



EVENTEENTH-



ENTURY



NEWS

FALL - WINTER 2003

Vol. 61

Nos. 3&4



Including

THE NEO-LATIN NEWS Vol. 51, Nos. 3&4

---

# SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY NEWS

VOLUME 61, Nos. 3&4

FALL-WINTER, 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](mailto: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 E. Garrett, Texas A&M University  
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. 3&4

FALL-WINTER, 2003

### REVIEWS

- Philip West, *Henry Vaughan's Silex Scintillans: Scripture Uses*.  
Review by ALAN RUDRUM ..... 189
- Donald R. Dickson, ed., *Thomas and Rebecca Vaughan's Aqua Vitæ: Non Vitis* Review by ALAN RUDRUM ..... 193
- Abraham Cohen de Herrera, *Gate of Heaven*.  
Review by WILLIAM E. ENGEL ..... 197
- Walter Stephens, *Demon Lovers: Witchcraft, Sex, and the Crisis of Belief*. Review by WILLIAM E. ENGEL ..... 202
- Marsha Keith Schuchard, *Restoring the Temple of Vision: Cabalistic Freemasonry & Stuart Culture*. Review by D. R. DICKSON .... 206
- Lisa M. Gordis. *Opening Scripture: Bible Reading and Interpretive Authority in New England*. Review by IRA CLARK ..... 210
- Richard Greaves. *Glimpses of Glory: Bunyan and English Dissent*.  
Review by U. MILO KAUFMANN ..... 214
- Mary Floyd-Wilson, *English Ethnicity and Race in Early Modern Drama*. Review by JONATHAN BURTON ..... 217
- Katherine O'Donnell and Michael O'Rourke, eds., *Love, Sex, Intimacy, and Friendship Between Men, 1550-1800*. Review by GEORGE KLAWITTER ..... 220
- Marc Berley, ed., *Reading the Renaissance: Ideas and Idioms from Shakespeare to Milton*. Review by FRANCES MALPEZZI ..... 224
- Andrew Barnaby and Lisa J. Schnell, *Literate Experience: The Work of Knowing in Seventeenth-Century English Writing*.  
Review by HUGH WILSON ..... 227
- Douglas Anderson, *Bradford's Books: Of Plymouth Plantation and the Printed Word*. Review by WILLIAM J. SCHEICK ..... 231
- Daniel Patterson, ed., *Taylor's Gods Determinations and Preparatory Meditations*. Review by WILLIAM J. SCHEICK ..... 236

Neil Forsyth, <i>The Satanic Epic</i> . Review by JAMES EGAN .....	240
John Barnard and Donald F. McKenzie, eds., <i>Cambridge History of the Book in Britain</i> . Review by RANDY ROBERTSON .....	245
H. Neville Davies, ed., <i>At Vacant Hours: Poems by Thomas St Nicholas and His Family</i> . Review by A. H. DE QUEHEN .....	252
Mary Elizabeth Ailes, <i>Military Migration and State Formation: The British Military Community in Seventeenth-Century Sweden</i> . Review by LEE SATHER .....	255
A. Houston and S.Pincus, eds, <i>A Nation Transformed: England After the Restoration</i> . Review by CHARLES W. A. PRIOR .....	258
T. Morton and N. Smith, eds., <i>Radicalism in British Literary Culture: From Revolution to Revolution</i> . Review by R. C. TAYLOR .....	261
Michael Winship, <i>Making Heretics: Militant Protestantism and Free Grace in Massachusetts</i> . Review by KONSTANTIN DIERKS .....	264
Matthew Glozier, <i>The Huguenot Soldiers of William of Orange and the Glorious Revolution of 1688: The Lions of Judah</i> . Review by EDWARD M. FURGOL .....	267
Toby Osborne, <i>Dynasty and Diplomacy in the Court of Savoy</i> . Review by MICHAEL R. LYNN .....	271
Gianvittorio Signorotto and Maria A. Visceglia, eds., <i>Court and Politics in Papal Rome</i> . Review by ERMINIA ARDISSINO .....	274
Helen Watanabe-O'Kelly, <i>Court Culture in Dresden: From Renaissance to Baroque</i> . Review by MARIAN MATRICIAN .....	278
Thomas Bürger, ed., <i>Verzeichnis der gedruckten Briefe deutscher Autoren des 17. Jahrhunderts</i> . Review by SUSAN R. BOETTCHER .....	282
Jana Matlová and Jirí Beneš, eds., <i>Johann Valentin Andreae's Theophilus</i> . Review by DONALD R. DICKSON .....	284
Bryan Reynolds, <i>Becoming Criminal: Transversal Performance and Cultural Dissidence in Early Modern England</i> . Review by WILLIAM E. ENGEL .....	286
Johann Anselm Steiger, ed., <i>Johann Gerhard: Erklärung der Historien des Leidens vnnnd Sterbens vnsers Herrn Christi Jesu nach den vier Evangelisten (1611)</i> . Review by SUSAN R. BOETTCHER .....	289
Shankar Raman, <i>Framing 'India': The Colonial Imaginary in Early Modern Culture</i> . Review by NAGENDRA RAO .....	292
Matthew Wikander, <i>Fangs of Malice: Hypocrisy, Sincerity, &amp; Acting</i> .	

Review by SARAH SCOTT .....	295
<i>The Wisest Have Their Fools About Them.</i>	
Review by NANCY BUNKER .....	297
Sidney L. Sondergard, <i>Sharpening Her Pen: Strategies of Rhetorical Violence by Early Modern English Women Writers.</i>	
Review by JANE LYTTON GOOCH .....	300
Christina Luckyj, <i>'A moving Rhetoricke': Gender and Silence in Early Modern England.</i> Review by ELISA OH .....	304
Marie le Jars de Gournay, <i>Apology for the Woman Writing and Other Works.</i> Review by ALISA PLANT .....	307
Andreini, <i>La Mirtilla: A Pastoral.</i>	
Review by NANCY BUNKER .....	310
Joyce Green MacDonald, <i>Women and Race in Early Modern Texts.</i>	
Review by LISA J. SCHNELL .....	313
Valerie Traub, <i>The Renaissance of Lesbianism in Early Modern England.</i> Review by MARIO DIGANGI .....	316
Linda C. Mitchell, <i>Grammar Wars: Language as Cultural Battlefield in England.</i> Review by MELISSA MOHR .....	321
Joan DeJean, <i>The Reinvention of Obscenity: Sex, Lies, and Tabloids in Early Modern France.</i> Review by MELISSA MOHR .....	325
Roger D. Sell, <i>Literature as Communication: The Foundations of Mediating Criticism and Mediating Criticism: Literary Education Humanized.</i> Review by ALAN RUDRUM .....	329
William R. Newman and Lawrence M. Principe, <i>Alchemy Tried in the Fire: Starkey, Boyle, and the Fate of Helmontian Chymistry.</i>	
Review by LUCIANO BOSCHIERO .....	333
Steve Sturdy, ed., <i>Medicine, Health and the Public Sphere in Britain, 1600-2000.</i> Review by CELESTE CHAMBERLAND .....	337
Christopher Baker, ed., <i>Absolutism and the Scientific Revolution: A Biographical Dictionary.</i> Review by IRVING A. KELTER .....	340
Suzanne L. Stratton-Pruitt, ed., <i>Velázquez's "Las Meninas."</i>	
Review by TANYA J. TIFFANY .....	342
NEO-LATIN NEWS .....	346

Philip West. *Henry Vaughan's Silex Scintillans: Scripture Uses*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001. xii + 271 pp. \$70.00. Review by ALAN RUDRUM, SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY.

Henry Vaughan's verse is saturated in biblical reference, and it may seem odd that a book-length study has not appeared before now. Until 1976, Vaughan's editors appeared to think that readers would catch such references for themselves. Even had that been true, to notice a reference does not dispose of questions of interpretation. Certainly, the appearance in 1985 of Chana Bloch's *Spelling the Word: George Herbert and the Bible* might have suggested the need for a similar attack on Vaughan. How many, one wonders, have set out only to be repulsed by the dragon Difficulty? Two British dissertations to my knowledge were never completed, and probably others elsewhere. Philip West's book is then to be welcomed; it appears at a good moment for Vaughan studies, stimulated as they have been in the past few years by the scholarly contributions to *Scintilla*. I shall be recording some disagreements, but my overall impression is easy to summarize: this is a welcome, stimulating, and very intelligent contribution to the discussion of Vaughan's work.

A section which should generate ongoing discussion is the second chapter, "Patriarchs and Pilgrims." It opens with a reminder of Sir Robert Filmer's argument "that royal power was absolute—given directly by God, and placing the monarch above earthly laws—and moreover patriarchal, like a father's power over his family" (23). West points out, in reference to "The Constellation," that Vaughan was "thinking patriarchally when he saw the execution of Charles I as an almost Oedipal monstrosity," and argues that Vaughan's writings "deploy patriarchal figures in a far more politically nuanced fashion than his modern readers have realized" (25). Without question, West has given more thought to Vaughan's meditation on the patriarchs than previous critics, and the resulting discussion is of great interest, though in some instances his revisionist conclusions may be overstated. He points out that in *The Mount of Olives* (1652) and in the 1655 *Silex Scintillans*,

“Vaughan draws on the Protestant view that Jacob is a type of the invisible church of the elect, forced to flee into the desert to escape Esau’s murderous revenge . . . in the 1650s, the fleeing elect are suffering Anglicans, forced out of God’s church by reprobate rebels” (25-26). He considers, however, that this view has been incorrectly ascribed to the earlier *Silex* (1650) and his extended discussion of “Regeneration,” the opening poem of the 1650 *Silex*, headed “JACOBS BED” takes issue with the argument of Summers and Pebworth that “*Jacob’s bed*” is a “church in nature” (34). He sees it rather as a figure for the holiness of churches—“a strongly Anglican idea in an age when Puritans increasingly disdained ecclesiastical buildings” (25). West points out that the Ordinance of 1645 putting the *Directory for Public Worship* into practice asserted flatly that “no place is capable of any holiness under pretence of whatsoever Dedication or Consecration” and sees “Regeneration” as “belonging to an Anglican tradition of revering churches which became highly unacceptable to Puritans at precisely the time Vaughan turned to God” (40). He considers that Summers and Pebworth misinterpret the historical context of the poem and concludes that Ruth Preston Lehmann got it right in arguing that *Jacobs Bed* is not “a grove that resembles a church, but a church interpreted as a grove” (40). Unfortunately, most of West’s readers will be unable to evaluate Lehmann’s argument, in a Ph.D. thesis of 1942, for he simply quotes her conclusion from Ross Garner’s *Henry Vaughan: Experience and the Tradition* (1959).

The historical evidence seems less clear to me than it does to West. Churches in South Wales may not have been closed by the time Vaughan wrote “Regeneration,” but a good deal had happened which might be held to support the view of Summers and Pebworth, rather than that of Lehmann. The attack on Anglican forms of worship was initiated well before the 1651 Act for the Propagation of the Gospel in Wales, and Royalist incumbents were ejected well before then too: sequestrations were carried out under military authority in Brecknock as early as 1645, and in Bedfordshire Thomas Vaughan’s father-in-law, Timothy Archer, was dispossessed some time before October 15, 1644 and imprisoned in the Fleet for



eighteen years (Donald Dickson, ed., *Aqua Vitæ: Non Vitis*, [reviewed below] xix). Much of the literary evidence in my view works against West's interpretation, for example the way in which the natural world is treated as sacred space in "Rules and Lessons," which is also in the 1650 *Silex*; Anglican approval of the work of Boehme, who constantly exhorted his readers to seek God in Nature; clear evidence that both Thomas and Henry Vaughan, in opposition to the Calvinists of their time who interpreted the non-human world in purely instrumental terms, saw Christ's redemption as being for the whole Creation; and the close relationship between "Regeneration" and the Vision of Thalia in Thomas Vaughan's *Lumen de Lumine*, in which the protagonist found himself "in a Grove of Bays. The Texture of the Branches was so even, the Leaves so thick, and in that conspiring order, it was not a wood, but a Building. I conceived it indeed to be the Temple of Nature, where she had joyn'd Discipline to her Doctrine" (Alan Rudrum, ed., *The Works of Thomas Vaughan*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984: 304). I discussed the imagistic and intellectual relationship between "Regeneration" and this work of Thomas Vaughan's in a 1963 essay with which West does not engage.

In his introductory chapter West asserts that his critical reorientation is not in conflict with other approaches, in particular "the long tradition of attention to Vaughan's alchemical and hermetic imagery" (5). However, he might have done well to give that "long tradition" rather more attention, since Vaughan's use of Scripture (the passages he evokes, and the meanings he elicits) is often connected with hermeticism. This is so, for example, in his use of Romans 8:19-22, the New Testament's most important passage on the theology of nature. West's inattention to this aspect of Vaughan's work becomes clear when he writes, of a 1989 article of mine, that it "falters only where it tries to read for doctrine poems whose emphasis is firmly on *discipline*" (120). Discipline and doctrine are not so easily separated, as the quotation from Thomas Vaughan above suggests, and it is a demonstrable fact that both the Vaughans enunciated *doctrines* which are biblical, closely related to doctrines set forth by hermetic authors such as Paracelsus; relatable, if some-

what idiosyncratically, to contemporary Anglicanism; and plainly opposed to the neo-Calvinism of their time. I invite readers to read Vaughan's "The Book," and then the article to which West refers, and, if they think me mistaken on this point, to let me know where and why.

Naturally, in his chapter "Patriarchs and Pilgrims," West deals with "Isaac's Marriage" of which he writes that "it is the only text which Vaughan decided to revise for the 1655 edition of *Silex*, suggesting that he continued to value and want to perfect it" (53-54). He goes on to say that Vaughan "requested" that 'Isaacs Marriage' be reset with alterations, adding in a note that this interpretation is based upon internal evidence (64 and n. 6). These remarks need to be put into context. The first part of the 1655 edition of Henry Vaughan's *Silex Scintillans* is made up of unsold sheets of the 1650 edition, with the exception of leaves B2 and B3, which were reprinted. These leaves run from line 75 of "The Search," the poem before "Isaac's Marriage," to the end of "The British Church," which immediately follows it. The latter, a poem of some twenty lines, is thus the only complete poem, apart from "Isaac's Marriage," on those leaves. Four brief passages of "Isaac's Marriage" are amended and one error introduced. What West writes, of course, makes some sense. Vaughan's introduction of revisions does indeed suggest that he continued to value the poem. However, the phrase "the only text which Vaughan decided to revise" is misleading, in carrying the implication that Vaughan valued the poem uniquely. The likeliest explanation for the revisions is that those sheets were spoiled in the printing house and for that reason Vaughan was asked to supply fresh copy. Given the opportunity, he may well have wished to revise a number of poems, but publishers were no more likely than they are now to accede to the wishes of an author whose work had already left them with unsold sheets on their hands. I have recently published an article on this poem, in the German journal *Connotations*, and will here confine myself to saying that the ecstatic description of Isaac's prayer, followed by the extended simile beginning at line 53, are both quintessential Vaughan and at some remove from the biblical account.

Its sexually-charged and masculine language (of undressing, piercing, scattering) calls into question West's description of the poem as a "curiously prim meditation on the nuptials of Jacob's father," as the wording of that description fails to take into account the significance of the marriage of Isaac in biblical typology. Jean Daniélou's *From Shadows to Reality* appears in West's bibliography, and might have been usefully drawn upon in discussion of "Isaacs Marriage."

In general, however, this book is so enlivening to read because its author has clearly made good use of, and enjoyed, his opportunity for research. I liked especially his exposition of the evidence that Royalists connected Charles Stuart, who was crowned King of Scotland in 1651, with the suffering Jacob. The Stone of Destiny was thought to be the same one on which Jacob had slept at Bethel. That Charles could not sit on it at his coronation, because it had been removed to Westminster in 1297, would, West suggests, have symbolized to Vaughan the disturbance of the patriarchal line from Jacob's day. Whatever particular reservations one might have, West's discussion of Vaughan's meditation on the patriarchs, and their relevance to contemporary Anglican sufferings, is an important contribution to understanding.

Donald R. Dickson, ed. *Thomas and Rebecca Vaughan's Aqua Vita: Non Vitis* (British Library MS, Sloane 1741). Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2001. liii + 270 pp. \$35.00  
Review by ALAN RUDRUM, SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY.

Insofar as modern students of literature are aware of Thomas Vaughan (1621-1666), it is as the twin brother of the poet Henry Vaughan. Yet during his lifetime, being of a more swashbuckling disposition, he made more stir in the world than did Henry. His work was known outside Great Britain and was read in German translation through the eighteenth century. Substantial extracts were copied into commonplace books on both sides of the Atlantic. Like his twin, he published prolifically during the period 1650-1655 and is generally regarded as the most notable alchemical or

“occult” philosopher after Robert Fludd. Henry Vaughan wrote that Thomas had given all his books and manuscripts to Sir Robert Moray, the first President of the Royal Society. The only manuscript known to have survived is a notebook of personal records and alchemical recipes, now in the British Library, and now printed in its entirety for the first time, in a diplomatic edition, with a substantial biographical, contextual and textual introduction, a useful glossary of alchemical terms, and a bibliography.

The Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies series is to be congratulated and thanked for this volume. Nothing by Thomas Vaughan has ever appeared in so handsome a format. Donald Dickson, too, is to be congratulated and thanked. Sloane MS 1741, if not quite in the Aubrey league, still has its difficulties, and Dickson’s editorial competence has navigated them splendidly. Beyond that, and perhaps even more impressive, is the archival research which underlies the introduction. We might expect archival competence from the author of *The Tessera of Antilia*, but we also know how inhibiting the law of diminishing returns can be when we contemplate biographical data which has been raked over in detail by our forerunners, in this case Gwenllian Morgan and Louise Guiney, F. E. Hutchinson, Thomas Willard, and the present reviewer.

I am writing these words on April 17, the date on which Thomas Vaughan’s wife, Rebecca, died: “My most deare wife sickened on Friday in the Evening, being the 16 of April, and dyed the Saturday following in the Evening, being the 17. And was buried on the 26 of the same Month, being a Monday in the afternoon, at Mappersall in Bedfordshire. 1658.” This is just about where one of Dickson’s impressive pieces of archival research begins. It has, of course, long been surmised that the place of burial was also the place of Rebecca’s birth. There is independent confirmation that “Rebecka, the Wife of Mr. Vahanne”, was indeed buried at Meppershall in Bedfordshire on April 26, 1658; but who was she? One clue lies in a letter of 1652 from the alchemist George Starkey to Robert Boyle giving the news that Thomas Vaughan had married the daughter of a certain cleric of no fortune: “Philosophus

maximus Thomas Vaughan nuperimme uxorem duxit, clerici cuiusdam filiam, nullius fortunam." We know from Sloane 1741 that Thomas and Rebecca were married on 28 September 1651. Using a revision of another early source, *Walker Revised*, Dickson discovered that the rector of Meppershall, Dr. Timothy Archer, had eleven children; though only nine of them are accounted for in the baptismal records, we know the name of a tenth (Marie), and as Dickson has shown we can deduce from the intervals between the known births when the eleventh, Rebecca, is likely to have been born. Archer's wife was named Rebecca; Dickson points out that the Archers seemed especially fond of using family names, and "there was a daughter named Rebecca in every generation of every branch at this time." So far, so good, but so what, some might ask, who have not taken in T.S. Eliot on the importance of facts. In this case the answer is that we now have yet more evidence of the "ultra" and intransigent Royalism of the Vaughan family and those with whom they were allied. According to *Walker Revised*, Timothy Archer was dispossessed by the Parliamentarians sometime before 15 October 1644 and imprisoned in the Fleet for eighteen years. This fits in with just about everything else we know of the friends of Henry and Thomas Vaughan—in the case of Thomas, for example, his close friendship with Thomas Henshaw.

Thomas Vaughan himself was evicted under the Act for the Propagation of the Gospel in Wales in 1650; the charges as given by Dickson (xiii) are a little less racy than those in Bodleian MS Walker E.7, fol. 213b, where he was described as a common drunkard, a common swearer, no preacher, a whoremaster, and in armes personally against the Parliament." Dickson remarks that in the MS notebook Vaughan himself suggests that the charge of drunkenness may have been accurate, but he does not deal with the accusation that he was a "whoremaster" ("Incontinency" in the account he quotes). Dickson points out that charges of scandalous living were levelled in more than twenty per cent of the cases reported by Walker, but does not fully discuss the possible implications of the fact that the charges against Thomas Vaughan were more serious than those against any other Breconshire incumbent. I draw upon

this fact in a discussion of his twin brother Henry's poems of mourning in an essay soon to be published.

Dickson quite rightly stresses Thomas Vaughan's obvious devotion to, and respect for, his wife; and the fact that she was his co-worker and Muse in the alchemical enterprise (she was not alone among women of the time in her alchemical work—Hartlib wrote that Henshaw's father was a "great chymist" and "so is his mother who is yet alive"). This, and the format of the MS from the date of her death on, is the rationale for Dickson's ascription of joint authorship of Sloane 1741. While his emphasis on the importance of the relationship in Thomas's endeavours is accurate enough, it leads him, I think, to downplay a little the intellectual bond between Thomas and his twin brother Henry. He writes that while Stevie Davies's view that "Henry's psyche was forged in the crucible of twinship" has sparked considerable interest in the nature of the twins' relationship, there is "little evidence, i.e. intertextual references in their writings, of this bond" (xi). While it is true that Henry's poems have more references to the Bible and to Herbert than to Thomas Vaughan, intertextual references we do find are significant: for example a major poem of Henry's ("Regeneration") has an important relationship with a major passage of Thomas's, the vision of Thalia in *Lumen de Lumine*. I have dealt with this, from Henry's side, in "Henry Vaughan and the theme of transfiguration," *Southern Review* (Adelaide) No. 1 (1963): 54-68; and from Thomas's side in "Thomas Vaughan's *Lumen de Lumine*. An Interpretation of Thalia" (Luanne Frank, ed., *Literature and the Occult*, Arlington: University of Texas, 1977: 234-243). In such important matters as their view of childhood, and their views on God's concern for the non-human creation, the Vaughans were at one, and at odds with majority opinion of their time. The first doctrine Thomas announces is that of the pre-existence, and the royalty, of the soul: a clear attack on Calvinist views. Like his brother Henry, he praised the state of childhood, but stressed the child's desire for knowledge rather than his innocence. Again, as in Henry's work, the historical figure of Jesus is less important to Vaughan than was Christ conceived cosmically, as in St. John's Prologue and in

Colossians 1:17. Christ's redemption is for the whole Creation—again, in mid-seventeenth century England, an anti-Calvinist position (*Anthroposophia Theomagica*, 56). See also, in this respect, *Euphrates*, 517-518: "I fear not to say, that *Nature* is so much the business of *Scripture*, that to me, the *Spirit of God*, in those sacred Oracles, seems not only to mind the *Restitution of Man* in particular, but even the *Redemption of Nature* in *generall*. We must not therefore *confine* this *Restitution* to our own *Speciè*" (references to the Clarendon Press edition).

In my edition of Thomas Vaughan's *Works*, only the personal entries of Sloane 1741 were reprinted, partly through cheeseparing on the part of the Clarendon Press, partly because enquiries I made among historians of alchemy turned up nobody who could make sense of the alchemical "recipes." The clue to his intentions, however, is clear from the fact that the physician Henry Vaughan thought of himself and his twin brother as having practised the same profession: "My brothers employm<sup>t</sup> was in physic and Chymistrie . . . My profession also is physic." Dickson's account of the Vaughans' relationship to the iatrochemical revolution inaugurated by Paracelsus forms a substantial and significant part of his introduction, and, if justification were needed, justifies the reproduction of the notebook in its entirety. It is good to have so faithful a transcription of the manuscript I have pored over so many times, and always with a complex sensation compounded of affinity with, and unbridgeable distance from, the man whose pen marked the pages so idiosyncratically.

Abraham Cohen de Herrera. *Gate of Heaven*. Translated from the Spanish with Introduction and Notes by Kenneth Krabbenhoft. Leiden, Boston, and Köln: Brill, 2002. xxxiv + 548 pp. + 1 illustration. □135.00 / \$169.00. Review by WILLIAM E. ENGEL.

Scholars working in history of philosophy, kabbalah, *marrano* culture, and Spanish literature, at last have ready access to Herrera's *Gate of Heaven*. Not only is this the first English translation of *Puerta del Cielo*, but it is also the first complete annotated edition of

this important work of Jewish mysticism in any language. As such, and insofar as it is unique both in the history of kabbalah and of Spanish literature (for having been written in the vernacular), it is a true landmark in scholarship, and one that reflects well on Brill's commitment to publish important works such as this one in its relatively new series, "Studies in European Judaism."

Abraham Cohen de Herrera (d. 1635), a merchant and son of a rabbi, originally wrote this book in Spanish for the *marrano* community of Amsterdam, "to rescue the truth and beauty of kabbalah from the neglect of philosophers and the obscurantism of kabbalists that, in his opinion, kept it out of reach of many interested readers" (xvii-xviii). He follows closely the syncretic model of Marsilio Ficino and Pico della Mirandola in reconciling the teachings of the *Sefer Yesirah* (traditionally attributed to Abraham, but probably written between the third and ninth centuries), the *Sefer ha-Zohar* (a masterpiece of Spanish kabbalah written by Moses de Leon in the late thirteenth-century), Moses Cordovero, Isaac Luria Ashkenazi and the Lurianic school (in particular, as transmitted through Israel Sarug), with Aristotelian, Platonic, and Neoplatonic metaphysics, medieval Islamic and Jewish theology, and Scholasticism. His expository style in large measure accounts for why his work has had an impact on thinkers like Spinoza, Leibniz, Henry More and the group of divines known as the Cambridge Platonists, Hegel and later German Idealists, and more recently kabbalistic scholars such as Gershom Scholem.

Kenneth Krabbenhoft is to be commended for bringing this work back into circulation for new readers. Like Herrera, he is an exemplary guide. His notes are clear and his translations and transliterations allow for a leisurely swim in occasionally deep philosophical waters. His notes, if excerpted and published separately, could be the basis of a helpful *Who's Who* in Medieval and Renaissance Philosophy (especially, for example, regarding the Neoplatonists and Jewish Scholastics, 112-13). What is more, whole sections of Ficino are given in the original Latin, and Pico in Italian, so the specialist can see where Herrera was drawing his material and upon what foundation building his arguments. And since



the bulk of Herrera's sources were in Latin, a detailed future study of his quotations from Greek sources in early modern Latin translations could well supply a more thorough understanding of the pan-European intellectual climate.

*Gate of Heaven* derives its title from a passage in Genesis (28:17): "This is none other than the house of God, and this is the gate of heaven." It is divided into ten books, perhaps as a reflection of the volume's main subject, the *sefirot*, the ten points of divine emanation—the manifestations of the uncaused First Cause ('*Ein-Sof*). Book One is as comprehensive and straightforward an introduction to kabbalah as you are likely to find anywhere. The reader is made aware of alternative paths in the transmission of kabbalistic teachings, but is not made to choose one strand of the tradition to the exclusion of another. For example, in Proposition XVI, Herrera tells the reader: "This is the most approved and widely accepted ordering of the sovereign sefirot" (24). One potentially confusing point comes up, however, when Herrera introduces *Din* (meaning rigor, or letter-of-the-law justice, and signifying an aspect of the fifth emanation) without linking it to its more prominent name, *Geburah* (strength), but this is cleared up in Krabbenhof's note (25) and is discussed later by Herrera himself (204). This method of making sure the reader is allowed to follow the larger themes without becoming bogged down in basic points that Herrera assumes his readers will know makes the volume a delight to read. In this regard Krabbenhof is as accommodating to his readers as Herrera open-hearted to his.

Book Two considers how and for what purpose the 'Ein-Sof caused all things—no small topic indeed. It takes up where Book One left off regarding the question of to what end the uncaused First Cause "wishes to manifest itself . . . and thereby emerges from concealment" (8). It thus considers why "it extended itself into all things and all places and times in which they could be, had been, are or would be, without implying any contradiction and out of the enormity of its active potency, which is not separate from itself, so that when it wished it produced them again out of its free and eternal will without any alteration, giving them the being

they had so utterly lacked" (63). Despite long sentences like this one, the author pretty much covers all of the requisite definitions and contingencies in very direct prose. It is this clarity of thought and philosophical rigor that allows him to advance important points in Western metaphysics. Once the conditions of his argument are set forth, the reader can trust whatever is proved and revealed, even the most abstruse points of *gematria*, a hermeneutic technique based on number combinations using the twenty-two letters of the Hebrew alphabet (67). This is especially the case when we come face to face, in Book Two, with the Ineffable Name, the Tetragrammaton, the unpronounceable four-letter name of God, analogous to the Hidden God (*Deus absconditus*) of the Neoplatonic and Christian mystical traditions.

With the main foundation thus prepared for the treatise, Book Three clarifies that the First Cause "is not a numerical source of unity" (93), and concludes with arguments that it is infinite, and that it is the supreme Good (95, 103). Having proved the transcendence of the First Cause and the role of its instruments (namely, the sefirot), in Book Four, Herrera turns his attention to the metaphorical union of the sefirot in the form of the Primordial Man (106). This is the book that owes its greatest debts to, and sums up key arguments from, Pico, Ficino, Sanchez, and Scaliger; and, as such, will be of special interest to intellectual historians. Book Five is a *tour de force* of scholastic argumentation, deducing and describing eight kinds of infinity, "only three of which are applicable to the First Cause" (140). Aristotle's *Physics* is the touchstone initially, but Neoplatonic thought carries the day, especially that of Plotinus and Ficino. It is in this book that Platonic anamnesis and the doctrine of the transmigration of soul are mentioned in passing, with respect to the body's death. The larger interest here though resides in conceptualizing the channels of emanation and trajectory of sefirot as "irradiations, extensions, and communications of the Deity" (174). In recounting how sefirot descend from their limitless source through many ranks, Herrera humbly defers to the "true reception" of those kabbalistic expositors who, "having

understood it well, have revealed it, and whose disciple I would fain to be" (174).

Highlights of Book Six include Herrera's discussions of the colors of sefirot depending on their operations (205), and of beauty, which, as Krabbenhoft notes, parallels Socrates's exposition in Plato's *Symposium* (233). Book Seven continues to answer potential objections and goes on to explain how the sovereign emanation resembles the production of illumination which, depending on light, is communicated to diaphanous effects, colors, and eyes. This book reiterates an important claim outlined in the opening chapters: that emanation, procession, and result are not strictly speaking creation, birth, or invention. Indeed, the 'Ein-Sof is said to fill the sefirot with itself "as if with light, it is present in them and deeply infused into them" (310). Book Eight is a thorough summa of the mystical teachings concerning the "superior lights above the ten sefirot" as discussed in the *Sefer Yesirah* and *Zohar*. Book Nine continues in this vein by reporting on some of the "qualities and excellencies of the Man of the ineffable Tetragrammaton" (392).

As I am something of a novice in the study of kabbala, these two books, along with the final one, seemed the most esoteric; though, to be sure, the ones which no doubt will provide the greatest rewards when I return to them in the future. For it is in these final books that we learn about "Reversion," the last phase in Herrera's kabbalistic plan, through his discussion of the Lurianic mystical doctrines of "the shattering of the vessels" and "the restoration of the faces." The two phases preceding reversion concern, first, the nature and activity of the Transcendent Cause, and then procession, which concerns emanation and "shrinking," or the accommodation of 'Ein-Sof to fill and interfuse vessels according to their proper attributes. Reversion accounts for the existence of the lower worlds, including imperfection and evil. Herrera uses the image of a shattering of the divine perfection when it is communicated downward toward the realm of physicality to set up his exposition of how the mental spirits descend to give life to the earthly body and how the fallen vessels, imperfect and prone to evil, finally are raised up and perfected.

The ten-page glossary is extremely useful, especially because of the special meanings associated with key philosophical terms, such as, for example, infinity, procession, and undiminished bestowal. Readers who have specific arguments and themes they wish to pursue will benefit immeasurably from the 19-page index summing up each chapter. But the delight received from working through Herrera's analysis and reconciliation of kabbalistic contemplation with Luria's doctrine of "the spark of the lights," communicated admirably through Krabbenhoff's clear translation, will bring other rewards as well. The reader might just end up fathoming something about the sefirot or the place of real existence, and momentarily see beyond the unreliable and fleeting, like something glimpsed in a mirror "which really exists in one place but is reflected in another" (471). This book gives the attentive reader a way to follow the trajectory of just such an image back to its source—in every sense of the term.

Walter Stephens. *Demon Lovers: Witchcraft, Sex, and the Crisis of Belief*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002. xv + 451 pp. + 16 halftones + 2 diagrams. Cloth \$35.00; Paper \$20.00. Review by WILLIAME. ENGEL.

Walter Stephens has written a truly significant book on the origin of witches and the underlying philosophy giving rise to early modern demonology and skepticism. Owing to his rigorous analysis and painstaking translations of original materials (mostly written between 1430 and 1530), he debunks many lingering scholarly myths. For example, he points out how those who must rely on translations and modern editions of the oft-cited *Malleus maleficarum* (*Hammer of Witches*) receive a skewed view, based on only several (though to be sure, important) sections, thus "distorting their understanding of every aspect of the book, starting with misogyny" (33).

And yet, as Stephens is quick to point out, questions of sex and gender are central to witchcraft, though in ways not generally assumed. Specifically, necromancers were not stereotyped as sex

partners of demons, not simply because they were men but because, being men, they could read. Since most women were illiterate, their sexuality was the only real trait that literate men could imagine bringing them into contact with demons (53). It is this type of careful reasoning that leads him to probe further still, to explain why women, cast in the roles of unwilling “field-workers” for judges and inquisitors, needed to be seen as coming into contact with demons. It concerned, as the subtitle announces, the larger “Crisis of Belief.” For, as he wraps up this point in a detailed analysis of Marlowe’s *Doctor Faustus*, only “physical contact with an embodied demon can prove that hell and the soul exist, that the soul is a *substance* that can be bought and sold, contracted away like any other *thing*” (354).

Without the proof of a devil, there can be no proof of God—which was phrased with terrifying lucidity by very late defenders of witch-hunting: *Nullus Deus, sine diabolo* (341). Owing to the necessary belief in the devil then, by a kind of palindromic logic, God’s presence can be inferred even when his works are imperceptible. And so “[t]o deny that devils and witches can cooperate or copulate is to deny that devils can demonstrate their reality and to accept that they must in some sense be imaginary, including the possibility that they are totally nonexistent” (75). Thus the logic of the “witchcraft theorists” (as Stephens astutely terms the inquisitors, jurists, and writers of treatises—to whom he devotes the first six pages of his magisterial twenty-one-page bibliography) followed “the logic inherent in orthodox sacramental theory” (266).

Thus Stephens argues convincingly that early modern witchcraft is less about sexuality and gender *per se*, and more about metaphysics and theology. The men who brought about these legal proceedings are “*metaphysical* voyeurs. They scrutinize bodies hoping to glimpse ‘spirit’” (347). By shifting the ground on the way much witch-scholarship has been conducted, *Demon Lovers* demonstrates, for example, how accusations of witches drinking broth made from babies was seen as, properly speaking, “antisacramental activity” (200). As an interesting side-light, Stephens points out important differences between the presumed

desecration of the host on the part of Jews and of witches: Jews gave voice to the skepticism about the reality of transubstantiation, demonstrating “real presence,” while witches confirmed its truth through topsy-turvy applications in their rites. By “vilifying the Jew, the narrator condemned and atoned for his own doubts, camouflaging the projection with time-honored theologically sanctioned stereotypes and hatreds of Jews” (214).

To be sure though, this anxiety over the Eucharist’s reality was a principal motive for theorists finding demon lovers for witches. But other anxieties are being exorcised as well, such as the unexplained death of children, especially unbaptized infants. This raises important issues (in Chapter Nine, “Witches, Infanticide, and Power”) regarding the need to account for perceived gaps in God’s plan by making special places in purgatory. One of the main theorists examined by Stephens, Bartolomeo Spina, concludes his treatise with the suggestion “that the phenomenon of infant death was the principal stimulus behind the need to believe in the reality of witchcraft” (249).

Throughout, in his recounting of the main theorists’ views, such as those by Kramer whose name is inseparable from the *Malleus*, Stephens judiciously repeats phrases like “assuming he did not invent the entire story” (289). Likewise, since “the dialogue between defendants and prosecutors was governed by an unfair balance of power, particularly where torture was used,” Stephens repeatedly applies the crucial legal question to get to the bottom of things: “Cui bono,” which is to say, “whose interests were best served by a particular confession” (7). In the process, Stephens uncovers some important points of origination relating to and associated with the identification of witches, such as screech-owls, black cats, boiling cauldrons, and flying broom-sticks (transvection), as well as locating subtle shifts in the iconographic portrayal of witches and their otherwise invisible activities.

Stephens’s reasoned approach to the question of why witches appeared on the world stage when they did, from the twelfth century up through the seventeenth, as a class of people to be targeted and questioned, supports his view that a “desire to be convinced of

the reality of spirit was the psychic glue that held the witch myth together . . . . This conceptual adhesive accounts for otherwise puzzling resemblances between myths about witches, Jews, necromancers, and heretics" (366). Further, this gives rise to the irony, not lost on Stephens, that "both the skeptic and the witch existed in the mind of the theologian long before they were found in external reality. In fact, the theologian's witch never existed externally, but the skeptic became an increasing real presence."

In the end, then, witchcraft theory was theological damage control. And the legacy is still very much with us, as Stephens points out from entries in the Catholic Encyclopedia, as well as with reference to "modern fundamentalist Christians professing shock and horror at demonic influences in Halloween celebrations or the Harry Potter novels." Furthermore, in "alien abduction, as in witchcraft, the corporality of the alleged encounters is prized as conclusive proof of *reality*, provoking strong emotions and allegedly unshakable beliefs in humans who 'confess' to interviewers" (367-8). To be sure though, the "solitary witches who call themselves alien abductees perform no *maleficia* [deeds of harmful magic] and have their own peculiar breed of kindly inquisitors among specialized psychiatrists."

By bringing us up to the present, Stephens ends with a clarion call to find new answers using the old *Cui bono*: "To what degree does Christian mortality continue to be invoked, even in post-Christian, secularized forms, to reinforce belief in spirits and human immortality?" (371). Tough questions like this one make *Demon Lovers* a landmark in intellectual history. With Stephens as our guide, we can continue to ponder with early theorists, following Aquinas, such questions as: "How can a body that is not real have real sex?" (65). Accordingly, this book will change the way we discuss early modern witchcraft, sex, and the crisis of belief.

Marsha Keith Schuchard. *Restoring the Temple of Vision: Cabalistic Freemasonry and Stuart Culture*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2002. *Studies in Intellectual History*, vol. 110. xiii + 845 pp. \$281. Review by DONALD R. DICKSON, TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY.

*Restoring the Temple of Vision* paints a fascinating sketch of the early history of Freemasonry that flourished in lodges in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries by tracing its roots to medieval Jewish sources and Scottish sources of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Schuchard details “the flights of visionary Temple building” that are described in the rituals and symbolism of “high-degree” Masonry to various architectural and religious documents. Academic historians have shied away from this subject—with the exception of David Stevenson’s *The Origins of Freemasonry: Scotland’s Century, 1590–1710* (Cambridge, 1988)—because there are so few facts. Masonic histories are plentiful but these are seldom taken seriously since they can offer little in the way of credible, textual evidence to buttress most of their claims. Such is the case here. Schuchard, in a manner reminiscent of Dame Frances Yates, does an able job of stitching together a readable and often highly detailed story (the text runs to nearly 800 pages); finally, though, *Restoring the Temple of Vision* must be accounted as a possible representation—rather than a definitive one—due to the lack of hard evidence.

The reach of *Restoring the Temple of Vision* is impressive, for Schuchard begins her story, as most Masonic versions do, with the legends surrounding the building of the temples in ancient Israel, beginning with Solomon’s master-mason, Hiram Abif, continuing through the founding of Jewish building guilds led by priest-masons overseeing the renovation of the Herodian temple that was destroyed in A.D. 70. She also links Jewish mystical traditions of the Middle Ages with its emphasis on architectural symbolism featuring the craftsman with a hammer to show how ancient temple mysticism took on an “operative significance” (42). She emphasizes, for example, the role of Abraham Abulafia (1240–1292) whose practices led to discoveries in “visionary Cabala” in the *Sepher*



*Yetzirah* (49), especially its erotic symbolism. Thus the ancient sources for this secret brotherhood run from the earliest temple through these Cabalistic treatises with their architectonic visions of the creation of the cosmos, to the legendary Knights Templar, Jewish artisan guilds, and into Renaissance memory systems that were predicated on “memory palaces.”

In subsequent chapters she constructs a foundation myth for Scottish Masonry, using such figures as Michael Scot, whom she regards a conduit for Arab theosophical methods to the West, Roger Bacon, Duns Scotus, and Ramon Llull. In an effort to firm up the tenuous links between Scottish operative masons and the Knights Templar, she cites an unpublished article by Ron Heisler who argues that a payment in Edward I's accounts for 1278 for the employment of one “Brother John of the Order of St. Thomas of Acre” (83) proves that architectural knowledge from the east found its way into Scotland. Then using Masonic histories she asserts that with this powerful Masonic presence in Scotland, Masonic kings rebuild the “Temple in the North,” especially during the reign of James I. Schuchard takes as fact what only Masonic historians accept as settled, i.e., James Stuart's association with cabalistic figures from his youth. In a note on page 237, she observes that Stevenson himself is skeptical of the claim about James I's initiation, but she sees no reason to reject the claims of the Masonic lodge involved. This is the heart of the matter: she does not discriminate in her use of sources and relies heavily on Masonic historians who have no credible documentation before the seventeenth century, so legend passes into fact too readily at times. In her analysis, every building becomes an emblem of the temple; every reference to a lamp or a building tool serves as further proof; every reference to the words “essay” or “apprentice” prefigures the initiatory rituals of Freemasonry (200). While the temple-building metaphor has undeniable power, not all references to the temple mean Masons are near: witness George Herbert's *The Temple: Sacred Poems and Private Ejaculations*.

Still *Restoring the Temple of Vision* offers a compelling case for some kind of esoteric subculture in Scotland and to a lesser degree

the Stuart court in Whitehall based on the sheer volume of circumstantial evidence she adduces. As Stevenson shows in his more circumspect account, *The Origins of Freemasonry*, Masonry emerged in Scotland in the seventeenth century, with its social and ritual elements originating in the stonemason's guilds of the Middle Ages. While copies of the so-called "Old Charges"—the legendary history of the craft recited at guild meetings that traced masonry back to the sons of Lamech in Genesis who founded geometry and the masons who built the temple of Solomon—can be found in England as early as 1400, there is simply no hard evidence that "speculative" Masonry existed at that time. Not until about 1600 would the distinctive organization that continues to this day, based on the lodge system—i.e., elaborate, symbolic rituals and secrets involving the "Mason Word"—emerge in Scotland and begin to attract the devotion of those who were not practicing stonemasons. While many claims are pressed by partisan historians who wish to trace their ancestry back to the pillars on which the ancient wisdom were carved and that were found after the Great Flood, the first hard evidence, as Stevenson shows, dates to the seventeenth century and the career of William Schaw, Master of Works for James VI of Scotland. At this time modern Freemasonry can be said to have originated.

Schuchard, too, regards Schaw as central in establishing the lodge system, though she argues that the motive force was provided by King James VI of Scotland, who made Schaw his General Warden of the Craft, and instructed him to revamp the entire structure of Freemasonry into what it became today. She cites Stevenson on the significance of the records in 1619 for the Masons' Company of London, which are "the best early evidence of institutionalized Masonic initiation of some sort in England" (332) but she supposes an extraordinary range of Masonic activities in the person of the king whom she believes to have been initiated into Freemasonry at the Lodge of Scoon and Perth in 1601 at the age of 35.

To this nascent Masonic revival, Schuchard connects the speculations of Yates' *Rosicrucian Enlightenment* (1972), who finds evidence of the political reach of this secret fraternity everywhere in

Central Europe, in much the same way that Freemasons or Illuminati were seen as the secret hands behind later events in European history. My own views of Yates are a matter of record (see "Johann Valentin Andreae's Utopian Brotherhoods," *Renaissance Quarterly* 49 [1996]: 860-902). Suffice it to say, that Yates offers little to substantiate her claims, which Schuchard largely accepts, save for Yates's assumptions about Johann Valentin Andreae's opposition to James's peace-making efforts (343). While many in the early seventeenth century step forward to claim membership in the mystical brotherhood described in the so-called Rosicrucian pamphlets that were written in the century's first decade, no one has offered any credible evidence of an actual Rosicrucian society involved in any political initiatives in Central Europe during the Thirty Years' War.

In a book of this scope—and my review only focuses on a portion of its many subjects due to the limitations of space—there is ample room for error; and this author is not immune. These range from small spelling errors (such as "cousel" for counsel on 78, "staes" for states on 209, or "Nüremberg" for either Nürnberg or Nuremberg on 380) to minor factual errors (such as "1617" instead of 1517 on 132 or attributing the translation of the Rosicrucian tracts to Thomas Vaughan on 287, when he was the publisher). The index is lengthy (eighteen pages) but restricted to references in the text, which limits its utility since so much discussion is carried out in the voluminous notes. Yet despite my reservations about many of the bold claims made in *Restoring the Temple of Vision*, the story told over "grows to something of great constancy." She offers a view of Stuart intellectual circles that emphasizes mystical male bonding and spiritual *amicitia* that rings true. Readers will find much of interest in the connections made with Freemasonry and Solomonic architecture, Hermetic masques, and early modern science. They will gain insight into the reigns of the Stuart monarchs, and new areas for future research will be opened.

Lisa M. Gordis. *Opening Scripture: Bible Reading and Interpretive Authority in Puritan New England*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2003. xi + 309 pp. \$39.00. Review by IRA CLARK, UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA.

*Opening Scripture* puns. As we anticipate in *Puritan New England*, Lisa M. Gordis' subtitle first suggests that *Opening Scripture* refers to *Bible Reading*, an activity that characterized Reformed faith in *scriptura sola*. But contrary to any anticipation of one literal sense, a transparent Scripture necessary for saving faith, and *Interpretive Authority* links a contrary referent. *Opening Scripture* can mean "opening up" Scripture to individualistic, even idiosyncratic interpretations guided by the Spirit, collection of biblical passages, contexts, and applications. Gordis' pun requires attention to interpreters, presenters and auditors. So Gordis' interpretation of biblical exegesis in Puritan New England scrutinizes the activities and consequences of ministers and lay congregants interpreting Scripture. Her attentiveness to Reformed theories of understanding and preaching the Bible, to New England preachers, church members, and church disputes allows her to counter the dominant paradigm from Vernon Louis Parrington through Darren Staloff—that Puritan interpretation of the Bible was closed, uniform. She extends the more complex, adaptable notion of Puritan understandings of the Bible proposed by Perry Miller and expanded by Nathan O. Hatch and Mark A. Noll—that Puritan interpretations of the Bible could allow complexity, openness. She thereby contributes to an understanding of Puritan New England that includes dissidence and change.

Gordis lays out *Opening Scripture* in two parts, each beginning with a theoretical grounding. Chapter one presents the founding theoretical principles of Puritan biblical exegesis; then chapters two through four follow practice, exegetical sermons by three prominent Puritan preachers. Chapter five delineates lay reactions to sermon exegeses; then chapters six through eight treat three notorious disputes between the 1630s and the 1660s.

“Humane Skill” and “The Arte of Prophecyng” establishes Reformed principles for the allied arts of exegesis and preaching that supply foundation for Gordis’ study. She tracks the implications in two dominant Puritan guides to preaching, William Perkins’ *The Arte of Prophecyng* (1592) and Richard Bernard’s *The Faithfull Shepheard* (1607). These include the belief in the saving clarity of literal scripture with recognition that the literal includes the figurative and that exegetes disagree about passages, the belief that clarity is achieved when the holy spirit illuminates obscure passages (with the employment of such techniques as comparing similar Bible passages, examining multiple translations and lexical, grammatical, and rhetorical handbooks), the belief that clarity can be aided by geographical, political, and theological historical accounts, and the belief that clarity can be promoted by applications to a congregation’s situation. All can lead to interpretive freedom. Preaching manuals risked compounding the problems of interpretive ambiguity when they advised that plain style sermons minimize the difficulties through the art of artless explication and that the sermons exhort the congregation to imitate their minister by opening Scripture for themselves, albeit without knowledge of the multitude of conflicting, “opening” guides the preachers employed. Thus, what could restrict interpretation enabled it.

John Cotton, the most popular early New England Puritan preacher, provides an exemplum of practices. His sermons present seemingly transparent readings of Bible passages; he is a vehicle to transmit the Spirit through the Word to his congregation. But by bringing to bear on a passage the collation of many passages with their situations, and by exhorting his auditors to interpret and judge the passage for themselves, without taking into account his rhetorical skill, exegetical art, and disciplined learning in the construction of his interpretations, he opened up Scripture more than he seems to have recognized. Thomas Shepard employed collage to construct sermons dense with Bible quotations, loose translations, echoes, and allusions freed of context so that the Word would enter the ears and plumb the hearts of his congregation so as to comfort anxious doubts and foster exalted joy. In view of

Shepard's proclivity to employ the fourth gospel, Gordis might have called him the kerygmatic preacher celebrating the poetry of Scripture. The power of Thomas Hooker's sermons issues from his use of dramatic techniques to emphasize application, even adaptation, of biblical passages to individual congregants and their situations. His sermons stress his auditors' identification with Scripture, their emotional dialogues with Scripture as they play both sinners convicted of sin and prophets hopeful of salvation, another opening of Scripture.

In "Goe Home and Consider': Lay Responses to the Preached Texts" Gordis shifts focus from the preacher to the congregant, from promulgation to reception opening Scripture—though all along Anne Hutchinson has been foreshadowed as the individualistic, perhaps wayward auditor. Drawing on manuals about employing Scripture to gain literacy and self-knowledge (especially Lewis Bayley's popular *The Practise of Pietie*), on accounts of auditors taking notes on sermons, meditating on and discussing Bible passages, on conversion narratives Shepard recorded, and on writings wherein authors such as William Bradford and Anne Bradstreet placed themselves in biblical contexts, Gordis evokes the pervasiveness of Puritan New England's biblical culture and the joy individual laity took in the very language as well as the complexity and potential that lay in opening Scriptures.

In elaboration Gordis offers accounts of three prominent controversies determined by political, economic, social, theological, and gender issues as well by differences over biblical exegesis. Chapter six looks at the controversies roused by Roger Williams over the separation of church and state governance and summed up in his *The Bloody Tenent* and John Cotton's polemical response. The Puritan establishment anticipated consensus over reading Scripture and applying it to New England/Israel; they pronounced that Williams misread. But Williams countered that their reading erred by failing to segregate the spiritual from the physical in Scripture and by misapplying references to Paradise to the fallen Wilderness; moreover, misinterpretation is an inevitable consequence of the fall and the history of exegesis is one of dispute. Chapter

seven revisits the Antinomian Controversy of 1636-38, particularly the trials and testimony that led to the civil banishment and church excommunication of Anne Hutchinson. By examination and refutation of the charges Gordis demonstrates that Hutchinson's errors were no aberration but rather representative of the widespread slippery-slope consequences built into the very system that extolled the clear unity of Scripture read by way of the spirit's guidance of clerics and lay alike. Finally Gordis employs the debates about infant baptism, those surrounding the *Propositions* of the Synod that affirmed the Halfway Covenant of 1662, and the 1680 Confession of Faith to review her history. She analyzes how a later generation of Puritan ministers, chastened by the elusiveness of interpretive consensus, tried to curb the laity by emphasizing their own expert authority earned by rigorous training without denying the premises and values of Reformation exegesis that open up Scripture to lay interpretations.

All along Lisa M. Gordis offers persuasive close readings of her subjects' manuals, sermons, responses, and the histories of religious disputes that characterize Puritan New England. In addition she provides an informative annotated bibliography of scholarship. While she may attribute more to self-conscious unity and design than her texts may warrant, she takes care to explain. Her greatest strength is demonstration of her thesis. *Opening Scripture: Bible Reading and Interpretive Authority in Puritan New England* provides a salutary reminder that reformers and revolutionaries open societies, activities, knowledge up to more mutability, more enjoyment, more wonder than the parents could possibly envision. It is indeed a wise father who knows his own children—in the earlier sexist but more far more vulnerable, and significant, sense than DNA identification allows. Nowhere is it more important to recognize this proverbial contribution to our understanding than in systems of belief.

Richard Greaves. *Glimpses of Glory: John Bunyan and English Dissent*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2002. xix + 693 pp. \$75.00. Review by U. MILO KAUFMANN, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN.

It is difficult to imagine anyone doing a better job than has Richard Greaves at the several tasks he has set himself in this masterful biography of John Bunyan. The author undertakes to discuss every one of Bunyan's published works, locating each to the fullest extent possible both in time and in place, while drawing all the accessible details about Bunyan's life and the turbulent historical context into a coherent narrative.

Greaves' credentials are impeccable, with his earlier works on English nonconformity and his editorial contributions to period scholarship well known to those in the field. He gives the impression of having read everything of possible relevance in English mid-century religious and political controversy, and often adduces illumination for well-known features of Bunyan's major works. This last achievement is, of course, the legitimation of historical scholarship for all those among us who see themselves more as practical critics and aestheticians than as historians. Given the fact that the vast majority of Bunyan's works have very little literary value, one might wish for somewhat more attention to questions of significance, which naturally point beyond the particularities of who preached where and when to those currents of new ideas so insuppressibly dynamic in Bunyan's time, as well as to the enduring mystery of genius which means in Bunyan's case that we attend to a mass of dated material because it came from the hand of one who fashioned a handful of masterpieces.

Yet it is as a historian that Greaves presents his study and his history documents a time in English affairs when a compromise of enormous current importance was taking shape. How is a political state to be defined so that religious diversity is fully accommodated? England at the time of its civil war and for three decades thereafter was a kind of laboratory for mixing volatiles without



some terminal explosion, and planet Earth in the twenty-first century seems to be much the same on the grand scale.

It is the cumulative weight of the minutiae which make Greaves' narrative of Bunyan in the context of English dissent so effective an evocation of the fearsome disorder of the time. Greaves takes us well beyond the three-way split among Catholics, Church-of-England communicants and sectarians or dissenters, apprising us of such a diversity of passionate conviction that one can appreciate the relief that must have attended the compromises of the 1680s. It is true that the temper of Christiana's journey is quite different from that of Christian's, and the causes appear to lie in a change of religious climate, as well as in a development in Bunyan's own spiritual pilgrimage.

The development I refer to is one of the several themes which organize Greaves' biography. I list three, and return to the first for a moment's discussion. Greaves risks the perils of practicing psychological diagnosis from a remote vantage point and makes a persuasive case for Bunyan as a depressive, by strict medical definition. *Grace Abounding* provides a wealth of evidence and there are abundant hints elsewhere, including Christian's pilgrimage. Interestingly, in Part Two of the allegory, Doubting Castle is destroyed and Giant Despair slain. The episode, in keeping with the tenor of Part Two, argues for a late triumph on Bunyan's part over a psychological and spiritual malady which plagued him for decades. The merit in Greaves' analysis is that it can alert us to easily-slighted details in Bunyan's allegories, for example, Christian's moment of panic in death's river; though Celestial City is in sight, and the dramatic reversals of fortune in Mansoul during the Holy War. (I recall a story by Lionel Trilling in which a student refers to the confectionery world of Coleridge's *Ancient Mariner*, missing the tone altogether; and recall, as well, an older study of Bunyan referring to the pervasive joy of *The Pilgrim's Progress*. Joy, yes, but Greaves would have us take the despair as real and recurrent.)

In addition to the theme of Bunyan's depressions and his eventual cure, Greaves stresses the theme of Bunyan's evangelical Calvinism or "pastoral Arminianism" and also the theme of his concern

for the poor. The first theme calls attention to the outworking of Calvinist theology in a practice which stressed the freedom to respond and the need to strive. As with so many paradoxes of faith, practice reconciled the contraries. The second theme is prominent in Greaves' review of Bunyan's later works, especially the second part of *The Pilgrim's Progress*. The common reading of Christiana's journey notices the frailty and weakness of the pilgrims, but Greaves provides a corrective, noting those who show courage, whatever their names, and noting as well the more important fact that they are poor folk who are making successful pilgrimage.

Every one of Bunyan's works is discussed, with valuable insights about Bunyan's exegetical method, his mastery of vivid imagery, his staunch personal and doctrinal integrity. In addition to a chronology which lines up more than a hundred texts or editions of texts, the reader is offered an epilogue including a fine review of Bunyan's reputation among writers and others of note after his death.

No review, I suppose, is taken seriously if it does not include a critical comment or two, so I oblige. The title, *Glimpses of Glory*, is misleading, since it suggests that more by way of heavenly vision will be discussed, particularly since heavenly-mindedness was such a prominent and carefully-cultivated discipline of Bunyan's century. Perhaps one is to assume that the stress is on "glimpse," with only glimpses of glory possible in the tempestuous polemical milieu which Greaves documents. The index is lengthy, but better for names than for ideas. One or two ideas which I came across without making a marginal note I later found I could not locate in the text since the index listed none of the key elements. Greaves does not disguise the reality of Bunyan's prejudices with respect to women and persons of color. He might have done more to suggest how it was that, even so, in a distraught and polarized time, Bunyan showed an uncommonly generous spirit.

Mary Floyd-Wilson. *English Ethnicity and Race in Early Modern Drama*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003. xii + 256 pp. + 10 illus. \$65.00. Review by JONATHAN BURTON, WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY.

Even for experienced readers of early modern texts, sixteenth- and seventeenth century theories of humoral medicine can appear esoteric, convoluted, or downright nonsensical. Given the genre's characteristic contradictions, reading a second or third text in the hope of corroborating one's knowledge often yields greater confusion. Where, for example, one text insists that "southerners" are hot, dry, and melancholic, another finds them cool, moist, and phlegmatic. By indicating how these "scientific" texts are never socially neutral and are in fact ideologically malleable, Gail Kern Paster's *The Body Embarrassed* (1993) spearheaded a body of scholarship seeking to untangle, or at least explain, these contradictions. Paster's work illuminates the gender and class valences encoded in a hierarchy of physiological differences. *English Ethnicity and Race in Early Modern Drama* by Mary Floyd-Wilson extends Paster's project by arguing that regionally inflected humoralism, or "geohumoralism," was "the dominant mode of ethnic distinctions in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries" (1). This is not to say that early modern humoralists simply carried on a classical tradition. Instead, Floyd-Wilson argues, forces such as the rise of the Atlantic slave trade and developments in British historiography encouraged British authors to reassess and reconceptualize inherited ideas in order to rectify England's debased and marginal status in the classical model. The updated geohumoral models that they produced would, Floyd-Wilson suggests, act as a bridge to modern racialism.

*English Ethnicity and Race in Early Modern Drama* is neatly divided into two parts. Part 1 provides a very useful primer on classical climate theory before indicating how early moderns engaged with and reconfigured this knowledge for their own purposes. Part 2 then employs geohumoralism as an animating context for a series of readings of early modern plays by Marlowe, Jonson,

and Shakespeare. While those readings may sometimes feel limited or speculative, this book's contribution to early modern studies of race is undeniably momentous.

Crucial to Floyd-Wilson's arguments throughout the book is her observation that while scholars have recognized the continued predominance of a tripartite classical model in early modern ethnography, "they have overlooked the significance of Britain's decentered position in this paradigm" (3). Classical models of the world, developed by Herodotus, Hippocrates and others, situated the British on the northern margins of a three-part world where their hyper-white barbarism amounted to a simple inversion of southern blackness. Both the frigid north and the burning south were understood as unbalanced extremes in relation to a temperate Mediterranean. For as long as the British accepted the myth of their Trojan ancestry, they could disassociate themselves with stereotypes that figured northerners as uncivil, slow-witted, and more bodily-determined than those people living in more temperate zones. Likewise they could ignore the implications of an intertwined northern whiteness and southern blackness. However, as the English came to doubt the myth of Brutus and acknowledge their northern roots, they "confronted the possibility that they were the barbaric progeny of a dissolute, mingled and intemperate race" (15), whose history was marked by conquest and corruption.

Considering a range of early modern texts including William Camden's *Britannia*, Robert Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy*, Francis Bacon's *Sylva Sylvarum*, and Thomas Browne's *Pseudodoxia Epidemica*, Floyd-Wilson indicates how anxieties over northern barbarism lead English writers to rearrange geohumoral knowledge and locate value in "northernness." The recuperative strategies outlined in her book's first three chapters include the emergence of philobarbarism in regard to the Anglo-Saxon past simultaneous with a demotion of Africa's elevated past. In some instances this involved the appropriation of prized southern qualities (such as the sagacity associated with melancholy); in others it meant the reassessment of those qualities so that, for example, southern pursuits of medicine, math, and astrology are deemed the fevered prac-

tices of wily artificers. Above all, Floyd-Wilson indicates that blackness was reinvented in the seventeenth century “to carry the formal humoral connotations of extreme whiteness” (81).

Turning to its literary subject, *English Ethnicity and Race in Early Modern Drama* does not merely trace the same patterns of anxiety and recuperation in the drama. Instead Floyd-Wilson indicates how geohumoralism informs the responses of English dramatists to the social and political controversies of their day. Thus, in Marlowe’s *Tamburlaine*, Floyd-Wilson finds a distinctly northern protagonist whose spectacular eloquence and obduracy defends the theater against the attacks of anti-theatricalists who worried over the impressibility of English audiences. Chapters on Jonson’s *Masque of Blackness* and Shakespeare’s *Cymbeline* contribute new insights to discussions of these works as commentaries on the proposed Anglo-Scottish union under James I. In each case, Floyd-Wilson finds the drama engaged with anxieties over the Scots’ potential corruption of Englishness. Thus, after examining the language of blackness and blanching in Jonson’s masque, she concludes that the “real point” of the spectacle may be “the presentation of a genealogy of people who transmitted southern wisdom and culture to a region that eventually granted them external whiteness” (124). In regard to *Cymbeline*, Floyd-Wilson argues that Shakespeare participates in the emerging philobarbaric tradition by imagining a history where Scots and Britons submit to Roman rule, while the English “emerge as a naturally civilized race, unaffected by Britain’s ancient history of mingled genealogies and military defeats” (163). The book’s longest chapter considers the contest of older, geohumoral knowledge and nascent racialism in Shakespeare’s *Othello*. More specifically, Floyd-Wilson argues that the jealousy that is central to the play needs to be understood in a geohumoral context where it would be most often associated with Italians such as Iago, rather than a Moor-like Othello. Although I can think of no one who continues to argue for Othello’s innate savagery, Floyd-Wilson offers an important insight in her argument that “Iago’s manipulation of Othello does not awaken the

Moor's repressed passions or provoke his innate savagery: it utterly transforms the Moor's humors" (146).

It is in this chapter on *Othello* that the book's only significant weakness seems apparent. That is, in its attention to regionally inflected humoral identity, *English Ethnicity and Early Modern Drama* tends to slight the importance of religious identity, especially in relation to the discourses of impressibility and vulnerability. Floyd-Wilson's discussion of Iago's Italianate "civility" makes virtually no reference to English concerns with apostasy, recusancy, or Roman Catholic conspiracies. Along with Reformation politics, the emergence of English mercantilism likewise receives scant attention here. Thus the history of developing racialism that emerges is compelling and important but perhaps too neatly delineated. *English Ethnicity and Early Modern Drama* does not promise a history of race in the West, but it would benefit from a more focused discussion of precisely how the shift from geohumoral ethnology to racialism matters in terms of socio-cultural relations. What kind of work did racialism perform that geohumoral ethnology could not? Might one simply argue for racialism as a reassignment of the roles apportioned by geohumoralism? These questions aside, Mary Floyd-Wilson's study of English ethnicity offers an important contribution to the study of race in the early modern period. Its account of geohumoral ethnology is innovative and fascinating. Furthermore it offers an important supplement to Ania Loomba's largely overlooked but nonetheless excellent study of *Shakespeare, Race and Colonialism* by indicating how seemingly archaic climate theory was remade to engage with sixteenth- and seventeenth-century English anxieties in regard to historiography, politics, and the theater.

Katherine O'Donnell and Michael O'Rourke, eds. *Love, Sex, Intimacy, and Friendship Between Men, 1550-1800*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003. xiv + 206 pp. \$65.00. Review by GEORGE KLAWITTER, ST. EDWARD'S UNIVERSITY.

Somewhere along the way “affect” has become a noun. David Halperin uses it thus a dozen times in his preface to *Love, Sex, Intimacy, and Friendship Between Men, 1550-1800*: “The result is that the life of queer affect . . . never comes in for sustained, unembarrassed, analytic attention” (2). The sentence (and a good part of the preface) is thus muddled by what is an expression peculiar to psychology and begs for a little explanation on such short notice. Overall, the preface to the book is scattered and not of much help to the very fine essays that follow it. Halperin, who has done vintage work in gay studies, did not seem to expend much effort on the writing of this preface. On the other hand, George Rousseau, in his essay on same-sex attraction, painstakingly explains three neologisms that he has been refining for decades: “homoplatic,” “homodepressed,” and “homomorbid.” He does not use the terms to characterize specific eras as one might expect (e.g., “homoplatic” for the Classical Period), but he rather uses the terms to explain conditions of same-sex attraction that are prevalent when conditions exist for their presence regardless of century. Thus “homodepressed” is a useful approach to Thomas Gray as well as to Tchaikovsky. The Renaissance, of course, predates medical research on homosexuality so that most of Rousseau’s remarks on the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries pertain to homoplatic reflections in literature. Eventually, a reader presumes, both “homodepressed” and “homomorbid” will serve as investigative tools for Renaissance researchers. The scarcity of Renaissance gay texts, however, may limit the usefulness of Rousseau’s latter two terms, but one would hope that advances in understanding homodepression and even the more desperate homomorbidity could shed light on, for example, the Shakespeare sonnets or Barnfield’s pastoral lyrics. Rousseau’s essay is a valuable first essay in this collection.

Alan Stewart’s essay on A. L. Rowse reads like a book review of Rouse’s *Homosexuals in History*, until the last four pages when Stewart discusses the sexual orientation of James I. Similarly disappointing is George Haggerty’s short essay on eighteenth-century male love and friendship: half of the piece is a gloss on his book *Men in Love*, and the other half is a quibble over categories of

homosexuals established by David Halperin in "How to Do the History of Male Homosexuality." This broadside prompted Halperin, by the way, to devote a three-page end-note reply to Haggerty. The end-note is as long as one third of Halperin's entire preface. This flyting simply gives the book a kind of "last minute" feel, and one would think that writers of prefaces would not engage so violently with a contributor to a volume. A reader suspects that both Halperin and Haggerty were solicited for the book based on their very excellent previous contributions to gay studies, not for their contributions to the present book.

A short testimonial to the memory of Alan Bray is followed in the book by a short essay by Bray himself on the tombs of men who were buried together in England. His research unearthed such tombs from the fourteenth century to the nineteenth century, and he spends his most valuable attention on the tomb of Cardinal Newman and Newman's friend, Ambrose St. John. The essay is a taste of Bray's forthcoming book, a posthumous work on the subject of pairs of men buried in the same tomb. The present essay reads with Bray's usual clarity and is every bit as convincing as his earlier monumental work *Homosexuality in Renaissance England* (1982). What John Boswell did for same-sex marriage with church texts (*Same-Sex Unions in Premodern Europe*), Bray does here for church tombs.

One of the most valuable essays in the O'Donnell-O'Rourke book is Randolph Trumbach's piece on the eighteenth-century male. It begins, "Around 1700 a profound shift began to occur in sexual relations between males in Western societies" (99). Although the assertion that homosexuality is a modern construct has become a commonplace, the assertion becomes clear only after reading an essay like Trumbach's. Societies, Trumbach asserts, were divided by age rather than by gender until the eighteenth century, and indeed some Western societies did not discriminate sexual partners by gender until the beginning of the twentieth century. This is a most illuminating essay, which Trumbach ends with half a dozen pages on sodomy court cases, sparing us none of the details.



Dovetailing Trumbach's work is Nicholas Radel's exploration of servant-master relations in both real life (for which he uses the Castlehaven affair) and literary life (for which he refers to numerous English Renaissance satirists from Guilpin to Rochester). What the real and the literary have in common is the gradual erosion of silent servants so that what was once accepted as normal behavior (sex between master and servant) becomes legally problematic once the servant assumes a voice and protests his complicity in a same-sex act. Coke and other English Renaissance jurists had no trouble dismissing sodomy as inconsequential, argues Radel, until servants avowed willing participation in sexual relations with their masters, in which cases they threatened the social order by usurping a desire which traditionally could belong only to the ruling class. Although a modern reader might initially dismiss another visit to the Castlehaven case after Leah Marcus has mined it so effectively, Radel's new focus on the servant Fitzpatrick rather than the Earl of Castlehaven brings new light to this old affair.

The final essay in the volume analyzes the eighteenth-century reception of Sappho via Ovid's fifteenth epistle (*Heroides*). Of particular interest to Jody Greene are the years 1711-13 when English Sapphism peaked. Greene concludes that Sappho has been more abused than appreciated, and various hands have perverted Ovid's Sappho, making her a vehicle for masculine readers to swing the Greek poetess into heterosexual alignment via either a prurient interest in Sappho's sexual self-indulgence or an emphasis on her purported affair with the man Phaon. Of particular umbrage to Greene is the loose translation of Ovid by Matthew Stevenson for the Earl of Dorset, a translation that turns Sappho masturbatory as she is made to proclaim, "Grunting all day I sit alone." It is curious that Greene does not refer in this regard to John Donne's own rendering of Sappho who enjoyed herself, minus the grunting, over half a century before the Augustan Age.

Marc Berley, ed. *Reading the Renaissance: Ideas and Idioms from Shakespeare to Milton*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 2003. viii + 278 pp. \$60.00. Review by FRANCES M. MALPEZZI, ARKANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY.

In *Reading the Renaissance: Ideas and Idioms from Shakespeare to Milton* Marc Berley has gathered an engaging and readable collection of essays on a wide range of Renaissance topics. The book is dedicated to Edward W. Taylor, whose influence pervades the volume and whose own contribution, "Bugswords," serves as its epilogue. As the blurb on the dust jacket observes, Berley's book not only presents interpretations of Renaissance literature but also addresses problems with recent critical theory as it suggests the direction for future literary studies. The essays are thus concerned with reading the Renaissance and with mis-readings of it.

Three of the essays focus on Shakespeare. Frank Kermode in "On Certain Verses of Shakespeare" argues for the importance of understanding the language of a given text and the resonances of that language. Like the volume as a whole, his essay is dedicated to Taylor, whose critical work has manifested his belief in the importance of such a philological approach. For Kermode, determining what words meant is the "primary task of literary scholarship" (26) and he concludes with the salvo "Back to the Language!" (26). Marc Berley focuses on *King Lear*. Arguing that Sidney's *Apology for Poetry* is a crucial source for Shakespeare's tragedy, Berley demonstrates Shakespeare's play is designed to humble humankind through a series of brutal teachers: Cordelia, Kent, Lear's Fool, and Lear. In "The Consolation of Art in the *Aeneid* and *The Tempest*" Michael Mack turns to a Shakespearean comedy. While Shakespeare's reworking of Virgilian material in *The Tempest* has been previously explored, Mack takes on a new perspective as he examines ways in which Virgil's epic and Shakespeare's play call attention to themselves as works of art. In the process, he illuminates the comparison between the duty bound Aeneas and Prospero as well as the lovers Aeneas/Dido and Ferdinand/Miranda. Mack ultimately reveals the varying ways Virgil's epic and Shakespeare's

comedy treat the consolation of art as a response to human loss and suffering.

Four essays are on Donne. Influenced by Tayler's book on Donne's *Anniversaries*, a book he considers "the most important study of Donne's poetry to appear to in the past decade" (78) and an important corrective to Lewalski's reading of the poems, Louis Martz reworks his previous attempts to structure Donne's poems. Martz's death in December 2002 makes his Donnean closing, "Here therefore be the end" (89), especially poignant. These are, indeed, his final words on Donne's *Anniversaries*. With its unique amalgam of Donne, Thomism, and contemporary experience, "The *Donna Angelicata* of Donne's 'Aire and Angels'" is an essay only Al Labriola could write. Whether leading us into a reading of a Donne poem by taking us through the experience of purchasing a gift of perfume as he does here or by reminding us of the lyrics of The Penguins' "Earth Angel" as he has previously done in addressing this poem, Labriola wonderfully links Donne's world to ours while eruditely exploring the differences. Labriola prefaces his reading of "Aire and Angels" with an investigation of Neoplatonic and Paraclesian views on herbal and floral essences and an examination of lyrics from *Hesperides* which celebrate perfumes. In "Male Lesbian Voices: Ronsard, Tyard and Donne Play Sappho" Anne Lake Prescott gives us a literary and cultural context for Donne's "Sappho to Philaenis." Reminding us Donne was not the only male poet to imagine love from a lesbian perspective, she explores three elegies—two by Pierre de Ronsard and one by Pontus de Tyard. As she demonstrated in *French Poets and the English Renaissance*, Prescott also illustrates here that English poetry can be better understood when we consider French as well as British models. In his essay Stanley Stewart does not focus on a specific poem by Donne but instead cites readings and mis-readings of the poet as he excoriates postmodern criticism in his "Reading Donne: Old and New His- and Her-storicisms." Contrasting "Old" historicists with the New, Stewart exemplifies the former through Tayler's book on Donne's *Anniversaries* and the latter principally through Ronald Corthell's *Ideology and Desire in Renaissance Poetry*. Stewart pre-

sents Tayler as a critic who “posits a contextual claim of relevance for the various literary and cultural practices encompassed by his argument” (135). In contrast, he denounces New Historicists like Corthell, referring to them as New Empsonians who focus on close readings of texts but provide no supporting evidence. Instead of focusing on Donne, Corthell’s real subject, Stewart asserts, is himself; New Historicists in general present us not with critical analysis but “thinly disguised forms of social preachments” (147).

In the three remaining essays, Ernest B. Gilman treats Jonson’s “On My First Sonne”; Martin Elsky explores the work of Eric Auerbach, the seventeenth century, and the history of feelings; and Anthony Low examines the fall into subjectivity in *Paradise Lost*. Gilman’s essay is perceptive and richly suggestive, sensitively treating Jonson’s oft-anthologized poem as a plague text then further urging we re-evaluate all literary works written during plague times within that context. Elsky’s topic is clearly the most expansive of the volume. He focuses not on *Mimesis* but on some of Auerbach’s untranslated essays, many of which deal with seventeenth-century literature. For Elsky these works are important because Auerbach provides through them a history of emotions, “a history of what it means to *have feelings* in the European west” (178). In his essay Low explores not the paradise but the hell within, the way in which the journey inward can be abysmal. Low illustrates how Milton anticipates the modern usage of “alienation” as the fall into subjectivity brings with it isolation and loneliness.

“Bugswords,” a brief epilogue by Edward W. Tayler, provides a fitting conclusion to a book dedicated to him and determined to suggest directions for the study of Renaissance literature. Tayler concisely manages to span the practice of criticism from the “old” historicism through new criticism, deconstruction, and all the isms of postmodern theories. As he catalogs the many bugswords of criticism, Tayler makes clear how we impede rather than facilitate understanding. His conclusion calls for a return to one concern: intention—a need to understand authors on their terms, not ours, if we are to understand and learn from the past.

Those disaffected with postmodern critical practices will appreciate the stance of many writers in this collection. *Reading the Renaissance* suggests no new methodology for approaching literature; rather, in statement and practice these gracefully written and insightful essays recommend and model a reversion to an earlier approach. Both adherents and detractors of postmodernism should appreciate the contribution this volume makes to an understanding of early modern literature.

Andrew Barnaby and Lisa J. Schnell. *Literate Experience: The Work of Knowing in Seventeenth-Century English Writing*. New York: Palgrave; Houndsmills: Macmillan, 2002. xiii + 243pp. \$55.00  
Review by HUGH WILSON, SUNY-PLATTSBURGH.

*Literate Experience* offers to demonstrate an early modern paradigm shift, coinciding with the rise of modern science, involving changes in the interrelated conceptions of knowledge and legitimate authority. The authors remark that “to the thinkers and writers of the seventeenth century, knowledge was more properly a social issue than a purely philosophical one” (xi). In support of this contention, the five central chapters of this book are intended to demonstrate changing attitudes toward epistemology and challenge traditional readings of selected works by Bacon, Shakespeare, Lanyer, Marvell, and Behn. Each author is portrayed as progressively more estranged from the Elizabethan world picture than the next. New perspectives on established figures sometimes generate new insights, and in that regard, this book is a partial success. Although many of the ideas proposed provoke serious objections and reservations, the last chapter was genuinely exciting, and left the reader with the feeling of learning something significant.

This chapter appears to develop from ideas sketched in Barnaby’s Princeton dissertation, “Politics of Knowing: Epistemological and Political Reform in Bacon, Hobbes, and Milton” [1989], and in Barnaby’s essay, “‘Things Themselves’: Francis Bacon’s Epistemological Reform and the Maintenance of the State,” *Renaissance and Reformation* 21:4 (Autumn 1997): 57-80. Bacon is central to

the book's preoccupation with method, but Bacon is unconvincingly depicted as a cynical absolutist, even a torturer (66; 213). Barnaby and Schnell portray Bacon as a skeptic of religion and a committed authoritarian, as if he had newly rediscovered (and embraced) the hoary speculation that religion was nothing but a charade to intimidate and subdue the masses, as if he sought to reform the acquisition of knowledge in order to ratify rather than to transform the status quo. The Bacon who wrote the *New Atlantis*, the rhapsodic passages in the *Advancement of Learning*, the Bacon who read More and Erasmus, who excited both John Milton and Abraham Cowley, the man who inspired the Royal Society, disappears. Despite all the discussion of Bacon's method, of his epistemology, Bacon's great and humane essay, "Of Truth," is never mentioned.

The second chapter appears to elaborate ideas aired in Barnaby's, "Authorized Versions: Measure for Measure and the Politics of Biblical Interpretation," *Renaissance Quarterly* 51:4 (Winter 1998): 1225-54. There, Barnaby makes the contrarian argument that instead of criticizing worldly practices in light of the ideals expressed in the Sermon on the Mount, Shakespeare was allegedly suggesting the impracticality of such ideals from a skeptical, worldly perspective. Contrary to the traditional Christian reading of *Measure for Measure*, the authors declare that the premise of the Duke of Vienna's plot is "morally repugnant," and suggest that Shakespeare was trying to expose religion as a mere manipulative ideology. As Barnaby and Schnell observe, Duke Vincentio lies, but one might regard his lies as part of a pedagogic stratagem just as the equally bald lies of Jane Elliott were in her famous experiment with prejudice in which she purposely discriminates against children for having "blue eyes" or "brown eyes." In this reader's view, the entire tone and tenor, the plot and allusions of Shakespeare's play undermine any theory that the play dramatizes any Shakespearean repudiation of religion, or any glorification of political authority *as such*. (Of course, the credibility of particular *authorities* is a matter of discernment.) The Duke of dark corners acts like a benevolent *Deus absconditus*.

Instead of satirizing religion, *Measure for Measure* seems more like an attempt to envision an entirely benign authority (very unlike the actual King James) and to imagine a congenial resolution to one of the major problems of theodicy: God's apparent toleration of evil or the apparent deferral of interdiction, intercession, and judgment. As the play concludes, the hypocritical Angelo is exposed, is convinced of his sin, becomes penitent, and is forgiven. The play has the atmosphere of a fairy tale or a fable; Machiavelli's Italy, the world of *The Prince* or *Mandragola* is worlds away: the company returns to the palace for marriages and merriment, not Thyestean feasts, or clandestine after-dinner massacres.

If abstracts are any indication, the third chapter seems to develop ideas broached in Schnell's Princeton dissertation, "The Fetter'd Muse: Renaissance Women Writers and the Idea of a Literary Career" [1990]; in "Breaking 'the rule of cortezia': Aemilia Lanyer's dedications to *Salve Deus Rex Judaeorum*," *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 27 (Winter 1997): 77-101; and in "So great a difference is there in degree': Aemilia Lanyer and the Aims of Feminist Criticism," *Modern Language Quarterly* 57 (March 1996): 23-35. Barnaby and Schnell apologize for largely ignoring Aemilia Lanyer's outspoken feminism. Instead, they claim that Lanyer is more alienated and *socially* critical than is usually assumed, that her dedicatory poems to prominent noble women and her final poem to Cooke-ham reveal a profoundly ambivalent attitude toward patronage: they argue that her poems somehow express a simultaneous endorsement of and resentment toward the aristocracy and the entire class system. Nonetheless, Lanyer's imputed critique of the social hierarchy (as distinguished from her critique of male chauvinism) does not seem nearly as thoroughgoing and far-sighted as that of Milton or Lilburne, much less Winstanley or Walwyn.

The fourth chapter develops ideas suggested in Barnaby's "Affecting the Metaphysics: Marvell's 'Definition of Love' and the Seventeenth-Century Trial of Experience," *Genre* 28:4 (Winter 1995): 483-512. The discussion of Marvell in "Affecting the Metaphysics" invokes John Dryden's blinkered comment on Donne's love

poetry, and reiterates Samuel Johnson's neoclassical disparagement of the metaphysical poets. Barnaby and Schnell argue that "The Definition of Love," and "The Garden" enact a retreat from politics, that they express a desire for and a scepticism about the possibility of a "restored" social order. Still, from this chapter, one would never guess that Marvell was politically active dissident for decades, that he was a friend, co-worker, and defender of John Milton, that he worked as an under-secretary for Oliver Cromwell, composed Protestant polemics, and served as an active member of Parliament after the Restoration.

Barnaby and Schnell save their best for last. Although they only touch on Aphra Behn's most absorbing work, *Oroonoko*, this last chapter is genuinely interesting: I felt my pulse race because I knew I was learning something new. Barnaby and Schnell discuss the wit and wisdom of some of Behn's neglected prose translations, and the permutations of her strange novella, *The Fair Jilt*. Above and beyond Behn's feminism, the authors find a genuine (and original) engagement with some of the important philosophical issues of the day: epistemology, ethics, and politics. Aphra Behn is a complex and elusive character, and the authors appear to grasp her complexity convincingly. The revelation of her intellectual independence and intelligence are engaging. The discussions of Behn's witty translations and the author's analyses of *The Fair Jilt* are not always convincing, but they *are* genuinely illuminating. Still, this reader wishes there had been more acknowledgment of previous scholarship, more acknowledgment of Behn the feminist, the humanist, and the novelist. Compared to Bacon, Shakespeare, Lanyer, and Marvell, Aphra Behn seems morally unstable, even erratic. On one hand, her feminism, her unfeigned respect for a real or imagined black slave, and her manifest contempt for his white torturers reveal a spontaneous humanity. On the other hand, at other times Behn seems caught up in the world of the Stuart masque, the Royal African Company, and the slaver's guinea; at other times she seems drawn toward the world of the Restoration rakes, toward the cynical attitudes of Rochester and La Rochefoucauld, toward the vortex of nihilism.



The ideas of Barnaby and Schnell are often out-lyers in the continuum of opinion, and a stronger, more explicit review of the scholarly literature on the poems, plays, and novels they discuss would be welcome. The authors need to engage ideas of those outside the charmed circle of their own “discursive community.” The book closes with several pages of scholastic abstraction that Bacon described as one of the distempers of learning—sometimes it seems that the demonstration of mastery of the fashionable idiom matters more than what is being said. The book concludes with a brief and orphic epilogue refers to the so-called “experiment [?] we call America,” and suggests we might benefit from relearning the lessons of history, but what those lessons are, remains unsaid. Although this study has the weaknesses of an early selection, both scholars are young and audacious, and their insights will deepen over time. When the authors resonate with a particular writer, their readings are more persuasive: the resourceful, idiosyncratic Aphra Behn fits their theory better than the others; chapter five was their best.

Douglas Anderson. *William Bradford's Books: Of Plymouth Plantation and the Printed Word*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003. ix + 280 pp. \$45.00. Review by WILLIAM J. SCHEICK, UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN.

From the outset Douglas Anderson puts his readers on notice that his study offers “a wandering viewpoint ... rang[ing] backward and forward through the bulk of Bradford's book” (22). Expect neither a fully enunciated thesis nor a sequential development of argument, and (it might be added) do not look for any help from the 100-word, extraordinarily general book-jacket description. If the reviewer's task includes summarizing the contents of a book, then in this instance such an undertaking is harder than usual.

The title announces Anderson's subject: the books that Bradford read or could have read, and also the impact of his keen awareness of these works in particular, print media in general, and his own

book-defined work-in-progress. All of these perspectives intermingle, especially in relation to Bradford's personal understanding of history. They effectively form a network of crisscrossing associations that shape the narrative manner of his record of Plymouth colony. Even the opening pages of Bradford's manuscript, Anderson observes, not only allude to specific authors (Socrates Scholasticus, Eusebius, John Fox) but also in their hand-ruled appearance mimic the very look of printed books. Similarly, the initial storm-at-sea episode is rendered textually complex by its allusion to Paul's voyage in *The Acts of the Apostles*. These and other such deliberate maneuvers in the historian's manuscript insist on the reader's identification of narrative frames. Such features, Anderson contends, announce Bradford's intention to imitate the artifice of literary design.

There is another interest woven into this emphasis on books: namely, how in Bradford's history, reflecting his view of narratives generally, a sense of design-like coherence surprisingly emerges out of sundry resistant and conflicting fragments. Relevant here is the colonial historian's unusual accommodation of experiences seemingly at variance with Pilgrim ideals. Possibly influenced by Jean Bodin and William Perkins, among others, Bradford embraces contingent responses to apparent aberrations within the Pilgrim community and hence resists any closure in his own textual record. Instead, as an "example of the resilience and flexibility of the 'textor's' narrative art" (68), he permits his narrative to imitate history's subtle interweaving of variety and unity, dissolution and preservation, hopelessness and hope—that is, history's containment of both unnerving circumstances and human differences. Recognizing the artificial or representational nature of human performance—its tangle of emotions and intentions replete with either deceit or potentiality—Bradford pertinently endorses the spirit of compromise apparently implied in John Robinson's writings.

A third concern, intertwined with these two subjects, includes the correspondence between the textual interdependence of Bradford's account and the geographic codependence of Plymouth colony and Europe. In the art of Bradford's book, which mirrors

the unifying narrative strategies of other self-reflective Pilgrim documents, what might appear to some European observers as an eccentric marginal outpost becomes an important participant within the focal design of the Reformation. It is in this context, Anderson concludes, that the colony's diminishment in size and importance should be understood at the end of Bradford's account. Anderson here refutes the long-standing reading of this historian's document as an elegiac story of declension. Instead, Bradford celebrates the absorption of Plymouth into the divine scheme of history; the colony's once eccentric difference is now incorporated in the grand design.

Anderson's book teems with insights, some of which become more plausible if we now and then adjust the critic's underlying assumption about Bradford's degree of narrative management. It is interesting to observe that Anderson stresses Bradford's appreciation of humanity's unpredictable and ambiguous tangle of emotion and will, but in turn accords this historian little of this same human complexity. When such issues crops up, it is explained away as "rare exceptions" (108). Anderson's portrait inclines toward pure unadulterated authorial intention, which he somehow knows. A mere handful of instances will make the point: "Bradford chose to emphasize," "carefully interweaves," "is acutely aware that all constructions of character are dependent upon artifice," "carefully selected letters and documents for a similar purpose," "surely realized [apropos "a meaningful narrative design"] that the effect of doing so would inevitably jar readers" (101, 125, 217, 218). The words *chose*, *carefully*, *acutely*, *surely*, among other instances in the study, insist on Bradford's thorough self-conscious control at nearly every turn of his narrative. This view of the man counters the historian's own understanding of the impact of circumstance and feelings on human behavior, is counter-intuitive to our everyday experience, and obscures one of the most productive tensions in *Of Plymouth Plantation*.

More probable is a Bradford whose ambivalent emotional responses to the vexing welter of historical process register beneath and through his conscious intentions. Then, for example, it might

be more reliable to indicate that his text does finally suggest the upbeat absorption of Plymouth colony into the grand divine scheme but that the text does so only because of narrative accretions—accidental progressive implication—that resist Bradford's manifest elegiac and nostalgic state of mind at the end of his account. Anderson's attribution of iron-fisted authorial control to Bradford sometimes results in both over-reading and under-reading.

The latter limitation mainly occurs when a passage threatens Anderson's insistence on Bradford's firm authorial hand. Such is the case with the historian's entry for 1624, the year when Bradford felt forced by circumstance and human behavior to depart from the communal ideal and so assigned parcels of land to individual families. Anderson reads this decisive occasion as an instance when the historian, who "*clearly* presents change itself as constructive," "*is prepared* to accommodate the lessons of experience" (107, 109; emphasis added). To maintain this position Anderson unfortunately abandons close reading, the very manner that he employs so productively throughout most of his study. Close attention to the text in this instance, however, suggests a deep emotional undercurrent that veers far away from Anderson's thesis-facilitating claim.

Note, first of all, the syntactic performance of Bradford's introductory comment concerning his reluctant decision to allow private possession of land: "At length, after much debate of things, the Governor [Bradford] (with the advice of the chiefest amongst them) gave way." Consider the three responsibility-defusing qualifications, the strategy of verbal distancing, before Bradford pens, in a telling phrase, that he "gave way" from the communal ideal. Such phalanxed defensiveness finds reinforcement in an eccentric reference to Plato: this experience, "amongst godly and sober men, may well evince the vanity of that conceit of Plato's . . . that the taking away of property and bringing in community into a commonwealth would make them happy and flourishing." Plato would never have been the authority behind the Pilgrim social ideal, and his convenient appearance at this sensitive point—which is only noted in passing by Anderson—is very curious indeed. At one level,

Bradford might be self-protectively justifying his violation of Plymouth's charter concerning land, a violation he mitigates by expressly indicating that the distribution was "for present use" only, not "for inheritance." At another level, the reference to Plato displaces an undeclared departure from the Pauline communal ideal of the first generation of Christians, the actual nostalgic model for the Pilgrims. As Anderson astutely points out elsewhere, Paul's epistles are intertextually interwoven in Bradford's history. In this overlooked instance, Paul's unseen ghost is present in an unusual displacement of authority similar, perhaps, to the underground textual work performed by Bradford's equally peculiar pre-dating of William Brewster's death by a year at a later point in the history.

Bradford, moreover, particularly pointed to the importance of this 1624 passage when in later years he appended a sad note on its opposite blank page. This added passage bothers Anderson enough to move him to dismiss it as "melodramatic" (113), but its disconsolate sentiment unequivocally remains nonetheless. Although Anderson rightly connects this appended commentary with a passage by John Robinson, in this instance he misses its key intertextual link to Bradford's own writing. The image in the addendum most invested with emotion here is an elaborate conceit: "But (alas) that subtle serpent hath slyly wound in himself under fair pretences of necessity and the like, to untwist these sacred bonds and ties." This theme—the uncertain meaning of necessity—runs throughout Bradford's history. Time and again he struggles to decide whether this or that necessity encodes a communication from the divine taskmaster or from corrupt postlapsarian human desires. The entry for 1624 records Bradford's nervous, syntactically qualified hope that the necessity leading to his *temporary* departure from the Pauline ideal is a sign from God, who "seeing all men have this corruption ... in His wisdom saw another course fitter for them." In the entry for 1632, however, Bradford rereads this moment. Between 1624 and 1632, more and more land had been demanded by church members who "broke away under one pretense or another, thinking their own conceived necessity" suffi-

cient justification. In the appended passage there is no melodrama, only a sad finish to this reversal in Bradford's understanding of the "necessity" of 1624. Bradford now believes that, like Adam in response to the "fair pretenses" of Eve, he "gave way" to human corruption, the pretense of a divinely-ordained necessity, and as a result the Pilgrims lost (uncoiled) their Eden-like Pauline communal ideal.

A more progressive reading of events is also recorded in *Of Plymouth Plantation*, but often unwittingly and against the grain of Bradford's feelings. Bradford's manifest awareness and imitation of print media, which Anderson cogently highlights, certainly comprise part of the story that needed to be told. Yet there is another story, as well, concerning the productive narrative tension between an author's intention and execution, conscious design and unconscious product, that also underlies much of this colonial history. Read with this other story in mind, Anderson's rich book has much to offer. Concerning its number of highly speculative interpretations, each reader will personally decide what to attribute to Bradford's resourcefulness and what to Anderson's creativity. Either way, *William Bradford's Books* is engaging. Anderson comes well prepared to conduct his exploration *Of Plymouth Plantation*, and on the whole he succeeds wonderfully in imparting new insights concerning its surprising intertextual resonance.

Daniel Patterson, ed. *Edward Taylor's Gods Determinations and Preparatory Meditations: A Critical Edition*. Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 2003. xvi + 583 pp. \$65.00. Review by WILLIAM J. SCHEICK, UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN.

Edward Taylor (1642?-1729), the Cambridge-educated Restoration émigré, still remains a mystery. At the top of the list of puzzles is the seeming inconsistency between his conservative Calvinistic ministry and his Renaissance-faceted verse meditations, especially the poems written between 1682 and 1692. The often peculiar manner and matter of Taylor's metaphysical poetry have long resisted close scrutiny. Few critics have ventured detailed

readings of his multi-layered texts, and some have simply doubted that there is any rhyme or reason for what happens in these poems. Unlike George Herbert's work, to which the self-exiled poet sometimes alludes, Taylor's meditations have never had their day.

A good motive to attempt to surpass Donald Stanford's 1960 transcription of Taylor's verse manuscripts would be to foster a more reliable close encounter with *Preparatory Meditations*. For now, at least, that would be a highly speculative and unlikely aim. An adequate default claim would be that we simply ought to have the best edition available for whatever scholarly use the poems might be put in the future. Daniel Patterson offers another rationale for a new edition—to show that the poetry “is much more smoothly polished than previous editions have suggested” (41). But this point is hobbled by the editor's requisite “yes . . . but” admission that “there is some truth to the charge [of crudity], but not nearly as much as has been thought.” While Patterson's revisions occasionally enhance the smoothness of certain lines, there are other instances, often buried in the emendations, of editorial transcriptions indicative of even more poetic coarseness.

Taylor apparently reveled in a self-portrait of poetic incompetence, a point established in his “Prologue.” There he asks whether a crumb-of-dust poet can be relevant in the resplendent divine scheme of things when, at his best, all he can do is “hand a Pen whose moisture doth guild ore / Eternall Glory with a glorious glore.” “Glore” is the word to consider. Stanford glosses the term as a Scottish form of “glory,” a claim undercut by his failure to observe any other instances of Taylor borrowing from the same or any other Scottish dialect. Patterson, who draws on and expands Stanford's glossary, repeats his predecessor's reading of the word as “glory” while omitting any reference to its putative Scottish origins.

But the disagreeably-sounding word will not budge. It is “glore,” not “glory.” It conveys exactly the poet's situation. Taylor represents himself as disabled by sin-engendered ineptitude, which results in the utterance of an unattractive word when futilely trying to celebrate divine glory. The best he can do is get it half right,

the “glore” part of “glory” without (alas) the voice-lifting, aesthetically-pleasing feminine ending.

There is even more to Taylor’s game here. “Glore” may playfully represent the pitiful best of a poet besotted by his fallen condition, but it also remains as potentially redeemable as does the sinner. Only divine intervention is needed, the hand of the Master Artist who can change the position of a poet’s word or a poet’s soul and hence engender their latent capacities. “Glore,” in other words, could be redemptively repositioned so that its silent final “e” would suddenly resound. This potentiality inheres in the representative fallen state of the word because in pre-standardized English “glory” may alternatively be spelled “glorie” and even “glore.” So “glore” does not mean “glory,” but is instead a partial word designed to underscore the need for a divine positioning of the poet in a better place in the redemptive rhyme scheme. Then the poet’s words would meet the obligation to celebrate “Eternall Glory.” Taylor, in short, consciously practiced a Puritan decorum of imperfection—an awareness of various biblical injunctions pertaining to artistic representation and, as well, of the fallen self’s incompetence when undertaking any creative act, particularly in relation to the deity.

What matters, finally, is less a rationale for a new edition of the poems than the outcome of the transcription. Without the manuscript in hand, most readers (including me) will have to judge the success of Patterson’s edition based on internal evidence drawn from the poems. In this regard the most helpful tool the editor provides is an appended 23-page directory of the variations between his and Stanford’s edition. This list, however, must be used cautiously.

First, the variant catalog is not reliable concerning all the differences in punctuation and capitalization between the two editions. Without editorial explanation, sometimes differences in capitalization are noted (e. g., *Gods Determinations*, line 2030; “Meditation 2.6,” line 45), while most often they are not recorded. Consider “Meditation 2.20,” for which there are nearly as many unannounced as there are reported differences between the two editions. Punctuation is more consistently reported, but is by no



means complete. And in the middle of the entry for “Meditation 2.140” we are told: “At this point this list ceases to report most variants in punctuation.”

Second, the variant inventory must be checked against the emendations register. Patterson properly warns, “In many cases, a reading that [Stanford’s] *Poems* reports as the manuscript reading agrees with an *emended* reading” in the present edition. These many changes include such dubious new transcriptions as “Enleckerd” in “Meditation 2.58” and “Macri’dalls” in “Meditation 2.65,” both wisely revised to Stanford’s version. Another unlikely transcription, “paint” in “Meditation 1.39,” fails to make the variant list, but can be detected in the emendations log, where it is sensibly altered to read “plaint,” which is also Stanford’s reading.

This later observation points to a third issue concerning the variant record. Unfortunately, entire poems have somehow dropped from it. For the first series of 49 meditations, for example, there is no listing for poems 3, 5, 6, 15, 21, 22, 28, and 38. While Patterson’s transcription of punctuation can be controversial, its impact on Taylor’s meaning is minimal. However, an uncataloged substantial change such as occurs in line 39 of “Meditation 1.38” is another matter. So to appreciate all of the differences between the two editions, readers will need to have a copy of Stanford’s volume in hand.

Although single-word variants number considerably less than the entries for punctuation in the new edition, these significant differences serve as a measure of the value of Patterson’s edition. Based on my assessments of the internal logic of select poems, Patterson provides a number of improved readings. “Coy” for “Clay” in “Meditation 1.23,” “stall’s” for “stale’s” in “Meditation 1.40,” “waftings” for “Castings” in “Meditation 1.48,” “beares” for “grows” in “Meditation 2.16,” “Stowd” for “stand” in “Meditation 2.20,” “interest” for “merit” in “Meditation 2.32,” “Coine” for “Gaine” in “Meditation 2.42,” “paled” for “Opaled” in “Meditation 2.63,” “wormeaten” for “worm eat on” in “Meditation 2.69,” “Adorn” for “are in” in “Meditation 2.90,” “heate” for “heart” in “Meditation 2.82”—each of these substitutions relates well to other imagery in

their respective poems. These valuable changes improve the overall sense of their poems.

As is to be expected, there are instances where even close attention to the poems does not resolve which variant is preferable. “Mould” for “would” in “Meditation 2.17,” “Hit” for “Hint” in “Meditation 1.38,” “brings” for “kings” in “Meditation 2.72,” “plight” for “night” in “Meditation 2.77,” and “tenses” for “senses” in “Meditation 2.118” are typical of this class of unassessable changes. In this group both variants are supported by the internal evidence, and so the verdict concerning them remains open.

It is good to be able to report that only two unemended single-word variants strike me as mistaken. The word “mandle” in “Meditation 2.101” is possibly an archaic form, but if so it would then be an anomaly in Taylor’s verse, in which the preferred word “mantle” occurs on thirteen other occasions. It is more likely than not that the word is “mantle” in “Meditation 2.101.” More problematic is Patterson’s reading of “flip” for Stanford’s “slip” in “Meditation 2.109.” The sense of the pertinent lines is clear: “Thy hand Let take my heart its Captive prey / In Chains of Grace that it ne’r slip from thee.” “Slip,” not “flip,” is the more obvious choice in light of the references in the lines to hand and chain. The handwritten long “s” apparently snagged the editor.

A project like this one is a very difficult, painstaking undertaking. It is doubtful that any such venture can be snag-free. Although the flaws in the emendation and variant lists impede scholarly facilitation, they amount to an inconvenience. This new, handsome edition of Taylor’s poems is effectively a gift, especially since it highlights a number of whole-word variants that ideally enables us to better appreciate Taylor’s poetic achievement.

Neil Forsyth. *The Satanic Epic*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2003. x + 382 pp. \$22.95. Review by JAMES EGAN, UNIVERSITY OF AKRON.

Forsyth notes at the outset that *The Satanic Epic* should not be considered a sequel to his earlier work, *The Old Enemy: Satan and*

*the Combat Myth* (1990), though many connections between *Paradise Lost* and the combat myth are made, some of them elaborate. He demonstrates in this book, with proofs ranging from mythography, etymology, and historiography to syntactical analysis, the attraction of Satan. As Forsyth reviews Romantic and modern objections to Milton's dour God, he locates the commonality in such objections—Satan's attractiveness points to the "problem of God." He counts himself a member of the "Milton's flawed God" camp, yet Forsyth's rationale for this stance extends well beyond the peevishness and impressionism of many earlier objectors, growing as it does from the position that "Satan's presence both causes and excuses the fall of mankind, and it is his role to allow God to forgive Adam and Eve" (17). Evidence unfolds in twelve chapters, matching Milton's epic structure and developing chronologically through the poem. The opening traces the origins of Satan's identity in Christian mythology, epic literature, apocalyptic literatures, the medieval and Renaissance dramatic traditions in England, and seventeenth-century politics. Parts of this summary seem encyclopedic in the negative sense, that is, information for its own sake rather than as essential grounding for the case to be made in the body chapters. Contextualizing his own position in relation to that of important earlier voices in the Satan debate, notably William Blake, Percy Shelley, William Empson, C.S. Lewis, and Stanley Fish, Forsyth aims to put Satan "back at the center" of the poem (72), proposing that Milton "did indeed invite his readers to adapt a Satanic reading of Scripture and of human experience" (73).

Few would quarrel with Forsyth's initial position, that the text invites its readers to sympathize with the "heroic and divided character" of Satan (85). To support this position, he must raise challenges to the "solemn authority" typically attributed to the poem's narrative voice (89). Forsyth valuably critiques the assumptions of Fish, Anne Ferry and others who had constructed Milton's narrator as the standard voice of epic authority, all the while implying that the narrator was not only immune to the contaminants of Satan, but was a single, stable personality. The language of the

epic similes in Books 1 and 2, according to Forsyth, often “disturbs the clarity of vision generally associated with epic similes and therefore the authority of the voice that uses the similes” (103). This is an intriguing, fresh perspective, plausibly illustrated. The scenes in Heaven presented in Book 3 restrain the presumed adversarial relation between the narrator and Satan, a position Milton reinforces by devising several narrative feints to link the reader with the demon, above and beyond our sharing of Satan’s point of view as he approaches Paradise. For this argument, Forsyth’s mixture of assertion and corrective rebuttal links syntax, poetic rhythm, and semantics credibly in what amounts to a postmodern “close reading.”

Chapter 4 treats the “private Hell” which confines Satan, an appealing and at the same time “dangerously infected” place, appealing because Milton has anticipated the “modern” self and “modern” subjectivity therein (149-50). Forsyth does well to show how Satan’s rhetoric in Book 4 insinuates curious likenesses to God and His rhetoric, reminding us that the problem of Satan doubles as the problem of God. However, maintaining, as Forsyth does, that Satan’s “command of the interior world of modernity helps to render him deeply sympathetic... [and] also sinister” perhaps begs the question at issue. Clearly, Forsyth must illustrate the sympathetic Satan rather than the sinister one, the burden of proof for Satan’s wiles having been capably carried by the “pro-God” camp, yet even a cursory review of the “interior world of modernity” on display in Eliot’s *Prufrock*, Kafka’s *Gregor Samsa*, the characters of Sartre, Camus, and Albee, and the small army of their postmodern descendants will suggest how grotesquely repulsive the “interior world of modernity” can be. Chapter 5 continues the devil’s advocacy, this time somewhat indirectly, by showing the doubleness and paradoxes built into the rebellion in heaven. In Forsyth’s reading, God’s declaration of the sovereignty of Christ seemingly creates both Son and Satan at the same time (172). One likely source of the rebellion narrative is Hesiod, who presents Zeus himself as the rebel who, arbitrarily, almost whimsically, disturbs the “settled order of heaven” (186), establishing the autonomy

of Christ by decree rather than evident merit. This excavation of Hesiod's tale about Zeus will surely be provocative.

Chapter 6 engages the language of "evil" and the traditions which inform the word, with the intention of properly establishing culpability in the epic. "Evil," of course, sounds suspiciously like "Eve," though the etymology of the two words is fundamentally different. Following Forsyth, one would question Satan's responsibility for human evil. At most, Satan would be the "proximate cause" because human freedom, if genuine, must allow for evil. To answer the intriguing questions his interpretation raises, Forsyth proposes that "the real problem for men and women, Milton thinks, is not the world as created by God and perverted by Satan, but each other" (208), the inevitable crisis of sexual difference. The identification of Satan as "proximate cause" is an intriguing blend of metaphysics and postmodern gender theory which, however plausible, does not diminish Satan's archetypal status as plotter and tempter. Even if Satan proves less accountable for evil, as Forsyth would have it, he does not become more attractive thereby, one might reply.

A lengthy, somewhat labored discussion of the etymology of "dis" prefixes in *Paradise Lost* is followed by Chapter 8, "Homer in Milton: The Attendance Motif and the Graces," which draws several parallels between Eve and Homer's graceful heroines, elaborating the earlier argument about culpability. Eve's charm may well have precipitated more problems than Satan's plotting because of Adam's uxoriousness and Eve's vulnerability to her own ambivalent image. If Forsyth's insights here are valid, Milton would have displaced the problem of evil from its apparent cause (Satan) to its more demonstrable cause, Adam and Eve, and their creator. The problem of Satan translates, inevitably, as the problem of God, which Forsyth had urged from the outset. Identifying the demon as a sexual interloper, an adulterer who makes himself "as sensually attractive a serpent as he can be" (264). Chapter 9 offers a metatextual reading of the fall, restoring Satan to the pinnacle of the epic by illustrating how he can usurp the powers of language, of God's Word, and successfully seduce Eve, almost as a

well-shaped artifact might allure or entangle a reader. Book 9 qualifies as “the high point of *Paradise Lost* as Satanic epic” (285) by virtue of its complex tropes of seduction and entanglement. The intention of Forsyth’s case in the middle and later sections of the book, then, has been judicial, to defend Satan by raising doubts about the credibility of evidence traditionally used to trivialize or transform him into a grotesquely comic version of himself.

From Book 10 through the end of the poem, Satan’s damnation and the reader’s distinction from him rather than our similarity to him dominate the narrative, but even now the reader’s similarity to Satan shapes our difference from him. Chapter 10 studies the implications of “hearing” in *Paradise Lost*, a sophisticated and intriguing interpretation, perhaps the strongest individual argument in *The Satanic Epic*. In effect, the reader “hears” the regeneration of Adam and Eve. Figuratively in Book 10 Adam hears the promise of Christ’s Redemption, but literally he hears the voice of Eve. In contrast, Satan cannot hear or address God, hearing instead only the solitary hiss of his own voice. Forsyth achieves a phenomenological perspective on Christ’s sentencing of Adam and Eve and the promise of Redemption, a perspective which foregrounds Christ’s statement but, equally important, the circumstances of “when and how the words are heard” (299). Chapter 11 makes a final pitch for Satan’s preeminence by evaluating the symbolism of dove and serpent and their curious closeness: even as the narrative distances the reader from Satan, a counter-movement blurs distinctions between Christ and Satan. The structural arguments of Chapter 12, a neo-formalist assessment of the epic’s plot and Milton’s decision to adopt a twelve-book structure in the 1674 edition, reinforce the evidence of Chapter 11. Challenging Barker and Shawcross, Forsyth insists that Milton never conceded that his emphasis on Satan had been excessive: even in the twelve-book version he retained a plot that opens with “powerful scenes for Satan” (318). No matter how the poem may be parsed structurally, it weaves together closely God’s plot and Satan’s, until the two characters come to mirror each other. Simply put, the poem requires both satanic and divine points of view. In fact, argues

Forsyth, the epic's closing lines, with their likening of God's sword to Satan, may be read as a "Satanic triumph," or very close to it (340).

Despite this nearly melodramatic plea for a "Satanic triumph," Forsyth succeeds far more often than not in *The Satanic Epic*. Unlike earlier devil's advocates such as Empson, Forsyth proves versatile and extremely resourceful as a critic, assembling discrete but related support from several sources, even if he sometimes lapses into overabundant detail to do so. Most of his evidence proves fresh and all of it challenging. His claims add up to substantially more than attempts to launch several pro-Satan balloons in the hope that one might reach a far shore. His colloquy of rebuttal with Fish, Barker, Shawcross and others seems astute. *The Satanic Epic* even takes a Quixotic turn. Like Milton as an early pamphleteer, Forsyth hopes to reach an "interested, but nonexpert, reader" (ix) who is not a Miltonist by trade. Despite its clarity and intelligibility, however, the book's necessary references to the history of literary controversies such as the Satan debate, the positions of particular critics such as Georgia Christopher, and the intricacies of post-1950's Milton scholarship as a whole limit the access of non-specialists. Unfortunately, *The Satanic Epic* should prepare for a brief shelf life at Barnes and Noble, and even less at Walmart.

John Barnard and Donald F. McKenzie, eds. *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, Vol. IV, 1557-1695*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. 891 pp. + 31 illus. \$140.00. Review by RANDY ROBERTSON, DEPAUL UNIVERSITY.

This rich, polyphonic volume is a timely contribution to the "history of the book," a field of inquiry that has flourished in recent years. The work is a fitting tribute to Donald McKenzie, whose "textual sociology" has continued to open up vistas in bibliographical studies even after his death in 1999. The story begins in 1557, the year that Queen Mary granted the Stationers' guild its charter, and ends in 1695, the year that preventive censorship lapsed for good in Britain. In his very fine introduction, John

Barnard offers a compendious history of the Stationers' Company, a body that held a virtual monopoly in print during this period: the Stationers' charter restricted printing to Company members, effectively confining printing to London (later the Universities received printing privileges, as did the Archbishop of York). Barnard traces the Company's battles with royal patentees, the shift in power from printers to booksellers, the consolidation of certain patents in the English stock, and the rising output of the London presses.

The remainder of the book is broken down into eight sections: Religion and Politics; Oral Traditions and Scribal Culture; Literature of the Learned; Literary Canons; Vernacular Traditions; The Business of Print and the Space of Reading; Beyond London: Production, Distribution, Reception; and Disruption and Restructuring: The Late Seventeenth-Century Book Trade. The topics naturally bleed into one another: as Patrick Collinson and others point out, religion "permeated much . . . of what is now secularized" (29), canons and business intermingled, and London trafficked with the provinces.

The number of religious titles produced in early modern England dwarfs that on other topics, and confessional writing encompassed myriad genres, from solemn treatises to jouncy ballads. Even Puritans did not frown on the theater or the ale-house song as vehicles of reform until the 1580s, and the godly never abandoned satire as a weapon (32-33). Collinson and company chart the religious controversies that gave rise to several print wars in this period. Nonconformist ministers deprived of their livings thrust themselves into print (30, 32), and dissidents pelted orthodoxy from the margins. Sects ramified, but there was continuity as well as change: Martin Marprelate of the late sixteenth century was lineal ancestor to Richard Overton's Martin Mar-priest of the civil wars. Neither Martin, however, succeeded in his aim of a more thoroughgoing reformation: the acrid style of the polemicists alienated more of the public than it converted (42-44).

The Quakers, who started off militant in the 1640s and 1650s and softened into pacifism at the Restoration, proved more successful. Although they often published their writings anonymously



and without official license, even diffusing the risk of publishing their work by parceling print jobs among different printing houses, the “Friends” devised internal systems of authorization and copy-right and developed sophisticated methods of book distribution (70-75). On the opposite end of the religious spectrum, Roman Catholics, like Puritans, were persecuted ceaselessly, but the Catholic church’s well-organized network disseminated Roman Catholic writings surreptitiously with a fair degree of success. Indeed, Collinson, Hunt, and Walsham challenge the “conventional wisdom” that Protestants relied on the printing press to a markedly greater extent than did Catholics (44-55). In addition to discussing Britain’s sundry denominations and their relationship with the book trade, the two chapters on religion provide a store of information on individual and group reading habits.

Harold Love’s contribution is the standout in the section on “Oral Traditions and Scribal Culture.” Love’s essay brims with fascinating details about the relationship between spoken and written language. We learn, for instance, that the radical Robert Overton wrote out anti-government ballads that he heard on the London streets (119); Cromwell’s regime arrested Overton, while the “fidler’s boy” who had sung the lyrics apparently got off scot-free—writing left a tangible record, whereas singing did not. John, Lord Lucas, delivered a speech against Charles II’s Subsidy Bill of 1671, which, he complained, fell heavily on the peerage. The King was present at the Lords’ debate, but in theory at least parliamentary privilege protected Lucas’s right to inveigh against crown policy. When others transcribed the speech and circulated it abroad, however, the House of Lords called it in; indeed, Lucas claimed that the scribal version had gathered accretions that were none of his. As Love observes, the authorship of such manuscripts is highly complex: on the one hand, “the publicly circulated version was the work of an editor who had interpolated a few strokes that had not occurred to the speaker”; on the other hand, “[s]ince Lucas must have realized that so flagrant a confrontation of the King would lead to the circulation of versions of his words in manuscript, the

oral delivery becomes, in one sense, an act of scribal publication by dictation" (99).

"The Literature of the Learned" comprises a tessellate group of chapters: on the Latin trade, patronage, university presses, classical scholarship, maps, travel literature, scientific publications, Samuel Hartlib, public and private libraries, and monastic collections. The essays on patronage and cartography are disappointingly brief; those on the Latin trade, the Oxbridge press, and Hartlib's circle manage an impressive range in a narrow compass. Adrian Johns's paper, "Science and the Book," is superb. Johns reads through the experimentalists' rhetoric of abandoning the library for the natural world: he details the ways in which the Royal Society produced and consumed books. (John Sprat, the Society's historian, "denied that it had a library," but one was later created, "and [Sprat] himself boasted that its members were 'Read', as well as 'Travell'd', 'Experienc'd', and 'Stout'" [275].) The Society exercised an extraordinary control over its own publications, encroaching on territory that was traditionally the Stationers'; but Society fellows also learned to deal with guild printers and booksellers to advance their own interests.

The Royal Society's central aim in imposing such a stringent order on its publications was to preserve the intellectual property of its members. Natural philosophers continually worried the question of "priority": as Johns notes, charges of plagiarism were rife in the scientific community. Members were also concerned to prevent piracy: corrupt redactions of their work lowered their credit at home and on the Continent. The Society therefore licensed its publications and even kept its own book register, analogous to the register at Stationers' Hall.

The following section on "Literary Canons" addresses the twin questions of authorship and "credit" in a somewhat different manner. John Pitcher argues that "the arrival of the recognizably modern author and the beginnings of the formation of the English literary canon" date to "the late Elizabethan period" (359). Chaucer was the first English author to be canonized: not only was he the subject of a spate of literary hagiographies, but several editions of his

“Complete Works” were published in folio. Magistrates of taste, including Gabriel Harvey, soon nominated living authors for the bays: Sidney, Daniel, Shakespeare, and Jonson. (Indeed, Jonson nominated himself, superintending the production of his own *Works* in 1616. That same year, James appointed him laureate.) Many used the touchstone of originality to distinguish these writers from the lesser lights of the period, a decidedly modern impulse.

Elsewhere in this section, Paul Hammond maps the Restoration canon adroitly and thoroughly. Other scholars discuss marginalized groups: Nigel Smith explores the literature of dissenters, and Maureen Bell tracks both the canonization of women writers and the canon of writers whom women read. Milton, naturally, gets his own chapter. “Vernacular Traditions” contains chapters on the Bible trade, law books, ABCs, almanacs, domestic writing, newsbooks, and other popular genres. Baker’s essay on legal publishing and the patents for law books is meticulous—in it, Baker covers nothing less than the tortuous history of who owned the law; Nelson and Seccombe’s piece on periodicals is also very good. “The Business of Print and the Space of Reading” treats the material facets of book making, from “the economic context,” to the minutiae of paper manufacture, bookbinding, letter foundries, and finally, the “*mise-en-page*.” In his valedictory essay, “Printing and publishing 1557-1700: constraints on the London book trades,” Donald McKenzie makes a vitally important point about the survival rates of early modern books. He demonstrates cogently that the further back we go, the higher is the “loss rate” of books and other publications; this leaves the misleading impression that the printing trade expanded in a more dramatic fashion than it did. McKenzie’s conclusion also bears on how we read the extant documentary evidence, providing yet another caveat against Whiggish narratives: what may seem an increasing occurrence of certain ideas and practices may simply be a function of the survival rates of certain documents—salient “trends” may in any particular instance be a scholarly fiction, an epistemological mirage. The penultimate section, “Beyond London, Production, Distribution, Reception,” places the London book trade in a broader context,

including chapters on the provincial trade, Scotland, Ireland, Wales, the Continent, and the American colonies.

No book with such a wide scope can be without mistakes or lacunae. My criticisms of the volume are three. First, most of the contributors slight the issue of censorship (Michael Treadwell and Julian Roberts are notable exceptions). McKenzie, for instance, contends that censorship's impact was nugatory:

the [London] trade's total production for, say, the years 1641 to 1700 was 75,285 titles or editions of them, excluding serials. Allowing a loss rate for the period of something like 25 per cent, the total output of the trade would have been about 100,000 titles or editions of them over those years. For precisely that same period, I have recorded every book mentioned in the journals of the Lords and the Commons, the State Papers (Domestic), and the court books of the Stationers' Company. There are some 800 items, of which 400 are entirely innocent and 400 in some degree suspect. Those 400 represent 0.4 per cent of the output of the trade. Of those 400 the number which led to a charge, let alone a conviction, let alone punishment, was only the tiniest fraction. (566)

He concludes by pronouncing that "fear of the courts had virtually no impact on the economy of the book trade." But despite the surface persuasiveness of the data he presents, there are several glaring flaws in McKenzie's analysis. To start with a relatively minor point, he posits a "loss rate" for books of 25 percent, but he assumes that the loss rate for state papers and Stationers' court records was zero—an unwarranted assumption. He assumes further that the sources he consulted comprehend all cases of censorship during this time, yet we cannot be certain that all of the books to which parliament objected, for instance, are noted in the House journals, or that all of the volumes in a messenger's quarry are recorded in the state papers; indeed, many journal entries and government documents refer to the seizure of "scandalous and

sedition books and pamphlets,” without specifying either number or title. And how many manuscripts did the licensers blot or alter rather than suppress?

To be sure, the licenser’s trawl was not always effective, but in July of 1664 Roger L’Estrange, chief censor during the Restoration, “calculated that government agents had seized approximately 130,000 pamphlets and books in the latest crackdown,” a figure that suggests the extent to which censorship affected “the economy of the book trade” (Richard L. Greaves, *Enemies Under His Feet: Radicals and Nonconformists in Britain, 1664–1677* [1990]: 169). Perhaps most seriously, McKenzie fails to consider the psychological impact of censorship, the “chilling effect” that licensing and exemplary punishment undoubtedly had. One wants to know what part self-censorship played in the literature of the period. Some writers were willing to write, and some stationers to publish, unlicensable work, yet given the barbaric punishment meted out to the likes of William Prynne, John Twyn, and Stephen College on the public stage, surely many more were loath to do so. To determine whether “fear of the courts” had any effect on the book trade, rather than estimate how many books were produced and how many censored, we would need to reckon how many works *would have been produced* had it *not* been for the censorship. In his account of the “constraints” on the London trade, McKenzie begs this and other questions.

Second, the editors of the volume should have set aside more space for the problem of copyright. References to the Stationers’ register are sprinkled throughout, but there is no one chapter devoted to the intricacies of copy ownership. This is a signal omission, as “copyright” embraces the topics of authorship, intellectual property, possessive individualism, Stationers’ Company custom, and a host of others.

Finally, the book does little to make bibliography sexy. A faint antiquarian air hovers above the volume, and I doubt that it will hook those not already interested in the history of the British book trade. On a similar note, a few of the articles read like annotated bibliographies—a dutiful listing of titles is followed by a handful of

perfunctory remarks. This is nevertheless an indispensable collection of essays for anyone interested in the early modern book trade, and it is to be hoped that Cambridge will soon make it available in a more affordable paperback version. At \$140.00, the vast erudition between its covers is bound to remain the preserve of the literary aristocracy.

H. Neville Davies, ed. *At Vacant Hours: Poems by Thomas St Nicholas and His Family*. Birmingham: University of Birmingham Press, 2003. xlvii + 492 pp. \$60.00. Review by A. H. DE QUEHEN, UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO.

Thomas St Nicholas was a Kentish man, born in 1602 at Ash, near Sandwich, where his family was long established. He proceeded from Emmanuel College, Cambridge, to the Inner Temple but was not called to the bar for some years. In the interim he was married and widowed, his four children also dying. His second wife, who survived him, came from the West Riding; St Nicholas joined her brothers in an ironworking partnership, and his business interests brought him often to Yorkshire. He was there in 1642 and a subscriber to the *Declaration and Protestation* against the Yorkshire commission of array. He was taken prisoner at Rotherham by "great Newcastle's popish legion" and confined for some time in Pontefract Castle (16). Once released, he continued to work for the parliamentary cause, and Fairfax made him receiver-general for the West Riding. Having returned to Kent in 1649 with his wife and two surviving children, he held increasingly important legal posts and was a member of the Barebones Parliament and the Council of State. However, he objected to Cromwell's interference with the Commons, from which he was one of those excluded in 1656. He was active again in the last Parliaments of the Protectorate and justified himself at the Restoration when his wartime accounts were scrutinized and approved. He retired, deeply disillusioned by the ungodliness of the new age, and died in 1668. Throughout his adult life he wrote poetry—"when / Some vacant hours invite, I take my pen / Instead of cards or dice or tavern

folly / To put aside some fits of melancholy" (3). He collected seventy poems of various lengths, including a few by relatives, in a manuscript volume now in Birmingham University Library and admirably edited by H. Neville Davies.

It is true that St Nicholas may not achieve, and perhaps never sought, the brilliant lines with which his talented contemporaries surprise and delight their readers; however, his meticulous descriptions and conventional imagery can bring clearly to mind the human drama of those troubled years. Take the poem "For My Son," describing his humiliation, and that of other Pontefract prisoners

At whose approach t' the castle the bystanders  
 Did inhumanely triumph and rejoice,  
 Jeer, and with shoutings elevate the voice . . .  
 To see poor men stripped to their shirts and driven  
 Ten miles or twelve barefoot, some six or seven  
 Tied by the thumbs together, some, that stood  
 With shirts like boards stiffened with cold gore blood,  
 Surbate and lamed i' the feet with walking bare,  
 Begging for water for God's sake . . . . (25)

In the Yorkshire towns, swept for soldiers by "besoms of array," a stranger seeing "No males appear would sure be at a stand, / And think th' Amáizons had possessed the land" (26). St Nicholas's rather deliberate sense of humour appears more innocently in another Pontefract poem, "Upon the Sight of a Mouse, Taken by a Samson's Post, under Sir Walter Raleigh's *History*"—a handy trap replicated by the editor with Birmingham University's 7½-lb. copy—"So great a weight as needs contained must be / In such an universal history." But for a Puritan no happening is without implications: like the mouse, the "silly sons of Eve" nibble at forbidden fruit, and St Nicholas prays his soul "might trample underfeet / The moon [as

in Rev. 12:1] with all her tempting baits" (32). In "The Recreation of an Accountant at the Grand Audit of England" he is soon "pressed / Upon the thoughts of numb'ring calculations / A little to dilate my meditations / On that of Moses, where he sweetly prays / 'O Lord, teach us to number up our days'" (48-49, quoting Ps. 90:12). In the sequel, "Upon the Declaring and Passing of My Accounts, May 21, 1663," he inevitably reflects, "But I have yet greater accounts to pass. / A greater audit than yet ever was / Is yet to come" (65). Mercifully he can count on Christ's "Act of Oblivion" for protection.

God was active in saving the St Nicholases when a flooded river engulfed their coach. The poet's "Hymn of Praise," written in eight and six, elicited "An Echo" in heroic couplets by his brother John, the ejected rector of Lutterworth in Leicestershire, and St Nicholas responded with a "A Return to the Echo" in octosyllabics. This friendly interchange of poems is an attractive aspect of the collection. Other poems are satirical: "God Speed the Plough" on lawyers practising "the noble art of angling / In clients' purses' and parsons plying 'the steeple-monger's trade" (66-87), or "Upon Loquacity" on various misusers of speech. The longest, and angriest, poem is "The Voice of the Rod" (from Mic. 6:9), berating the society that has brought upon itself the Great Plague of 1665. With its Hudibrastic metre and recycling of Butler's notorious rhymes (such as "stickle/conventicle" in lines 267-68), this reads like a response-text turning anti-Puritan rhetoric back against the debauched proponents of Uniformity. The rod speaks again, more smoothly in heroic couplets but just as bitterly, in "1666: Upon the Burning of the City of London." But St Nicholas's manner is more typically personal, or familial, as in "My *Ultimum Valè*," his last farewell to his relatives and non-conformist brethren. A couplet on his grandchildren—"My pretty surculi, who rise / To fill my garden's vacancies"—neatly captures the mixed emotions in his memory (171). "Myself reprinted," he continues, "May th'edition / Corrected prove is my petition!"

He would surely have been gratified by H. Neville Davies's edition of his poems. The commentary, which fills more pages



than the text, is immensely thorough in its historical research and always a pleasure to read. The printed text is modernized; however, the University of Birmingham Press has included a CD-ROM with nice clear images of all the manuscript's pages. This is an excellent expedient: it makes an already most interesting book a place where scholars of the seventeenth century will feel entirely at home.

Mary Elizabeth Ailes. *Military Migration and State Formation: The British Military Community in Seventeenth-Century Sweden*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2002. xiv + 192 pp. + 8 figs. + 2 tables. \$50.00. Review by LEE SATHER, WEBER STATE UNIVERSITY.

The period roughly stretching from 1600 to the early 1700s is generally referred to as Sweden's Age of Greatness when that nation briefly acquired a Baltic empire and played a major role in the 30 Years' War and European politics for several decades thereafter. These developments led both to a significant growth in the size of its military forces and to the creation of the "military state." Given Sweden's particularly limited resources, it was also forced to recruit relatively large numbers of foreign troops both as ordinary soldiers and officers. Professor Ailes in this work examines the 119 British officers recruited in this fashion, their integration into Swedish society, and the significance of this phenomenon in the creation of a Swedish military state.

In her first chapter Ailes discusses the various phases to Swedish recruitment of foreign officers, particularly those from Britain. She notes that this practice occurred most often during the decade from 1628-1638 when Sweden established supremacy over the Baltic states at the expense of arch-rival Poland, successfully participated in the Thirty Years' War, and became a major European power. Demand receded thereafter as Sweden's role and power declined especially after 1660. Ailes also makes the point that recruitment of officers abroad not only fulfilled the obvious military need for officers as the army grew in size but also was done to

reduce the bargaining power of the native nobility during a period of critical constitutional strife with the Crown.

Ailes in her second and third chapters examines the recruitment process by which Sweden secured the services of these British officers. She finds that almost all of the British officers came from Scotland since the English possessed other outlets for opportunity and Irish Catholics sought military service elsewhere. Most of the Scots who served in the Swedish army were younger sons of noble families, illegitimate, or belonged to cadet branches of the nobility. If this was the “push,” the “pull” or advantage to seeking service in Sweden came from the proclivity of the Swedish monarchy during the seventeenth century to reward their foreign officers much more handsomely—including the greater likelihood of ennoblement—than was true elsewhere, such as in Denmark. For example, thirty-five officers from twenty-eight British noble families were ennobled in Sweden during the seventeenth century. Most were then entitled to sit with members of the third (lowest) class of nobles in the *riksdag* [Parliament] although seven became aristocrats or of the first class of the order. All therefore owned large amounts of land and enjoyed considerable social prestige.

But the actual integration of these foreign officers into Swedish society was another matter. In the fourth and most extensive chapter Ailes considers this situation. Her study shows that half of the British officers in Sweden during the century married British women either prior to or during their Swedish service. This first generation therefore tended to be a tightly-knit group that shared a common language and religion and remained relatively isolated from their Swedish peers.

Circumstances were much different for the second generation of these families during the second half of the century. On one hand, the influx of foreign officers declined considerably and new opportunities for advancement through military success became almost non-existent as Sweden followed a less aggressive foreign policy. But this group nevertheless were generally able to capitalize on their fathers' previous achievements and their own greater acculturation to Swedish society. They often married with native

Swedes, including into the highest ranks of the Swedish nobility, and were able to play a much more active role in public affairs. Ailes also investigates in this chapter the relative success of British officers in acquiring substantial amounts of land through the policy of donation practiced particularly by Gustav II Adolf [Gustavus Adolphus] and Queen Christina in the first half of the century. Here she shows the rather remarkable willingness of Swedish rulers to reward loyal foreign officers in this way as well as native noble officers. Ailes also presents evidence of Swedish rulers who allowed three generations of foreign officers to retain their property without ennoblement or granted land to the widows of foreign officers as clear and unusual examples of the loyalty that these monarchs demonstrated towards those who had served them well.

Another indication of the more complete integration of the second generation into Swedish society can be seen through their participation in the *riksdag*. Although verbatim records of the body do not exist, available evidence indicates that this was the case and Ailes concludes correctly that their more complete mastery of Swedish as well as their greater status within Swedish society accounts for this development.

In her last chapter Ailes discusses the interesting opportunities that existed for this group to act as diplomatic envoys, chiefly as representatives of the Swedish government to the British court. But she also points out that on occasion they were employed to represent British interests in Sweden or in some cases an individual might alternate diplomatic roles as circumstances allowed.

This work reflects the author's extensive use of Swedish archival sources and published primary works in both English and Swedish. Her study also ought to introduce interested readers to the extensive consideration by Swedish historians of their country's Age of Greatness and the "military state." This study is a welcome addition to this discussion of an oft-forgotten military group and corrects common misconceptions of their treatment and later fate.

Alan Houston and Steve Pincus, eds. *A Nation Transformed: England After the Restoration*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001. 327 pp. \$65.00. Review by CHARLES W. A. PRIOR, QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY AT KINGSTON.

One way to test a student's grasp of the history of early modern England is to ask how the society of 1700 differed from that of 1640. This collection, the product of a conference held at the Huntington Library in 1996, proposes to answer this question. The English, argue the editors, were "obsessed by modernity," and that this obsession meant that the period of the Restoration witnessed the rise of secularism and progressive political ideas. Their principal analytic term—"modernity"—is one that is increasingly bandied, but continues to elude precise definition. The editors trace it through the work of scholars such as Immanuel Wallerstein, Anthony Giddens, Charles Larmore, and, of course, the Great Habermas himself. Having thus tried to define "modernity," the editors announce that, after the Restoration, "The emergence of modernity was anything but tidy. Continuity and change were intermixed." Here we detect the faint bugle note of retreat, and the central weakness of the book, of which more below.

The essays themselves resemble, as the editors admit, a series of "discrete case studies," rather than a united attempt to fulfil the mandate so boldly set forth by Houston and Pincus. Blair Worden examines the problem of secularisation, and argues that the English did not abandon religion, but rather practised in different ways. Dissenting sects like Deists and Socinians replaced the "uniform" Christianity that defined the age of Charles I; the emergence of a "civil religion" signalled that faith was less important than "conduct." A further aspect of religion is considered by Mark Knights in an essay that examines the Declarations of Indulgence issued by James II. The result of the extension of toleration was a severing of the link between individual "conscience" and the coercive powers of the state, and the undermining of the "religious polity." Gary De Krey finds a further spur to individualism in the London clubs which brought together "radicals" of various kinds,

and which moulded them into “discursive communities.” The link between the family and commerce is posited by Rachel Weil in an essay which challenges nearly thirty years of scholarship on what Gordon Schochet called the “authoritarian family.” In Weil’s hands, Locke, Sidney, Filmer, and Tyrrell are united in their belief that the production and care of children was the foundation of a strong commercial polity. A less structured view of society informs Tim Harris’s essay which builds on his early work on the politics of the crowd. Once dismissed (and fated to be so still by Steele and Addison), the “mob” came to be courted by the Crown which itself was anxious to display its sensitivity to “public opinion.”

A cluster of essays by Nicholas von Maltzahn, Joshua Scodel, and Paulina Kewes examine aspects of literate culture. Von Maltzahn traces the transformation of the notion of a War in Heaven as it was expressed in poems published during the War for the Spanish Succession and also Marlborough’s campaigns. The result was a secular rendering which made it possible to celebrate an “imperial” civil religion. Scodel—in an essay prone to jargon and circumlocution—argues that Abraham Cowley’s *Pindaric Odes* led people to leave behind the riotous tendencies of the mid-century and to celebrate “daring in nonpolitical spheres.” Finally, Kewes examines suits over plagiarism in the world of the London stage and argues that a property-based association of the writer and what was written pushed the concept of authorship toward its modern connotation.

The volume concludes with essays by Houston, Pincus, and Barbara Shapiro. The former takes up the concept of “interest”—traced by J. A. W. Gunn’s seminal study of 1969—and suggests that talk of articulate political interests helped to define a range of public goods that comprised the “interest of the nation.” A further aspect of this interest is treated by Pincus, who builds on earlier work to situate the rise of England as a commercial power within the context of the Anglo-Dutch Wars. Where these conflicts differed from those of the early Stuart era was that they were driven not by religion but by economics. The volume concludes with Shapiro’s essay on the Restoration scientific community and its

relations with government; co-operation between and among scientists was fostered by the setting aside of all talk of “faith and virtue”—politics and religion were out of conversational bounds.

Like many collections, one notes here a gap between the ambition of the editors and the achievements of the various essays. One expects a certain degree of variation among individual contributions, but those by Scodel and Kewes in particular are out of step with their neighbours. Nor is there any indication that either editors or contributors are familiar with the vast scholarship on early Stuart England, a body of work which has been and is still divided on a number of fundamental questions. Instead, the period they wish to tell us is waning is presented as a kind of caricature—not one of these essays deals in any substantial way with sources or historiographical problems pertaining to the period before 1640. Moreover, those who *have* written on the earlier period, and especially those so clearly disparate in their aims and conclusions as Quentin Skinner, John Morrill, Jonathan Scott and J. C. D. Clark, are lumped together into a single camp.

In fact, it is Clark’s concept of the *ancien regime* that receives the most specific criticism—itsself oddly confined to the now much revised 1985 edition of *English Society*. Also missing is any treatment of Ian Green’s work on the continuity of popular Protestantism, Paul Halliday’s valuable discussion of the religious *timbre* of town politics, and much other excellent work that has a firmer grasp of the period before 1640, and which challenges many of the arguments presented here. For example, Alexandra Walsham’s work on Providence and David Armitage’s study of the ideology of empire suggest that religion informed a range of activities, from simple rural celebrations to the grander enterprise of uniting commerce and religion. Donald Spaeth’s work on parishes and Adam Fox’s valuable book on “oral and literate” culture suggest spheres of political activity not mentioned here; new social histories, notably Carl Estabrook’s study of post-Restoration Bristol, have enhanced our understanding of how communities formed identities, and how religion continued to shape this process. In sum, the collection is oriented toward to the ideas of the elite: there is no

local or social history of the sort that would convince the reader that the “nation” was indeed transformed. Regardless of what historians might wish for them, the people of Restoration England lived in a society shot through with religion, and obsessed with the events of the Civil War—if anything, this bred a kind of conservatism with which any push for “modernity” would have been obliged to contend. History, memory, hierarchy and order continued to shape perceptions, and scholars forget this at their peril.

Timothy Morton and Nigel Smith, eds. *Radicalism in British Literary Culture, 1650-1830: From Revolution to Revolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. x + 284 pp. \$60.00. Review by RICHARD C. TAYLOR, EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY.

For Timothy Morton and Nigel Smith, radicalism is a “lived relation to cultures of fundamental social change,” a way of “inhabiting historical moments,” and—perhaps most intriguingly here—a way of transmitting and interpreting subversive messages, ideologies, and radical personae across a span of time (14). This collection of essays demonstrates how successive generations re-read the English Revolution by appropriating its central figures, theological disputes, and political debates for use in new ideological contexts. With an interdisciplinary approach centered on aspects and methods of cultural criticism, the book questions the commonly held judgment that the period between the English Restoration and the French Revolution was a political lull between two great upheavals. From the regicide in 1649 (it is unclear why the editors list 1650 as their titular beginning point) to the end of the Romantic period, writers interpreted the English Revolution, both praising and condemning, to suit a range of political and religious arguments and a host of radical positions.

The larger project here is to show how political movements appropriate history, and how historical events—or perhaps the re-interpretations of these events—help construct and define new political eras. The contributors are “reading radicals reading other

texts" (14). If "radicalism" seems a somewhat unusual appellation for the reform movements and protests of the long eighteenth century, the contributors demonstrate how the literature of seventeenth-century republicanism and theodicy re-emerges in the discourses of commercialism, language use, taste, political liberty—even diet—that fill the products of an exploding print culture. The past, in short, is up for grabs, a valued set of icons to be marshaled in the service of inspiring reform, a text to be decoded for a new historical moment.

In a chapter that draws its title from a radical pub toast, "May the last king be strangled in the bowels of the last priest," Justin Champion sees the aftermath of the English Revolution, and especially of the Toleration Act of 1689, as triggering a long-term heterodoxy in public discourse about religion and politics. With the grip of the Church and the monarchy somewhat relaxed, a "new public sphere" emerged in the form of coffee houses and periodicals and clubs, where challenges to orthodoxy flourished. Rather than accepting the early eighteenth century as a period of inertia and theological stability, Champion finds a disruption of traditionally understood authority, including that of the printed word, and an ongoing debate centered primarily on religion rather than political philosophy. In fact, what he calls "politico-religious moments" illustrate the connectedness of the two forms of discourse.

Peter Kitson shows how changing representations of Cromwell have underscored ideological positioning in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. He questions the view that Cromwell's reputation was singularly rescued by Thomas Carlyle, whose 1845 edition of Cromwell's letters and speeches casts him as a paragon of religious toleration and political liberty. Earlier histories, such as David Hume's, had cast Cromwell as a fanatical tyrant. The author suggests that pre-Carlyle views were more nuanced and ambiguous towards the Republicans than had been recognized. He finds in the 1790s a religious radicalism that recalled the revolutionary spirit of the 1640s—notably William Godwin's invocation of the republican tradition. For others, Cromwell became a



sort of measuring stick around which Robespierre and later Napoleon would be judged.

Both Jane Shaw and Charlotte Sussman discuss another sort of radical politico-religious phenomenon: the case of fasting women, particularly Anna Trapnel, perhaps the spiritual heir of Margery Kempe. Trapnel "claimed spiritual and political authority through bodily suffering" (102-103). A part and product of the religious fervor of the Interregnum, Trapnel gained respect as a prophetic figure claiming a political authority that was threatening to some and embraced by others. Shaw argues that the eighteenth-century medicalized the body: fasting became a subject for scientific investigation. By the early nineteenth century, women such as Ann Moore were using fasting for radical protest, in Moore's case against the poverty women faced when their husbands deserted them. Sussman uses Trapnel's fasting not only as an instance of protest against Cromwell's government, but also as a stimulus to a new understanding of sacred text, of reading that is "both active and passive, both a private experience and a publicly visible set of effects" (133).

Timothy Morton finds another manifestation of politico-religious radicalism in the discourse of vegetarianism. Morton, who has contributed substantially to the host of recent studies of food as a cultural phenomenon, shows how seventeenth-century writers such as Thomas Tryon use vegetarianism as a vehicle for espousing non-violence, human rights, and spiritual enlightenment.

Two figures who loom large in the book are John Thelwall and Richard "Citizen" Lee. Thelwall appropriates the writings of Milton and the regicide itself as a focal point for analyzing the French Revolution. Michael Scrivener notes that for late eighteenth-century republicans, Milton became an emblem of republican virtue and a worthy forebear of the likes of Thomas Paine and William Godwin. Lee represents a different radical strain: a blend of republicanism and evangelical enthusiasm. John Mee argues that Lee's belief in "full grace" and his religious fervor generally echo seventeenth-century Puritanism. For his anti-monarchical writ-

ing, Lee was indicted for sedition, but he managed to escape prison dressed in women's clothing that had been smuggled in.

This collection of essays is uniformly lucid, engaging, and densely documented historical discourse from the English to the French Revolutions. It provides an especially cogent account of how one historical moment re-imagines another for its own ideological purposes. Finally, it offers a rich tapestry representing strains of radical thought, and it forces a reconsideration of the interim between the revolutions as a quiescent, politically dormant period. The subject itself is enormous and awaits further treatment, but this book serves as an exciting stimulus to an ongoing investigation of the kind of historical intertextuality Morton and Smith illustrate in this book.

Michael P. Winship. *Making Heretics: Militant Protestantism and Free Grace in Massachusetts, 1636-1641*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002. xv + 322 pp. \$29.95. Review by KONSTANTIN DIERKS, INDIANA UNIVERSITY, BLOOMINGTON.

It is not uncommon for reviews of new books on Puritanism in seventeenth-century New England to begin by registering astonishment that yet another book has been written on the subject. In fields such as Native American history, creativity comes from the paucity of archival sources, but in the case of Puritan New England it is sparked by the very richness of existing historiography, which imposes a tremendous burden to make an original contribution. *Making Heretics* certainly offers an original and important new study. Michael Winship reinterprets the interval between 1636 and 1641, years of intense controversy in colonial Massachusetts and years of escalating crisis in an England on the verge of what would be prolonged civil war. This chronological focus is central to the very mission of *Making Heretics* and underpins the analytical high ground claimed by Winship to justify adding a new book to the groaning library shelves on Puritan New England.

Winship insists that attention to chronology is vital to the writing of history. That should not be a provocative statement, but, in Winship's view, and to his dissatisfaction, recent scholarship on Puritan New England has tended to foreground a structural framework, preoccupied with neat binary oppositions and consequently inattentive to historical contingencies. As correctives, Winship engages in a fresh look at the archives and a return to the fundamental historicity of history, all meant to point away from predictable historical accounts pitting orthodoxy against heterodoxy.

In Winship's hands, six short years of the early history of Puritan New England become riddled with dynamism, indeed already so before the outbreak of any controversy. Chapters One and Two introduce us to the Puritans' ongoing debates about salvation and grace stretching forward from the sixteenth century and set the stage for the emigration of John Cotton and Anne Hutchinson from England to Massachusetts in the early 1630s. These are typically the two central figures in what other scholars have been calling the "Antinomian Controversy," but which Winship renames the "free grace controversy" to honor the longer cultural debate underlying the dispute that would flare up suddenly in 1637. Chapters Three and Four provide additional background enabling us to appreciate the sheer abruptness of the outbreak of controversy. Before 1637, there was amplifying social change brought by a rising tide of immigration, as well as a burgeoning cultural vibrancy of Puritan experimentation in conditions of religious freedom in the New World. Debate, change, experimentation—these were key characteristics of early Puritan New England, so that the outbreak of full-fledged controversy would manage to agitate colonists accustomed to unsettlement in their lives.

Chapters Five through Ten dwell on the heart of the story, the pivotal year of 1637, when the tenor of cultural experimentation suddenly crossed a threshold from the routine to the controversial. It is here that Winship's tight chronological focus pays its greatest dividends, because his narrative immerses us in the muddy processes whereby attitudes suddenly hardened and factions suddenly

solidified—the very processes he believes are obscured by a structural approach to history. In a structural approach, factionalism is predictable, even *a priori*, unnecessary to explain. But Winship insists that the factionalism characterizing 1637 was something new and momentous, and thus constitutes the historical problem requiring explanation.

And it is here that Winship is at his most original. Other scholars have concentrated upon John Cotton and Anne Hutchinson as representative of structural oppositions in colonial Massachusetts. Winship, however, stresses the roles of John Wheelwright and Henry Vane. It was Wheelwright's trial in early 1637 which shifted the terms of the debate from free grace to political authority. The resulting clashes in court and in print concerned the very definition of Puritanism and the control of Massachusetts. Hence, Winship reverses the usual treatment of Wheelwright's trial, typically cast as a brisk prelude to Anne Hutchinson's trials later in 1637. For Winship, Wheelwright's trial was impetus, while Hutchinson's trials were epilogue. Winship also trumpets the central role of Henry Vane in catapulting the controversy into the political arena, thereby raising the stakes.

By 1641, the controversy faded as abruptly as it had once flared, and gave way to the consolidation of Puritan orthodoxy. In the view of scholars such as Mark Peterson and James Cooper writing in the late 1990s, this orthodoxy reflected a pragmatism that would enable Puritanism to continue to grow in New England even amid the propulsive social transformations of the latter seventeenth century and the early eighteenth century.

Winship adds a bit of darkness to the story, however, perhaps reflective of the spiking darkness of the early twenty-first century. 1641 may have marked the transition toward an era of consolidation—of the achievement of workable and abiding coalitions of power and boundaries of community in New England. Yet for Winship there was troubling postponement of necessary cultural work, a postponement facilitated by the decimation of Native American communities throughout New England, affording open space for the exile of dissidents from Massachusetts. Exile was a

false solution, seemingly effective in the short run, but ultimately untenable in a Massachusetts and a New England whose social and cultural diversity was only increasing, and whose demands for justice were multiplying. (Winship does not make the connection himself, but his ominous conclusion reminded me of false solutions being pursued since September 2001.)

Following the cue of David Hall, many scholars of Puritan New England like Peterson, Cooper, Erik Seeman, and Laura Henigman have been focusing their attention on the laity more than the clergy. One could wish Winship had turned his archival mastery toward greater attention to the perspective of the laity, since his narrative history approach strays toward a top-down account. One also might have wanted Winship to widen not only the social but also the cultural context, since, except for nods to the presence of Native Americans and of England, his account keeps Puritan leaders eerily segregated from other dimensions of colonial life. Here I am thinking of exciting new scholarship on the economy and on masculinity. But these are quibbles about what is otherwise a tightly conceived and compelling contribution to the field.

Matthew Glozier. *The Huguenot Soldiers of William of Orange and the Glorious Revolution of 1688: The Lions of Judah*. Brighton: Sussex Academic Press, 2002. xi + 228 pp. + 4 illus. \$69.95. Review by EDWARD M. FURGOL, NAVY MUSEUM, WASHINGTON NAVY YARD, D.C.

As an early modern military historian the title of the book excited me, and I approached it with enthusiasm. I anticipated comparisons with other itinerant groups (Irish Roman Catholics and Scottish Presbyterians, for instance), as well as a work that would answer questions regarding numbers—whether of officers' origins or casualties—usually asked by military historians. However, the book failed to meet those expectations.

The author divides the 148 pages of text into seven chapters plus an introduction and epilogue. The first two chapters, dealing with French Huguenots in France and the Revocation of the Edict

of Nantes, occupy almost a third of the book. In them Glozier makes the case that military activity had attracted the noble Huguenots before the Revocation led to exile of thousands of all classes. Chapters three-five (another third) examine the post-1685 military experiences of Huguenots in The Netherlands and England. Glozier makes the point that William, as Prince of Orange, and the Dutch state (unlike James II and VII) readily employed the refugees in their militaries. James, who had to accept the exiles to cover his re-Catholicization policy, condemned the entire group regardless of social class or previous loyal military service to the French crown as “republicans” (49). His employment of the Huguenot earl of Faversham as commander-in-chief of the Royal Army ran contrary to his general negative perspective. Indeed James thought the only suitable military service for the martial exiles enlisting in Britain was as auxiliaries of the Emperor Leopold against the Turks in Hungary (96-7). Glozier corrects earlier views of the Huguenots being a major presence in the English army pre-1689. While William and the Dutch state in their respective armies employed only limited numbers of Huguenots in 1685-88, they readily accepted them as volunteers and incorporated them in the British brigades in Dutch service, illustrating a linkage of French, Dutch and British Protestant aspirations. In William’s 1688 invasion army they accounted for a fifth of the 21,000 troops (chapter six). More importantly their extremely ferocious loyalty to Calvinism and antipathy to Roman Catholics made them ideal instruments in opposing a king suspected of emulating the practices of their persecutor—Louis XIV. The advent of war in Ireland presented William with a genuine security threat that could divert British military resources from the main confrontation with France. He met part of the need for additional troops by creating a double strength Huguenot cavalry regiment and three battalions of infantry not only from his invasion army but also from recruits from France, Switzerland, Brandenburg and The Netherlands. Fired by their anti-Catholic zeal (71, 105) and view of William as a liberator (107), these troops greatly contributed to Williamite success in Ireland, sadly not free from atrocities (chapter seven). Nearly six

hundred of these veterans settled on the Portarlington estates of the Huguenot earl of Galway. The able-bodied survivors of the Irish campaign served in Flanders until the war ended in 1697, and suffered from the worst level of arrears of any units on the British establishment. The Huguenots' failure to secure other emigrants from France and the attrition of war reduced their numbers. In 1697-99 William contemplated using the Huguenot veterans to stymie Louis' Mississippi Valley ambitions, but the French moved first. Despite their unstinting service to Great Britain, the English Parliament treated them with the same disdain that it had for William's other foreigners. Galway's disastrous defeat at Almanza in 1707 eliminated the Huguenots as a separate military entity. Their descendants featured in the British army and navy throughout the 1700s, and seem even abandoned the French nobility's antipathy to bourgeois activities by forming joint stock companies and participating in skilled crafts. Glozier sees the Huguenot military refugees as an important, but limited influence on European and British military history.

The book would have benefited from critical editorial services. The lengthy introduction to the main topic of Huguenot military service with Protestant armies seems tangential. Glozier provides a chart indicating Huguenot connections with James in 1685-88 (4), but why is none provided for William? Material is unnecessarily duplicated, such as the French population in 1629 given twice (13), and the number of Huguenot exiles (37, 41). The author refers to pre-1685 Huguenot military service outside France before 1685 (40), but provides no numbers. He states both that each Dutch province paid the national regiments (causing a disparity in pay/maintenance rates) and that the States General paid them equally (51). He lists both de Tersay's (1668) and de Mauregrault's (1664) as the oldest French regiments in Dutch service (58). He provides conflicting numbers of Huguenots commissioned by William in his three senior regiments on the eve of invasion (50 on 63 and 88 on 65). He initially claims Protestant constitutionalist militancy appeared to the British brigades in The Netherlands after 1685 (74), but later claims it had started in the

late 1670s (78), which he reinforces by citing James' view of them as disloyal to the crown in 1685 (85). Surely it was Scottish Episcopalians who gave their loyalty to James and not the "Presbyterians" cited by Glozier (89)? No manuscript sources are listed in the bibliography, although they are cited in the notes.

Other problems exist. Why does the discussion of French officers in Dutch regiments (1670s-1680s) lack a chart or graph (59-60)? Glozier's referring to the three English and three Scots regiments as the "Anglo-Dutch brigade" (chapter four) runs contrary to generations of Scottish historiography. Closer attention to numbers would have helped. For instance, we learn that Huguenots replaced English captains in the English brigade, but were there only three of them (79) and did that matter? Glozier likewise claims that William commissioned "known political renegades and refugees" from Britain (86), yet fails to quantify the trend. That matter becomes more important when he refers to 43x53 officers from the British brigades leaving to serve James, but does not provide information on the origins of their replacements (86-7). It is highly unlikely that twenty-six infantry regiments contained only "seven hundred and eighty men" (118). The author uncritically accepts Marshal Schomberg's condemnation of the military qualities of the Williamite Ulstermen (118), who held Londonderry against James' army and defeated a portion of it in the field. He refers to heavy Huguenot losses during the Carrickfergus and Limerick sieges, and the battles of the Boyne and Aughrim, but provides no numbers (119, 122-3, 125, 127). The author notes that in the September 1690 campaign the Huguenots served in the advance guard with Danish and Dutch troops, but provides neither numbers nor proportions (125). Why does the appendix list only seventy-one Huguenot officers in the regiments used in Ireland, when the author states that 510 men served in that capacity (130)? Glozier states that had Irish campaigns not become necessary, that the Huguenots would have been "expanded and depleted" in Flanders (133); I fail to see how that fate differs from what they actually experienced. William knew he had a loyal corps of troops with nowhere to go and he seems uncon-



cerned about husbanding them as a tactical reserve. Quoting a renegade Scots Whig (James Montgomery of Skelmorlie) that William only landed in 1688 to seize British men and money for his war against France (136), completely overlooks the geopolitical disaster that would have engulfed Britain in wake of a French victory in Flanders. Although citing four Huguenot military memoirs for the 1689-97 campaigns, Glozier does not seem to utilize them to any great extent. He rightly notices the assimilation of the Huguenots into British Protestant society after the first generation (138-9, 148), but fails to say how long the process took. In the age of electronic typesetting, why did the press release a book with endnotes instead of footnotes?

The book indicates solid research, but suffers from the problems listed above. The book could have been longer, including extensive lists of Huguenots in Brandenburg, Dutch (both William's and the republic's army) and British service. Or it could have appeared in the form of two dense articles—one detailing Huguenot service in Protestant armies, 1685-88, and the second examining their military achievements from 1689 to 1707. A longer work would have allowed for a comparison of the Huguenot experience abroad with Irish Roman Catholics and Scottish Presbyterians. The exclusion of that analysis limits the book's value as a major contribution to early modern military history. However, its correction of previous historians and assemblage of useful data in one place make it a valuable starting point for early modern French, British, Dutch, and military historians.

Toby Osborne. *Dynasty and Diplomacy in the Court of Savoy: Political Culture and the Thirty Years' War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. xii + 304 pp. \$65.00. Review by MICHAEL R. LYNN, AGNESSCOTT COLLEGE.

The duchy of Savoy has received relatively little attention from historians outside of the Italian peninsula. The first half of the seventeenth century has proven particularly hard on the potential inclusion of Savoy in ongoing historiographical debates and dis-

cussions thanks to the tumultuous consequences of the Thirty Years' War and the usual focus on early modern great powers. Nonetheless, the north of Italy faced tremendous military and diplomatic pressures, especially from the dominant states of the period who saw the region as crucial to their own political agendas. In particular, France and Spain, and their chief ministers of this period, Cardinal Richelieu and the Count-Duke Olivares, considered the region vital to their political machinations and their attempts to assert continental dominance. Toby Osborne wants to reinsert Savoy back into the historiographical narrative of the first half of the seventeenth century.

Traditionally, historians of the region have vacillated over how to characterize early modern Savoy. Those keen to anticipate the *Risorgimento* have portrayed the region during this period as a hotbed of political liberty that helped fuel nineteenth-century Italian nationalism. Other historians have focused instead on the political ineffectualness of Savoy against larger international concerns. A third view has suggested that the leaders of Savoy foolishly attempted to intercede in the politics of the Thirty Years' War and that their actions served to destabilize the region rather than increase their power. Osborne has taken a different tactic altogether. Rather than focus on the dukes of Savoy and their efforts, he instead concentrates his attention on the realm of diplomatic exchange and, in particular, on the efforts of one man, the abate Alessandro Scaglia (1592-1641), who served as an ambassador for Savoy. Osborne attempts, with varying degrees of success, to describe several levels of political activity—including the dynastic aspirations of the dukes of Savoy, the family politics of the Scaglia family, whose head was the count of Verrua, and the ongoing conflicts of the Thirty Years' War—all through the lens of this specific individual. Scaglia, a second son, joined the Catholic church, from which he received several benefices, although he never took holy orders just in case his older brother died and he was forced to give up his position, assume the title of count, and marry.

The book is organized in four parts with part one providing the necessary background information on both the ducal family

and their noble clients, the Scaglia di Verrua. The Scaglia family is implicitly established as both the most powerful noble family in Savoy and, somehow, as representative of a larger realm of political culture developing during this time period. The second and third parts turn to the activities of Alessandro Scaglia and his diplomatic efforts on behalf of Savoy. Chapter three looks at his mission to Paris from 1624-1626 while the fourth chapter examines his work negotiating between England, France, and Spain. The next two chapters explore the issues surrounding the war in the north of the Italian peninsula between 1628 and 1632, over Mantua and Monferrato, and the part played by Scaglia. The fourth part deals first with the voluntary exile of Scaglia, in the Spanish Netherlands, due to conflicting opinions over the direction Savoy should take. Although he had gotten along well with the previous duke, Carlo Emanuele I, Scaglia opposed some of the polities of the new duke, Vittorio Amedeo I, who took power in 1630. The last chapter explores the dynastic troubles facing Savoy after the death of Vittorio Amedeo I in 1637 and, one year later, of his six-year old successor Francesco Giacinto. Internal conflict occupied Savoy for the rest of the 1630s and into the 1640s until order was restored under Carlo Emanuele II.

Osborne uses ministerial records and correspondence to great effect in order to reconstruct the political networks in which Scaglia participated. The book provides a narrative account of the diplomatic debates, debacles, and delusions in the middle of the Thirty Years' War. Throughout this, Osborne wants to argue for the success of Scaglia's efforts and his importance in the diplomatic community in which he operated. To accomplish this, Osborne does two things. First, he points repeatedly to the respect Scaglia seemed to receive from his contemporaries who often appear to have gone out of their way to accord the ambassador special privileges and easy access to the corridors of power. Second, Osborne redefines what it means to be a successful diplomat. Had he focused on typical measures, such as important treaties negotiated and signed, Scaglia would have to be considered a failure. Instead, Osborne measures success through the dynamics of Savoyard dynasticism

and the interests of the Scaglia di Verrua clan. Thus, Osborne claims somewhat unconvincingly, although it seems that Scaglia did not accomplish much, his efforts paved the way for future familial and ducal accomplishments.

Scaglia, Osborne notes, did not always work towards obvious goals. Instead, he operated within a developing political culture that prized contacts, friendships, and artistic patronage. Osborne, in this last instance, makes much of the fact that Scaglia commissioned works of art from Anthony Van Dyke, a point repeatedly made but not fully integrated into his narrative. More generally, Osborne provides a detailed, event-by-event, description of Scaglia's diplomatic career. While the book, as a result, abounds in specifics, the connection between these biographical details and the political culture of the time remains a little vague. This illustrates the downside of Osborne's sources that provided considerable detail but failed to give evidence to elucidate a coherent account of seventeenth-century political culture. As a result, interesting questions, such as the nature of diplomatic "friendships" or the exact connections between private and public diplomatic affairs (diplomacy in the service of the state and in the service of the family), are often raised but not pursued systematically. In sum, Osborne has provided us, on the one hand, with a rigorously researched discussion of the Savoyard ambassador Alessandro Scaglia that will surely be of interest to historians of the Thirty Years' War and of diplomatic history. Indeed, he has successfully shown the crucial role played by a representative of a smaller state, Savoy, in international negotiations during this period. On the other hand, those individuals interested in the development of political culture may find their interests piqued but could also feel that many important questions were left unanswered.

Gianvittorio Signorotto and Maria Antonietta Visceglia, eds. *Court and Politics in Papal Rome 1492-1700*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. viii + 258 pp. \$60.00. Review by ERMINIA ARDISSINO, UNIVERSITY OF TORINO.

The volume recently published in the series of Cambridge Studies in Italian History and Culture covers the papacy in the early modern period. It analyses the structures of the Roman court, the changes within it during an age crucial for European history, and the role played in Italian and European politics in sixteenth and seventeenth centuries by the papal institutions. The collected essays take advantage of research into the recently opened Roman archives and are conducted with innovative methods, offering issues which overcome the traditional historiography of the topics.

One group of essays deals with the Sacred College, showing the complexity of life in the most powerful of the Roman institutions. Marco Pellegrini in his "A Turning-Point in the History of the Factional System in the Sacred College: The Power of Popes and Cardinals in the Age of Alexandre VI" (8-30) presents research on ethics and behaviour of the cardinals, and studies attempts made by the pope in order to control this institution. The pontificate of Alexander VI Borgia (1492-1503) appears as the most interesting for the emergence of factors leading to the decline of the Sacred College as an organ of government in the Roman Church. Different forms of erosion of the prerogatives of dignity of the cardinals become evident in the early fifteenth century. The pope altered the composition of the Sacred College by extensive and frequent promotions, in order to forestall attempts to depose him. Generally, during his papacy, the administration, politics, and diplomacy were concentrated in the hands of a small palace committee. The changing force is put in evidence by the essay of Maria Antonietta Visceglia: "Factions in the Sacred College in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries" (99-131). This extensive research proves that in the Roman court "factions were neither a static reality nor a source of perennial political instability, but rather dynamic aggregations, whose political value must be defined in relation to a set of variables" (102). In Rome, factions were not determined by spiritual issues, but created mainly by the election of the pope. Visceglia discusses the actors of the factions (i.e. ambassadors, agents of European courts, cardinal-nephew, conclavists, etc.) and their interactions: how the cardinal-nephew determines

the outcome of the papal election following the death of his pontiff-uncle and how he was influenced by the representatives of international power. A further example of the way factions acted in the conclave and in the politics of the Roman curia is the chapter devoted to the affairs related to the *squadrone volante*. "The *Squadrone Volante*: 'Independent' Cardinals and European Politics in the Second Half of the Seventeenth Century" (177-211) by Gianvito Signorotto. The *squadrone* was a faction of eleven talented young cardinals formed in 1655 after the death of Innocenzo X. It continued its activity for thirty years, until the condemnation of the quietists in 1684. Animated by a strict pragmatism, it determined the choice of the papacy and the orientation of international politics of the Church in years of great instability and continuous transformation, which saw the passage from Spanish egemony to the French one.

The cardinal-nephew appears to be another fundamental component in the life of the curia, acting as the pope's *alter ego*. But, during the seventeenth century the Secretary of State acquired such importance as to be considered a serious rival of the pope's nephew. Antonio Menniti Ippolito in his "The Secretariat of State as the Pope's Special Ministry" (132-57) studies the way the Secretary deprived the cardinal-nephew of all his functions, becoming "a sort of 'cardinal-nephew' unrelated by blood to the pontiff" (134). Starting with Fabio Chigi (appointed in 1651), the Secretary became a key reference in the curia, an innovation continued by his followers, Giulio Rospigliosi and Decio Azzolini.

Another institution which played an important role in the papacy in the early modern period was the cardinal protector. Olivier Poncet in his "The Cardinal Protectors of the Crowns in the Roman Curia During the First Half of the Seventeenth Century: The Case of France" (158-76) traces the story of the institution since Saint Francis, which introduced the protector of a religious order, to the Cardinal Mazarino, which brought to an end the intrusion of papal nepotism into the system of protectorships. The protector of a Catholic crown was an indirect instrument of control of Roman curia to the government of Catholic countries. Mazarino's

action showed that the papacy at the end of the seventeenth century was losing its role within the international theatre of Europe.

At the beginning of the seventeenth century Rome was “the place in which tensions and conflicts rife in Europe came to a head, but where it was also possible to mediate and form alliances. It was a theatre in which individual bravura in dealing with the succession of events and ‘turns’ of fortune was indispensable” (78), and was a centre of business, a market-place for bankers and men of finance. Mario Rosa in his “The World’s Theatre: The Court of Rome and Politics in the First Half of the Seventeenth Century” (78-98) shows the significance of the relationship between politics, religion and culture in the Roman curia through the analyses of the activity of the Accademia dei Virtuosi and of the memoir addressed by Gregory XV to his nephew-cardinal Lodovico. The Virtuosi acted with political and moral aims and pursued the foundation of a “Christian” political system. In their meetings they tried to outline the figure of the prince indicating in its virtues of beneficence and magnanimity the essentiality of a monarch according to the Scriptures. As on a stage, the pope and the curia acted when involved in ceremonies, whose symbolic value was used in order to safeguard a hierarchical order or to modify it according to the need of the Apostolic See. In Rome there was no actual place that could be defined as a court, all the people who orbited around the pope and had access to him, all the city areas which were involved in the daily life of the pontiff and of his courtiers constituted the court. The chapter “Court and City in the Ceremony of the *Possesso* in the Sixteenth Century” by Irene Fosi deciphers the symbolism expressed in one of the most significant festas: the possession of the Corpus Christi, a cavalcade to the Lateran which sanctioned the functions of a new pontiff. Fosi considers three moments: the papacies of Jules II and Leo X at the beginning of the century, that of Paul III in the middle, and that of Sixtus V at the end, three steps which show the changes in the spiritual and political role of the Roman curia. Still, on the ceremonial life in Rome “Hegemony Over the Social Scene and Zealous Popes (1676-

1700)" by Renata Ago informs on the variety of problems related to the relationship between the pope and the Roman families as far as the ceremonies are concerned. The reform attempts introduced by Innocent XI intended to fight the civic and spiritual corruption that were withdrawing the pope from the festive scene.

The diplomatic representatives sent to the rest of Europe *avvisi* on Roman life, which became a well-developed model of information for the rest of Europe. This practice, started in the second half of the sixteenth century, in private and handwritten form, was put under strict rules as a gazette. Elena Fasano Guarini studies the correspondance between Rome and Florence, showing how, through the role of observer, the young Cardinal Ferdinando de' Medici learned the difficult art of governing, which he had to use when he became duke of Tuscany ("Rome Workshop of All the Practices of the World: From the Letters of Cardinal Ferdinando de' Medici to Cosimo I and Francesco I," 53-77). Mario Infelise presents the evolution of the *avvisi* since their beginning until the end of seventeenth century, using many examples of this informing activity which introduced a new factor into political life: public opinion ("Roman *Avvisi* : Information and Politics in the Seventeenth Century," 212-28).

This collection of essays seems to respond very well to the intents of the editors as stated in the brief introduction (a useful bibliographical overview on the matter): "by rejecting a generic approach, by looking beyond the stereotypes and taking detailed account of the historical events, we hope to have introduced a variable—an element of complication that is still largely neglected—into the 'general' histories and into those of individual countries." The image of the Roman court which comes out from reading these pages is new and leads to suggestions for further studies.

Helen Watanabe-O'Kelly. *Court Culture in Dresden: From Renaissance to Baroque*. Palgrave, 2002. xv + 310 pp. + 56 illus. \$39.95. Review by MARIAN MATRICIAN, UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS, LITTLE ROCK.



Reformation era warfare resulted in loss of the electoral dignity by one branch of the house of Wettin in Saxony and grant of this privilege to the rival Albertine faction. The latter was in residence at Dresden. Thus when Moritz, Duke of Saxony, attained the position of Elector in 1547, Dresden became the capital. Soon, an ambience of richness, embellishment and thematic art began to unfold around the court. Helen WatanabeO'Kelly explains how access to records for the Dresden court only became possible after German reunification. Yet Saxony was the most important Protestant court, uniquely strengthened by its enduring dynasty. The family's continuity allowed it to promulgate notions of its destiny and grace through complex celebrations and patronage. All of which unleashed a tide of powerful iconography around the family, and created the etiolated culture of Dresden that the author sets out to explore. While the Albertine dynasty had the power to shape culture for its own ends, the author also shows how even the most headstrong members were limited and guided by their society and culture.

The period under study covers the following Electors: August (1553-1586), Christian I (1587-1591), Christian II (1591-1611), Johann Georg I (1611-1656), Johann Georg II (1656-1680), Johann Georg III (1680-1691), Johann Georg IV (1691-94), and Friedrich August I, i.e., August II, King of Poland, (1694-1733). The text moves chronologically and thematically, beginning with the impact of Lutheranism upon the courts of Moritz and August. Martin Luther was from Saxony, and local rulers protected him at a crucial point in his career, so that Luther's struggles were seen as integral with the powers of Saxon rulers. Luther's ideas about drama and music found a willing audience in this court; the Electors favored allegorical pageants that elevated and embellished their roles in history. And religious iconography was employed to delineate their sectarian stance.

Dramatic pageants typically occurred at points of great celebration—perhaps a wedding, or political anniversary—and could last a month, or longer. The festivity was recorded in illustrated

catalogues and through publication of the music or other texts created for the event. Architecturally significant buildings were added to the court or town at such times. Artwork sponsored by the Electors thus contributed to a living legacy of their grandeur.

While the Albertine Electors elevated Lutheranism, it did not prevent their employing the ideas of Italian architects and craftsmen. Chapter two discusses the impact of Italian culture on Dresden. Watanabe-O'Kelly suggests that Italian culture/design was not viewed as "foreign" so much as "modernization," which is an interesting point, since Protestant rulers enthusiastically pursued Italian artisans and styles. In addition, Renaissance classicism opened a new elite discourse that helped separate high culture from more common local forms. Renaissance art also enabled Protestant rulers to associate themselves with ancient and Biblical themes.

Chapter three shifts the examination to the role of collecting, and collections in the education of a ruler. The objects in a *Kunstkammer* were meant in part to inspire the contemplative to see patterns and to think inductively and deductively. Not many could afford such collections, which underscored the powers of those who could. The author takes us step by step through collections in the Dresden palace, housed in seven rooms. Some of the logic behind what is described here or elsewhere in the book is obvious. But throughout are long passages of pure description which would benefit greatly from the author's analysis of the significance of what she has put before us.

Chapter four addresses alchemy, astrology, and mining. Alchemists sought knowledge of transformation and transmutation in nature. But the potential that a rare element like gold could be made from ordinary substances had huge appeal for rulers in an era demanding ever greater fiscal responsibility from the state. By the later sixteenth century, it seems every ruler kept an alchemist, or several, under steady employ. For Saxon rulers, alchemy overlapped with local mining and metal industries. Electress Anna, Princess of Denmark and wife of August of Saxony, had her own laboratories.

The material met up to this point flows well into chapter five which presents the ambitious ceremonial machinations of Johann Georg II (r. 1656-1680). This Elector distinguished himself through his attention to official art and elite ceremony. His savvy pursuits were well rewarded, including his election in 1668 to the British Order of St. George, or the Order of the Garter.

Chapter six examines the entrance into Dresden of performance work from abroad. Plague and politics had expelled many of the best English acting troupes to the continent, where they picked up German casts and began performing in German. The author notes some English plays were performed in Germany before appearing in print in England. But the interaction between the Dresden court and the new theatre, including Moliere, is not entirely clear. However, explanation of the ballet at Dresden falls more in line with what we have learned so far. Originating in Renaissance Italy, ballet fused poetry, music, dance, and painting. The French developed ballet as an entertainment for the aristocracy. Like high court ceremony, it featured elaborate scenery and rich costumes. Early modern courts sponsored ballet and shaped its evolution. The Dresden court used ballet as a more recent art form to portray familiar themes and allegories concerning dynasty and Elector.

Electeur Johann Georg III created a standing army and cadet school. His son, Friedrich August, appeared in iconography as Hercules, or August the Strong. Chapter seven tells his story and reintroduces earlier themes such as collecting, metallurgy, and alchemy. Friedrich August converted to Catholicism to become eligible for the throne of Poland. Although he succeeded in this, Saxony remained Protestant. As a young man August had been indelibly impressed with collections he saw at Versailles and Vienna. The scope of precious objects and artwork, and their elaborate display in these places maximized the pomp and power of the rulers. The experience of such grand collections thoroughly inspired him to improve and reorganize Dresden's collections of art and precious objects, making him one of the most important patrons of the day. All Electors met in this book continually built Dresden's official

heritage and culture. Helen Watanabe-O'Kelly's work ends by showing how Friedrich August broadened the nature of Dresden society, making it an important European court and a city that belonged among those gleaming jewels: Europe's great cities.

Thomas Bürger, ed. *Verzeichnis der gedruckten Briefe deutscher Autoren des 17. Jahrhunderts. Teil 2: Drucke zwischen 1751 und 1980*. 4 vols. Series: Repertorien zur Erforschung der frühen Neuzeit, Vol. 12.2. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2002. 1480 pp. Vol. 1 (paper), □159; Vol. 2 (paper), □138; Vol. 3 (paper), □138; Vol. 4 (paper), □138. Review by SUSAN R. BOETTCHER, UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN.

As the title states, this four-volume reference work consists of an alphabetical listing of printed letters written by German authors of the seventeenth century. This second installment of a work begun by Monica Estermann (Part One to 1750 was published in 1992) was funded by the *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft* and completed at the Herzog-August-Bibliothek in Wolfenbüttel under the supervision of Bürger. It concerns reprints made between the middle of the eighteenth century and the fourth fifth of the twentieth century. As in the previous volumes, "seventeenth century" refers to authors born between 1575 and 1675. "German" means those authors occupied in the Holy Roman Empire (including their correspondents outside of it) and includes letters written in other languages by authors who can be considered German according to this definition. Abbreviated biographies of the correspondents are provided where available (many are not), including their presence in the major bibliographical literature. Examination of the entries reveals that the authors are primarily members of the nobility and intelligentsia, as the boundary of "printed" naturally suggests. Entries are derived from approximately 1200 sources. Full bibliographic references for these are provided at the beginning of the first volume; in each individual entry a reference is provided to the library where the original letter can be found along with the signature according to which it is

catalogued in that library—a tool that has the potential to be a major timesaving device. Entries include references to replies to the letters listed when extant and are cross-referenced in the entire work by recipient as well. A minor quibble: no index of the language abbreviations is provided, though most are obvious, and for reasons unclear to me, occasionally an indication of the language of the letter (included throughout in the right margin) is simply omitted.

It would have been well nigh impossible to provide an exhaustive reference to every single print of a German letter dating from the seventeenth century, and the preface by Helwig Schmidt-Glintzer acknowledges the potential for incompleteness. As the Schmidt-Glintzer suggests, even in the absence of the actual letters the work could be used as an aid to social history studies of intellectual networks in Europe following the pioneering work in this regard by Wolfgang Reinhard. The primary utility of this tool, however, appears to be three-fold. First, it has the potential of providing a summary of the miscellanea that appear like weeds following every critical edition of correspondence, hence providing a collective correction and expansion of mistakes and omissions that inevitably occur, although for the sake of completeness, this work also indexes authors like Hugo Grotius whose epistolary production is largely reproduced in reliable and widely available modern critical editions. Second, the tool provides the most important rudiments for research on figures for whom a complete critical edition is unavailable, like August Hermann Francke; in such cases, it has the potential to be a real aid to the researcher. Third, one imagines that in particular this second part of the index will be of greatest value to researchers outside of Germany and Europe or major research libraries elsewhere who may not be able to resort to the manuscript letters or older, original editions of these works, but may be able to put their hands on the more modern reprints catalogued here or order them via library exchange networks. The work thus has the potential to be of use to researchers who are participating in the recent upsurge in interest in research on the German Baroque, Pietism, and history of science and philosophy

before the eighteenth century. Its scope means that it will not be of much aid in supplementing research relating to the rapidly expanding interest in the genre of *Selbstzeugnis* in this era, but that was not its intent, and the conception of the work clearly predates our contemporary scholarly preoccupations. Because of the narrow utility of the tool and its cost, as with the first installment, this second portion will primarily be of interest for librarians of special collections with a focus on early modern literature and history or bibliographers at high-level research libraries. One hopes that the Herzog-August-Bibliothek will someday make available an electronic version of both parts of the work for use from its website.

Johann Valentin Andreae. *Theophilus*. Edited by Jana Matlová and Jirí Beneš and translated by Viktor Friedrich Oehler and Frank Böhling with commentary and introduction by Jirí Beneš. Volume 16 of *Gesammelte Schriften*, Wilhelm Schmidt-Biggemann, general editor. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Fromman-Holzboog, 2002. 469 pp. □108. Review by DONALD R. DICKSON, TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY.

This is the fourth of a projected twenty volume edition of the collected works of Johann Valentin Andreae (1586-1654), under the general editorship of Wilhelm Schmidt-Biggemann of the Free University of Berlin. Three others volumes have appeared: *Veri Christianismi Solidaeque Philosophiae Libertas* (1618), edited by Frank Böhling in 1994; some biographical works in 1995; and most recently *Theca Gladii Spiritus* (1616), edited by Frank Böhling and Carlos Gilly. The legends surrounding the secret brotherhood of the Rosicrucians has obscured the reputation of Andreae, ever since 1614 when the anonymous collection of pamphlets known as the Rosicrucian manifestos first appeared in print in Kassel. For centuries the only real link between Andreae and these two manifestoes was the name Christian Rosenkreutz taken from Andreae's youthful romance, the *Chymische Hochzeit Christiani Rosenkreutz*, which was written in 1605. Evidence of Andreae's direct involvement in the composition of the *Fama fraternitatis* and the *Confessio fraternitatis*, though, was discovered independently and nearly si-

multaneously by Roland Edighoffer and Martin Brecht. This led to a renewal of interest in Andreae as an intellectual figure in the early seventeenth century and gave a certain momentum for this massive collected works edition. With each new volume of the *Gesammelte Schriften* that appears, the portrait of this educational and social reformer, who so embodied the Protestant culture of Germany in the transition from Renaissance to Baroque, becomes more complete.

Andreae wrote his *Theophilus* about 1623, though it existed only in manuscript for circulation among his friends. He believed that it had been lost in the fire at Calw, until Jan Amos Comenius sent him a copy in 1648, which Andreae then had published the next year. The subtitle of the work indicates its contents: *Theophilus: Sive de Christiana religione sanctius colenda, vita temperantius instituenda, et literatura rationabilius docenda consilium* (advise for a more spiritual cultivation of the Christian religion, for instituting a more temperate life, and for teaching more rationally). This work sets forth some of Andreae's key ideas, which likely originated in Johann Arndt's *True Christianity*, about improving the inner life of the church as well as educating youth according to Christian principles. Andreae's *Theophilus* articulates his views on the need for a second reformation of the Lutheran church directed toward the inner life that ultimately led to the development of Pietism later in the seventeenth century. Given the harsh realities of the Thirty Years' War, Andreae did not favor setting up another theocracy and warned against the regimentation of the church if it took on the authority of the state. He advocated instead a church free from worldly influences that placed a premium on the individual. As a proponent and promoter of a new Christian philosophy, Andreae recognized that reforming education was crucial. Not only was the person of the educator an important role model, but the teaching methodology needed to be geared to the pupil. Accordingly he put forward some principles (237-43) advocating that instruction take place in the vernacular, that abstract philosophizing be avoided, and that texts be age appropriate. This new edition of *Theophilus* makes this interesting work available again.

The 1649 edition of *Theophilus* also included his “Planctus Jeremiae renovatus” (166-85), “Vir bonus ad lapidem Lydium examinatus” (186-200); “Medium Christiani” (201 ff.). These three short works appeared in 1667 under the title *Vox Libera* and were translated into German in 1678. The works published with Theophilus are also attacks on the morals of the time: “The Wailing of Jeremiah Renewed” uses allegory to condemn the “boar” of a vulgar people, the “wolf” of riches and might, the “ape” of hypocrisy, the “lion” of tyranny, etc. Always under his attack is the Antichrist who would mix church and state, thereby perverting both Law and Gospel.

As with many intellectuals of his time, Andreae aspired to an elegant Latinity based on humanist models and so his style is often difficult to negotiate. His translators have wisely rendered his prose in a more straightforward German in the translations that face the original text. The commentary is helpful, though it may have been more useful had it been placed at the bottom of the page. While readers will have to wait for a comprehensive index of people and places for all of the volumes, we are much indebted to Professor Schmidt-Biggemann and his colleagues. When complete, Andreae’s *Gesammelte Schriften* will be yet another monument to German scholarship.

Bryan Reynolds. *Becoming Criminal: Transversal Performance and Cultural Dissidence in Early Modern England*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002. xi + 217 pp. \$41.95. Review by WILLIAM E. ENGEL.

*Becoming Criminal* sets out to reconceptualize the criminal subculture of early modern England while stressing that this can help us likewise understand the strange affective appeal of contemporary configurations of criminality. How well it succeeds will depend on the extent to which the reader is convinced by Reynolds’s argument for a theory of transversal power. And this is a book heavy on theory.



The theory, though, is inseparable from Reynolds's treatment of the "criminal culture's chroniclers" (117). In effect then, *Becoming Criminal* is a book-length manifesto on transversal power (his essays on the theme began appearing in 1997). As such it contains a series of demonstrations of how this theory helps account for certain social rifts and cultural shifts in early modern England. Although typical of a manifesto insofar as it exemplifies the theory that it discusses through praxis, it is missing its own critique. And yet this seems consistent with the larger critical dynamic that Reynolds puts in place, an "investigative-expansive mode of analysis" offered as an alternative to "the methodology characteristic of most dialectical argumentation, scientific investigation, and Western historiography" (4).

In a nutshell transversal power is understood "as a mechanism for experienced alterity"; it "energizes and is energized by the enunciation and amplification of transition states, as when one empathizes, performs, transgresses, or, to cite more far-reaching examples, when one copes with transformations spurred by tragic happenings, sociopolitical uprisings, or natural disasters" (19). Thirty years ago Félix Guattari used the idea of transversality to discuss the phenomenon of group desire, "in particular the way in which the degree of awareness of others in space and time serves to govern movement and change" (17). Reynolds expands this definition to include "conceptuality and its territories," and applies it to "the process of individuals as well as of groups getting outside themselves through various means" (18).

The other main intellectual debt is to Louis Althusser, but again with Reynolds's own corrective stamp—in this case, which leads him to speak about "state machinery." In doing so, he seeks to emphasize that the "overall desire for governmental coherence is driven by diverse conductors of state-oriented organizational power that are, at different times and to varying degrees always both repressive and ideological" (9). As a result, newly coined terms and special meanings of existing ones come fast and furious in the first chapter, "State Power, Cultural Dissidence, Transversal Power." Readers must square their shoulders and accept Reynolds's new

terms and his amendments to old ones if they are to grasp the relevance of how concepts like “the nomadic transversal” are played out in the ensuing chapters; terms such as “affective presence,” “subjective territory,” “biunivocal,” “imagined communities,” and “objective agency.”

But this may well be part of Reynolds’s larger performative plan. Needing to acquire a new vocabulary to understand Reynolds’s theory-in-application, after all mirrors the underworld “cant” which is discussed at length in the third chapter. Further, there is a performative aspect to the notes, which are as long as the longest chapter (forty pages). They are descriptive, conversational, and often quite long—in the service of situating theoretical points with respect to their histories. As such they advance Reynolds’s critical notion of “biunivocal” (two into one) discursivity, as a way to twist free from what Reynolds sees as problematic in the more traditional modes of carrying out literary history. The notes also make it clear that Reynolds, while familiar with the on-going debates surrounding current issues in Renaissance scholarship, is not interested in textual quibbles and attribution problems *per se* but with propounding his larger point about rethinking cultural dissidence. For example, in the first chapter he discusses *The Spanish Gypsy* referring throughout to Middleton as the author, while in a note he observes that although the play was not included in the new *Collected Works of Thomas Middleton* edited by Gary Taylor, for his purposes “it does not matter who wrote the play” (171). And indeed it does not, for Reynolds is stalking other game. This is reflected as well in the bibliography, which makes no distinctions between contemporary theoretical texts, primary works from the Renaissance, and articles on literary history.

Notwithstanding Reynolds’s self-consciously innovative way of talking about rogue pamphlets and Jonson’s *Gypsies Metamorphos’d* for example, from start to finish, he is very clear about his purpose. Ultimately he would like for others to pick up his transversal ball and run with it as far as they can into other areas of early modern scholarship, especially those that are informed by cultural alterity and social ambivalence. And the field

seems wide open indeed, for, as he argues, the enduring presence of this criminal culture markedly affected the official culture's aesthetic sensibilities, systems of belief, and socioeconomic organization. As such this book truly advances the borders of early modern cultural studies in some important and unexpected ways.

Johann Anselm Steiger, ed. *Johann Gerhard: Erklärungen der Historien des Leidens vnnnd Sterbens vnsers Herrn Christi Jesu nach den vier Evangelisten (1611)*. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog, 2002. 510 pp. + 3 illus. + indices, appendices. □101. Review by SUSAN R. BOETTCHER, UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN.

This attractively-presented book is the sixth volume in a series of critical editions of the works of Gerhard published from the Johann Gerhard research project at the theological faculty of the University of Hamburg. These editions have been drawn primarily from the collections at the Herzog August Bibliothek Wolfenbüttel and the Forschungsbibliothek Gotha. Gerhard (1582-1637), a theology professor at the University of Jena, was the most meaningful representative of early Lutheran orthodoxy. Having been born concurrently with the Book of Concord that established the basis for that orthodoxy, Gerhard generated a voluminous oeuvre consisted primarily of dogmatics, for which he is now best known, as well as works of pastoral care, spiritual and moral instruction, and numerous printed sermons. This edition is the result of an interdisciplinary program that Steiger has been following for several years to rehabilitate the long-disdained works of Lutheran orthodoxy in early modern Germany as valuable texts in their own right, a goal followed in the critical studies that comprised the first volume of the edition, as well as an independent series of essays, *Fünf Zentralthemen der Theologie Luthers und seiner Erben*, published by Brill in 2002. This volume demonstrates in many ways the main programmatic claims Steiger has made in his previous works: that the later prejudice against Lutheran orthodoxy as intellectually stale and uncreative, which was cultivated by the late nineteenth century Luther Renaissance as well as

by Pietism and *Aufklärung*, is unfounded. Though the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century read Luther differently than their successors, according to Steiger, the intellectual heritage of humanism in its examination of the ancient world, as well as late medieval German mysticism, do not find their culmination and turning point in Luther's work, but rather are most fully explored in the literature of orthodoxy. While readers accustomed to Luther's exciting style, diverse vocabulary and creative employment of metaphor may occasionally find themselves bored by the more sober formulations in the texts of orthodoxy, the historical advantages to Steiger's approach are significant and immediately clear. The active attempt to rehabilitate orthodoxy in recent years, a trend in which Steiger is a leader, reminds us of an important realization that the Luther Renaissance obscured: that Lutheranism, particularly as a theological and intellectual direction, was composed of much more than the pioneering thought of one man. The way that Luther's ideas were digested, consolidated, corrected, and mediated for the future is arguably the most important matter for understanding the directions that Lutheranism moved after the mid-sixteenth century, and it is undeniably central as a factor in understanding the cultural heritage of Paul Gerhard, Matthias Claudius, Bach, and many others who are less well known.

The *Erklärung* is a central work in the long tradition of Lutheran cultural treatments of Christ's passion, standing midway between Luther himself and the works of Johann Sebastian Bach a century later. It stems from the gospel concordance of Johannes Bugenhagen (1524), and its major intellectual source is Martin Chemnitz's *Historia der Passion* (1590). In turn, it was a major influence on figures as diverse as Andreas Gryphius, Simon Dach, the authors of Bach's texts, Tobias Clausnitzer, and Johann Olearius. Gerhard's preface provides a discussion of previous methods of dividing up the story of the passion, and then explains his own method at length. His reflections are divided into five "acts" on the garden of Gethsemane, the trial, Pontius Pilate, the cross, and the tomb. The text itself is a curious, intriguing combination of the sort of rigor typically associated with Lutheran dog-

matics, in which each matter is divided up into a series of instructive subsections or questions, and a quasi-mystical reflection on the topic at hand. The role of the church as the bride of Christ is a predominating theme, as is the inability of the human to comprehend the extent of Christ's suffering. The interesting mix of approaches in the text make it hard to classify: clearly, as Steiger reminds us, mystical themes are present, but not the medieval mysticism of the contemplation and imitation of Christ, nor the sort of mysticism that we associate with seventeenth-century Spanish poetry (and authors like San Juan de la Cruz, for example). The clear organization and attempt at exhaustive consideration of themes reminds us more of English sermons of the period, but the mystical elements as they are present here, however subdued they may be, strike a strong contrast to English sermons as well. The text clearly shows, however, that the emotional, mystical and self-examinatory prescriptions of Pietism can not only have been a reaction against orthodoxy; indeed, if we take Gerhard's *Erklärung* as model, we must begin to view Spener and authors like him as intensifiers of a tendency always present in orthodox thinking. At the same time, however, the sort of pastoral care offered here is rather subdued and sober in its expression. Steiger provides a comparative perspective for Gerhard's mysticism inside the genealogy of Lutheran theology and culture in the first volume of the series, but clearly, more secondary research regarding comparisons to literatures other than German will be necessary before we can integrate this text effectively into our understanding of the wider body of the mystical aspects of seventeenth century literature outside of Lutheran orthodoxy. The edition provides an accessible basis for such comparisons.

The volume is compromised primarily of Gerhard's text with a collation of the different editions, very brief footnotes, an index of biblical loci, and a short backgrounding essay by Steiger. The collations, while appropriate to the task of a critical edition, reveal no really momentous changes in the four editions of the text considered here. The notes reveal Gerhard's reception of a broad panorama of ancient and medieval authors including but not lim-

ited to Flavius Josephus, Homer, Origen, Jerome, Chrysostom, Bernhard of Clairvaux, Albertus Magnus, and Gregory the Great. None of these references excludes the possibility that these authors were digested by Gerhard in the form of *florilegia*, however, and it would have been interesting to learn more from Steiger about the vehicles for the transmission of these texts as they were in use among orthodox Lutheran theologians of the period. Steiger's claims of interdisciplinary research should be understood in the most limited sense, for while the references to theology and philosophy are useful, the notes and the essay provide no information about society and culture of early orthodoxy and only basic information on matters such as literature or music even in the German context, let alone in other national traditions. Brief comparisons to Catholic authors like Bellarmine are tantalizingly under-explored. Some of these matters are examined in Steiger's rapidly proliferating essays and books, however, and thus this felicitous edition will hopefully encourage readers to delve into the work of one of the most actively publishing church historians of this generation. The volume is essential to libraries with comprehensive collections in the areas of theology or German literature and recommended for comparative purposes in libraries with a focus on early modern matters.

Shankar Raman. *Framing 'India': The Colonial Imaginary in Early Modern Culture*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2002. xii + 389 pp. + 12 illus. \$60.00. Review by NAGENDRA RAO, GOA UNIVERSITY.

Shankar Raman in this book has attempted an absorbing and fascinating study of portrayal of colonial ideology and perceptions in contemporary literature. Looking at the title of the book one may infer that this work deals with the colonial powers in India. However, the author himself dispels this postulation. The work studies Luiz Vaz de Camoë's "Os Lusíadas," John Fletcher's "The Island Princess," John Druden's "Amboyna," and Shakespeare's "A Midsummer Night's Dream" and endeavors to identify the mak-

ing of colonial ideology pertaining to India. However, the authors have dealt with various other regions of Asia which were not the part of India. Thus, India was equated with east. For instance, one work begins by narrating that its setting is in India. Yet, the play unfolds in two Moluccan islands in present-day Indonesia. Raman points out the importance of the East and India by remarking that Columbus's original idea was to discover India and not America.

Raman states that this book seeks to discover India anew. However, instead of discovering India there is discovery of colonial powers like Portuguese, Dutch, and the English whose ideology is represented in these works. The contemporary literature does not provide many details regarding colonies, but they give us the perceptions of colonial powers and their interpretations by different authors. Thus, absolute historical facts are not available in this opus. The author presents a protracted discourse on the philosophical backdrop of the contemplation of the colonial literature, which are connected to thinking of Greek schools of thought. Such a lengthy discussion of philosophical aspects makes us ask the question: "What was the need for such protracted polemic regarding philosophical origins of the literary genre in the west?" Quite often one wonders whether it is possible to recognize historical facts through the study of literature. This is not to discount the undeniable merit of the work which has to be seen as a study of literature of certain regions and interpretation of these literary works. Raman is interested in how India and the East were made productive for the nation states of early modern Europe. He clearly states that this work does not offer a systematic archival account of the ways in which, for instance, trade with the East or particular Indian social formations were represented in contemporary historical documents. It is not about India *per se* but about European discursive formations through whose framing India and the East emerged as objects of colonial knowledge and practice. These texts have been chosen because of their relevance to an understanding of India and the East in early modern culture. Raman avers that, "Not only do they reflect real distinctions among different forms of

colonialism in different domains, but they refer back to and emerge from shared and relatively autonomous historical conditions prevailing in early modern Europe" (4). Raman argues that from antiquity onwards India functioned as an important boundary through and against which Christian Europe constructed distinctive forms of identity and belief. He proceeds to substantiate his theoretical formulations by the specific study of the making of the literature of the times. Raman demonstrates how Camoës tries to present Portugal as having dominated India. Camoës represents the state ideology which rested on royal absolutism in Portugal.

Fletcher's "The Island Princess" represents the Anglo-Portuguese conflict. This friction is represented as a fragmentation internal to the Portuguese subject itself, thereby transforming an Iberian presentation of its colonial history into a figure for England's future usurpation of the Iberian colonial empire. Here India becomes available as an object that can be comprehended and possessed.

John Dryden's work indicates a shift in England's preoccupation away from its Iberian competitors, towards the impetuous rise of The Netherlands as a colonial and mercantile force. "Amboyna" reflects seventeenth-century shift in colonial power in the East. We discern the use of sexual conflict to represent colonial conflict. Here English are described as those with generosity, gratitude, honour, heroism, and true religious faith. The Dutch, on the other hand, incarnate a pure commercial interest that excludes all forms of faith, justice and reciprocity. Here Dryden's task is to produce not just an ideal English identity and to reconstruct an intra-European difference without jeopardizing the power differential upon which mercantile colonialism rests. It appears that importance is given to emergence of England as an important colonial power after the seventeenth century. In the process, we also find reference to works relating to domination of Portuguese and Dutch in pre-English colonial history. These works demonstrate England's complex competition with other European powers like Portuguese and the Dutch, over the spoils of the East.



The author has presented complex amalgam of theoretical formulations and historical developments connected with colonialism. Colonized area becomes the subject dominated by the European powers. Thus, the work exhibits several interpretations and symbolisms. A lay reader may find it difficult to perceive the perplexing narration of events and interpretations. However, the present reviewer has no hesitation in recommending this work to the scholarly world as the readers with basic perception of working of colonialism will find this work interesting.

Matthew Wikander. *Fangs of Malice: Hypocrisy, Sincerity, & Acting*. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 2002. 238 pp. \$32.95. Review by SARAH SCOTT, UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS.

In this recent addition to Studies in Theatre History & Culture, Matthew Wikander investigates the age-old antitheatrical complaint that actors' performing corrupts social stability because actors, when they play, pretend that they are what they are not. Given their propensity for seeming rather than being, according to traditional antitheatrical arguments, actors, then, are hypocrites. *Fangs of Malice: Sincerity, Hypocrisy, and Sincerity*, in its discussion of hypocrisy ranging from the seventeenth to the twentieth centuries, asks how western "antitheatrical prejudice" informs ways in which individuals and societies perceive the value of sincerity, of being true to oneself and to others, given that explorations into being false require inquiry into what it means to be honest and true.

Offering well-argued discussions of numerous dramas ranging from *Hamlet* to Susanna Centlivre's *The Gamester* to *The Ice-man Cometh*, Wikander arranges his book according to acts and then scenes, an organization reflecting the design of many historical antitheatrical writings, most notably Stephen Gosson's *Plays Confuted in Five Actions* (1582). Within the text's three acts, named after the most common slanders against actors, "They Dress Up," "They Lie," and "They Drink," the author addresses these accusa-

tions as they relate to the worlds presented in their respective plays and to antitheatrical and philosophical writings contemporary to these plays.

Extending upon and challenging the work of Jonas Barish, Wikander informs his discussions further with studied and frequent references to literary critics of diverse theoretical perspectives past and present. The effect is such that multiple viewpoints are offered in Wikander's arguments, allowing for complex treatment of morally complex issues. Such discussion leads the author to conclude that what remains constant, despite paradigm shifts in imaginative, moral, and philosophical writings and in theoretical perspectives on presentation and representation, is the continued belief that vice is performance and virtue is unperformable. Although religious-laden language of conscience in the early modern period is slowly replaced by "a secularized cult of sincerity," Wikander finds authentic presentation of the self repeatedly evading complete representation in dramatic arts.

One compelling chapter is "As Secret as Maidenhead," scene one of act one, "They Dress Up." Wikander's discussion of Viola's disguising, a male child actor playing Viola, and women taking women's roles on the Restoration stage is interlaced with historical and present-day pro-theatrical and antitheatrical positions. After considering multiple theoretical perspectives from critics such as Harley Granville-Barker, Charles Kingsley, Juliet Dusinberre, Michael Goldman, Coppélia Kahn, Stephen Orgel, and many others deemed antitheatrical or no (although Judith Butler is conspicuously missing), and, after close reading of the text itself, Wikander determines the following: "Those who see the Renaissance boys and the Restoration women as subversive forces in the theater, deconstructing gender and empowering women, and those who see this subversion as wholly contained in a hegemony of binary oppositions look at actors and see transvestites or prostitutes. Feminists and new historicists alike adopt the vocabulary of the antitheatrical divines, but so, too, does Viola in her anxiety about disguise and so, too, do the rare defenders of theater in the early modern period." Wikander tailors his antitheatrical discussion of

*Twelfth Night* to accommodate issues central to the play, intersecting early modern English issues of gender and sex with those of the self while maintaining his search for sincerity. Such style of argumentation persists throughout the book.

Valuable also is Wikander's discussion of Lady Teazle's and Joseph Surface's portrayals of falseness to others as well as to the self, a discussion informed, in part, by the writings of Rousseau, Hegel, and Sartre. Extending upon his earlier discussion of *School for Scandal*, Wikander then goes on to view Ibsen's portrayal of Hedda as one that can be understood as "Rousseau's modern type or as one of Hegel's self-deceiving hypocrites," which leads him to conclude that Ibsen's provocative play suggests that the search for an authentic self is a ruse. Wikander's incisive treatment of *Long Day's Journey into Night* and his discussion of O'Neill's hostility toward actors deserve special attention for their intelligence and insight, especially as it discusses the interrelationships of actors, authors, performance, and text.

Throughout this book, Wikander strives to strike a balance between depth and breadth. In so doing, occasionally one is left wanting more of one or the other, and Wikander anticipates such a want by providing his reader with detailed notes. *Fangs of Malice* will be of great interest to a wide audience, to those interested in psychological issues, habits, and conditions of actors and acting, to those wishing to explore the inter-connectedness of theatre and society, and to those investigating seventeenth and eighteenth-century western drama and its cultural contexts. Indeed, it offers several entry points for important discussions for students and scholars alike about the purposes of drama and the search for the self.

*The Wisest Have Their Fools About Them.* The Malone Society Reprints, Vol. 164. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001. v + 43 pp. \$39.95. Review by NANCY BUNKER, MACON STATE COLLEGE.

Cloaked in mystery, *The Wisest Have Their Fools About Them*, an anonymous and "hitherto unpublished and untitled play" (iv),

has been given an editorial title “based upon a proverbial phrase used in the play and the emphasis on the role of the fool in resolving the action” (v). The title, *Musophilus* (also the name of the title character), has been used to discuss this play, but the editors note such naming caused confusion with the Samuel Daniel poem *Musophilus* and generated “wrong assumptions about the play, which the present title is intended to avoid” (v).

The Introduction first situates the manuscript’s provenance; unknown circumstances place it among the Crewe family papers in the Cheshire and Chester Archives. Found among letters, accounts, and deeds linked to Sir Ranulph or Randolph Crewe (1558-1646), the text likely came into the family through this member of Lincoln’s Inn, later speaker of the House of Commons (1614) and Lord Chief Justice (1625-6). Crewe would have had “opportunities to acquire the manuscript, although reasons for doing so remain unclear. He could have been connected in some way with the performance of the play, either as a member of the audience, friend of the author, or even butt of some of the jokes” (v). Playwright confirmation also evades verification, and although “Thomas Mas” and “Thomas” appear on Fols. 1a and 15b of the play text, the names reveal no connection with Cheshire, the Inns of Court, or the wills of the period.

Superior detailed physical description of the text, extensive discussion of the sewing, page sizes, damage, and watermarks more than satisfy bibliographic inquiries. Five acts and separate scenes are identified, attention to indention of verse speech noted, speech headings isolated, and stage directions placed mostly within the margins inform the play’s readers. Four reproduced folio pages provide examples. Dating the play remains “inconclusive” but “suggests” the “later years” of the 1620s (xii); both the handwriting and the events of Sir Ranulph Crewe’s life reflect the era. One “tempting” speculation, especially since Crewe once held possession of the text, is the reference within the play to “corrupt practices” regarding “commission concerning gold and silver thread” (xii). Crewe prosecuted such a case in 1616, and lawyers and courtiers in the audience would have remembered it. Numerous

references to character names found in printed plays of the period and links with John Donne's "A Tale of a Citizen and his Wife," Shakespeare's *The Comedy of Errors*, and Ben Jonson's plays are delineated in a clear, expansive commentary. The playwright's knowledge of Latin and Greek is evidenced not only through character names but also through Latin puns, usage of Latin law, and original dramatic plots. Although there is no evidence the play was ever performed, the copyist's surviving text demonstrates the "structure of the play and the care taken with the stage directions" suggest its viability for use by "troupe of players to give a performance" (xviii).

In *The Wisest Have Their Fools About Them*, Cremulus, a user, attempts to set his sons against one another. Musophilus, second son and poor academic, contests Crusophilus, elder son and fool, for the family inheritance. Musophilus proves himself unsuccessful in business and returns home for money, but Cremulus refuses and settles the entire estate upon his apparently incapable first-born. Money and marriage converge for Musophilus as he seeks marriage to Vrina—a woman whose reputation will restore him with his father. Initially unwilling, she falls in love after Musophilus courts her with poetry and song. Destiny rewards the enterprising son when he learns his father's eye disease will render him blind unless Cremulus can "procure the water of an honest woman or an vnspotted virgin" (5.5.1279-81). In his supreme charity for a hard-hearted father, Musophilus volunteers Vrina. Cremulus is healed and learns that Musophilus tricked his father in order to secure the property designated to Crusophilus. Rather than continue the conflict, the father admits the obvious—anyone can become a fool—and bestows an inheritance upon Musophilus. As the play closes, fools are acknowledged for a problem-solving role; named fools will be cared for, and the foolish father learned his lesson.

*The Wisest Have Their Fools About Them* employs the full complement of editorial conventions, and preparer Elizabeth Baldwin's exceptional work creates a readable text in spite of the deleted material, lost or indecipherable text, and illegible or lost characters.

Footnotes on each page provide variants and show textual adjustments. The editors address continuous line numbering, reproducing textual elements such as speech prefixes as exactly as type permits, and normalizing punctuation above or below the line has been normalized. Special note is given to the difficult task in distinguishing full stops from commas, which reflects the scribe's practice. N. W. Bawcutt, G. R. Proudfoot, and H. R. Woudhuysen checked the edition and deserve high praise for their meticulous attention to detail. A quick read, this play will interest those intrigued by the provenance offered by early modern texts, rare manuscript scholars, and bibliographers.

Sidney L. Sondergard. *Sharpening Her Pen: Strategies of Rhetorical Violence by Early Modern English Women Writers*. Selinsgrove: Susquehanna University Press; London: Associated University Presses, 2002. 188 pp. \$38.50. Review by JANE LYTTON GOOCH, UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA.

In his Introduction, Sidney Sondergard makes interesting connections between six female writers, from the time of Henry VIII to Charles I, in their use of rhetorical violence. All of these authors have different purposes within their social and political environments, but all decry actual violence as a means of persuasion. They have, however, adopted rhetorical violence, or the description of physical suffering, as a means to strengthen their arguments and create a powerful feminine voice. Sondergard clearly makes his point that these writers use violence in their images, tropes, and arguments to combat male dominance, to assert their intellectual autonomy, and to create approval for their writing. He has chosen three—Elizabeth I, Aemilia Lanyer, and Lady Mary Wroth—who have already received much critical attention and placed them beside three relatively unknown writers—Anne Askew, Anne Dowriche, and Lady Anne Southwell. By examining how they use rhetorical violence, Sondergard establishes the presence and importance of the individual authors within their literary works. In order to

understand the texts, he says, one must realize the authors' particular motives.

Sondergard devotes a chapter to each writer, examining them in chronological order. His thorough discussion, with specific reference to critical comment and the literary texts, is supported by extensive notes, a valuable bibliography, and an index. He has obviously given a great deal of thought to the subject, and he is able to show why six unique female authors, who are opposed to violence, would adopt rhetorical violence as a tool to make their voices heard. The earliest example of the description of violence is the most startling. Sondergard looks at Anne Askew's *Examinations* in Chapter 1. Having steadfastly denied the doctrine of transubstantiation, Askew was accused of heresy, imprisoned, and tortured on the rack on June 29, 1546. Her account of the racking and horrible suffering in prison is remarkable for the lack of rhetorical violence; she chooses not to use her pain to win support, but, instead, to offer calm resistance through a defense based on scripture. As Sondergard points out, Askew's personal experience is the strongest argument, and she does not need to embellish it with gory details to make her voice powerful. The *Examinations* are not, however, without rhetorical violence. The editor, John Bale, also wrote a commentary which focuses on Askew's suffering in order to promote his political and religious agenda to oppose the Catholics and identify Askew as a Christian martyr.

In his discussion of the writing of Elizabeth I, Sondergard shows how she cleverly uses rhetorical violence for the purposes of gaining sympathy from her subjects as the vulnerable queen and of exerting power over them by a show of force. Elizabeth needs to demonstrate that she is as strong a ruler as a man, and although she abhors violence, she believes that sometimes it is necessary to weed out anyone, Mary, Queen of Scots, for example, who threatens her personal safety. Elizabeth makes effective use of the images of wounding, the deformed body, and the infection of the body politic to justify the show of force in governing; strong measures must be taken, even though violent, to rid the country of danger.

Anne Dowriche's *The French Historie* (1589), a long narrative poem based on the French civil wars, is the subject of the third chapter. Through the persecution of Protestants, Dowriche shows the dangers of sectarian violence and the feminine inclination to support the suffering victims. In a manner similar to Askew, Dowriche's description of the execution of Protestants focuses on images of martyrdom and prayers of forgiveness for the executioners. She does include, however, male accounts of horrible violence, and these grisly details, while reminding the reader of violent Biblical history, are effective for their cathartic value and for creating an antipathy to excessive cruelty. The Catholic persecutors are shown to be under Satan's influence, and the fictional Queen Mother, Catherine de Medici, executes the leaders of the Huguenots to protect herself, much like Elizabeth I dealing with the Catholic threat in Mary, Queen of Scots.

In Chapter 4, Sondergard presents Aemilia Lanyer's rhetorical strategies in *Salve Deus Rex Judaeorum* (1611); she uses Christ's Passion to promote feminine virtues and to assert her individuality as a female poet. Biblical examples of women who have defeated evil men support Lanyer's belief that the Crucifixion is mankind's principle crime, not Eve's disobedience. Lanyer argues against the male hierarchy in her society, and she is opposed to violence directed at innocent people. She advocates humility and self-sacrifice, following Christ's example, as a means to bring honour to the sufferer. Further, Lanyer suggests that women can reverse the male cruelty of the Crucifixion by doing good deeds and saying prayers. Her devotion to Christ can bring her strength and can help to combat the anti-feminist attitude that male poets are superior. Lanyer goes so far in her use of rhetorical violence, as Sondergard explains, to call on women to become Christ-like soldiers in a battle to alleviate suffering and to gain feminine power.

Sondergard turns next to fictional violence in the romance of Lady Mary Wroth, *The Countess of Montgomeries Urania* (1621). Here, male and female roles are reversed with passive men and aggressive women. As men, according to Wroth, gain power through falsehood and violence, so she invests her women, Urania



for example, with the capacity for violence to gain control, but who often decide against it. A further reversal is apparent in Wroth's treatment of the lover's suffering; the convention in courtly love is to demonstrate the man's pain, but Wroth looks at the woman in love and makes her metaphorical dangers literal. Wroth affirms a feminism that contradicts the violence implied by male descriptions of love.

In his sixth and final chapter, Sondergard moves from fictionalized romance to the commonplace book of Lady Anne Southwell in which she describes her unhappy marriage of 32 years. Like Askew and Lanyer, Southwell gains control through her stoicism; she believes that the trials and suffering in life are designed to make her stronger. Sondergard shows how her writing allows her to overcome the pain of her past, particularly her adulterous husband, and to confirm the values of honourable people, especially women. She objects to the expectation that women must be subservient, claiming that men and women are equal or God's creation is imperfect. Sondergard refers to *A Wife Now the Widdow of Sir Thomas Ouerburye* (1614) to illustrate Southwell's defense of women through her criticism of Donne's light-hearted treatment of illicit relationships.

The comparison between actual experience and fiction is effective in Sondergard's book to show the importance of rhetorical violence as a tool in the hands of female writers. From a racking to an unhappy marriage, with illustrations of rhetorical violence in the realms of politics, history, scripture and romance in between, he has presented six unique voices, all of which promote feminine values by, paradoxically, adopting the masculine imagery of violence. Sondergard's scholarly approach gives his study a firm foundation and enables him to bring disparate works together to support his argument that this rhetorical strategy of violence gives these female authors a stronger identity.

Christina Luckyj. *'A moving Rhetoricke': Gender and Silence in Early Modern England*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002. viii + 198 pp. \$69.95. Review by ELISA OH, BOSTON UNIVERSITY.

In *'A moving Rhetoricke': Gender and Silence in Early Modern England*, Christina Luckyj posits that silence for both men and women in early modern texts is more complicated than the simple binaries that critics usually read into it; in fact, she shows that silence is a highly unstable site of various competing cultural discourses. With a new historicist attention to letters, pamphlets, sermons, advice literature, and dramatic texts, she aims to destabilize modern critics' complacent assumptions about early modern silence and gender, such as the "silence-chastity-obedience" equation, by demonstrating the multiple, simultaneous, and often paradoxical meanings that moments of silence can contain. Luckyj devotes a chapter to tracing the different constructions of silence in the history of Western philosophy, with special attention to how early modern writers appropriated and reinterpreted the classical rhetorical tradition. She divides instances of silence into a spectrum of meanings including eloquence, impotence, Stoic strength of character, wisdom, plenitude, lack, open rebellion or defiance, bestiality, chaos, ignorance, androgyny (i.e., containing both traditionally male and female qualities), and, for women, an "inscrutable" space of private subjectivity that is beyond the definition and control of male-dominated language.

After establishing these categories of early modern discourses of silence, Luckyj shows how they are manifested in dramatic texts and how silent characters can embody more than one discourse of silence and gender at the same time. She illustrates the multivalency of silence—ultimately to the point of unreadability—by demonstrating the proliferation of contradictory meanings silences can contain in canonical dramatic texts. According to Luckyj's close readings, *Richard II* deploys silence as both rhetorical impotence and eloquence, Hieronimo's silence embodies madness, chaos, death, grief, Stoic self-containment, and subversive political resistance to coercion, and Lavinia's enforced silence contains monstrous un-

chastity, and shame *or* guilt. Similarly, Cordelia exhibits a resistance to one stable definition by choosing a silence that encompasses both submissive filial love *and* subversive disobedience, and the “seeming” of the Player Queen in *Hamlet* becomes overdetermined because it could signify either the acting gestures recommended by the dumb show stage directions or a calculated deception. Luckyj reads Coriolanus’s famous silence as at once eloquence, resistance to social exchange, effeminate defeat, and stoic masculinity, while Volunnia’s equally complex and indeterminate silence can be seen as feigned submission, pride, and/or self-sufficiency. For male writers, the overdetermined silence of women characters came to stand for a detachment from the classical “silence-as-eloquence” trope and to signal a “turn away from rhetorical culture”(115). Luckyj claims, however, that this indeterminacy of feminine silence was empowering for women writers interested in representing the depth and complexity of female subjectivity.

Luckyj’s final chapter applies this idea of a multivalent and inscrutable subjectivity in silence to the works of women writers, claiming that they exploited the many definitions that could be read into their silences, such as power, erotic desire, defiance, and superior moral wisdom to men and their words. Anne Askew’s silences under interrogation are thus both signs of good, submissive womanhood and radical resistance to male authority. In the silences of female characters in Wroth’s *Urania*, Luckyj reads both conventional and subversive representations of gender, often paradoxically present at the same time. For example, Pamphilia serves to deconstruct gendered binaries with her silences: she advocates both discreet and indiscreet meanings for her silence in love, that is, a quiet comportment coupled with a freely acknowledged and cherished inner life full of erotic energy. Luckyj sees Pamphilia’s love expressed in *Pamphilia to Amphilanthus* as “exist[ing] in a silent, non-discursive space”(144). Mariam and especially Graphina in Cary’s *Tragedy of Mariam* are used to illustrate the conflation of “Stoical, Christian, and gendered paradigms of silence” (149) and the ultimately “heroic, overdetermined, and unassimilable” quality of silent women.

In her epilogue, Luckyj claims that early modern ideas about silence were changing: “silence came increasingly to signify an impermeable and autonomous space resistant to discursive expression or interpretation and opposed to masculine rhetoric . . . silence when detached from eloquence was associated primarily with women” (165). To illustrate this assertion, she contrasts male and female authors’ use of Philomela in their poetry. Male writers like Sidney and Shakespeare use the figure of Philomela as the singing instrument of the male poet’s inspiration, but for women writers like Lanyer and Wroth, the silenced Philomela functions as “a cogent protest against masculinist rhetorical convention” (173). In conclusion, Luckyj makes a basic distinction between male and female uses of silence, asserting that “if men could appropriate feminine silence to their own rhetorical agenda, women could inhabit the space of silence to resist such appropriation” (174).

Luckyj’s work opens up a valuable new field of inquiry in early modern gender studies: the history of the rhetoric—and “anti-rhetoric”—of silence, a theoretically rich “extraverbal” discourse. In relation to female silence, however, Luckyj dismisses too quickly the role of silence as an early modern cultural signifier of virtue. Though it is true that female silences can also be read as erotically and politically disobedient, Luckyj does not acknowledge how frequently feminine virtue is the intended or ostensible reason for female silence in early modern texts. For example, Hermia apologizes for speaking in public about her choice of husband in the first scene of *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*: “I do entreat your Grace to pardon me./I know not by what power I am made bold,/Nor how it may concern my modesty/In such a presence here to plead my thoughts.” Many other similar elaborate modesty topoi denote an intense cultural anxiety about female speech and foreground pervasive conventional attitudes about the apparent chastity of female silence. Finally, Luckyj ends her analysis of silence and gender by demonstrating how early modern women used silence to escape the patriarchal confines of language into something like Irigaray’s indeterminate feminine plurality. However, Luckyj never fully establishes what is empowering or desirable about being be-

yond discursive meaning. Certainly the silent women succeed in establishing a space that is beyond stable definition, but this “escape” from rhetoric and discourse itself also effectively exiles them from the realm of social circulation in which they are understood, albeit in terms of the dominant discourse, and contribute to the production and negotiation of meaning. Luckyj’s provocative work invites scholars to investigate the complex implications of silences—both theoretical and cultural—and should prompt questions about whether multivalent silences also inform other early modern cultural discourses such as treason, Protestant spirituality, witchcraft, race, and class.

Marie le Jars de Gournay. *Apology for the Woman Writing and Other Works*. Edited and translated by Richard Hillman and Colette Quesnel. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2002. xxi + 176 pp. \$49 cloth, \$17 paper. Reviewed by ALISA PLANT, TULANE UNIVERSITY.

Marie le Jars de Gournay is perhaps best remembered today for being Montaigne’s self-proclaimed “adoptive daughter,” who published the first definitive edition of the *Essays* (1595) after his death in 1592. For the remainder of her life, she worked to fulfill “her self-appointed role as custodian of Montaigne’s intellectual legacy” (7-8). Yet Gournay was prolific in her own right, publishing in a wide range of genres up to her own death in 1645. Splendidly edited and translated by Richard Hillman and Colette Quesnel, *Apology for the Woman Writing and Other Works* brings together four relatively short works: “The Promenade of Monsieur de Montaigne,” “The Equality of Men and Women,” “The Ladies’ Complaint,” and “Apology for the Woman Writing.” The result is a volume that will not only help to strengthen Gournay’s literary reputation—long moribund, and revived only in the twentieth century—but will also contribute to a greater understanding of intellectual life in seventeenth-century France.

As the title piece indicates, Gournay was acutely aware of the inferior status that her gender conferred upon her. The eldest daugh-

ter of a minor (and impoverished) noble family, Gournay resisted what must have been substantial pressure to marry; instead, she secretly taught herself Latin and, with the aid of a tutor, some Greek as well. Reading the *Essays* in her late teens sent her “into ecstasy” (7); at her invitation, Montaigne spent three months at the Gournay estate in Picardy, where he and Marie cemented their “adoptive” relationship (Gournay’s own father had died when she was young). Upon her mother’s death in 1591, Gournay “definitively settled into a Parisian existence of genteel poverty . . . relieved by regular intellectual stimulation” (9). Her ambition to be taken seriously as a woman of letters was realized only with difficulty, but Hillman and Quesnel contend that “she succeeded to a surprising degree” (9), eventually counting Louis XIII and Richelieu among her patrons.

Still, Gournay had many detractors—indeed, her growing literary reputation only sharpened attacks by hostile (male) critics, who subjected her to ridicule and caricature—and her works are colored by resentment of the fact that her gender prevented her from participating as an acknowledged equal in all aspects of the contemporary intellectual scene. “The Promenade of Monsieur de Montaigne,” written in her late twenties and her only work of fiction, is a wildly dramatic tale of love turned into tragedy. A royal Persian princess, Alinda, is reluctantly on her way to marry the elderly king of the Parthians when she falls prey to the honeyed words of young, handsome Leontin. The pair elope, are shipwrecked, and find refuge in the house of a Thracian lord, who himself falls madly in love with Alinda. The lord persuades his sister—who lusts after Leontin—to seduce one of his guests in order to have the other for himself. Leontin duly repudiates Alinda; but while pretending to assent to a change of husbands, Alinda privately resolves upon her death. In a bloody finale, Leontin commits suicide upon seeing Alinda’s corpse. Gournay repeatedly interrupts the narrative to comment on her larger theme of women’s constancy and men’s infidelity. As Hillman and Quesnel note, Gournay seems to be asserting that “to celebrate women in the

context of courtly love . . . is a very different matter from promoting their interests as human beings" (23).

Her feminist beliefs emerge more fully in "The Equality of Men and Women" (1641), which challenges both the prevailing ethos of male superiority and a minority view that held women to be the superior sex. Gournay draws on a wide range of classical and Christian authors to prove that women were seen as men's equals in earlier times, often reading her sources with astonishing selectivity. (St. Jerome, among other authorities she co-opts, was hardly an advocate of women in any sense!) Despite this flaw, the "Equality" offers an intelligent, carefully reasoned indictment of the misogyny she saw everywhere around her and a corresponding plea for women to be taken seriously as thinking beings. To ensure improvement on this score, Gournay believes, education is of paramount importance. As she argues, "If . . . women attain less often than men to the heights of excellence, it is a marvel that the lack of good education—indeed, the abundance of outright and blatantly bad education—does not do worse and prevent them from doing so entirely" (81).

Gournay rails against the inferior status of women far more passionately in "The Ladies' Complaint," which first appeared in her introduction to the 1595 edition of Montaigne's *Essays*. It met with an overwhelmingly negative reception; in response, she cut it from later editions, eventually revising it as a companion piece to the "Equality." One can easily see why it caused such a sensation. Echoing the Beatitudes, Gournay writes, "Blessed art thou, Reader, if you are not of that sex to which one forbids everything of value, thereby depriving it of liberty; indeed, to which one also forbids almost all the virtues, removing it from public duties, responsibilities, and functions—in a word, cutting it off from power, by the moderate exercise of which most of the virtues are formed—with the object of setting up as its only happiness, its crowning and exclusive virtues, ignorance, servitude, and a capacity to play the fool if a woman likes that game" (101). Hillman and Quesnel emphasize the "skillfully contrived literary effect" (97) of Gournay's *cri de coeur*, but there is no mistaking its genuine bitterness.

This bitterness is also evident in “Apology for the Woman Writing,” a “profuse autobiographical self-justification” (107) dedicated to a prelate, possibly a cousin. As Gournay defends her carriage, her infrequent dinner parties, and her modest outlays upon alchemical experiments, one is forcibly struck by the difficulties she faced in maintaining her social position; as she defends her reputation against the calumnies of false friends, one can’t help but be saddened. Gournay’s prose is characteristically vigorous, lucid, and persuasive, but the “Apology” is a melancholy read.

Hillman provides a thoughtful general introduction, recounting Gournay’s life and intellectual preoccupations, the influence she had on contemporaries, and the reception of her works. The four works are individually prefaced by brief introductions that contextualize them more completely. Moreover, as part of “The Other Voice in Early Modern Europe” series published by Chicago, the book is enhanced by a series introduction that gives a historical overview of misogynist attitudes toward women. This wealth of informative and stimulating commentary—along with a full measure of equally useful textual notes—makes *Apology for the Woman Writing* extremely suitable for classroom use. Hillman and Quesnel deserve praise not only for producing such a fine edition, but for amplifying the intense and compelling voice of a woman who deserves to be heard more widely.

Isabella Andreini. *La Mirtilla: A Pastoral*. Translated with an Introduction and Notes by Julie Campbell. Tempe, Arizona: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2002. xi + 105 pp. \$26.00. Review by NANCY BUNKER, MACON STATE COLLEGE.

*La Mirtilla: A Pastoral* by Isabella Andreini, translated and introduced by Julie Campbell, is available for the first time in English. Campbell’s comprehensive introduction situates the playwright within a highly cultivated and cultured circle, which included her friendship with Torquato Tasso and correspondence with Erius Puteanus, Milanese professor of classical languages. In *La Mirtilla*,



Andreini imitates Tasso's conceits in *Aminta* and chooses materials that document her efforts to commingle ancient literature with dramatic flare. Utilizing, adapting, and manipulating classical sources such as Ovid and Terence in her representation of underlying themes of balance and moderation in love, Andreini's work "flourished during the height" (xi) of the *commedia dell'arte* and the *commedia erudite*.

Campbell identifies *La Mirtilla* as a comic masterpiece replete with conventional romantic circumstances governed by Amore. The play's Prologue consists of a conversation between Amore (Cupid) and his mother Venere (Venus) that outlines Amore's infamous position, since he is called upon by frantic lovers, criticized for his actions, and blamed for ill-fated matches. Venere reminds her son that mortals make poor choices, but he corrects the mistakes. As the play opens, Uranio's love is unreturned by Ardelia, and Tirsi is unwilling to love; Filli and Mirtilla both fancy Uranio, and Ardelia loves only herself. Amore's snares bring each potential partner together with the correct spouse (Filli and Igitio, Mirtilla and Tirsi, and Uranio and Ardelia), but not until each has cursed his efforts and denied his skill.

Andreini's extensive pastoral imagery, noted by Campbell, discusses three adaptations from classical literature that influence *La Mirtilla's* outcome. A decorative cup, similar to one serving as an "incentive" (xiv) in Theocritus's *Thyrsis*, is offered after Tirsi's proposal, but Mirtilla refuses his initial overture and inflames him all the more. In *Country Singing-Match*, Theocritus's shepherds "compete to a draw" (xv), and the contest between Filli and Mirtilla ends in the same manner, which frees both females to marry their true loves. Carving a lover's name on a tree reminds us of Virgil's *Gallus* in the tenth eclogue. As with Gallus, Igitio "carves his love's name on the trees in the woods so that as they grow, so will his love" (xv); ultimately Filli accepts him.

Andreini's *La Mirtilla* imitates Tasso and employs the tragicomedy's happy closure with "contented couples making offerings of thanksgiving at the temple of Venere for the lessons they have learned. The individual questions about love debated

throughout the play are subsumed in the end in the group acknowledgment of Amore's power" (xxv). However, Campbell identifies three events that mark Andreini's liberties with tradition and that suggest a change in women's roles. In Act III, Filli keeps herself from being victimized, frees herself by her wits, and as an accomplished con artist, teaches her would-be offender a lesson that puts an end to his misogynist ways. Also in Act III, Filli and Mirtilla instigate a signing contest, which reaches resolution when Opico designates the battling heroines as equals, advises them to make peace and value their friendship over infatuations, and the women follow his advice. Act IV exposes Andreini's lampoon of Ardelia, not as the Petrarchan beloved Narcissus but "taking the stereotype taken to its limits . . . by allowing her to speak" creates "in essence, a caricature" (xxi). Campbell also notes the tragicomedy motif in each lover that identifies death as the best relief from unrequited love, but the disharmony gradually dissipates; especially, both Filli and Mirtilla save their lover's lives and accept their proposals. Andreini retains "timeless sexism," according to Campbell, through Uranio as he remarks Filli's change of mind "has clearly proven herself a woman" (xxv).

Andreini's individuality and literary contribution manifest themselves through merging the classical with a "subversively wicked and witty" treatment of lovers (xxi). Filled with the "rich variety of love and desire," *La Mirtilla* exemplifies Andreini's "astute understanding of the human experience" and reveals her ability to "argue philosophically about the nature of love" (xxiii). As the first pastoral authored by a female, Campbell argues for *La Mirtilla* as one of the best of the genre written in this period. The playwright provides an "element long missing from the traditional canonical studies"—the female voice writing in response to the texts of her male contemporaries on subjects such as mythology, Platonic philosophy, literary theory, and *questioni d'amore* (xvii). Bringing a female-authored counterpart into the development of playwrighting in this period, Andreini sets forth a representation of an ideal Renaissance woman that diverged from her male contemporaries' view. It is interesting to note Filli, a role understood as

one Andreini reserved for herself, as her speeches manifest the heroine's overt feminist inclination. Constituting a cultural moment in tragicomedy development, *La Mirtilla* represents Andreini's literary talent for her own self-fashioning. Although first trained as a courtesan and later an actress and a playwright, she married Francesco Andreini and exemplified both "humanist and Christian ideals for early modern women, attributes considered unusual for an actress" (xii). Recognized as "one of the greatest *immamorate* in the history of Italian comedy" (xi), she held membership in the academy of Pavia; along with her husband, she co-directed the famous Gelosi theatrical company, thus fashioning her own identity and reputation.

*La Mirtilla's* popularity speaks to extensive readership. Italian publication in 1588 generated multiple editions and nine reprints by 1616, and editions were printed in Paris; however, there are no extant manuscripts of *La Mirtilla*. Campbell based her translation upon Maria Luisa Doglio's 1995 edition, which deviated from the 1588 edition by modernizing Italian spelling and regularizing capitalization but retained the edition's line breaks and line numbers. She accomplishes her goal, to "render a text that is a close translation of Andreini's vocabulary, being mindful of her sixteenth-century idiom, while at the same time producing an easily readable, standard English text, suitable for use in the college classroom" (xxvi). Campbell's attractive and accessible *La Mirtilla* enlarges the scope of Renaissance scholarship, provides a welcome addition to the pastoral, women's studies, and the drama canon, and it brings a successful, although lesser-studied author, to new readership.

Joyce Green MacDonald. *Women and Race in Early Modern Texts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. ix + 188 pp. \$55.00. Review by LISA J. SCHNELL, UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT.

Joyce Green MacDonald's *Women and Race in Early Modern Texts* deals with a broad range of material having to do with representations of African women in primary material from the late

fourteenth century to the Restoration. The book begins with a chapter on late twentieth-century critical race theory and early modern representations of Cleopatra and then moves to a discussion of Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra*, a consideration of the two women of Carthage—Dido—and Sophonisba, two chapters on Aphra Behn's *Oronooko* and its subsequent adaptations, a piece on Katherine Philips' translation of Corneille's *La Mort de Pompée*, and, finally, a reading of Behn's seldom-studied *Abdelazer*. The phrase that might most come to mind is "casting a wide net" but the phrase would be inaccurate, for while MacDonald characterizes the book as a monograph in her introduction, a reader expecting a single "net" that pulls the fairly disparate material together into a coherent argument is likely to be disappointed.

Of the seven chapters of the book, four were originally published as journal articles, a fact which would not be at all remarkable except for the fact that the chapters of this book feel remarkably discrete. Indeed, in the places in the book where MacDonald attempts to bring together the chapters' various arguments, the thinking is often careless and at best provisional. For example, introducing the Restoration texts of the second half of the book MacDonald says, "Instead of the relational bond between Rome and Egypt, Mariam and Salome, Octavia and Cleopatra, Dido and Sophonisba, we see more texts which betray no knowledge of the possibility that female whiteness can produce or be defined by its opposite" (88-89). By "opposite" I suppose she means female blackness, but if she does it is neither clear nor an appropriate signification. (Such lack of care—and the example I've cited is but one example of many such instances in the volume—forces one to wonder also at the editorial process behind the book.)

MacDonald's primary concern, as she articulates it in the Introduction, is "with discovering how women's bodies, white as well as black, and women's writing identities were 'taken' and used by early modern cultures of race and colonialism" (4). The book, she says, "will trace two . . . gendered tactics of communicating empire: the removal of dark-skinned women from representation, and the submersion of Englishwomen's racial identity into gender" (10).

Given those aims, the reader might quite justifiably anticipate a discussion heavy on cultural and intellectual history: how does the history of the representation of black women participate in a broader history of ideas about English empire and colonialism? More specifically, the organization of the book around two separate narratives designed to contain women's raced bodies—narratives of Rome's founding and its progress toward Empire, and narratives of Britain's establishment of colonial authority in the New World—might reasonably lead one to expect a careful, nuanced discussion of the ways in which ideas about race figure in the change in English attitudes toward empire between, say, the late sixteenth century and the early eighteenth centuries. But while the chapters offer some insightful and even surprising readings of texts, the kind of historicizing that is necessary to do the work MacDonald seems to be promising in her introduction is almost completely absent.

For instance, MacDonald writes quite convincingly about the way in which Katherine Philips "chastens" her *Pompey* of racial consciousness: "To acknowledge more fully the play of racial and cultural difference operating in the historical materials which *Pompey* dramatizes would be to acknowledge that gender is not the immutable and indivisible category Philips' achievement of authorship requires it to be" (133). But while MacDonald's discussion of this "chastening" is convincing at the level of the text, the expected discussion of the ways in which Philips' chastened account of Roman civil war might be in conversation with English civil war and ideas about empire never takes place. Instead, the "chaste thinking" (MacDonald borrows the phrase from Stephanie Jed) of *Pompey* has only to do with Philips' conflicted habitation of literary authority.

One is compelled to make the comparison to the work of John Michael Archer, whose own deeply nuanced, learned work on race in early modern England surely sets the standard for the kind of historicizing that is necessary in making such important arguments. It is work that MacDonald knows: Archer's fine essay on the relationship between Rome and Egypt—and early modern En-

gland—in Shakespeare’s *Antony and Cleopatra* was, in fact, first published in a 1997 collection that MacDonald herself edited—*Race, Ethnicity, and Power in the Renaissance* (inexplicably, Archer’s important essay is never even cited by MacDonald).

Still, the book, while it doesn’t live up to its own billing or the historicist expectations this reader brought to it, contains some important arguments. MacDonald’s oft-reiterated assertion that determining race by skin color is a modern and not a Renaissance phenomenon leads to some very insightful, and original, readings of early modern texts that read race in the body and bodily behaviors as well as in social institutions like marriage and the family. My sense is that in this way MacDonald’s work has already opened the field to important reevaluations of race in early modern texts. Furthermore, her discussion of early women writers like Philips and Behn, who she shows to be at best ambivalent about issues of both race and gender, also contributes valuably to other recent work that is providing a much-needed correction to a field that has sometimes devoted too much energy to establishing a female literary tradition and ignored the differences, as MacDonald puts it, “not only between, but sometimes even within women” (148). Yet in the end the book’s methodological weaknesses will mean that *Women and Race in Early Modern Texts* is not likely to have the impact on the field of early modern studies that its capacious title—and its introduction—seems to promise.

Valerie Traub. *The Renaissance of Lesbianism in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. xvi + 492 pp. + 33 illus. \$80.00 cloth. \$29.00 paper. Review by MARIO DIGANGI, LEHMAN COLLEGE AND THE GRADUATE CENTER, CUNY.

*The Renaissance of Lesbianism in Early Modern England* provides an encyclopedic account of the transformation of the cultural representation and ideological significance of female homoeroticism in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century England. Traub’s compellingly argued study contributes significantly to early

modern scholarship not only on sexuality but also on gender, anatomical science, marriage and the family, poetic and dramatic texts, classical mythology, women writers, and royal iconography. Collecting a vast range of primary and secondary sources, and demonstrating an impressive fluency with theoretical, historical, and literary critical modes of analysis, Traub constructs a diachronic narrative of the shifting meaning of female same-sex relations throughout the early modern period. In the sixteenth century, Traub argues, representations of female-female desire were split between the positive image of the friend and the negative image of the tribade. Whereas the “feminine” friend represented the “chaste” and “unexceptional” love between (English) women (19), the “masculine” tribade was usually depicted as a foreign woman who penetrated another woman with an enlarged clitoris or dildo. Yet as images of female sexuality proliferated during the seventeenth century in scientific treatises, travel narratives, and the arts, the once distinct types of the friend and the tribade became conflated, thus “contaminating” female same-sex desire in general with the stigma of immorality and irrationality formerly reserved for the tribade. This stigmatization “provide[d] the condition of possibility for modern erotic identities” to emerge during the eighteenth century (20).

Traub describes her project not as a quest to discover “the lesbian” in early modern texts, but as a “genealogy” of the “conditions of intelligibility” through which *lesbian* desire gained “cultural signification” during this period (28). Throughout the book *lesbian* appears in italics to mark its function as a contingent, inadequate “rhetorical figure” or “discursive effect” rather than as a “stable epistemological or historical category” (15), let alone a transhistorical category of personhood or sexual orientation. In chapters 1–4, Traub examines the contradictory rhetorical strategies Renaissance writers used to render *lesbianism* visible or intelligible at the same time that they figured it through the tropes of insignificance or impossibility. The second half of the book (chapters 5–7) traces the uneven historical process by which this discourse of impossibility was displaced by an emergent discourse of “suspicion and

possibility" (20). In the final, most self-reflective, chapter regarding the "quest for origins" of modern *lesbian* identity, Traub uses the psychoanalytic distinction between identification and desire to advocate that we "move beyond identity" as a mode of encountering the *lesbian* past, and instead recognize our own desires—particularly the desire for a "*lesbian*-affirmative future"—as a resource for "historical engagement" (353).

From the vantage point of a genealogical stance that allows her to "look simultaneously backward and forward" (353), Traub brilliantly rewrites the renaissance in terms of female homoeroticism. By referring to the "renaissance" of *lesbianism*, Traub means to indicate both the proliferation of representations of female homoeroticism during this period and the indebtedness of these representations to classical sources and models. More polemically, she also wishes to expose the inadequacy of the traditional view of the Renaissance as an organically coherent, ideologically homogeneous culture, an account that is belied by the "dynamic interactions of a range of knowledges" about *lesbian* desire during this period (10). It is through her meticulously rendered, deeply informed, exposition of this range of knowledges that Traub makes her greatest contribution to seventeenth-century studies.

The first four chapters establish conclusively that, whatever recourse early modern writers had to tropes of the "impossibility" of *lesbian* desire, their texts mapped out the scientific, ideological, and imaginative terrains through which the articulation of that desire became possible. Chapter 1 establishes a foundation by outlining the medical, theological, and legal discourses that informed understandings of *lesbianism* in early modern Europe and by revealing the circulation of these discourses in a canonical literary text, Shakespeare's *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, with its allusions to female bedfellows, Amazons, and convents. Turning to "the production of cultural knowledge (scientific and obscene) about women's eroticism" (79), Chapter 2 argues that female erotic pleasure was considered "a central component of reproductive, marital chastity" in the period (78). Yet male anatomists and writers of obscene poems such as Thomas Nashe also recognized that the



clitoris (newly “discovered” by anatomical science) could give women access to an erotic pleasure detached from any purely reproductive ends. Provocatively titled “The politics of pleasure; or, queering Queen Elizabeth,” Chapter 3 extends the previous chapter’s exploration of “the potential for female erotic agency from within the confines of patriarchal ideology” (125) to a consideration of female erotic agency outside of marriage. Like the *pudica* (a naked woman protecting her genitals with her hand) found in the period’s anatomy books, portraits of Queen Elizabeth that center the gaze on her concealed genitals paradoxically “perform feminine modesty while also calling attention to erotic potential” (125). Chastity is not equivalent to asexuality, as many critics have wrongly assumed; rather, Elizabeth’s erotic self-display, which was justified in terms of her sovereign power, was “determinedly fetishistic” and “delightfully polymorphous” (150). Chapter 4, a revised version of Traub’s influential essay “The (in)significance of *lesbian* desire,” demonstrates how an “imagined golden age of female intimacy” (188), encoded in the pastoral representation of love between conventionally “feminine” women, allows the elegiac expression of a *lesbian* desire that is ultimately displaced by the imperatives of reproductive marital alliance and its ostensible basis in women’s “natural” attraction to men.

Positing the mid-seventeenth century as “an inaugural period in the construction of the erotic meanings of modernity” (231), the second half of the book explores how female same-sex behavior in general began to be represented as overtly sexual, hence as morally and socially transgressive. In Chapter 5, “The Psychomorphology of the Clitoris,” Traub returns to the common early modern linkage between the clitoris and the tribade described in Chapter 2. Anatomy texts and travel narratives, she demonstrates, express anxiety about strange women who “abuse” the clitoris to achieve pleasure outside masculine control. As the century progressed, however, even friendships between English women were in danger of being interpreted as sexually illicit, an ideological development that Traub calls the “perversion of *lesbian* desire” and that she examines in poetic, pictorial, and theatrical representa-

tions of the Ovidian myths of Diana and Calisto (chapter 6) and Iphis and Ianthe (chapter 7). In these mythological narratives, the kind of intimacy once regarded as “chaste feminine love” becomes “imbued with associations of tribadism” (278), and the lament over an *amor impossibilis* voices the frustration of experiencing a desire perceived as “unnatural,” because not able to be consummated through patriarchal marriage and sexual reproduction. Appropriating the trope of *amor impossibilis* to lament not the unnaturalness of *lesbian* desire but the absence of the beloved, the poet Katherine Philips employs a rhetoric of idealized friendship to legitimate female homoerotic subjectivity as natural. At the same time, however, discourses of *lesbianism* were moving away from a paradigm of the “natural” and towards the “more scientific, biologically based concept of normality and its deviations” that would come to define the parameters of modern sexual identity in the eighteenth century (324).

*The Renaissance of Lesbianism in Early Modern England* is a challenging, demanding book. Each of its long, dense chapters shuttles back and forth between various discursive registers and interpretative modes: explications of Renaissance texts produced within distinct generic and aesthetic traditions; accounts of findings from the fields of social, sexual, and political history; critiques of current developments in literary and cultural scholarship; and theoretical engagement with historicist, psychoanalytic, feminist, and lesbian methodologies and critics. Patiently unfolding her expansive, complexly layered, argument, Traub produces a compelling narrative of historical change that should profoundly impact future scholarship on Renaissance sexuality. Precisely because of the impact her study is likely to have, however, it will be important to keep in mind Traub’s own gracious acknowledgment, in a brief “Afterword,” of the contingency of her findings (355): many Renaissance texts await reinterpretation through a *lesbian*-affirmative methodology, and archival materials remain to be discovered. Moreover, in strategically focusing on the figures of the tribade and the friend, Traub, as she readily admits, bypasses other *lesbian* figures like the lusty mistress or “female procuress” (26), the kinds

of texts in which these figures typically appear (e.g., Jacobean tragedies and satiric comedies), and the particular social and economic tensions informing female same-sex relationships that they typically express. Traub might not have exhausted the subject of Renaissance *lesbianism*, then, but she has undeniably given us a wealth of knowledge about its history and a model of scholarship for interpreting its significance that cannot be ignored.

Linda C. Mitchell. *Grammar Wars: Language as Cultural Battlefield in 17<sup>th</sup>- and 18<sup>th</sup>-Century England*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001. viii + 218 pp. + 10 illus. \$74.95. Review by MELISSA MOHR, STANFORD UNIVERSITY.

Mitchell sets out firmly new historicist aims for her book. She wants to explore the ways in which seventeenth- and eighteenth-century grammar texts—long regarded as nothing more than straightforward guides to conjugations and declensions—are actually implicated in key social, political, and religious issues of their day. These texts also come to shape contemporary ideas about the teaching of grammar and, to some extent, even the politics of gender and class in the contemporary classroom. She bases her conclusions on readings of over 300 early modern grammar texts—one of the book's primary values is as a compendium of these works. If you want to know what Thomas Blount thinks about the education of women (fine, within narrow limits, as long as they are not “loose” (144), or how Charles Butler defines grammar (the “art of speaking and writing well” (2), Mitchell is sure to provide a few paragraphs summarizing their points of view.

The book is organized—somewhat loosely, as Mitchell is wary of pinning herself down—around five grammatical controversies that have wider social implications: standardization of the vernacular, pedagogy, writing instruction, universal language schemes, and social position. She begins with the triumph, by the end of the seventeenth century, of the vernacular over Latin as the language of the learned, and the debates this engendered over the teaching

of grammar and the status of the English language itself. Should grammar be taught in English or in Latin? What are the dangers of a living and changing language, one, unlike Latin, not “fixed” (31) and governed by strict rules? Should attempts be made to fix English, and who should be given authority to do so? Mitchell summarizes arguments made by grammarians on both sides of these disputes; history has declared the winners those who, like Bishop Robert Lowth in 1762, argued for the teaching of grammar in English, even while using Latin models to standardize English usage. She provides interesting examples of the ways in which grammarians “corrected” English by making it conform to the rules of Latin grammar—“it’s me” had to become “it is I”; “different to” and “different than,” both previously acceptable, became “different from”; and, of course, “the centuries old double negative” was declared “incorrect and illiterate” (33-35).

The triumph of the vernacular was enabled by the increasing societal importance of the middle classes. Their greater role in “a newly developing mercantile economy” (46) also led, Mitchell argues, to changes in the educational system. Pedagogues were faced with new kinds of students—those of the middle, even lower classes, as well as foreigners—in larger numbers than ever before. In order to address an increased demand for literacy and for vocational training that would be useful to young merchants, teachers had to abandon the traditional early modern model of education, with its emphasis on the trivium, Latin, and classical texts. Mitchell addresses these changes mostly through summaries of the work of Samuel Hartlib and Johann Amos Commenius, two of the most vocal advocates for pedagogical reform in seventeenth-century Europe.

Writing was an important component of the new vocational training, and two types of writing skills were especially sought after: letter writing, for both business and personal correspondence, and writing “commercial documents like receipts, contracts, and purchase orders” (74). Mitchell devotes some space to the differing writing styles taught in grammar and rhetoric texts, categories that have been somewhat confused in her book up to this point.

Rhetoric texts “favored the eloquent prose of the aristocratic tradition, a prose that had flourish and style. Grammar books, on the other hand, promoted functional writing that would serve the most basic of purposes” (74). These styles fitted the needs of their respective target audiences—rhetoric texts were used largely by the “privileged class” (74), while grammar books were firmly middle class. By the mid-eighteenth century, however, rhetoric became the more important subject for all classes, as it “subsumed grammar and logic to form the basis of the rhetoric handbook that is still used for composition today” (85).

A chapter on universal language schemes shows grammarians using what they had learned about Latin and English to try to create a perfect language. Ideas of what would constitute this perfect language varied widely from scheme to scheme. Some grammarians wanted to return to the language Adam invented, spoken world-wide before the Tower of Babel divided the earth’s tongues. (Mitchell glosses over how they hoped to reconstruct this language—more information about this seemingly impossible project would have been interesting.) Others wanted to invent a philosophical language with symbols that somehow embodied the nature of the things they represented. All agreed, however, that a universal language spoken by people in all nations would advance the cause of true religion, promote commerce, and allow the faster spread of scientific ideas. When, in the late seventeenth century, grammarians realized that a universal language was not practically possible, former “universalists” began instead to compare existing languages, looking for similarities among them in attempts to define correct grammar across a spectrum of examples—the basis for modern linguistics, according to Mitchell.

The last chapter, on “social position,” is the least successful—oddly, given Mitchell’s new historicist aims. It investigates how grammarians “had the power to create, assign, and reinforce identities for marginal social groups . . . . While foreigners and women had an identity thrust upon them, the middle class, by contrast, generated its own identity . . .” (133). Foreigners were both encouraged to learn English as a way of proving their loyalty to their

new home, and feared for their propensity to corrupt the language. Many grammarians argued that women should be taught grammar, that they might instruct young children before they went off to school and into the hands of more capable (male) tutors. Underlying this relatively permissive attitude to women's education, however, was a deep suspicion of women's intellectual and even physical capacity to learn. (Benches in the schools were too hard for frail women to sit upon, and the reading of Latin might "upset their stomachs" (142).) The middle class, by which Mitchell presumably means middle class *men*, saw "morals"—read "religion"—and "literacy" (133) as key elements in its identity and found grammar texts an ideal way to instill both.

Mitchell avoids pursuing the tantalizing issues she raises here to any great extent. She never explains, for example, what she means by her claim that foreigners and women have an identity thrust upon them by grammar texts, while "the middle class" creates its own. Certainly grammar books would seem equally prescriptive to *all* readers, whether instructing middle class men in the proper form of a business receipt (and thus indirectly in their societal role), or women in what they should be reading to best educate their children. If she means that many authors of grammar texts were middle-class men, what about female authors of grammars, such as Bathsua Makin and Ann Fisher (whom she does mention)—might they not be seen as "creating" an identity for their female readers? And why lump female readers together, when women of different classes were expected to study very different things? The wife of a merchant, for example, might very well learn to write the same receipts he did, while an aristocratic lady might spend more time perfecting her personal, or, like Anne Clifford, household and legal correspondence.

These faults—overgeneralization and an unwillingness to flesh out and support grand but vague claims—are present throughout the book. It ultimately falls short of its author's stated aims. But its details are insightful and useful in that they provide copious exposure to an understudied genre. *Grammar Wars* goes a long

way toward making early modern grammar texts, considered dry and boring even at the time of their printing, *interesting*.

Joan DeJean. *The Reinvention of Obscenity: Sex, Lies, and Tabloids in Early Modern France*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002. xii + 204 pp. + 10 illus. \$45.00 cloth; \$18.00 paper. Review by MELISSA MOHR, STANFORD UNIVERSITY.

DeJean's book is more ambitious than its title suggests. She traces the history of obscenity from ancient Rome to late seventeenth-century France, touching along the way on attitudes towards four-letter words and other kinds of indecency in the middle ages across Europe, in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Italy and England, and in the present-day United States. The book, not surprisingly, given DeJean's areas of expertise, is most successful when it deals with France, as three of its five chapters do.

In these chapters, DeJean argues that obscenity was reinvented in France between 1550 and 1663, and that it spread in its new form to England and Italy. This reinvention occurred when obscene literature, previously the province of elite male readers (and previously not identified as "obscene" *per se*), began to circulate in an uncontrolled fashion among a broader population of bourgeois readers, both male and female. As its readership expanded, the obscene changed in character. It became strongly identified with what we today would call four-letter words and began to focus almost exclusively on female genitalia. DeJean contends that the latter change signals the cultural imposition of heterosexuality on male desires—and on the literature that represents them—which were formerly "polyvalent, desiring all that was desirable" (55). The key cause and sign of obscenity's reinvention, however, was that obscene texts became subject to systematic secular censorship. These contested texts in turn played important roles in the development of mass-market print culture and of "modern censorial machinery" (4). The modern concept of "the author" thus originates in obscene discourse, since, as DeJean argues, following Foucault, books

only began to have ‘authors’ when someone needed to be punished for contents considered to be transgressive.

DeJean’s first case study is that of Théophile de Viau, who was prosecuted for a “sodomite sonnet” (29) that appeared in a 1622 collection of satiric verse, *Le Parnasse des poètes satiriques*. His trial was conducted by civil authorities—DeJean gives a brief account of the battles between secular and religious censors over the burgeoning book trade and cases like Théophile’s. Though the charges against Théophile were of “impiety and blasphemy” (43), DeJean argues that “what the magistrates were actually trying to prove, rather than the charges they claimed to be prosecuting” (51) involved two secular crimes—drunkenness and sodomy. Théophile’s libertine poem circulated publicly at alehouses, and “speech crimes uttered in such promiscuous surroundings had the potential to corrupt an unpredictably diverse audience” (45). This potential for contamination beyond restricted circles of elite male readers made the poem’s last line—“Je fais vœux désormais de ne . . . tre qu’en cul” [“I swear from now on to . . . ck only in the ass”] (41)—even more dangerous. DeJean implies that even a few years previously, this line would have occasioned little comment and certainly no censorship. But in 1622 Théophile was caught on the wrong side of “a demarcation never before operative in sexually transgressive literature: between desire for women and desire for men” (46). The category of the decent had changed, leaving poets who followed classical models vulnerable to prosecution.

DeJean next addresses the attempted suppression of *L’Ecole des filles* (1655), “the obscene’s first modern classic” (154). This work was immensely popular, bringing obscene literature to a whole new group of readers—the bourgeoisie, male and female—because of its “format, genre, and language and, . . . radically new content” (61). It was published in inexpensive editions; it was a novel, with characters that came straight out of the Parisian bourgeoisie; and it was written in the vernacular. Above all, it promoted a new version of sexuality, in which women’s genitalia were talked about, “moreover, *celebrated* in a fashion previously reserved for male organs. . . . [F]emale genitalia, for the first time in any erotic or



transgressive literature, are portrayed not as disgusting but as a source of pleasure for both partners" (72). *L'Ecole* thus "inaugurates modern pornography" (74), for along with its emphasis on female genitals came the concealment of male genitalia and a resolute denial that desire can be anything but heterosexual. The novel's printing history also shows secular censorship becoming more and more systematized—the print run of the 1655 edition was entirely destroyed.

As France's "first truly modern author" (84), Molière draws the biggest share of DeJean's attention. She examines the controversy surrounding his *L'Ecole des femmes*, first performed in late 1662. Though she has insisted throughout the book that official, secular censorship is a necessary feature of "modern obscenity," *L'Ecole* attracted no civil prosecution—she never makes clear how this play fits into her definition, or perhaps changes it. The play instead inspired a flood of public criticism objecting to its scandalous "scene of the *thé* (*la scène du 'le'*)" (102). In *La Critique de "L'Ecole des femmes"* (1663), Molière gives a name to what fuels his public's ire—it is "*obscénité*" (103)—and thus, "after 150 years during which it was usually only partly understood even by the few who used it, [he] finally brought the vocabulary of the obscene fully into public existence" (104). *L'Ecole* and the controversy it provoked also gave rise to the phenomenon of author as celebrity, and with it, tabloid journalism. Molière was the first French author "able to sell widely on the basis of his name" (120), and as a result, his private life became public. 'Newsmen' such as Jean Donneau de Visé suddenly felt free to print that his young wife Armande Béjart was cuckolding the playwright, or that she was really his daughter. "Molière's censors," DeJean argues, "must somehow have felt that his traffic in the obscene had authorized them to extend the specter of sexual indecency into his private life" (118).

The first chapter, with its sections on ancient Rome, the middle ages, Italy, and England, is less successful—it suffers from oversimplification and occasional factual inaccuracies. DeJean repeatedly emphasizes, for example, "the obscene's far less troubled life in antiquity" (7) than in early modern France, which she sets out to

show in an unconvincing page of discussion spanning hundreds of years of Greco-Roman history. And she claims that, after the term's long hibernation during the middle ages, "English speakers only began to use *obscene* once the usage had been reinvented in French. What appears to be the first appearance of *obscene* in its modern context occurs in the charges against those who had printed and sold the 1688 English translation" (134) of *L'Ecole des filles*. She thus ignores, among others, instances of "obscene" in the works of John Marston (1598), Ben Jonson (1640), Joseph Hall (1656), and Robert Fletcher (1656), as well as examples of "obscenely" in Shakespeare (1588) and Milton (1642), and other variants such as "obscenousnesse," in John Harington's preface to his *Orlando Furioso* (1591). Such cases certainly suggest that the "obscene"—as a concept and as a word—was alive and well in England before 1688. These faults stem partly from her attempt to address the European history of obscenity from ancient Rome through the late seventeenth century in the book's first twenty-seven pages. *The Reinvention of Obscenity* would benefit either from vastly expanded coverage of these areas or from their excision, leaving its author to concentrate on early modern France where her true interest seems to lie.

The biggest problem with the book is DeJean's unwillingness to address blasphemy, charges of which feature in two of her three main examples. As she acknowledges, Théophile's sonnet was actually accused not of obscenity or indecency, but of "impiety and blasphemy" (43). And *L'Ecole des filles* was condemned, as she again acknowledges, for being "against the honor of God and of the Church" (100), "impious" (116), and "contrary to Christian discipline" (116)" (63). Rather than exploring what seems to be a strong and interesting connection between the blasphemous and the obscene in these two cases, she simply decides that "When the obscene was finally reinvented, it caught the censors up short, and no one knew what to call it" (63). She does occasionally note that French censorship displays much "confusion between religious and secular issues" (31), but her own evidence implies that censors do not *confuse* blasphemy and obscenity, but rather that the two concepts are integrally related. They are two kinds of powerful trans-

gressive language, one in a slow decline, one in the ascendant as what she and Norbert Elias call “the civilizing process” (19) exerts increasing control over European minds and mores.

Despite its drawbacks, *The Reinvention of Obscenity* has much for readers interested in early modern French print culture. For more in-depth histories of obscenity, especially in Italy and England, pick up instead *The Invention of Pornography: Obscenity and the Origins of Modernity, 1500-1800*, edited by Lynn Hunt, or Ian Moulton’s *Before Pornography: Erotic Writing in Early Modern England*.

Roger D. Sell. *Literature as Communication: The Foundations of Mediating Criticism*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2000. xiv + 348 pp. \$95.00. *Mediating Criticism: Literary Education Humanized*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2001. x + 431pp. \$85.00. Review by ALAN RUDRUM, SIMONFRASER UNIVERSITY.

I began to read *Literature as Communication* a short while before September 11, 2001. The events of that day drove me to Robert Fisk’s *Pity the Nation* and related books by Jonathan Randal, Noam Chomsky, and Edward Said. In my institution, a prolonged and rancorous e-mail war broke out, in which any attempt to contextualize 9/11 was treated as anti-American and anti-semitic, as was any suggestion that the incursion into Afghanistan would be no more effective in combating terrorism than the 1982 invasion of Lebanon had been in finishing off the PLO.

The point of this recollection is the relevance of Sell’s project to consideration of “the clash of cultures.” *Literature as Communication* is prefaced by quotations from Stuart Hampshire, Isaiah Berlin, and K. Anthony Appiah, all of which formulate the need for empathy. Hampshire recalls the vision of Heraclitus, that “life, and liveliness within the soul and within society, consists in perpetual conflicts between rival impulses and ideals, and that justice pre-sides over the hostilities and finds sufficient compromises to pre-

vent madness in the soul, and civil war or war between peoples.” Sell’s two books are of interest to all teachers of literature, since they encourage us to think about the value of what we do and about the ways in which we should do it. They are of special interest to those who teach the literature of past centuries, or in multicultural contexts, or in countries where religious and cultural values are quite different from those of the West. The distance from our own culture that we encounter in literature of the past requires mental and emotional processes akin to those needed to understand cultures of the present which may seem intensely alien and, if only for that reason, threatening. Those of us who are steeped in the language, literature, and history of a particular period need to remember that our pupils are not: good teaching will involve some withholding of what we know so as to create a space in which they can make discoveries, instead of merely being told about things. That can be difficult to do. Indeed a weakness of this interesting book, published in the series *Pragmatics and Beyond*, may be that its author, steeped in the language of pragmatics and of his fellow researchers, sometimes forgets Orwell’s rule of “using the fewest and shortest words that will cover one’s meaning” (*Shooting an Elephant and Other Essays*, London, 1950: 99-100).

Sell has long taught in Finland, and is therefore familiar with the problems of mediating English literature to students for whom English is not their first language. He will surely read with interest Azar Nafisi’s recent *Reading Lolita in Tehran*, which recounts how *Lolita* becomes a quite different book when read by a Muslim for whom the girl is not under-age, since in the Iranian version of Islamic law, girls can be given in marriage at the age of nine. To the more pious Muslim student, it is obvious that *Lolita* is a harlot who has seduced Humbert into sin. Nafisi records an encounter with an Islamic fundamentalist student who, inspired by the Qur’an and Said’s *Culture and Imperialism*, denounced *Mansfield Park* as an anti-Islamic work that condoned slavery (*The Times Literary Supplement*, July 4, 2003, 36). As the reviewer points out, more attention has been given to who reads books than to where books are read. Temporal distance may result in less dramatic need for mediating

criticism than geographical distance; but I encountered an amusing example after an afternoon spent reading Sell's book. I assume that in 1945 Hitchcock's film *Spellbound*, with its dream sequence by Salvador Dali, may have been taken straight as a psychological thriller. In 2003 it looked like a hilarious send-up of the psycho-analytic enterprise.

Sell views literature within the framework of a general theory of communication, without denying that literary texts may have features of content, form and style not often found elsewhere. Orwell wrote that "no book is genuinely free from political bias" (*Collected Essays*, reprint 1982: 26). Sell would agree, in the sense that he sees communication as generally meant to *achieve* something, to *enact* something in the world. Some readers will recall his distinctive 1987 essay, "The Unstable Discourse of Henry Vaughan: A Literary-Pragmatic Account." It seems appropriate that Vaughan's poem "The Match," clearly addressed to George Herbert, should come to mind: "Here I join hands, and thrust my stubborn heart / Into thy *Deed*, / There from no *Duties* to be freed." Here there are puns on the legal and the non-technical senses of "*Deed*" and "*Duties*." Vaughan is thinking of Herbert's poems both as a legacy and as an act to which he responds by acting himself. This instance, from a writer who is also a reader, supports Sell's view that literary works are acts which may result in transformations in the world. This view has not been universal within the past half-century of literary theory. Paul de Man argued that Rousseau's accusing the servant-girl of a crime he had committed himself was "merely" a piece of language; the fact that unpleasant consequences ensued for the servant girl was due to the obtuseness of the presiding judges who took Rousseau's words as something more than "just" words (50). This example may be especially telling, given what was later learned of De Man's record; but it slotted neatly into the prevalent view of creative literature as a "heterocosm," a world set quite apart from day-to-day communication.

Sell begins *Mediating Criticism* by sketching the history of the rise of professionalism in literary studies, with its analogy to the rise of Modernism in literature, and points out problems that may

arise when we lose touch with “what non-academic readers experience as reality.” The essays in this book are meant as practical demonstrations of the concerns discussed in *Literature as Communication*. Sell’s aim is to have Saintsbury’s “energy, enthusiasm and breadth,” while taking into account, and having positions on, “more than a century of intense theoretical discussion” (13). His subjects range from the seventeenth century to the twentieth. The book is divided into three parts. The first (“Empathizing”) calls for reconsideration of the novelist William Gerhardie and the poet Andrew Young. The second (“Recognizing Achievement”) deals with T. S. Eliot, Henry Vaughan, *Dombey and Son*, and Robert Frost. The third (“Responding to Hopefulness”) looks at Frost and Dickens from a different perspective and ends with an essay on “Fielding’s reluctant naturalism.” Not everybody would think of juxtaposing Dickens and Vaughan in the same sentence, but Sell does so very effectively (16-17). “The impoliteness of *The Waste Land*” is of special interest to readers of this journal, given Eliot’s influence on seventeenth century studies, through his essays on Milton and on the Metaphysical poets.

Most of us, perhaps the majority, teach outside our specialism. It can be difficult to find time to take stock of what we do and why we do it. I enjoyed these two books because they took me to authors I had not read, or had not read for some time; and I enjoyed too writing my own version in my head as I went along. The chapter on Vaughan might profitably have taken into account more of the work published in *Scintilla* in the past ten years or so; the account of the deixis of “I walked the other day” (160) comes a little too close to the mathematical permutations in Beckett’s *Watt* which most of us skip on a second reading. The reading of that poem would have gained from reference to Peter M. Sacks’s splendid book, *The English Elegy*. More generally, attention to Gadamer is good, but why so little to E. D. Hirsch? If “modernist gloom,” has a bracing effect worth writing about, why not say more about Samuel Beckett and the more recent example of bracing gloom in the work of J. M. Coetzee? If one accepts Sell’s view of literature as doing work in the world, how do we think about the widening

of the canon of literature in English? It answers to legitimate concerns, but is it cost-free? Does it make for a more or a less cohesive society? One might ask a similar question about the abandonment, in liturgical contexts, of the Bible in the King James Version. Because both these books positively invite such participation and such questions, both are good “machines for thinking with.”

William R. Newman and Lawrence M. Principe. *Alchemy Tried in the Fire: Starkey, Boyle, and the Fate of Helmontian Chymistry*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2002. xiv + 344 pp. + 8 illus. \$40.00. Review by LUCIANO BOSCHIERO, UNIVERSITY OF NEW SOUTH WALES.

Historians of science have often questioned the practices of the early modern alchemists; what type of experiments, if any, did they carry out? Precisely what literary sources did alchemists use during the Middle Ages and the Scientific Revolution? And what influence did alchemical studies have on the history of science? With the help of some important manuscript sources, Newman and Principe offer some enlightening answers to these questions. Through the laboratory notes of seventeenth-century American alchemist, George Starkey, these authors provide a rare insight into the field of alchemy. In the process, Newman and Principe also claim that they hope to dispel traditional myths and misconceptions about alchemy/chymistry (Newman and Principe interchange the term “alchemy” with “chymistry”, as if they were synonymous), including the notion that chymists were interested only in finding occult qualities and spiritual harmonies in nature. According to Newman and Principe, this position mistakenly assumes that alchemists offered nothing of value to the emergence of “new science” in the second half of the seventeenth century, since a break supposedly occurred in that period, in which scholastics and alchemists were replaced by experimenting mathematicians.

In 1650, George Starkey moved from America to England in order to meet and work with others interested in alchemy and

mysteriously published under the pseudonym of Eirenaeus Philalethes. Robert Boyle was among those with whom Starkey collaborated in England during the 1650s. Boyle only developed an interest in alchemy after meeting Starkey in January 1651, and from that moment on, began to collect an extensive library of alchemical texts. What is particularly interesting in chapter one, in the authors' analysis of the relationship between these two figures, is the lack of acknowledgment that Boyle gave Starkey and other chymical writers in his own publications. While appropriating claims from alchemists, Boyle did not wish to be associated publicly with them and risk gaining the reputation of an occultist, rather than a mechanical natural philosopher.

However, despite Boyle's attempt to distance himself from the occultist reputation of alchemists, Newman and Principe claim that their research on the collaborative efforts between Boyle and Starkey, shows that Boyle's alchemical interests were far more extensive than what he was prepared to acknowledge publicly. At this point of the book, it becomes obvious to the reader that Boyle is actually the focus of the authors' study. While Starkey provides Newman and Principe with the pertinent issues regarding alchemy in the mid-seventeenth century, this research is actually directed towards understanding Robert Boyle's intellectual background: "our reason for exploring this topic is to show how little one can rely upon the image of the iconic Boyle for grounding claims about seventeenth-century chymistry and Boyle's place therein" (33).

Chapter two provides some background to the emergence of alchemical studies in the seventeenth century. According to Newman and Principe, there was an experimentalist and quantitative aspect of alchemical studies since the Middle Ages that has been ignored or overlooked by many historians. In particular, Newman and Principe identify Joan Baptista Van Helmont, an early seventeenth-century Flemish metallurgist, as the leading figure in experimental quantitative chymistry. Van Helmont was interested in finding the chemical composition of substances and their physical characteristics before and after experimentation, including their



weight and specific gravity. This is part of what the authors identify as the Helmontian technique of “analysis and synthesis” (90).

Newman and Principe conclude the chapter by claiming that Van Helmont’s approach to alchemy “found no more eager adherent than George Starkey” (91). Indeed, from Starkey’s laboratory notes, examined closely in chapters three and four, we come to appreciate the experimental quantitative technique behind Starkey’s work that he acquired from his readings of Van Helmont. Furthermore, Newman’s and Principe’s analyses of Starkey’s projects, such as the preparation of the Philosophical Mercury, reveal the degree to which Starkey’s experiments were laden with Helmontian theory. Newman and Principe contend that “Starkey does not deploy mere empirical or unguided trials . . . but rather turns to theoretical principles to direct his practical investigations” (102). Additionally, these manuscripts reveal that Starkey sometimes vouched for claims, not proven through experiment, on the basis of textual authority; his trust of certain authors. This was a typical scholastic technique for presenting claims and further strengthens the notion of continuity in the history of science that Newman and Principe support.

After revealing the laboratory practices of a typical alchemist in the mid-seventeenth century, Newman and Principe move on to the main target of their research, Robert Boyle. The reason for the authors’ interest in Boyle is quite understandable considering that Boyle was both a student and collaborator of Starkey. In fact, Newman and Principe convincingly demonstrate in chapter five that Starkey was Boyle’s most influential chymistry teacher, and that the two remained correspondents until Starkey’s death in 1665. This means that traces of Starkey’s Helmontian experimental quantitative skills and theoretical commitments can be found in Boyle’s early alchemical interests and publications throughout his career.

Furthermore, Boyle was one of the most influential figures in natural philosophical circles between 1660 and 1690. To find such a strong link between Boyle and the beliefs and practices of one of the most prominent alchemists of the period, certainly presents the opportunity for the authors to comment about the supposed

origins of chemistry and the experimental philosophy in the mid-seventeenth century. Newman and Principe, therefore, reinforce the historiographical aim of the book by claiming that their research of Starkey's and Boyle's relationship rejects stories about discontinuity in the history of science: "To reiterate what is important for our study is the historiographical consequence—Boyle's silence about his sources has made it seem that he had none and has consequently given the impression of a greater discontinuity in the history of chemistry at Boyle's period than is really the case" (272).

So this research of Starkey's laboratory practices has the potential to create quite an impact on the search for origin stories in the history of seventeenth-century science. However, rather than comment extensively about pertinent historiographical issues relating to this topic and experimental philosophy, Newman and Principe continue in chapter six with an analysis of Helmontian chymistry in the eighteenth-century work of Antoine Laurent Lavoisier and relegate the historiographical issues to a few brief points in the conclusion. Indeed, it would be interesting to read Newman and Principe's opinion of recent writings by Peter Dear, Steven Shapin, John Henry, and Peter Anstey, among others, regarding experimental philosophy, the mathematisation of nature, and the history of the philosophy of alchemical studies in the seventeenth century.

In summary, few significant criticisms can be made of this book. The argument against traditional notions of discontinuity is compelling, but more recent writings should also be considered. Furthermore, clearer definitions of the words "alchemy," "chymistry" and "chemistry" might help to distinguish the application of these terms throughout the text. Also, some questions remain unanswered: exactly why did Starkey use a pseudonym? Did he manage to disguise his identity from all his English colleagues, not just Boyle? What was Starkey's reaction to Boyle's appropriation of some alchemical concepts? Were Boyle's colleagues aware of his collaboration with Starkey? In any case, this is an enlightening account of seventeenth-century alchemy and a de-

light to read. It is well written and narrates some difficult alchemical concepts of the period in a very lucid and comprehensible fashion, even for readers who have limited knowledge about this topic.

Steve Sturdy, ed. *Medicine, Health and the Public Sphere in Britain, 1600–2000*. London: Routledge, 2003. xiii + 290 pp. \$95.00. Review by CELESTE CHAMBERLAND, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS.

In recent years, Jürgen Habermas's groundbreaking characterization of the public sphere as the main site of "discourse and opinion formation" independent of state control has piqued the interest of historians and sociologists seeking to decipher the intricacies of social interaction and the emergence of civil society in early modern Europe (7). By identifying the demarcation between public and private activity, Habermas has provided scholars with a vital analytical tool for assessing the broad social context of bourgeois capitalism and the legitimization of government action. However, as *Medicine, Health and the Public Sphere in Britain, 1600–2000* demonstrates, Habermas's theory provides a useful starting point for social and cultural historians but is limited in scope by an overly rigid assessment of the distinction between the public and private spheres and an exceedingly narrow definition of public discourse. A collection of essays authored by a diverse range of medical historians seeking to broaden Habermas's account of the public sphere, this volume offers an innovative assessment of the ways in which medicine historically has intersected with collective action and public institutions. As the book's contributors contend, expanding the boundaries of Habermas's deterministic theory to include a more extensive range of communities and multiple modes of action will enrich our understanding of civil society in general, and the medical sphere in particular.

As a key component in the distribution of public services, such as immunization and the general provision of health care, medicine furnishes a fascinating matrix through which the changing

dynamics of the public sphere and public discourse in Britain are illuminated. From the emergence of medical professionalization to the formation of public health policy, this volume explores a broad range of issues illustrative of the connection between medicine and matters of public concern. By providing detailed analyses of the critical link between the medical sphere, institutionalization and state involvement during the past four centuries, *Medicine, Health and the Public Sphere in Britain, 1600-1900* successfully elucidates the crucial role played by medicine in the development of public discourse and social action, and the ways in which matters pertaining to health care and the body have provoked much debate among patients, medical practitioners, government health councils and various communities throughout Britain.

The principal strengths of this volume lie in its comprehensive coverage of topics central to medicine's changing public functions, and its geographic breadth, which incorporates a variety of major British cities, including London, Edinburgh, Glasgow and Birmingham, as well as the relationship between the city and country in matters of public health legislation and the provision of institutionalized health care. From the controversies surrounding the professional conduct of physicians in seventeenth-century London to the heated abortion and fertility treatment debates of the 1980s and '90s, each chapter delves into noteworthy but often overlooked topics in medical history that highlight the dynamic relationship between medicine, collective action and social policy. Drawing on a wide range of methodologies and analytical tools, including demography, cultural history and detailed case studies, *Medicine, Health and the Public Sphere in Britain* will be of particular interest to historians of medicine and modern Britain due to its emphasis on medical matters of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. While it offers an innovative exploration of medicine's public roles over the past two centuries, this collection of essays focuses less on the connection between medicine and the public sphere in the early modern period, with only one of the book's thirteen chapters pertaining to the seventeenth century.

“Public and Private Dilemmas: The College of Physicians in Early Modern London,” Margaret Pelling’s lucid assessment of the tension between public and private occupational activities inherent in the professional conduct of physicians—and the book’s lone chapter situated in the seventeenth century—offers a rich and detailed analysis of the ways in which seventeenth-century physicians faced discredit by abandoning “male structures and processes of authority” in favor of semi-private gatherings within a milieu that identified public practice as normative (39). In Pelling’s interpretation, the physicians’ withdrawal from public action not only attests to the continuing significance of the private sphere despite the emerging prominence of the authentic public sphere in the seventeenth century, as defined by Habermas, but also represents the “germs of the modern stress of privacy” (27). This chapter provides an illuminating account of occupational identity and the complex network of interactions between patients and practitioners in the early years of medical professionalization. Although it sheds much light on the social position and institutionalization of the College of Physicians, this essay focuses less on matters of public health or the ways in which the physicians’ private identity contrasted with the public roles of other seventeenth-century medical practitioners, particularly surgeons and apothecaries.

While Pelling’s essay successfully challenges Habermas’s privileging of public action over domestic privacy, other chapters further complicate his class-based theory by exploring the ways in which factors such as gender and locale influenced the division between public and private. In particular, Elaine Thomson’s essay, “Between Separate Spheres: Medical Women, Moral Hygiene and the Edinburgh Hospital for Women and Children,” offers an insightful account of the intersection between early twentieth-century medical women and moral hygiene with regard to the prevention of venereal disease and the entrance of Edinburgh’s public health departments into the “domestic world of the private sphere” (118). Thomson successfully demonstrates that the relationship between gender and the provision of health care and preventive medicine challenges Habermas’s clear-cut distinction

between public and private. Like Thomson, Adrian Wilson complicates notions of "bourgeois publicness" in "The Birmingham General Hospital and its Public, 1765-79" (99). Wilson's assessment of the connection between public action and Birmingham's general hospital in the eighteenth century astutely suggests that Habermas's narrow conception of the public sphere does not adequately account for complexities such as confessional difference and the clash between town and country.

By enriching and expanding Habermas's characterization of the public sphere, each chapter in *Medicine, Health and the Public Sphere in Britain* offers a vital counterpoint to traditional distinctions between civil society and the state and demonstrates that medicine represents a vital force in the construction of the public sphere and collective action. Although limited in chronological scope by its prevailing emphasis on the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, this volume nonetheless offers an innovative and wide-ranging assessment of the interplay between the state, society, and medical institutions throughout Britain during the past four centuries.

Christopher Baker, ed. *Absolutism and the Scientific Revolution 1600-1720: A Biographical Dictionary*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2002. xxxiv + 450 pp. \$99.95. Review by IRVING A. KELTER, UNIVERSITY OF ST. THOMAS, HOUSTON.

*Absolutism and the Scientific Revolution 1600-1720: A Biographical Dictionary*, edited by Christopher Baker, is one of the volumes being published by Greenwood Press in its "Great Cultural Eras of the Western World" series. Each volume attempts to treat a period of Western history that had its own distinctive cultural physiognomy. Earlier volumes include ones on the Renaissance and Reformation and on the late Middle Ages.

The book begins with a short introduction by Christopher Baker, explaining the layout of the book and the principles of its organization. He argues that by 1600 the Renaissance was losing

“momentum” as a series of cultural forces and new forces were at work. The two he singles out were the rise to prominence of new methods and insights in the natural sciences and of new forms of monarchical government; hence the title of the work. Baker briefly analyzes the major trends in these areas as he sees them, also dealing with another major term used by earlier scholars to define the culture of this period, i.e. baroque. What surprised me about the introduction was its neglect of the major arguments among historians of politics and of science concerning the nature and usefulness of the terms “absolutism” and “scientific revolution” to define this period of European history. What also surprised me was Baker’s use of the term “absolutism” in the title given his statement that “individuals were chosen according to their contribution to the social, artistic, and intellectual milieu of seventeenth-century Europe” (xv). As he goes on to say, political or military figures were treated only if they had a broader impact on the culture of their day. Why then use the political term “absolutism” and possibly mislead readers who will expect to see more political and military figures than they will find in this book?

The book is organized in the classic alphabetic manner, with short, succinct articles on 400 figures. Each article contains a short bibliography appended to it. There is also a useful chronology that precedes the articles and two appendices of entries, arranged by subject and country, a general bibliography and an index of names that follow the articles. Finally, the reader will find the list of contributors and their affiliations. This is a very user-friendly book!

The usual suspects are all here, as well as a number of lesser-known figures. In the arts we find Bernini, the Brueghels, and Rembrandt. In exploration, we discover Hudson and Raleigh. In literature, we can read of Donne and Cyrano de Bergerac. In philosophy and science, my own special areas of research, readers can delve into the thoughts of Bacon, Descartes, Kepler, Galileo, and Newton. In line with recent scholarship, attention is paid to women and their cultural accomplishments in these areas. Consequently, we find articles on Artemisia Gentileschi, the painter, Margaret

Cavendish, the writer, and Nell Gwyn, the actress and royal mistress of Charles II of England. There are numerous other cases of entries on important women in this period and all are examples of a salutary concern for putting European women back into history. Of course, some figures one would want to find, such as the great Catholic astronomer Riccioli, are not present, but no such book can be all-inclusive.

In some cases, I found the bibliographical entries to be either too short or too old in terms of the literature they cite. Surely the author on William Gilbert could have found something to cite besides a very general survey of Tudor science published in 1972? Was there nothing other than a 1970 article to cite in the bibliography at the end of the entry on the major Jesuit astronomer Scheiner? Why weren't the standard, valuable essays in the *Dictionary of Scientific Biography* cited? In the case of political figures, why were the works of the great J. H. Elliot not included in either the article on Philip IV of Spain or in the general bibliography.

I do not want to end on a negative note. This is a very useful volume for students and teachers to have on their shelves. I am sure I will refer to it a lot to help me in my early modern European courses.

Suzanne L. Stratton-Pruitt, ed. *Velázquez's "Las Meninas."* Masterpieces of Western Painting. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. xii + 223 pp. + 25 illus. \$55.00 hardcover, \$20.00 paperback. Review by TANYA J. TIFFANY, SOUTHERN METHODIST UNIVERSITY.

*Velázquez's "Las Meninas,"* edited by Suzanne L. Stratton-Pruitt, forms part of Cambridge University Press's "Masterpieces of Western Painting," a series aimed to present students and scholars with reconsiderations of canonical works of art through various approaches and methodologies. As Stratton-Pruitt explains, she has pursued this objective not by advancing "new interpretations," but rather by offering "an introduction to the reception history and the critical fortunes" of *Las Meninas* (1656, Madrid, Museo del



Prado) since its first public exhibition in 1819 (i). This focus on the painting's modern reception provides an apt counterpart to the recent exhibition and catalogue, *Manet / Velázquez: The French Taste for Spanish Painting* (Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, 2003), which explores the impact of Spanish Golden Age painting on nineteenth-century French art. In Stratton-Pruitt's collection as well as the catalogue, the emphasis on audience response represents an important development in Spanish art history by elucidating how changing cultural circumstances inform perceptions of particular works of art. Students interested in modern artists' engagement with old master paintings and in critics' enduring fascination with Velázquez's elusive masterpiece will therefore particularly profit from this book.

Stratton-Pruitt opens the volume by quoting from the early descriptions of *Las Meninas* by Felix da Costa (1696) and Antonio Palomino (1724) in order to set the stage for the subsequent essays. The next three contributions explore the painting's critical fortunes in the nineteenth century, when Velázquez was "discovered" outside Spain and *Las Meninas* was characterized as a naturalistic snapshot and a dazzling display of Impressionistic brushwork. Focusing on Spain and France, Alisa Luxenberg suggests that critics "mystif[ied]" *Las Meninas* by asserting that its invention was incomprehensible to all but true connoisseurs and its virtuosic technique simply lost in the reproductions consumed by the public (14). Xanthe Brooke argues that responses to the painting were more tepid in nineteenth-century Britain, where Velázquez was increasingly admired but *Las Meninas* was not yet hailed as his undisputed masterpiece. M. Elizabeth Boone then analyzes the role of *Las Meninas* in nineteenth-century American painting and criticism, proposing that Americans saw Velázquez as a reflection of their own values and admired both his supposed freedom from the precepts of academic art and the predominantly secular nature of his subject matter. By providing ample testimony to the widespread yet varied pictorial and critical engagement with *Las Meninas*, each of these surveys opens promising avenues for focused studies of specific responses to the work.

Stratton-Pruitt then offers students a helpful guide to the vast twentieth-century literature on the painting, focusing in particular on the multiple strands of inquiry proposed over the past four decades. Her essay summarizes influential interpretations ranging from Michel Foucault's meditation on the painting as a paradigm of classical representation, to Jonathan Brown's reconstruction of Velázquez's role at Philip IV's court, to Joel Snyder and Ted Cohen's examination of the artist's use of perspective. Although Stratton-Pruitt's aim is to provide a bibliographical tool rather than a critique, the sheer diversity of readings of *Las Meninas* raises important questions about how scholars should approach the painting. Is Foucault's characterization of *Las Meninas*'s mirror as a paradoxical reflection of the monarchs' image (rather than the viewer's) compatible with assessments of its original audience and analyses of its perspectival construction? In an article discussed by Stratton-Pruitt, Fernando Marías has analyzed the enigmatic reflection within its historical context by arguing that *Las Meninas*'s entire composition was designed to puzzle and delight the beholder—the great collector and amateur painter, Philip IV—through a mathematically accurate but deliberately ambiguous depiction of space.

The final two essays further examine *Las Meninas*'s reception in the twentieth century. Estrella de Diego argues that among the key contributions of Foucault's analysis was his insistence on effacing *Las Meninas*'s status as a "masterpiece" created by a "genius" (151). She suggests that by focusing instead on the painting's role within the Western system of representation, Foucault shifted the discourse from artistic intentionality to the spectator's necessary role in the composition. Gertje R. Utley next provides extensive evidence of the range of twentieth-century artists' responses to *Las Meninas* by distinguishing among artists who admired the painting's formal qualities, those who appropriated it for political and social aims, and those who treated it as a model of perception. These categories nevertheless overlap significantly; for example, Utley demonstrates that Salvador Dalí extolled Velázquez's skill while couching his praise in terms of Spanish nationalism. On a technical note, it is unfortunate that the suggestive comparisons

offered by Uteley and the other contributors are illustrated only by low-quality black-and-white reproductions.

As a whole, the essays provide a valuable overview of the modern critical reception of *Las Meninas*. Yet it would be difficult to encompass all relevant aspects of *Las Meninas* studies within one book. This volume will therefore need to be supplemented by other scholarship in order to provide students with a thorough introduction to the painting. An analysis of *Las Meninas* itself—the circumstances of its creation, its elusive narrative, and its linear perspective—would have given readers an understanding of the painting within its historical circumstances before guiding them through its subsequent critical fortunes. Similarly, an essay on late seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century responses to *Las Meninas* in Spain would have provided a helpful point of comparison for the discussions of the painting's later reception. Scholars have long used the primary sources to analyze *Las Meninas*'s narrative content, but have not sufficiently considered the texts as evidence of the painting's critical context and early canonical status. In his 1724 collection of artists' lives, Palomino unequivocally characterizes *Las Meninas* as "the most illustrious work by Don Diego Velázquez" (whom he considers the finest Spanish painter) and describes its christening as "the theology of painting" by the court painter Luca Giordano (*Vidas*, 1986, 181, 183). Both Giordano and Juan Bautista Martínez del Mazo (Velázquez's pupil and son-in-law) furthermore adapted the composition of *Las Meninas* in their own works, indicating the painting's importance to the visual culture of Madrid's court artists in the generation after Velázquez's death.

By concentrating on the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, *Velázquez's "Las Meninas"* nevertheless contributes significantly to an understanding of the roles of Velázquez and his most celebrated work in modern artistic discourse. Like the authors of *Manet / Velázquez*, Stratton-Pruitt and her collaborators amply demonstrate the long overlooked centrality of Golden Age Spanish painting to the birth of modern pictorial traditions.

## 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 Bensi 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 egregia*, 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, verumenim 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 Brunini, 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 on 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 SISMELE 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 bibliographi-

cal 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 *Praeludia*, 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” (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<sup>e</sup> 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 philosophie*.

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 Eckard 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 coopera-

tion 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 (pp. 13-24), Ulrich Eigler into both poets' striving for posthumous fame (pp. 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 (pp. 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 (pp. 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 Stroh (pp. 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 (pp. 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 *Phlacce* 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 (pp. 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 (pp. 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 (pp. 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, panegyric, 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 (pp. 291-99), Paul Gerhard Schmidt (pp. 301-5), and Hermann Wiegand (pp. 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 (pp. 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 sacrificant*, Summers'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 Inter-*



*national 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[a]ve 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 *iuventilia*,

'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 (pp. 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 subventione 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 neither been 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 subventione 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 prod-

uct 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 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 remaining 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 it, where and when it was 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 heliocen-



tric 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 implications 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 *Neulateinisches 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 falles?* 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 peridi? 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 (pp. 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 the 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 (pp. 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, Emeritus, 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 Bruni'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)

