property paintings are portraits tied to love or desire. Massinger gives the nudes of *The Renegado* fiery presence as they initiate the hero Vitelli's affair with the Moorish princess Donusa. Theodosius, the young emperor who scrutinizes portraits of women in *The Emperor of the East*, functions like a mirror for onstage and offstage audience members who must grapple with the person that is represented in the artistic image. The onstage spectator takes on heightened validity

in *The Picture* when the artistic image ceases to function as mimetic representation. Sophia's face, her soul, and Mathias's psyche disappear for the spectator. Rather, the art piece teaches a moral concept: Massinger's art functions within the play as a type of inset piece disclosing the spectator audience's passions.

The conclusion addresses three additional inset forms: paradramatic scenes, informal playlets, and trial scenes, each manifesting Massinger's extensive view regarding the importance of onstage spectatorship. Rochester argues that spectators react to events not formally staged—"pivotal scenes of conversion, seduction, or recognition" as "Massinger stages reception at the same time as performance" (126). Readings of these forms include a satiric treatment of Novall by the *Parliament of Love's* doctor Dinant and his "psychodrama staged" to cure the suicidal Martino in *A Very Woman* (130). In *The Roman Actor* the playwright asks his audience to probe for the "meaning and function of drama itself" (140). Rochester's discussion of the trial of King Antiochus in *Believe As You List* foregrounds the spectator whose interpretation is watched by another audience. In this play, the actor playing a king, is a "king forced to be an actor, to be literally dependent on spectator response for survival" (135).

Massinger's characters must be able to comprehend intentions based upon actions; the onstage spectator must be able to make meaning from the audience experience. Inset pieces are presented with the requirement that audiences onstage and offstage "correctly interpret" the plays presented; further, offstage audiences must investigate the moral and intellectual aspects of the spectators' behavior. Rochester's study makes a valuable contribution to theatre history, illuminating Massinger's place in performance and reception discourse, and argues for the function of self-aware reflexivity embedded in his works.

Peter E. Medine, John T. Shawcross, and David V. Urban, eds. *Visionary Milton: Essays on Prophecy and Violence*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 2010. xxv + 346 pp. + 29 illus. \$60.00. Review by ANTHONY WELCH, UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE, KNOXVILLE.

This Festschrift for Michael Lieb features essays by eleven prominent voices in Milton studies. The collection draws its central themes from Lieb's forty years of scholarship on prophecy, visionary experience, religious violence, and the nature of Milton's God. Although it presents itself as a timely engagement with these issues in an age of global terrorism, this fine book is under-served by its packaging and marketing. Its role as a festschrift is absent from the volume's title and its dust jacket description; the reader first learns of it in the editors' introduction, which offers an overview of Lieb's writings, while a selected bibliography of his published work appears at the end of the volume. The editors make a valiant effort to tie all of the contributors' essays to the twin themes of prophecy and violence—two terms which, as some of these scholars demonstrate, are often mutually opposed rather than conjoined in Milton's writing—but the essays are bound more tightly together by their shared admiration for and indebtedness to Lieb's work than by the book's stated topic. That diversity is a strength rather than a weakness of the collection. Here the reader will find a range of provocative viewpoints on Milton's poetry (the emphasis is mostly on the later poems), grappling with such concerns as authorship, biblical exegesis, gender issues, literary genre, reception and influence, and, of course, political and religious controversy.

Visionary Milton opens with three essays that relate the visionary mode to matters of authorial self-presentation and political dissent. First, the late John Shawcross traces Milton's vatic rhetoric in the early poetry. Culminating in a sensitive reading of "The Passion," his essay helpfully reminds us that Milton was able to handle the role of the inspired prophet with witty irony as well as high seriousness. Barbara Lewalski's "Milton and the Culture Wars" steps back to survey Milton's whole poetic career, viewed here as an ongoing project to reform English literary culture by transforming the traditional poetic genres. This "aesthetic contestation," Lewalski argues, was viewed by

Milton as a kind of warfare, training his readers to cultivate the habits of mind required of a free people (25). Turning to a later moment of cultural conflict, Sharon Achinstein explores the work of Abraham Polonsky, a leftist Hollywood writer blacklisted during the McCarthy era. Achinstein shows how Polonsky's 1955 television script, "The Tragedy of John Milton," deployed the figure of Milton—with supporting roles by Andrew Marvell, Thomas Ellwood, and William Prynne—to mount a critique of state violence and the repression of free speech.

A second group of studies addresses the contexts and reception of Milton's writings. Stanley Fish's crisply argued essay, "How Hobbes Works," contrasts Milton's commitment to private conscience with Hobbes's insistence on the shared, public, social, conventional, and contractual basis of truth and of language itself. In a meditation on pain in *Paradise Lost*, Diana Treviño Benet draws on the period's medical and religious writings to explore how Milton portrays the pain suffered by the rebel angels, and how he tries to manage the questions it poses about the justice of God. A lengthy essay on *Samson Agonistes* by Wendy Furman-Adams and Virginia James Tufte surveys how both the biblical Samson and the hero of Milton's poem have been portrayed by visual artists from the early Middle Ages through the late twentieth century. More than two dozen accompanying illustrations largely bear out the authors' claim that visual artists have anticipated many of the critical approaches and controversies that literary scholars have recently brought to bear on Milton's *Samson*.

All of the remaining essays in the volume showcase Milton's *Paradise Regained*. Here the book's concern with prophecy, violence, and iconoclasm becomes more tightly focused. Four of these studies pay close attention to the poem's biblical and theological matrices. Joseph A. Wittreich explores a dispute among biblical exegetes, both before and after Milton, over whether Satan's temptation of Jesus in the wilderness "is to be read literally or figuratively, whether it is real or visionary." In Wittreich's view, *Paradise Regained* rejects "the either-or answers of institutionalized interpretations" (126) as it portrays "the evolution of human consciousness and the building up of the human spirit" (134). Addressing the poem's relationship to its Gospel sources in a different way, Mary Beth Rose asks, "Why Is the Virgin Mary in

Paradise Regain'd." Noting that Milton's other writings show a Protestant discomfort with Marian devotion, Rose links Mary's prominent role in the poem to contemporary attitudes toward maternity and the family, as she suggestively argues that "Milton locates the origins of the Son's eventual triumph over Satan in his relationship with his mother" (206).

Directing our attention back to the Father, Michael Bryson extends his controversial reading of *Paradise Lost* to Milton's brief epic. Building on Stanley Fish's familiar thesis that Jesus rejects the purely external, worldly goods offered to him by Satan and turns instead to the divine source within him as the true measure of all value, Bryson makes the startling claim that this divine source "*is not the Father*" (262, italics in original). For Bryson, both the Father and Satan "speak the same language" of worldly power, glory, and force, so that, in the poem's apophatic vision, the search for God must lead to a rejection of both figures (252). On firmer historical ground, Stella P. Revard's "Charles, Christ, and Icon of Kingship in *Paradise Regain'd*" traces the poem's concern over what it means for Jesus to inherit the Davidic kingship. Revard's subtle observations on the poem's theorizing of monarchy focus on its implied critique of Charles II, a false king whose earthly reign, celebrated by his apologists as divinely ordained, everywhere stands in contrast with the millenarian kingdom of God.

David Loewenstein's essay, "From Politics to Faith in the Great Poems?" concludes the volume. Loewenstein rejects the view that Milton slunk toward political quietism after the Restoration, but neither does he find a straightforwardly activist posture in the last poems. Instead, he argues, each of Milton's later works expresses "divergent and, indeed, sometimes agonized political responses" to the failure of the English Revolution (271). The result is a complex poetic texture marked by unresolved tensions and contradictions, such as the ripple of submerged violence that disturbs the Son's loving ambition, "By winning words to conquer willing hearts, / . . . the stubborn only to subdue" (*PR* 1.222-26).

Perhaps what most clearly unites these well written, thought-provoking essays is Michael Lieb's longstanding interest in "the more disturbing aspects of Milton's God." The contributors frequently cite Lieb's research into the "terrifying, inscrutable, even primitive" quali-

ties of this deity and the fearsome grandeur of the *odium Dei* (xv). In showing how Milton and his successors struggled to interpret the mystery of the divine will, and how they strove to bring human life more fully into line with their vision for it, this essay collection is a worthy tribute to Michael Lieb's scholarly career.

Maria Rosa Antognazza. *Leibniz: An Intellectual Biography*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009. xxvii + 623pp. \$45.00. Review by Jonathan Wright, Hartlepool, United Kingdom.

Describing this as an “intellectual biography” was an astute decision on the part of author and/or publisher. The book's greatest virtue is its ability to guide the reader through the staggering diversity and frequent complexity of Leibniz's thought—from ethics to logic, from physics to theology, from math to metaphysics. Even some of the more rarefied aspects of Leibniz's theorising are explained with great clarity and one would not have to be especially familiar with the subject to enjoy this volume. Antognazza is to be especially commended for tracing the gradual development of Leibniz's ideas. As she puts it, his was a “labyrinthine” intellectual odyssey (90) but it is still eminently possible (though far from easy) to plot the trajectories of some of his most influential contributions (the theory of monads, for instance) back to his more youthful work and conjectures. Leibniz always dreamed of producing a grand philosophical synthesis. He never came close to achieving this goal but, as this book clearly demonstrates, there was more systematisation and coherency to his life's work than is sometimes allowed.

Another accusation routinely levelled at Leibniz is that he was something of a dreamer. Antognazza rejects this characterisation and insists that he usually had his “feet firmly on the ground” (100). For Leibniz, utility was extremely important. He wanted to improve the world in practical ways. This is a refreshing adjudication. Leibniz adored the realms of pure mathematics and abstruse metaphysics but, as Antognazza reminds us, he also weighed into debates about Louis XIV's foreign policy and spent a great deal of time conjuring up schemes to drain water from the Duke of Hanover's mines. It can

sometimes seem that Leibniz dipped his toe into too many different philosophical pools but the very ambition of his project was itself the result of a straightforward aspiration: to improve the human condition to the greater glory of God. Leibniz saw no obvious or necessary division between the study and the workaday world: the one fed the other.

Mention of God leads us to the other major strength of this volume. It is very good on Leibniz's religion. Antognazza argues (and she is absolutely right) that Leibniz's faith was foundational. He saw no contradiction in accepting both contemporary mechanistic physics and the basic tenets of Christianity. Others paid lip-service to such tenets: Leibniz seems to have believed in them passionately and while he was a life-long irenicist many of his theological stances (a firm Trinitarianism, for instance) were anything but radical.

Antognazza has produced a rounded portrait of Leibniz the thinker and some of the themes developed here (that his "respect for the past ... differentiated him so clearly from most of his great philosophical contemporaries" (33), for instance) are very welcome. Not that the author neglects Leibniz the man. The structure of this book is rigorously chronological and the reader will discover all the highlights of Leibniz's travels and career. The sections on the younger Leibniz are particularly rewarding, and while the great man cannot be said to have lived a spectacular life, he still emerges as an interesting, even endearing, figure. Antognazza often focuses on Leibniz's frustrations: scrambling for position, trying to get noticed, growing increasingly infuriated with the tasks (that long stint as a librarian, for example) that put bread on the table but distracted him from his true passions. There are also some excellent sketches of the various regional intellectual milieus through which Leibniz strode (or stumbled), and the account of the so-called calculus wars (who had invented what? and when? who had plagiarised whom?) is great fun.

This book works on many levels. It will be of greatest interest to those who specialise in seventeenth-century intellectual history, especially those who seek to understand the heady brew of confusion and optimism that defined post-1648 Germany. It deserves a much wider audience, however. It is accessible enough to charm the general reader and it would also be the perfect volume to put in the hands of a bright

undergraduate student who is thinking about pursuing a doctorate on Leibniz or a related topic. He or she would learn three valuable lessons from these splendid pages. First, mastery of the sources is crucial. Second, we should never forget just how astonishingly fertile and star-studded the intellectual world of the seventeenth century could be. Early in Leibniz's career (in 1671) a copy of his *Hypothesis physica nova* arrived on the doormat of the Royal Society in London. Four people were invited to report back on the contents: Robert Boyle, Robert Hooke, John Wallis, and Christopher Wren. That's about as stellar a cast as the Republic of Letters was ever likely to produce, though it should be noted (and we should all thank Antognazza for this nugget) that Hooke did not like it very much and neither Boyle nor Wren bothered to read it. Enter the third lesson for our budding graduate student: it sometimes takes a while to be appreciated. Persistence is everything, and, as this well-researched, sure-footed biography reveals, Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz was nothing if not persistent.

Craig Ashley Hanson. *The English Virtuoso: Art, Medicine, and Antiquarianism in the Age of Empiricism*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2009. xvii + 316 pp. + 8 illus. \$50.00. Review by JAMES FITZMAURICE, UNIVERSITY OF SHEFFIELD.

As might be expected of a book with a title such as this volume has, there is, in the opening chapter, a discussion of Pope, Gay, and Arbuthnot's *Three Hours After Marriage*. That discussion nicely displays the ambivalent attitude of people living during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries towards antiquarianism. The play makes light of an actual antiquarian, Dr. John Woodward of the Royal Society, but, as Craig Hanson points out, the play's authors were by no means "turning their backs on the classical past" (13). Pope translated the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. Gay, according to Hanson, "worked throughout his career to formulate an appropriate modern response to ancient classical forms," and Arbuthnot "published a treatise on ancient measures, weights, and coins." Hanson tells us that these three Scriblerians only aimed to discredit men who engaged in a "muddled [as opposed to meaningful] dialogue with the past," but there is also much discussion of some-

thing more like ambivalence towards antiquarianism. I would extend that ambivalence to modern attitudes towards both virtuoso science in general and the Royal Society in particular. In any event, Hanson's book is clearly written, is widely as well as deeply informed, and is beautifully illustrated. For those who know the subject, especially, it will be a delight to read.

There are some surprises, too, perhaps the most striking of which is the chapter devoted to the importance of Cervantes' *Don Quixote* in the medical community. Hanson makes the practice of medicine as well as the extra-medical interests of doctors the centerpieces of his book. Dr. Thomas Sydenham, according to Hanson, dismissed medical theory as found in books and instead recommended the reading of *Don Quixote* to those who would learn the trade of healers. Sydenham, "celebrated for his emphasis on clinical observation and treatment ... [avoids] listing medical books" (126). The point, of course, is that Quixote lived in a fantasy world derived from print on paper and was unable to deal with the actual existence of people and things. Hanson might have made this point in a few pages, but goes on at length, and I am inclined to go along with him, as the journey is interesting. *Don Quixote*, it is clear, found a deep resonance in the eighteenth century because of an ambivalent feeling in England towards the past and towards learned authority more generally. Hanson quotes Stuart Trave, who stresses the "amiable humor" of Quixote as opposed to the "caustic satire of the Restoration" (130). It makes sense to be amiable about the foibles of a group of people to whom one belongs. Sydenham wrote medical texts and was himself an established authority by virtue of print.

Hanson is an art historian and the connection between art and medicine is foregrounded. Dr. Theodore Mayerne, physician to James I, Charles I, and Henrietta Maria was "especially interested in the physical properties of paint" and corresponded with artists like Rubens and Van Dyke about oils and turpentine (36). Hanson also documents in detail how medical doctors were important collectors of paintings as well as prints. Why? "What is the connection?" we might ask. By way of answer, Hanson makes the unexpected assertion that connoisseurship was taken to be a marker of medical competence during the eighteenth century. Dr. Woodward's "alleged medical shortcomings,"

we learn, “are tied to his aesthetic preferences” (138). Nor were artists unaware of the world of medicine. The etchings and engravings of Hogarth show the influence of value placed on empiricism, for Hogarth “insists not on idealized forms but on the beauty of everyday modern life” (150-51). Borrowing from the language of medicine in *The analysis of Beauty*, Hogarth “identifies as quacks those dubious connoisseurs set on selling Old Master Holy Families and Venuses to naïve Englishmen” (156). It seemed to me that Hanson might have looked into the commentary of Margaret Cavendish, Duchess of Newcastle, on Robert Hooke’s *Micrographia* (1665) while dealing with empiricism. Cavendish critiques Hooke’s volume by saying that objects under a microscope can be described in differing fashions according to the ways in which people light them. An observer does not simply “see what is there” under a microscope; he or she helps to create what is seen. Put another way, the artist and the medical doctor both are engaged in interpretation and representation based on the faculty of sight.

Hanson is well aware that there was a long association between quackery and “empiric doctors,” such as those lampooned by Ben Jonson in “Dr. Empiric.” For Jonson’s contemporaries, an empiric was a doctor who was unlearned, and that lack of knowledge of books was seen as serious. An empiric was likely to be a quack, in part because he had no institutional medical training and none of its attendant exposure to medical theory or philosophy more generally. Hanson looks at William Salmon, who built a career on invented or implied credentials. Salmon, who had no medical credentials of his own, dedicated his *Synopsis Medicinae* to men who did. In an attempt to mimic genuine doctors, Salmon mixed “basic art instruction, explanations of techniques and media, medical advice, [and] hermetic wisdom [in his book] *Polygraphice*” (121). Salmon was exposed as a fraud, but his attempt to imitate actual doctors helps to demonstrate the close connections between art and medicine.

Hanson mentions Margaret Cavendish-Bentinck, Duchess of Portland, as a person who visited and described an art collection gathered by the eminent Dr. Mead, and Hanson credits her as “a formidable collector herself” (174). I would have liked to have read more about this duchess, whose collection of materials relating to

natural history had enormous scientific import for the eighteenth century. Indeed, I would have liked to have read more about women, medicine, and art. To this end, references to Jacqueline Broad's *Women Philosophers of the Seventeenth Century* might have proved fruitful. But these are mostly quibbles. With about a hundred pages of detailed notes, bibliography, and index, the present book, *The English Virtuoso*, is a great deal more than another monograph. It is a very fine reference volume.

Jamie C. Kassler. *The Honourable Roger North, 1651-1734: On Life, Morality, Law and Tradition*. Farnham, Surrey, UK: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2009. xvii + 466 pp. + 8 illus. \$114.95. Review by ELLEN J. JENKINS, ARKANSAS TECH UNIVERSITY.

Roger North was a prominent jurist and politician in late-seventeenth-century England, but after his refusal to take the Oath of Allegiance to William III and Mary II resulted in his departure from public affairs at the early age of 39, he retired to the country and wrote compulsively, addressing such varied subjects as biography, law, musicology, architecture, the poor laws, and history, as well as fish ponds and "accompts." Very few of North's works were published during his lifetime, and those that were published appeared without his name. When a number of his manuscripts, most of which were privately held, were published posthumously, their texts were altered so that North's anti-Whig stance became the most prominent characteristic of his intellectual legacy. Jamie Kassler points out that these alterations were not only a disservice to North, a man of integrity, conviction, and lively intelligence, whose historical reputation was damaged by flawed and unsystematic interpretation, but they also failed to reveal the depth of North's personal inquiry into themes of human ethics, skepticism, and moral philosophy. It was not until the late twentieth century that more accurate editions of North's works began to be published.

Jamie Croy Kassler, whose distinguished academic and research career has combined musicology, history, philosophy, and science, is the author or editor of a number of books, including *The Science of*

Music in Britain, 1714-1830: A Catalogue of Writings, Lectures, and Inventions (1979); Roger North's *The Musicall Grammarian, 1728* (co-edited with Mary Chan 1990), and *Music, Science, Philosophy: Models in the Universe of Thought* (2001). Kassler, who holds a Ph.D. from Columbia University, is a fellow of the Australian Academy of the Humanities and a recipient of the Centenary Medal awarded by the Australian government for her contributions to the humanities and society.

When the "Glorious Revolution" placed William and Mary on the throne of England in 1689, Roger North had been a King's Counsel to Charles II; attorney general to James II's queen, Mary of Modena; Treasurer of Middle Temple; legal advisor to the Archbishop of Canterbury; and Tory MP for Dunwich. He was also a younger brother of Francis North, first Baron Guilford, Lord Keeper of the Great Seal under Charles II, who was much involved in the legal wrangling over the Exclusion Crisis, as well as the trials after the Popish Plot and the Rye House Plot, and was, therefore, reviled by the Whig opposition. Roger North's refusal to swear allegiance to the new rulers cost him his positions, and though he was quickly branded an entrenched royalist and Jacobite, Kassler points out that his non-juring stance had less to do with his commitment to Tory rule and more to do with his conviction that he could not, in good conscience, violate the oaths he had taken earlier to James II. By this time, however, North appears to have had quite enough of public life, having seen at close range the damage done to the English legal system on behalf of James Stuart by his Lord Chancellor, George Jeffreys (1645-1689), known as "the Hanging Judge" for his draconian rulings.

During his self-imposed exile to the countryside, North turned his hand to redressing the criticism of his late brother, Francis, writing a biography that overtly aimed at the exploration and description of Francis's character traits but that also tested and expressed his own thoughts. Or, as Kassler puts it, Roger North was engaged in "the process of thinking about thinking" (57). He also wrote biographies of his brothers Sir Dudley North (1641-1691), who had been a sheriff of the City of London, and John North (1645-1683), who had been Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, as well as a critical analysis of his own characteristics in an autobiography, *Notes of Me* (circa 1693-1698).

In each case, the work went on for years, since North continued to revise his compositions, and as Kassler laments, almost never dated his work, making it nearly impossible to determine the chronological order of his revisions. Still, Kassler writes, North's experimentation in writing and his interest in writing about human nature objectively and honestly are actually extensions of his ongoing exercise in learning "how to live" (77). His biographical undertakings are noteworthy for having focused upon the private lives of his subjects rather than just the importance of their public actions, and in doing so, North provided a significant amount of information about the times in which he lived and the issues of that era. Kassler points out that North's interpretation of morality required that the individual choose to do good, rather than merely choosing to obey the rules. In this way, North refuted the idea that morality exists as a universal principle, seeing it rather as the individual's choice of options in response to experience.

In the period 1710-1722, North wrote his history of Charles II's reign, *Examen: or, An Enquiry into the Credit and Veracity of a Pretended Complete History ... Tending to Vindicate the Honour of the Late King Charles the Second*, as a caustic refutation of White Kennett's *History of England*, which he considered to be full of falsehoods about the Stuart kings and inaccuracies about common law. *Examen* was edited by his son, Montagu North, and was published in 1740, the first of Roger North's publications to name him as author. The biographies of his brothers saw publication in 1742 and 1744, but as Kassler relates, Montagu North was responsible for many changes and omissions from the original versions.

Fortunately, Kassler writes, many of North's works have become available since the late nineteenth century, with thousands of pages held by the British Library, alone, and other records in repositories in Australia, the UK, and the United States. Kassler includes a portion of North's essay, "Of Etymology" (circa 1706-1715) as an example of his reasoning on language, translation, and the law. One of the most riveting sections of Kassler's book is the appendices, in which she provides information on provenance and physical features of works she has divided into those published during North's life and those published between his death and the year 1900. Kassler's analysis of North's evolving philosophy on "how to live" is not effortless read-

ing, but the present work will be a most useful contribution to the fund of resources on the tumultuous seventeenth century, as well as providing a new valuation of the very remarkable Roger North and his many pursuits.

Malcolm Wanklyn. *The Warrior Generals: Winning the British Civil Wars 1642-1652*. Yale University Press, 2010. xviii + 312 pp. + 8 illus. \$55.00. Review by CHRIS R. LANGLEY, UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN.

Professor Wanklyn's latest work builds on his previous research, which underlined the importance of logistical dominance and the art of writing about conflict in Parliament's eventual victory in the Civil Wars. Here, though, Wanklyn aims to illustrate the centrality of the decision-making process to the short and long-term outcomes of battles. In this sense, the author has not drawn on recent historiographical developments on the experiential level of conflict, as recently encapsulated by Barbara Donegan's monograph *War In England 1642-1649*. Furthermore, Wanklyn seems to have at least partly discarded his reservations about using the phrase "British Civil Wars," with which, as recently as 2005, he "fundamentally" disagreed. However, by deliberately maintaining a focus on the strategic and higher-level decisions involved in conflict, Wanklyn is able to present a lucid chronological portrayal of the conflicts that engulfed Britain and Ireland in this period.

The criteria set for assessing military leadership is deceptively simple and masks the depth of research put into the work. The achievement of one side's sovereign's war aims (whether it be the Parliament, the Committee of Both Kingdoms, the Royal Council or the Estates General in Scotland) is defined as constituting success, whether by design or through the mistakes or ineptitude of other generals. Wanklyn charts a roughly chronological narrative to assess individual decisions and their relationship with higher war aims. To do so, he examines the fast-moving source material of personal correspondence and burgeoning numbers of newsbooks rather than accounts such as Clarendon, whom Wanklyn refuses to countenance as a fair source of assessments of Prince Rupert or other rivals.

By using such criteria, Wanklyn is able to challenge a number of views on notable figures in this period, both parliamentarian and royalist. Questioned first is the prevalent image of the inactivity of the Earl of Essex after the battle of Edgehill and Turnham Green in 1642-1643. Essex is introduced as a “well-padded figure of sedentary middle age” yet with a deceptively “solid core of resolution and determination” (14). Despite confusion at the battles of Lostwithiel in 1644, Wanklyn concludes that “the most remarkable aspect of the whole affair was the loyalty that Essex’s officers and men showed towards their general” in contrast to his negative stereotype (112). The assessment of the marquis of Newcastle similarly inverts prevalent negative stereotypes with a closer reading of the sources. Traditionally cited for Newcastle’s failure to march south to attend the battle of Newbury is his lack of military experience. Wanklyn objects to this view and finds that royalists in Yorkshire requested that Newcastle protect them from the imminent invasion of Alexander Leslie from Scotland. The author also rejects overly negative assessments of the Earl of Manchester, claiming that views that hold Manchester to have lost the will to fight or to have experienced post-traumatic shock, to be “questionable at the very least and may be totally erroneous” (122). Rather, Wanklyn asserts that Manchester delayed for purely military reasons and that he kept his northern force intact to shadow the movements of Prince Rupert, in keeping with his orders. Such important reinterpretations show the complexity of both parliamentarian and royalist sides in the wars and the intrigue within each camp.

In extending his work to Scotland and Ireland, Wanklyn has given other geographical areas of study his expertise, but unfortunately, he limits himself to a few handpicked generals. The reasons for this may be explained by lack of space, but for Ireland at least, the author contends that “the Confederate generals did not rise much above the level of mediocrity” and by not achieving any notable war aims do not warrant assessment (180). His discussion on generalship in Ireland is limited to that relating solely to English commanders in the country after 1648. In one paragraph, Wanklyn rejects Owen Roe O’Neill’s leadership qualities without assessment and does not assess the possibility of military leadership from the Catholic Confederacy. For Scotland, Wanklyn is less denunciatory, and reassesses the role

of James Graham, marquis of Montrose extensively; questioning the view that he was a bungled military leader. Yet, by illustrating the degree of control Montrose could indeed exert, Wanklyn regularly reflects on his ally, Alasdair MacColla, without assessing the latter's leadership qualities on their own terms. Although such omissions are disappointing, as Wanklyn may have offered further reinterpretations, they allude to a number of research questions for future scholars and engage in debate outside of an English-focused discussion.

One assessment that warrants much attention is that of Oliver Cromwell, and it is certain to have resonance with the current work of John Morrill, Micheál Ó Siochrú and Andrew Barclay. Wanklyn tentatively suggests that Cromwell may have deliberately misrepresented the Earl of Manchester to hide his own shortcomings after the battle of Newbury (a topic Professor Wanklyn has moved to discuss further in a recent journal article). Wanklyn concludes that Cromwell, overall as a general, was "nothing short of outstanding" and was so successful in achieving his sovereign's war aims after 1648 because "he had the inestimable advantage of having the sovereign under his thumb" (233). The author re-examines Cromwell's notorious carriage in Ireland, particularly at Drogheda, Wexford and Clonmel, and he concludes that overly negative views in some ways "need modifying" (211). Wanklyn applauds Cromwell for being the first parliamentarian commander to ensure that the force "did not run out of steam" and that such events as in Drogheda and Wexford were "not untypical of warfare in western and central Europe in the mid seventeenth century or indeed in Scotland" (213). Such a conclusion goes contrary to the findings of Micheál Ó Siochrú who refuted the idea that contemporary massacre stories were a good enough reason to justify the loose rein Cromwell gave to his troops. By defining "success" so specifically, Wanklyn has set himself in opposition to those who argue that Cromwell, though victorious, subverted norms of engagement by killing civilians. In such a way, Wanklyn has added a valuable contribution to an already heated debate.

Professor Wanklyn's work adds to his already important corpus of research into the military aspects of the Civil Wars. As with his previous work, *Warrior Generals* includes a rich array of battlefield diagrams and maps which act as an invaluable resource to any scholar

of the period. Whilst Wanklyn's book contains some omissions that may have proved valuable to his current "British" approach, the work is meticulously researched, and his reassessments of leading protagonists raise a variety of research questions for generations to come.

Imtiaz Habib. *Black Lives in the English Archives, 1500-1677*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2008. ix+415 pp. Hardcover \$99.95. Review by BABACAR M'BAYE, KENT STATE UNIVERSITY.

Imtiaz Habib's *Black Lives in the English Archives, 1500-1677* is an ambitious and meticulous study of the African presence in Britain from the reign of King Henry VII to that of Charles II. The book is a result of many arduous years of meticulous collection and analysis of "scattered, fragmented, and historically disregarded records of black people [in England] for four centuries back" (ix). From this painstaking endeavor, Habib has produced a brilliant monograph that successfully writes the contributions of Africans into an early history of England in which they have been considered as "absent" and "invisible." Challenging past and current scholarship about England's history, Habib reconstructs black presence and visibility in this history during the reigns of many Tudors and Stuarts.

Habib's attempt to establish the presence of blacks in early modern England fits into the effort of many scholars to uncover the neglected role of these blacks in British history. One of these scholars is Peter Fryer whom Habib praises for having provided us with primary "empiricism" about "historical black people in England in the later seventeenth century" (9). In a similar vein, Elizabeth Kowaleski Wallace's book, *The British Slave Trade and Public Memory* (2006), represents Fryer's *Staying Power: The History of Black People in Britain* (1984) as a work which, like Walvin's *Black Ivory: A History of British Slavery* (1992), attempts "to counteract the removal of traces of black life from the British past, by way of ensuring that black people are part of the British future" (8). Habib makes unique contributions to this scholarship which is still "in infancy" by tracing the origins of blacks in England to the Tudor and Stuart years from which essentialist and construc-

tionist approaches to history have removed them in an attempt to relegate them “into the unknowable” (9). Resisting this ideological refutation of factuality, Habib uses poststructural philosophy as well as postcolonial theory in order to enable “the visibility and historical impress of black people” in early modern England through archival sources such as cryptic parish records, “arcane legal testimony, and casual household inventory listing” (11). Habib classifies his materials in a ninety-five page index-section containing the three following categories:

(a) government records, (b) personal references, and (c) parochial church notations. The first type includes monarchic promulgations, government accounts, law cases, and national chronicles mentioning black people. The second comprises descriptions of, and allusions to, black people in letters, household accounts, and diaries and personal papers. The third constitutes entries in local parochial church registers and ecclesiastical courts, documenting the christening, marriage, and deaths of black people in that neighborhood, including wills made by them or mentioning them. (16)

Habib’s purpose in collecting and organizing such archival data is to correct and disprove the conservative representation of black life in English history as “unknowable.” By studying the meaning of these sources in fluid contexts during which terms such as “blackamoore,” “moor” “Blackmoore,” “Blackemer,” “negus,” “morian,” and “blackman” were frequently used in England, Habib wants to counter the “assumptions of traditional early modern history that have made black people in Tudor and Stuart England absent by default” (17). Criticizing this historiography, Habib suggests the scholarly importance of an early history of British “racial naming[s] [which] proceeds not from the fixity of essence but from its very ambiguity” (12).

Another great asset of Habib’s book is its groundbreaking methodology which begins with a refutation of certain key paradigms of both past and current scholarship about blacks in English history. First, Habib argues that “early modern black people are untraceable in the work” of such numerous scholars as the social historians Lawrence Stone and Peter Laslett, literary scholars Louis Wright, Samuel Schoenbaum, and G.K. Hunter, and traditional and poststructuralist

scholars Linda Yungblut and Patricia Fumerton for whom “black communities have not comprised an analytical category” (7). While he acknowledges the efforts of later works such as those of W.E. Miller, Eldred Jones, and Robert Fleissner, which attempt to provide “Empirical Elizabethan knowledge of black people,” Habib says that such studies are problematic because they are “spotty, diffuse, and generally ineffective” in their findings (8). Though he also recognizes the contributions of social historians such as Folarin Shyllon, Paul Edwards, James Walvin, Peter Fryer, and St. Clair Drake for their use of “documentary evidence” in the study of the slave trade, Habib contends with these scholars’ focus on the more known period of the second half of the seventeenth century and derides their consideration of “historical blacks in the England of [Queen] Elizabeth and her immediate successors” as just “a minor and occasional presence in their data” (11). In the same vein, Habib gives credit to scholars such as David Dabydeen, Ruth Cowhig, Elliott Tokson, Anthony Gerard Barthelemy, and Jack D’Amico for “importantly foregrounding race and blackness as neglected topoi in Elizabethan and Jacobean literary studies” (8). Yet he criticizes these scholars for having “occluded the materiality and consequent historical import of the black presence in the earlier centuries of the English early modern age” (8).

Writing against past and current scholarly practices, Habib thus demonstrates the historical and material significance of blackness in early modern England by paying attention to subtle dynamics that resulted from the first migrations of blacks into England. As he suggests, the incoming of blacks in early Tudor England resulted from two processes which were “first their introduction to England through the Africans in Catherine of Aragon’s retinue and, under the aegis of cordial Anglo-Spanish relations that it both reflected and ushered in, work relocations of skilled black people to England . . . and, second the small trickle of Africans brought back by English merchants trading with the Iberian peninsula” (63). Habib gives the example of the 1501 arrival in England of two slaves who followed the Spanish princess Catherine of Wales. According to Habib, “these first black arrivals” were “mentioned casually in a letter of Ferdinand and Isabella to De Puebla, their ambassador in England” as part of the “personnel” the princess was taking with her to England (23). As Habib points

out, the two “black figures” were at the bottom of a list of “maids of honour,” “high female companions, and attendants” who “are for that reason in all probability female, [and] are proud advertisements of an ambitious Christian Spain’s recent imperial achievements” (23). Giving further meaning to this example, Habib writes: “This political history, which positions the two slaves as fitting accoutrements for a Spanish princess in her future foreign home, makes their black identity almost a certainty. This certainty is bolstered by the fact that since 1459 the word ‘slave’ (‘escravo’) in common Portuguese usage primarily if not exclusively denotes a black African” (23).

Another compelling evidence of the black presence in early modern England that Habib gives comes from the mid-to-late sixteenth century when the arrival of Africans in Britain exclusively resulted from “England’s expeditionary forays to Africa and the Western Atlantic in search of new commodities and markets” (63). Therefore, like the first phases of black migrations to England, the later ones occurred within political and historical contexts that shaped the materiality of Africans by transforming these people into workers that produced wealth for the English monarchy and empire without being publicly acknowledged as “present” in a nation that preferred to see itself as white only. Furthermore, by the late sixteenth century, the Africans in London suffered “cultural suppression and political and legal effacement,” “‘obsessional’ surveillance,” as well as “collective xenophobia about aliens,” which rendered them “an obviously disadvantaged group” (118). By the mid-seventeenth century, the victimization of blacks in London had spread to the counties outside of the city as a result of competitions between small merchants who greatly benefited from business practices and living habits which included “the acquisition of black people” (195).

It would be unfair to assess *Black Lives in the English Archives* without acknowledging the efficiency of its interdisciplinary methodology that allows Habib to theorize the notion of “community of color” beyond ethnic boundaries. For instance, early in the book, Habib suggests the broad meaning that the term “black” had in early modern England as a “typological identifier” of “a loose category of the non-white, non-English (as distinct from white but non-English people)” (1). This information is crucial because it suggests that the term “black”

in early England could have signified “Negro,” “Ethiopian,” “moor,” “blackamoor,” “barbaree,” “barbaryen,” or “Indian” (1). Habib also suggests the plural meaning of the term “black” in the first chapter of his book where he discusses thirty records of Indians, Americans, and other people of color that he found in different parts of England, suggesting new ground for research on the history of East Indians and Americans in early modern England (239).

Black Lives in the English Archives is a major book that any serious scholar of early Atlantic history and cultures must have, since it suggests the complex roles that blacks had in England from 1500 to 1677. The book covers almost two centuries during which blacks were hidden in a British society that used them as commodities and vestiges of monarchy and imperial grandeur without shielding them from the abuses of xenophobia, imperialism, and slavery. In addition, the book reveals the presence of blacks in English archives ranging from 1500 to 1677, giving modern scholars an invaluable means for studying the social, political, and economic significance of black migrations to England in new and pluralistic terms that broaden the meaning of color and caste in early Atlantic studies.

Kevin Sharpe. *Images Wars: Promoting Kings and Commonwealth in England, 1603-1660*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010. xvii + 665 pp. \$55.00. Review by TILLMAN W. NECHTMAN, SKIDMORE COLLEGE.

Kevin Sharpe’s *Image Wars: Promoting Kings and Commonwealth in England, 1603-1660* is the second in a three-volume series in which the author plans “to turn attention to the changes in the modes and media representing rule and of the relationship of such representatives to perceptions of rule” (xvi). As in his earlier volume, *Selling the Tudor Monarchy*, Sharpe insists that early-modern governments—like those we know today—“had to project images which subjects found appealing in order to secure support for their authority and policies” (xiv). In some ways, then, Sharpe’s trilogy is an early history of political messaging, a pre-history of what those of us accustomed to the twenty-four hour news cycle have come to call “spin.”

The notion that politics is about messaging hardly seems new, but Sharpe's argument here is more nuanced. Indeed, one of the great successes of Sharpe's work is his appreciation of the challenges facing any new political leader, and particularly those facing the early Stuarts. Imagine having to sit on the same throne recently vacated by such historical luminaries as Henry VIII and Elizabeth I. As Sharpe notes, Henry VIII branded monarchy as specifically Tudor, and Elizabeth branded it specifically Elizabethan. No wonder that so many have for so long felt that James I somehow did not fit the bill. But, Sharpe argues, James I did not merely accept that he could not be the monarchical "brand" that his predecessors created.

Rather, he worked to re-make the face of monarchy in his own image, using the representational tools that best fitted his particular accomplishments. And he did have some. He was, for instance, the first male to occupy the English throne in half a century and the first to come to the throne with an heir in more than a century. In many ways, then, James represented a return to a pattern of early-modern political power that was properly masculine and dynastically stable. And, unlike his immediate predecessor, who had used her figure and the theatricality of her presence to establish her claims to power, James I had a sense that the Sovereign's power could not be assumed to be sacred *per se*. Having come from a contentious political climate and accustomed to making political arguments both in person and in written form, James I felt he had to (and indeed was equipped to) argue for the sacredness of his throne. "James was his own spokesman in print—both in prose and poetry" (46). As Sharpe notes, those who looked for James I to intervene in politics-as-pageantry found him remote—even missing. Only when we accept that James' interventions were discursive can we truly get at the representational core of his reign.

Like his father, Charles I is often analyzed in historical comparison. His father talked too much; Charles talked too little. Here again, Sharpe is attuned to the way different reigns represented themselves differently, arguing that Charles I's reign was very much a matter of image. Rather than "*arguments for royal policies*," Charles I seems to have favored "*(silent) representation of majesty*" (143). Here, we might conjure famous images of the king by Van Dyck, but Sharpe notes

that Charles I's vision of majesty was not like that of Elizabeth I. Rather, the new king "made his family itself a dominant representation of his rule" (205). In Sharpe's view, Charles I was hardly a silent monarch. He was, though, a monarch who seems not to have noticed that, while he was deeply concerned with the image-as-message, others had come to control the discursive political sphere his father had dominated for so long. As such, Sharpe reads the king's speeches to the Long Parliament in 1640-41 not as the story of a king finally being convinced to communicate to his people but rather as "the story of a king in a crisis" who "learned a different vocabulary of self-representation" (173).

Perhaps the most interesting material in this book is that which investigates the period after 1649. Here, Sharpe argues that the republican project failed because, ultimately, it was never able "to secure its own cultural authority or even significantly to undermine the culture of kingship" (388). As Sharpe suggests, the end of monarchy should have brought about an end to the forms through which monarchy had asserted itself. It did not. Rather, those who stood in opposition to the king used the representational tools of monarchy to make and advance their cause. Such was the case when Parliament attempted to forge a seal of state to replace the one that Charles I had carried off with him. Such was also the case as Cromwell tried to forge a functioning political alternative to monarchy. As Sharpe notes, Cromwell's face—and not the notion of "the parliament or of a people made stronger by a union of equals"—is "the most prominent image of the republic" (435). The great irony here is that 1649 marked the moment when one king-as-man lost his life but when the institution of kingship was re-sacralized. Charles I became the great symbol of kingship, and his death an inauspicious founding moment for the republican project. Because the Commonwealth retained the representational structures of royal power—the seals, the portraits, the palaces—it never established itself as a viable alternative to the sacred space left empty by the martyred king.

Image Wars is a big book—both in scope and in size—that revisits the period from 1603-1660 with a new appreciation for the "representations of monarchy" behind state power in this period. Given Sharpe's early claim that "representations of monarchy" are inseparable from "perceptions of monarchy," there is a lot more here

about representation than perception (xiv). One wonders exactly how we might go about understanding what the broader public read in various representations of political power—whether a portrait, a royal procession, or a face on a coin. Sharpe offers us some insights here, but primarily into the minds of an elite political few. That said, *Image Wars* (with its two companion volumes) is likely to be a significant part of the conversation about early-modern English politics for some time to come.

Thomas N. Corns, Ann Hughes, and David Loewenstein, eds. *The Complete Works of Gerrard Winstanley*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009. Vol. I. xi+600pp. Vol. II. 465pp. \$335. Review by TOM HAYES, BARUCH COLLEGE AND THE GRADUATE CENTER, C.U.N.Y.

This new Oxford English Texts edition of Gerrard Winstanley's complete works, fittingly dedicated to the memory his most ardent admirer Christopher Hill, places him in the company of such canonical seventeenth-century writers as Milton, Bunyan, Hobbes, and Traherne. Indeed, today Winstanley is celebrated more for his vivid and accessible prose style than for his radical political ideas.

As the leader of the Digger colony founded on St. George's Hill near Cobham on April, 1, 1649. Winstanley wrote eighteen works varying in length from five to a hundred and five pages. In these works he tirelessly maintains that aristocracy, i.e. kingship, and clergy, i.e. university-trained exegetes, should be abolished and the earth should again become a common treasury.

The *Gerrard Winstanley* produced by this new scholarly edition differs from the utopian mystic that emerges from George Sabine's edition of *The Complete Works of Gerrard Winstanley* published by Cornell University Press in 1941, as well as the Marxist avant la lettre of Christopher Hill's Penguin Classics edition published in 1973. The new edition of Winstanley's works puts much more attention on his early works such as *The New Law of Righteousness* where Winstanley tells readers that one day while he was in a trance he heard a voice that said, "Worke together. Eat bread together, declare this all abroad." Winstanley was "raised up and filled with abundance of quiet peace and secret

joy” (i:513). And in the later work entitled *Fire In the Bush* Winstanley invests the apocalyptic battle between the archangel Michael and the Dragon with fresh socio-political and symbolic significance.

Eschewing any attempt to historicize the events described in the book of Revelation, Winstanley explains that the four beasts that Daniel sees born out of the sea are all vestiges of the imaginary Clergy-Power that will be destroyed by “the poor despised ones” when they discover that the kingdom of heaven is in them. Winstanley reminds his readers that

The Scriptures of the Bible were written by the experimental hand of Shepherds, Husbandmen, Fishermen, and such inferiour men of the world; And the Universitie learned ones have got these men’s writings; and flourishes their plain language over with their dark interpretation, and glosses, as if it were too hard for ordinary men now to understand them” (ii:200).

But Winstanley’s alternative metaphorical readings of scripture are accessible to the literate working classes. In his last and longest work *The Law of Freedom* Winstanley laments his failure to transform Kingly Oppression: “And now my health and estate is decayed, and I grow in age, I must either beg or work for day wages, which I was never brought up to” (ii:352-53). As Hill notes “there is no evidence that our Winstanley left Cobham, ... nor that he ever became a corn-chandler, nor that he experienced any such striking reversal of fortune as to be dealing in very large sums of money by 1666 ... There is no ... evidence ... that he joined the Quakers” (33).

I have only one caveat: In their informative introduction the editors say there is “no evidence for the persistent claim that Winstanley was a hired laborer amongst the poorer inhabitants of Cobham” (i:11). In support of this statement the editors cite my study *Winstanley the Digger* published by Harvard University Press in 1979 as the “influential source” of the allegation that Winstanley worked as a hired laborer. While the editors do not say so directly the implication is that I made up this statement. However this is not the case. Thirty-two years before my book was published Sabine noted that “In 1649, ... Winstanley evidently was making a precarious living by pasturing his neighbors’ cattle” (6), and thirty-two years later Christopher Hill noted that in the 1640s Winstanley “herded cows, apparently as a hired laborer”

(12). Hill gives four page numbers in his edition where evidence to support this statement may be found.

In light of this the editors' charge that my book is an "influential source" of the statement in question is untenable. First of all, as the statements from Sabine and Hill indicate, I did not invent the statement in question; second, even if the statement is not true the editors' citation of my book as the "influential source" of the statement is disingenuous. To suggest that a statement in my book could be more influential than Hill's paperback edition decries credulity. If the editors were unaware of Hill's statement but chose to cite my statement they are guilty of an even more damning fault. Hill, the former Master of Balliol College, Oxford, author of many prize-winning books, is one of the most influential scholars in the English-speaking world. My scholarly credentials pale in comparison to his. It appears that the editors did not dare cite him as a flawed commentator on Winstanley's biography but saw no problem in citing my book as the source of the statement in question.

Finally, something must be said in reference to the cost of this two volume edition of Winstanley's works. Few potential Winstanley scholars are willing or able to fork-out \$325 for the two volume set. Presumably they will have to rely on library copies. That is a sad commentary on the state of academic publishing.

Mogens Laerke, ed. *The Use of Censorship in the Enlightenment*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2009. x + 203 pp. \$ 147. Review by ROBERT H. BLACKMAN, HAMPDEN-SYDNEY COLLEGE.

This volume contains eight papers delivered at the 2006 conference "The Use of Censorship from the Age of Reason to the Enlightenment," held in Copenhagen under the auspices of the *Classicisme & Lumières* research network. The essays begin chronologically with censorship practices in England during the 1630s and end with a discussion of the publication history of the *Encyclopédie*. The essays discuss the impact of censorship on authors and ideas, the institutions and practices of censorship, and the theories of censorship proposed by Enlightenment figures. Two major themes run through the essays.

The first is the notion of a “moderate” Enlightenment and its opposition to a more “radical” one. In this, the volume builds on the themes introduced by Jonathan Israel in his *Radical Enlightenment* (2001). The various authors are not afraid to contest Israel’s ideas and in some cases find them wanting. The second theme is that of the practical impact of censorship on the behavior of authors.

Mogens Laerke introduces the volume with a discussion of the history of censorship in Europe. The essay is thoughtful and informative and situates the volume well in historical and literary attempts to describe censorship in the Early Modern period.

In the first section, “Censoring the Enlightenment,” three authors discuss particular cases of censorship. In “Suppress or Refute?: Reactions to Spinoza in Germany around 1700,” Manfred Walther argues that an examination of attempts to prevent the spread of Spinoza’s ideas reveals that German intellectuals fought a war on two fronts. While they wished to censor dangerous ideas, they were reluctant to take actions that narrowed the range of moderate inquiry into theological and scientific matters. Radical ideas were not only dangerous for their content, but also from the way in which religious fanatics could use them to stifle the progress of legitimate enquiry.

In “Pierre Bayle and Censorship,” Hubert Bost demonstrates that while Bayle did exercise a kind of self-censorship, he never seemed to moderate his philosophy out of a fear of his own persecution and in fact refused to abandon his ideas, even when ordered to do so by the Consistory. Bost shows this in order to refute arguments that Bayle shows in his work the kind of Straussian esoteric/exoteric strategy attributed to Bayle by Gianluca Mori (*Bayle philosophe*, Paris, 1999). Bayle’s refusal, in fact, to pursue such a strategy given the radicalism of his ideas and the real threat of punishment leads Bost to doubt that a Straussian analysis is appropriate for the study of the late seventeenth-century thinkers.

In “French Royal Censorship and the Battle to Suppress the *Encyclopédie* of Diderot and d’Alembert, 1751-1759,” Jonathan Israel uses the publication history of the *Encyclopédie* to argue that there was a clandestine, radical agenda behind Diderot’s editorial strategy. In showing this, he attacks Robert Darnton’s argument that the project’s agenda was “acknowledged openly” (*The Business of Enlightenment*,

Cambridge, MA, 1979, 9). Israel concludes that to make any sense at all of the massive struggle necessary to halt the legal publication of the *Encyclopédie* one must understand that that “the *Encyclopédie* was a philosophical engine of war directed not just at Christianity but also against the providential Deism of Voltaire, Turgot [et al.]” (73), and that to understand why this was, one must “differentiate clearly between moderate and radical [strains of the Enlightenment]” (68). He also concludes, like Walther above, that moderates and radicals were involved in a “three-cornered contest,” fighting each other and against “the Counter-Enlightenment of the *dévots* and Jansenists” (74).

The second section of the book, “Institutions and Practices of Censorship,” contains essays in which the authors discuss censorship practices and how these practices impacted the content of political and philosophical works. The first, Tue Andersen Nexø’s “Between Lies and Real Books,” examines censorship during the era of the English Civil War and comes to the conclusion that Jürgen Habermas’s model of the Public Sphere does not adequately describe the birth of a print-mediated public sphere in England. England of 1639-1642 still had severe censorship laws on the books, but they were only arbitrarily and haphazardly applied. This led to a situation in which authors had to hide their identities to avoid punishment while adopting authoritative identities to gain credibility. The outcome was a free speech situation in which the quality of information was very poor and undermined rather than facilitating and rational for discussion.

Wiep van Bunge, in “Censorship of Philosophy in the Seventeenth-Century Dutch Republic,” argues against traditional views that the Dutch Republic functioned as a haven for radical philosophers because of its lax censorship regime. He demonstrates that the local government and local church bodies were sporadically effective in pursuing and arranging for punishment of authors who violated the idiosyncratic norms of their local communities. The lack of a strong central censorship system allowed for each local area to pursue its own “initiatives against radical philosophy and its implications for the reformed creed” (111). While Dutch censorship was much more sporadic than that of other Continental states, it was nonetheless vigorously practiced. More surprisingly, van Bunge comes to the conclusion that censorship in the Dutch Republic continued to

function on theological grounds (114), despite the Dutch Republic's reputation for religious tolerance.

In the third section of the book, the attitudes toward censorship of three major Enlightenment authors are described. Colas Duflo, in "Diderot and the Publicizing of Censorship," explores the rhetorical strategies Diderot used to show how ineffective and counterproductive official attempts to suppress written works would always be. Using Diderot's discussion of censorship in his *Lettre sur le commerce de la librairie* and tactics Diderot used elsewhere to creatively evade censorship, Duflo comes to the conclusion that attempts to censor unwelcome opinions that have the perverse effect of fostering "active, interpretive reading which seeks to complete, create links, detect irony beneath the most harmless remark, . . . and so forth" (122). The only way in which to actually combat pernicious ideas, Duflo's Diderot tells us, is a kind of ridicule familiar to the readers of *The Spectator* or Voltaire's satires—but for Diderot the place in France for this kind of ridicule would have to be in the theatre (134).

In Tristan Dagron's scintillating "Toland and the Censorship of Athiesm," Dagron asks how Toland could argue that "atheism is both morally and politically superior to superstition" when he wished to deny it "the official tolerance that he grants superstition" (139). Dagron argues that Toland held a notion of "true religion" that "was not considered from the view-point of its possible truth" (139). This true religion was grounded in experience, but since the life experience of each person relied so heavily on the prejudices of those around him/her, Toland thought it impossible to ever find a religious "truth" that could be divorced from such prejudices. Nevertheless, insofar as there was no attempt to force adherence to a set of beliefs that could not be verified through common experience (what he called "mysteries" or "superstitions"), multiple faiths had to be tolerated. Atheism, however, struck at the roots of the community by denying any truth, however practical, to these common prejudices, without which no society of ordinary men could flourish. While superstition and atheism were both enemies of true religion, the former could be tolerated in a plural society, while the latter could not.

In the final essay, "G.W. Leibniz: Moderation and Censorship," Laerke argues that Leibniz's notions regarding censorship arose

from his ideas concerning the need for moderation in philosophizing. According to Laerke, Leibniz argued that only certain kinds of thinkers might need to be censored, among them atheists, enthusiasts and Libertines. What these groups had in common was not a set of beliefs (for how could enthusiasts and atheists share beliefs?), but a lack of moderation in their ideas. They were guilty of “asserting these principles with more certainty than they objectively have ... while rejecting those of others violently” (178). Immoderate behavior removed one from a proper scholarly conversation, and it was the duty of the state to intervene to prevent immoderate ideas from harming a society. But Leibniz was consistent in his reasoning when it came to suppressing dangerous ideas. Leibniz worried that a lack of moderation in repression would be worse than simply allowing the ideas to flourish, and Laerke gives several convincing examples from Leibniz’s *opus* to support his claims.

This is an impressive collection of essays. While none of them qualify as earth-shattering in importance, combined they give the reader a sufficient overview of recent work in a variety of national traditions considering the practices and theories of censorship and of recent work on the early Enlightenment.

Elvira Vilches. *New World Gold: Cultural Anxiety and Monetary Disorder in Early Modern Spain*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010. xi + 361 pp. \$45. Review by ELIZABETH R. WRIGHT, UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA.

The six chapters of *New World Gold* attest to an ambitious, precocious and impressively executed research project, in which Elvira Vilches combined the analytical tools of a cultural critic and an economic historian. At its heart is a question that vexed seventeenth-century Spanish poets, moralists and theologians: how could the Spanish Monarchy control the gold and silver of the Americas yet rule over so many impoverished subjects in its Iberian heartlands and be itself subject to foreign creditors? This “Indies paradox” was most famously voiced by the Baroque poet Francisco de Quevedo in a satire built on the refrain, “Poderoso caballero es don Dinero,” (*don* Money is a powerful gentleman). Its best known stanza traces Sir

Money's life span: "Nace en las Indias honrado / donde el mundo le acompaña; / viene a morir en España / y es en Génova enterrado. Y pues quien le trae al lado / es hermoso, aunque sea fiero." (He is born in the Indies, honored where the world hails him; he comes to die in Spain, and is buried in Genoa. And whomever he accompanies is fair, no matter how savage; in *Poesía lírica del Siglo de Oro*, ed. Elias Rivers, Madrid, Cátedra, 1979, p. 341 [translation mine]). Notwithstanding their deceptive simplicity, the verses present a quintessentially Baroque grammatical crux that questions notions of individual value; that is, *honrado* here could be an adjective denoting a virtue or the participle of an elided passive verb that suggests he is worshiped for his wealth. Vilches examines how a wide range of writers in diverse genres grappled—like Quevedo—with the increasingly complex mechanisms of international finance and the resulting distortions in notions of individual merit. To be sure, scholars of such literary movements as the picaresque novel have long explored this issue in Spain's "Golden Age" of literature. But Vilches's contribution follows from her rigorous addition of economic treatises, merchants' handbooks and theological texts to this analytical framework. Scholars of early-modern English literature will also appreciate her engagement with Mary Poovey's 2008 *Genres of the Credit Economy* and Mark Taylor's 2004 *Confidence Games*. In terms of its organization, the book spans from Columbus's first expedition to the Baroque writers of the seventeenth century. The primary organizational scheme, however, is thematic.

Chapter 1, "New World Gold," delves into how writings from the first phase of overseas expansion grapple with issues of value. Here Vilches considers such well-known *conquistadores* and colonizers as Columbus and Gonzalo Fernández de Oviedo, while also drawing attention to theologians at the University of Salamanca and authors of the first guides to trans-Atlantic trade. Summing up the tension common to different genres, she notes that many intellectuals and moralists were "haunted by the Indies as an agent of change and disruption that altered the meaning and functions of money, corroded the ideals of civility, and transformed the structure of commerce" (52). As its title suggests, Chapter 2, "Selling the Indies: Columbus and the Economy of the Marvelous," Vilches expands on the line of research opened by such scholars as Margarita Zamora and Stephen Greenblatt. For

her part, Vilches examines Columbus's changing rhetorical strategies, when the promised rivers of gold from the Indies fail to materialize.

Continuing this line of inquiry, Chapter 3, "Gold: A Problematic Standard," considers some of the practical consequences of colonization, as wonder at the new lands and people encountered overseas gives way to issues related to colonial exploitation. In a compelling section, she examines how moralists and economic writers debated issues of land rights and the growing trans-Atlantic slave trade. The cultural tension that informs both Chapters 2 and 3 is the adherence to gold as the ultimate measure of worth, even as growing credit instruments were rendering value an abstract concept. While not central to her argument, Vilches also compares the Spanish "gold standard" to the different native-American systems of value, a comparative angle that attests to her work in the magnificent collection of early Americana preserved in the John Carter Brown Library.

Chapter 4, "The New World of Money," focuses on how the authors of dialogues, commercial handbooks, and theological treatises came to terms with the expanding money market instruments used to finance international trade. She offers particularly insightful comments on merchants' guidebooks of the mid-sixteenth century, such as Saravia de la Calle's *Instrucción de mercaderes* (Instructions for merchants, 1544, 1547) and the Dominican Tomás Mercado's *Suma de tratos y contratos* (Guide to negotiations and contracts, 1569). Not unlike the bumper crop of books on personal finance that have appeared since our own economic meltdown of 2008, the proliferation of such texts in sixteenth-century Spain reflects that: "from the king on down to the average citizen, it was almost impossible to grasp that the flood of American bullion could be dried up by interest rates and mortgaged debt" (208). One result of this anxiety was that many writers demonized or caricatured the Genoese financiers who provided the Spanish crown with desperately needed liquidity. Vilches, in contemplating attacks on the Genoese and other financial intermediaries, raises thorny issues related to alterity. Though she briefly discusses the tradition of money lending as it relates to Spain's *conversos* (converted Jews and their descendants), she book does not delve into the question of minority identities. In fact, a similar issue relates to *Moriscos*, the descendants of the Muslims forced to convert

to Christianity after the 1492 conquest of Granada. One of the many calumnies used to defend their 1609 expulsion from Spain was that they compulsively hoarded gold, thereby distorting the economy. One hopes that she or someone else inspired by her nimble examination of diverse writings on the subject of financial intermediaries will probe further into this question.

Overall, Chapters 1-4 are most useful for expanding the horizons of literary scholars by proposing connections to a broad range of economic and theological treatises. Shifting focus, Chapter 5 ("Writing about Debt") and Chapter 6 ("The Indies, Value, and Wealth") reflect on how debt and credit shape imaginative literature. Summing up the literary projection of New World gold, Vilches notes that "the picaresque novel, Cervantes's fiction, the urban aristocratic setting of the *comedia*, and the post-Cervantine novella all created new ways of understanding the relative importance of persons in relation to the rising power of money by illustrating new routes of wealth while evoking nostalgia for the nonpecuniary past" (212). She offers fascinating discussions of the emergence of a decidedly Baroque topos of the world upside down, whereby Spain becomes the Indies. A particularly memorable formulation is found in *El criticón* (1657), the monumental Baroque novel by the Jesuit Baltasar Gracian. In one section, a Frenchman laments his nation did not get an Indies, to which *Fortuna* replies that it has an even better source of easy riches—Spain. That is, just as Columbus traded valueless glass beads for New World gold, so the French now swindle Spaniards with unproductive luxury items in exchange for their gold and silver (243). Vilches also offers perceptive remarks on Juan Ruiz de Alarcón's *La verdad sospechosa* (The Suspect Truth), which Corneille adapted for his *Le menteur*. She contemplates the famous monologue in which the young protagonist, just arriving at court from the University of Salamanca, woos a glamorous young woman by saying he is a wealthy *Indiano* (colonist returning from the New World). In Vilches's reading, the sumptuous but fictitious summer feast he describes to make this lady jealous culminates a long line of New World texts, starting with Columbus's first reports to Ferdinand and Isabella. Spain's exploitation of overseas mines may not have produced a rich metropolis in the long run, but Vilches makes the convincing argument that its great profusion of literary

experiments had a powerful vein of inspiration in its American dream.

This thesis, backed by the examination of diverse texts, will make this study of interest to a wide range of students and scholars of early modern Europe and the colonial Americas. Non-Hispanists may, however, find that the breadth and range of sources Vilches discusses require further orientation. An appendix to define technical terms of finance and identify the many lesser-known writers mentioned would be a helpful addition to a paperback reprint. For now, readers might pair *New World Gold* with studies by John H. Elliott for orientation on the historical context, or with the essays on “Golden Age” literature by the contributors to the *Cambridge History of Spanish Literature* (ed. David T. Gies). Despite this difficulty, readers from early-modern English studies and other fields outside of Hispanism need not be daunted. With the thematic organization, individual chapters work well as stand-alone studies, whether to provide comparative analysis for individual research or in graduate seminars. Even advanced undergraduates could benefit from the book, particularly in light of how much financial anxiety has informed their own college years. For instance, the “Conclusion” along with the last two chapters would provide a fresh and illuminating perspective on Baroque literature of Spain. The first two chapters could enrich a study of Columbus’s travel log or Cortés’s “Letters from Mexico.” Whether read in parts or as a whole, Vilches’s book offers the reader a layered and insightful examination of early modern Spain’s “Golden Age,” attune to all the contradictions that follow from this term.

Alban K. Forcione. *Majesty and Humanity: Kings and Their Doubles in the Political Drama of the Spanish Golden Age*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009. x + 286 pp. Review by LAURA BASS, TULANE UNIVERSITY

Most well known for his groundbreaking books on the novelistic universe of Miguel de Cervantes, Alban Forcione brings to us in *Majesty and Humanity* a no less original study of the theater of Golden Age Spain in relation to absolutist monarchy, that most theatrical of institutions of the Baroque. In doing so, he newly enriches the body of scholarship that has emerged in the past two decades to challenge

the long-held view of the *comedia* as a cultural form in the service of what José Antonio Maravall labeled the “monarchical-seigniorial interests” of seventeenth-century Spanish society. Forcione anchors his study in two plays, Lope de Vega’s *El villano en su rincón* and *El Rey Don Pedro o el Infanzón de Illescas*, attributed to Lope, though his rich analysis, facilitated by generous summaries in the appendices, unfolds through engagement with a broader corpus of texts and images. The result is a book of luminous erudition and eloquence (Forcione is a master of copious sentences, subordinate clauses, and discursive endnotes—Yale University Press deserves praise for allowing them) on the nature and limits of the subjectivity of individuals in relation to their monarch and of the monarch’s own identity in relation to his subjects.

As the title announces, never far from view is the theory of the king’s two bodies (the immortal, royal being and mortal, human nature), classically expounded by Ernst Kantorwicz. Starting from its introductory chapter, Forcione sets out to uncover a “countercurrent in the political and literary culture” of seventeenth-century absolutism that enacted a demystification, or what he refers to as a “denuding” and “disrobing,” of the royal body (1). For his point of departure, he brings into dialogue Diego Velázquez’s *Las Meninas* and Miguel de Cervantes’s famous burlesque sonnet on Philip II’s tomb as bold examples of that demystification: both works point to the ultimate insubstantiality of the sovereign of official imagery—whether state portraits (such as Velázquez’s own equestrian paintings) or monumental catafalques (like the one mocked by Cervantes). Both, moreover, disrupt the spaces of royal representation with gestures of their creators’ own self-assertion. (Forcione’s argument here is more in keeping with Roberto González Echevarría’s recent political comparison of *Las Meninas* and *Don Quixote* [see *Love and the Law in Cervantes* [New Haven, Yale UP, 2005], pp. 119-124] than with Foucault’s well-known epistemological reading). Forcione then introduces his main topic—the demystification of the king in Lopean drama. For all the recent reevaluations of Lope’s theater, it is still refreshing to find him given place alongside the paradigmatically self-reflexive Velázquez and Cervantes, especially because Cervantes, in particular, is often championed for unmasking the playwright’s putative strategies of

conformity (see, for example, William Egginton, “The Baroque as a Problem of the Thought,” *PMLA* 124.1 [2009], 143-149).

In his multilayered analysis of *El villano en su rincón*, the subject of chapter one, Forcione shows Lope himself unmasking baroque rituals of power. Constructive contrast between the *comedia* and a subsequent adaptation of it as an *auto sacramental* by José de Valdivielso allows the author to question previous readings of the drama as an apotheostic celebration of monarchy. Although the play concludes with a spectacle put on by the king, “it itself is not a spectacle of power” but more profoundly a critical reflection on “the dynamic of royal visibility in the theatrically constructed absolutist state” (25). Lope introduces points of fracture in the contemporary cult of the monarch in Juan Labrador’s refusal to see the king, which undermines the totalizing royal gaze of public ceremony and much of seventeenth-century political theory. In a reversal of the monarch-subject hierarchy, the king becomes obsessed with laying his eyes on the peasant and pays him a visit *in cognito* in the second act. That encounter becomes a veritable *speculum principis*: cast in the role of the classical peasant-sage, the protagonist has a transformative effect on the monarch; before his “modest philosophical double” (32), the king is “humanized” (“humanarse,” we learn, was actually a term employed in contemporary writings on kingship). Indeed, Forcione argues that it is precisely a humanist vision of kingship that prevails in the third act when the royal figure abandons the specter of tyranny evoked in his allegorical masque and offers instead promises of reason and justice—the foundations of a “kingdom of good” (79). At the same time, though, the humanizing reconstitution of the sovereign exacts a price: in finally submitting to the “dispossessing power of the court” (90), the peasant-protagonist loses much of his own humanity—the freedom and individuality emblemized in his utopian *rincón*.

If *El villano en su rincón* aims to transcend the “radical dualism” inherent in the conception of the king’s two bodies (30), in *El Rey Don Pedro en Madrid y el Infanzón de Illescas*, the focus of chapter two, the “doubleness of the king crystallizes as a hybrid that is truly monstrous” (102). Forcione argues that the principal duality in the play’s title between king and feudal lord works as a displacement for the fundamentally ambivalent legacy of Pedro I of Castile summed up in

his two nicknames, *El Justiciero* and *El Cruel*. In keeping with attempts on the part of royalist historiography to purge the latter epithet from early modern Spain's collective memory, the drama aims to project the medieval king's notorious cruelty onto his tyrannical fictional double, Tello, and, in the process, to cast him as a foundational figure in the emergence of a just, centralized monarchy. However, Forcione brilliantly shows that Don Pedro cannot fully submit to the "repressive order of his own majesty" (155) and that the "cleansing" (178) of his historical memory is far from complete. While superficially the play could be read as a celebration of a triumphant ascendancy of the modern state over Spain's bloody medieval past, dramatically it conveys a longing for the "sublime individualism" (178) and "manly" force embodied by the lawless *infanzón*. As in the case of *El villano en su rincón*, the complexity of *El rey don Pedro* comes into sharper focus through comparison to a later reworking of the drama—Agustín Moreto's "rational, statist" *El valiente justiciero* (126)—and in relation to other fields of contemporary cultural production. For example, Pedro's slaughter of his unruly horse betrays the violent underside of the commanding majesty of equestrian portraiture; Tello's "exuberant enumeration" of his possessions echoes Góngora's Polyphemous and the anarchic self-assertion that court society sought to suppress (160-163).

Forcione's epilogue treats us to a brief excursus on Bernini's famous equestrian statue of Louis XIV, a work, he explains, so daring in its rapturous dynamism that the king wanted it demolished and commissioned more staid versions in its place. Bernini's sculpture, in turn, dovetails with the principal dramas that have been Forcione's focus: all three works depict kings breaking out of the bounds of their prescribed roles, and they were each followed by tamer, more conventional renderings by subsequent artists and authors. The epilogue concludes with penetrating reflections on the "disrobing of the king" in Calderón de la Barca's *La vida es sueño* and *El príncipe constante*, dramas deeply pessimistic in their views about earthly political order. Although Forcione addresses this only in the case of the latter, it is worth noting that in both plays the princely protagonists are given female doubles; the questions of majesty and humanity explored throughout the book were often played out in relation to women.

In the epilogue, Forcione also argues that the works studied ultimately dramatize the burdens and limitations the rise of the modern state imposed on all human beings; the monarchs' "nostalgia for humanness" becomes the "condition of every man and woman" (187). Taking the book as a whole, at times I sensed the author's own possible nostalgia for an archetypal criticism prior to the historicist turn in early modern literary studies. For example, he considers *El villano en su rincón* to be much more pertinently related to the genre of romance than to the double royal wedding of 1612 and the ambitions of Lope's patron, the Duke of Sessa, with which it may have been linked (29). Even as he recognizes the identification of the figure of Tello in *El Rey Don Pedro* with "the anarchic, violent culture of the feudal aristocracy" (and indeed devotes several pages to the social and political structures of medieval Spain), he argues that he "is simultaneously connected with areas of human experience that are far more fundamental and universal than anything that can be accounted for by reference to a specific social class or historical moment" (157)—areas of experience he finds in the heroic registers of myth and epic. Still, this appeal to universal structures does not diminish the importance and brilliance of this study on the political drama of the seventeenth-century Spain. With his magisterial readings and dazzling erudition, Alban Forcione reminds us that we find the culture's deepest reflections on its structures of power and social order not only in writings of political theory but in works of art and imaginative literature, in all their complexity and resistance to closure.

Xavier Bray. *The Sacred Made Real. Spanish Painting and Sculpture 1600-1700*. London: National Gallery Press, 2009. 208 pp. \$65. Review by JOSEPH R. JONES, UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY.

Like other conservative Spanish art forms that non-Spanish historians have neglected or, worse, rejected as kitsch, Spain's polychrome wooden religious sculpture is as worthy of serious attention for its beauty, emotional content, and display of exquisite craftsmanship as the colorless marble saints of, say, the Italian Renaissance, which even those who disapprove of religious statuary on principle have been

taught to appreciate. The prejudice against the venerable tradition of painted statuary has also affected otherwise sympathetic art historians, who have been intimidated by taste-makers and have failed to integrate these unique Spanish creations into mainstream European art history. A reevaluation of Spanish (and indeed of pan-Iberian) religious imagery is long overdue. The examples that have miraculously survived the social upheavals that Spain has endured since at least the period of the French Revolution constitute a class of works that merit comparison with the world's finest religious sculpture, like the similar and much-admired German pre-Reformation or Japanese polychrome wooden statuary. Thanks to the work of a large team of experts headed by Xavier Bray of London's National Gallery, English and American art lovers who have never seen supreme examples of this Spanish form had the opportunity during 2009-2010 to study the sculpture—and the paintings which it often inspired—in the neutral atmosphere of two great museums, where the light, background, and isolation of the pieces provided an entirely new way of seeing them. The Ahmanson Foundation, which sponsored the exhibition and the magnificent catalogue, deserves universal gratitude for yet another example of its enlightened philanthropy.

It is the catalogue that is the object of this review. It begins with a list of acknowledgements that reveals how complicated and costly it is to assemble such an exhibition, since the objects borrowed come not just from museums but from religious institutions where the images are still the focus of centuries-old veneration.

Xavier Bray's introductory essay argues that many Spanish painters, like Zurbarán and Velázquez, received training in the decoration of the "hyper-real sculptures" that are the centerpieces of the exhibition and that the visual and emotional impact of these lifelike images had a profound influence on artists who grew up observing them in churches and processions. He believes that careful study of the images taught some of Spain's greatest painters how to depict three-dimensional figures on canvas. Zurbarán's remarkable canvas of "Christ on the Cross," from 1627, is an example of such an "illusionistic masterpiece" based on sculptural concepts. Bray supports his thesis, that the two arts of sculpture and painting fed each other, with convincing photographs of paintings copied from images or, in one remarkable

case, of an image of St. Francis copied from a picture by Zurbarán by Pedro de Mena, who, though one of the brilliant practitioners of the genre, is virtually unknown outside of Spain.

The second essay, by A. Rodríguez G. de Ceballos, continues the theme of the interaction of sculpture and painting. According to the essayist, the popular depiction of the Immaculate Conception so common in Spanish painting was first produced in statuary by Juan Martínez Montañés, the greatest sculptor of his day, around 1606. Rodríguez provides a useful theological and historical context for the other essays in the catalogue with his discussion of the patronage that supported the enormous output of colored wooden imagery. The funding came, as one would expect, from religious institutions and from a small number of wealthy private individuals, though both groups represented only a small percentage of the total population.

Two experts in conservation who work at Washington's National Gallery, Daphne Barbour and Judy Ozone, explain how the artists of Golden Age Spain produced the masterworks on display. Barbour and Ozone use the Gallery's life-size image of St. John of the Cross, attributed to the sculptor Francisco Antonio Gijón and gilder Domingo Mejías, to illustrate the techniques of carving, gilding, painting, and *estofado* (the method that produces the illusion of sumptuous textiles). The 21-year-old Gijón carved and completed his commission in seven weeks, using a team of craftsmen to assemble the complicated figure from separately carved elements (the head, hands, feet, drapery) and to prepare the surfaces with various glues, gesso, fabrics, and bole. The painter or painters and gilder then applied different types of oil-based and egg-tempera paints and gold leaf in a system of collaboration inherited from the practices of medieval guilds.

Pages 74-193 of the catalogue contain detailed analyses of thirty-five individual works, both paintings and sculptures, beginning with Velázquez's portrait of the sculptor Juan Martínez Montañés, several of whose statues were among those on display, particularly the superb St. Francis Borgia. A close-up of the arresting face of this image is on the cover of the catalogue.

Pages 198-205 contain the most up-to-date bibliography on this subject. The tiny number of studies on the sculptures, as opposed to the paintings, in languages other than Spanish illustrates, if it were

necessary, the indifference of art historians to any genre not in the outdated canon from which they and textbook-writers still take their cues.

While the excellent essays and descriptions fill most of the pages, it is the extraordinary illustrations and photography that set this catalogue apart. The diagrams of the stages of the construction of a statue, the x-rays, and the magnified cross sections of paint layers illuminate the explanations of technical matters. The photographers listed on page 208 certainly merit more credit than they receive. The large color photos of the statuary are so fine that the catalogue is worth the price for them alone. No one, after looking at the pictures of these amazing creations, can fail to see why art historians must give them a place of honor in future accounts of Western sculpture.

John A. Marino. *Becoming Neapolitan. Citizen Culture in Baroque Naples*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2011. 342 pp. including illustrations. \$60. Review by R. BURR LITCHFIELD, BROWN UNIVERSITY.

John Marino's well written, carefully researched, and detailed book will be useful for those studying seventeenth-century Baroque festivities in their urban social setting. It contains a discussion of public spectacles (seasonal, civic, religious, and occasional) in Naples in the period of Spanish Hapsburg rule (1503-1700). In this period the city grew in size from 155,000 inhabitants in 1528 to ca. 360,000 before the plague of 1656 to become the largest city in Europe after Paris. The Spanish authorities tried to limit population growth that had led to provisioning problems and urban unrest. Ruled by vice-roys, Naples became the keystone of Spanish influence in Italy, a city of remarkable riches, diversity, and spirit: "the jewel in the Spanish crown" (29). Its festivities were played out in the city streets, which became the stage where different groups asserted their identity and projected their message to this great urban audience. Central elements of cohesion were the five noble "seggi" of the Neapolitan nobility, based in districts with complex membership (which did not include all feudal nobles of the Kingdom), and the one "seggio del popolo"

(which excluded plebeians). The “seggi” had some role in municipal government. A typical procession might begin with troops and trumpets followed by carriages with the Viceroy and Sindaco, great office holders, the feudal nobility grouped by title, the representatives of the “seggi,” the legal “togati” of magistrates, and officials of the Royal palace. Many festivities emphasized symbolically the ancient Greek foundation of Naples, before Rome, and the distance of Neapolitan from Roman culture.

Due to archival damage during World War II records of the “seggi” in the Archivio di Stato no longer exist, but Marino has thoroughly explored other archives and the printed literature of the period: contemporary accounts, guidebooks, almanacs, and memorials of particular occasions. There were many festivities during the year, beginning in September after the hot summer, with the feast of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin, September 8th. Then came St. Januarius (September 19th) who was Naples’ chief patron saint. His preserved blood liquefied on auspicious occasions. He was so important that he had a second feast-day in May. St. Theresa of Avila (who became a patron of Spain) did not have a clear presence, but the Spanish Jesuits of St. Ignatius, who acquired an important church in 1584, became very conspicuous. The festive year continued through the Advent and Christmas seasons to Carnival with its raucous celebration and the Easter season, culminating with the week-long observance for S. Giovanni Battista that centered on his feast-day, June 24th. Some of the festivities were largely secular, such as the welcome given to new viceroys for their three-year terms, which often happened during the S. Giovanni celebration. No Spanish ruler visited Naples after Charles V in 1535, but there were festivities to welcome other foreign princes and great nobles. Some festivities were continuing memorials of significant events, such as the Battle of Lepanto (in October 1571) or the great eruption of Mount Vesuvius (in December 1631).

There was a significant development in the nature of festivities in that the Church after Trent, and the viceroys tended to exert control over earlier more popular celebrations, especially after the week-long plebian Masaniello (Tommaso Aniello) revolt in July 1647, which was set off by imposition of a new tax on fruit. S. Maria Maddalena (whose feast day was in July) gradually fell from prominence while

Corpus Christi rose. The decoration of churches came to assert the new order of Trent. The nobles of the “seggi” became more closely associated with the Viceroy, and they receded from popular involvement into parlor games in their private palaces. Marino provides a good example of the change in festivities through the feast of S. Giovanni Battista. This was very ancient, from the fourth century when a temple of Partenope had been transformed into a church of S. Giovanni. By the sixteenth century S. Giovanni had accumulated a week-long celebration with conspicuous popular involvement: the guilds decorated floats in the procession, there were mountains of free food, and there was nude bathing in the Bay of Naples. There was a confraternity of S. Giovanni and his preserved blood also liquefied. To counteract the “pagan” elements, the Church in the 1560s began to recommend a day of meditation in church, a “Forty Hour Vigil.” To exert their own authority, the Viceroys in the 1580s joined and dominated the procession. Gradually the “popular” elements were muted and the vitality of the feast of S. Giovanni dimmed.

The lesson for “becoming Neapolitan” from this interesting book is that Neapolitan society, as seen through its festivities, was becoming more stratified in the Baroque period. As the author concludes at one point (227), the development of Neapolitan festivities “shows the co-optation of popular celebrations by elite civil and clerical powers ... and eventually exhaustion of any authentic popular participation.” This, with the final enfranchisement of the middle classes in the nineteenth century, was the lasting legacy of Baroque Naples: its plebeians were excluded.

Catherine Gimelli Martin. *Milton Among the Puritans: The Case for Historical Revisionism*. Great Britain: Ashgate, 2010. xvi + 360 pp. + 4 illus. \$99.95. Review by JOHN MULRYAN, ST. BONAVENTURE UNIVERSITY.

This beautifully written, stridently polemical book advances, against the grain of current Milton scholarship, the provocative thesis that Milton was *not* a Puritan. The evidence against Milton as a Puritan is laid out in convincing detail, but the terminology may be daunting for the reader unfamiliar with seventeenth-century Protestant theol-

ogy. For example, Martin assumes that the reader understands the meaning of the following terms describing religious and philosophical groups (presented here in alphabetical order), even though she never defines any of them: Anabaptists, Antinomianists, Arians, Arminians, Baptists, Cambridge Platonists, Comenians, Congregationalists, Erasmianists, Erastians, Fifth Monarchists, Latitudinarians, Levellers, Seekers, Ranters. Sometimes these terms are applied indiscriminately to poets and writers as if the designations were settled and not open to debate. Thus it is problematic to refer to Anglo-Catholics like Lancelot Andrewes and Jeremy Taylor as Arminians; and while Martin does define Calvinism in terms of the total depravity of humankind and the special election of the few, it is difficult to see how the term relates to both John Donne and George Herbert (2, 68, 71), especially in the light of Stanley Stewart's brilliant attacks on the supposed Calvinism of both poets. In another bit of rhetorical overstatement, Martin, citing Milton's *Christian Doctrine* as evidence (*Complete Prose Works* 6: 168-202), attempts to demonstrate Milton's "deep conviction that Calvin's God [the god of the Puritans] was always an intellectually reprehensible construct" (88). The problem is that Calvin is not mentioned in the passage under review; in fact there are no references to any text except the Bible. The passage implicitly endorses the attack of Arminius on Calvin's doctrine of double predestination (some are necessarily saved, the rest necessarily damned), but at one point is actually in agreement with Calvin, that some human beings receive more grace than others: "God claims for himself the right of making decrees about them [human beings] as he thinks fit, without being obliged to give a reason for his decree though he could give a very good one if he wished" (192).

In her introductory remarks, Martin traces the idea of Milton as a Puritan back to the nineteenth-century romantic historian Thomas Carlyle, and the Milton biographer David Masson (himself inspired by Carlyle); their legacy is accepted uncritically by the twentieth-century Marxist historian Christopher Hill (twentieth century). Thus a myth is created that Puritans were at the forefront of republican systems of government, free expression of ideas, scientific inquiry, and modernity in general. According to Martin, nothing could be further from the truth. Most Puritans were credulous about science

(especially heliocentrism), distrusted new ideas, disassociated religion from contemporary political practice, focused attention on the issue of their own salvation without regard for the religious community at large, were intolerant of other religions and religious practices (note “iconophobic attitudes toward almost all symbols and rituals” ([169]), and attempted to monitor the behavior of all people, not just members of their own sect. On this last point, Martin quotes, with sparkling cynicism, Allison Coudert’s point that “the idea of a sacred community enshrined in covenant theology made it essential for everyone to be his brother’s keeper lest one erring individual spoil everyone’s chance at heaven” (193).

As Martin points out, there is no evidence that Milton ever belonged to any Puritan sect, and “he was married and buried according to the rites of the Church of England” (xi). A secondary thesis of the book is that Milton looks to the secular Francis Bacon for his thought, rather than the Calvinist theology of the Puritans. While Puritans eagerly sought evidence of their own election and salvation, Milton followed Bacon in eschewing certitude and adopting “the comparatively cool suspension of judgment” associated with Bacon’s methods (3). Unlike Milton, “Puritans almost universally disparaged the pagan classics, the legends of the Round Table, and nearly all ‘feigned’ romances of the kind Milton admired in Spenser” (92). In Milton’s *Likeliest Means to Remove Hirelings*, Milton reveals his suspicion of the Puritans when he warns against giving too much political power to the Elect (the Puritan “godly”) (203).

Calvinism (the theology of Puritanism) certainly does not encourage speculation about the divine, and Milton’s stated aim of justifying the ways of God to man in *Paradise Lost* would be neither permitted nor encouraged by these sober divines: “. . . even the opening pages of *Paradise Lost* would have upset strict Calvinists who denied any human being the capacity to ‘justify the ways of God to men’ (1.26). From their point of view, Milton’s initial invocation openly challenges the common Calvinist orthodoxy that God’s justice cannot and should not be measured by human understanding” (216).

Finally, Milton was not a Puritan by temperament. While bitterly averse to Roman Catholicism, he was consistently tolerant of any and all Protestant belief systems. As “L’Allegoro,” “Il Penseroso,” and

Comus amply demonstrate, he did not share the Puritans' aversion to physical pleasures, or even external, "Catholic" signs of religious faith like incense, church music, and the dance. In Milton's Eden, human sexuality is designed for physical pleasure as well as for progeny, a view not shared by St. Augustine and his Puritan successors (238). Moreover, Milton's passion for freedom of expression, enshrined for the ages in the immortal words of *Areopagitica*, goes against the grain of Puritan exclusivity and intolerance.

Nor was Puritanism popular among Milton's contemporaries. Jeremy Taylor "rejected Calvin's inscrutable god as a tyrant who damns all but a select few [e.g. the Puritan elect] for Adam's sin" (195). "After the Restoration, Calvinists were increasingly 'convicted' not only of making God responsible for sin but also of depriving humans of independent authority for their actions" (195).

In short, Martin's richly provocative and engaging study confronts the Milton-as-Puritan thesis head on and invites learned responses that will enrich Milton scholarship for ages to come.

NEO-LATIN NEWS

Vol. 59, Nos. 1 & 2. Jointly with SCN. NLN is the official publication of the American Association for Neo-Latin Studies. Edited by Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University; Western European Editor: Gilbert Tournoy, Leuven; Eastern European Editors: Jerzy Axer, Barbara Milewska-Wazbinska, and Katarzyna Tomaszuk, Centre for Studies in the Classical Tradition in Poland and East-Central Europe, University of Warsaw. Founding Editors: James R. Naiden, Southern Oregon University, and J. Max Patrick, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee and Graduate School, New York University.

◆ *Classroom Commentaries: Teaching the Poetria nova across Medieval and Renaissance Europe.* By Marjorie Curry Woods. Text and Context Series, 2. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 2010. xlii + 367 pp. The subject of this book is the *Poetria nova* of Geoffrey of Vinsauf, a 2000-line poem written at the beginning of the thirteenth century that teaches Latin verse composition according to rhetorical principles. It is one of several such works that were written beginning in the last third of the twelfth century: Matthew of Vendôme's *Ars versificatoria*, Geoffrey's *Documentum de modo et arte dictandi et versificandi*, Gervase of Melkley's *Ars versificaria*, John of Garland's *Parisiana poetria*, and Eberhard the German's *Laborintus*. The *Poetria nova* was far more popular than any of these other works, surviving in five times the number of manuscripts as any of the other *artes poetriae*. These treatises have been well known since the publication of Edmond Faral's *Les arts poétiques du XII^e et du XIII^e siècle* (Paris, 1924) and served collectively as the subject of a chapter in James J. Murphy's *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1974), but the sheer popularity of the *Poetria nova* has proved an impediment to the production of the monograph called for by its importance. Woods has solved this problem in the heroic, old-fashioned way, by examining most of the 220 surviving manuscripts herself. The result is the definitive study of the

Poetria nova that has been so eagerly awaited by those who have been following the years of travel and research that Woods has invested in this project.

The importance of this book lies in two areas, as indicated by the title. First Woods has chosen to focus on how the *Poetria nova* was taught rather than what it might mean in some abstract, timeless sense. This is significant because it allows her to engage both with specialists in the history of rhetoric and literary criticism as well as the growing body of research into earlier classroom practices. Work in the history of education has tended to focus on theory over practice, in part because it is easier to generalize from a few treatises that are available in modern critical editions than it is to puzzle over hundreds of pages of handwritten documents that contain the records of actual classroom practices but are notoriously difficult to gain access to and decipher. More work is being done on the level of practice, with, for example, a volume of essays being about to appear on the teaching of the classics in the Middle Ages and Renaissance (see *The Classics in the Medieval and Renaissance Classroom*, ed. J. F. Ruys, J. Ward, and M. Heyworth (Turnhout)). The *Poetria nova* is an excellent model for study from this perspective, since a quarter of the surviving manuscripts contain some glosses and half contain enough notes to show what teachers thought was important and how that material was taught. Rather surprisingly, perhaps, Woods has discovered that this same text was taught to students at all levels, from fairly young pupils near the beginning of their educational careers to university students working at advanced levels. It appears to have been taught at different levels in different areas, and to have been taught differently depending on the level of preparation of the students, but this adaptability accounted in part for the popularity of the text.

The other area of emphasis suggested in the title is the one that will be of more interest to readers of this journal. The *Poetria nova* was composed in the thirteenth century, which means that according to the cultural histories of the humanists, it should have been decisively rejected along with the other products of the despised Middle Ages. Yet the documents tell a different story: the majority of the surviving manuscripts date from the fifteenth century, which suggests that as historians of education like Robert Black have been arguing, there

was greater continuity in classroom practice between the Middle Ages and the Renaissance than the humanist educational theorists were prepared to acknowledge (see *Humanism and Education in Medieval and Renaissance Italy: Tradition and Innovation in Latin Schools from the Twelfth to the Fifteenth Century* (Cambridge, 2001). Italian humanists like Bartholomew of Pisa, Pace of Ferrara, and Gasparino Barzizza admired the *Poetria nova*, and it served as part of the curriculum through the fifteenth century at the universities of Vienna, Krakow, and Erfurt. Eventually when humanism prevailed to the extent that only classical writers became acceptable stylistic models, the *Poetria nova* passed out of popularity. But until then, it allowed early Renaissance teachers to make textual analysis into an advanced discipline. In the end, Cicero came to dominate Latin style in the Renaissance, but Woods has shown us that contrary to what we would have expected, Geoffrey of Vinsauf played a key role as well in the Latin classes of the early Renaissance. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *The Return of Lucretius to Renaissance Florence*. By Alison Brown. I Tatti Studies in Italian Renaissance History. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 2010. xviii + 139 pp. \$35. While Lucretius was seldom read in the Middle Ages, the outline of his recovery in the fifteenth century has long been familiar. Rediscovered by Poggio Bracciolini in 1417, *De rerum natura* was copied in more than fifty manuscripts, then printed, with further contextualization being provided by Diogenes Laertius's biography of Epicurus. The details of this story continue to be filled out—Ada Palmer, for example, is currently drawing from her research on the manuscripts of Lucretius to update the article in the *Catalogus translationum et commentariorum*—but by this point we know a fair amount about how the text of *De rerum natura* re-entered circulation in the Renaissance.

But while we are reasonably well informed about who was reading Lucretius during this period, we know much less about how he was being read and about how he influenced the history of ideas in the Renaissance. Brown has chosen to tackle these questions in a precise, circumscribed way, beginning with the textual work of others and asking what that work might mean in Florence from the 1450s,

when *De rerum natura* began to play an important role in Florentine intellectual life, until 1516-1517, when the work was prohibited in Florentine schools. Her study focuses on three men whose close personal relationships make a shared interest in Lucretius tenable. Bartolomeo Scala developed his early interest in Lucretius along with Marsilio Ficino, but while Ficino renounced his connection to *De rerum natura* after a religious crisis, Scala continued to be attracted to Lucretius throughout his time as chancellor of Florence, drawing from the poem in the frescoes of his urban villa at Borgo Pinto and in a late poem, *De arboribus*. His successor as chancellor of Florence was Marcello Adriani, who also taught for many years at the Florentine Studio and incorporated Lucretian themes into his lectures throughout his career. Adriani's assistant in the chancery was Niccolò Machiavelli, who likewise found Lucretius's unorthodox thinking to be compatible with his own inclinations.

While it is unlikely, as Paul Oskar Kristeller pointed out long ago, that anyone in Renaissance Florence was really an atheist, some people were more pious than others and intellectual systems could be more or less orthodox. In this environment Lucretius was perceived as a real threat, for in attempting to free his readers from the fear of death, he argued that the gods did not interest themselves in human affairs. *De rerum natura* offers an explanation of how chance operated in human affairs that appealed to men like Scala, Adriani, and Machiavelli, but this explanation rested in a materialism that also denied the immortality of the soul. Even Lucretius's explanation of the emergence of civilization was uncomfortable for traditional thinkers, since it unfolds without divine guidance. It is probably no accident that the three men on whom Brown concentrates lived and worked in a secular environment and that they were not considered at the time to be particularly pious.

This is a valuable book, carefully argued and well documented, that can provide a model for other studies on the reception of classical authors among Neo-Latin writers. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Appunti per un corso sull'Odisea*. By Angelo Poliziano. Ed. by Luigi Silvano. *Hellenica*, 37. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso, 2010. CXXIV + 384 pp. 50 euros. Poet, philologist, and teacher, Angelo Poliziano (1454-1494) was one of the most renowned classical scholars of his day, widely recognized as the first man in western Europe whose knowledge of Greek was on the same level as that of the Byzantine émigrés. Poliziano taught rhetoric and poetry at the Florentine Studio from 1480 until his premature death fourteen years later. Each year he devoted one or two courses to the explication of Greek and Latin authors. Over the last forty years a series of publications have made available Poliziano's lecture notes on Ovid, Terence, Statius, Persius, Virgil, and Juvenal along with *recordationes* of his private lessons on Suetonius and other Latin authors (references to these editions can be found in my bibliography on Poliziano in the Renaissance and Reformation series for Oxford Bibliographies Online, to be launched in summer, 2010 and accessible at: <http://oxfordbibliographiesonline.com/subject/id/obo-9780195399301.1>). Poliziano's Greek teaching, however, has been less well served by modern scholarship: his introductory *prolusiones* to Aristotle and Homer have been published in critical editions, but they function more as programmatic statements than records of what actually went on in Poliziano's classroom. Paola Megna recently published an edition of Poliziano's youthful glosses on *Iliad* 2-5 (*Le note del Poliziano alla traduzione dell'Iliade* (Messina, 2009)), but the scholarly path leading to his notes on the *Odyssey* has been less direct. The manuscript in which they are contained, Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Par. gr. 3069, has been known for over a century to contain these notes. The *praelectio* has been discussed by several scholars, Lucia Cesarini Martinelli studied Poliziano's grammatical sources in these lectures (1992), and F. Pontani include transcriptions of some of the notes in his larger study on Greek scholia (2007) (references on p. LX of Silvano's study). It was time, in short, for this edition to appear.

A quick glance at the eight plates between pp. LXIV and LXV suggests why no one has been in a hurry to undertake this project. Unlike with his *prolusiones*, Poliziano did not intend to publish these lectures in this form, nor were they necessarily complete: we can imagine him with these pages on his lectern along with others, from which he drew

as the occasion demanded in the kind of virtuoso performance for which he was famous. Since he alone needed to read these notes, the handwriting is worse than usual, contorted with an irregular ductus and a plethora of abbreviations, such that much of it is difficult to read and some passages have remained indecipherable. Tracing his sources also proved a nightmare, in that Poliziano was drawing from early printed editions that are very difficult to find now and sources in grammar and lexicography that are otherwise unknown. In the face of these difficulties, Silvano has produced a work of formidable erudition. His introduction, of more than 100 pages, provides information on the manuscript and its contents, discussing the structure of the presentation, its originality, its sources, and its style. Five indices offer access to readers looking for particular things: two of *lemmata*, arranged by verse and alphabetically, with others of names and *notabilia*, sources and *loci similes*, and manuscripts and annotated books. The volume concludes with a list of other books in this series, the contents of all the volumes of *Medioevo greco* that have been published to date, and a description of the *acta* in the series Quaderni that derive from conferences held by the Centro internazionale di studi sulla poesia greca e latina in età tardoantica e medievale, reminding us of the contributions to later Greek studies made by Enrico Maltese and by Edizioni dell'Orso, which has established itself as a leading outlet in this field. Congratulations to all concerned. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Annotationes in Novum Testamentum (pars quinta): In epistolam ad Galatas, ad Ephesios, ad Philippenses, ad Colossenses, ad Thessalonicenses 1-2.* By Desiderius Erasmus. Ed. by M. L. van Poll-van de Lisdonk. *Opera omnia*, VI-9. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2009. xii +483 pp. 99.00 euros / \$ 99.00. This is a critical edition of Erasmus's annotations on Paul's epistles to the Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, and Thessalonians. Van Poll-van de Lisdonk also edited the previous volume of the same 'ordo' of the Amsterdam edition of Erasmus's *Opera Omnia*, namely, ASD VI-8, his annotations on his two epistles to the Corinthians.

Five editions of Erasmus's annotations were published during his lifetime, beginning with the one printed in Basel by Froben in 1516, followed by four subsequent revised and expanded editions (Basel 1519, 1522, 1527, and 1535). The editor uses the 1535 edition as the base text and has placed variant readings from the earlier editions in the textual apparatus. The book begins with an introduction (in German) by the editor, followed by the edition itself (accompanied by the textual apparatus and the editor's annotations, also in German), a list of abbreviations, and an index of names.

In the introduction the editor mentions some of Erasmus's notable annotations that appear in this volume. For example, in his note to Eph. 5:32, Erasmus denies that the verse proves that matrimony was one of the seven sacraments; at Phil. 2:6, he defends his substitution of the Vulgate's translation *Esse aequalem Deo* with *ut esset aequaliter Deo* against his critics, who interpreted the change as proof of Arianism; thirdly, as he did in his annotation to 1 Cor. 7:8, Erasmus continued to insist that Paul was married, using Phil. 4:3 as proof; finally, in his annotation to 1 Thess. 2:7, Erasmus oddly inserts a quasi-panegyric to his patron, William Warham, which, however, was removed from the 1535 edition.

This edition continues the superb quality of scholarship demonstrated in the previous ASD volumes. Scholars not comfortable working with the Latin and Greek of Erasmus's annotations are, for the time being, out of luck, since the English translation in CWE is not yet available. The closest is CWE 43, which is a translation of his paraphrases on the same Pauline epistles. (Milton Kooistra, University of Toronto)

◆ *Jacques Lefèvre D'Etaples and The Three Maries Debates: Introduction, Latin Text, English Translation and Annotation*. Ed. by Sheila M. Porrer. *Travaux d'Humanisme et Renaissance*, 451. Geneva: Droz, 2009. 520 pp. \$219.00. This volume makes available for the first time an edited Latin text and a translation of the four pamphlets published by Jacques Lefèvre d'Etaples (ca. 1460-1536) during the so-called "Three Maries" controversy, an exegetical debate which was launched by the French humanist in 1517 and drew in authors as significant as

the Sorbonne theologian Josse Clichtove (*ca.* 1473-1543), the bishop of Rochester, John Fisher (1469-1535), and the future leader of the conservative faction within the theology faculty, Noel Beda (*ca.* 1470-1537). The book also includes a substantial introduction (137 pages) which details the context and content of—as well as the reactions to—each pamphlet.

It was after a decade of rising anxiety towards humanist exegesis in Paris that Lefèvre challenged three widely accepted church traditions: the belief that the forgiven sinner of Luke 7:36-50, the sister of Martha and Lazarus (Jn. 11:1-2), and the woman from whom seven evils were cast out were the same Mary of Magdalen (Lk. 8:2, Jn. 20:1-18); the popular tradition by which the Virgin Mary had two half-sisters, her mother St. Anne having married three times; and the conventional explanation of the *triduum* (Christ's three days in the tomb) by synecdoche, according to which it was understood that Jesus rose from the dead on the third day since the part (here of a day or night) may be taken to signify the whole. Although the immediate occasion of Lefèvre's first pamphlet was a request by Louise de Savoie, Porrer suggests that the debate was in the air at that particular time for three reasons. First, she notes the general desire for reconciliation with the Greek Church which had come to a head both with the Council of Florence (1438-1442) and the Lateran Council (1512-1517). The Orthodox liturgy, however, had never recognized the amalgam of the three women as Mary Magdalen. A second reason was the resurgence of interest in the Greek and Latin Fathers, several of whom did not identify the three women as one and the same. Finally, the Magdalen problem fit well into the context of the desire for liturgical reform which was prevalent in the second decade of the sixteenth century. By defending the existence of three different Mariés, Lefèvre was also seeking to separate Mary of Bethany from the association with prostitution which dominated her popular personality, and thus to purify the cult of the saints.

In her successive analyses of each edition of the four pamphlets, Porrer not only carefully describes the origin and importance of the popular traditions which Lefèvre was questioning, but also examines the development of the argument in each pamphlet, noting Lefèvre's appeal to Scripture, to the church fathers, or to what he calls the "true

spiritual sense” of Scripture. The last two parts of the introduction discuss the wider debate and, in particular, the two most substantial responses defending the single Magdalen view which were published in 1519 by John Fisher and Noel Beda. While Fisher was mainly concerned with the effects of the debate on public worship from a pastoral point of view, Beda, as a professional theologian suspicious of the new learning, was preoccupied more directly with maintaining orthodoxy.

Porrer’s presentation of the Three Maries Debates constitutes a precious contribution to the history of French humanist exegesis and the early years of the Reformation. Of particular help is her detailed introduction, in which she successfully shows that the Three Maries controversy was in many ways representative of the burning issues of its time, and in particular the question of authority. As Porrer notes, while a major issue at stake in the debate was the authority of the scholars of the new learning to discuss Scripture, patristic tradition, and Church practice, several participants also investigated the relationship between Scripture, Church, Council, and Pope, thus echoing the debate begun between Luther and Rome at the same period. This careful introduction, supplementing a flowing translation and helpful annotations of the Latin text, makes this volume a valuable source and resource for historians of the early years of the Reformation. (Monique Cuany, Deerfield, IL)

◆ *Renaissance Syntax and Subjectivity: Ideological Contents of Latin and the Vernacular in Scottish Prose Chronicles*. By John C. Leeds. Farnham, UK and Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing, 2010. xiii + 232 pp. \$99.95. John Leeds has set himself an ambitious goal, to defend “humanist essentialism” through detailed analysis of and reflections on sixteenth-century Scottish texts written in Latin and in Scots. For Leeds, humanist essentialism is the belief that ideas have objective reality, that ideas are in being as well as in thought. Leeds contrasts humanist essentialism with the (to him) odious belief that human beings only inhabit arbitrary sign-systems, outside of which we cannot act, that reality is simply a construct of our language. Because of his defense of essentialism, Leeds’s book is as much a philosophical as

a philological study.

In each of his four relatively independent chapters, Leeds selects several Latin and Scots passages which deal with the same topic, and indeed are often by the same author writing in the two different languages. After a sentence-by-sentence comparison, Leeds outlines the fundamental syntactic, and hence philosophical, differences between the passages. He then proceeds to cite philosophers from the sixteenth to the twentieth centuries, with special attention to Hegel, in support of his conclusions. The discussions range widely, from scholastic nominalism, the causes of the Scottish reformation, and Roman agriculture to Marxism and Saussure's linguistic theories.

The titles of the four chapters indicate the topic. In chapter 1 ("Sleeping Beauty: Accusative Case, Passive Voice, and the Subject of Production") Leeds selects several passages from Hector Boece's *Scotorum historiae* and the translations of these same passages by John Bellenden, *The Chronicles of Scotland*. He shows how the "dialectic of bondage," that is active and passive agents, were encoded in the Latin and the Scots texts. In the Latin the active agent is not always in the nominative, but in the vernacular this "categorical mismatch" is resolved and the active agent is almost always the subject of the sentence, even if the sentence then must be passive in construction.

Chapter 2 ("Against the Vernacular: Ciceronian Formalism and the Problem of the Individual") concerns humanist education and the rise of Ciceronianism. Leeds compares a passage from Livy and Bellenden's Scots translation of the same passage. Of more interest is Leeds's comparison of parallel passages from John Knox's *History of the Reformation in Scotland* and Buchanan's *Rerum Scoticarum historia*. He makes the point that the difference in emphasis of the two parallel narratives is governed by the different syntactic structures of the two languages: the Scots narrative posits the subject first and organizes each sentence around one individual, with others functioning as objects of that individual. In contrast, the Latin narrative uses a variety of devices for separating the subject and verb, for distributing the activity among several actors, and it assigns different grammatical functions to the same person, often in the same sentence.

Chapter 3 ("From the Ground Up: Matter, Spirit, and the Linguistic Sign in John Lesley's Chronicles of Stewart Scotland") addresses

metaphor in Latin, contrasting the language in Lesley's Scots *History* (1571) and the same author's Latin *De origine* (1578). The former is functional and shows a minimum of rhetoric. The Latin, however, is full of metaphor. Leeds cites words like *effluxere*, *maculae*, *incensi*, and *diffluerent* to point out the pervasive agricultural metaphors which are part of the Latin language; many words refer both to agricultural operations and to political and social affairs. Like the word "cultivation" in English, these metaphors point both up and down, to use Leeds's phrase.

Chapter 4 ("*Corpus Mysticum*: The Status of Universals in John Mair's *Chronicle of Greater Britain*") discusses medieval nominalism, as defined by Ockham, in John Mair's (or Major's) *Historia Maioris Britanniae* (1521). Nominalism, as used here, means that only objects exist and that any generalization (the concept of a species "cat," in contrast with the animal now sitting in my lap) exists only in the mind, and that these generalizations are only names. Leeds shows that Mair was far from a strict nominalist and points out the Aristotelian universals that pervade Mair's work, especially the concept of *corpus mysticum*, meaning (in Mair) the corporate collective of king and people.

This book is especially valuable for its inclusion of long passages from little-read Latin and Scots texts. Leeds gives the reader some help with the Scots texts, which are readable with some difficulty. Most of the Latin texts are translated in the comments. On the surface, this book is for any interested reader, but despite Leeds's hopeless attempts to briefly explain Latin grammar to his audience, only those fairly fluent in Latin will benefit. (Mark Riley, California State University, Sacramento (Emeritus))

◆ *Juvenilia: édition critique, traduction, annotation et commentaire*. By Marc-Antoine Muret. Ed. by Virginie Leroux. Geneva: Droz, 2009. In 1552 Marc-Antoine Muret published his *Juvenilia*, a collection carefully designed to demonstrate the young scholar's virtuoso facility in a range of poetic genres in Latin and to serve as an intervention in wider literary and scholarly debates. The book under review, a revision of the author's doctoral thesis, is no mere critical edition; it also includes a huge amount of paratextual material, the bulk of it in the

‘commentaire littéraire,’ which covers 230 pages and is essentially a collection of seven essays on aspects of text and genre. Covering each of the collections that make up the *Juvenilia*, Leroux examines Muret’s sources and theoretical models and explores the context of composition and publication. Much of the analysis focuses explicitly on questions of genre, and a great deal of thought goes into making formal and thematic distinctions between the different genres. Undoubtedly this was a major concern to Muret himself, as the analysis convincingly demonstrates. The liminary texts strategically positioned Muret’s poems as part of a wider debate about literary genre and aligned his project with that of the Pléiade in the vernacular. Muret wanted his poems to actively define an aesthetic ideal; his approach to imitation was governed by principles of *variatio* and what Leroux terms an ‘esthétique de l’échantillon.’ The collection as a whole is read as a series of attempts on Muret’s part to integrate his poetic vision into a range of properly classical forms.

Muret’s poetry is intimately linked to his scholarship, and Leroux’s analysis brings out intriguing parallels between the *Juvenilia* and his scholarly *œuvre*. His poems combine theoretical reflections on genre with a pedagogue’s interest in the workings of language. Muret’s strong sense of code and genre convention comes through especially in ‘programmatic’ poems, which frequently read as reflections on genre itself. This is particularly evident in those poetic genres that inherently lend themselves to metapoetic reflections on their own conventions, such as the elegy, epigram, and epistle. Leroux highlights this aspect of the text in (for example) her readings of Muret’s elegiac compositions in the context of his scholarly interest in the Roman elegists, as well as his enthusiastic promotion of new kinds of love poetry in the vernacular.

It is clear that Leroux’s primary interest is in questions of genre, and if the approach sometimes risks being overly formal and schematic (not to say glutted with detail), it also has the virtue of illuminating the context of composition and reception, for example in demonstrating how Muret exploits *topoi* to polemical ends, as interventions in wider literary debates. Much of the analysis focuses on Muret’s motivations to construct and be part of a literary community and the ways his poems engage with a wider literary polemic: the poems of the *Juvenilia*

are presented as the ‘Latin counterpart’ to the Pléiade project.

But genre is not the exclusive focus of this edition, and there is a wealth of other material here. An introduction gives an account of Muret’s biography, the more lurid details passed over in favour of a careful tabulation and evaluation of the facts available in the existing chronologies. This, in common with the rest of the book, is researched with great diligence and well supported with reference to recent scholarship. There is a thorough analysis of Muret’s tragedy *Iulius Caesar*, the most important and influential of the works collected in the *Juvenilia* (omitted from Summers’s recent edition of the *Juvenilia*). In it Muret engaged both with the contemporary theoretical discourse on tragedy and with classical models (chief among which was Seneca’s *Hercules on Oeta*) in an ultimately ambiguous exploration of ethical and political questions.

The edition accurately reproduces the text of the *editio princeps* of 1552-1553 (retaining the original punctuation and orthography) and provides a thorough *apparatus criticus*. The facing-page French translation is readable and precise. The detailed footnotes to the text, which supply information on people, literary allusions, and contextual glosses, are usefully cross-referenced to the fuller analysis in the ‘commentaire.’ An *apparatus fontium* at the foot of each page lists Muret’s sources, evidently the fruit of great effort and erudition—a handy resource. A potentially overwhelming mass of information is thus presented in a quite coherent and engaging manner. Leroux has performed a great service to scholars in preparing such a thorough, richly detailed edition of this important text. (Paul White, Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge)

◆ *Mithridates*. By Conrad Gessner. Introduction and French translation by Bernard Colombat and Manfred Peters. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 2009. Conrad Gessner’s *Mithridates* (1555) is one of the smaller works of the Swiss polymath (1516-1565), perhaps better known for his encyclopedic *Pandectae* (1549), his *Historia plantarum* (1541), and his *Historia animalium* (1551-1558). The present work is a compendium on linguistics, from Abyssinian to Zagovane. Gessner describes every language he can find out anything about, attempting

to determine their relationships and giving sample texts (usually a version of the “Lord’s Prayer”). While not all the linguistic facts and methods in the book have stood the test of time, as a document of the state of the art in comparative linguistics in 1555, it is fascinating to read.

Colombat and Peters have supplied a useful introduction, a densely annotated translation, and indices. The introduction, at eighty pages almost a monograph of its own, begins with a brief biographical sketch, followed by an overview of Gessner’s other works. Next the authors analyze the structure of *Mithridates* and its relationship with the linguistic ideas of its time. In particular, it was widely believed that Hebrew was the original language, parent of all others, and that there were exactly seventy-two languages in the world, not counting dialect variations (22-23). Gessner’s definition of “dialect” comes from Clement of Alexandria: *est autem dialectus dictio peculiarem alicuius loci notam seu characterem prae se ferens* (1v; I follow the editors in citing Gessner’s text by leaf of the 1555 edition) and later *nos dialectum alias simpliciter sermonem sive orationem articulatam significare observavimus* (2r, discussion 30-32). Examples are the several dialects of classical Greek, though Gessner treats Koine, the language of the New Testament, as the best and purest form of the language and refers to the others as *vulgares dialecti* (46r and 203 note 12).

The introduction goes on to consider Gessner’s treatment of several specific languages: the Slavic family (42-44), Arabic (60-64), Hebrew (64-67), and Icelandic (67-71). There is also an extensive discussion of Gessner’s sources and how he used them. In addition to ancient writers like Tacitus (for Germany), Herodotus, and Strabo, Gessner cites his own contemporaries who have written on ethnography or language. Prominent among these are Johannes Aventinus (*Annales Botorum*), Sebastian Münster (*Cosmographia universalis* and other works), and Henrichus Glareanus (commentary on Caesar). Colombat and Peters catalogue the citations by frequency and length; by their figures (74 and figure 1), some 47% of the book consists of quotations, 11% of text samples in the languages under study, and only 42% of Gessner’s own words. Gessner does not always make it clear where his quotations, translations, or paraphrases begin and end, although he generally does give his source’s name. Colombat and Peters have

marked all the quotations and given precise references, including determining, where possible, which edition of a work Gessner was using.

The book closes with six indices: languages, places, peoples, sources cited, other people named in the text, and the words and passages given as samples. The translation is clear and precise, relatively literal by deliberate choice (91). The typography is complicated but faithfully reproduces the punctuation and sectioning of the 1555 edition, although the modern editors have added some additional paragraph breaks. Very long quotations are marked with a vertical bar in the margin. Footnotes are conveniently marked in both the Latin text and the translation. They flesh out Gessner's internal references (for example, if he just writes *supra*, the note gives a page reference), give the original text of sources Gessner paraphrases, comment on his etymologies with references to standard modern works, correct his notions of linguistic relations (Persian, for example, is no longer considered a dialect of Turkish, 63r, 246), and so on.

Readers may not learn much about language from Gessner's work, but it is a seminal document in the history of linguistics, and this new critical edition makes it available to a broad audience. (Anne Mahoney, Tufts University)

◆ *Hart voor Leiden. Jan van Hout (1542-1609), stadssecretaris, dichter en vernieuwer.* By Karel Bostoën. Zeven Provinciënreeks, 28. Hilversum: Uitgeverij Verloren, 2009. 128 pp. 14 euros. *Het Vruntbuuc van Jan van Hout. Facsimile-uitgave van het album amicorum van Jan van Hout (Leiden, Stedelijk Museum De Lakenhal, nr. 3385) met inleiding, vertaling en toelichting.* By Chris L. Heesakkers. Leiden: Ginkgo, 2009. 245 pp. 39.50 euros. On 11 December 2009 the city of Leiden celebrated the four hundredth anniversary of the death of one of its most famous citizens: Jan van Hout (1542-1609), secretary to the town of Leiden and to the governing body of the newly founded university, a Dutch poet himself and an administrator with modern ideas about social welfare. In order to commemorate this day Karel Bostoën was asked by the Jan van Hout Society to produce a new biography of this prominent civil servant, while the transcription of and commentary on Van Hout's *liber amicorum* (= *Vruntbuuc*) was entrusted to the Nestor

of Neo-Latin Studies in the Low Countries, Chris L. Heesakkers.

The structure of the new biography by Bostoën is based mainly upon elements contained in the last will of Jan van Hout, written down in 1606, completed with newly discovered archival materials. It furthermore owes a lot to the dissertation presented at the University of Leiden in 1998 by Johan Koppenol, *Leids heelal: het loterijspel (1596) van Jan van Hout* (Hilversum, 1998). The author pays particular attention to the Catholic upbringing of the poet and his early sexual activities, to his sudden marriage (in 1561), and to the hitherto neglected relationship between Jan van Hout and his father-in-law, who was a prominent citizen of Zoutleeuw (Brabant) and who was also active in literary circles. He elaborates on the affair leading to the dismissal on 9 May 1578 of Hermann Rennecher, Professor of Hebrew, at the University of Leiden, and on the contributions to the *liber amicorum* (in Latin and in Dutch) of Jan van Hout.

It was most probably the example of his friend Janus Dousa which induced Jan van Hout to start an album of his own, but his enthusiasm was of short duration: in a period of five and a half years he gathered no more than twenty-seven contributions. Only five are in Dutch; Latin is used exclusively in ten, while the other ones have a combination of several languages (Dutch, Latin, Greek, French). All these contributions are transcribed, translated, and annotated in an exemplary way by Heesakkers, as he had done before for the *album amicorum* of Janus Dousa: *Een netwerk aan de basis van de Leidse universiteit. Het album amicorum van Janus Dousa. Facsimile-uitgave van hs. Leiden UB, BPL 1406 met inleiding, transcriptie, vertaling en toelichting*, 2 vols. (Leiden, 2000).

Still, a few mistakes and misinterpretations mar this otherwise nicely produced volume. A few examples only: in the introduction (15), it is said that Jan van Hout started his *album* on 10 February 1578, but in the modern Dutch translation of Van Hout's own contribution appears, erroneously, the date 1574 (125). On 139, read *epigramma fusum et cusum* instead of *fusum et usum*. On 143, Heesakkers corrected *gravistellus* to *gravastellus* in the poem by the spendthrift Utrecht canon and Neo-Latin poet Philippus Morus (†1578), arguing on 144 that *gravistellus* does not appear either in classical Latin or in the Neo-Latin dictionary by Hoven, or in the *Neulateinische Wortliste* by Ramminger,

and hence could be a neologism or, more simply, a slip of the pen. That statement might be right: it is indeed *gravastellus* which is read nowadays in all critical editions of Plautus (*Epidicus*, 620), and even in the *apparatus criticus* there is no trace of *gravistellus*. The editor did not, however, take into account that *gravastellus* (gray-headed fellow) is contradicted by a poem by Janus Dousa, entitled *De Rufo*, and even by l. 10 of the poem under discussion, where *purpurei mei Hermanni* also alludes to the red colour of his hair. Furthermore, the term *gravistellus*, indicating a corpulent and imposing figure of a man, is present in all the best sixteenth-century editions of Plautus, including the ones by J. Camerarius (Basel, 1552 and 1558), Johannes Sambucus (Antwerp, 1566), Denis Lambin (Paris, 1576), and even Janus Dousa himself (Leiden 1589). In that same poem the following passage occurs:

Nam qui minus liceret id mihi, nempe
 Amore capto purpurei mei Hermanni,
 Apollinem quod facere non puduit ipsum?
 Quem percitum olim amore regis Admeti
 Aetas vetusta bubulcitarier vidit.

The editor refers here to Hyginus, 49 and explains that Apollo became friends with Admetus and helped him to obtain Alcestis's love. This explanation, unfortunately, is not to the point: the author here refers to the homoerotic love of Apollo for Admetus, which already during the Alexandrian period became the principal motif for Apollo's stay with a mortal and his acting as a herdsman. See my "Apollo and Admetus: The Forms of a Classical Myth through the Middle Ages and the Renaissance," in *Forms of the "Medieval" in the "Renaissance": A Multidisciplinary Exploration of a Cultural Continuum*, ed. George Hugo Tucker (Charlottesville, 2000), 175-203. (G. Tournoy, Catholic University of Leuven)

◆ *L'autobiographie d'Athanasius Kircher. L'écriture d'un jésuite entre vérité et invention au seuil de l'oeuvre. Introduction et traduction française et italienne.* By Giunia Totaro. Bern: Peter Lang, 2009. xiv + 430 pp., illus. \$101.95. Athanasius Kircher's autobiography has long been an enigmatic point of reference in the study of the seventeenth-century Jesuit polymath. Very few copies of Kircher's printed *Vita* survive—Totaro

has identified sixteen, along with six manuscript versions, making it a difficult text to consult. Giunia Totaro has remedied this problem by providing us with a critical edition of the Latin text, accompanied by French and Italian translations and a lengthy introduction. This publication is based on her doctoral dissertation at the Université de Caen Basse-Normandie.

Totaro's introduction has several goals. She examines the ever-growing corpus of Kircher scholarship, especially the work of the past few decades. She discusses all the extant copies of Kircher's *Vita* and reconstructs his relationship with Hieronymus Langenmantel, who facilitated its publication. Finally, she compares key episodes in Kircher's autobiography with other documentation of his life and work to resolve a number of uncertain points—including the date of his birth or the year of his arrival in Rome—and to clarify the choices Kircher made in the composition of his autobiography as a reconstruction of the principal episodes of his life. As Totaro rightfully observes, the *Vita* allows us to understand who Kircher wanted to be in relation to who he actually was. We see the long gestation of his work culminating in the *Oedipus Aegyptiacus*, the virtual absence of any discussion of his equally bulky contributions to the science of magnetism or his much discussed *Mundus subterraneus*, and the omnipresence of his devotion to the shrine at Mentorella, where his heart remains. Totaro is to be commended for her careful reconstruction of Kircher's self-presentation and her insistence on its role in arriving at a better understanding of this fascinating Jesuit.

For all these reasons, Totaro's study of Kircher's autobiography and her richly annotated presentation of the Latin text with translations is a most welcome contribution to recent work on Kircher. Given the value of her critical edition of the *Vita*, it is unfortunate that she partially framed her project as a critique of the work of many scholars who preceded her. Rather than rehashing the specifics, I will simply say that I found a number of her comments ungenerous, some of them doubtful in their conclusions (or put a different way, a declaration of victory in subjects that have been full of ambiguity), and especially uncharitable towards the work of another young scholar whose research she relies on extensively. To some degree, Totaro seems to feel that Anglo-American scholars insufficiently appreciate the

work of their European counterparts—although the rich, multi-lingual bibliography on Kircher and the international nature of a number of collaborative publications in various languages, including Italian, German, and English, does not support this view—and potentially do not read original sources well. I suspect that it is a feature of a relatively unrevised dissertation in which the author is rightfully proud of the discoveries her patient detective work has yielded, perhaps forgetting for a moment that we all stand on a number of shoulders to arrive at our conclusions, knowing that the next generation will revisit and revise them as well. Any scholar interested in Kircher will nonetheless want to own a copy of this book, and scholars interested in Neo-Latin autobiographical writing will welcome this carefully prepared critical edition, which has the additional virtue of making the text accessible to readers in two modern languages. (Paula Findlen, Stanford University)

◆ *The Neo-Latin Epigram: A Learned and Witty Genre*. Ed. by Susanna de Beer, Karl A. E. Enenkel, and David Rijser. *Supplementa Humanistica Lovaniensia*, 25. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2009. vi + 350 pages. 59.50 euros. The essays in this volume originated as papers from the conference on “The Neo-Latin Epigram. Towards the Definition of a Genre,” held at the Royal Netherlands Institute in Rome in April, 2006. As one would expect from the theme of the conference, the question of generic definition runs throughout the volume, beginning with the introduction, “The Neo-Latin Epigram: Humanist Self-Definition in a Learned and Witty Discourse,” by one of the editors, Karl A. E. Enenkel. There is no question that the epigram was one of the central genres in Neo-Latin literature, attracting such poetic luminaries as Jacopo Sannazaro, Michele Marullo, Giovanni Pontano, Angelo Poliziano, Conrad Celtis, Thomas More, Ulrich van Hutten, George Buchanan, and Hugo Grotius. Yet surprisingly, there is considerable confusion about what, precisely, the epigram is. An American Supreme Court justice once exclaimed that one of the problems with obscenity is that everyone knows it when they see it, but no one can actually define it. There is a similar problem here, which the authors of these essays confront courageously, head-on.

Enenkel explains in his introduction that, while post-romantic aesthetics and modern hermeneutics can offer some interesting things to say about the Neo-Latin epigram, they should be supplemented by what was said in Renaissance and Baroque poetics. He does this by starting with two modern efforts to define the epigram, those of Peter Hess (*Epigramm* (Stuttgart, 1989)) and Marion Lausberg (*Das Einzeldistichon. Studien zum antiken Epigramm* (Munich, 1982)), integrating his critique of these theories with observations from the chapter on the epigram (III, 126) in Julius Caesar Scaliger's *Poetices libri septem* (1561) and Matthaeus Rader's *De epigrammate* (1601) and offering his own observations on the problem. Enenkel argues that at the core of the epigrammatic enterprise is an effort to create a set of shared values between writer and reader, one that relies on wit and understatement. The importance of wit is stressed in two essays in this volume: Susanna de Beer, "The *Pointierung* of Giannantonio Campano's Epigrams: Theory and Practice," and Johannes Jansen, "The Microcosmos of the Baroque Epigram: John Owen and Julien Waudré." Hess argues that epigrams should refer to a certain material object, and some certainly do, as is confirmed by David Rijser in "The Practical Function of High Renaissance Epigram: The Case of Raphael's Grave," Maarten Jansen in "*Epigramma cultum* and the *Anthologia Palatina*: Case Studies from Michael Marullus' *Epigrammata*," and Moniek van Oosterhout, "Hugo Grotius and the Epigram." Two common epigrammatic themes, love and hate, however, often do not have this material connection, as becomes clear in Christoph Pieper's essay, "Genre Negotiations: Cristoforo Landino's *Xandra* Between Elegy and Epigram." It is often said that the title is an important part of the epigram, but de Beer's essay on Campano suggests that many poems either lack titles or pick them up from someone other than the author. Verse is indeed the usual medium, as Hess suggested, but other parts of his definition appear to be more problematic, such as the claim that the epigram is restricted to one topic or that it is not connected to other poems in a series. A couple of Scaliger's observations—that the genre is unusually flexible and that its brevity is qualified by the complexity of the topic it treats—are valuable and proved very influential, as Jan Bloemendal shows in "The Epigram in Early Modern Literary Theory: Vossius's *Poeticae Institutiones*."

Other essays approach the question of definition from different angles. In “*Versus ex variis locis deducti*. On Ancient Collections of Epigrams,” Stephan Busch goes to the ancient sources, while in “Janus Lascaris and the Greek Anthology,” Marc D. Lauxtermann looks at how Lascaris’s edition of the Planudean Anthology straddles two worlds, that of Byzantium and that of Renaissance Italy. In “The Comic and the Obscene in the Latin Epigrams of the Early Fifteenth Century,” Donatella Coppini focuses on Panormita’s *Hermaphroditus* as a groundbreaking generic model whose brand of comic obscenity carried over into the next several generations of Neo-Latin epigrammatists. Han Lamers follows up on this claim in “Marullo’s Imitations of Catullus in the Context of His Poetical Criticism,” where he shows that in his criticism of Martial and his imitations of Catullus, Marullo challenges the obscenity of Panormita, proposing instead a more chaste and modest poetics that stresses the emotional complexities of love. In “Incisività sublime: l’arte epigrammatica di Aurelio Orsi nel giudizio di Giambattista Marino,” Tobias Leuker used Marino’s *La galleria* (1619) to draw attention to a little-known Neo-Latin epigrammatist, Aurelio Orsi. The important role played by the epigram in the humanist educational activities of Joannes Murmellius is the subject of Juliette A. Groenland’s essay, “Epigrams Teaching Humanist Lessons: The Pointed Poems and Poetics of the Latin School teacher Joannes Murmellius (c. 1480-1517).” Finally, in “Angelo Colocci’s Collections of Epigrams,” Ingrid D. Rowland focuses on the most important compiler of verse in early sixteenth-century Rome, a man who also composed epigrams himself that run the full gamut of themes and emotions.

So what, in the end, is the Neo-Latin epigram? I think it is only fair to give the last word here to the indefatigable Karl Enenkel, whose work in preparing this conference and introducing its proceedings leads to this: “The epigram is a refined and extremely artistic genre of early modern poetry that largely depends on various kinds of learned wit. This may be connected with the reception of classical antiquity, intertextuality, a superior mastering of the Latin language, a constant sidestepping between various forms of learning and scholarship, attitudes, perceptions, between emotional and rational approaches, social settings, and, not in the least, various segments of human life.

Moreover, the various strategies of *argutia* offer a powerful potential for humanist self-presentation and -definition” (22). (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *History of Venice*. Vol. 3, Books IX-XII. By Pietro Bembo. Ed. and trans. by Robert W. Ulery, Jr. The I Tatti Renaissance Library, 37. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009. xii + 396 pp. *The Hermaphrodite*. By Antonio Beccadelli. Ed. and trans. by Holt Parker. The I Tatti Renaissance Library, 42. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2010. xlvi + 299 pp. *Humanist Tragedies*. Trans. by Gary R. Grund. The I Tatti Renaissance Library, 45. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2011. xliv + 399 pp. \$29.95. The three volumes under review here represent the riches and variety that continue to pour forth in The I Tatti Renaissance Library. Ulery’s *History of Venice* is the third and final volume of a series that began in 2007. Pietro Bembo (1470-1547) is well known for his writings on love and on the Italian vernacular, but he was also appointed official historian of Venice in 1529 and composed his account of the events covering the years from 1487 to 1513. Internal politics and events are considered, but much of the interest of Bembo’s history lies in its account of Venice’s interactions with the other European states and with the Turks. This edition is the first to contain an English translation and appears at a timely moment, just before Professor Ulery’s retirement from Wake Forest University.

The Hermaphrodite is one of the most scandalous books in the entire Neo-Latin corpus, a collection of poems whose obscenity even led one modern historian to mark it as the first step down the path towards the revolutions of the late eighteenth century. The author was Antonio Beccadelli (1394-1471), often called Panormita from the Latin name for his birthplace, Palermo. Beccadelli himself was of two minds about the work. On the one hand, it functioned as a sort of professional credential for him as he moved about in search of work, from Duke Filippo Maria Visconti in Milan to the University of Pavia to, eventually, the Aragonese court at Naples, where he presided over a stable of humanists, founded the Academia Neapolitana, and served both Alfonso V and his son Ferdinand I. But the poem also

got him embroiled in a series of polemics, with Antonio da Rho, Pier Candido Decembrio, and Lorenzo Valla, leading Beccadelli eventually to write a recantation of his dedication to Cosimo de' Medici. Parker's edition includes much of this polemical material along with the text and translation of *The Hermaphrodite*, along with an unusually full set of textual notes.

Grund's *Humanist Tragedies* is a different sort of work, containing five tragedies in the Senecan tradition written between 1314 and 1493. Senecan tragedy was effectively rediscovered by the Paduan pre-humanist Lovato dei Lovati, so it is not surprising that the earliest of these plays, which predates Petrarch's pioneering humanistic work, was written by one of Lovato's pupils, Albertino Mussato. Mussato's *Ecerinis* depicts episodes in the career of Ezzelino III da Romano, a lieutenant of Emperor Frederick II who terrorized Padua, but the play was actually a thinly disguised portrait of a contemporary Veronese tyrant, Cangrande della Scala. The *Achilles* (1387) of Antonio Loschi likewise comes from the Veneto, but Loschi turned to the Trojan War for the subject of his play. On one level the *Achilles* draws from pseudo-Dares's *De excidio Troiae historia*, but it also continues the rhetorical bombast, *sententiae*, emotional overreaching, and acts of unspeakable horror that comprise the Senecan heritage in drama. The author of the *Progne* (ca. 1429), Gregorio Correr, came from a noble Venetian family and continued the lurid sensationalism of neo-Senecan tragedy from the Veneto, this time incorporating a story from Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. Leonardo Dati's *Hiempsal* (ca. 1442) went off in a different direction, relying on allegory and presenting a significant moral overlay, while Marcellino Verardi's *Fernandus Servatus* (1493) uses an unsuccessful assassination attempt on Ferdinand II of Aragon, king of Spain, to present one of the earliest experiments in tragicomedy, a genre that would flourish in the next century with Giraldis Cinthio and Guarini.

All in all, three very different volumes, but all done to the high standard of excellence we have come to expect from the I Tatti Renaissance Library. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Budapestinensis: Proceedings of the Thirteenth International Congress of Neo-Latin Studies (Budapest, 2006)*. General editor, Rhoda Schnur. Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 386. Tempe, AZ: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2010. xxxiv + 865 pp. \$95. Here, almost a year and a half late, are the proceedings of the Budapest congress of the International Association for Neo-Latin Studies, the major professional organization for scholars working in this area. Like its predecessors, this volume begins with a brief presidential address by Jean-Louis Charlet, followed by the five plenary papers, one in each of the five official languages of the IANLS: Joaquín Pascual Barea, “Los certámenes de poesía latina en la España del Renacimiento”; Amedeo di Francesco, “La poesia neolatina ungherese fra tradizione e innovazione”; Karl A. E. Enekel, “Die neulateinische Autobiographik: ein Versuch zur Methode ihrer Interpretation”; Outi Merisalo, “*Sapere aude*: The Book as a Vehicle of Classical Culture in Northern Europe in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries”; and Colette Nativel, “La lexique artistique moderne: quelques sources néo-latines.”

The rest of the volume is taken up with communications from the congress participants: Dominique Arrighi, “L’usage du latin dans les relations internationales au XVI^e siècle”; Jerzy Axer, “Varietas Latinitatis Reipublicae Polonorum”; Paul Richard Blum, “Platonischer Idealismus bei Francisco Suárez”; Gábor Bolonyai, “Orpheus’ Sweat: Antonio Bonfini as Translator of Hermogenes and Philostratus”; Claudio Buongiovanni, “Tacito e il canone storiografico dell’*Actius* di Giovanni Pontano”; Elwira Buszewicz, “Between General and Particular: The ‘Polish Horace’ Promoting Ladislaus IV Vasa’s Fame”; Claudia Corfiati, “Donne famose del Quattrocento nella scrittura di Giacomo Filippo Foresti”; Zoltán Csehy, “*Hortorum custos* (Alcune manifestazioni del discorso priapeo nella poesia)”; István Cselényi, “La *Tabula aurea* di Pietro da Bergamo: l’opera nel suo tempo”; Zaynab Dalloul, “Sándor Kováznai e Janus Pannonius”; Alexandra de Brito Mariano, “On Gold and Poetry: The *Metallurgicon*, Gold Lore, and the Society of Jesus through the Work of Bartakovics”; Domenico Defilippis, “*Maius solito negotium mei impendere humeris*: nota sulla descrizione del Regno di Napoli nell’*Italia illustrata* di Biondo Flavio”; Josef Eskhult, “Humanistic Latin Versions of the Hebrew

Old Testament”; Laurent Grailet, “Les *Lettres de Turquie* de Busbecq: néo-latin et méthodes quantitatives”; Roger P. H. Green, “Poetic Psalm Paraphrases: Two Versions of Psalm 1 Compared”; Maria Grazia Bistoni Grilli Cicilioni, “Un frate, un poeta, un pellegrino a Santiago di Compostela e a Finisterre nel 1523”; László Havas, “La conception de l’histoire chez le poète hongrois Janus Pannonius”; Chris L. Heesakkers, “*Ore tuo loqueris*: Joseph Scaliger’s *Epicedium* on Justus Lipsius”; Gerhard Holk, “*Latinitas* as the Medium of the First History of America: The *Decades de orbe novo* by Pietro Martire d’Anghiera”; Simona Iaria, “Enea Silvio Piccolomini: *Oratio in divi Ambrosii celebritate*: un modello culturale per i padri conciliari”; Antonio Iurilli, “Favolistica neolatina in Italia: la *Bestiarum schola* di Pompeo Sarnelli”; László Jankovits, “*Vir tersissimus Iacobus Piso*: A Hungarian Humanist, Poet, and Diplomat in the Erasmian World”; Erika Juríková, “The Present State of Research on Matthias Bel’s Life and Work in Slovakia”; Gábor Kecskeméti, “Philological Activities of Early Modern Hungarian and Transylvanian Humanists”; Zsuzsanna Kiséry, “*Et poetis ipsis necessarium argentum*: Überlegungen zu einem Versuch über den Humanismus in der Umgebung von Sigismund von Luxemburg”; Wolfgang Kofler, “Madruzzo-Lob in Ingolstadt: Johann Engerd und Jakob Fischer”; György Komlóssy, “Hungarian Runic Letters: A Mythical History”; Jozef Kordoš, “The Historical Epos *Tyrnavia nascens* (Stephanus Csiba, 1706)”; Martin Korenjak, “Latin Poetry about Simon of Trento”; Sylvie Laigneau, “De l’éloge de l’humanisme à l’éloge de la France: la *translatio studii* chez Nicolas Bourbon (Nugae, 1533)”; Réka Lengyel, “Dialoghi contraddittori (Sulla struttura dialogica del *De remediis utriusque fortunae* del Petrarca)”; Annamaria Lesigang-Bruckmüller, “*Quid Galli in Germania?* (Anti)französische *Gallicinia* des 17. Jahrhunderts”; Mariano Madrid Castro, “Los comentarios de Badius Ascensius a *Contra amorem* y *De natura amoris* de Baptista Mantuano”; David Marsh, “Obscenity and Poetic Invective in the Early Italian Renaissance”; Maria Aurelia Mastronardi, “La *institutio principis* nel *De felici progressu* e nel *De vera re publica* di Michele Savonarola”; Ida Mastrorosa, “Biondo Flavio e le istituzioni di Roma antica: matrimonio e famiglia nella *Roma triumphans*”; Barbara Milewska-Wazbinska, “*Vixi casta*: Neo-Latin Women’s Epitaphs in Poland”; Francesco S. Minervini, “Strutture oratorie delle dedicatorie di Antonio Bonfini a Mattia Corvino”; Laura Mitaro-

tondo, “La scrittura politica di Bartolomeo Platina (1421-1481): fra la tradizione dei classici e l’innovazione umanistica”; David Money, “Poemata Itolorum Neo-Latina atque lectores Angli saeculi decimi octavi: Alexander Pope, *Selecta poemata Itolorum* (1740)”; Stephen Murphy, “Philology and Torture”; Ilona M. Nagy, “Mittelateinische und neo-lateinische Versionen der Legende der Hl. Margit aus der Arpadendynastie”; Karl August Neuhausen, “De Francisci Xaverii Trips eo poemate, quod a. 1688 Coloniae prodiit inscriptum *Heroes Christi In Vngaria et alibi adversus IVratos hostes Otomannos strenue pugnantes?*”; Isabella Nuovo, “Il ruolo del filosofo nell’epistolario di Antonio De Ferrariis Galateo”; Klára Pajorin, “Poggio Bracciolini e l’Ungheria”; Joanna Partyka, “Classical Erudition and ‘a Female Pen’: Education versus Literary Consciousness”; Lee Piepho, “Heaven’s Blessing and Earth’s Joy: Commemorative Anthologies for the Marriage of Frederick V and the Princess Elizabeth”; Krisztina Rábai, “*Morbus Gallicus*, Focusing on the Sixteenth-Century Written Sources”; Ludovica Radif, “Aristofane Aretino”; Valery Rees, “Marsilio Ficino’s Translation Programme in the 1480s”; Ágnes Ritoók-Szalay, “L’edizione critica delle opere di Janus Pannonius”; Giovanni Rossi, “Tradizione politica classica e Controriforma: i *Dialogi de rei publicae dignitate* (1556) di Marco Girolamo Vida”; M^a Teresa Santamaría Hernández, “La interpretación de los textos como instrumento de polémica en la apología *In Leonardum Fuchsium* de Michael Villanovanus”; Raija Sarasti-Wilenius, “How Students Were Taught Latin Letter-Writing in Seventeenth-Century Finland”; Péter Sárközy, “L’edizione delle poesie di Janus Pannonius di Norbert Conradi (1754)”; Sonja Schreiner, “Literatur, Topik, Medizin: William Harveys Dedikationen zur *Exercitatio anatomica de motu cordis et sanguinis in animalibus*”; Nicol Sipekiová, “The Importance of Pomey’s Lexicographical and Grammatical Works (*Syntaxis ornata seu de tribus Latinae linguae virtutibus*)”; Anna Skolimowska, “From Respect to Disdain: Political Geography and Terminology concerning Power in Latin Letters and Occasional Poems by Ioannes Dantiscus”; Daniel Škoviera, “*Hungaria loquitur*. Das Bild von Ungarn in der Paraphrase des Psalms 79 von Georg Purkircher”; Antônia Soler i Nicolau, “El *Codex rationum Octavii Pacati?*”; Katarína Šotkovská, “Franciscus Babai and His Work *Epigrammatum miscellaneorum, sacrorum, et profanorum libri III*”; Lav Subaric, “Writing

a Regional History of Latin Literature: An Example from Tyrol”; Silvio Suppa, “Storia, ragione e critica nel Latino di Giambattista Vico”; György Szabados, “Fountain of Renewal: The Roots of Critical Hungarian Historiography in the Seventeenth Century”; Hanna Szabelska, “Zum Begriff der Konventionalität des Sprechzeichens im Dienste der humanistischen Argumentationen”; M. Szendrényi, “Epic and Creation: Vida and Milton in the Development of Vergilian Epic Tradition”; Nikolaus Thurn, “Die Rolle der volkssprachlichen Kultur für die neulateinische Poesie: Juan de Vilches und Martin Balticus”; Stefan Tilg, “Paulus Ricius (ca. 1480-1541/42): kaiserlicher Leibarzt, Theosoph—und Objekt regionaler Literaturgeschichtsschreibung”; Gábor Tüskés and Éva Knapp, “Deutsch-ungarische Verbindungen auf dem Gebiet der lateinischen Literatur im 17. Jahrhundert”; Piotr Urbaniński, “English Paraphrases and Emulations of Maciej Kazimierz Sarbiewski’s Poetry”; Sebastiano Valerio, “Tradizione classica e cultura retorica nello *Spicilegium* di Lucio Giovanni Scoppa”; Juan J. Valverde Abril, “Al margen de los manuscritos latinos de la *Política*”; Toon Van Hal, “Justus Lipsius’s Discovery of the Wachtendonck Psalms: A Controversial Contribution to Old Germanic Language Study”; Kristi Viiding, “Neulateinische Reisetmethodik in Livland im 17. Jahrhundert”; and Peter Zeeberg, “The *Bucolica* (1560) of Erasmus Laetus.” (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Humanistica Lovaniensia*. Ed. Dirk Sacré, Gilbert Tournoy, Monique Mund-Dopchie, Jan Papy, and Lambert Isebaert. Vol. 59. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2010. 80 euros. vi + 486 pp. This issue of the premier journal of Neo-Latin studies begins with the fourth annual Jozef IJsewijn lecture, given in honor of the founder of the Seminarium Philologiae Humanisticae and this journal: Monique Mund-Dopchie, “*Plus ultra* ou *non plus ultra*? Fortunes et infortunes de la représentation antique de la terre à la Renaissance.” The bulk of the journal consists of the following texts and studies: Alberto Pavan, “Ercolo Strozzi’s *Venatio*. Classical Inheritance and Contemporary Models of a Neo-Latin Hunting Poem”; Mark Crane, “A Scholastic Response to Biblical Humanism: Noël Beda against Lefèvre d’Etaples and Erasmus (1526)”; Walther Ludwig, “Die emblematische *Festina*

Lente—Variation des Achilles Bocchius”; Robert Forgács, “Gallus Dressler’s *Praecepta musicae poëticae*: Musical Humanism and Education in Sixteenth-Century Germany”; Manuel Mañas Núñez, “Sanctius y Scioppius”; Gilbert Tournoy, “*Lipsiana novissima IV*: Justus Lipsius, Livy, Persinius and Pynssenius (Pyndenius, Pynslenius)”; Alejandra Guzmán Almagro, “Lucas van der Torre, Van Torre, Torrius: la identidad de un erudito flamenco a la luz de algunos documentos”; Dirk Sacré, “Torrius. Appendix: Some Unpublished or Little-Known Documents”; Noël Golvers, From Propertius’s *Laudes Italiae (Romae)* to 17th-Century Jesuit *Laus Sinarum*. A New Aspect of Propertius’s Reception”; and Romain Jalabert and Dirk Sacré, “Bibliographie intermédiaire des poètes et versificateurs latins en France au XIX^e siècle.” The next section contains a group of papers delivered on 5 June 2009 at the Belgian Academy in Rome, to mark the publication of a booklet of Latin verse written by Joseph Tusiani: Joannes Carolus Rossi, “De Josepho Tusiani Oratiuncula inauguralis”; Emilio Bandiera, “I *Fragmenta ad Aemilium* di Joseph Tusiani”; Iacobus Dalla Pietà, “Pauca de Latinitate scribendique genere Iosephi Tusiani”; Tom Deneire, “‘Two strange halves of one?’ A Poetological Comparison of Joseph Tusiani’s Latin and English *Standstill*”; and Mauro Pisini, “Aspetti di modernità nella poesia di Joseph Tusiani. Lettura antologica di *In nobis caelum. Carmina Latina*.” Four shorter pieces, under the rubric ‘Instrumentum criticum,’ follow: Katarzyna Jasińska-Zdun and Konrad Kokoszkiewicz, “A ‘Poetical Play’? Critical Notes to a Letter of Ioannes Dantiscus (Kolberg, No. 3)”; Thomas Gärtner, “Zur brieflichen Responsio Ulixis ad Penelopen”; Gilbert Tournoy, “Some Observations on the *Liber amicorum* of Jan van Hout”; and Dirk Sacré, “‘Women Latin Poets’: Some Notes.” Next comes the invaluable ‘Instrumentum bibliographicum neolatinum,’ 75 pages listing the books and articles that comprise the year’s work in Neo-Latin studies. Several pages containing newly identified Latin words (the ‘Instrumentum lexicographicum’) and announcements are followed by indices of manuscripts and names from the articles contained in the journal.

It is a sign of health and vitality that Neo-Latin studies is being served by a couple of newer journals, but *Humanistica Lovaniensia* remains the gold standard for the field, the journal against which other

very worthy achievements are still measured, almost sixty years after its founding. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)