



EVENTEENTH-



ENTURY



NEWS

SPRING - SUMMER 2003

Vol. 61

Nos. 1&2



Including

THE NEO-LATIN NEWS Vol. 51, Nos. 1&2

SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY NEWS

VOLUME 61, Nos. 1&2

SPRING-SUMMER, 2003

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

University of Akron
Concordia University, Wisconsin
Oklahoma State University
Texas A&M University

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

SUBSCRIPTIONS, Domestic and International. \$15.00 (\$20.00) for one year; \$28.00 (\$37.00) for two years; \$40.00 (\$52.00) for three years. Checks or money orders are payable to *Seventeenth-Century News*. A current style sheet, announcements, previous volumes' Tables of Contents, advertising rates, and other information all may be obtained via our home page on the World Wide Web. Books for review and queries should be sent to:

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

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

ISSN 0037-3028

SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY NEWS

EDITOR

DONALD R. DICKSON
Texas A&M University

EDITOR EMERITUS

Harrison T. Meserole
Texas A&M University

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

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

EDITORIAL ASSISTANTS

Christopher L. Morrow, Texas A&M University
Jae Young Park, Texas A&M University
Larry A. Van Meter, Texas A&M University

CONTENTS

VOLUME 61, Nos. 1&2

SPRING-SUMMER, 2003

ESSAY

- Bacon's "Serious Satire" of the Church and the "Golden Mediocrity" of Induction by KENNETH ALAN HOVEY 1

REVIEWS

- Jonathan F.S. Post, ed., *Green Thoughts, Green Shades: Essays by Contemporary Poets on the Early Modern Lyric*.
Review by SIDNEY GOTTLIEB..... 13
- Joseph Wittreich, *Shifting Contexts: Reinterpreting Samson Agonistes*
Review by WILLIAM B. HUNTER..... 20
- David Gay, *The Endless Kingdom: Milton's Scriptural Society*. Review
by JOHN MULRYAN..... 23
- Derek N. C. Wood, *Exiled from Light: Divine Law, Morality and Violence in Milton's "Samson Agonistes."*
Review by STEPHEN M. BUHLER..... 26
- Graham Parry and Joad Raymond, eds., *Milton and the Terms of Liberty*. Review by JAMES EGAN..... 29
- Luc Racaut, *Hatred in Print: Catholic Propaganda and Protestant Identity During the French Wars of Religion*.
Review by ALISA PLANT..... 33
- Charles W. J. Withers, *Geography, Science and National Identity: Scotland since 1520*. Review by DOUGLAS CATTERALL..... 36
- John Christian Laursen, ed., *Histories of Heresy in Early Modern Europe: For, Against, and Beyond Persecution and Toleration*.
Review by ALISA PLANT..... 40
- Barbara Fuchs, *Mimesis and Empire: The New World, Islam, and European Identities*. Review by NABIL MATAR..... 44
- Heidi Hutner, *Colonial Women: Race and Culture in Stuart Drama*.
Review by CHLOE WHEATLEY..... 47

Joyce Green MacDonald, <i>Women and Race in Early Modern Texts</i> . Review by JULIE D. CAMPBELL.....	49
Margaret Cavendish, <i>Observations Upon Experimental Philosophy</i> . Ed. Eileen O'Neill. Review by JAMES FITZMAURICE.....	52
Richard Terry, <i>Poetry and the Making of the English Literary Past: 1660–1781</i> . Review by JAMES FITZMAURICE.....	55
John Manning, <i>The Emblem</i> . Review by WILLIAM E. ENGEL.....	58
van Os, Kok, Luijten, Scholten <i>et al.</i> , <i>Netherlandish Art at the Rijksmuseum 1400-1600</i> . and Kok, Baarsen, Cornelis, Kloek, Scholten <i>et al.</i> , <i>Netherlandish Art at the Rijksmuseum 1600-1700</i> . Review by HANNEKE GROOTENBOER.....	61
Jonathan Israel, <i>Radical Enlightenment: Philosophy and the Making of Modernity 1650-1750</i> . Review by MARK G. SPENCER.....	64
Joshua Scodel, <i>Excess and the Mean in Early Modern English Literature</i> . Review by IRA CLARK.....	69
Stephen Guy-Bray, <i>Homoerotic Space: The Poetics of Loss in Renaissance Literature</i> . Review ELENA LEVY-NAVARRO.....	72
N. H. Keeble, ed., <i>The Cambridge Companion to Writing of the English Revolution</i> .. Review by JASON PEACEY.....	75
N.H. Keeble, <i>The Restoration: England in the 1660s</i> . Review by TY M. REESE.....	79
Jason Peacey, ed., <i>The Regicides and the Execution of Charles I</i> . Review by MICHAEL ROGERS.....	82
Alan Wharam, <i>Murder in the Tower and Other Tales from the State Trials</i> . Review by ELLEN J. JENKINS.....	86
Allan I. Macinnes and Jane Ohlmeyer, eds., <i>The Stuart Kingdoms in the Seventeenth Century: Awkward Neighbors</i> . Review by BRETT PARKER.....	89
William Tate, <i>Solomonic Iconography in Early Stuart England</i> . Review by JONATHAN NAUMAN.....	94
Richard C. McCoy, <i>Alterations of State: Sacred Kingship in the English Reformation</i> . Review by DAVID A. SALOMON.....	99
Luke Wilson, <i>Theaters of Intention: Drama and the Law in Early Modern England</i> . Review by DOUGLAS BRUSTER.....	101
Gigliola Pagano de Divitiis, <i>English Merchants in Seventeenth-</i>	

<i>Century Italy</i> . Review by JAMES PATERSON.....	104
Jonathan Brown and John Elliott, eds., <i>The Sale of the Century: Artistic Relations between Spain and Great Britain, 1604–1655</i> . Review by ELIZABETH R. WRIGHT.....	108
Rolena Adorno, <i>Guaman Poma and His Illustrated Chronicle from Colonial Peru / Guaman Poma y su corónica ilustrada del Perú colonial</i> . Review by NANCY JOE DYER.....	111
Giovanni Tarantino, <i>Martin Clifford 1624–1677: Deismo e tolleranza nell’Inghilterra</i> . Review by MICHAEL J. REDMOND.....	115
Suzanne L. Stratton-Pruitt, ed., <i>The Cambridge Companion to Velázquez</i> . Review by TANYA J. TIFFANY.....	117
Anthony J. Cascardi, ed., <i>The Cambridge Companion to Cervantes</i> . Review by HILAIRE KALLENDORF.....	120
Jürgen Renn, ed., <i>Galileo in Context</i> . Review by LUCIANO BOSCHIERO.....	124
Lane Furdell, <i>The Royal Doctors 1485–1714: Medical Personnel at the Tudor and Stuart Courts</i> . Review by KAROL WEAVER.....	128
I. Bernard Cohen & George E. Smith, eds., <i>The Cambridge Companion to Newton</i> . Review by ALESSANDRO GIOSTRA.....	131
Claire Jowitt and Diane Watt, eds., <i>The Arts of 17th-Century Science: Representations of the Natural World in European and North American Culture</i> . Review by KAROL K. WEAVER.....	135
Agnes R. Varkonyi, <i>Europica varietas–Hungarica variatas 1526–1762</i> . Review by HUGO LANE.....	137
BOOK NOTES.....	141
NEO-LATIN NEWS.....	145
NEWS.....	178

Bacon's "Serious Satire" of the Church and the "Golden
Mediocrity" of Induction

Kenneth Alan Hovey
University of Texas at San Antonio

It is as a reformer of natural philosophy rather than of the church that Francis Bacon is best known, and for good reason. From 1605 on he devoted the bulk of his published writings to the promotion of "the new philosophy." In the quasi-satiric *Advancement of Learning* (1605) he surveyed all knowledge to reveal how barren the old philosophy was and how much men did not know. Then in the *Novum Organum* (1620) he sought to replace the old philosophy in its two contemporary forms, the all-too-theoretical Scholasticism and the too randomly empirical alchemy, with the dynamic *via media* of empirical yet theoretical induction, a scientific method that would systematically increase human knowledge and render philosophy fruitful. Continuing to his death in 1626 to add to his plan of scientific reform, dubbed the *Instauratio Magna*, he succeeded in attracting a large and growing following, beginning with James I.

But prior to 1605 he had devoted himself largely to the reform of the Church of England. In two major treatises and a number of official papers and other works, all written from 1589 to 1604, and reflecting Elizabethan rather than Jacobean conditions, he satirized the chief opposing parties within the British church, the Puritans and the prelates, and proposed reforms by which they could be reconciled. The two treatises, which circulated in manuscript, received no official support from Elizabeth or James, and Bacon's proposed reform of the church proved as much of a failure as his reform of philosophy proved a success. When the treatises were finally published in 1640 and 1641, both church and state were on the brink not of reform but revolution.

The fame of Bacon's later writings has long cast his early religious writings in shadow. It was not until the 1930's, when it was argued that the Puritan ethos was the motive force behind England's scientific revolution,¹ that interest in Bacon's religious position within the Church of England was awakened. Although scholars aligned him with the Puritans, on the basis of his family and early political connections, what he actually wrote about the Puritans and their opponents was ignored. In the last few years, however, notable attention has been given to the first of the early treatises, *An Advertisement touching the Controversies of the Church of England*. Inspired, presumably, by Patrick Collinson's glowing allusions to this work, Julian Martin offered a secular political reading of it in 1992 (38-42) and Brian Vickers reprinted it with an elaborate historical introduction and notes in 1996.² But neither of these scholars has more than touched on the later and longer treatise, *Certain Considerations touching the better Pacification and Edification of the Church of England*, or Bacon's briefer statements on the Church of England which, together with the two treatises, form a coherent whole. It is the object of this study then to examine this whole, to show how Bacon sought in these neglected ecclesiastical works to solve the problem of the British church through satire and mediating reforms and, though he failed, how this failure ironically prepared the way for his successful promotion of the middle way of modern science.

Well before Bacon began his public career his family had taken a distinctive public stand on religion, upholding the established church though critical of prelatical power while favoring Puritan preaching. But if the 1584-85 letter of advice to Elizabeth doubtfully ascribed to Bacon by his Victorian editor is really his, it would represent a definitive rejection of the "preciseness" of Puritans like his mother and three elder half-brothers.³ A 1589-1590 letter written for his former tutor at Cambridge, Archbishop Whitgift, and more certainly attributed to Bacon is more conciliatory. It lists the ways "Reformers," as they at first reasonably "named themselves," had

transformed themselves in the course of time into a caricature, what “we commonly call Puritans” (*Works* 8.100). The fine line drawn in this letter between a reform movement originally capable of good within the church and rebellious Puritanism potentially threatening the state is more finely and fully presented in *An Advertisement Touching the Controversies of the Church of England*, written at about the same time.

Unlike the letter for Whitgift, there is no evidence that Bacon was commissioned to write this treatise and, instead of defending the archbishop’s or his family’s position, it criticizes the prelates no less than the Puritan preachers with an even-handedness that could not have pleased either side. It is not surprising, therefore, that the work was not printed until some fifty years later. Yet his object, Bacon says, is to heal the “wound” or “disease” that both sides together have caused in the church. He is confident that such a healing can occur because the differences do not concern matters “of the highest nature,” but only “ceremonies” and “extern policy” over which men may differ and still uphold the “true bonds of unity . . . ‘one faith, one baptism,’ and not one ceremony, one policy” (Vickers 1-2).

As to the prelates, blame for occasioning the controversies is placed squarely at their door. At first they considered the ceremonies rejected by the Puritans as “things indifferent” and acknowledged “many imperfections in the church,” while now they stand “precisely upon altering nothing.” Bacon’s application of the word “precisely” to the prelates makes them appear to be guilty of the same fault they ascribed so commonly to their opponents. Not only have the prelates become overly precise, but, upheld by the power of the state, they have enforced their precision by various means, especially by “easy silencing” of the preachers for minor verbal infractions, which, Bacon notes, “in such scarcity of preachers, . . . is to punish the people.” Still Bacon endorses episcopacy itself in the Church of England, since the church is already “settled and established,” but hints that only “if some abuses were taken away” in the episcopal government could English Protestantism match “the fruits of the churches abroad.” Overall, though, he supports a healthy diversity within Protestantism through which the Church of

England may “contend with other churches, as the vine with the olive, which of us beareth best fruit,” each fruit being acceptable (Vickers 10-14).

Bacon’s depiction of the negative side of Puritanism is even more vivid and detailed than his critique of the prelates. “The universities are the seat and continent of this disease,” he argues, because there professors who “seek an inward authority . . . over men’s minds” captivate “men of young years and superficial understanding” and inflame them with “private emulations and discontentments.” Under the aegis of “the simplicity of the Gospel,” Puritan preaching, fostered at the university, has become ignorant and anti-intellectual, not grounded on “sound conceits,” “little but generality,” interested only in “restraints and prohibitions,” and determining all to be “good and holy, by . . . what is more or less opposite to the institutions of the Church of Rome.” Furthermore, the preachers have become unbiblical by turning what the gospels call a “house of prayer” into a “house of preaching” and by appealing everything to the judgment of the people (Vickers 8-9, 16-17).

Bacon’s portrayal of the prelates as declining from leaders who accept diversity and criticism to petty martinets who employ political power to uphold the moral authority they lack and the Puritans as worthy reformers of admitted abuses who have declined into shallow demagogues running roughshod over the Bible, the authority they claim, could not have won him many friends on either side. The sharpness of the double attack is all the more remarkable because the *Advertisement* was occasioned by the vicious attack of each side upon the other in the Marprelate and Anti-Marprelate tracts, which Bacon condemned as serving “to turn religion into a comedy or satire; to search and rip up wounds with a laughing countenance; to intermix Scripture and scurrility sometime in one sentence” (Vickers 3). Bacon’s own double attack, if not scurrilous, is certainly in places quite satirical and offers fodder for the Elizabethan dramatists who were soon to create corrupt stage-prelates and hypocritical stage-Puritans for public entertainment.

Bacon acknowledged the similarity of what he was doing and what the tract-writers were doing by characterizing both as metaphorically “searching wounds,” but while the tract-writers ripped up wounds with a laughing countenance, he adopted a serious countenance and determined to open “what it is on either part, that keepeth the wound green,” only that the necessary “remedies be applied unto them” (Vickers 3). Such verbal “laying open of the distemper,” which might be considered satire, he later characterized as *Satira Seria*, “serious satire” (*Works* 1.730, 5.18). While the satirist of the Marprelate and Anti-Marprelate stamp sought “by wit to deride and traduce much of that which is good in professions,” a serious Christian satirist like himself sought “with judgment to discover and sever that which is corrupt” in a profession from that which is not (Vickers 253; cf. *Works* 5.17). What Bacon achieved in the *Advertisement*, as Patrick Collinson has said, is a “truly irenical critique,” a “remarkable *eienicon*,”⁴ and his hope was that by cauterizing the wound he would promote its healing.

Shortly after finishing the *Advertisement* Bacon wrote for his uncle, Lord Burghley, another treatise, *Certain Observations Made upon a Libel Published This Present Year, 1592*, which includes a section, titled in the margin, “Concerning the controversies in our church,” which reinforces points made in the *Advertisement* (*Works* 8.165). Between *Certain Observations* and James I’s accession in early 1603, Bacon wrote nothing concerning the controversies within the English church and until 1601 fairly little on public issues at all. This relative silence was no doubt a result of Bacon’s fall from royal favor in March of 1593 for opposing the subsidy proposed by Lord Burghley under direction from the queen. Bacon claimed in his speech in parliament against the subsidy that his opposition followed from an attempt “to search the wounds of the realm and not to skin them over” (*Works* 8.223), much as his views in the *Advertisement* followed from an attempt to search the wounds of the church. But Bacon’s serious satire on the realm was evidently even less

pleasing to the queen, who acknowledged no wounds in the state, than his serious satire of the church had probably been to prelates and Puritans.

Nonetheless, Bacon wrote several short but important works on non-public matters relevant to his religious and philosophical views just before and during his decade of royal disfavor. The first is a brief letter to Lord Burghley, written at about the same time he was writing the *Certain Observations* for him, which offers Bacon's earliest statement of his philosophical agenda. According to that letter, he intended first to "purge" philosophy of what he satirized as "two sorts of rovers," i.e., philosophical pirates, Scholasticism with its "frivolous disputations, confutations, and verboisities" and alchemy with its "blind experiments and auricular traditions." This purgation was then to be followed by a restoration of philosophy to health and fertility by means of what he later called induction but in the letter described only as "industrious observations, grounded conclusions, and profitable inventions and discoveries" (Vickers 20). Bacon then restated this agenda in a speech, "The Praise of Knowledge," from a dramatic work apparently written in 1592. Although the speech offers the hope that future knowledge shall not be "ever barren," it is chiefly devoted to satirizing the "knowledge which is now in use" in its two piratical versions (Vickers 34-36). In philosophy, as first in the church and then in the realm, Bacon sought to lay open the distemper with serious satire before applying the healing remedy.

In 1597 he brought out the first edition of his *Essays* and along with them a brief devotional collection in Latin, the *Meditationes Sacrae*. In one of the meditations from that collection he defends his practice of serious satire:

To a man of perverse and corrupt judgement all instruction or persuasion is fruitless and contemptible, which begins not with discovery, and laying open of the distemper and ill complexion of the mind which is to be recured, as a plaster is unseasonably applied before the wound be searched.

His previous writings had already revealed evidence of “perverse and corrupt judgement” in prelates and Puritans, Scholastics and alchemists, no less than in the queen, but since these were the authorities that one who “aspireth to . . . a fructifying and begetting goodness” must address, their “prejudicate opinion” must be met first and foremost by such wound-searching (Vickers 91).

When James I ascended the English throne in March of 1603, Bacon found himself, he says, “as one waked out of sleep” (*Works* 10.73) and immediately sought court employment. He bolstered his claims on the king by promptly addressing to him *A Brief Discourse touching the Happy Union of the Kingdoms* and followed it with a longer discourse on the unity of the church. This treatise, *Certain Considerations touching the better Pacification and Edification of the Church of England*, was apparently written before the Hampton Court Conference in January of 1604 and constitutes Bacon’s last and longest statement on the church. The printing of the work in 1604 was halted by order of Richard Bancroft, bishop of London, presumably because he considered it too Puritan (Vickers 501), and thus *Certain Considerations* was not published in full until 1640, the year the Long Parliament was seated and the year before Bacon’s earlier ecclesiastical treatise, the *Advertisement*, was first printed.

In its first few paragraphs Bacon implicitly links *Certain Considerations* to the *Advertisement* by saying the later work offers only “opinions . . . long held and embraced” (*Works* 10.103), and in many ways the two works complement each other. To the earlier work’s quite negative serious satire of both prelates and Puritan preachers the later work offers a quite positive and practical scheme of reform and remediation. Despite Bancroft’s response, Bacon claims in *Certain Considerations* the same “lack of partiality to either side” he had demonstrated in the *Advertisement* and advocates the mean or, as he calls it, “golden mediocrity.” To justify his claim he rejects two extremes: the prelatical view that “no reformation [is] to be admitted at all” and the Puritan view that “there should be but one form of discipline in

all churches, and that imposed by a necessity of a commandment and prescript out of the word of God" (*Works* 10.103-7; cf. 10.73). Thus the reforms to which he devotes the body of *Certain Considerations* are presented as a middle position that allows for change and diversity within the church.

In that body Bacon emphasizes that the changes he seeks are actually, in his view, restorations justified by Jesus' statement in Matthew 19.8, "in the beginning it was not so," which he quotes three times in Latin (*Works* 10.106, 110, 111). His "beginning" in this work is the "primitive Church," to which he frequently alludes (*Works* 10.106, 116, 117, 121), but that does not mean for him the church in Acts or in the "times of persecution, before temporal princes received the faith," but in "the better times," "the purest times of the first good Emperors that embraced the faith" (*Works* 10.108-9). Thus he accepts episcopacy but seeks to limit the bishops' power so that "in the greatest causes, and those which require a spiritual discerning," no bishop may decide alone and apart from "a presbytery or consistory," and no bishop may in matters of "spiritual science" act by deputy. Yet he also insists on a learned ministry, not just the preaching ministry favored by the Puritans. If these reforms were carried out, Bacon maintains, the church would be assured "a sweet and fruitful shower of many blessings" in this "spring of kingdoms" under James's rule (*Works* 10.103, 106, 110, 113, 118-21).

The reforms proposed in *Certain Considerations*, which include the elimination of the word "priest" in the liturgy, of the general absolution and confirmation, of private baptism by women or laymen, of the ring in marriage, of the oath *ex officio*, and of the requirement of cap and surplice (*Works* 10.114-21), are quite similar to those in the Millenary Petition delivered to James I by Puritan ministers in April 1603. All of Bacon's reforms are also found in the petition, except the call for the education of the clergy and, surprisingly, for limitation of episcopal power. The Millenary Petition also advocates a number of reforms not mentioned by Bacon. More significantly, the

rhetoric of the Petition and some of its proposed reforms have, unlike Bacon's, a decidedly "Puritanical" tone. The petitioners depict themselves as "groaning, as under a common burden of Human Rites and Ceremonies," and as "suspended, silenced, disgraced, imprisoned for men's traditions." They ask that "no Popish Opinion . . . be any more taught" and "divers Popish canons . . . be reversed," and they insist that "the Lord's day be not profaned" but the "Rest upon Holy-days [be] not so strictly urged."⁵ Unlike Bacon they make no claim of even-handed impartiality, nor learnedly look back to the early church, nor forward to the fructifying and begetting goodness of a Jacobean spring.

What the contrast between *Certain Considerations* and the Millenary Petition shows is that while virtually all of Bacon's proposed reforms would have been greeted with applause by the Puritans, Bacon was not a Puritan advocating innovation, but a reformer who sought restoration to a healing position as far from the Puritan extreme as from the prelatical one, both of which together were distempering the church. In portraying himself in this way, he sums up in *Certain Considerations* the major directions of his previous writings. Having drawn a line between himself and the "preciser sort" first in the letter to Elizabeth, if that is his, he maintained this line, while also showing sympathy for the Puritans' earliest positions in the letter for Whitgift and the *Advertisement*, and in the *Advertisement* and *Certain Observations* exposed the rift in the church as bridgeable once the extremes were renounced.

But Bishop Bancroft, who became archbishop of Canterbury ten months after the Hampton Court Conference, apparently did not accept Bacon's claim of "golden mediocrity," and James I failed to address many of the reforms proposed in *Certain Considerations*, while responding positively to the others largely in general or carefully limited terms.⁶ The principle of uniformity that James avowed at the Hampton Court Conference, that he would have "one doctrine, one discipline, one religion, in substance and ceremony" (as cited in *Works* 10.128-132),

left no room for the principle of diversity Bacon had first advocated in the *Advertisement* and then restated in *Certain Considerations* as the basis for mediocrity in the church, “one faith, one baptism, and not, one hierarchy, one discipline” (*Works* 10.108). Bacon’s seasonable plaster was implicitly rejected by both bishop and king, and the wound in the church only grew worse.

Although the failure of his plan for the reform of the church did not lose Bacon the favor of James, it apparently led him to avoid ecclesiastical matters altogether in the future. Writing in the proem to the undated and unfinished *De Interpretatione Naturae* (assigned to 1603-1604 by its editors, *Works* 10.82), possibly the first philosophical work he had begun since “The Praise of Knowledge,” Bacon claimed that at one time he was not without hope (the condition of Religion being at that time not very prosperous) that if I came to hold any office in the state, I might get something done too for the good of men’s souls. When I found however that my zeal was mistaken for ambition, and my life had already reached the turning-point, . . . I put all those thoughts aside. (*Works* 10.85)

Consequently, he determined to devote himself henceforth to the study of natural philosophy.

Although Bacon does not identify the date of this turning-point, the most obvious moment for it would be between the calling in of *Certain Considerations* in 1604 and the first printing of a philosophical work by him, the *Advancement of Learning*, in 1605. Prior to 1605 his ecclesiastical writings are lengthy, substantial, and addressed to the public or to public figures, while his philosophical pieces—the letter to Burghley, “The Praise of Knowledge,” the proem to *De Interpretatione Naturae*, and possibly *Temporis Partus Masculus* and *Valerius Terminus*—are all brief, fragmentary, and remarkably personal. But from 1605 on he wrote nothing on ecclesiastical policy, while publishing much philosophical work publicly dedicated to James I. Whatever the date of the turning-point, the proem makes clear that there

was a connection between Bacon's churchmanship and his science, but it was a negative one. When he ceased to work at healing the one, he began promoting the other.

But there is a positive connection as well, for the pattern established in his ecclesiastical writings bore fruit as a model for his philosophical writings. The relationship between the *Advertisement* and *Certain Considerations* is exactly paralleled by that between the *Advancement of Learning* and the *Novum Organum*. In the *Advancement* Bacon presents a serious satire on the diseased state of human knowledge, while in the *Novum Organum* he offers a positive means of curing it. What primarily kept the disease alive, he asserted, were the two major schools of philosophy, that of Aristotle and the Scholastics with its deductive generalizations and that of the alchemists and others with its undirected experimentation. Like prelacy and Puritanism, these schools stood at opposite extremes and committed piracy on true knowledge. After exposing the flaws of the philosophical schools, as of the ecclesiastical factions, Bacon sought to replace them with a mediating position, one which would bind abstract generalization to concrete experimentation, like bishops to presbyters or prelates to Puritans, in the "golden mediocrity" of induction.

This reformation in learning Bacon viewed as he did his proposed reform of the church, not as an innovation but as a restoration. The *Instauratio Magna*, the unfinished masterwork intended to include both the *Advancement* and the *Novum Organum*, means the "Great Restoration." The scientific method of induction would restore man to the prelapsarian knowledge of Adam, just as the reforms in *Certain Considerations* would restore the church to its best primitive state. But restoration to an original state in both cases would only be a step toward a future state of fruitful blessings, in which a spiritual temple surpassing the temple of Solomon would be matched by scientific wisdom surpassing the wisdom of Solomon.

In the end Bacon's plaster for science proved more seasonable than that for the church. James I, the British Solomon, could not help but be pleased by the scientific project Bacon dedicated to him. Only three months after the publication of the *Novum Organum* Bacon was accorded his highest title, Viscount St. Albans. But it took twenty more years for the suppressed *Certain Considerations* to be recognized and published by a rebelling Parliament. By then, however, the infection Bacon had hoped to cauterize and cure with moderate measures was ready to set the whole nation aflame in Civil War.

Notes

1. The theory and ensuing controversy is documented and summarized in I. Bernard Cohen, *Puritanism and the Rise of Modern Science: The Merton Thesis* (Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1990).

2. Julian Martin, *Francis Bacon, the State, and the Reform of Natural Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 24, 29-33; and Brian Vickers, *Francis Bacon* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 1-19, 493-512. Further citations from the latter are indicated parenthetically by "Vickers."

3. James Spedding et al., ed., *Works of Francis Bacon*, 14 vols. (London: Longmans, 1858-74), 8: 43-50, 10: 49. Further citations from this collection are indicated parenthetically by "*Works*."

4. Vickers 496; Patrick Collinson, *Godly People: Essays on English Protestantism and Puritanism* (London: Hambledon Press, 1983), 153.

5. Lawrence A. Sasek, ed., *Images of English Puritanism* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1989), 338-41.

6. Edward Cardwell, *A History of Conferences*, 3rd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1849), 212-17.

Jonathan F.S. Post, ed. *Green Thoughts, Green Shades: Essays by Contemporary Poets on the Early Modern Lyric*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2002. xiv + 300 pp. \$18.95 paper. Review by SIDNEY GOTTLIEB, SACRED HEART UNIVERSITY.

The title of this volume—intended to show the value of a “direct encounter with verse” (4) and record the responses of a particularly talented group of poet-critics to late-sixteenth and seventeenth-century lyrics—is properly allusive and specific: the phrase “Green Thoughts, Green Shades” invites us to a rich meditative garden in which words, shapes, and minds interpenetrate and generate cascades of provocative meanings; and the subtitle identifies the guides and the basis of their authority. But judging by his introduction, Jonathan Post perhaps envisions this collection as in some ways more suitably titled *I’ll Take My Stand*, acknowledging that it is a manifesto as well as a series of meditations. “The time is right,” he says, “to offer readers of the early modern lyric an alternative to the dominant discourse of political criticism” (4). Not content simply to say that the focus throughout the book is on “the sense of exhilaration and joy (and power) enabled by the poetry itself” (14), he notes that these are qualities “so evidently missing in much criticism,” a claim that could be (and has been) with good reason levied against every age but is here directed specifically at contemporary new historicism and, perhaps to a lesser extent, postmodern criticism in general, implicitly identified as causes of the regrettable fact that “Matters of aesthetics have been largely abandoned in many academic quarters” (14).

Post’s strategy may be to a certain extent preemptive, defense masked as offense: whether or not he had introduced this polemical frame for the book, it would undoubtedly have been applied, by readers and certainly by reviewers. One can hardly speak of poetry or criticism these days without being or seeming proprietary, without positioning oneself or being positioned somewhere in the almost always heated debate about the function of poetry and the function of criticism at the present time, a debate typically figured as about power as much as methodology. But Post is by no means

an entirely reluctant or unwilling polemicist. He does not want to let the volume get distracted from its primary concern, demonstrating how certain kinds of “poetic” approaches to the early modern lyric yield valuable and much-needed results, so his comments on the critical controversies are brief and scattered, and the essays in the volume rarely address these matters directly. But even as he maintains the pull throughout the volume as centripetal, into the garden, Post does not want us to completely forget that it is an embattled garden, and that the intellectual and imaginative activities on display there are also, when necessary, weapons in the ongoing critical and cultural wars.

Where do the contributors to this volume stand and what kind of approach to the early modern lyric do they display and recommend? Their shared emphasis on a personal response to poetry adds a dispersive element to the centripetal pull mentioned above, and fills the volume with diversity and carefully cultivated individuality, even eccentricity, so much so that it is difficult to extract a series of principles that they all subscribe to. But there are some unifying and recurrent motifs that can be identified. They each, as Post notes, “stake a claim for reading *poetically*, in all that that tricky word implies” (5), and their focus is almost exclusively on canonical works and poets—although I should add that they carefully think through, revise, adjust, and expand as well as reaffirm and justify the canon. It would be a misleading overstatement to say that they live primarily in the word rather than in the world—the essays here are not by poetic recluses about other poetic recluses—but they focus relentlessly on dramas of as well as embedded in poetic diction and form, ever deepening nuances of meaning and effect, and self-referentiality. This last term is particularly important, and complicated: the essays here repeatedly highlight not only the way poems are about poetry and the art of making poetry but the way that poems are essentially about the construction of self—of consciousness, personality, style, emotion, and intelligence. Co-existent with the focus on self construction and expression is a recurrent consideration of poetic tradition and communication, that is, the way poems connect to poets and to other readers who may

not be practicing writers of poetry but are encouraged (and instructed how) to read responsively. (This would be a worthwhile but insular book if it were only about poets reading poetry; one of its subtle strengths is that it is about other kinds of reading as well.) And apart from overlapping critical methodology and subjects, the essays here are linked by their playfulness, intensity, allusiveness, and willful independence and idiosyncrasy.

Finally, lest the above list wrap up too neat a package, let me conclude with a suggestive and open-ended phrase from one of the contributors, Thom Gunn, that Post uses as a kind of credo for the volume: the business at hand is the pursuit of “the expression of energy and the exploration of complexity within that energy” (qtd. 14-15). As Gunn acknowledges, this way of praising literature and criticism may strike some as “old-fashioned,” but it is at the heart of each one of the essays herein. I find it particularly interesting that this key phrase is not altogether old-fashioned, and that it would not be out of place in, say, an essay by Stephen Greenblatt, who is similarly fascinated by complexity and the circulation of energy in texts. I’ll have more to say later about how throughout these essays gulfs ostensibly separating critical styles more than occasionally turn into bridges.

The main value of the book lies not so much in its underlying premises or refracted argument against other critical practices but in the details of the specific engagements as the contemporary poet-critics take on an intriguing variety of poetic forms, traditions, and predecessors. My brief comments on the individual essays cannot do full justice to but can at least sketch out their richness, and also occasionally call attention to some of their limitations and irritations.

The first three essays address forms and traditions rather than individual poets. Peter Sacks examines the sonnet, especially in the hands of Wyatt, as a genre that is essentially and intricately involved in issues of personal identity, visible not only in recurrent images of the human face but also in the way that prosody and syntax “stage” crises of the self. Sacks’s masterful technical analysis is supplemented by extensive biographical and contextual

knowledge, and the result is an exemplary marriage of formalism and historicism. Anthony Hecht gives more attention to form than facts in his essay, but as he focuses on structural and verbal play he acknowledges that “even fictive worlds are made to resemble the one we commonly think of as ‘real’” (56). He risks risibility by framing one of his key concerns as whether or not a poet can write a sestina that is not desolate or mournful—a concern not shared by many—but his analysis is more broadly on how important it is for us to know the rules of the game, so to speak, and the contours of a tradition before we can understand or appreciate the achievement of a poet, and by the end of the essay the drama of what Elizabeth Bishop and James Merrill do with the sestina is indeed captivating and momentous. Like Sacks and Hecht, Heather McHugh is enamored of metrical intricacy, poetic play, and the bravado of poets as they twist meaning and tease and challenge readers, and she illustrates all this by citing and free-associating on selected poems from Wyatt to Rochester. But what is most on display here is her own unfettered preciousness, and for me at least, her wonderfully energetic but infinitely repeated alliteration and echolalia, redoublings and conjunctions, and endless puns and paradoxes quickly become tiresome.

The remaining essays focus on individual poets, but rarely lose sight of the traditions they work in. Ben Jonson was famous for his quarrel with the “loathed stage,” but Linda Gregerson focuses on his quarrel with the “loathed word,” his deep-seated suspicion of the trustworthiness, integrity, and potential uses of poetic language. She recognizes the topicality of Jonson’s poems, but relies not on “philological and sociohistorical detail” (83) but strenuous formal analysis to “unlock” the lyrics, especially his often neglected devotional poems, and disclose their many tensions and recurrent strategies. Calvin Bedient puts Donne in the context of what used to be defined as the metaphysical poets’ tradition of “having things both ways” (109). He defines “sovereignty” in terms of playfulness and performance, not monolithic power, and suggests that Donne’s conception of love as “expansively metaphoric” (116) helps generate poetry that is boundlessly energetic, restless, imaginative,

self-delighting, and self-knowing. Bedient's analyses have all of Heather McHugh's enthusiasm but more ballast, and his essay rises to a stirring conclusion that discloses "What Donne exemplifies" and confirms why Donne matters.

Carl Phillips approaches Herbert as a poet of experience, particularly of affliction, that is registered as much in the form as in the details of his poems. The "irregular and unpredictable shifts of heart and mind that are what it is to be human" (137) give shape as well as substance to *The Temple* as a whole and the individual lyrics within. Phillips' own essay is similarly irregular and unpredictable, and like other contributors in this collection he downplays linear, systematic, demonstrative argument and writes in an allusive, suggestive, deeply personal and impressionistic manner, along the way embodying the "particular arrogance" (144) that he finds so valuable in Herbert and other great poets, a blend of confident assertion and earnest questioning. Even more than Phillips, William Logan suggests that form reveals mentality (in the broad sense, I might add: of a person and of an age). His test case is Milton's sonnets, and while there is initially something potentially ludicrous about using the term revolutionary to describe the use of a hyphen at the end of a line—"It promises that none of the proprieties is safe any longer" (169)—Logan's essay is a magnificent demonstration of how to read the large in the small. He is as persuasive as Christopher Hill or David Norbrook in arguing for a radical Milton, which he locates more in the "ripening of the vernacular" (170) in the sonnets than in the grand style of the epics.

Eavan Boland's essay on Anne Bradstreet is purposely decentered, and freely interweaves details about Bradstreet's life and her poems with meditations on "how poets of one time construct the poets of a previous one" (176). It is the least concretely analytical of the essays in the volume, but the most haunted and haunting, describing ever widening circles of Bradstreet's mysterious "construction" as a poet and ongoing reconstructions, hovering between success and failure, as John Berryman reads Bradstreet and writes his poems, and as Boland herself reads Berryman reading Bradstreet, and writes her poems. Alice Fulton takes on an even

more daunting subject, haunted not by Bradstreet but by Margaret Cavendish. Fulton's foundational claims are that Cavendish's poetry makes her cry (and she tells us several times that "I don't cry easily" [191]), that Cavendish's low reputation is based on "the laziness of hearsay and the wickedness of misogyny for 350 years" (192), and that her poems, when viewed sympathetically, are remarkable records of "unordinary passions," displaying a feminist sensibility and deep insight into the life of animals. Fulton's vigorous enthusiasm for Cavendish will undoubtedly attract more attention to her, but I suspect that many of these new readers will discover not only that she is a curiosity and somewhat more than a curiosity, but also that it is more than critical inattention and misogyny that keep her from deserving the reputation of a "great" poet, if that term is to retain any meaning at all.

In a collection of strong essays, Stephen Yenser's is one of the highlights. His hyper-refined sensibility almost gets him into trouble as it leads him into the realm of rarified commentary, a danger he is aware of from the very beginning but can't always avoid: observations like "the speaker's address to his love [in "The Gallery"] . . . at no point contains a hint of the atrabilious" (237) can only work against him in most readers' circles. But this same sensibility allows him to read Marvell's poems from the inside, and he shows uncanny insight into Marvell's creative volatility, "restless, virtually indefatigable" artistry (229), and the "structures within structures" that characterize his poems. Thom Gunn is, like Yenser, ingeniously attentive to form and voice, but his subject is far more resistant and controversial than Marvell. Rochester is an interesting crux, especially in a volume like this which applauds playfulness, wit, and idiosyncratic inventiveness but generally operates under an arch of high seriousness. Perhaps I betray my own prejudice when I say that I find Gunn's special pleading for Rochester more interesting than Fulton's for Cavendish, but it is special pleading nonetheless, and by no means entirely convincing. Gunn effectively rebuts the notion that Rochester's focus on sexuality in and of itself disqualifies him from consideration as a serious poet, and rightly documents how his poems are cynically observant, pro-

vocative, comical, and usefully subversive of the unexamined and often quite stupid and repressive niceties of conventional life. But while this is no mean achievement for a poet, Gunn's arguments and illustrations fall short of confirming that Rochester consistently escapes a foreshortened view and limited analysis and critique of human sexual behavior and desires, and that he is a "supremely talented stylist" (250).

Robert Hass's essay on Edward Taylor is placed last in the volume because the essays are arranged chronologically according to the time period of the poet discussed. But as Post notes in his introduction, this essay also "serves in many respects as a logical terminal point for this collection" (13), by emphasizing yet once more the overriding importance of approaching a poet through his or her poetic style, relationship to poetic forbears (and descendants), and struggle to find voice and form. All that is indeed foregrounded as Hass explores Taylor's poems as "full of verbal wonders" (263) but perhaps even more importantly as embodiments of "one of the main experiences that poetry has to offer: the intimate confrontation with another mind" (264). Even as Hass suggests that Taylor's primary experience was one of privacy, he traces a contrary impulse, motion, and achievement: to "only connect," if not by touch, then by text, to earlier generations of poets and later generations of readers.

But part of what makes Hass's essay a particularly valuable conclusion to this volume for me is that he seems to at least momentarily concede that his central points about Taylor's privacy and what he takes to be the conspicuous lack of social context in Taylor's poems are observations about sociology as well as psychology and aesthetics, areas of life that are densely and inextricably interrelated. Hass's subject, he implicitly admits, is not only the "issue of [Taylor's] style" (261), but also "New England culture" and "the solitariness, self-sufficiency, and peculiarity of the American imagination" (261). Exactly. And Stephen Greenblatt or Cary Nelson couldn't have said it better.

Post seems to suggest that this book rebuts the catch-phrase "always historicize" with a better one, "always poeticize," but I think

that the deeper wisdom demonstrated herein is that we can and should both historicize and poeticize. Many of the contributors to this volume do so, and their fascination for the concrete circumstances of consciousness and creativity, for the inevitably social context of poetry, for irrepressible *jouissance*, and for the tension between sometimes precise and other times uncontrollable signification mark key affinities even with the critics that they are supposed to be at war with. There are real differences in emphasis and approach between those who historicize and those who poeticize, but each approach can substantially enhance, enrich, correct, and perhaps complete the other. *Green Thoughts, Green Shades* activates thoughts about meditative gardens and annihilations, but also deeper Marvellian inflections about causes too good to go to war over and the prospect of world enough and time to forge a higher criticism that will satisfy poets and historicists, the outlines of which are sketched very impressively in this important volume.

Joseph Wittreich. *Shifting Contexts: Reinterpreting Samson Agonistes*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 2002. xxxii + 352 pp.+ 5 illus. \$60.00. Review by WILLIAM B. HUNTER, GREENSBORO, N.C.

The 1758 lines of *Samson Agonistes* may have elicited in the past few years more critical discussion than that occasioned by any other work of equivalent length. Besides numerous notes and articles there are three fulllength books by Harold Skulsky (1995), John Shawcross, and Derek Wood (both 2001), plus collections of essays edited by George Maclean (1995) and by Mark Kelley and Joseph Wittreich (2002). Earlier books on *Samson* by Mary Ann Radzinowicz (1978) and Wittreich (1986) won the Milton Society's

James Holly Hanford Award for the most distinguished work of the year.

Now Wittreich continues with a second exemplary study of the play (or dramatic poem as Milton called it). In it he sees Milton as a spokesman for radical Puritanism, a thesis founded to a considerable extent upon his responsibility for the divergences from orthodoxy in *De Doctrina Christiana*. Early in the first chapter Wittreich points out that facing the title page of the first edition, which *Samson* shared with *Paradise Regained*, is the official licensing of the book, exceptional in Milton's works printed after 1670. But lacking is any ecclesiastical imprimatur because of the "disturbing theology" of the poem, he believes, and of the "seemingly terrorist agenda" of the play (15). In his eyes Milton is a puritan extremist even though the brief epic closely follows the account in Luke (and in part the Anglican baptismal formula), and the evidence for the terrorist agenda is primarily based on the omission of twenty lines of text that Stephen Dobranski characterized as "the poem's most urgent and violent images for the revitalization of the Good Old Cause." Unfortunately for this argument, the text printed these lines as *omissa*, actually calling attention to them but without raising any censoring objections.

Many of the most interesting insights that Wittreich explores are these provided by analysis of the work in light of earlier plays on similar religious subjects: Gregory Nazianzen's *Christ Suffering* as Milton stated in the Preface (recognized today as *Christos Paschon*, of uncertain date and authorship), Grotius's *Christus Patiens* and *Sophompaneas*, Buchanan's *Jephthes* and *Baptistes*, and Joost van den Vondel's *Samson*. Illuminating details show how Milton was engaged

with this large body of dramatic material as well as the use he made of classical models, Euripides and Seneca.

His major source, of course, was the Bible. Everyone knows Samson's story as narrated in Judges 13:16. Elsewhere he is named only once, rather unexpectedly in Hebrews 11:32 as one of those who were saved by faith: "What more shall I say [of such leaders, six having been named]? For time would fail to tell of Gideon, Barak, Samson, Jephthah" and others—a passage that evidently approves of Samson. But several biblical scholars of Milton's day thought otherwise. Wittreich follows up their citation of Genesis 49 in which the elderly Jacob characterized the future of the tribes descended from his twelve sons. At verses 16:17 he reaches Samson's group, Dan, who "shall judge his people as one of the tribes of Israel. Dan shall be a serpent in the way, a viper by the path, that bites the horses' heels so that his rider falls backward." Samson was the most famous member of that tribe, and so by something of a stretch several of Milton's contemporaries interpreted him as evil, bordering on the Satanic as "a serpent in the way, a viper by the path." To support such a reading these scholars turned to the list of the tribes that were saved according to the narrator of Revelation. There in chapter 7, twelve thousand out of each tribe received the "seal of the living God." In that roll call the tribe of Manasseh replaces that of Dan—proof enough for these commentators to minimize the praise in Hebrews: instead one should recognize a serpentine Samson who with his Danite relatives perished because of the evils foreseen by Jacob. Here too is the source of the strange "evening Dragon" that appears near the end of the play, dragons and serpents being nearly synonymous (252).

Such a view makes possible an entirely new understanding of Milton's Samson with concomitant revaluations of the entire play in its shifting contexts that Wittreich investigates and invites his readers to share. As he summarizes,

If Dan is the tribe of idolatry and, for some, the tribe from which Antichrist will arise, Samson, no less than Dan, was thought to be the serpent in the way, the adder in the path, blocking the way into Jerusalem and representing a false form of salvation through destruction that would be swallowed up in the creative salvation represented by Christ. (245)

Whether this view of the play (and of Milton's beliefs) will prevail will be up to each reader. We certainly have here a book that Miltonists cannot ignore.

Such an interpretation places Milton among the dissidents unreconciled to the restoration of crown and church in 1660. Much of the support for such dissension derives from the heterodoxies of *De Doctrina Christiana*. But as its author Milton surprisingly has no interest whatsoever in Samson. The three chapters of Judges are cited only for texts to prove that God is wonderful and incomprehensible, that the Hebrew word for angel has several different meanings, and so on. Most surprising of all, the verse in Hebrews asserting Samson's salvation by faith is ignored in the chapter on "Saving Faith" (I, xx). Indeed, Hebrews 11:32 is quoted once elsewhere to illustrate fortitude and then names from it only Gideon. Wittreich recognizes these facts as well as the omission of Samson from the treatise's list of Israel's judges and against such apparent inconsistency argues (205) that Milton in a canonical work, *Paradise Regained*, likewise omits Samson but names Gideon and Jephthah as "those who from lowliest plight 'attain'd / . . . to highest deeds' (2.43738)." But Manoa and his family did not live in "lowliest plight" and so Samson could not have been cited here. The existence of the play proves that its author was deeply concerned with the character just as the total indifference of the treatise proves

that its author was not. Perhaps we are reading the works of two different authors.

David Gay. *The Endless Kingdom: Milton's Scriptural Society*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2002. 220 pp. \$43.00. Review by JOHN MULRYAN, ST. BONAVENTURE UNIVERSITY.

Gay's *Endless Kingdom* challenges the idea that after the Restoration, Milton withdrew from politics and wrote his three great poems (*Paradise Lost*, *Paradise Regained*, and *Samson Agonistes*) without specific reference to the Royalist regime. For Gay, Milton sought a connection between the social world of England and the textual world of the Bible. When the Restoration broke that connection, Milton proclaimed the kingdom of God within the context of his poetry: "In 1644, when Milton published *Areopagitica*, the dynamic correspondence of textual and social vitality seemed almost possible to achieve. The Restoration of 1660 destroyed this correspondence for Milton, and so he chose to proclaim the endless kingdom primarily in the textual and critical space of the poetry he bequeathed to future generations" (31). The three major poems are, according to Gay, "radically counterhistorical in their critical engagement with, and opposition to" the Royalist discourses that connect the Restoration with providential statements in the Bible (12).

Gay also claims that "the Bible is initially a broken and incomplete text. Its texture is aphoristic, consisting of sayings, precepts, and isolated teachings" (10) that generate wisdom. Gay finds a similar "structure" in *Areopagitica*: "The pieces of its scattered body are verbal units comprised of maxims and aphorisms, or short, pithy, and memorable phrases that strike the reader as forms of wisdom . . . The writer's task of linking these aphorisms in prose provides a model for the reader's interpretive task of gathering up the scattered body of truth" (36). Wisdom is the common thread that binds together Gay's interpretation of the three great poems: as perception in *Paradise Lost* (chapter 2), as opposi-

tion in *Samson Agonistes* (chapter 3), and as revelation in *Paradise Regained* (chapter 4).

It is obvious and understandable that the Royalists would celebrate the restoration of Charles II by searching for biblical texts that would connect that event with the workings of Divine Providence. That point, as Gay makes plain, was loudly preached from Royalist pulpits. Indeed, even before the Restoration, Clement Ellis preached a sermon supporting the restoration of Charles II with a gloss on Proverbs 24:21: "My son, fear God, and the King, and meddle not with them that be seditious, or desirous of change" (cited 28).

It is, however, quite another matter to demonstrate a "counterhistorical" thesis that runs through Milton's three major poems. Since Milton did not announce any such plan, it can only be intuited through a close reading of his poetry against the background of sacred scripture. Such a reading must be based on *our* understanding of *Milton's* understanding of sacred scripture, and then applied to a particular interpretation of the poetry itself. And as Gay himself admits, "the Bible was amenable to the defense and destruction of monarchy" (30). Gay can never be sure that Milton would draw the same implications from a scriptural passage that he does, or that his reading of the poetry in the light of scripture parallels Milton's. For example, in commenting on the disappearance and discovery of the Son in *Paradise Regained*, and how that episode is held in memory by both Mary and Satan, Gay makes the following claim:

The Gospels present the life of Christ, not as a continuous biography, but in pericopes, which are discontinuous sequences of episodes; moreover, Gospel pericopes frame the teaching of a specific precept or parable. In *Paradise Regained*, discontinuous, aphoristic "sayings" present a rhetorical counterpart to the discontinuous narrative pericopes recreated in the poem . . . Discontinuity both invites and resists an interpretive synthesis. (182)

In other words, aphorisms or wise sayings are scattered throughout the poem in some kind of meaningful pattern that it is the reader's task to discover (see *Areopagitica*, above). Even if this were

the case, it would be almost impossible to demonstrate; thus the statement is an unproveable assertion and does not advance the argument.

Gay also claims that while the Royalists connected scripture with external events (the Restoration in particular), authentic readers of the Bible focused inwardly on the encoded message of liberty: "The voices that celebrated the Restoration emphasized the outwardness rather than the inwardness of liberty. They did so by identifying scriptural precepts with the material displays of monarchy. For Milton, this identification led the English people from an active envisioning of a reformed society to the passive reception of a political idol" (10-11). Thus in *Samson Agonistes* "the destruction of the temple of Dagon attacks a political culture of material display with an intensity equal and opposite to the violent spectacles of punishment and retribution that accompanied the celebratory pomp of the Restoration" (139). This is an interesting statement, but since Gay cannot point to any direct allusion to "the celebratory pomp of the Restoration," in *Samson Agonistes*, it does not advance the argument.

Gay's readings of Milton's three great poems are situated within the hostile context of Restoration pamphlets, some of them calling for Milton's own blood in vengeance for the execution of Charles I: "this Murther [of King Charles I] I say, and these Villanies were defended, justified, nay extolled and commended, by one Mr. John Milton" (21—by George Starkey, in his *Dignity of Kingship Justified*, London, 1660). Gay also notes the irony of the royalist regime's simultaneous condemnation and practice of blasphemy. After the Quaker James Nayler was tried for blasphemy because he reenacted the ceremony of Palm Sunday in Bristol, he was whipped, mutilated, and imprisoned for life without the means to continue his writing. At the same time, a Royalist poet blasphemously identified Christ with the new king and received no punishment at all. "George Starkey's poem '*Britain's Triumph*,' in contrast [to Nayler], celebrates Charles II's triumphant return to London using the imagery of Jesus' entry into Jerusalem on Palm Sunday. The messianic aura surrounding Charles' return is an

ironic counterpart to the trial and punishment of James Nayler. Taken together, the two events demonstrate the polarity of cultural and political images Milton responds to his in his major poems" (75-76).

This is a beautifully written book filled with interesting insights about Milton's great poetry. Unfortunately, those scattered insights do not cohere into a defensible thesis. In this respect, *Milton's Scriptural Society* imitates the discontinuous structure that Gay attributes both to the Bible and to *Areopagitica*.

Derek N. C. Wood. *Exiled from Light: Divine Law, Morality and Violence in Milton's "Samson Agonistes."* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001. xxii + 247 pp. \$ 55.00. Review by STEPHEN M. BUHLER, UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA-LINCOLN.

To a great extent, this book has been commandeered by recent history. Just two months after its initial publication, the multiple assaults on the World Trade Center, the Pentagon, and an unknown target of yet another hijacked jet brought the reality of political violence home to North Americans in ways they had not yet experienced. In such a context, Derek Wood's *Exiled from Light* and its call to reconsider triumphalist readings of Milton's *Samson Agonistes* resonates profoundly—if in ways the author could not have foreseen.

Wood endeavors to rescue Milton's tragedy (for so the author himself categorized it) from interpretations—largely influenced by strains in Christian doctrine, it must be noted—that unequivocally celebrate the devastation that Samson visits upon the Philistines. He offers, instead, a sense of the text as deeply ambiguous and ambivalent; not only does the inability of the Israelites to take advantage of Samson's victory come into question, but so too does Samson's perhaps desperate attempt to redeem himself and the Israelite cause. As Wood rightly notes, Samson had unwisely presumed on divine sanction before, with Dalila. Milton's text sur-

rounds its hero's resolve and his "rousing motions" with what may be sacred mystery and what may be plain uncertainty.

The case for *Samson Agonistes* as an indeterminate text is made, fairly convincingly, from two historical points of reference: genre and exegesis. Renaissance tragedy readily accommodated deeply flawed—and far more flawed than Wood at first insists upon for Samson—tragic heroes. In this, Wood argues, early modern dramatists and theorists were closer to Aristotelian precept and ancient practice than their successors (for whom a misreading of *hamartia* was the fatal Cleopatra) ever could be. Milton, following in this tradition, crafted a hero that was neither completely vindicated by victory over his adversaries, nor utterly culpable in his own destruction. Christian attitudes toward Old Testament figures could also be, as the paradoxical phrase goes, decidedly mixed: lacking the full benefits either of revelation or of subsequent sacred history, Samson could be seen as a "hero of faith" (87) and "yet be an exemplum of understanding that is flawed and behaviour that is from far admirable or deserving of imitation" (90).

Wood shrewdly contextualizes and undermines earlier commentaries that proclaim Milton's Samson to be a problematic figure before his defining act, while an undoubted hero in bringing death and destruction upon others and himself. He then endeavors to counterbalance such over-optimistic and over-simplistic readings. Unfortunately, the strategies that he employs in this effort often tend to undermine his own important message that Milton's text is ambiguous, ambivalent.

His chief strategy can only be described as "Samson-bashing." Every exchange with Dalila is presented as a rhetorical and moral victory for her. Harapha, too, is presented in a virtuous light, simply a younger warrior curious about an aged veteran past his prime: "Mohammad [sic] Ali meeting Joe Louis" (154), in Wood's strangely cross-generational analogue. The result is that his examples insist on a particularity that Wood's overall argument rejects. Samson must be unrighteously indignant with Dalila; he must be driven, Antony-like, by aging pride with Harapha; he must be (but how can we know this?) physically immobile through most of the drama.

Wood suggests some interesting consequences from such interpretive choices, but their status as choices fades in the heat of insistence, along with the openness of the Miltonic text.

A secondary strategy is equally problematic. Milton's tracts are frequently quoted to assess the author's attitudes toward the use of violence for political purposes, even though Wood cautions us against conflating polemical practice with poetic exploration of scripture. Responding to David Loewenstein's invocation of *Eikonoklastes* at one point, Wood asks, "But how do we know that Milton approved of the iconoclasm, rage, and violence of Samson in 1671?" (17). Elsewhere, however (as on 95), Wood cites Milton's *A Treatise of Civil Power* to assert the poet's rejection of force. In so doing, Wood elides a crucial difference: over and over, Milton clearly rejects the use of state violence—the utmost of civil power—to enforce conformity in spiritual matters; it is less clear that he ever completely rejects the use of violence in opposition to unjust state authority. That is the dilemma we face in *Samson Agonistes*. The Philistines seek to compel Samson's participation in their rites; as many have noted, the parallel with Laudian demands and, later, Restoration pressures for Puritan capitulation to more involved ceremony in worship is unmistakable. The degree to which seventeenth-century Reformers continued to identify with their admittedly "incomplete" Old Testament types further intensifies the ethical problem presented by Samson's example: seeing themselves as the fully realized successors to the Chosen People, threatened by misbelieving gentiles, many Puritans in England and North America could well be tempted to take grim (or ecstatic) satisfaction in the downfall of Dagon's temple and its latter-day counterparts, however engineered.

If, too often, his counter-arguments to the triumphant view of Samson simply veer to the other extreme, it must be acknowledged that Wood's argument is an important one. Given the poet's frequently stated preferences for "peace [which] hath her victories / No less renowned than war" (as he avers in his sonnet to Cromwell), Milton may have indeed questioned all violent means toward liberation. *Samson Agonistes*, as Wood demonstrates, dramatizes the

questioning as well as the violence. We in the United States may have found it too easy, given our Puritan heritage, to identify with the Israelites in our readings of Milton's text and of the Book of Judges; Wood reminds all of us what it can mean if we recognize ourselves in the Philistines.

Graham Parry and Joad Raymond, eds. *Milton and the Terms of Liberty*. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2002. xvi + 218 pp. \$60.00. Review by JAMES EGAN, THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON.

This collection includes twelve essays originally presented as papers at the Sixth International Milton Symposium, held at York in July 1999. The essays touch on Marvell, Milton, and the Millennium, though the focus is, in fact, the political Milton, linkages between literary form and ideas in the expression of his political concerns, and occasionally the language of political engagement practiced by his contemporaries.

Quentin Skinner's "John Milton and the Politics of Slavery" locates the essence of Milton's theory of free government in *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates*, *Eikonoklastes*, and *Pro populo Anglicano defensio*. Milton appears to share the view of Henry Parker and other defenders of Parliament from 1628 through 1642, namely that a legitimate government entails a ruler morally accountable to his subjects, and subjects who accept the "strenuous" social and ethical challenges of a life of freedom (21). Like Henry Parker's, Milton's views generally align with those of Roman law, but Milton also extends the positions of classical authorities by multiplying the liabilities of monarchial rule. In "Milton before Lycidas," Thomas N. Corns questions much of the evidence currently invoked to support claims of Milton's youthful radicalism, particularly the notions that Milton's relationship with Alexander Gill urged him toward Puritanism, that the Earl of Bridgewater admired Milton's radical ideology, and that the religious poems of the 1645 collection embed the same radical ideology. *Comus*, Corns argues, celebrates the beauty of holiness characteristic of the *via media* so

eloquently that Laud himself would have applauded. *Comus* may be read as a transference of the values, assumptions, and sensibility of Laudianism to the genre of the pastoral masque. Corns offers the first of several prudent caveats in *Milton and the Terms of Liberty*, succinctly challenging the second round of attempts, this time by new historicists and cultural materialists, to radicalize the young Milton. John Creaser's "Prosody and Liberty in Milton and Marvell" contrasts Milton's innovations as a prosodist to Marvell's prosody of containment, demonstrating these contrasts in each poet's treatment of poetic form. If Milton proves to be as much a radical individualist and libertarian in his politics, theology, and social policy as he was in prosody, Marvell tries regularly to match content and expression in the same way that he remains attached to stability (47).

"Milton and Roman Law," by Martin Dzelzainis, moves in the same general direction as Quentin Skinner's essay by examining a controversial translation from Martin Bucer's *De Regno Christi* in Milton's *The Judgement of Martin Bucer*, a translation which seemingly manipulates Bucer's original. Dzelzainis exonerates Milton when he suggests that Milton knew Roman law well enough to realize that the apparent resistance in Bucer's text to his own argument for divorce was, in effect, overruled by historical circumstance. Joad Raymond's "The King is a Thing" studies the "nature of the relationship between the word 'king' and its referent, whether material or merely nominal" (70). In the 1640s royalist and republican pamphleteers and journalists, with Milton prominently among them, battled over the meanings of the language of kingship and tyranny. By 1654, Milton's earlier (1649-51) ambivalence and anxiety over nominal versus material definitions of "king" "had shifted wholesale onto Cromwell" (94). In

"The Politics of Martial Metaphors in Post-regicide England," Christopher Orchard demonstrates the political subtext of "military metaphors in ostensibly apolitical texts" (95), using as examples Christopher Wase's translation of *Electra* (1649) and the preface to Davenant's *Gondibert* (1650). Milton's *Eikonoklastes* pro-

vides a plain, aggressive republican antidote to the royalist rhetoric of stealth and passive resistance.

“Self-representation and Anxiety in Milton’s Defences,” by Stephen M. Fallon, measures the growing importance of self-representation and self-defense in Milton’s heroic prose of the 1650s. As Alexander More recognized, Milton “projects onto others—and condemns—his own propensity for self-serving self-representation” (113). The very hyperbole of Milton’s heroic self-construction in the 1650s increasingly and ironically exposes the uneasiness it seems intended to conceal (117). John Rumrich’s “Stylometry and the Provenance of *De doctrina christiana*” raises several weighty challenges to the “Burrowes technique” of stylometric analysis recently applied to determine the authorship of the *De doctrina*. Among the reservations Rumrich voices are these: that the statistical, quantifiable stylometric method used so successfully in attributing the authorship of *The Federalist Papers* does not properly apply to a seventeenth-century Latin work of exegetical theology; that Milton’s prefatory epistle leaves intact the assumption that he himself wrote the following treatise; and that stylometric analysis generates flawed conclusions because of its inability to measure Milton’s use of scripture (135). Like the earlier piece by Corns, this essay offers a welcome caveat, namely that stylometry constitutes an extraordinary standard of authorial attribution and may risk statistical oversimplification of available evidence.

Janel Mueller’s “Samson as a Hero of London Nonconformity, 1662-1667” reads *Samson Agonistes* as incorporating “the three notable events of the nonconformist perspective on London experience between 1662 and 1667: imprisonment for steadfastness in God’s service, the dejections and sufferings of the plague, and the consuming catastrophe of the fire” (146). This trope suggests that after the Restoration Milton continues to honor English nonconformity in the figure of Samson, but disavows revolutionary militancy. Katsuhiko Engetsu’s “The Publication of the King’s Privacy” traces Milton’s treatment of the interaction between the private and the public in *Paradise Regained* and *Of True Religion*, with particular emphasis on Milton’s exposure of the corrupt “private”

life of “public” figures in Charles II’s court (171). “Milton’s last Seven Years,” by Barbara Lewalski, traces the pervasiveness of Milton’s role as oppositional educator, from the models of political response to conditions of trial and oppression he presents in *Paradise Regained* and *Samson Agonistes*, to his plea for toleration for Protestants in *Of True Religion*, to the political implications of certain features of presentation in the 1673 edition of his shorter poems (188). The twelve-book edition of *Paradise Lost* published in 1674 seems intended to counter the attempt of Dryden, Davenant, and the royalist culture to appropriate the Vergilian epic (189). In “Surveying Milton’s ‘vain empires’ in the Long Eighteenth Century” Anne-Julia Zwierlein correlates British imperial politics to eighteenth-century adaptations of Milton’s epics, establishing that over the course of the century Milton was transformed from a sacred poet into a national, and then an imperial one, while the sacred images of divine rule in *Paradise Lost* and the images of “vain” empires in *Paradise Regained* were transformed into visions of the British imperial mission and sublime vistas of worldly possessions.

Though the essays by Skinner and Creaser are reprinted here in revised forms, their inclusion does not compromise the overall timeliness and integrity of this collection, nor does the fact that *Milton and the Terms of Liberty* is a vague title for a collection preoccupied with the political Milton. The political Milton has been subject to such frequent, energetic recontextualization that the 1999 date of the essays might seem to leave them dated, but that is not the case. Ideally, the caveats provided by Corns and Rumrich will provoke a general re-examination of currently fashionable methodologies and assumptions, and for that provocation Miltonists should be grateful. Finally, the Raymond, Mueller, and Zwierlein pieces, with their fresh insights into major texts of Miltonic prose and poetry, allow *Milton and the Terms of Liberty* to strike a welcome balance among reassessment, wary skepticism, and the forward movement of Milton scholarship as a whole.

Luc Racaut. *Hatred in Print: Catholic Propaganda and Protestant Identity During the French Wars of Religion*. Aldershot, England: Ashgate, 2002. 161 pp. Review by ALISA PLANT, TULANE UNIVERSITY.

In this suggestive study, Luc Racaut seeks to recast the traditional interpretation of the Reformation in France by restoring Catholicism to the equation. Despite the tremendous vitality of the early Reformation, he notes that “its eventual achievements were limited, certainly in terms of its original ambitions” (2). On the eve of the Wars of Religion, as many as 10 percent of French men and women were Huguenots; yet just over a century later, Louis XIV was able successfully to revoke the Edict of Nantes, which had guaranteed religious toleration to the Reformed church in France. Why did France remain Catholic? By looking at a sample of French Catholic polemic published before the St. Bartholomew’s Day massacre of 1572, Racaut hopes to provide a partial answer to this question. He persuasively argues that, unlike the German Reformation, in which Protestants gained an early and decisive control of printed media, the French Reformation was marked by the dominance of conservative, if not reactionary, forces. Well before Luther’s break with Rome, the Faculty of Theology of the University of Paris—bastion of orthodoxy in the kingdom—had harnessed the printing press to its purposes. Over time, Catholics were able to parlay this dominance of the printed word into dominance of religious belief. Although Protestant caricatures of Catholicism are now far more familiar, thanks in large part to Whiggish historiography, Racaut contends that “Catholic representations were nonetheless more successful in the short term in fostering distrust and hatred of Protestants” (5). Racaut may overstate his case, however, when he writes that “the French Wars of Religion were lost and won by the ability of Catholics and Huguenots to create and to block competing narratives and representations of each other” (5). Violence, organized or improvised, surely had a role to play as well.

Racaut begins by addressing the role of censorship and of vernacular works in the French Reformation, delineating the ways in

which France deviated from the German experience. A chapter on confessional violence suggests that since Catholic polemic relied heavily on medieval precedents and stereotypes that demonized heresy and heretics, it “contributed to building a mental picture of Huguenots as monsters” (36). For Racaut, this helps to explain Catholic ferocity and lack of regard for human life during outbreaks of urban violence. The savagery of some Catholic polemic also underscores the complex relationship between print and oral culture. In an age that primarily relied not on the printed page but the spoken word for news and information, Racaut argues, written polemic was simultaneously a reflection and an expression of contemporary opinion, even as it actively helped to shape public thought about doctrinal and political differences.

Racaut then discusses some of the predominant themes in mid-sixteenth-century Catholic polemic, which relied not only on a rhetoric of exclusion but also on appeals to the past. In the decade before the civil wars, when Huguenots sought to evade detection by meeting clandestinely (and often at night), Catholic polemic was filled with versions of the “blood libel”—traditionally directed against the Jews—in which Huguenots were accused of participating in secret orgies that often involved ritual murder and cannibalism. After the outbreak of war, Catholic authors moved away from the trope of the blood libel in favor of portraying Huguenots as traitors and rebels—accusations that were fueled by the Conspiracy of Amboise, in which a small Huguenot army tried and failed to gain control of the boy-king Francis II.

Another common theme in Catholic polemic was that of inversion, or the “world turned upside down.” As Racaut himself notes, many scholars have recently explored how metaphors of inversion and disease, cast in terms of gender, religion, and the social order at large, were used by sixteenth-century authors to express profound anxieties about what they perceived to be the unmooring of their world. More interesting is Racaut’s discussion of how the thirteenth-century Albigensian Crusade was used by both Catholic and Protestant polemicists as a way of validating their respective religious and cultural world views. Albigensianism had posed the

“most formidable threat to orthodoxy that France had known before the outset of the Reformation” (100); it was both highly organized and supported by much of the Languedoc elite. Thus it is hardly surprising that sixteenth-century Catholic authors seized on the Albigensian Crusade—spearheaded by none other than (St.) Louis IX—as an illustration of how heresy could be extirpated by a strong and pious king. Racaut provides an engrossing analysis of how the crusade was used in different ways by Catholic polemicists as the political situation in France changed. Meanwhile, Protestant polemicists were appropriating the Albigensian Crusade for their own purposes. The Albigensians, they wrote, were persecuted because they had dared to denounce papal abuses (119). After the St. Bartholomew’s Day massacre, the Albigensian Crusade took on a special resonance for Huguenots. Albigensians became fellow martyrs at the hands of a corrupt Church, and Huguenot authors increasingly trumpeted (as their German counterparts had done decades earlier) that the pope was in fact the Antichrist. Racaut does a fine job of tracing the Huguenots’ increasing identification with the Albigensian movement.

Unfortunately, the book is marred by inconsistent or downright sloppy editing. Most of the errors are minor: to take only two examples, Natalie Zemon Davis is Frenchified as “Nathalie” (82) and Agrippa d’Aubigné is alphabetized by his first name, not his last, in the bibliography. One might reasonably hope for better editing and proofreading in a \$75 monograph.

Still, *Hatred in Print* is a much-needed corrective to traditional interpretations of the early Reformation in France. Racaut effectively demolishes any lingering sense of the universal applicability of the “German paradigm,” explicated most notably by Elizabeth Eisenstein, which attributed the success of the Reformation to the spread of printing. He ably examines the appeal, concerns, and influence of Catholic polemic in mid-sixteenth-century France. Yet his work has broader implications as well. The success of Catholic authors in countering Protestant writings and affirming their vision of their religion did not end with St. Bartholomew’s Day, but continued throughout the Wars of Religion and well into the sev-

enteenth century. While scholars have mined Leaguer polemic and propaganda, much more work remains to be done on Catholic polemical writings, even (especially?) after the Edict of Nantes. Valuable in itself, *Hatred in Print* also suggests many avenues for further research.

Charles W. J. Withers. *Geography, Science and National Identity: Scotland since 1520*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001. xviii + 312 pp. + 36 illus. \$69.95. Review by DOUGLAS CATTERALL, CAMERON UNIVERSITY.

To what extent can local communities of practice represent the nation? This is the question that Charles W. J. Withers raises with his new study of geography's role(s) in shaping Scotland's national identity. Withers's provocative answer suggests that the Scottish nation was and is highly textured and local in expression. Taking the period between 1520 and 1930 as his focus, Withers explores the interplay between the exercise of geographical knowledge and the networks in which it was embedded, from which, in his view, larger constructs such as that of nation emerged. His emphasis is on the constructed and situational nature of geographical knowledge: its reliance on social networks for its production and reception, its dependence on particular linguistic conventions and data-gathering techniques for credibility, and its ties to the use and control of particular spaces for its production and dissemination. He links his project to revisions by cultural geographers of geography's disciplinary history and to work in the history of science.

In each of the five chapters following his introduction, Withers examines the communities and contexts in which geographical knowledge arose in Scotland between 1520 and 1930. Chapters 2 and 3 largely address the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, chapters 4 and 5 the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Chapter 6 considers the years from 1884 to 1930 and is followed by a con-

cluding seventh chapter that reviews and synthesizes Withers's findings.

In Withers's view, geography informed many discussions in Scots intellectual circles c. 1520-1680, and chorography, local geographical description, was central in discourses on national identity. The Scots humanists Hector Boece, John Major, and George Buchanan, he argues, made attempts to define their nation through chorographical description. They also helped bring geography to Scotland's universities. A range of travelers and elite Scots interested in the history and geography of parts or all of Scotland followed up their efforts from 1600-1680, also availing themselves of chorography. The most "national" of these efforts were Sir John Scot of Scotstarvet's project to collect information about Scotland through Kirk of Scotland ministers (c. 1641-1649) and Timothy Pont's survey of Scotland (c. 1583-1596). The work of such men was, for Withers, integral to thinking on the 1603 unification of the English and Scots crowns and to symbolic representations of England, Scotland, and Britain in Stuart masques, theater, and processions.

Turning to the period from 1680 to 1707, Withers argues that geographical knowledge emerged definitively in Scotland as a way to view the nation, recognized not just by landowners and intellectuals, but also by the state and a small but important public. Desiring to place Scotland "on the map" and in British culture prominent figures like Sir Robert Sibbald and Robert Wodrow, and less well-known men such as Martin Martin and John Adair, all immersed in the Scientific Revolution, inaugurated these changes. Sibbald, who held an appointment as Geographer Royal and also founded the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh, made use of past chorographical practices. He also, however, used geography to know Scotland as a whole. He employed, for example, a method for collecting data via questionnaires given to a network of elite members of local communities to generate reliable geographic knowledge. Robert Wodrow took a similar tack. John Adair and Martin Martin, on the other hand, collected information in the field. Geography, now often displaying Cartesian and

Newtonian influences, also continued its advances in Scotland's university classrooms in this era.

The developments immediately before the Union of 1707 set the stage for geography's progress in Enlightenment and early 19th-century Scotland, which Withers links to the public sphere and to efforts at self-improvement among Scots. Although never overwhelming, public interest in geography in this period was increasingly strong from the 1790s. A variety of teachers, mostly men, taught geography in Glasgow, Edinburgh, and some smaller burghs. The venues ranged from private homes, coffee houses, theaters, and observatories to burgh schools and universities. Geography usually supported the teaching of other disciplines, such as history or astronomy, and teaching methods favored globes and maps over texts. This period also saw the first successful national surveys of Scotland: *The Statistical Account of Scotland*, completed in 1799, and the Military Survey of Scotland, begun in 1747.

In chapters 5 and 6, Withers addresses the years from 1830 to 1930. The middle and second third of the nineteenth century saw geography becoming part of civic discourse proper. Beyond public lectures there were now also public figures, such as the Free Church of Scotland leader Thomas Chalmers, promoting geography's use and at least one major publication popularizing geography, the *Edinburgh Journal of Natural and Geographical Science*. Local field clubs contributed too, conducting studies of their environs, and a Parliamentary survey of 1838 showed that geography was being taught across Scotland. Geography's widening base of support in Scotland generated a particular Scots developmental trajectory, which expressed itself in artifacts such as Scots textbooks in geography, and in a Scots infrastructure supporting the teaching of geography and geographical research.

As an advocacy piece for a research agenda, and Withers's conclusion underscores how sizeable his agenda is, this book succeeds. Withers shows clearly that, when dealing with the nation as a concept, one can and should combine the world of *praxis* with that of ideas. His approach to the Scots nation is especially apt for the period from 1500 to 1800, when Scotland's inhabitants were often

adjusting to radical shifts in Scotland's position within Britain, Europe, and the Atlantic world.

I cannot say, however, that Withers has realized his research agenda's full potential. Withers does not always embed his inquiry in the particular contexts that he examines as well as he might have. Readers of *Seventeenth-Century News* will likely view his treatment of chorography with concern. Chorography was a local, and localizing, sub-field in early modern geography. Yet Withers asserts that chorography could accommodate a supra-local geographical discourse on Scots notions of nation. His analyses of Boece, Major, and Buchanan, unfortunately, are too brief to establish his point. Moreover, what he himself says of the activities of Scots lords in the seventeenth century, who were mainly engaged in collecting information that placed them in their respective localities, not in a larger nation, undermines the notion of chorography as an activity fostering a sense of nation. I agree intuitively with Withers's hypothesis that the systematic collection of chorographical data about all parts of Scotland's territory tended towards a concept of nation. Nevertheless, it still remains for him to indicate *how* such locally oriented and situated practices of knowledge creation produced that result.

If he sometimes fails to contextualize local communities of practice, Withers also allows larger constructs, like the public sphere, to blend too much with these same communities. Thus, he argues that several geographical discourses of an educational tenor were unfolding in Scotland's public sphere during the eighteenth century, implying that they amounted to a national discourse on self-improvement. At no point does Withers indicate, however, what he understands by public and private in eighteenth-century Scotland. Without this information, the reader can conclude that geographical education was more widespread during the Enlightenment, but its contributions to ideas of the Scots nation are less clear.

The challenging project that Withers has undertaken suggests important new directions for future research in several humanities disciplines. Yet working out the details of executing such a project

are equally as important as the agenda. And while Withers has done this in the articles in which some of the ideas for this book first appeared, the fruits of this labor are not fully in evidence in this volume.

John Christian Laursen, ed., *Histories of Heresy in Early Modern Europe: For, Against, and Beyond Persecution and Toleration*. Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave, Macmillan, 2002. 290 pp. Review by ALISA PLANT, TULANE UNIVERSITY.

Drawing on an important but underutilized body of source material, the articles in *Histories of Heresy in Early Modern Europe* set out to explore the “ways in which the writing of history of heresy contributed to the understanding of the term and its related concepts” (1) in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In a brief but stimulating general introduction, John Christian Laursen notes that heresy and orthodoxy were constantly shifting terms, mutable over time and place and always subject to debate; the authors’ proclaimed goal is not to construct a definitive account of the historiography of heresy, but instead to spur further research. The result is a rich and suggestive volume.

The book is divided into five parts, each with a separate introduction by Laursen. The fourteen articles are arranged thematically but proceed in roughly chronological order. This organization allows the reader to trace broader trends in attitudes toward heresy and toleration. While some of the writers or works under discussion may not be familiar to non-specialists, others—such as Hobbes, Bayle, and Gibbon—need no introduction. Perhaps unsurprisingly, given its lesser experience of heretical belief and practice, southern Europe does not get much attention here; most of the articles concern French or English topics. As a result, this is an unusually cohesive volume. One of its real strengths lies in its frequent cross-references linking chapters and allusions to the same historical figures.

Three contributions are especially outstanding. Martyn P. Thompson's chapter, "Hobbes on Heresy," is an incisive rebuttal of recent scholarship that has sought to portray Hobbes as an advocate of toleration. Drawing on two lesser-known works, *An Historical Narration Concerning Heresy and the Historia ecclesiastica*, Thompson focuses on the interplay between two of Hobbes's contentions: that a sovereign was obligated to establish uniformity of religion in a Christian commonwealth and that, no matter what one's inner beliefs, "outward obedience was always required" (83). Public—and uniform—worship of God was an essential component of the well-ordered state. Thus, Thompson contends, "to argue from Hobbes's notion of freedom of conscience to even a minimalist program for religious toleration is to mistake Hobbes's point" (83). Thompson situates Hobbes's writings firmly in their "historical moorings" (94), thus underscoring Hobbes's belief that lack of religious uniformity would only lead to civil wars. For the creator of *Leviathan*, the specter of civil unrest was to be vanquished at all costs.

Richard Popkin's contribution, "Two Jewish Heresies: Spinozism and Sabbatianism," offers a lively and informative look at two seventeenth-century belief systems that persist today. Sabbatianism, a messianic movement centering on the charismatic figure of Shabbatai Zevi, generated widespread enthusiasm across Europe (especially in the Ottoman Empire, Poland, and the Dutch Republic). Although Shabbatai Zevi converted to Islam in the face of official pressure, the movement that he founded declined only gradually. Even today Sabbatianism remains a hot-button issue in Turkey. Likewise, the ideas of Baruch de Spinoza continue to polarize contemporary Judaism. Two of his controversial views—that Jewish ceremonial law had "lost any validity or meaning and should be dispensed with," and that since God was inherent in everything, there was "no special providential history going on but only a divine natural history" (176–7)—made Spinoza a divisive figure in his lifetime and ever since. Popkin's wide-ranging discussion outlines a number of avenues for further research.

Finally, with his customary erudition J. G. A. Pocock analyzes Edward Gibbon's stance toward heresy and orthodoxy, which, Pocock argues, Gibbon saw as "phenomena of the same order, produced by the same set of workings of the human mind and by the same historical processes" (206). Yet Gibbon was "no deist Mercutio, professing a hearty contempt for both houses" (216); despite his profound reservations about the influence of ecclesiastical authority in a civil society, he concluded that "an established and undemanding Church subordinate to the state was the best guarantee of civil liberty against the twin dangers of clericalism and fanaticism" (217–8).

While these three contributions stand out, the other chapters are worthwhile as well. In their essays, Sammy Basu and Stacey Searl-Chapin focus on "hard-line" reactions to heresy. Basu analyzes the rhetoric of English Presbyterian divine Thomas Edwards's *Gangraena* (1646), a catalog of contemporary heresies intended to "sway public opinion against toleration, shock Parliament into punitive action, and further solidify a Presbyterian settlement of the Kingdom" (13); ironically, Edwards's meticulous discussions of contemporary heresies led to charges that he was disseminating dangerous information that only fostered heterodoxy. Searl-Chapin studies Francis Lee's implicit attack on the French Prophets, a millenarian Huguenot sect, in his *History of Montanism* (1709).

Several articles focus on defenders of heretics and calls for toleration. Maryanne Cline Horowitz traces variations among the editions of Gabriel Naudé's *Apology for Great Men Suspected of Magic* (first edition, 1625). Luisa Simonutti addresses the ways in which Phillipp van Limborch's 1692 *History of the Inquisition* (a heavily annotated edition of thirteenth-century Toulousian inquisition records) was used to justify religious toleration. Sally Jenkinson discusses the public context of heresy, focusing on published exchanges between Pierre Bayle (a Huguenot), Louis Maimbourg (a Catholic), and Jean LeClerc (a Dutch Remonstrant).

In the section entitled, "Radical Heretics on the Offensive," Anthony McKenna examines early eighteenth-century clandestine

manuscripts in light of their debt to the writings of Bayle, while Martin Muslow looks at Socinian “counter-histories” that challenged accepted fault lines between orthodoxy and heterodoxy. In the second half of the eighteenth century, the prevailing cultural winds shifted against spiritual enthusiasms. Heinrich Corrodi’s *Critical History of Chiliasm* (1781–3) is the subject of Simone Zurbuchen’s analysis; she ably traces how he adopted the criteria of “‘reasonable’ religion and ‘true’ revelation” to come up with “his own, original concept of history” (200).

The final section, “Enlightened Orthodoxy,” is especially tightly knit; all three contributors address attitudes toward heresy in the Enlightenment, particularly in reference (or reaction) to the anti-Catholicism of Diderot’s famous *Encyclopédie*. Patrick Coleman charts the “enlightened orthodoxy” of the Abbé Pluquet’s *Dictionnaire des hérésies* (1762), while Clorinda Donato discusses heresy in the Swiss *Encyclopédie d’Yverdon* (1770–80) and Kathleen Hardesty Doig investigates the abbé Nicolas-Sylvestre Bergier, author of many theological articles in the *Encyclopédie methodique*.

This volume has its roots in a conference at the University of California at Los Angeles in 2000, in which scholars from a number of different fields—including history, philosophy, political science, French, and Italian—participated. If the resulting articles are any measure, the conference must have been a splendid success.

Barbara Fuchs. *Mimesis and Empire: The New World, Islam, and European Identities*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001. xiii + 211. \$54.95. Review by NABIL MATAR, FLORIDA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY.

Imitatio was a respectable form of adoption and adaptation in the Renaissance. From Seneca to Petrarch to Ben Jonson, writers and poets prided themselves on using material from previous authors and making something new, without losing sight of their model. In *Mimesis and Empire*, Barbara Fuchs approaches this Renaissance practice from the cultural studies perspective and produces a rich examination of chiefly Spanish but also Italian and English texts and contexts. Fuchs relies on the work of René Girard and Michael Taussig, and shows how mimesis “functions as a powerful weapon for non-Western subjects, challenging both the distinctiveness and the hegemony of the West.”

The book strikes a happy balance between historical context and literary interpretation—a balance that many current books in cultural studies dismally fail to do. In six chapters, Fuchs shows how early modern European empire-building was wrought with anxiety and instability. Power on the ground did not necessarily mean religious or racial assuredness because both victims and conquerors “wrote back” to show the hypocrisy, cruelty, and un-Christianness of imperial claims. Whether the authors were from the victimized peoples of the New World—Incas such as Inca Garcilaso and Guaman Poma—or sympathetic to those victims—to the Moriscos in Ginés Pérez de Hita’s *Guerras civiles de Granada* and to the Araucanians in Alonso de Ercilla’s *La Araucana*—they produced narratives that showed how fractured the divisions and polarities were which empires instituted, as against “the inconvenient similarities and shared heritages.”

One of the fascinating discussions in this book focuses on the interplay of representations. Spanish writers repeatedly viewed the Amerindians as “Moors” and treated them as religious, cultural, and racial adversaries. In *Aztecs, Moors and Christians: Festivals of Reconquest in Mexico and Spain*, which appeared just as Fuch’s book was going to press, Max Harris examines the cultural legacy of such interplay and shows its survival into modern times. Fuchs goes further to show how Amerindian writers tried to inscribe

themselves into the Spanish discourse of racial purity in order to differentiate themselves from the “infidels.” Meanwhile, numerous Spanish writers and government officials saw the *conquista* of America as a continuation of the *reconquista*, and approached the Amerindians as they did the Muslims and Jews of Spain—as enemies to be either converted or expelled. But as Fuchs carefully shows, the paradox of Spanish mimesis was never fully resolved: the Spaniards were willing to convert and integrate the Amerindians, but accepted neither the Moriscos nor the Marranos. As a result, and while the Amerindians were able to remain on their land, by 1609, the others had been expelled from Spain.

The chapter on “Virtual Spaniards” is extremely important for any evaluation of early modern Christian-Islamic relations in the Mediterranean. Fuchs analyses two documents by “virtual” or dissimulating Spaniards: Núñez Muley and the authors of the Lead Tablets. The arguments presented by Muley to the Spanish authorities in defense of the cultural distinction of the Moriscos is of relevance even today. Muley hoped that the different language of the Moriscos, along with their separate customs and social codes, would not be seen to undermine their Christian identity or Spanish allegiance. Culture should be separated from religion, since Spain, he believed, would be deeply enriched by the multi-culturalism of its differing Christian communities. But his eloquent appeal fell on deaf Spanish ears. The forged Lead Tablets that were discovered in Granada in the 1590s and purported to present Arabic gospels (with Mary as the central figure) show the extent to which the Moriscos believed themselves part of Spanish history and religion. Ahmad bin Qasim, a Morisco who examined the plates, copied some of them, and then circulated them in North Africa. The Muslim acceptance of these forgeries casts doubt on the theory that these were Christian/Spanish rather than Morisco/Spanish forgeries. The Arabic in Qasim’s version of the “Book of the Gifts of the Reward” is too Qur’anic for Christian Spaniards to have imitated, and the non-incarnational and non-trinitarian theology is not easily conceivable within a post-Tridentine mood in Western

Christendom. (Qasim's autobiography is available in an English translation by P.S. Van Koningsveld et al., 1998.)

The single chapter which Fuchs dedicates to England is too narrow to fit within the general discussion of empire. As Fuchs correctly observes, the England of the late sixteenth- and early seventeenth centuries was not yet an imperial power. Fuchs thus focuses on pirates and renegades to show how they constructed themselves within an imperial discourse and were inscribed, through plays and biographies by Heywood, Daborne, Massinger, Rowley, and John Smith, into the mimesis of conquest. But there is a vast difference between the imperial hegemony of Spain that spanned oceans and continents, and the make-believe world of the pirates in the Mediterranean presidios. The Spaniards dominated peoples and civilizations for centuries: there is nothing in English similar to the petitions, histories, chronicles, and polemics (notwithstanding the instabilities of those genres) that characterized the Spanish imperial venture. There is, however, the record of the early English colonization of the American North East that shows how the English "imitated" the Spaniards in their ideological justifications, and superimposed Moor and Turk on Indian, and vice versa. From the very beginning of their empire, the English practiced mimesis.

Barbara Fuchs surveys an extensive range of material from non-English sources for which she is to be commended: there is an unfortunate tendency among critics and historians in early modern English studies to work in isolation of the rest of Europe and the Mediterranean. Furthermore, her treatment of "mimesis" shows how indispensable this concept is in both cultural history as well as literary criticism. *Mimesis and Empire* is an intelligent and balanced book—and a necessary eye-opener on the triangulation of Europe, the Mediterranean, and America in the early modern period. \

Heidi Hutner. *Colonial Women: Race and Culture in Stuart Drama*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001. ix + 141 pp. \$35.00. Review by CHLOE WHEATLEY, TRINITY COLLEGE, HARTFORD CONNECTICUT.

Heidi Hutner's *Colonial Women: Race and Culture in Stuart Drama* provides valuable insight into just how deeply discourses of gender and colonialism were entwined in the literature of the seventeenth century. An in-depth study of drama by John Dryden, Thomas Duffet, Thomas Durfey, and Aphra Behn, Hutner's study also casts a glance back in time in order to link such Restoration plays to earlier texts, including Shakespeare's *The Tempest* and prose descriptions of the colonial encounter. She is particularly interested in how early modern writers produced narratives not only about the "regulation of European women's sexuality" but also about the "repression of the native woman," and the "effacement of the black woman" (15). Although such narratives often were used as a means to justify European domination, Hutner ultimately shows how "the contradictory and conflicted nature of the stage text in performance" ultimately "destabilizes the spectacular attempt to legitimate the colonial project" (18).

Colonial Women begins by considering how the myth of Pocahontas provided the early seventeenth century with a complex figure for colonial desires and fears about assimilation. She then focuses on how Shakespeare's *The Tempest* and John Fletcher's *The Sea Tempest*, particularly in their representations of native and European women, served as sites where theories not just about assimilation but also colonial subjection and eradication could be tested. Chapter 2 draws connections between Shakespeare's *The Tempest* and later adaptations such as *The Enchanted Island* and *The Mock-Tempest*, noting in particular how these Restoration plays share an attempt "to write the divisions in English political discourse over the bodies of the absent/present Indian or black woman, or the body of the European woman who has gone native" (63). In Chapter 3 Hutner again introduces fascinating contextual material, this time the story of La Malinche or Dona Marina, the native woman who served as translator, advisor, and mistress to Hernan Cortes and

who was often blamed, essentially, for the conquest of Mexico. While English playwrights like Dryden did not represent Marina directly, Hutner suggests that they did nonetheless draw on the general concept of the native woman who is “empowered by the rejection of her own people” and acts “in favor of the white men’s religion and culture” (69). Hutner concludes that Restoration plays such as *The Indian Queen* and *The Indian Emperor* draw upon the figure of the “sexually savage indigenous woman” (19) in order to justify colonial domination. Finally, Chapter 4 considers Aphra Behn’s contribution to these conflicted and unstable discourses of gender, race, and colonial contact. Positioning Behn within the historical contexts traced through the course of her study, Hutner emphasizes how *The Widow Ranter* “conflates the problematic of divine right and the (falling) Stuart throne in England with the woman-as-land metaphor and the myth of Pocahontas in Virginia” (91). She sees Behn’s play as not merely a compendium of colonial themes but rather a work richly “beset by internal tensions,” containing “conflicting and overlapping positions about race, gender, and royal authority” and hence registering “the chaos and confusion of [Behn’s] times” (92).

Colonial Women shows clearly how Restoration drama, through its appropriation of readily available tropes, reworked narratives of the colonial encounter and engaged with issues of interracial contact, commerce, slavery, and empire. In this way, I find Hutner’s work a particularly strong reminder of what can be gained by thinking across period divides that can split the study of seventeenth-century drama. Hutner’s work also provides an important supplement to readings that focus only on the link between Restoration literature and a monarchic context. Hutner herself acknowledges and contributes to our understanding of how contradictory discourses of colonialism were often used to figure fractured political authority. However, she also makes it very clear that she objects to methodologies that see in the dramatization of colonial narratives only an allegory of English political issues. The other crucial side of the equation, she reminds her readers, is “what is at stake for women and non-Europeans in this discourse” (23). *Colo-*

nial Women, with its reading of how Restoration drama staged issues of both gender and colonialism, makes clear the benefits of bringing a “New World” more centrally into our analysis of early modern English literature.

Joyce Green MacDonald. *Women and Race in Early Modern Texts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. 188 pp. \$55.00 cloth. Review by JULIE D. CAMPBELL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY.

From the striking opening anecdote about tournaments involving “the wild knight and the black lady” at the court of King James VI of Scotland in 1507 and 1508 to her concluding comments on the “cultural work” of race, MacDonald seeks to discover how “raced,” “sexual” bodies are used to delineate and define culture, as well as how they can also appear as “political bodies” whose “sexual motions dictat[e] civic destinies” (165-166). Her commentary mainly covers use of race in texts from the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries, as well as issues of race in Britain and various colonies during this period.

In general, MacDonald writes about aspects of race and culture that are of great interest in contemporary early modern studies, and she does so from a particularly personal point of view, which is evident throughout but especially underscored in the conclusion where she recounts her own journey with writing about race during her career. The book is written in emphatic first person through which MacDonald primarily argues the importance of approaching race and gender together. In Chapter One, “Cleopatra: Whiteness and Knowledge,” which is less about Cleopatra than it is a survey of what other critics have to say about race, MacDonald articulates her own theoretical approach by engaging with those of numerous critics ranging from Henry Louis Gates, Spike Lee, Kwame Anthony Appiah, and Shelley Haley to Jared Taylor. She also focuses a great deal of attention on Mary Lefkowitz’s book, *Not Out of Africa: How Afrocentrism Became an Excuse to Teach Myth as History* (1996), including a long discussion of Lefkowitz’s cover

illustration. Referring to these critics and others, MacDonald meshes examples from popular culture with examples from the period in question to present a wide array of judgments as she carves out the territory of her own critical discourse. Ultimately, she argues that skin color, while very significant, is not the only racial issue that matters in the early modern period and that skin color should be studied in relation to “region, gender, sexuality, and religion”(44) over the course of the period.

What follows in the ensuing chapters is a series of detailed interrogations of the texts in question regarding raced and sexual bodies and how those bodies function in the shaping of cultural and authorial identity. One of MacDonald’s most striking observations is that the characters who are raced, sexual, and political appear most often in pre-Restoration texts, presumably because these texts were “written during a precolonial, or protocolonial, period” during which the “structures of an overseas empire supported by slavery were not yet fully in place, so that textual reproductions of the consequences of exogamous encounters were freer to imagine these encounters in much larger terms than they were after the lines of the triangle trade and hardening racial regulations in the colonies were laid down” (166). Regarding the characterization of raced characters in the later texts, MacDonald suggests, based on her examination of *Pompey* and *Abdelazer*, that “English women writers produced both female characters who more consistently conform to the dominant culture’s notions of proper femininity, and non-European characters, male and female, who are more firmly contained and suppressed”(89). Both of these lines of thought would be intriguing to explore in more texts from the period. They also resonate with and expand on Kim Hall’s discussion of how England’s “movement from geographic isolation into military and mercantile contest with other countries . . . sets the stage for the longer process by which preexisting literary tropes of blackness profoundly interacted with the fast-changing economic relations of white Europeans and their darker ‘others’ during the Renaissance” (*Things of Darkness*, 1995, 3-4).

The book is divided into two parts, with the first part focusing on nonwhite women of the classical world and the second part addressing nonwhite women in early modern Britain. MacDonald states that the book has six chapters (18), but it actually has seven, excluding the introduction and conclusion. The first three chapters focus on Rome and Egypt. First, MacDonald looks at how the figure of Cleopatra “may figure in contemporary and Renaissance attempts to reclaim or deny a non-European cultural identity.” Second, she addresses Shakespeare’s *Antony and Cleopatra*, arguing that it “significantly refuses many of the majoritarian sexual, racial, and imperial biases many Renaissance readers extracted from stories of Rome’s encounters with Egypt.” Third, she explores how images of Dido figure “in narrations of empire’s relations to race and sexuality” (18-19). The discussions in Part One especially illustrate the complexities inherent in portrayals of Cleopatra, as well as markers of racial difference regarding issues of dynasty, as exemplified in the legends of the founding of Rome.

Part two, the final four chapters, addresses subjects related to Britain’s “New World empire supported by slavery.” First, MacDonald examines white-skinned versions of Aphra Behn’s black heroine, Imoinda, in the eighteenth-century dramatizations of *Oroonoko*. Second, continuing this discussion, she looks at the white Weldon sisters and the white Imoinda in Thomas Southerne’s version of *Oroonoko*. Third, she interrogates the “writing and unwriting” of race in Katherine Philips’ *Pompey*, and fourth, she explores sexual and racial difference in Behn’s Abdelazer. One of the most interesting aspects of the second part of the book is MacDonald’s synthesis of historical issues regarding race in the colonies in America and Surinam as she explores the links between “whites’ racial authority, black women’s sexuality, and white women’s social repression” (96), which she then connects to eighteenth-century adaptations of *Oroonoko*. MacDonald also extends this discussion to include issues of sentimentality and *préciosité* in light of the “modesty, blamelessness, and chastity” (128) intrinsic to the self-fashioning of Katherine Philips and her circle.

All things considered, *Women and Race in Early Modern England* provides a thought-provoking look at race in texts and culture in the early modern period. MacDonald's attention to historical and cultural backdrops for the texts in question especially illuminates her arguments.

Margaret Cavendish. *Observations Upon Experimental Philosophy*. Ed. Eileen O'Neill. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001. xlvii + 287 pp. \$60.00. Review by JAMES FITZMAURICE, NORTHERN ARIZONA UNIVERSITY.

For the last ten years or so, those who work with early women writers have understood that, in spite of what Dorothy Osborne wrote to William Temple, Margaret Cavendish was not "distracted" and did not belong in Bedlam. This is not to deny that Cavendish was flamboyant in dress or odd in behavior but only to assert that her writing, which was once ridiculed, is now taken seriously. Plays by Cavendish are understood these days as having fascinating, if equivocal, protofeminist elements. Her autobiography is often discussed within the context of women's life writing, and her romances are studied in light of Royalist political theory. Two biographies have appeared in the last five years. She also is studied by historians of science, but, for those who are not well versed in seventeenth-century and classical philosophy, Cavendish's scientific speculation has remained almost impenetrable. Eileen O'Neill's edition of *Observations Upon Experimental Philosophy* (1666) will go a long way towards making what Cavendish had to say on a variety of scientific subjects understandable for those whose main interests in Cavendish lie elsewhere. Fortunately for those scholars, O'Neill's introduction is lucidly written and manages to treat highly technical philosophical questions without resorting to a great deal of jargon. Historians of science, of course, will be pleased to find that what O'Neill takes to be Cavendish's most important single volume on natural philosophy is once again available in print.

Cavendish often claimed that she did not read the work of others and that instead she generated philosophical understanding out of her own unaided imagination. It is true that because she was a woman she had no access to formal education, and it is also the case that she had no male mentor or correspondent, as had Anne, countess of Conway, in the person of Henry More. Nevertheless, Cavendish did not generate all of her thinking out of her own imagination, and O'Neill does an excellent job of finding the sources of Cavendish's scientific speculation, most notably in Thomas Stanley's *History of Philosophy* (1655–62), but also elsewhere as with Van Helmont's book on chemical vitalism, *Oriatrike, Or, Physick Refined* (1662). In other instances, Cavendish shows at least "second hand knowledge . . . [as with] Cicero's rendering in *De Fato* of the Stoic distinction between 'auxiliary and proximate causes,' as opposed to 'perfect and principal' causes" (xxx). Indeed, O'Neill's project is to situate Cavendish among seventeenth-century and classical philosophers of science.

Although Cavendish began by accepting Lucretian atomism, she soon adopted a view more in line with the Stoics, which was that the universe is continuous and that discrete atoms cannot exist independent of a natural whole. So, too, the impossibility of vacua, which if they existed would deny the continuity of all things. At the same time, Cavendish was a materialist and held that no spirit existed in the universe outside of matter. Matter, then, she classified as inanimate, sensitive, and rational. Matter that one encounters in nature is a mixture of these three types and is self-moving rather than moved by external forces. Its movement is, in addition, sympathetic rather than mechanistic. O'Neill uses the example of a hand throwing a ball to illustrate what Cavendish is trying to say. Cavendish would deny that a hand imparts motion to a ball when the ball is thrown. Rather, the matter in the ball is in sympathy with the matter in the hand and moves itself so as to "pattern out" the hand. Cavendish's early articulation of her system in *Philosophical Fancies* bears considerable resemblance to the system created by Francis Bacon, who argued in favor of "active spiritous matter" and "gross matter" in *Novum Organum*.

O'Neill suggests that Cavendish may have become acquainted with the Stoics while in Antwerp and points out that her house there had once been owned by Peter Paul Rubens, who was involved in a Neostoic circle. Rubens' brother was a follower of Justus Lipsius, a prominent Neostoic. Another group, the Newcastle Circle, more clearly influenced her thinking, and it contained her brother-in-law, Sir Charles Cavendish, Thomas Hobbes, and Kenelm Digby. Cavendish was, according to O'Neill, "one of the few seventeenth-century thinkers . . . to side with Hobbes in espousing a materialist philosophy that denied the existence of incorporeal souls in nature," though he was a mechanist and she was not (xiii).

Observations Upon Experimental Philosophy, itself, is conveniently divided in this edition, as it was in the first, into sections, mostly of a page or two, on clearly demarcated topics such as "Of Congelation or Freezing," and "Of the Universal Medicine." In considering this last topic, Cavendish spends some time being less theoretical than one might suppose for she writes,

But to return to the universal medicine; although I do not believe there is any, nor that all diseases are curable; yet my advice is, that no applications of remedies should be neglected in any diseases whatsoever; because diseases cannot be so perfectly known, but that they may be mistaken; and so even the most experienced physician may be many times deceived, and mistake a curable disease for an incurable; wherefore trials should be made as long as life lasts. (243)

Cavendish shows this practical side from time to time.

O'Neill is perhaps a little coy in her final appraisal of Cavendish as a philosopher of science. O'Neill does make clear that the philosophy is not daft but, apparently, neither is much of it original and it had almost no effect on contemporary philosophers. For O'Neill, Cavendish is most notable as a highly competent woman philosopher, who dared to publish her notebooks. Cavendish scholars may wish that O'Neill had said more about the Newcastle Circle and in particular looked into Cavendish's interactions with Sir Charles Cavendish or Kenelm Digby. Those interactions, however,

may be more the matter of biography than of an introduction to a volume of philosophy.

Richard Terry. *Poetry and the Making of the English Literary Past: 1660–1781*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001. xii + 354 pp. \$72.00. Review by JAMES FITZMAURICE, NORTHERN ARIZONA UNIVERSITY.

Poetry and the Making of the English Literary Past asserts that its central project is an examination of the notion of English literature in the long eighteenth century. That notion is neither unambiguous nor uniform, and it lurks behind various labels including “*belles lettres*” and “poesy.” Nevertheless, the idea of English literature that emerges from the book is not altogether unfamiliar. English literature presupposes the selection of a group of valued imaginative texts, including representatives from earlier times. As might be imagined, Richard Terry devotes a good deal of space to canon formation. His approach combines a judicious amount of theory with a good deal of attention paid to what he takes to be important agents influencing the canon: anthologies, biographical dictionaries, and school curricula.

Terry begins by looking at the belief that “literature” was an invention of the “mid- to late eighteenth century” and at the consequence of that belief, that “the application of the term [literature] to writings earlier . . . constitutes an unwarrantable anachronism.” He has in mind, of course, Eagleton’s widely read *Literary Theory*, along with books by others like Alvin Kernan and Douglas Lane Patey. Terry is meticulous in observing the meanings of words at various points in time and often describes semantic shift, so it is no surprise when he asserts that the idea of literature existed within the meanings of other terms earlier than 1750 and that discussions of this idea are not necessarily anachronistic.

Less interesting for me than his arguments with those who theorize literary history broadly is Terry’s dealing, chapter by chapter, with a set of specific topics related to his enterprise. In one chapter, for instance, he offers a close examination of the relationship

between literary fame and dictionaries of authorial biography. He is most interested in William Winstanley's *Lives of the Most Famous English Poets* (1687), though he also covers a host of other compilers including Thomas Fuller (*Abel Redevivus*, 1651), Edward Phillips (*Theatrum Poetarum*, 1675), Giles Jacob (*Poetical Register*, 1719), and Elizabeth Cooper (*Muses Library*, 1737). The business of selection for such people was complicated, Terry says, by the influence of the tradition of "worthies," in which biographers included "meritorious individuals" who had led morally exemplary lives (82). The difficulty arises, according to Terry, "because writers, perhaps, more than any other category of persons, tend to be valued for their creations rather than their deeds [and thus] the employment of worthies-style conventions might seem somewhat inapt and mistaken." It is no small irony, which Terry points out in another chapter, that Katherine Philips became famous because she was taken to be a modest woman who did not seek fame for her writing. Ben Jonson, on the other hand, published his *Works* (1616) so as to shape his own posthumous reputation, leaving out *Bartholomew Fair* for whatever reason. As if the situation were not worried enough, the word "fame," Terry says, shifted in meaning away from "accolade conferred by posterity" and towards "modern ideas of 'public profile' and 'celebrity status'" (91).

A chapter which treats Johnson's *Works of the Poets* (1779-1781) continues the connection between literary canon and biography. Many will be startled to learn that a "cartel of booksellers" and not Johnson was responsible for the choice of fifty-one of the entries, while Johnson himself only picked five. *Works* was followed by the much more important *Lives*, but *Lives* stands "on the foundation of a great deal of earlier biographical endeavour" rather than on "original research" (226). *Lives* is, however, more skeptical and more apt to discriminate between sources than are other such collections, and it owes a great deal to Johnson's self-conscious decision to include vivid anecdotes, as with the story of the death of Otway. Otway, destitute and in a "rage of hunger," choked to death on a piece of bread. Terry sees *Works* and *Lives* taken together as a "project" that was attacked on the one hand for being indiscrimi-

nate in inclusion (*Works*) and on the other for being overly zealous in criticism (*Lives*).

Other chapters deal with literature as it finds its way into the curricula of schools, Dryden's sense of literary tradition, the canon of literature by women, and the opposition between classical and gothic models for English literature. Terry's achievement is in part encyclopedic, for he discusses a great many books and in so doing creates something like one of the dictionaries that he describes. Fortunately, he does a fine job of tying his material together. He subordinates well and is neither indiscriminate in inclusion nor overly zealous in criticism. He may miss a book or two, and I was surprised not to see Horace Walpole's *Royal and Noble Authors* among his biographical dictionaries. He also is perhaps a little off base when he says that he hopes he has been successful in changing the view that the eighteenth century is characterized by its suppression of women's literary voices. Many would say that there was plenty of suppression but that significant numbers of women managed to overcome it. These, however, are small problems. *Poetry and the Making of the English Literary Past* is both an important study of literature as an idea and a pleasant read. It is at the same time a serious and reliable reference work, to which I expect to return from time to time.

John Manning: *The Emblem*. London: Reaktion, 2002. ix + 398 pp. + 150 illus. \$35.00. Review by WILLIAM E. ENGEL.

John Manning is well known to scholars working on the connection between poetry and the visual arts. Here at last is the culmination of decades of his research and ruminations, the result of his careful scholarship and irrepressible jocundity. This book is one of the most provocative and substantial books on literary criticism and art to appear in a long time, and it is destined to be a pacesetter for years to come.

Manning begins his study of the emblem by situating its origin, as near as can be determined, in the festive, coterie environment of

Alciato's circle of friends. Just as we might say things among dinner guests that we might not declare in public, so too with the first collection of epigrams published without the creator's approval (42). This becomes an emblematic moment for how Manning subsequently treats the genesis and development of the form, focusing less on the austere and more on the ludic aspects. This is true with respect to his style as well, which ably matches the content.

Among the delights of this book are the author's apt colloquialisms ("the very riddle of the Sphinx, that dies when answered"), his echoes of great literature folded into his text ("stale, flat and unprofitable"), and his always impeccable scholarly approach to various reinventions and mutations of the emblem up to the present day. Throughout are displays of wit and intellectual verve that complement his never-flagging and cheering study. For example the concluding chapter, aptly entitled "Last Things" tells the story of the emblem up to the modern age while surveying popular seventeenth-century works concerning, well, last things: Death, Judgment, Hell, and Heaven—the "chiliastic horror" which gave shape to many of the emblem books, reflecting the extent to which "their attitudes are shaped by an acute *post mortem* consciousness" (275). Along the way, many important presuppositions about the age are opened up to critical scrutiny; many are debunked and then recast in a way that renders Manning's analysis fresh, fullsome, and profitable.

In particular, this book is critical of the well-intentioned efforts to bring emblem literature to a wider, contemporary audience through facsimile reprints. Manning implicitly warns us against resting too easily and readily with new print and digital technologies because they tend expensively to "preserve the errors and typographical idiosyncrasies of individual copies, even down to the accidents at the press, the ink blots and scribbles left by early readers, which render, on occasions, the printed text illegible" (17). And yet, on the other hand, in the service of his larger argument, this study puts to good use several popular assumptions associated with history of the book research as it pertains to the performance of culture; specifically, the view that the "printed book had a life of its

own, and its shape and destiny was controlled by various hands—booksellers, printers, artists, composers and editors” (46). All of this contributes to Manning’s effort to breathe new life into the ever-growing body of emblems studies.

It is in this regard that the thirty-six page Introduction is indispensable, and should be required reading for anyone interested in gaining a deeper and more thorough understanding of how to approach the study of emblems and visual regimes of early modern culture. This is made possible though because, in the Introduction, Manning wisely warns against any simple definition of the emblem while also cautioning against overly pedantic ones. He points out, most importantly, that the very question “What is an emblem?” is not even a good question, because it implies that the answer lies “in the same eternal present as the question, and that there is *an* emblem, a normative type” (21).

Although it is a long book by contemporary academic publishing standards, it is a very important book, page for page. It is not so much to be considered a reference work as an exemplary reminder of how a responsible scholar thinks about literary criticism before setting out to practice it. And while the reader with some knowledge of the key texts discussed will learn new things about the main sources usually cited in emblem studies (from Alciato and Giovio, through Whitney, Wither, and Quarles, to Vænius and Valeriano, and even some of the less well known writers of the later seventeenth century), the reader new to emblem studies will find here many avenues of research worthy of future pursuit.

And for the emblem-savvy reader as for the newcomer alike, there is much to be mined from the second chapter entitled “Towards an Emblematic Rhetoric” (which considers such perennial themes as the primacy of the word, the primacy of the image, and iconographic redundancy), as is there from the Appendix, consisting of facsimile pages from three emblem books which “deploy representative strategies by which word and image relate to one another.” Chosen for the exemplarity, we are presented with an edition of Alciato, a book derived from the French Court culture of Louis XIV, and a late edition of Quarles that “shows an accommodation

of Protestant and Catholic traditions of meditation" (321). The sixteen-page index, three columns per page, is invaluable (including a complete listing of all of the mottoes cited). As an earlier review noted in this regard, this book is unique among emblem studies for its frank indexing of anatomical body parts including the most private, male and female. But we would expect no less, given the unshrinking and unapologetic tone of the entire volume which seeks to set new standards for what we think about and what we do with emblems.

Though a light touch may characterize this book, it is not all, "as the Erasmian motto warns us, simply fun and games"(144). Notwithstanding the joyous ethos of this volume, Manning's virtuoso performance owes a great deal to his previous experience as a scrupulous editor of rare and, in some cases, unique archival materials. And the result is a festive celebration indeed, with chapters including "Children and Childish Gazers," "Carnal Devotions," and "Licentious Poets and the Feast of Saturn." The gamesome aspect of the emblem, long recognized by scholars by virtue of explicit references such as Wither's lottery at the end of his celebrated collection, at last is extended to take into account a much larger part of the tradition than previously had been considered decorous. This provides—indeed restores—a context for thinking about, and for rethinking, the culture of emblems and ingenious displays of wit in its many forms so prevalent during the seventeenth century. In the end then, as Manning maintains, the emblem should not "be used as a peep-hole into the cultural assumptions of the period"; but rather, "the emblem itself can only be understood in terms of the broad cultural assumptions that produced it" (9).

Henk van Os, Jan Piet Filedt Kok, Ger Luijten, Frits Scholten *et al.* *Netherlandish Art at the Rijksmuseum 1400-1600*. Amsterdam and Zwolle: Rijksmuseum and Waanders, 2000. 279 pp. + 194 col. pls. + 139 b&w illus. \$65.00.

Jan Piet Filedt Kok, Reinier Baarsen, Bart Cornelis, Wouter Kloek, Frits Scholten *et al.* *Netherlandish Art at the Rijksmuseum 1600-1700*. Amsterdam and Zwolle: Rijksmuseum and Waanders, 2001. 295pp. + 190 col. pls. + 150 b&w illus. \$65.00.

Review by HANNEKE GROOTENBOER, TULANE UNIVERSITY.

Netherlandish Art 1400-1600 and *Netherlandish Art 1600-1700* are the first two beautifully published volumes of a four part series on the holdings of the Rijksmuseum. Lavishly illustrated, both books offer a comprehensive overview of the development of the arts in the Netherlands by bringing together a selection of paintings, sculptures, prints, and decorative art objects from the museum's various collections. The next two years will see the publication of the two remaining titles on eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Netherlandish art.

The Amsterdam Rijksmuseum is preparing itself for the twenty-first century. In the fall of 2003, the museum will close its doors to the public for a three-year period of extensive renovation to open them again in 2006. Part of the ambitious restructuring project involves plans for changing the format of the traditional permanent display based on the division between the various arts. Suggestions have been brought up for dividing the display not by medium but into three historical periods (middle ages, early modern, and modern era) by integrating paintings, sculptures, historical objects and decorative arts in thematically arranged rooms. Definite decisions on the presentation of the materials have not yet been made, but if the experimental plans for the fusion of the arts would be realized, the final result will be unprecedented in Europe. This promising, innovative approach of the staff to the museum's various collections we see already partly reflected in the two publications under review here.

The celebrated British National Gallery survey *Giotto to Dürer* (1991) served as an example for the series, as the editors state in the introduction to the first volume. The reason why the Rijksmuseum series remains incomparable with *Giotto to Dürer* is

only partly due to the scope of the respective collections. Although the editors admit that they cannot possibly provide a complete overview of European painting offered by their London model because of the Rijksmuseum's exclusive focus on Netherlandish art, the main difference is manifested in the structure of the works. The strength of the London survey lies in the ways in which the writers have managed successfully to discuss many of the paintings in the collection in several larger narratives. *Giotto to Dürer* as well as its companion *Dürer to Veronese* are divided into chapters on themes, genres, or the process of making painting under which groups of works are brought together within a larger cultural-historical context. Admittedly, this set-up anticipates a target audience whose interests in the arts exceed that of the general tourist. Yet, the museum staff's decision to place groups of art works in the shared context of their cultural history instead of describing single art works in individual catalogue entries made these publications excellent textbooks for college-level education.

Intended for the interested visitor rather than the student of art history, each of the two volumes of *Netherlandish Art* combines about a hundred entries on individual objects with essays on the production and function of art, on the world of the artist, and on the history of the museum and its politics of display. Most authors of the first volume have attempted to incorporate objects from the museum in their essays, resulting sometimes in clear struggles with the collection's lack of Northern Renaissance paintings by major artists such as Jan van Eyck, Rogier van der Weyden or Hans Memling. Frits Scholten has decided to sail around these gaps in his essay on "The World of the Late-Medieval Artist" by rarely referring to any of the museum pieces. Contrarily, former director of the Rijksmuseum Henk van Os effectively shows in his opening essay that such gaps do not necessarily pose limitations. Focusing exclusively on works from the Rijksmuseum's collections, Van Os explains the function of early Netherlandish art by leading his reader from object to art work in a highly accessible if slightly fragmented narrative. His essay thus carries the character of an inspiring guided tour through the museum. The dilemma as to

how the museum's holdings should be placed in a larger thematic or historical narrative has not been fully resolved in this volume. The choice of the editors for individual, numbered entries may testify to an attempt to avoid rather than confront the problem.

Netherlandish Art 1600-1700 is more coherent in presenting the impressive core of the Rijksmuseum's collections, which include renowned paintings by Vermeer, Rembrandt, Ter Borch and Willem Kalf, to name a few. Presumably, the excellence of Dutch seventeenth-century art and the items in the collection hardly needs further introduction. It is therefore remarkable that Wouter Kloek in his essay, "The Art of Specialists," repeatedly praises the greatness of the paintings he discusses in terms of their high quality rather than addressing the intriguing question as to how the explosive production of paintings or the artist' tendency toward specialization in the Dutch Republic came about. Contrarily, Arie Wallert's essay on techniques of seventeenth-century artists and the materials they used offers some nice views on seventeenth-century business management when he explains how various techniques increased the production of paintings in the workshop. For instance, in a portrait studio, the use of templates for body and dress assisted apprentices in preparing the picture for the master to fill in the head.

Despite the museum staff's progressive plans for innovating the display to offer the visitor a more complete image of the rich Dutch history, little attempt has been made in these publications to incorporate the exciting results of current national and international scholarship in the proliferating field of Dutch art history. Mariet Westermann in *The Art Bulletin*, historical studies of domestic material culture, research on the economic system of the art market, on optical experiments, and on the Dutch "art of describing," as well as theoretically informed close readings shedding new lights on old masters have all contributed to new and surprising insights in the meaning and function of Netherlandish art. Of all these thrilling new perspectives, only a handful is included in the Rijksmuseum publications. This exclusion is all the more regrettable, as lively debates on Vermeer's use of the *camera obscura*,

Rembrandt's self-awareness or Dou's virtuosity precisely point to the greatness of these art works, a greatness which reveals itself in the variation and abundance of its seventeenth-century subjects as much as in the wealth of interpretations they have engendered in the centuries thereafter.

Jonathan I. Israel. *Radical Enlightenment: Philosophy and the Making of Modernity 1650–1750*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001. xvi + 810 pp. + 23 plates. Review by MARK G. SPENCER, UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO.

Jonathan I. Israel, like many scholars before him, argues that the Enlightenment is instrumental “for understanding the rise of the modern world”(vi). But the dimensions of Israel's Enlightenment are such that they differ in important respects from most modern interpretations. Israel aims to portray the “European Enlightenment as a single highly integrated intellectual and cultural movement”(v). His Enlightenment was not of a predominately French or English inspiration. It was not a movement played out on any one national stage but rather a drama whose cast was drawn from many countries, albeit centered on north-western Europe. The Enlightenment did, however, owe more to one country than modern scholars let on. The importance of Dutch thinkers to the Enlightenment is a theme Israel demonstrates here with encyclopedic thoroughness. Israel's view emerges, in part, by locating what historians know as the radical Enlightenment more firmly within the Enlightenment's mainstream current. The radical Enlightenment was, he writes, “an integral and vital part of the wider picture”(vi). Readers of this journal, in particular, may be interested to know that for Israel the late seventeenth century is the crucial period for understanding the origins and flavour of the European Enlightenment. Israel's perspective alters the dimensions of the Enlightenment in other important ways too, as we shall see.

This book has five parts. Part I is really an extended introduction. It defines a “general process of rationalization and secularization” which created a “Crisis of the European Mind,” a phrase Israel borrows from Paul Hazard’s classic account of European intellectual history in the early modern period. By the early seventeenth century, Israel argues, the confessional conflicts occasioned by the Reformation had yielded to a “stable and imposing façade of spiritual and intellectual unity”(16). But from within that stability developed a “contest between faith and incredulity”(4), what Israel later characterizes as “the escalating conflict between revealed religion and philosophical irreligion, the war between Christianity and the new heretics”(458). Israel traces how that crisis swept over western and central Europe after 1650. This radical shift was one inspired by élites, but evident to common people who debated its implications and felt its effects.

The central figure in Israel’s account is Benedict de Spinoza. Spinoza’s notion of “*libertas philosophandi*” (freedom of thought and speech), his doctrine that motion is inherent in matter, his infamous denial of Biblical miracles in the *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*, and his argument for the impossibility of the existence of devils in *Korte Verhandelin* all contributed in important ways to the radical Enlightenment. Spinoza’s writings helped create the very core of the eighteenth-century Enlightenment. Not least important were the implications of Spinoza’s thought for political philosophy, a topic on which Israel has much to offer. A central tenet of Israel’s argument is that “If the concept of the secular ‘common good’ intrinsic to radical thought and Spinozism is allowed to spread, then inevitable political and social revolution based on notions of the ‘general will’, and the call for equality, seemingly becomes inevitable”(80). In many respects this is a book that aims not only to illuminate ideas but also to demonstrate their power.

Along the way Israel pauses to make many interesting points on a variety of topics. Indeed, Israel has a wonderful ability to forage far and wide, discussing in context hundreds of sources typically far removed from the beaten path. He notes a shift in the aims of European censors in the years under review as they moved “away

from a theological focus to suppression of proscribed secular, 'philosophical' ideas"(104). Yet that changed emphasis did not stop censorship of books like Pietro Giannone's *Historia civile del regno di Napoli* (1723). Israel charts the contents of "universal libraries," discusses lexicological literature such as Bayle's *Dictionnaire* whose "influence was ubiquitous and could not be reversed"(137), and explains the growth of "erudite periodicals"(142). Journals in particular, such as *L'Europe Savante*, were important for disseminating debate inspired by the enlightened. "In an age when barriers of language and the vagaries of the book trade frequently impeded the circulation of books internationally, it was especially the journals which spread awareness of new discoveries, ideas, and controversies around Europe"(150) and "helped define the clandestine Radical Enlightenment"(155). While Israel is primarily concerned with intellectual history of a high order, this book shows a keen sense of the social history of ideas. That theme is explored in Thomas Munck's recent book *The Enlightenment: A Comparative Social History, 1721-1794* (London, 2000), a book which may not have been available to Israel before *Radical Enlightenment* went to press.

Parts II and III trace the origins, development, and principles of Spinoza's thought in more detail. They do so by placing Spinoza in the context of seventeenth-century Holland and within the milieu of Franciscus van den Enden, Adriaen and Johannes Koerbagh, Lodewijk Meyer, Johannes Bouwmeester, and other Dutch thinkers who are not often found in modern accounts of the Enlightenment. For Israel, however, at the very "core" of Spinoza's thought "stands the contention that 'nothing happens in Nature that does not follow from her laws, that her laws cover everything that is conceived even by the divine intellect, and that Nature observes a fixed and immutable order,' that is, that the same laws of motion, and laws of cause and effect, apply in all contexts and everywhere"(244).

Spinoza's thought was highly contested during his lifetime. Israel traces reactions to Spinoza's writings, arguing that they had "an appreciable significance in shaping attitudes and fixing the status

of ideas, laying down legally the separation between radical and moderate Enlightenment which . . . was to extend across the whole of Europe”(294). For instance, Spinoza’s radical views on philosophical toleration are differentiated from the more moderate toleration of John Locke, a theme on which Israel has published before. The debate about Spinoza’s ideas did not end with his death, an event which was itself the subject of disagreement. Israel outlines the debates aroused by Spinozist writers, such as Johannes Cuffeler, Petrus van Balen, and Hendrick Wyermars. The dissemination of Spinoza’s ideas is traced in a variety of writings, including the fictional *Philopater* and *Description of the Mighty Kingdom of Krinke Kesmes*, Pierre Bayle’s writings (especially his article on Spinoza in the *Dictionnaire*), and in the publications occasioned by the Brandenburg disputes.

One of Israel’s main arguments is that “during the last third of the seventeenth century” there was “a vast triangular contest in Europe between intellectual conservatives, moderates, and radicals”(375) which generated a “psychological tension”(436). That strain certainly was evident in reactions to Balthasar Bekker’s *Betoverde Weereld*, a book which denied magic, witchcraft, and the supernatural, and aroused diverse reactions. Another figure typically overlooked by Enlightenment scholars, but rating detailed discussions by Israel, is Frederik van Leenhof whose “universal philosophical religion” caused a great stir among his contemporaries. “The chief significance of the Leenhof furor was that it demonstrated more clearly than any comparable episode the feasibility of distilling from Spinoza a complete system of social, moral, and political ideas built on philosophical principles totally incompatible with authority, tradition, and revealed religion, which could be effectively popularized and infiltrated into the consciousness of the non-academic reading public, without readers necessarily even realizing they were imbibing Spinozism”(431).

Part IV explores late seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century reactions to Spinoza, devoting space to French thinkers such as Bossuet, Melbranche, and Houtteville, but also German thinkers such as Leibnitz. Israel argues, controversially, that the thought of

English thinkers Isaac Newton and John Locke “was both less evident and less universal than is commonly assumed”(526). That is an interesting challenge, but one not entirely substantiated in the pages of this book which ought to be read alongside Roy Porter’s *Enlightenment: Britain and the Creation of the Modern World* (Penguin, 2000).

Part V delineates the clandestine progress of the Radical Enlightenment. An interesting chapter explores Spinozistic novels that were not only “fiercely anticlerical and anti-Christian” but whose “ultimate goal is not just to sweep aside revealed religion and ecclesiastical power but, in the realm of fantasy at least, construct an entirely new society from which monarchy, nobility, and hierarchy are excluded, along with institutionalized inequality of the sexes, and in which the well-being of man comes to be based instead on philosophy, enlightenment, equality, virtue, and justice”(598). Another chapter discusses the circulation of clandestine philosophical manuscripts, such as the *Traité des Trois Imposteurs*, which were “the chief method of propagating radical thought in Europe, laying the intellectual foundations, and opening the way psychologically and culturally, for the printed onslaught”(685) of *philosophes* such as Rousseau.

The book is well constructed with few printers’ errors and is illustrated with twenty-three black-and-white prints. The index is useful but does not exhaustively cover the contents of *Radical Enlightenment*, which in any event ought to be read from cover to cover.

Joshua Scodel. *Excess and the Mean in Early Modern English Literature*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002. viii + 367 pp. \$55.00. Review by IRA CLARK, UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA.

In this exemplary work of historical literary criticism, Joshua Scodel offers readers both old-fashioned scholarly and current theoretical virtues. *Excess and the Mean in Early Modern English Literature* reminds me both of the monumental and meticulous learning that

informed criticism founded in the history of ideas and as well of interpretations developed from recent theoretical contexts. The book exhibits Scodel's knowledge of classics and philosophy of many strands, acute reading skills in philosophical and scientific writing, poetry, fiction, and drama, plus the examination of his topic's continuing pertinence to thinkers as diverse as Stephen Jay Gould, John Rawls, Charles Taylor, and Jean Beaudrillard.

Scodel argues that Aristotle's proposal of virtue as the balanced mean between extremes of excess and deficiency is fundamental to understanding a range of ethical expressions in early modern England that extends far beyond the well-known positions of the middle way in religion and politics. To make his argument he prudently employs an adaptable and discriminating notion of authors' transforming what might seem an outworn ethical commonplace so as to demonstrate how various writers manipulated the ideal of moderation between extremes in supporting highly divergent personal, social, political, and intellectual goals. He finds the ideal itself vital because of its revered heritage, its malleability in application, and its valorization of tensions between means and extremes. Such virtues are particularly prominent in his suggestive observations about contemporary employment of this ethic.

In order to avoid any appearance of a progressive history of the Aristotelian mean from early in Elizabeth's reign until the Glorious Revolution, *Excess and the Mean* describes various, and contested, movements through the historical developments of several genres. Scodel's introduction traces Aristotle's mean through the redactions and revisions by Cicero, Seneca, Plutarch, Horace, and Augustine that deeply influenced early modern writers. Then his first part describes early modern revisions by John Donne and Francis Bacon. He finds that Donne through satires and epistles developed an idiosyncratic mean whereby to encourage a skeptical quest for a Christian church and a space among established social identities for personal social mobility. Scodel's Bacon ingeniously employed the mean in support of a stable commonwealth at the same time that he advocated a flexible mean and sometimes an outright rejection of the mean in favor of excess to encourage in-

tellectual search and personal political ambition. Scodel's second part tracks the early modern Georgic from Spenser and Milton through Denham to Cowley. Here he applies his mean-extremes paradigm to look at adaptations of Virgil that celebrated England's emulation of Rome and proposed various visions of rural labor as moderate balance between or contention with extremes, with divergent visions of the incipient nation. Then he describes the advocacy of balance for internal stability with the promotion of zeal for imperial expansion. Part three considers ideals that set in opposition balanced and extreme ideas of love and politics from Samuel Daniel's sonnets and Sidney's *Arcadia* through cavalier lyrics into the heroic plays of John Dryden and Aphra Behn. Here he juxtaposes the rational ideals of moderate love and conjugal comfort advocated by English Protestants with the ideals of passion in erotic extremism as a mark of those "truly noble" in early romances. Restoration developments in the epic and in heroic plays could then exalt the consequences for the public or for the private sphere. Part four follows the contours of the symposiastic drinking lyric through moderation and excess from Ben Jonson and Robert Herrick through Richard Lovelace to John Wilmot, earl of Rochester. From the beginnings this poetry participated in the era's conflicts, such as those over tavern norms of conviviality versus exhortations to moderation, or such as those ethnic and religious conflicts in the choice between "rich wine" and "Luther's beer." These became polarized between Milton's republican moderation and Royalist imbibings over defeated loyalty in isolation or close friendship, until they culminated in drunken escapist excess or, in the case of Rochester, transgressive erotic with symposiastic pleasures. Scodel's conclusion looks at John Milton's counter re-imagining of an ideal of moderation in *Paradise Lost*. Here he focuses on the exaltation of Adam and Eve's paradisaic balance of self-respect and conjugal love.

Each of Scodel's chapters begins with a consideration of the classical context and influence on the Renaissance—of skeptical thought, of Virgilian imperialist georgic, of the Aristotelian and Christian heritage of moderate sexuality and love lyrics and ro-

mances, of Anacreontics and Horatian libation verse. Then he turns to the developments within the genres as early English writers adapted the conventions and exploited often opposed tendencies inherent in them so as to gain new ends. In considering the developments he is particularly intent on the texts and their social and political contexts and implications as writers expanded on or contended with others. Here Scodel is at his most informative as well as his most subtle. The range of texts extends from the well-known, such as Donne's satires and Bacon's essays, Spenser's *Faerie Queene*, Drayton's *Poly-Olbion*, Denham's *Coopers Hill*, Dryden's and Behn's heroic plays, Lovelace's "Grasse-hopper," and Milton's *Paradise Lost*, to the lesser known, such as John Davies of Hereford's *Microcosmos*, Thomas Randolph's *Aristippus, or the Jovial Philosopher*, William Davenant's *Gondibert*, Charles Cotton's "Clepsydra," and Alexander Brome's "A Round." All of the discussions are placed historically amidst discourses on the mean from sermons and polemics and ethical treatises throughout the era. And all along Scodel is attentive to our own critical movements and controversies, taking care to note and qualify agreements and to explain differences.

Among Joshua Scodel's most persuasive interpretations are those of Donne's revision of "mediocrity" so as to further his personal goals and of Bacon's adaptations so as to promote balance in politics and reject balance in the pursuit of knowledge and private ambition. He is compelling as well about Milton's sense of moderation as pleasurable restraint in the senses and as a mean of self-respect in personal integrity and marriage. Some of his most intriguing results come from taking drinking songs seriously. Throughout *Excess and the Mean in Early Modern English Literature* he offers perceptive ideas about the relationships between the discourses of love and of politics, of balanced moderation and control in internal politics versus expansionist excess in pursuit of empire, and of the commingling of public and private motives. Most of all, he gives us a new appreciation of the human capacity to remake our ideals into servants of our needs and desires. And he offers us a host of subtle readings of literature across an expansive

range of expression in early modern England. Both contributions should prove useful as models.

Stephen Guy-Bray. *Homoerotic Space: The Poetics of Loss in Renaissance Literature*. Buffalo; Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002. x + 265. Review ELENA LEVY-NAVARRO, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-WHITEWATER.

Homoerotic Space represents an important intervention in criticism on the history of “sexuality” in the Renaissance period. Of particular importance is its emphasis on “homoerotic space,” a space created from the central classical texts that comprised a humanistic education. In reading classical pastoral and epic texts, Guy-Bray argues, the educated Renaissance male reader could use them to “construct, or at least to adumbrate, an emancipatory sexual discourse” (9). Interestingly, such readers could do so even as male homoeroticism signified only as something temporally “before” and geographically “other.” As Guy-Bray explains, homoeroticism in this period is “always elsewhere and usually textual” (15).

This book admirably pays close attention to classical texts and in so doing, describes some of the ways that these texts influenced Renaissance male authors. The story Guy-Bray tells overall is curiously pessimistic, however, especially given his stated goal of uncovering a homoerotic space too frequently ignored by critics. He presents a surprisingly straight story in which space is seen as increasingly colonized and diminished, first in the movement from Greek to Roman texts examined in the first two chapters and subsequently in their Renaissance imitations. In chapter one, Guy-Bray sees the move from Theocritus to Virgil as one in which the homoerotic associated with the pristine landscape of the past becomes increasingly irrecoverable as it is overridden by political and military Rome. In chapter two, he describes the epic as teaching the Renaissance reader that intense affective bonds between two men are destructive to the well-being of the state. As Guy-

Bray explains, the “lessons Renaissance writers learned . . . is that death is the price paid for the embrace of two men” (84).

In what follows, the story becomes even more pessimistic as Guy-Bray delineates the further diminishment of this space. In the third chapter, homoeroticism is now located in the vacant space of the tomb. In the subsequent two chapters, even that space is said to disappear as homoeroticism is displaced by heteroeroticism. In the third chapter, for example, Guy-Bray describes Milton’s elegy to his youthful friend Diodati as dismissing the homoerotic relationship of their youth. In the fourth chapter, he describes Spenser as participating in the increasing “heterosexualization” of the English Renaissance pastoral (134). Both of these readings suggest some of the limitations of his approach. The categories Guy-Bray depends on retain a restrictive modern sense that explains in part the story he tells. Terms such as “heterosexual” and “(homo)sexual” seem foremost in his readings, as do modern understandings of “women” and “men.” Below I consider some of the ways in which a very different story might emerge if he did not rely on such modern categories. Some of these poets, it might even be argued, seem to increase the homoerotic space by extending it to male, female, and even angelic or heavenly bodies.

Guy-Bray argues that Spenser diminishes the homoerotic in *The Shepheardes Calender* in part because he focuses on Elisa and her virgin maids. Queen Elizabeth offers at the very least another version of the homoerotic pastoral, the female homoerotic examined so astutely by Valerie Traub. I would have liked Guy-Bray to problematize his reading here by considering some of the queer implications of the gender of both Elisa and her virgin maids. The variety of ways in which Elizabeth was figured as both masculine and feminine offer alternative readings of the pastoral site, many of which problematize an easy reading of homoeroticism as only possible between male bodies.

Milton’s “Epitaphium Damonis” offers equally challenging possibilities, especially when we consider the final description of heavenly bodily consummation. Guy-Bray is unable to see such a possibility because he is focused only on the empty tomb and a

repressed “sexuality” between men. In the final moments of the poem, Milton describes how Diodati’s virginity is rewarded in heaven with eternal joyful *communal* consummations. Milton, Guy-Bray argues, does so only to defend himself against charges that his friendship had been “sexual” (I’d say “sodomitical”). Ultimately, Milton, like Spenser, is said to turn to the epic to celebrate “heterosexuality” (131). In both his epic and “Epitaphium,” however, Milton seems to open up a sacred space for multiple eroticisms, including those we would call homoerotic. Anticipating the lavish descriptions of angelic consummation in *Paradise Lost*, “Epitaphium” offers its own heavenly erotic space, one in which love is not limited to any two bodies.

Despite these reservations, Guy-Bray has offered a very important book to the subject at hand. It will be of great interest to all scholars interested in the subject.

N. H. Keeble, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Writing of the English Revolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001. xxii + 296 pp. + 7 illus. \$59.95/\$21.95. Review by JASON PEACEY, HISTORY OF PARLIAMENT TRUST.

This collection of fifteen short essays by leading scholars of seventeenth-century literature introduces undergraduate and non-specialized readers to the broad range of literary forms which existed, and emerged, in the English ‘revolution’. It treats not just the canonical authors with whom every school-child is familiar, but rather a broad range of less well known figures, and its understanding of ‘literature’ incorporates more

than just grand works of imaginative prose and poetry, and complex political treatises. It also involves more ephemeral works, and those new forms, such as radical religious texts and newspapers, which emerged during a period of intense political upheaval, and which reflected the emergence of a new, non-elite reading audience. In seeking to recognize 'the centrality of literary engagement with the revolutionary times' (7), this work is clearly to be welcomed. But like all such collections it is something of a mixed bag.

The first section, on 'contexts', arguably proves the strongest. John Morrill provides a brief introduction to the 'causes and course' of the civil wars. Written with his usual panache, it nevertheless focuses on the period before 1649, and is rather aggressively 'revisionist' in tone. Stressing that the period before 1640 witnessed no oppressive censorship, Morrill's 'context' is one of a problematic king, rather than profound political breakdown. There was no desire for civil war, let alone for resistance or regicide, and war was unexpected, and the result of a 'British' crisis. Martin Dzelzainis' assessment of the political thought of the revolutionary period is a marvelous brief introduction to key theoretical concepts and practical ideas. He breaks down dualistic pictures which link 'absolutism' with royalism, and 'ancient constitutionalism' with parliamentarianism. He also demonstrates that while 'republicanism', strictly conceived, was absent before 1649, the desire for a mixed constitution was prevalent. And he recognizes that neither royalism nor parliamentarianism was a unified theory. Equally valuable is Sharon Achinstein's chapter on the press and print culture, and the impact of civil war 'literature' on the people. As well as providing a balanced assessment of the state of censorship

in the 1640s and 1650s, she also explores how print spread down the social spectrum, and across the gender divide, in terms of both authors and readers, not least through newspapers and the radical popular press. Ultimately, she demonstrates convincingly how print drew the people into conflict.

Unfortunately, much of the rest of the book is less successful, and many of the authors seem caught between the competing demands of introductory and analytical coverage. Thomas Corns opens the section on 'Radical voices' by introducing the work of radical groups who were fascinated by print as means of engaging with a new audience, but in addressing the Levellers, the Diggers, the Ranters and the Quakers, few themes are explored. The introductions to the political prose of John Milton (by David Loewenstein) and the political poems of Andrew Marvell (by Annabel Patterson) are clear and concise, but both are hampered by having insufficient space to undertake the kind of contextual analysis which these scholars rightly value. Moreover, while it is hard to argue with the inclusion of studies of either Milton or Marvell, it is mystifying that the editor chose to classify either author as a 'radical' voice. Equally problematic is the equation of 'conservative voices' with royalism. Alan Rudrum considers the variety of lyric poetry, but while he stresses the need to contextualize the likes of Robert Herrick, John Cleveland, Abraham Cowley, and Henry Vaughan, because they were far from being retired neutrals writing timeless masterpieces, his attempts at contextualization are somewhat weak. Isabel Rivers' analysis of 'prayer-book devotion' introduces not just the *Eikon Basilike*, but also the works of less famous interregnum Anglicans, such as Anthony Sparrow and James Harwood. Paul Salzman's chapter on the 'royalist epic and romance' of Abraham Cowley, Sir William Davenant, John Barclay, and Sir Percy Herbert, reveals how the civil war transformed the way in which political criticism could be expressed in literature, as well as the variety of political opinions within 'royalism'.

The least impressive section considers 'female voices'. Susan Wiseman studies the poetry of Katherine Philips, Margaret Cavendish, Anne Bradstreet, and Lucy Hutchinson, while Helen

Wilcox and Sheila Ottway consider 'women's histories', and the texts generated by Margaret Cavendish, Lucy Hutchinson, Lady Anne Fanshaw, Brilliana Harley, and Anne Clifford. Elaine Hobby analyses the prophecies and religious enthusiasm of Elizabeth Poole, Anna Trapnel, Anne Venn, and Anne Wentworth. Such chapters display the wide variety of texts which need to be considered by students of literature, from published verse, autobiographies, memoirs, and popular tracts, to diaries and letters, but the authors considered are so various, and their circumstances so different, that there is little to unite them beyond their gender. There is too little analysis of why they need to be studied as female authors, and what was distinctive about female literature. Furthermore, while their variety is recognized, there remains a tendency to try and distill a female message. Some women may indeed have been empowered by the revolutionary events to participate in history and literature, and some may consciously have been carving out new roles for themselves. But it is somewhat strange to interpret Lucy Hutchinson as being 'anti-feminist', or to suggest that she wrote about her husband because she was uneasy writing about herself, and it is hard to accept that Brilliana Harley spoke for all women caught up in war. While it is almost certainly true that female prophetesses, pamphleteers, and petitioners were challenging accepted gender roles, and that this provoked unease in some quarters, it is less easy to demonstrate gender consciousness, let alone that a link between kingly and masculine power meant that questioning the monarch's power involved challenging male power. The final section of the book contains three studies of writers who were engaged in 'rethinking the war' after the Restoration. David Norbrook examines the contemporary historiography of the civil war, in terms of Thomas May, John Milton, and Edmund Ludlow, as well as the more familiar works of Hobbes, Hutchinson, and Clarendon. Sensitive to context as well as content, Norbrook offers intriguing insight into the way in which humanism, puritanism, and a widened public sphere combined to transform seventeenth-century historiography, not least by encouraging writers to consider the immediate as well as the distant past, and by broadening

interest beyond monarchs' reigns into works on nations and identity. Nigel Smith grapples with the complexity of Milton's *Paradise Lost*, in an attempt to grasp what contemporaries made of a work which demanded more thoughtful engagement than any other text of the period. Finally, Richard Greaves provides a skilful contextual study of the works of John Bunyan.

This book ably demonstrates the range of literary forms during the mid-seventeenth century, from the ephemeral to the canonical, and from the published to the unpublished. It reveals the variety of authors, and demonstrates the need to contextualize both works and writers, and to recognize that literary forms were transformed by political upheaval, as well as the way in which the emergence of new forms reflected the appearance of new kinds of author and sought to address new audiences. Its coverage is somewhat biased towards conventional 'literature', and this reviewer would have welcomed more on political writers such as William Prynne, Henry Parker, and Henry Ferne, as well as journalists such as Marchamont Nedham and Sir John Berkenhead. Not to mention Hobbes, author of one of the few literary masterpieces of the period. Moreover, the book will arguably do little to break down disciplinary boundaries between literature and history, much less break down old fashioned and anachronistic notions of radicalism and conservatism. The book is hampered by the editor's attachment to the notion that the civil wars represented a revolutionary and ideological conflict. Useful though the editorial apparatus may prove, with guides to further reading, a political and literary chronology, and a brief glossary, closer attention might have been paid to individual chapters, which contain occasional factual errors and interpretative howlers. Ultimately, the book works less well as a 'companion' than as an introduction, whose greatest achievement might be to arouse curiosity, and to entice readers into the marvelously varied world of seventeenth-century literature.

N.H. Keeble. *The Restoration: England in the 1660s*. History of Early Modern England series. Oxford: Blackwell, 2002. xvi + 270 pp. \$34.95. Review by TY M. REESE, UNIVERSITY OF NORTH DAKOTA.

N.H. Keeble's *The Restoration* is another installment in the Early Modern England history series, edited by John Morrill, that seeks to provide a thorough understanding of England in this period. Keeble's work is a vital part of this series in that it deals with the collapse of the Protectorate, the restoration of the monarchy, and the continuation of the social and economic changes affecting English society. While the 1660s continued a general process of change for England, Keeble's work explores this decade through the actions and writings of England's political and literary elite. For the political developments, Keeble provides an excellent and detailed narrative of the Restoration and the first seven years of the reign of Charles II. This detailed focus upon the English elite during the 1660s, including the intrigues surrounding Anne Hyde, prepares the reader for Keeble's narrow focus of those individuals in a position to influence and shape high culture. While Keeble's work clearly illustrates the consequences of the Restoration upon this small but powerful group one would hope, within a general history series, for a broader treatment of English society. The New Model Army, and the radicalism it often represented, plays a minor role in Keeble's narrative of the events of 1658-1660 and only reappears when it is disbanded in 1661. The lower classes only receive a brief mention within the context of the 1662 Poor Relief Act, and England's developing middle class is seldom mentioned or examined. In relation to interpretation and historiography, Keeble, in his introduction, states that "the 1660s proved inconclusive; they brought back the King, but settled nothing" (3). This inconclusiveness is clearly seen throughout Keeble's work. Because the Restoration remained unfinished at 1669, Keeble decided to downplay conclusions and instead focus on "the construction of identities, in roles and role-playing, in culturally supportive or subversive myths, in perceptions, claims and counter-claims" (3). While a great variety of identities are being constructed in this period,

Keeble's work explains how the Restoration affected high culture's understandings of not only themselves but of England. Throughout the work, high culture dominates while popular culture is decidedly absent.

The first four chronological chapters explore the fall of the commonwealth, the restoration, consolidation and protection of the monarchy, and ends in 1667 with war and Clarendon's downfall. Chapter one provides a detailed narrative of the calm that followed Cromwell's death, as England anxiously waited to see what would happen, and then intricately explores the Restoration of Charles II. The chapter focuses upon the army, and its ability to intervene, the fear of both dictatorship and anarchy along with prominent figures such as John Lambert and George Monck. Chapter two involves a narrative of the years 1660 to 1661 including how the army, which once fought the king, allowed him to return, the contemporary attempt to explain and justify the Restoration and the dichotomy between celebration and uncertainty. The chapter ends with the disbanding of the army and the trial of the regicides. Chapter three explores the relationship between Charles and the Convention. This chapter is strong in its focus on the contemporary views of Charles and the Restoration along with the major acts designed to consolidate and protect the king. Keeble does a thorough job in explaining how the Convention worked to accomplish its three major goals of establishing security, eliminating threats, and rewarding supporters. The fourth chapter examines a broader time, the years 1661 to 1667, but continues the political narrative by focusing upon Clarendon and the Cavalier Parliament. In this period, compromise loses out to "reactionary partisanship" (85), bribery becomes an important part of parliamentary functioning, censorship increases, the 1662 Poor Relief Act works to reduce the mobility of the lower class, and the Dutch war causes the fall of Clarendon when he becomes a political scapegoat.

The first four narrative chapters are then followed by four thematic chapters. Chapter five explores the changes within the Church of England including the Act of Uniformity, the Clarendon Code,

and the Laudians. Anglican conformity is followed by nonconformity as chapter six begins with the “destroyed hopes”(132) of Milton and Bunyan, briefly examines nonconformist culture, and then shows how censorship became an important Restoration tool. Chapter seven, “The Temper of the Times,” explores the plague and the fire and illustrates, through Pepys and others, how these events intensified feelings of unease for some and divine judgment for others. The chapter then moves to Clarendon’s fall, the rise of the Cabal, and the influence of Louis XIV on Charles. The chapter ends with an exploration of court excesses, especially its immoral actions and sexual aggression. The final chapter examines constructions of gender as contemporaries developed ideas concerning the subservient place of women and their “much greater sexual appetite” (187). This uncontrollable female need justified the excesses of the court while placing the blame upon the female rather than male participants.

Keeble’s work constitutes a thorough exploration of high culture but as a history of England during the Restoration it falls far short. Keeble’s literary, rather than historical, background clearly comes through in the work and his utilization of journals, diaries, pamphlets, and newspapers engagingly add a contemporary voice to his history. At times, he relies too much on quotations from these sources and for readers unfamiliar with the contemporary literature the text can become quite cumbersome. For those readers looking to understand English society during the Restoration this is not the book for them but for those interested in high culture, court intrigues, and

the literary response to the Restoration, this work has much to offer.

Jason Peacey, ed. *The Regicides and the Execution of Charles I.* Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001. x + 294 pp. \$72.00. Review by MICHAEL ROGERS, NORTHEASTERN STATE UNIVERSITY.

This excellent collection of eleven essays originated in a 1999 conference held at the Institute of Historical Research in London. Although the political and diplomatic context of the events of December 1648 and January 1649 are prominent, the authors examine so many other facets of the Regicide (religious, literary, legal, and iconographic among them) that scholars of literature and culture will also find much of interest. This is due in no small part to Jason Peacey's fine introduction, which notes that the subject remains "inexplicably understudied," especially considering the abundance of primary sources and the explosion of writing on the 1640s and 1650s. Peacey also provides a historiographical overview, summarizes each contributor's thesis, and identifies the book's main themes. In so doing, he reminds readers that the approaches and methodologies generally affecting seventeenth-century studies—revisionism, the problem of governing multiple kingdoms, and the civil wars as "wars of religion"—have relevance for a new understanding of the Regicide itself.

Perhaps the book's most important theme is the practical as well as ideological reasons to bring Charles to justice, to delay his trial, or to oppose entirely any legal proceedings against him. The longest chapter, John Adamson's "The Frightened Junto: Perceptions of Ireland, and the Last Attempts at Settlement with Charles I," is representative of four essays that explore motive. Adamson focuses on the "Denbigh mission," an Army proposal for a political settlement that the Earl of Denbigh conveyed to the king. Prior to Charles's rebuff of Denbigh in mid-December 1648 there was

very little support for a trial among the grandees and MPs, but the royalist resurgence in Ireland beginning in the winter of 1648 spurred the Army to action. It is this Irish context and the very real possibility of a third civil war, Adamson asserts, that explains the decision to try and execute the king in January of 1649; Charles had been defeated as king of England and Scotland, but definitely not as king of Ireland. Adamson thus explicitly embraces a “three kingdom” explanation for the Regicide, stressing clear and present dangers rather than desire to punish the king primarily for his past crimes. The only way to end the continuing threat of the anti-parliamentary alliance in Ireland was therefore to execute the king. John Morrill and Philip Baker’s “Oliver Cromwell, the Regicide, and the Sons of Zeruiah,” complements Adamson’s portrait of reluctant regicides. Employing a close reading of letters, speeches, and the Putney Debates among other sources, Morrill and Baker chart the evolution of Cromwell’s decision to try Charles, focusing on the weeks from late November to the last days of January. In line with Morrill’s emphasis on religion as the key motivation for the English Revolution, they find that intensive Bible reading, particularly of the Old Testament, pervaded Cromwell’s understanding of events. Although earlier persuaded on scriptural grounds of Charles’s primary “blood guilt” for the civil wars, Cromwell showed no desire prior to 25 November 1648 to abolish monarchy or execute the king; there was simply too much opposition to regicide and a republic. In fact, the authors argue, he originally planned new elections and a constitution prior to any trial of the king. But uncertainties unleashed by Pride’s Purge and Charles’s rejection of Denbigh’s proposal pushed Cromwell reluctantly towards regicide as the only way to confront the Army’s many enemies.

David Scott offers a regional perspective on motivation in his fascinating, if speculative, “Motives for King Killing.” Noting that a relatively high percentage of signatories to the king’s death warrant were men from northern counties, Scott suggests that a “British perspective” may explain their strong desire to see justice executed upon Charles. After examining the careers of the eight northern regicides, the author reviews the devastation wrought by three

Scottish occupations of the North between 1639 and in 1648. Logically, these northern counties had special reasons to fear the king's continuing Irish and Scots alliances; thus, the regicides may have concluded that only the king's execution could prevent a fourth invasion if the Scots chose to fight for Charles again.

The last essays dealing with motivation examine why two very different groups opposed to the king's execution. Andrew Sharp's "The Levellers and the End of Charles I," begins by demonstrating how leaders such as Walwyn, Overton, and above all John Lilburne radically and consistently critiqued monarchy from 1646 to late 1648. In a close reading of key texts, Sharp convincingly demonstrates that Leveller attacks on the Regicide from February to August 1649 did not originate in an opportunistic conversion to royalism. Rather, as a result of their experiences with the grandees and parliamentary Independents late in 1648, Lilburne and company realized that the Regicide was a cynical exercise of arbitrary power. Thus their proposed restoration of monarchy was aimed at creating a counterweight to Army and parliamentary tyranny. Moreover, the Levellers' terms for a restored monarchy were so limiting and subject to popular approval that no royalist could ever have accepted them. So, Sharp's essay is an excellent and fully contextualized reassertion of the Levellers' principled radicalism. The other study of motives for opposing the king's trial is Elliot Vernon's "The Quarrel of the Covenant: the London Presbyterians and the Regicide." Taking his cue from Milton's pillorying of the Sion College Conclave of Presbyterian ministers in *Tenure of Kings and Magistrates*, Vernon seeks to recover the political theology behind the clergymen's published opposition to the death of a king they had reviled in the early 1640s. He finds the key to their thinking in the Solemn League and Covenant of 1643; the ministers viewed it as a "first engagement," a sacred agreement that bound Ireland, England, and Scotland together as covenanted people in support of liberty, public safety, and—most importantly—monarchy. Thus the parliamentary coalition abrogated a sacred religious obligation when it permitted the king's death.

The remaining chapters apply similar methodologies to several different facets of the Regicide. Sean Kelsey and Alan Orr analyze the trial itself and its vocabulary. Kelsey's "Staging the Trial of Charles I," studies the iconographic vocabulary of the trial (regalia, coats of arms, etc.) for clues about divisions within the Army over issues such as the very fate of the king, republicanism, and England's monarchical past. Alan Orr, in "The Juristic Foundations of Regicide" clearly analyzes the legal vocabulary of the High Court of Justice's treason charge against Charles, and demonstrates how that vocabulary blended English with Roman law concepts. Again we see the regicides as hesitant and anxious to maintain some continuity between past and present rather than single-mindedly pursuing a completely revolutionary regime.

Three authors study some of the reactions to the trial both at home and abroad. In "Reporting a Revolution," Peacey explores the propaganda aims of the Court's official coverage of the trial and discovers royalists successfully adapting those accounts to their own ends. Andrew Lacey's "Elegies and Commemorative Verse in Honour of Charles I, 1649-1660," examines fifty royalist poems and how they helped construct the cult of the "martyred Charles." Like Vernon, his main interest is in political theology, particularly what this poetry tells us about royalists' explained their "lost cause." Richard Bonney's "The European Reaction to the Trial and Execution of Charles I" takes up the European response not only to the king's execution but also to the Commonwealth and Protectorate. He finds that "reason of state" and practical concerns rather than ideology guided Spanish, French, and Dutch diplomacy.

All in all, these essays constitute a well-integrated and remarkably cohesive collection, with extensive cross-references in the very useful endnotes. And the authors' approaches and methodologies certainly overlap. One can see the influence of revisionism in the downplaying of ideology, the close reading of texts that cover limited periods, and in the portrayal of the regicides as hesitant and reluctant. The book also well illustrates the fruits of applying cultural history and (particularly) a "three kingdoms" approach to

a fuller understanding of the trial and execution of “that man of blood.”

Alan Wharam. *Murder in the Tower and Other Tales from the State Trials*. Aldershot, U.K.: Ashgate, 2001. x + 286 pp. + 12 b&w illus. \$84.95. Review by ELLEN J. JENKINS, ARKANSAS TECH UNIVERSITY.

The twists and turns of criminal misdeeds, murder mysteries, and court trials continue to fascinate and intrigue us, a phenomenon that explains the considerable increase over the past few years of cable and network television series based upon examples of such social turmoil. In *Murder in the Tower and Other Tales from the State Trials*, Alan Wharam has selected fifteen court cases from a collection of State Trials compiled and published in 1730, unearthing a substantial amount of social history while demonstrating that present-day society has no monopoly on nefarious deeds or pernicious and arbitrary application of the law. Among the seventeenth- and early-eighteenth-century trials included in *Murder in the Tower* are “The Impoisonment of Sir Thomas Overbury;” an extensive section on those connected to “The Rye House Plot,” along with the subsequent investigation into the murder of the Earl of Essex in the Tower of London in 1683; and a absorbing but lesser-known case, entitled by Wharam, “Scratching a Witch.”

In 1613, the poet Sir Thomas Overbury died after several weeks of illness while in custody in the Tower of London. Two years later, evidence came to light that Overbury had been poisoned at the direction of the Frances, Countess of Essex, who was, at the time of the murder, the married mistress of Overbury’s former friend and patron, Robert Carr, Viscount Rochester, (Earl of Somerset from 1614). Overbury, who disliked the Countess, had made threats of blackmail against Rochester, trying to convince him to have nothing to do with her. Lady Essex became enraged and convinced Rochester that Overbury must be eliminated. After using their influence to engineer Overbury’s arrest and incarcera-

tion in the Tower, the pair of lovers arranged to have him poisoned.

In 1614, having divorced their respective spouses, the villainous couple married. The following year, their misdeeds came to light. Edward Coke, Lord Chief Justice of the King's Bench, who was appointed to investigate the murder, questioned hundreds of people while unraveling the conspiracy behind Overbury's death. Eventually, those convicted and hanged for the crime included the Lieutenant of the Tower, an apothecary, Overbury's Tower warder, and a female go-between, each of whom had played a role in the poisoning at the behest of the Countess and Rochester. The Earl and Countess of Somerset, who had planned and initiated the plot, were tried separately in the House of Lords, as was the custom for peers. Both were sentenced to death. Ironically, despite the damning evidence uncovered and the executions of their subordinates, the Somersets were eventually reprieved, and in 1624, James I pardoned them.

The Rye House Plot was a conspiracy to assassinate King Charles II and his brother, James, Duke of York, on Easter Sunday in 1683. Though the plot went awry, the conspirators and many who were implicated, including several noblemen, were arrested and tried for treason. Many of the accused turned King's evidence and testified against the others; several were condemned and executed on the thinnest evidence. The most intriguing of Wharam's accounts of this conspiracy and the subsequent treason trials, however, involves the "suicide" of Arthur Capel, Earl of Essex, who was implicated in the plot. Essex was arrested in July 1683 and was confined to the Tower. Within three days of his arrest, he was found dead with his throat cut through from his windpipe to his vertebrae. Despite the improbability that a man could cut his own throat in such a manner, as well as testimony by several witnesses that a bloody razor was thrown from Essex's window and hastily retrieved just before the Earl was found dead, and despite evidence that James, Duke of York, may have ordered the murder of Essex, the jury verdict was that of *felo de se*—that the Earl had murdered himself.

The controversy over Essex's supposed self-murder did not end there. Laurence Braddon, a barrister of the Middle Temple, launched his own investigation. Braddon discovered that Tower warders and soldiers who had questioned the verdict were threatened, beaten, or forced to flee. Braddon was, himself, repeatedly arrested, tried, and imprisoned for his efforts, and even in later years was an object of hostility to Queen Anne, who claimed that the barrister had impugned her father as a murderer. The appearance of an official cover-up was extensive, and though Wharam points out that it is unclear *why* the Duke of York might have had reason to fear Essex, the two had had many previous dealings while Essex was Viceroy of Ireland from 1672 to 1677 and Lord Commissioner of the Treasury in 1679.

Belief in witchcraft was still in evidence at the cusp of the eighteenth century. In September of 1700, a Southwark blacksmith's apprentice named Richard Hathaway became ill after allegedly having been bewitched by Sarah Morduck, a local woman. Hathaway not only went into a serious physical decline, unable to see or speak, but he repeatedly vomited pins, supposedly a common symptom for a victim of witchcraft. In order to be cured of his condition, claimed his friends and employers, Hathaway must scratch Morduck and draw blood. By this time, claims of witchcraft were more likely to meet with skepticism than in previous centuries, so a local clergyman tricked the supposedly blind Hathaway and presented another woman to be scratched. Hathaway's sight was instantly "restored" afterward, but when the trick was revealed, he relapsed just as quickly. The same clergyman was later summoned to witness Hathaway vomiting pins as proof of the matter, but when Hathaway was searched, his pockets were found to hold several packets of pins. In 1702, the long-suffering Sarah Morduck was tried for witchcraft at Guildford, though she was acquitted. Hathaway was tried the following year at the Guildford Assizes for being an "imposter." The jury found him guilty, and though Wharam explains that there is no record of the sentence he was given for this, nor for his conviction at the subsequent trial he underwent for "riot and assault" with the con-

federates who had supported his claims, it is likely, according to the author, that the sentences included several hours in the pillory and confinement in Newgate Prison for a year or two.

Beyond the absorbing accounts of these trials, a particularly useful and enlightening part of the book is the Introduction, in which Wharam describes not only the history of the *1730 State Trials*, published by Sollom Emlyn, a member of Lincoln's Inn born in 1697, but also deciphers many intricacies of the English court system of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The reader learns with interest that in English courts, unlike contemporary courts in Scotland, the accused had no rights to brief his own counsel, to find out in advance the charges against him, or to look at the prosecution's depositions before his trial. *Murder in the Tower* is an excellent work and is one that will be particularly useful to graduate students and specialists in English jurisprudence.

Alan Wharam, born in 1928, was educated at Christ's College, Cambridge. He is a retired former barrister and college lecturer, having taught at Leeds College of Commerce and the Leeds Polytechnic Law School before retiring in 1988. Wharam has also written *The Treason Trials, 1794* (1992) and *Treason: Famous English Treason Trials* (1995).

Allan I. Macinnes and Jane Ohlmeyer, eds. *The Stuart Kingdoms in the Seventeenth Century: Awkward Neighbors*. Dublin: Four Courts Press. 2002. 256 pp. \$45.00. Review by BRETT PARKER, UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA.

Almost thirty years ago J.G.A. Pocock pleaded for the development of a new subject called "British history," suggesting that historians give sufficient emphasis to Scotland, Ireland, and Wales in order to better understand the process of English state formation. Initially, his call fell on deaf ears but more recently historians of early modern England have responded by analyzing the political and cultural relationships between the multiple kingdoms of the British

Isles. The aim of this new approach has been to build an integrated portrait of British politics and culture in part to show that Anglo insularity was a Whig invention. Nevertheless, widening the context has not produced the fulsome and cohesive treatment of Britain Pocock and his followers had envisioned. The reason for this failure is that the multiple kingdoms have never had a comfortable or fully cooperative relationship. This stark reality is the common theme of the most recent work on British history, *The Stuart Kingdoms in the Seventeenth Century: Awkward Neighbors*. Here is a collection of essays that not only extends the domestic and international dimensions of British history but also accentuates the clumsiness of state relations. In fine detail it demonstrates the whirling circumstances that both pushed the four kingdoms together and pulled them apart. Yet not only is the historical context thickened in these essays but so is the methodological approach, as several essays ask what were the cultural perceptions of these kingdoms and to what degree were they a product of their shared history.

Editors Allan I. Macinnes and Jane Ohlmeyer have cleverly organized *Stuart Kingdoms* into five sections that relate the awkwardness of state building by examining Britain in an international, ethnical, diplomatic, Anglo-centric, and religious context. As for the first, two essays explore state formation models that undoubtedly influenced Anglo-Scottish relations in the seventeenth century. Especially compelling is Steven G. Ellis's argument that much of the English view of Britain and particularly Scotland's role in it post 1603 can be traced to the late medieval period when English state building was focused on annexing and consolidating continental territories. According to Ellis, a significant shift in state formation occurred in 1453 when the fall of Lancastrian England also spelled the end of the short lived dual monarchy. Ellis laments this as "one of the great might-have-beens of English history," since it would have promoted greater administrative and juridical efficiency (42). As it was, the Tudors were left to integrate English peripheries and not develop the complex and diverse struc-

tures needed to administer multiple crowns, a development that seriously hampered James VI & I's efforts in 1603.

A larger question is what constitutes a state and how might the history of several peoples who certainly make up a distinct nation, but are ruled by one monarch, be written. Conrad Russell, who for more than a decade has implored scholars to treat Britain from a multiple kingdoms perspective, gives a nonsense answer. In his essay "Is British History International History?" Russell declares that British history is not a subject but rather a method, and one that benefits from a variety of perspectives and viewpoints. It is properly international, moreover, because when rightly considered, British history is about "calling in the history of one country to elucidate what happened in another" (63).

After these initial inquiries, *Stuart Kingdoms* turns attention to cultural and ethnic perceptions of the English and Scots. It is in this section that methodological strategies are most creative, especially in the case of Claire McEachern's reading of Shakespeare's *Macbeth*. She argues that the play reflects an acute sense on the part of Jacobean England of cultural difference and sameness with their northern neighbor. The play's protean gender quality serves to prioritize England over Scotland, especially in the case of lady Macbeth's desire to free herself of "of the bondages of female bodily destiny," which is taken to typify Elizabeth's self-fashioning of the "chaste protector" of an exclusive England (112, 100). The play works on a much different level, however, when read in the context of the proposed union of kingdoms in 1603. Macbeth's fierce nationalism is taken as the defensive posture of parliamentarians and common lawyers who championed English law over royal prerogative. England now identified with a Scottish savior. This sort of reconfigured identity could work in opposition to others as well, as Paul McGinnis and Arthur H. Williamson demonstrate in their essay on the construction of Britishness in the face of an Iberian world empire. Having a shared enemy in Spain, the English and Scots could imagine a British state that was both free and Protestant. In this sense, national distinctions did not wither but common interests did help to sooth them.

The next two sections both extend the scope of influences on Britain and intensify the Anglo-centrism of the three kingdoms. Two chapters examine the Scottish and Irish efforts in the war of three kingdoms. Steve Murdoch persuasively argues that one of the most difficult challenges the Scottish Covenanters faced in their war against Charles I was securing men and munitions from Swedish armies. Scottish soldiers and diplomats on the continent managed to procure naval supplies and influence the sympathies of Charles's uncle, Christian IV of Denmark-Norway, just enough to sustain the campaign against Charles. By contrast the Irish campaign of the 1640s was unsuccessful in large measure because of the destabilizing effect continental influences had on the Confederate Catholic Association. Essayist Tadhg Ó Hannracháin contends that France and the Papacy had conflicting views about the extent to which a religious settlement in Ireland would shape settlement in England and Scotland, with the Papacy committed to a secular settlement with Charles.

The complexity of these circumstances reminds readers that the British Isles were developing under continental as much as inter-kingdom pressure. Nevertheless, Englishness continued to assert itself despite (or because of) external circumstances. James Scott Wheeler examines English ethnocentrism as manifested in the New Model Army's petitions, proclamations, and letters. From these sources he concludes that members "saw themselves as 'English,' men who shared a heritage of common English rights and freedoms," and because it included rank-and-file members, such thinking "was a major step in the development of English national identity" (152-153). Victories, especially over the "uncivilized" Irish, only reinforced a sense of national superiority. Sarah Barber's analysis of cultural views in the 1650s enhances this understanding, showing that the construction of "otherness" and the language of "antithesis" enabled the English to subsume the Irish and Scots into an "English" not "British" Commonwealth.

National identity was only part of the stew being stirred in the creation of British *imperium* under the Stuarts. Of course the extent and aim of the reformations in the British Isles largely shaped

the nature of union between the kingdoms. In Ireland, John McCafferty argues, the Church of Ireland did not collapse in the face of colliding reformations as the New British History suggests. Rather the Church was accommodating because it allowed minimal conformity, and bishops understood it was a dependent of the English Church.

Different national experiences and religious perspectives do, nevertheless, help explain the “incompatible revolutions” of 1688-89. In a brilliant analysis of the various understandings of revolution and political obedience among conforming Protestants in England, Scotland, and Ireland, Tim Harris shows the difficulty they faced in justifying political change without appropriating Whig contract theory. The Irish and Scots stood at opposite ends in some ways; Scotland being much less scrupled about resistance than Protestant Ireland, where there was no Presbyterian revolution and James II was actively fighting William of Orange. In all three kingdoms, resistance to James II was couched as passive not active since the implications of revolution were more dangerous than abdication. Nevertheless, Protestants in each kingdom tweaked passive resistance to their own interest and historical reality. In the case of Scotland, the revolution of 1689-1690 was especially radical because of the reform program of “The Club,” a parliamentary group that drew on the 1640-41 Covenanting Movement. As a result of The Club’s activity, as John R. Young explains, there was a “reassertion of the powers of the Scottish Estates against the royal prerogative and external court interference in Scottish affairs” (250). Most importantly, “The Club” insisted upon retaining the Scottish parliament against an incorporating union. That Great Britain was an incorporating union echoes the “awkwardness” of state formation.

Stuart Kingdoms is a commendable work because it recognizes that “British” history in the seventeenth century was never really British. Rather, it was a history of diverse peoples and institutions shaped by circumstances both internally and externally. It also realizes that while England may have been the locus of any feigned Britishness, such an identity was always constructed with the great-

est anxiety and trepidation. Nevertheless, if British history is going to remain a viable method in the study of the three kingdoms and their relation to European and transatlantic worlds, it must be remembered that the methodological mirror is two-way. Multi-kingdom approaches should tell us as much about national idiosyncrasies and personalities as they do about British ones. *Stuart Kingdoms* is a modest start in this direction.

William Tate. *Solomonic Iconography in Early Stuart England: Solomon's Wisdom, Solomon's Folly*. Lampeter, Wales: The Edwin Mellen Press, 2001. £59.95. 315 pp. Review by JONATHAN NAUMAN, USK VALLEY VAUGHAN ASSOCIATION.

The past two decades have seen increased interest in the person and policies of the Stuart monarch James I, and though William Tate's study of the Stuarts's political use of the Biblical King Solomon is not limited in scope to James, it definitely contributes and responds to recent characterizations of Jacobean political policy. Tate's work focuses on how James, his son Charles, and their contemporaries handled the "extradogmatic surplus of undetermined meaning" in the Scriptural story of Solomon, a line of inquiry suggested in Debora Shuger's *Renaissance Bible*. The project successfully clarifies how the figure of Solomon could be used either to undermine or to reinforce the prestige of the Stuart monarchy; and it argues that, in the Biblically literate culture of seventeenth-century England, James's Solomonic pose would not have been perceived as a safe and unidimensional religious self-compliment, but rather as a daring or opportunistic attempt to emulate and surpass a complex historical figure.

Tate begins his work by contrasting James's funeral sermon by Bishop John Williams, completely endorsing the King's emulation of Solomon, with John Donne's more principled tribute, which alluded to the Solomon-James connection without propagating it. Thence follows an account of the darker aspects of Solomon's story, which opponents to Stuart monarchism found useful when countering James's pose: the Biblical king's uxorious

late-life apostasy, the Divine judgment on this apostasy that resulted in a division of Solomon's kingdom during his son Rehoboam's reign, the traditional elaborations on Scriptural accounts that associated Solomon with magic and the occult. In Chapter Two ("Building Solomon's Temple: King James as *Defensor Fidei*"), Tate shows that both Puritan and Episcopal Anglican spokesmen used Solomonic compliment to imply James's duties and role as a supporter of religion. He also shows that neither faction used this typology exclusively to flatter the King; and he fields a series of examples to show how Solomon's story functioned in current theological, ecclesiastical, and political debates. Henri IV scoffed at the English King's implicit claims to wisdom by saying that James's likeness to Solomon lay mainly in his being son of David—i.e., the natural son of David Riccio, Mary Stuart's paramour. Puritan Lucy Hutchinson characterized James's Solomonic pose as an evasion of his need to pursue theological and moral improvement. Bishop Lancelot Andrewes used Solomon's obtaining of the throne against the will of High Priest Abiathar to show that the Pope had no Scriptural right to determine the English succession. Bishop George Carleton praised James as a "peaceable Salomon" and recounted James's wisdom in uncovering and frustrating the Gunpowder Plot, presumably implying that Solomonic peaceability depended on being wary of Roman Catholic alliances. Court Chaplain Thomas Scott urged both King and Puritan to moderation and mercy, quoting the Solomonic warning, "Bee not too just," and citing as an example of excessive justice Calvinist refusal to make the sign of the cross without explicit Scriptural mandate. And William Laud, in a birthday sermon for "our Solomon," capitalized on the *shalom* etymology for the ancient king's name to advise prayer for peace in Church and State, despite some Puritans' claims that God's sovereign providence made such prayers improper. James's choice to publicly emulate Solomon clearly provided a point of departure for remarkably various destinations: a locus for communicating both dissent and assent to current Anglican doctrine and discipline, a handle on the King enabling both confirmation and critique of his political claims.

Tate's third chapter focuses on Jacobean use of the Queen of Sheba's visit to Solomon, and shows that James's political and colonial postures were often presented in terms of the ideals of this Scriptural event. But here again, Tate demonstrates that James took a risk when he chose to associate his court and his foreign policies with the Arabian queen's gift-giving and admiring of Solomon. When John Harington recounted the King of Denmark's dissolute 1606 visit to the Jacobean Court at Theobalds Estate, he emphasized a botched masque performance of the Queen of Sheba's gift-giving; the dramatic accolades, including an exotic queen bringing dainties to the visiting monarch, were fatally compromised by the drunkenness of actors and audience alike; and the bathetic performances prompted Harington to find the Court of James inferior to that of Elizabeth, who would not have involved herself in such behavior so quickly after the discovered Gunpowder Plot. Tate also points out that the uxorious polygamy of Solomon's later years made the story of the Queen's visit rather vulnerable to libertine speculation. Midrashic legend inferred an event of sexual commerce from the Biblical account of Solomon's generosity ("he gave her everything she wanted"), and characterized the Queen of Sheba as a demon-lover on whom Solomon begat Nebuchadnezzar, the Babylonian king who would later destroy Jerusalem and the Temple. Such resonances were evidently available in Jacobean times: Tate cites Marlowe's Mephistophilis, who tempted Faust with a demonic prostitute "as wise as *Saba*." He also mentions Jonson's *The Alchemist*, where Sir Epicure Mammon's avaricious megalomania includes ridiculous Solomonic pretensions toward worldwide power and fame. It was in spite of such potential for bathos that James (in *Basilikon Doron*) enjoined Prince Henry to courtly order and humility, coolly adding that such behavior would impress visitors as Solomon impressed the Queen of Sheba. The King's choice to allude to a story that could so easily be turned on him indicates the strength of his belief in his court's potential for virtuous behavior—and also, perhaps, his overly strong endorsement of the inviolability of the kingly station.

Tate's chapter on Francis Bacon's Solomon shows how Bacon used James's Solomonic emulation to help market his *Great Instauration*. Bacon noted that Solomon had commissioned a natural history, and that the ancient king's pursuit of knowledge could be espoused in the Christian era as charitable public service. The *New Atlantis* played out this sales strategy by way of fictional exemplum: practical, exploitable knowledge is accumulated in the state-subsidized "Salomon's House"; and the Bensalemites owe their technological advancement to the greathearted endowments of King Solamona, an earlier monarch whose lesson for James is prevented from becoming too explicit by the Bensalemites' claim that, despite appearances, the name "Solamona" had no connection with the ancient Hebrew king. Tate concludes his chapter on Bacon with a "coda" describing the most obvious and enduring manifestation of James's Solomonic emulation, the Rubens frescoes on the Whitehall Banqueting House ceiling. (Tate admits to using the word "iconography" broadly in his study, and only this ceiling and some title-page engravings from his primary sources seem to me strictly to match the term. Might the book have been more appropriately titled *The Figure of Solomon in Stuart England, or James, Charles, and the Solomonic Type?*)

Tate's final chapter is the only one not directly relevant to James. It builds on Erica Veevers's observation that Charles I refitted his father's Solomonic pose to his own situation, particularly to his marriage with the Roman Catholic Henrietta Maria. In the Carolean court, the learned Solomon of *Proverbs* and *Ecclesiastes* was left aside in favor of the chaste romantic lover of the *Song of Songs*. Again, Tate shows that the royal couple's ideal Scriptural pretext was vulnerable to hostile readings. *Canticles* had a long history of being associated with Solomon's marriage to the pagan princess of Egypt, and this played easily into the Puritans' opposition to Henrietta Maria's Catholicism, tolerated by Charles's court but condemned as pagan and idolatrous by iconoclastic lower-church theologies. Having described these uses of Solomon in Carolean politics, Tate cites important Protestant commentators who classified *Canticles* as an apocalyptic pastoral. He then em-

ploy such commentary to warrant a hypothetical reading of Milton's pastoral masque: *Comus* quites Charles and Henrietta Maria's high-church Solomonic romance with a Protestant Lady on pilgrimage who chastely rejects the advances of a corrupt Solomonic wizard. I find Tate's suggested anti-Carolean resonance in *Comus* sufficiently probable, but sense nevertheless a certain disproportion when such extensive and interesting reviews of patristic mythology, Scriptural interpretation, and the impassioned praise of chastity in Milton's poem become mere means toward detecting the politics of yet another anti-Solomonic innuendo. The implied reading of *Comus* seems unfortunately close to Tolstoy's Prince Stepan enjoying his newspaper article:

With his natural quickness of perception, he understood the point of each taunt: whence it came, for whom it was intended, and what had provoked it; and this as usual gave him a certain satisfaction. (*Anna Karenin*)

Despite this and several other gestures toward fashionably politicized reading, despite a trace of American animus against James and some overfuss in the footnotes, Tate's examination of the King's Solomonic emulation successfully corrects the slight notice given to this aspect of James's character elsewhere. In Jonathan Goldberg's *James I*, for instance, the "biblical matrix" of John Williams's funeral sermon is largely ignored in favor of repeating Williams's forensic description of James as a "Lively *Statue*"; and though James Doelman's recent *King James I* cites Tate's work and helpfully elaborates on it, I think that Tate may have a better feel than Doelman for the gradient between the Solomon of Scripture and the positive and negative elaborations traditionally added to the figure—a gradient that would have been quite important to seventeenth-century Anglican readers.

In conclusion, I'd like to propose one implication of James's Solomonic sobriquet that Tate doesn't pursue. There may have been significant benefit for James in a parallel between Solomon's mother Bathsheba and his own mother, Mary Stuart. The figure of Bathsheba could implicitly address a problem that James failed to solve or even openly acknowledge in his political prose. Despite

being the object of David's adulterous affections, Bathsheba does not play the part of an evil woman in the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures; and she appears in the opening New Testament lineage of Jesus Christ, apparently as part of St. Matthew's demonstration that the central genealogies of sacred history included a number of women who, like the Virgin Mary, gave birth to sons amidst circumstances that would be considered irregular. Charles Williams, in his early twentieth-century biography of James, notes that when the King maintained that royal authority passed immediately and unproblematically to the nearest heir, he provided himself with no defense against the succession of Mary Stuart. It seems unlikely that James alone among the authorities of Europe took Mary Stuart's revoked abdication seriously, and all too likely that James, amidst his ambitious hopes for succeeding Elizabeth, "merely and naturally forgot" about his mother. But in the figure of Bathsheba, Mary Stuart could receive a displaced but reverent recognition, even while her suppressed claims continued to be tacitly evaded. Something other than the ideal or norm had occurred in the case of Bathsheba, but without her Israel would not have had Solomon.

Richard C. McCoy. *Alterations of State: Sacred Kingship in the English Reformation*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2002. 218 pp. \$29.50. Review by DAVID A. SALOMON, BLACK HILLS STATE UNIVERSITY.

Richard McCoy's *Alterations of State* is a welcome addition to any scholar of the seventeenth century. The book is a study of, as its subtitle puts it, "sacred kingship in the English Reformation," and it approaches its subject through the work of John Skelton, Shakespeare, John Milton, and Andrew Marvell.

Illustrated with pages from contemporary literature, the book aims to be a study of kingship and what Ernest Kantorowicz referred to as "the king's two bodies." The authors surveyed were

chosen, we are told in the preface, because they lived and worked at the beginning, middle, and end of the early modern period. They also approach the issue of kingship from a variety of different perspectives, from the sacred to the profane.

The book's opening chapter, "Real Presence to Royal Presence," is perhaps its best. Here McCoy distinguishes between the body of the King, the body of Christ (the Eucharist), and the metaphorical body of the King. He notes the dispute over the burial of Henry VII, and the battle to, alternatively, revere or deride his tomb. Henry VIII, McCoy claims, "proved to be a halfhearted reformer," due mostly to his attempts at "godly rule."

The chapter on John Skelton is well-written and informative, though its argument is best summed up by McCoy in one sentence—"Skelton was a zealous defender of royal authority and traditional religion"—although McCoy does then show us how Skelton became satiric fodder for the Protestants. Poetry is viewed here as memorial monument, the equivalent of a cold stone slab erected in memory of a dead hero. McCoy argues throughout that, when the physical monuments were removed, the poetic ones were erected. Thus Skelton's poetry was replaced, in a sense, when Mary Tudor restored Westminster Abbey.

The chapter devoted to Shakespeare notes the failure of the Elizabethan Settlement, renaming it the "Elizabethan Compromise." Here McCoy regards the development of a cult of Elizabeth that in some way replaced the body of Christ with the body of the Queen; nevertheless, Elizabeth's tomb never became a pilgrimage site even though it "remained an object of veneration." Because it was first performed at the end of Elizabeth's reign, *Hamlet* reflects "the political anxieties of an unsettled succession as well as the religious ambiguities of the Elizabethan era." As has been noted in earlier critics, the word "doubt" is most significant in *Hamlet*, and McCoy shows how the play continually "raises doubts about the adequacy of commemoration, Protestantism's replacement for intercession of the dead." McCoy on *Hamlet* is a nice complement to Stephen Greenblatt's recent study, *Hamlet in Purgatory*.

The chapter on Milton is most disappointing here. Though it runs to little more than thirty pages, Milton's name does not really appear until ten pages in. In a study that concerns itself with commemoration of the dead, one hoped to see discussion of "Lycidas," but instead we get an extended discussion of several of the prose works. Although they are of course important, in the context of a book that deals mostly with poetry (Skelton, Shakespeare, Marvell), one would have liked a bit more consistency here. *Paradise Lost* is eventually addressed, and McCoy's analysis of the closing books of the epic is lucid and helpful. Ultimately, "*Paradise Lost* . . . affirms one of the Reformation's fundamental premises: there is no sacred space." This statement, one of the most important in McCoy's study, provides a link to other important works such as Eamon Duffy's *Stripping the Altars*. Had this chapter in McCoy's book more carefully examined the idea of sacred space in Milton's work, it would have had, I think, more relevance to McCoy's overall study.

The final chapter (the book lacks a "conclusion" as such) looks at Andrew Marvell and the Restoration. After Milton's death "civil idolatry seemed to be making comeback," and plans were afoot to re-bury Charles I in St. George's Chapel. Christopher Wren's and others' designs for the monument are welcome illustrations. The chapter's point is to contrast Milton's approach to sacred kingship with Marvell's.

If there is one major criticism of this book, it is its length. The text of the study comes in at 156 pages, while almost 50 pages are given to notes. The chapter on Milton, in particular, is at times superficial, and the chapters are at times disconnected, reading as a series of lectures loosely given under the same umbrella theme. Concluding remarks would have helped to make the connections and bring the reader in from the rain. Nevertheless, this is a solid study of an important issue in our field.

Luke Wilson. *Theaters of Intention: Drama and the Law in Early Modern England*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000. x +

362 pp. + 13 illus. \$55.00. Review by DOUGLAS BRUSTER, THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN.

Most Shakespeareans would freely acknowledge that the majority of the surviving information about Shakespeare's life derives from his pursuit of and exposure to the law. Most recognize the names of some notorious legal cases of the era: Hales v. Petit, for instance, or the Overbury affair. And the legal wranglings at the heart of *Henry V* and *The Merchant of Venice*, to name only these two plays, invariably produce useful material for class discussion. Yet at the same time that many scholars will concede the importance of legal matters and codes in early modern society and its literary representations, there obtains a general lack of familiarity with the topic. Shakespeareans will thus confess themselves, like Warwick, to be "no wiser than a daw" in "these nice sharp quilllets of the law" (*1H6* 2.4.17-8).

Luke Wilson's *Theaters of Intention: Drama and the Law in Early Modern England* will go a long way toward educating the field on the legal contexts that shaped and enriched early modern drama. It is a learned and wide-ranging study that simultaneously makes the case for the law's foundational importance to the drama of this time, and gives us a variety of languages for understanding that importance. Wilson's primary argument is that "During the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries . . . the theater absorbed and redeployed representations of human action developed in the English common law over the long course of its history;" these developments "produced and satisfied a demand for a sophisticated language of intentional action, [a language which] became instrumental in parallel developments in the theater's increasing ability to produce representations of human beings acting out routines of practical reasoning" (4).

Wilson demonstrates the intellectual overlap between drama and the law in six substantial, interrelated chapters following his book's useful introduction. Each of these chapters advances a significant argument that deserves more attention than can be granted here. The brief chapter summaries that follow, then, are not meant to

diminish that significance, but instead to convey the range of what the book makes available.

In chapter 1, “*Hamlet, Hales v Petit*, and the Hysteresis of Action,” Wilson takes up what is arguably Shakespeare’s most legalistic play and argues that, for this tragedy, “The ‘problem of action’ . . . is less a matter of how it is possible to act than of how it is possible to account for one’s actions after the fact; and like other Renaissance actors, on stage and off, Hamlet conceives such explanations primarily in terms of intention” (39). Wilson adduces several legal cases from the era to show how both law and drama faced “problems in the representation of action” (50). The second chapter here, “Ben Jonson and the Law of Contract,” moves from criminal to contract law in examining the role of *assumpsit* in Ben Jonson’s works. Noting that *assumpsit* “had in the beginning referred to an actual taking in hand, but . . . had come to designate the promise of which that taking in hand was both sign and consequence” (97), Wilson explores the ways in which this legal conception of promises undergirded Jonson’s thinking about contracts, theater, and theatrical contracts.

The potentially economic structures of contractual thinking unfold in Wilson’s third chapter, “Commodities and Contracts,” which centers on *Bartholomew Fair* and offers a variety of contexts—the “Great Contract” of 1610, wardship, fetishism, and gift theory—to illuminate this notoriously unruly play. Chapter 4, “Promissory Performances,” treats the links between promise and performance, first through an examination of theatrical labor and *The Tempest*, then in *Timon of Athens*, where, Wilson argues, “Timon’s characterological incompleteness, his disastrous failure to master the temporal aspect of exchange, and Shakespeare’s own compositional predicaments . . . are all closely related” (178). Wilson’s next chapter, “Contracting Damnation,” examines several social and legal documents concerning witchcraft as a prelude to analysis of performances—theatrical and contractual alike—in Marlowe’s *Doctor Faustus* and Barnes’s *Devil’s Charter*. The book’s sixth and final chapter, “Nobodies That Matter,” is its most playful. Here Wilson takes up the longstanding trope of “nobody” as actor—as in, for

instance, Odysseus's joke on Polyphemus in the ninth book of Homer's epic—as a means of unpacking various changes in the representation of identity and action in the early modern theater. Wilson provides what should be history's most extensive reading of the anonymous play *Nobody and Somebody* before turning to Desdemona's famous answer to Emilia's pressing question: "O, who hath done this deed?"

If there is a weakness in this book it has to do with difficulties that are built into the topic. The law is notoriously obscure when it comes to words: in its attempt at precision the law often, as Jonson said of Spenser, writes "no language." Thus it can be challenging to read continuously about matters of, for instance, "assumpsit," "deodand," and "nonfeasance." But to Wilson's credit, he takes great pains to clarify what are essentially issues of tremendous complexity, all the time asking us to see that it is precisely this complexity that drew playwrights to legal thinking and expression in the first place.

This is a provocative book, one that may well repay repeated consultation. For its insight into questions of agency and action alone, it deserves serious consideration from those within and without the field of early modern studies. Its focus on the drama will prove particularly helpful to those interested in issues of performance and politics in the theaters of other places and times.

Gigliola Pagano de Divitiis. *English Merchants in Seventeenth-Century Italy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997. xv + 202 pp. \$59.95. Review by JAMES PATERSON, UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY.

The title of Pagano de Divitiis's *English Merchants in Seventeenth-Century Italy* is frankly a misnomer. It promises a study of the English mercantile community in Italy, perhaps something along the lines of M.C. Engels's *Merchants, Interlopers, Seamen and Corsairs* (1997) or Daniel Goffman's *Britons in the Ottoman Empire, 1642-1660* (1998). But while Engels studies the Flemish mercantile

communities of Livorno and Genoa and Goffman documents the careers of English Levant Company representatives in Turkey like Sir Thomas Bendysh and Henry Hyde, Pagano de Divitiis relegates individual English merchants almost entirely to her footnotes and says very little about English mercantile communities in Livorno or anywhere else in Italy.

Deciding what *English Merchants in Seventeenth-Century Italy* actually is is a rather more complicated matter, however. Perhaps the most accurate way to describe the book would be to state that it is simply a compendium of information about seventeenth-century Anglo-Italian trade. Viewed as such, it can be regarded as a reasonably important addition to the existing stock of literature on the early modern Italian economy available in English. It contains a wealth of data about most every conceivable aspect of Anglo-Italian trade and will certainly provide the resource of first resort for economic historians interested in the subject for years to come.

That said, the book seems to want to be something more—something which, it must be said, it manages with far less success. In her Preface, Pagano de Divitiis presents the book to her readers as an attempt “to clarify the ways in which England came to replace the cities of northern Italy as the guiding force in the organisation of Mediterranean trade over the course of the seventeenth century, and the reasons why it was able to take on this role” (xiii). *English Merchants in Seventeenth-Century Italy*, therefore, is offered to the reader as a work of problem-centred historiography, a study in the process by which the English wrested the long-distance trade between the Mediterranean and northern Europe from Italian hands. In this regard, *English Merchants in Seventeenth-Century Italy* belongs to a well-established historiographical tradition that seeks to establish the reasons for Italy’s economic decline after the Renaissance, a problematic complicated by growing appreciation of the fact that Italy’s decline was of a relative nature only.

The problem the book sets out to address is, in fact, only directly addressed in its first chapter, “Times and places.” Here Pagano de Divitiis discusses the English penetration of the Mediterranean

trade after 1573. She presents an interesting, nuanced account of the process by which Italian mercantile activity declined and English traders achieved superiority by the middle of the seventeenth century. This turnaround, which provides the basis for Fernand Braudel's famous assertion that the seventeenth century saw the "Northern Invasion" of the Mediterranean, is examined in a dual perspective. Recognizing the relative nature of Italian economic decline, Pagano de Divitiis discusses both factors illustrating Italy's weaknesses and England's new strengths.

The problem with Pagano de Divitiis's approach is that her historiographical problematic rapidly fades from view with the second chapter, "The ships." In certain respects, this chapter deepens the picture created in the first by narrowing the focus to reasons why the Italian shipbuilding industry went into decline in the late sixteenth century and why English (and Dutch) ships possessed important advantages over Italian-built ships. A point Pagano de Divitiis makes well is that from the 1660s onwards English ships regularly enjoyed the benefits of protective convoys. No one would disagree that such protection was "a significant step towards the establishment of English commercial hegemony in the Mediterranean" (63). However, with "The ships" Pagano de Divitiis begins to lose sight of her problem in favor of simply amassing information about Anglo-Italian trade. With the last three chapters - "Routes and ports," "Imported goods," and "Exported goods"-the problematic virtually disappears, and we find ourselves confronted by data that are intrinsically interesting, perhaps, and certainly useful to future researchers, but which shed very little light on the problem that the book purports to address.

In this respect, *English Merchants in Seventeenth-Century Italy* is a casualty of the thematic organization of its chapters. By this means, Pagano de Divitiis certainly builds up a comprehensive overview of seventeenth-century Anglo-Italian trade. But by compartmentalizing her information in chapters that do not seem to reflect the development of an argument, she will leave many of her readers feeling extremely dissatisfied. Perhaps the chief fault of her method of organizing her information is that many facts which seem in-

dispensable to the problem examined in the first chapter are doled out in a seemingly arbitrary and casual manner in succeeding chapters.

Most perturbing to this reviewer was the fact that certainly the most pertinent fact in the entire book is withheld until page 132, when it is only mentioned incidentally. The problem the book seeks to examine, it should be stated again, is that the English increasingly monopolized the Mediterranean trade to northern Europe. Since the expression "northern Europe" refers in most parts of this study simply to English ports, the problem is how the English managed, during the course of the seventeenth century, to monopolize the flow of Ottoman and Italian goods to England. Yet not until page 132 does Pagano de Divitiis tell us that in 1615 King James I enacted a decree that allowed only English ships to import goods from the Mediterranean. Here, strikingly, Pagano de Divitiis is talking about why Dutch (not Italian) ships were unable to import goods to English ports. But if Italian merchants, from 1615 onwards, were also barred from carrying Mediterranean products to England, as this reference to the decree implies, then almost everything else Pagano de Divitiis has to tell us about England's displacement of Italians from the Anglo-Mediterranean trade is redundant. At least three chapters in this book dispense facts that seem to shed light on the changing dynamics of Anglo-Italian trade—such as that even in the fourteenth century, at the height of Italian domination of the Mediterranean trade to England, the English already controlled the transportation of Italian wine—in contexts where their significance is not examined in a way that relates them clearly to the problem.

There is space for only two more criticisms. First of all, Pagano de Divitiis has a habit of broaching problems and dismissing them with glib and unsatisfying answers. When she considers the problem of why the Italians relied so heavily on imports of English herring when they should have been able to provision themselves adequately with fish from the Mediterranean, for instance, her answer is to the effect that, because the Reformation diminished the English need for fish, the English offloaded the surplus to Italians

whose dietary habits were still regulated by the church calendar. This implies that the English only ate fish because compelled to do so by the Catholic church and that the Italians were content to buy up the English surplus. This argument presents at least two problems that ought to have been resolved. First, since neither the Dutch nor the Scandinavian peoples lost their appetite for herrings after the Reformation, why did the English? Second, was there a compelling price rationale for Italian consumption of English fish? Were the English able to supply herrings to the Italians so cheaply that it was simply not worth the Italians taking the trouble to provision themselves? Finally, as Geoffrey Clark, a previous reviewer of this book, has observed, “the text is occasionally vague and its arguments telegraphic.” Although the translation seems correct and proper throughout, it still possesses that elusive and insubstantial quality that too often mars Italian academic prose.

Jonathan Brown and John Elliott, eds. *The Sale of the Century: Artistic Relations between Spain and Great Britain, 1604–1655*. Madrid: Yale University Press and Museo Nacional del Prado, 2002. 315 pp. \$65 hardback. Review by ELIZABETH R. WRIGHT, UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA.

Art historian Jonathan Brown and historian John Elliott have joined forces to provide an indispensable guide to the political and artistic relationship between Spain and England in the first half of the seventeenth century. Though specifically focused on the Commonwealth Sale of 1649–1654 that dispersed Charles I’s magnificent art collection, this catalogue of a 2002 exhibit gives a thorough account of Spanish–English relations between the Peace Treaty of 1604 and the sale that transferred numerous paintings by Titian, Veronese, Raphael, and other masters from England to Spain. Along with introductory essays, a chart of ambassadors, and annotated catalogue entries, the editors have included untranslated transcriptions of the Spanish documents that chart the sale. As with their

earlier collaboration, *A Palace for a King: The Buen Retiro and the Court of Philip IV* (Yale: London and New Haven 1980), Brown and Elliott make one milestone of seventeenth-century royal patronage a focal point for a wide-ranging exploration of the era's complicated cultural and political history.

John Elliott launches his survey of Spanish–English relations with a vivid depiction of the Earl of Nottingham's 1605 visit to Spain, an event that reacquainted the two nations that religious antipathy and commercial rivalry had separated in the era of Philip II and Elizabeth Tudor. Non-specialists and seventeenth-century scholars alike will relish Elliott's description of the human drama that shaped the Stuart-era rapprochement between old enemies. In a characteristically delightful passage, he recounts the Viscount Wimbledon's 1625 raid on Cadiz, an act of Tudor nostalgia that failed when the invaders "attacked" an unguarded wine warehouse (30). Though Elliott built his distinguished career on extensive archival work and political history, he is peerless when describing the literary and cultural reflections of the statecraft he examines. An essay by Jonathan Brown retraces Elliott's steps from a specifically art-historical perspective. Next, David Howarth assesses the Earl of Arundel's artistic patronage, which he judges as limited in its understanding of contemporary artists but highly sophisticated in its appreciation of sixteenth-century artists and antiquities. Marcus Burke follows with a discussion of Luis de Haro, the Spanish minister most responsible for Philip IV's canny purchases of Charles I's treasures. Finally, Bonaventura Bassegoda reconstructs the redecoration of the Escorial that the painter Diego de Velázquez supervised. Though many of the new paintings came from England, this essay diverts the catalogue's focus to a specifically Spanish topic.

In terms of the annotated exhibit catalogue, the editors have followed a chronological scheme that provides a narrative spark and records the vagaries of international court politics. Thus they begin with the 1604 peace treaty, continue with the Prince of Wales's ill-starred 1623 romantic adventure in Spain, follow with the renewed conflicts of the 1630s, and then depict the Commonwealth

Sale itself. The final section comprises notable paintings that Spaniards bought from non-royal British collections. Signed by fifteen contributors, this section includes particularly thoughtful entries from Jonathan Brown, Miguel Falomir Faus, and Matilde Miquel Joan. There are, however, inconsistencies in the bibliographic citation formats that the different contributors use, suggesting the volume could have benefited from more thorough editing.

Taken together, the annotated catalogue, archival documents, and introductory essays suggest several compelling questions about canon formation in the visual arts that merit closer study in a cultural studies framework. At the outset, Brown and Elliott depict paintings as “trophies” of seventeenth-century courtiers that attested to “the triumph over rivals in the incessant struggle for the glory and prestige that dignified power” (13). As an example of this mindset, Jonathan Brown’s introductory essay describes the Prince of Wales’s almost unseemly angling for gifts from among the Titians held in Spanish collections during the Stuart heir’s bizarre 1623 visit to Madrid. What criteria made the Venetian master the painter of princes fifty years after his death? Was it scarcity, abundance, the cachet that Habsburg patronage conferred, or some aspect of style? Elsewhere, however, Brown notes that the Commonwealth withdrew royal tapestries from the massive art sale after it was already in progress (60). This last-minute revalorization of one category of royal treasure alongside the liquidation of another might cloud the editors’ depiction of the painting as the ultimate courtly status symbol. Though the bibliography guides the reader to the primary and secondary sources that chart Spanish–English relations and art history, readers interested in analyzing the ebb and flow of cultural capital will need to supplement this volume with theoretical considerations of court culture, conspicuous consumption, and gifts.

Another interesting path for future exploration emerges in the annotated catalogue entries. Specifically, the transfers of paintings that the contributors reconstruct often involved middlemen whose protagonism might complicate the editors’ portrait of the Commonwealth Sale as an affair of statesmen and aristocrats. For

instance, Titian's *Allocution of the Marquis of Vasto* (232) and Palma il Giovane's *The Conversion of St. Paul* (243) passed through the hands of the embroiderer Edward Harrison before the Spanish ambassador purchased them. Based on background information in Brown's introductory essay, the reader can surmise that this artisan was a royal servant to whom the Commonwealth owed back wages. Yet neither the annotations nor the prefatory studies provide explicit information about the various middlemen who appear in the sale records. Did these short-term owners simply buy low and sell high without taking pleasure in their "trophies"? Though the editors and contributors choose to tell a story about kings, grandees, and ambassadors, the sale documents might also tell a story about enterprising artisans and military officers who profited from the Stuart tragedy.

As a record of Spanish–English relations in the first half of the seventeenth century, this volume might surprise scholars of English literature, in that it portrays many notable Spanish statesmen and patrons who remain little studied. Brown and Elliott have done much to correct Spain's marginality in the Anglo-American academy through their own independent and collaborative projects, as well as those of the many students they have supervised. In a time where increasing numbers of English majors also study Spanish, this book could be a roadmap to guide students to comparative topics for advanced study. Given its many potential applications, it would be a shame if the exhibit-catalogue price and heft confined this beautiful book to museum bookshops and library shelves.

Rolena Adorno. *Guaman Poma and His Illustrated Chronicle from Colonial Peru: From a Century of Scholarship to a New Era of Reading / Guaman Poma y su corónica ilustrada del Perú colonial: un siglo de investigaciones hacia una nueva era de lectura*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press, University of Copenhagen & The Royal Li-

brary, 2001. 88 pp. + 8 illus. \$21.00. Review by NANCY JOE DYER, TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY.

The book was published in conjunction with the opening of a complete digital facsimile edition of their autograph manuscript of Felipe Guaman Poma de Ayala's 1189-page *Nueva crónica y buen gobierno* (MS Gl. kgl. S. 2232, 4°, Royal Library of Denmark, Copenhagen). It is written in English with complete Spanish translations of all component parts. The Foreword by the General Director of the Royal Library, Erland Kolding Nielsen, traces the manuscript's recent history, credits the contributors to the web project, especially the Departments of Manuscripts and Rare Books, of Preservation, and of Digitisation and Web Publishing, and affirms the online edition's objective to make global cultural heritage available through technology. Introductory materials include full-page, albeit sketchy, maps of Peru and of the Departments of Ayacucho and Apruimac, and from the chronicle, a self-portrait drawn by Guaman Poma.

The centerpiece of the book is Adorno's commissioned essay on the occasion of the May 15, 2001, inauguration of the online edition; it also appears in full on the Library's web site (<http://www.kb.dk/elib/mss/poma>). Other components are a photocopy of the letter of transmittal from Guaman Poma to King Philip III (MS Archivo General de Indias, Seville, Audiencia de Lima 145), a modernized transcription and translation into English. Fifteen representative European-style full-page drawings from the chronicle illustrate the central points of the essay's theses.

Adorno had transcribed the unique manuscript and in 1977 studied the Copenhagen codex while finalizing her jointly-edited critical edition of the chronicle with John V. Murra, and Quechua translations by Jorge L. Urioste (Mexico City: Siglo Veintiuno, 1980). Her familiarity with the manuscript, her experience with the critical apparatuses of the 1980 edition, and knowledge of current scholarship qualify her to write the solid, well-balanced, informative, and evocative overview of the Peruvian writer, his work, and his times. In the chronicle, Guaman Poma recounts the

mechanism of impending destruction of Andean society through the threat of the rapidly-growing, non-tax-paying *mestizo* population, and the exploitation of the native Andean population. To engage the Spanish monarch who was thought to be fond of art, he illustrated his poignant narratives and essays with 398 full-page line drawings. The Yale scholar's essay provides an overview of the chronicle's content, describes the unique autograph codex which was copied into a print-ready format, including captions and catchwords. She summarizes her own original findings and current scholarship on Guaman Poma's visual and verbal art, particularly with regard to his multiple dialects, artistic style and influences, emphasizing his "conceptual power and complexity" (26). Because of the chronicle's emphasis on sociohistorical developments, the essayist characterizes the Andean author's attitude toward his own social position and justification to raise the Indian's cause before King Philip III. She contextualizes the chronistic record within the framework of documentary and testamentary records which have been discovered in the past seventy years. The remainder of the essay portrays the personal and historical circumstances which allowed the devout, ideological social activist to develop and illustrate the chronicle while living in forced exile. Adorno reveals her own deep appreciation of the chronicle, its author, and its new medium of delivery when she concludes that "the manuscript in its digitalized version gives to the 'archive of the world' that Guaman Poma ... imagined, a unique and coherent native Andean account of the struggle to hang onto a disappearing Andean order and to reform, not to overturn, the decadent foreign imperial regime that would replace it" (40). The Spanish translation of the essay by Adorno's student Fernanda Macci accurately captures the nuances of the English which is scholarly, yet free-flowing, at times nearly colloquial, and untainted by academic clichés.

The 77 entries in Works Cited, fewer than half of which are in English, provide the reader a solid and up to date resource for further inquiry. In its Spanish translation, *Obras citadas* zealously renders all bibliographic technical apparatus into Spanish, includ-

ing names of university presses (“Editorial de la Universidad de Duke”), and some place names (Filadelfia). Although a Cornell University “Ph.D. diss.” is translated as “*Tesis doctoral*” in the *Obras citadas*, conversely, a Peruvian “*Tesis de licenciatura*” is not translated as “Masters Thesis” in the English Works Cited.

Guaman Poma, condemned and publicly lashed for insubordination and fomenting unrest among his fellow Indians, was sent into exile where he wrote the chronicle, probably between 1612 and early 1616 (22). Nearing the age of eighty, he wrote a letter of transmittal to accompany the chronicle to King Philip III. In the present book, an illegible fuzzy photocopy of that letter appears alongside its Spanish transcription, modernized for orthography and punctuation, based on a transcription previously published by Guillermo Lohmann Villena (1945). Adorno translated the letter into English from the 1945 transcription.

The List of Plates/*Lista de laminas* provides a descriptive title for each of the fifteen drawings discussed in the essay. Inspired by contemporary printers’ compositional style, the dramatic illustrations of the title page, detailed images of torture and sacrifice of perceived Andean traitors, and a nearly Ortelian *Mapamundi* of the Incan empire which puts to shame the schematic modern maps appeared earlier in the commemorative book only hint at the cultural and artistic splendor which lies within Guaman Poma’s magnum opus.

Just as any successful overview which describes and accompanies an artistic and/or literary masterpiece orients the audience away from itself toward the object of study, this book impels the seventeenth-century scholar to examine the digital manuscript itself. A review of the chronicle edition’s Danish website falls outside the scope of this review, but it must be stated that the clarity and amount of textual and extra-textual information to be gathered from the facsimile online edition of this elegantly crafted and powerful chronicle should engage scholars from any field, including history, law, religion, literature, art history, anthropology, and linguistics. Its technological functionality, presentation of codicological and paleographic data invisible to the naked eye, impeccable schol-

arly standards, and the sheer beauty of the views of the codex have raised the benchmark against which future digital editions should be evaluated. This occasional book constitutes a worthy vehicle to announce the premier of the distinguished online digital version of Guaman Poma's chronicle, and in and of itself merits scholarly recognition.

Giovanni Tarantino. *Martin Clifford 1624-1677: Deismo e tolleranza nell'Inghilterra della Restaurazione*. Studi e testi per la storia della tolleranza in Europa nei secoli XVI-XVIII, 3. Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 2000. x + 390 pp. + 5 illus. Lit. 68,000. Review by MICHAEL J. REDMOND, UNIVERSITY OF PALERMO.

While Martin Clifford is an obscure figure in Restoration studies, as Giovanni Tarantino concedes at the start of this well-researched book, his role as the long-term secretary of George Villiers, second Duke of Buckingham, put him at the centre of the turbulent religious, political, and literary debates of the period. With his personal connections and acerbic wit, giving him a reputation for libellous verses, Clifford found space for himself in the cultural life of Charles II's court. Along with his close friends Abraham Cowley and Thomas Sprat, he has long been identified as one of the contributors to *The Rehearsal*, Buckingham's satiric attack on the heroic tragedies associated with John Dryden. Clifford's own criticisms of Dryden, published posthumously in 1687 as *Notes upon Mr. Dryden's Poems in Four Letters*, were notorious for their viciousness. What particularly interests Tarantino, however, is the contribution that Clifford made to Buckingham's efforts to promote religious tolerance. In 1674, when Clifford's tract *A Treatise of Humane Reason* was published, the parliamentary influence of Buckingham had waned with the failure of the Declaration of Indulgence and the rise of Sir Thomas Osborne, later Earl of Danby. In arguing that individual reason is the principal guide to religious practice, denying the precedence of any specific church, Clifford's timely

intervention in the dispute over the place of dissenters and Catholics in English life aroused a controversy that gained his work attention throughout Europe. The importance of the *Treatise* was such that even Dryden was forced to take account of it in his *Religio Laici* and *The Medall*.

One of major concerns in the book is the political application of Clifford's arguments. There is no question that Clifford was beholden to Buckingham and the Earl of Shaftesbury. When *A Treatise* was written, Charles II had already appointed Clifford to the mastership of the Charterhouse at the urging of Buckingham. After publication, via the intervention of Shaftesbury, the school's governors granted him a pay rise. The importance of the tract for the parliamentary opposition to Danby was that it denied the need for the monarch to impose religious conformity, offering freedom of opinion as a means of avoiding social conflict.

For although Clifford's willingness to equate different creeds offended believers from every religious group, scandalized by what was seen as his promotion of deism, the main focus of the arguments against the tract in England was political. For the Church of England establishment, the danger of religious non-conformity was that it was symptomatic of political non-conformity. The anonymous tract *Plain Dealing* contended that, in contrast to Clifford's arguments, what was needed were stronger civil and ecclesiastical measures to stamp out dissent by coercive means. Such opponents appealed to the theories of Thomas Hobbes, giving the king an exclusive right to determine the nature of religious worship.

From his position as a religious historian, Tarantino contends that the terms of the debate about the *Treatise*, giving faith a "giustificazione tutta politica," were based on a fundamental misreading of Clifford's complex arguments about personal conscience (144). It is clear, however, that the theological aspects of the tract were always overshadowed by more pressing anxieties about social cohesion and religious oppression. Albertus Warren's *An Apology for the Discourse of Humane Reason* in 1680, published under the patronage of Shaftesbury, dispensed with moral issues entirely,

concentrating its defence of Clifford on the political utility of tolerance. Indeed, the fate of Clifford's tract on the continent, with the publication in Amsterdam of William Popple's French translation in 1682, was linked to Louis XIV's persecution of the Huguenots. Tarantino's study is supplemented by an extensive appendix containing the original English versions of the principal tracts he discusses, including Clifford's *Treatise*, Warren's *Apology*, Buckingham's letter "To Mr. Clifford on his *Humane Reason*," and William Popple's *A Discourse of Humane Reason* (247-362). Within the text, the inconsistent use of quotations from other sources in either English or the author's own translations can be distracting. Although the book is clearly aimed at religious historians interested in the minutiae of theological disputes, the political context of Clifford's relationships with such major figures as Buckingham, Shaftesbury, and Dryden may give it a wider resonance in other areas of Restoration studies.

Suzanne L. Stratton-Pruitt, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Velázquez*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. x + 246 pp. + 62 illus. \$75.00 hardback; \$28.00 paperback. Review by TANYA J. TIFFANY, JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

The Cambridge Companion to Velázquez, edited by Suzanne L. Stratton-Pruitt, provides a guide to recent developments in scholarship on Diego Velázquez (1599-1660) while offering innovative critical approaches to his art. As explained in the introduction, the volume is intended to give a survey of Velázquez's life and oeuvre through traditional art-historical approaches and to present novel readings of his paintings within broader contexts including political theory, theater, and music at the court in Madrid. The new methodologies and interpretations used to place Velázquez within this cultural framework will prove of interest to specialists and students alike. In her valuable introduction, Stratton-Pruitt situates the essays within their historiographical context by providing an overview

of Velázquez's life and critical fortunes through a discussion of the principal primary sources on the artist, the rediscovery of his naturalism by nineteenth-century painters and critics, and the archival investigations of his origins in Seville and achievements in Madrid. Highlighting the importance of contextual approaches to Velázquez and his art, she commends scholars' recent examinations of his career within the social milieu of the court of Philip IV and praises interpretations of his works within the intellectual framework documented in the writings of his learned associates and the inventory of his impressive library.

Following this opening, the first three essays consider Velázquez's oeuvre in concert with the artistic practices and traditions of his time. In an excellent discussion of artists' training in Spain, Zahira Véliz examines Velázquez's apprenticeship in the studio of the erudite painter, Francisco Pacheco, and analyzes both his appropriation of Pacheco's belief in the necessary union of artistic theory and practice as well as his challenge to the elder master's insistence on the primacy of history painting. Jonathan Brown then turns to Velázquez's artistic maturity and examines his crucial but little-studied first trip to Italy through an analysis of the painter's critical engagement with the example of sixteenth-century Venetian color and brushwork and an assessment of his refusal to bow to the authority of central Italian art. Focusing on Velázquez's often overlooked study of Northern art, Alexander Vergara provides a survey of his use of motifs, compositional techniques, and stylistic elements by Northern artists ranging from Dürer and Aertsen to van Dyck and Rubens. Both Brown's and Vergara's essays help to challenge conventional notions of Velázquez as a master isolated at the Spanish court and demonstrate his participation in larger European artistic trends.

Interdisciplinary in scope, several of the subsequent contributions present new methodological models for examining Velázquez's works. In a groundbreaking study, Antonio Feros examines the uncompromising naturalism of Velázquez's royal portraits through the prism of early modern political theory. Establishing a critical framework for considering the sobriety of Spanish Habsburg por-

traits, Feros relates Velázquez's unadorned images of Philip IV to Erasminian notions of the importance of the king's individual and personal virtues over the attributes and symbols associated with his office. In a further exploration of the court, Magdalena S. Sánchez provides a close examination of women's strategies for asserting political influence through their husbands and confessors, and analyzes how the pious reputations of *beatas* and other holy women served as justifications for their proposed correctives to the monarchies' policies. Sara T. Nalle then provides a useful synopsis of religious beliefs and practices in Velázquez's Spain by discussing contemporary controversies including the expulsion of the Moriscos while giving an account of the fluid boundaries separating established Catholicism, witchcraft, and magic. Although neither Sánchez nor Nalle concentrates on particular works of art, the subjects of their essays point to potentially rewarding avenues in Velázquez scholarship; gender studies remain almost entirely neglected in Golden Age Spanish art history, and Velázquez's religious paintings have yet to be fully examined in terms of post-Tridentine spirituality and doctrine.

The final essays offer stimulating approaches to Velázquez's works by locating them within the larger cultural context of arts and letters in seventeenth-century Spain. Lía Schwartz establishes the doctrine of *ut pictura poesis* as a forum for comparing poems by Góngora and Quevedo with paintings by Velázquez, emphasizing the evidence of the artist's study of letters provided both by the inventory of his library and his early eighteenth-century biography by Antonio Palomino. In an exemplary investigation of the nexus between theater and the visual arts in Golden Age Spain, Margaret R. Greer examines the similar themes and discursive modes structuring plays by Calderón de la Barca and paintings by Velázquez. Greer analyzes specific connections between their images of the royal pastimes and kingly magnificence of the court of Philip IV, and sheds light on the analogous inventions informing the pictures-within-pictures described in the playwright's *ekphrasis* and depicted in the painter's compositions. Finally, Louise K. Stein makes an original contribution to Velázquez studies by examining

the unexplored musical imagery of his paintings. She uses musical iconography to enrich earlier readings of masterpieces such as Velázquez's enigmatic *Fable of Arachne* and suggests that the stringed instrument in the painting's background is a *lira grande*, whose soothing resonance was believed to serve as a "musical antidote to the spider's bite" (183).

As a whole, the essays offer insight into both Velázquez's paintings and the cultural framework in which they were created. Comprehensive in scope, the volume considers paintings by Velázquez from each period of his long career and in every pictorial genre in which he worked. In addition to the themes addressed in this collection, promising areas for exploration might have included his documented engagement with contemporary optical theories, the critical context of his stylistic development, or a close analysis of his role in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century discourse. The essays in *The Cambridge Companion to Velázquez* nevertheless provide a touchstone for examining the directions in which scholarship on the artist is advancing and, equally important, pose new perspectives for relating the painter and his works to the art and culture of early modern Spain.

Anthony J. Cascardi, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Cervantes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. xvii + 242 pp. + 3 illus. \$60.00. Review by HILAIRE KALLENORF, TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY.

This thoughtfully-chosen collection of essays is a welcome guide to the labyrinthine world of Cervantes scholarship. Cervantes is one of those few great writers whose work itself is so complex that the maze of critical studies it has generated is almost impossible to navigate without assistance, especially to those non-specialists who have not spent a lifetime acquiring this type of expertise. But this volume will prove valuable even to specialists, for few *cervantistas* would claim to dominate every "minor" work of this author, let alone every theoretical approach to every text in the corpus.

This book contains a good balance of traditional and newer approaches. As would be appropriate for any guide to a field, all but one of the contributors are well-established scholars with senior ranking in the profession. Several of them, however, are writing within “new” or only recently-developed critical traditions in the arena of Cervantes studies. Several of the essayists note the inherently conservative nature of most Cervantes scholarship up until quite recently. This trend is perhaps due to the fact that most *cervantistas* have usually been white, Eurocentric males. The representation in this volume of feminist, psychoanalytical, and New World perspectives, especially toward the end of the book, demonstrates that this field of criticism is finally “catching up” with the rest of the scholarly world. In fact, it seems that within the last twenty years there has been a veritable explosion of criticism on Cervantes written from more “cutting edge” theoretical standpoints ranging from materialism to queer theory. There have also been laudable interdisciplinary studies stemming from artistic and religious approaches to Cervantes’ texts. It is only appropriate that this explosion of new critical interpretations

be accompanied by a new volume such as this one. In that sense its publication is very timely indeed.

The book begins with notes on the contributors, a chronology of Cervantes' life, a note on editions and translations, a list of Cervantes' works, and a brief introduction. It ends, as any up-to-date volume of this type should, with an appendix of electronic editions and scholarly resources. As editor, Cascardi states the purpose of the volume in the broadest possible terms:

The present volume is a "companion" to Cervantes. Without slighting Don Quixote in the least, it aims to provide an accompaniment to the broad range of Cervantes' work—in prose fiction, in drama, and in verse. The essays assembled here, all written with this purpose in mind, strive to situate his work historically, to place it within the wider context of early modern (Renaissance) literature, and to give an account of its importance for the subsequent development of the major literary genres. (2)

We see here that these essays are new, having been commissioned specifically for this volume. As such, they are by and large useful surveys of the scholarship in each subfield they are meant to cover. They do not attempt to break new critical ground but rather to survey the existing work in a given area and assess the importance of a range of contributions.

The collection starts out strong and ends with a flourish. The first essay, by B. W. Ife, is titled simply "The Historical and Social Context." It delivers what it promises, examining in detail particularly the history of the monarchy and the emergence of Spain as a world power. It explores issues of class and race (i.e., "purity of blood") as they were affected by legislation and political upheavals of this time period. It chronicles the "discovery" of the New World, the defeat of the Invincible Armada, and the fluctuations of the Spanish economy. It is an incisive and accurate snapshot of the world in which Cervantes lived.

The next essay, “Cervantes and the Italian Renaissance,” is my personal favorite (it also provides all three of the book’s illustrations). I would see its purpose as twofold: to demonstrate Cervantes’ obsession with Italy and to show his conscious imitation of the classics in the manner of the Renaissance humanists. Frederick De Armas executes these two ambitious projects with elegance and ease, and the results are more than convincing. It would take an “insider” in the world of Cervantes studies to realize that the connections he is proposing are far from obvious; if anything, they verge on heterodoxy to the staunch supporters of the older view of Cervantes as a “lay genius” who did not consciously partake of the classical heritage. De Armas is not the first to have concluded that Cervantes was a great deal more learned than he seemed or even wanted to reveal at first glance. Alban Forcione, following Américo Castro, had long argued for a genealogy of Christian humanism to be traced through Cervantes’ *Persiles* as well as his *novelas ejemplares*. The prominence of De Armas’ work in this volume signals to the world of Cervantes scholars that

the famous *ingenio logo* formulation has been, effectively, defeated.

No volume purporting to be a companion to Cervantes would be complete without an essay on the development of the novel. Cascardi himself answers the call of duty with a handy essay reiterating the insistence that Cervantes basically invented the novel as we know it; he executes this summation utilizing the familiar critical framework derived from Bakhtin. Alexander Welsh's essay on "The Influence of Cervantes" is a broadly comparative study of the many novels since Cervantes that have drawn on him for inspiration. Similarly obligatory are Mary Gaylord's entry on "Cervantes' Other Fiction," describing primarily *La Galatea*, the *Persiles*, and the *novelas ejemplares*, and Melveena McKendrick's magisterial treatment of Cervantes' "Writings for the Stage." The former does a stylish job of demonstrating often-unnoticed coherence within Cervantes' *obras completas*, revealing in the less-studied works some recognizable precursors and echoes of characters, techniques, and themes (such as perspectivism) that we also find in the *Quijote*. McKendrick's study is probably the most useful

essay in the volume, in the sense that not even a specialist can possibly keep track of every *entremés* or dramatic interlude ever penned by Cervantes. It provides the kind of succinct summaries that make this reference work one to which scholars will return again and again.

The last three essays are somewhat more “trendy” but still based on rock-solid scholarship. These approaches have come only recently to be accepted into the canon of Cervantes studies. Adrienne Martín’s study of “Humor and Violence in Cervantes,” Anne Cruz’s survey of work done on “Psyche and Gender,” and Diana De Armas Wilson’s suggestive treatment of “Cervantes and the New World” round out a diverse collection of essays representing some of the most important critical developments. Martín’s essay begins rather basically with definitions of humor, while Cruz’s survey is in large part a defense of the legitimacy of psychoanalytical approaches to literature. That these gestures would be considered necessary demonstrates just how conservative this scholarly field still is. But Cruz in particular does a good job of historicizing the theoretical movements in their own right and acknowledging the

emphasis of these approaches on the critics' concerns of the moment rather than the literature itself. Her essay is a fair and balanced assessment of even some of the more "far out" or less well-received (but highly publicized) critical treatments of Cervantes in recent years.

The worst criticism to which this volume remains vulnerable is that its citation format is confusing. Most of the essays include endnotes and then a list of suggestions for further reading. But repeatedly within the volume one encounters interlinear citations (not tied to endnotes) to books not listed in the "Further Reading" sections. For some of these citations, this reader could not find anywhere a full reference to the original work. This aspect of the format must have been overlooked in the editing process. One other complaint would be that individual authors sometimes refer to titles of Cervantes' works by different translations, even within the space of a single page (e.g., *El retablo de las maravillas* becomes variously *The Miracle Show* or *The Wonder Show*, 155). For a reader unable to translate the original Spanish, this inconsistent practice would prove confusing. A few unfortunate misspellings

and typos also mar the final product: “an nonexistent lover” (187), “Don Quixote itself contain many” (208), and the most offensive to this reader, “Texts A&M University” (!) (227). But these errors are minimal and do not detract much from this valuable tool. All in all, a fine accomplishment, and one that equals the sum of its elegant parts.

Jürgen Renn, ed. *Galileo in Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001. 431pp. \$25.00. Review by LUCIANO BOSCHIERO, UNIVERSITY OF NEW SOUTH WALES.

In 1654, Vincenzo Viviani, one of Galileo Galilei’s last students in Tuscany, wrote a biography of his teacher. In this work, Viviani seemingly exaggerated Galileo’s exploits as an experimenter. For example, Viviani claimed that in Galileo’s youth he dropped heavy objects from the leaning tower of Pisa to prove his anti-Aristotelian theory regarding heavy falling bodies. Similarly, Viviani described how Galileo observed a swinging chandelier inside Pisa’s Cathedral, an observation that, according to Viviani, led Galileo to think of the motion of the pendulum. Despite the likelihood that these events never ac-

tually occurred in Galileo's life—they were never mentioned in any of Galileo's own publications and manuscripts—readers of Viviani's biography about Galileo are led to believe that the famous Pisan mathematician was the first natural philosopher to practice an 'experimental science.' In fact, this is the image that historians of science have traditionally employed when describing Galileo's life and works. It is precisely this traditional image, based on simplistic accounts of Galileo's exploits, that Jürgen Renn attempts to discard once and for all in this collection of essays, entitled *Galileo in Context*.

With this aim in mind, Renn introduces the seven essays in this book and promises, as the title suggests, a rich contextual analysis of Galileo's works. Moreover, it must be noted that by 'context', Renn does not mean merely the analysis of social, religious, and political 'factors' that supposedly impinged on Galileo's life as he composed his writings. Instead, he insists that 'context' is about the production and dissemination of knowledge as part of a social dynamics: "a cultural system of knowledge, that is, the shared knowledge of the time with its social structures of transmission and dissemination, its material representations, and its cognitive organization" (2). So Renn is calling for detailed analyses of Galileo's intellectual, practical, political, and religious skills and commitments based on his education and training.

The contextualist aim set out by Renn in the introduction is immediately met in the opening article by Lefèvre, "Galileo Engineer: Art and Modern Science." Lefèvre shows that it is no longer acceptable to regard Galileo purely and simply as a philosopher. Rather, historians should consider that Galileo was educated and

trained as a practical mathematician and engineer. Such considerations reveal that Galileo's interests in solving dynamical problems in physics, such as the laws of free fall, stemmed from his knowledge of practical mathematics and from his skills in traditional disciplines such as statics and mechanics. Therefore, Lefèvre argues that contrary to Alexandre Koyrè's belief that Galileo was simply a natural philosophical theorist uninterested in the practical applications of knowledge, Galileo actually employed many of the skills and commitments that he learnt from traditional practical mathematics and engineering, to solve dynamical problems in physics. In other words, a deeper understanding of Galileo's works is achieved by taking a greater interest in the context of sixteenth-century skills and commitments in practical knowledge.

While Lefèvre's paper is an excellent example of contextual history of science, the following essay in Section One provides for an even greater understanding of Galileo's commitments to practical mathematics and engineering. In "Hunting the White Elephant: When and How did Galileo Discover the Law of Fall?" Renn, Damerow, and Rieger begin by describing their aim to identify when Galileo discovered his law of free fall and the parabolic shape of the projectile trajectory. However, through some compelling manuscript evidence, including data accumulated from recent analyses of the composition of the ink used in Galileo's manuscripts, these authors find that it is far too simplistic to state that Galileo made these discoveries on any single date, or as a result of a single crucial experiment. Instead, they state that Galileo's anti-Aristotelian arguments were based on his accumulation of practical skills and commitments during his education. That is, throughout his early career he made claims regarding the trajectory of a projectile according to tools gained from traditional mathematical disciplines such as statics.

This demonstrates the following two points: firstly that Galileo was trained according to the technical knowledge of the late sixteenth-century engineers. Secondly, although mathematicians were not considered by the sixteenth-century natural philosophical community to be legitimate creators of natural knowledge, Galileo

still became determined to use practical mathematics to solve traditional Aristotelian problems in physics. In other words, Galileo believed that his skills in mathematics could be used to produce natural knowledge, therefore raising the status of mathematicians to the level of natural philosophy: “Galileo succeeded in giving his treatise an anti-Aristotelian twist that made it possible for him to pose an a natural philosopher” (73).

This means that Galileo was far from an ideal example of an early experimental scientist. Although he undoubtedly performed experiments, this does not mean that he used some type of inductivist experimental method. Instead, he relied more on his conceptual framework of nature, including his abilities as an engineer-scientist, to accumulate natural knowledge: “he trusted a proof which he believed to be true within his theoretical framework more than the outcome of an experiment” (131).

The remaining two sections of the book go on to offer some equally convincing arguments about the need to apply detailed contextual accounts of the history of science. The arguments presented in Section Two regarding Galileo’s skills as a draftsman are relevant to how he was able to strengthen the credibility and acceptance of his work with the help of the visual arts (H. Bredekamp, “Gazing Hands and Blind Spots: Galileo as Draftsman”; S. Booth & A. van Helden, “The Virgin and the Telescope: The Moons of Cigoli and Galileo”). Similarly, in Section Three, Mario Biagioli discusses how Galileo secured a position in the Tuscan Court by shrewdly crafting the presentation of his work in such a manner as to maximise its acceptance and minimise the potential for competitors to undermine him (“Replication or Monopoly? The Economics of Invention and Discovery in Galileo’s Observations”). Also in Section Three, Paolo Galluzzi examines how Galileo’s claims were accepted, rejected, and modified by his contemporaries and followers (“Gassendi and *l’Affaire Galilée* of the Laws of Motion”). Meanwhile, Rivka Feldhay highlights the inaccuracies in recent historiographies regarding Galileo’s confrontation with the Inquisition in 1633 (“Recent Narratives on Galileo and the Church or The Three Dogmas of the Counter-Reformation”). So all these papers

provide detailed accounts of the social, political, and religious processes involved in the production and dissemination of natural knowledge in the early seventeenth century and continue to justify Renn's aim to build an accurate and truly contextual account of Galileo's life and works. As Renn, Damerow, and Rieger put it in their conclusion—probably the most important paper in this book—Galileo's works were “the outcome of a complex human interaction determined by both tradition and innovation” (126).

In summary, this is not only a book that demands attention because of its great scholarly work on Galileo, but it also presents some pertinent historiographical issues. Most of these papers could have benefited from a greater use of the recent erudite work by Peter Dear, who also discusses the emergence of physico-mathematics in the seventeenth century and the importance of practical mathematics to the Scientific Revolution. Nevertheless, in the Appendix Renn still does an excellent job of bringing our attention to the brilliant studies undertaken by some famous late nineteenth-century and early twentieth-century historians of Italian science, Raffaello Caverni, Antonio Favaro, and Emil Wohlwill. The writings by these authors may have been forgotten by many historians today, but Renn shows that they have contributed greatly to our understanding of Galileo's work on projectile motion, and are now helping recent scholars, such as the contributors to *Galileo in Context*, to accumulate thorough and contextual accounts of Galileo's achievements.

Lane Furdell. *The Royal Doctors 1485-1714: Medical Personnel at the Tudor and Stuart Courts*. Rochester, NY: Elizabeth University of Rochester Press, 2001. 315 pp. \$65.00. Review by KAROL WEAVER, PURDUE UNIVERSITY.

Elizabeth Lane Furdell's *The Royal Doctors 1485-1714: Medical Personnel at the Tudor and Stuart Courts* is a traditional history of England's royal medical practitioners. Furdell provides biographies of figures in the history of British medicine, and offers retro-

spective diagnoses of the illnesses suffered by the monarchs of England. Consulting a wide variety of primary and secondary sources, Furdell is at her best when she shows the effects that political circumstances had on medicine.

Furdell presents an amazing treasury of biographical facts on royal medical practitioners, including physicians, surgeons, apothecaries, and midwives. Furdell's inclusion of medical personnel at both the high and low ends of the medical corporate ladder is commendable. *The Royal Doctors* is an excellent reference book for information about the men and few women who served the kings, queens, and rulers of England. Furdell considers prominent individuals such as Thomas Linacre, physician and advisor to Henry VIII, as well as lesser-known persons like Margaret Kennix, an irregular who employed simples and who may have been consulted by Elizabeth I. Furdell rightly observes that a history of medical practitioners who catered to England's elite is not a popular or fashionable topic in the history of medicine today: "In recent years, medical and social historians have focused on ordinary practitioners and their patients, eschewing the study of acclaimed . . . doctors for political or publishing reasons" (254). She correctly argues, "Besides their individual import, the doctors at court are too consequential collectively and their multifaceted impact on medicine too great to be ignored" (254-255).

Like other customary histories of medicine, Furdell's work employs retrospective diagnosis to ascertain what physical conditions English rulers experienced. For instance, she presents the medical history of Mary I, including her peri-menopause and a phantom pregnancy. Furdell contends that the ill health of the monarchs and the care they received affected the nation. Speaking of the royal medical practitioners, she notes, "They correctly envisioned their function as pivotal in the protection of harmony throughout the kingdom through their attention to the ruler's health" (255). Furdell's presentation of case studies also shows how monarchs influenced medicine "by the medical personnel whom they summoned to attend to them" (259). These royal medical practitioners then used their positions to advance their careers, promote certain

medical theories, and endorse particular types of remedies. Thus, Furdell's use of retrospective diagnosis, which may appear to be a throwback to earlier days in the history of medicine, is, instead, an excellent tool for uncovering England's medical past.

The strongest portion of Furdell's text is her use of primary and secondary sources to elucidate the relationship between political events and the transformation of medicine over time. For instance, the ascension of James I to the throne of England affected the practice of medicine because the monarch "came to promote a more rational approach to medicine and science through his court appointments" (100-101). James I exercised his authority in order to speak out against the harmful effects of tobacco and dueling. Unlike his predecessors, he did not support the King's Touch. His wife, likewise, affected the course of medical history by backing the efforts of apothecaries to separate from the grocers, whom they considered "tradesmen" (101). An excellent example of Furdell's contextualizing medicine in the midst of political change is her explanation of the attempts by the College of Physicians to maintain a low profile to weather the political storm of the Interregnum. By consulting the *Annals of the College of Physicians* and secondary sources, she shows that the College avoided recording major political and social happenings, such as "war, regicide, or the establishment of a new government" (135) but, instead, concentrated on dealing with unlicensed practitioners. Ultimately, the College's reserve did not profit them; Paracelsian practitioners, more attuned to the political and social atmosphere of the time and backed by Charles II, triumphed at the end of the Interregnum.

Several different audiences would benefit from reading Furdell's book. Historians of medicine will find excellent biographical sketches of royal medical practitioners who served the British crown from the fifteenth to the eighteenth centuries. These same students also may learn that a traditional history of medicine is, in the current academic and historiographic environment, quite revolutionary. Finally, scholars interested in the history of the British monarchy will discover the physical conditions to which leaders

were subject, the ways rulers influenced medicine, and how royal practitioners shaped and reacted to changing political fortunes.

I. Bernard Cohen & George E. Smith, eds. *The Cambridge Companion to Newton*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. xiv + 514pp. £15.95 paper/£ 45.00 hard. Review BY ALESSANDRO GIOSTRA, ACCADEMIA GEORGICA, TREIA.

“The goal of this volume is to provide an introduction to Newton’s work, enabling readers to gain more rapid access to it and to become better judges of how well subsequent philosophers have dealt with it” (4). These words, which are part of the introduction by the editors, clearly express their main preoccupation in issuing this work. This collection of essays, included in the Cambridge Companions to Philosophy, was released through the contribution given by some specialists of Newtonian thought, who lay stress on the main aspects of the activity of “*the giant of science in the seventeenth and eighteenth century*” (1).

The editors introduce this volume by pointing out the contribution given by Newton to philosophy, even if he cannot be deemed a philosopher in the common meaning of this word. His own vision, which opposed Descartes’s mechanical philosophy, does not contain any philosophical arrangement. Newtonian ontology, however, arises from the distinctive feature of his scientific research; “hence it too was part of the split between science and philosophy” (2). Besides a “Brief Biographical Sketch” (9-14), the editors treat the role played by the scientist from Woolsthorpe in the advancement of learning, referring to the contents of the single works by the contributors. The analysis of each aspect of Newton’s thought allows grasping a sort of methodological unity belonging to the wide range of disciplines he dealt with.

The philosophical theory of absolute space-time is the one which most made Newton a milestone in the history of philosophy. That vision underwent its final crisis during the nineteenth cen-

ture and was replaced by the achievement of Relativity at the beginning of the twentieth century. Robert Disalle's contribution remarks the change, occurring in the past decades, of the opinions on Relativity and its relationship with the Newtonian conception of space and time. According to his viewpoint, both Einstein's and Newton's theories establish a space-time absolutism linked with physical phenomena; in other terms, "they are assumptions implicit in the laws of physics" (34).

The character of Newton, as a scientist, is especially connected with his *Synthesis* of Kepler's astronomy and Galilei's studies on motion, which was able to join terrestrial and celestial physics; thus, that *Synthesis* positively defeated the traditional cosmos and brought to an end the revision of Aristotelian natural philosophy, which had started in the late Middle Ages. William Harper shows the great value of the achievement of universal gravitation for the following astronomical enquiry, as it "illustrates a general methodology in which phenomena constrain theory to approximation established by measuring parameters" (175). A further view on Newton's law of gravitation was given by Curtis Wilson: gravitational theory, which consisted in an acceptance and correction of Kepler's three laws of planetary motion at the same time, left some unresolved questions which were investigated in the period following Newton's death and solved at the end of the eighteenth century. Newtonian *Synthesis*, a fundamental progress in the history of science, was announced in the *Philosophiae Naturalis Principia Mathematica* [*The Mathematical Principles of Natural Philosophy*], the second edition of which, issued in 1713, contains the famous statement "Hypotheses non fingo" [I do not feign Hypotheses] (139); it soon became an emblem of Newton's experimental philosophy. The *Principia* can be considered to be the final step of those theories and discoveries which had led to the twilight of the Aristotelian world view. The analysis of "The Methodology of the *Principia*" (138-173), carried out by George E. Smith, argues that only through the solution of the open questions in Newton's work by later scientists, "the new approach to theory construction that

the book was intended to illustrate [...] became a permanent part of the science of physics" (167).

In this volume a careful attention was also paid to the disciplines Newton devoted himself to, not falling within the physical and mathematical subjects. Alchemical and theological studies were particularly considered, that is, those matters the editors deem to be part of "The Other Newton" (23). Newton's interest in alchemy is well known, even if "It may seem surprising to present Isaac Newton, the founder of modern mathematical natural science, as a serious student of alchemy" (370). This difficult impact in accepting his alchemical activity is due to the general negative opinion that the early modern scientific community had for alchemists and their link with occult disciplines. Newton's vision, as Karin Figala shows, is the belief in the presence of a single matter for all natural things, which changes into different kinds of bodies and forms a hierarchical structure. Figala's analysis lays stress on the influences exerted by such authors as Michael Maier on Newton's alchemical writings, especially on the idea of a hierarchy among planets. The importance given by students, especially in the past decades, to Newton's theological investigations is due to the methodological uniformity between physical and theological arrangements in his thought. Maurizio Mamiani points out Newton's interpretation of *Apocalypse*, to interpret the biblical language the English scientist used the same method which had been employed in the *Principia*; it reflects the existence of a single truth which is present in microcosm and macrocosm, revealing a physical world not provided with an inherent necessity.

The last two works in this volume concern the dispute between Newton and Leibniz, that is, probably the most famous conflict within the history of philosophy. Indeed, as Rupert Halls remarks, "it was a sad chronology that brought two such inventive mathematicians as Newton and Leibniz to live in the same age; never were temperaments and intellectual characters more at odds" (431). The most controversial point of that hard debate consisted in the divergent approach to calculus, which led Newton to excogitate the kinematical method of fluxions; it was the result

of his conception of calculus as a “collection of interrelated methods for solving problems, not a radically new, superior approach to mathematics” (21). Leibniz’s view, on the contrary, was founded upon a greater employment of symbolization. This dispute, also involving the priority of the discovery of this method, generated a larger detachment between two different mathematical schools, which can generally be identified as the English and continental ones, following Newtonian and Leibnizian arrangement respectively. Within the topics belonging to this discussion, Domenico Bertoloni Meli focuses the contents of the Leibniz-Clarke correspondence. Newton’s and Leibniz’s different cosmological visions came at odds in that exchange of letters. A clear instance of their opposite viewpoints can be shown in the role God plays in the universe: Leibniz, whose conception trusted in the belief in a Clockwork Universe, rejected Newton’s idea of a God who “had to intervene from time to time in the mechanisms of the universe in order to repair it, as if God lacked foreknowledge to arrange them perfectly from the beginning” (461). On the other side, Clark charged Leibniz’s model of the universe as a preordained universal harmony, for it led to materialism and gave no space to the intervention of God, as a person, in natural processes. The source of this Newtonian conception can be found in the Medieval voluntarism which supported, against Aristotelian pantheism, the total power exerted by God on nature.

The whole contents of this collection of essays make it a complete survey on Newton’s thought, as it also covers those aspects which have often been disregarded by historians of science. Thus it can be considered a useful work for all those students who are going to probe into the questions belonging to Newton’s contribution to the advancement of philosophical learning. A full understanding of this volume, however, requires readers to be already familiar with the basic topics concerning the history of science and, particularly, the Scientific Revolution. This publication, as an outcome of the co-operation made by important researchers in this area of investigation, succeeds in giving the right tribute to one among the most fascinating and complex characters in the

history of thought: namely, the scientist who “had deduced with unprecedented precision most of the known phenomena of optics and all the known phenomena of celestial and terrestrial mechanics” (T. Kuhn, *The Copernican Revolution: Planetary Astronomy in the Development of the Western World*, [1957] 260).

Claire Jowitt and Diane Watt, eds. *The Arts of 17th-Century Science: Representations of the Natural World in European and North American Culture*. Aldershot, U.K.: Ashgate. 284 pp. \$84.95. Review by KAROL K. WEAVER, PURDUE UNIVERSITY.

The Arts of 17th-Century Science: Representations of the Natural World in European and North American Culture is a collection of essays that considers how scientific and literary sources of the early modern period overlapped and influenced each other. Editors Claire Jowitt and Diane Watt skillfully separated the volume into four major topics, did a fine job selecting essays that explored these subjects, and placed essays in such a way that they supported one another and the major ideas of a particular section. Despite the tendency of some of the authors to employ jargon-laden language, the collection as a whole succeeds in its goals to contextualize both art and science in particular historical periods, and to demonstrate the interaction between these two disciplines that are normally defined in opposition to each other.

Jowitt and Watt divided the text into four themes: philosophy, religion, gender, and colonialism. Each of these sections considers the natural world as represented by many different types of discourses, including religious, philosophical, scientific, and literary documents. “Part III: Gender, Sexuality and Scientific Thought” is especially strong due to the quality essays chosen for this section. For example, Bettina Mathes’ fine contribution, “From Nymph to Nymphomania: ‘Linear Perspectives’ on Female Sexuality,” contemplates sources that range from medical texts to Renaissance artwork in order to show how the “introduction of the term *nymphomania* does

not indicate the discovery of a new disease, rather it reflects changes in the perception of female genitalia...and helps to make visible a significant part of their history" (177).

The editors should be commended for their excellent editing. Andrew Bradstock's "Restoring All Things from the Curse: Millenarianism, Alchemy, Science and Politics in the Writings of Gerard Winstanley" and Carola Scott-Luckens' "Providence, Earth's 'Treasury' and the Common Weal: Baconianism and Metaphysics in Millenarian Utopian Texts 1641-55" in "Part II: Religion, Politics and the Natural World" both consider the work of Digger theorist Gerard Winstanley, but from two very different angles. Bradstock looks at the influence that early modern agricultural innovations had on Winstanley's ideas, while Scott-Luckens studies how Winstanley's husbandry manuals were shaped by seventeenth-century political philosophies. By deciding to include both articles, the editors successfully accomplish the goal of Part II, which is to address "the interaction of theological, religio-political and scientific developments."

The authors of the essays do a fine job contextualizing their subjects. Within the history of science and medicine, there is a tendency to analyze topics in light of modern-day discoveries. The writers who contributed to this well-crafted volume do not fall into that trap. Instead, they consider science in terms of the time in which it developed and in relation to other disciplines that had a decided influence upon it. They reread and interpret their subject matter as it might have been when it was created. Thus, editors Jowitt and Watt completed the task that they set forth in the introduction: "We...hope that this collection of essays will continue the process of interrogating and dismantling the historical and anachronistic opposition of the spiritual and the empirical, the rational and imaginative, art and science" (10). For example, Ruth Gilbert's "The Masculine Matrix: Male Births and the Scientific Imagination in Early Modern England" analyzes how early men of science employed images of birth to understand and characterize their intellectual work and dreams. Gilbert explains how male practitioners of the "new science" talked about their accomplishments as

types of births, and how this imagery not only was apparent in scientific texts, like William Harvey's *Exercitationes de Generatione Animalium*, but also in the poetry of John Milton. Thus, Gilbert does not separate science from art or from religion, but, instead, shows her readers how scientists like Harvey drew from Judeo-Christian imagery and Greek mythology to describe scientific productions and how literary authors like Milton lent their voices to the use of birth as a symbol for intellectual creativity.

Unfortunately, some authors who contributed to this collection were unable to write simply and clearly, and, as a result, they lost their reading audience. In order to describe a work as truly interdisciplinary, it must hold the attention of many different readers and avoid jargon that is discipline specific. Individuals who read *The Arts of 17th-Century Science* may decide to skip these selections, and enjoy the essays that speak to them. That decision would not be unwise because, as a whole, the book is greater than some of its individual parts.

Agnes R. Varkonyi. *Europica varietas–Hungarica variatas 1526-1762*. Budapest: Akademi Kiado, 2000. 302 pp. \$62.00. Review by HUGO LANE, POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY, BROOKLYN, NY.

As the Latin title suggests, this book is a collection of essays about Europe and Hungary from 1526, the year of the Battle of Mohacs, when the Hungarians came under Habsburg rule, to 1762, the year before Joseph II was elected Holy Roman Emperor. Subjects covered in the book range from the relationship between the end of witchcraft prosecutions and public health in eighteenth-century Hungary to efforts by Hungary, and later Transylvania, to win European wide support during the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries. In addition, there is a closing essay entitled "An Undivided Europe?" that makes clear that Varkonyi sees her work

as testimony to Hungary's current claim to be included in the new Europe being created by the European Union.

By far the most interesting of all these articles is "Public Healing and Witchcraft" in which she discusses the important role folk healers, mostly women, played in Hungarian society even though they could be subjected to trials as witches. As elsewhere in Europe such trials dropped off in the early eighteenth century, but what is particularly intriguing is how Varkonyi then relates how well-intentioned new laws intended to limit medical treatment to doctors, surgeons, and midwives did not end up providing adequate health service to most Hungarians. Thus lay healers, now freed from prosecution as witches, continued to play an important role in health care in Hungary.

Unfortunately, this piece is atypical of the essays in this book and seems to have been included as further means to demonstrate Hungary's strong connection with Western Europe, which is the main theme of this book. This is a well-worn concern among Eastern or East Central European societies. Still, the essays in the book, by showing that seeds of that division can be found from the beginning of early modern times, provide ample evidence that the division between Eastern and Western Europe was not a phenomenon originating in the Enlightenment Europe. Thus, while Varkonyi makes it clear that Hungarians knew the works of Erasmus, Jan Amos Komenský (Comenius), Hugo Grotius and others, Hungarians' efforts to use the concept of European unity propagated by these writers to win support against the Ottoman invasion had little effect. We also learn how, once the Ottomans had retreated, Hungarians sought to use international diplomacy to win recognition for Hungary and Transylvania as separate independent states.

Non-specialists in the region likely do not realize how much attention the plight of the Hungarians received among the English and the French over time. Yet against Varkonyi's intentions, her research shows that while a few influential figures in those countries concerned themselves with Hungary's plight, when it came to actually making diplomatic and military decisions, the fate of Chris-

tian Hungary under Ottoman rule mattered little. Thus, the French never gave up their alliance with the Muslim Ottoman Empire in order to unite with the Habsburgs to save Hungary from Ottoman rule. Even when the French did demonstrate some diplomatic support by bringing the separate Hungarian principality of Transylvania into the negotiations of the Treaty of Westphalia as an ally, they did so only at the last minute and expressly as an ally of the French, not as an independent state.

Similarly, while Varkonyi's argument that there was a pro-Hungarian party in England at the time of the War of Spanish Succession is doubtlessly correct, English perceptions of Hungary's significance seem always to have been driven by English interests. As she herself admits, the Duke of Marlborough's concern about the Hungarian cause was directly related to his desire to have the Habsburg troops, then poised to attack the principality of Transylvania, shifted westward to fight the French. Moreover, when the English saw a chance for a separate peace with France they took it, thwarting Prince Ferenc II Rakoczy's plans to use an international conference to end the War of Spanish Succession as a means to secure Hungarian and Transylvanian independence. As result, Hungary and Transylvania came under Habsburg rule with only limited concessions to their respective political elites.

For Varkonyi, the lesson for Western Europe is clear. Including Hungary in European international system and taking Hungary's commitment to European unity and European values like religious tolerance seriously are essential for the future security of Europe. But even if specialists in East Central Europe would be sympathetic to that belief, as well as with her assertion that Western Europeans learn more about their Eastern neighbors, this book does little for her cause on three counts. First, given that the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries were relatively peaceful periods, the notion that Europeans lost a great deal by not paying more heed to Hungarian interests at the outset of the eighteenth century does not stand up to scrutiny. (Even if the twentieth century was not, it is hard to accept that this can be explained by not taking Hungary more seriously in the seventeenth and eighteenth centu-

ries.) Second, the implicit suggestion that the French and English strategic thinking on a global scale made the Hungarian cause a regular consideration in their diplomacy comes off as incredible. If anything, it suggests that Hungarians have as much to learn about Western European history, as Western Europeans and Americans have to learn about East Central Europe. Finally, for a work meant to increase awareness of a neglected region, strangely little attention is given to some basic essentials. There is no guidance for the pronunciation of Hungarian names, and considerable background information about political relations among the other East Central and Eastern European states during the early modern period is assumed. Biographical and contextual information for the Hungarian figures she focuses on is usually assumed, making it harder to appreciate their significance. Consequently, insights about how the Hungarians understood what it meant to be European in early modern Europe are not as easy for non-Hungarian specialists to grasp as they ought to. Still, if the book does not do what it aimed to, it is good to have these essays available in English, and perhaps they will inspire specialists in early modern, French, English, and Habsburg history to look at the Hungarian question in these countries in a new way.

NEO-LATIN NEWS

Vol. 51, Nos. 3 & 4. Jointly with SCN. Subscriptions: \$15.00 (\$20.00 international) for one year; \$28.00 (\$37.00) for two years; \$40.00 (\$52.00) for three years. Checks or money orders are payable to *Seventeenth-Century News*, 4227 TAMU, College Station, Texas 77843-4227. NLN is the official publication of the American Association for Neo-Latin Studies.

Edited by Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University; Western European Editor: Gilbert Tournoy, Leuven; Eastern European Editors: Jerzy Axer, Barbara Milewska-Ważbińska, and Katarzyna Tomaszuk, Centre for Studies in the Classical Tradition in Poland and East-Central Europe, University of Warsaw. Founding Editors: James R. Naiden, Southern Oregon University, and J. Max Patrick, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee and Graduate School, New York University.

Angelo Camillo Decembrio. *De politia litteraria*. Ed. by Norbert Witten. Beiträge zur Altertumskunde, 169. Munich and Leipzig: K. G. Saur, 2002. 592 pp. □94. Angelo Camillo Decembrio was born in Milan in 1415, into a family of accomplished humanists: his father was Uberto Decembrio, and one of his older brothers was Pier Candido, the most famous of them all. Angelo studied in Milan with Gasparino Barzizza, then in Ferrara with the physician Ugo Benzi and the renowned schoolmaster Guarino da Verona. He began his career by dividing his efforts between giving lessons and serving as a copyist for his brother, but in 1441 he and Pier Candido broke off relations permanently. Benzi introduced him into the humanist circle of Niccolò d'Este and his son

Leonello; his travels took him to Milan, Bologna, Perugia, Burgundy, Spain, and the Aragonese court in Naples, but he returned often to Ferrara. The following works are attributed to him with certainty: *De maiis supplicationibus veterumque religionibus*, *Contra Curtium historicum* (also entitled *Disputatio super conditionibus pacis inter Alexandrum et Darium reges*), *De cognitione et curatione pestis egyptia*, a poem entitled *Panaegiris Vergiliana ad Carolum Aragonensem principem*, some epigrams and letters, and his masterpiece, *De politia litteraria*.

Dedicated initially to Leonello d'Este, then to Pius II after Leonello's death, *De politia litteraria* is what its title suggests. In 1.2, Decembrio provides his basic definition: *Ita ergo politiam hanc litterariam diffiniemus non a 'civilitate' seu 'rei publicae' Graecorum appellatione, ut initio diximus, quam et ipsi eadem terminatione 'politiam' vocant, neve a 'forensi' vel 'urbana conversatione', quam a verbis 'polizo polesco' ve denominant, verum enim a 'polio' verbi nostri significatione, unde ipsa 'politia' vel 'expolitio'—etenim Virgilius de Vulcanis armis dixit: 'iam parte polita ...', quam et ipsam 'elegantiam' 'elegantiaeque culturam' intelligi volumus.* The 103 chapters of Decembrio's seven books range widely in pursuit of the things one needs to know to attain a cultured elegance, ranging from the arrangement of an appropriate library and a consideration of the best form of government in selected Greek authors to a knowledge of how coinage and the measurement of weight worked in antiquity, Dante's misunderstanding of *Aen.* 3.56f., and (above all) such philological niceties as correct spelling, homonyms, and the peculiar meaning of words like *aegritudo*, *aegrotatio*.

What to make of all this is not so easy to decide. From the autograph manuscript, Vatican City,

Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 1794, two sixteenth-century editions ultimately derive, the *editio princeps* (Augsburg, 1540) and a Basel edition of 1562. That is, even by Renaissance standards, *De politia litteraria* was not exactly a best seller. It is not discussed much by modern scholars, and references to it like that of Michael Baxandall ("*De politia litteraria* is a very long and badly written book that repels attention in several ways," "A Dialog on Art from the Court of Leonello d'Este," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 26 (1963): 304) hardly spur one on to read further. Indeed, by modern standards the use of historical evidence leaves something to be desired, and the presentation lacks both thematic unity and formal polish. Nevertheless *De politia litteraria* deserves the efforts Witten has made to rescue it from oblivion. In his desire to provide novel solutions to various philological cruxes, Decembrio shows efforts at originality that make him a worthy student of Guarino da Verona, and his work (as Witten puts it, p. 128) is another stone that fits perfectly into the mosaic of writings by humanists like Bruni, Valla, and Bracciolini. In the end its value lies less in the objective results it presents than in the idealized portrait it offers of humanistic activity at the court of Ferrara, making it a snapshot, as it were, of humanist discussion in the first half of the fifteenth century.

Witten has done an enormous amount of work in presenting this snapshot. The text itself covers four hundred pages, with each page containing two apparatuses, one of variant readings, the other identifying the ancient sources Decembrio cites. The text is preceded by over a hundred pages of introductory discussion and followed by four indexes that sort the proper names appearing in the text into different

categories. Pressures to have one's dissertation published in Germany have led to a number of series like this one, in which not every work is fully deserving to see the light of day. Witten's *Doktorvater*, however, is Manfred Lentzen at the Westfälischen Wilhelms-Universität, which has ensured that this dissertation has been prepared to the highest standards. In making accessible Decembrio's text, Witten has done a worthy service to the field of Neo-Latin studies. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

Benedetto Luschino. *Vulnera diligentis*. Ed. by Stefano Dall'Aglio. Florence: SISMEL, 2002. CV + 421 pp. □58. Benedetto Luschino is well known to students of Savonarola and of the religious movement he created. A miniaturist by profession, he was inspired by Savonarola's sermons to become a Dominican and to seek admission to the convent of San Marco. At the completion of his novitiate he was professed by Savonarola himself, becoming one of his most loyal and devoted followers. Luschino defended Savonarola on the night of 8 April 1498 when, after fierce resistance, the convent was stormed by an angry mob which captured Savonarola and led him into prison. Though momentarily weakened in his resolve by confessions extracted from Savonarola under torture, Luschino continued to venerate the memory and the ideals of his martyred leader, writing a number of works in his defence and praise, the last when he was almost eighty years of age in 1550. Of fiery disposition, Luschino, who was rebuked by Savonarola himself for some unspecified transgression, spent at least eight years in the prison of the convent of San Marco for homicide.

It was during this period of imprisonment that he began to defend Savonarola with his writings.

His production is most impressive: he wrote in both Latin and Italian, in poetry and prose, and in a variety of genres. With but one exception, these works have never been edited in their entirety, though they have been consulted by generations of historians. The most substantial and complex of them is the *Vulnera diligentis*, here edited for the first time. It is a difficult work to characterize. It is part biography, part hagiography, part indictment, part chronicle, and part doctrinal statement. Despite its partisan distortions, the *Vulnera diligentis* is an invaluable, in some instances unique, source of information not only on Savonarolan issues but also on religious and historical developments in the years 1490-1520. Imprisonment did not mean isolation. As we know from his writings, Luschino was kept informed of events by similarly minded brethren and shows himself to be well acquainted with developments of relevance to Savonarola's cause in Florence and in the Church.

Luschino adopts the dialogue form, the better to deal with the multiform matter under discussion. In the dialogue as we now have it, there are seven interlocutors, five of whom are allegorical (a farmer tilling the vineyard of the Lord and defending it in words and deeds from four fierce animals intent in despoiling it) and two historical, the Prophet, Savonarola himself, and Gasparo Contarini, his influential Venetian defender. The dialogue format, though not always deftly handled, proves most effective in presenting contrasting points of view. Savonarola is at the heart of the debate. Luschino's purpose is to demonstrate through the examination of Savonarola's life, sermons, and activities his leader's holiness and the divine origin of his mandate. To this end, he analyses Savonarola's prophecies, the source of the most pointed criticism by his adversaries,

placing them in their proper historical and religious contexts. He also distinguishes between conditional and unconditional prophecies, arguing that in the light of the evidence provided, failure to believe in them is a sign of bad faith and unchristian behaviour.

This defence of the Prophet is followed by a condemnation of his enemies, beginning with Alexander VI and the ecclesiastical hierarchy. Echoing arguments already voiced by Savonarolans, Luschino casts doubts on the legitimacy of Alexander VI's election and on the principle of papal infallibility, thereby justifying Savonarola's refusal to obey papal commands. Much effort is also devoted to confuting Savonarola's falsified trials. As Dall'Aglio rightly emphasizes, Luschino's treatment of the whole complex issue of Savonarola's trials is invaluable since it canvasses evidence no longer extant. The final chapters of the book deal with the supernatural signs which, in Luschino's opinion, confirm the truth of Savonarola's prophecies and the divine nature of his mission.

The text has been edited with exemplary thoroughness and expertise. The extant autograph manuscripts presented considerable problems caused by additions and emendations to the text made over a long period of time either by the author or by a copyist. Dall'Aglio has resolved them by establishing the likely sequence in the composition of the manuscripts, then relying for the transcription principally on the earliest redaction while recording all subsequent variations. This approach enables him to produce a text which is clear and readable but at the same time has all the elements the reader requires to establish its reliability. To facilitate understanding, a very comprehensive listing of explanatory notes has been appended to the text. One cannot but admire

this meticulous scholarship. Dall'Aglio has consulted all the relevant primary and secondary material in print. When necessary, moreover, he has not hesitated to consult manuscript and archival sources. Our understanding of the *Vulnera diligentis* has been vastly enhanced as a result.

Similarly helpful is the scholarly introduction prefacing the text. In it, Dall'Aglio provides the most complete and reliable biography of Benedetto Luschino now available, adding immeasurably to our knowledge of his activities, especially for the period before his induction into the Dominican Order. In addition, he establishes the correct date for the composition of the *Vulnera diligentis*, then discusses its diffusion, or lack of it, and its structure. This is followed by a useful summary of its content and by a codicological description of the surviving manuscripts. Luschino's other extant works are also examined, dated, and evaluated. The introduction ends with a most valuable review of the historiographical treatment of Luschino and his writings.

With this book, historians of Savonarola and of Florence are presented with a major new source, admirably edited and introduced by a gifted scholar. There is much for which to be grateful: to Luschino for his determination to defend his spiritual leader from all attacks, to Dall'Aglio for his scholarship, and to SISMEL for publishing the work in its excellent series 'Savonarola e la Toscana.' (Lorenzo Polizzotto, University of Western Australia)

Paolo Pellegrini. *Pierio Valeriano e la tipografia del Cinquecento: nascita, storia e bibliografia delle opere di un umanista*. Libri e biblioteche, 11. Udine: Forum, 2002. 192 pp. □20. Giovan Pietro Bolzanio, better known as Pierio Valeriano, is one of a group of unduly

neglected Italian humanists (like Aulo Giano Parrasio) who are finally receiving the attention they deserve from modern scholars. Julia Haig Gaisser's *Pierio Valeriano on the Ill Fortune of Learned Men: A Renaissance Humanist and His World* (Ann Arbor, 1999) (reviewed in *NLN* 58 (2000): 303-4) and the essays collected in *Umanisti bellunesi fra Quattro e Cinquecento: atti del convegno di Belluno, 5 novembre 1999* (Florence 2001) (reviewed in *NLN* 61 (2003):159-61) have shed a good deal of light on the man and his work. Pellegrini picks up where these books left off, using the sixteenth-century editions and the information contained in them to connect Valeriano to the world of printers, editors, and scholars in which he lived and worked. Pellegrini begins by situating his subject within the bibliographical tradition of Valeriano's native city, noting that the sixteenth-century editions of his books have received less than twenty pages of study in the two most important catalogues of early printing in Belluno. The three chapters that follow are devoted to the three key periods in Valeriano's mature intellectual life. In Venice Valeriano supplemented his teaching activity with work as a textual corrector, moving on the periphery of two closely connected worlds, those of writers like Aldo Manuzio and scholars like Marco Antonio Sabellico and Giovanni Battista Egnatio. After his move to Rome, his connection to the world of printing grew tighter, leading ultimately to the publication of the *Castigationes et varietates Virgilianae lectionis*, an important work reprinted more than thirty times in the sixteenth century. Returning then to the Veneto, Valeriano saw through the press a reprint of his uncle Urbano Bolzanio's *Institutiones grammaticae*, a reprint of his own *Praehudia*, and the first edition of his most important work, the

Hieroglyphica, a collection in fifty-eight books of symbols and emblems from antiquity. Bibliographical information on these and other work written by Valeriano comes next in a fifty-seven-page bibliography of sixteenth-century editions, followed by indexes arranged by author, year, printer, and place. The book concludes with a list of ghost editions, manuscripts and rare books cited, and names referenced in the text.

As one would expect of a book produced in a series directed by Cesare Scalon, Luigi Balsamo, Conor Fahy, Neil Harris, and Ugo Rozzo, Pellegrini's work represents the best of a new generation of Italian historians of the book. With the announced purpose of moving from a *Bibliographie materielle* to a *Bibliographie intellectuelle*, Pellegrini uses a letter of Valeriano's to Gerolamo Venturini in an edition of Nausea's *Disticha*, for example, to place the letter-writer in Padua in 1520 and to establish his claim to a previously unrecorded title, that of *sacrae theologiae professor*. Similarly the marginalia entered into the Marciana copy of the *Praeludia* by Valeriano himself are shown to have been the basis for the reprint of Gabriel Giolito de'Ferrari in 1549-50, a discovery which clarifies the relationship between author and printer. In seeking to move beyond the sometimes-sterile limits of conservative Italian bibliography, Pellegrini has nevertheless preserved the best features of that tradition. His descriptions of sixteenth-century books are accurate and concise, and the fullness of his annotation allows his readers to follow up easily on any of the minor figures who crossed paths with Valeriano. The result is therefore both a bibliographical study that will satisfy the rigors of that field and an intellectual biography that will remind readers of this journal of the importance of

the objects on which our work depends: the books in which Neo-Latin literature entered the culture of its day. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

Fosca Mariani Zini, ed. *Penser entre les lignes: philologie et philosophie au Quattrocento*. Cahiers de philologie, apparat critique, 19. Villeneuve d'Ascq: Presses Universitaires du Septentrion, 2001. 340 pp. □25.92. As the editor explains in the introduction to this volume, the authors of the essays collected here have begun from the premise that humanism's characterization of itself as a radical break with the medieval past should, like any other premise, be held up to critical examination. There are, to be sure, signs of rupture, but also signs of continuity, such that Italian humanism of the Quattrocento is characterized by a coexistence between a predominantly medieval university system and sites like the court, the *studio*, or the prince's library in which a new culture flourished and among which humanists moved freely. The novelty of humanism, Zini asserts, lies in its "invention of philology"—that is, in its establishment of a critical science of textual transmission, focused on using a genealogical method to recover (as much as possible) the original, authentic text. A major consequence of this invention is the transformation of the text from a timeless authority to a timebound object of study, one which arose in a particular time and place, was transmitted through a succession of other times and places, and can only be evaluated in the present after its exact wording has been recovered from the past. In this way humanism has made an original contribution to philosophy, by underscoring the historical dimensions of the thought process: indeed, Zini argues that "the humanists

became ... the first true historians of philosophy" (p. 13).

The essays in the collection develop this argument from three different, but related, perspectives. The first section, entitled "Savoir lire," explores how the humanists read a text and how these techniques led to a transformation of knowledge. In "La lecture comme acte d'innovation: le cas de la grammaire humaniste," Eckhard Kessler illuminates the novelty of humanist grammar, beginning with Battista Guarino, and its consequences in the analysis of method, especially in the reform of logic by Rudolph Agricola and medicine by Niccolò Leonicensi. Mayotte Bollack shows in "Marulle, ou la correction latine" how a detailed set of corrections in the text of Lucretius reflects presuppositions that are both innovative and limited by an *emendatio* that is conceived as a process of purification. And in "Jean Pic de la Mirandole: déboires et triomphes d'un omnivore," Anthony Grafton retraces a distinctive method of interpreting the texts of the past, influenced heavily by the philology of Poliziano and his attitude toward the tradition of astrology. The second section, "Les controverses philosophiques," highlights the originality of humanist thought in its dismantling and reconstruction of different intellectual traditions. James Hankins uses "En traduisant l'*Ethique* d'Aristote: Leonardo Bruni et ses critiques" to juxtapose the ideological and cultural principles informing Bruni's translations of Aristotle with those of his critics, while in "L'interprétation platonicienne de l'*Enchiridion* d'Epictète proposée par Politien: philosophie et philologie dans la Florence du XV^e siècle, à la fin des années 70," Jill Kraye studies the close connection between philology and philosophy in Poliziano's translation and interpretation of

Epictetus's *Enchiridion*. The other two papers in this section focus on Marsilio Ficino: Enno Rudolph's "La crise du platonisme dans la philosophie de la Renaissance: une nouvelle interprétation du *Timée* et de la *République*" shows how Ficino transformed Platonic dialogue, establishing its critical approach in relation to religious orthodoxy and the Neoplatonism of antiquity, and Christopher S. Celenza's "Antiquité tardive et platonisme florentin" proposes another account of the relation between Ficino and the tradition of Neoplatonism, one that finds continuities in conceptions of the soul and matter. In the last section, "Lorenzo Valla philologue et philosophe," the authors explore how the philological and historical activities of one of the most important figures of the Quattrocento go hand-in-hand with his efforts to reform dialectic (that is, Aristotelian philosophy) and to rethink its relationship with religious belief. In "Disputationes Vallianae," John Monfasani examines the principal points of historiographical controversy regarding Valla; in "Poggio Bracciolini contre Lorenzo Valla: les 'Orationes in Laurentium Vallam'," Salvatore I. Camporeale studies the controversy between these two humanists regarding how to read and interpret the ancients; and in "Lorenzo Valla et la réflexion sur la *Res*," Fosca Mariani Zini studies the transformation of *ens* and *res* in Valla's *Repastinatio dialectice et philosophicæ*.

The essays in this collection are of high quality. This by itself would make the book worth buying for readers of this journal, but the methodological premise from which the volume begins is significant as well. In and of itself, this premise is not stunningly original, but in the United States at least, the Renaissance is often given very little attention indeed in the history of philosophy. Focusing on

philology as its distinctive quality, however, provides a justification for revisiting figures like Ficino and Valla in this context and, one hopes, restoring to them the prestige they had won in their own day. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

Ulrike Auhagen, Eckard Lefèvre, Eckart Schäfer, eds. *Horaz und Celtis*. NeoLatina, 1. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 2000. 338 pp.. DM 108. The present volume collects the papers of a symposium held at the University of Freiburg / Breisgau (Germany) in 1999, in which Eckart Lefèvre and his Freiburg colleagues inaugurated a series of conferences dedicated to Neo-Latin poetry. (The following meetings dealt with Petrus Lotichius Secundus and Neo-Latin elegy, Giovanni Pontano and Catullus, and Johannes Secundus and Roman love elegy). At the same time they started in cooperation with the Gunter Narr Verlag a new series, 'NeoLatina,' where the papers of those meetings were published.

The twenty-one articles of the first volume explore the intertextual relations between the poetry of the German 'errant humanist' Conrad Celtis (1459-1508) and his great classical model, Horace. They are arranged in seven sections according to the six types of poetry being studied, preceded by a general section ("Allgemeines"). Here Lore Benz inquires into the role and importance of music in Celtis and Horaz (13-24), Ulrich Eigler into both poets' striving for posthumous fame (25-38), and Joachim Gruber into Celtis's design of life by which he tried not simply to imitate his great model but partly to distance himself from Horace and partly to surpass him ("Imitation und Distanzierung—Celtis' Lebensentwurf und Horaz," pp. 39-51).

The *Proseuticum ad divum Fridericum* with which three contributions are dealing is a collection of various texts in prose and verse compiled by Celtis as documentation of his own coronation as poet laureate by the Hapsburg Emperor Frederick III (1443-1493) in Nuremberg on April 18, 1487. It contains three famous poems which were later incorporated into Celtis's *Odarum libri IV* and *Epodon liber*. Ulrike Auhagen (55-66) discusses the two versions of the ode to the emperor in stichic asclepiads which was later to become *Ode* 1, 1, Dieter Mertens (67-85) the various stages of imitation of Horace in the first two odes of Book I and the epode from the *Proseuticum* (= *Epode* 1, on the political situation of 1486, expressing the hope for a victory of the emperor over his enemies and the return of the Golden Age), and Wilfrid Strohm (87-119) the presence of Horace in the *Proseuticum* with an interpretation of the three major poems in which Celtis intended to present himself as the new 'German Horace.'

The four books of Celtis's (and Horace's) *Odes* were dealt with in nine papers, most of which consist of longer or shorter interpretations of single poems comparing them with their Horatian and other models. I only mention briefly Irene Frings's interpretation (135-151) of the famous ode to Apollo with its central didactic passage (*Proseuticum* 6 = *Odes* 4, 5 [revised version]) as an ode to Horace with the acrostic *Phlaccé* in lines 1-6, where the first diphthong *Ph-* is shared by the acrostic and the first word of the ode, *Phoebe*; and the paper by Jürgen Leonhardt (209-19), which unveils metrical and formal principles of arrangement in Celtis's first book of *Odes*, which is based on a speculative play with the numbers seven and four, whereas similar numeric constructions seem to be absent in the other three books.

One paper each deals with the *Epodes* and the *Carmen saeculare*. Gesine Manuwald (263-73) detects in Celtis's *Epode* 12 an attitude of pride and self-consciousness similar to the one Horace exhibits in *Epistle* 1, 19, because both poets claim the translation of poetry from another country to their fatherland as their personal achievement (Horace brought lyric poetry from Greece to Rome; Celtis, Latin poetry from Italy to Germany). Bernhard Coppel (277-87) reads Celtis's *Carmen saeculare* for the year 1500 as the "Lied der Deutschen" in which the poet imitates several aspects of Horace's *Carmen saeculare*—chronological (new era / century), mythological, cultural, penagyrical, national, formal, and aesthetic—moulding them into a genuine German song of praise, hope, and patriotic feelings.

Celtis's four books of *Amores*, which have no direct Horatian counterpart, are nevertheless full of reminiscences from Horace's *Satires* and other poems, as the three papers by Jürgen Blänsdorf (291-99), Paul Gerhard Schmidt (301-5), and Hermann Wiegand (307-19) are able to show. Wiegand in particular makes some good observations on the necromancy scene in *Am.* 1, 14 in comparison with similar scenes in Tibullus, Ovid, Horace, and some of Celtis's own poems (*Epigr.* 1, 43; 2, 60; 3, 37; *Ode* 3, 19) and draws an historical line to the contemporary disputes about occultism in poetry and science (Johannes Trithemius, Agrippa von Nettesheim).

Finally Dieter Wuttke, the leading German scholar in the field of Celtis studies, presents three epigrams by Celtis which were discovered already some thirty years ago but are discussed for the first time in some detail here.

The volume is the first to study Celtis's debt to Horace and will certainly stimulate further research

on the German 'errant humanist' and his poetic legacy. It makes clear that we need new critical editions and studies in order to assess his aesthetic and political value and to avoid such misguided judgements as that by A. Baumgartner in his book *Die lateinische und griechische Literatur der christlichen Völker* (Freiburg, 1900), quoted at length by Schmidt at the beginning of his paper (301 f.). (Heinz Hofmann, University of Tübingen)

A View from the Palatine: The Iuvenilia of Théodore de Bèze. Text, translation, and commentary by Kirk M. Summers. Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 237. Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2001. 504 pp. \$40. Summers's edition of Théodore de Bèze's *Iuvenilia* (1548), more than just putting an end to the "woeful state of affairs" (p. xii) in both critical and editorial work on the early poetry of Calvin's brother in arms, restores Bèze to full glory as one of France's most important sixteenth-century Neo-Latin poets (Montaigne, among several contemporaries to sing his praises, includes him in a list of "bons artisans de ce mestier-là"). Although in this day and age we know Bèze as an ardent Calvinist whose literary fame is based mostly on his 1550 play *Abraham sacrificiant*, Summer's long-awaited edition and English translation will make his relatively unknown Latin poetry accessible to a larger audience, and thus also become an effective tool to underline for our students the close but all-too-often-neglected link between French and Neo-Latin Renaissance poetry. As Malcolm Smith rightly states, the difference between writing poetry in French or in Latin was still a "superficial and transient one" (*Ronsard and Du Bellay versus Bèze. Allusiveness in Renaissance Literary Texts* (Geneva, 1995), 13)

in 1548, and an edition like Summers' will allow us to value Bèze as an influential contemporary of the Pléiade, a humanist admirer of the classics, and a love poet of Ronsardian proportions.

In a 1986 article ("The Poemata of Théodore de Bèze," in *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Sanctandreami: Proceedings of the Fifth International Congress of Neo-Latin Studies*, ed. Ian Macfarlane (Binghamton, NY: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1986), 409-15, to be read along with the same author's critical edition in his 1983 Oxford dissertation), Thomas Thomson had already drafted some detailed indications for an edition of Bèze's 1548 *Poemata*. Summers's edition follows these and other criteria in establishing a text that reproduces the 1548 publication and provides an apparatus that includes variants from two other editions revised and authorized by Bèze himself (1569 and 1597) as well as from some unauthorized editions and miscellaneous sources. In this manner, while the text and translation highlight Bèze the secular (love) poet in the Pléiade style, the critical apparatus gives us an idea of how the "Muses of Helicon g[ave] way to the Holy Spirit" (p. xii) after Bèze turned into a Reformer and started to purge and Christianize his poetry in later editions. The fourth *Sylva* (*A Poetic Preface to David's Penitential Psalms*) is a case in point. Bèze retells the story of David's adulterous affair with Bathsheba, which gave rise to the penitential psalms. While the 1548 edition features Cupid and an abundance of pagan associations, in the later post-1548 editions, as Summers's commentary clearly shows, a strongly Christian imagery which transforms Cupid into a treacherous devil predominates.

Since the later Bèze not only purified his poetry but also added many new poems which reveal

his desire to reform his audience in the spirit of Calvinism, the question remains, why not produce an edition and translation of Bèze's entire (i.e., pre- and post-1548) poetic production? On the one hand, such a choice would stress, more than is the case in the current edition, Bèze's transformation from a lyrical classicizing-poet to an engaged religious reformer-poet. Incidentally, it would also allow for an interesting parallel with other sixteenth-century poets going through a similar poetic and religious development, such as Clément Marot (whose translation of the Psalms of David was continued and published by Bèze). On the other hand, however, it would create the false impression of a highly arguable poetic 'maturity,' stressed by Bèze's own (and probably disingenuous) contempt towards his *iuvenilia*, 'youthful errors' of which he himself repeatedly claims to have repented. This argument has misled critics even in our times, as, for example, his biographer Geisendorf, who states that we should not let these "péchés de jeunesse" obscure Bèze's fame (*Théodore de Bèze, labor et fides* (Geneva, 1949), 25). Summers's choice of the 1548 text justifiably emphasizes the necessary contrast which alone can restore the pre-1548 Théodore de Bèze as a poet in his own right. It makes us understand better why Ronsard in his later polemics with Bèze would regret so much the 'loss' of this worthy colleague turned, in his eyes, into a bawling and aggressive reformer.

Finally, we should express praise for Summers's magnificent commentary, which is no doubt the biggest asset of this edition. It is through these erudite and enlightening annotations that the reader can truly gauge the profundity of Bèze's poetry. Summers provides detailed, although not too encumbering, philological and linguistic remarks and

clearly points out word-plays, double meanings, chiasmic structures (see, e.g., pages 393 and 429), and other literary and rhetorical devices, especially if these cannot always be rendered in the English translation. His introductory remarks on the five different genres (*sylvae*, elegies, epitaphs, icons, and epigrams) are particularly informative, and his long dissertation (190-96) on the not-so-common genre of *icones* is a true homage to the ephrastic power of Renaissance poetry. The wealth of information on the cultural context makes this book particularly useful for readers at all levels, including college-level students. My only objection, however minor, regards the commentary on Epigrams 91 and 92, on the pros and cons of marriage. In spite of the accuracy of classical sources, this topic of declamatory exercise was much more common in the early Renaissance than Summers makes it seem by referring only to Poggio's dialogue and the two (1567!) poems of Walter Haddon and Turberville (p. 430). Why not mention more popular rhetorical best sellers by Della Casa (*Quaestio lepidissima an uxor sit ducenda*) or Erasmus (*Encomium matrimonii*), not to mention the famous oratorical jousting on Panurge's matrimonial dilemma in Rabelais' *Tiers Livre*?

Yet these small details do not in the least obscure Summers's superb effort to make Bèze shine: much more than an insipid poet of occasional and 'mirror-of-the-time' poetry, we see a classicizing, mocking-and-praising, parodying, and, last but not least, loving French Renaissance poet. (Reinier Leushuis, Florida State University)

Juan Luis Vives. *De subventione pauperum sive de humanis necessitatibus libri II. Introduction, Critical Edition, Translation and Notes*. Ed. by C. Matheussen

and C. Fantazzi, with the assistance of J. De Landtsheer. *Selected Works of J. L. Vives*, 4. Leiden, Boston, and Cologne: Brill, 2002. xli + 176 pp. \$90. The *De subventionem pauperum* of 1526 occupies a special place among Juan Luis Vives's works. Not without reason an English translation with an introduction and commentary by Alice Tobriner, dating from 1971, has recently (in 1999 to be precise) been reprinted by the Renaissance Society of America and the University of Toronto Press. Strikingly both this recent reprint and its original—entitled *A Sixteenth-Century Urban Report, Part I: Introduction and Commentary, Part II: Translation of On Assistance to the Poor by Juan Luis Vives* (Chicago: University of Chicago, School of Social Service Administration, 1971) — have been neither mentioned nor used by the Brill editors of Vives's treatise. Still, this new critical edition, based on all the earlier editions and on Vives's authorized version, together with its faithful English translation, will certainly allow Neo-Latin scholars and historians to appreciate Vives's 'modern' views on the social responsibility of the civic community once more.

Calling upon both single individuals and the state authorities to perform works of mercy for the poor, Vives in fact argues for a lasting utopian, yet Christian programme to be realized in the city of Bruges. And indeed, especially the second book of *De subventionem pauperum* appears to be an astonishingly modern practical programme on how to deal with the needs of the poor. As usual Vives starts by offering a theological and philosophical framework, and then turns to the duties incumbent upon the city and its ruler(s). Next to practical and specific measures to deal with the problem of poverty (e.g., census and registration of the poor, offering work to the poor,

caring for abandoned children, schooling all children, placing of collection boxes), Vives comments upon these suggestions. Depending on time and place, they must be introduced gradually. Moreover, if all of Vives's ideas are to be linked to the situation in sixteenth-century Bruges and the *Franc* of Bruges ('Brugse Vrije'), they also had great influence in the later regulations prescribed in Lille, Ghent, Breda, Brussels, Antwerp, Louvain, and Mechelen. But not everyone who read Vives's treatise agreed with it. Apart from criticism during his lifetime, the Neo-scholastic theological works by Domingo de Soto and Juan de Medina questioned or rejected some of Vives's views while praising others. Still more important is the fact that for centuries afterwards, Vives's efforts to achieve a Christian postlapsarian Utopia have been honoured by new editions and Dutch (1533, 1566), German (1533, 1627), Italian (1545), French (1583, 1933), and Spanish (*ca.* 1531; 1781 with reprints in 1873, 1915, 1991 and 1992; 1942; 1947-1948 with reprint in 1992; 1991; and 1997) translations of his treatise on poverty. Matheussen and Fantazzi's careful edition with its modern and faithful translation crowns this impressive series in a most impressive way. (Jan Papy, Catholic University of Leuven)

Laurie J. Churchill, Phyllis R. Brown, and Jane E. Jeffrey, eds. *Women Writing Latin from Roman Antiquity to Early Modern Europe*, vol. 3: *Early Modern Women Writing Latin*. New York and London: Routledge, 2002. x + 298 pp. \$125. This is the third of a three-volume set of short studies of women who wrote in Latin from antiquity to the later seventeenth century, edited by a classicist and two medievalists. The set is itself part of a series of similar works,

Women Writers of the World. The first volume covered the period from antiquity to the *Itinerarium Egeriae*, and the second took the story onward from early medieval Europe to St. Birgitta of Sweden; this one begins in Italy at the beginning of the fifteenth century and ends with Anna Maria van Schurman. It comprises eleven studies, in each of which a short biographical introduction is followed first by a selection of texts in Latin (some of them the product of original editorial work), and then by translations, which are offered "in order not to perpetuate the exclusivity of Latin literacy."

The volume begins with two pieces by Holt N. Parker, one on Angela and Isotta Nogarola, and the other on Costanza Varano. These are followed by two pieces by Diana Robin, on Cassandra Fedele and Laura Cereta, which draw on her volumes translating these writers in the series 'The Other Voice in Early Modern Europe' (published by the University of Chicago Press). An admirable essay on the Latin writings of Italian nuns in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries by Jane Stevenson pays particular attention to the Dominican nun Laurentia Strozzi, whose writings are remarkable not least for the metrical variety of her hymns, from the trochaic tetrameter of the *Pange, lingua* to sapphics. It is followed by another contribution from Holt Parker, on Olympia Fulvia Morata, which announces that "the time is ripe for a scholarly edition and a full biography of this remarkable woman," and leaves the field as clear as possible for the latter by introducing her in a page and a half of text, followed by the same amount of footnotes. (Parker's translation of Morata's complete works has just appeared in the series 'The Other Voice' and will be reviewed soon in *NLN*). Morata's life moves us from Italy to Germany, and the remain-

NEO-LATIN NEWS

Vol. 51, Nos. 1 & 2. Jointly with SCN. Subscriptions: \$15.00 (\$20.00 international) for one year; \$28.00 (\$37.00) for two years; \$40.00 (\$52.00) for three years. Checks or money orders are payable to *Seventeenth-Century News*, 4227 TAMU, College Station, Texas 77843-4227. NLN is the official publication of the American Association for Neo-Latin Studies.

Edited by Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University; Western European Editor: Gilbert Tournoy, Leuven; Eastern European Editors: Jerzy Axer, Barbara Milewska-Ważbińska, and Katarzyna Tomaszuk, Centre for Studies in the Classical Tradition in Poland and East-Central Europe, University of Warsaw. Founding Editors: James R. Naiden, Southern Oregon University, and J. Max Patrick, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee and Graduate School, New York University.

Latin Language and Latin Culture, from Ancient to Modern Times. By Joseph Farrell. Roman Literature and Its Contexts. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001. xiv + 148 pp. \$20. The premise on which this inquiry is based is stated clearly at the beginning: "Thinking about latinity just as a very small collection of familiar, world-class texts mostly produced at Rome over a relatively brief span of time by elite pagan men writing in the most rarified dialect of what is now a long-dead language, is neither an inevitable nor a preferable perspective. It is in fact more realistic to think of latinity as a vast and largely unexplored region of linguistic and social pluralism extending from remotest antiquity *down to the present day*. I would even suggest that, because this conception of latinity does extend to our own day, we who are interested in it might give more thought to the ways in which our discipline resembles a culture, and thus regard our studies not as the contem-

plation of a completely external, independent, objective reality but as a hermeneutic engagement with a developing entity in which we ourselves are inextricably involved" (pp. xii-xiii).

The chapters that follow reflect one effort to expose some of the unexamined assumptions on which those who study Latin culture have tended to rest. For example, there has long been general agreement that there is a correct, elegant Latin style, which is universally valid yet under constant assault by the 'other,' by some outsider who threatens to pollute the pure expression of the native Roman spirit. Yet as Farrell shows, essentially all of the people who have expressed themselves in this way began as outsiders who journeyed to Rome, where their 'otherness' was absorbed and transformed. A second assumption, one that was postulated by the Romans themselves, stresses the poverty of the Latin language, its lack of resources especially in relation to Greek. A careful reading of Lucretius, however, shows that poverty does not mean inferiority: Greek may well possess a larger vocabulary, a greater capacity for compounding and subtle nuancing, but these attributes lead to obscurity and vanity, so that the simple straightforwardness of Latin becomes both a moral and a stylistic virtue. Then there is the matter of gender. The assumption here equates good Latin with maleness: classical Latin is gendered masculine, while first the vernacular, then medieval Latin become feminine; the speaking subject is seldom female, and its preferred form is as an echo of the male voice; indeed the failure to project the desired traits of Latin speech results in linguistic 'effeminacy,' whether the speaker is male or female.

A constant theme throughout these ruminations is that the rigid focus on elite culture in antiquity makes it difficult to see those parts of the broader Latin culture on which a more interesting and liberating inquiry could rest. The feminine voice is far more audible in the plebeian and the provincial, in Christian and medieval writings, but we must be willing to listen. The metaphors we use to talk about Latin culture, again, restrict us unnecessarily. The golden age, for example, suggests that even the silver age is less worthy of study—but where, Farrell asks, are the ages of bronze

and iron in our curricula and in our scholarship? By extending his reach, Farrell suggests first through reference to Thomas Tallis that Latin can express the opinions of those at the margins of power as well as those at the center, and then through reference to Stravinsky's *Oedipus Rex* that a Latin libretto that is woefully deficient by classical standards has a great deal to say when taken on its own terms. In other words, as Farrell suggests somewhat disingenuously, "Instead of a language realized ideally in the stylistic preferences of one author or one historical period, it is appreciated as richer and more appealing for the diversity it gained through time and space in the contrasting voices of many speakers. This is a theme, I suggest, that merits further exploration. Whether it could lead to a new history of latinity, a history that emphasizes the play of voices against one another, always and everywhere, rather than attempting to construct successive, homogeneous periods of better or worse latinity according to ideas of rise and fall, death and rebirth, I will not guess" (p. 123).

Like the other volumes in this series, *Latin Language and Latin Culture* is intended to stimulate discussion, not provide the last word or even a definitive expression of the state of scholarship in its area. This lack of closure will bother some readers, as will the author's insistence that we examine the traditionally unexamined assumptions on which our teaching and research rest. Yet for readers of this journal, an approach like Farrell's offers many potential rewards, for Neo-Latin literature contains in exuberant abundance the voices that can challenge from within the institutionalized Latin culture which is certainly not dead yet, but may for all intents and purposes drift to the margins of academic and cultural life within the present generation unless it receives a breath of life from somewhere. Farrell has done the profession of classics a great service by opening this dialogue, and it is in our best interests as Neo-Latinists to take up the challenges he offers. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

Latin, or the Empire of a Sign from the Sixteenth to the Twentieth Centuries. By Françoise Waquet. Trans. by John Howe. Lon-

don / New York: Verso, 2001. vi + 346 pp. \$30. In a review in these pages of Jozef IJsewijn's magisterial second edition of his *Companion to Neo-Latin Studies*, Craig Kallendorf mused on what a history of Neo-Latin culture might look like in the wake of the massive shifts in critical focus that took place within the academy during the late twentieth-century. Now that Françoise Waquet's book has appeared in John Howe's serviceable translation, we have one answer to this question. *Latin, or the Empire of a Sign* refocuses the history of Neo-Latin culture by shifting its assumptions. In my judgment it is one of the most interesting and challenging studies of European and American high culture to appear in English during the past ten years. In brief, whereas IJsewijn's *Companion* is a record of Neo-Latin literature, Waquet is interested in how from the time of the Quattrocento humanists Latin became the preeminent sign of Western culture. By this she means most obviously that as a language it predominated in the schools, that (at least in Catholic countries until the reforms of Vatican II) it continued to be heard in the Church, that for longer than many of us assume it remained the chief vehicle for scholarly learning, and that until quite recently it continued to be an important and tenaciously defended force within the culture of America and especially Western Europe. Unsurprisingly, she is most detailed in her discussions of France. Nonetheless, her range is striking, moving from Czarist Russia to pre- and post-revolutionary America. Waquet notes, for instance, that the Reformation displaced Latin in the church but not the schools of German-speaking countries, and that indeed there was a humanist revival of it there during the nineteenth century in educational establishments for the elite. Likewise although attacks on Latin's preeminence in American school curricula began as early as the 1750s, as late as 1900 half the students in America's high schools still studied it (only algebra ranked higher). Her statistical surveys of the dominance of Latin in publishing are interesting but, as she concedes, can give only a general impression (the comparatively small number of Latin books published in England be-

tween 1530 and 1640 is partly due, for instance, to yielding the market in schoolbooks and editions of classical text to superior printers on the continent). She shows that although vernaculars increasingly established themselves during the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in works intended for a popular audience or dealing with practical matters, well into the nineteenth century Latin remained the preferred language for works aimed at a learned readership. Here she is helpful in reminding us of the longstanding use of Latin in scholarly periodicals and translations of works aimed at an international audience. Some writers, she notes, chose their language on the basis of subject matter and readership. Evangelista Torrecelli, for instance, wrote *De motu projectorum* in Latin because he intended it for mathematicians, not gunners, but published his *Lezioni accademiche* in Italian for what he describes as a “literary” readership. Especially in the sixteenth century, Waquet points out that writers like Dürer and Bodin achieved success for their works only when they were translated (Campenella’s *Città del sole* seems to me an especially striking case: largely neglected in its original Italian edition, it attracted attention in a translation Campenella made, eventually being turned into French, German, English, and even back into Italian, the original edition having been neglected until the middle of the nineteenth century).

How many people actually read, wrote, or spoke Latin well is, of course, quite another matter. As Waquet notes, up to now we have not had a very full picture here. And the second part of her book gives a detailed, quite valuable survey, drawing together the scattered published research and assembling a wealth of anecdotal evidence. The outlines she draws are, perhaps predictably, discouraging. Especially in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, students could often read and translate Latin well and indeed took pleasure in using it. Nevertheless, an overall decline is epitomized for her in a judgment made early in the twentieth century that in Latin studies “where the mass of pupil is concerned, the standard is lower than it

ought to be.” One might question her using so extraordinary a Latinist as John Milton to judge the success of English schoolmasters. All in all, however, the record she assembles amply reinforces the conclusions of Anthony Grafton and Lisa Jardine in *From Humanism to the Humanities* (Cambridge, Mass., 1986) concerning the gap that existed between the expectations of educators and the reality that they increasingly had to face.

If Part Two is her most immediately valuable contribution, the third part of Waquet’s book is apt to be her most controversial. Here she turns to Latin’s larger, less tangible effects on culture and society. In addition to answering the yearning for a universal language and establishing a cultural model aimed at shaping the whole man and postulating the idea of universal and eternal values, Latin, she argues, sometimes served more ambiguous, darker motives. Drawing on Thorstein Veblen’s theories of the formation of the leisure class, she shows how Latin, shorn of the professionalism of the German philological approach, increasingly became a certificate of authenticity used to identify the English gentleman and French bourgeois. Moreover, the combination of its quasi-institutional weight and the mysterious meaning that Latin possessed in the imaginations of those not trained in it gave the language a prestige perceived in terms of power that allowed its users to maintain a position of dominance within what was often represented as an immutably ordered, hierarchical social structure. Alternatively (and less darkly) Latin could be used for the good of others to shield them from realities shocking or harmful to them, most notably from brutal medical realities that then as now (e.g., dementia) are commonly disguised behind a veil of Latin terminology. And Latin could be used to talk about sex, a strategy often announced as meant to avoid embarrassing the “fairer sex” but which Waquet (following Foucault) sees as a way by which sexual discourse found contexts that could be tolerated, authorized, and on occasion (for example, the salacious Latin passages inserted within so-called “translation”) made intentionally seductive.

Surveying the outlines of Waquet's book unfortunately does a disservice to the nuances and wealth of detail in it and to the implications of her overall argument. She is useful, for instance, in recalling the terms of the passionate debate on Latin's place in French education that took place in 1968, a tumultuous time that she rightly sees as a major turning point in the fortunes of the language within European culture. Her conclusion that as a sign Latin has largely lost its meaning in culture and society and her assertion that unlike Latin, English carries no corpus of cultural references seem to me worth further discussion. But her challenge to broaden the scope of Latin studies to include the vast body of Neo-Latin texts should serve as a clarion call to classicists and indeed to all of us. One of four extant volumes owned by Edmund Spenser has turned out to contain collections of verses by German poets writing in Latin. Well into the eighteenth century, Latin remained the medium that linked writers living in different territorial states and working in almost every conceivable field of learned inquiry. Waquet's call for training in Latin in the graduate schools so that this vast literature can be more thoroughly explored seems to me her most important contribution to the discussion of future directions in the study of early modern literature and culture. (Lee Piepho, Sweet Briar College)

Boccaccio narratore, storico, moralista e mitografo. By Vittorio Zaccaria. Biblioteca de "Lettere Italiane", Studi e Testi, 57. Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 2001. xvi + 270 pp. □28.92. Readers of this journal are likely to be among the few people alive today who know Giovanni Boccaccio as the author of three important works in Latin (*De mulieribus claris*, *De casibus virorum illustrium*, and *Genealogie deorum gentilium*) as well as the vernacular *Decameron*. Some twenty-five years ago, when I was first beginning my own work on these Latin texts, there was very little modern scholarship on them; indeed, Hortis's *Studi sulle opere latine del Boccaccio* (1879) and Hauvette's *Études sur Boccacce* (1894-1916) still provided the last word on many points.

In the last thirty years, however, much has been done: the journal *Studi sul Boccaccio* has helped direct scholarly attention to the entire corpus, not just the works in Italian, and P. G. Ricci has published a series of exacting inquiries on the Latin works, collected in *Studi sulla vita e le opere del Boccaccio* (1985). During the same period the author of the book under review here has published editions of the three Latin texts in the series *Tutte le opere di G. Boccaccio* (Mondadori) and established himself as an expert, perhaps the expert, on these works.

Boccaccio narratore is designed, quite simply, to serve as an introduction to the reading of Boccaccio's Latin works. In Chapter 1, Zaccaria offers an introduction to each work, then comments on the transmission of the text, the narrative genius of the author, and the impact of the work, first for *De mulieribus claris*, then for *De casibus virorum illustrium*, then for *Genealogie deorum gentilium*. Chapter 2 is a detailed study of the language of these three works, focused first on orthography, then on lexical, morphological, and syntactical matters, again with a separate analysis for each work. In the next chapter, Zaccaria traces in detail first the influence of Dante in Boccaccio's Latin works, then the traces of Petrarch found there as well, showing that Boccaccio ends up assuming the role of mediator between his two great masters; the chapter concludes with a detailed study of the defense of poetry as it is set forth in the various works of Petrarch and Boccaccio. Chapter 4, entitled "Il Boccaccio e alcuni classici nelle opere latine maggiori," begins with a rapid overview of Boccaccio's use of standard sources like Virgil and Seneca, then ends with a more detailed analysis of Tacitus and Pliny the Elder, whose seeming presence in Boccaccio's Latin works raises problems tied to the circulation of manuscripts in his day.

Much of the last chapter is new, but the first three rest in whole or in part on Zaccaria's previous work, both in his Mondadori editions and in a group of journal articles on the subject. There is nothing inherently wrong with this, especially since the author acknowledges the fact repeatedly through-

out the book, given that the material is gathered together conveniently in one place here, giving the author an opportunity as well to update and correct his previous observations. The decision to draw most of the first three chapters from previously published work does not always, however, lead to a totally satisfactory product. The compositional scheme of the first chapter, for example, is pleasingly balanced in theory, but in fact Zaccaria has written more in the past on some parts of this scheme than others, so that, for example, we get eighteen pages on textual matters in *De mulieribus claris*, with only four pages on Boccaccio's narrative technique and nothing on the impact of the work, although the introductory scheme calls for a section on it; a similar imbalance is found for the other two works as well. Parts of the book end up as long lists, of responses to articles by other scholars like Ricci and Zappacosta or of non-classical word choices and syntactical patterns in Boccaccio's style. These passages make for some difficult reading, as do some of Zaccaria's analyses of Boccaccio's narrative strategies, which do not always escape the obvious. On occasion, Zaccaria leaves in confusion an issue that seems to have been resolved elsewhere: see, for example, his attempts to explain Boccaccio's attempt to defend Dido against the accusations of adultery arising from the *Aeneid* (pp. 192-95), a matter that I thought had been settled in my "Boccaccio's Dido and the Rhetorical Criticism of Virgil's *Aeneid*," published first in *Studies in Philology* (82 (1985): 401-15), then as "Boccaccio's Two Didos" in *In Praise of Aeneas: Virgil and Epideictic Rhetoric in the Early Italian Renaissance* ((Hanover, NH, 1989), 58-76), both of which appear to be unknown to Zaccaria.

I would not, however, wish to leave a negative impression of this book, for in fact it has many merits. Zaccaria may be better at textual than literary criticism, although I'd be the first to admit that this is a subjective judgment with which others may not agree; nevertheless the latter depends inexorably on the former, and Zaccaria has done a fine service in continuing his efforts to resolve the *cruces* in Boccaccio's texts. And while

the lists of words and syntactical patterns may make for heavy reading, they represent the kind of careful, painstaking study that will allow us to move beyond facile generalizations about postclassical Latin style to see how Latin actually evolved under the gradual impact of humanism. One of the most valuable features of the book is its bibliography, which presents twenty-five pages ranging from lists of manuscripts containing the three major Latin works to an almost complete list of secondary works on them. This is in the end the best single book specifically on Boccaccio's Latin works in almost a hundred years, and it belongs on the bookshelf of everyone seriously interested in the subject, next to Hortis, Hauvette, and the irreplaceable *Boccaccio medievale* of Vittore Branca. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

Cornu copiae, seu lingua Latinae commentarii. By Niccolò Perotti. Sassoferrato, Istituto Internazionale di Studi Piceni. Vol. 1, ed. by Jean-Louis Charlet and Martine Furno, 1989, x + 200 pp.; vol. 2, ed. by Jean-Louis Charlet, 1991, 388 pp.; vol. 3, ed. by Jean-Louis Charlet, 1993, 232 pp.; vol. 4, ed. by Marianne Pade and Johann Ramminger, 1994, 363 pp.; vol. 5, ed. by Jean-Louis Charlet and Pernille Harsting, 1995, 257 pp.; vol. 6, ed. by Fabio Stok, 1997, 331 pp.; vol. 7, ed. by Jean-Louis Charlet, Martine Furno, Marianne Pade, Johann Ramminger, and Giancarlo Abbamonte, 1998, viii + 359 pp.; vol. 8, ed. by Jean-Louis Charlet, Marianne Pade, Johann Ramminger, and Fabio Stok, 2001, 405 pp. Each vol., □26. A brief look at the bibliographical headnote for this review suggests that the appearance of the eighth and final volume of this edition brings to a conclusion one of the most significant publishing events in contemporary Neo-Latin studies. More than two decades in the making, these eight volumes bear witness to a remarkable international collaboration in which scholars from France, Italy, Denmark, and Austria have collaborated to produce a scholarly edition, prepared to the highest standards, of one of the most important works of Quattrocento humanism.

Niccolò Perotti (1429 or 1430-1480) was born and died in Sassoferrato, but he made a good career for himself in Renaissance Italy, first studying with Vittorino da Feltre and (perhaps) Guarino da Verona, then entering the service of Cardinal Bessarion, from whom he obtained a number of ecclesiastical benefices, most notably the archbishopric of Siponto. His writings, for the most part unedited according to modern standards, include translations from the Greek (most importantly Epictetus's *Enchiridion* and five books of Polybius), original poems in Latin (*Liber epigrammatum ad Sigismundum Malatestam* and *Epitome*), discourses marking various important occasions, correspondence, polemical exchanges with other humanists (Poggio Bracciolini, George of Trebizond, Giovanni Andrea Bussi, and Domizio Calderini), metrics (*De metris* and *De ratione carminum quibus Horatius et Severinus Boethius usi sunt*), and grammar (*Rudimenta grammatices*). But his masterwork was the *Cornu copiae*, in which, under cover of a commentary on Martial, Perotti wrote an etymological, analogical, and encyclopedic dictionary which became, in effect, a *summa* of Quattrocento humanist culture. In examining the epigrams of Martial, Perotti defines every single word in the text, not only in its fundamental sense but also in its secondary meanings, with discussions on etymology and on related words often thrown in for good measure. To illustrate his points, Perotti cites texts from antiquity and (less often) from the Middle Ages and from contemporary humanists. The *Cornu copiae* had a tremendous influence, serving as a dictionary for a number of humanists like Erasmus and being pillaged freely by Calepino and Robert Estienne, with its effect on Latin lexicography being felt even to the days of Forcellini.

For Charlet and his editorial team, the preparation of this edition posed formidable challenges. For one thing, even though Perotti never got past the first book of Martial's epigrams, the text is very long indeed. Fortunately a manuscript offered by Perotti to Federico of Urbino (Urb. Lat. 301) exists, but its orthography is not fully in accord with classical norms and it

contains marginal corrections in Perotti's hand. Using this as a base text, a critical edition has been prepared through reference to the *editio princeps* (1489), the Venetian edition of 1496 prepared by Polydore Virgil, and the final, best Aldine edition of 1526, with variant readings recorded in a full *apparatus criticus*. More serious challenges arose, however, in preparing the second *apparatus*, which contains the certain or probable sources on which Perotti drew. Again, the sheer amount of work is at issue, since there are over 12,000 citations to identify: even if Perotti gives the name of the author, he does not tell us precisely where he found the passage, nor does he always quote it accurately, since in some cases he presumably took the citation directly from ancient sources (especially Virgil, Cicero, Plautus, Pliny, Ennius, Sallust, and Apuleius), but in other cases he took it from works of lexicography or more general scholarship (Festus, Gellius, Nonius, Macrobius, and Isidore), from commentaries to classical authors (Servius and Donatus), or from grammatical works (Varro, Carisius, Diomedes, and Priscian), perhaps even from *florilegia*. The most interesting of these citations are some two hundred for which there is no confirmation in the texts that have come down to us today. A vigorous debate has arisen about these so-called 'new fragments', with some scholars accusing Perotti of being a forger and others defending the possibility that he had access to materials that have disappeared between his day and ours.

As the editors themselves freely acknowledge, perfection in such a project is impossible to attain, yet each volume has been prepared with a degree of care that is belied by the relative speed with which the project has been completed. The scholarly merits of the series are confirmed by three indices—an *index verborum Graecorum*, an *index verborum et nominum*, and an *index auctorum*—which fill the eighth volume and which are necessary if the work is to be fully exploited but do not always appear in Italian editions like this. Much work on the *Cornu copiae* remains to be done, but it is worth noting that the editors of this edition and those closely associated with them have al-

ready published some seventy articles and at least four books on Perotti, so that the series is already stimulating some of the scholarly inquiry which should follow the appearance of an important new edition.

Much (although certainly not all) of this work, like the edition itself, is appearing under the auspices of the Istituto Internazionale di Studi Piceni, located (suitably) in Sassoferrato itself. Each year the Istituto hosts a conference, the Congresso Internazionale di Studi Umanistici, in which established scholars can share their work in Neo-Latin studies, preceded by a Seminario di Alta Cultura, in which qualified postgraduate students and those who have recently received the doctorate can follow a series of lectures on a stated theme. The proceedings of the conference are published each year in a journal, *Studi Umanistici Piceni*. Those who are interested in the Istituto and its work may contact its secretary by mail (P.za Matteotti, 60047 Sassoferrato (AN), Italy), phone (0732-956230), fax (0732-956234), or e-mail (studiumanistici@tiscali.it); there is also a web page at <http://web.tiscali.it/studiumanistici>. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

Literarische Vitruvrezeption in Leon Battista Albertis De re aedificatoria. By Harmut Wulfram. Beiträge zur Altertumskunde, 155. Munich and Leipzig: K.G. Saur Verlag, 2001. 441 pp. A comparative study of architectural principles in Vitruvius and Alberti, this recent Göttingen doctoral dissertation in philosophy is organized with thesis-like divisions into six main parts. Since Alberti divides all of architecture into six parts—*regio*, *area*, *partitio*, *paries*, *tectum*, *apertio*—the number seems especially appropriate. Wulfram's sections consist of an introduction to the two authors and their analogous works, a close reading of Alberti's prologue, an extensive survey of the themes in Alberti's complete treatise, a discussion of Alberti's 'agonal' relationship to Vitruvius, a detailed bibliography (also in six parts!), and indexes to Vitruvius's text and related subjects.

Wulfram's text and notes offer a rich sampling of passages from Vitruvius, Alberti, and relevant scholarship.

The heart of the study lies in the second and third chapters, which may be briefly summarized here. To simplify Wulfram's argument, Chapter 2 discusses Alberti's debt to Vitruvian themes (*inventio*), and Chapter 3 his debt to Vitruvius's organization (*dispositio*).

In Chapter 2, Wulfram discusses how Alberti follows Vitruvius in aiming his treatise at an educated reader rather than a specialized architect. Yet in tracing the origins of society and architecture, Alberti reverses the process envisioned by Vitruvius and claims that building led to the formation of society. In discussing the two authors' preliminary chapters, Wulfram concludes that Alberti organizes his material more effectively than his Roman model, and that his index of topics improves on Vitruvius's more haphazard list.

In Chapter 3, Wulfram examines a series of thirteen passages in which Alberti outlines important theoretical principles. To summarize a number of the topics discussed:

1. Alberti derives his six parts of architecture—*regio*, *area*, *partitio*, *paries*, *tectum*, *apertio*—from the notion of an archetypal hut. These essential elements of architecture parallel the six parts of a speech in the rhetorical tradition.
2. Alberti adopts wholesale the three Vitruvian criteria of *firmitas*, *utilitas*, and *venustas*.
3. Both authors write for an enlightened amateur client.
4. The discussion of construction materials, found in the second book of both Vitruvius and Alberti, is more logically arranged in the latter.
5. Alberti establishes *venustas* as the highest criterion in architecture, and treats *ornamentum* in ways that recall rhetorical *ornatus*.
6. Alberti's division of sacred, profane, and private in Books 7-9 follows the articulation of Vitruvius's Books 3-6, and his *ornamenta* borrow from what Vitruvius calls *expolitiones*.

7. In treating the ornamentation of sacred buildings, Alberti improves on the organization of Vitruvius's Books 3-4. In discussing the form of the *basilica*—in classical times a law-court, but adapted by Christians for worship—Alberti notes that lawgiving is based on sacred beliefs, but assigns it less magnificent ornamentation than the *templum*.

8. Alberti's *pulchritudo* refers to overall beauty rather than detail and is generally equated with *concinntas*, a sort of harmony consisting of the proper *numerus*, *finitio*, and *collocatio*.

9. While both authors insist on the architect's general culture, Alberti takes exception to the specialized disciplines proposed by Vitruvius—law, astronomy, optics, and music—and instead emphasizes painting and mathematics.

10. In their discussion of the maintenance and restoration of buildings (Book 8 in Vitruvius, Book 10 in Alberti), both authors discuss water sources and various hydraulic questions.

As this brief outline suggests, this book offers a daunting wealth of analysis and bibliography on numerous complex questions concerning Alberti's debt to Vitruvius. The validity of Wulfram's conclusions about Alberti's debt to Vitruvius (and Cicero) is not only established by the tautness of his argumentation. They have recently been confirmed—independently, it seems—by the similar findings of Hans-George Lücke in a two-part article titled "Das Bauwerk as Gedankenwerk ... über Vitruv und L. B. Alberti" in *Albertiana* 4-5 (2001-02). (No doubt, more details will emerge from the Mantua congress held in October, 2002, which included both Wulfram and Lücke as speakers.) The Germanic scope and detail of Wulfram's study may prove daunting to the general reader, but its thorough investigation of notions central to Alberti and Vitruvius will prove invaluable to students of architecture and of the rhetorical tradition in both antiquity and the Italian Renaissance. (David Marsh, Rutgers University)

Umanisti bellunesi fra Quattro e Cinquecento. Atti del Convegno di Belluno, 5 novembre 1999. Ed. by Paolo Pellegrini. Biblioteca

dell'«Archivum Romanicum», Serie I: Storia, Letteratura, Paleografia, 299. Florence: Leo S. Olschki Editore, 2001. xiv + 296 pp. EURO 30.99. The standard histories of Italian humanism focus first on Florence, then on Rome, Venice, and Naples, with (perhaps) side trips to Bologna and Milan. Humanism also took hold in the medium- and smaller-sized cities, however, and it is always good to see scholarship in these areas move out of the pages of local history journals into more broadly diffused venues. This is especially true for Belluno, which was the birthplace of two important humanists: Urbano Bolzanio and Pierio Valeriano.

Bolzanio was born in Belluno in 1442, but he made his career elsewhere, first in Venice and Padua, where he began his studies in Greek, then in Florence, where he taught the young man who later became Pope Leo X. He travelled to Greece and Asia Minor, then returned to Messina, where he perfected his knowledge of Greek with Constantine Lascaris. Back in Venice, he worked with Aldus Manutius, contributing to the *Thesaurus cornu copiae et horti Adonidis*, then publishing his *Institutiones Graecae grammaticae*, which provided the theoretical base for the study of Greek in western Europe for quite some time, then collaborating with Erasmus on the Aldine publication of the *Adagia* in 1508. He died in 1524, but his cultural heritage passed to his nephew, Pierio Valeriano. Born in Belluno in (perhaps) 1477, Valeriano joined his uncle in Venice in the early 1490s, then moved to Padua to attend the university. He lived and worked primarily in Rome, where he published his *Castigationes et varietates Virgilianae lectionis*, a basic work in the history of Virgilian scholarship. He achieved renown as a teacher, instructing privately the nephews of Pope Clement VII and lecturing at the Studio Romano; some of his public lectures in turn were published as the *Praelectiones in Catullum*, which combined grammatical and philological commentary with observations on the literary qualities of a difficult poetic text. Later in life he moved about among Florence, Venice, and Padua, but unlike his uncle he returned often to Belluno, where he worked on his *De infelicitate litteratorum*. To him is generally ascribed as well the *Hieroglyphica*, which appeared two years before his death in 1558.

Following the introduction by G. Frasso, this volume contains the following essays, selected to shed light on the life and works of these two humanist scholars: "Pierio Valeriano e l'Umanesimo," by M. Pastore Stocchi; "1517: l'istituzione dell'arcipretura della cattedrale nei nuovi equilibri postcambraici a Belluno," by M. Perale; "Gli incunaboli e le cinquecentine possedute dalla Biblioteca civica di Belluno. Con note in margine alla bibliografia bellunese," by C. Griffante; "Vecchi e nuovi appunti su frate Urbano," by P. Scapecchi; "Dai *Miscellanea* alle *Castigationes Virgilianae*," by V. Fera; "Pierio Valeriano e la nascita della critica catulliana nel secolo XVI," by A. Di Stefano; "La grammatica greca di Urbano Bolzanio," by A. Rollo; "Genèse et composition des *Hieroglyphica* de Pierio Valeriano: essai de reconstitution," by S. Rolet; "Medicina e simboli nei «Geroglifici» di Pierio Valeriano," by E. Riva; and "«In montibus nutritus»: il compositore Cristoforo da Feltre nelli fonti di cronaca e d'archivio," by P. Da Col. Unlike some Italian *acta*, the plates here are flawlessly reproduced, and this volume comes equipped with good indices, of plates, names, and documents cited. The essays offer a good range, some (like that of Pastore Stocchi) broad, some (like that of Da Col) more specialized, some (like that of Scapecchi) principally biographical, some (like that of Di Stefano) primarily literary, and some (like that of Griffante) bibliographical.

There is much interesting reading in this volume, which I recommend enthusiastically to those who wish to extend their humanistic studies beyond Petrarch and Erasmus to the scholars they threaten to eclipse, the skilled philologists whose work made a qualitative improvement in how ancient Greece and Rome were understood in later centuries. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

Lee Piepho. *Holofernes' Mantuan: Italian Humanism in Early Modern England*. Currents in Comparative Romance Languages and Literatures, 103. New York: Peter Lang, 2002. xiii + 176 pp. \$50.95. In 1989 Lee Piepho published his edition and translation of the *Adulescentia*, the collection of ten eclogues by the Italian Carmelite Baptista Mantuanus (1448-1516). Now he provides a study of the English reception and appropriation

of Mantuan. While he does discuss echoes of Mantuan in Elizabethan poetry, he argues that Mantuan's main importance for England was less as a poetic influence than as an author whose texts were seen to inculcate values "that writers and educators sought to appropriate into English culture" (p. 135). This means that Piepho's book, as its title implies, largely has to do with Mantuan's use in the schools. The title, of course, alludes to the misquotation of the first line of Mantuan's first eclogue by the ebullient pedant Holofernes in *Love's Labor Lost*. The *Adulescentia* were such a standard school text that Shakespeare could expect a sufficient portion of his audience to recognize and enjoy the schoolmaster's blunder.

Piepho's first main point, however, is that the story of Mantuan in England is not just about the *Adulescentia*. Piepho agrees with Mantuan's early-twentieth-century editor W.P. Mustard that when Dean Colet prescribed the reading of Mantuan in his statutes for St. Paul's School, he probably had in mind Mantuan's religious poems such as his *Parthenice Mariana*. As context for this assertion, Piepho develops a rich account of the appreciation of Christian Latin verse by humanists around 1500 and reviews evidence that Mantuan's religious poems were read and taught in England before the break with Rome.

The second chapter takes up Jodocus Badius Ascensius's commentary on the *Adulescentia*, which appeared in every one of the work's almost forty English editions in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Piepho argues that Badius interpreted (and influenced others to interpret) Mantuan as more didactic, moralistic, unequivocal, and thus acceptable as a school text than the poet in himself actually was. This is an interesting rejoinder to readings like Patrick Cullen's and Thomas Hubbard's, which ascribe to Mantuan the qualities Piepho tends to displace on to Badius. The latter part of chapter two deals with the ways Mantuan was read. Piepho has collected marginalia from copies of the *Adulescentia* in the British Library, the Bodleian, the Folger, and the Huntington. We can

not only watch schoolboys doing what they were supposed to do—gathering phrases and adages that exemplified wisdom and eloquence—but also see particular students showing more individual tendencies. This is the liveliest, most interesting part of Piepho's book.

His last chapter is on "Mantuan's Eclogues in the English Reformation." Mantuan's ninth eclogue especially, with its allegorical excoriation of papal Rome, quickly became a "corroborative text" (93) for Protestants. While the *Adulescentia* were probably taught earlier, curricula from the 1540s are the earliest surviving records of their use in schools; Piepho convincingly argues that their combination of good Latinity with anti-papal content explains their attractiveness to educational policy-makers from Thomas Cromwell on. The rest of the chapter discusses the use of Mantuan by English Protestant poets, specifically a pattern in which the model Mantuan supplied, at first informing English anti-Catholic invective, was eventually used by Spenser in his "September" eclogue to frame criticism of Anglican clerics. One of the book's appendices, of special value to Neo-Latinists, prints a poem (*ca.* 1569) by Giles Fletcher the Elder which is not included in Lloyd E. Berry's edition of Latin poems by Fletcher in *Anglia* 79 (1961): 338-77.

In a book by so diligent a textual scholar as Piepho, it is a shame that the copy-editing is poor: mistakes in English and Latin occur too often. A bit of opening orientation to Mantuan's life and works would have been helpful; similarly, more orientation to the full sequence of Mantuan's English poetic imitators would have helped chapter three. But overall Piepho solidly does what he sets out to do: describe some of the ways in which Mantuan was an important figure not only for the literary but also for the broader culture of sixteenth-century England. (John F. McDiarmid, New College of Florida)

Parrhasiana II. Atti del II Seminario di Studi su Manoscritti Medievali e Umanistici della Biblioteca Nazionale di Napoli, Napoli, 20-21 ottobre 2000. Ed. by Giancarlo Abbamonte,

Lucia Gualdo Rosa, and Luigi Munzi. A.I.O.N.: Annali dell'Istituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli, Dipartimento di Studi del Mondo Classico e del Mediterraneo Antico, Sezione Filologico-Letteraria, XXIV-2002. Naples: Istituto Universitario Orientale, 2002. 242 pp. This collection of essays begins with two miscellaneous contributions. The first, Mirella Ferrari's "In ricordo di un maestro della filologia medioevale e umanistica: Giuseppe Billanovich," is a detailed portrait of the 'grand old man' of humanistic studies in Italy, who died in 2000 but who had begun his university teaching career immediately after the war in Naples. The second essay, Fulvio Delle Donne's "Epistolografia medievale e umanistica. Riflessioni in margine al manoscritto V.F.37 della Biblioteca Nazionale di Napoli," focuses on an interesting manuscript which contains letters of three famous political figures (Pier della Vigna, Pellegrino Zambecari, and Coluccio Salutati), copied on behalf of an unknown recipient as models of style for someone who would be able to use a humanist education as the basis for a future political career. Also valuable is the essay of Angela Piscitelli, "Le note di Gasparino Barzizza alla versione di Crisolora / Dicembre della *Repubblica* di Platone (Napoli, Biblioteca Nazionale, ms. VIII.G.51)," which was originally delivered as part of a conference on Barzizza in 1999.

But the real hero of these *Atti* is Aulo Giano Parrasio (1470-1521), the Calabrian humanist who formed an extensive and valuable collection of manuscripts and printed books, often with annotations in his hand. Many of these books have been dispersed (one of them, the 1517 Aldine *Priapea*, has recently ended up at the Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center in Austin, Texas), but the core of the collection went first to Cardinal Antonio Seripando, studied here in Carlo Vecce's "Postillati di Antonio Seripando"; then to his brother, the Cardinal Girolamo Seripando, head of the Augustinian order; then to the Augustinian library of San Giovanni a Carbonara; then to the Biblioteca Reale, from which part of the books went to Vienna, then back to Italy, where they can be found *inter alia* in

the Biblioteca Oratoriana dei Girolamini and the Biblioteca Nazionale in Naples and the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. The most valuable manuscripts in the collection are those that came originally from the library of San Colombano di Bobbio, two of which are discussed in “Una trascrizione umanistica del *Carmen de Iona*,” by Roberto Palla, and “La scrittura del *Liber pontificalis* nel codice bobbiese IV.A.8 della Biblioteca Nazionale di Napoli,” by Paolo Radiciotti. Much remains to be discovered about the dispersal of Parrasio’s books, but also about how and when they came into his library in the first place, some during his youthful stay in Lecce and some during his two trips to Rome (in 1477-1479 and 1515-1519), with some being inherited from Demetrio Calcondila and others being stolen in Venice by the obscure Hellenist Lucius Victor Falconius. In this collection of essays, some first steps are taken. Carmela Ruggiero, for example, provides the *incipit* and *excipit* for thirty-four letters sent by Parrasio for the most part to his Calabrian collaborator Giovanni Antonio Cesario, in “Lettere del Parrasio in un codice della Biblioteca Oratoriana dei Girolamini.” In “Note del Parrasio a un’edizione dell’opera di Tacito,” Teresa Cirillo studies the marginalia left in Parrasio’s copy of the *editio princeps* of Tacitus, now residing in the same library. Luigi Ferreri, in turn, provides a study of the ten Greek and Latin manuscripts of Parrasio now to be found in the Vatican Library, in “I codici parrasiani della Biblioteca Vaticana, con particolare riguardo al Barberiniano Greco 194, appartenuto a Giano Lascaris,” most of which were presumably taken from Naples in 1637 by Luca Holstenius on behalf of his protector, Cardinal Francesco Barberini. Giuseppe Ramires, finally, turns his attention to Parrasio’s philological activity in “Parrasio e Servio,” tracing Servius’s presence in Parrasio’s library, then studying Parrasio’s interventions into the text of Servius’s commentary, as recorded in the margins of a Milanese edition of Alessandro Minuziano.

Unlike some humanists of his generation, Parrasio has attracted the attention of a number of scholars who have produced good accounts of his life, his work, and his books, some

of which are still valuable generations after they first appeared (e.g., F. Lo Parco, *Aulo Giano Parrasio. Studio biografico-critico* (Vasto, 1899), others of which are comparatively recent (e.g., M. Manfredini, "L'inventario della biblioteca del Parrasio," in *Rendiconti della Reale Accademia di Archeologia, Lettere e Belle Arti di Napoli* (1985-86): 133-201; and C. Tristano, *La Biblioteca di un umanista calabrese: Aulo Giano Parrasio* (Manziana, 1988)). Much, however, remains to be done, for much is yet unknown about Parrasio's relationships with the editors, printers, and scholars of his day and about the peregrinations of his books through the libraries, both personal and institutional, of Europe. These papers do not answer all the questions that remain about Parrasio's life or his methods of collecting, annotating, and editing his texts, but they will undoubtedly stimulate other scholars to take up other problems, from which, eventually, a full picture might emerge. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

Wiederholte Ansprache an Baron Wolzogen / Iteratus ad Baronem Wolzogenium sermo. By Johann Amos Comenius. Trans. by Otto Schonberger, with a commentary and an introduction to the antisocinian controversy of Comenius ed. by Erwin Schadel. *Schriften zur Triadik und Ontodynamik*, 22. Frankfurt am Main: P. Lang, 2002. 550 pp. \$66.95. Whereas Johann Amos Comenius (Jan Amos Komensky, 1592-1670) is mostly known as a humanist, theologian, and founding father of a new pedagogical approach, his 'universal reform-concept,' in which politics, science and religion are interrelated in an ontotrinitarian way, remained unexplored until today. Comenius's program consisted in saving the Trinitarian way of thought as opposed to the rationality of the Socinians.

In this magnificent and important edition, translated for the first time (into German), Comenius's letter to Baron Wolzogen from 1659 has been presented in an exemplary way. First, the edition has been based on the former critical edition by Erwin Schadel in J.A. Comenius's *Ausgewählte Werke* IV 1/2

(Hildesheim, 1983); second and more important, the entire text has been analyzed, contextualized, and commented upon in a detailed and scholarly way so as to open up its importance for the history of ideas, the history of philosophy, and the study of contemporary ideas concerning Logos-Christology. Especially since Comenius's antisocinian writings have been neglected in the two major biographies of Comenius (one by Johann Kvacšala, and a second by Milada Blekastad), this text has finally received its deserved full attention.

Comenius got acquainted with Johann Ludwig von Wolzogen, Baron of Tarenfeldt and Freiherr of Neuhausel (ca. 1599-1661), in 1638. One year later Comenius sent him a copy of his *Vorläufer der Pansophie*, first published at Oxford in 1637. In 1641 Wolzogen had a second meeting with Comenius and discussed his views on the Trinity. Like Comenius, Wolzogen devoted several treatises to the subject. His anonymously published *Erklärung des beyden unterschiedlichen Meinungen von der Natur und Wesen des einigen allerhöchsten Gottes, nemlich Von dem einigen Gott dem Vater und von dem einigem Gott in einem wesen und dreyen Personen* (s.l., 1646) was translated into Latin (*Declaratio duarum contrariarum sententiarum de Natura et Essentia unius Dei Altissimi*) and taken up in the monumental *Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum* (Vol. 8, Amsterdam 1656 [=1668 / 69]). Further, Wolzogen translated Johann Crell's *De uno Deo Patre Libri duo* (Racoviae 1631) into *Von dem einigen Gott, dem Vater, zwei Bücher*. Comenius's controversy with the Socinians came to a climax in his writings to Wolzogen, published at Amsterdam in March 1659 as an appendix to his second work written against the Socinians.

The *Iteratus ad Baronem Wolzogenium sermo* proves to be an exciting document of Comenius's pansophical ideas, his controversial theology, and his moderating position in the theological and philosophical debates of his time. For Neo-Latin scholars it will open up a world of ideas on pedagogy and philosophy not entirely unknown to readers who are already

acquainted with humanist educational treatises. (Jan Papy, Catholic University Leuven)

Leeuven: Beschrijving van de stad en haar universiteit. By Justus Lipsius. Ed., trans., introduction, and commentary by Jan Papy. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2002. 373 pp. EURO 37.06. In 2000-01 the Catholic University of Leuven (Louvain) celebrated its founding under Pope Martin V with conferences, exhibitions, and commemorative publications from the university press. In honor of his *alma mater's* five hundred seventy-fifth anniversary, Dr. Jan Papy prepared a scholarly yet stylish and accessible volume of Justus Lipsius's *Lovanium*, translated as *Leuven. Beschrijving van de stad en haar universiteit*. Not a critical edition, the book is a photostatic reproduction of Lipsius' *editio princeps* (1605: Antverpiae, ex officina Plantiniana apud Ioannem Moretum). The original volume would go through four reprints. Papy's publication consists of foreword, introduction, text and Dutch translation on facing pages, illustrations, notes, bibliography, and index.

In the elegant foreword, Dr. Papy modestly expresses his thanks to colleagues in archives and libraries and the departments of classics and history at the university. But Dr. Papy is no mean scholar himself. The volume falls within his own area of interest and expertise as part of the Neo-Latin team in Leuven preparing the critical edition of Justus Lipsius's correspondence (volume VII is already in print, with volumes VIII and XIII in press). Papy identifies as the audience for this book the academic community and alumni, as well as local historians and those interested more broadly in the province of Brabant. He imagines that alumni, in particular, might delight in the recognition of streets and buildings, familiar not only by their Latin descriptions but also in the sixteen illustrations, which are reproduced engravings and ink drawings. There are two fold-out maps, one of the city of Leuven and one of Heverlee, sewed in exactly as in the 1605 edition.

Notwithstanding the nostalgia that the volume sparks in one such as myself, the *Lovanium* remains a scholarly work. The *Lovanium* is a dialogue between four students and Lipsius, who had returned from his rectorship at the University of Leiden in 1591 to take up a post as Professor of History and Latin in Leuven, where he would remain until his death. Drawn by the nuptials of Charles III, Duke of Croy—a noble member of the Hapsburg court and Spanish imperial family—Lipsius hoped to lobby and solidify his appointment as historian of the States of Brabant. He had already been appointed Philip II's court historian. Unfortunately Lipsius died the year after the *Lovanium's* publication.

In a brief but thorough, annotated introduction, Dr. Papy summarizes I.) Lipsius's career as one of the luminaries of his time, as philosopher and philologist; II.) his return to his Brabantine homeland and the impetus and circumstances for the composition of the *Lovanium*; III.) his association and rapport with Charles, Duke of Croy; IV.) his use of antique and medieval sources and his models of history; and V.) the text of the *Lovanium* and the translation, with remarks upon Lipsius's terse (Senecan, Tacitean, and Plautean) style (pp. 14–26).

Papy mentions that one could produce a critical edition of the *Lovanium*, as the working autograph (Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, ms. Lips. 13) is extant, and he thinks it even desirable (p. 23). I would agree. In fact, I would agree because I think Papy may underestimate his audience. The *Lovanium* ought to be of interest to scholars of the history of universities, of Justus Lipsius (his career, his style), and of antiquarianism. On the latter note, I found it fascinating that Lipsius had established a rapport with Charles III, who collected books, manuscripts, coins, and paintings. Apparently Lipsius hoped that the University (or he himself) would inherit Charles III's library. On the map of Heverlee, Lipsius had requested the engraver to locate a site for an Academia—a study/cultural center (cf. James Hankins, "The Myth of the Platonic Academy of Florence," *Renaissance Quarterly* 44 (1991): 429-

75). Lipsius's appearance with his four students (and two dogs) at the top left corner of the map of Leuven perhaps echoes Petrarch's lookout over Rome with his companion and guide, Giovanni Colonna. Certainly there is much fodder in the works of Justus Lipsius, and even the works of 'local interest' will intrigue the modern reader and scholar. (Angela Fritsen, The Episcopal School, Dallas)

Thomas and Rebecca Vaughan's Aqua vitæ: non vitis (British Library MS, Sloane 1741). Ed. and trans. by Donald R. Dickson. Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 217. Tempe, AZ: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2001. lv + 270 pp. \$35. Donald Dickson has taken the British Library manuscript Sloane 1741, an alchemical notebook written in Latin and some English in the late 1650s and early 1660s, and presented an accurate but unpedantic edition of its text together with a facing-page translation into English, a good introduction, a minimal commentary, and a glossary. His work has been well served by the publishers of the Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies series: this is a handsomely produced book, a model in many ways of an unpretentious scholarly edition. Its subject matter, though, is at first glance rebarbative. Even though we have learned to take early modern alchemy seriously, seeing it as part of the intellectual lives of people like Newton and Boyle rather than as the concern of charlatans, gulls, and eccentrics, Neo-Latinists still tend to steer clear of its primary texts. There is so much good and interesting writing to enjoy in other genres and other areas: why, we may ask, should we read material which is highly technical at best and wilfully obscure at worst? A prospective reader taking this volume up and seeing the mission statement on the dustjacket—"MRTS emphasizes books that are needed—may wonder whether editions of alchemical manuscripts are indeed needed.

In fact, there are several good reasons for editing Sloane 1741. Firstly, there are grounds, to be discussed below, for see-

ing it as the record of the collaborative work of a married couple. If it were, it would offer evidence for the alchemical work of an early modern woman, and would thus contribute to the story of gender and science in the period; it would also add to our knowledge of the ways in which seventeenth-century texts might be the result of partnership between men and women. Secondly, the manuscript is almost entirely in the hand of Thomas Vaughan, whose poetry and prose in English are of interest both in their own right and for the light they shed on Thomas's twin brother, the poet Henry Vaughan. Thomas is a substantial enough figure for editions of all of his works to call for publication. Thirdly, although printed alchemical texts from the early modern period are common enough, it is well worth having an edition of a manuscript which appears to have been intended for private use to compare with them. This edition is, then, a welcome contribution to scholarship.

The claim which Dickson makes for the significance of Sloane 1741 in the title of his edition, that it is "Thomas and Rebecca Vaughan's," is worth discussing further. He argues that there is clear proof in the notebook that Rebecca Vaughan was an active laboratory worker; she "assisted him [Thomas] in his research," and "their work together ... produced a number of conceptual breakthroughs." The passage quoted in support of this claim actually says that "what I now write, and know of ... I attained to in her Dayes ... I found them not by my owne witt, or labour, but by gods blessing, and the Incouragement I received from a most loving, obedient wife." This is hardly convincing evidence for the kind of collaborative work which Dickson imagines, and other passages which he cites are at best ambiguous and sometimes irrelevant (for instance, the use of *iniquiunt TRV* and *dicunt TRV* which he adduces is always directly after a pious exclamation, not a record of laboratory work). Indeed, the fact that Thomas signed entries in the notebook with the monogram TRV after Rebecca's death suggests strongly that he saw her as a muse rather than as a laboratory

partner: the former position can be held posthumously, and the latter cannot.

Three other points are worth noting. The first is a small factual supplement: although Dickson states that “nothing significant is known of Sir John Underhill,” with whom Thomas Vaughan found shelter at a time of personal distress, more can be said of him than that: he was once Francis Bacon’s gentleman-usher, and he married Bacon’s widow. He might repay further investigation. The second is perhaps a lament that the edition does not achieve the impossible: it offers literal translations of alchemical recipes, but not explanations. So, for instance, *Arcanum Resinarum. R[ecipe] Dendrocollae partem 1. Sulphuris mineralis partes 2, vel tres. Sublima, &c.* is translated “The Mystery of Resins. Take one part dendrocolla [glossed by Dickson as ‘some kind of resin’], two or three parts mineral sulphur. Sublime, etc.” This leaves one none the wiser: what does the *etcetera* mean? Does the word *dendrocolla* occur in other alchemical writings? What was Vaughan trying to accomplish here: something like the vulcanization of rubber? Were other alchemists interested in heating resins with sulphur, or was Vaughan up to something quite idiosyncratic? No doubt alchemical procedures are untranslatable into modern terms, but some attempt at contextual commentary would have been most welcome. Finally, something which Dickson does not appear to state anywhere in his edition is that this notebook is by no means a new discovery. It has been identified in print as an autograph of Thomas Vaughan’s since Ayscough’s catalogue of the Sloane manuscripts in 1782, and has been widely known at least since Greg reproduced a leaf in his *English Literary Autographs* in 1932. Moreover, the notebook was transcribed in a Ph.D. thesis submitted to the University of Wales in 1970, and also in an elusive trade edition released by the Holmes Publishing Group, which appears to have specialized in alchemical and esoteric texts, in 1983. It is surprising that Dickson does not mention the existence of these two earlier editions (or, indeed, of the brief selections published by Alan Rudrum in his

Oxford edition of Thomas Vaughan in 1984) in the introduction to his own. Of course, his work goes further than that of his predecessors, and it is much more accessible than theirs, but it is not quite as ground-breaking as an unsuspecting reader might suppose. (John Considine, University of Alberta)

Les humanistes et leur bibliothèque / Humanists and Their Libraries. Actes du Colloque international / Proceedings of the International Conference, Bruxelles, 26-28 août 1999. Ed. by Rudolf De Smet. Université Libre de Bruxelles / Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Travaux de l'Institut Interuniversitaire pour l'Étude de la Renaissance et de l'Humanisme, 13. Leuven, Paris, and Sterling, Va.: Peeters, 2002. 286 pp. EURO 45. For those who wish to enter the world of Neo-Latin culture through the libraries of the scholars who fashioned it, there are many difficulties to be overcome. The main one is that even for first-tier humanists, the number of books that survive from their libraries is maddeningly small: for Erasmus, less than forty; for Thomas More, less than ten; and for Juan Luis Vives, only two. There are ways to go about reconstructing the contents of these lost libraries, of course, but here, too, there are complications. In "La bibliothèque de Marnix de Ste. Aldegonde à travers sa correspondance," for example, Rudolf De Smet mines the letters of this scholar-diplomat from the Low Countries for evidence about what he read, but a comparison of the correspondence to the sale catalogue of his library reveals that Marnix maintained an interest in some authors long after he broke off correspondence with them, while there are other authors whose works he collected and whose interests he shared with whom he never exchanged a single letter. How do we proceed in the face of meager, sometimes conflicting evidence?

The authors of the essays in this collection have devised a variety of ways to reconstruct the working libraries of humanist scholars. Perhaps the most obvious line of inquiry develops when a catalogue of the lost library survives. This is the case for Jeanine De Landtsheer, who uses a catalogue in "The Library of Bishop Laevinus Torrentius: A Mirror of *Otium* and *Negotium*" to clarify

the interests of this sixteenth-century Flemish scholar. This line of inquiry becomes more complicated when two or more catalogues of the same library survive, but Alexandre Vanautgaerden (“Item ein schöne Bibliothec mit ein Register: un deuxième inventaire de la bibliothèque d’Érasme (à propos du manuscrit C VIa 71 de la bibliothèque universitaire de Bâle”) and Cornelis S. M. Rademaker (“A Famous Humanist’s Library: Gerardus Joannes Vossius (1577-1649) and His Books”) each do a nice job of showing how the problems posed initially by multiple sources can be resolved so that the complementary evidence leads to a better understanding of the material. In “La bibliothèque de Beatus Rhenanus: une vue d’ensemble des livres imprimés,” James Hirstein is able to compare almost 1300 books of Beatus Rhenanus that are still preserved together in the famous library at Sélestat with an eighteenth-century catalogue, but again, things are not straightforward: books mentioned in Beatus Rhenanus’s works and letters had already disappeared from his library by the time this catalogue was prepared and are to be found today in a number of other modern repositories. In “The Library of Pieter Gillis,” Gilbert Tournoy and Michel Oosterbosch have examined an unusually wide range of sources (books written, edited, or corrected by Gillis; knowledge about his circle of friends; even the will of a man whose books passed to Gillis after his death) to reconstruct the library of this Antwerp humanist. Similarly Frans Baudouin, in “Rubens and His Books,” begins with Rubens’s letters, but goes as well to a sales ledger at the Plantin publishing firm and the auction catalogue of Rubens’s eldest son Albert to confirm that Rubens had one of the largest artist’s libraries of his age, which he used in both his artistic and diplomatic work. Several of these essays show how libraries connect their owners to the world of scholarship in which they participated: in “Le Cardinal de Cuse en voyage avec les livres,” for example, Concetta Bianca shows how a man constantly on the move managed to continue reading and used his travels to strengthen his library through the help of his friends. This personal dimension is even stronger in “Early Humanism in Flanders: New Data and Observations on the Library of Abbot

Raphael de Mercatellis (d. 1508),” for as Albert Derolez shows, in a library composed solely of manuscripts, each volume is a record of relationships.

The remaining three essays form a separate group, in that they move away from the specifics of individual libraries and how they can be reoriented toward more general considerations. In “Philosophie de la bibliothèque de Montaigne: le difficile trajet des mots aux choses,” Thomas Berns notes that a book possessed is not necessarily a book read, and therefore approaches Montaigne’s library “comme un phénomène philosophique interne à la pensée de son propriétaire plutôt que comme une source historique” (p.193). Paul Nelles in turn shows in “The Renaissance Ancient Library Tradition and Classical Antiquity” that Justus Lipsius returned to the ancient model to remove the library from the contestatory confessional model that had prevailed in preceding generations. Finally, in “The Web of Renaissance Humanists, Their Libraries, and the Organization of Knowledge in Pre-Enlightenment Europe,” Thomas Walker offers some brief observations on Trithemius and Gesner, the fathers of modern bibliography and information retrieval.

One of the great virtues of this book is that it does not pretend to offer all the answers in a field of inquiry that is fraught with obstacles. Indeed, in his very valuable “Les humanistes et leur bibliothèque: quelques considérations générales,” Alain Dierkens concludes by suggesting some areas where more work needs to be done: with music libraries and collections of engravings, with the physical aspects of where and how books were stored, with the differences between working libraries and those formed with an eye on more aesthetic considerations, even with the various nuances of the various words used for ‘library.’ This collection is valuable for the answers it provides, but also for the questions it raises, questions that will continue to preoccupy all of us who are concerned with Neo-Latin literature as a book culture which can only exist in the passage from one library to another. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

Yes, Virginia, there is a Santa Claus – in Latin! = Vere, Virginia, Sanctus Nicolaus est! By Francis Pharcellus Church. Trans. into Latin by Walter Sauer and Hermann Wiegand; illustrated by Matthias Kringe. Wauconda, Ill.: Bolchazy-Carducci Publishers, 2001. [IV] + 22 pp. \$14.95. On September 20, 1897, Francis Pharcellus Church, an editorialist for *The New York Sun*, was handed a letter by the eight-year-old Virginia O'Hanlon, a New York City girl who, troubled by her friends' assertion that Santa Claus did not exist and on her father's advice, had sought the truth from her family's favorite newspaper. The editorial, which appeared the next day—paradoxically, three months before the appropriate time—became universally known and was later published separately.

The present book offers a bilingual edition of the text. The Latin translation, by Walter Sauer and Hermann Wiegand, appears twice: by itself, formatted as folios of a manuscript (pp. 1-13), and together with the same-page English original (pp. 14-20). In the first, totally Latin part, the body of the text and the decorated initials represent a mixture of scripts, based on medieval models: mainly textualis, but also some square capitals, uncials, and rustic capitals, a feature which contributes towards the translator's own innovative style. After the second, English-Latin, part, there is a two-page Latin-English glossary of words that may be unknown to readers with less Latin. This translation belongs to the tradition of rendering into Latin important books written in the vernacular, from Dante's *Divina Commedia* to Macchiavelli's *Il principe*, from the Islandic *Edda* to the Finnish *Kalevala*, from the fables of La Fontaine to Goethe's *Faust*. Children's books have also had their place among the translations in the language of the *res publica litterarum*, although some of them have suffered by translation into poor and artificial Latin (on this see J. IJsewijn and D. Sacré, *Companion to Neo-Latin Studies* (Leuven, 1998), 2:245).

Among the noted Latin children's books we may recall *Pinoculus* of H. Maffacini (*Pinocchio*), A. Lenard's *Winnie Ille Pu* (*Winnie the Pooh*), *Regulus* of A. Haury (*Le petit prince*), *Alicia in*

terra mirabili of C.H. Carruthers (*Alice in Wonderland*) (if the latter two are really children's books), and the recent translations of J. Tunberg and T. Tunberg: *Quomodo invidiosulus nomine Grinchus natalem Christi abrogaverit* (*How the Grinch stole Christmas*) and *Cattus petasatus* (*The Cat in the Hat*). Such books have a place in the Latin heritage of the Western civilization, but they can also be used as a powerful didactic instrument. By approaching through Latin the archetypes of their childhood, students may create their own shortcuts towards understanding Latin and more easily internalize a language that for all too many remains external. Furthermore, some of these translations go far beyond the original and proclaim their own life in the new language.

Vere, Virginia, Sanctus Nicolaus est! contains two letters: the short inquiry of Virginia, and the longer reply of Franciscus P. Church, the latter one being really a treatise in an epistolary form. The language used is the one of philosophical and moral discourse. Some of the monosyllabic sentence endings could be shifted within the sentence to preserve a better Latin rhythm (as in the title *Vere, Virginia, Sanctus Nicolaus est!*). In favor of a genuine Latin sentence-structure, the vocatives could be moved from the very beginning to second or third position, e.g., on p. 4: *Cara Virginia, affirmare ausim amicos tuos parvulos errare* could become *Affirmare ausim, cara Virginia, amicos tuos parvulos errare*. Also, the name of the sender, already incorporated in the initial greeting, may be omitted at the end of the letters, so that *Bene vale* is the conclusion of the letter (p.13).

Vere, Virginia, Sanctus Nicolaus est! would be a lovely touch of sophistication under the Christmas tree (a Christmas memories journal is included, hopefully to be composed in Latin!), but also an addition to the library of anyone collecting the complete Latin tradition throughout the centuries up to our days. (Milena Minkova, University of Kentucky)

• **The Milton Society of America**

Approximately 90 members and guests attended the dinner and meeting of the Milton Society of America on 28 December 2002, at the Harmonie Club, 4 East 60th Street, New York City at which Annabel Patterson presided. . The following members of the society were nominated for office and were elected by acclamation: John Leonard for President, Charles W. Durham for Vice President, and Stephen Dobranski and Jeffrey Shoulson for three-year membership on the Executive Committee (2003-2005), replacing Lares and Martin.

There will be two open meetings at MLA 2003: "Milton and Allusion," with John Leonard presiding, and "Milton and Popular Culture" with Laura L. Knoppers and Gregory Semenza presiding.

The James Holly Hanford Award for an essay recognized the excellence of the following: William Shullenberger, "Into the Woods: The Lady's Soliloquy in *Comus*," in *Milton Quarterly*, 35 (March 2001), 33-43.

The James Holly Hanford Award for a book recognized the excellence of the following, David Loewenstein, *Representing Revolution in Milton and His Contemporaries: Religion, Politics, and Polemics in Radical Puritanism* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge UP, 2001).

The Irene Samuel Memorial Award recognized the excellence of the following multiauthor collection: *A Companion to Milton*, ed. Thomas Corns (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd., 2001).

The featured address, "Milton's *Theanthropos*," was given by John Rumrich, Professor of English, University of Texas at Austin.

Joseph Wittreich, Distinguished Professor of English, Graduate Center, CUNY cited Annabel Patterson, Sterling Professor of English, Yale University, as Honored Scholar of 2002.

Albert C. Labriola, Secretary
The Milton Society of America

• **International Milton Congress**

“Milton in Context”

11-13 March 2004 (Thursday-Saturday)
Duquesne University
Pittsburgh, PA 15282

The topic is “Milton in Context,” including comparative studies of Milton and others, cultural studies, the history of ideas, critical perspectives, literary history, studies of the reception of Milton’s writings, sources and analogues, Milton’s influence, and the like.

PAPERS AND PANELS

Papers with a reading time of 20 minutes and proposals that identify and organize panelists, as well as cite and briefly summarize the topic for a 75-minute discussion period, should be sent by e-mail or postal service to:

Albert C. Labriola
Department of English
Duquesne University
Pittsburgh, PA 15282
E-mail: Labriola@duq.edu

The deadline for papers and for proposals to establish panels is November 15, 2003. There will be a plenary session on Milton and terrorism, featuring Stanley Fish, Michael Lieb, David Loewenstein, and Annabel Patterson.

REGISTRATION

Registration for the congress will include 2 Continental breakfasts, 2 lunches, 1 banquet, 2 evening receptions, refreshment breaks. The opening reception will be in the evening of March 11 (Thursday), and the congress will end in the late afternoon of March 13 (Saturday). Funds are available to defray some of the cost of registration for graduate students, whether participating on the program or attending. To register for the conference, send a check, payable to "Duquesne University," to Labriola. The regular cost is \$125.00; the discounted cost for graduate students is \$50.00. Include your mailing and e-mail addresses, as well as your academic affiliation, along with your check.

HOTEL

The Pittsburgh Marriott City Center, 112 Washington Place, Downtown Pittsburgh will offer discounted rates. Free shuttle service will be provided between the Pittsburgh Marriott City Center and Duquesne University, nearby. There is transportation to/from Pittsburgh International Airport and the Pittsburgh Marriott City Center. For information, phone Airlines Transportation at 412-321-4990 or Yellow Cab at 412-665-8100.

The cost for room rental is \$99.00, plus 14% tax. The rate is the same for a single, double, or triple accommodation. Parking in an indoor garage adjacent to the hotel is \$14.25 per 24-hour day.

To reserve a room, phone 1-888-456-6600 or 412-471-4000. WHEN DOING SO, REQUEST THE DISCOUNTED RATE FOR THE "MILTON CONFERENCE AT DUQUESNE UNIVERSITY." The discounted rate is effective for reservations made before February 18, 2004. After that date, the discounted rate will be granted only if space is available.

ing contributions all treat women from Transalpine Europe. Edward V. George presents the Spanish humanist Luisa Sigea (to whom some readers of this review may have been introduced by Sol Miguel-Prendes's paper at the IANLS meeting in Avila), noting that none of her works appears previously to have been translated into English. Then follows another excellent piece by Jane Stevenson, this time on women's Latin poetry in reformed Europe, with the Netherlandic poet Johanna Otho as an exemplary case. Brenda Hosington's piece on Elizabeth Weston is largely taken from the edition which she and Donald Cheney published through the University of Toronto Press in 2000 (reviewed in *NLN* 50 (2002): 354-57). Anne Leslie Saunders treats another Englishwoman, Bathsua Makin (née Reginald), who is better known for her vernacular writings but appears here on the strength of the eight Latin poems in her early polyglot collection *Musa Virginea*. Pieta van Beek writes an appropriately learned final essay on van Schurman.

It will be apparent that this is a volume with much to offer the reader. It offers introductions to some important women writers in Latin, with a taste of what they actually wrote and good bibliographical references. Nothing else quite like it is available at present. However, it suffers from some serious flaws in its design. Firstly, the translations do not face the texts, which is not a problem for readers who do not need translations or for readers who have no Latin at all, but is a great nuisance for the large middle group of readers who have enough Latin to follow a text with a translation to guide them and will have to flip awkwardly back and forth from one to the other. The alternation of introductions and texts may have led to this inconvenient format; it would have been better

to have put the texts together at the second half of the volume, facing their translations, and better still to have made the set of three volumes to which this belongs into a complementary pair, one being a survey of women's writings in Latin from antiquity onwards, and one an anthology of texts and translations. Something of the sort seems to have been done in the two volumes on pre-revolutionary France in the same series as this.

Another problem is the structure of the book as a sequence of author-focused essays. Representing women's writings in Neo-Latin with a mere twelve authors perpetuates the old story that women like Weston were truly exceptional, that only a tiny handful of early modern women achieved anything in Latin. It also gives disproportionate emphasis to a very minor figure like Makin, at the expense of numerous women writers well worthy of inclusion (for instance the Cooke sisters, Caritas Pirckheimer, Lady Jane Grey, Elena Cornaro, and Maria Cunitz, let alone some of the less famous figures represented with vernacular poets from the British Isles in Stevenson and Davidson's brilliant *Early Modern Women Poets: An Anthology* or noticed in Kristeller's *Iter Italicum*). There would be much to be said for giving less space to each individual in order to include a greater number of writers. After all, many of the authors treated here can be read more extensively elsewhere. Weston is available in a bilingual edition, and Cereta, Fedele, Morata, and van Schurman are represented in translation in the 'Other Voice' series, in which Isotta Nogarola is also forthcoming.

This leads to a last point: this book costs one hundred and twenty-five American dollars. Not every instructor will be prepared to ask students to buy such an expensive textbook—but this collection, with

its preponderance of well known subjects and its recycling of work from other editions and translations, may look to librarians handling increasingly tight acquisitions budgets more like a textbook than a work of enduring value. An anthology of writings by women from the fifteenth century onwards, following Harvard's excellent I Tatti series in layout and pricing, is greatly to be desired, and *Early Modern Women Writing Latin* suggests, in its weaknesses and in its strengths, what such an anthology might look like. (John Considine, University of Alberta)

Owen Gingerich. *An Annotated Census of Copernicus' De revolutionibus (Nuremberg, 1543 and Basel, 1566)*. *Studia Copernicana*, 2. Leiden, Boston, and Cologne: Brill, 2002. XXXII + 402 pp. \$132. The goal of this project is deceptively simple: to prepare a list of all the known copies of the first two editions of Nicholas Copernicus's *De revolutionibus orbium coelestium libri sex*. As a book which revolutionized human thought, first by presenting the advantages of a new heliocentric cosmology, then by presenting a step-by-step technical description of the motions of the heavenly bodies in this sun-centered system, *De revolutionibus* fully deserves to join the Gutenberg Bible, Shakespeare's First Folio, and Audobon's *Birds of America*, for which a complete census has already been prepared.

I described Gingerich's goal as "deceptively simple" for two reasons. The first has to do with the sheer amount of work that has gone into preparing this census. The author has located 277 copies of the first edition and 324 copies of the second, over 95% of which he has examined personally. This has taken over three decades and required literally hundreds of thousands of miles of travel. Some copies are found

in large libraries whose resources have been well catalogued for a long time, but many reside in small provincial libraries and private collections, while others have appeared and then disappeared again in auction records and booksellers' catalogues, been lost or stolen, and so forth. It has taken patience, hard work, and the mind of a first-rate detective to assemble all this information.

To describe this census as a list, however, oversimplifies to the point of deception. Although Gingerich is a professor of astronomy and the history of science, he has obviously spent a great deal of time during the last thirty years talking to bibliographers, librarians, and book historians. His census therefore reflects the best of contemporary practice in these fields, providing not only a reasonably detailed physical description of each copy, but also information about who owned them, where and when they were bought, and what kind of annotations were left by early readers. Here, actually, is where the chief value of the census lies. An exacting study of such physical attributes as paper stock and type face has allowed Gingerich to describe the printing of the *editio princeps* in detail. Even more importantly, however, careful study of the marginalia has revealed that most important sixteenth-century astronomers owned *De revolutionibus*, and that many of these astronomers and their students annotated it. Rather surprisingly, the most important annotations can be found in multiple copies, from which it is possible to reconstruct a network that connected sixteenth-century astronomers. Copernicus's only disciple, Georg Joachim Rheticus, saw the book through the press for him but did not leave any technical notes in any of the surviving copies. An entire family of annotations, however, can be traced back to Erasmus

Reinhold, professor of mathematics at Wittenberg and the leading teacher of astronomy in the generation following Copernicus; another family has now been traced back to Jofrancus Offusius, a little-known Rhenish astronomer teaching in Paris in the late 1550s. The most heavily annotated surviving copy was owned by Kepler's teacher, Michael Maestlin, who taught at the University of Tübingen. Most of these readers thus knew *De revolutionibus* well, but most of them also did not accept without reservations the reality of the heliocentric theory it propounded, a position that proved compatible with that of the Catholic Church, which took unusual care to specify the corrections that were necessary before an expurgated copy could be read by the faithful.

In short, *De revolutionibus* was an enormously influential book, entering right away into the libraries of humanists like Johannes Sambucus, architects like Juan de Herrera, leading religious figures like Aloysius Gonzaga, cartographers like Gerhard Mercator, kings like George II, and book collectors like Duke August, whose library at Wolfenbüttel was the finest in eighteenth-century Europe. As such it merits study by Neo-Latinists, who will find their access to the book and their understanding of it greatly enriched by Gingerich's study. Perhaps more importantly, however, this census reminds us yet again of how important marginalia are to the interpretation of Renaissance Latin texts. There is no reason, from the distance of four centuries or more, to make educated guesses about how readers should have responded to a Neo-Latin text when the comments they wrote in their books tell us for sure how they did respond. Gingerich has taken the first, crucial steps here in suggesting how those readers who could best understand the revolutionary implica-

tions of Copernicus's book attempted to process this understanding within the world view of their day. Hopefully other scholars will both follow up on what has been suggested here with Copernicus and transfer Gingerich's analytical model to the other books that have had a similar impact on the development of western culture. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

Die Aeneissupplemente des Jan van Foreest und des C. Simonet de Villeneuve. Ed. by Hans-Ludwig Oertel. *Noctes Neolatinae, Neo-Latin Texts and Studies*, 1. Hildesheim, Zürich, and New York: Georg Olms Verlag, 2001. xiv + 421 pp. □40.80. During the Renaissance and Baroque periods, Latin supplements to classical texts were popular: Johannes Freinsheim 'completed' Tacitus and Curtius Rufus; C. B. Morisot, Ovid's *Fasti*; Pius Bononiensis, Valerius Flaccus's *Argonautica*; and Thomas May, Lucan's *Pharsalia*. As the centerpiece of a humanist education during this period, Virgil's *Aeneid* received more than its share of such supplements, including those by Pier Candido Decembrio (1419), Maffeo Vegio (after 1428), Jan van Foreest (1651), C. Simonet de Villeneuve (1698), an anonymous author from Munich (1705), Ludwig Bertrand Neumann (mid-eighteenth century), and Martin Rohacek (1982). The second, third, and fourth of these are the most important, but Vegio's supplement was edited twice in the last century, the second time in a critical edition (by Bernd Schneider, *Das Aeneissupplement des Maffeo Vegio* (Weinheim, 1985)), and has received extensive critical discussion in the last fifty years, so Oertel concentrates, wisely, on van Foreest and de Villeneuve.

Van Foreest's supplement, the *Exequiae Turni*, consists of two books, containing 1178 hexameters in

total. The action centers around the deliberations that follow the death of Turnus, and drama is introduced through the figure of Pilumnus, the brother of Turnus, who demands revenge, not peace, a demand which in the end remains unfulfilled. In his analysis of the poem, Oertel concentrates on biographical data as the interpretive key. Van Foreest received the standard humanist education of his day at the University of Leiden and was on friendly terms with Joseph Justus Scaliger, Daniel Heinsius, C. Huygens, and I. Vossius. Thus if we compare the supplement to the *Aeneid*, we find variation and nuance within the *imitatio* that humanist poetics favored, such that new poetry emerges in language that is largely Virgilian. Van Foreest, however, followed the active life, not the contemplative one, so that his literary activity took place in the intervals between his political activity as mayor of Hoorn and member of the high council of Holland. The consuming issue of the day was the drive for independence in the Netherlands, so that the supplement, according to Oertel, reflects clearly the war-weariness that followed the Thirty Years War. The drive toward a peace treaty in Van Foreest's supplement, in other words, reflects the premium placed on peace in the Low Countries of his day.

The *Exequiae Turni* contains some Baroque tendencies, but De Villeneuve's *Supplementum ad Aeneida*, written some fifty years later, displays the full Baroque aesthetic. Nothing is known about the author, other than that he served at the court of the Duke of Orléans in St. Cloud, but the 827 lines of his poem speak for themselves in the *querelle des anciens et des modernes*, reflecting key themes of the 'modern' Baroque taste: inconstancy, change and illusion, the spectacle of death, night and light, description of art works, the erotic, and the burlesque of the heroic. De

Villeneuve's *imitatio*, as we might expect, veers more toward the effort to surpass Virgil's poetic effects than simply to imitate them. Nevertheless the content of the poem is worth our attention along with its form. The *Supplementum* is probably not to be read as a *roman-à-clef* directed toward anyone specific, but it does serve as a pattern for princely behavior, a meditation on proper behavior for the high and mighty.

A great deal of work has gone into the preparation of this critical edition. The introduction to the two poems covers more than two hundred pages, and the poems themselves are presented with Latin text and facing-page German translation, along with relevant references to Virgil and content notes to the text. There is a useful bibliography of both primary and secondary sources, from which one can follow several tangents related to Virgilian imitation and influence, but no index. The work began life as a 1999 dissertation at the University of Würzburg and reflects all the virtues of its genre (*inter alia* thoroughness and accuracy) along with a couple of its vices (in particular a tendency to diffuseness in the prose of the introduction). Nevertheless as the inaugural volume in a new series associated with the *Neulateinishes Jahrbuch*, Oertel's volume bodes well for the success of a publishing program that will join the 'I Tatti Renaissance Library,' the 'Bibliotheca Latinitatis Novae,' and MRTS's 'Neo-Latin Texts and Translations' in attesting to the health of Neo-Latin studies today. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

Descartes y Plauto: la concepción dramática del sistema cartesiano. By Benjamín García-Hernández. Madrid: Editorial Tecnos, 1997. 328 pp. The back cover of this book states, "To publish a book in which it is

shown that the genuine source of Descartes' philosophical system is Plautus's comedy, the *Amphitryon*, is, at the very least, surprising." Indeed it is. When I heard Prof. García-Hernández present his paper on this same idea at a meeting of the IANLS in Cambridge in the summer of 2000, I was initially very skeptical of his thesis—that the sources of the most profound and most influential ideas of Cartesianism are to be found in one of Plautus's plays—but I found that, as he carefully delineated his ideas, the presentation of evidence for his startling thesis at least deserves serious consideration.

Were it merely a coincidence that the language of Plautus in the *Amphitryon* and that of Descartes in his *Meditations* is similar, a close resemblance arising from the fact that both authors dealt with similar ideas, albeit in widely disparate genres, one could dismiss the thesis of this book as interesting, indeed daring, but in the final analysis misguided, in spite of the overt similarities in language and subject matter. However, Prof. García-Hernández's case is built not merely on coincidences of subject matter and language, but on the fact that the *Amphitryon* provided Descartes with three basic elements essential to the building of his philosophical system—doubt about one's own existence, the existence of a trickster god, and the existence of a god who is not a trickster—and, of course, the Latin terminology necessary for the framing of these concepts.

The book is divided into three parts, the first ("El sistema filosófico de Descartes") running to eighty-two pages. For the reader who is not familiar with Descartes, this is an excellent introduction to his philosophical method. For the Neo-Latinist, the most interesting sections are undoubtedly the ones found in Part B.2 (*Cogito, ergo sum* [*Pienso, luego soy*]. *Meditación segunda AT VII 23-24*), which

I will shortly relate to the Plautine text. In this place we find a discussion of the famous maxim *cogito, ergo sum*, of the progression from doubt to *cogito*, of the notion that a person is a thinking substance (*sum res cogitans*), and in B.3. the idea of God as a deceiver, a *Deus deceptor*, who is finally shown to be not a deceiver but a *Deus non fallax*. The perceptive reader will no doubt have already detected in this paragraph a striking parallel to some of the plot elements of Plautus's *Amphitryon*!

In the 110 pages of Part II, subsection B.1 (*Amphitruo* de Plauto, fuente genuina del sistema cartesiano), Prof. García-Hernández discovers Mercury of the *Amphitryon* as the *deceptor* in his encounters with Sosia, as in lines 265, (Mer.) *quando imago est huius in me, certum est hominem eludere*; 295, (Mer.) *Timet homo: deludam ego illum*; and 392-94, (Sos.) *Tuae fide credo?* (Mer.) *Meae.* (Sos.) *Quid si fallas?* Moreover, the source of the famous Cartesian *cogito, ergo sum* is to be found in *Amphitryon*, line 447, (Sos.) *Sed quom cogito, equidem certe idem sum qui semper fui*, and, to demonstrate that externals cannot assure existence because the body, its shape etc. are chimerical, a concept stated in *Meditations* 24, 14-17, Prof. García-Hernández finds the Plautine origin in lines 455-58 (Sos.) *Di immortales, obsecro vostram fidem, ubi ego perii? Ubi immutatus sum? Ubi formam perdididi? An egomet me illic reliqui, si forte oblitus fui? Nam hic quidem omnem imaginem meam, quae antehac fuerat, possidet.*

In the *Amphitryon* Jupiter is, of course, like Mercury, a *deus deceptor*, but one who is transformed at the end of the play into a *deus non fallax*. Thus, according to Prof. García-Hernández, "The God of Descartes is a *deus ex machina*, in conformity with the classical model; in this case it can be said that he is like Plautus's Jupiter who, from a *dios burlador* (*sc. deus fallax*), at the culminating point of the tragicomedy, is transformed and manifests himself in all his majesty as a God who is not a deceiver" (p. 137).

Because Descartes wrote his *Meditations* while influenced by the structure and language of drama—in this respect, *mutatis mutandis*, following Plato's *modus scribendi*—Prof. García-Hernández concludes, “In the *Amphitryon* Descartes encountered a good model of the destructive effects of skeptical doubting, but above all he encountered an outstanding example of the restoration of certitude and the consolidation of truth. Thus, taking his inspiration from this work, he gave a dramatic structure to his philosophical system which closes with the definitive intervention of a *deus ex machina*” (p. 168).

The eighty-seven pages of the third part of the book (“El teatro en la vida y en la obra de Descartes”) are an exposition of the determinative role that theatre, and especially Roman comedy, played in the philosopher's life. At the age of ten Descartes entered the Jesuit Collège de la Flèche in Anjou; the curriculum of this Collège (*ratio studiorum*) stressed theatrical presentations and, according to Prof. García-Hernández, it was during this period of study that Descartes must have encountered Plautus's *Amphitryon* (p. 212).

These three principal parts of the book are followed (297-306) by a short concluding statement (“Conclusión: Inspiración y trascendencia textual”), in which the author forcefully states, “We are not dealing with a casual source but with the *genuine source* which begins with the nucleus of entire structure of his system” (p. 297).

In this review I have only been able to skim the surface of the richness and depth of this book, whose surprising thesis deserves serious consideration by readers interested in the genesis of the thought of one of the western world's most significant philosophers. In borrowing from Plautus, Descartes has

shown that the entwining of the tragic and comic masks by the ancients, so frequently shown in illustrations, proves that the serious and the comic are more closely related in literature and life than we are often wont to consider. (Albert R. Baca, Emeritus, California State University, Northridge)

Historia del humanismo mexicano. By Tarsicio Herrera Zapién. Mexico City: Editorial Porrúa, 2000. xi + 270 pp. \$90 (Mexican pesos). Professor Herrera of the National University of Mexico (Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México) covers five centuries of the Neo-Latin tradition in Mexico by offering the reader a survey of authors from 1500 to the end of the millennium, with texts cited and placed in their historical context. The book's five parts proceed in chronological order, the first covering the sixteenth century, "From Náhuatl to Latin"; the second the seventeenth century, "Neo-Latin Poets in the Circle of Sor Juana"; the third the eighteenth century, "Our Age of Gold in Neo-Latin Poetry and Philosophy"; the fourth the nineteenth, "Translators Rather than Neo-Latinists"; and the fifth, "The Twentieth Century."

Perhaps American readers will be surprised to learn from Part One, as I was, that the conqueror of Mexico, Hernán Cortés, was able to speak and write Latin. Significantly, then, not only does the history of modern Mexico begin with Cortés, but so does its Neo-Latin tradition. With the establishment in Mexico of schools and universities to which the Aztec elite were admitted, Náhuatl-speaking Neo-Latinists appeared on the scene, men like Antonio Valeriano, Juan Badiano, and Pablo Nazareo. Of Valeriano it was said that he could improvise Latin speeches of such elegance that he was compared to Cicero or Quintilian (p. 31).

Part Two is dominated (97-115) by one of the New World's most remarkable women, Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz, known in Mexico as "The Tenth Muse." She was the illegitimate daughter of a Spanish adventurer and was educated by her grandfather, who later took her to Mexico City, where news of her precociousness had preceded her and gave her entrée to the court of the Spanish viceroy, who helped her in obtaining the books and instruments, both scientific and musical, that she needed for her studies. She became a favorite friend of the viceroy's wife, to whom she dedicated passionate poetry, and also fell in love with male members of the court; all of her affairs appear to have been platonic. Since in her day an academic or literary career was out of the question, she took orders, which, however, interfered little with her studies and researches. Word of her brilliance angered church officials, however, and she was ordered to confine herself to religious subjects and tending the ill. She died tending the sick during an epidemic of the plague in Mexico City.

Part Three, "The Golden Age of Neo-Latin in Mexico," saw outstanding writers such as Diego José Abad, whose *De Deo Deoque homine heroica carmina* proved to Europeans that Latin poetry of the highest order could be written in the New World, and Rafael Landívar, whose *Rusticatio Mexicana* introduced Europeans readers to the exotic landscapes, flora, and fauna of the New World in a style worthy of Vergil's *Georgics*.

In Part Four Prof. Herrera characterizes the nineteenth century not as a Silver following a Golden Age, but as a century whose writers were more translators than Neo-Latinists. He selects for special praise José Rafael Larrañaga, who translated Virgil's works into hendecasyllabic lines between 1777 and

1788; Anastasio de Ochoa y Acuña, who translated Ovid's *Heroides*; and Manuel José Othón, who effectively employed classical allusions, especially Horatian ones, in his own poetry.

Part Five stresses the great educative role the National University of Mexico has played in fostering and preserving the classical tradition in Mexico. Prof. Herrera states with justifiable pride that in the last century Mexico was not an undeveloped country in art or philology (p. 219). Evidence for this proud assertion is the "Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Mexicana," containing translations of all of the major writers of Greece and Rome. Another achievement of the national university was the establishment of its Centro de Estudios Clásicos, the equal of many departments or classical institutions in Europe or Northern America in terms of the quality of its faculty, its publications, its students, and the congresses it has sponsored. The twentieth century also saw the publication of a remarkable classical journal, *Abside*, founded by the remarkable scholar Alfonso Méndez Plancarte and other classicists. For forty years this journal published the articles and translations of the best Mexican classicists, and when it ceased publication, a serious loss was inflicted on Mexican classical studies.

Prof. Herrera closes Part Five with a survey of the works of the contemporary Neo-Latinist Francisco José Cabrera, whom he calls the most mature and productive classical Latin poet of Mexico in the twentieth century (p. 256). As a young man this poet published an epigram to commemorate the second millennium of Horace's death, but he then left poetry for a career in commerce and diplomacy. Upon retiring he returned to the writing of Latin poetry and found his major inspiration in the legends and

history of his own country. Thus to celebrate Pope John Paul's visit to Mexico, he wrote a poem in 698 hexameters, *Laus Guadalupensis*, dedicated to Juan Diego, who witnessed the apparition of the Virgin of Guadalupe.

To celebrate Mexico City's splendid past, he wrote *Mexicus Tenochtitlan. Urbis ortus et mirabilia*, as well as the *Tamoanchan*, which deals with the Mexican Elysium. Another remarkable work is his *Quetzalcoatl*, named after the Toltec cultural hero who left Mexico with the promise to return one day. This myth was exploited by Cortés because many Aztecs thought he was the hero returning as he had promised. Assessing these and other epics on Mexican topics Don Francisco has composed, Professor Herrera concludes that his poems can be considered one of the most important cycles of humanistic poetry from the Americas (p. 267).

I enthusiastically recommend Prof. Herrera's book to anyone who wants to learn about the classical tradition in Mexico. The book is written in an easy style, and anyone with a fair knowledge of Spanish should be able to read it with profit. (Albert R. Baca, California State University, Northridge)

Leon Battista Alberti. *Momus*. Ed. by Virginia Brown and Sarah Knight, trans. by Sarah Knight. I Tatti Renaissance Library, 8. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2003. xxvi + 407 pp. \$29.95.

Giannozzo Manetti. *Biographical Writings*. Ed. and trans. by Stefano U. Baldassarri and Rolf Bagemihl. I Tatti Renaissance Library, 9. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2003. xx + 330 pp. \$29.95. The first of this installment of volumes from the I Tatti Renaissance Library, *Momus*, is a mordant satire that is less well known than a number of other

works by its famous author. Leon Battista Alberti received a good humanist education under Gasparino Barzizza, then began an ecclesiastical career, entering the papal curia in 1431 and accompanying the Pope to the ecumenical council in Ferrara and Florence from 1437 onward. While in Florence and later in Rome, he also associated with such famous artists as Brunelleschi, Ghiberti, Donatello, and Masaccio, adding *De pictura* and *De re aedificatoria* to such other more traditionally humanist works as his *De commodis litterarum atque incommodis*, *Intercenales*, and *Della famiglia*. *Momus* draws ultimately from these life experiences. On the surface Alberti gives us a complex comic narrative that follows the career of Momus, god of fault-finding and the personification of bitter mockery. As such, his main literary models are Lucian, Apuleius, and Aesop, appropriate classical sources for a humanist drawn to irony. His irony, as he states in his preface, is designed to amuse and to instruct, taking its targets from what Alberti knew best. On one level, *Momus* is a satire on the proper government of both *oikos* and *polis*, in that neither Jupiter nor Virtue can control their rowdy families, with authority in the larger world being exercised even more precariously. Most of the printed editions and translations are entitled *De principe*, and *Momus* subverts the conventions of the *speculum principis* tradition as could only have been done by someone who had observed closely what princes, both sacred and secular, really do. Alberti was also involved in the building projects of Pope Nicholas V, so it is no surprise to find *Momus's* Jupiter undertaking “the ultimate design project of universal renewal” (p. xxi). *Momus* has also been read biographically, as a humanist *roman-à-clef*, with Jupiter being decoded as either Pope Eugenius IV or Pope Nicholas V and Momus as

Bartolomeo Fazio or Francesco Filelfo. Perhaps, perhaps not, but in any event, *Momus* adds a dark side to the personality of Alberti while serving as an important precursor to a succession of later Renaissance satires, from works by Erasmus, More, and Rabelais to, ultimately, Cervantes.

For Manetti, too, life and art are closely connected. Born into one of the richest families in Florence, Manetti was first and foremost a merchant. At first it is difficult to reconcile his activities as businessman, writer, and ambassador, first as a rhetorician for the Florentine republic, then as secretary to Nicholas V, the humanist pope, then as a well paid advisor to Alfonso of Aragon, a strikingly authoritarian king. Yet beneath all this was a straightforward, guiding ideology: "power should be celebrated, regardless of its form, as long as law and order are preserved in defense of the Christian faith and in the interests of the mercantile class" (p. xiii). From this perspective the material presented in this volume hangs together. Following a number of early manuscripts and Manetti's own words in a letter to Vespasiano da Bisticci, the editors have joined Manetti's biographies of the 'three crowns of Florence' (Dante, Petrarch, and Boccaccio) to the parallel lives of Socrates and Seneca. The life of Dante joins Boccaccio's contemplative thinker to Brunetti's politically engaged intellectual, leading to a certain inconsistency that may indeed reveal sloppy scholarship but also initiates a patriotic assessment that continues by praising Petrarch for being a kind of humanist father of the church and Boccaccio for participating in the revival of Greek in Florence. The three Florentines are complemented by the two classical philosophers, with Socrates being a kind of prototype of Christ and Seneca being an exemplar of moral dignity. The

editors add extracts from *On Famous Men of Great Age* and *Against the Jews and the Gentiles* to place Manetti's studies of the three early Florentines in the context of his understanding of humanist biography in general.

Like the other volumes in this series, these two offer better texts than the often-modest disclaimers suggest, along with consistently reliable English translations and enough notes to facilitate an informed first reading. This is an excellent series, and I am pleased to note that its initial successes are encouraging the general editor and the press to try to bring out more than the three volumes per year initially targeted. An excellent idea! (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)