condemn ourselves to ignorance. “The vivid babbling presence of the body, and of bodies, drowns the Master’s voice with its message of truth. So true is it that for Malebranche any philosophy that ignores theology cannot hope to diagnose, or even correctly to describe, the obstacles besetting the search for truth” (248).

Michael Moriarty’s *Early Modern French Thought: the Age of Suspicion* is an exemplary work of scholarship. It deals deftly with complex philosophical issues and draws on a wide range of sources, from history and theology to critical theory and psychoanalysis. In the midst of all the erudition, though, the central theme of the book is never lost, nor does the reader ever come to feel that the forest is missed for the trees. The development of the attitude of suspicion in early modern French thought is carefully charted in the works of Descartes, Pascal, and Malebranche, in a way that will not fail to encourage among its readers a rethinking of the significance of this attitude and its enduring philosophical legacy.


This is a well-researched and amply documented book with numerous illustrations on a fascinating topic, namely the representation of the figure of Pan and the satyr in the early modern period from the end of the 15th century to the first third of the 17th in several European countries, especially France and Italy, with some scant remarks about England. Although several studies have already been devoted to the subject, none is as wide-ranging and intellectually ambitious, since it addresses the treatment of a ubiquitous theme in a variety of cultural media, including lyric poetry, narrative, essay, drama, dance, opera, and iconography. It purports to trace a two-century long evolution in the representation of mythical figures associated with the Pan legend (i.e., Marsyas, Midas, Faunus, Silenus, Sylvan, and the satyrs), as artists, dancers, poets, medical doctors, philosophers, and theologians debated about their symbolic meaning and significance through the Renaissance and Baroque Age.

The title translates rather convolutedly as “Pan’s pipes burnt at the stake.”
It refers to the myth of Syrinx, an Arcadian river-nymph who was pursued by Pan and escaped him by fleeing into a river where she pleaded the gods for help, and they changed her into a reed. Disappointed, Pan cut the reed into pieces of gradually decreasing lengths, fastened them together with wax and thus produced the shepherd’s flute, or “pipes of Pan,” upon which he played. Throughout the book, the metaphoric sense of the title is elucidated as the satyr’s seductive appeal is gradually reduced, transformed or eliminated as the Reformation and Counter-Reformation develop, and pagan imagery becomes censured, or displaced by parody, mockery, and fiction. One wishes that, at the outset of such a fully illustrated book, Theocritus’ famous poem shaped in the form of the pipes of Pan (c. 270 B.C.) had been reproduced for the reader’s benefit. As a textual object representing the birth of music, it became a paradigmatic example of the Greek technopaegnia, an art imitated in the medieval and early modern periods in the form of carmina figurata, and more specifically, an emblematic sign of pictorial and musical creation as sublimation of sexual desire.

The book begins with a study of the allegorizing process of Pan-like figures in Renaissance writings. One recalls that Erasmus borrowed the “silenus” image from Plato’s Symposium and developed his own interpretation in his Adages (“Sileni Alcibiades”) and to a lesser extent in the Praise of Folly. Rabelais, who followed his mentor’s example in the Prologue to Gargantua, turned the silenus into a little box “painted on the outside with comical figures like satyrs” but containing “rare drugs and other precious things inside.” This ironic device came to further problematize an aesthetic and ethical project based on reversals of meaning. Departing from Plato’s Urtext, Renaissance writers made this Platonic feature an emblematic sign and an ambiguous key to the whole hermeneutic process. The dismemberment of the allegorical process can also be observed in Italian impresse and, more dramatically, at the end of the 16th century in Giordano Bruno’s La Cena delle Ceneri [The Banquet of Ashes] with its systematic blurring of binary oppositions. Obviously, this chapter owes much to Michel Jeanneret’s Le Défi des signes (Paradigmes, 1994), a book devoted to the so-called “crisis of interpretation” at the end of the Renaissance.

Next to the transformation of Plato’s sileni, related mythical figures like Midas and Marsyas are given some attention. Midas, the king of Phrygia, to whom Dionysus granted the fateful power of turning everything into gold, is
also the incompetent judge who grew ears of ass for preferring Pan's music to Apollo's. Giuliano Romano portrayed him attending the punishment of Marsyas, an arrogant satyr who was flayed alive for engaging in a musical contest with Apollo. Skimpy analyses of a large sampling of early 17th-century works of art give credit to the idea of a gradual demonizing of the satyr figure, occasionally on a derisive mode, in Catholic and Protestant exegetical readings of the period. The satyr comes to represent the subversive threat of sexual excess: it is either criminalized or used to reflect the anthropological interest in a newly discovered world.

For 17th-century specialists, the pages devoted to pastoral literature will be of particular interest, including the paradoxical function of satyrs in Fletcher's The Faithful Shepherdess (1608), the fictional rewriting of Plutarch's “Death of Pan” episode in Gomberville's Carithée (1621), and the dogmatic reading of the myth in Calderón's auto alégorico, El verdadero Dios Pan (1670). Do satyrs increasingly become burlesque figures for decorative purposes, especially in masques and courtly entertainments (280)? Is the disappearance of fauns responsible for bringing about the decline of pastorals (369)? Can one trace a gradual humanizing process of hybrids with moralizing or parodistic overtones (passim)? The corpus is so vast, the subject matter so diverse, the thesis so multi-faceted that sweeping conclusions will be met with a whiff of faintness.

The author builds on earlier studies to examine the etymological confusion made by early modern humanists between the Greek mythical hybrid (satyrois) and the Latin diatribe against vices (satura). This connection, however, cannot be isolated from other driving influences, in particular the rise of sarcastic modes of writing influenced by cynicism and lucanism (see Michèle Clément's Le Cynisme à la Renaissance d'Érasme à Montaigne, suivi de Les Épistres de Diogène, Geneva: Droz, 2005). In our own time when theoretical concepts like "otherness" and "hybridity" have become common currency, the cultural representation of satyrs can significantly contribute to a deeper understanding of marginalized characters such as fools, monkeys, barbarians, and monsters of all sorts in early modern thought. Combined with the decline of allegory, the gradual displacement of goat-legged hybrids, along with the disappearance of bestiaries and the rise of radical Cartesian dualism, constitutes a significant subject of inquiry for early modern cultural studies. Interestingly enough, no mention is made here of the "scapegoat" as an increasingly problematic category, as it gradually moves away from its biblical origins: "boué émissaire"
The book ends with rather wild speculations on the birth of the 17th-century fictional hero as an end-point in the transformative series of the satyr family. Cervantes’s Sancho or Croce’s Bertoldo, Tasso’s Aminta or D’Urfé’s Céladon are recast as sublimated fauns who shed nothing but their goat-like physiques. As for the libertine hero, one could mistake him for the ultimate manifestation of an “internalized” silenic figure. The reader is naturally led to Enlightenment fictions with Voltaire (the “monkey” episode in *Candide* XVI), Rousseau (his divagations on the state of nature), and Diderot (his extravagant speculations on the mixing of species). In sum, from the 16th to the 18th century, the satyr has moved around from a despicable creature to the redeemed kin of the “noble savage.” Yes, but just wait: Hugo’s romanticized “Satyre” and Mallarmé’s re-allegorized “Faune” are waiting in the wings for their glorified stage entrance.


To review a lengthy annual containing a dozen articles is a daunting assignment. Like most anthologies, the articles are sometimes haphazardly coordinated around a central topic, and in this case the topic itself seems unusually protean. But for any scholars who have cultural interests in Dutch art, this journal annually provides must reading. By policy, each issue responds to a theme proposed by an editor, in this case Joanna Woodall, who provides the introductory essay. Contributors range from Germany and Holland to England and America, and they offer consistently fine essays.

Woodall’s overview sets out the issue(s). The core topic is “virtue” but used as in its root Latin origin, *virtue*, meaning strength and achievement (virtuosity) as well as the more conventional English understanding of the word, righteous behavior. Of course, these several aspects—strength, virtuosity, and virtue—converge in the prepossessing achievements of certain visual artists, often associated with courts, during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.