



EVENTEENTH-



ENTURY



NEWS

SPRING - SUMMER 2005

Vol. 63

Nos. 1&2

Including

THE NEO-LATIN NEWS Vol. 53, Nos. 1&2

---

# SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY NEWS

VOLUME 63, Nos. 1&2

SPRING-SUMMER, 2005

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

University of Akron  
Oklahoma State University  
Texas A&M University

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

**SUBSCRIPTIONS,** Domestic and International. \$20.00 (\$25.00) for one year; \$35.00 (\$45.00) for two years; \$50.00 (\$65.00) 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  
Jeffrey Walker, Oklahoma State University  
Michele Marrapodi, University of Palermo  
Patricia Garcia Ocañas, Our Lady of the Lake University

## EDITORIAL ASSISTANTS

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

## CONTENTS

VOLUME 63, NOS. 1&2

SPRING-SUMMER, 2005

### REVIEWS

- William A. Dymess, *Reformed Theology and Visual Culture: the Protestant Imagination from Calvin to Edwards*. Review by GRAHAM PARRY ..... 1
- Gerald Curzon, *Wotton and His Worlds: Spying, Science and Venetian Intrigues*. Review by DENNIS FLYNN ..... 4
- Robert Whalen, *The Poetry of Immanence: Sacrament in Donne and Herbert*. Review by JONATHAN NAUMAN ..... 7
- Jessica Wolfe, *Humanism, Machinery, and Renaissance Literature*. Review by IRA CLARK ..... 14
- Adam Smyth, "Profit and Delight": *Printed Miscellanies in England, 1640-1682*. Review by A.H. DE QUEHEN ..... 17
- Katherine Gillespie, *Domesticity and Dissent in the Seventeenth Century: English Women's Writing and the Public Sphere*. Review by JEROME S. DEES ..... 20
- Deborah G. Burks, *Horrid Spectacle: Violation in the Theater of Early Modern England*. Review by CHRISTOPHER J. WHEATLEY ..... 24
- Susan Green and Steven N. Zwicker, eds. *John Dryden: A Miscellany*. And Claude Rawson and Aaron Santesso, eds. *John Dryden (1631-1700): His Politics, His Plays, and His Poets*. Reviews by JEROME DONNELLY ..... 27
- Gillian Wagner, *Thomas Coram, Gent. 1668-1751*. Review by GILLIAN HENDERSHOT ..... 31
- Andrew McRae, *Literature, Satire and the Early Stuart State*. Review by MELISSA MOHR ..... 34
- James Fitzmaurice, ed., *Sociable Letters: Margaret Cavendish*. Review by SARAH R. MOREMAN ..... 37
- Ead Miner, senior ed., *Paradise Lost, 1668-1968: Three Centuries of Commentary*. Review by JOHN MULRYAN ..... 41
- Mark R. Kelley, Michael Lieb, and John T. Shawcross, eds., *Milton and the Grounds of Contention*. Review by W. SCOTT HOWARD ..... 43

Jonathan Gil Harris, <i>Sick Economies: Drama, Mercantilism, and Disease in Shakespeare's England</i> . Review by BYRON NELSON .....	47
Julia Crick and Alexandra Walsham, eds., <i>The Uses of Script and Print, 1300-1700</i> . Review by WILLIAM E. ENGEL .....	50
Nancy E. Wright, Margaret Ferguson, A. R. Buck, eds., <i>Women, Property, and the Letters of the Law in Early Modern England</i> . Review by NANCYM. BUNKER .....	53
Stefano Villani, ed., <i>A True Account of the Great Tryals and Cruel Sufferings Undergone by those Two Faithful Servants of God, Katherine Evans and Sarah Cheevers: La vicenda di due quacchere prigioniere dell'inquisizione di Malta</i> . Review by JULIE D. CAMPBELL .....	57
Laurel Amtower and Dorothea Kehler, eds., <i>The Single Woman in Medieval and Early Modern England: Her Life and Representation</i> . Review by LISSA BEAUCHAMP .....	60
Mary S. Hartman, <i>The Household and the Making of History: A Subversive View of the Western Past</i> . Review by R. BURR LITCHFIELD .....	64
Jesús Escobar, <i>The Plaza Mayor and the Shaping of Baroque Madrid</i> . Review by ELIZABETH R. WRIGHT .....	66
Vanessa Harding, <i>The Dead and the Living in Paris and London, 1500-1600</i> . Review by EDNA RUTH YAHIL .....	69
Brian Mann, ed., <i>The Madrigals of Michelangelo Rossi</i> . Review by ANDREW H. WEAVER .....	71
John Broad, <i>Transforming English Rural Society: The Verneys and the Claydons, 1600-1820</i> . Review by CATHERINE PATTERSON .....	75
Guy Rowlands, <i>The Dynastic State and the Army under Louis XIV: Royal Service and Private Interest, 1661-1701</i> . Review by WENDY F. KASINEC .....	77
Alan James, <i>The Navy and Government in Early Modern France 1572-1661</i> . Review by EDWARD M. FURGOL .....	79
Richard Butterwick, ed., <i>The Polish-Lithuanian Monarchy in European Context, c.1500-1795</i> . Review by JAKUB BASISTA .....	82
Emmanuelle Héning, <i>Ut Pictura Theatrum: Théâtre et peinture de la Renaissance italienne au classicisme français</i> . Review by KIKI GOUNARIDOU AND JESSICA RUSSELL .....	84
T. R. Langley, <i>Image Government: Monarchical Metamorphoses in English Literature and Art</i> . Review by STEPHEN GLEISSNER .....	89

Anat Gilboa, <i>Images of the Feminine in Rembrandt's Work</i> . Review by LISA ROSENTHAL .....	92
Alice Jarrard, <i>Architecture as Performance in Seventeenth-Century Europe: Court Ritual in Modena, Rome, and Paris</i> . Review by ALLISON LEE PALMER .....	95
Maryvelma Smith O'Neil, <i>Giovanni Baglione: Artistic Reputation in Baroque Rome</i> . Review by JEFFREY FONTANA .....	98
NEO-LATIN NEWS .....	102
NEWS .....	132

William A. Dyrness. *Reformed Theology and Visual Culture: the Protestant Imagination from Calvin to Edwards*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. xv + 339 pp. + 43 illus. \$85.00. Review by GRAHAM PARRY, UNIVERSITY OF YORK.

William Dyrness writes as an American professor of theology enquiring into the causes of the bleakness of the Reformed churches he frequents. These interiors were intended as containers for congregations who came in order to hear the word of God. Is their plainness simply a denial of traditional religious aesthetics, or was their doctrinaire rejection of imagery and colour a way of intensifying the inward workings of the spiritual imagination that had no need of external supports? In his introductory remarks Dyrness confesses to a certain sense of deprivation in his settings of worship, and even suggests that Reformed Protestants generally have a diminished response to the visual arts and to the beauty of the world around them. Taking as a starting point the belief that most American Protestants have lost touch with the historical reasons for their plain church settings, he explores the arguments for and against imagery in churches from the beginnings of the Reformation in Germany to eighteenth-century New England.

The question that Dyrness raises is: Was there in any positive sense a Puritan aesthetic? We are accustomed to characterising Puritan responses to the material world as wary, suspicious, or hostile, yet their preachers did on occasion evoke the complex harmony of the creation as evidence of God's goodness towards mankind, and some of them were prepared to admit that natural beauty revealed something of divinity. In attempting to identify an aesthetic sense that is demonstrably Puritan, Dyrness gets drawn into an ambitious yet not always rewarding survey of the artistic activities of the Calvinist societies of England, New England and Holland. Post-Reformation Tudor England has been described as a time of 'visual anorexia', but Dyrness is anxious to modify this view, if only a little. He explores the use of woodblock prints with religious texts—the illustrations in the Bible, catechisms, and Foxe's *Actes and Monuments*—in order to infer what effects Calvinist strictures against images had upon a nation once rich in religious imagery. He interprets the shift towards vivid portraiture in Holbein and Hilliard as a sign that Protestant artists needed to turn towards a genre outside the condemned category of religious images. The enquiry moves on into poetry, emblems, and the arts of

gardening in England, then passes into the unexpected revival of religious painting in Holland, before crossing to America to consider New England portraiture and tombstone art. The interconnectedness of these subjects is not always apparent, but Dymess does suggest ways in which they were susceptible to spiritual infusion and how they illuminate the values of the Calvinist societies that produced them.

Pushing into the early eighteenth century with a study of the ethos of Jonathan Edwards and his associates, Dymess pursues his search for a distinctive aesthetic of Puritanism without discovering more than the familiar and recognised values of simplicity, inwardness, and order. As with the hunting of the Snark, the Puritan aesthetic proves an elusive quarry, and much intellectual energy is expended without any great enlargement of our understanding of the Puritan spirit as it worked amongst the arts.

Much more rewarding, in this reader's view, is the account in the first half of the book of the many differing attitudes worked out by the early advocates of reformation towards images, representations of the visual world, and the place of the arts in religion, for these opinions, delivered as matters of belief, have had a powerful afterlife in Protestant societies, and Dymess has traced their development very clearly.

Right from the start, the leading reformers differed in their attitudes towards images, the decoration of churches, and the acceptability of the arts in a reformed society. The most enlightening section of this survey is the discussion of the divergent views of Luther and Calvin. Luther made it clear that he believed it was the preaching of the Word, grasped by faith, that changes lives, and that the power that is in God's Word in the Scriptures is what brings grace; however, he was prepared to allow music in reformed services. When he considered the role of images in worship, he did not condemn them, but argued that they were helpful "for the sake of remembrance and better understanding." Indeed, Luther's friend and follower Lucas Cranach was commissioned by the congregation at Wittenberg to paint an altarpiece, installed in 1547, which offered visual images of the Reformed Church as "a place where the word is rightly preached and sacraments administered according to the Scriptures." The scene of the Last Supper shows Luther sitting with the disciples, receiving the communion cup; in the panel on baptism, Melancthon baptises an infant; and in the scene of absolution (the third sacrament approved by Luther), it is the pastor of the Wittenberg church who

presides. This introduction of the contemporary into biblical iconography represents only a small departure from the Catholic tradition it replaced.

In Geneva, on the other hand, Calvin was insisting that the scripturally-sustained doctrine of justification by faith was all-sufficient, that preaching was the necessary way of communicating the spirit of Christ to the congregation, and that to seek the divine through any material means was idolatrous. For Calvin, “Christ has taken his humanity with him to heaven, and the Spirit now works, primarily, through the preached word.” Although he acknowledged that the glory of God is evident in the creation, man-made images could never add to that glory, and to seek to portray or evoke God’s majesty by artificial forms was vain, impertinent, and to be condemned. The arts of painting, sculpture and music are “gifts of God,” Calvin conceded, and have their legitimate secular uses, but must not be employed in the service of the Church. Instrumental music distracts from true worship (“it may minister to our pleasure, rather than our necessity”) and was therefore banned from services. Calvin did, however, allow the singing of Psalms as an act of communal worship, this innovation being in practice prayer sung in unison, a way of turning the congregation’s hearts wholly and unitedly to God. The elaborate architectural framework of worship was deemed to distract from total concentration on God’s Word and promise, with the result that Calvin ordered the church buildings in Geneva to be locked outside service hours “so that no one may enter for superstitious reasons” and indulge in the luxury of private unsupervised prayer in a congenial architectural setting. Dymess presents Calvin as a figure who, in the *Institutes* and in his instructions to his Geneva congregation, worked out a vast amount of prescriptive regulation concerning the order of service, the content of prayer, the nature of the sacraments, the status of images, the role of the arts, the minutiae of behaviour and dress, and the commerce of the sexes, all of it underpinned with scriptural reference, but with numerous rulings that were tendentious, arbitrary, and sometimes contradictory (as with the case of instrumental music bad, sung Psalms good).

Hovering between the views of Luther and Calvin was Zwingli, who dominated the Church in Zurich in the 1520s. He banned music as a distraction from the preached word, but hesitated over the abolition of images, feeling that they helped Christians struggling to understand the covenant of grace; only when the preaching had convinced the congregation of the truth

of justification by faith alone should they be proscribed.

Out of this austere environment of sensory deprivation came the Elizabethan Church of England, so many of whose leaders had their experience of reformed religion shaped by Calvin's teachings in Geneva. The Word, spoken, read, and commented upon, was everything. The English Church excluded almost all kinds of visual stimulus; black-letter texts on whitewashed walls and a royal coat of arms were the best that most congregations could look at. It is true that polyphonic choral music survived in cathedrals (where bishops also survived), but the setting for worship was otherwise bleak. The rich tradition of mystery plays ceased (despite the fact that Calvin's successor, Theodore Beza, composed religious dramas). English theologians of Calvinist descent reinforced the harsh creed evolved in Geneva, especially two Cambridge divines, William Ames and William Perkins, who would have a formative influence over the separatists who began to leave for America after 1620. Antipathy to images and devotional symbols was part of the baggage of the Puritans who were settling in Massachusetts. Their imaginative life was inwardly directed, and intensely recorded in print. Dymess comments admiringly on the vitality of the accounts of spiritualised living that appeared in seventeenth-century New England, where the "Paradise within" imagined by Milton seems to have been more fully realised than in the old country.

Distrust of visual richness persisted, and continues to this day in the churches of the nonconformist congregations. That these congregations have developed their own distinctive aesthetic is undeniable, but this aesthetic resists neat formulation. This book forces us to think empathetically about the difficulties that seriously reformed Protestants have always had with visual culture; whether their rejection of what is rich, elaborate, and heightening to the senses is adequately compensated by spiritual and intellectual satisfactions will always remain debatable.

Gerald Curzon. *Wotton and His Worlds: Spying, Science and Venetian Intrigues*. Philadelphia: Xlibris, 2004. 178 pp. \$33.00 Paper. Review by DENNIS FLYNN, BENTLEY COLLEGE.

The author of this biography of Sir Henry Wotton introduces himself as a neurochemist and amateur historian of the Tudor and Jacobean periods, whose interest in his subject stems from the fact that it was Wotton who first

communicated to England what he called “news” of Galileo’s discoveries through a telescope. Curzon recognizes that Galileo’s work, more than mere news, was “of earth-shattering—indeed, of universe-shattering importance.” Wotton, on the other hand, although he treated these discoveries as newsworthy, commented that they would make Galileo “either exceeding famous or exceeding ridiculous,” a dilemma proving that Wotton did not really grasp the importance Curzon finds here. Instead, Wotton sent a fresh copy of Galileo’s *Sidereus Nuncius* (1610) to Lord Treasurer Robert Cecil, earl of Salisbury, with a note commending the book as a novelty worth King James’s attention. What the King and Salisbury made of Galileo’s book we do not know. For his part, Wotton seems immediately to have dropped the matter; he never mentions it again in extant writings.

In making Wotton’s news of Galileo a central focus, the sum and substance of the “Science” listed among three of Wotton’s “Worlds” in the title of the book, Curzon inflates a trivial matter and thus exhibits a flaw often found in work of this sort. Actually, Wotton had no notion of what science is. Except for shipping Galileo’s book, nothing in Wotton’s biography supports the idea that “Science” was one of his “Worlds.” Curzon’s “Chapter 6: The New Philosophy Calls All in Doubt,” asks the lopsided question, “What is the justification for giving Galileo a place in Wotton’s world?” The answers Curzon gives remind us of certain unsatisfying biographies of Shakespeare, echoing their repeated use of locutions such as “they must often have,” “they would have,” and “they may also have.” Curzon admits that Wotton “probably did not clearly distinguish magic from science.” In truth, only by coincidence can his handling of *Sidereus Nuncius* seem scientifically noteworthy.

One other regrettable feature of this book is its questionable assurance, in view of the twentieth century, concerning the superior enlightenment and civilization of modern times. This assurance of the scientist spills over into moral and political matters that are not so easily judged. Curzon finds that sixteenth- and seventeenth-century mental processes in general were “tortuous,” not as efficient as ours are today, because “they did not see truth in the ‘either-or’ terms in which we tend to see it now.” In those days, Curzon maintains, human powers of reason were generally still weak, still plagued by contradiction, and comparatively “vulnerable to self-deceit.” This last stipulation seems especially ironic, itself an example of self-deceit.

As if looking at Wotton’s life through the wrong end of a telescope,

Curzon gives us some misstatements of fact and some distorted interpretations. Thus he thinks religious toleration was “an unfamiliar idea” to Wotton and his contemporaries; but in actuality the subject was widely known and discussed, despite Curzon’s observation (supported by the *Oxford English Dictionary*) that the word “tolerance” was not used before the eighteenth century. This may be so, but reading the dictionary for another few inches would have revealed that the words “tolerate” and “toleration” were common usage in Wotton’s time, as in the title of a 1609 pamphlet: “An Humble Supplication for Toleration and Libertie.”

In fact, Wotton himself wrote a book on the subject of religious toleration, *The State of Christendom*, which argues at length that “liberty of conscience” would be more desirable than the religious policy of the Elizabethan regime. According to Curzon, it is “highly unlikely” that Wotton wrote this book, despite the fact that it was published as his in 1657, seventeen years after his death, and is extant also in several anonymous manuscript copies that began to circulate in the mid-1590s. Departing from the judgment of professional historians of the period, Curzon tries to support his novel contention by arguing that the book is “about seven times longer” than any of Wotton’s other writings, and that it contains some expressions of opinion “inconsistent” with Wotton’s known views. But the book is a compilation based on Wotton’s readings and experiences during years of studious travel, and it has long been interpreted as using a fictional persona for purposes connected with the political program of the earl of Essex, Wotton’s employer in the 1590s. Here Curzon has simply been unable to square his preconceptions about the limitations of early modern political thinking with the idea that Wotton could have written about toleration.

On the other hand, Curzon’s bluff and downright naivety almost leads him to some fresh insights not found in the work of previous biographers. Wotton’s early travels, beginning in the late 1580s, covered about four thousand miles, criss-crossing Europe during a period of four years. He embarked at the suggestion of Salisbury’s father, William Cecil, baron of Burghley, and may have remained in Burghley’s service throughout the trip. Curzon is the first biographer of Wotton to express surprise that, after such a beginning, Wotton on returning to England entered the secretariat of Burghley’s emulous and contentious godson, Robert Devereux, earl of Essex: “Burghley must have had responsible posts for him in mind. Offers were probably made.

But none were accepted.” What Curzon does not explore on the basis of these remarks is the possibility that the Cecils may have pressed Wotton into service with Essex for reasons of their own.

In fact, the “Worlds” of “Spying” and of “Venetian Intrigues,” a brace of related “Worlds” surrounding the incongruous and negligible “World” of “Science” in the book’s title, were the main area of Wotton’s activities and interests. Here Curzon has contributed a wealth of background detail including Wotton’s superstitious entertainments of witchcraft, alchemy, and spiritualism; his sexual foibles; his anti-semitism; his priggishness; and yet his nearly enchanted fascination with Venetian high and popular culture. Curzon is also quite good on the subject of Wotton’s visionary pet-project, the conversion of the Venetians to Protestantism. The rich, sometimes delightful detail of these often humorous considerations makes Curzon’s book a worthwhile read, although it can never challenge the serious *Life and Letters* (1907) by Logan Pearsall Smith.

Robert Whalen. *The Poetry of Immanence: Sacrament in Donne and Herbert*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002. xxi + 216 pp. \$45.00. Review by JONATHAN NAUMAN, USK VALLEY VAUGHAN ASSOCIATION.

In this neo-historical study of the role of sacrament in seventeenth-century English devotional writing, Robert Whalen attempts to reconstruct the literary resonances and politico-religious implications of certain Anglican images of Holy Communion, with special focus on the poetry and prose of John Donne and George Herbert. While he presumes the current regime of cultural studies as context, Whalen’s basic view of sacrament is not Marxian, but liberal humanist: the Eucharist is a noble cultural construction that can plausibly answer real human needs. Specifically, it provided seventeenth-century Anglicans “an avenue of escape” from the personal discomforts and uncertainties of individual devotion, allowing Anglican experience of God to become a communal event within a broader “Christian *mythos*” (150-51). As a reader, Whalen seems to me to follow Calvin at a secularized distance, softening the hostility of modern psychological “demystification” with the reformer’s view of sacrament as a concession to human frailty. Enough sympathetic interest in seventeenth-century sacramental thought is retained in the process to give this study a literary complexity and theological perspicacity

well beyond the expectations its theoretical tenors raise.

Whalen places his work on the contemporary critical scene as a *via media* between the continental-meditative “Catholic Puritanism” of Louis Martz, and the Protestant readings pursued by recent Herbert criticism under the ethos of Barbara Lewalski’s *Protestant Poetics*. He contends that the early Stuart Anglican Church developed a “sacramental puritanism” in an attempt “to reconcile the potentially contrary imperatives of sacrament and devotion,” and that the Establishment cultivated “puritan devotional enthusiasm through an internalized yet fully sacramental and sacerdotal apparatus” (xii). While he shows the usual cultural-critical awareness of political imperatives driving religious imperatives, Whalen does not presume that Donne’s or Herbert’s devotional lyrics merely reflect political or religious controversy, and he makes a number of attempts in his introduction on “The Eucharist and the English Reformation” to undermine easy modern assumptions about the Catholic-Protestant sacramental divide—in particular, the simple opposition between a Catholic physical and objective presence of Christ in Holy Communion and a Protestant Divine Presence generally more spiritual and subjective. Prior to the Reformation, in the ninth and eleventh centuries, there had been debates about the mode of Christ’s presence in the Eucharist that in some ways anticipated later Protestant contentions (4-5), and Whalen shows that most Protestants sought to conserve an objective presence of Christ in the Eucharist, with many also characterizing that presence as physical. The Anglican tradition in particular seriously reconsidered the physical aspect of the Eucharist in the wake of Hooker’s attempt to combine Protestant spirituality with a national regimen of liturgy, and this provided Donne’s and Herbert’s early Stuart church with a full range of possible Eucharistic theologies.

Whalen’s readings from Herbert and Donne begin with Donne’s secular works: “the abundance of sacramental imagery and allusion in the secular verse relative to that of the divine poems is startling” (61). Rather than considering these profane references a “merely topical occasion for witty blasphemies (though these abound),” Whalen contends that the erotic and satirical uses of Eucharistic imagery imply “genuine religious concern.” He differs from Theresa DiPasquale’s inclination to deduce scurrilous rejection of Roman Catholicism from Donne’s profanations, suggesting rather that the erotic subject material doesn’t decisively subordinate the transcendent and sacramental images, and that the religious allusions function as a “satirical dimen-

sion of a poetry that would celebrate human love even while light-heartedly recognizing both its limitations and pretensions" (22-23). This inclination of Whalen's to feel a real force in both the religious and the erotic components of these poems seems to me right-headed. All the same, I find it difficult to postulate detached attitudes of celebration or light-hearted satire while under the raw rhetorical power of Donne's secular lyrics. Any reader of these poems, in the seventeenth century or the twenty-first, will I think feel a perverse dynamism absolutely inimical to readerly detachment, a casual violence against ways of thought able to contain, suppress, or redirect sensuality. In a number of cases, including the characterization of Donne just quoted, Whalen evades this aspect of Donne's scurrilous verse, and the evasion results not so much from the scholarly distance necessary for examining how the poems use Christian sacrament as from Whalen's efforts to place his readings on the contemporary critical forum by expounding the poems within modern allegories and theory-driven oppositions—Saussure's *langue/parole*, for instance (24), and Marx's and Foucault's versions of use/exchange (36).

These problems foreshadow further difficulties in Whalen's more straightforward doctrinal detections and assessments in Donne's secular and divine poems. I consider it quite useful, and by and large quite accurate, to see what Whalen's thesis would present: a Donnean poetic in which controversial doctrinal categories undergo a continuous scrutiny and "playing out." But at times I feel that too much pressure is applied to passing references and reminiscences, that Whalen pursues (albeit with more historical plausibility than in the examples above) what even a seventeenth-century reader would have considered a tangent. Take, for instance, Whalen's reading of "To Mr *Tilman* after he had taken orders," which interprets the following lines as an implicit repudiation of the Roman Catholic teaching on transubstantiation and the "indelible mark":

Onely the stampe is changed; but no more.  
 And as new crowned Kings alter the face,  
 But not the monies substance; so hath grace  
 Chang'd onely Gods old Image by Creation,  
 To Christs new stampe, at this thy Coronation. (ll. 13-18)

Whalen responds to this passage as follows:

The Aristotelian categories of substance and accident are evoked here in an analogy linking the authorities of Ordination and royal

currency. If “face” and “substance” echo the categories comprising a Roman Eucharist, however, the analogy in this case *denies* a transubstantive change. Just as currency has value by virtue of bearing the king’s stamp while its material significance is unchanged, so has Tilman’s Ordination the external mark of an authority which, though otherwise absent, continually informs his office. If the king is deposed or withdraws his authority, the coin may become worthless even though it bears his visage and mark; likewise, Donne implicitly cautions, Ordination does not confer power in such a way as to preclude its ever being withdrawn. (47)

I do not think that Donne’s mention of monetary “substance” in this poem yields sufficient warrant even tentatively to deduce any statement on change in the substance of the Eucharist. Also, I do not see that Donne’s image of Tilman being reminted by God and receiving a “Coronation” superseding the *imago Dei* “by Creation” argues that Tilman’s Ordination lacked an indelible mark; in fact, if I thought that the indelible mark were at all at issue in this poem, I might suspect that Donne supported the idea, since the poet would not be likely to insinuate that Christ’s kingship could be deposed or his authority withdrawn! Whalen’s differentiation between transcendent Protestant and immanent Roman Catholic models of Ordination is clear, interesting, and carefully articulated; and Donne probably did endorse the Protestant model when, as an ordained Anglican clergyman, he wrote this poem. But the poem is not about the Anglican model of Ordination. It champions Ordination’s spiritual gains, which “surmount expression” (l. 25); it attacks the contempt felt by the seventeenth-century gentry for ecclesiastical careers (ll. 25-36); it praises Holy Orders for mediating between man and heaven (l. 48); it praises the ordained man as “a blest Hermaphrodite” (l. 54); but it does not so far as I can tell even implicitly consider what might happen if Tilman and the Church parted company in the future.

Despite the caveats in the above examinations, Whalen’s readings from Donne’s sacred poems and 1626 Christmas sermon deliver an indefatigable and largely successful effort to read these works as “public, performative manifestations of religious interiority, their function analogous to that of sacraments” (82). Whalen interestingly shows Donne walking the boundary between Reform and Roman definitions of the Eucharist, articulating a Reformed sacramental doctrine in scholastic terms, attacking transubstantiation

while advancing “a formula remarkably similar to the one it would displace” (91). Occasionally one feels that Whalen could give some theological positions more benefit of the doubt. Supralapsarian Calvinism, for instance, need not imply that “communicants’ willingness to receive sacramental grace” has “no bearing at all on whether or not [grace] is in fact conferred” (94), for Calvinists of all descriptions held that God’s predestination would effect appropriate proximate causes within its economy, including the intentions of the human agent to partake of the sacrament in a worthy manner. Nor need we rap Aquinas for varying from conventional Aristotelian usage in his “separation of substance and accident” (6) in the Paschal bread and wine. St. Thomas did not intend in any case to limit Christian thought to what might have occurred to Aristotle, and his controversial theory of transubstantiation, his attempt to describe the sacrament through the concepts of “substance” and “accident,” would never have been attempted if the Christian Church hadn’t been claiming from earliest times that a miraculous and mystical change took place in the physical being of the consecrated Eucharistic species.

When we pass to Whalen’s readings from George Herbert, we find him again hypothesizing a poetic use of sacrament to counteract subjectivist dangers in devotional piety: “celebration of ceremonial forms not only complements but indeed is an integral feature of the devotional subjectivity [Herbert] cultivates” (127). Whalen would portray Herbert’s sensibility as comfortably sacramentalist and predestinarian at once, and he affirms the widespread observation that Herbert downplayed his avid awareness of theological controversy in order to construct a stable and eirenic devotional persona. Like Hooker, Herbert was able to sidestep open commitment to a doctrinal description of the Eucharistic mode by professing a deep reverence for the *mysterium tremendum* of *hoc est corpus meum*.

To take and taste what he doth there designe,

Is all that saves, and not obscure.

Whalen does give some support to R. V. Young’s recent remarks on Herbert’s doctrine, admitting that some of Herbert’s poems allow very Roman Catholic readings. In “The Invitation” there seems to be a change in the Eucharistic species before reception: “drink this, / Which before ye drink is blood”; and “The Agonie” strongly implies that Christ’s blood is experienced by the communicant as wine. But for the most part Whalen finds Herbert accomplishing an Anglican project similar to Donne’s sacramental ambivalence. “The Win-

dows,” for instance, delivers a Puritan-friendly argument about the basic importance of a preacher’s inner sanctity, but presents such thoughts as if they naturally followed from ecclesiastical architectural features that Puritans were inclined to denounce as distractions (131). Whalen is quite sensitive to Herbert’s much-noted achievements in tone: “A careful balance of respect and light-hearted familiarity or ‘domestic simplicity’ integrates stylized ritual with the rhythms of Christian existence” (135). His readings include an interesting take on “The Collar” as a pre-Eucharistic self-examination (142) and a close reading of “The Glance” as carrying implications of Eucharist and Baptism: in both cases, I find myself convinced that the ethos of sacrament is indeed in the poem’s background, though absent from its literal argument. Whalen’s impassioned and sympathetic reading of “[Love [III]]” as a divinely-granted transformation of the poet’s self (158-159) delivers what I experienced as this study’s high point, an inclusive and completely convincing close reading of what may be Herbert’s greatest poem.

Whalen ends with a few brief comments on sacramental images in Richard Crashaw and Henry Vaughan. Crashaw’s devotional “inwardness” is less extensive than Herbert’s, Whalen notes; and unlike Donne, Crashaw excludes sacramental motifs from his secular verse. Whalen finds in Henry Vaughan’s “The Sap” a “detailed investigation of ‘real presence,’” but an implication in the poem’s early lines that the Eucharist acts as a lodestone of infused natural grace troubles him; and he finally avers that the poem “documents a sacramental operation in which inside and outside have become but equally ephemeral reflections of each other” (174); i.e., it seems to Whalen that Vaughan has lost any clear concept of the Eucharist as a means of grace truly external to the human subject. I think this reading derives from Whalen’s connecting two images in Vaughan’s poem that were probably meant to remain distinct. “The Sap,” like many of Vaughan’s sacred verses, has not the tight internal construction and unity that one dependably finds in Herbert’s verses; and the spiritual life force that Vaughan’s “sapless Blossom” learns about in the poem’s first ten lines, the “something” God infused to make the plant “stretch for heav’n,” is not, so far as I can tell, the same internal force as the one described in lines 39-43:

There is at all times (though shut up) in you  
A powerful, rare dew,  
Which only grief and love extract, with this

Be sure, and never miss  
 To wash your vessel wel.

This “powerful, rare dew” is not the human tendency to long for God, the “thirst for dew” of line four, but rather the human ability to weep penitently: Vaughan is advising his reader to approach the Eucharist only after honest self-examination and repentance. (Whalen does note in connection with Herbert and Southwell how this sort of tear imagery can be used to “span internal and external dimensions of religious experience,” 150.) I cannot finally agree with Whalen’s speculation that Vaughan harbored “a genuine distrust of sensory experience,” or that his poems effect “a deliberate if muted diminution of sacrament and ceremony” (175). Vaughan’s distinctive visionary landscape, a landscape that seems prior to any specific focus on the objective sacraments, actually amounts to a defense of a world view that would recognize a true mediating functionality in the sacraments. Vaughan’s Christian anthroposophic cosmos, charged with dynamic intentionality emanating from and returning to God, tacitly opposes the impending despiritualization of the non-human creation, the nascent instrumentalist materialism and Deism of the Enlightenment; indeed, its seeds and keys and set ascents might plausibly be accused of hyper-objectivizing the flow of divine grace. Moreover, there are plenty of indications that Vaughan held a remarkably objective, physical view of Christ’s presence in the Eucharist. In one passage, for instance, we find him aghast that

Some sit to thee, and eat

Thy body as their Common meat. (“Dressing,” ll. 37-38)

Vaughan’s sacramental reverence often has a partisan edge, but we have no warrant to presume that it was disingenuous. Similar rhetoric occurs often enough in Vaughan’s poetry and prose to convince me that ceremony and sacrament held an important place in his religious life.

But Vaughan’s poetic vision, in which everything tends to become a window on transcendence, in which an orphic poetic sensibility rejoices in the rejection of worldliness—this vector has little to offer Whalen’s main thesis, which, though sympathetic to the Eucharist as “the human rendered *sub specie aeternitatis*” (177), finally places all sacramental thought in a cultural materialist world of competing communal fictions. The immanent, incarnational strains of Eucharistic theology are presumed valuable by Whalen not on Donne’s or Herbert’s terms (“Is this a sufficient and accurate description of what God does when this sacrament is celebrated?”), but within the terms of modern

social psychology (“Does this description of the Eucharistic rite help its assistants to overcome the discomforts of devotional isolation?”). The New Historicism’s assumption of the right to pressure texts, on grounds of a deconstructive turn inconsistently applied, has probably compromised a number of Whalen’s readings. But the study is remarkably resistant to the cultural materialist inclination to reduce religion to sociology and politics. At one point, Whalen mentions contemporary allegations that New Historicism fails to address poetry as poetry. He replies that “the detailed close readings provided here should allay such concern” (113). Although some problems remain, Whalen has certainly demonstrated that cultural materialist studies do not predictably lack either sympathy or tact.

Jessica Wolfe. *Humanism, Machinery, and Renaissance Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. xi + 305 pp. + 10 illus. \$65.00. Review by IRA CLARK, UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA.

A study of the multiple analogies to machines employed by Renaissance humanists from the late fifteenth-century court of Urbino through the early seventeenth-century court of James I might seem to lack promise. Nevertheless Jessica Wolfe’s inquiry opens up a complex of complementary and contrary concepts that range from rhetoric, compartment, and the arts through pedagogy, ethics, diplomacy, and warfare. Providing force for her intriguing intellectual and cultural history is, aptly for an era dominated by the humanist concentration on language as the center of knowledge, Wolfe’s interrogation of multiplicities signified through a host of interrelated terms that play around humanity-inhumanity, art-nature, reason-passion. Among these are “means and instruments” that include not only machines but also people; “technologia” that refers to methodical study, discipline, and art as well as to artifice, human contrivance, and fraud; “engine” that can denote wit as well as machine and tool, subtle policy and deceit; “ingegno” that can refer to an engine, art, and cunning; “virtù” that signifies both mechanical force and political efficacy; “metis” that indicates cunning intelligence that enables the weak to overcome; and “subtlety” that includes acuity and precision, excessive intricacy, and dishonesty. Such slippages of terms from one linguistic and intellectual domain to another in our view (membership in as yet undefined domains in theirs) suggest the potential in Wolfe’s theme that instruments “distort and confuse as

well as clarify . . . [that] machines are of ‘ambiguous use’ to Renaissance culture, serving alternately as ‘hurt’ and as ‘remedy’ in resolving the culture’s most urgent conflicts and questions” (28).

Wolfe’s introduction to “Renaissance humanism and its machinery,” “Subtle devices,” offers an initial glimpse at an admirable linguistic, cultural, and intellectual range. The book extends across disciplines and includes figures less memorable as well as renowned, the pseudo-Aristotelian *Mechanical Problems* as well as Castiglione’s *The Book of the Courtier*, John Blagrave’s *Mathematicall Jewell* as well as *Hamlet*, Gabriel Harvey’s commonplace book and annotations as well as Sidney’s *Apology for Poetry*, Roberto Valturio’s *De Re Militari* as well as *The Faerie Queene*. For evidence she ransacks a panoply of texts that include dictionaries, rhetorics, translations, commentaries, emblem books, technical manuals, courtesy and advice books, poems, plays, stage machinery, illustrations, and paintings. The range is vital to understanding the productive conflux of investigations and promulgations more often speculative and less often practical than have since been sorted into disciplines. For the study depicts the fostering of polymathic slippage among intellectual disciplines we now segregate—primarily the gulf we perceive between what we call science, a word which then encompassed all knowledge, and the humanities.

“Automatopoesis: machinery and courtliness in Renaissance Urbino” sets the topic in motion with the Montefeltros’ compelling dual interests in mechanics and mores, the material and the intellectual, political and social negotiations. The guiding concept is a renewed interest in Archimedean mechanics, particularly admiration for the series of levers Archimedes used to distribute weight so he could easily hoist a ship onto land. This image of an ingeniously conceived instrument that employs concealed force to effect difficult tasks with apparent ease, an art that effortlessly manipulates nature, with attendant valorization of “virtù” and “sprezzatura,” is applicable across a range of endeavors material, intellectual, and social. Sponsored by the court at Urbino, Guido Ubaldo and Bernardino Baldi’s treatises on mechanics are integrated with Baldassare Castiglione’s handbook of courtliness as examples of facile empowerment.

“Artificial motions: machinery, courtliness, and discipline in Renaissance England” transfers concern with the relationships of mechanics and courtliness to the spheres of influence around Leicester-Sidney, Essex, and Northumberland. It introduces the influence of Italy on English thinkers so

that technical tracts from John Dee's to Thomas Blundeville's claim that instruments can win success at court, as well as handbooks on courtly comportment, such as Henry Peacham's, rely on mechanical analogies to describe social subtleties. But because the influence of Italy on England was vexed, and since the intervention of human techniques into nature is problem-filled, analogies that could promote good could also be viewed as devolving into ill. Mechanical analogies can thus be heralded by stoics as methods for attaining rational discipline, but also condemned by cynics as modes of deceitful perversion.

"Inanimate ambassadors: the mechanics and politics of mediation" investigates how mechanical objects and practices bring about mediation in Renaissance thought and politics. Natural philosophers such as John Wilkins sought to employ instruments of discovery such as telescopes and of concealment such as cryptographic devices for political ends; meanwhile literary texts and paintings explored correspondences between animate and "inanimate ambassadors" perfecting and perverting, effecting and obstructing, the aims of their masters. The portraits in Hans Holbein's *The Ambassadors* represent instruments for diplomacy amid a still life of those for interrogation and communication. The painting's prominent anamorphism, moreover, simultaneously offers the promise of transmission and the threat of distortion—both "in ambage," as in circuitous, ambiguous, and ambushing.

"The polymechany of Gabriel Harvey" describes the methodical reading and applications from technical treatises to rhetoric, politics, moral philosophy, and courtesy theory that the scholar diligently employed to transform himself into an admired courtier and valued politician. Failing for obvious methodicalness and lack of "sprezzatura," he did make himself into an anti-courtly Ramist pedagogue—portrayed by himself as a prudent pragmatist and by Thomas Nashe as a knit-picking pedant.

"Homer in a nutshell: George Chapman and the mechanics of perspicuity" describes a different method of reading and writing based in part on the poet, playwright, and translator's interest in Thomas Hariot's manufacture of telescopes and in Robert Hues' manufacture of globes. These constitute visual instruments that abet perspicuous because far-searching magnification by the same instrumentality they distort and obscure. These dual aspects of interpretation inform Chapman's mode of allegorical composition and the demands as well as insights it confers on his readers. Globes indicate addi-

tional complications in instruments that represent much in little, “multum in parvo,” and consequently of texts such as epigrams and Chapman’s translation of *Achilles’ Shield*.

“Inhumanism: Spenser’s iron man” recapitulates and reconstitutes the promises and problems of mechanistic analogies during the era by focusing on fusions of the human and the mechanical in fantasies of war automata and machines. Talus, the instrument of justice in Book V of Spenser’s *The Faerie Queene*, becomes from one perspective the ideal martialist and consummate stoic perfected beyond passion; from another the horrific dominion of the warrior, method, and instrument from which all humanity has been extracted. The animate has been replaced by the inanimate, the soul by iron.

In *Humanism, Machinery, and Renaissance Literature* Wolfe offers a panorama of Renaissance humanist culture at a productive nexus from an unusual perspective. Students will find a multitude of suggestive contexts within which to consider their own projects, ideas from which they can extrapolate topics, and models for investigating domain sharing and productively ambiguous analogies. Valuable too is Wolfe’s reminder of the treasure trove in language subtly investigated. Precisely because our understanding is embedded in language and analogy, our inquiries therein can reveal vistas and delve depths.

Adam Smyth. *“Profit and Delight”: Printed Miscellanies in England, 1640-1682*. Detroit: Wayne State Univ. Press, 2004. xxii + 246 pp. \$39.95. Review by A.H. DE QUEHEN, UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO.

“*Profit and Delight*” is based on a study of forty-one printed miscellanies published between 1640 and 1682, a carefully chosen group out of the very large number of verse (or verse-with-prose) collections that the seventeenth century produced. Adam Smyth is not directly concerned with manuscript miscellanies, or with printed volumes of political or university verse, or with commonplace or songbooks, all of which he mentions from time to time. His chosen books are of a certain compact size, “usually octavo or duodecimo publications of between 100 and 300 pages,” and their favourite verse forms are “the epigram, the comic epitaph, the ballad, the epistle, the lyric, the mock, and the dialogue. ... The material was altered to suit the envisioned purposes of readers; was often set in an educative, generally Royalist, frame; and was

offered as an emblem and exemplar of elite, usually courtly, life” (2). One of the attitudes that distinguishes these collections from later ones is the compilers’ apparently not caring who had written the poems. Smyth speculates that an Oxford student who copied from miscellanies into a notebook of his own “understood these poems to be his—that they had ceased to belong to the original author” (xxi). The miscellanies themselves suggest a controlling, dominant relationship between reader and text in the altered lines, substituted titles, and marginalia for which the compilers, and also the buyers and later owners of the volumes, were responsible. Certainly the changes made are very interesting: Smyth shows how Jonson’s “The Musical Strife; In a Pastoral Dialogue” was altered in part to fit the requirements of musical setting, but also to make a more conventional love-relationship between the two speakers or singers. “This kind of textual alteration—the flattening out of the idiosyncratic in pursuit of the generic—was characteristic of many printed miscellany editorial interventions” (82). Names of poems and melodies changed in the popular imagination: the tune “Greensleeves” came to be called “The Blacksmith” after being used for that popular song; Transcribers and compilers responded to public interest, and also anticipated it, when “quite deliberately reworking the materials they encountered” (76).

*The Academy of Compliments* (1640; 18th edn. 1795) set the social tone for wooers and other aspirants, most likely to be “gauche young men” of low rank (29). Smyth is unsure that miscellanies were *really* encouraging would-be courtiers: although they “apparently usher readers towards exclusive worlds, their real emphasis lies in the need for readers to appropriate elite wit within their own contexts”; so paradoxically they “discourage and therefore presumably limit social mobility” (71-72). But the gauche young prototypes of Dickens’s Mr. Guppy may have heeded the cautions as little as consumers generally do advertisers’ disclaimers: after all, court favourites *have* been spectacularly advanced from humble origins even in more stable times than the mid-seventeenth century. In any case, “*Stiles and Tearmes used to the KING, or QUEENES Majesty*” are essential for one’s royalist fantasies (23). In his chapter on “Politics, Themes, and Preoccupations” Smyth captures very well the mood of the Interregnum royalists, whose “defiance in the face of melancholy” found expression in the miscellanies’ humour (153). The interest in anagrams and codes—“Cardinal *Richlieus* Key, his manner of writing of Letters”—could be a practical one in those times; indeed, the harsh fate of true

lovers might have “political resonance” (142, 144). Poems or songs about marginalized groups, such as “The Blacksmith,” came to stand for royalists. Yet after 1660 the Cavalier “grievance at exclusion” persisted, with the “new courtiers” becoming the “catalyst for the true Royalist’s dislocation” (148). These Restoration miscellanies do, however, “show a quite dramatic reassessment of the merits of past and present” and “little concern with connecting with a better bygone age” (169). Smyth’s discussion of the books’ implicit politics enlarges one’s understanding of the explicitly political collections, which he does not discuss (and for which see, among other sources, the Rump website maintained by Mark McDayter at [ett.arts.uwo.ca/rump/index.html](http://ett.arts.uwo.ca/rump/index.html)).

Smyth discusses, although quite briefly, the relationship between printed texts and manuscripts. Like other scholars, he encounters the seventeenth century’s inexplicable love of copying and recopying: Why should John Boydell “bother spending such effort transferring poems to manuscript” out of miscellanies he probably owned (125)? To make them more completely his own? The motives of the printed miscellanies’ compilers are thus more easily understood, both their “textual carpentry” and their often subversive additions (87). A poem “On the Tombs of Westminster Abbey” is a hilarious example of the latter, as the guide’s patter, in ballad quatrains, is disrupted by his group’s prose comments in the margin (65-67). Smyth certainly understands transmissional situations, for example, “the evident *difficulty* of accurate transcription” when Pepys was trying to copy down a song during a performance (114). But it is possible to enter too far into the spirit of the occasion: thirteen errors in the six lines quoted from Pepys’s *Diary* (an omitted clause, ‘blackhead’ for ‘blacklead’, the other mistakes less significant). Although Smyth has plenty of notes (twenty-four pages), a few more things could be explained: Isn’t “the popular expression ‘to dine with Duke Humphrey’” in dictionaries of proverbs (48)? Who is Mosely—even if Rochester’s readers won’t have forgotten her after “Timon” (50)? But the interest and sheer pleasure of this book is unaffected by such dull complaints. As one titlepage announces, the miscellanies are “full of Mirth and Pleasure” (21), and Adam Smyth has read them as they should be read. Moreover, he has read them with informed mirth: “A lack of seriousness was not an apolitical stance. In particular, the kind of pleasure these texts suggest—a pleasure full of drink, mirth, ribald humor, disengagement—was in some ways a powerful attack on Commonwealth and particularly Puritan ideology” (21). His website

([www.adamsmyth.clara.net](http://www.adamsmyth.clara.net)) provides an *Index of Poetry in Printed Miscellanies, 1640 to 1682*, where one can search the 4,639 titles. “Delight” scores fifty-two hits, “profit” four hits; but Smyth’s book is just as rewarding in each respect.

Katherine Gillespie. *Domesticity and Dissent in the Seventeenth Century: English Women’s Writing and the Public Sphere*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. xii + 272 pp. \$60.00. Review by JEROME S. DEES, KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY.

In this ambitious book, Katherine Gillespie has two broad aims. She seeks first to convince us that a small group of sectarian women writers “rightfully deserve to be included in ‘genealogies’ of liberal political theory” (13). But perhaps more controversially she wishes at the same time to rescue early modern political thought itself from the contention of “postmodern academic feminists” that liberal theory deriving from Locke’s *Two Treatises of Government* and its precursors is in fact a “blighted masculinist system” grounded in and perpetuating the continued subjection of women. Here she sets herself against such feminist scholars as Carole Pateman (whose *The Sexual Contract: Aspects of Patriarchal Liberalism* [1987] she finds seminal), Zillah Eisenstein, Catherine MacKinnon, Seyla Benhabib, and others. For these historians of political thought, a woman’s desire for “civil equality”—to be recognized as an individual—can never be fulfilled since, in Pateman’s words, “the ‘individual’ is a patriarchal category” (27). This is an error that Gillespie hopes to rectify through her elucidation of “an alternative source of political ideas” (25). To this end, her main claim is that the writings of Katherine Chidley, Anna Trapnel, Elizabeth Poole, Sarah Wight, Anne Wentworth, and Mary Cary “emerge rewardingly as a modest but nonetheless important body of heteronomous, multigeneric, performative, aspirational, allusive, religiomythological, exclamatory, and antinomian liberalism that intentionally critiqued its political world” (14). Gillespie’s argument cuts across three otherwise distinct disciplines: history, political philosophy, and literary criticism; and as this quotation suggests, her argument rests on a significant prior assumption: that effective political thinking may be accomplished outside the formal constraints of a systematically argued treatise. She argues her case strenuously and with a great deal of scholarly tact. While I am sympathetic to her aims and premises, the weighti-

ness of her claims seem too heavy for the slender columns of evidence supporting them. I suspect that this book will find its most sympathetic readers among feminist literary scholars, its most resistant among students of political thought.

Her argument is deployed over four long chapters that group the six women (pairing Chidney and Trapnel, as well as Wight and Wentworth) so as to elucidate in each chapter one of the principal tenets of liberal thought—the separation of church from state; government as contract; the sovereignty of the individual; and the free market. A brief, though heavily annotated, Introduction offers a reading of Milton's 1637 *A Maske Presented at Ludlow Castle* as "narrating the 'birth' of the possessive individual," i.e. a "baseline 'self' which one defines and possesses in defiance of all attempts by others to describe, prescribe, and circumscribe it on *their* terms" (2). This reading permits her to see the Lady, Sabrina, and the Attendant Spirit as variable "prototypes" of her sectarian writers and the men that they are closely associated with. She can then later draw analogies between the two sets of characters on the assumption that such comparison clarifies or solidifies the point she is making. I began to find this strategy distracting rather than helpful, and wondered why she adopted it.

Gillespie's dense and heavily referenced first chapter, "Born of the Mother's Seed: Liberalism, Feminism, and Religious Separatism," requires careful attention, since there she not only enunciates the complex set of assumptions and definitions on which will hinge the success or failure of her subsequent argument, but also reveals the rhetorical strategy which she will employ throughout: that of disclosing dichotomous habits of thought in the critics she opposes—e.g. Christopher Hill's notion of "two revolutions"—and then proceeding, not necessarily to mediate, but rather, as she puts it on page 53, to "ensnarl." Care is demanded because in addition to the complexity of her concepts, her sentences are themselves often so ensnared as to admit understanding only after several re-readings; I sometimes wondered whether her clotted syntax was not actually a product of her scrupulous acknowledgment of the scholars with whom she is in dialogue. This is a problem throughout the book: see, for example, pages 5, 6, 43, 48, 65, 130, 191, 222, and 234.

Since all of Gillespie's texts convey expressions of deeply held religious conviction, her argument invites at almost every turn the demurral that, in Patricia Crawford's words, "the really radical political ideas expressed by

women owe more to their religious beliefs than to political theory about patriarchalism” (qtd. on 49). To her credit, Gillespie is continuously sensitive to this charge, and seeks to counter it when necessary from her initial premise that it doesn’t have to look like a treatise to do political work.

Chapter 2, “A Hammer in Her Hand: Katherine Chidley and Anna Trapnel Separate Church from State,” seeks to convince us, in part by a nuanced engagement with Habermas’s theory of a “public sphere,” that these women “began the process of building a ‘feminist theory of state’ which . . . rested on a necessary separation of a private sphere of individual and group-based self-determination from a public sphere of patriarchal domination” (66). In particular, she finds in Habermas a “third way” for understanding the “complex and ‘liminal’ space that Trapnel narrates into being” (93). However, not only will some readers find the four main sections of this chapter repetitive, but in the case of Chidley in particular they may get a strong whiff of special pleading in Gillespie’s effort to defend her from the common charge that her arguments are not “woman centered”; at one point Gillespie must concede weakly that “while she does not mention women *per se*, her arguments have a decidedly antipatriarchal thrust” (83).

Chapter 3, “Cure for a Diseased Head: Divorce and Contract in the Prophecies of Elizabeth Poole,” is most heavily invested in the analogy with *Comus* established in the Introduction. Here Gillespie contends that both Milton and the Separatists “grounded their rationale for a contractual model of social and political relations within the individual (even female) propensity for contingency, miscalculation, and the consequential need for reassessment and revision” (125). It is here that Gillespie, drawing upon her considerable skills in rhetorical analysis, is forced to wrestle most strenuously against Patemen’s claim that republican contract theory is, in effect, a masculinist plot to disenfranchise women from entering into contract. It was in this chapter that I was perhaps most conscious of a certain slippage from “seems” to “is,” in addition to the more ubiquitous need to explain away arguments counter to her own by means of a sometimes strained interpretation of the writers’ metaphoric language and Biblical allusion.

In Chapter 4, “The Unquenchable Smoking Flax: Sarah Wight, Anne Wentworth, and the ‘Rise’ of the Sovereign Individual,” Gillespie argues that sectarian women writers “actually forged the model of the subject that feminists actively seek to displace—that of the ‘sovereign’ or ‘abstract’ individual”

(170). The argument is complex and resistant to easy summary, but its main thrust is that these women “drew upon a separatist concept of the sovereign self” as a way to *counter* the ideological belief “that female subjectivity was embodied and hence discontinuous and fragmented”: the writings of Wight and Wentworth are “pioneering articulations of the subject as an end unto herself” (171). In opposing postmodern feminist political theorists, she draws upon (and at times modifies) Althusser’s theory of “interpellation,” using it to underline the oddity that present-day feminist political theorists espouse an argument exactly counter to those of feminist literary scholars who have now for two decades been discovering a genuine female “self” in the writings of Anne Clifford, Aemilia Lanyer, Elizabeth Cary, and Mary Wroth.

I found myself most thoroughly engaged with, and convinced by, the argument of Chapter 5, “Improving God’s Estate: Pastoral Servitude and the Free Market in the Writings of Mary Cary.” Though the chapter is beset by many of the same murky sentences and paucity of evidence found in earlier ones, still I become convinced that, with her claim that Cary’s writings “insist that various forms of grass-roots communication, voluntary association, and persuasion through free preaching should supercede statism as the means by which revolutionary change was to come about” (216), she had successfully answered those who call Cary a socialist, and hence a totalitarian. Most appealing in this chapter was her demonstration that for Cary the implementation of the Fifth Monarchy, “rather than resulting in the violent destruction of the nonsaint, in actuality represents the time in which God will be most actively saving people through Grace” (225). For the most part, unlike earlier chapters where the point was gained via some rather tortuous interpretation of the quoted text, here her well-chosen passages unambiguously support their claims.

Given her ambitious aims and truly impressive amount of research (both primary and secondary)—though I wished continually for a complete Works Cited rather than the repetitious footnotes at the ends of chapters—many will find it easy to discount those features at which I’ve carped. They will see, for example, that she carefully situates each writer in her historical moment and material circumstances, as also that she is an attentive and sensitive reader. If on occasion they feel that her “political” conclusions are not necessarily the only or best ones to derive from what are essentially “religious” texts, they may ascribe it to the nature of argumentation. At the very least, they will

admit, as I do, that she has opened the way to what should be continuing and fruitful dialogue.

Deborah G. Burks. *Horrid Spectacle: Violation in the Theater of Early Modern England*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 2003. viii + 456 pp. + 11 illus. \$60.00. Review by CHRISTOPHER J. WHEATLEY, THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA.

This interesting and eclectic book traces the trope of violation through a wide variety of sources. “Violation” is meant in a very broad sense: it includes rape and personal assault, but also adultery, torture, and symbolic emasculation. Further, crimes against property (including women) are a violation, and, ultimately, Stuart absolutism is the greatest violation of all. She quotes William Hakewell claiming with alarm that the king’s “pleasure cannot be bounded by law” and explains that his choice of “pleasure” rather than “will” is significant: “Hakewell chose the less subtle of the two terms to make his point that the king’s impositions amounted to a seizure or *ravishment* of subjects’ property against their will—a violation” (181). Throughout the book Burk examines the discursive interplay between personal, social, and political violation, the vocabulary of which she perceives as an abiding rhetorical resource for writers in various genres.

Burk’s foundational texts are Foxe’s *Acts and Monuments*—commonly known as the “Book of Martyrs”—(first edition 1563) and Bale’s *Epistle Exhortatorie* (1544). The latter savages the Catholic-leaning bishops of England for their desire for wealth and pleasure; this is symptomatic of their ultimate allegiance to the heresies and oppressions of the papacy. The former book, and particularly its woodcuts by John Daye, dramatizes the perverse cruelty of the hierarchy and in particular Bishop Bonner. Burks sees a combination of horror and titillation in these works; that is, while we are supposed to sympathize with martyrs we nonetheless may feel “a vicarious thrill”: “While the text and the woodcuts construct rules for readership that make such an act decidedly transgressive, the illustrations do not and perhaps cannot exclude the prurient gaze” (69). Some readers may think Burks is straining her gaze in some cases. Many of the woodcuts the book reproduces just look like torture to me without any sexual charge whatsoever, but her strong reading of other woodcuts does reveal a pornographic and perverse violence.

In chapter five, Burks demonstrates that the tropes of martyrdom could be used both by Parliament in debates over property rights and by the unhappy Arbella Stuart Seymour in her attempts to marry and then to justify a marriage entered into without consent. Where Cecil and other members of the court saw her as “pathetic, vain, and deeply delusional” (210), Burks depicts an iconoclast trapped by her position into an unnatural life but offering defiance rather than meekly surrendering. The chief strength of the book is Burks’s compelling case for overlapping semantic fields in the personal, the political, and the dramatic.

Burks uses these backgrounds to good effect in her interpretation of *Measure for Measure* in chapter two. The visual and verbal background of clerical abuse she establishes in her first chapter does reinforce the difficulty of seeing Duke Vincentio, particularly in his adoption of a monastic cover, as anything other than “as skilled a manipulator and conman as Jonson’s Volpone” (74). In this chapter Burks also discusses the interrogation and torture of Anne Askew by Bishop Bonner and develops the parallels between this violation and Angelo’s attempt to violate Isabella. Ultimately the play becomes a depiction of widespread injustice with only a tenuously reestablished order administered by an untrustworthy duke. Askew also figures into Burks’s analysis of Chapman’s *Bussy D’Ambois*. Chapman’s play develops sympathy for the adulterous countess of Montsurry by developing a common visual vocabulary between her torture and that of Askew’s as presented by Foxe. The weakness of the king of France and the rapacity of his brother provide a political context for a world where a husband inhumanly wracks his wife.

Burks turns her attention to women as property in her analysis of Middleton and Rowley’s *The Changeling*. Here the contest turns on the double meaning of “will” as desire and as intent. Beatrice-Joanna’s father’s unquestioned authority over his daughter means that she cannot have her will in any socially sanctioned way when she prefers Alsemero to her betrothed Alonzo. By violating patriarchal order she creates the conditions of her own violation by DeFlores. In an excellent chapter on Shirley’s neglected play *The Cardinal*, Burks discusses the increasingly open class conflicts that led to the revolution. Alvarez in particular represents the effeminate sexuality that the “short haired men” (Puritans) caricatured in the Cavaliers. The cardinal himself is both a corrupt politician and a sexual predator: religious, political, and sexual crime are inseparably and disturbingly linked.

Burks is also interested in the question of periodicity: “this study considers Restoration drama (and the political discourses in which it participated) to have been situated at the end of a long seventeenth century, a century of political developments and discourses that supplied the Restoration with ideological and metaphorical constructs ready for use”(2); it is not a separate literary period nor the beginning of a long eighteenth century. This strikes me as problematic. Literary history is concerned with both continuities and discontinuities. Certainly the tropes of violation she sees in Jacobean drama are echoed in Restoration literature. On the other hand, Milton’s *Paradise Lost* and Dryden’s *Annus Mirabilis* are published within a year of each other, yet it is difficult to conceive of them as representing a single literary period because of the immense gap in aesthetic and political assumptions (and this despite the fact that Dryden was dazzled by *Paradise Lost*).

The book’s weakest chapters (the last three on Cavendish, Dryden and Behn) are, I believe, a consequence of Burks’s indifference to discontinuities. In her chapter on the duchess of Newcastle, Burks sees Cavendish as questioning the idea of monarchy because of the frequent misbehavior of rulers in her works: “might not her readers likewise think themselves prompted to ask why, given the folly, vanity and falsehood of kings, subjects should trouble themselves for monarchs’ sake?”(291). Of course on one level, as Burks is aware, this is a function of narrative: Cavendish is writing about the upper classes and for there to be narrative or dramatic tension, someone has to be the antagonist. But everyone during the Civil War had to reconsider his or her assumptions about monarchy. For a book so largely concerned with politics, there is strikingly little consideration of what political philosophers and commentators had to say. Hobbes, for instance, appears only in a couple of footnotes. When Burks points out that Cavendish “accepts the proposition that noblemen, like beasts, are ruled by their desires”(288), this shows the naturalist current in the philosophical revolution of the seventeenth century, a continuity, but not one with much connection to the religious discourse upon which many of her readings rely. In this Cavendish bears an affinity to the radical skepticism characteristic of much Restoration literature.

It is perfectly possible for a Restoration author to be skeptical of previous justifications of political or natural order and still support the monarchy (e.g. Halifax, for instance, also not mentioned in the book). Dryden is an excellent example (he was, after all, a member of the Royal Society which planned to

start knowledge on a new footing). In her efforts to establish continuity, Burks even argues that a Restoration audience would have seen the uxorious Boadellin in *The Conquest of Granada* as an analogue for Charles I. I doubt it; even aside from the fact there is no contemporary evidence for this response, Charles I had been executed twenty-one years previously. After that had come Cromwell, the Dutch Wars, the plague, the Great Fire and a variety of other traumatic events. Emotionally and intellectually, 1649 to 1670 was a long time.

Behn fits very nicely in this framework of Restoration skepticism, and it distinguishes her from her Jacobean predecessors. Burks claims more originality for Behn than she is perhaps entitled to: “[Behn’s] women, like the women in Dryden’s comedies and Wycherley’s and Etherege’s and Shadwell’s, have desires and pursue love interests. The difference between Behn’s women and their comcontemporaries is the dignity she accords them”(347). This is false: Shadwell and Dufey in particular also are well aware of the danger to women in a patriarchal society and are full of women characters who with wit and integrity critique the patriarchal order.

I do not think Burks knows the Restoration as well as she does earlier periods. For instance, she suggests that Shadwell was a Tory initially and that his split with Dryden was political. I know of no reason to believe that Shadwell ever entertained Tory sympathies (although Ormond was a patron of his father’s). *Maqflecknoe* probably dates to 1676, before the terms Tory and Whig had any real consequence, and Dryden’s enmity is founded on literary and social grounds.

I do not disagree with Burks’s claims of continuities, but there is a great deal more discontinuity here than she is prepared to acknowledge. That aside, this is a fine book, well researched and original, and will be particularly valuable to anyone interested in Jacobean drama.

Susan Green and Steven N. Zwicker, eds. *John Dryden: A Miscellany*. San Marino, Cal.: Huntington Library, 2001. vii+255 pp. And Claude Rawson and Aaron Santesso, eds. *John Dryden (1631-1700): His Politics, His Plays, and His Poets*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2004. 301pp. Review by JEROME DONNELLY, UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA.

Both of these collections celebrate Dryden’s tercentenary and are gener-

ated from sites—Yale and the Huntington Library—long associated with Dryden scholarship. Given this, the antipathetic stance in some of the essays in the Yale inspired collection seems inappropriate and, indeed, unfair.

Annabel Patterson continues her nearly obsessive practice of comparing Dryden with Milton and Marvell—invariably to Dryden’s detriment. After an opening and disarming reference to *Absalom and Achitophel* as “a masterpiece” (198), things change. She comes, not to praise Dryden but to harry him. Dryden’s success as a satirist is accomplished only from his having saturated himself in the “Whig poets” (200). Sounding like the “Friend” in Pope’s “Epilogue to the Satires,” (“Why now, this moment, don’t I see you steal? / ’Tis all from *Horace*...”), Patterson finds the good bits of Dryden’s “masterpiece” as derivative—the portraits indebted to Marvell and the architectonics to Milton, who supplies the father and son theology that Dryden parodies. Ungrateful despite his debts, Patterson claims, Dryden takes “revenge” (201) on his predecessors. Among the incidentals that Patterson ignores is that Marvell’s portraits have largely been relegated to the dustbin, whereas Dryden’s continue to be admired. Her assertion that “there is no trace of Marvell” (205) in *MacFlecknoe* misses Dryden’s use of the emaciated figure of Flecknoe in Marvell’s merciless lampoon of the starving poet as the basis for having his own Flecknoe claim that the rotund Shadwell bears his “perfect image.”

Maximilian Novak proposes to show, by mediating between Restoration and modern “angles of vision” (86), how Dryden’s “poetry and drama” serve “as a mode of staving off anarchy” (86). Having lingered long in Defoe’s City, Novak’s perspective is all too single-minded. His approach soon leads to confusion, when his remark that “we [moderns] are almost all believers in a degree of democracy” is immediately followed by, “Dryden flaunted his contempt for democracy...” (87), without carefully distinguishing two different conceptions. For Dryden, democracy meant absolutism by the mob. Novak further distorts Dryden by referring to him as “misogynistic” and “racist” (88), and by claiming that he saw Shaftesbury as “the leader of the forces of anarchy,” whereas Dryden saw him *using* anarchy as a means to personal power. Having served as an apologist for some of Defoe’s intolerant, even Hitlerian, ideas about mass deportations, Novak ignores Dryden’s tolerance.

Other contributors are more sanguine. Steven Zwicker traces Dryden’s gradual assimilation of Virgil, yet, in doing so, he can invent complications as

opportunities for comment. Dryden's acknowledgment, as Virgil's translator, that "Virgil...can never be translated as he ought" need hardly be seen as a "paradox" (111). What seems most paradoxical, as Zwicker observes, is that in the end Dryden is "cooly pushing Virgil away" (119) in favor of Homer.

David Womersley has a fine essay on the politics of *The Spanish Fryar*, while Howard Erskine-Hill ranges engagingly over Dryden's plays, dwelling on those written after 1688, especially *Don Sebastian*. Emrys Jones explores the ways in which Dryden's political or personal interests show up in Persius' originals and how Dryden expands Persius "so as to explain him to his English audience" (136). Paul Hammond examines anew "nature" and "art" in Dryden's Shakespeare criticism and finds in it "an exercise of self-definition" (172) and an occasion for self-criticism.

Susanna Morton Braund argues convincingly that the "most racy material" (139) in Juvenal's Sixth Satire, a passage consisting of sixteen lines (excised from the final version and published for the first time in 1972) was Dryden's way of practicing "safe sex" (139). The lines were deleted "to sanitize his translation" (155), since Dryden found Juvenal's attitude toward women distasteful. Braund's remarks provide an eminently sensible antidote to Novak's "misogynistic" Dryden, reminding us of Dryden's "generous attitude toward women" (156).

The late Louis Martz compares passages from *Paradise Lost* and *The State of Innocence* to illustrate how Dryden gives some of Satan's best lines to lesser devils and uses these and other devices "to deflate the apparent heroism of Milton's Satan..." (184). Martz raises the question of why, after Dryden combined the Miltonic with a language "directed toward the contemporary stage" (188), the work was, as Dryden said, "never acted" (188). Martz thinks that the answer lies in the difficulty of "the theme evoked in the long, hundred-line discussion of the problem of determinism versus free will presented in the fourth act" (189), a problem eventually resolved by the poet himself in his religious conversion.

Swift's animosity toward Dryden, his second cousin, twice removed, serves Ian Higgins's subject. Higgins finds many buried satiric (and sometimes questionable) references to Dryden in such works as "A Description of a City Shower" (where he also sees the parodies of the *Georgics* as a parody of Dryden's translation of them).

Valerie Rumbold's subject is "Plotting Parallel Lives" in Dryden and Pope.

Pope shared Dryden's sense of being besieged both by Philistine dullness and for his religion. Rumbold's informed essay serves as a reminder of the need for more work on Pope's inheritance; his poetry shows that he is often Dryden's best reader, a subject that has never been fully explored.

Dryden criticism could also use more of the sort of thing Barbara Everett does in her essay, Dryden's *Hamlet*: The Unwritten Masterpiece," which raises the question of "his *Hamlet*, or what it is we now recommend him for" (264). Everett does a wonderful job of regarding Dryden up close and from afar, consistently perceptive from either perspective. His plays, seldom produced now, contain no *Hamlet*, nor do the odes. The "six best-known lines he ever wrote" (268) (from the "Secular Masque"—"All, all of a piece") express a "potency" that "comes from the brisk ache of idealism refuted," and these lines are "only perhaps suggestive—in their quality as in their regret—of the *Hamlet* that Dryden never quite wrote..." (268).

The articles in the Green/Zwicker volume first appeared as an issue of the *Huntington Library Quarterly*, and their content is too often heavy with apparatus that yields only small rewards, whether tracing Dryden's female genealogy, the effect of shifting court politics after 1688 on Don Sebastian, Pepys's responses to repeated attendance at Dryden's *Tempest*, or themes of empire in Restoration drama. Alan Roper spends nearly forty pages on "Who's Who in *Absalom and Achitophel*" but comes to no new firm conclusions as to the identity of disputed minor characters.

More rewarding are the essays by Ann Huse and James Winn. She writes perceptively on the meaning of eroticism in *All for Love*—the tug of "public honor" and "private desire" (23) and how Antony's love for Cleopatra reflects Dryden's internationalism (in contrast to Marvell's "belligerent Protestant nativism") (24).

James Winn treats the "Past and Present in Dryden's *Fables*," observing that they include a number of passages "in which the end of a life, a century, or an age resembles its beginning" (157) and how the selections "establish a kind of simultaneity linking the ancients, the (medieval) moderns, and Dryden himself" (158). Further, the image of the circle functions as a "unifying device" both for the *Fables* and perhaps the poet's "own life cycle" (159). While Zwicker finds flux and uncertainty, Winn locates order in the poems.

Besides the essays by Huse and Winn, the most valuable pieces in this volume are its two reviews. Philip Harth examines "The Text of Dryden's

Poetry” as edited by Paul Hammond for the Longman’s series. Harth points out that modern editors have sometimes misappropriated Joseph Moxon’s *Mechanick Exercises on the Whole Art of Printing* (1683-84), misconstruing seventeenth-century printing practices and then producing new editions with unwarranted textual revisions in spelling, contractions, and italics. Having appeared in Kieth Walker’s edition of Dryden selections, those working assumptions also operate to a lesser extent in Hammond’s edition. As Harth points out, for example, shifting capitals to lower case risks interfering with their use in personifications, and removing italics risks diminishing rhetorical effects. In dropping authors’ italics, “Hammond has obliterated a feature that is an infrequent but nonetheless important ingredient of Dryden’s poetic expression” (240).

Harth admires other features of this edition, especially its annotations, for which “Hammond’s achievement deserves the highest praise” (243). Hammond, he says, brings “new and unpublished information” to “every important poem in these two volumes” (243), thus offering a perspective on Dryden’s verse which does not supercede but complements the California edition.

In another review, David Bywaters shows “Historicism Gone Awry” in several recent articles and books on Dryden, where history has either been misapplied or irrelevant to the subject, or used to “force literary texts into positions on questions of ideology or epistemology unknown to Dryden” (251), with the result that he is made to “speak as a ventriloquist’s dummy on a subject and before an audience of which he knew nothing” (253). While Bywaters has reservations about the application of history in Anne Barbeau Gardiner’s breathtaking new reading of *The Hind and the Panther*, he admires her “exhaustive review of court polemic under James” and concludes that “Dryden scholars are in her debt” (248). Bywaters also praises Susan J. Owen’s *Restoration Theatre and Crisis* (1996) and Steven Zwicker’s “The Paradoxes of Tender Conscience” (*ELH*, 1996) for their uses of history.

Gillian Wagner. *Thomas Coram, Gent. 1668-1751*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2004. x + 218 pp. + 8 illus. \$39.95. Review by GILLIAN HENDERSHOT, CENTRAL MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY.

The chief legacy of Thomas Coram is, of course, the foundling hospital

he established in 1739. This venture culminated in 1745 with the establishment of the Hospital's permanent site in Bloomsbury, London, which is thought to be the world's first incorporated charity. Clearly Coram was a man of unique vision, a vision which, it becomes clear after reading Wagner's biography, was marred by the limitations and flaws of his own personality. These limitations were exacerbated by general attitudes existing in Coram's lifetime. These popular attitudes marginalized many of the issues important to him, such as his belief in the necessity of helping abandoned children and his desire for equal rights for women.

Wagner's biography is timely as Coram has never been subject to a full scale study of his entire life, most accounts instead focusing on his later years and the foundling hospital. *Thomas Coram, Gent. 1668-1751* helps fill this gap. Wagner has gone back to Coram's early years to establish the general motivations and specific events that shaped his charitable contributions towards the "fate of its [England's] youngest, most defenseless, destitute and abandoned citizens" (1).

Wagner's text, although chiefly concerned with Coram, does offer some interesting glimpses of more general early modern English life. Attitudes towards women as well as the role and activities of women in elite society are discussed, and useful insights into the struggles and antagonisms of life in colonial Massachusetts can be found in the discussions of Coram's troubled early adult years in Taunton. Further insight into seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century life can be found in the frequent references to Coram's attempts to navigate the rigid structure of the English patronage system in which connections were everything and access to the right people was all important. *Thomas Coram, Gent. 1668-1751* will certainly appeal to anyone with interest in seventeenth-century English culture and society, gender relations, treatment and attitudes towards the poor (especially children), and of course early modern charitable efforts.

As stated above, Thomas Coram is most readily identified with the establishment of his foundling hospital. However, Wagner dedicates a large portion of her text to Coram's earlier years, in which he devoted much time and personal wealth to his various schemes to expand British interests in the American colonies. Coram's activities as a fully trained ship builder are also discussed. He worked in this trade for several years in both Boston and Taunton, and Wagner's discussion serves to highlight some of the struggles

and difficulties a young man would have had in establishing and maintaining a business in the colonies during the seventeenth century. Due in part to his own difficult personality and the apparent vengefulness of some of his Taunton neighbors, Coram returned to England heavily in debt following this unsuccessful venture.

It is in the examination of Coram's activities following this unspectacular return to England that Wagner is most successful. She ably highlights many of Coram's schemes and plans, including of course his concern for abandoned children and also his desire for the British government to exploit the natural resources of the Americas, particularly in Nova Scotia. Wagner illustrates many of the more fascinating traits of Coram's personality and interests, especially in the chapters "First Success" and "Lure of America." Wagner demonstrates in each of these that Coram was an early crusader for women's rights, and in doing so she highlights many of the gender biases inherent in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century London society.

It becomes apparent from reading these chapters that Thomas Coram was certainly a believer, if not a champion, of women's rights. He campaigned throughout his middle years for inheritance rights for women and for the necessity of educating girls. As Wagner states, "Coram was vociferous in their support. His sense of fair play was outraged. He had always seen the role of women as important, and in particular had championed the education of girls as necessary because they were the mothers of the next generation" (97). The importance of women to Coram can also be seen in the details Wagner provides of the twenty-one "ladies of quality and distinction" who provided essential patronage for Coram's scheme for a foundling hospital (198). However, the examination of the role these women played in Coram's activities would have benefited greatly from a more detailed discussion in the text, as it is clear that Coram himself felt their contributions were essential both to the long-term success of his plan and to his ability to acquire further patronage.

As a former chair, and indeed the first woman to chair the Thomas Coram Foundation, the favorable bias of Dame Gillian Wagner towards Coram is apparent throughout the text of *Thomas Coram, Gent. 1668-1751*. She rarely criticizes the actions of the man who fell out with his fellow governors of the foundling hospital he established to the extent that he was ejected from its governing body. When placed alongside other unhappy events in

Coram's life, this incident suggests that Coram had a difficulty maintaining cordial relations with people. But Coram's cantankerous nature is still apparent throughout the book, despite the sympathetic treatment by Wagner. This is especially true in the chapter entitled "Trouble in Taunton." In this chapter, Wagner absolves Coram of blame in his dealings with the townspeople of Taunton. She refers to Coram as "Hardworking, energetic and confident" (30). Of the people of Taunton she states, "There seems to have been a concerted move to obstruct Coram" (31). She describes a court case that Coram lost in which "executions were issued against Coram and were immediately levied against the two vessels in his yard," that "it was a coordinated attempt by some of the leading citizens of Taunton to pervert the course of justice" (33). However, despite Wagner's account, the image of Coram that emerges from this chapter is not a favorable one. He appears to be a proud, stubborn man who does not or will not understand the nuances of social interaction.

Gillian Wagner, in *Thomas Coram, Gent. 1668-1751*, has provided a much-needed biography of this early pioneer of children's charity. She highlights the life and inspirations of a man whose efforts helped save many of London's unwanted children. Wagner's efforts provide details of a man who "fits no stereotype and was unique in being a man of integrity in an age of corruption, with a generosity of spirit and a capacity for compassion that has rightly earned him a place in the history of his time" (5).

Andrew McRae. *Literature, Satire and the Early Stuart State*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. ix + 250 pp. \$65.00. Review by MELISSA MOHR.

McRae makes claims for literature that will excite most literary scholars. He argues that writing and reading the unauthorized texts of early Stuart England led to concrete political changes. Libels, pamphlets, formal satires and other texts in the 'satiric mode' provided a means for authors and readers to interrogate existing political structures and to imagine new ones, resulting ultimately in the Revolution. Satire, in McRae's account, is characterized by strategies of discrimination and stigmatization, making it uniquely useful in "a culture becoming increasingly anxious, and undeniably curious, about the phenomena of dissent and division" (4). Satire gave its authors and readers tools

to make sense of this fractious age, but also to intervene in it; by applying satiric strategies, they came to question the role of the subject in a monarchy, the value of consensus, the power of the monarch to authorize speech and writing. They came to question, that is, the ideologies that shored up the Stuart monarchy, and began to consider alternatives.

This is an extremely thorough book. It takes an in-depth look at the different ways satire was written and used from 1603 to 1640, when state censorship of texts collapsed and satires began to appear in new—though related—forms. Although the book contains very interesting discussions of Ben Jonson's and Thomas Carew's epideictic poetry, most of the texts McRae discusses are anonymous, relatively unknown, and not readily available. He is thus planning to publish an edition of them in 2005, at <http://pufl.oclc.org/emls/emlshome.html>.

McRae begins with libel, the most prevalent, and, he argues, most influential form of satire in the early seventeenth century. With the changes in political culture ushered in by James I's reign—the increase of royal largesse, the wide publicity of several court scandals, and especially the greater prominence of royal favorites—formal verse satire lost its charge. The libel, which attacks specific people, often to make broader social points, was the perfect genre to take its place. Then, as is most often the case now, the libel was figured as a “debased mode” (28)—popular and ephemeral, using indigenous verse forms instead of formal satire's iambic pentameter couplets. Much of McRae's first chapter, though, is devoted to showing how the libel might just as well be seen as a *literary* genre, composed by some of the period's finest poets and collected by its most discriminating readers in manuscript miscellanies (though also enjoyed by the general populace).

Libels seek to intervene in “the construction of identities” (51) to determine how individuals are viewed by others. McRae identifies several discursive strategies they employ, but sees the stigmatization of their subjects' bodies as the most common. “Sincere” epideictic poetry seeks to elevate its subjects into realms of moral and spiritual purity; libels, especially mock epitaphs, locate their targets firmly in their corrupt physical bodies, to indicate a corresponding spiritual and moral corruption. Buckingham, Robert Carr, Walter Raleigh, and Robert Cecil were the most frequent targets, but Kings James and Charles were not immune. By drawing attention to the personal faults of these statesmen and kings, libels “also provided occasions for some strikingly

sophisticated analyses of the political system” (82), and thus strengthened a sense of involvement in political processes among their readers.

The next two chapters address satire more broadly, looking at printed poetry, prose pamphlets, and some drama (*A Game at Chess*) to investigate what satire is and how it functioned in the period. In the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, satire was a mode that allowed subjects outside court circles to offer counsel to their king. It straddled an ill-defined boundary between *liberty*—the satirist’s frank speech is a defining feature of the mode, but is always premised on subjecthood and obedience—and *license*—language unauthorized by the monarch. In 1620, James’s ‘Proclamation against excesse of Lavish and Licentious Speech of matters of State,’ pushed satire firmly over the line into license. After 1620, “political libels and pamphlets increasingly abandon any residual interest in monarchical authorization, as they fashion freshly transgressive strategies of expression and publication” (98). More and more satirists opened up traditional models of counsel to address readers beyond the king and his court, and sought ‘authorization’ not in the monarch but in their own consciences, a radical move that “potentially authorized the views of people from all social levels” (106). As satirists and their readers debate their government and posit improvements, even alternatives, McRae sees the beginnings of a Habermasian public sphere—based, however, not on the principles of reason but on “satiric strategies of indirection and provocation” (111).

There was an outpouring of political satire in the 1620s, which helped the English in “reconceiving political alliances and identities, as well as concepts of conflict and contestation” (114). This decade was particularly full of political troubles—the Spanish Match negotiations, the continued rise of Buckingham, dissatisfaction with England’s role in the Thirty Years’ War—which, publicized and evaluated by satire, prompted the beginnings of opposition movements. Many satirists used the model of Tacitus, with his relentless scrutiny of tyranny and corruption, to anatomize the events of this period. Court favorites, particularly Buckingham, and other “politicians” were the major targets, providing covert and not-so-covert opportunities to criticize the king and even the monarchy itself. Other satires of the 1620s engaged with the on-going debate over Parliament’s role—whether, as James demanded, it should play a subordinate, advisory role, or whether it was (like the new figure of the satirist) “a body freed of courtly, and even monarchical, structures of author-

ity” (137). In this decade, satire’s radical potential thus came to the fore, as it was used to reveal the systemic corruption of the monarchy and locate “political rectitude” (140) among the common people.

The last two chapters present in-depth case studies of Richard Corbett and the satiric writings and trial of John Bastwick, Henry Burton, and William Prynne. Corbett, the second most popular poet in manuscript circulation (losing out only to Donne), shows that satire is not *by nature* an oppositional mode—he used satiric strategies to construct a discourse of royalism. Bastwick, Burton, and Prynne used similar strategies to redefine Puritanism as religious orthodoxy, and to stigmatize Laudianism as Arminianism and thus as popery. This final chapter, however interesting in and of itself, feels tacked on. Though they were charged as “seditious libellers,” the three men did not actually write much satire. (McRae has much recourse to their use of irony in correspondence and in their voluminous prose texts). He argues that their trial helped to politicize religious opposition—religious resistance becomes “sedition”—which is a theme he touches on throughout the book, but he needs to spend more time analyzing the satiric aspects of their writing.

In the epilogue, McRae briefly looks forward to the 1640s and the Revolution, pointing out how early Stuart satire influenced the work of John Taylor, John Cleveland, and Andrew Marvell. For many readers, the book’s primary interest probably lies in this glimpse at the poetic future, or in McRae’s skilled account of the ways in which a literary genre shaped English politics and history. It is a wonderful book about not-so-wonderful poetry.

James Fitzmaurice, ed. *Sociable Letters: Margaret Cavendish*. Peterborough, Ontario: Broadview Press, 2004. 336 pp. + 6 illus. \$12.95. Review by SARAH R. MOREMAN, SUL ROSS STATE UNIVERSITY RIO GRANDE COLLEGE.

Margaret Cavendish published thirteen books that went through twenty-two editions in her lifetime. She employed a surprisingly wide variety of genres for any seventeenth-century English writer, including poetry, fiction, autobiography, plays, scientific speculation, a biography of her husband, William Cavendish, and letters. Until recently, Cavendish’s works had not been available in modern editions except C. H. Firth’s edition of *The Life of William Cavendish, to which is added the True Relation of my Birth, Breeding and Life*, which

appeared in 1886 followed by later editions, and Douglas Grant's 1956 edition of letters written by William Cavendish and Margaret Lucas. *Sociable Letters* was the first of Cavendish's works to appear in a modern edition, reproduced as it was in a facsimile edition by Scholar Press in 1969. Scholar Press also reproduced the first edition of *Poems and Fancies* in 1972. Other than excerpts appearing in anthologies, no other works by Cavendish appeared in modern editions until Paul Salzman's edition of *The Blazing World* in *An Anthology of Seventeenth-Century Fiction* published in 1991 and Kate Lilley's 1992 edition of *The Blazing World and Other Writings*.

James Fitzmaurice did Cavendish scholars a great service by editing *Sociable Letters* for publication by Garland in 1997. Fitzmaurice's most recent Broadview edition of *Sociable Letters* is even more valuable because it situates the letters in context by providing a full introduction, appendices, illustrations, and annotations. The Broadview Editions series for which this edition was prepared brings together valuable newly-accessible texts with canonical texts, helpful introductions, and a variety of contemporary documents that set the lesser-known literature in context. Fitzmaurice's edition of *Sociable Letters* will help today's readers become the audience of "after ages" that Cavendish ardently desired.

*Sociable Letters* imitates the numerous epistolary relationships between men and women based upon ongoing philosophical or theological discussions; however, it models an exchange between two women instead of one between a male author and his female correspondent. The context of *Sociable Letters* is provided in the first letter as the correspondent writes to her friend that since they cannot visit personally, they should do so by letters. However, the letters are not intended for two readers only but for a wider audience including "All Professors of Learning and Art," to whom one of the prefaces is addressed, and to less virtuous readers, as we see when she cautions the "ensorious reader" that her "Wit indites for Profitable Use,/That Men may see their Follies, and their Crimes" (46). As Fitzmaurice points out in his Introduction, Cavendish's letters cover a wide range of topics including marriage, medicine and science, war, peace, and politics, and English and classical literature.

Cavendish accounts for the variety of topics explored in the letters by including amongst six prefatory pieces the verse "Upon her Excellency the Authoress" according to which Cavendish's teeming thoughts travel the world

and “to the Mind do bring/All the Relations of each several thing” (45). Emphasizing Cavendish’s interest in the variety of human action and experience, this verse is suggestive of the letters that follow. In a prefatory letter to her husband, Cavendish establishes to some extent her ethos: she claims that she is ignorant of needle work, spinning, preserving, and baking as well as of “Gaming, Dancing, and Revelling” (38). She insists, however, that she is not a “Dunce” in all employments because she understands instead the importance of writing and the business of managing sheep, concluding that if “Men were as Harmless as most Beasts are, then surely the World would be more Quiet and Happy than it is” (38).

Fitzmaurice writes in his Introduction that the most important topic in *Sociable Letters* is marriage, and that while Cavendish always praises her own husband and marriage, she nevertheless questions the institution’s value for women generally (13). Cavendish’s reader is treated to a surprisingly wide variety of observations about seventeenth-century life for women and men, and many of the letters reward attention by their wit and, at times, their unconventional perspectives on marriage. Other important topics that Fitzmaurice introduces include medicine, war and politics and their impact on families, and literary criticism. While Fitzmaurice observes that *Sociable Letters* covers a wide variety of subjects, too wide one infers for all to be mentioned in an introduction, he might have included Cavendish’s thoughts about women’s education.

Illustrating his observation about unexpected details in the letters, Fitzmaurice points out an interesting letter about marriage. The letter opens with a description of “the Lady C.R.” who “being a woman of none of the least Sizes, but one of the largest, and having Anger added to her Strength,” beats her husband soundly and in public (72). This is remarkable; however, the letter also addresses education, as we see in the regret expressed about the woman’s having to resort to physical rather than reasoned rhetoric, and in the lament that “for the most part Women are not Educated as they should be” because it is an “Education of the Body, and not of the Mind...for this Education is more for outward Shew, than for inward Worth” (73). In Letter 112, while the speaker laments that women’s wit is “brief,” she implies that a sensible education would solve the problem: “But, Madam, I observe, our Sex is more apt to Read than to Write, and most commonly when any of our Sex doth Write, they Write some Devotions, or Romances, or Receipts of

Medicines, for Cookery or Confectioners, or Complemental Letters, or a Copy or two of Verses” (167). Responding to critics of her scientific speculation, Cavendish says that she has “neither Confidence nor Learning to Speak to an Assembly, nor in such Forms or Phrases, as Masters of Learning” (205), implying again the importance of education for women, especially for self-educated writers who want to defend themselves from the aspersions of uncharitable critics. Letter 150 recommends reading as the best employment for one’s maids because “by Reading they will Inrich their Understandings, and Increase their Knowledges, and Quicken their Wit” (212), and Letter 152 focuses on strategies to encourage a daughter “to Listen to Wise Instruction, [and] to Study Profitable Arts or Sciences” (214).

Fitzmaurice situates Cavendish’s *Sociable Letters* in their cultural context with appendices and discussions about the significance of Cavendish’s letters to seventeenth-century writing. In the first of three appendices, Fitzmaurice provides an additional twenty-one letters from Margaret Lucas to William Cavendish, four poems Cavendish wrote to Lucas, and five letters written by Margaret Cavendish’s stepdaughters. In another appendix, Fitzmaurice includes seven letters written by Dorothy Osborne and Aphra Behn. These appendices allow one to read Cavendish’s early love letters and her later *Sociable Letters* within the context of correspondence written by family members and other women of the time. Fitzmaurice finds that the letters are often similar in style and general appearance. A third appendix, “The Context of English Letter Writing and the English Essay,” provides sources that may have influenced Cavendish’s choice of genre and topic; those sources are, specifically, excerpts from Angel Day’s popular *The English Secretary* and Francis Bacon’s essay-like letter on marriage.

Fitzmaurice’s Introduction contributes to current reevaluations of Cavendish’s texts, reevaluations established in part by his own years of work on Cavendish’s texts, by asserting that her writing is ironic, suggestive, and discursive, that it is important for historians of science, and that her plays are now being performed in Europe, North America, and Australia. Fitzmaurice’s expertise in Cavendish scholarship is evident in the helpful annotations conveying not only rich sources of contextual information but also his appreciation of the ironies and humor in Cavendish’s writing, and in his delighted explanations of the many anagrams and initials used in her letters. This thoroughly interesting and enjoyable edition will reward any reader’s attention,

particularly those interested in Restoration literature, women's writing, and seventeenth-century history, culture, and society.

Earl Miner, senior ed. William Moeck, co-ed. Steven Jablonski, corr. ed. *Paradise Lost, 1668-1968: Three Centuries of Commentary*. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 2004. 510 pp. + 25 illus. \$85.00. Review by JOHN MULRYAN, ST. BONAVENTURE UNIVERSITY.

This massive scholia of Milton's *Paradise Lost* is a fitting tribute to Earl Miner, the senior editor, who died while the book was still in press. It is unfortunate, however, that the editors proclaim (on the dust jacket) that a true variorum of *Paradise Lost* is "no longer possible," while one is in fact in preparation at Duquesne University press. The point is reiterated in the introduction, where a new variorum is dismissed as "hypothesis, wishful thinking" (16, col. 2). Instead, the editors provide detailed commentary from seventeen commentators, including themselves (the undated names listed here): Patrick Hume (1695), Joseph Addison (1712), Richard Bentley (1732), The Richardsons, Father and Son (1734), James Paterson (1744), Thomas Newton (1749), Henry John Todd (1801-42), William Cowper (1808), Thomas Keightley (1859), David Masson (1890), A. W. Verity (1920-29), Merritt Y. Hughes (1957), J. M. Sims (1962), Alastair Fowler (1968), Earl Miner, William Moeck, Steven Jablonski. There is also a stimulating chapter detailing the contributions of the early commentators on the poem.

While the earlier choices are excellent, I wonder about the wisdom of listing the three editors as separate commentators on the poem. It might have been better if the editorial voice had been one rather than three, as this (in my opinion) dilutes the force of the earlier commentators, and tempts the editors to deconstruct or reshape earlier commentary in line with their own opinions.

Sometimes two of the editors converge as one, e.g. Miner and Moeck on ll. 289-93 of Book 10 (344, col. 2). At other times Miner joins with Fowler to supply a feminist reading of the contest between Adam and Eve. On Book 10, line 162, both Fowler and Miner are credited with the notion that "Eve speaks one plain line to Adam's evasive nineteen, 125-43. 160-61 suggest that *we* [emphasis mine] draw much the same inferences from that" (341, col. 1). The editorial hand of Miner in particular lays too heavily on the responses of the earlier commentators. He has a strange affection for the

infamous Bentley, who posited the existence of a phantom editor who radically misrepresented Milton's assumed intentions in *Paradise Lost*. For example, on Book 8, line 320, Miner observes that "Bentley's captious insistence on accuracy leads to attention, disproof, and improved understanding" (297, col. 1). Homer may nod, but Bentley keeps us awake (Book 9, ll. 1183-84; 333, col. 2), even when his "pedantry has occasioned tiresome commentary" (Book 10, ll. 523-31; 350, col. 2). At other times Miner is whimsical, even charming. On the perceived sexism of Hume, the Richardsons, and (perhaps) Fowler, he comments ironically that "it is remarkable how gender presumptions are inscribed into the universe" (Book 8, l. 150; 293, col. 1). On Book 8, line 421, "editors have *fused* (emphasis mine) that Milton may be playing on 'numbers' as an antithesis to 'one' and on its Latin sense of 'parts.' Fowler concludes that Milton's primary meaning is that the divine monad contains all other numbers" (299, col. 1). On book 10, line 460, both Newton and Milton come in for a drubbing: "Newton dimly glimpses the formulaic nature of Homeric verse; it is not clear that Milton saw farther" (349, col. 2). And on line 588 of the same book, "it is not clear why this striking 'jingle' escaped the frowns of eighteenth-century critics" (353, col. 2). On Book 9, line 845, he finds Todd "lax" on a usage listed in the *Oxford English Dictionary*, but then suddenly recalls that "of course Todd had no *OED*" (327, col. 1). Then again, Milton also lacked a copy of this essential reference tool!

On Book 10, lines 664-7 (356, col. 2), Dunster "growled" about Milton's winds, while "Newton's quaint comment" that Milton's angels agreed with the medieval schoolmen that the soul died with the body (Book 10, ll. 789-92; 359, col. 2) is a very palpable hit. Finally, in commenting on Book 10, lines 888-95, Miner deconstructs his own interpretation of angelic sex: "I fear this note has wasted everybody's time" (362, col. 1).

Addison is cited very infrequently while other unlisted commentators, like William Empson and C. S. Lewis, are brought in through the back door, so to speak, through Miner's own summary comments on many of the lines and clusters of lines in the poem. Miner is especially good on cross-references, and also adds many enlightening historical observations from the *Oxford English Dictionary*.

An appendix on the illustrations notes that "the Faithome portrait used as a frontispiece [here] is considered the standard depiction of adult Milton" (421, col. 1). The editors also observe that *Paradise Lost* was "the first fully

illustrated long English narrative poem” (421, col. 1), and provide a detailed discussion of the first two illustrated editions (1688 and 1749), whose plates are reproduced in recto and verso before the text of each book of the poem. A series of “excurs” or learned digressions follow the commentary: “The Chronology of the Poem”; “To Compare Great Things [on the style and sublimity of the poem]”; “Personification, Relationship, and Allegory”; “To Venture Down and Up to Re-ascend [images of height and depth in the poem]”; “Politics in the Poem”; “When Satan First Knew Pain”; “Language and Laughter”; “Knowledge Is as Food”; “Music and the Sabbath”; “Cosmology, Astrology, and Belief”; “The Poem’s Irregular Regularities”; “So Called by Allusion”; “The First of the Visions of God”; and “Historical Measures of This Transient World.” A brief bibliography of primary and secondary sources completes the volume.

On balance, Miner’s personal touch and lively wit add a human dimension to an enterprise more often associated with drudgery and impenetrable prose. This last product from Miner’s pen is a poignant reminder of his many contributions to scholarship, and of the great loss we have endured at his passing.

Mark R. Kelley, Michael Lieb, and John T. Shawcross, eds. *Milton and the Grounds of Contention*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 2003. 352 pp. \$60.00. Review by W. SCOTT HOWARD, UNIVERSITY OF DENVER.

Edited collections tend generally to fall into two categories: those that have a unified sense of purpose, and those that do not. *Milton and the Grounds of Contention* gathers ten original essays that contribute substantially (if unevenly) to the field, sharpening our attention to a series of perennial topics examined from fresh perspectives. As the book’s title suggests, there are multiple grounds of Renaissance and early modern contention at work here—literary reception and influence; republican, devotional, and postcolonial poetics; reformation theology; discourses of gender, subjectivity, and property law; sectarianism; textual studies and authorial intention—these among the more conspicuous interpretive perspectives devised and defended by the contributors. The volume’s ten chapters (individually and collectively) are certainly engaging and important on their own merits, but they don’t quite work together toward a common goal.

*Milton and the Grounds of Contention* is dedicated to “Joseph Wittreich in recognition of and in thankful appreciation for his penetrating studies of John Milton’s life and works, and their afterlife” (10), and the book includes, as an appendix, a bibliography of Wittreich’s selected publications. Only six of the ten chapters respond directly to Wittreich’s scholarship, however, and those points of critical contact vary considerably. The bibliography is certainly useful, but would have been even more valuable if it were annotated. The collection unfortunately lacks a concluding essay that may otherwise have afforded an opportunity for the editors (or for a special guest contributor) to reflect synthetically upon the volume’s engagement with Wittreich’s work. True, the “Introduction” nods in that direction, but only in the most general terms, verging at times toward surprisingly vague language. For example, in one of the introduction’s defining paragraphs—just before the requisite chapter summaries—a noticeable vagueness belies the collection’s unified ground of contention concerning “these issues” (3-4). In all fairness, however, I should also underscore—with slight modification—the editors’ most explicit statement as to the book’s overall thematic organization: The first three chapters address Milton’s influence upon neglected women authors of the late seventeenth century and the eighteenth century; chapters four through six investigate cultural and philosophical contexts for reading *Paradise Lost*; chapters seven and eight reevaluate current scholarly attitudes toward *Samson Agonistes*, *Paradise Regained*, and other minor works that inflect the full development of Milton’s theology; and the final two chapters examine, within larger cultural contexts, specific aspects of Milton’s theology and belief that continue to provoke divergent arguments from Milton scholars (4). This review will now accordingly follow that outline.

In “The Deleterious and the Exalted: Milton’s Poetry in the Eighteenth Century,” John Shawcross checks the predominant view (from Samuel Johnson to twentieth-century critics, such as F. R. Leavis) of the “line of wit” in eighteenth-century English literature, arguing that a parallel, Miltonic “line of vision” also exists in the century for “poets from the middle or even lower middle class and notably [for] poetic women” (16). Within and against such a context of neo-classical dislike for Milton’s exalted (if deleterious) achievements, Shawcross rescues from the archive a generous gathering of poems by men and women who singly and collectively contribute to the legacy of Milton’s literary influence: for example, John Hoadly’s “To Mrs. Bowes with

y<sup>e</sup> force of Truth, an Oratorio. Sonnet in imitation of Milton" (1743); Charlotte McCarthy's *The Fair Moralist* (1745); and Mrs. Anne [MacIver] Grant's *Poems on Various Subjects, by Mrs. Grant, Laggan* (1803). In his final reflection upon the chapter's effort to expand the eighteenth-century literary canon, Shawcross notes that "some of the judgements about Milton's presence and influence cannot be totally sound until more attention is paid to more of the 'lesser' male poets and to all of the women poets of that era" (33). This first chapter also includes—beyond Shawcross's copious endnotes—a useful appendix of additional poems published between 1653 and 1757 that demonstrate various influences from Milton's shorter poems.

David Norbrook challenges the notion that "republicanism or Whiggery was antagonistic to the most advanced women thinkers of the [seventeenth century]" (38) in his chapter, "John Milton, Lucy Hutchinson and the Republican Biblical Epic." Through a contextualized reading of the politics and poetics of *Order and Disorder*, Norbrook concludes that Hutchinson's epic "closely parallels" *Paradise Lost* "in its literary and ideological projects" yet also strikes a more conservative stance on three significant points: orthodox Calvinist theology, the Trinity, and double predestination (50). Sharon Achinstein's "Pleasure by Description?: Elizabeth Singer Rowe's Enlightened Milton" underscores the extent to which imitations of the Miltonic style could bear "contradictory political or ideological meanings... even as his political identity remained clearly antimonarchical" into the early eighteenth century (65). Rowe's "A Description of Hell. In Imitation of Milton" provides a convincing case, following Achinstein's analysis, to "see how the Whig Milton could be, in addition to a defender of political liberty, also a religious Dissenter" (66).

As a corrective to the "Burke problem"—that is, what could explain Edmund Burke's ideological shift from a robust defense (*ca.* 1770) of the American Revolution to an attack (*ca.* 1790) against the French Revolution—Annabel Patterson invokes the pivotal influence of Milton's poetics and politics. Patterson's chapter, "Inventing Postcolonialism: Edmund Burke's *Paradise Lost* and Regained," considers striking allusions to *Paradise Lost* and *Paradise Regained* in Burke's "On Conciliation" and "Reflections on the Revolution in France" to assert that, in 1775, Milton's epic affirmed Burke's "fully developed philosophy of the Western empire, part tragic, part epic, part utopian foresight" (90). Peter Medine's "Gratitude and *Paradise Lost*: A Neglected Context" addresses the key role of dialogic discourse in the epic *vis-à-vis*

notions of gratitude from Philo of Alexandria to Aquinas to the Geneva Bible. The resolution to *Paradise Lost*, Medine argues, thematizes both gratitude and ingratitude by intensifying “the ambiguities of the expulsion through clashing perspectives on the prospects of achieving the Christian ideal and the paradise within the postlapsarian world” (116). According to Lynne Greenberg, Milton’s refashioning of the myths of Adam and Eve contributes progressively to “seventeenth century struggles over both property and gender” (151). In “Paradise Enclosed and the *Feme Covert*,” Greenberg studies *Paradise Lost* with regard to contemporary “debates over law, land and women” that culminated, later in the century, in substantive revisions to legal definitions and divisions of property that would establish a framework for women’s property rights (151).

In “Choice and Election in *Samson Agonistes*,” Susanne Woods evaluates Milton’s revision of the Samson legend with consideration to a current critical divide among Miltonists: whether (as Joseph Wittreich argues) *Samson Agonistes* concludes by emphasizing both ambiguity within and ambivalence toward Samson’s interior struggle to become a prophetic figure; or whether (as Barbara Lewalski holds) the poem portrays an emerging public hero who finally instructs the Chorus “who represents the Hebrew people” (174). This difference of opinion in fact turns out to be “exactly what [Milton] wanted,” according to Woods, because *Samson* “is preeminently about choice”—that is, about exhorting the reader to determine his or her own understanding of God’s word (175). As a challenge to the long-standing disesteem for the “awkwardness . . . in form and style” (188) of the early ode, “Upon the Circumcision,” John Rogers claims that this minor lyric actually plays a pivotal role in the arc of Milton’s theology by unwittingly exposing “the troubled origins of the liberal theologies of early modern England” (189). Rogers supports his chapter, “Milton’s Circumcision,” with a double thesis: that Milton’s wariness about the Atonement shapes his poem’s equivocal (if not contradictory) stance toward circumcision as a sign of not only repellent Calvinist passivity required in matters of personal salvation, but also of rational, virtuous, “obedient and chaste submission to the law” (212-3).

In the wake of the authorship controversy initiated by William Hunter in 1991, John Rumrich traces the reception history of *De doctrina Christiana* and critiques the historical and the stylistic methodologies employed in the more recently published committee report (1997) on the topic. Rumrich’s

chapter, “The Provenance of *De doctrina Christiana*. A View of the Present State of the Controversy,” advances the following determinations: that Milton may indeed “be confidently identified as the author”; that both the general, historical committee and the stylometric subcommittee failed to communicate effectively with one another and did not “take their own evidence into account”; and that we may “never receive an adequate answer concerning authorial revision of a document of such complex authorial genesis, one that is moreover so internally inconsistent as to be self-contradictory” (232-3). And finally, in “Milton and the Socinian Heresy,” Michael Lieb investigates two major issues: the emergence of Socinianism vis-à-vis Milton’s views on Christian doctrine and discipline; and the critical reception of Milton’s works, following his death, within modern contexts of Socinian practice. Lieb concludes that Socinianism deeply influenced both radical and conservative strains in Milton’s religious thought and that—as is the case with the authorship controversy over *De doctrina Christiana*—“the debate over the heterodox Milton, as opposed to the orthodox Milton” (283) will persist as an open ground of contention.

Jonathan Gil Harris. *Sick Economies: Drama, Mercantilism, and Disease in Shakespeare’s England*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004. 263 pp. \$49.95. Reviewed by BYRON NELSON, WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY.

Because of our habit of conspicuous consumption, Americans have long been the envy of the world. As a result, it’s hard to reflect back to a time when “consumption” was an incurable, debilitating wasting disease. While syphilis and canker have lost their economic implications, consumption has been transformed into an economic virtue. Jonathan Gil Harris reminds us, in this deft study, that “metaphors of infectious disease . . . continue to organize popular understanding of the economic.” He shows how Elizabethan and Jacobean playwrights eagerly seized on pathological images to flesh out narratives of mercantilism, and how by implication the birth of early modern capitalism was assisted by images of disease. The playwrights who staged the emergence of modern capitalism are a familiar lot: Shakespeare, Massinger, Heywood, Ben Jonson, Middleton and Dekker; while the early modern economic theorists are for the most part unfamiliar to literary scholars. Among these, Thomas Starkey worried that a nation’s wealth would be diminished by

consumption, palsy, and frenzy. Although he warned against conspicuous consumption as zealously as a medieval Franciscan might have, Thomas Smith provided a judgment-free explanation of international commerce as it was developing in early modern England. Gerard Malynes warned that no object of value is safe from infection. Thomas Milles noted the threats to national trading from entities, practices and goods. And Thomas Mun employed a vocabulary of pathology to depict the problems of international commerce. Harris calls his chosen mercantilist writers—Malynes, Milles, Misselden and Mun—the “four Ms,” and readers of this book should thank him for rescuing them from the dustier shelves of Renaissance libraries, if their ideas are as provocative as Harris makes them seem. Long before Adam Smith, these writers were the first to explain the national economy, and to do so they instinctively used imagery of the diseased body.

In the same spirit as the mercantilist writers, Shakespeare links syphilis and commerce in *The Comedy of Errors*, and he worries about “transnational contamination” in the much darker *Troilus and Cressida*. (Somewhat surprisingly, there is no extended discussion of the role of the pox in the Vienna of *Measure for Measure*.) Shakespeare imagines the early modern state besieged by immigrants and merchants in *The Merchant of Venice*. Harris insists that the identity and national status of the Jew is not a solvable problem in this play, and that hence recently scholarly efforts to find the “real” identity of Shylock are beside the point. In the chapter on Shylock on usury, Harris quotes in full an otherwise unknown “Dutch Church Libel,” a poetic pasquinade which had been sent to one of the “stranger churches” of Elizabethan London. Since the slander somewhat bizarrely compares the immigrant Dutch workers to the Jews (“like the Jews, you eat us up as bread”), it both illuminates the anti-Semitism of *Merchant* and offers a sobering reply to the cheerful assimilation of “Hans,” the supposed Dutch shoemaker, into Simon Eyre’s shoe factory in *The Shoemaker’s Holiday*.

The three subsequent chapters turn to non-Shakespearean plays. For Harris, *Volpone* is a satirical portrait of greed, in which the title character is a voracious CEO of a transnational corporation. Two pirate dramas, the unfamiliar *The Renegado* by Massinger and *The Fair Maid of the West* by Thomas Heywood, are used to support the argument that pirate drama, with its vocabulary of treasure, is imbued or infected with mercantilist discourse. The Barbary corsairs of Massinger’s play pose a clear threat to the Christian West,

while the pirates of Heywood's play anticipate their descendents in modern bodice-ripping romances and Hollywood pirate movies in their rapacious quest for bullion. Like blood and semen coursing through the male body, Harris speculates, bullion is the life-blood of the international economic "body." In his chapter on Thomas Middleton's plays, Harris makes a distinction between the playwright's earlier economic views and those found in his later plays. In *Michaelmas Term*, Middleton views consumption more negatively, as the loss of health and wealth. By *The Roaring Girl* (1611), Middleton takes a view closer to that of the mercantilist writer Thomas Mun, who anticipated the modern view of material consumption as a form of venture capital; in the later play, Middleton even sees consumption as a form of "retail therapy." The book also reminds us of the irony that the early modern playhouse was frequently cited as a nursery of contagion and that the authorities, who were always happy to close down the theatres for their potential for political subversion, could use the threat of plague as an excuse to shut the theatre doors.

By the end of the study, Harris shows the playwrights abandoning the imagery of the pathological body in favor of a more modern and more positive conception of the mercantilist capitalist economy. By then, the nation's economic well-being was seen to depend on consumption—if not quite to the extent of modern America, where citizens are accustomed to being admonished as unpatriotic if they don't spend huge amounts on consumer goods as Christmas presents.

Harris's study has some affinities with earlier books that relate the imagery of the diseased body to early modern drama, such as Gail Kern Paster's *The Body Embarrassed*. But this book says much that is original and is engagingly written. There are some eye-catching insights, such as "*Volpone* is teeming with drugs," and witty one-liners, such as when it describes Gerard Malynes's economic tract, *Saint George for England Allegorically Described*, as "a boiled-down *Faerie Queene* set in Lombard Street." Of Bassanio's casket scene in *The Merchant of Venice*, Harris says, "In what might seem like an unholy marriage of the Eurovision Song Contest and *The Love Connection*, Portia is both the M.C. and the prize..." This book offers great insight into the Renaissance discourses of the body, the emergence of mercantile theory, and early modern drama.

Julia Crick and Alexandra Walsham, eds. *The Uses of Script and Print, 1300-1700*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. xiv + 298 pp. + 6 illus. Review by WILLIAM E. ENGEL, UNIVERSITY OF THE SOUTH, SEWANEE.

Readers interested in what used to fall under the heading of “History of the Book” will welcome this timely and provocative corrective to literacy studies. And yet, as Margaret Astron writes in her Epilogue to this collation that will make us “more conscious of the mutability of exchange that operated in the early modern period between the spoken, handwritten and printed” (289), the word “revisionism” does not appear, and “interaction” rather than “impact” is used to “describe the dynamism of texts, their makers, owners, readers, users and hearers” (275).

Along these lines, the bibliographic references in these essays, each of which focuses intently on specific elements and local conditions in the diverse and fluid culture of script and print, trace important developments in all aspects of the history of literacy. The notes in the editors’ introduction alone could well form the reading list of any serious student of early modern cultural studies, and serve as a checklist for those of us currently researching either side of the long standing divide between the scribal tradition and print culture. For, as is pointed out early on, this “opposition between the two media is institutionalized in libraries in which the ‘Rare Books’ and ‘Manuscript’ rooms occupy separate spaces and are frequented by different sets of readers” (4). This volume goes a long way toward helping scholars rethink the rationale for such a split, and offers useful insights for setting a new agenda.

Many of these essays emphasize that long after the introduction of mechanized press, scribal copying remained economically and politically viable. Indeed, it is shown to have been “a competitive technology for transmitting texts even after 1700” (9). As others have previously pointed out, early printed books often took the form and typographical layout of manuscripts; this volume makes the reverse case as well, pointing out that bureaucratic documents “such as indulgence certificates and legal contracts” simulated medieval chancery hands, and that “both incunables and marriage charters sometimes left the printers unfinished, with the expectation that initials, decoration and even text would be added by hand” (16). This collection encourages scholars to reconceptualize the boundaries between script and print in terms of “inter-

mixture and hybridity” (12). Each essay is filled with close encounters with the sets of problems attending modes of communication within specific communities, which, regrettably, owing to limitations of space, can be mentioned only in the briefest of ways *seriatim* in hope of indicating the broad readership this book warrants.

In the first section, on late medieval religion, Felicity Riddy seeks to answer the question, “Before the introduction of printing into England, how did authors publish their works?” (29). This leads to a subtle discussion of the range of meanings given to the Middle English “publisshen,” which “is closely related to speech; ‘publisshen’ means ‘announce,’ ‘proclaim,’ ‘divulge’ (as in divulge a secret), ‘spread abroad’ (as in gossip or news), ‘propagate,’ ‘publicise,’ ‘become known’” (41). The essay concludes with an account of the textual transmissions of Julian of Norwich and Margery Kempe. David d’Avray looks at the book production that lay behind the popular preaching of the friars, and concludes that with “both heretical and orthodox religion, the combination of manuscript copying and oral dissemination should not be underestimated” (68). It should be recalled, and as this essay bears out in an appendix, “scribes acted as authors or editors, modifying the text they copied more or less freely in ways that made sense: i.e. we are not talking of scribal errors” (69). James G. Clark reminds us of the dangers “in exaggerating the discontinuities that emerged in the European shift from manuscript to moveable metal types” and makes a compelling case that the Benedictines played an important role in the promotion of printing (72). Moreover, on the eve of the Dissolution, “the monasteries were well stocked with a wide range of newly printed material” (75). Long before the printing press abetted religious radicals in the 1520s, as Clark demonstrates, “it had already come to occupy an honored position at the very heart of the religious establishment” (90).

In the next section, on the textual tradition, Anthony Musson explores how “the embodiment of law in written text affected the authority of the law and knowledge of its precepts both within the legal profession and among the general populace at large” (95). Musson reminds us that private collections of statutes and official documents, purchased through teams of manuscript copiers and later put in book form, were, for the most part, in Anglo-Norman. Indeed, French achieved respectability as a language of government, “a status not accorded to English until the fifteenth century” (99). Further, the spoken word remained important “not only in court (where

oral pleadings and the personal evidence of witnesses and jurors were paramount), but also in the conveyance of royal will through proclamations” (114). Julia Crick is concerned with the art of the unprinted, for manuscripts “eluded the regular scrutiny of the state” (116). With a focus on Coke and Selden, among other collectors, she pursues the implications of the “particular authority attached to the singular, hand-written word” (134). Readers of this journal will welcome Scott Mandelbrote’s consideration of the “practical and intellectual problems created by the editing of Scripture and the translation and publication of the Bible in English, especially during the seventeenth century” (136). He focuses primarily on “the relationship between the compromises made by printers and scholars transmitting the text of Scripture and changes in attitudes to the authority of the Bible” (137). Among his findings is the fact that, by the late eighteenth century, tens of thousands of “errors” in the printed text of the Bible could be traced to the italics from the Cambridge editors to indicate words that were not present in the original Hebrew or Greek. “Print was in fact a much less certain medium than early modern Protestant commentators would have liked it to be” (139).

In the third section, on speech, Andrew Butcher investigates “practical literacy” by questioning why records contain so much apparently “superfluous” detail and “why communities go to such lengths to preserve and store such records” (162). His test case is the port town of Hythe, which had trading connection to France, the Low Countries, the North Sea basin, and especially the east coast of England from as far north as Newcastle, which made for a “‘speech/text community’ of some size and complexity” (163). To be sure though, as is taken into account and analyzed, what survives must be seen not so much as accident but as archival choice (167). Christopher Marsh is concerned with the extent to which melody made meaning. His is a fascinating account of the way printed tunes functioned beyond visual symbols of melodic sound, and he calls for more serious attention to how music “does not often engage our conscious minds by stimulating us to think articulate thoughts about its role in our lives” (176). He is able to show, among other things, the way ballad-writers were able to popularize William of Orange in a song that was strongly associated with songs celebrating the defeat of the Spanish Armada a century earlier (187). Jonathan Barry looks at the contested civic culture of communication in Bristol “during the period most commonly identified with the emergence of this new public sphere, namely

1640-1714" (192).

The final section on persecution begins with Alexandra Walsham's account of how speech frequently remained "essential in authenticating and mediating texts to a body of auditors" (212). Of special interest is the observation that for Quakers, who spent long periods in custody, "books were an important replacement for communal interaction" (220). The reverse is considered as well, for when religious communities achieved a position of monopoly and dominance, "they had less need for manuscript and printed texts" (232). Thomas S. Freeman turns attention to the Marian Protestants, who tended to rely "more heavily on the written than the printed words as a means of communicating with their followers" (235). This leads to a careful examination of the conditions of incarceration, for "a Marian prison was only as secure as its gaolers" (239). Ann Hughes contributes to our understanding of Thomas Edwards's *Gangraena* (1646), seen as an exemplar of the power of print in mid-seventeenth-century England, which vividly demonstrates how it could "define, persuade, and mobilize" (257).

Taken together, this collection provides useful insights into "noisy reading" in the wake of so much recent scholarship on silent reading (278), as well as about how the handwritten page provided opportunities for circulating works among known groups for a variety of reasons, as has been observed by literary historians most notably regarding Shakespeare's sonnets and the publication of poems by Marlowe and Donne (282). Above all, this volume must make the historian and literary critic pause and consider the myriad uses of memory, speech, script, and print which tended to overlap and intermingle in important—and sometimes overlooked—ways.

Nancy E. Wright, Margaret Ferguson, A. R. Buck, eds. *Women, Property, and the Letters of the Law in Early Modern England*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004. ix + 304 pp. \$65.00. Review by NANCY M. BUNKER, MACON STATE COLLEGE.

*Women, Property, and the Letters of the Law in Early Modern England*, an interdisciplinary examination of women's legal status and property relationships, directs attention away from the "well-known narrative about women's legal disabilities in the common law regime" and toward women whose actions "shift" established parameters to "indicate the letter of the law was neither

definitive nor irremediable” (4). Editors Nancy E. Wright, Margaret Ferguson, and A. R. Buck collected thirteen important essays, each with its own attention to interdisciplinary analysis and multi-genre texts, in order to foreground the less studied “competing narratives of property told by and about women as subjects and agents in commercial and domestic economies” (5). Women’s lived experience, as revealed through case study, literature, letters, and legal documents, emerges in these essays that articulate selfhood and active agency.

Part One: “Credit, Commerce, and Women’s Property Relationships” examines the shaping of women’s roles by law and by discourses of commerce, contract, and credit. Patricia Parker investigates commercial and contractual promissory language in Shakespeare’s *The Winter’s Tale*. Her concentration upon the reproductive metaphors of pregnancy, gestation, or delivery of “issue” also includes usury (lending on the basis of credit) for new insights between the temporal and the legal in interpersonal relationships. Customary tenure, which allowed women to inherit property and thus insert themselves into the commercial arena, is the subject of Christine Churches’s “Putting Women in Their Place: Female Litigants at Whitehaven, 1660-1760.” Using archival letters from the estates of Sir John and James Lowther, Churches illuminates an understudied issue. Recording women as formidable litigants—as landowners or part owners of ships, lenders seeking payment for debts or goods and services provided (52-53)—Churches makes clear the differences among multiple jurisdictions that might influence property settlements in the early modern period. In an essay that speaks to the Consistory Court as protecting women and defending their sexual reputation or “propriety” in order to secure their marital or marriageable status, David Lemmings addresses the crucial nature of such courts for the “ordinary women who could not afford to pursue suits in equity” (75). Defending one’s sexual honor applied to prostitutes as well; Laura Rosenthal analyzes two popular biographies of the notorious prostitute Sally Salisbury and explores ways in which her “ownership of, and property in, the body” created an estate. Her whorish “combination of avarice and prodigality—or getting and spending—epitomizes the mobile and imaginary qualities of property itself in the emergent capitalist economy” (113).

In Part Two, “Women, Social Reproduction, and Patrilineal Inheritance,” essays address family property distribution and its multiple legal boundaries. Mary Murray’s argument, the single male-centered essay in this volume, sug-

gests the ancient practice of primogeniture as “resurrective,” since the immediate property transfer links the dead, the living, and the yet unborn (121). Symbolically, inheritance confers immortality through renewal of property rights; an “act of birth albeit of social rather than biological life” the “economic generation” (128,129) belongs to men and keeps the dead alive within the community. Women’s status in *Measure for Measure*, according to Natasha Korda, becomes repositioned from broken nuptials of impoverished gentlewomen to “propertied brides” (153). She argues that the play relieves society of its “placeless single women as a threat to economy” (138). Heiresses Elizabeth Wiseman and Lady Anne Clifford, wealthy propertied women who refuse to become merely commodified assets, inform Mary Chan and Nancy E. Wright’s examination of the “liberty” (162) both women act to retain legal rights as property owners and maintain their personhood. While confronting the legal system, both held to their belief that “alienable property, is an attribute of a person which cannot be sold or exchanged” (163). Ownership and identity became synonymous, and through protracted battles, letters and diaries reveal efforts to define an individual life. The final essay in this section explores the post-Restoration legal developments that protected aristocratic estates by preventing fraudulent transactions and preserving legitimate titles. A. E. Buck foregrounds aristocratic property and the consequences for women and notes the change in women’s legal status as evidenced by Shakespeare and Nahum Tate’s *King Lear*. Inheritance fails for Cordelia in Shakespeare—“all is lost” (190)—but Tate illustrates that the “land-family nexus” has been worked out through inheritance; Cordelia’s legitimacy as a wife and daughter “allows for the perpetuation” and landed family (191).

Part Three’s section, “Women’s Authorship and Ownership: Matrices for Emergent Ideas of Intellectual Property,” contains several notable essays that reevaluate the interconnectivity of selfhood and literary property. Jennifer Summit’s “Writing Home: Hannah Wolley, the Oxinden Letters and Household Epistolary Practice” argues for women’s letters as an “alternative model of property—one whose defining characteristic is not individual ownership but the state of ongoing negotiation and exchange to which the letters owe their existence” (203). Sample letters of Wolley’s provided in her work of instruction, *Supplement to the Queen-like Closet*, furnish models for gentlewomen’s discourse and provide a “shaping role” to young women preparing for domestic life (210). The self as property emerges in the Oxinden household

where questions of property and ownership that “revolved around courtship, marriage, and service, found appropriate rhetorical form in letters” (210). Katherine Oxiden, as Mistress of the household, provides the “female education and surrogacy she experienced as ward in Oxinden family” (216) and privileges the letter writing practice. Personal property exists after death, as Lloyd Davis’s essay on women’s wills suggests. Wills, which women wrote or dictated, were shaped by and subsequently shaped the testator’s legacy, and although authorial intention and voice conformed to formulaic legal discourse, wills evidence “elite” and ordinary women’s involvement in producing texts and representing themselves. The published wills of Dorothy Leigh, Elizabeth Jocelin, and Elizabeth Richardson, according to Davis, reveal “discursive agency” (233) in their critiques of patriarchal inheritance and property laws.

Modern day intellectual property laws owe a debt to the Benedictine Nuns of Cambrai, as Claire Walker describes in her essay. The Cambrai asserted their right to retain as “spiritual property” manuscripts derived from collaboration in the writings of Augustine Baker. Baker acknowledged that the nuns advanced his spiritual method and enlisted them to disseminate his writings (244, 246), but when they promoted other methods as well, Baker sought recovery. Through this stance, the nuns helped to define “what property was and in whose name it could be secured, alienated, and/or transmitted to posterity” (17). Personal property also applies to names, as Eleanor Shevlin’s analysis of female surnames in titles of eighteenth-century fiction shows. She investigates two noncanonical novels, *The History of Betty Barnes* (1753) and *The Memoirs of a Magdalen: The History of Louisa Mildmay* (1767), and argues that the laws governing property rights mark the relationships between property and gender in these texts. Paul Salzman’s “Early Modern (Aristocratic) Women and Textual Property” offers an intriguing look into the ways Lady Anne Clifford and Margaret Cavendish determine private ownership and control over their writings, and influence audience reception. Clifford’s diaries and *Great Books* express “defiance of attempts to silence her” (283), and Cavendish, while seeing herself as an author, “manipulated the reader’s first experience of one of her books” with engraved frontispieces and introductory poems to reinforce the “legitimacy of her ventures” (289). This volume’s “Afterward” by Margreta DeGrazia offers fitting closure in its treatment of the common law of coverture. With its bar on women owning,

inheriting, or purchasing property, the gendered law deprived personhood, but as this collection reveals, women did find ways to obtain or have conferred upon them agency long before their full right to private property. DeGrazia also notes that men did not enjoy absolute power to retain and dispose of their property as wished; marriage was to benefit both parties rather than any one individual.

*Women, Property and the Letters of the Law in Early Modern England* furnishes fresh insights and clear analysis of the era's most intriguing social and legal practices. Renaissance and Restoration scholars as well as modern and legal historians will relish each essay's scope and diverse resources and students of gender relations especially will note the vital link between women's active agency—often dismissed or diminished—and property law.

Stefano Villani, ed. *A True Account of the Great Tryals and Cruel Sufferings Undergone by those Two Faithful Servants of God, Katherine Evans and Sarah Cheevers: La vicenda di due quacchere prigioniere dell'inquisizione di Malta*. Pisa: Scuola Normale Superiore, 2003. xiv + 366pp. + 4 illus. 30,00. Paper. Review by JULIE D. CAMPBELL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY.

In the introduction to his edition of *A True Account of the Great Tryals and Cruel Sufferings Undergone by those Two Faithful Servants of God, Katherine Evans and Sarah Cheevers*, Villani documents the experiences of Evans (ca. 1618-1692) and Cheevers (ca. 1608-1664) during their missionary journeys. In the process, he provides an overview of Quakerism during this period, beginning with its inception ca. 1647 with the followers of George Fox. Making excellent use of archival sources from Rome, Pisa, Malta, Florence, Venice, the Vatican, and the British Library, as well as numerous other sources, Villani constructs an engaging narrative that traces the paths of Evans and Cheevers from their earliest connections with Quakerism to their ill-fated voyage to Alexandria, which was curtailed by their incarceration by the Inquisition from 1659-1662 on Malta. He also describes their liberation, their return to England, and the travels that they undertook afterwards, undeterred by the hardships that they had suffered.

Beginning with Evans's personal history, Villani describes how Thomas Murford of Inglesbatch heard the charismatic Quaker preacher John Audland at Bristol and brought him to Inglesbatch in 1654. One result of his preach-

ing there was “almost certainly” the conversion of Murford’s wife, her brother John Evans, and his wife Katherine (4). Villani posits that Katherine’s missionary activities began before 1656, when she was forced by the authorities to leave the Isle of Man. He notes that from there she went on to Ireland where she “had an encounter” with Henry Cromwell, the second son of Oliver Cromwell. We are told that Evans, true to form, attempted to convert Henry to Quakerism (7). After meeting with trouble in Ireland, Evans returned to England, where her problems continued. Villani traces the violent encounters and incarcerations experienced by Evans and numerous other Quakers working in the same areas during this period. Especially in his section on “Missioni Quacchere a Roma e a Gerusalemme,” Villani examines the activities of John Perrot, John Luffe, George Robinson, and others who undertook extraordinary journeys to Rome and the Holy Lands (15-20).

Regarding Cheevers’s early years, Villani notes that less is known about her first encounters with Quakerism than is known about Evans’s. However, since Cheevers came from the same region in England as Evans, it is quite likely that their experiences were similar. Although sources suggest that the two met in London in February of 1658, Villani speculates that “è infatti molto probabile che le due donne avessero partecipato insieme ad alcune assemblee quacchere” [it is in fact very probable that the two women had participated together in some Quaker assemblies] in or near Bath before 1658, since their homes were in Inglesbatch and Slaughterford, respectively (22).

Speculation about their first encounters aside, Villani’s discussion of their voyage and incarceration together is comprised of interesting details gleaned in part from commentaries by Catholic authorities that document their time in Italy upon arriving in Livorno 24 November 1658, their arrival on Malta on 21 December 1658, and their ensuing imprisonment. Regarding Malta in particular, Villani includes items ranging from records of their inability to communicate in Italian or Latin with the nuns they encountered (although they gave the nuns a tract in Latin by George Fox) to comments on their clothing (described as being a bit like that of monks), to details of their interrogations and descriptions of the priests and monks with whom they interacted (27-44). In his sections “Una visita” and “Il ritorno a casa,” Villani covers the visit of the London Quaker Daniel Baker to Evans and Cheevers in prison and their eventual release and return to London aboard *The Sapphire* in 1663 (61-

68). Finally, in “Di nuovo in viaggio,” he traces the last missionary journeys the two women undertook before their deaths.

Also in the introduction, Villani examines the publication history of documents associated with Evans and Cheevers, including Daniel Baker’s work based on information from them, *This is a short Relation of some of the Cruel Sufferings (For the Truths sake) of Katherine Evans and Sarah Cheevers in the Inquisition of the Isle of Malta* (1662); *To all People upon the face of the Earth: A sweet Salutation and a clear Manifestation of the True Light, which lighteth every one who cometh into the World* (1662) by Sarah Cheevers; and *A brief discovery of God’s Eternal Truth* (1662) by Evans, as well as *A True Account...*, written mostly by Evans.

The second part of Villani’s volume is his edition of *A True Account...*, based on the 1663 edition printed in London for R. Wilson. Like the 1663 edition, Villani’s also contains *A short Relation from George Robinson, of the Sufferings which befel him in his Journey to Jersalem; and how God saved him from the hands of Cruelty, when the Sentence of Death was passed against him*. It should be noted that *A True Account...* is comprised of numerous short works, including Daniel Baker’s “Epistle to the Readers,” Evans’s account of prison experiences, letters from both women to family and friends, and songs of praise. Additionally, Villani’s volume contains Evans’s *A Brief Discovery...* and Cheevers’s *To all People...*

The third part of this volume contains transcriptions of the Italian and Latin interrogation documents written during Evans and Cheevers’s incarceration, as well as a bibliography of Evans’s and Cheevers’s manuscripts. The whole of Villani’s volume is copiously footnoted, with care given to documenting the biblical sources of Evans’s and Cheevers’s writings. To that end, Villani includes a special index to the biblical passages cited in the work.

In general, this volume would be of great interest to scholars of Quakerism, as well as to those who are especially interested in the activities of Evans and Cheevers. Many such scholars would welcome an English translation of the introduction. Villani’s work provides a compelling look at the experiences of Quakers during this period, as well as gathering key texts pertaining to Evans and Cheevers into one well-annotated volume.

Laurel Amtower and Dorothea Kehler, eds. *The Single Woman in Medieval and Early Modern England: Her Life and Representation*. Tempe, Arizona: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2003. xx + 242 pp. + 6 illus. \$35.00. Review by LISSA BEAUCHAMP, UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA.

This collection of essays explores the history, both practical and figurative, of the single woman in medieval and early modern England. The conception of the “single woman,” as opposed to that of the married woman, is perhaps deliberately determined to overstep the proper boundaries of such a categorization. In other words, the editors establish the category of the single woman in comparison (rather than strict opposition) to “non-single” woman—“since at some stage in her life, if only the earliest, every female is single, every woman is a life-cycle single woman and grist for our mill” (ix). The single woman is thus virgin, betrothed but not yet married, widow, and even in some cases married but abstaining from or resisting marital relations. Amtower and Kehler acknowledge the “dizzying picture” that this approach presents, and it is undeniably useful, in a critical sense, to complicate the notion of any kind of categorization. Interesting as such an approach is, however, the collection of essays that follows is at times too dizzying to really develop the historical conception of the single woman as a coherent category, even if it does overlap into other life-cycle categories.

The eleven essays are arranged under four sub-headings, designed to examine by turn the celebration of celibacy, the deferral of marriage, the liminality of widowhood, and finally the significance of virginity (this last subsection would likely make more sense if placed at the beginning rather than at the end of the volume). Part I: Celebrating Celibacy focusses on the medieval period, with essays on Anglo-Norman single woman saints (Jane Zatta), variations on the fifteenth-century legends of St. Katherine of Alexandria (Paul Price), and Malory’s use of the single woman as a determining signifier of the masculine (single man) virtue of chivalry (Dorsey Armstrong). Zatta’s and Price’s articles are nicely complementary: the former evokes the Anglo-Norman saints’ subversive moral victories when obeying higher authority in order to assert independence from ecclesiastical control, while the latter traces the development of one saint’s hagiography in order to depict the alchemical transformation of martyrdom. Katherine’s pagan preference for the ideal

spouse is then typologically fulfilled in her *Sponsa Christi* conviction later in her life. Her stated preference then dictates her choice to re-envision “married” life with a different kind of spouse, again subverting the usual expectation of marriage through the assertion of virtuous choice. Armstrong’s concern to conflate the masculine singularity of Lancelot and other knights of the *Arthurian* as dependent on the defence of single women is interesting too, and serves as a useful bridge to the next section: with marriage, the knight becomes less knightly and the lady less in need of defence, and so the deferral of marriage serves to clarify identity for both genders.

Part II: Repudiating Marriage considers the versatility of money-lending as an occupation that allowed late Tudor and Stuart Englishwomen to remain single by choice (Judith M. Spicksley), and John Lyly’s alternatives to marriage as a generic conclusion for comedy in the Elizabethan court (Jacqueline Vanhoutte). Spicksley’s essay thoughtfully opens the discussion of the economic status of early modern single women, establishing that, contrary to received knowledge that women were entirely dependent on men regardless of marital status, women had a number of viable economic choices to support themselves in single life, and furthermore, that this economic versatility was in fact exercised—by single and married women alike. Vanhoutte’s examination of Elizabeth’s “exceptional” status as a single woman suffers somewhat from an insistence on a literal interpretation of the single state of the queen, and so mistakes the complications of “early modern society’s rigid system of categorization” (102). That Elizabeth actually retained her non-marital status on the basis of being metaphorically married to her people or the state complicates such assumptions of rigid categorization in the period. In her reliance on feminist scholarship of the early 80’s, such as Linda T. Fitz (1980) and Suzanne Hull (1982), Vanhoutte fails to recognize the subtlety of how marital figures and tropes sustained Elizabeth’s independence. The critical notion that “chastity, silence, and obedience” must always be undesirable for women, and thus necessarily compelled, hampers the otherwise interesting insights into Lyly’s quasi-disruption of the comedic genre through the use of relationships other than heterosexual marriage to resolve the plots of his plays. Many of Lyly’s alternatives depend on the desirability of a marital relationship if only to present variations of it.

Part III: Imaginary Widowhood includes Amtower’s and Jeanie Grant Moore’s re-assessments of Chaucer’s widows, and Allison Levy’s examina-

tion of widow portraiture as an expression of masculine anxiety in the Restoration period. Amtower's consideration of Chaucer's Dido and Cleopatra (from *Legend of Good Women*), Criseyde, and the Wife of Bath as widows, presents a wide-ranging set of characteristics for this sub-category of the single woman. From pathetic to noble, from self-silenced iconic figures to more or less successful speakers, the widow "manipulate[s] social judgment and create[s] a space" (132) for individually determined status. Moore's focus on the Wife of Bath in the subsequent essay then follows nicely, drawing out the liminal nature of the widow: she is both married and single, controller and controlled, and discursively androgynous, thereby managing "to invert the rules and demonstrate new possibilities for a woman as wife" through her present status as "between" marriages (146). Levy's article, like Armstrong's at the end of the first section, offers a useful summation of the widowhood sub-category as well as a nice connection to the final section. In this consideration of widow portraiture, "masculine anxiety is both inevitable and necessary, and when channeled positively, this anxiety can become a strategic tool" for self-fashioning—both for women and for men (152). Just as a good betrothal determines a good marriage, "a good death was determined by good grief" (152); the portraits of widows commissioned by their husbands in advance of death shows how the anticipation of singleness for a woman is "a Synecdoche, under one to comprehend both Sexes" (162, qtg Acheson, *Diary*).

Part IV: Sexuality and Revirgination traces the connections between female desire and its representations in virginal women. Perhaps the most compellingly nuanced essay in the collection, by Tracey Sedinger, considers how "[w]omen were usually represented as strangely 'class-less' . . . even though their virtue implicitly signified an elevated social status" in versions of maid-servant-lady relationships in Ariosto's *Orlando Furioso* (Book 4), Spenser's *Faerie Queene* (Book 2), and Shakespeare's *Much Ado About Nothing* (174). Sedinger, unlike some of the other authors in this collection, notes explicitly the anachronism of some feminist approaches to the medieval and early modern female subject, which places priority on agency as a contingency of subjectivity: "For early modems, . . . the subject did not connote freedom; to be a subject was to embrace (or be defined by) a subjection both social and political in character" (170). Like more recent work by Christina Luckyj (*A moving Rhetorick?: Gender and silence in early modern England*, 2002) and Karen Newman (*Fashioning*

*Femininity and English Renaissance Drama*, 1991), Sedinger questions Suzanne Hull's 1982 assertion that the "chaste, silent, and obedient" woman is necessarily without visibility or agency. Sedinger concludes that "Visibility is always implicated within hegemonic discourses. . . the purchase of visibility often requires that one surrender desires and goals that cannot be articulated within available forms. Disguise indicates that the feminist projects of historical recovery should be suspicious of the rhetoric of visibility, and the assumptions regarding agency, representation, and power that often accompany it" (191). Susan C. Staub's examination of Anne Greene, a woman who survived being hanged for killing her newborn son, also raises important questions regarding the versatility of female representation. The pamphlets examined here present Greene as wrongly accused, and expose a legal malpractice through her revived, virtuous body (though the case for "revirgination" is quite thin here, unless we assume that virtue can only abide in a virginal body, which seems to contradict the tremendous cultural significance of the virtuous and chaste married woman). Mara Amster's essay, which concludes the volume, treads the tricky path of the correlation between appearance/performance and empirical reality. Though the body is considered to be increasingly legible in the early modern period, Amster's exploration of "virgin tests" in the controversial legal case of Frances Howard's annulment, medical texts, courtesy manuals, and in Middleton and Rowley's *The Changeling* exposes again the versatility of virtuous performance for women. The emphasis in all these media is on "Teaching women how to create a readable chaste body, rather than advising them how actually to remain chaste" (226). Just as Frances Howard and Beatrice-Joanna perform their chastity, early modern women must claim the agency of virtue through their performances of it.

Ultimately, this collection offers a variety of useful and thought-provoking approaches to the notion of the single woman, if only because it refuses to settle on the strictures of categorization. While there are a few examples that do not seem consonant with this approach, most of the essays included here go well beyond single status to explore marriage, and many also go beyond issues of the feminine life and representation to consider masculine life and representation as well.

Mary S. Hartman. *The Household and the Making of History: A Subversive View of the Western Past*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. xi + 297 pp. \$70.00. Review by R. BURR LITCHFIELD, BROWN UNIVERSITY.

This book will be useful for those interested in a lively discussion of writing about family and gender history over the past generation. But its shallow depth and peculiar logic limit its value as an historical work. The author is a professor at Rutgers University and director of the Rutgers Institute for Women's Leadership. She is known for an earlier co-edited book *Clio's Consciousness Raised: New Perspectives on the History of Women* (1974), an early and respected collection of essays on women's history from the Berkshire Conference (of which she was president). The present book focuses on a theme in demographic, family, and gender history that arose during the upsurge of interest in historical demography in the 1960s from an article by J. Hajnal entitled "European Marriage Patterns in Perspective" (in D. V. Glass and D. E. C. Eversley, eds., *Population in History: Essays in Historical Demography*. London: E. Arnold, 1965). In traditional Europe the mean age at first marriage for men was later than for women, but both tended to marry in their late rather than their early twenties, and a large proportion of the population (10-15%) never married. This observation produced much speculation about causes and consequences. (It should be noted, however, that with the rise in standard of living resulting from the commercial and industrial revolutions of the eighteenth-nineteenth centuries, which facilitated earlier household formation, the traditional marriage pattern unraveled. Until quite recently, marriage age has fallen and the proportion married has risen sharply.) Hartman's book focuses on the forty-year discussion of this theme and adds theorizing of her own, called here a "re-imagining," about its implications. The book is "subversive" presumably because demographic, family, and gender history can be made to seem productive of insights with large implications not perceived by more traditional economic, social, political, intellectual, and cultural history. The chief elements in the discussion, however, were present a generation ago.

In fact, there proved to be at least two traditional European patterns: a southern (Mediterranean) one where there was limitation of marriage but husbands sometimes married later and wives much earlier (in their late teens or early twenties), and a North Western European one where both partners

married later. The author focuses on the North European pattern. Although this was present in Western Germany, Northern France, the Low Countries and England (and by extension New England), the monographic literature surveyed is mostly about England, much of it selected from work of the Cambridge Group for the Study of Population and Social Structure. This is unfortunate since although the author uses the Mediterranean pattern as a foil for her discussion of the North European one, the ample literature about the southern pattern (only works in English, or translated into English, are cited in the footnotes) is largely ignored.

From the later debate about Hajnal's article the author fills in details: the chronology of appearance of the northern pattern (before the mid-fourteenth century?), a possible cause (the need of peasant families on feudal holdings to keep older children at home as a work force?), and property implications (less secure tenure because households were formed later?). The author's chief interest, however, is the gender implications of the traditional pattern. In the continuing tension between men and women, it was easier for men to preserve a male hierarchy of dominance with the younger wives of the Mediterranean pattern than in the northern European one, where husbands and wives were closer in age and thus more equal household partners. Greater equality gave women more power but also created more anxiety about the relationship between the sexes. The author compares two case areas in some depth: Montaignou, in southern France, through the English translation of Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie's classic study of this fourteenth century heretic Cathar village (*Montaignou: The Promised Land of Error*. [1978]) and Salem, Massachusetts, through the work of recent scholars studying the witchcraft trials of the 1690s. The author's gendered elaboration of Hajnal's model does not fit seamlessly into the historical cases. At Montaignou wives do seem to have been quite subservient to husbands; they were treated more as mothers of children than as helpmates, and they tended not to be Cathars. But the author criticizes Le Roy Ladurie's interpretation on ideological grounds for not perfectly fitting her model without appealing to further evidence (even though the Latin source he used is published) or referring to studies of other Mediterranean communities. At Salem more studies are available. Still it is unclear whether the greater power of wives that led women to make denunciations of witchcraft to further enhance their power was more important, or rather the greater anxiety of husbands that led men to join the

witch hunt in an effort to protect property from women. Other circumstances of Salem in this period are partly explored.

The traditional marriage pattern developed in peasant society. One wishes in this book for more discussion of aristocratic or middle class elites (both men and women) who are generally more interesting to historians because they are more articulate and better documented. Upper class families presumably experienced the same kind of pressures that peasant families did, but they may have expressed them differently and elaborated different outcomes. But the author passes directly from peasant society to “large social processes,” although the means of arriving at these is unclear: the Reformation, the English revolutions of the seventeenth century, the Enlightenment (labeled here the “so-called Enlightenment” [209]), the French Revolution, capitalism, industrialization, democratization, modernization. “Most women and men had no sense that familial arrangements that had emerged first among the peasant masses played any part in their attitudes or actions” (230). One misses here the “affective individualism” that more traditional historians say softened family relationships in the upper classes through the Enlightenment and helped eventually to mitigate the suffering even of unwed mothers oppressed by clerically upheld patriarchy in such places as Italy and Ireland. The author’s “re-imagining” of history goes beyond what can be sustained in the book.

Interest in this kind of demographic family history has waned in recent years, and younger historians have returned to elaborating traditional modes of history in new ways. But women’s history has developed splendidly. Perhaps readers should be advised to seek out other more rounded works in this field before accepting this one at face value.

Jesús Escobar. *The Plaza Mayor and the Shaping of Baroque Madrid*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. xxvii + 347 pp. + 123 illus. \$85.00. Review by ELIZABETH R. WRIGHT, UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA.

The title of this book gives an understated distillation of Jesús Escobar’s wide-ranging, multi-faceted fusion of social and architectural history. His point of departure is the ambitious and sophisticated urban planning enterprise designed to give Madrid a central plaza (*plaza mayor*). But from here, he provides a dense, scrupulously researched, and meticulously documented study of how early modern people of all social echelons engaged their urban

environment and interacted with their rulers. One of the most important facets of this book relates to Escobar's consideration of Madrid's urban reforms in an international context that encompasses other European cities, as well as the evolving urban spaces of Spanish America. The author also provides large numbers of illustrations that will enlighten specialists and non-specialists alike. Particularly helpful are clear, legible photographs of the different maps, blueprints, and memoranda that Escobar found in Spanish archives. A number of photographs show the present-day state of the urban spaces the author discusses.

Chapter 1, "Madrid, Town and Court," discusses the origins of a most unlikely capital for a world empire. Unlike London or Paris, which had longstanding claims to capital status, Madrid began the sixteenth century as a market town of regional importance. In 1561, when Philip II made it his court city, its population was somewhere between twelve- and sixteen thousand people. By 1600, it had grown to between ninety- and ninety-five thousand (42). In order to shed light on Philip II's choice, Escobar pays heed to symbolic and practical factors. Thus he discusses the importance of Madrid's location at the "heart" of Philip's peninsular realms. But he also notes the king's desire to base his court at a remove from the Archbishop of Toledo, the most powerful ecclesiastical authority in Spain and a counterweight to royal authority. Escobar provides a particularly illuminating analysis of the efforts by city chroniclers to negotiate between Madrid's actual Muslim origins and the desired Roman heritage that some writers were happy to furnish through faulty lexicography.

Chapter 2, "Architecture and Bureaucracy," surveys the people who spearheaded the major urban reform plan that took shape once Madrid had become the court city. This chapter's discussion of an urban planning process that was state-of-the-art and collaborative will surprise specialists and non-specialists alike, since Spain in the early modern era has often been described as a backward place ruled by an absolutist monarchy.

Chapter 3, "Sixteenth-Century Initiatives," applies the methodologies of micro-history as it seeks to revise the long-held notion of Madrid's central plaza as an early-seventeenth-century building project that stemmed from royal initiative. Escobar begins his examination of the plaza's expansion with a discussion of the efforts, in 1551, of one property owner, Marí Gómez, to renovate her facade and thus increase her home's value. The author also

mines the labor contract of a street cleaner for clues about how the space evolved (109).

Continuing in this vein, Chapter 4, “The Panadería and its Impact,” tells the history of the central bread distribution center, which was situated on the north side of the *plaza mayor*. Specifically, Escobar notes how the need to regulate and maintain the growing town’s food supplies shaped the planning of this crucial building on the plaza.

The final two chapters will be of the most direct interest to specialists in seventeenth-century topics. Chapter 5, “Seventeenth-Century Reforms,” discusses the most famous physical transformation of the *plaza mayor*, circa 1617-19, under Philip III. Yet the author moves beyond the traditional focus on elite actors to a discussion of how ordinary residents wielded the discourse of good government in lawsuits designed to assert their needs. The chapter also records debates about the use of public space that led, among other things, to proposals to remove the “master of pulling molars” from the *plaza mayor*, since the spectacle of tooth extraction might not be worthy of an imperial capital. More than just a picturesque anecdote, this story reinforces the thesis of Madrid as a dynamic city whose residents and rulers negotiated the uses of ceremonial and public space.

Chapter 6, “The Plaza Mayor of Madrid as Political Symbol,” takes as its point of departure the Calderonian image of the “wide plaza of the great theater of the world.” As the great Baroque playwright deploys this image in his masterpiece, *Life is a Dream* (*La vida es sueño*), it is a statement of disenchantment that subordinates the “drama” of life on earth to the question of how to attain salvation. For his part, Escobar deploys this image to situate the evolution of the *plaza mayor* in relation to Spanish cities across the Atlantic. This chapter could quite easily stand alone as an introduction to Spanish urbanism for scholars of the seventeenth-century Atlantic world. Of particular interest here is how Escobar argues that contact with the Americas changed Spanish conceptions of urban planning. He notes, in this regard, the powerful influence of Hernán Cortés’s survey of the Aztec capital. One important detail Escobar does not discuss in relation to the Conquistador’s famous urban description is how he uses the Islamic cities of Andalusia and North Africa as the measures of urban sophistication. This aspect of Cortés’s “Second Letter from Mexico” (first published in Seville, 1522) could be fruitfully connected to Escobar’s discussion in Chapter 1 of the efforts by the town’s

chroniclers to erase or minimize Madrid's heritage as an Islamic city.

Overall, this study presents sufficient new documents and analysis to enlighten even the most experienced Hispanists, but also gives non-specialist scholars a window through which to examine the Habsburg court city in an international context. My one quibble with the book is the use of "Baroque" as its defining term, which Escobar ties to the influential study by José Antonio Maravall, *The Culture of the Baroque* (1975). The author draws on this political theorist to support his goal of transcending the art historical definitions of Renaissance and Baroque (7). But Maravall's overly influential depiction of the Spanish Baroque pivots on a thesis of a top-down government unobstructed by the agency of ordinary people. When this book appeared in English translation, the eminent historian John Elliott pointed out the problems with its thesis about royal power (*New York Review of Books*, 9 April 1987). Yet Maravall's paradigm of a reactionary "theater state" took root and contributed to a marginalization of Spain within studies of Early Modern Europe. In fact, the lingering and deleterious influence of this thesis inspired one of the most important recent books on Spanish theater, Melveena McKendrick's *Playing the King: Lope de Vega and the Limits of Conformity* (2000). It would be unfortunate if the "Baroque" label on Escobar's book encouraged hurried readers to filter his study through Maravall's thesis. One hopes instead that Escobar's beautifully wrought and multi-faceted book will recharge the Spanish Baroque with new significations that recall the contentious *villa y corte* (town and court) of Madrid that stood at the heart of a far-flung world empire.

Vanessa Harding. *The Dead and the Living in Paris and London, 1500-1600*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. xvi + 343 pp. + 10 illus. + 2 maps. \$65.00. Review by EDNA RUTH YAHIL, WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY, SWISS CENTER.

By 1670, the populations of London and Paris exceeded 450,000, making these two of the largest cities in northern Europe. Both cities were capitals of centralizing states, and were represented by contemporaries as unified wholes despite being fractured judicially into a patchwork of overlapping ecclesiastical and lay jurisdictions. In *The Dead and the Living in Paris and London, 1500-1600*, Vanessa Harding has attempted a comparative study of these

two cities focused around the issue of social responses to the dead and burial practices. Certain practices conducive to record-keeping, such as the use of wills and testaments by the mid- and upper echelons of society and state sponsored recording of births and deaths from the mid-sixteenth century, make such a comparison possible. In this work, Harding adroitly carves out her niche in the burgeoning study of history of death which primarily focuses on “interiorized experience,” such as eschatology, rather than social history. In the end, she reaches the conclusion that London was better than Paris at disposing of the dead.

The book consists of two introductory chapters, four chapters about burial places, three chapters on burial practices, and a conclusion. Chapter Two provides a comparison of Paris and London, focusing on population and mortality as well as municipal administration and policing issues, including epidemics and food supply, that is useful summary for all scholars of early modern European urban history. One of the major differences between the two cities was that hospitals and hospitalization played a pivotal role in the Parisian life-cycle but not in that of the inhabitants of London. The following four chapters closely examine the spaces occupied by the dead, namely churchyards, civic/non-parochial churchyards, church burials, and private burial locations such as burial chapels and tombs. The second half of the book consists of three chapters on funeral practices, considering the funeral conventions, the price of burial, and the rituals associated with it.

Harding is a well-regarded historian of London, and yet she delves quite competently into Parisian archival material as well as secondary writings to produce a lucid, intelligent comparative history. In Paris, she considers archival documents from Saint Andre des Arts, Saint Germain l’Auxerrois, Saint Jean en Grève and Saints Innocents, cemeteries that have left relatively plentiful records, as well as records of the Hotel Dieu and some Bibliothèque nationale material. The sources from London include parish records and material from St. Paul’s cathedral as well as from various libraries and the PRO; this material is more plentiful not only because this is her expertise, but also because many Parisian records were destroyed in the Revolution and a subsequent series of mishaps, including the fire of 1871 that destroyed many of the municipal records for Paris and of the Hotel Dieu. One available source that Harding does not fully exploit is the Minutier Central, sampled by Pierre Chaunu for his book, *La Mort à Paris XVIe, XVIIe, XVIIIe siècles* (1978).

Instead of doing her own sampling, perhaps in unexamined areas of Paris, she relies on the results obtained by Chaunu's students in their master's theses.

Death was ever present in the early modern city, and the living and dead coexisted, sharing urban space in a way that is difficult for us to imagine today. The need to dispose of the dead forced groups that might not otherwise come into contact, such as authorities, various individuals, and marginals, to interact, negotiate, and eventually compromise. Throughout the volume, Harding demonstrates that a close examination of the relationship between the living and the dead is a valid exercise that sheds new light on this society and the increasing authority of the burgeoning state. Harding's work is an excellent example of careful research clearly presented in lucid prose that is rich with anecdote. This volume should serve as a model for others undertaking comparative urban history.

Brian Mann, ed. *The Madrigals of Michelangelo Rossi*. Monuments of Renaissance Music, 10. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002. ix + 227 pp. + 6 plates. \$150.00. Review by ANDREW H. WEAVER, NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY.

Ask any early music fan to name preeminent composers of chromatic polyphonic madrigals, and the first—and probably only—name you will hear is Carlo Gesualdo. Gesualdo's enduring popularity, however, has meant that later composers of madrigals featuring shocking, unorthodox chromatic harmonies have either been dismissed as mere imitators or completely overlooked by modern scholars. Take, for instance, the case of Michelangelo Rossi (1601/2-1656): despite being the composer of thirty-two sophisticated and idiosyncratic chromatic madrigals, until recently he has been known to musicologists almost solely because of one publication of keyboard music. Gesualdo is not, however, entirely to blame for this neglect; credit must also go to the unusual transmission of Rossi's madrigals. Although written during an age when composers made names for themselves through the publication of their music, these works have only come down to us in six manuscript sources, none of which can be dated with any certainty. Brian Mann is thus to be commended for finally offering these madrigals for publication, allowing not only for a new appreciation of these neglected works, but also for a much needed reevaluation of the composer himself. While at first blush this

edition, consisting entirely of a cappella five-voice madrigals featuring traditional imitative counterpoint, would seem to be of interest only to scholars of the Renaissance (as its inclusion in the "Monuments of Renaissance Music" series would imply), this volume is also of much interest to scholars of the Seicento, thanks primarily to Mann's superb introduction.

Divided into three chapters ("Michelangelo Rossi: A Biography," "The Madrigals," and "The Sources"), Mann's introduction places both the composer and his madrigals squarely into their historical and cultural context, raising many provocative questions along the way. Throughout all three chapters Mann weaves historical fact, quotations from a variety of seventeenth-century sources, close musical analyses, and expert evaluations of source material into an engaging and colorful portrait of the composer and the milieu in which his unusual madrigals were enjoyed. In the first chapter, for instance, Mann examines not only documents naming Rossi but also a wide range of sources pertaining to his employers and contemporaries, not only to support the contention that Rossi wrote most of the madrigals while employed in the Roman household of Cardinal Maurizio of Savoy during the 1620s (despite the fact that the anomalous "Mentre d'ampia voragine tonante," a setting of a sonnet describing the eruption of Vesuvius in 1631, could not have been written before the poem's publication in 1632) but also to advance new hypotheses about Rossi's reputation and lasting influence. The third chapter, moreover, goes well beyond providing thorough and detailed discussions of the manuscript sources for Rossi's madrigals, also considering important issues such as the very important question as to whether these works ever made it into a publication that has since been erased from the historical record.

It is the second chapter, however, that is of more wide-ranging value to scholars of the seventeenth century. The chapter opens with a sweeping historiographical overview of the polyphonic madrigal in the seventeenth century, uncovering a vibrant musical culture that has been almost completely neglected by modern scholarship. Mann deftly argues that despite the music-historical commonplace that this traditional sixteenth-century vocal genre was firmly swept under the rug by the reforms of the Florentine Camerata and their followers in the first decade of the seventeenth century, there nonetheless remained at least one prominent musical center in which the genre was avidly cultivated: the Roman academies of the 1620s and 30s. Already in the first

chapter Mann has informed us that Cardinal Maurizio had established one such academy in 1624; by now offering this larger context, Mann provides further evidence for his hypothesis of the original context of Rossi's works. This idea gains even further support in the next section of Chapter Two, a discussion of the composer's poetic choices. Only two of the thirty-two madrigals feature texts with any claim of being fashionable: the above-mentioned topical "Mentre d'ampia" and a single work from Marino's *La lira* ("Alma afflitta, che fai?"). As Mann astutely notes, the remainder of the texts, most of which are by Guarini, are decidedly retrospective, while several, including one poem published as early as 1472, are "patently esoteric" (13). These considerations lead smoothly—almost inevitably—to Mann's conclusion that these works were undoubtedly written for "a connoisseur of the madrigal's history, someone with a lively, almost antiquarian engagement with its literary traditions, possibly an academician" (14), pointing once more to Rossi's first patron.

The bulk of Mann's second chapter, however, is devoted to a consideration of Rossi's music. Perhaps owing to the academic surroundings in which Rossi most likely composed them, these works betray a thorough knowledge of the long, distinguished madrigalian tradition; accordingly, Mann opens this section by acknowledging those features of the madrigals that are decidedly behind the times: the lack of an independent basso continuo, the avoidance of soloistic vocal writing, and even the scoring that consistently features two tenors instead of the much more popular inclusion of two soprano parts. Despite these consciously retrospective features, however, Rossi emerges in these madrigals as anything but an old-fashioned composer. Mann is also careful to point out those aspects of Rossi's works that echo the styles of Rossi's contemporaries and immediate predecessors, including the renowned monodist Sigismondo d'India (Rossi's colleague in the Cardinal's household) and, inevitably, Gesualdo. But Mann is careful to paint Rossi as a thoroughly original composer, one whose chromatic experiments derive ultimately from his own idiosyncratic creative mind. Acknowledging Rossi's clear debt to Gesualdo (and even pointing out one instance in which Rossi directly quotes the older composer, in the setting of the one text also set by Gesualdo), Mann is nevertheless careful to stress the many ways in which Rossi's chromatic style differs from Gesualdo's. Rather than presenting Gesualdo as a mere model whom Rossi slavishly copied, Mann uses the

more well-known music as a heuristic tool, as an important precedent through which we can better understand Rossi's idiosyncratic compositional choices. For instance, while Mann does not hesitate to demonstrate how Rossi may have learned from Gesualdo how to distort specific voice-leading conventions, Mann's nuanced analyses always go beyond Gesualdo to highlight the uniqueness of Rossi's treatment. This approach can serve as a valuable model for other scholars seeking to free a little-known composer from the shadow of an imposing earlier master.

Above all, Mann's superb edition of Rossi's unusual madrigals is a valuable resource for scholars and performers of both Renaissance and Baroque music. In addition to the introduction, the edition features all of the other components that go into creating a useful tool for scholarship and performance, such as six high-quality plates drawn from two of the manuscript sources, detailed critical notes providing full texts and translations of the works as well as complete discussions of the variant readings in the sources, and of course clean, easy-to-read musical scores, with each work preceded by incipits providing the original notation. The value of the edition to non-music scholars, however, is not quite as readily apparent, especially with Mann's somewhat unusual treatment of accidentals in the music, which goes against the conventions of modern musical notation. Mann reproduces every accidental exactly as it appears in the primary source (which often leads to the same accidental appearing numerous times in a single measure), with all editorial accidentals (including necessary natural signs canceling out a sharp or flat earlier in the measure) placed above the staff. While Mann's desire to accurately reproduce the original source is admirable, the result can nonetheless be confusing even to those adept at reading music. Is not the main goal of transcribers of early music to translate an unfamiliar notation into an immediately recognizable and accessible format? All the same, non-musical scholars who are interested in the artistic and academic circles of early seventeenth-century Rome can undoubtedly still find much to enjoy in Mann's fine introduction to this valuable collection.

John Broad. *Transforming English Rural Society: The Verneys and the Claytons, 1600-1820*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. xvi + 292 pp. \$75.00. Reviewed by CATHERINE PATTERSON, UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON.

The seventeenth and eighteenth centuries are generally held to be an era of economic and social transition. While we often read of these large-scale changes, we less often get a glimpse of how they affected particular families or communities across a long stretch of time. John Broad's study of the Verney family and their estates in Buckinghamshire provides just that. The book's stated intention is to use the Verney family as a case study into how the rural economy, landholding patterns, and society were shaped by the great landowning families of England. Exploiting the extensive Verney correspondence and estate records, Broad situates one landed family in its local context, offering useful insights into the changing nature of rural society in the early modern period and weaving together a story of dynastic aspiration, economic development, and community interaction.

Much of the book focuses directly on the Verney family and its dynastic aspirations. Multiple generations of Verney men made active decisions to value expansion of the family fortune over enhancing the family's social status or national political profile. The first Sir Edmund, a courtier to Charles I, built up the family name, but also accumulated debt in his service to the crown. On his death in the Battle of Edgehill, Sir Edmund's son Ralph struggled to keep the family solvent during the difficult war years. Despite having married a well-to-do heiress, Sir Ralph's finances remained insecure; as head of the family, he had to deal with the financial needs of his many siblings and resolve the debts left by his father. Sir Ralph seems to have been of a fairly pragmatic nature. Seeing his financial straits, he worked to restructure the family finances, undertook some serious belt-tightening, and rigorously paid down his debts. Weathering the 1640s and 1650s with some difficulty, he emerged at the time of the Restoration in reasonable financial shape.

The same hard-headed approach he took to securing his finances he used in providing for his children. He married his eldest son, Edmund, to a substantial heiress, Mary Abell, while his younger son, John, was set up with an apprenticeship to a merchant, making his own living in the Levant trade. John's three wives all came from families with London connections and

substantial fortunes. Sir Ralph was a hard bargainer in marriage negotiations, expecting large dowries but not offering particularly generous jointures to the new daughters in law. Upon Edmund's death, John gave up trade to become the heir to the Verney estates. Like his father, he focused on the family's financial health, marrying his eldest son Ralph to the heiress of a wealthy but declining gentry family in Essex. Across multiple generations, dynastic aspirations centered on the accumulation of wealth rather than advancement of social standing. With the exception of the first Sir Edmund in the early seventeenth century and a later Ralph, second early Verney, in the late eighteenth century (who ruined the family fortune through profligate spending), the family's social sphere lay in the locality and the county, not at Court. A rising social status gradually accompanied the family's growing wealth—Sir John's son Ralph would become the first earl Verney in the mid eighteenth century—but leaping to the highest levels in the social universe was clearly not the top priority for the Verneys.

The family's attitude toward estate management mirrored the calculated attitude toward marriage and dynastic development. The family's imperative was to maintain and increase the central holdings in Middle Claydon, using enclosure and the purchase of neighboring properties when possible. The family's estate management physically changed the landscape, making Middle Claydon an enclosed estate community, and put into place more modern farming practices. The heads of the family remained directly involved in estate management, employing stewards but retaining control over much day-to-day decision-making. They charged high rents—at times, higher than the market would bear—but also worked flexibly with tenants in order to ensure long-term profitability. Sir Ralph Verney actually detailed in a letter written in 1650 his philosophy of estate management, including his attitude toward rent levels and tenant relations; his heirs seemed to have followed his hard-headed approach. One of the more interesting sub-themes of the book is the level of economic awareness of the Verneys, and the "modern" sense of economic decision-making they pursued. While the author does not make an explicit argument for this, the book provides evidence for a developing capitalist (or at least market-oriented) outlook among the landed gentry.

Even if the Verneys were fairly hard-nosed businessmen on their estates, they nevertheless operated with a sense of paternalism regarding their tenants.

While seeking to maximize rents, they also made allowances for good tenants who fell on hard times. But in return for this benevolence, they expected—and wielded—a great deal of control. The Verneys' enclosure of Middle Claydon reduced the village's population, and the family strove to keep the population small. They also kept a firm hand on housing and charity in the village, significantly influencing the lives of the people. Broad argues that the Verneys' dealings with the people of Claydon reflects the tension between the family's modernizing economic outlook and a strong sense of paternalism, "modified and modernised to accommodate the Puritan ethic" (195).

Broad's detailed look into the lives and landholding strategies of one prominent family offers a useful window into both the changing patterns of rural life in England and the development of "modern" economic attitudes. The author might have done more to grapple with the issue of economic thinking—was Sir Ralph Verney's focus on the bottom line in his farming practices and his prioritizing of wealth over status in marriage negotiations typical of gentlemen of his rank in 1650? It is perhaps less surprising that his son and grandson followed these practices in the eighteenth century. The words "modern" and "modernizing" are also used without clear definition at times. Nevertheless, the story of the Verneys, their estates, and the people of their community is well told; it should appeal to scholars interested in local history, rural society and agriculture, and economic development in early modern England.

Guy Rowlands. *The Dynastic State and the Army under Louis XIV: Royal Service and Private Interest, 1661-1701*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. xxv + 404 pp. \$70.00. Review by WENDY F. KASINEC, SOUTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY.

This ambitious and provocative book by Guy Rowlands regarding the army during Louis XIV's rule situates this vital institution within the context of personal and dynastic concerns held by both the king and his noble subjects. While nominally considering the ministries of Richelieu and Mazarin and the early years of the Sun King's personal reign, the work deals primarily with the latter portion of the seventeenth century, especially from the Nine Years' War into the War of Spanish Succession. Rowlands's decision to concentrate his research on those years is especially relevant given the importance of the army

in times of extended warfare as well as the tremendous cost of those wars to the kingdom of France.

The book is divided into three sections: Part I focuses on the “Patrimonial bureaucracy,” wherein the first half of the section is devoted to the actions of the Le Tellier family, such as the marquis de Louvois, within the Ministry of War while the other half considers civilian officials, corruption, and the financial situation within the Ministry of War. Part II pays attention to the management of the French officer corps and the creation of a standing army by detailing how they were organized, funded, and accommodated during Louis XIV’s reign. Part III considers various commanders-in-chief of the French army with particular emphasis on the relationships between Louis XIV and important, often talented, nobles within the military. Rowlands demonstrates clearly that military commanders, if they were trusted by the king, enjoyed great freedom in the field, that they expended much of their own capital at times to support the war machine, and that they tried to fill their companies with trusted associates with whom they had personal ties. While coverage of those connections and the financial costs of war in terms of individual commanders, such as the maréchal de Luxembourg as head of the army of Flanders, is particularly well illustrated throughout the study, the entire monograph rests upon extensive research from a variety of sources such as memoirs, royal correspondence, and official documents from the Ministry of War.

The author argues that dynasticism is “the crucial prism” by which one should understand the development of France’s standing army in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries in the context of Louis XIV’s concern for the Bourbon dynasty. It also provides the basis for his consideration of various noble families associated with the army, notably the Le Tellier family and its occupation of the office of Secretary of State for War in the seventeenth century. Rowlands’s view highlights the personal and familial concerns of Louis XIV as expressed by his advancement of his sons, legitimate and illegitimate, within the army as well as those nobles who were closely aligned through marriage ties with his second wife, Madame de Maintenon, such as the maréchal-duc de Noailles, as commander of the army of Catalonia, whose son married her niece. The overall analysis of the king as a pragmatic, knowledgeable, and involved leader is illustrated by numerous examples, and it serves as the basis for Rowlands’s characterization of seventeenth-century France as a very personal, dynastic domain tied to the unique abilities of Louis

## XIV.

The introduction and conclusion both emphasize the importance of dynasticism in Louis XIV's reign with an explicit rejection of "modernist" theories of statism and centralization. Given the author's perspective, it is not surprising that Louis XIV's leadership is a focal point within the work, but the implementation and rationale of civil and royal policy in the field deserves increased coverage. Rowlands's total rejection of the statist view of seventeenth-century French history denies the vision of Louis XIV and his ministers, such as Colbert and Louvois, who recognized the importance of established interests (especially those of the nobility) but also the need for reform along rational lines. The desire for reform in civil and military administration coexisted with the continuation and manipulation of traditional patronage, clientage, or dynasticism by the king, his ministers, and royal agents.

The strength of this book is in the details about the management of war in terms of finances, communication, and personal ambitions of the military leaders from the bottom of the military pyramid to the king. Rowlands's mastery of intricate familial and political connections, with reference to multiple and shifting titles, is just one example of how the work is grounded in a solid understanding of the century, the people, and the system. His argument is clear, as is his strident rejection of other interpretations (notably those found in the works of John Lynn, such as *Giant of the Grand Siècle: The French Army, 1610-1715* (1997)), and it has changed the parameters of the ongoing discussion about 'absolutism' among military and political historians of the seventeenth century. Despite his overly broad conception of dynasticism as the primary way of understanding Louis XIV's kingdom and government, his work provides valuable information about royal power, status, and the place of the army within a broad framework of social, cultural, and political history, making an important contribution to our understanding of Louis XIV and his reign.

Alan James. *The Navy and Government in Early Modern France 1572-1661*. Rochester: Boydell & Brewster, 2004. ix + 198 pp. \$70.00. Review by EDWARD M. FURGOL, NAVAL HISTORICAL CENTER.

Building upon his doctoral dissertation dealing with Richelieu and the French navy, James has produced a book that contains a number of surprises

for those who consider France to have been an insignificant naval power before Colbert. The book covers nearly ninety tumultuous years of French royal naval policy during the early modern period.

James's book divides into three sections: the navy in the 1570s-1620s, Richelieu's tenure as grand-maitre, and the legacy of his efforts. The first part, consisting of two chapters, addresses both the challenges presented to the crown by Huguenot naval power and the royal government's efforts to secure control of national naval assets. In the first case, a regal response was essential both to curb the potential of Huguenot financing through privateering and to stifle the consequences of the Protestants' involvement with their co-religionists' attacks on Hapsburg Spain, attacks which could have entangled France in unintended foreign wars. The second instance deals with activities dating back to the 1550s, generally through the office of admiral of France. The extensive remit of the admiral—over fortifications, ports, merchant shipping, and admiralty courts, in addition to warships and their munitions—may have presented the incumbent with problems insoluble in an early modern state. When one realizes that Brittany, a major maritime center, and the Mediterranean galley fleet lay outside the scope of the admiral's authority, the possibility of effective national mobilization of naval resources becomes even more questionable. In chapters three through seven, James charts how Richelieu (and his heirs until 1646, and the French state between then and 1660) attempted to resolve these and other problems. In order to circumvent local resistance to central authority, the cardinal secured key provincial and port governorships, as well as naval commands, for himself and his clientele. (Indeed, the increase in naval power required political manipulation, in addition to administrative efforts.) Richelieu simultaneously stressed his authority as Grand-Master of Navigation to control the sailing of merchant shipping and to maintain admiralty courts. Paradoxically, it was fear of English intervention on behalf of La Rochelle, and not the naval power of French's traditional enemy, Hapsburg Spain, that spurred efforts to increase the number of sailing warships, to create national shipbuilding yards and to develop port facilities for the navy. Following the successful siege of the Huguenot port, however, Spanish positions in the Channel, the Bay of Biscay, and the Mediterranean became the focus of French naval activity. These efforts had mixed results, with the capture of Dunkirk balanced against the failure to make headway in northeastern Spain and Italy. The galley fleet, with each ship privately owned

by the captains yet maintained by the national government, and Provence acting as a highly independent province, together presented a complex situation that Richelieu positively impacted by adding more galleys to the fleet. The cardinal contributed more directly to the navy by establishing royal shipyards at Le Havre and île d'Indret, as well as naval bases at the former, Brouage, and Brest. Despite the native production of warships, over a fifth of those in Atlantic service in 1638-40 (Table 2) had been purchased from the Dutch. Reliance on foreign shipbuilding continued as late as 1647, when the navy bought four Swedish warships. Richelieu tried to establish fiscal control of the navy, but like many early modern endeavors money advanced by individuals (including the cardinal) was essential to fund the fleet. One means of establishing sound financial oversight was the appointment of a single treasurer (in this case Louis Picard), who transformed the position from an investment to a career. Chapter eight illustrates how Colbert misrepresented the immediate past in order to enhance his own achievements with the navy. In the six years following Richelieu's death in 1642, France sustained its naval power. The Fronde, which had strong support in Bordeaux, Provence, and Normandy, checked the previous momentum. Intriguingly, the threat of hostilities with England in the mid-1650s led not to war, but to an alliance in 1657. Perhaps one could argue that English naval assistance removed the grounds for expansion of the French navy. James astutely observes that the physical and personal distance between the French capital and the country's maritime centers hampered the country from developing the commercial and naval power found in England, the United Provinces, Denmark-Norway, Sweden, and Portugal.

James's book has many sound qualities and a few shortcomings. His research in the primary sources and comprehension of the secondary sources is outstanding. The provision of a bibliography, as well as notes at the bottom of the page, is laudatory. Four tables in the appendix provide valuable information about the sources of warships in the Atlantic fleet, and the quality of those in the Mediterranean squadron. The index is serviceable. The exclusion of maps and images is unfortunate. Including charts that showed the conflicting lines of maritime authority would have helped one understand the complexity faced by the government in Paris.

James possesses a sound knowledge of the interpretations of his subject stretching from Colbert to the present. He rightly argues that Richelieu, rather

than creating innovative policies, regularly resurrected ideas dating back to the 1500s. The book focuses on political and administrative activities, which causes some difficulty in calculating the effectiveness of the French navy. Only a work concentrating on the operational aspects would allow one to see whether the cardinal's and his successors' efforts were justified by the results. James does a good job in comparing the French situation to the contemporary one in England. Given the French struggle between the center and localities, more attention should have been paid to the Dutch who functioned as a naval power despite a multiplicity of admiralties. Equally, more attention should have been paid to Spanish comparisons, since the period 1621-59 marks the eclipse of that country's navy.

James proves to the reviewer that the French navy was an integral part of the country's armed forces and not a mere afterthought. The book is valuable for scholars of early modern French and naval history. Given the book's complexity, it appears more suitable to academics and postgraduates than to undergraduates and the general reader.

Richard Butterwick, ed. *The Polish-Lithuanian Monarchy in European Context, c.1500-1795*. Hampshire: Palgrave, 2001. xx + 250 pp. + 4 maps. \$95.00. Review by JAKUB BASISTA, JAGIELLONIAN UNIVERSITY, KRAKÓW.

The English language book market does not spoil students of Central European history with too many publications. It is slightly better when contemporary history and post-Communist times are concerned, but books referring to mediaeval and early modern history are quite rare.

Thus any publication on the topic is welcome, as it enriches our reading lists and allows English language students to venture into the otherwise hardly-accessible territory of Latin, Hungarian, Lithuanian, and Slavic language publications based on sources in those languages. The more so when we are faced with so important a volume as the one presented here.

*The Polish-Lithuanian Monarchy in European Context* is the result of a colloquium held at the Queen's University, Belfast in 1999. Reading this collection one has to admit that the said colloquium was very well thought up and prepared. It gathered a group of 10 speakers, each an expert on various aspect of European monarchy in the early modern period, and each presenting a different aspect of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth/Monarchy in

the European context.

The volume opens with essays by Robert J.W. Evans and Ian Green, which set the stage and background for further deliberations. Evans sets the tone for the volume, challenging the existing opinions about Polish history and putting forth questions about the way it was understood and taught in the last century. He questions existing opinions about the uniqueness of Polish history, and goes on to suggest a comparison of Polish history with the German Empire, the Habsburg Monarchy or Brandenburg-Prussia that might amend our views (especially Polish views) of the “unique” history of Poland-Lithuania.

Ian Greed presents the most recent writings on the growth and transformation of early modern European monarchies, surveying various theoretical models described and applied by historians. In doing this he allows the reader to put the Polish-Lithuanian state in the context of early modern Europe and compare the different political solutions. One might ask, were they indeed different?

The remaining eight authors present various aspects of Polish-Lithuanian history in more or less unorthodox ways. This is done through the examination of new, hitherto neglected sources as Jūratė Kiaupienė does in her chapter; through looking at the Polish-Lithuanian state from a somewhat outside perspective as Karin Friedrich does; through presenting new and fresh interpretations of the “known” events and phenomena, which characterizes Robert Frost’s and Jerzy Lukowski’s contributions; or simply through rewriting parts of Polish-Lithuanian history as Mariusz Markiewicz and the editor of the volume, Richard Butterwick do.

The volume is dedicated to the problem of government and the relationship between monarch and subject in early modern Poland-Lithuania. The authors make an effort to present the newest findings but do so using concepts foreign to traditional history. Throughout the volume one feels a sense of freshness. With the exception of maybe one chapter, the authors have managed to present relatively well-known facts in a new and provocative way. This was done with full respect and appreciation for the old Polish historical schools and for the interpretations of earlier historians. Nevertheless we get an image from a different lens. A short look at the bibliography shows that the authors incorporated the results of all the newest works of both English and local historians. At least a small part of very impressive and important recent historical writings in Polish, Lithuanian, Russian, and Ger-

man is thus made available to English language students.

This volume is not a history of Poland-Lithuania in the early modern period, but it was not intended as a textbook. It is an invitation to discussion on the form of government of Poland-Lithuania in the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries through the perspective of new methodological proposals developed by early modern historians. It is also the first English language book on this period and topic since the fall of the Iron Curtain in 1989, with a substantial contribution of historians on both sides of the former "Curtain."

Let me end with a very personal comment. While I consider the whole volume to be of great value, it was Jûratë Kiaupienë H (ÿ—□s chapter which was the biggest eye-opener for me. I must confess, much to my regret and that of my students, that for many years I have taught the history of the Polish-Lithuanian union as a voluntary act, backed actively by the lesser Lithuanian nobility. I am truly grateful that we can put away some of the old textbooks and study the history of Poland-Lithuania from several perspectives, not just the Polish one.

The book is very well edited and prepared for readers who may be new to the topic. It carries the necessary guides to the varying use of place names (English, Polish, Lithuanian, Byeloraussian, Ukrainian, German and Russia), several maps, chronology and genealogical table of Polish monarchs, and a glossary of terms. In the opinion of this reviewer, the volume should find its way to all early modern European university seminars, not just those devoted to the Central and Eastern peripheries of Europe.

Emmanuelle Hénin. *Ut Pictura Theatrum: Théâtre et peinture de la Renaissance italienne au classicisme français*. Geneva: Librairie Droz S.A., 2003. 707 pp. + 70 illus. \$179. Review by KIKI GOUNARIDOU AND JESSICA RUSSELL, SMITH COLLEGE.

The comparison between theatre, the literary genre closest to the image, and painting, both of which *represent*, was so obvious to thinkers of the Renaissance and classical France that they took it for granted and did not even think to formulate an *ut pictura theatrum*. Hénin's book seeks to rectify this gap and to show how today's *ut pictura poesis* depends on the earlier *ut pictura theatrum*.

Most often, Aristotle states the *paragone*, as Hénin calls it, of theatre and painting as a proportional analogy:  $A/B=C/D$ . This is a comparison of relationships within the two arts: for example, drawing is to color (in painting) as tale is to character (in tragedy). Hénin's book traces the *paragone* within the larger discourse on painting and poetry. In this new look at the *topoi* of the *paragone*, both Aristotle's analogies themselves and a parallel in the function of these ideas within the two arts reveal the latent influences that the arts exercised on each other. In taking stock of the *topoi*, Hénin's synthetic methodological approach, combining thematic (or structuralist) and historical approaches, demonstrates the continuity of the reflection on the comparison throughout the centuries.

This study is focused on the period between the rediscovery of the *Poetics* around 1550 and the treatise of Du Bos (1719), which marks both the complete assimilation of the *topos* and its shift towards a more subjective critique. It should be remembered, however, that the tradition roots itself in antiquity at both the philosophic and the practical levels. The result (*aboutissement*) of the *topoi* occurs in the eighteenth century, but by then they correspond to another logic: that of the spectacular and of the search for a language which speaks directly to one's sensitivity through images and which simplifies its message to reach the larger public.

The organization of the book follows the fundamental three-way split of the rhetoric among the *inventio*, the *dispositio*, and the *elocutio*. This schema also permeates the Renaissance treatises on painting and theatre, as it had, centuries earlier, organized the *Poetics*. This rhetorical tripartition permits one to see three areas in which the comparison between the two arts developed: the content of the representation, the display of the image, and the demand of expression. If the image is created in regard to a glance, as demanded by Aristotle, this is because it is destined for the spectator, whom it must move in order to accomplish its proper effect, the purgation of passions. These passions however are transmitted by way of a rigid protocol. The expression of the *paragone* thus prepares the ground for the rupture carried out by Riccoboni and Diderot, while stopping just before "real" modernity.

In Part One of the book, "Portraits of the Theatre," Hénin explains that, throughout the Renaissance and the classical period, theorists debated whether dramatic *mimesis* or pictorial *mimesis* was superior and used various measures for proof. In his *Poetics*, Aristotle rests drama's mimetic superiority over the

epic's on the ability of drama to represent directly: while the epic imitates actions with words, drama imitates them with actions. The *Ut pictura theatrum*, arising from Aristotelian metaphors and their reworking, reaffirms the unity of painting and theatre. Its theorists characterize the modalities of representation in both arts by the same traits: the illusion of presence linked to the use of natural signs, to concentration, and to the economy of means. But if theorists agree on the global validity of the parallel, they all propose different classes of imitative arts.

Aristotle states that representation provides a double pleasure: a cognitive pleasure, based on recognition of the object represented, and a totally aesthetic pleasure created purely by the artist's talent. According to Maggi and Lombardi (1550) and, later, Castelvetro, painting pleases only if it reproduces faithfully a particular object, while tragedy imitates universals and builds a generic *mimesis* through character types. Aristotle, after classifying mimetic arts according to their mode and their instrument, distinguishes representations according to their object. This hierarchy of genres, sketched by Aristotle, is reborn at the beginning of the seventeenth century by Giovanni-Battista Agucchi, who reactivates the Aristotelian hierarchy in order to apply it to modern painting. A series of antitheses that cover all the dimensions of representation accompanies the rigidifying of the hierarchy of genres. Comedy represents specific simple objects, and tragedy, heroes and kings; comedy uses a medium style, tragedy a sublime one; comedy imitates invented characters, tragedy real ones; comedy stages the passage from misfortune to happiness, tragedy, the reverse; and comedy provokes laughter, tragedy, fear and pity. This hierarchy becomes an ideological norm and any transgression is considered a crime against art.

In Part Two, "The Theatrical Image: From Unity to Unities," Hénin observes that, in Renaissance Italy, perspective, just recently invented by painters, is applied progressively to theatre, which, in turn, contributes to the rise of the illusionist stage. From its beginnings, illusionist perspective is linked in an indissoluble way to the idea of a single vanishing point and point of view. The illusionist stage, theorized by Serlio, organizes itself entirely around the function of a privileged point of view. The spectator can occupy many places, not all equally favorable: the prince's box is placed at an ideal distance, and all the other positions are more and more unfavorable the farther they are from the ideal line.

Aristotle's example of "an enormous animal," the Aristotelian analogy between narrative and the body of a very large animal, serves moreover as a theoretical basis for the unity of time and place (the length of the animal becoming the duration of the story and the space of the stage) and the unity of action (the unification of multiplicity in a complex and ordered totality, like the parts of the animal). On the other hand, it is almost impossible to separate the theory of unity of action from that of episodes. Aristotle advised the playwright to include episodes (action which diverges from the main plot) in his tragedies in order to make them more agreeable, but also decreed that the episode play a structural role and not just an ornamental one. The episode paves the way for Le Brun and Félibien to formulate, around Poussin's *La Manne*, a theory of *péripéties* that allows the painter to break temporal unity and show different phases of an action. The painter is not just excusable for having broken the rules—he is laudable for having applied to his painting the fundamental rule of tragic composition: *la péripétie*, that is, the reversal of action from happiness to unhappiness (or vice-versa). In pictorial practice and theory, from the fourteenth to the sixteenth centuries, the placement of characters in a painting directly reflects their place in the story and is important to the unity of action, because the secondary figures correspond to secondary actions or episodes.

In Part Three, "Ut Pictura Theatrum: The Theatre of Passions," Hénin suggests that verisimilitude gradually becomes confused with the category of *decorum*. *Decorum* involves the relationship between the object and the public and relationships within the object. These two parameters however are often in conflict: one is founded on unalterable essences while the other varies with the public's tastes. Although "general expression" is theorized as such only in the second half of the seventeenth century, it is entirely anticipated by the concept of *decorum*. The critique of the mixing of genres serves as the link between *decorum* and general expression and is a preponderant theme in both pictorial and dramatic treatises. If unity of tone is indispensable to the functioning of a representation and to the reception of its message, what happens when genres mix? If life is made of laughter and tears, a theatre seen as the mirror of life must provide an image of this mix. Le Brun annexes the theory of modes into the discourse on *decorum* and uses it for the distinction of genres and the critique of their mixing. Le Brun's interpretation is doubly restrictive: not only is the theory of modes presented as a purely negative

theory of seemliness, but the identification of the modes with propriety removes *catharsis* from the discussion.

In the *Poetics*, *catharsis* is defined as unclearly as *mimesis*. The most common interpretation is that tragedy, in acclimating the spectator to terror and pity, liberates him from these two emotions. Painful passions are transformed into pleasure when experienced in a filtered form. Hénin's definition of tragedy designates purgation as the goal towards which representation should aim. The theory of modes affirms the autonomy of pictorial *catharsis* in basing it not only on the drama of characters but also on pictorial means such as color and light. *Catharsis* no longer depends on the story represented, but on a direct communication of the passions. Rhetoric rests on the communication of a passion through impersonation. According to Horace, only the actor who is truly moved can give to his face the expressions that communicate true passions. Thus the sympathy linking the creator to his works prolongs itself directly in the spectator. This principle of empathy simplifies the functioning of *catharsis*: instead of being the result of a series of parameters of the story (the goodness of the characters, the nature of the reversal, etc), spectacular *catharsis* (both pictorial and stage) is produced by simple contagiousness and consists in identification with the image of laughter or of tears. The principle of empathy describes a chain of mimetic passions.

In conclusion, while proposing to explore an unexplored field, Emmanuelle Hénin has tried to put into communication several fields and to inscribe them within a larger perspective: whence, as Hénin herself argues, the work's necessary incompleteness, linked to the amplitude of a *corpus* susceptible to an infinite extension; whence also its summary, schematic, and even systematic character. There is a multitude of tracks that deserve to be pursued, and in this measure, Hénin proposes, her book's conclusion can only be a beginning.

This enlargement of critical perspectives rests, however, on a restriction that is not negligible and that Hénin recognizes: before speaking of the parallel between painting and poetry, one must remember that this *poesis* is first and foremost dramatic, because Plato and Aristotle speak only of drama. Even more, the *paragone* holds an intrinsic coherence within itself, because it involves not a comparison of the same to an other but rather of the same to the same.

The perfect reciprocity of the original parallel can be summed up in the reversibility of the two fundamental concepts, the *scène-tableau* and the *tableau-*

*scène*, in other words, in the invention of the concept of the painting to designate all representation, pictorial or theatrical. This double invention of the painting-stage and of the stage-painting introduces a certain number of ruptures in the concept of representation, ruptures which are probably not confirmed completely until Diderot's century. The most obvious are the divorce between the representation and the public, the naming of the object-painting and the object-stage, or even the substitution of a relationship of separation (if not of distance) with a relationship of participation which prevailed in religious imagery. Another field to be explored, also at Hénin's suggestion, is the reception of a representation, which plays an important role in the formation of classical theory.

Hénin explains that her book, out of concern for coherence, has deliberately left out the debates on the purgation of the passions, even though this notion plays the role of final causality in representation. And lastly, she affirms, only a mastery of these debates will allow one to understand the Renaissance and classical conceptions of the role of the actor. We agree with Hénin; the book is an indisputable classic. She has given us the gift of an invaluable survey and an ingenious methodology: art and theatre historians should now borrow from and continue the in-depth study of *Ut Pictura Theatrum*.

T. R. Langley. *Image Government: Monarchical Metamorphoses in English Literature and Art*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 2001. 256 pp. + 6 illus. Review by STEPHEN GLEISSNER, WICHITA ART MUSEUM.

Langley's study of transformations in the imagery of power in seventeenth-century England departs from two scholarly articles written more than a generation ago: E. R. Wasserman's "Nature Moralized: Divine Analogy in the Eighteenth Century," *EHL*, 20, 1953 and Edgar Wind's "Julian the Apostate at Hampton Court," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, vol. 3, 1939-40. Wasserman asserted that prior to the Restoration of 1660, images of authority, particularly those of kingship, were perceived in the same manner as they had been since the Elizabethan period: analogically. Thus, when a ruler was compared with the sun, the audience assumed a palpable similitude or correspondence between the two so that one could be substituted for the other. The imagery of the Tudor and Early Stuart monarchs, thinks Langley (through Wasserman), was imbued with a sense of dignity and credibility of

an almost incomprehensible degree. Yet by the end of the century, the comparisons made in royal imagery were understood by the viewing/reading audience to be, at best, self-consciously metaphorical—that is, having no actual basis in the subjects compared—or, more likely, fictions of statecraft. Langley sees the production and reception of late seventeenth-century royal imagery as the origin of modern political identity formation and branding.

Few historians would deny Langley's overarching assertion (as described above). Nor would they deny his belief that the years between 1660 and 1687 were critical to the change from analogical representation to self-conscious, cunningly crafted representation. Dissatisfaction with *Image Government* arises when Langley moves to causation. What brought about this change in the general perception and expression of royal identity? Langley believes that partial responsibility lies with the personalities and policies of the Late Stuart monarchs. He also seems, however, to believe that it was an almost inevitable result of a change in the spirit of the times, or, in his words, history moving inexorably in cycles (12). Yes, there were those early skeptics, such as Bacon and Hobbes, who thought that kings ruled through covenant, just as there were nineteenth-century botanists who clung to the old assumptions. But in general, an even wind seems to blow in the new spirit, a wind untroubled by multiple and often conflicting audiences for the literature or art discussed, not to mention the many motivations that lay behind their production.

*Image Government* is a largely unreadable book not because of its motivating idea, but because of (1) its structure and manner of exposition; and (2) the author's use of written English. Langley writes like a post-structuralist. His structure and style are so open to meaning, and at the same time so opaque to meaning, that the reader is left to make his or her own conclusions. Even the publisher has difficulty summarizing the meaning of the book. The dust jacket synopsis states that "*Image Government* traces some of the cranks and windings, ebbings and flowings that lead from Charles I's downfall to Queen Anne's coronation. . . ." What sort of object of history, one wonders, is an ebb or a flow?

The book begins with a preface and a "Prologue," then divides into two parts of twelve chapters each. The structure of the book vaguely resembles a masque in that there is an ostensible subject surrounded by various independent entertainments. Unfortunately, the structure and tone of each chapter more closely resemble a sermon than an entertainment. No chapter begins

with an introduction, proceeds with a development, or ends with a conclusion. Nor is there a transition to or argument for the movement from one chapter to another.

The main subjects of the book are the writing of Edmund Waller in Part I and the decorative painting of Antonio Verrio in Part II. Neither subject is interpreted in a balanced manner or placed in a broad enough context. Regarding Verrio's murals, for example, too much attention is given to the iconography of Julian the Apostate and too little is given to Verrio's extensive program of decorative paintings for Charles II at Windsor Castle. Is the representation associated with William III at Hampton Court any more self-conscious or deliberate than Verrio's ceiling in the King's Great Bedchamber at Windsor that depicts Louis XIV keeling in submission at the feet of Charles II? A further cost of failing to make the comparison is the opportunity Langley loses to show that, for whatever reason, the iconography associated with William III at Hampton Court is far more complicated and difficult to read than any executed by Verrio for Charles II, yet this could possibly have supported his larger argument.

What makes *Image Government* most unreadable is the author's style. There are few straightforward sentences in the book. The second sentence of the book, for example, includes a three line parenthetical aside and ends with a quotation from Ead Wasserman that in turn quotes Shakespeare. Paragraphs are plagued with quotations from the writings of minor period figures whose significance is insufficiently explained. The following is a typical paragraph:

From the start the number was, as it were, up. "Witchcraft" would win—strenuously pretending, with cries of

Away this Goblin Witchcraft, Priest-craft Prince,

Give us a King, Divine, by Law and Sense,

that it wasn't. This time, too, the spell was to hold good, for good; made all the more binding (witness Howard Nenner's book, so entitled) *By Color of Law*—and, for the first few, difficult years, tincture of Mary. (9)

Frequently, paragraphs are of undecipherable meaning:

What, then, is the appropriate audience for *Image Government*? Certainly not, as the dust jacket claims, students or scholars. The former would never be able to untangle the prose, while the latter would be put off by the author's neglect of the requisite secondary literature. Langley devotes considerable

space to Dryden without reference to James Winn's *John Dryden and His World* (1987). Nor are the important recent studies of English court culture of the period cited, notably *Art and Patronage in the Caroline Courts*, edited by David Howarth (1993) or any of the three books on the subject by R. Malcolm Smuts (1987, 1996, and 1999). The general, well-educated reader would be lost not only in the prose but in the labyrinth of references to minor period figures. The most obvious reader of *Image Government* would be an antiquarian who takes delight in recognizing obscure references. That reader would appreciate Langley's vast and admirable command of the period literature, and would, unlike most of us, be amused to find the significance of the book's title revealed at the end of the last chapter.

Anat Gilboa. *Images of the Feminine in Rembrandt's Work*. Delft: Eburon Publishers, 2003. 241 pp. + 18 black and white figures and 16 color plates. \$35.00. Reviewed by LISA ROSENTHAL, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS, URBANA-CHAMPAIGN.

Anat Gilboa's *Images of the Feminine in Rembrandt's Work* speaks to the enduring interest in the art of Rembrandt, attested to by a spate of recent publications including monographs by Stephanie Dickey, Catherine Scallen, and Michael Zell, and catalogues from several exhibitions including *Rembrandt's Journey: Painter, Draftsman, Etcher* (Boston/Chicago 2003-04) and *Rembrandt's Women* (Edinburgh/London 2003), and to the growing literature on the representation of gender in seventeenth-century art. Originally written as a dissertation for the author's doctorate from the Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen, Gilboa's book aims to cover a broad array of paintings, prints and drawings while maintaining its organizing focus on Rembrandt's varied and shifting approach to the female figure in his art.

In a brief introductory chapter Gilboa describes her undertaking as a fundamentally iconographic study which seeks to elucidate Rembrandt's "personal and artistic development" (20). This developmental thesis organizes Chapter 1, which provides a chronologically-arranged overview of the diverse kinds of imagery that featured women across the span of Rembrandt's career. The artist's biography, especially regarding his marriage to Saskia van Uylenburgh, and, following her death, his relationship with Hendrickje Stoffels, provides the general framework both for this chapter and for the book as a

whole.

The remaining five chapters take up particular themes or genres. In a chapter on Rembrandt's images of Mary, Gilboa stresses Rembrandt's "dialogue with the pictorial tradition" (64). She argues that this dialogue, deepening over the course of his career, enabled him to combine Catholic and Protestant conceptions of Mary into his own "idiosyncratic" (69) image of her which would speak to the needs and tastes of his audience. A similar structural emphasis on the artist's development organizes her chapter on portraits of women. Here Gilboa sees in Rembrandt's works a growing "psychological sensitivity" (78) and articulation of the "individual" rather than the social surface (95) of his sitters.

Gilboa expands upon these two notions, i.e., Rembrandt's profound engagement with an inherited pictorial tradition and his evolving interest in representing psychological states, in her remaining chapters. In a chapter entitled "The Nude and the Erotic," she touches upon a large number of works in all three media (painting, prints, and drawings). Gilboa characterizes Rembrandt's approach to the female nude as neither idealizing nor moralizing; in her account the nude represented for Rembrandt a particular challenge as both a historical genre of art and as an authentic form of nature, both familiar and unknowable. Woman, as simultaneously a familiar (and familial) but also elusive subject is the particular focus of her chapter "Intimacy and Distance: Saskia and Hendrickje." In his pictures of the women in his life, Rembrandt produces what Gilboa sees as an ambiguous but deeply personal body of work which presses against the inherited conventions shaping the familial and marital imagery of his age. "Goddesses and Heroines" concentrates on narrative subjects and renderings of single figures such as Minerva, Juno, or Lucretia, again in all three media. Here Gilboa argues that despite Rembrandt's interest in scenes of violence and abduction, and the striking absence of images which depict harmonious relations between the sexes, his oeuvre moves in the direction of an increased sympathy for what she terms "the female perspective," evinced perhaps most vividly in his late works on the theme of Lucretia (173). In her conclusion, Gilboa asserts that Rembrandt's achievements included the ascription of greater "individual, emotional and psychological nuances" (172) to his female figures even while working within the confines of powerful traditions of Italian and Northern Renaissance and Baroque imagery.

One key question I had in mind while reading this book concerns the efficacy with which the author makes her claims. In fact, the very structure of the book mitigates a fully persuasive demonstration of an effective method. Gilboa's priority on broad inclusiveness curtails the fuller explication of how Rembrandt's images create their complex meanings that a more focused approach would have yielded. Although Gilboa defines her project as an iconographic one, her generally abbreviated discussions of individual works constrain her analysis of Rembrandt's encounter with pictorial tradition and of the particular effects of his borrowings, remaking, and rethinking of past art. This drive toward inclusiveness compels Gilboa to divide her chapters into subsections, many of which are no more than one or two paragraphs long. The result is a fragmented rush through a large catalogue of work that hampers the development of a sustained train of thought, while sometimes yielding the flattening effect of a list. Further exacerbating this problem is the lack of illustrations for several of the images that Gilboa does spend some time on; for example, the Brunswick family portrait, to which she refers more than once. A more acute problem of method, however, is the undeveloped theoretical foundation of Gilboa's enterprise. Some of this lack of clarity may be an effect of the occasionally awkward prose of the translation. However, her notion of the artist's capacity to render some form of psychological truth about his subjects begs for further analysis. Psychology, sexuality, and most particularly "the feminine" remain fully naturalized concepts, even as Gilboa mobilizes them as aspects of both the making and the reception of Rembrandt's art.

My second question concerns how the focus on women enlarges or alters our understanding of Rembrandt's art. Gilboa's interest in foregrounding the narrative challenges and the fundamental problems of representing nature that Rembrandt invested in his images of women is clearly a worthy project. But although Gilboa discerns complexities and ambiguities in Rembrandt's images of women, she appears hesitant to contend with the fuller demands of the task she has set herself.

Alice Jarrard. *Architecture as Performance in Seventeenth-Century Europe: Court Ritual in Modena, Rome, and Paris*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. xvi + 298 pp. + 125 illus. \$80.00. Review by ALLISON LEE PALMER, UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA.

Alice Jarrard's careful assessment of the complex confluence of issues surrounding Italian Baroque patronage—a topic that has long held the interest of art historians—provides new answers to a series of questions about art and political identity. While most scholars have focused on Rome, interpreting the city as the cultural center of Italy in the seventeenth century, Jarrard has chosen to focus on the secular court of the d'Este in Modena in order to show how these ducal courts, often understood as “provincial” compared to the courts of Rome, were at times more creative in their cultivation of a “princely” image, given that these courts needed to negotiate their reputations simultaneously on regional, papal, and international levels. The d'Este family is an excellent example to begin this discussion because they were the first family to be granted a duchy on the Italic peninsula. From this point in the mid-fifteenth century they had established their home and a thriving court system in Ferrara until 1597, when they were driven out of the city by Pope Clement VIII Aldobrandini, who claimed this wealthy center as papal territory. Thus, the d'Este, at the height of their power, were forced to move to the small town of Modena. Further complicating their authority at the height of their prominence was the fact that the Medici had, only thirty years before, been elevated to an even higher level of authority—that of the “Grand Duchy,” while the Farnese, with the Duchy of Parma and Piacenza, had already gained a firm foothold in Rome, and the Savoy dukes in Turin were vying for increased titled authority in Northern Italy.

Jarrard begins her discussion with the idea of “magnificence” as defined by Machiavelli, whereby “magnificence exists in sumptuous, grand and sublime things” and consists of “public things and great expenditures” (2). She then demonstrates how, in the seventeenth century, these notions become more concrete, based in part on the ideas of Giovanni Botero, in his *Della ragion di stato*, published in 1598, which demonstrated how reputation preserved power, and art cultivated reputation. Then, in addition to the very propagandistic accounts of courtly events published by the courts that most scholars have used in their research, Jarrard expands her archival study to

include lesser-known documentation of formal ambassadorial reports and etiquette texts, as well as less formal letters and contracts to provide a fuller picture of patronage in the secular court.

Francesco remains a pivotal figure in the d'Este family, and thus provides a case study for Jarrard's ideas. Despite Francesco d'Este's importance, however, he has long been characterized by scholars as "feckless" (Brown, 86), "frivolous" (Haskell, 63), and one who demonstrated a certain "prudishness" (Southern, 88) in his patronage. How could this be true, given his importance in the world stage at this time period? Jarrard argues that Francesco, in fact, set the stage for a more sophisticated political display that in some ways anticipated the commissions of the papacy and of Louis XIV. She notes that his "frivolous" reputation was perhaps founded upon the fact that the majority of his commissions, at least early in his career, focused on defensive or festive works, mainly involving the creation of ephemeral architectural sets for theatrical performances and tournaments. It is interesting that none of his early works were permanent religious or civic monuments or buildings, which Jarrard attributes to a need to create impressive works very quickly in order to help secure his immediate rule in the city of Modena. In Francesco's final testament, however, he never mentions his temporary works, but instead it is precisely the permanent works that he describes as necessary to a more tangible and lasting transfer of power (215).

Jarrard organizes her text with a chronological overview of Francesco's commissions, showing how his political goals changed over time. Within this chronology, she begins with Francesco's temporary public works, then moves to his more intimate temporary work, then his ducal residence, and finally, his portraits, including a fine discussion of Bernini's famous marble image of the Duke from 1651. In Francesco's thirty-year reign, portraiture changed from primarily historical images that drew on classical models to a more focused depiction of Francesco glorified in military dress, in order to secure, as Bernini stated, "a reputation among foreigners" (145). It is an interesting fact that while Louis XIV commissioned a very similar portrait from Bernini in 1664, unlike Francesco, the French monarch was able to command the personal attention of Bernini via an "arduous" trip to Paris (186).

Most of Jarrard's focus is on the ephemeral works made under Francesco's reign. Unlike the religious processions and festivals discussed by Jennifer Montagu in her book *Roman Baroque Sculpture: The Industry of Art* (1989),

Francesco chose to revive feudal myths centered on the tournament in order to show his worth before the Emperor (18). Taking this topic a step further, it would be interesting to examine the first d'Este tournament, from 1630, with earlier traditions of chivalric display beginning with the courts of the Visconti and Sforza, that then spread through much of northern Italy in the Renaissance and very likely also provided an important source of inspiration for Francesco d'Este. Instead, Jarrard carefully lays out how the popular carnival becomes the sophisticated theater, with highly technical theatrical advancements and vast sums of money spent to dazzle the audience. To compare some of the sums spent on such ephemeral displays, Jarrard notes that while the Medici paid 50,000 *scudi* for a wedding and the Barberini spent 60,000 *scudi* on a joust, the d'Este spent four times that amount on a tournament (52). The Medici in particular were well aware of these events which, after all, were made to impress foreigners first and foremost. This is confirmed with the very seating arrangement of one such tournament, where Jarrard carefully demonstrates how the Cardinal of Savoy, Duke Oduardo Farnese, and then the Florentine Ambassador and his wife, together with other visitors and members of the d'Este family, sat carefully arranged around the Duchess of Modena, Maria Farnese, while the noblewomen of Modena were left to make their own seating arrangements (26).

Finally, Jarrard shifts her discussion to the family palace in Rome, giving a secular emphasis to a topic where most attention has been focused on papal, high clerical, or local noble family palaces. It is worth noting, however, that Francesco's dream of a Roman palace did not come to fruition during his lifetime, but occurred in conjunction with the appointment in 1688 of Rinaldo d'Este as cardinal. It certainly might have been Francesco's aspiration to claim a palace in Rome, given his gradual shift from feudal to Roman ambitions, but a fuller discussion of this palace in the context of Rinaldo's position in Rome would provide a more complete understanding of the building. I find it quite impossible to separate out temporal from sacred issues in these discussions, and have found Tracy Ehrlich's *Landscape and Identity in Early Modern Rome: Villa Culture at Frascati in the Borghese Era* (2002) to be a good demonstration of the complexity of these challenges. For this discussion, Jarrard cites Waddy's important work in the field of Roman Baroque *palazzi*, but other sources can be used to provide a fuller picture, including Thomas Dandele's article "Setting the Noble Stage in Baroque Rome: Roman Palaces,

Political Contest, and Social Theater, 1600-1700,” in *Ambiente Barocco: Life and the Arts in the Baroque Palaces of Rome* (1999).

Overall, Alice Jarrard provides a focused, well- detailed and interesting study of the patronage of Francesco d’Este that does much to restore his reputation as a serious patron, and highlight the sophisticated diplomatic skills that allowed him to cultivate an international acclaim and secure a lasting place for his family in the world of art history.

Maryvelma Smith O’Neil. *Giovanni Baglione: Artistic Reputation in Baroque Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. xxiii + 404 pp. + 15 color and 108 b&w illus. \$125.00. Review by JEFFREY FONTANA, Austin College.

As O’Neil states in her introduction, her goal is to redress the “standard antagonistic position against Baglione” as an “academic toad” taken by modern scholars, particularly of Caravaggio (1). The two painters were rivals in early seventeenth-century Rome, and while Giovanni Baglione (c. 1566-1643) gained greater success as measured by social status Caravaggio was by far the more innovative, which has made the latter the clear favorite of art historians. Baglione’s situation as an accomplished gentleman-painter was similar to that of Giorgio Vasari in Florence during the third quarter of the sixteenth century, and like Vasari Baglione is valued today more for his collection of artists’ biographies than for his paintings. Baglione brought a lawsuit for libel against Caravaggio and three others, prompting scholars to side with or against him. O’Neil pleads Baglione’s case in the court of scholarly opinion through an examination of his career and writings and an analysis of the libel trial. By gathering together much archival and photographic documentation to demonstrate the high reputation Baglione enjoyed she serves both the painter and the reader well.

O’Neil begins her rehabilitation of Baglione’s image by treating his lawsuit against Caravaggio and three co-defendants in 1603, brought in response to slanderous verses attributed to these men. She examines the verses as an attack on his reputation, and she justifies his reaction in the context of heightened contemporary efforts in Rome to punish defamation. She further argues Baglione’s absence of vindictiveness from the even-handed evaluation

of Caravaggio in his *Le Vite de' pittori, scultori et architetti* (1642). By analyzing the verses and the trial transcript—both helpfully provided in English translation—O'Neil fleshes out the players' motivations and the shadiness of the defendants' characters in this fascinating drama. By dealing with the trial in her first chapter the author has put herself at a disadvantage, however, because her references to Baglione's early works, and the attempt to contextualize his two versions of the Caravaggesque *Divine Love Overcoming Earthly Love* exist somewhat in a vacuum. A reader might do well to read the second chapter first.

The second chapter traces Baglione's career from his training through about 1601. O'Neil publishes numerous drawings in this and the following chapter to characterize the painter's graphic manner, but apparently at present there are few works to document his earliest activity, since she inserts Baglione into a narrative of the typical painter's training in late sixteenth-century Rome. One feels a bit adrift as she lists painters by whom Baglione was influenced, such as Federico Barocci and the Cavaliere d'Arpino, without any explication or comparative illustrations. O'Neil boldly claims that in an early fresco "Baglione established his overriding ambition to forge a new Roman style founded on the legacy of Raphael" (57), but the sole evidence she gives that goes beyond simple assertion is one study of a woman's head after Raphael's *Spasimo di Sicilia*. Rather than explore how the painter sought to build a reputation by creating a style that interwove the styles of certain masters, the author charts Baglione's pursuit of fame in terms of his networking with patrons. Following in the steps of her thesis advisor at Oxford University, the late Francis Haskell, recognized for his pioneering work on Roman Seicento patronage, O'Neil links Baglione to a series of prestigious patrons, including Cardinals Jacopo Sannesio, Pietro Aldobrandini and Paolo Sfondrato. The author illustrates well how Baglione had achieved a prominent place in the Roman art world by 1603, when his success spurred rivals to slanderous action.

In her third chapter O'Neil gives a chronological presentation of Baglione's commissions for the better part of his career, from 1604 until 1632 when his vision degenerated to the point that he virtually gave up painting. By illustrating the succession of major commissions from prestigious patrons she clearly demonstrates the painter's elevated status and insider position within the Roman artistic environment. While the evidence of Baglione's recognition is plain to see, what distinguished his style in the eyes of contemporaries is

harder to appreciate, and it is in the analysis of paintings and drawings that O'Neil leaves the reader somewhat unsatisfied. She characterizes his style as a "rich play of chiaroscuro, a sculpturesque conception of form, and a sensuous surface handling derived from life studies" (100). Echoing the previous chapter she similarly states that in order "to assume the mantle of a seventeenth-century Raphael, Baglione had aimed to ally a central Italian tradition of *disegno* with coloristic naturalism" (107). Exploring the implications of these characterizations would have helped understand Baglione's striving for reputation through the paintings themselves, as well as through his titles and social networking. The desire to synthesize Venetian color handling and central Italian *disegno* can be traced back to Barocci's works in the 1550s, and was a concern of numerous painters during the late 1500s and early 1600s, among them Annibale and Ludovico Carracci and Ludovico Cigoli. Rivalry with Raphael places the meaning of fame in a different light, implying competition in the context of posterity and written history and suggesting a self-consciousness about style set within the long view of artistic "progress." O'Neil's defense of Baglione's work would have been enriched and perhaps strengthened by deepening the discussion of his style as a self-projection, to be viewed in the context of history and the nascent genre of artists' biographies. Particularly pertinent to this would be the passage from Giulio Mancini's *Considerazioni sulla pittura* (c. 1617-21) that O'Neil cites in which Baglione is categorized with artists who "worked in individual styles and did not follow in the footsteps of anyone" (117-18).

Changing gears, in the fourth chapter O'Neil discusses Baglione's long association with the Academy of St. Luke in Rome, beginning with the first record of his membership in 1593. She draws a parallel between his rise and the increasing prestige of the Academy, and credits him with forging important connections to cardinal-protectors and strengthening institutional policies and practices while holding various offices, resulting in a more authoritative role for the organization in Roman artistic production. Drawing upon archival documents, many unpublished, O'Neil describes the operations of the Academy and its changes during the course of Baglione's membership. Baglione drifts in and out of the discussion somewhat, and the chapter focuses more on the Academy than on the painter himself. The clear and concise portrayal of the Academy's operations is useful, but makes no direct contribution to understanding Baglione's paintings, only his biography.

The final chapter treats Baglione's work as a writer, focusing primarily on the *Vite*. O'Neil analyzes the structure and style of his books in order to understand his method, and defends his writing against the predominantly negative criticism of it, which began soon after the painter's death. What critics perceived as lack of focus and inelegant style was intentional, according to O'Neil, who calls attention to his "primary commitment to the 'clarity of truth,'" as set out in the *Vite's* preface, rather than to judgment (185). She argues well that a plain style and the accurate reflection of messy stylistic diversity gave Baglione's writing a desirably "objective tone."

The text is followed by six appendices that provide chronological lists of paintings, drawings, and lost works, a register of documents, and an English translation of the libel trial. Though not a *catalogue raisonné*, the lists bring together basic information about dating, provenance, and references, and will prove valuable to any scholar pursuing research on Baglione. Unfortunately there are no references to O'Neil's text or plates, making the lists difficult to use with this book.

One notes a few missteps or missed opportunities along the way in the interpretation of Baglione's images: In *The Presentation of the Virgin* in Santa Maria dell' Orto the temple out of which the priest emerges to greet Mary is the church itself (pl. 31); we see not a *prie-Dieu* but Neri's knees in *Saint Charles Borromeo and Saint Philip Neri in Meditation* (pl. 63); the Düsseldorf drawing identified as a study for *Saint Sebastian Cured by Saint Irene* (pl. 102) represents instead the Virgin Mary and the dead Christ, and may be connected to the *Anointing of Christ's Body for Burial* (pl. 57); the *Madonna in Glory* fresco on the vault of the family chapel (pl. 103) may include a cratered moon, perhaps a rare reflection of Galileo's discovery seen in Cigoli's *Woman of the Apocalypse* in the dome of the chapel of Pope Paul V, Santa Maria Maggiore, Rome. One must applaud the assembly of a great amount of valuable material, however, in a volume that illuminates the artistic milieu in early Seicento Rome and that will stand as a useful reference for future Baglione scholars.

## NEO-LATIN NEWS

**Vol. 53, Nos. 1 & 2. Jointly with SCN. Subscriptions: \$15.00 (\$20.00 international) for one year; \$28.00 (\$37.00) for two years; \$40.00 (\$52.00) for three years. Checks or money orders are payable to *Seventeenth-Century News*, 4227 TAMU, College Station, Texas 77843-4227. NLN is the official publication of the American Association for Neo-Latin Studies.**

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

◆ *Oswaldi de corda opus pacis*. Ed. by Belinda A. Egan. Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Mediaevalis, 179. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2001. 154 + 97 pp. 110 Euros hardback, 97 Euros paper. In 1417 Oswald de Corda published his *Opus pacis*, a manual for Carthusian copyists and correctors of Latin manuscripts. Oswald was born in Bavaria and took a degree in arts at Vienna. Sometime after 1404 he joined the Carthusians and, after some years in charterhouses in Germany, he was transferred to the motherhouse of the order, the Grande Chartreuse, in 1414; in the 1420s he served as vicar of the house. He corresponded with the leading theologian of the day, Jean Gerson, and translated several of the latter's French works into Latin. He died in Scotland in 1435. The *Opus pacis* is an attempt to formulate principles of textual emendation. In the manual, Oswald discusses matters of orthography, etymologies of Latin words, and occasionally grammar; he focuses on the practical dilemmas of scribes faced with the varying orthography, accentuation, and pronunciation of Latin in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Today twelve manuscripts of the text survive, dating from 1417 to 1514. Two of these are autographs by Oswald. The

manuscript tradition shows that the *Opus pacis* has been most widely used by charterhouses in Switzerland, Germany, and the Netherlands. Its circulation was not restricted to charterhouses, though: four of the twelve surviving manuscripts come from sources outside the Carthusian Order. What is more, the *Opus pacis* inspired the compilation of similar scribal handbooks in other religious orders.

Ever since Paul Lehmann drew attention to the treatise in 1924, excerpts from the *Opus pacis* have occasionally appeared in print. The present volume, however, contains the first complete critical edition of this interesting text. The first part of the long and well-researched introductory study examines the historical context of the *Opus pacis*: the Carthusian tradition of textual uniformity, the biography of Oswald de Corda, the *Opus pacis* itself with special focus on its sources and structure, the use and influence of the work within and outside the Carthusian Order, and the way in which Carthusian piety fundamentally inspired and encouraged the copyists' concern for textual accuracy. The second part of the introduction deals with the transmission of the text and contains a very thorough description of the manuscript.

The two surviving autographs of the *Opus pacis* offer a rare look at the process of composition. One of these is a working draft of the treatise that contains extensive additions, deletions, and emendations, while the other is Oswald's fair copy of the final state of the text. Egan shows how changes made to the text in the draft reveal deliberate attempts to simplify complex grammatical principles and to soften judgments by eliminating references to specific people in connection with orthographical errors.

The aim of the *Opus pacis* was to enable scribes to determine when emendation of Latin texts was necessary, and whether in copying a Latin text they should retain antiquated or corrupted spellings or spellings apparently altered by the influence of vernacular languages. Oswald warns against copying outdated word forms from exemplars, but recommends that scribes use common sense and emend old manuscripts only when necessary—that is, when the meaning of the word is affected. To provide the guidelines that would enable copyists to make the right textual choices, Oswald relies on several grammars and lexica common in the Middle Ages, such as Priscian, Papias's *Vocabulista*, the *Doctrinale* by Alexander of Ville-Dieu, and Balbi's *Catholicon*. He also quotes guides to accentuation.

According to Egan, the *Opus pacis* is the earliest known example of an

attempt to formulate principles of textual emendation (p. 1\*) and marks a turning point in the medieval attitude toward authority. The practical focus of the treatise brings the *Opus pacis* close to the genre of textual criticism, traditionally held to begin with Italian humanist scholarship later in the fifteenth century (10\* and 12\*). Here Egan to some degree exaggerates the novelty of Oswald's approach to his subject. The important medieval scholar Nicholas Maniacutia (d. 1150) formulated principles for the textual emendation of the Bible in his *Suffraganeus bibliothecae* and in the *Libellus de corruptione et correptione psalmodorum et aliarum quarundam scripturarum*. The *Suffraganeus*, the earlier of the two treatises, was admired by Cardinal Bessarion in the fifteenth century (for Nicholas, see V. Peri, *Aevum* 41 (1967): 67-90; and L. D. Reynolds and N. G. Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edn. (Oxford, 1991), 278). And a bit closer to Oswald's time we find numerous examples of an awareness of textual problems in Petrarch's *Familiares*, in the letters of Coluccio Salutati, and especially in Salutati's *De fato et fortuna* (written 1396 / 1397), as pointed out by Silvia Rizzo in her *Il lessico filologico degli umanisti* (Rome, 1973; rpt. 1984), *passim*.

The edition of the *Opus pacis* is generally well produced, but it would have been interesting if the editor had stated her own editorial principles more explicitly, e.g., in relation to the rendering of Oswald's orthography. The edition itself is accompanied by two appendices. One is a treatise on spelling and pronunciation entitled *Rubrica de cautelis notandis pro emendatore et correctore librorum*, probably of German origin. It has survived in two manuscripts of German provenance, one of them bound after the *Opus pacis*. The other is the fragmentary *Notabilia quaedam de correctione librorum*, a summation of the first part of the *Opus pacis* itself. The *Rubrica* reflects the disputes about textual uniformity within the Carthusian order that also inspired the *Opus pacis*, and both appendices are highly relevant in the context of this edition. It is, however, rather confusing for the reader that there are no indications in the actual edition about the provenance of these two treatises, nor are we told about their textual histories. This information has to be gleaned from various passages in the introductory study (27, 56, and 72). This leads me to a serious *desideratum*. The edition is furnished with an *Index locorum S. Scripturae* and an *Index auctorum* for Oswald's non-Biblical sources, but there is no index of any kind to the long and extraordinarily rich introductory study of 154 pages. I am convinced that readers would have appreciated both an index of names and of the many, primarily medieval, works quoted in it.

These minor flaws should not detract from the fact that Belinda Egan's introduction to the *Opus pacis* and her edition of the text itself will be of great use to students of the Carthusian order and of the history of textual scholarship. (Marianne Pade, University of Aarhus, Denmark)

◆ Tito Livio Frulovisi (Titus Livius de Foro-Julienis). *Travel Abroad: Frulovisi's Peregrinatio*. Trans. with intro. by Grady Smith. Medieval & Renaissance Texts and Studies, 251; Neo-Latin Texts and Translations, 2. Tempe, Ariz.: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2003. viii + 166 pp. \$30. Cultural historians have for a long time attended to the circle of Humfrey, duke of Gloucester as one of the main sources through which Italian humanism first came into England. Among the more interesting humanists Gloucester employed is Tito Livio Frulovisi, and we are indebted to Grady Smith and the MRTS series for now giving us his *Peregrinatio*, one of the more intriguing texts Frulovisi produced during the few years he spent in England.

Born ca. 1400 in Ferrara, Frulovisi studied Latin and Greek under Guarino da Verona before moving to Venice, where he set up a school. During his time there he wrote three Latin comedies that were produced by the boys on festival days. Always a prickly man, Frulovisi became embroiled in charges of plagiarism and excessive paganism in his plays, however, and in 1435 he resigned his position and undertook an Italian journey, during which he began his *De republica*, historically important as the first Italian humanist description of a Renaissance state. An unsuccessful bid for employment in the court at Ferrara preceded an offer from Gloucester in 1436 for him to come to England, where it was expected that Frulovisi would draft his correspondence in the best humanist style, satisfy his interest in translating Greek works into Latin, and, of course, compose encomia and other items meant to advance Gloucester's status. Frulovisi's most successful work in England was a biography of Humfrey's brother, Henry V, which Holinshed used as a source in his chronicles. No translations from Greek exist, Frulovisi's mastery of the language being, in Smith's judgment, too superficial. Perhaps, Smith suspects, to compensate, Frulovisi composed two further Latin comedies for Gloucester. But unlike his plays written in Italy, neither of these comedies was produced, and soon after writing them Frulovisi left Gloucester's employ, returning to Italy in 1440, where he established a successful medical

practice and ended his days ca. 1465 in Venice.

*Peregrinatio*, the second of Frulovisi's two English plays, is, like his earlier comedies, modeled on Plautus and Terence, using the characters, plots, and diction established in ancient Roman drama. In brief, the play recounts the adventures of Clerus and his slave Aristopistes as the young man leaves England to search in Rhodes and Crete for his long-lost father Rhystes. The usual complications arise, including an encounter with a prostitute in which the sexual double entendres of Latin are put on full display. All ends happily, of course, Aristopistes being freed and Clerus reunited with his father and married off to his stepdaughter. Within these predictable twists and turnings, however, Smith points out that Frulovisi has introduced some interesting variations. Foremost among them is an expansion of women's roles in the play well beyond the conventions of Roman comedy. Respectable women seldom appear prominently in Terence and Plautus, but Clerus's mother, Epiichis, is a complicated character in *Peregrinatio* who is given a major role in two of the scenes. More striking is the role of Elpis, an *ancilla* in Frulovisi's play who is given the role of the clever slave conventionally reserved for male characters in Plautine comedy. For all this, Smith notes that Frulovisi was no feminist, a statement about women's frailty towards the end of the play betraying typical fifteenth-century assumptions.

Anyone foolish enough to try translating Terence or Plautus literally knows how difficult rendering the language of Roman comedy can be. Smith in this regard seems to have steered a largely successful middle course. On the one hand, he has sought out a colloquial idiom appropriate to contemporary readers. Thus, Epiichis sweet-talks her husband with "pretty please," Elpis is urged to "bring off" a scheme, and Rhystes resigns himself to living with a certain amount of "foofaraw." On the other hand, Smith has on the whole resisted paraphrase and adaptation. In places he adds useful stage directions to clarify the action. His boldest addition, however, is a page-long interpolation of dialogue to fill a lacuna in the unique manuscript copy of the play. Here Smith's background in the theater serves him well. His interpolation reads (and, I suspect, plays) well, and it fits in seamlessly with the dialogue that precedes and follows it.

What makes Frulovisi's *Peregrinatio* especially intriguing to historians of the theatre is its problematic place in the history of English drama. In the prologue to his play Frulovisi calls attention to his conscious violation of unity of

place, observing that “the custom is the same in Britain” (*similis in Britannico mos est*). This remark would seem to indicate that Frulovisi knew, and perhaps had even seen, the Corpus Christi plays current in pre-Reformation England. Conversely, the deeply humanist interest in Roman drama evident in *Peregrinatio* appears at first glance to connect the play with Latin comedies produced at Oxford and Cambridge. But there is no trace of these classically-inspired university plays in England before the sixteenth century. And the fact that Frulovisi’s play was never produced and survives in a single manuscript that went unprinted until the twentieth century suggests how little it fit in with the religious interludes and medieval ceremonial representations (e.g., the Feast of Fools, the Lord of Misrule) that dominated in the English universities during the latter half of the fifteenth century.

But Smith’s edition of *Peregrinatio* should also be of interest to other groups of readers. Despite his limited assumptions about gender, Frulovisi’s play should figure in the future into feminist discussions of representations of women in early modern European drama. And, of course, the play, like most of Frulovisi’s work, recommends itself to cultural historians working on the development and dissemination of Italian humanism during the fifteenth century. In terms of theatre history it seems safe to say that Shakespeare is in little danger of being dethroned by Frulovisi (though as Smith notes, an exchange between Anapausis and her attendant calls to mind a similar scene between Juliet and her nurse). All in all, however, it is useful to have his *Peregrinatio* available in the text and translation with introductory material in English that MRTS has made available in this attractive, reasonably priced edition. (Lee Piepho, Sweet Briar College)

◆ “*Melancholia christiana*”: *Studi sulle fonti di Leon Battista Alberti*. By Rinaldo Rinaldi. Biblioteca di “Lettere Italiane,” Studi e testi, 58. Florence: Leo S. Olschki Editore, 2002. 244 pp. The eight essays in this volume present interesting interpretive studies of Alberti’s works, ranging from his early Italian dialogue *Deifira* to the late *De ieiarchia*, with particular emphasis on the Latin works *Vita S. Potiti*, *Apologi*, and *Momus*. Rather than offering detailed summaries of each chapter, which by themselves would exhaust the space awarded to the reviewer (and can be found in David Marsh’s review in *Renaissance Quarterly* 57 (2004): 171-73), I will only discuss the “melancholic methodology” adopted by the author.

Most of the links between sources and texts provided by Rinaldi strike an attentive reader as more fascinating than convincing. The author has a distinctly “modern” approach to books and libraries of the early Renaissance. One does not want to underestimate the power of memory, especially in authors like Alberti, whose encyclopedic wits are legendary. However, when the “vertiginosa complessità delle citazioni” and the “vortice di corrispondenze” (6) carries the critic’s good historical sense away, it is necessary to question his approach altogether. Literary history is not just a pseudo-diachronic game of anticipations of a mystic, unchanging synchronicity. The individuality of an author and the circumstances under which he produced his works always have to be taken into careful consideration. The availability of texts in fifteenth-century Italy, even for avid humanists like Alberti, was extraordinarily limited by our ‘academic’ standards. Accessing a manuscript was not as easy as clicking a mouse on a screen or going to the circulation desk across campus. The acceleration of the access to information, even erudition, tends to give us the illusion of ubiquity. The wandering life of Leon Battista, although he could visit the largest libraries of his time, such as Nicholas V’s and Federico da Montefeltro’s, hardly allowed him to spend all of his busy days consulting books in them. Even if we accept this remote possibility, Rinaldi does not ask himself the question. Moreover, his source-mania is not nearly as poignant as it should be. A ‘source,’ by definition, is not just a topos or a hint. Either quotations are ‘philologically’ correct and precise verbatim, or not. If any generic echo and ‘philosophical’ similarity is good enough to infer an influence or a hidden pun, then everything goes. Intertextuality is not a melancholic, combinatory puzzle. It needs to establish with rigor the possibility of the actual access to, and positive use of, a text, classical or humanistic. The ‘tone’ of a work is too subjective a criterion to become scientific proof of stylistic overlapping. One can easily fall for the temptation of finding a ‘universal key,’ an exoteric code which explains all of the contradictions and complexities of an author, particularly one as prolific as Alberti. But we must resist this trend, to avoid becoming the unwitting celebrators of Platonic or Christian platitudes, which indeed can be found anywhere in Western culture. The fact that Alberti plays with them, and systematically reverses them, does not seem to bother Rinaldi. It is also striking that a book that is so keen on seeing the ‘negative’ in Alberti is so optimistic about recognizing intellectual genealogies and analogies.

In conclusion, Rinaldi is an extremely knowledgeable, sympathetic, and clever reader of Alberti, and every line he writes is deeply thought through and personally felt. So much so, that sometimes he gives the impression of having slipped inside Leon Battista's head in the shape of a *libripeta*, a book-worm devouring his brain. (Marcello Simonetta, Wesleyan University)

◆ *Biblioteca y epistolario de Hernán Núñez de Guzmán (El Pinciano): Una aproximación al humanismo español del siglo XVI.* By Juan Signes Codoñer, Carmen Codoñer Merino, and Arantxa Domingo Malvadi. Nueva Roma, 14. Madrid: Consejo superior de investigaciones científicas, 2001. xix + 558 pp. \$72.20. Hernán Núñez de Guzmán (1473-1553), known as "El Pinciano" from the ancient name of his birthplace, Valladolid, became the first Spanish Hellenist to hold the chair of Greek at the University of Alcalá de Henares, and a translator of the Greek text of the Complutensian Polyglot Bible. Political embarrassment drove him to Salamanca, where he taught Greek and rhetoric from 1522 to 1548. He had command of Hebrew, Arabic, and 'Chaldean' (Syriac or Aramaic). His students included Juan de Vergara, Francisco Sánchez de las Brozas, and other humanist luminaries. He commented on Pliny, Pomponius Mela, and Seneca and is credited with continuing Nebrija's interest in scientific lexicography, particularly the vocabulary of plants, animals, and minerals with curative properties. Otis Green calls him simply "the most eminent humanist of his time."

*Biblioteca y epistolario*, obviously the product of meticulous dedication, consists of three parts, covering, respectively, Pinciano's library, donated to Salamanca at the end of his career; the marginal notes in his books; and finally, a seventy-two-item corpus of his letters, sixteen of them edited here for the first time. The book ends with multiple indices, an inventory of Pinciano's library, and twenty-four fine-quality, full-page plates, illustrating Pinciano's hand and the bindings of relevant volumes. This material, here systematically exploited for the first time, reveals El Pinciano "in constant dialogue with his books" as "a painstaking person, an indefatigable and voracious reader, a severe critic, an unrepentant polemicist" (xvii). In the Preface and Part I, Juan Signes Codoñer tells how this volume originated in a more modest project: to determine the relationship of a group of Greek manuscripts at Salamanca catalogued as having Pinciano's annotations. Signes Codoñer came to realize, after concluding that these manuscripts had been Pinciano's own, that additional Salamanca

manuscripts, incunabula, and other early imprints could be traced to Pinciano's bequest of books to the University. Pinciano's glosses in these volumes number in the tens of thousands. Signes Codoñer adds arguments against the existence of a Greek collection at Salamanca prior to Pinciano's arrival.

The academic authorities are known to have directed that the books given by Pinciano be marked as University property. And indeed, the legend "Es de la Universidad de Salamanca" appears "not only on all those Greek manuscripts annotated by Pinciano, as well as on all the Latin manuscripts and the imprints containing his notes [with rare exceptions], while on the contrary [the legend] is entirely absent from those manuscripts and imprints which lack Pinciano's annotations or which cannot be linked to him" (29).

Juan Signes Codoñer surveys Pinciano's books found at other locations, documents Pinciano's legacy to Salamanca's library (and argues for a fixed death date of 1553), discusses the bindings and gatherings of the Salamanca volumes, and provides evidence that the books Pinciano donated had actually been originally procured by the University for his use (105-15). Pinciano's flyleaf markings on any and every topic are as good as diary entries.

Carmen Codoñer Merino covers Part II, the marginalia: the annotations are treated as a "virtual library." By studying them Codoñer Merino aims at a reconstruction of Pinciano's actual library. Technical discussions follow: e.g., distinguishing Pinciano's various hands, cases of uncertainty about whether a given citation of an author is direct or indirect, and instances where one may infer ownership of a volume from the way Pinciano alludes to it. Codoñer Merino lists authors cited (160-63) and discusses Pinciano's remarks on them. The only noteworthy surprises, to me, are the absence of Sallust (although he shows up in the list of Pinciano's holdings), popular elsewhere in rhetorical contexts, and the inclusion among grammarians and rhetoricians of the Lutheran Philipp Melanchthon (193).

In Part III, Arantxa Domingo Malvadi prefaces the edition of the correspondence with a biographical conspectus. She seconds Helen Nader's view that Pinciano's political involvements belie his image as a scholarly hermit. There are seventy-two letters, fifty-two of them to his student Jerónimo Zurita. Sixty-four, including all the Zurita letters, are in Spanish, the other eight in Latin. Only one of the Latin letters is by Pinciano himself. Letter Nr. 2, to Juan Vergara, in fluid and direct Latin, invites interest for the comments on Pinciano's removal to Salamanca and for the earnestness of his plea for a

codex of Archimedes' geometry. Letters from Vergara, Lucio Marineo Siculo, and five by Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda, all previously edited, round out the Latin items. Scholarly discussions, allusions to personal relations, grumbling over widespread contemporary ignorance, frequent thanks for receipt of books, and pervasive evidence for Pinciano's immersion in ancient philosophical, agricultural, and scientific sources mark the collection as a whole.

*Biblioteca y epistolario* will be of value to Neo-Latinists and to Renaissance scholars generally, both for the rich new conspectus of Pinciano's career and scholarly habits, and for its discussions of the technical side of ferreting out and organizing the documentary material on which the book is based. (Edward V. George, Texas Tech University)

◆ Olympia Morata. *The Complete Writings of an Italian Heretic*. Ed. and trans. by Holt N. Parker. *The Other Voice in Early Modern Europe*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003. 275 + xiii pp. Holt Parker's first English translation of the complete works of the mid-sixteenth-century Italian intellectual Olympia Morata (1526/27-1555) fills a major gap in the history of women's writing. One of the most important women writers of her time, Morata has projected a wraith-like presence in women's history. Morata, the woman, has been constantly cited, but her works—the majority of them untranslated letters and poems in classical Greek and Latin—have not. In the mid-nineteenth century, interest in Morata briefly surged in England and France: E.A.B. Southey's biography *Olympia Morata* (London, 1834) presented her *Dialogue of Theophila and Philotima* and sixteen of her fifty-two letters in English translation; Robert Turnbull's *Olympia Morata* (Boston, 1846) reprinted Southey's translation of the *Dialogue*, and Jules Bonnet's *Vie d'Olympia Morata* included French translations of selected letters (Paris, 1856).

The last of the prominent Latin-writing women humanists in Italy, Morata differs in every possible way from her fifteenth-century humanist predecessors, whose writings Margaret King and Albert Rabil first published in English translation in their groundbreaking anthology *Her Immaculate Hand* (Binghamton, NY, 1983). She diverges also from her sixteenth-century Italian contemporaries, Vittoria Colonna, Laura Terracina, Gaspara Stampa, Tullia d'Aragona (an earlier habitué of the Este court), and the numerous other women poets who, in the middle of the sixteenth century, placed collections of their poetry, letters, and dialogues with Venetian presses, in Italian. As with

the previous volumes in Chicago's "Other Voice" series, Parker's translation of Morata demonstrates that the more we come to know early modern women thinkers through their own writings, the more we realize not only how varied they are, but that facile theorizing about their lives and writings will not work.

All theory begins, of course, with translation, and Parker's translation of Morata's previously unknown works from classical Greek and Latin represents a breakthrough in itself. But his edition offers much more than an elegant and accurate translation. His deeply researched introduction and his scholarly annotation of the classical and biblical references in Morata's letters make the volume essential reading for anyone studying women intellectuals in early modern Europe.

Parker compares Morata to the quattrocento Latin-writing women who were her predecessors—Isotta Nogarola, Cassandra Fedele, and Laura Cereta. But unlike those women humanists, Morata never worked in isolation. By the time Morata arrived at the Ferrarese court in 1539, Renée de France, the reigning duchess, had established a salon that was a known center for reform thinkers—a court within the Este court. In 1536 Calvin had visited the court, and the following year, the reform leaders Vittoria Colonna and Bernardino Ochino spent several months in Ferrara. Like so many literary women in the sixteenth century, Morata was very much part of a vibrant group, in this case the one that studied and discussed doctrine in the ambience of Renée's circle. Among these young scholars, mostly in their early to late twenties, were the duchess's daughter Anna d'Este, Renée's lady-in-waiting Françoise Boussiron, and Lavina della Rovere, all of whom became Olympia's intimates. Three Lutheran students from Heidelberg, who had come to study medicine at the University of Ferrara, joined the group in 1541: Andreas Grunthler and the two Senf brothers, Johannes and Chilean, the former Senf serving as Renée's personal physician and the latter as Anna's tutor in Greek (90-98).

These were the personalities in Ferrara who shaped Olympia Morata's highly unusual career. Far from being principally the product of her humanist father, Fulvio Morato, Olympia's religious and literary formation emanated from her young peers in Renée's salon as well as from longtime friends of her family such as Celio Calcagnini and Celio Curione. Duchess Renée herself acted as Morata's most powerful patron and mentor, even as she struggled to sustain her circle of reform thinkers in the face of her husband Duke Ercole's

opposition. Beginning in 1541, under pressure from the Duke, Renée's salon slowly began to unravel. When the Protestant Johannes Senf fell in love with Françoise Boussiron, both were dismissed from court (111). Morata's confidant and lifelong correspondent, Lavinia della Rovere, left the court in 1541 to marry a client of Pope Paul III in Rome (105-6, 112-13, 117-18). Anne de Pathenay, daughter of Renée's exiled Protestant guardian Françoise Soubise, was dismissed from court in 1544. And when Morata's father died in 1548 and the duchess's daughter Anna left court to marry the Duke of Guise, Olympia, too, was let go. By 1549, though, Morata had fallen in love with Grunthler and would leave Ferrara to join him in Germany at the end of that year. For Morata, the final blow came in 1550, with the public execution in Ferrara of the alleged heretic Fanio Fanini (115).

Once in Germany, Morata reestablished her correspondence with the Italian Protestant converts she had known through her father in Ferrara: Celio Curione (113-16, 139, 159, 162, 173, 176-77), a professor at Basel and the editor of her collected works, published posthumously in 1558; the former friar Bernardino Ochino in Geneva, to whom Morata repeatedly sent greetings through Curione (173, 175); and the exiled Bishop of Capodistria Pietro Paolo Vergerio, then at Tübingen (167-68).

Among her writings are fifty-two letters to friends, all in Latin with the exception of three letters in Italian and one in classical Greek. There are nine poems, five in Greek and the rest in Latin; and two dialogues, both between women. The most vivid letters in the collection are those in which Morata describes the siege and burning of Schweinfurt (137-48). When she and Grunthler attempt to get out of the city after the men of Nuremburg set fire to it, she describes her clothes being ripped off her back in the middle of the city square and her arrival in a neighboring village dressed in rags. "Among the refugees," she wrote, "I looked like the queen of the beggars. I entered [Hammelburg] with bare feet, unkempt hair, torn clothes which weren't even mine but had been loaned me by some woman. I was so exhausted that I developed a fever, which I could not get rid of in all my wanderings" (140)—a haunting note, since in a little over a year she would be dead.

Morata's writings before 1552 had been showpieces of classical learning studded with references to Homer, Aristotle, Xenophon, Diogenes Laertius, Isocrates, Plato, Plutarch, and Lucian; and among the Latins, Terence, Lucretius, Cicero, Vergil, Horace, Ovid, Propertius, Pliny the Elder, Gellius, and Seneca.

But after 1552, her letters almost solely reflect her readings in scripture. Filled with piety and prayers, they little resemble the letters of her female humanist forerunners Nogarola, Fedele, and Cereta. Differing also from the irenical texts of Valdés and his reform circle in Naples, Morata's letters after she settled in Germany turned fiercely condemnatory. She repeated the charges in a number of letters that the mass represented idolatry and the pope the Antichrist (115, 127, 146, 149). Only the reading of scripture, she wrote, would lead to proper faith in God, and hence salvation (129, 133, 137, 145, 150).

Parker's new English edition of Olympia Morata is a must for scholars of women in the Renaissance and the Italian Reformation, representing a forgotten but key chapter in these fields. (Diana Robin, Newberry Library)

◆ *La Plume et la tribune. Michel de L'Hospital et ses discours (1559-1562). Suivi de l'édition du De initiatione sermo (1559) et des Discours de Michel de L'Hospital (1560-1562).* By Loris Petris. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 2002. xxvii + 610 pp. Michel de l'Hospital played an important, yet controversial, role in French history. Designated chancellor of France in April, 1560, he exercised considerable influence over governmental policy for close to nine years and has been recognized—perhaps unjustly, as Loris Petris's lengthy study suggests—as a major promoter of religious tolerance prior to the Edict of Nantes. Placed at the helm of a nation embroiled in religious controversy and on the verge of civil war, his primary objectives were to avoid internal strife and reinforce through judicial and financial reforms a weakened monarchy. Observers and critics have portrayed him diversely as an atheist, a crypto-Protestant, a founder of the *Politique* movement, a liberal thinker, and a proponent of religious pluralism—characterizations Petris rejects as unfounded.

Petris focuses our attention on the years immediately prior to the first religious war, between L'Hospital's election to the chancellery in April, 1560 and the massacre of Protestants at Wassy in March, 1562. Having spread to as much as ten per cent of the population by then, Protestantism became a divisive political issue that placed not only Catholics and Protestants, but also Catholic militants and Catholic moderates, in opposition to one another. Whereas militant Catholics favored a more radical solution, moderates such as L'Hospital preferred dialogue to force. In his first major speech before the Parliament of Paris on 5 July 1560, L'Hospital endorsed the edict of

Romorantin, which in essence suspended capital punishment for crimes of heresy by placing such matters within the exclusive purview of ecclesiastical courts. At the Estates General held in Orleans later that year, he called for the release of religious prisoners, the suspension of heresy cases, and the application of the edict of Romorantin. However, opposition at various levels, including the local parliaments, rendered much of the government's legislation ineffectual. The following year, the edict of Fontainebleau (19 April 1561) was sent directly to regional governors and law enforcement officers in an effort to circumvent the conservative elements in Parliament, but again without much success.

According to Petris, L'Hospital's speech of 3 January 1562 marked a clear transition from the government's insistence on religious unity to the adoption of provisional civil tolerance, but it did not signify that L'Hospital or his entourage had abandoned the ultimate goal of religious unity. L'Hospital, he argues, did not embrace religious tolerance as a goal in itself, but as a temporary solution to a pressing political problem. More a tactical maneuver than an historic change of cap, Petris feels the chancellor's expression of tolerance does not make him a founder of the *Politique* movement (*Père des Politiques*), as some have claimed, and less still a champion of religious pluralism. The *Politique* movement, writes Petris, did not come into existence until 1575, well after L'Hospital had left office. Its members were "modérés à qui l'on reproche de préférer la paix à l'éradication de l'hérésie" (moderates accused of preferring peace over the eradication of heresy). To speak of *Politiques* in 1560-1562 would, in Petris's view, be a misuse of the term. The term 'political moderate' may perhaps be more appropriate, but one question remains unanswered: What fundamental differences—if any—lie between the Catholic Moderates of 1560-1562, also known as 'moyenneurs' or 'mediatores,' and the *Politiques* of 1575-1585?

Alongside Paul de Foix and Arnaud Du Ferrier, L'Hospital expressed support for the royal edict of 17 January 1562 which offered Protestants the right to openly assemble and practice their religious beliefs, as long as this was done outside city walls. Modern historians have considered this edict one of the earliest official recognitions of French Protestantism, yet Petris cautions his readers against excessive enthusiasm, noting that intolerance was so deeply engrained in the thought of sixteenth-century society that the liberalism contained in that edict was more a recipe for tragedy than a sign of nascent

modernity.

In addition to the historical and political analysis discussed above, Petris offers readers valuable insight into the rhetoric of political discourse in the sixteenth century. He discusses in great detail the classical structure of L'Hospital's political speeches, the logic of his arguments, his use of citation, and his recourse to pathos. Recurrent themes in the chancellor's thought—obedience to the crown, maintenance of law, and unity of religion—suggest that as a conservative politician, he adhered to the proverbial stance of 'one religion, one law, one king.' In the final pages of his book, Petris assembles, for the first time, detailed minutes of the chancellor's political speeches and a representative sample of his personal correspondence, poetry, and various memoirs, along with modern French translations of texts written in Latin.

Debate over L'Hospital's role in the French Religious Wars will undoubtedly continue, and scholars interested in the crucial years 1560-1562 will inevitably turn to Petris's authoritative study for guidance. (Jan Pendergrass, University of Georgia)

◆ *Erasmus in the Twentieth Century: Interpretations c 1920-2000*. By Bruce Mansfield. Toronto, Buffalo, and London: University of Toronto Press, 2003. xiv + 324 pp. \$70. Bruce Mansfield's *Erasmus in the Twentieth Century* completes a three-volume series which discusses interpretations of Erasmus from the year of his death to the end of the twentieth century: *Phoenix of his Age* (1979, reviewed by Lawrence Ryan in *Neo-Latin News* 28.4 (1980): 94-95) covered the period from the first memorials to Burigny's biography of 1757, and *Man on his Own* (1992) ran from the *Encyclopédie* and Voltaire to the biographies by Preserved Smith and Huizinga. The subject is vast, and although Mansfield's treatment is, naturally, decreasingly comprehensive as the centuries go by, the three books read together comprise a mighty triptych, comprising more than nine hundred pages of text, with a couple of hundred pages more of endnotes and bibliographies.

*Erasmus in the Twentieth Century* is, more than its predecessors, an account of the work of professional scholars, communicating with each other not only through their published writings but in the conferences which marked the centennial and sesquicentennial commemorations of 1936, 1967-70, and 1986. Accounts of the topics which were discussed on these occasions help to give the book its chronological structure. A "prologue" on the 1936

celebrations is followed by a chapter on studies of Erasmus's political thought (and not least the strain in it which can be compared to recent liberation theology) and one on studies of his audiences, with special attention to Marcel Bataillon's *Erasmus et l'Espagne* and Silvana Seidel Menchi's *Erasmus in Italia*. Then an "interlude" on the celebrations of the quinqucentenary—or indeed all the possible quinqucentenaries, from 1967 to 1970—of Erasmus's birth is followed by a chapter on the reception of his theological thought in the age of the Second Vatican Council, and one on his writings as studied with reference to language and rhetoric. An "epilogue" on the 1986 celebrations and an overview of Erasmus studies at the end of the century bring the volume to a close. The whole book is magisterial. Mansfield has read enormously in English, French, German, Spanish, Italian, and Dutch sources, and presents his reading not as a catalogue (he acknowledges his debt to the great annotated bibliographies of Jean-Claude Margolin, and announces that he will not compete with them), but as a coherent, thematically ordered account. Indeed, its thematic ordering and its selectivity make the book more approachable than either of its predecessors: there are really no *longeurs* here as there were in the exhaustive treatment of the confessional approaches of certain minor thinkers in *Man on his Onn*. Mansfield is consistently fair to the authors whose work he discusses, so that his words of adverse criticism carry all the more weight when they are ventured. His own opinions, for instance on Erasmus's personal complexity and attractiveness and on the value of ecumenically oriented approaches to him, are tactfully expressed.

The degree to which Mansfield's three volumes really comprise a unified whole is a question raised in the first sentences of the present volume, which states that it is and is not a sequel to the first two. The writings it documents are on the whole less strongly marked by confessional prejudice than those of previous centuries, and they are less idiosyncratic; this makes for differences of approach. *Phoenix of his Age* and, to a lesser extent, *Man on his Onn* could combine accounts of interpretations of Erasmus with remarks on the life and thought of each interpreter: we learn in the former, for instance, about Jean Le Clerc's Calvinist background, his developing Arminianism, his early theological works, his journalism, and his friendship with John Locke. Both earlier books are appropriately illustrated with portraits, some of them (notably a dramatic image of Mark Pattison and an attractive sketch of Huizinga as Erasmus) vivid counterparts to Mansfield's text. There are no portraits in

*Erasmus in the Twentieth Century*, and much less interest in the biographies of the scholars whose work it discusses. Perhaps this was inevitable, though a reader might be legitimately interested in questions such as the confessional background (and, in a number of cases, ordained ministry) of recent Erasmus scholars, or the disciplinary perspectives from which they have approached their subject. Like its predecessors, the present volume devotes less space than it might to editorial projects, and practically none to translations of the works of Erasmus, and this is a pity. Editions and translations are, after all, interpretations. The stories of the Toronto *Collected Works* and the Amsterdam *Opera omnia* would no doubt have been as interesting as the projects are important, and, to take one other example, it seems a pity to identify Clarence Miller as having given a single lecture on Erasmus without so much as mentioning his translation of the *Praise of Folly*, though this is consistent with the decision taken in *Man on his Own* to discuss J. B. Kan's writings on Erasmus without mentioning his edition of the same work. Like its predecessors again, *Erasmus in the Twentieth Century* does not deal with fictional interpretations of Erasmus: his appearance in, for instance, Geoffrey Trease's novel *Shadow of the Hawk* (1946) goes unrecorded, just as his appearances in Thomas Nashe's *Unfortunate Traveller* (1594) and the collaborative play *The Booke of Sir Thomas More* (ca. 1593) are not mentioned in *Phoenix of his Age*, and Charles Reade's very popular romance *The Cloister and the Hearth* (1861), whose protagonist is Erasmus's father, is only noticed in two of the endnotes of *Man on his Own*.

These are, however, understandable and even necessary choices. The project which Bruce Mansfield has brought to a close was conceived on a grand scale; if it had been extended, it might well have become unfinishable, and as it is, it has been definitively and admirably executed. The volume under review, like its predecessors, will be read from end to end by anyone seriously interested in the study of Erasmus, and it will be an important reference work for many others. (John Considine, University of Alberta, Canada).

◆ Marsilio Ficino. *Platonic Theology*, vol. 4: Books 12-14. Trans. by Michael J. B. Allen, text ed. by James Hankins, with William Bowen. The I Tatti Renaissance Library, 13. viii + 371 pp. Angelo Poliziano. *Silvae*. Ed. and trans. by Charles Fantazzi. The I Tatti Renaissance Library, 14. xx + 215 pp. Maffeo Vegio. *Short Epics*. Ed. and trans. by Michael J. C. Putnam, with James Hankins. The I Tatti Renaissance Library, 15. lviii + 184 pp. Leonardo Bruni.

*History of the Florentine People*, vol. 2: Books 5-8. Ed. and trans. by James Hankins. The I Tatti Renaissance Library, 16. xiv + 584 pp. Cambridge, Mass. and London: Harvard University Press, 2004. \$29.95. It is a pleasure to record the four latest appearances in The I Tatti Renaissance Library, which has quickly established itself as a major new publication outlet for Neo-Latin literature that, unlike most new series, is putting out volumes more quickly than was originally projected. It is appropriate now, I believe, to single out the work of the General Editor, James Hankins, whose inexhaustible appetite for plain old hard work is the driving force behind the success of the series. The press is certainly to be commended for committing resources to an area whose commercial success was not a given, but I know from my own experience that Hankins not only manages the timely appearance of the volumes, but oversees details to a degree that far exceeds normal editing. Bravo!

The Ficino and Bruni books are the fourth of six and the second of three projected volumes, respectively, that will bring into print a reliable Latin text and readable English translation of two fundamental works in Italian Renaissance humanism. The first volume of each series was reviewed in an earlier issue of *NLN* (60,1-2 (2002): 182-84), where information about the works can be found. I have reviewed the Vegio volume at greater length than is possible here in *Vergilius* 50 (2004): 216-22, to which I refer the reader interested in this text. For the remainder of this review, I shall concentrate on Poliziano's *Silvae*, which is an important work that merits at least a quick reading by every serious Neo-Latinist. Angelo Poliziano (1454-1494) is one of the key figures in quattrocento humanism, a courtier of Lorenzo de' Medici and a professor at the Florentine *Studio*. It was in the latter capacity that he composed the *Silvae*, which serve as introductions, in verse, to his lectures at the university. The poems are available in a series of early printed editions, beginning with the *editiones principes* from Florence and extending through the reprints by the Bolognese printer Francesco Platone de' Benedetti to the Aldine *opera omnia*, and in a critical edition published nine years ago by Francesco Bausi, but the modern edition is difficult to find outside of Italy and the early printed editions are even harder to obtain, so Fantazzi has done a real service in (essentially) reprinting Bausi's text and adding the translation and explanatory notes that will make the *Silvae* accessible to the wider audience they deserve.

When Poliziano took up his chair in poetry and rhetoric in the fall of 1480, he based his inaugural lecture on Quintilian's *Institutiones oratoriae* and

Stadius's *Silvae*. It is perhaps difficult for us today to appreciate the risk he took with this choice of authors at a time when humanism had just succeeded in establishing Cicero and Virgil as stylistic models in the effort to reform education on the model of antiquity, more accurately understood. Poliziano acknowledges that he is heading down new, untrodden paths, but he argues that it is easier for students to imitate more accessible authors than to try immediately to scale the heights. Besides, he argues, Stadius offers plenty of inventive richness and stylistic accomplishment, and Quintilian's description of the education of the orator is actually fuller than Cicero's. Behind these arguments is a challenge to what was already becoming the orthodoxy of the new humanism: writers other than Cicero and Virgil should be evaluated on their own merits and appreciated for what they do well, with authors from every period of antiquity, even from modern times, providing material with which each student can develop an individual style that suits his own temperament and goals. This principle will guide Poliziano as he composes his own poems in imitation of Stadius, which served in turn as *praelectiones*, or introductions to a series of lectures, in later academic years.

As Poliziano explains, *silva* means *indigesta materia*, a sort of confused mass of raw material rather than a polished finished product, but this is disingenuous, for Poliziano's poems, like Stadius's, are both learned and exquisitely refined. The first, *Manto*, is a sustained encomium of Virgil and a careful analysis of his works, including the *Appendix Virgiliana*, as a way to encourage his students as they return to poems they undoubtedly knew well from their school days. The *Rusticus* is an introduction to Hesiod's *Works and Days* and Virgil's *Georgics*, which blends vignettes of country life from ancient sources with observations about the Florentine countryside of his own day, all with appropriate references to Cato, Varro, Columella, Lucretius, Claudian, Aratus, and Pliny. *Ambra* in turn praises Homer, the font of all eloquence, underscoring the fact that unlike his teacher and predecessor, Cristoforo Landino, Poliziano was an accomplished Hellenist, able both to appreciate the stylistic challenges of Homer and to compose his own verses in Greek. The last and longest of the *Silvae*, the *Nutritia*, celebrates poetry in general, beginning with the role of poetry in civilizing society and the nature of the *furor poeticus*, then moving to a catalogue of poets that begins in ancient Greece and ends with Dante, Petrarch, Boccaccio, Cavalcanti, and Lorenzo himself. The *Nutritia* is therefore a fitting conclusion to a volume that should bring renewed attention to one of the

most rewarding sets of poems in all of Neo-Latin literature. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ W. Keith Percival. *Studies in Renaissance Grammar*. Variorum Collected Studies Series. Aldershot, Hampshire and Burlington, Vt.: Ashgate Publishing, 2004. xii + 342 pp. \$105.95. As with the other volumes in this series, this book consists solely of previously published essays, photographically reproduced from their original venues with original pagination retained. Here, however, there is unusually good reason to republish, given that the author is the acknowledged authority in his field and that the essays group themselves around several major figures, producing a volume that is more unified than most such collections.

The first four essays, grouped under the rubric “General Topics,” offer four overviews of the field, two reflecting the state of scholarship in the seventies and two in the eighties: “The Grammatical Tradition and the Rise of the Vernaculars,” “Grammar and Rhetoric in the Renaissance,” “Renaissance Grammar,” and “Renaissance Grammar, Rebellion or Evolution?” The next three essays focus on Guarino of Verona (1374-1460), whose work marked one of the earliest efforts to move away from medieval speculative grammar toward a usage based on the classics: “The Historical Sources of Guarino’s *Regulae Grammaticales*: A Reconsideration of Sabbadini’s Evidence,” “Textual Problems in the Latin Grammar of Guarino Veronese,” and “A Working Edition of the *Carmina Differentialia* by Guarino Veronese.” The next three articles from the eighties are on Niccolò Perotti (1429 or 1430-1480), the guiding light for the annual Congresso Internazionale degli Studi Umanistici in Sassoferrato, on whose *comitato scientifico* Percival has served for many years: “The Place of the *Rudimenta Grammatices* in the History of Latin Grammar,” “Early Editions of Niccolò Perotti’s *Rudimenta Grammatices*,” and “The Influence of Perotti’s ‘Rudimenta’ in the Cinquecento.” Four essays from the nineties are on Antonio de Nebrija (1444-1522), whose work dominated the teaching of grammar in the humanistic schools of his native Spain but was also given international diffusion through the Jesuit order: “Nebrija and the Medieval Grammatical Tradition,” “Italian Affiliations of Nebrija’s Latin Grammar,” “Nebrija’s Syntactic Theory in Its Historical Setting,” and “Nebrija’s Linguistic Oeuvre as a Model for Missionary Linguistics.” Finally, three essays extend the inquiry to other figures: “The *Artis Grammaticae Opusculum*

of Bartolomeo Sulmonese: A Newly Discovered Latin Grammar of the Quattrocento,” “The *Orthographia* of Gasparino Barzizza,” and “Lorenzo Valla and the Criterion of Exemplary Usage.” The book concludes with an index of manuscripts and a thorough general index.

Collections like these serve several useful purposes. For one, when they print together four magisterial overviews of the same subject by the same person, they remind us of how a field can come to be dominated for a generation or more by the work of one scholar. Also, by paying attention to the dates of original publication, the reader can follow the trajectory of intellectual interests in an important person’s career. And when the subject is grammar, a field which is not only interesting in itself but serves as the basis for all further work in Neo-Latin studies, the decision to republish is even easier to justify. I am happy to have these essays collected together in one place on my bookshelf, and I am confident that many other readers of this journal will feel the same way. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ John Monfasani. *Greeks and Latins in Renaissance Italy: Studies on Humanism and Philosophy in the Fifteenth Century*. Variorum Collected Studies Series. Aldershot, Hampshire and Burlington, Vt.: Ashgate Publishing, 2004. xii + 334 pp. \$111.95. John Monfasani, the distinguished scholar who is currently the executive director of the Renaissance Society of America, is the only person I know to have had not one, not two, but three groups of his essays collected and reprinted in Ashgate’s Variorum Collected Studies Series. The volume under review here joins *Language and Learning in Renaissance Italy: Selected Articles* (1994) and *Byzantine Scholars in Renaissance Italy: Cardinal Bessarion and Other Emigrés* (1995), this time gathering together essays originally published between 1993 and 2002.

The essays collected here represent some new topics for Monfasani (e.g., Marsilio Ficino, Nicholas of Cusa, Giovanni Gatti, and Italian scholasticism) and some new observations on topics of longstanding interest to him (e.g., Lorenzo Valla, Theodore Gaza, the Plato-Aristotle controversy, and Greek émigrés to Renaissance Italy). Their titles give a good indication of the range of Monfasani’s interests: “Greek Renaissance Migrations,” “The Averroism of John Argyropoulos and His *Quaestio utrum intellectus humanus sit perpetuus*,” “L’insegnamento de Teodoro Gaza a Ferrara,” “Theodore Gaza as a Philosopher: A Preliminary Survey,” “Greek and Latin Learning in Theodore

Gaza's *Antirrheticon*," "The Pseudo-Aristotelian *Problemata* and Aristotle's *De Animalibus* in the Renaissance," "Giovanni Gatti of Messina: A Profile and an Unedited Text," "Nicholas of Cusa, the Byzantines, and the Greek Language," "Marsilio Ficino and the Plato-Aristotle Controversy," "Aristotelians, Platonists, and the Missing Ockhamists: Philosophical Liberty in Pre-Reformation Italy," "The Theology of Lorenzo Valla," and "*Disputationes Vallianae*." As Monfasani notes in the short preface to the volume, all but two of these essays result from an invitation from a conference organizer or volume editor. On the one hand, this is eloquent testimony to the esteem in which the author is held in the international scholarly community. But it also means that the essays were originally published in collections from Florence, Ferrara, Naples, and Padua in Italy, and from Leiden, Berlin, Copenhagen, and Lille in the rest of Europe. Even a bad university library will have the article originally published in *Renaissance Quarterly*, and a good one should have the ones published in *Italian History and Culture* and *I Tatti Studies*, but when we move to volumes of conference proceedings from Lille and Copenhagen, we quickly get to the point where even a scholar at one of the best universities in North America will be driven repeatedly to Interlibrary Loan. It is therefore well worth the effort (and the rather hefty price) to have these essays collected together in an accessible format, since their author represents, in the spirit of his mentor, the late Paul Oskar Kristeller, a kind of scholarship that is rapidly disappearing (at least in the U.S.), one that is equally at home among intellectual historians and philosophers and that rests on a facility in both Greek and Latin that surpasses that of many professional classicists. Since this is a book review rather than a eulogy—indeed, we have every reason to believe that the author will give us a fourth volume in the series a few years from now—I shall leave this last line of reasoning behind and simply recommend that you order this book, at least for your university if not for your personal library. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Silva: Estudios de humanismo y tradición clásica*. Vol. 2 (2003). 426 pp. This is the second volume of a new annual devoted to humanistic studies and the classical tradition, published by the University of León. This issue contains eleven articles, along with seventy-five pages of book reviews, and unlike many publications from southern Europe, it concludes with a thorough, twenty-page index.

The volume opens with “Los libros y las lecturas del humanista,” in which Vicente Bécara Botas draws on a quantitative analysis of library and bookstore inventories to show that for humanists in Spain, Greek authors like Aristotle, Josephus, Plutarch, Ptolemy, and Aesop (in that order) and modern authors like Erasmus, Valla, Nebrija, Budé, Vives, Politian, and Petrarch were the most popular reading choices. In “*De varia republica*. política y Biblia en Arias Montano,” Natalio Fernández Marcos provides an imaginative analysis of Arias Montano’s commentary to the book of Judges (1592), which is used to support his role as adviser to Philip the Second in the Netherlands. José Manuel Floristán Imízcoz presents new data in “Intérpretes de lenguas orientales en la Corte de los Austrias: tres notas prosopográficas” on the life and activity of three men, Diego de Urrea, Francisco de Gurmendi, and David Colville, who served kings Philip II, III, and IV as interpreters of eastern languages. In “Literatura y filosofía. De la inspiración entusiástica de Descartes en Plauto,” Benjamín García Hernández continues to develop the implications of his unexpected, but convincing, argument that the philosophical system of Descartes is built on the plot of Plautus’s *Amphitruo*. Francisco Garrote Pérez, in turn, uses “El «ascenso platónico» o el poder transformador de la belleza. Un proyecto humanista de realización personal,” to show how the Petrarchist ‘platonic ascent’ through beauty to perfection plays itself out in Spanish humanism. “Tras las huellas de don Juan de Persia y otras persas,” by Luis Gil Fernández, is a fascinating account of how a sizeable number of the retinue of Persian ambassadors from Shah Abbas I of Persia to Philip III, the best-known being Don Juan of Persia, converted to Christianity and remained in the service of the Spanish court. In “*La Vida de Boecio* de Francisco de Moncada y el Conde de Rebolledo,” Rafael González Cañal sorts out the circumstances of the publication of the life of Boethius and takes note of how the author uses this work to comment on concerns about the power and training of the prince that are tied to his own, later culture. The interests of Felipe González Vega are evident in his title, “Indicios de una determinación del lector implícito en el comentario literario de Antonio de Nebrija y otros humanistas de su tiempo,” which turns into an imaginative application of reader-response theory to Nebrija’s dedicatory prologues and inaugural lectures, along with the *Flores rhetorici* of Fernando Manzanares, his disciple at Salamanca. Juan Antonio López Férrez, in “Notas sobre la historia de los estudios clásicos en España, con atención especial al Griego: desde el siglo

XIII hasta 1936,” provides a detailed overview of a subject at the core of humanistic studies, concluding that the history of Greek teaching and scholarship is better documented than Latin, but that both reveal a long attitude of careless neglect on the part of the state. Rosa Navarro Durán’s “El «Lazarillo» como palimpsesto de las lecturas de Alfonso de Valdés” traces the imprint of the author’s reading through several of his works. And finally, “Los manuscritos griegos copiados por el Pinciano” of Juan Signes Codoñer is a painstaking, and successful, attempt to trace the development of the handwriting of Hernán Núñez de Guzmán, called ‘el Pinciano,’ a Spanish humanist of the sixteenth century who left his library to the University of Salamanca in 1548 (see the review of *Biblioteca y epistolario de Hernán Núñez de Guzmán (El Pinciano)* earlier in this issue of NLN).

The essays in this volume are of notably high quality, especially for a new journal, and reflect well the range of activity at present among Spanish Neo-Latinists. Some of the essays are on figures who are discussed regularly in studies of Spanish humanism, like Nebrija, Arias Montano, and el Pinciano, while others, like the essays of Floristán Imízcoz and Gil Fernández, explore relatively untrodden paths. Traditional one-author studies appear, as do essays like that of López Férez, which offers instructive reading to non-Spanish as well as Spanish Neo-Latinists. It is also worth noting that this issue contains good examples of the prosopographical and paleographical studies that are done so well in Spain, as well as an effort by González Vega to bring a theoretical perspective to humanism that would look avant-garde in the U.S. as well as Spain. Finally, it is worth noting that the essays of Floristán Imízcoz and Gil Fernández demonstrate very clearly the connections with the east that give Spanish humanism its distinctive flavor. All in all, this is a journal that should be taken by every library that aims to support serious research in Neo-Latin studies. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Jacob Burckhardt’s Social and Political Thought*. By Richard Sigurdson. Toronto, Buffalo, and London: University of Toronto Press, 2004. xii + 279 pp. \$55. Much has been written over the last hundred years about Jacob Burckhardt (1818-1897), the great Swiss historian who remains important enough now to justify the preparation of a complete, critical edition of his writings, projected for twenty-seven volumes. His most influential book is certainly *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy* (1860), which remains a seminal

document in the modern understanding of early modern culture. Sigurdson develops a new perspective on Burckhardt in this book by virtue of his training as a political scientist, which leads him to explore such major themes in Burckhardt's political writings as the relationship between the individual and society, the tensions between equality and excellence, the quality and nature of culture in an age of mass participation, and the role of the intellectual in the modern world. As Sigurdson shows, Burckhardt self-consciously looked at the past with an eye on the present—that is, “[i]t is indeed because he can orient himself to the past that he is able to criticize the present with such acumen and realism” (223). Burckhardt, in other words, used his historical perspective to argue that the foundation for a sense of collective identity lies not in our place as citizens of an artificial nation-state, but in our participation in a common culture. Culture, in turn, makes us free—free from political coercion and from religious dogmatism. The only meaningful justification for life in the modern world is an aesthetic one, which can produce the autonomous, self-fashioned individual whose model Burckhardt sought in the past. This approach is difficult to pigeonhole. On the one hand, a thinker who distrusts human nature, values order, believes in a natural inequality of individuals, and looks to tradition and custom to provide guidance for the future looks like a conservative. Yet Burckhardt's analysis of freedom and the emphasis on the individual resembles classic liberalism, and his stress on genius, the preemptive power of creativity, the uniqueness of the individual, and the pre-eminence of culture led directly to the development of these themes in the work of Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900), who regarded Burckhardt as his mentor. This explains, partly at least but in a new way, why Burckhardt remains so controversial: it is easy to lament the levelling effects of modern mass democratic culture, but less easy to accept the alternative, that society should be organized to train a cultural elite, even a solitary genius, at the expense of a broadly educated and refined citizenry. Separating aesthetics from politics in turn seems reasonable, indeed laudatory, to some and ideologically naive to others.

As a specialist in contemporary politics, Sigurdson analyzes Burckhardt's historical writing for what it can tell us about his views on the society of his own day. Readers of this journal might want to perform the opposite exercise, asking themselves how Burckhardt's political thought helped shape the history he wrote, then the way we see the Renaissance as heirs of Burckhardt.

The humanist education on which the achievements of Neo-Latin literary culture were constructed was never designed for the masses, and now and again it is probably good for us to think about how the material we study fits more broadly into the culture from which it emerged. It is also probably good for us to interrogate ourselves in the same way as Sigurdson interrogated Burckhardt, asking how our own ideas about politics and the arts in our society affect the way we see these things in the past. The value of this book for a Neo-Latinist is therefore not direct, but as a stimulus for broader thinking about what we do and why we do it. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Nova de veteribus. Mittel- und neulateinische Studien für Paul Gerhard Schmidt.* Ed. by Andreas Bihrer and Elisabeth Stein. Munich and Leipzig: K. G. Saur, 2004. xxx + 1121 pp. 224 Euros. The essays published in this volume constitute a *Festschrift* for P. G. Schmidt, designed to reflect the breadth of his interests in postclassical Latin. It is a humbling experience to look through the sixteen pages that list Professor Schmidt's published work over the last forty years; given this level of activity, it should not surprise us to find a good many scholars, from Germany and abroad, who wanted to contribute to the volume. A list of their contributions gives an adequate idea of the riches contained in this book: Bernhard Zimmerman, "Et vidi et perii. Zu Ovids Medea-Epistel (Heroides XII)"; Peter Stotz, "Bilder des Bösewichts: Judas Ischariot in lateinischen Texten der Spätantike und des Mittelalters. Eine Skizze"; Dieter Schaller, "Schicksale des Asclepiadeus im Übergang zum Mittelalter"; Marie-Luise Weber, "Die Merovingerkönigin Brunichilde in den Quellen des lateinischen Mittelalters"; Rolf Heine, "Zu einer Schnalleninschrift aus Andernach"; Michael W. Herren, "The 'Cosmography' of Aethicus Ister: Speculations about its date, provenance, and audience"; Michael Lapidge, "Bede and the 'Versus de die iudicii'"; I Deug-Su, "Ut merear te in fratris locum accipere. un appello di fratellanza di Leoba a Bonifacio Vinfrido"; Ulrich Schindel, "De septem artibus liberalibus—ein unedierter anonymer Traktat aus dem 8. Jahrhundert"; Walter Bershin, "De moribus perfectionis. Beitrag zur Lokalisierung und Datierung der 'Althochdeutschen Benediktinerregel' St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek 916"; Francesco Stella, "Autor und Zuschreibungen des 'Karolus magnus et Leo Papa'"; Michael D. Reeve, "Boethius, Cassiodorus, and Vegetius"; Thomas Zotz, "Ludwig der Fromme oder Ludwig der

Gnädige? Zur Herrschertugend der *pietas* im frühen und hohen Mittelalter?; Hildegard L. C. Tristram, “Bede’s ‘Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum’ in Old English and Old Irish: a comparison”; Peter Dronke, “The Latin and French Eulalia sequences”; Birger Munk Olsen, “Le réception de Stace au moyen âge (du IX<sup>e</sup> au XII<sup>e</sup> siècle)”; Luc Deitz, “Ein Boethius-Fund und seine Bedeutung. Bnl, Ms. 770, und die Echternacher Klosterschule um das Jahr 1000”; Michael Borgolte, “Zwischen Erfindung und Kanon. Zur Konstruktion der Fakten im europäischen Hochmittelalter”; François Dolbeau, “Deux catalogues inédits de bibliothèques médiévales”; Giovanni Orlandi, “Dall’Italia del nord alla Lotaringia (e ritorno?). Un capitolo nella storia delle *laudes civitatum*”; Elisabeth van Houts, “The epitaph of Gundrada of Warenne”; Ulrich Mölk, “Eine neue Datierung und andere Präzisierungen zur Überlieferung der ‘Historia de preliis’”; Pascale Bourgain, “La honte du héros”; Thomas Haye, “Das ‘Antidotum’ des Magister Wilhelm: Eine rhythmische Werbeschrift für den jungen Grammontenserorden (ca. 1130 / 1140)”; Fritz Lošek, “Antikes, Biblisches und Christliches in der ‘Vita Altmanni’”; Jürgen Petersohn, “Spirituelle Dimensionen der Prüfeningener Vita Bischof Ottos I. von Bamberg”; Felix Heinzer, “Imaginierte Passion – Vision im Spannungsfeld zwischen liturgischer Matrix und religiöser Erfahrung bei Elisabeth von Schönau”; Christel Meier, “*Per visibilia ad invisibilia*? Mittelalterliche Visionsikonographie zwischen analoger, negativer und ‘analytischer’ Ästhetik”; Stefano Pittaluga, “Boezio, Goffredo da Viterbo e la ruota della Fortuna”; Kurt Smolak, “*Semivir arma tulit*. Zu den mittellateinischen ‘Causae Aiakis et Ulixis’”; Alois Wolf, “Metamorphosen des Schauens: Narziß, Troubadours und die drei Blutstropfen im Schnee”; Fritz Wagner, “Der entrückte Mönch”; Ruth Schmidt-Wiegand, “*Qui prior est tempore potior est iure*. Eine lateinische Rechtsregel und ihre Entsprechungen im ‘Sachsenspiegel’ Eikes von Repgow”; Arthur G. Rigg, “‘Descriptio Northfolchie’: A critical edition”; Michele C. Ferrari, “Johannes Damascenus in Franken. Zur Rekontextualisierung arabo-griechischer Erzählstoffe bei Vinzenz von Beauvais, Hugo von Trimberg und anderen Autoren”; Monika Rener, “*Ne fragmanta pereant*. Zwei bisher nicht beachtete Viten der heiligen Elisabeth”; Francesco Santi, “La trasmissione delle ‘Quaestiones quas quaesivit quidem frater minor Raimundo’”; Agostino Sottili, “Albertino Mussato, Erasmo, l’Epistolario di Seneca con San Paolo”; C. H. Kneepkens, “The Reception of Boethius’ ‘Consolatio’ in the Later Middle Ages: Trevet, Whetely and the Question-Commentary, Oxford, Exeter C., 28”; Dieter Mertens,

“Mont Ventoux, Mons Alvernae, Kapitol und Parnass. Zur Interpretation von Petrarca's Brief Fam. IV, 1 ‘De curis propriis’”; Christian Heitzmann, “Giannozzo Manetti und das Erdbeben von 1456. Christlicher Humanismus und empirische Naturwissenschaft”; Heinz Erich Stiene, “Daphnis und Daphne: Vergilisches und Ovidisches in der ersten Ekloge Naldo Naldis’”; Peter Walthert, “Rudolf Agricolas Rektoratsrede für Johannes von Dalberg’”; Christian Berger, “Die *animata*, oder: Wie Johannes Tinctoris Halbtontschritte zu beschreiben versucht’”; Dieter Wuttke, “Film vor dem Film’: Zur lateinischen Buchanzeige von Hartmann Schedels ‘Liber chronicarum’”; Peter Orth, “Rom an der Regnitz, Babylon an der Pegnitz. Beobachtungen zur ‘Norimberga’ des Konrad Celtis’”; Hartmut Broszinski, “Spuren klösterlicher Alchemie in Kasseler Handschriften des 15. und 16. Jahrhunderts’”; Reinhard Düchting, “Helius Eobanus Hessus *Baccho debacchatus*’”; Eckart Schäfer, “Renatus Henerus: ‘Bucolica’ (Paris 1551). Hirtenlieder im Exil’”; Marc Laureys, “Das osmanische Reich aus der Sicht des Genueser Historikers Uberto Foglietta’”; José Manuel Díaz de Bustamante, “About the *visio Ezechielis*, the Fathers of the Church, the emblematic tradition and the Latin *praefatio* to the ‘Biblia del Oso’ (1569) of Casiodoro Reyna’”; Walter Jarecki, “Die Verdener Bischofsgeschichte des Elard von der Hude’”; Fidel Rädle, “Keuschheit und Abenteuer. Hieronymus’ ‘Vita Malchi’ und ihre Wiederkehr auf der Jesuitenbühne’”; Gerlinde Huber-Rebenich, “Visuelle *argumenta* zu den ‘Metamorphosen’ Ovids. Die Illustrationen des Giacomo Franco und ihre Tradition’”; Eckard Lefèvre, “Zeisig und Dichter (Jakob Balde, Lyr. 3. 43)’”; Ludwig Braun, “Warum ist der Acinaces krumm?’”; Pierre Petitmengin, “Notes de dom Calmet sur des manuscrits conservés en Lorraine et dans les pays voisins (avec le premier catalogue de Sélestat)’”; Helga Schmidt, “‘Vor uns lag das stolze Rom ...’ Arnold Hermann Ludwig Heeren als Reisender in Rom 1786’”; Volker Schupp, “Ekkehard von St. Gallen und ‘Konrad von Alzey’. Zwei mittelalterliche Dichterfiguren im 19. Jahrhundert’”; Haijo Jan Westra, “The centaur in the garden: Anne Payne on Menippean satire’”; Ewald Könsgen, “‘Der Nordstern scheint auf den Pol.’ Baudolinos Liebesbriefe an Beatrix, die Kaiserin – oder ‘Ex epistolis duorum amantium.’”

This volume does an admirable job of reminding us, as Professor Schmidt did in his own work, that the dividing line between medieval Latin and Neo-Latin is not a rigid one. The result, however, is that not all of the essays here will interest readers of this journal. That would not necessarily be

a problem, except for the price, which is almost \$300 at the current rate of exchange. I would definitely recommend purchase, but by university libraries, not individuals. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Catalogue of Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts in the Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library Yale University*, vol. 4: MSS 481-485. By Robert G. Babcock, Lisa Fagin Davis, and Philip G. Rusche. Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 176. Tempe, Ariz.: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, and Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2004. xxviii + 459 pp. 150 plates. \$55. This book is the fourth in the series of manuscript catalogues from the Beinecke Library, but it is also considerably more than that. Beinecke shelf numbers MS 481, 482, 483, 484, and 485 denote five discrete collections of manuscript fragments, the first two originally compiled by the Rev. Franz-Josef Zinniker of Lucerne, Switzerland to serve as a paleographical collection documenting the Latin bookhands used during the Middle Ages. These fragment collections are indeed useful for this purpose, providing, *inter alia*, a seventh-century leaf with part of the Gospel of Luke written *per cola et commata* (481.1), several leaves of Notker Balbulus's sequences, with musical notation written in the margins instead of above the text (481.39), and an apparently unique Pilgrim's Guide to Jerusalem, which may have been used as an amulet (181.77). These fragment collections are also, as the cataloguers eloquently note, "the battered remnants of otherwise lost books from the Middle Ages" (11). With luck and hard work, volumes like the early commonplace book of Boccaccio's studied by Virginia Brown ("Boccaccio in Naples: The Beneventan Liturgical Palimpsest of the Laurentian Autographs (MSS. 29.8 and 33.31)," *Italia Medioevale e Umanistica* 34 (1991): 41-126) can be recovered by analyzing their dismembered leaves. The Beinecke collections contain their own rarities, like a leaf from a pre-Vulgate Latin translation of Judges (482.1), another leaf from a portion of Dynus de Mugello's *Super Infortiatio* that is not attested elsewhere (483.20), and one of the earliest surviving witnesses to Leonardo Bruni's Latin translation of Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* (481.123). Yet despite the research potential that fragments offer, few catalogues devoted exclusively to them have been published.

Because there are so few models, pioneer cataloguers like the Beinecke team have to work out matters of procedure and format that do not trouble those working with larger units. Their guiding principle is clearly stated: "to

present the researcher with as much information as possible that might help in identifying other surviving fragments from the same original manuscript” (xiv). This in turn might provide more information about the origin or provenance of the Beinecke fragments, and in general about the lost medieval books from which the fragments come. As a result the descriptions here are not shorter than the ones of the complete, or almost complete, manuscripts in the preceding volume, but longer, written to a template specially designed with the advice of Richard Rouse. In line with this goal, the catalogue also contains a picture of every single fragment in the five collections, printed clearly on glossy paper at the end of the volume. (In contrast to the *Festschrift* just reviewed, this catalogue is a bargain!)

It would be difficult to overstate what has been achieved here. Given that the work from which almost every fragment comes has been identified, one can only guess at how many hours of painstaking labor have gone into this project. The template developed for this catalogue should be transferable with few, if any modifications. One can hope that this will lead to other catalogues of similar collections, but also to renewed attention to the many manuscript fragments that were recycled as flyleaves, pastedowns, or covers in early printed books. Surely such fragments will no longer be removed, as the ones in these collections were, but descriptions of them can be incorporated into catalogues of the books in which they are now found or into separate publications and databases. From this, we should be able to add considerably to our knowledge of the literary cultures of the ages before us. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

**Proceedings of the Milton Society of America  
Radisson Plaza-Warwick Hotel, Philadelphia  
December 28, 2004**

**Secretary: A. C. Labriola [Labriola@duq.edu](mailto:Labriola@duq.edu)**

The officers and Executive Committee met in a preliminary session at 4:00 PM at the Radisson Plaza-Warwick Hotel. Present were Charles W. Durham (President), Edward Jones (Vice President), Labriola (Secretary), Diana Treviño Benet (Treasurer) and the following members of the Executive Committee: Stephen B. Dobranski, Angelica Duran, Elizabeth Skerpan-Wheeler, and Paul Stevens. Excused were Gardner Campbell and Jeffrey Shoulson.

**OFFICERS AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.** The following members of the society were nominated for offices: Edward Jones for President; Laura L. Knoppers for Vice President; and Margaret Arnold and Thomas Luxon for three-year membership (2005-2007) on the Executive Committee, replacing Elizabeth Skerpan-Wheeler and Paul Stevens.

**TREASURER'S REPORT.** Benet indicated that the assets and net worth of the society as of July 1, 2004, were \$9,800.00. Benet and Labriola stressed the importance of donations and space advertisements as sources of revenue in order to stabilize the cost of the annual dinner at \$55.00. Benet will monitor the added revenues and report whether they are adequate to cover the mounting costs of the dinner and the increased expenses of printing the booklet, postage, and the like.

**COMMITTEE ON SCHOLARLY AWARDS.** Benet indicated that Joseph Wittreich will serve as chair. She has a list of other distinguished Miltonists (chiefly past recipients of the awards) as eventual replacements for the present committee members. To ease the burden of the committee, entrants will be encouraged, but not required, to submit multiple copies of their works, one for each member of the committee.

SECRETARY'S REPORT. Labriola indicated that his announcements were printed on pages 4-5 of the annual booklet. He announced the names of the members of the society who are recently deceased: David Dickson, Edward Le Comte, Earl Miner, Elizabeth Sims, John Wooten.

OPEN MEETINGS AT MLA 2005 in Washington, D. C. The following open meetings, each 75 minutes long, were approved: "John Milton: A General Session," with Edward Jones presiding and "Milton's America, America's Milton," with Paul Stevens presiding.

NOTE THE FOLLOWING RULES FOR MEETINGS:

The chairs should have one-page proposals/abstracts submitted electronically by March 20<sup>th</sup>. Usually three papers are chosen, and the chair may appoint a respondent; or two longer papers may be selected, with or without a respondent; or a panel discussion might be organized. The chair must submit the names of participants, academic affiliations, and titles of presentations to Labriola (**Labriola@duq.edu**) no later than April 1st. Labriola will place an announcement concerning the open meetings in the upcoming *MLA Newsletter*; Benet will also include notice in her upcoming letter to all members; and the chairs of the open meetings are urged to publicize in other ways. All presenters must be members of MLA. If not, they must join by April 1st unless their specialty is something other than language and literature, in which cases they must seek, through Labriola, special permission for their participation from the MLA Executive Director. Chairs are encouraged to be in contact with each other to be sure that they are not considering duplicate papers and to call attention to papers that may seem more suitable for the other's open meeting.

At the executive session after the general business meeting, the following were present: Jones (President), Knoppers (Vice President), Labriola (Secretary), Benet (Treasurer), Dobranski, Duran, Luxon. Excused were Arnold, Campbell, and Shoulson of the Executive Committee. Labriola and Benet

Approximately 70 members and guests attended the dinner and meeting at which Durham presided. The James Holly Hanford Award for a distinguished essay recognized the excellence of the following: David Norbrook, "John Milton, Lucy Hutchinson and the Republican Biblical Epic," in *Milton and the Grounds of Contention*, ed. Mark R. Kelley, Michael Lieb, and John T. Shawcross (Pittsburgh: Duquesne UP, 2003), pp. 37-63, 292-293. The James Holly Hanford Award for a distinguished book recognized the excellence of Neil Forsyth, *The Satanic Epic* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 2003). The Irene Samuel Memorial Award recognized the excellence of the following multi-author collection: *Paradise Regained in Context: Genre, Politics, Religion, Milton Studies* 42, ed. Albert C. Labriola and David Loewenstein (Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 2003). The featured address, "Studied Argument," was given by J. Martin Evans. Dennis Danielson, Professor of English, University of British Columbia, cited J. Martin Evans, William R. Kenan Jr. Professor of English, Stanford University, as Honored Scholar of 2004.

At the executive session after the general business meeting, the following were present: Jones (President), Knoppers (Vice President), Labriola (Secretary), Benet (Treasurer), Dobranski, Duran, Luxon. Excused were Arnold, Campbell, and Shoulson of the Executive Committee. Labriola and Benet were reappointed Secretary and Treasurer, respectively. Benet was empowered to choose a site for the 2005 dinner and meeting in Washington, D. C. Gordon Campbell was the nominee for Honored Scholar of 2005 and for featured speaker at the dinner-meeting.

